

A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF SELF-STEREOTYPING AND SELECTIVE
SELF-STEREOTYPING BY SORORITY WOMEN

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Kathleen A. Lobban, B.A.

San Marcos, Texas
May 2012

A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF SELF-STEREOTYPING AND SELECTIVE
SELF-STEREOTYPING BY SORORITY WOMEN

Committee Members Approved:

Toni Watt, Chair

Patti Giuffre

Audrey McKinney

Approved:

J. Michael Willoughby
Dean of the Graduate College

COPYRIGHT

by

Kathleen Ann Lobban

2012

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgment. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Kathleen A. Lobban, authorize duplication of this work, in whole or in part, for education or scholarly purposes only.

DEDICATION

Without two individuals, I would not be in a position to receive my Master's degree and therefore would not be writing this thesis. To my parents, Kevin and Mary Lobban, I dedicate this to you. I do not take for granted the love and support you have had for me throughout my academic career. I know, without a single doubt, that if I was not blessed to have parents who put an emphasis on the importance of education and support me through every step of it, I would not be anywhere near I am today. I appreciate everything you have done for me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am eternally grateful to all those who helped me during the process of composing my Master's thesis.

A special thank you goes to Dr. Toni Watt for acting as my thesis chair and being supportive every step through. She allowed for me to take the smallest spark of an idea and shape it into a topic that I am proud to present. The motivation and constructive criticism she gave through every step guided me to the completion of my thesis and made the tedious and tiring process enjoyable. I was honored to have her as my thesis chair.

In addition, I owe many thanks to Dr. Patti Giuffre and Dr. Audrey McKinney. Dr. Giuffre's qualitative research method was my first graduate course and she made me feel comfortable within the discipline as well as within my writings and researching skills. Dr. McKinney's Images of Women's course inspired me to narrow my thesis to a study that was representative of the female gender. The appreciation I have for both of these scholars cannot be expressed.

To those who edited my many drafts, especially Sarah Wood, the meticulous attention to detail shown was an enormous aid to me. Also, thank you to Erin Lobban for helping me in the surveying process.

Finally, to my sorority sisters, my Greek experience laid the groundwork for this study. Thank you.

This manuscript was submitted on April 4, 2012.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
ABSTRACT.....	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
Social Benefits of Sorority Membership.....	4
Negative Consequences of Sorority Membership.....	6
Stereotyping.....	10
III. Methodology.....	17
IV. Results.....	21
Self-Stereotyping.....	21
In-Group Versus Out-Group Stereotyping.....	25
Factors Related to Self-Stereotyping.....	26
Chi-Square Analysis.....	26
Independent Samples t-Test.....	32
V. Conclusion.....	36
Suggestion for Future Research on Self-Stereotyping.....	40
APPENDIX.....	42

REFERENCES.....49

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequencies.....	21
2. Frequencies (Sororities compared to Non-Greeks).....	25
3.1. Chi Square Analysis (Race/Ethnicity).....	26
3.2. Chi Square Analysis (Leadership Position).....	28
3.3. Chi Square Analysis (Live Where).....	30
4. Independent Samples t-Test.....	32

ABSTRACT

A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF SELF-STEREOTYPING AND SELECTIVE SELF-STEREOTYPING BY SORORITY WOMEN

by

Kathleen A. Lobban, B.A.

Texas State University-San Marcos

May 2012

SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: DR. TONI WATT

In an attempt to further the knowledge of who is responsible for stereotyping and continuing stereotypes, 150 sorority women were surveyed to obtain their views on common stereotypes of sorority members. While existing literature suggests that stereotypes tend to be endorsed by out-group members, the present study explored whether sorority women (the in-group) perpetuate stereotypes of their own group. Results reveal that sorority women do support existing (and predominately negative) stereotypes of sororities. However, they engage in selective self-stereotyping strategies. These strategies include accepting positive (e.g. pretty) but not negative (e.g. promiscuous) stereotypes for themselves and viewing themselves and their own sorority as different from sorority women in general. The results also reveal that race/ethnicity, GPA, leadership roles, length of time in the sorority, classification, and sorority house residence relate to sorority women's tendency to stereotype their own group.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

A French printer Didot coined the term “stereotype” in 1798. He used the term to describe the printing process used to create reproductions of his prints (Ashmore & Del Boca 1981). Later, a journalist Walter Lippmann (1922) used the term to describe the generalizations of the images in his head of social groups, and the term advanced over time to encompass groups and individuals in all social classes, ethnicities, and locations in today’s society. Stereotypes “can at times be positive, but for the most part, they tend to be negative and resistant to change” (Plous 2003:1).

