

70-15,118

RENTZ, Audrey Louise, 1941-
A PERCEPTUAL STUDY OF THE SORORITY IMAGE
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1969
Education, guidance and counseling

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

© Copyright by
AUDREY LOUISE RENTZ
1970

A PERCEPTUAL STUDY OF THE SORORITY IMAGE
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By
Audrey L. Rentz

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling,
Personnel Services and Educational Psychology

1969

ABSTRACT

A PERCEPTUAL STUDY OF THE SORORITY IMAGE AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Audrey L. Rentz

The "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" was administered to a stratified random sample of 75 sorority women and 375 non-sorority affiliated women on the Michigan State University campus. The purpose was to determine the Sorority Image and also to ascertain specific differences between the Sorority Image and Sorority Profile; the Sorority Image and the Independent Profile; and the Sorority Profile and the Independent Profile. The sorority group answered the Survey themselves and the non-sorority group answered in two ways: (a) themselves and (b) as they perceived the sorority group as responding. Data obtained from sixty items were analyzed employing the chi-square technique of statistical analysis using the .05 level of probability as criterion of difference. The items were written around the following labels, characterizations or criticisms gleaned from the literature as applying to sorority groups in the past: (1) Educational objective; (2) Parents' educational background; (3) Socio-economic level; (4) Family Greek-letter affiliation; (5) Dating patterns; (6) Drinking patterns; (7) Social skills; (8) Drugs (knowledge of and usage); (9) Prejudice; (10) Civic volunteer/service activities; (11) Leadership positions; and (12) Conformity.

Since the central focus of this study was to determine an image and profile, the conclusions or data are reported from a consensus perspective. This allows for the compilation of a rather descriptive image and profile, rather than a statistical model based on direction of differences between responding groups.

Differences between the Sorority Image and Sorority Profile were found in items composing the following labels, characterizations, or general content areas: (1) Family Greek-letter affiliation; (2) Prejudice; and (3) Conformity.

Differences between the Sorority Image and Independent Profile were found to result from items written under the following labels or characterizations: (1) Educational objective; (2) Parents' educational background; (3) Socio-economic level; (4) Family Greek-letter affiliation; (5) Dating patterns; (6) Drinking patterns; (7) Social skills; (8) Prejudice; (9) Civic volunteer/service activities; and (10) Conformity.

Differences between the Sorority Profile and Independent Profile were found under the following labels or characterizations: (1) Educational objective; (2) Parents' educational background; (3) Socio-economic level; (4) Family Greek-letter affiliation; (5) Dating patterns; (6) Drinking patterns; (7) Social skills; (8) Prejudice; and (9) Civic volunteer/service activities.

Fundamental conclusions of the study were: (1) Labels, characterizations, or criticisms levelled against sororities in the past are very much a part of the Sorority Image of 1969; (2) Sorority women project an image of: (a) higher socio-economic backgrounds; (b) college educated parents who are Greek-letter members; (c) no financial self-support; (d) ethnocentric dating and drinking patterns

confined to the Greek sub-culture; and (e) emphasize value of social skills; (3) The Sorority Image almost matches completely the sorority reality, the Sorority Profile; (4) Independent women consider themselves to be very different from sorority women with regard to the items from ten of the twelve content areas, labels or characterizations; (5) Sorority women are a distinctly different sub-culture group from the Independent group of women surveyed.

Several questions remain unanswered by this study: (1) What factors connected with the rushing program or objectives of sororities are responsible for perpetuating the sorority image of the 1930's and 1940's?; (2) Are sororities aware of the total image they project to non-sorority women?; (3) Is this image consonant with the image sororities would like to project?; (4) If not, how might the image be changed?; and (5) Are contemporary sorority groups dysfunctional? Are their objectives relevant to contemporary campuses or society as a whole?

AUDREY LOUISE RENTZ

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Oral Defense: November 11, 1969

Dissertation: A Perceptual Study of the Sorority Image
at Michigan State University

Outline of Studies: Major Subject - Student Personnel
Administration
Minor Subjects - Psychology, Higher
Education

Biographical Information: Born, May 1, 1941, Peekskill, New York

Undergraduate Degree - College of Mount
Saint Vincent, New York City, New York,
1959-1963, A.B.

Graduate Degree - The Pennsylvania State
University, University Park, Pennsylvania,
1963-1965, M.S.

Experience: Education - Residence Hall Floor Counselor,
College of Mount Saint Vincent, New York
City, New York, 1961-1962. Senior Resident
Adviser, The Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania, 1963-1965.
Dean of Women, Virginia Polytechnic Institute,
Blacksburg, Virginia, 1965-1966. Teaching
Intern, College of Education, Michigan State
University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1966-1967.
Senior Graduate Assistant, Counseling Center,
Michigan State University, East Lansing,
Michigan, 1967-1968. Instructor, Department
of Psychology, Lansing Community College,
Lansing, Michigan, 1967-1968. Dean of
Women and Instructor in Psychology, Alma
College, Alma, Michigan, 1968-

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to her major faculty adviser, Dr. Laurine E. Fitzgerald, Professor of Higher Education and Administration, for her continued friendship, sincerity and support throughout the doctoral program.

The technical assistance provided by Mrs. Dorene Chapman with the editing, typing and reproduction of the study is gratefully acknowledged.

To her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Rentz, this study is dedicated; without whose love, kind understanding and gentle support it might never have been brought to completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	THE PROBLEM	1
	Background for the Study	1
	Need for the Study	7
	Statement of the Problem	11
	Definition of Terms	13
	Procedure	14
II	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
	Greek versus Non-Greek Student Research	17
III	PROCEDURE OF STUDY	22
	Introduction	22
	Construction of the Instrument	22
	Selection of the Groups to be Surveyed	23
	Administration of the Instrument	27
	Treatment of the Data	28
IV	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	31
	Introduction	31
	Responses and Ascribed Responses to the	
	Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey	37
	Educational Objective	37
	Parents' Educational Background	40
	Socio-economic Level	40
	Family Greek Affiliation	49
	Dating Patterns	49
	Drinking Patterns	63
	Social Skills	71
	Drugs	81
	Prejudice	81
	Civic Volunteer/Service Activities	85
	Leadership Positions	88
	Conformity of Sorority Women	91
	The Sorority Image	92
	The Sorority Profile	95
	The Independent Profile	98
	Differences in Image and Profiles	101
	Sorority Image versus Independent Profile	103
	Sorority Profile versus Independent Profile	106

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	108
	Restatement of the Problem	108
	Procedure	109
	Limitations	110
	Summary of Major Findings	111
	Implications	114
	Recommendations for Further Studies	117
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	118
	APPENDIX A	120
	APPENDIX B	129

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Characterizations, Item Numbers, and Content of Each Item in the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey"	24
2	Data Showing Groups Surveyed, Number Contacted, Number of Respondents, and Percentage of Respondents	28
3	Characterizations, Item Numbers, and Content of Each Item in the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey"	33
4	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 7 Concerning College Major	38
5	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 45 Concerning Post-Graduation Plans	39
6	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 59 Concerning "Bull Sessions"	41
7	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 60 Concerning "Bull Sessions"	42
8	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 8 Concerning Amount of Education of Father	43
9	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 9 Concerning Amount of Education of Mother	44
10	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 13 Concerning Tuition Payment	46
11	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 14 Concerning Tuition Payment	46
12	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 15 Concerning Tuition Payment	47
13	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 16 Concerning Student Employment	47

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
14	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 17 Concerning Student Employment	48
15	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 10 Concerning Parental Memberships in Greek Letter Social Societies	48
16	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 11 Concerning Parental Memberships in Greek Letter Social Societies	50
17	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 12 Concerning Parental Memberships in Greek Letter Social Societies	50
18	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 24 Concerning Dating Categories	52
19	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 29 Concerning Dating Categories	53
20	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 26 Concerning Date Qualities Preferred	54
21	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 27 Concerning Date Qualities Preferred	55
22	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 28 Concerning Date Qualities Preferred	56
23	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 42 Concerning Mate Qualities Preferred	58
24	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 43 Concerning Mate Qualities Preferred	59
25	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 44 Concerning Mate Qualities Preferred	60
26	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 58 Concerning Date Activity Preferred	61
27	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 46 Concerning Code of Sexual Behavior	62
28	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 47 Concerning Code of Sexual Behavior	62
29	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 48 Concerning Code of Sexual Behavior	64

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
30	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 49 Concerning Code of Sexual Behavior	64
31	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 18 Concerning Attendance at TGIF's	65
32	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 20 Concerning Attendance at TGIF's	65
33	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 22 Concerning Attendance at TGIF's	67
34	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 21 Concerning TGIF Organizers	68
35	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 23 Concerning Types of TGIF's	69
36	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 19 Concerning Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages . . .	70
37	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 50 Concerning Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages . . .	70
38	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 51 Concerning Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages . . .	72
39	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 31 Concerning Etiquette	73
40	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 33 Concerning Etiquette	74
41	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 54 Concerning Etiquette	76
42	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 32 Concerning Table Settings	77
43	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 55 Concerning Table Settings	78
44	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 34 Concerning Receiving Line Etiquette	79
45	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 57 Concerning Receiving Line Etiquette	80
46	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 56 Concerning Dating Etiquette	82

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
47	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 35 Concerning Knowledge of Drugs	83
48	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 25 Concerning Use of Drugs	83
49	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 40 Concerning Use of Drugs	84
50	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 41 Concerning Use of Drugs	84
51	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 36 Concerning Religious Preferences	86
52	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 52 Concerning Racial Preferences	86
53	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 37 Concerning Value of Civic Volunteer/Service Activities	87
54	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 38 Concerning Value of Civic Volunteer/Service Activities	87
55	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 39 Concerning Involvement with Civic Volunteer/ Service Activities	89
56	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 4 Concerning Elected Office	89
57	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 5 Concerning Appointed Office	90
58	Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 53 Concerning Self-evaluation of Conformity	90

CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Background for the Study

A unique and differentiating element found in the historical development of the system of higher education in the United States is the collegiate social fraternity. This movement was and is a novel result in the evolution of earlier literary societies¹ and is not to be found in the history of the predecessors of the United States system of education, in Europe. Three literary societies, which later evolved into social fraternity organizations, were initiated by North American male undergraduates in the middle of the nineteenth century: Kappa Alpha (1825), Sigma Phi (1827), and Delta Phi (1827).² This unique element of collegiate social fraternities has continued. From 8 female fraternities on record from 1902 and 26 male fraternities established by 1907,³ the Greek-letter social system has grown to include 4,092 active male chapters and 2,374 active female chapters registered in 1963.⁴

1

John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958), p. 122.

2

John Robson, The College Fraternity and Its Modern Role, (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, Inc., 1966), p. 23.

3

Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities, ed. by George Starr Lasher, (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, Inc., 1957), p. 52.

4

Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities, ed. by George Starr Lasher, (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, Inc., 1963), p. x.

The developmental route of these groups was not a smooth path to the present, but a path studded with violent and frequent opposition, and criticism. Until 1865, opposition to this new form of student social grouping was vehement on many campuses and centered around the secret nature of the society and its accompanying ceremonies.⁵

The opposition to male fraternities began to decrease during the period 1850-1900 and a similar social group for women students had already been established. This group, Alpha Delta Pi, was the first secret sisterhood founded for college women.⁶ Pi Beta Phi, originally titled I.C. Sorosis when founded in 1867,⁷ became the first national organization of college women established by college women as a national college fraternity. In 1870, Kappa Alpha Theta, receiving assistance from a previously existing male fraternity at DePauw University, was recognized as the first Greek-letter society of women organized with principles and methods similar to those of men's fraternities.⁸

Although a few sororities maintain the official title of "fraternity," they are actually female fraternities with somewhat feminine goals and objectives. "Members of the National Panhellenic Conference have continuously (since 1902) emphasized social standards and the responsibility

⁵

Brubacher and Rudy, op. cit., p. 123.

⁶

Baird, op. cit., p. 384.

⁷

Baird, op. cit., p. 428.

⁸

Baird, op. cit., p. 417.

of their members to contribute through personal conduct to good campus standards, and they have consistently cooperated with college authorities in stimulating interest in good scholarship. Also, members of the National Panhellenic Conference have brought the spirit of fair play to the problems of opportunity to meet prospective new members."⁹

For the next sixty years, social fraternities gained in membership as a result of their increased appeal to the American undergraduate student population. These social groups offered the college student: housing at a reasonable cost; a center for fellowship; arranged social activities;¹⁰ "norms for marriage as well as . . . sources for upward mobility by controll(ed) dating patterns, . . . (and) maintenance of the status of the family unit through the structure of the sorority house. . . ."¹¹

In the decade of the thirties the social fraternities once again were subjected to severe criticisms. These critical attacks questioned the fraternities' allegiance to the objectives of higher education in the United States. Among some of the critical charges or labels were the following: "centers of anti-intellectualism, religious and racial

9

Baird, op. cit., p. 41.

10

Brubacher and Rudy, loc. cit.

11

John F. Scott, "The American College Sorority: Its Role in Class and Ethnic Endogamy." American Sociological Review, XXX (August, 1965), pp. 514-527.

prejudice, caste feeling, and . . ." "subversive movements. . . ."12

Also, that these groups encouraged social and class endogamy by peer maintenance of "norms for marriage. . . ."13

In 1953, the State University of New York ordered all student groups to discontinue their national fraternal affiliations and also demanded the elimination of any selection criteria for membership based on "race, color, creed, or national origin."14

In the same year, other accusations were made against national organizations of social fraternities. Some of these allegations also mentioned the alumni: "It is the national organizations, frequently under the alumni influence, which insist on maintaining the color and religious bias. Thus racial discrimination is shown to be a national and not a local fraternity policy. . . ."15

Criticisms leveled against the social fraternities thus centered around the following labels: centers of ethnocentrism; groups maintaining norms regarding marriage and ways toward upward social mobility; anti-intellectual groups; and groups classified as racially and religiously prejudiced. Such labels or characterizations of these social fraternal groups tend to be perceived as negative attributes by non-fraternity members. Such negativism is related to the image that

12

Brubacher and Rudy, loc. cit.

13

Scott, loc. cit.

14

The New York Times, October 9, 1953, p. 20.

15

"Church Colleges and the Fraternity Racial Bar," Christian Century, LXX (June 17, 1953), p. 709.

these social fraternities project to those around them on the campus.

In an attempt to determine if differences actually exist between those students considered to be a part of these Greek-letter groups and their independent or non-member counterparts, several studies have been initiated. One such study was concerned with women students and attempted to show significant differences between the following two groups: sorority and non-sorority students. Instruments used included (1) Thurstone Temperament Scales and (2) Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.¹⁶

Another study, by Widmar in 1963,¹⁷ investigated differences between Greek-letter members and non-members of both sexes at the Florida State University. Using Part I of the College Student Questionnaire, data was gathered about the following: (1) social and extra-curricular experiences in high school; (2) socio-economic levels; (3) scores on the School and College Ability Test; and (4) self concepts of independence and conformity.¹⁸

A third study centered around the areas of retention, academic achievement and scholastic aptitude and was conducted by Collins and

16

Nola Stark Rogers, "A Study of Certain Personality Characteristics of Sorority and Non-Sorority Women at the University of California, Los Angeles," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles), 1952.

17

Gary E. Widmar, "A Comparative Study of Fraternity and Sorority Membership of Entering Freshmen at the Florida State University," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University), 1963.

18

Widmar, loc. cit.

Whetstone in 1965.¹⁹ Comparing sorority and non-sorority women students they concluded that significant differences did, in fact, exist and tended to separate the two groups in the three areas.

Although the above studies do not report the same conclusions about sorority and non-sorority groups of students, certain communalities do appear. These communalities appear to be directly related to the critical labels or characterizations cited previously: anti-intellectual groups (inferring a variance in academic involvement, ability and objectives); groups of higher socio-economic levels endeavoring to maintain the social and economic level of their membership; groups with greater extra-curricular activity involvement; groups of students with different personality profiles; and a new label applied to such group members--more conforming than independent.

In view of the past frequent opposition to Greek-letter social groups and the "negative" labels applied to them, it is conceivable that some administrators and members of college faculties perceive these groups to be an anathema. Although the following statements about fraternal groups were written several years ago by Kate Hevner Mueller, it appears that they are grounded in the realities of today:

19

Wanda P. Collins and Robert D. Whetstone, "A Comparison of Sorority and Independent Women Based on Retention, Academic Achievement and Scholastic Aptitude," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXVIII, No. 4 (1965), p. 178.

