

Bryant University

HONORS THESIS



Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workplace

BY Elena Freedman

ADVISOR • Allison Butler

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation
with honors in the Bryant University Honors Program
April 2016

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Introduction	
Introduction to Greek Life	2
Literature Review	4
Stereotypes	4
Contact and Social Identity Theories	9
Stereotype Threat Theory	14
Leadership Benefits	15
Well-Being: Purpose, Social, Financial, Community and Physical	18
Research Questions and Purpose	21
Methodology	
Participants	24
Data Sources	25
Procedures	28
Results	
Non-Greek Undergraduate Student Survey	29
Greek Undergraduate Student Survey	30
Greek Alumni Survey	34
Hiring Professional Survey	36
Comparisons between groups	37
Discussion	44
Conclusion	50
Appendices	
Appendix A- Stereotype Subscales	53
Appendix B- Non-Greek Undergraduate Survey	54
Appendix C- Greek Undergraduate Survey	57
Appendix D- Greek Alumni Survey	61
Appendix E- Hiring Personnel Survey	66
Appendix F- Sorority Stereotype Ranking by Group	71
Appendix G- Fraternity Stereotype Ranking by Group	72
Appendix H- Professional Benefits Ranking by Group	73
References	74

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine perceptions of Greek students by four specific groups of people: undergraduate Greek students, undergraduate students who are not members of Greek organizations, Greek alumni, and hiring personnel. In addition, hiring professionals' opinions and perceptions of Greek students were further explored to determine whether membership in a Greek organization is seen as an asset or a liability in the workforce. Attained or expected skills as a result of membership in a Greek organization were also elicited from Greek students, Greek alumni, and hiring personnel. Data analysis of stereotype responses showed that Greek students and Greek alumni tend to hold more favorable opinions of those involved in Greek organizations, and the belief of both groups differed from beliefs held by both non-Greek students and hiring personnel.

INTRODUCTION

At their origin on college campuses, fraternities and sororities were held in high regard as an elite group of scholars. Currently, however, fraternities have been making headlines for hazardous hazing rituals, unsafe alcohol consumption, and themes promoting racism and rape culture. For example, the Sigma Alpha Epsilon chapter at the University of Oklahoma was shut down when a video was released of members singing racist chants on a bus. Sororities are not immune to the backlash, also suffering the consequences of stories of hazing as well as criticisms of vanity as some believed was shown in a recruitment video created by Alpha Phi at the University of Alabama during the summer of 2015. Criticisms of the video were based on appearance proclaiming that the video represented only tall, blonde women and everything, including the women, appears artificial.

Many modern-day fraternities had very different origins than what appears to be their current purpose, typically deriving from underground secret organizations. For example, the first fraternity was founded in 1776, although it had existed 26 years prior as the “Flat Hat Club” which specialized in social and literary activities (“General History of Fraternities”, 2014). Despite their lack of Greek specificity, these organizations held similar values and symbols including mottos, badges, rituals, and fraternal bonds. The first sorority then emerged in 1831 when Greeks began to act as a network (Glass, 2012). These groups were able to meet to discuss topics of interest otherwise not mentioned as well as to prepare for future careers. As time and rules evolved, these groups became more social in nature as they began to abandon their literary and political roots.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

As Greek organizations are often riddled in controversy by media, it is important to look at how these Greek men and women are perceived by each other and also their non-Greek peers at school. Are these unfortunate stories specific instances or a glimpse into life of Greek culture? Are the women seen as stereotypical sorority women who lack individualism, while the men are viewed as unmotivated party animals who drink their days away? Among those involved in Greek organizations, do members associated specific stereotypes and traits to those involved in a different chapter? Literature has shown to answer these questions and determine the strength of stereotypes that exist. Additionally, literature has begun to explore benefits those in the Greek community have received as a result of membership in their respective organizations.

The process of examining stereotypes and perceptions of those involved in Greek life is beneficial as it affects such a large number of people. The number of Greeks alone are astounding. As of 2012, The North American Interfraternity Conference (NIC) contains 75 Greek letter organizations with 5,500 chapters in the US, for a total of roughly 350,000 fraternity men (Patick, 2014, p. 4). The National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) shows impressive numbers as well, with 26 organizations, 3,078 chapters and 300,000 sorority women in 2011 (Patrick, 2014, p. 4). This total of over 600,000 Greek members doesn't even include members of the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) which is comprised of nine historically African American fraternities and sororities, local chapters that are not affiliated with a national organization, or the National Multicultural Greek Council (NMGC) which contains twelve additional organizations. With this many people involved in Greek

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

organizations, it is important that researchers go to a greater length to understand this cultural phenomenon.

Although Greeks are certainly affected by stereotypes and the personal opinions of others, the actions and depictions of fraternity and sorority members affect many more people. Publicity on behalf of collegiate Greeks, whether good or bad, directly affects the administration of the school. It may give university officials something to promote, but unfortunately more often times the university is forced to deal with damage control (Kleiner, 1999, 74). This can impact how potential students, alumni, and donors feel about the school and can thus affect funding and enrollment.

Stereotypes

The literature on the topic of stereotypes is robust, encompassing a wide range of both Greek and non-Greek participants, research questions pertaining to both personal experiences and the ideas of Greek life as a whole, and methods including surveys and focus groups. A vast amount of research has focused on how members view other members as well as how non-affiliated students view those involved in fraternities and sororities. The studies also used a wide variety of methods, including psychological theories and methods of stereotype measurement. In the process of determining the prevalence of stereotypes on a college campus, there are multiple ways this can be determined. A study conducted by Tollini and Wilson (2010) focused on the negative stereotypes asking members of five fraternities in separate focus groups to choose the stereotypes they have personally heard about. The questions were based on fraternities at the specific school the participants attended and were

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

related to finding the most prevalent and the most damaging stereotypes in the eyes of these specific fraternity men. The men were requested to not only state the stereotypes, but also explain the accuracy and applicableness they think apply. The open focus groups allowed for coercion from other members to agree with the majority of the group however once results were tabulated it was evident that this was not a factor.

While there was some overlap, the five different fraternities provided a number of answers to the questions asked by researchers. The answer that all five fraternities provided, however, was the stereotype of excessive alcohol use. Multiple participants believed non-Greeks “believed fraternity members did not engage in other activities (e.g., community service and attending classes) because of their alcohol consumption” (Tollini & Wilson, 2010, p. 36). The stereotype did not just relate to legal activities however, as multiple members pointed out the concern that fraternities were tightly bound with the idea of both underage drinking and wild, dangerous parties that could result in bodily injury.

Other common stereotypes mentioned by the fraternity men included womanizing, paying for friends, arrogance, as well as hazing, poor academic performance and a lack of community service. While some members mentioned womanizing as in mistreatment or the use of Rohypnol, another member spoke of a more systematic plan of “sexual conquest” including “sharing” women with brothers or “mov[ing] though one...group of women just as fast as he can” (Tollini & Wilson, 2010, p. 38). The stereotype of womanizing as well as paying for friends was introduced by four of the five fraternities while the rest listed were brought up by three or less.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

As for the accuracy of the stereotypes, participants felt the only accurate stereotypes were related to paying for friends and more alcohol use than non-affiliates. An observation in this study, however, was the participant's declaration that while some of the stereotypes may have been true, they were exhibited by a different fraternity and not their own.

This same sentiment was echoed in another study which looked at sorority women where the women "did not deny that these negative attributes described sororities in general..." (Biernat, Vescio & Green, 1996, p. 1199). The study about selective stereotyping explored the self-categorization theory and its relevance to the social identity theory. The authors introduced a paradox related to the theory stating a rejection of negative stereotypes means a denial of part of the social identity, however accepting this kind of negative publicity and perception works against the advancement of a chapter or organization. To further explore this, sorority women were asked to rate 28 traits as most applicable to the participant's own sorority, sororities at the college in general, or students at the college in general.

In addition to grouping traits based on these three categories of people, the participants used the percent estimate task to identify what percent of members within the chosen category exhibited the specific behavior. As expected based on the hypothesis, participants rated their own sororities the highest when faced with positive attributes but the lowest when faced with negative attributes. Negative attributes such as conceited, conforming and judgmental were denied for the participants personal sorority however "respondents ascribed the most negative traits to sororities in general" showing that the women did not completely self-stereotype (Biernat, Vescio & Green, 1996, p. 1199). A second related study that only gave the options

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

of sorority versus all students of the college found sorority women higher in positive and negative attributes, showing a clear endorsement of stereotypes.

The percent trait task was also used in other studies to compare homogeneity between in-group and out-group members. Sorority members were asked to rank the sororities from most to least liked by giving a trait that characterized each sorority and the percent that they members felt fit that trait in said sorority. Differences appeared between the most liked and least liked groups as the most liked groups saw trait percentages of 85% while the disliked sororities saw percentages of 75% (Koenig, 1999, p. 246). This means that while the sorority may have been less popular, other sorority members felt that less members fit a specific trait of the sorority than members fit the trait of a more liked sorority. Stereotypes for these positively perceived groups were therefore seen as stronger than stereotypes for negatively perceived organizations.

Another method used was the implicit associations test in which Greek and non-Greek participants were shown 10 organizations (five Greek and five academic or service) and 16 words, ten of which were “good” and ten of which were “bad.” Using computer software, participants were asked to differentiate between groups using a response key. This was done multiple times by associating Greek organizations with “good” words and with “bad.” Difficulty increased in subsequent rounds.

The results showed that Greeks were faster when associating Greek organizations with “good” words while non-Greeks were faster to associate Greek organizations with “bad”

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

words. This could be a result of in-group bias. Interestingly, results showed that non-Greek students exhibit more negative attitudes toward Greeks, as opposed to neutral. Researchers posed a reason for this, stating “both sets of results can be explained by the fact that group membership is an option...and so people with positive attitudes are more likely to join” (Wells & Corts, 2008, p. 845). This could, however, lead to a revelation of other social or professional groups that may harbor negative connotations.

These negative connotations could also be a reason that in recent years, sorority and fraternity retention and recruitment has decreased despite the expansion of multiple chapters across the country. This could be due to the organizations appearing less desirable due to a prevalence of stereotypes and negative stigma attached to Greek organizations. A study used the innovation decision model to identify the reason for this decrease in affiliation. The innovation decision model consists of five stages including knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation (Fouts, 2010, p. 25). Based on whether an innovation is considered to be favorable, it may be accepted or could be rejected if deemed unfavorable. In this instance, the innovation would be joining a fraternity or sorority and going through the process of becoming a member. This model is heavily dependent on the “users” interactions with affiliated members. The member acquisition and retention model is the process of converting non-members to members and requires substantial contact and media presence as well.

New members cited the source of their knowledge regarding Greek organizations to be friends, family, and television or movies. Participants who had never rushed a Greek

organization cited reasons of stereotypes, time commitment, obligations, lack of benefits, and financial constraints. When further pried about stereotypes, participants answered their negative perceptions related to “falsehood, snobbery, racial and sexual orientation, discrimination, sexual promiscuity, or harmful comments shared by athletic or other staff” (Fouts, 2010, p. 28). Select reasons for withdrawing were similar stating time commitment, value mismatch, alcohol, hazing, and sexual assault. Overall, friends and family were primary motivators for joining a Greek organization while negative perceptions detracted from the experience and ultimately led to potential members either withdrawing or not considering rushing at all.