A group that is often stereotyped is sororities. While existing stereotypes of sororities include both positive and negative traits, the predominant stereotypes of this group tend to be negative (Lemire 2004). Sororities are often depicted as women of privilege and prestige who engage in seedy, unwholesome activities. Wearing designer brands, binge drinking, promiscuity, and putting academic success second to a social life are typical stereotypes of sorority woman.

Pickering (2007) suggests that stereotypes tend to be generated from people of greater power and status that are not categorized as members of the group that is being stereotyped. Although, most often, stereotypes are created from an outside source, those external forces are not the only ones continuing and endorsing the stereotypes. The in-group has the potential to self-stereotyping by not denouncing the negative stereotypes,

thereby allowing them to continue to be a common belief in society.

For this paper, self-stereotyping and selective self-stereotyping is studied. Self-stereotyping is when people see in themselves similar characteristics to other individuals within the in-group. Persons stereotype themselves in the same way as their in-group is stereotyped. Selective self-stereotyping is when a person chooses to accept only particular aspects of a stereotype. For example, one might accept the positive traits of a stereotype but think of the negative traits of a stereotype as applying only to other members of the in-group, but never oneself. The difference between self-stereotyping and selective self-stereotyping is that when a person selectively self-stereotypes the person is only self-ascribing the positive traits, but in self-stereotyping the person accepts all of the traits *carte blanche* of the in-group whether positive or negative.

Biernat, Green, and Vescio (1996) studied self-stereotyping of in-groups. By analyzing the responses of sorority women and non-Greek women, they found that the sorority women denounced negative stereotypes as characteristics of their own sorority yet named them as characteristics of other sororities on their campus. The sorority women ascribed the negative traits more on sororities in general than they did on non-Greek students. As a result, the sorority women were selectively stereotyping, contributing to the perpetuation of the negative stereotypes that blight the group. The respondents were answering with in-group as well as self-biases. The present study attempts to expand upon the Biernat, Green, and Vescio (1996) study to deepen our understanding of self-stereotyping and selective-self stereotyping. I argue that this is detrimental to a group's dynamic. Specifically, if sorority women are continuing to endorse the negative stereotypes, they are endangering the future of the organization and

defaming the organization members.

The purpose of this study is to conduct a survey of sorority women in order to determine whether sorority women engage in self-stereotyping and/or selective self-stereotyping. If they selectively self-stereotype, what are the particular strategies? I will explore whether sorority women accept only the positive but not the negative traits for themselves. I examined whether sorority women assign stereotypes differently for themselves, their sorority, and sorority women in general. This study is sociologically important because it creates deeper understanding of stereotypes and how they are generated in society.

Chapter II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Benefits of Sorority Membership

Heida (1990) reported that the “successes are harder to detect than the failures” (p. 3) for the Greek community. Sororities were created to be a beneficial experience for all of the women who choose membership. They were designed to serve as a mechanism for a sense of sisterhood that started during collegiate years but lasted a woman’s lifetime. According to one study, “sororities were founded on principles of friendship, scholarship, leadership, rectitude, and service. These are honorable values that provide a strong foundation for any learning community” (Boschini and Thompson 1998:22).

The potential for business networking is another positive aspect of sorority membership. Numerous studies have documented gender inequality in the workplace. There is an inequality between the genders. In order to succeed in the workforce, it is important to have connections. Campbell and Rosenfeld (1985) reported that because males have a larger social network and they also have increased opportunities, they are at an advantage over women. But by joining a sorority, women are augmenting their opportunities by strengthening the size of their social networks. Sororities have alumni groups present in every major city in the United States, as well several international chapters. Sorority membership can create connections worldwide, which might allow women to navigate the male dominated economy.

Sororities place an emphasis on the importance of community service. Every sorority in the sample for this study has a nationally recognized Philanthropy it partners with. Dugan (2006) found a statistically significant relationship between community service and leadership development. Placing an emphasis on the importance of volunteerism encourages the women to have better ideals and morals. Sorority women partake in more volunteer hours than do non-Greek students (Abrahamson 1987).

According to research, sororities are often viewed as a subculture of society. Kuh and Whitt (1988) defined a subculture as “a group of people who have persistent interaction, a distinct group identity, and collective distinct understandings that form a basis of action” (p. 83). Sororities and fraternities are designed to create a sense of community for their members. Sorority members are more self-confident than other non-Greek woman, which is due, in part, to feeling a sense of belonging to something on their college campus (Kilgannon and Erwin 1992). Sorority women also have greater involvement in extracurricular activities and higher academic achievements than non-Greek women (Kilgannon and Erwin 1992).