To their own members whether students or alumni, the advantages of fraternal organizations are not only outstanding but self-evident. To non-members their disadvantages are overwhelming, and their presence on the campus is inimical to the objectives of higher education. To the personnel division the local chapters are simply facts of campus life to be studied and understood to be manipulated towards a greater good of the total student body. . . .²⁰

In 1969, Greek-letter societies may be perceived, labelled, or characterized as ethnocentric, anti-intellectual, or as any of the following: groups with greater extra-curricular involvement, groups of conforming people, groups recruited from upper or uppermiddle class socio-economic levels, groups of people with different dating patterns and family backgrounds. These criticisms of fraternal organizations may be adversely influencing prestige resulting in the decreasing memberships²¹ felt on some college and university campuses. Undoubtedly these factors, labels and negative characterizations are reinforced by the image these fraternal groups present to those non-fraternal students around them. How, in fact, do the non-Greek students perceive the image of the social fraternities? How accurate is the non-Greek perception of the social fraternities?

Need for the Study

Considering the rough developmental path travelled by many male and female fraternities since the late 1880's, it is not surprising that

²⁰

Kate Hevner Mueller, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 444.

²¹

Charles R. Dalton, "Fraternities at the University of Rochester," School and Society, XCIII (February 6, 1965), p. 77.

another period of criticism currently exists. Many of the charges leveled against Greek-letter social groups during the past five years have centered around the issue of racial discrimination. Although there are several fraternities and sororities whose membership is predominantly Negro (Alpha Phi Alpha, Kappa Alpha Psi, Omega Psi Phi, Phi Beta Sigma, Alpha Kappa Alpha, Delta Sigma Theta, Sigma Gamma Rho, and Zeta Phi Beta),²² other Greek-letter social groups have been strongly discouraged by local college authorities from using race or religion as a criterion for non-membership.

The two following excerpts from a 1968 issue of a national newspaper are representative of the type of attack the Greek system is currently undergoing:

It was (the Greek system) . . . a snobbish, discriminatory system that unfairly dominated (twelve years ago) student government and campus life and cruelly relegated members to a social ghetto. . . . But for the most part, the Greek system has lost influence to the point that few bother to attack it anymore.

. . . within the past few years, state colleges and universities and most private schools have required Greek groups to sign anti-discrimination clauses. Most have done so. Some have taken minority group members. But not many.²³

Some comments by women students enrolled at Northwestern University during the present academic year, 1968-69, have made the following statements, negative and positive about the sororities on their campus:

²²

Baird, op. cit., p. 85.

²³

Ursula Vils, "Greeks' Are a Dead Issue," The State Journal, October 7, 1968, p. 2.

Most of us know it's a lousy system, but you don't get dates otherwise. Fraternity men just don't date GDI's.²⁴

The rushees tend to come from uppermiddle class homes. Many are "legacies" to Greek houses where their parents once romped and reveled.²⁵

And, until a recent change in admissions policies, almost all of the students were white Anglo-Saxon Protestants with status yearns and money to burn.²⁶

They look alike, dress alike and talk alike. They sit at your feet and hold ashtrays and practically smoke your cigarets. I've decided I'll pick my own friends.²⁷

But on many campuses--mostly in the Middle West and the South--the rah rah pledge or die myth lingers on. These are the areas of the country where newspapers always mention a girl's sorority in the wedding-engagement columns. If she's an independent, her announcement may not see print.²⁸

Some of the advantages of the Greek system and its liabilities cited by Mueller and Seward in 1956 include:

They provide housing . . . in the small units which are especially desirable and successful, but which the university cannot afford to provide . . .²⁹

24

"New Era for Northwestern: Sororities Struggle to Live," The Detroit Free Press, October 21, 1968, p.11-D.

25

Ibid.

26

Ibid.

27

Ibid.

28

Ibid.

29

Kate Hevner Mueller and Doris Seward, "An Interpretation of Sororities on the Campus," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XIX (January, 1956), p. 71.

they lend support to current standards in dress, grooming, etiquette and social skills, and emphasize the all-around personal development of the individual.³⁰

liabilities include . . . exclusion of membership . . . ,³¹ and over emphasis on political and social aspects of campus life. . . .³²

Some of the useful qualities of the Greek system, i.e. providing housing, may be dying aspects in today's collegiate culture.

. . . working against the Greeks is a new feeling of pride among independents. . . . Some of it is fostered by fancy new dormitories--often with swimming pools--that are cheaper to live in than the shabby Greek houses.³³

A series of questions must be raised: Is the Greek system existing beyond its period of usefulness? Are the critical attacks leveled against these groups in the past, grounded in current reality? Are members different from their non-Greek counterparts on their own campuses? Are non-Greeks perceiving Greeks in stereotypic terms and/or perceptions which are not grounded in direct contact with Greeks? Do non-Greek students perceive Greek members as different from themselves? What are some of the variables which contribute to the Greek "image"?

There are no research findings reported which relate to the variables concerned with the "Greek-image" or what is the common perception of fraternity members.

30

Mueller and Seward, op. cit., p. 72.

31

Mueller and Seward, op. cit., p. 73.

32

Mueller and Seward, op. cit., p. 74.

33

The Detroit Free Press, loc. cit.

The implications of such findings would seem to be centered around the following types of concerns: (1) if Greeks are not different from non-Greeks, but are perceived as being different, then a communication program ought to be established to inform both groups of their communalities; (2) if Greeks are different and are not perceived by non-Greeks as being different, then what are the factors for the decline in Greek memberships; (3) if Greeks are different and are perceived as being different by non-Greeks, what are some of the factors which tend to differentiate the two groups; and (4) if Greeks are characterized by the negative labels or perceptions cited previously, then what are the responsibilities of any institution of higher education to maintain and support such a sub-culture?

This study will seek to determine the image of the sororities on the Michigan State University campus, and some of the variables, labels or characterizations which are a part of that image.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine whether any of the past critical attacks, labels or characterizations described earlier are a part of the Greek-letter social sorority image of today. More specifically, the problem is to determine how non-Greek women students perceive women Greek members on the Michigan State University campus. Such perceptions or labels include the following: (1) centers of anti-intellectualism; (2) groups seeking to maintain marriage norms and foster social upward mobility; (3) groups of people more conforming than independent; (4) groups of people from a high socio-economic strata; (5) groups characterized by racial and religious prejudice; (6) groups of people with different dating patterns; (7) groups of people with less

intellectual educational objectives; and (8) groups of people who occupy more leadership roles than other student sub-cultures.

Additionally, a secondary purpose is to determine the accuracy of the non-sorority women's perception of the sorority members with regard to the above characterizations.

The following three major hypotheses will be tested:

- H₁: There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with the responses of non-sorority women when asked to respond as they perceive sorority women responding;
- H₂: There are no significant differences in the responses of non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with non-sorority perceptions of sorority responses;
- H₃: There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women when compared with non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey."

More specifically, these three general hypotheses will be tested in the following twelve categories:

1. Educational objective of sorority women
2. Parents' educational background
3. Socio-economic level of sorority women
4. Family Greek affiliation
5. Dating patterns
6. Drinking patterns
7. Social skills
8. Drugs (knowledge of and usage)

9. Prejudice
10. Civic volunteer/service activities
11. Leadership positions
12. Conformity of sorority women

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined here in order to clarify their usage throughout the remainder of this study:

1. Anti-intellectual - noninvolvement or lack of participation in voluntary discussions; preference for noninvolvement with abstract concepts or thinking---preference for academic areas related to preparation of practitioners;
2. Independent - a woman student not affiliated with a Greek-letter social sorority;
3. Independent Profile - a descriptive summary of non-sorority responses to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey";
4. Legacy - a sorority woman whose Greek-letter social society affiliation is identical to her mother's;
5. Prejudice - an irrational attitude of hostility directed against an individual, a group, a race or their supposed characteristics;³⁴

6. Social skills - knowledge of, and acceptance/performance of socially dictated principles influencing personal actions and appearances in various social settings;
7. Social upward mobility - the process involving certain methods which permit an individual to move from one socio-economic strata to another strata of higher socio-economic status.
8. Sorority - a society or club of girls or women (as in a college);³⁵
9. Sorority Image - a descriptive summary of ascribed sorority responses made by non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey";
10. Sorority Profile - a descriptive summary of sorority responses to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey":
11. Value - "Meanings perceived as related to self."³⁶

Procedure

In order to test the three hypotheses of this study, a questionnaire instrument was constructed by the investigator. The "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" contains sixty items designed to elicit responses to

³⁵

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, op. cit., p. 2175.

³⁶

Gordon W. Allport, "Values and Our Youth," Teachers College Record, (December, 1961), p. 216.

questions comprising the twelve general labels or characterizations applied to Greek-letter groups which were cited earlier. The following two groups will participate in the study:

1. A random selection of 75 undergraduate women students enrolled at Michigan State University who are members of 5 national Greek-letter social sororities and reside in sorority houses off the campus;
2. A random selection of 375 women resident students enrolled at Michigan State University who are not members of Greek-letter social groups and who reside in 2 residential complexes on the campus.

During Fall Term, 1968 and Winter Term, 1969 a schedule of meetings will be established to distribute, administer and collect the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey." The above two groups will respond to the Survey in the following manner:

1. The sorority students will answer the items in the Survey themselves;
2. The non-sorority students will answer the items in the Survey themselves;
3. The non-sorority students will also answer the items in the Survey as they perceive the sorority group responding.

Three major analyses of the data obtained from the Survey will be performed. Each analysis will test one of the three hypotheses of the study. The statistical technique to be employed in the analyses of the data is the chi-square analysis utilizing the .05 per cent level of probability as a criterion for statistical significance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Among the publications reviewed to obtain findings of research studies related to sorority groups and the image these groups tend to project to non-Greek affiliated students around them, the following were of major significance: (1) the Education Index since 1946; (2) the Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors since 1948; (3) Dissertation Abstracts since 1950; (4) the Personnel and Guidance Journal; (5) the Journal of College Student Personnel; (6) the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature since 1946; and (7) The New York Times Index since 1952.

Although there have been studies concerned with sorority versus non-sorority students and articles relating to the prejudice and bias evident in some Greek-letter social sororities on certain campuses, there have been no research findings reported that are directly concerned with the "sorority image" on a specific campus, or campuses in general. Likewise, there have been numerous perception studies, usually undertaken with the intent of improving communication between two or more groups, based on perceived personality images. There are no reported findings concerning perceived roles for, or, the perceptions of Greek-letter social sorority groups made by non-sorority students.

Therefore, the studies which are briefly reviewed here are those which relate to the typical Greek versus non-Greek design. These results give evidence to support the theory that these two groups of people are, in fact, different from each other demographically, as well as, on other personality dimensions. Since one of the hypotheses to be

tested in this study is concerned with the similarities between sorority and non-sorority groups, such research findings are considered relevant and presented below.

Greek versus Non-Greek Student Research

The following two studies are representative of the types of research generally undertaken and the data which usually result. Willingham published a set of responses in 1962¹ gathered from a research study conducted at the University of Georgia. His concern was to determine certain trends among freshmen men who pledge during their freshmen year. Although he concluded that freshmen pledges are less likely to drop out of the University of Georgia during their first year and that their level of academic achievement tended to be slightly higher than their non-fraternity counterparts, Willingham did not publish data concerning academic or intellectual ability of these students. A similar study reported from the University of Michigan in 1963² was concerned with making comparisons between fraternity members and non-Greek male students. The following conclusions were reported: (1) fraternity members are more likely to have college educated parents; (2) fraternity members are more active in athletics and other extra-curricular activities; (3) fraternity

1

Warren W. Willingham, "College Performance of Fraternity Members and Independent Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal, (September, 1962), p. 30.

2

William W. Brickman, ed., "Facts on Fraternities," School and Society, XCI (February 23, 1963), p. 80.

members tend to have more dates; (4) fraternity members tend to occupy or assume more campus leadership roles or offices; and (5) fraternity members tend to receive lower grades. A secondary finding included the following list of adjectives typically applied to fraternity men by others: "well-dressed; well-to-do; aggressive; enthusiastic; and sophisticated."³

Several researchers have been interested in comparisons of sorority women and non-sorority women. These studies have centered around such categories of data as: personal backgrounds, academic performance and personality classifications or structures. Rogers' dissertation in 1952⁴ indicated differences which resulted from administrations of the Thurstone Temperament Scale and five scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Her subjects included two groups of women (N=183) at the University of California at Los Angeles; sorority and non-sorority women students. The significant differences reported by Rogers include the following: (1) the mean scores of the non-sorority group were lower than those of the sorority group on the Impulsive, Dominant and Sociable Scales of the Thurstone Temperament Scale; (2) on the Reflective and Vigorous Scales, the sorority mean scores were higher than those of the non-sorority group; (3) with regard to the MMPI scales: a) sorority mean scores were higher on the Social Adjustment, Family Relations, Emotionality and Economic Conservatism Scales than were the non-sorority

3

Brickman, loc. cit.

4

Nola Stark Rogers, "A Study of Certain Personality Characteristics of Sorority and Non-Sorority Women at the University of California, Los Angeles," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1952).

group means.⁵

In 1951, Stone⁶ investigated affiliation to a Greek-letter social sorority and degree of personal adjustment. Her study was conducted at the State College of Washington and involved a total group of 864 women students enrolled in a required physical education course. The 4 undergraduate classes were represented as follows: 399 freshmen; 241 sophomores; 181 juniors; and 52 seniors. The personality instrument utilized was the Bell Adjustment Inventory. Stone's findings indicated that in the following three areas of Home Adjustment, Social Adjustment and Emotional Adjustment, the more favorable scores were attributed to the sorority women in the sample. She did state that factors other than sorority membership may have accounted for the high ratings, although it did appear that sorority membership was a factor in successful personality adjustment.

Collins and Whetstone in 1965⁷ compared sorority and non-sorority women on the following three basis: retention, academic achievement and scholastic aptitude. Their sub-samples were composed of 550 sorority pledges and 795 independent women enrolled at the University of Colorado. The following four conclusions were reported: (1) sorority pledges have significantly higher scholastic aptitude scores than non-sorority women; (2) sorority pledges dominate the

5

Rogers, loc. cit.

6

Carol Larson Stone, "Sorority Status and Personality Adjustment," American Sociological Review, XV (1951), pp. 538-541.

7

Wanda P. Collins and Robert D. Whetstone, "A Comparison of Sorority and Independent Women Based on Retention, Academic Achievement, and Scholastic Aptitude," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, IV (Summer, 1965), p. 178.

middle-range of aptitude scores and represent a more homogeneous group than non-sorority women; (3) more sorority women, regardless of aptitude, return for their sophomore year than do non-sorority women; and (4) no difference was found between the percentages of sorority and non-sorority women in academic difficulty.

Providing evidence to the theory that sorority and non-sorority women students are somewhat alike in personality profiles, Plant,⁸ in 1966, investigated intolerance and authoritarianism over a two year period at San Jose State College of California. Of the original sample of 1,343 women students enrolled in 1958, only 449 women were still enrolled in 1960. The instruments used were the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, a modified Ethnocentrism Scale and Gough's modified Authoritarianism Scale. While sorority women dropped more than non-sorority students in their scores on the dogmatism scales, both groups, sorority and non-sorority students showed equivalent declines in authoritarianism and ethnocentrism.

Another study published in 1966 was conducted by Widmar. His concern was a comparison of fraternity and sorority aspirants at the Florida State University.⁹ Conclusions were that sorority aspirants tended to differ from non-sorority aspirants in the following ways: (1) sorority aspirants had greater extra-curricular experiences while in high school;

8

Walter T. Plant, "Changes in Intolerance and Authoritarianism for Sorority and Non-Sorority Women Enrolled in College After Two Years," Journal of Social Psychology, LXVIII (February, 1966), pp. 79-83.

9

Gary E. Widmar, "Comparative Study of Fraternity and Sorority Membership Aspirations of Entering Freshmen at the Florida State University," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1966).

(2) sorority aspirants came from smaller families; and (3) non-sorority aspirants had higher scores on the SCAT and considered themselves to be independent and unconforming to a greater degree than their sorority aspirant counterparts.

Certain general trends seem to emerge from a summary of such research studies' concerning Greek versus non-Greek affiliated students. Greek-letter affiliated college students, whether fraternity or sorority members, tend to be differentiated from their independent counterparts on the following general variables: (1) Involvement in extra-curricular activities; (4) Campus offices and/or leadership positions; (5) Dating; (6) Academic achievement; (7) Personality variables; (8) Academic ability; (9) Ethnocentrism; and (10) Conformity.