Contact and Social Identity Theories

Additional studies regarding the stereotyping of members of Greek Life used a contact approach to elicit feelings from both members and non-members of the Greek community. One method introduced the notion of social identity theory, stating that the group a member belongs to “is represented in the individual member’s mind as a social identity that both describes and prescribes one’s attributes as a group member” (Robinson, W.P & Tajfel, 1996, p. 66). This theory is often cited in literature to explain how members of different groups interact.

A study conducted by Beirnat and Crandall (year) examined contact theory in its search to understand interactions amongst social groups. The researchers explained due to contact theory, they were able to “predict that contact of the sort that occurs among students on a college campus (e.g. equal status, cooperative context, opportunity for intimate connection)

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

will be positively associated with liking of the relevant group(s)” (Biernat & Crandall, 1994, p. 661). As opposed to measuring specific stereotypes with this study, the purpose was instead to determine the best way of measuring stereotypes in an accurate fashion.

While the contact hypothesis was the basis for this study, stereotypes were evaluated based on descriptive abilities, sensitivity to variations, and relationships with group contact and liking. As described in the introduction, the researchers were “most concerned with how to best measure stereotypes, and not with whether stereotypes....predict group attitudes” (Biernat & Crandall, 1994, p. 662). In order to determine the efficiency of these measurements, undergraduate participants completed questionnaires regarding the contact, liking, and stereotypes of three groups on campus. These groups included football players, sorority members, and students enrolled in the small liberal arts residential college on campus. Contact was measured with four questions, liking with three and stereotypes were determined using trait ascription based on Anderson’s list of personality traits. This study also included the use of the percent estimate task as a measure of stereotyping. Results showed that the trait ascription methods were the best performing.

Another study stated that in addition to contact theory, members were able to signify and differentiate their groups through comparisons to alternative groups, typically by negatively evaluating others why positively evaluating their own (Warber, K.M, Taylor, M.E., & Makstaller, D.C., 2011, p. 15-16). The importance of social identity theory falls in determining how groups differ from one another. Once these groups can be differentiated, perceptions amongst them can be obtained.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

The same study also discussed the concept of contact theory and its relevance to social identity theory. According to contact theory, “given optimal conditions, contact between antagonistic social groups will reduce prejudice and consequently improve intergroup relations” (Erasmus, 2010, p. 388). In relation to social identity theory, this means that once the individual member recognizes these attributes and compares themselves to other groups, it may harbor negative feelings, however, once more contact is made between groups, the negative feelings will gradually fade and ultimately lead to more friendly relations amongst groups.

In this study, feelings toward Greek students were determined using a questionnaire in which participants were asked about the last conversation they had with a member of Greek Life. The questionnaire was completed by both Greeks and non-members. Follow up questions elicited responses relating to who initiated the conversation, the duration of the conversation, as well as the actual topic that was discussed. Other questions included whether the conversation was voluntary and overall pleasant or not. Participants were measured on self-disclosure, trust, and salience. Overall, results showed that an increase in self-disclosure tended to decrease the perception of member deviance and in turn build trust between those involved in the conversation (Warber, Taylor, & Makstall, 2011). Furthermore, members perceived themselves as more stereotypical than non-members.

The contact hypothesis was documented in a third study regarding the perceptions of group distinctiveness. In this example, contact was used to determine the strength of stereotypes among four different groups of people. The groups included were based on housing arrangements

and included dormitory residents, fraternity members, sorority members, and students enrolled in a co-op program. The hypothesis suggested contact would likely decrease the strength of stereotypes, stating “two constructs are proposed as likely associated and predictors of stereotype strength: contact with and liking of the target group of interest” (Biernat, 1990, p. 1486). The conducted study looked at stereotype length as a dependent variable as participants were asked a variety of questions relating to the specific mentioned groups.

Questionnaires distributed to college students yielded results that supported the hypothesis. Despite sorority women being the most stereotyped group, the study concluded as people were more familiar with the groups and liking increased, they were less stereotyped. This held true for all four groups examined. Additionally, “there was indeed a significant positive relationship between number of acquaintances and interest in the group” (Biernat, 1990, p. 1494). Since this data was based on housing, however, the idea of interest could not be directly applied to liking as variables such as class year had the possibility of playing a factor.

Regarding stereotype length, Biernat conducted a second study that explored stereotype perceptions over a two year period. Results showed not only was the number of acquaintances in a specific group associated with liking, but there was a reduction in stereotypes over time. This was especially seen among the sorority women group. After the completion of both studies, Biernat came to the conclusion that contact resulted in greater liking, however it also resulted in greater stereotype strength. Results also showed that liking

led to a reduction in stereotype strength, while a strength reduction in stereotypes was evident over time regardless.

While still being longitudinal in nature, another study examined the process of going from out-group to in-group and its effect on stereotype accuracy. Sorority pledges were contacted four times over eight months to look for change in stereotype perception as the new members became more engrossed in the organization. Findings “indicated that new members initially perceived greater dispersion among out-group than among in-group members” which was inconsistent with differential familiarity (Ryan & Bogart, 2001, p. 119). These findings were based on questionnaires that asked questions regarding the initial impression of the sorority, subgroups within the sororities, and attributes complete with a percent estimate task.

As previously stated, the new members perceived the in-group as less positive as the socialization process continued, which was an unexpected result as it was expected as members became more comfortable and included in the group they would have more favorable opinions of it. A reason for this could be the new members joined with unrealistic expectations that the sororities could not live up to. As for accuracy, the study found “self-ratings revealed greater overall accuracy for the in-group the out-group and a general increase in accuracy over time” (Ryan & Bogart, 2001, p. 124). Despite this, over time, accuracy was greater for the out-group than the in-group although it is not possible to determine whether stereotypes were overstated or understated. Ultimately there is clear evidence that most stereotypes of fraternity men and sorority women have an overwhelmingly negative

perception. An overwhelming trend, however, showed stereotype strength decreases as affiliated members have more contact with non-Greeks as the contact increases trust.

Stereotype Threat Theory

While stereotypes are often misinformed generalized statements perpetuated by those not involved as part of the group, they are still important as they have a profound effect on those the stereotypes are attributed to. Claude Steele highlighted this in his stereotype threat theory in which “a negative emotional reaction...occurs when people realize the possibility of their confirming a negative stereotype about their group” (Cervone, 2015, p. 534). While this phenomenon was originally used to describe groups such as gender or ethnicity, it can be applied to social groups. If these sorority and fraternity members believe they may be embodying these negative stereotypes, they may also fear being reduced to said stereotypes, ignoring redeeming qualities whether they are more prevalent or not. The fraternity or sorority members may feel as though if they are expected to drink heavily or act in a snobby manner, they might as well engage in these behaviors as it is assumed by others that they already do.

This self-fulfilling prophecy acts as a perpetuator of stereotypes, and as the group becomes more aware of these stereotypes, they perform worse which causes the stereotype to continue (Breedlove, 2015, p. 658). The effects of stereotype threat include distraction and poor performance overall. Stereotype threat is at its height when an individual is trying to perform well on a task however is expected to perform poorly due to group affiliation and when this person is reminded of this stereotype (Cervone, 2015, p. 535). One of the most common

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

examples of this is the stereotype that girls aren't good at math, showing a reduction in test scores when this statement is made prior to an exam. This is the equivalent of saying that those involved in Greek Life are prone to excessive drinking on college campuses on a weekend. These members of Greek Life may feel that since this is expected of them they might as well engage in parties. Non-members will then see members partying on the weekends which will cause the stereotype to live on.

While it is clear negative stereotypes are emphasized, it is important to acknowledge there is a solid research base indicating the documented benefits Greek members obtain. The in-school benefits range from networking and developing leadership skills to increased academic support (Kokemuller, 2015). The majority of the research, however, focuses on post-graduation career benefits.

Leadership Benefits

Leadership and academic benefits were also examined as to determine consistent benefits and traits among Greek individuals. While there is a lack of research on Greek members during their post-graduate experience, these studies of traits that showed leadership and academic behaviors could potentially be transferred in a career setting. These traits that could include motivated, capable, and dedicated have the possibility of being further indicators of career success, and could potentially be worth highlighting to employers.

Currently, some believe challenges facing Greeks include diversity, faulty critical thinking skills, alcohol use, legal issues, lack of ethical development and standards/expectations

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

(Whipple, 1998, p. 87). According to some researchers, Greeks are not contributing to the educational mission of universities and will not do so until “Greek letter organizations understand, confront, and resolve the challenges that face them” (Whipple, 1998, p. 91). Once this is completed, Greek organizations can become learning communities that will benefit the entire campus. Strong leadership is necessary to implement change that will bring organizations back to their founding principles, making them “partners, facilitators, enablers, and guides” able to confront issues that erode their contributions to society.

A study that aimed to determine the perceptions of leadership in fraternities explored the use of the five factor model with the addition of dominance. The five factor model includes the traits intellect, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability. A clear distinction made in this study, however promotes the differences between motive and trait, in which motives are defined as ‘the underlying and often unexplored, desires of the individual,’ which, in the case of this study, is examined as Hope for Power and Fear of Power (Harms et al, 2006, p. 83). Participants in the study included fraternity and sorority members using a variety of methods to determine dominance, power motive, leadership identity, social influence, transformational leadership, as well as organization offices.

Despite no correlation between the big five traits and leadership, leaders were found to rank higher on dominance, hope for power, and leadership identity while ranking lower on fear of power. Individuals were identified as leaders based upon those who held offices in their specific organizations. Additionally, “individuals who attained formal positions of power tended to exhibit characteristics of ambition” as they tended to view themselves as leaders

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

(Harms et al, 2006, p. 88). Further research on how to assist in the development of these skills in other members was requested by researchers.

A study by Kelley focused on future impact of being a fraternity president by receiving data via questionnaires sent to fraternity presidents ten years after graduation. The 30 item Self Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) and 28 item Leadership Acquisition Form (LAF). The SLPI was designed to measure challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart while the LAF measured goal setting, delegation, and motivation among others (Kelley, 2008, p. 5).

Ten years after becoming president, the most common job titles included, managers, attorneys, vice presidents and CEO's/presidents and most were not hired by a member of the same organization. While hiring managers were not directly questioned in this study, the high status of the fraternity members in the organization implies positive or neutral feelings of Greeks. The study found serving as president did have a positive influence on leadership skills, however "being a fraternity chapter president is not a guarantee or prerequisite for success in one's post collegiate career" (Kelley, 2008, p. 9). Enhanced leadership and interpersonal skills are needed for job success, and fraternity presidents were shown to be most effective at meeting management, conflict management, teamwork, and interpersonal relations as their experiences in their role at college helped them to be more prepared.

These leadership qualities have caused professionals to notice. The co-founder of Campuspeak, David Stollman, noted "a great correlation between those skills being developed

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce

Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

and the ability to be successful in any endeavor...not necessarily just famous-successful, like a president or CEO, but successful as a community leader or as a small business owner” (Glass, 2014). A cause for this is due to member’s experiences working with those of clashing personalities which is a daily part of life in the workforce. This, along with running meetings and meeting new people are vital interaction skills that become imperative later on. This is a highly sought after skill, with Curtis Burell, the Greek Life coordinator at American University, stating “if you can be the new member educator for 30 women, I’m probably going to hire you to run a team” (Glass, 2014). Essentially, teaching a new member class is the same as teaching and leading a group of employees in a work environment.