Handler (1995) determined that “sororities are a celebration of women's friendships. They are the embodiment of the relational model of women's nature: women need each other. Sororities help satisfy that need, however, women in sororities need each other not only for the intrinsic value of their emotional bonds, but also as a guiding force in the navigation through the heterosexual culture of college and Greek life” (p. 252). In other words, the need that some female students have can be fulfilled by Greek participation. Handler studied the importance of sorority membership for women to succeed and exist in a patriarchal society. Sorority women are a source of friendship and

support for each other in the college years. The organization can also create social situations that may increase heterosexual dating pools due to campus involvement and networking with male students and organizations. Confidence is built by the involvement in the activities that the women undertake in together. In a study done by Bernsheid, Snyder and Onoto (1989), undergraduate students named their romantic relationships as the most desired and acted upon interpersonal relationship they experienced in their college years. Sorority women can be exposed to more situations that benefit them romantically. The study found that romantic relationships are positive for the identity and help people grow and develop into who they desire to be. Scheele (2003) found that the reason many college students participate in a sorority is because sororities offer higher expectations to attain personal and academic goals than do non-Greek organizations. In addition, Kuh (1985) reports that Greek organizations serve as powerful socializing agents. A 1997 study revealed that members of the National Interfraternity Conference (NIC) and the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) excelled in social capital (e.g. connections to higher paying jobs, class status, and social network) in comparison to their non-Greek peers. One limitation of this study is that the women in sororities may have had higher social capital before they joined the Greek community because women who are chosen to be in sororities are often screened for social capital.

Negative Consequences of Sorority Membership

In addition to the numerous positive aspects of sorority membership mentioned, negative aspects are likewise found in the literature. Topics such as alcohol abuse, victimization, body image issues, academic dishonesty, and sexual aggression were common themes found in sociological articles. It is vital to understand the social stigmas

that are associated with women in sororities before beginning to study who are endorsing these images.

According to research, sorority women primarily date fraternity men (Copenhaver & Grauerholz 1991). Studies have found that some fraternity members take their sexual aggression out on strangers, as well as their significant others (Martin and Hummer 1989). Since it has been reported that members of the Greek community are commonly dating men who are also members of the Greek community (their in-group), it is hypothesized that sorority women are often victims of sexual aggression from fraternity men. Fraternal events typically involve and are attended by members of sororities. Alcohol can increase sexual activity and victimization (Kalof 1993). Drug-induced sexual attacks are reported as being a common occurrence for sorority women with fraternity men (Copenhaver and Grauerholz 1991). Sexual victimization and alcohol abuse are concluded to be a prominent part of sorority life and Kalof (1993) found that sorority women were aware of the sexual threat of rape surrounding fraternity men, but the threat did not limit the involvement sorority women had with fraternity men. According to Martin and Hummer (1989) Greek members are expected to maintain a sense of loyalty to their brotherhood or sisterhood. Also, they are expected to conform to the social norms of what is masculine and feminine. The research suggests that part of this loyalty is interpersonal relations (sexual and non-sexual) with Greek members.

Researchers found a higher incidence of eating disorders among women involved in the Greek system. Rolnik, Engeln-Maddox, and Miller (2010) found that rush participants showed evidence of self-objectification and were more likely to have an eating disorder than female students that do not participate in sorority recruitment.

Objectification theory (Fredrickson and Roberts 1997) is used to conceptualize sorority recruitment. This theory suggests that frequent experiences that are objectifying will lead to self-objectification; and, self-objectification is linked to body image issues, shame, and eating disorders (Fredrickson and Roberts 1997). According to Rolnik, Engeln-Maddox, and Miller's study (2010), sorority recruitment can be credited as being an experience that leads to self-objectification. The authors hypothesize that the "two minute conversations are just a chance for as many girls (as possible) to judge how pretty you are; that's the only thing they could determine in such a short amount of time" (p. 6). Sorority recruitment week is "the worst week many freshman girls experience. It is awkward, ego-crushing, and brought us to the depths of shallowness" (p. 6). Therefore, it is viewed as a negative experience according to this study. Involvement in sorority recruitment is positively correlated to the increase of objectification issues. Sorority involvement has been found to have negative consequences for participants. Eating disorders are a medical illness that often appear throughout one's teenage years and early adulthood and frequently coexist with other illnesses such as depression, substance abuse, or anxiety disorder. Eating disorders prominently occur in females dealing with objectification issues (Calogero, Davis, and Thompson 2005). Eating disorders and the other negative outcomes have long-term effects for the women. In addition to the physical health risks, women suffering from these conditions have a higher likelihood to develop a lack of self-worth, which negatively impacts their opportunity to have productive, successful futures (Mercurio and Landry 2008).