No research findings are reported which investigate all or several of these variables at one time with the same sub-samples. There are no findings published concerning the non-sorority perception of the sorority group or "sorority image" and how, in fact, these variables may influence or be a part of the projected "sorority image."

From the above listing of variables, gleaned from the literature, the following characterizations or variables were derived and/or selected to test the three hypotheses of this study: (1) Educational objective of sorority women; (2) Parents' educational background; (3) Socio-economic level of sorority women; (4) Family Greek affiliation; (5) Dating patterns; (6) Drinking patterns; (7) Social skills; (8) Drugs (knowledge of and usage); (9) Prejudice; (10) Civic volunteer/service activities; (11) Leadership positions; and (12) Conformity of sorority women.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE OF STUDY

Introduction

The basic purpose of this study is to determine whether any of the past criticisms, labels, perceptions or characterizations as found in the literature are a part of the Greek-letter social sorority image of today. Specifically, the problem is to determine how women non-Greek member students perceive women Greek members on the Michigan State University campus.

The actual stages concerned with the development of this study included the following four general procedures: (1) construction of the instrument; (2) selection of the groups to be surveyed; (3) administration of the instrument; and (4) analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from the instrument.

Construction of the Instrument

The investigator developed an instrument of the questionnaire type containing sixty items. The instrument was divided into two parts; (1) Part One contained items designed to gather certain demographic data about the subject, and (2) Part Two contained items designed to elicit actual responses and perceived responses of subjects to items concerned with characterizations generally applied to sorority groups, reported in previously cited studies.

Part Two of the instrument contained items about the following types of information related to the characterizations or perceptions generally applied to sororities:

1. Educational objective of sorority women
2. Parents' educational background
3. Socio-economic level of sorority women
4. Family Greek affiliation
5. Dating patterns
6. Drinking patterns
7. Social skills
8. Drugs (knowledge of and usage)
9. Prejudice
10. Civic volunteer/service activities
11. Leadership positions
12. Conformity of sorority women

Table 1 shows the above twelve characterizations or labels, the particular content of the items in the Survey, and the position number of each item as it appeared in the Survey.

An initial testing sample of the undergraduate women students enrolled at Alma College, Alma, Michigan served as a panel of student experts who reviewed the instrument. This initial sample of students consisted of sorority and non-sorority affiliated students. Their comments and criticisms of the instrument were noted during meetings with them and later the instrument was revised using their reactions as a guideline. The content of the items and overall presentation of the questionnaire was then considered adequate for its later use with the groups to be studied in this investigation.

Selection of the Groups to be Surveyed

Two groups participated in this study. One group included undergraduate women sorority members residing in off-campus sorority houses,

Table 1 Characterizations, Item Numbers, and Content of Each Item in the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey"

Characterization	Item Number	Content of Each Item
1. Educational objective of sorority women	7 45 59, 60	College major Graduate study plans "Bull sessions"
2. Parents' educational background	8, 9	Amount of education
3. Socio-economic level of sorority women	13, 14, 15 16, 17	Tuition payment Student employment
4. Family Greek affiliation	10, 11, 12	Parental memberships
5. Dating patterns	24, 29 26, 27, 28 42, 43, 44 58 46, 47, 48, 49	Dating categories Date qualities preferred Mate qualities preferred Date activity preferred Code of sexual behavior
6. Drinking patterns	18, 20, 22 21 23 19, 50, 51	Attendance at TGIF's TGIF organizers Types of TGIF's Consumption of alcoholic beverages
7. Social skills	31, 33, 54 32, 55 34, 57 56	Etiquette Table settings Receiving line etiquette Dating etiquette
8. Drugs (knowledge of and usage)	35 25, 40, 41	Knowledge of drugs Use of drugs
9. Prejudice	36 52	Religious preferences Racial preferences
10. Civic volunteer/service activities	37, 38 39	Value of such acts Involvement with such activities
11. Leadership positions	4 5	Elected office Appointed office
12. Conformity of sorority women	53	Self-evaluation

and the other population was composed of undergraduate non-sorority affiliated women students. Both populations are students of the Michigan State University campus.

The sorority affiliated group was selected in the following manner: from a roster of the twenty-two sorority groups on the Michigan State University campus, the two sororities which hold affiliative or associative types of membership in the National Panhellenic Council (NPC) were eliminated. This listing provided the investigator with a roster of the twenty sorority groups which hold regular membership in the National Panhellenic Council. The names of these groups were placed on separate pieces of paper and put in a jar. Five slips of paper were independently drawn from the jar, supplying the five sororities which were to be surveyed in the study. These groups will be designated as Sorority A, B, C, D, and E, as per an agreement with the Michigan State University Panhellenic Adviser and the Panhellenic Executive Council.

Since the size of the sorority group sample had been set at seventy-five subjects, each of the presidents of the selected sorority groups were requested to provide a sample of some fifteen members to participate in the study. From the membership list, arranged by class, for each sorority group, the president selected the sub-sample of fifteen members to approximate equal representation of sophomores, juniors and seniors. Depending on the number of members of the group within each class, the presidents selected either every other name, every second or every third name from their list.

The non-sorority group was determined and selected by the following technique: the names of the residence hall complexes were placed on separate pieces of paper and placed in a jar. Two pieces of paper were independently drawn, providing the two areas to be surveyed in

the study. For each geographic complex area selected, the names of the residence halls for women in each area were designated as the sub-samples for the study. The actual ratio of women non-sorority members to sorority members is ten to one on the Michigan State University campus. The ratio of five to one had been selected to provide a reduced stratified random sample and also to provide a workable number of subjects in the study. Therefore, the following numbers of participants in the study resulted: 75 sorority members and 375 women non-Greek students.

Each of the five women Head Resident Advisers was contacted individually and their willingness to participate in the study obtained. Instructions concerning the administration of the Survey were given to the Head Resident Advisers. It was decided by the investigator and the five Head Resident Advisers, to request the Resident Assistants to distribute copies to students on their floors. The Resident Assistants selected the students in each of the four undergraduate classes to whom the Surveys were to be given. This was accomplished by having the Resident Assistants pick the students from a list of roommates for each house. No uniform system, e.g. every other student or every third student, was utilized. The numbers of students in each of the Resident Assistant sub-groups was established so that approximately equal representation of the four classes was possible. Thus, each Resident Assistant was in charge of a sub-group of approximately ten women students.

The total tested population was controlled to the extent that all of the participants in the study were enrolled as students on the Michigan State University campus during the Fall and Winter Terms of the academic year 1968-1969. Another controlling factor was that none

of the subjects in the non-sorority group had participated in a Pan-hellenic Rushing or Pledging Program. This was determined by a response to Question 3 in Part One of the Survey. The non-sorority perceptions of the sorority group members were, therefore, based on stereotypic perceptions, rumors, and a generalized reputation based on hearsay, rather than direct involvement with or exposure to sorority groups.

Administration of the Instrument

The Survey was administered in two ways. Following individual meetings with the presidents of the five sorority houses, a schedule of meetings was arranged to administer the Survey. The schedule below indicates the arranged meetings of the investigator with the various five sub-samples:

Sorority A and Sorority B	Monday, November 11,
at Sorority B	9:30 p.m.
 Sorority C and Sorority D	 Monday, November 11,
at Sorority C	9:30 p.m.*
 Sorority E	 Monday, November 11,
at Sorority E	6:30 p.m.**

The non-sorority women students received their questionnaire via their Resident Assistants within their residence hall units. Three hundred and seventy-five non-sorority women were selected from among two large residence hall complexes. The Resident Assistants returned

*An assistant, Mr. Jack Cassidy, presided at the administration at this location.

**The "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" was reviewed by the alumnae adviser before approval was given for its use in this house.

the completed Surveys to their Head Resident Advisers. The investigator collected the completed Surveys from the Head Resident Advisers.

The sorority group and 160 of the non-sorority group responded to the instrument during the period of November 11 to November 23, 1968. A follow-up procedure was initiated during the week of November 24, 1968. The remaining 215 students of the non-sorority group responded to the instrument during the two week period of January 8 to January 22, 1969.

Table 2 indicates the per cent of response by groups of women students surveyed.

Table 2 Data Showing Groups Surveyed, Number Contacted, Number of Respondents, and Percentage of Respondents

Group	Number	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Sorority	75	73	96
Sophomores	24	23	96
Juniors	26	26	100
Seniors	25	24	96
Non-Sorority	375	274	73
Freshmen	115	83	71
Sophomores	110	84	76
Juniors	90	61	66
Seniors	60	46	76

Treatment of the Data

The participants were asked to respond to sixty items in the questionnaire. Some of these items requested demographic data of the subject; some required the subject to express an opinion; and some of the items requested the subject to rate the value of certain qualities or characteristics of people. The two groups responded to the instrument

in two ways: (1) the sorority women answered the items, supplying an actual sorority response pattern, and (2) the non-sorority women responded with an actual response pattern and by taking the instrument a second time at the same meeting responded with their perceptions of sorority responses. Thus, the following three types of data were produced:

- (1) sorority women responses; (2) non-sorority women responses; and
- (3) perceived sorority responses made by non-sorority women.

The chi-square technique using the .05 level of probability as a criterion of significance was utilized to test each of the following three hypotheses. Each hypothesis was tested for each of the items on the Survey concerning the twelve perceptions or labels applied to sororities:

- H_1 : There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with the responses of non-sorority women when asked to respond as they perceive sorority women responding;
- H_2 : There are no significant differences in the responses of non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with non-sorority perceptions of sorority responses;
- H_3 : There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women when compared with non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey."

Three major analyses were performed with the data obtained from the questionnaire: the first analysis compared the responses of sorority women and the perceived sorority responses made by non-sorority women

to the instrument; the second compared responses of non-sorority women and their perceptions of sorority responses to the instrument; and the third compared responses of sorority and non-sorority women to the Survey.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the data obtained from the administration of the instrument, and analysis of the data used in testing the three following hypotheses:

- H₁: There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with the responses of non-sorority women when asked to respond as they perceive sorority women responding;
- H₂: There are no significant differences in the responses of non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with non-sorority perceptions of sorority responses;
- H₃: There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women when compared with non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey."

The sixty items contained in the Survey were divided into twelve major categories reflecting the images of sorority women cited in the literature:

1. Educational objective of sorority women
2. Parents' educational background
3. Socio-economic level of sorority women
4. Family Greek affiliation

5. Dating patterns
6. Drinking patterns
7. Social skills
8. Drugs (knowledge of and usage)
9. Prejudice
10. Civic volunteer/service activities
11. Leadership positions
12. Conformity of sorority women

The data from the two groups studied in this study were statistically analyzed using the following method: since the chi-square technique was to be employed and the IBM 3600 Computer used, the responses to the Surveys were transferred to IBM cards by the key punch operators of the Computer Laboratory on the Michigan State University campus. The computer program selected to treat the data was the ACT program--the basic chi-square analysis program. ACT employs the following fundamental definition of the statistic, chi-square:

$$\frac{(\text{observed frequency} - \text{theoretical frequency})^2}{\text{theoretical frequency}} = \chi^2$$

with degrees of freedom: $df = (c-1) (r-1)$

Therefore, since three analyses were to be made, each hypothesis was tested independently for each item in the Survey. The IBM 3600 Computer processed the data by making three runs; each run analyzing the data for one of the three hypotheses of the study.

Tables 4-58 indicate the response patterns to the items in the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey," for each of the groups studied.

The following table, Table 3, is presented to provide the reader with a guide to the understanding of tables which follow in this chapter. Each of the twelve characterizations constitute a major table heading

Table 3 Characterizations, Item Numbers, and Content of Each Item in the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey"

Characterization	Item Number	Content of Each Item
1. Educational objective of sorority women	7 45 59, 60	College major Graduate study plans "Bull sessions"
2. Parents' educational background	8, 9	Amount of education
3. Socio-economic level of sorority women	13, 14, 15 16, 17	Tuition payment Student employment
4. Family Greek affiliation	10, 11, 12	Parental memberships
5. Dating patterns	24, 29 26, 27, 28 42, 43, 44 58 46, 47, 48, 49	Dating categories Date qualities preferred Mate qualities preferred Date activity preferred Code of sexual behavior
6. Drinking patterns	18, 20, 22 21 23 19, 50, 51	Attendance at TGIF's TGIF organizers Types of TGIF's Consumption of alcoholic beverages
7. Social skills	31, 33, 54 32, 55 34, 57 56	Etiquette Table settings Receiving line etiquette Dating etiquette
8. Drugs (knowledge of and usage)	35 25, 40, 41	Knowledge of drugs Use of drugs
9. Prejudice	36 52	Religious preferences Racial preferences
10. Civic volunteer/service activities	37, 38 39	Value of such acts Involvement with such activities
11. Leadership positions	4 5	Elected office Appointed office
12. Conformity of sorority women	53	Self-evaluation

with regard to the hypothesis under investigation. Following each characterization, the number of the item, as it appeared in the Survey, is shown and also the specific content of each item. Thus, for the area entitled Educational Objective, the next four tables present data from Questions No. 7, 45, 59, and 60 relating to College major, Graduate study plans and "Bull sessions."

The following pages, presenting the discussion of the analysis and interpretation of data, are organized according to the following outline:

Responses and Ascribed Responses to the
Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey

The focus of this investigation was to determine the image of sorority women as held by non-sorority women on the same campus. As a result of this, the significant information is the sorority image ascribed by the majority of non-sorority women surveyed. Therefore, the discussion section reflects the findings from a consensus point of view. The image is a reflection of the ascribed responses made by most of the non-sorority women.

In some cases, the data relating to significant statistical differences between the groups being compared may reflect evidences of a difference which appear to be contradictory to the consensus response pattern discussed. This statistically significant difference results from the frequency and spread in

distribution of the various responses of the groups. Indications of statistical difference are provided in each table, but are not a consistent part of the discussion section.

Due to the consistent inflation of the computed chi-square values resulting from the second chi-square analysis (comparing non-sorority responses with ascribed sorority responses made by non-sorority women), the chi-square values have been omitted from the tables. Statistically significant differences were found for every item analyzed, indicating non-sorority women see themselves as very much different from sorority women.

Summary of Composite Image and Profiles

The majority responses to each question have been compiled for each group and presented in a descriptive manner for each group.

The Sorority Image is a descriptive summary of ascribed sorority responses made by non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey."

The Sorority Profile is a descriptive summary of sorority responses to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey."

The Independent Profile is a descriptive summary of non-sorority responses to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey."

Differences in Image and Profiles

This section presents a concise description of the differences in majority responses for each of the groups studied. The following comparisons were made: Sorority Image and Sorority Profile; Sorority Image and Independent Profile; and Sorority Profile and Independent Profile.

Responses and Ascribed Responses to the
Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey

Educational Objective

The general content area entitled Educational Objective was composed of the following sub-categories and questions: (1) College major, Question No. 7; (2) Graduate study plans, Question No. 45; and (3) "Bull sessions," Questions No. 59 and 60.

Concerning College Major: modal non-sorority response (21.9%) was a major within the College of Social Science and posited a major in the College of Education for sorority women. The most frequent response selected by sorority women (39.7%) indicated majors in the College of Education and thus matched the ascribed sorority response of Independents. See Table 4. Although a chi-square value of 36.06 was found to be significant at the .05 level, this result was probably due to the observed variance in the distribution of responses among other college majors.

When asked what their post graduate plans were, Question 45, the category with greatest frequency selected by Independents indicated a combination of "Marriage and work," (36.0%) while indicating the same response would be made by sorority women. The majority of sorority women (28.7%) did, in fact, respond "Marriage and work." See Table 5. The significant chi-square value of 88.57 tended to result from the observed variances in frequency of responding "Marriage" and "Work and Graduate Study."