Well-Being: Purpose, Social, Financial, Community and Physical

This sentiment regarding the employment of Greeks was further echoed by the Gallup-Purdue Index (2014). Gallup partnered with both the NPC and IFC in order to measure workplace engagement, well-being (financial, social, physical, etc), and alumni attachment in 30,000 graduates of a U.S. college or university, 16% of which were affiliated with a Greek organization in college. These college graduates were asked to respond to a poll via phone, mail, or web, in order to determine the effects of affiliation on a post-graduate career.

Once data was collected, responses were analyzed for statistically significant results between the in-group and out-group respondents. Research showed 43% of Greeks were classified as engaged in the workplace compared to 38% of non-Greeks (Busteed, 2014, p. 7). A nearly equal number of those affiliated and not affiliated (11% and 12%) were listed as actively

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

disengaged in the workplace. In controlling for gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, Greeks were determined to be more engaged at work than others.

Well-being was also measured in terms of purpose, social, financial, community and physical well-being. In every category, Greeks had a higher percentage in the thriving category than their counterparts and had a larger percentage in thriving than in struggling or suffering with the exception of physical well-being. For example, 59% of Greeks were listed as thriving in regard to liking their job and doing something interesting on a daily basis compared to 54% of non-affiliated respondents (Busteed, 2014, p. 8). This trend remains consistent in each of the other four categories. A deviation occurs, however, in physical well-being. While Greeks still have a larger number in thriving than non-Greeks, 37% of fraternity or sorority members describe themselves as thriving while 55% describe themselves as suffering. This remains consistent in non-Greeks, however, where 34% describe themselves as thriving and 56% as struggling. Greeks also showed a higher allegiance to their former colleges than those not affiliated.

Differences in experiences may be a contributing factor to the statistically significance difference in results. Research showed that Greeks felt more strongly connected to at least one professor than those who were not involved in a Greek organization. Additionally, 11% said they worked on a term project, had an internship that applied what they were learning, and they were involved in other organizations compared to 5% of other participants (Busteed, 2014, p. 9). The largest difference was in involvement in other activities in which 39% of members replied yes compared to just 16% of non-members. Overall findings saw that

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

fraternity or sorority members were more prepared for life after graduation than those who were not affiliated.

Using data from the Gallup-Purdue poll, another study was able to justify that Greeks are better at their jobs than their non-affiliated counterparts. A review by Business Insider found the results to be an indication that members of Greek Life's "engagement advantage indicates that they are more likely to be intellectually and emotionally connected to their organizations and enthusiastic about their work" (Jacobs, 2014). Hiring managers would be interested in this finding because people more engaged and enthusiastic about work typically produce work of higher quality and are dedicated in seeing projects through. This would serve as an asset to Greeks as they may be more inclined to be hired as these findings stay consistent. Having a Greek affiliation on a resume also shows employers the existence of core values that will in most cases align with the values of the company as well as the importance of giving back to the community as shown through examples of community service ("Will Joining a Fraternity Help"). The data was also used in an article by the *Wall Street Journal*, in which it is related to happiness. Additional information from the Gallup-Purdue poll showed Greeks are less stressed about money, have more supportive social lives, and, as shown from the index, are healthier in terms of their physical well-being (Belkin, 2014, p. 1). Based on research, membership in a Greek organization is shown to be an asset on a résumé and generally in life.

As Greeks have been continuously compared to their non-Greek counterparts, some trends have emerged highlighting the benefits of membership that others may not have experienced. For example, a study of over 400 participants, both Greek and unaffiliated, yielded results that

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce

Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

those involved in Greek letter organizations showed elevated levels of vocational identity, career decision-making self-efficacy, and goal directedness. The study cited paying financial dues, attending chapter meetings, and abiding by the curfew of a chapter house as measures of goal commitment, as well as the increase in time management skills due to obligations such as chapter meetings and philanthropy events (McClain, 2014). These disciplines promote future academic and career success as time management and goal commitment are critical to professional advancement.

In summary, it is important to tease the stereotypes from actual observed outcomes. While the stereotypes are typically negative in nature, observed outcomes highlight typically neglected benefits including the development of leadership skills and overall a more positive well-being. Members should be comfortable promoting their involvements, however when the negatives are emphasized, members of Greek organizations are more likely to hide their affiliation to avoid immediate negative impressions. It is especially important for hiring managers to recognize these benefits as they may be overlooking candidates who would be advantageous employees.

Research Questions and Purpose

The purpose of this research was to explore perceptions of Greek members that are held by Greek and non-Greek undergraduates, Greek alumni, and hiring personnel in the workforce. The study addresses the following three research questions:

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

1. How valid are stereotypes regarding members of fraternities and sororities as perceived by fellow students, Greek alumni, and hiring professionals in the workforce?
2. Do perceived benefits and skills at the college level translate to the workforce?
3. How are fraternity and sorority members perceived by hiring personnel? Do they recognize the benefits in a similar way as either the Greek or non-Greek students or alumni?

Research was conducted to analyze hypotheses regarding the perception of Greek students. These hypotheses included that non-Greek students hold a favorable opinion of Greek students, that Greek alumni hold a favorable opinion of Greek students, and that hiring personnel hold a favorable opinion of Greek students. Additionally, based on studies by Glass (2012) and Jacobs (2014), it was hypothesized that Greeks obtain skills and benefits from their membership in Greek organizations, and moving forward, that Greek alumni have noticed skills and benefits from their membership in Greek organizations, and that hiring personnel recognize that Greek students obtain skills or benefits during their undergraduate membership that can translate to the workforce.

Study Rationale

This research adds to literature as there is actually not much research regarding values and perceptions of members of Greek organizations as most articles and journals are in regard to stereotyping. Often articles about Greeks highlight hazing, substance abuse (both alcohol and drug), and rape scandals as opposed to positive organizational values such as service,

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

leadership, and academics. Also, this project adds to the existing research of differences in how Greeks view themselves (in-group) versus how Greeks are viewed by non-Greeks (out-group). This body of research also explores how perceptions differ between Greek undergraduates, and Greek alumni. This accounts for differences when a members is slightly removed from the everyday lifestyle of a Greek undergraduate.

Another place this thesis will add to existing research is in the category regarding Greeks in the post-graduation phase of life. Very little research has been conducted regarding how hiring managers and other employers perceive those involved in Greek organizations as candidates for a job. There are currently different perceptions in which some think Greek involvements should be highlighted on a resume as an example of leadership where others think it should be removed due to the surrounding negative stigma. Research through surveys comes to a consensus of whether Greek affiliation benefits or detracts from a resume. As expected benefits of Greek membership are rated by both alumni in the workforce and hiring professionals, results dictate the possibility of a gap between what Greeks feel they are offering a company and what the company actually perceives as the skill set of a candidate. There are over 9 million Greeks, however research into the topic is full of untapped potential.

Method

Participants

Participants included non-Greek undergraduate students at Bryant University, undergraduate members of Greek organizations and Bryant University, Bryant University Greek alumni, and hiring professionals in the workplace. A sample of 84 non-Greek undergraduate students was acquired with 52% being female and 48% male. All participants were over the age of 18, and all class years from freshman to senior were represented, with the most results coming from freshmen (39%) and sophomores (35%). A sample of 48 Greek students from Bryant University was sampled with 75% being females in a sorority and 25% being males in a fraternity. The Bryant campus does hold more sorority members than fraternity members causing these unequal measures of gender. Similar to the non-Greek Bryant students, all participants were over the age of 18 and all class years are represented with the majority of respondents being freshmen (25%) and sophomores (45%).

A total of 323 Bryant University Greek alumni were sampled with 42% being female and 58% being male. These respondents indicated that they are 22 years old or older, with Bryant undergraduate graduation years spanning from 1954 to 2015, thus providing a multi-generational view of perceptions of Greek students. 24 hiring personnel were sampled with 58% being female and 42% male. Ages of the hiring personnel ranged from 21 to 60, and participants work in over ten different industries.

Data Sources

All data for this research came from electronically administered multi-faceted surveys to the previously identified four different groups. Surveys were administered through Qualtrics, an online survey format which allows a link to be sent to participants in order to collect data. Each survey was broken into four or five subsections, dependent upon which group the subject belongs to. The survey was used to answer the research questions and test the indicated hypotheses, and was distributed to both Greeks and non-Greeks on the Bryant University campus, as well as Greek alumni, and hiring professionals in order to account for a difference in perception of stereotypes on and off a university campus. Each group received the same stereotype section of the survey to allow for mean comparisons of perceptions. Questions were used to elicit responses of how Greeks and non-Greeks view Greek membership in regards to commonly held beliefs and stereotypes regarding behaviors of Greek students. The use of surveys was appropriate as this thesis is uncovering personal opinions of a body of people. Surveys have an aspect of anonymity which is an important factor when asking participants questions of their personal feelings which they may find to be uncomfortable in person.

Each of the four groups must first respond to a consent page, during which they agreed they are over 18 years of age and fit one of the four groups described. Additionally, they agreed to understanding they may stop the survey at any time and that their privacy will not be compromised. Each participant in the four groups also received a demographics page. While this varies based on the group, it measured, in general, gender, age, graduation year, leadership experiences, and work-related questions such as number of people hired and

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

industry of work. Each participant also received the stereotype section, which is broken down into an individual page for sororities and accompanying page for fraternities. The sorority page listed 30 stereotypes derived from previous literature regarding behaviors and perceptions of Greek students. Participants were asked to rank their level of agreement on a seven point likert scale (1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agree) in response to each of the 30 stereotypes in regards to sorority women only. This process was then repeated using the same 30 stereotypes and likert scale but respondents are asked to answer in regards to fraternity men only. Within the stereotypes section, the 30 questions were categorized into ten subscales including attitude, appearance, sex, hazing, social, academic, alcohol, finances, exclusion, and leadership, of which social and leadership are the only positive categories. These subscales were used for both the sorority stereotypes section and the fraternity stereotypes section for each of the four groups of participants. The questions associated with each subscale can be found in Appendix A. After this section, non-Greek undergraduates had completed the survey. The full non-Greek undergraduate survey can be found in Appendix B.

Greek undergraduate students, Greek alumni, and hiring personnel were given an additional section related to skills and benefits received by membership in a Greek organization. This went on to further explore if membership in a Greek organization produces any unexpected benefits or disadvantages to members that those outside of these organizations may not be aware of. These benefits could span both collegiate and post-graduation success. Each of these sections differed between groups, but had ten comparable questions to compare means of benefits. The skills and benefits section for Greek undergraduate students had 30 questions related to academics, support, professionalism, and philanthropy, all in a 1-7 likert scale

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

fashion of agreement. This section of the survey was used to analyze benefits that current undergraduate Greek students feel they are gaining as a result of membership. The full survey completed by Greek undergraduates can be found in Appendix C.

The skills and benefits section for alumni focused predominantly on skills acquired such as self-confidence in meeting others, presentation skills, and teamwork abilities to name a few. This section for alumni had a total of 15 questions using the 1-7 likert scale to indicate agreement. Questions were phrased as “[m]y Greek organization allowed me to develop collaboration/teamwork skills applicable to my job” in order to determine benefits the alumni believe they have received. Ten of the questions in the alumni skills and benefits section directly correlated to both the undergraduate Greek and hiring personnel surveys, while five additional questions relating to membership on a resume being an asset or reactions to interviews correlated to the hiring professional survey only. The survey questions completed by Greek alumni can be found in Appendix D.