Kalof and Cargill (1991) researched traditional gender norms among Greek women and non-Greek women. They found that Greek women were more likely to

endorse traditional gender norms than non-Greek women. According to this study, conforming to a female organization's ideals causes women to endorse female stereotypes and traditional roles (Kalof and Cargill 1991). Because of the specific features of the stereotypes involved, women who endorse traditional roles accept a patriarchal society as the norm and propose no desire to change this norm. This research concludes that the stereotypes negatively affect one's identity, not only while during their collegiate years, but also continuing into their adult lives.

Sorority members are required to pay national and chapter dues. On average, the membership dues are over \$3,000 a school year. A stereotype facing sororities is that members come from affluent backgrounds. Ryan (2010) researched whether class status had anything to do with invitation and membership in Greek lettered organizations. The majority of the members were described and assigned as upper and upper-middle class students based upon material goods and the experiences the women were a part of. Class did matter when it came to Greek membership.

Lemire (2004) revealed that sorority women are portrayed to be "elitist and materialistic--promiscuous party girls prone to binge drinking and bulimia" (p. 2) in television, movies, and other media outlets. Mass media markets endorse negative images of sororities. The media market is sometimes used to warn potential new members and parents to avoid membership in a Greek organization (Lemire 2004). Negative media reports can lead to the stereotyping of all sorority women by broadcasting negative images. Often, media are covering specific, isolated cases, but this characterizes the entire Greek community with the same images. For example, author Alexandra Robbins (2005) wrote *Pledged: The Secret Life of Sororities* with the intention to uncover the

negative aspects of sororities. According to Lemire (2004), Robbins specifically writes about the negative parts of sorority membership in order to “shock those who weren't involved in sororities -- as if such behavior is exclusive to sorority girls” (p. 3). With books like Robbins' bestseller, negative behaviors are predominantly displayed in the mass media, and this overshadows the positive attributes.

Sororities have also been criticized for their selection criteria. Boschini and Thompson (1988) hypothesize that sororities base their acceptance on race, although it is not a bylaw of any Panhellenic sorority to be a certain race or ethnicity. According to Boschini and Thompson (1988), “historically white fraternities and sororities were established on predominantly white campuses at a time when the student body was primarily white, Christian, and male” (p. 19) but with campuses now becoming more diverse, the Greek system needs to open up to the minority groups. The National Study of Student learning (1996) determined that Greek members were primarily Caucasian and the group members were opposed to creating a diverse group (Whitt 1996). The Greek community is seen as being strictly homogeneous and unwilling to embrace anything new. Boschini and Thompson (1988) believe that members of the Greek community will not be ready for life after their sorority experience. They will not be able to adapt to the diverse work places that makes up society today because of the lack of diversity in their sorority and college in-group.

Stereotyping

Research shows that stereotypes are commonly created by judgments from a member of another group and tend to be negative. However, Fiske (2000) found that stereotypes could be reduced when people are motivated to do so. Stereotypes can be

reduced if people could view the stereotyped from the perspective of the group members who are being stereotyped (Galinsky and Moskowitz 2000).

Sociologist Kornblum (2009) found that stereotypes are created by expectations about the traits of members of a group and they do not account for individuality. Because of this, members are all stereotyped to have the same negative and positive traits. Typically, the ones who perceive the members of the group to be identical are not a part of the group. This literature indicates that stereotyping occurs from the out-group.

A major cause of stereotyping is in-group bias, or the tendency of people to favor their own group. (Aberson, Healy, and Romero 2000). Brewer (1999) concluded that these group biases are developing not because the out-group is hated, but because “positive emotions such as admiration, sympathy, and trust are reserved for the in-group” (p. 438). Because these positive feelings are reserved for members of the in-group, people are selectively endorsing stereotypes because of personal feelings and desire to be a member of the more stereotypically positive group. They are categorizing themselves as like those of the idolized group, and seek membership in that group.

Some literature finds that the in-group members also endorse negative stereotypes of members of the in-group. Govorun and Fuegen (2006) found that people will forego in-group biases in order to raise their self-esteem and how they are personally viewed. The person will denounce negative characteristics for themselves, and name them as characteristics of other members of their in-group. This is done to make one’s self look better and is part of selective self-stereotyping. The person is separating one self from the members of the group in order to only benefit him or herself. The authors found that people who are projecting stereotypes on already stereotyped groups do not feel bad

about their actions because they believe it is justified to continue the stereotype as reality regardless if they believe it to be true or false (Govorun and Fuegen 2006).