Question 59 asked how often the woman became involved in "Bull sessions." Most Independents (47.6%) responded "Two or three times a week," and ascribed the same response to sorority women. Most sorority

Table 4 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 7 Concerning College Major

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Arts and Letters	14	19.1	70	26.8	53	19.3
b) Agriculture	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
c) Business	5	6.8	4	1.5	10	3.6
d) Education	29	<u>39.7</u>	148	<u>56.7</u>	54	19.7
e) Home Economics	6	8.2	21	8.0	19	6.9
f) Natural Science	0	0.0	2	0.7	36	13.1
g) Social Science	16	21.9	10	3.8	60	<u>21.9</u>
h) JMC, LBM, JMC	1	1.3	1	0.3	0	0.0
i) Other	2	2.7	5	1.9	41	14.9
	<u>N₁=73</u>		<u>N₂=261</u>		<u>N₃=274</u>	

df=8

Chi-square .05=15.5

 $\chi^2_1=36.057^*$ $\chi^2_3=31.717^*$

"Within the College of:"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority
and ascribed sorority
responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority
and independent
responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 5 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 45 Concerning Post-Graduation Plans

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Marriage	2	2.7	92	34.7	7	2.5
b) Work	11	15.0	18	6.7	53	19.4
c) Graduate study	6	8.2	4	1.5	18	6.6
d) a) and b)	21	<u>28.7</u>	112	<u>42.2</u>	98	<u>36.0</u>
e) a) and c)	1	1.3	13	4.9	5	1.8
f) b) and c)	19	26.0	6	2.2	35	12.8
g) All three	<u>13</u>	17.8	<u>20</u>	7.5	<u>54</u>	19.8
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=265$		$N_3=272$	

df=6

Chi-square .05=14.06

 $\chi^2_1=88.567^*$ $\chi^2_3=8.805$

"Immediately following graduation, my plans include:"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

women (60.2%) indicated a frequency of involvement identical to their ascribed response, "Two or three times a week." See Table 6. A chi-square value of 20.22 was considered significant at the .05 level.

Concerning the most generally discussed topic, Question 60, the most frequent Independent response (26.2%) was "Men," and the ascribed sorority reply was "Dating." The sorority category with greatest frequency was "Men," (36.1%). See Table 7.

Parents' Educational Background

Questions No. 8 and 9 asked for the highest level of educational training received by either parent. Table 8 presents the responses concerning the educational background of the father and Table 9 shows the responses regarding the mother.

Modal Independent response (40.5%) indicated fathers were "High school graduates" and ascribed "AB or BS" degrees to the fathers of sorority women. Most sorority women (46.5%) indicated their fathers were college graduates. See Table 8. Although the majority response is identical in each case, a chi-square value of 12.96 being significant at the .05 level resulted from the differences in the spread of responses.

Most Independents (52.9%) indicated their mothers were "High school graduates" and indicated "AB or BS" degrees for mothers of sorority women. Most sorority women (43.8%) responded "AB or BS" degrees for their mothers. See Table 9.

Socio-economic Level

This general content area contained items relating to manner of tuition payment, Questions No. 13, 14, and 15; and student employment

Table 6 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 59 Concerning
"Bull Sessions"

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Nightly	12	16.4	65	24.2	60	21.9
b) Two or three times a week	44	<u>60.2</u>	134	<u>50.0</u>	130	<u>47.6</u>
c) Once a week	16	21.9	39	14.5	56	20.5
d) Once or twice a month	1	1.3	25	9.3	20	7.3
e) I never do	0	0.0	5	1.8	7	2.5
	<u>N₁=73</u>		<u>N₂=268</u>		<u>N₃=273</u>	

df=4

Chi-square .05=9.49

 $\chi^2_1=10.770^*$ $\chi^2_3=7.977$

"How often do you get involved in and/or participate in 'bull sessions'?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority
and ascribed sorority
responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority
and independent
responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 7 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 60 Concerning
"Bull Sessions"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Dating	17	23.6	96	<u>37.2</u>	45	17.1
b) International problems	1	1.3	2	0.7	7	2.6
c) Sex	8	11.1	41	15.8	47	17.8
d) Politics	3	4.1	0	0.0	10	3.8
e) Men	26	<u>36.1</u>	84	32.5	69	<u>26.2</u>
f) M.S.U.	5	6.9	14	5.4	28	10.2
g) Other	<u>12</u>	16.6	<u>20</u>	7.7	<u>55</u>	20.9
	$N_1=72$		$N_2=258$		$N_3=263$	

df=6

Chi-square .05=12.5

 $\chi^2_1=20.220^*$ $\chi^2_3=7.054$

"What is, generally, the most discussed topic?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority
and ascribed sorority
responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority
and independent
responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 8 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 8 Concerning Amount of Education of Father

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) High school	12	16.4	18	6.8	110	<u>40.5</u>
b) Some college without a degree	13	17.8	29	10.9	77	28.4
c) College (AB, BS)	34	<u>46.5</u>	178	<u>67.4</u>	38	14.0
d) Masters	8	10.9	25	9.4	28	10.3
e) PhD, EdD	2	2.7	5	1.8	11	4.0
f) MD, DVM, DDS	<u>4</u>	5.4	<u>9</u>	3.4	<u>7</u>	2.5
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=264$		$N_3=271$	

df=5

Chi-square .05=11.07

 $\chi^2_1=12.995^*$ $\chi^2_3=42.843^*$

"highest degree completed by"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 9 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 9 Concerning Amount of Education of Mother

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) High school	20	27.4	37	14.0	144	<u>52.9</u>
b) Some college without a degree	18	24.6	88	33.3	72	26.4
c) College (AB, BS)	32	<u>43.8</u>	131	<u>49.6</u>	43	15.8
d) Masters	3	4.1	7	4.7	13	4.7
e) PhD, EdD	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
f) MD, DVM, DDS	0	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=264$		$N_3=272$	

df=5

Chi-square .05=11.07

 $\chi^2_1=8.505$ $\chi^2_3=28.824^*$

"highest degree completed by"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

during the academic year, Questions No. 16 and 17.

Table 10 shows the responses to the question, are you taking advantage of the M.S.U. sliding scale tuition plan? (re: tuition plan, see Appendix B). Most Independents (61.5%) responded "No," and attributed "No" to sorority women. Most sorority women (79.4%) indicated "No."

Question 14 concerned the average amount of savings per term, if the student was utilizing the M.S.U. sliding scale tuition plan. Table 11 shows that most Independents (62.6%) responded "\$61.00 per term," (the maximum) and ascribed a response of "\$0.00 per term," (the minimum) to sorority women. The ascribed response was accurate. Most sorority women (60.0%) responded "\$0.00 per term." See Table 11.

When asked what part of their tuition the students, themselves, pay Question 15: most Independents (46.6%) indicated "Part." The ascribed sorority response was "None." Most sorority women (75.3%) responded "None." See Table 12. A significant chi-square value (8.17) resulted from distribution variance in response patterns, although "None" was the majority response made by each group.

Question 16 asked if the student had any form of employment during the academic year. Most Independents (51.4%) indicated "Yes" and indicated a response of "No" would be made by sorority women. See Table 13. Most sorority women (68.4%) responded "No."

If the student had a source of employment, Question 17 asked how many hours per week she worked. Most Independents (42.0%) responded "Ten hours," and attributed the response "Less than ten hours," to sorority women. Most sorority women (42.3%) indicated they worked "Less than ten hours," per week. See Table 14. The statistical difference significant at .05 level (chi-square of 11.00) results from the variance in response frequencies of both groups.

Table 10 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 13 Concerning Tuition Payment

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	15	20.5	61	23.2	103	38.4
b) No	<u>58</u>	<u>79.4</u>	<u>201</u>	<u>76.7</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>61.5</u>
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=262$		$N_3=268$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=0.243$	
					$X_3^2=8.110^*$	

Table 11 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 14 Concerning Tuition Payment

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) \$61.00 per term	6	20.0	21	17.8	82	<u>62.6</u>
b) \$5.00 per term	6	20.0	24	20.3	19	14.5
c) \$0.00 per term	<u>18</u>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>61.8</u>	<u>30</u>	22.9
	$N_1=30$		$N_2=118$		$N_3=131$	
df=2			Chi-square .05=5.99		$X_1^2=0.079$	
					$X_3^2=19.847^*$	

Legend

A - Sorority Responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 12 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 15 Concerning Tuition Payment

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) All	3	4.1	2	0.7	32	11.7
b) Part	15	20.5	89	33.2	127	46.6
c) None	<u>55</u>	<u>75.3</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>66.0</u>	<u>113</u>	41.5
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=268$		$N_3=272$	
df=2			Chi-square .05=5.99		$\chi^2_1=8.171^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=26.383^*$	

Table 13 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 16 Concerning Student Employment

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Yes	23	31.5	48	17.9	140	51.4
b) No	<u>50</u>	<u>68.4</u>	<u>219</u>	<u>82.0</u>	<u>132</u>	48.5
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=267$		$N_3=272$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$\chi^2_1=6.351^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=9.203^*$	

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 χ^2_1 = Comparison of sorority
and ascribed sorority
responses (A&B)

 χ^2_3 = Comparison of sorority
and independent
responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 14 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 17 Concerning Student Employment

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Ten hours	10	38.4	25	31.2	58	42.0
b) Less than ten hours	11	42.3	53	66.2	32	23.1
c) Twenty hours	4	15.3	2	2.5	28	20.2
d) More than twenty hours	1	3.8	0	0.0	20	14.5
	$N_1=26$		$N_2=80$		$N_3=138$	

df=3

Chi-square .05=7.81

 $\chi^2_1=11.004^*$ $\chi^2_3=5.324$

Table 15 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 10 Concerning Parental Memberships in Greek Letter Social Societies

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Yes	20	27.4	173	66.0	37	13.5
b) No	53	72.6	89	33.9	236	86.4
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=262$		$N_3=273$	

df=1

Chi-square .05=3.84

 $\chi^2_1=34.894^*$ $\chi^2_3=8.023^*$ Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Family Greek Affiliation

This general content area consisted of items concerning affiliation of parents with Greek-letter social groups and similarities of membership between daughters and mothers.

Question 10 asked if the student's father was a Greek-letter social group member. Table 15 indicates most Independents (86.4%) responded "No," and ascribed a response of "Yes" to sorority women. Most sorority women (72.6%) indicated "No." The ascribed response pattern was not accurate. Chi-square values of 34.89 and 8.02 were significant at the .05 level.

Concerning Greek-letter social memberships of mothers, most Independents (91.5%) responded "No," their mothers did not hold memberships. They assigned a response of "Yes" to sorority women. Most sorority women (63.0%) responded "No." See Table 16. The significant chi-square value of 38.00 at .05 level appeared to result from differences in the frequency distribution of sorority and non-sorority responses.

When asked if the student belonged to the same Greek-letter social group as her mother (Question 12), most Independents (96.2%) indicated "No." They posited a response of "Yes," for sorority women. See Table 17. Most sorority women (76.1%) did respond "No."

Dating Patterns

The general content area entitled Dating Patterns consisted of thirteen items concerning dating categories; preferred characteristics of a date for an evening; preferred characteristics of a marriage partner; type of activity preferred while on a date; and a code of sexual behavioral standards.

Table 16 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 11 Concerning Parental Memberships in Greek Letter Social Societies

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	27	36.9	213	80.9	23	8.4
b) No	<u>46</u>	<u>63.0</u>	<u>50</u>	19.0	<u>250</u>	<u>91.5</u>
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=273$		$N_3=263$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=54.211^*$	
					$X_3^2=38.007^*$	

Table 17 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 12 Concerning Parental Memberships in Greek Letter Social Societies

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	10	23.8	110	68.7	3	3.7
b) No	<u>32</u>	<u>76.1</u>	<u>50</u>	31.2	<u>77</u>	<u>96.2</u>
	$N_1=42$		$N_2=160$		$N_3=80$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=27.861^*$	
					$X_3^2=11.640^*$	

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Question 24 asked the student to indicate which dating category or label best described her. Table 18 shows Independents most frequently responded "Dating around," (43.9%). They ascribed the response choice "Pinned" to sorority women. Most sorority women (71.2%) responded "Dating around." The ascribed sorority response was not accurate. A chi-square value of 41.49 was significant at the .05 level.

When asked how many of their friends are either pinned or engaged before graduation (Question 29), (30.0%) of the Independents indicated "Between 49% and 25%." They attributed the following response to sorority women, "Between 74% and 50%." However, most sorority women (36.9%) responded "Between 49% and 24%." See Table 19. A chi-square value of 46.06 was considered significant at the .05 level.

Most Independents (43.4%) considered a date's quality of fraternity membership as "Very unimportant," but ascribed the sorority rating as "Important." See Table 20. Most sorority women (57.7%) considered fraternity membership (Question 26) as "Doesn't matter to me." Both chi-square values (129.54 and 35.16) were significant at the .05 level.

Concerning the date quality of religious practice or persuasion (Question 27), most Independents (38.3%) rated this quality of a prospective date as "Doesn't matter to me." They assigned the same response to sorority women. Most sorority women (45.2%) responded "Doesn't matter to me." See Table 21. A significant chi-square value of 35.16 may have resulted from the differences in the N's of the two groups compared.

The occupational aspirations of a prospective date were rated by most Independents (43.2%) as "Important." See Table 22. They indicated the same response would be made by sorority women. Most sorority women (50.6%) did rate this quality as "Important."

Table 18 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 24 Concerning Dating Categories

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Engaged	2	2.7	3	1.1	39	14.2
b) Pinned	5	6.8	116	<u>43.2</u>	20	7.3
c) Going steady	12	16.4	49	18.2	58	21.2
d) Dating around	52	<u>71.2</u>	99	36.9	120	<u>43.9</u>
e) None of the above	<u>2</u>	2.7	<u>1</u>	0.3	<u>36</u>	13.1
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=268$		$N_3=273$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$X_1^2=41.488^*$	
					$X_3^2=21.50^*$	

"Which 'dating category' best describes you?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 19 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 29 Concerning Dating Categories

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Between 100% and 75%	3	4.1	61	22.8	12	4.4
b) Between 74% and 50%	20	27.4	129	<u>48.3</u>	53	19.4
c) Between 49% and 25%	27	<u>36.9</u>	44	16.4	82	<u>30.0</u>
d) Between 24% and 5%	19	26.0	28	10.4	73	27.1
e) Less than 5%	4	5.4	2	0.7	40	14.6
f) None	0	0.0	3	1.1	12	4.4
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=267$		$N_3=272$	
df=5			Chi-square .05=11.1		$\chi^2_1=46.064^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=9.678$	

"How many of your friends in your immediate living area are either pinned or engaged before graduation?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 20 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 26 Concerning Date Qualities Preferred

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Very important	1	1.3	76	27.9	0	0.0
b) Important	9	12.3	148	<u>54.4</u>	7	2.5
c) Doesn't matter to me	42	<u>57.5</u>	37	13.6	99	36.1
d) Unimportant	10	13.7	8	2.9	49	17.8
e) Very unimportant	<u>11</u>	15.0	<u>3</u>	1.1	<u>119</u>	<u>43.4</u>
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=272$		$N_3=274$	

df=4

Chi-square .05=9.49

 $\chi^2_1=129.540^*$ $\chi^2_3=35.162^*$

"Greek-letter membership (fraternity)"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 21 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 27 Concerning Date Qualities Preferred

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Very important	2	2.7	13	4.8	15	5.4
b) Important	16	21.9	70	25.9	73	22.9
c) Doesn't matter to me	33	<u>45.2</u>	135	<u>50.0</u>	105	<u>38.3</u>
d) Unimportant	14	19.1	39	14.4	47	17.1
e) Very unimportant	8	10.9	13	4.8	44	16.0
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=270$		$N_3=274$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$\chi^2_1=5.580$	
					$\chi^2_3=35.162^*$	

"Religious practice or persuasion"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 22 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 28 Concerning Date Qualities Preferred

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Very important	17	23.2	80	29.4	48	17.5
b) Important	37	<u>50.6</u>	128	<u>47.0</u>	118	<u>43.2</u>
c) Doesn't matter to me	16	21.9	51	18.7	87	31.8
d) Unimportant	3	4.1	9	3.3	16	5.8
e) Very unimportant	0	0.0	4	1.4	4	1.4
	$N_1 = 73$		$N_2 = 272$		$N_3 = 273$	

df=4

Chi-square .05=9.49

 $\chi^2_1 = 2.403$ $\chi^2_3 = 5.021$

"Occupational aspirations"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 = Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 = Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Question 42 concerned the rating of the quality of fraternity membership of a prospective marriage partner. Most Independents (48.9%) rated this quality "Very unimportant," while ascribing a rating of "Important," to sorority women. Most sorority women (56.2%) responded "Doesn't matter to me." See Table 23. Significant chi-square values of 80.94 and 28.30 were found to exist at the .05 level.

Most Independents (51.4%) considered religious practice or persuasion an "Important" quality of a prospective marriage partner. They ascribed a rating of "Important" to sorority women. See Table 24. Most sorority women (56.1%) did respond with a rating of "Important" concerning this quality. The variance within frequency distribution of the last category resulted in a significant chi-square value of 11.05 at the .05 level.

Occupational aspirations of a prospective marriage partner were rated as "Important" by most Independents (64.8%). They assigned a rating of "Very important" to sorority women which coincided with the majority sorority response (47.9%) of "Very important." See Table 25.