The hiring personnel skills and benefit section contained 16 likert scale questions, 15 of which directly related to statements in the alumni survey. These modified questions related to leadership skills, meeting efficiency, and other skills that are beneficial in progressing within a career. In this survey, questions are phrased as “I would expect that membership in a Greek organization helped Greek employees to develop collaboration/teamwork skills applicable to their jobs.” This allowed for direct comparison to means of the same question from the alumni and Greek undergraduate surveys. The survey for hiring professionals can be found in Appendix E.

Participant Recruitment & Procedure

Surveys were distributed through the online Qualtrics platform in order to reach the maximum number of participants. A link to the survey for non-Greek undergraduates were initially sent through email to friends on the Bryant University campus. The link was also sent to professors asking to share the link with their class, as well as on campus organizations including the Student Programming Board and Omicron Delta Kappa leadership honors society. Greek undergraduates on the Bryant campus were reached through help of the Greek Life adviser, Sue Zarnowski, as well as emails to chapter presidents asking them to share the link with all of their members, and announcements made at a Panhellenic meeting.

Greek alumni were reached through help by the Office of Alumni Engagement. The Office of Alumni Engagement sent an email to all alumni coded as “Greek” as well as posted the link to the alumni survey on their Greek alumni Facebook page. Participants for hiring personnel were recruited through Dr. John Poirier’s connections at the Rhode Island chapter of the Society of Human Resource Management. Personal contacts as well as help from the Amica center for career education were also utilized to reach a larger sample. In each way the survey was sent out, no personal information regarding the purpose of the survey or who initiated the survey was presented to the participants in order to reduce bias of the answers.

Results

Chronbach's alpha was used to measure internal consistency reliability for each of the ten subscales represented in the stereotypes survey. The attitude subscale was found to be highly reliable for both sororities and fraternities (4 items; $\alpha=.862$, $\alpha=.874$) as was the appearance subscale (3 items; $\alpha=.772$, $\alpha=.847$), sex subscale (3 items; $\alpha=.803$, $\alpha=.859$), hazing subscale (4 items; $\alpha=.758$, $\alpha=.834$), academic subscale (4 items; $\alpha=.882$, $\alpha=.915$), alcohol subscale (3 items; $\alpha=.817$, $\alpha=.873$), exclusion subscale (2 items; $\alpha=.750$, $\alpha=.817$), and leadership subscale (2 items; $\alpha=.776$, $\alpha=.749$). The social subscale was found to be less reliable (3 items; $\alpha=.588$, $\alpha=.682$), as the statement regarding Greeks being outgoing differed in answers from the other questions and brings down reliability. Similarly, the finances subscale had a lower reliability (2 items; $\alpha=.541$, $\alpha=.559$), which could be a result of such few questions in the subscale.

Non-Greek Undergraduate Student Survey

Non-Greek undergraduate students completed the sorority stereotypes section of the survey and means were calculated for each of the subscales based upon the results of Cronbach's Alpha. All means were based upon the likert scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agree. The highest rated sorority stereotype was leadership with a mean of 4.815 ($SD=1.041$), placing it at the somewhat agree level. As this was a positive stereotype regarding members of Greek life, a higher mean was expected. The following highest sorority mean was exclusion at 4.601 ($SD=1.429$) and then hazing at 4.286 ($SD=1.174$). Finances was the fourth most accepted stereotype with a mean of 4.232 ($SD=1.361$) followed by appearance with a mean of 4.190 ($SD=1.316$) before reaching the second positive category of social with a mean of 4.159 ($SD=.996$). The alcohol stereotype rounded out the neutral category with a

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce

Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

mean of 4.079 ($SD=1.265$) before reaching statements non-Greek members somewhat disagreed with including attitude as shown by a mean of 3.821 ($SD=1.220$), sex with a mean of 3.587 ($SD=1.297$), and lastly academic stereotypes with a mean of 2.887 ($SD=1.134$) which shows that non-Greek students disagree that Greeks cheat in their classes and do not care about their school work.

The same subscales were rated by non-Greek undergraduate students in regards to members of fraternities with different results. For fraternities, the negative stereotype of unsafe alcohol consumption was the most agreed with stereotype as shown by a mean of 5.012 ($SD=1.367$). The second most agreed upon stereotype was hazing with a mean of 4.777 ($SD=1.282$), finally followed by the positive stereotypes of leadership with a mean of 4.643 ($SD=1.253$) and social with a mean of 4.504 ($SD=1.072$). Finances was the next most agreed upon stereotype in regards to fraternity men with a mean of 4.417 ($SD=1.301$), with exclusion coming next at 4.292 ($SD=1.292$), and then sex at 4.075 ($SD=1.378$). Subscales that non-Greek students somewhat disagreed with included attitude at 3.952 ($SD=1.226$), appearance at 3.881 ($SD=1.313$), and lastly academics at 3.439 ($SD=1.277$), proving once again that non-Greeks disagree with the negative academic stereotypes the most.

Greek Undergraduate Student Survey

Greek undergraduate students were also given the stereotypes section in regard to sorority women and fraternity men. Means were higher for positive stereotypes and lower for negative stereotypes due to the possibility of in-group bias. Once again, leadership was the most agreed upon with a mean of 6.479 ($SD=.515$), followed by the other positive stereotype

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

category of social which had a mean of 5.042 ($SD=.871$). As for the negative stereotypes, means took a drastic decline with the next stereotype of exclusion falling into the disagree category with a mean of 2.646 ($SD=1.321$). Appearance then came next with a mean of 2.438 ($SD=1.009$), followed by finances at 2.406 ($SD=.955$), alcohol at 2.347 ($SD=1.161$), attitude at 2.25 ($SD=.959$), and hazing at 2.177 ($SD=.835$). Sex stereotypes fell into the strongly disagree category at a mean of 1.910 ($SD=.844$) followed lastly by negative academic stereotypes at 1.573 ($SD=.648$).

In terms of fraternity stereotypes, the most agreed upon stereotypes were once again the positive stereotypes of leadership and social categories with means of 5.813 ($SD=.873$) and 5.458 ($SD=.824$) respectively. Although means did once again plummet upon introduction of the negative stereotypes, for fraternity men the highest mean came from alcohol with 3.090 ($SD=1.465$) followed by hazing at 3.031 ($SD=1.138$) and sex at 2.688 ($SD=1.352$). Exclusion was next, fitting along the point of disagreement, with a mean of 2.396 ($SD=1.153$). Also in the range of disagreement fell finances at 2.229 ($SD=.857$), as well as attitude at 2.203 ($SD=.842$) and appearance at 2.125 ($SD=.996$). Once again, the least agreed with stereotype was academics at a mean of 2.094 ($SD=.916$).

Greek undergraduate students also responded to an additional skills and benefits section. These questions, which can be seen in Table 1, covered a wide range of topics including bonding and sisterhood brotherhood, academics, professional skills, and philanthropic causes. This study focused exclusively on the professional skillset which are denoted with an asterisk.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

These questions were based off of skills and benefits that may have been noticed or practiced at an undergraduate level that has real-life work implications.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations on the Measure of Benefits and Skills as a Result of Membership in a Greek Organization by Greek Undergraduates

Variable	N	M	SD
I have been introduced to others I would not have otherwise met	45	6.778	0.517
I feel a bond with my brothers/sisters I do not believe I would find anywhere else	45	6.289	1.18
I have access to additional academic resources (e.g. study guides, notes, etc)	45	6.156	1.314
I feel deeply connected to the causes my organization supports	45	6.222	0.849
I have had the opportunity to develop my leadership skills	45	6.467	0.661
I am motivated to receive the academic awards presented by my organization	45	5.956	0.999
I have become more proficient in communication through leadership opportunities in my organization	45	6.067	1.116
I have practiced financial management through my organization (e.g. managing officer budget, paying dues)	45	5.933	0.963
I am more likely to continue with community service in the future to my experience in my organization	45	6.02	0.965
My grades are better due to my involvement in my organization	45	5.111	1.418
I have been presented with leadership opportunities due to my involvement in my organization	45	6.333	0.798
Some of the closest friends I have made have come through my fraternity/sorority	45	6.533	0.757
I know I have brothers/sisters I can talk to when I feel upset	45	6.6	0.72
I have developed presentation skills through my organization	45	5.867	1.325
I have learned to be self-directed as a result of membership in my organization	45	6.089	0.949
it brings me piece of mind knowing I am not alone	45	6.2	1.12
I have been given the opportunity to attend leadership conferences	45	6	1.331
I feel happier when I am with my brothers/sisters than when I am not with my brothers/sisters	45	5.533	1.502
I have become more confident in meeting new people as a result of my involvement in my organization	45	6.333	1.045
I know my brothers/sisters will support me in other activities I'm involved in	45	6.378	1.007
I have been held accountable by members of my organization	45	5.911	1.362
I have learned to work on a team as a result of membership in my organization	45	6.022	1.033
I feel proud to display my letters when I'm around campus	45	6.244	1.131
I have been given the chance to manage others due to my membership in my organization	45	5.911	1.24
I feel challenged to do my best knowing my behavior affects perception of my organization	45	6.356	0.933
I have been provided with networking opportunities through my organization	45	6.378	0.747
I have been provided with opportunities to give back to my community through my organization	45	6.489	0.626
I have been brought outside my comfort zone to socialize with others due to my involvement	45	6.422	0.783
I have been connected with causes I would not have known about had it not been for my organization	45	6.467	0.726
I have learned time management skills as a result of membership in my organization	45	6.267	1.031

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Greek Alumni Survey

Greek alumni also held positive reactions to the positive stereotypes, and negative reactions to negative stereotypes. The highest ranked sorority stereotype as leadership at 5.861 ($SD=1.026$) and second highest as social at 5.027 ($SD=.872$) follows a similar pattern of the Greek undergraduate students. Similarly, the means dropped off with the negative stereotypes but to a lesser extent, as shown by the next stereotype of exclusion at 3.197 ($SD=1.418$) which puts it in the somewhat disagree range. Hazing falls in a similar range at 3.180 ($SD=1.141$), followed by alcohol at 2.845 ($SD=1.315$), appearance at 2.663 ($SD=1.231$), and finances at 2.503 ($SD=1.124$). The following categories of attitude at 2.245 ($SD=1.044$), sex at 2.171 ($SD=1.060$), and academic at 1.875 ($SD=.930$) fall into the category of disagree.

Results were somewhat similar in regards to fraternity stereotypes, with leadership ranked the highest at 5.803 ($SD=1.004$) and social being second highest at 5.330 ($SD=.910$). For fraternity men, the most agreed with negative stereotype was hazing with a mean of 3.429 ($SD=1.348$), followed by alcohol at 3.383 ($SD=1.546$), exclusion at 2.754 ($SD=1.449$), and sex at 2.698 ($SD=1.348$). Finances and appearance were also in the disagree range with means of 2.556 ($SD=1.166$) and 2.517 ($SD=1.237$), with academic and attitude rounding out the subsections at 2.516 ($SD=1.070$) and 2.214 ($SD=1.011$), marking the first instance in which academic was not the most disagreed upon stereotype.