When asked what type of activity was preferred on a date, the modal Independent reply was (31.2%) "See a movie," while projecting "Informal mixer at a fraternity" as the sorority response. See Table 26. "Informal mixer at a fraternity" was selected by (39.7%) of sorority women and matched the ascribed image held by Independents. The significant chi-square value of 35.37 tended to result from the variances in the frequency distributions of the two groups compared.

Identical responses of "Disagree" resulted in response to Question 46 concerning the fact that there are two differing standards of sexual behavior applying to sorority and non-sorority students. See Table 27. Most Independents (85.8%) matched the ascribed sorority response of

Table 23 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 42 Concerning
Mate Qualities Preferred

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Very important	0	0.0	40	14.8	1	0.3
b) Important	7	9.5	139	<u>51.4</u>	4	1.4
c) Doesn't matter to me	41	<u>56.2</u>	65	24.0	94	34.3
d) Unimportant	7	9.6	13	4.8	41	14.9
e) Very unimportant	<u>18</u>	24.7	<u>13</u>	4.8	<u>134</u>	<u>48.9</u>
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=270$		$N_3=274$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$\chi^2_1=80.935^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=28.302^*$	

"Greek-letter membership"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 = Comparison of sorority
and ascribed sorority
responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 = Comparison of sorority
and independent
responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 24 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 43 Concerning
Mate Qualities Preferred

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>			
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>		
a) Very important	8	10.9	53	19.7	66	24.2		
b) Important	41	<u>56.1</u>	157	<u>58.3</u>	140	<u>51.4</u>		
c) Doesn't matter to me	16	21.9	48	17.8	40	14.7		
d) Unimportant	4	5.4	9	3.3	11	4.0		
e) Very unimportant	4	5.4	2	0.7	15	5.5		
	$N_1=\frac{4}{73}$		$N_2=\frac{2}{269}$		$N_3=\frac{15}{272}$			
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49			$\chi^2_{11}=11.047^*$		
						$\chi^2_{37}=7.109$		

"Religious practice or persuasion"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority
and ascribed sorority
responses (A&B)

X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority
and independent
responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 25 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 44 Concerning Mate Qualities Preferred

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Very important	35	<u>47.9</u>	155	<u>57.6</u>	61	22.3
b) Important	33	46.5	104	38.6	177	<u>64.8</u>
c) Doesn't matter to me	4	5.5	9	3.3	32	11.7
d) Unimportant	1	1.4	1	0.3	2	0.7
e) Very unimportant	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
	<u>N₁=73</u>		<u>N₂=269</u>		<u>N₃=273</u>	

df=4

Chi-square .05=9.49

 $\chi^2_1=3.825$ $\chi^2_3=18.160^*$

"Occupation"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority
and ascribed sorority
responses (A&B)

 χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority
and independent
responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 26 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 58 Concerning Date Activity Preferred

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Informal mixer at a fraternity	29	<u>39.7</u>	126	<u>48.6</u>	24	8.9
b) Grandmother's, CD's, "the Gables"	8	10.9	88	33.9	22	8.1
c) See a movie	4	5.4	6	2.3	84	<u>31.2</u>
d) Private date, without others around	16	21.9	19	7.3	66	24.5
e) Other	<u>16</u>	21.9	<u>20</u>	7.7	<u>73</u>	27.1
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=259$		$N_3=269$	

df=4

Chi-square .05=9.49

 $\chi^2_1=35.367^*$ $\chi^2_3=51.222^*$

"What do you prefer to do when going out with a date for an evening?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 27 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 46 Concerning Code of Sexual Behavior

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Agree	7	9.7	57	21.6	38	14.1
b) Disagree	$\frac{65}{N_1=72}$	$\frac{90.2}{}$	$\frac{206}{N_2=263}$	$\frac{78.3}{}$	$\frac{231}{N_3=269}$	$\frac{85.8}{}$

df=1

Chi-square .05=3.84

 $X_1^2=5.224^*$ $X_3^2=0.962$

Table 28 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 47 Concerning Code of Sexual Behavior

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Agree	7	9.5	46	17.6	49	18.6
b) Disagree	$\frac{66}{N_1=73}$	$\frac{90.4}{}$	$\frac{214}{N_2=260}$	$\frac{82.3}{}$	$\frac{219}{N_3=268}$	$\frac{81.3}{}$

df=1

Chi-square .05=3.84

 $X_1^2=2.797$ $X_3^2=3.364$ Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

"Disagree;" and most sorority students (90.2%) responded "Disagree." Although the majority responses were identical, the significant chi-square value (5.22) resulted from variances in frequency distribution.

When asked if the behavioral code pertaining to sorority women was less stringent than among Independents, identical responses of "Disagree" resulted. Most Independents (81.3%) matched the attributed sorority response and most sorority women (90.4%) indicated disagreement. See Table 28.

Question 48 read: "Pre-marital sexual intercourse is more prevalent among sorority women than among non-sorority women at M.S.U." Identical responses of "Disagree" were indicated. See Table 29. Most Independents (86.2%) matched the ascribed sorority response and the majority of sorority women (97.2%) who responded with "Disagree."

When asked if pre-marital sexual intercourse is more prevalent among Independents than among sorority women, similar responses of "Disagree" resulted. Most Independents (86.6%) matched the ascribed sorority response and also the majority of sorority students (65.2%) who indicated "Disagree." See Table 30. The significant chi-square value of 18.68 tended to result from variances in the frequency distribution and N's of the two groups compared.

Drinking Patterns

The eight items which composed this general content area concerned frequency of attendance at TGIF parties; TGIF organizers; types of TGIF's; and consumption of alcoholic beverages.

Question 18 asked if the student generally goes to TGIF parties. Table 31 shows that most Independents (63.5%) responded "No," and indicated a sorority response of "Yes." Most sorority women (95.8%)

Table 29 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 48 Concerning Code of Sexual Behavior

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Agree	2	2.7	12	4.6	36	13.7
b) Disagree	$\frac{70}{N_1=72}$	<u>97.2</u>	$\frac{249}{N_2=261}$	<u>95.4</u>	$\frac{226}{N_3=262}$	<u>86.2</u>
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=2.797$	
					$X_3^2=6.732^*$	

Table 30 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 49 Concerning Code of Sexual Behavior

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Agree	25	34.7	73	27.9	34	12.9
b) Disagree	$\frac{47}{N_1=72}$	<u>65.2</u>	$\frac{188}{N_2=261}$	<u>72.0</u>	$\frac{228}{N_3=262}$	<u>86.6</u>
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=0.464$	
					$X_3^2=18.676^*$	

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 31 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 18 Concerning Attendance at TGIF's

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	70	<u>95.8</u>	259	<u>95.9</u>	100	36.5
b) No	<u>3</u>	4.1	<u>11</u>	4.0	<u>174</u>	<u>63.5</u>
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=270$		$N_3=274$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=0.000$	
					$X_3^2=81.370^*$	

Table 32 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 20 Concerning Attendance at TGIF's

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Once a month	22	31.4	19	7.4	89	<u>73.5</u>
b) Twice a month	27	<u>38.5</u>	69	26.9	12	9.9
c) Three times a month	17	24.2	75	29.3	12	9.9
d) Every Friday	<u>4</u>	5.7	<u>93</u>	<u>36.3</u>	<u>8</u>	6.6
	$N_1=70$		$N_2=256$		$N_3=121$	
df=3			Chi-square .05=7.81		$X_1^2=45.121^*$	
					$X_3^2=37.459^*$	

Legend

A - Sorority response

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

did respond "Yes." A chi-square value of 81.37 was found to be significant at the .05 level.

When asked with what frequency the student attends TGIF parties, most Independents (73.5%) indicated "Once a month." They ascribed "Every Friday," as a sorority response. Table 32 indicates the most frequently selected response by sorority women (38.5%) was "Twice a month." Both chi-square values obtained were significant at the .05 level.

Most Independents (61.1%) indicated "I want to be with my friends," when asked their motivation for attending TGIF parties. See Table 33. The attributed sorority response of "I want to be with my friends," coincided with the response indicated by most sorority women (62.8%).

Question 21 asked which group generally organized the TGIF parties attended. Table 34 presents data indicating most Independents (65.9%) responded "Informal group of friends," and ascribed the response "Fraternity," to sorority members. Most sorority women (91.6%) did respond "Fraternity"; the ascribed response was accurate.

Most Independents (90.9%) responded they attended TGIF parties of "Completely mixed group of Greeks and non-Greeks." They projected the response "Sorority and fraternity members only," to sorority students. Table 35 indicates that most sorority women (85.9%) did respond "Sorority and fraternity members only." The smaller chi-square value of 9.73 was found to be significant at the .05 level.

When asked what was the typical type of drink consumed at TGIF's, most Independents (54.5%) replied "Beer." The ascribed sorority response was "Beer," as shown in Table 36. Most sorority women (97.1%) did respond "Beer." The ascribed response was accurate.

Question 50 read: "Over consumption of alcohol is more prevalent among non-sorority women than among sorority women at M.S.U." Most

Table 33 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 22 Concerning Attendance at TGIF's

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) It's Friday and I need it	22	31.4	42	16.6	30	20.8
b) My sorority requires it	1	1.4	68	26.8	0	0.0
c) I want to be with my friends	44	<u>62.8</u>	136	<u>53.7</u>	88	<u>61.1</u>
d) I wouldn't to if it were up to me	<u>3</u>	4.2	<u>7</u>	2.7	<u>26</u>	18.0
	$N_1=70$		$N_2=253$		$N_3=144$	
df=3			Chi-square .05=7.81		$\chi^2_1=23.931^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=10.846^*$	

"What motivates you to go?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 34 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 21 Concerning TGIF Organizers

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Informal group of friends	0	0.0	35	13.6	116	<u>65.9</u>
b) Sorority	3	4.1	54	21.0	3	1.7
c) Residence hall friends	3	4.1	6	2.3	9	5.1
d) Fraternity	66	<u>91.6</u>	154	<u>60.1</u>	36	20.4
e) Spontaneous	0	0.0	7	2.7	12	6.8
	<u>N₁=72</u>		<u>N₂=256</u>		<u>N₃=176</u>	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49			$\chi^2_1=30.077^*$
						$\chi^2_3=116.740^*$

"Which group typically organizes the TGIF's?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 35 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 23 Concerning Types of TGIF's

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Sorority women only	1	1.4	1	0.3	0	0.0
b) Sorority and fraternity	61	<u>85.9</u>	177	<u>69.1</u>	4	3.0
c) All women, sorority and non-sorority	1	1.4	7	2.7	8	6.0
d) Mixed Greeks and non-Greeks	<u>8</u>	11.2	<u>71</u>	27.7	<u>121</u>	<u>90.9</u>
	$N_1=71$		$N_2=256$		$N_3=133$	

df=3

Chi-square .05=7.81

 $\chi^2_1=9.729^*$ $\chi^2_3=150.469^*$

"What type of TGIF's do you usually go to?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 36 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 19 Concerning Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Beer	68	97.1	149	57.0	80	54.4
b) Whiskey/Scotch	0	0.0	18	6.9	11	7.4
c) Soft drink	2	2.8	5	1.9	33	22.4
d) Mixed drinks	0	0.0	89	34.1	23	15.6
	$N_1=70$		$N_2=261$		$N_3=147$	

df=3

Chi-square .05=7.81

 $\chi^2_1=42.437^*$ $\chi^2_3=40.165^*$

Table 37 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 50 Concerning Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Agree	9	12.3	91	34.4	32	11.9
b) Disagree	64	87.6	172	65.1	235	87.6
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=264$		$N_3=267$	

df=1

Chi-square .05=3.84

 $\chi^2_1=13.865^*$ $\chi^2_3=0.280$

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Independents (87.6%) indicated disagreement and ascribed the same response to sorority women. Most sorority women (87.6%) also registered disagreement with the statement. See Table 37. The significant chi-square value (13.87), indicating statistical difference, resulted from the frequency distribution of responses.

When told over-consumption of alcohol was more prevalent among sorority women, most Independents (64.3%) responded "Disagree." They attributed the same response to sorority women. The attributed response was valid. Most sorority women (84.9%) responded "Disagree." See Table 38. Although the same response was selected by both groups, a chi-square value of 11.36 was found to be significant at the .05 level.

Social Skills

This general content area contained items concerning the rating of certain social skills or practices i.e. etiquette; table settings; receiving line etiquette; and dating etiquette.

Question 31 asked the student to rate the importance of standing when an older person, regardless of sex, enters the room. Most Independents (42.1%) responded "Doesn't matter today," and ascribed "Important" to sorority women. Most sorority women (54.7%) did respond "Important." See Table 39. The significant chi-square value (15.82) tended to result from the overall frequency distribution of responses.

The knowledge and/or use of etiquette on the part of a date was rated "Important" by most Independents (64.8%). The assigned sorority response was "Important," although most sorority women (56.1%) responded "Very important." See Table 40.

Table 38 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 51 Concerning Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Agree	11	15.0	39	14.7	96	35.6
b) Disagree	$\frac{62}{N_1=73}$	$\frac{84.9}{}$	$\frac{226}{N_2=265}$	$\frac{85.2}{}$	$\frac{173}{N_3=269}$	$\frac{64.3}{}$

df=1

Chi-square .05=3.84

 $\chi^2_1=0.006$ $\chi^2_3=11.355^*$

"Over-consumption of alcohol is more prevalent among sorority women than among non-sorority women at MSU."

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 39 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 31 Concerning Etiquette

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Very important	16	21.9	29	10.7	15	5.4
b) Important	40	<u>54.7</u>	117	<u>43.3</u>	108	39.5
c) Doesn't matter today	12	16.4	104	38.5	115	<u>42.1</u>
d) Unimportant	4	5.4	13	4.8	24	8.7
e) Very unimportant	<u>1</u>	1.3	<u>7</u>	2.5	<u>11</u>	4.0
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=270$		$N_3=273$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$\chi^2_1=15.824^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=32.773^*$	

"Standing when an older person, regardless of sex, enters the room"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 40 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 33 Concerning Etiquette

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Very important	41	<u>56.1</u>	130	48.5	83	30.4
b) Important	32	43.8	131	<u>48.8</u>	177	<u>64.8</u>
c) Doesn't matter today	0	0.0	7	2.6	10	3.6
d) Unimportant	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.1
e) Very unimportant	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>0</u>	0.0
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=268$		$N_3=273$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$X_1^2=2.883$	
					$X_3^2=18.347^*$	

"The knowledge and/or use of etiquette on the part of her date"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

When asked how frequently the student rose when an older person, regardless of sex, entered a room most Independents (52.0%) responded "Seldom." They attributed the sorority response as "Only when at the sorority house." Most sorority women (56.1%) indicated "Frequently." See Table 41. Significant chi-square values of 28.73 and 70.01 were found to exist at the .05 level.

Most Independents (60.2%) rated the correct table setting for a large dinner party as "Important," and ascribed "Very important," as the sorority response. The modal sorority response (49.3%) rated this characteristic as "Important." See Table 42.

When asked how well the student thought she could arrange a table correctly for a large party, most Independents (48.3%) responded "Well." They indicated the same response would be made by sorority women. The response "Well" was selected most frequently by sorority women (41.1%). See Table 43. Significant chi-square values at the .05 level resulted from frequency of responses in the fourth cell group.

The ability to arrange a receiving line correctly for a formal reception was rated "Important" most frequently by Independents (41.9%). The ascribed sorority response was the same. Most sorority women responded "Important." See Table 44.

"Would need help" was selected most frequently by Independents (41.3%) when asked how well they could arrange a receiving line for a formal reception. They posited "Well" as the sorority response. Most sorority women (56.1%) indicated "Would need some help." See Table 45. The chi-square value of 13.57 was considered significant at the .05 level.

When asked how frequently the student actually stepped back from an unopened door allowing a man to open it for her, most Independents (49.8%) responded "Frequently." They attributed "As often as I can,"

Table 41 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 54 Concerning Etiquette

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Whenever an older person enters	8	10.9	19	7.1	15	5.5
b) Frequently	41	<u>56.1</u>	74	27.8	79	29.1
c) Only when at the sorority house	11	15.0	107	<u>40.2</u>	2	0.7
d) Seldom	13	17.8	53	19.9	141	<u>52.0</u>
e) Never	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>13</u>	4.8	<u>34</u>	12.5
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=266$		$N_3=271$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$X_1^2=28.727^*$	
					$X_3^2=70.014^*$	

"How often do you find yourself standing when an older person, regardless of sex, enters the room?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 42 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 32 Concerning Table Settings

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Very important	29	39.7	136	<u>50.1</u>	56	20.4
b) Important	36	<u>49.3</u>	123	45.3	165	<u>60.2</u>
c) Doesn't matter today	5	6.8	11	4.0	27	9.8
d) Unimportant	2	2.7	0	0.0	17	6.2
e) Very unimportant	<u>1</u>	1.3	<u>1</u>	0.3	<u>9</u>	3.2
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=271$		$N_3=274$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$X_1^2=10.882^*$	
					$X_3^2=12.499^*$	

"The correct table setting for a large dinner party"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 43 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 55 Concerning Table Settings

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Very well	19	26.0	98	36.8	63	23.0
b) Well	30	<u>41.1</u>	132	<u>49.6</u>	132	<u>48.3</u>
c) I wouldn't have to	0	0.0	11	4.1	14	5.1
d) Would need help	24	32.8	24	9.0	52	19.0
e) Would have no idea	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>1</u>	0.3	<u>12</u>	4.4
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=266$		$N_3=273$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$\chi^2_1=29.125^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=12.826^*$	

"How well do you think you could arrange a table for a large party if called upon to do so?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 44 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 34 Concerning Receiving Line Etiquette

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Very important	12	16.4	105	39.3	41	15.0
b) Important	50	<u>68.4</u>	138	<u>51.6</u>	114	<u>41.9</u>
c) Doesn't matter today	8	10.9	19	7.1	73	26.8
d) Unimportant	2	2.7	4	1.5	30	11.0
e) Very unimportant	<u>1</u>	1.3	<u>1</u>	0.3	<u>14</u>	5.1
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=267$		$N_3=272$	
df=4			Chi-square .05=9.49		$\chi^2_1=14.188^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=20.958^*$	

"The ability to arrange a receiving line for a formal reception correctly"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 = Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 = Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 45 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 57 Concerning Receiving Line Etiquette

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Very well	7	9.5	61	22.9	27	9.8
b) Well	23	31.5	143	<u>53.1</u>	79	28.9
c) I wouldn't have to	0	0.0	14	5.2	22	8.0
d) Would need help	41	<u>56.1</u>	45	16.9	113	<u>41.3</u>
e) Would have no idea	2	2.7	3	1.1	32	11.7
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=266$		$N_3=273$	

df=4

Chi-square .05=9.49

 $\chi^2_1=50.507^*$ $\chi^2_3=13.570^*$

"How well do you think you could arrange a receiving line at a formal reception if called upon to do so?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

to sorority women. Most sorority women (58.9%) did respond as ascribed, "As often as I can." See Table 46.

Drugs

This general content area contained items concerning knowledge of and usage of drugs.

Most Independents (62.4%) indicated they did not know all they wanted to know about such drugs as LSD and marijuana. They projected the same response for sorority women. Most sorority women (72.6%) responded in the manner projected by the Independents. See Table 47.

When asked if the student has ever attended a party where marijuana was being used, most Independents (73.9%) responded "No," and ascribed the same response to sorority women. Most sorority women (61.6%) did respond "No," as indicated in Table 48.

Most Independents (86.8%) indicated they had never tried or experimented with marijuana (See Table 49) or LSD (See Table 50) (98.9%). In both cases, they ascribed negative responses to sorority women. Most sorority women indicated never trying or experimenting with marijuana (Table 49) (69.8%) or LSD (See Table 50) (98.6%). The ascribed responses were accurate even though significant chi-square values resulted.

Prejudice

The general content area entitled Prejudice contained two items concerning religious preferences and racial preferences.

Question 36 read: "While thinking of the ideal living unit of 60 women students what percentages of the following religious sects would you like to see living together? (your total of percentages should equal 100%)." The following four alternatives were provided: (1) Catholic; (2) Jewish; (3) Oriental sects; and (4) Protestant.

Table 46 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 56 Concerning Dating Etiquette

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) As often as I can	43	<u>58.9</u>	157	<u>58.8</u>	90	32.9
b) Frequently	25	34.2	92	34.4	136	<u>49.8</u>
c) Only on a date	5	6.8	15	5.6	25	9.1
d) Seldom	0	0.0	3	1.1	20	7.3
e) Never	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>2</u>	0.7
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=267$		$N_3=273$	

df=4

Chi-square .05=9.49

 $\chi^2_1=0.969$ $\chi^2_3=19.318^*$

"How often do you find yourself stepping back from a door to allow a man to open or close it for you?"

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

 χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 47 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 35 Concerning Knowledge of Drugs

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	20	27.4	104	39.2	103	37.5
b) No	$\frac{53}{N_1=73}$	$\frac{72.6}{}$	$\frac{161}{N_2=265}$	$\frac{60.7}{}$	$\frac{171}{N_3=274}$	$\frac{62.4}{}$
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=3.459$	
					$X_3^2=2.618$	

Table 48 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 25 Concerning Use of Drugs

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	28	38.3	128	48.1	70	25.6
b) No	$\frac{45}{N_1=73}$	$\frac{61.6}{}$	$\frac{138}{N_2=266}$	$\frac{51.8}{}$	$\frac{202}{N_3=272}$	$\frac{73.9}{}$
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=2.198$	
					$X_3^2=4.786^*$	

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 49 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 40 Concerning Use of Drugs

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Yes	22	30.1	108	40.4	36	13.1
b) No	$\frac{51}{N_1=73}$	<u>69.8</u>	$\frac{159}{N_2=267}$	<u>59.5</u>	$\frac{237}{N_3=273}$	<u>86.8</u>
df=1	Chi-square .05=3.84			$\chi^2_1=2.582$		
				$\chi^2_3=11.860^*$		

Table 50 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 41 Concerning Use of Drugs

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Yes	1	1.3	25	9.2	3	1.0
b) No	$\frac{72}{N_1=73}$	<u>98.6</u>	$\frac{244}{N_2=269}$	<u>90.7</u>	$\frac{271}{N_3=274}$	<u>98.9</u>
df=1	Chi-square .05=3.84			$\chi^2_1=5.132^*$		
				$\chi^2_3=0.038$		

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Because of the nature of the type of responses collected for this item, Table 51 presents the majority response patterns only. These data appear more significant when presented in this manner. Frequencies are not indicated. Most Independents responded with an equal representation and ascribed the following to sorority women: Catholic (50%); and Protestant (50%). Most sorority women responded with an equal representation among all four alternatives.

Question 52 read: "While thinking of the ideal living unit of 60 women students, what percentages of the following races would you like to see living together? (your percentages should equal 100%)." The following three alternatives were provided: (1) Caucasian; (2) Negro; and (3) Oriental.

The majority response patterns are indicated in Table 52. Most Independents responded with an equal representation and attributed the following to sorority women: Caucasian 100%. Most sorority women indicated an overwhelming preference for Caucasian only. The attributed response pattern was accurate.

Civic Volunteer/Service Activities

The general content area, Civic Volunteer/Service Activities, contained items concerning the value of and involvement in activities classified as civic volunteer/service in nature.

Most Independents (75.6%) responded "Yes" when asked if they felt that civic, charitable or other such volunteer work is an important part of the life of the college graduated woman in today's society. The projected sorority response was also positive. Most sorority women (87.6%) indicated consent. See Table 53.

When asked if the college graduated woman should make time for

Table 51 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 36 Concerning Religious Preferences

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>	<u>Column B</u>	<u>Column C</u>
a) Catholic	25%	50%	25%
b) Jewish	25%	0%	25%
c) Oriental sects	25%	0%	25%
d) Protestant	<u>25%</u> 100%	<u>50%</u> 100%	<u>25%</u> 100%

Table 52 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 52 Concerning Racial Preferences

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>	<u>Column B</u>	<u>Column C</u>
a) Caucasian	100%	100%	33 1/3%
b) Negro	0%	0%	33 1/3%
c) Oriental	<u>0%</u> 100%	<u>0%</u> 100%	<u>33 1/3%</u> 100 %

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

Table 53 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 37 Concerning Value of Civic Volunteer/Service Activities

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Yes	64	87.6	235	88.6	205	75.6
b) No	9	12.3	30	11.3	66	24.3
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=265$		$N_3=171$	
df=1	Chi-square .05=3.84				$\chi^2_1=0.057$	
					$\chi^2_3=4.878^*$	

Table 54 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 38 Concerning Value of Civic Volunteer/Service Activities

Responses	Column A		Column B		Column C	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a) Yes	56	76.7	212	80.0	186	68.8
b) No	17	23.2	53	20.0	84	31.1
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=265$		$N_3=270$	
df=1	Chi-square .05=3.84				$\chi^2_1=0.377$	
					$\chi^2_3=1.693$	

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

such volunteer/service activities as part of her everyday life, most Independents (68.8%) responded "Yes." The assigned sorority response coincided with the majority sorority response (76.7%) "Yes." See Table 54.

Question 39 asked if the student spends any time during the academic year involved in such civic volunteer/service activities. Most Independents (67.5%) responded "No" and ascribed a positive response to sorority women. Most sorority women (61.6%) did respond "Yes." See Table 55. A chi-square value of 20.68 was found to be significant at the .05 level.

Leadership Positions

This general content area contained items concerning the possession of an elected or appointed campus-wide office.

Most Independents (97.0%) indicated they did not hold any campus-wide elected office. They indicated a negative response for sorority women, which coincided with the "No" response for sorority women, (100%). See Table 56. The significant chi-square value of 38.70 tended to result from the observed frequency distribution of responses.

Question 5 concerned the possession of a campus-wide appointed office. Most Independents (96.7%) indicated they did not hold such an office and also ascribed a similar response to sorority women. Most sorority women (86.3%) indicated they did not hold such an office. See Table 57. Although the majority responses were identical for both groups, the significant chi-square values were obtained because of the variance in frequency distribution between the two alternate responses.

Table 55 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 39 Concerning Involvement with Civic Volunteer/Service Activities

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	45	61.6	181	67.0	89	32.4
b) No	28	38.6	89	32.9	185	67.5
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=270$		$N_3=274$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$\chi^2_1=0.744$	
					$\chi^2_3=20.680^*$	

Table 56 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 4 Concerning Elected Office

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	0	0.0	101	37.4	8	2.9
b) No	73	100.0	169	62.5	265	97.0
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=270$		$N_3=273$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$\chi^2_1=38.704^*$	
					$\chi^2_3=2.190$	

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

χ^2_1 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B)

χ^2_3 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 57 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 5 Concerning Appointed Office

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	10	13.7	108	40.4	9	3.2
b) No	<u>63</u>	<u>86.3</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>59.5</u>	<u>265</u>	<u>96.7</u>
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=267$		$N_3=274$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=18.103^*$	
					$X_3^2=12.078^*$	

Table 58 Responses and Ascribed Responses to Question 53 Concerning Self-evaluation of Conformity

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>		<u>Column C</u>	
	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes	30	41.1	161	<u>60.5</u>	59	21.8
b) No	<u>43</u>	<u>58.9</u>	<u>105</u>	39.4	<u>211</u>	<u>78.1</u>
	$N_1=73$		$N_2=266$		$N_3=270$	
df=1			Chi-square .05=3.84		$X_1^2=8.792^*$	
					$X_3^2=11.075^*$	

Legend

A - Sorority responses

B - Ascribed sorority responses

C - Independent responses

 X_1^2 =Comparison of sorority and ascribed sorority responses (A&B) X_3^2 =Comparison of sorority and independent responses (A&C)

*Significant at .05 level

Conformity of Sorority Women

Question 53 read: "Do you consider yourself to be 'Conformist' rather than 'Independent'?" Most Independents (78.1%) responded with a "No" response and attributed a "Yes," response to sorority women. See Table 58. Most sorority women (58.9%) responded "No."

The Sorority Image

The following represents a summary profile of the sorority image on the Michigan State University campus compiled from the ascribed characteristics indicated by the majority of independent women students. The image profile indicates the way in which sorority women are seen by the independent women on their own campus.

Sorority women are undergraduate majors within the College of Education. They become involved in "Bull sessions," "Two or three times per week" usually centered around the topic of "Dating." After graduation from the University they tend to expect "Marriage and work" to fill their lives.

Both parents of sorority women are college graduates and also both are perceived as being Greek-letter social society members while in college. The mothers were members of the same sorority in which their daughters hold membership. Thus, sorority women on campus today are considered to be "legacies" to their groups.

Sorority women do not participate in the University's sliding scale tuition plan based on family income, nor do they contribute any part of their own tuition costs. They are not employed during the academic year.

In considering a date for a Saturday evening, sorority women rate fraternity membership as "Important"; the date's religious persuasion as "Doesn't matter to me"; and his occupational aspirations as "Important." While assessing or considering a prospective marriage partner, sorority women rate fraternity membership as "Important"; and his occupational aspirations as "Very important." Sorority women are "Pinned," as opposed to other labels applying to social standings. They believe that "Between 50% and 74%" of the women within their immediate living unit

will be either pinned or engaged before graduation from the University. When given various options of activities for a Saturday night date, most sorority women prefer to attend an "Informal mixer at a fraternity."

They do not believe there are two differing codes of behavior applied to sorority women and Independents. They do not believe either group could be characterized by an excess of involvement in pre-marital sexual intercourse or an excess of alcohol consumption.

Sorority women prefer to attend TGIF parties "Every Friday night" which are organized by a fraternity. They go because they "Want to be with my friends." At such parties they drink "Beer" and socialize only with sorority and fraternity members.

They consider standing whenever an older person, regardless of sex, enters a room a "Very important" quality of the college graduated woman of today. However, they stand to show respect for age "Only when at the sorority house." Sorority women consider or rate the knowledge and/or use of etiquette on the part of their date as an "Important" quality. They will stand back from a door allowing a man to open it for them as often as they can. They rate the ability to correctly set a table or arrange a receiving line for a formal reception as "Very important" and "Important" qualities of the woman college graduate. They feel they could arrange either of these activities "Well," and would not need help.

Concerning such drugs as marijuana or LSD, sorority women do not know all they would like to about them, nor have they ever attended a party where these drugs were being used. They have never tried or experimented with such drugs themselves.

Sorority women show a preference for a living unit of sixty women to have the following representations of the listed races and religious

persuasions: (a) Catholic (50%); Jewish (0%); Oriental sects (0%); and Protestant (50%); and (b) Caucasian (100%); Negro (0%); and Oriental (0%).

Sorority women consider civic volunteer/service activities an important part of the life of the college graduated woman. They believe such women should budget time in their everyday schedules to engage in such activities. During the academic year, they do become involved in such activities.

Sorority women do not hold either campus-wide elected or appointed offices. They are not in key leadership positions on their campus.

Sorority women consider themselves "Conformist" rather than "Independent."

Thus, sorority women are seen as: (a) education majors; (b) from higher socio-economic levels with college graduated and Greek-letter member parents; (c) unemployed during the academic year and contributing nothing toward their tuition costs; (d) preferring ethnocentric dating and drinking activities confined to the Greek sub-culture; (e) emphasizing the value of social skills and civic volunteer/service activities; and (f) not in key leadership positions on their campus.

The Sorority Profile

The following represents a summary profile of sorority women on the Michigan State University campus compiled from the actual responses of the majority of sorority women.

Sorority women generally major within the College of Education. They become involved in "Bull sessions", "Two or three times per week" usually centered around the topic of "Dating." After graduation from the University, they tend to expect "Marriage and work" to fill their lives.

Both parents are college graduates. Their fathers are not Greek-letter social society members, while their mothers are. The daughters in sororities belong to different social groups than their mothers. Thus, the daughters are not "legacies" to their own groups.

Sorority women do not participate in the University's sliding scale tuition plan based on family income; indicating a family income in excess of \$18,500. They do not contribute any part of their tuition costs, nor are they employed during the academic year.

In considering a date for a Saturday night, sorority women rate fraternity membership as "Doesn't matter to me"; his religious persuasion as "Doesn't matter to me"; and his occupational aspirations as "Important." While assessing or considering the qualities of a prospective marriage partner, sorority women rate fraternity membership as "Doesn't matter to me"; his religious persuasion as "Important"; and his occupational aspirations as "Very important." Sorority women list themselves as "Dating around" as opposed to other labels applying to social standings. They believe that "Between 25% and 49%" of the women within their immediate living unit will be either pinned or engaged before

graduation from the University. When given various types of dating activities, sorority women prefer to go to an "Informal mixer at a fraternity" to other alternatives.

They do not believe there are two differing standards or codes of behavior applying to sorority women and Independents. Nor do they believe that either group is guided by a more stringent code or set of values. Neither group is characterized by a prevalence of pre-marital sexual intercourse or an excess of alcohol consumption.