Greek alumni took a similar skills and benefits survey, although all of these questions related specifically to professional skills utilized in the workplace. These questions, exhibited in Table 2 have ten questions that can be compared with both Greek undergraduates and hiring

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

professionals, as well as four questions that allow for a direct comparison with only hiring professionals.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations on the Measure of Benefits and Skills as a Result of Membership in a Greek Organization by Greek Alumni

Variable	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
I have bonded with other Greek coworkers	278	4.838	1.741
I am more confidence in meeting new people	313	5.294	1.711
Listing membership was an asset in the job search process	288	4.462	1.7
My experience is something I feel comfortable talking about	312	5.923	1.373
I have had positive reactions when speaking about my experience in interviews	261	5.498	1.408
I believe my employer sees my involvement as valuable	266	4.571	1.541
I have developed time management skills	311	5.441	1.562
Networking with other Greeks helped me obtain my job	251	3.645	1.947
I have developed financial management skills	285	4.596	1.847
I have developed presentation skills	300	5.32	1.707
I have developed communication skills	305	5.738	1.484
I have developed teamwork skills	304	5.944	1.405
I am self-directed at work	298	5.279	1.692
I am a more effective manager	293	5.522	1.543
I have developed leadership skills	303	5.743	1.512

Hiring Personnel Survey

Hiring personnel tended to fall more in the middle between the extremes of Greek undergraduates and non-Greek undergraduates. Hiring personnel also rated leadership and social as the most agreed with stereotypes for sorority women at 5.333 ($SD=1.029$) and 4.306 ($SD=.916$) respectively. Hazing was between neutral and somewhat disagreed with at 3.677 ($SD=1.208$), similarly to exclusion which was rated at 3.646 ($SD=1.272$) and appearance at 3.403 ($SD=1.163$). Alcohol fell closer to somewhat disagree with a mean of 3.208 ($SD=1.311$), followed closely by finances with a mean of 3 ($SD=1.161$). Attitude had a mean of 2.844 ($SD=1.086$), while sex had a mean of 2.625 ($SD=1.118$) and the most disagreed upon stereotype was once again academic at 2.385 ($SD=1.118$).

Similar to the results that hiring personnel created for the sorority women, the first two means of leadership, and social were the highest for fraternity men, yet lower than that for sororities at 4.979 ($SD=1.068$) and 4.528 ($SD=1.026$) respectively. Additionally, hazing was still the most agreed upon negative stereotype, however it fell at a mean of 4.427 ($SD=1.212$) which places it between neutral and somewhat agree where as it was closer to disagree for sorority women. The alcohol stereotype were also closer to the somewhat agree side at a mean of 4.250 ($SD=1.435$). Sex was the first stereotype on the somewhat disagree side with a mean of 3.431 ($SD=1.342$), followed by exclusion at 3.396 ($SD=1.302$) and finances at 3.229 ($SD=1.179$). Attitude ranked low at 2.990 ($SD=.988$), with academic ranking lower with a mean of 2.729 ($SD=1.142$) and appearance the most disagreed with stereotype at 2.236 ($SD=1.024$).

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations on the Measure of Benefits and Skills as a Result of Membership in a Greek Organization by Hiring Personnel

Variable	N	M	SD
I am aware of which of my employees are Greek	24	3.42	1.692
I would expect Greek employees would bond with Greek coworkers	24	4	1.694
I would expect Greeks have more confidence in meeting new people	24	4.25	1.294
I believe listing membership in a Greek organization is an asset in the job search process	24	4.33	1.465
I would expect Greek employees would feel comfortable talking about their experiences	24	4.88	1.191
I would expect Greek employees had positive reactions when talking about Greek experience during an interview	23	1.87	1.18
I see involvement in a Greek organization as valuable to the company	24	4.42	1.613
I would expect Greeks developed time management skills	24	3.92	1.613
I would expect networking helped Greeks obtain jobs	24	5.5	1.103
I would expect Greeks to have developed financial management skills	24	3.92	1.558
I would expect Greeks to have developed presentation skills	24	4.17	1.695
I would expect Greeks to have developed communication skills	24	4.67	1.711
I would expect Greeks to have developed teamwork skills	24	4.71	1.732
I would expect Greeks to be more comfortable being self-directed at work	24	4.29	1.459
I would expect Greeks managing in organizations to make them more effective managers	24	4.38	1.952
I would expect Greeks developed leadership skills	24	4.63	1.715

Comparisons between Groups

An ANOVA was run for sorority stereotypes in order to determine which of the four groups statistically significantly differed from others on the basis of specific stereotypes. Each of the four groups were run against each of the ten stereotype subscales to spot trends amongst different groups. Each of the sorority stereotype subscales including attitude $F(3,475)=50.033, p<.05$, appearance $F(3,475)=38.666, p<.05$, sex $F(3,475)=41.562, p<.05$, hazing $F(3,475)=39.669, p<.05$, social $F(3,475)=24.455, p<.05$, academics $F(3,475)=30.047, p<.05$, alcohol $F(3,475)=25.305, p<.05$, finances $F(3,475)=52.135, p<.05$, exclusion $F(3,475)=27.607, p<.05$ and leadership $F(3,475)=34.376, p<.05$, were significant at the .05 level, indicating differences amongst groups for each subscale.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Bonferroni post-hoc analyses of the sorority stereotypes revealed significant differences between Greek alumni and non-Greek undergraduates, Greek undergraduates and non-Greek undergraduates, and non-Greek undergraduates and hiring personnel for attitude, alcohol, and finance subscales. In each of these cases, non-Greek undergraduates ($M=3.82$, $M=4.08$, $M=4.23$) had a higher mean than hiring personnel ($M=2.84$, $M=3.21$, $M=3.00$) while the mean of the hiring personnel was larger than the means of the Greek alumni ($M=2.25$, $M=2.85$, $M=2.50$), and the Greek undergraduates ($M=2.25$, $M=2.35$, $M=2.41$). In the case of appearance, Greek alumni had a statistically significant lower mean at 2.66 than non-Greek undergraduates at 4.19 and hiring personnel who had a mean of 3.40. Greek undergraduates also had a significantly lower mean ($M=2.44$) than their non-Greek counterparts as well as the hiring personnel. Even the non-Greek undergraduates and hiring personnel differed with Greek undergraduates having the higher mean.

The sorority sex subscale showed a statistically significant difference between Greek alumni with a lower mean of 2.17 compared to the 3.59 mean of non-Greek undergraduates. The Greek undergraduate mean of 1.91 was also significantly lower than that of the non-Greek undergraduates. The hazing stereotype showed differences between Greek alumni ($M=3.18$) and Greek undergraduates ($M=2.18$), as well as Greek alumni and non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.29$). Additionally, Greek undergraduates exhibited a lower mean than non-Greek undergraduates as well as hiring professionals ($M=3.68$). The social subscale also showed many differences, with Greek alumni ($M=5.03$) exhibiting a higher mean than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.16$), as well as hiring professionals ($M=4.31$). The mean for Greek undergraduates was the highest at 5.04, and differed significantly from both the non-Greek

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

undergraduate and hiring personnel groups. In a rare instance, Greek alumni ($M=1.88$) had a significantly lower mean than the Greek undergraduates ($M=1.57$) for the academic stereotype. Greek undergraduates had a significantly lower mean than their non-Greek counterparts ($M=2.89$) as well as the hiring personnel ($M=2.39$). The exclusion subscale showed Greek alumni ($M=3.20$) having a significantly lower mean than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.60$). Greek undergraduates ($M=2.65$) had a significantly lower mean than non-Greek undergraduates and hiring personnel ($M=3.65$), while non-Greek undergraduates had a significantly higher mean than hiring personnel. Lastly, results from the leadership subscale showed that Greek alumni ($M=5.86$) had a significantly lower mean than Greek undergraduates ($M=6.48$), but significantly higher than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.85$). Additionally, the mean for Greek undergraduates was significantly higher than non-Greek undergraduates and hiring personnel ($M=5.33$).

Similarly to the sorority stereotypes, an ANOVA was run for fraternity stereotypes in order to determine which of the four groups statistically significantly differed from others. Each of the fraternity stereotype subscales including attitude $F(3,475)=65.882, p<.05$, appearance $F(3,475)=33.496, p<.05$, sex $F(3,475)=24.669, p<.05$, hazing $F(3,475)=31.387, p<.05$, social $F(3,475)=22.473, p<.05$, academics $F(3,475)=37.310, p<.05$, alcohol $F(3,475)=29.808, p<.05$, finances $F(3,475)=62.797, p<.05$, exclusion $F(3,475)=31.261, p<.05$ and leadership $F(3,475)=30.910, p<.05$, were significant at the .05 level, indicating differences amongst groups for each subscale.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Bonferroni post hoc analyses showed a significantly lower mean in Greek undergraduates ($M=2.20$) as opposed to non-Greek undergraduates ($M=3.95$) and hiring personnel ($M=2.99$) for the attitude stereotype. Additionally, Greek alumni ($M=2.21$) had a higher mean than non-Greek undergraduates and hiring personnel. The hiring personnel mean was also significantly lower than the non-Greek undergraduate mean. In terms of the appearance subscale, Greek alumni ($M=2.52$) had a significantly lower mean than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=3.88$) and hiring personnel ($M=2.24$). Greek undergraduates ($M=2.13$) were similar in they also had a significantly lower mean than non-Greek undergraduates and hiring personnel. The sex stereotype showed a significantly lower mean for Greek alumni ($M=2.70$) than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.08$), and a significantly lower mean for Greek undergraduates ($M=2.69$) than non-Greek undergraduates. Results for the hazing subscale showed that both Greek alumni ($M=3.43$) and Greek undergraduates ($M=3.03$) had significantly lower means than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.78$) and hiring personnel ($M=4.43$).

The positive social stereotype showed Greek alumni ($M=5.33$) with a significantly higher mean than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.50$) and hiring personnel ($M=4.53$). Similarly, Greek undergraduates ($M=5.46$) held a significantly higher mean than non-Greek undergraduates and hiring personnel. Both Greek alumni ($M=2.52$), Greek undergraduates ($M=2.09$), and hiring personnel ($M=2.73$) had a significantly lower mean than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=3.54$) in the academic stereotype. The alcohol subscale resulted in both Greek alumni ($M=3.38$) and Greek undergraduates ($M=3.09$) having statistically significant lower means than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=5.01$) and hiring personnel ($M=4.25$). The finances stereotype showed significantly lower means in Greek alumni ($M=2.56$) and Greek

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

undergraduates ($M=2.23$) than non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.42$) and hiring personnel ($M=3.23$). Additionally, non-Greek undergraduates had a significantly higher mean than that of hiring personnel. Both Greek alumni ($M=2.75$) and Greek undergraduates ($M=2.40$) had a significantly lower mean than that of non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.29$) for the exclusion stereotype. Additionally, Greek had a undergraduates had a statistically significant lower mean than that of hiring personnel ($M=3.40$), while non-Greek undergraduates had a significantly higher mean than hiring personnel. Lastly, for the positive leadership stereotype, Greek alumni ($M=5.80$) and Greek undergraduates ($M=5.81$) had a significantly larger mean than both non-Greek undergraduates ($M=4.64$) and hiring personnel ($M=4.98$).

An ANOVA was also run between the Greek undergraduate, Greek alumni, and hiring personnel groups to analyze differences in perceptions of professional skills. Each of the professional skillsets including confidence in meeting new people $F(2,379)=13.943, p<.05$, time management $F(2,377)=18.875, p<.05$, networking $F(2,317)=52.441, p<.05$, financial management $F(2,351)=14.183, p<.05$, presentation skills $F(2,366)=8.202, p<.05$, communication skills $F(2,371)=7.522, p<.05$, teamwork skills $F(2,370)=9.093, p<.05$, self-directedness $F(2,364)=10.177, p<.05$, effective management $F(2,359)=8.045, p<.05$ and leadership skills $F(2,369)=12.703, p<.05$, were significant at the .05 level, indicating differences amongst groups for each subscale.