Sorority women tend to attend TGIF parties "Twice a month" because they "Want to be with my friends." At these parties, organized by a fraternity, they drink "Beer" and socialize with sorority and fraternity members only.

They consider standing whenever an older person, regardless of sex, enters the room an "Important" quality of the college graduated woman of today, but indicate they stand only "Frequently" to show respect for age. Sorority women consider the knowledge and/or use of etiquette on the part of their date as "Very important." The ability to correctly set a table or arrange a receiving line for a formal reception is rated as "Important." They indicate they could perform the first task "Well," but "Would need help" for the second. They stand back from a door as often as they can, thus allowing a man to open it for them.

Sorority women do not know all they would like to about such drugs as marijuana or LSD. They have never attended a party where these drugs were being used, nor have they ever experimented with or tried them themselves.

They indicate a preference for a living unit of sixty women with the following representations of races and religious persuasions:

(a) Catholic (25%); Jewish (25%); Oriental sects (25%); and Protestant (25%); and (b) Caucasian (100%); Negro (0%); and Oriental (0%).

Civic volunteer/service activities are considered by sorority women an important part of the life of the college graduated woman in today's society. They believe the woman graduate should budget some time from her everyday schedule for involvement with such activities. Sorority women, during the academic year, do spend some time engaged in such volunteer and charitable activities.

Sorority women do not hold campus-wide leadership positions, either elected or appointed offices.

They do not consider themselves "Conformist" rather than "Independent."

The Independent Profile

The following represents a summary profile of the Independent women on the Michigan State University campus compiled from the responses of the majority of independent women.

Independent women tend to major within the College of Social Science. They become involved in "Bull sessions," "Two or three times per week" usually centered around the topic of "Men." After graduation from the University, they expect "Marriage and work" to fill their lives.

Both parents are "High school graduates." Consequently, neither parent holds membership in a Greek-letter social society.

Independent women do not participate in the University's sliding scale tuition plan based on family income. Those who do indicate a usual savings of "\$61.00 per term," the maximum allowable. They contribute "Part" of their tuition costs and are employed "Ten hours" per week during the academic year.

In considering a date for a Saturday night, Independents rate fraternity membership as "Very unimportant"; religious persuasion as "Doesn't matter to me"; and occupational aspirations as "Important." When considering qualities of a prospective marriage partner, Independents rate fraternity membership as "Important"; religious persuasion as "Important"; and occupational aspirations as "Important." Independent women label themselves as "Dating around." They believe that "Between 25% and 49%" of the women within their immediate living unit will be either pinned or engaged before graduation. When given various types of dating activities, Independents prefer to "See a movie."

They do not believe there are two differing standards or codes of behavior which apply to sorority and independent women. Nor do they

believe that either group could be characterized by an excess of alcohol consumption or a prevalence of pre-marital sexual intercourse.

Independents indicated they do not generally attend TGIF parties. Those few who do indicated a frequency of "Once a month" and went because "It's Friday and I need it." Their TGIF's are organized by an informal group of friends and attended by Greek and non-Greek members. They drink "Beer."

Standing when an older person, regardless of sex, enters the room is rated as "Doesn't matter today" when assessing the qualities of a college graduated woman. They themselves stand "Seldom." They consider the knowledge and/or use of etiquette on the part of their date as "Important." The ability to correctly set a table or arrange a receiving line are rated as "Important," but they indicate they could perform the first task "Well," but "Would need help" for the second. They stand back from a door "Frequently," thus allowing a man to open it for them.

Independent women do not know all they would like to about such drugs as marijuana or LSD. Nor do they indicate they have either attended parties where these drugs were being used or experimented with them themselves.

Independents indicate a preference for a living unit of sixty women students to have an equal representation of religious persuasions and races as follows: (a) Catholic (25%); Jewish (25%); Oriental sects (25%); and Protestant (25%); and (b) Caucasian (33 1/3%); Negro (33 1/3%); and Oriental (33 1/3%).

Civic volunteer/service activities are considered by Independents as an important part of the life of the woman college graduate in today's society. They believe she should budget some time from her schedule for

involvement in such activities. Independent women indicate they do not spend any time during the academic year involved in these kinds of activities.

Independents indicate they do not hold campus-wide leadership positions; either elected or appointed offices.

They do not consider themselves "Conformist" rather than "Independent."

Differences in Image and Profiles

Sorority Image versus Sorority Profile

The following is a list of the differences in majority response patterns between the sorority group and ascribed sorority responses made by Independent women.

1. Fathers and mothers of sorority women are not Greek-letter social society members, although Greek-letter membership is attributed to them;
2. Sorority women are not "legacies" to their groups, although they are seen as such;
3. Sorority women are not "Pinned," as projected;
4. Sorority women believe that between 25% and 49% of women within their immediate living unit will be either pinned or engaged before graduation, as opposed to the ascribed response of "Between 50% and 74%";
5. Sorority women rate fraternity membership as "Doesn't matter to me" when assessing a prospective date. The attributed sorority response was "Important;"
6. Sorority women attend TGIF parties "Twice a month," rather than "Every Friday" as indicated by Independents;
7. Sorority women stand "Frequently" to indicate respect for age, as opposed to "Only when at the sorority house," which was attributed to them by Independents;
8. Sorority women consider knowledge and/or use of etiquette on the part of their date "Very important." The projected response by Independents was "Important";

9. Sorority women consider setting a table correctly an "Important" quality of a woman college graduate. The ascribed sorority response was "Very important";
10. Sorority women indicated they "Would need help" arranging a receiving line correctly. The assigned response was "Well," implying ability to complete the task without assistance;
11. Sorority women prefer a living unit of sixty women to include an equal representation of religious persuasions. The ascribed sorority response was Catholic (50%); Jewish (0%); Oriental sects (0%); and Protestant (50%);
12. Sorority women do not consider themselves to be "Conformist" rather than "Independent," although they are perceived as "Conformist" by non-sorority women.

Sorority Image versus Independent Profile

The following is a list of differences in the majority response patterns of non-sorority women and their responses attributed to sorority women:

1. Independents major within the College of Social Science and perceive sorority women as College of Education majors;
2. Independents discuss "Men" during "Bull sessions," while they expect sorority women to discuss "Dating";
3. Independents' parents are high school graduates, but they attribute college educations to parents of sorority women;
4. Independents save "\$61.00 per term," the maximum allowable on fee reductions and assign a savings of "\$0.00 per term" to sorority women;
5. Independents contribute "Part" of their tuition costs and ascribe "None" to sorority women;
6. Independents are employed during the academic year while ascribing no employment to sorority women;
7. Independents rate fraternity membership of a prospective date "Very unimportant," while projecting a sorority response of "Doesn't matter to me";
8. Independents rate occupational aspirations of a prospective marriage partner as "Important," but attribute a sorority response of "Very important";
9. Independents prefer to "See a movie" on a Saturday night date while projecting a sorority response of going to an "Informal mixer at a fraternity";

10. Independents, who attend TGIF parties, go "Once a month" and attributed "Every Friday" to sorority women;
11. Independents attend TGIF's because "It's Friday and I need it" contrasted with the perceived sorority response, "I want to be with my friends";
12. Independents attended TGIF's organized by an "Informal group of friends," while assigning a sorority response of "Fraternity";
13. Independents attend TGIF's populated with "Completely mixed group of Greeks and non-Greeks," but attributed the sorority response as "Sorority and fraternity members only";
14. Independents rate standing as a sign of respect for age as "Doesn't matter today" and assigned a rating of "Important" to sorority women;
15. Independents stand as an indication of respect for age "Seldom" and attribute the response "Only when at the sorority house" to sorority women;
16. Independents rate knowledge and/or use of etiquette by a date as "Important" and inferred a rating of "Very important" to sorority women;
17. Independents step back from a door "Frequently" allowing a man to open it for them and project a frequency of "As often as I can" to sorority women;
18. Independents prefer a living unit of sixty women to equally represent religious persuasions and predict the sorority responses as Catholic (50%); Jewish (0%); Oriental sects (0%); and Protestant (50%);

19. Independents prefer a living unit of sixty women to equally represent races and ascribe the following response pattern to sorority women: Caucasian (100%); Negro (0%); and Oriental (0%);
20. Independents do not spend any time during the academic year engaged in civic volunteer/service activities and assign the sorority responses as some involvement.

Sorority Profile versus Independent Profile

The following is a list of the differences in the majority response patterns of sorority women and non-sorority women:

1. Sorority women are majors within the College of Education, while Independents major within the College of Social Science;
2. Sorority women are involved in "Bull sessions" which center around "Dating," as opposed to the indicated topic of "Men" for non-sorority women;
3. Parents of sorority women are college graduates, while parents of Independents are high school graduates;
4. Sorority students save "\$0.00 per term," the minimum allowable on fee reductions, while some non-sorority women save "\$61.00 per term";
5. Sorority women do not contribute any part of their tuition costs, while Independents do contribute "Part";
6. Sorority women are not employed during the academic year, while non-sorority women are and indicate working "Ten hours" per week;
7. Sorority women rate fraternity membership of a prospective date "Doesn't matter to me," while non-sorority women rate it "Very unimportant";
8. Sorority women rate fraternity membership of a prospective marriage partner "Doesn't matter to me," while ascribing "Very unimportant" to sorority women;
9. Sorority women prefer to attend an informal mixer at a

- fraternity, while non-sorority women prefer to "See a movie" for a Saturday night date;
10. Sorority women attend TGIF parties "Twice a month," while Independents attend "Once a month";
 11. Sorority attended TGIF's are organized by a "Fraternity," while those attended by non-sorority women are organized by an "Informal group of friends";
 12. Sorority attended TGIF's are populated with "Sorority and fraternity members only," while non-sorority attended TGIF's are populated with "Completely mixed group of Greeks and non-Greeks";
 13. Sorority women consider standing as a sign of respect for age "Important," while Independents indicate the quality "Doesn't matter today";
 14. Sorority women stand, as an indication of respect for age, "Frequently," while Independents responded with a frequency of "Seldom";
 15. Sorority women rate the knowledge and/or use of etiquette on the part of their date as "Very important," while the non-sorority women rate it "Important";
 16. Sorority women spend some time during the academic year engaged in civic volunteer/service activities, while non-sorority women do not.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Restatement of the Problem

The basic problem of this study was to determine whether any of the past criticisms, labels, perceptions or characterizations as found in the literature are a part of the Greek-letter social sorority image of today. Specifically, the problem was to determine how women non-Greek member students perceive women Greek members on the Michigan State University campus.

The following three hypotheses were tested as part of this study:

- H₁: There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with the responses of non-sorority women when asked to respond as they perceive sorority women responding;
- H₂: There are no significant differences in the responses of non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with the non-sorority perceptions of sorority responses;
- H₃: There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women when compared with non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey."

Procedure

In order to test the three hypotheses of this study, a survey instrument was constructed by the investigator. The "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" contained sixty items designed to elicit responses to questions comprising the twelve general labels or characterizations gleaned from the literature as applying to Greek-letter social groups. These twelve labels or general content areas were:

1. Educational objective of sorority women
2. Parents' educational background
3. Socio-economic level of sorority women
4. Family Greek-letter affiliation
5. Dating patterns
6. Drinking patterns
7. Social skills
8. Drugs (knowledge of and usage)
9. Prejudice
10. Civic volunteer/service activities
11. Leadership positions
12. Conformity of sorority women

The following two groups participated in the study:

1. A random selection of 75 undergraduate women students enrolled at Michigan State University who were members of 5 national Greek-letter social sororities and resided in sorority houses off campus;
2. A random selection of 375 women resident students enrolled at Michigan State University who were not members

of Greek-letter social groups and who resided in 2 residential complexes on the campus.

During Fall Term, 1968 and Winter Term, 1969 a schedule of meetings was established to distribute, administer and collect the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey." The above two groups responded to the Survey in the following manner:

1. The sorority students answered the items in the Survey themselves;
2. The non-sorority students answered the items in the Survey themselves;
3. The non-sorority students also answered the items in the Survey as they perceived the sorority group would respond.

Three major analyses of the data obtained from the Survey were performed. Each analysis tested one of the three hypotheses of the study. The statistical technique employed in the analyses of the data was the chi-square analysis, utilizing the .05 level of probability as a criterion for statistical significance.

Limitations

The data gathered during this study were limited to the stratified random sample responses of the women students enrolled at Michigan State University during the Fall Term, 1968 and Winter Term, 1969.

None of the non-sorority population surveyed had ever participated in a Panhellenic Rushing or Pledging Program. Thus, the non-sorority responses should not be biased as a result of direct experience with these Panhellenic activities.

Summary of Major Findings

Since the focus of this study was to determine the sorority image and profile, the findings are presented from a consensus perspective. Interpretation of the data obtained from administrations of the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" revealed that one of the three hypotheses tested was supported. Thus, the major conclusions of the study are:

1. There are no significant differences in the responses of sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with the responses of non-sorority women when asked to respond as they perceive sorority women responding;
2. There are significant differences in the responses of non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey" when compared with the non-sorority perceptions of sorority responses;
3. There are significant differences in the responses of sorority women when compared with non-sorority women to the "Sorority and Non-Sorority Survey."

Specific differences found in a comparison of the Sorority Image and the Sorority Profile are discussed in Chapter IV. Some of the major differences or incongruencies discovered were:

1. Sorority women are not "legacies" to their own groups;
2. Sorority women expressed a preference for equal representation of religious persuasions in a living unit, rather than the narrow White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant image ascribed to them;

3. Sorority women do not consider themselves "Conformist" rather than "Independent";
4. Sorority women label themselves as "Dating around" rather than "Pinned."

Some of the similarities between the Sorority Image and the Sorority Profile are as follows:

1. Sorority women tend to major within the College of Education, as perceived;
2. Sorority women come from a higher socio-economic level and are far less self-supporting financially than are Independents, as perceived;
3. Sorority women tend to have dating patterns and prefer dating activities within their own Greek sub-culture, as perceived;
4. Sorority women tend to expect both "Marriage and work" to fill their lives after graduation, as perceived.

Specific differences resulting from a comparison of the Sorority Image and the Independent Profile are discussed in Chapter IV. Differences resulted in almost every instance from the Survey items indicating non-sorority women consider themselves different from sorority women. Consequently, no similarities between non-sorority self responses and perceived sorority responses were revealed.

Specific differences between the Sorority Profile and the Independent Profile are discussed in Chapter IV. Some of the major differences or incongruencies were:

1. Sorority women tend to indicate a College of Education major while Independents tend to select majors within the College of Social Science;

2. Sorority women tend to come from families on a higher socio-economic level than do Independents;
3. Sorority women tend to come from homes of college graduated parents while parents of Independents are high school graduates;
4. Sorority women spend some time during the academic year engaged in civic volunteer/service activities, while Independents do not.

There were no major similarities found between the Sorority Profile and the Independent Profile. The basic conclusion being that sorority women differ from non-sorority women on the basis of all twelve labels or characterizations employed in devising the Survey. These two groups are then to be considered dissimilar student sub-cultures.

To summarize, the major findings of this study are:

1. Labels, characterizations or criticisms applied to sororities in the past, gleaned from the literature, are a part of the sorority image of 1969;
2. The Sorority Image can be predicted almost perfectly by non-sorority women and in such a way as to indicate congruence between the Sorority Image and the actual sorority responses, or Sorority Profile;
3. Sorority women project an image of higher socio-economic backgrounds; college graduated parents who are Greek-letter members; no financial self-support; ethnocentric dating and drinking patterns confined to the Greek sub-culture; emphasis on value of social skills; and involvement in civic volunteer/service activities;

4. Non-sorority women consider themselves different from sorority women on many of the bases used as labels; socio-economic level; parents' educational and Greek-letter background; dating and drinking patterns, et cetera;
5. Sorority women are different from non-sorority women on such bases as: socio-economic level; parents' educational background; dating and drinking patterns; social skills, et cetera.

Implications

Several questions must be raised revolving around the findings of this study. A Sorority Image has been established and described for the sorority women on the Michigan State University campus. Why is the described image so similar to the stereotypic image of sororities found in the literature of the 1930's and 1940's? What factors connected with the rushing program or the objectives of the Greek-letter system have contributed to the maintenance or support of the image? Do sorority women on the Michigan State University campus realize the type of image which they are projecting? Is the projected image consonant with the image they would like to have projected? Is the M.S.U. Sorority Image similar or dissimilar to the sorority image held on other types of college and university campuses? What are some of the factors which the Greek-letter social system for women might change in an attempt to alter their image among non-sorority women? What about the validity of comparing levels of academic achievement based on grade point averages of sorority and non-sorority women? By the very selective process

of obtaining new members, do sororities accept women students after they have demonstrated ability to achieve at a certain level and not before? Does the influence of sorority majors within the College of Education affect the grade point average of the groups compared to non-sorority majors within other disciplines?