Bonferroni post hoc analyses revealed a statistically significant difference in means amongst groups. The Greek undergraduate mean of 6.33 was significantly larger than both Greek alumni ($M=5.29$) and hiring professionals ($M=4.25$) for the confidence in meeting new people

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

skill. Additionally, the alumni mean was significantly higher than the mean of hiring professionals. As for the time management skill, there was a similar pattern where each group differed from one another with the highest mean coming from Greek undergraduates ($M=6.27$), then Greek alumni ($M=5.44$) and finally hiring professionals ($M=3.92$). For the networking benefit, both Greek undergraduates ($M=6.38$) and hiring professionals ($M=5.50$) significantly differed from Greek alumni ($M=3.65$). The financial skill also showed a difference between Greek alumni and Greek undergraduates, with Greek undergraduates having a higher mean of 5.93 compared to a mean of 4.60. Additionally, Greek undergraduates had a significantly higher mean than hiring professionals at 3.92. The presentation skill showed that both Greek undergraduates ($M=5.87$) and Greek alumni ($M=5.32$) had significantly larger means than hiring professionals ($M=4.17$).

Greek undergraduates ($M=6.07$) had a significantly higher mean than both Greek alumni ($M=5.74$) and hiring professionals ($M=4.67$) in terms of communication skills. Teamwork skills saw a similar pattern, as the hiring personnel mean ($M=4.71$) was significantly lower than the Greek alumni ($M=5.94$) and Greek undergraduate ($M=6.02$) means. Self-directness showed significant differences amongst all three groups, with the highest mean coming from Greek undergraduates ($M=6.09$), next being Greek alumni ($M=5.28$), and the lowest coming from hiring professionals ($M=4.29$). The same holds true for the leadership skill, where Greek undergraduates held the highest mean ($M=6.46$), followed by Greek alumni ($M=5.74$), and lastly hiring professionals ($M=4.63$). Lastly, the effective management skill showed that the hiring professional mean ($M=4.38$) was significantly lower than both Greek undergraduates ($M=5.91$) and Greek alumni ($M=5.52$).

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Lastly, four select questions regarding the interview process and workplace environment were given to only Greek alumni and hiring professionals. These questions measure workplace acceptance of Greek membership from both perspectives. A t-test was run on these questions with the results shown below.

Table 4
Comparison of Greek Alumni and Hiring Personnel Means on Workplace Acceptance of Greek Life

	Greek Alumni		Hiring Personnel		t-test
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
I believe Greek membership is an asset on a resume.	4.462	1.7	4.33	1.465	0.359
I would feel comfortable talking about my Greek membership at work.	5.923	1.373	4.88	1.191	3.635***
I have had/would expect positive reactions about my membership during an interview.	5.508	1.414	4.87	1.18	2.077*
I believe my boss would see my Greek involvement as valuable to the company	4.61	1.574	4.42	1.613	0.469

*p<.05 **P<.01 ***p<.001

Discussion

Sorority stereotypes showed there was a consensus in that leadership was the most agreed upon stereotype by each of the four groups, although the means did vary from a high of 6.48 for Greek undergraduates to a low of 4.85 for non-Greek undergraduates, although all were on the positive somewhat agree to agree side. Additionally, the other positive stereotype of social was the second most agreed upon sorority stereotype for three of the four groups, excluding non-Greek undergraduates who ranked it at number six with a mean of 4.16. Despite its low ranking, the mean of 4.16 did not differ significantly from the social mean for hiring personnel which fell at 4.31. The most disagreed with stereotype was the negative academics stereotype for each of the four groups, and fell just below sex which ranked as ninth for each of the four groups. This led to a consensus of three of the ten stereotypes for all four groups. The rank ordering of each of the stereotypes by group can be seen in Appendix F. As shown by the Bonferroni analysis, Greek alumni and Greek undergraduate means were similar and non-statistically significant for each of the stereotypes subcategories except for the categories of hazing, academics, and leadership, in all of which Greek undergraduates reported more drastic means than their alumni counterparts. For example, the Greek mean was higher than the alumni mean for leadership, however on negative categories such as hazing and academics the means were lower.

In most cases, Greek alumni and Greek undergraduate means statistically significantly differed from non-Greek undergraduates with the exception of academics where Greek undergraduates differed from non-Greek undergraduates while alumni did not. Non-Greek

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

undergraduates and hiring personnel had a statistically significant difference in five out of ten sorority subcategories of stereotypes including attitude, appearance, alcohol, finances, and exclusion. Greeks differed from hiring personnel in seven of the ten stereotype categories including appearance, hazing, social, academics, alcohol, exclusion, and leadership showing that Greeks and hiring personnel have different views of most sorority stereotypes. Adversely, undergraduate Greeks and Greek alumni tended to have very similar views which differed most from non-Greek undergraduates.

In terms of fraternity stereotypes, there was less consensus among the four groups as rankings indicated that no stereotype held the same ranking for all four groups. The ranking for each stereotypes based on means can be found in Appendix G. Leadership and social, the two positive groups, were the most agreed upon stereotypes for Greek undergraduates, Greek alumni, and hiring personnel, however placed in the third and fourth position for non-Greek undergraduates below the negative stereotypes of alcohol and hazing. For the other three groups, alcohol and hazing fell in third and fourth place slots. In each of the ten subscale stereotypes for fraternities, Greek undergraduates and Greek alumni did not show a statistically significant difference. Additionally, for each of the ten stereotype categories, both Greek alumni and Greek undergraduates showed a statistically significant difference from non-Greek undergraduates. Greek scores were significantly different from hiring personnel means in eight of the ten categories including attitude, appearance, hazing, social, alcohol, finances, exclusion and leadership. Trends for fraternity stereotypes were similar to the trends seen in sorority stereotypes where Greek undergraduates and Greek alumni had similar views which different significantly from non-Greek undergraduate views. In most cases, Greek

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

undergraduates held the most dramatic means of close to either strongly agree or strongly disagree, with alumni falling next in suit, and hiring personnel and non-Greek undergraduates showing means more in the middle.

Conclusions that can be deducted from the stereotype section include that Greek undergraduates are most likely to agree with positive stereotypes and disagree with negative stereotypes. This is a result of the in-group bias effect. As they are in the group being evaluated, they are more likely to perceive themselves better than those not affiliated would perceive them. Next, Greek alumni tended to follow the trend of the Greek undergraduates, however this occurred at a lesser extreme of lower means than Greek undergraduates for positive stereotypes and higher means than the Greek undergraduates for the negative stereotypes. In regards to the non-Greek undergraduates, they were least likely to agree with positive stereotypes and more likely to agree with negative stereotypes. The hiring personnel tended to fall between the opposing groups.

The skills and benefits assessment section provided interesting results as a result of the Bonferroni post hoc analysis after running an ANOVA. Results showed that all three groups of Greek alumni, Greek undergraduates, and hiring professionals, statistically significantly differed in four of the ten skill assessment categories. These questions included confidence in meeting new people, time management skills, self-directedness, and leadership skills in the workplace. In each of these cases, Greek undergraduates had the highest mean indicating they agreed most with the statement, followed next by Greek alumni, and lastly by hiring personnel.

In many cases, Greek alumni and Greek undergraduates had similar means that both differed from the means of the hiring professionals. This was seen in the categories of presentation skills, communication skills, teamwork skills, and the effectiveness of managing. In very few cases, Greek alumni and Greek undergraduates held different views which could be seen in networking, and financial management.

One of the most interesting findings was in networking in which Greek undergraduates and hiring professionals held similar views. Greek undergraduates had a mean of 6.378 indicating they were given the opportunity to go to networking events which could help them get a job. The hiring personnel also had a high mean of 5.50 stating they agreed with the statement that they believed networking would help Greeks obtain jobs. While these means did not statistically differ from each other, they had a statistically significance difference from alumni who had a mean of 3.645, indicating they actually disagreed with the statement that networking with Greeks helped them in getting their job. Greek undergraduates ranked networking as the 2nd most agreed with benefit in the skills and benefits section, while hiring personnel ranked it in the top spot. Greek alumni ranked it last, as the least helpful and agreed upon skill and benefit. The rankings for the skills and benefits by group can be seen in Appendix H. This is significant as networking is a benefit often mentioned during undergraduate membership however alumni who have been through the job search process are stating that networking with other Greeks was actually not helpful to them.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Additionally, an analysis of four questions regarding Greek life and the interview process and social aspects of work life provided further clarification on how Greek membership is perceived in the workplace. Statements including “Greek membership is an asset on a resume” and “I believe/I expect my boss would see my Greek involvement as valuable to the company” did not statistically differ between Greek alumni and hiring professionals. Means for the two statements ranged from 4.46 to 4.33 and 4.57 to 4.42 for the respective questions, with Greek alumni having the higher mean in both cases. As these numbers are above four, this indicates that both groups somewhat agree that Greek membership is an asset on a resume, and that management would see Greek involvement as valuable to the company.

A statement in regards to “I would feel/ I would expect Greeks to feel comfortable talking about Greek membership at work” had a statistically significant difference between Greek alumni and hiring professionals, with means exhibiting a mean of 5.92 compared to the hiring professionals mean of .488. This indicates Greeks are more comfortable speaking about their experiences in a Greek membership in a work setting than the hiring professionals would expect them to be. Additionally, another statement saying “I have had/would expect positive reactions about membership during an interview” showed a statistically significant difference with Greek alumni having a mean of 5.50 compared to the hiring professional’s mean of 4.87. These results are similar to last statement, indicating that Greeks have had better reactions when mentioning their affiliation in an interview than hiring personnel would have expected them to.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

As the purpose of this research is in determining how Greeks are perceived in the workplace, these last few statements indicate that Greeks are more comfortable with their Greek membership in a workplace than their hiring professional counterparts either expect them to be or think they should be. Additionally, all hiring professional means were closer to a neutral standpoint than a strong agreement, indicating that they may not in fact be as open to the idea of Greek membership as previously considered. This could be because of all of the previously mentioned negative stereotypes, as shown how eight of the ten stereotypes that are most common are negative.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Greek undergraduates are getting many benefits from their membership experience in terms of professional skills that can translate to the workforce. This is supported by Greek alumni in the workforce, as means regarding the skills and benefits, as well as stereotypes, remained consistent with those of the Greek undergraduates, meaning these skills and benefits are actually applicable to the workforce in the future. This is not always noticed by hiring personnel however, resulting in the need for more communication of these work related skill sets that Greek undergraduates and alumni have acquired through their membership. Alumni have indicated that they feel they are exhibiting these skill sets in the workplace, however hiring personnel indicated lower scores meaning that they may not have actually noticed this. Better communication of these skill sets in the future could positively impact Greeks as they look for jobs. Replacing the idea of the negative stereotypes in the minds of the hiring personnel with these beneficial skill sets Greek undergraduates can bring with them into the workforce is an important step in bridging the gap in perceptions between Greek students and those in charge of hiring at companies.