In addition to the above questions relating to specific parts of the Sorority Image, the evaluation of the composite image leads to the following discussion of sorority groups as a whole.

Sororities appear dysfunctional. As controlling and structured groups they tend to provide select women students with a social class of distinction on a large university campus which is inherently heterogeneously populated. Is this goal one of the original objectives of the Greek-letter social system for women? Are the traditional objectives of inexpensive housing, arranged social life (when there was none on the campus) and personal identity with and gained from a sisterhood upheld today? Are these objectives relevant to contemporary campuses or society? Do such objectives represent viable goals for a collegiate sub-culture?

Why have sororities tended to recruit women who match the Sorority Profile discussed earlier? Why have they not, instead, expanded their horizons and recruited a more heterogeneous group of women?

Does the intellectual woman on a large university campus feel out of place with a sorority group and elect not to rush; or is she not rushed by any sorority group? What type of woman student seeks to become identified with high socio-economic level students and parents rather than with intellectually acute students? Why are upper middle class women students in need of or seeking another form of social class distinction when their family financial status provides a social

class distinction in itself?

Research (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969) indicates that children of non-college graduated parents, who gravitate toward state institutions, tend to major in education.....why do sorority women select the same academic major? Or do sorority women change their major after they become affiliated with a sorority? Do they major in education because it is typically viewed as a "feminine profession"? What about the differences revealed between sorority emphasis on the value of social skills or tasks and the inability of sorority women to successfully perform such tasks?

Many of these researchable questions must remain unanswered as a result of the findings of this study. A beginning has been made and certain data are now defined concerning the image of sororities; the sorority reality or profile; congruencies and incongruencies between the two; and the non-sorority profile.

Recommendations for Further Studies

1. Administrations of the Survey pre-and post-academic years would give evidence to sorority members of the image they are projecting to their own campus. It would also provide data to indicate which factors might be altered or de-emphasized by the individual group members in order to change any part of or the total image of the group.
2. Replications of this study could be used to gather data for comparing the composite sorority image of one campus with the sorority image of a similar or dissimilar campus.
3. A longitudinal study should be made of those women who are accepted in a sorority and those who tried and were rejected. What happens to the woman student who is accepted over a two or three year period? Does she change her college major to conform to the group? Does her social life change or her drinking patterns, after membership? What are her attitudes toward dating and marriage before and after membership?
4. The Survey could be modified and used to study any of the various student sub-cultures and their images on a college or university campus.
5. The Survey could be administered to advisers of groups and the membership to determine the accuracy of the adviser's image of the group he advises. In such cases, differences in total objectives of the group may be discovered.
6. Replications of this study on other campuses having chapters of the same sororities would enable an adviser, student personnel administrator, or national officer, to determine if there are differences in chapters on different campuses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, Gordon W. "Values and Our Youth." Teachers College Record, (December, 1961), 216.
- Brickman, William W., ed. "Facts on Fraternities." School and Society, XCI (February 23, 1963), 80.
- Brubacher, John S. and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958.
- "Church Colleges and the Fraternity Racial Bar." Christian Century. LXX (June 17, 1953), 709.
- Collins, Wanda P. and Whetstone, Robert D. "Comparison of Sorority and Independent Women Based on Retention, Academic Achievement and Scholastic Aptitude." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXVIII, No. 4 (1965), 178.
- Dalton, Charles R. "Fraternities at the University of Rochester." School and Society, XCIII (February 6, 1965), 77.
- Lasher, George Starr, ed. Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, Inc., 1963.
- Lasher, George Starr, ed. Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, Inc., 1957.
- Mueller, Kate Hevner. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.
- Mueller, Kate Hevner and Seward, Doris. "An Interpretation of Sororities on the Campus." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XIX (January, 1956), 71.
- "New Era for Northwestern: Sororities Struggle to Live." The Detroit Free Press. October 21, 1968.
- Plant, Walter T. "Changes in Intolerance and Authoritarianism for Sorority and Non-Sorority Women Enrolled in College After Two Years." Journal of Social Psychology, LXVIII (February, 1966), 79-83.

- Robson, John. The College Fraternity and Its Modern Role.
Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, Inc., 1966.
- Rogers, Nola Stark. "A Study of Certain Personality Characteristics of Sorority and Non-Sorority Women at the University of California, Los Angeles." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1952.
- Scott, John F. "The American College Sorority: Its Role in Class and Ethnic Endogamy." American Sociological Review, XXX (August, 1965), 514-27.
- Stone, Carol Larson. "Sorority Status and Personality Adjustment." American Sociological Review, XV (August, 1951), 538-41.
- The New York Times. October 19, 1953.
- Vils, Ursula. "Greeks' Are a Dead Issue." The State Journal, October 7, 1968.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, 3rd ed., unabridged, 1961.
- Widmar, Gary E. "A Comparative Study of Fraternity and Sorority Membership of Entering Freshmen at the Florida State University." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1963.
- Willingham, Warren W. "College Performance of Fraternity Members and Independent Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal, (September, 1962), 30.

References Not Cited in Study

- Burke, C. J. and Lewis, D. "The Use and Misuse of the Chi-Square Test." Psychological Bulletin, XLVI (1949), 433-89.
- Henderson, John W. "Follow-up Study of the Members of Greek Letter Social Fraternities at Michigan State University." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University at East Lansing, 1958.
- Michigan State University. Spring 1969 - Schedule of Courses and Academic Handbook. LXIII (February, 1969), 22.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York City, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

APPENDIX A

a) _____
b) _____

	<u>SELF</u>	<u>SORORITY</u>
6) Academic major:	a) _____	a) _____
7) Within the College of:		
a) Arts and Letters	a) _____	a) _____
b) Agriculture	b) _____	b) _____
c) Business	c) _____	c) _____
d) Education	d) _____	d) _____
e) Home Economics	e) _____	e) _____
f) Nat. Science	f) _____	f) _____
g) Soc. Science	g) _____	g) _____
h) JMC, LBC, JMC	h) _____	h) _____
i) Other	i) _____	i) _____
8) Educational Background of Parents: highest degree completed by		
Father:		
a) High school	a) _____	a) _____
b) Some college without a degree	b) _____	b) _____
c) College (AB, BS)	c) _____	c) _____
d) Masters	d) _____	d) _____
e) PhD, EdD	e) _____	e) _____
f) MD, DVM, DDS	f) _____	f) _____
9) Mother:		
a) High school	a) _____	a) _____
b) Some college without a degree	b) _____	b) _____
c) College (AB, BS)	c) _____	c) _____
d) Masters	d) _____	d) _____
e) PhD, EdD	e) _____	e) _____
f) MD, DVM, DDS	f) _____	f) _____
10) Is your father a member of a Greek-letter social fraternity?		
a) Yes	a) _____	a) _____
b) No	b) _____	b) _____
11) Is your mother a member of a Greek-letter social sorority?		
a) Yes	a) _____	a) _____
b) No	b) _____	b) _____
12) If yes to #11, are you and your mother members of the same sorority?		
a) Yes	a) _____	a) _____
b) No	b) _____	b) _____
13) Have you or are you now taking advantage of the sliding-scale tuition plan at MSU?		
a) Yes	a) _____	a) _____
b) No	b) _____	b) _____
14) If yes to #13, what is the usual amount of savings per term?		
a) \$61.00 per term	a) _____	a) _____
b) \$ 5.00 per term	b) _____	b) _____
c) \$ 0.00 per term	c) _____	c) _____

SELFSORORITY

15)With regard to your tuition, do you yourself, without family help, pay:

- a) All
- b) Part
- c) None

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____

16)Do you have any form of employment during the academic year?

- a) Yes
- b) No

a) _____
b) _____

a) _____
b) _____

17)If yes to #16, how many hours per week do you work?

- a) Ten hours
- b) Less than ten hours
- c) Twenty hours
- d) More than twenty hours

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

18)Do you go to TGIF parties?

- a) Yes
- b) No

a) _____
b) _____

a) _____
b) _____

19)What do you generally drink at the TGIF's?

- a) Beer
- b) Whiskey/Scotch
- c) Soft drink
- d) Mixed drinks; martinis, old fashioned

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

20)How frequently do you go to TGIF's?

- a) Once a month
- b) Twice a month
- c) Three times a month
- d) Every Friday

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

21)Which group typically organizes the TGIF's?

- a) Informal group of friends
- b) Sorority
- c) Residence hall friends
- d) Fraternity
- e) Spontaneous, no one organizes them

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____
e) _____

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____
e) _____

22)What motivates you to go?

- a) It's Friday and I need it
- b) My sorority requires it
- c) I want to be with my friends
- d) I wouldn't go if it were up to me

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

- | | <u>SELF</u> | <u>SORORITY</u> |
|--|-------------|-----------------|
| 23) What type of TGIF's do you usually go to? | | |
| a) Those attended by sorority women only | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Sorority and fraternity members only | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) All women, sorority and non-sorority | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Completely mixed group of Greeks and non-Greeks | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| 24) Which "dating category" best describes you? | | |
| a) Engaged | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Pinned | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Going steady | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Dating around | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) None of the above | e) _____ | e) _____ |
| 25) Have you ever been at a party where marijuana was being used? | | |
| a) Yes | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) No | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| 26) If you were selecting a dating partner for this Saturday night, how important would each of the following characteristics be to you? | | |
| 1) Greek-letter membership (fraternity) | | |
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter to me | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |
| 27) 2) Religious practice or persuasion | | |
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter to me | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |
| 28) 3) Occupational aspirations | | |
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter to me | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |

SELFSORORITY

29) How many of your friends in your immediate living area are either pinned or engaged before graduation?

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| a) Between 100% and 75% | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Between 74% and 50% | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Between 49% and 25% | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Between 24% and 5% | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Less than 5% | e) _____ | e) _____ |
| f) None | f) _____ | f) _____ |

30) What kind of college or university would you hope your daughter would attend?

- | | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| a) Church-related liberal arts (4 yrs) | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Private liberal arts (4 yrs) | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) State supported small college | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) State supported large university | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Ivy League college for women | e) _____ | e) _____ |

31) How important or valuable do you consider each of the following qualities or characteristics of the college graduated woman of today?

1) Standing when an older person, regardless of sex, enters the room

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter today | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |

32) 2) The correct table setting for a large dinner party

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter today | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |

33) 3) The knowledge and/or use of etiquette on the part of her date

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter today | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |

34) 4) The ability to arrange a receiving line for a formal reception correctly

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter today | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |

SELFSORORITY

35) Do you feel that you know all that you want to know about such drugs as LSD and marijuana?

- a) Yes
b) No

a) _____
b) _____

a) _____
b) _____

36) While thinking of the ideal living unit of 60 women students, what percentages of the following religious sects would you like to see living together? (your total of percentages should equal 100%)

- a) Catholic
b) Jewish
c) Oriental sects (such as Buddhism, Moslem, etc.)
d) Protestant denominations

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

37) Do you feel civic, charitable or other such volunteer work is an important part of the life of the college graduated woman in today's society?

- a) Yes
b) No

a) _____
b) _____

a) _____
b) _____

38) Do you feel the college graduated woman should make time for such volunteer/service activities as part of her everyday life?

- a) Yes
b) No

a) _____
b) _____

a) _____
b) _____

39) Do you spend any time while now in college engaged in such volunteer/service activities?

- a) Yes
b) No

a) _____
b) _____

a) _____
b) _____

40) Have you ever experimented with or tried marijuana?

- a) Yes
b) No

a) _____
b) _____

a) _____
b) _____

41) Have you experimented with or tried LSD?

- a) Yes
b) No

a) _____
b) _____

a) _____
b) _____

42) In choosing a marriage partner, how important are each of the following characteristics to you?

1) Greek-letter membership

- a) Very important
b) Important
c) Doesn't matter to me
d) Unimportant
e) Very unimportant

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____
e) _____

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____
e) _____

- | | <u>SELF</u> | <u>SORORITY</u> |
|---|-------------|-----------------|
| 43) 2) Religious practice or persuasion | | |
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter to me | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |
| 44) 3) Occupation | | |
| a) Very important | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Important | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Doesn't matter to me | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Unimportant | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Very unimportant | e) _____ | e) _____ |
| 45) Immediately following graduation, my plans include: | | |
| a) Marriage | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Work | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Graduate study | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) a) and b) | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) a) and c) | e) _____ | e) _____ |
| f) b) and c) | f) _____ | f) _____ |
| g) All three | g) _____ | g) _____ |
| 46) There are two standards of behavior with regard to liberal trends in sexual behavior between sorority and non-sorority women. | | |
| a) Agree | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Disagree | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| 47) The code pertaining to sorority women is less stringent than among non-sorority students at MSU. | | |
| a) Agree | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Disagree | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| 48) Pre-marital sexual intercourse is more prevalent among sorority women than among non-sorority women at MSU. | | |
| a) Agree | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Disagree | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| 49) Pre-marital sexual intercourse is more prevalent among non-sorority women than among sorority women at MSU. | | |
| a) Agree | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Disagree | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| 50) Over-consumption of alcohol is more prevalent among non-sorority women than among sorority women at MSU. | | |
| a) Agree | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Disagree | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| 51) Over-consumption of alcohol is more prevalent among sorority women than among non-sorority women at MSU. | | |
| a) Agree | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Disagree | b) _____ | b) _____ |

SELFSORORITY

52) While thinking of the ideal living unit of 60 women students, what percentages of the following races would you like to see living together? (your percentages should equal 100%)

- | | | |
|--------------|----------|----------|
| a) Caucasian | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Negro | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Oriental | c) _____ | c) _____ |

53) Do you consider yourself to be "conformist" rather than "independent"?

- | | | |
|--------|----------|----------|
| a) Yes | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) No | b) _____ | b) _____ |

54) How often do you find yourself standing when an older person, regardless of sex, enters the room?

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| a) Whenever an older person enters | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Frequently | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Only when at the sorority house | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Seldom | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Never | e) _____ | e) _____ |

55) How well do you think you could arrange a table for a large party if called upon to do so?

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|
| a) Very well | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Well | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) I wouldn't have to | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Would need help | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Would have no idea | e) _____ | e) _____ |

56) How often do you find yourself stepping back from a door to allow a man to open or close it for you?

- | | | |
|----------------------|----------|----------|
| a) As often as I can | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Frequently | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) Only on a date | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Seldom | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Never | e) _____ | e) _____ |

57) How well do you think you could arrange a receiving line at a formal reception if called upon to do so?

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|
| a) Very well | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Well | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) I wouldn't have to | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Would need help | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Would have no idea | e) _____ | e) _____ |

58) What do you prefer to do when going out with a date for an evening?

- | | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| a) Informal mixer at a fraternity | a) _____ | a) _____ |
| b) Grandmother's, CD's, "the Gables" | b) _____ | b) _____ |
| c) See a movie | c) _____ | c) _____ |
| d) Private date, without others around | d) _____ | d) _____ |
| e) Other | e) _____ | e) _____ |

SELFSORORITY

59)How often do you get involved in and/or participate in "bull sessions"?

- a) Nightly
- b) Two or three times a week
- c) Once a week
- d) Once or twice a month
- e) I never do

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____
- d) _____
- e) _____

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____
- d) _____
- e) _____

60)What is, generally, the most discussed topic?

- a) Dating
- b) International problems
- c) Sex
- d) Politics
- e) Men
- f) M.S.U.
- g) Other

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____
- d) _____
- e) _____
- f) _____
- g) _____

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____
- d) _____
- e) _____
- f) _____
- g) _____

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

The sliding-scale tuition plan utilized on the Michigan State University campus from September, 1968 to June, 1969, is described in the Spring 1969 issue of the Schedule of Courses and Academic Handbook, a Michigan State University publication as follows:

Page 22 - "FEE REDUCTIONS: Students paying Michigan resident fees and not receiving scholarships and grants of \$95 or more are eligible to apply for fee reduction when the total 'parental' income for 1968 is less than \$18,400 for undergraduates (\$19,400 for graduate students). In such cases, fees will be 1% of total 'parental' income for 1968, but not less than \$123 (\$148 for graduate students). Some students who are completely independent and self-supporting and who are in no way supported by their parents may apply on the basis of their own income. Married students, veterans, and older students often qualify on this basis."