Consideration for future work within this study includes a differentiation between fraternity and sorority differences among the four groups utilized in the stereotype section of the survey. Data was gathered independently for fraternities and sororities, however general findings tended to use both groups together when discussing how the different groups interacted in

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

regards to each other and the stereotype subsections. Additionally, further research could be done in regards to providing Greek alumni with an open text box to tell their stories, as many were eager to explain what Greek life means to them and their personal experiences as a member of a fraternity or sorority. Lastly, it is important to remember this was a small sample of a college in the Northeast, and results could differ significantly at larger schools in a different area of the country. Further research in this area of study could also be done in different areas as means to compare if these results are specific to this geographical location as opposed to a more widespread national phenomenon.

APPENDICES

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Appendix A – Stereotype Subscales

Attitude

- Are conceited
- Are elitist
- Are unfriendly
- Are not approachable

Appearance

- Must fit a specific image
- Exclude people who are unattractive
- Are preoccupied with their appearance

Sex

- Are sexually promiscuous
- Sleep around
- Are involved in sexual assaults/rape

Hazing

- Force members to do things that they don't want to do
- Deny hazing within their own chapter
- Haze new members
- Humiliate/embarrass other members

Social

- Are outgoing
- Throw great parties
- Always have fun

Academics

- Get poor grades
- Do not care about their school work
- Cheat in their classes
- Do not prioritize academics

Alcohol

- Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students
- Promote unsafe alcohol consumption
- Promote underage alcohol consumption

Finances

- Are wealthy
- Pay for their friends

Exclusion

- Exclude non members
- Only spend time with other Greek students

Leadership

- Are strong leaders
- Are actively involved on campus

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce

Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Appendix B – Non-Greek Undergraduate Survey

Please circle the response with which you most identify

What is your gender? _____

What is your class year? 2016 2017 2018 2019

What is your age? _____

Which College is your major in? College of Arts & Sciences College of Business

What is your Greek affiliation status? Sorority Fraternity Not Affiliated

If affiliated, when did you pledge? Fall Spring Year: N/A

Are you currently a New Member of a fraternity or sorority? Yes No

If affiliated, please list your Greek leadership positions you currently hold or have held

How many immediate family members (parents and/or siblings) were members of a fraternity or sorority?

All respondents, please list any non-Greek leadership positions.

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement with respect to SORORITY WOMEN. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

I believe that sorority women...

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Are conceited | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. Must fit a specific image | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Are sexually promiscuous (slutty/players) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Force members to do things that they don't want to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. Are outgoing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. Get poor grades | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. Are wealthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. Are elitist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. Do not care about their school work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. Deny hazing within their own chapter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. Throw great parties | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. Exclude non-members | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. Are unfriendly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. Cheat in their classes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

16. Promote unsafe/excessive alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Sleep around	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Are strong leaders	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Exclude people who are unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Always have fun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Are not approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Pay for their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Haze new members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Only spend time with other Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Do not prioritize academics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are involved in sexual assaults/rape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Are actively involved on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Are preoccupied with their appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Promote underage alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Humiliate/embarrass other members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement with respect to FRATERNITY MEN. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

I believe that fraternity men....

1. Are strong leaders	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Throw great parties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Pay for their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Are conceited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Promote underage alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Force members to do things they don't want to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Promote unsafe/excessive alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Exclude non-members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Deny hazing within their own chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Are unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Do not care about their school work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Only spend time with other Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Are elitist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Do not prioritize academics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Are approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Are preoccupied with their appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Must fit a specific image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Are wealthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

20. Are sexually promiscuous (slutty/players)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Humiliate/embarrass other members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Get poor grades	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Sleep around	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Are outgoing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Cheat in their classes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are involved in sexual assaults/rape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Exclude people who are unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Haze new members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Are actively involved on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Always have fun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Appendix C- Greek Undergraduate Survey

Please circle the response with which you most identify

What is your gender?

What is your class year? 2016 2017 2018 2019

What is your age?

Which College is your major in? College of Arts & Sciences College of Business

What is your Greek Affiliation Status? Sorority Fraternity Not Affiliated

If affiliated, when did you pledge? Fall Spring Year: N/A

Are you currently a New Member of a fraternity or sorority? Yes No

If affiliated, please list your Greek leadership positions you currently hold or have held.

How many immediate family members (parents and/or siblings) were members of a fraternity or sorority?

All respondents, please list any non-Greek leadership positions.

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement with respect to SORORITY WOMEN. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

I believe that sorority women...

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Are conceited | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. Must fit a specific image | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Are sexually promiscuous (slutty/players) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Force members to do things that they don't want to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. Are outgoing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. Get poor grades | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. Are wealthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. Are elitist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. Do not care about their school work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. Deny hazing within their own chapter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. Throw great parties | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. Exclude non-members | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. Are unfriendly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. Cheat in their classes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. Promote unsafe/excessive alcohol consumption | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

17. Sleep around	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Are strong leaders	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Exclude people who are unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Always have fun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Are not approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Pay for their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Haze new members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Only spend time with other Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Do not prioritize academics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are involved in sexual assaults/rape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Are actively involved on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Are preoccupied with their appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Promote underage alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Humiliate/embarrass other members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement with respect to FRATERNITY MEN. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

I believe that fraternity men....

1. Are strong leaders	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Throw great parties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Pay for their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Are conceited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Promote underage alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Force members to do things they don't want to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Promote unsafe/excessive alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Exclude non-members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Deny hazing within their own chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Are unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Do not care about their school work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Only spend time with other Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Are elitist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Do not prioritize academics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Are approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Are preoccupied with their appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Must fit a specific image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Are wealthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Are sexually promiscuous (slutty/players)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

21. Humiliate/embarrass other members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Get poor grades	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Sleep around	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Are outgoing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Cheat in their classes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are involved in sexual assaults/rape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Exclude people who are unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Haze new members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Are actively involved on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Always have fun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. As a current member of a FRATERNITY/SORORITY, please circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

- I have been introduced to people I would not have otherwise met due to my involvement in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I feel a bond with my brothers/sisters that I do not believe I would find anywhere else.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I have access to additional academic resources (e.g. study guides, notes, etc).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I feel deeply connected to the causes my organization supports.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I have had the opportunity to develop my leadership skills.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I am motivated to receive the academic awards presented by my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I have become more proficient in communication through leadership opportunities in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I have practiced financial management through my organization (e.g. managing officer budget, paying dues on time).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I am more likely to continue with community service in the future due to my experience in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- My grades are better due to my involvement in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I have been presented with leadership opportunities due to my involvement in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

12. Some of the closest friends I have made have come through my sorority/fraternity.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I know I have brothers/sisters I can talk to when I feel upset.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. I have developed presentation skills through my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. I have learned to be self-directed as a result of membership in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. It brings me piece of mind knowing I am not alone.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. I have been given the opportunity to attend leadership conferences.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. I feel happier when I am with my brothers/sisters than when I am not with my brothers/sisters.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. I have become more confident in meeting new people as a result of my involvement in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. I know my brothers/sisters will support me in other activities I'm involved in.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. I have been held accountable by members of my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. I have learned to work on a team as a result of membership in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. I feel proud to display my letters when I'm around campus.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. I have been given the chance to manage others due to my membership in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. I feel challenged to do my best knowing my behavior affects perception of my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. I have been provided with networking opportunities through my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. I have been presented with opportunities to give back to my community through my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. I have been brought outside of my comfort zone to socialize with others due to my involvement in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. I have been connected with causes I would not have known about had it not been for my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. I have learned time management skills as a result of membership in my organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Appendix D- Greek Alumni Survey

Please circle the response with which you most identify

What is your gender? _____

What is your age? 22-25 26-30 31-40 41-50 50+

What year did you graduate from Bryant? _____

Which College did you major in? _____

College of Arts & Sciences

College of Business

I graduated prior to 2004

How many immediate family members (parents and/or siblings) were members of a fraternity or sorority?

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement with respect to SORORITY WOMEN. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

I believe that sorority women...

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Are conceited | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. Must fit a specific image | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Are sexually promiscuous (slutty/players) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Force members to do things that they don't want to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. Are outgoing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. Get poor grades | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. Are wealthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. Are elitist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. Do not care about their school work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. Deny hazing within their own chapter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. Throw great parties | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. Exclude non-members | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. Are unfriendly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. Cheat in their classes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

16. Promote unsafe/excessive alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Sleep around	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Are strong leaders	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Exclude people who are unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Always have fun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Are not approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Pay for their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Haze new members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Only spend time with other Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Do not prioritize academics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are involved in sexual assaults/rape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Are actively involved on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Are preoccupied with their appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Promote underage alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Humiliate/embarrass other members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement with respect to FRATERNITY MEN. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

I believe that fraternity men....

1. Are strong leaders	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Throw great parties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Pay for their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Are conceited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Promote underage alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Force members to do things they don't want to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

7. Promote unsafe/excessive alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Exclude non-members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Deny hazing within their own chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Are unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Do not care about their school work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Only spend time with other Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Are elitist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Do not prioritize academics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Are approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Are preoccupied with their appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Must fit a specific image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Are wealthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Are sexually promiscuous (slutty/players)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Humiliate/embarrass other members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Get poor grades	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Sleep around	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Are outgoing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Cheat in their classes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are involved in sexual assaults/rape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Exclude people who are unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Haze new members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Are actively involved on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Always have fun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. As a current Greek alum, please circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

1. I have bonded with other Greek coworkers. (support)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
2. I have more confidence in meeting new people at work due to involvement in a Greek organization in college. (social)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
3. Listing membership in a Greek organization on my resume was an asset in the job search process. (perceptions)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
4. My experience in a Greek organization is something I feel comfortable talking about in the workplace. (perceptions)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
5. I have had positive reactions when speaking about my experience with my Greek organization during interviews. (perceptions)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
6. I believe that my employer sees my involvement in a Greek organization as valuable to the company
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
7. My experience in a Greek organization allowed me to develop time management skills applicable to my job. (professional)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
8. Networking with other Greeks helped me obtain my job. (professional)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
9. My experience in a Greek organization allowed me to develop financial management skills applicable to my job. (professional)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

10. My Greek organization allowed me to develop presentation skills applicable to my job. (professional)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A

11. My Greek organization allowed me to develop communication skills applicable to my job. (professional)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A

12. My Greek organization allowed me to develop collaboration/teamwork skills applicable to my job. (professional)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A

13. I am more comfortable being self-directed at work due to my involvement in a Greek organization. (professional)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A

14. My experiences managing others in my Greek organization allows me to serve as a more effective manager in the workplace. (leadership)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A

15. My experiences in a Greek organization allowed me to develop leadership skills applicable to my job. (leadership)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Appendix E- Hiring Personnel Survey

Please circle the response with which you most identify

What is your gender? _____

What is your age? 21-30 31-40 41-50 51-60 61+

In what area was your college major? _____

Business Education Engineering Liberal Arts Science

Other (please specify) _____

What is your Greek Affiliation Status? Sorority Fraternity Not Affiliated

How many immediate family members (parents and/or siblings) were members of a fraternity or sorority? _____

In what industry do you currently work? _____

Advertising Accounting Banking Beauty Communications
Construction Education Entertainment Finance Food and Beverage

Health Care Hospitality/Tourism Insurance Legal Services

Manufacturing Retail Technology Other (please specify) _____

Where are you currently employed? You may skip this question if you do not wish to disclose. _____

What is your job title? _____

How many years have you been in this position? _____

Are you involved in hiring decisions? Yes No

Are you primarily responsible for making hiring decisions? Yes No

In your current position, how many people have you been involved in hiring?

0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement with respect to SORORITY WOMEN. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

I believe that sorority women...

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Are conceited | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. Must fit a specific image | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Are sexually promiscuous (slutty/players) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Force members to do things that they don't want to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. Are outgoing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. Get poor grades | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

7. Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Are wealthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Are elitist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Do not care about their school work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Deny hazing within their own chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Throw great parties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Exclude non-members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Are unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Cheat in their classes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Promote unsafe/excessive alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Sleep around	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Are strong leaders	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Exclude people who are unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Always have fun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Are not approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Pay for their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Haze new members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Only spend time with other Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Do not prioritize academics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are involved in sexual assaults/rape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Are actively involved on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Are preoccupied with their appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Promote underage alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Humiliate/embarrass other members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

statement with respect to FRATERNITY MEN. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

I believe that fraternity men....

1. Are strong leaders	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Throw great parties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Pay for their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Are conceited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Promote underage alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Force members to do things they don't want to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Promote unsafe/excessive alcohol consumption	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Exclude non-members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Deny hazing within their own chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Are unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Do not care about their school work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Only spend time with other Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Are elitist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Do not prioritize academics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Are approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Are preoccupied with their appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Must fit a specific image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Drink alcohol more than non-Greek students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Are wealthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Are sexually promiscuous (slutty/players)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Humiliate/embarrass other members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Get poor grades	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Sleep around	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Are outgoing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

25. Cheat in their classes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are involved in sexual assaults/rape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Exclude people who are unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Haze new members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Are actively involved on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Always have fun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. As a current HR Manager, please circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement. Please do not skip any rating.

1= strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neither agree nor disagree
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

- I am aware of which of my employees are members of Greek organizations
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A
- I would expect that Greek employees would bond with other Greek coworkers.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I would expect that Greek employees have more confidence in meeting new people at work.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I believe that listing membership in a Greek organization on a resume is an asset in the job search process.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I would expect that Greek employees would feel comfortable talking about their experience in a Greek organization in the workplace.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I would expect that Greek employees have had positive reactions when speaking about their experience in a Greek organization during interviews.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I see involvement in a Greek organization as valuable to the company.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I would expect that membership in a Greek organization helped Greek employees to develop time management skills applicable to their jobs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I would expect that networking with other Greeks helps Greek employees obtain a job
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- I would expect that membership in a Greek organization helped Greek employees to develop financial management skills applicable to their jobs.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I would expect that membership in a Greek organization helped Greek employees to develop presentation skills applicable to their jobs.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I would expect that membership in a Greek organization helped Greek employees to develop communication skills applicable to their jobs.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I would expect that membership in a Greek organization helped Greek employees to develop collaboration/teamwork skills applicable to their jobs.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I would expect that Greek employees are more comfortable being self-directed at work due to their involvement in a Greek organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I would expect Greek employees managing others in their Greek organization allows them to serve as a more effective manager in the workplace.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I would expect that membership in a Greek organization helped Greek employees to develop leadership skills applicable to their jobs.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Appendix F- Sorority Stereotype Ranking by Group

Non-Greek Undergrads	Greek Undergrads	Greek Alumni	Hiring Personnel
1. Leadership.....4.85	1. Leadership.....6.48	1. Leadership.....5.86	1. Leadership.....5.33
2. Exclusion.....4.60	2. Social.....5.04	2. Social.....5.03	2. Social.....4.31
3. Hazing.....4.29	3. Exclusion.....2.65	3. Exclusion.....3.20	3. Hazing.....3.68
4. Finances.....4.23	4. Appearance..2.44	4. Hazing.....3.18	4. Exclusion.....3.65
5. Appearance..4.19	5. Finances.....2.41	5. Alcohol.....2.85	5. Appearance..3.40
6. Social.....4.16	6. Alcohol.....2.35	6. Appearance..2.66	6. Alcohol.....3.21
7. Alcohol.....4.08	7. Attitude.....2.25	7. Finances.....2.50	7. Finances.....3.00
8. Attitude.....3.82	8. Hazing.....2.18	8. Attitude.....2.25	8. Attitude.....2.84
9. Sex.....3.59	9. Sex.....1.91	9. Sex.....2.17	9. Sex.....2.63
10. Academic.....2.89	10. Academic.....1.57	10. Academic.....1.88	10. Academic.....2.39

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Appendix G- Fraternity Stereotype Ranking by Group

Non-Greek Undergrads	Greek Undergrads	Greek Alumni	Hiring Personnel
1. Alcohol.....5.01	1. Leadership.....5.81	1. Leadership.....5.80	1. Leadership.....4.98
2. Hazing.....4.78	2. Social.....5.46	2. Social.....5.33	2. Social.....4.53
3. Leadership.....4.64	3. Alcohol.....3.09	3. Hazing.....3.43	3. Hazing.....4.43
4. Social.....4.50	4. Hazing.....3.03	4. Alcohol.....3.38	4. Alcohol.....4.25
5. Finances.....4.42	5. Sex.....2.69	5. Exclusion.....2.75	5. Sex.....3.43
6. Exclusion.....4.29	6. Exclusion.....2.40	6. Sex.....2.70	6. Exclusion.....3.40
7. Sex.....4.08	7. Finances.....2.23	7. Finances.....2.56	7. Finances.....3.23
8. Attitude.....3.95	8. Attitude.....2.20	8. Appearance..2.52	8. Attitude.....2.99
9. Appearance..3.88	9. Appearance..2.13	9. Academic.....2.52	9. Academic.....2.73
10. Academic.....3.54	10. Academic.....2.09	10. Attitude.....2.21	10. Appearance..2.24

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

Appendix H- Professional Benefit Ranking by Group

Greek Undergrads	Alumni	Hiring Personnel
1. Leadership6.47	1. Teamwork.....5.94	1. Networking.....5.50
2. Networking.....6.38	2. Leadership.....5.74	2. Teamwork.....4.71
3. Confidence.....6.33	3. Communication.....5.74	3. Communication.....4.67
4. Time MGT.....6.27	4. Management.....5.52	4. Leadership.....4.63
5. Self-Directed.....6.09	5. Time MGT.....5.44	5. Management.....4.38
6. Communication.....6.07	6. Presentation.....5.32	6. Self-Directed.....4.29
7. Teamwork.....6.02	7. Confidence.....5.29	7. Confidence.....4.25
8. Financial MGT.....5.93	8. Self-Directed.....5.28	8. Presentation.....4.17
9. Management.....5.91	9. Financial MGT.....4.60	9. Financial MGT.....3.92
10. Presentation.....5.87	10. Networking.....3.65	10. Time MGT.....3.92

REFERENCES

- Belkin, D. (2014, May 27). Greek Life Shown to Be Linked to Real-Life Happiness. Survey Finds College Graduates Who Were in a Fraternity or Sorority Are Generally More Content. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/greek-life-shown-to-be-linked-to-real-life-happiness->
- Biernat, M. (1990). Stereotypes on Campus: How Contact and Liking Influence Perceptions of Group Distinctiveness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 1485-1513.
- Biernat, M., & Crandall, C. S. (1994). Stereotyping and contact with social groups: measurement and conceptual issues. *European Journal Of Social Psychology*, 24(6), 659-677.
- Biernat, M., Vescio, T. K., & Green, M. L. (1996). Selective Self-Stereotyping. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 71(6), 1194-1209.
- Breedlove, S.M. (2015). *Principles of Psychology*. New York: Sinauer Associates, Inc. Publishers
- Busteed. (2014). Fraternities and Sororities: Understanding Life Outcomes. *Gallup-Purdue*. Retrieved from <https://www.npcwomen.org/resources/pdf/Gallup-Purdue%20Index%20%20Fraternities%20and%20Sororities%20Understanding%20Life%20Outcomes.pdf>
- Cervone, D. (2015). *Psychology: The Science of Person, Mind, and Brain*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Erasmus, Z. (2010). Contact Theory: Too Timid for “Race” and Racism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(2), 387-400.
- Fouts, K.S. (2010). Why Undergraduates Aren’t “Going Greek”: Attraction, Affiliation, and Retention in Fraternities and Sororities. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors*, 5(1), 24-33.
- General History of Fraternities and Sororities in the United States. (2014, Sept 12) Retrieved from <http://www.sjsu.edu/getinvolved/frso/history/usfslhistory/>
- Glass, N. (2012, May 8). Examining the benefits of Greek Life. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://college.usatoday.com/2012/05/08/examining-the-benefits-of-greek-life/>
- Harms, P.D., Woods, D., Roberts, B., Bureau, D. & Green, A. M. (2006). Perceptions of Leadership in Undergraduate Fraternal Organizations. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors*, 2(2), 81-94.

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

- Henley, T. K. (2001). Utilizing Research to Develop a Plan to Gain Members and Increase Morale in a University Sorority. *Journal Of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 8(4),103.
- Jacobs, P. (2014, May 28). People who were in Frats and Sororities Are Better At Their Jobs. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/hire-fraternity-sorority-member-2014-5>
- 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 Advisors*, 3(1), 1-12.
- Kleiner, C. (1999). Schools turn off the tap. (Cover story). *U.S. News & World Report*, 127(8), 74.
- Koenig, F. (1999). Group affective stimulus value and stereotype homogeneity. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 139(2), 245-246.
- Kokemuller, N. (2015). What are the Benefits of Joining a Fraternity or Sorority? *Demand Media*. Retrieved from <http://education.seattlepi.com/benefits-joining-fraternity-sorority-1452.html>
- Martin, G. L. (2011). How and Why: Moving Forward to Promote High Quality, Purposeful Research on the Fraternal Experience. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors*, 6(2), vi-vii.
- McClain, M.C. (2014, April 1). The Value of Greek Life Membership and Career Development. Retrieved from http://www.ncda.org/aws/NCDA/pt/sd/news_article/87490/_PARENT/layout_details_cc/false
- Patrick, B. (2014). Introduction. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 39(6), 1-12.
- Robinson, W.P, & Tajfel, H. (1996). Social Groups and Identities: Developing the Legacy of Henri Tajfel. Oxford. Hartnolls Limited, Bodmin, Cornwall.
- Ryan, C. S., & Bogart, L. M. (2001). Longitudinal Changes in the Accuracy of New Group Members' In-Group and Out-Group Stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 37(2), 118-133.
- Shonrock, M. D. (1998). Standards and expectations for Greek letter organizations. *New Directions For Student Services*, (81), 79.
- Tollini, C. & Wilson, B. (2010). Fraternity Members' Views of Negative Stereotypes. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors*, 5(1), 34-44

Greek Life: Perceptions on Campus and in the Workforce
Senior Capstone Project for Elena Freedman

- Warber, K. M., Taylor, M. E., & Makstaller, D. C. (2011). A Social Identity Approach to Intergroup Contact between Fraternity and Sorority Members and Non-Members. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors*, 6(2), 15-25.
- Wells, B., & Corts, D. P. (2008). MEASURING ATTITUDES TOWARDS SORORITY AND FRATERNITY MEMBERS: INDICATION OF IMPLICIT, INGROUP FAVORITISM. *College Student Journal*, 42(3), 842-846.
- Whipple, E. G., & Sullivan, E. G. (1998). Greeks as communities of learners. *New Directions For Student Services*, (81), 87
- “Will Joining a Fraternity Help Me Later in Life?” (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.fraternityinfo.com/2011/03/16/how-will-joining-a-fraternity-help-me-later-in-life/>