Handler found this sort of selective self-stereotyping among sorority women (Handler 1995). The women in Handler's study did not deny that negative characteristics were true of their sorority, and therefore were allowing negative stereotypes to continue. Handler found that the women see themselves as exceptions to the negative stereotypes. These women are "failing to challenge the stereotypes. Sororities continue to reinforce the very stereotypes they are trying to escape" (p. 253). The women do not want the negative stereotypes to be characteristics of themselves or their close in-group, yet they do nothing to actively change the general stereotypes and are allowing them to exist.

This study explores in-group stereotyping and selective-self stereotyping. Selective self-stereotyping is the term for the phenomenon in which persons embrace positive stereotypes as descriptions of themselves and sometimes the people of their in-group, but they reject the negative stereotypes as descriptions of themselves (Biernat, Green, and Vescio 1996). By selective-self stereotyping, the person is protecting he or she from the threat posed by exposure to negative attributes. In-group and out-group biases are a cause of selectively stereotyping. Theorists believe that selective self-stereotyping is motivated by the desire for positive self-regard. According to Hogg and Abrams (1988), the persons condone positive attributes for themselves and their in-group members as part of self-stereotyping and creating a positive social identity. They accept only the characteristics that reflect well on their in-group.

In a study of gender and stereotypes, Oswald and Lindstedt (2006) determined that their respondents were participating in both self-stereotyping and selective self-

stereotyping. They used gender stereotypes and found that females only identified the gender stereotypes to be true “to the general” population of females. The participants reported that the positive stereotypes were self-descriptive, and the negative stereotypes were only group-descriptive. The authors concluded that the reason the respondents were selectively self-stereotyping the gender stereotypes that were personality and physical traits is because they wanted to increase their personal self-esteem rather than the collective self-esteem of their in-group. This was done to only better oneself, not the others in the group.

In another study of self-stereotyping and selective self-stereotyping, results found that those who highly identify with their in-group are willing to engage in selective self-stereotyping (Pickett, Bonner, Coleman 2002). The reason a person selectively self-stereotypes is for the need of in-group inclusion but also the need for differentiation. This is done so that the person feels a connection to a group of others, but also sees himself or herself as an individual, typically one of more admirable traits than the others in the in-group.

Biernat, Green, and Vescio (1996) studied the stereotypes of sorority women. They found that sorority members are selective self-stereotyping often, which leads to lack of unity of the overall in-group. By doing this, the individual members of the Greek community are separating themselves from other sororities. They are accepting negative stereotypes as descriptions of other sororities and fraternities, but deny them as attributes of themselves and their sorority sisters (Biernat, Green, and Vescio 1996).

Biernat, Green, and Vescio (1996) examined both negative and positive stereotypes and asked sorority women how much they identified themselves and others

with the stereotypes. They found that the Greek system is fostering these stigmas by not denying the negative stereotypes, but, instead, labeling other sororities than their own as the cause of the rumors. Likewise, the authors found that within sorority systems, chapters are not accepting of other chapters on their campus and help spread the stereotypes throughout the Greek line and into the entire student body. For example, the sorority women denied that the negative stereotypes of being conceited, conforming, and judgmental were descriptions of themselves and their closest in-groups, but they did not deny these traits for other sorority women in general. They answered that these traits were in fact descriptions of sorority women, excluding themselves.

The researchers also surveyed non-Greek women as their respondents. They compared the answers to those of the sorority women. For example they found that 78% of sorority members agreed to the stereotype that sorority women are pretty, only 50% of the non-Greek respondents agreed as well. In addition, they found that the sorority women were more willing to categorize other sorority women with negative stereotypes than the non-Greek students. The authors hypothesized that this was done in order to increase self-esteem by being one who possesses positive characteristics in a group that is stereotypically negative.

To summarize, Biernat, Green, and Vescio (1996) found that sorority women tended to rate their own sorority most positive, sororities in general next highest, and non-Greek students least positive. They rated their own sorority least negative, sororities in general the most negative, and non-Greek students in between. This pattern appeared for 12 of the 14 positive traits and 11 of the 14 negative traits.

There are significant gaps in the literature on sorority stereotypes. First, negative

characteristics are the predominant themes in studies of sorority women. There are few studies revealing the positive characteristics of membership in a Greek organization. It is important to study both the negative and positive stereotypes. Although this study is similar to the one by Biernet, Green and Vescio (1996), it is using different research methods to analyze the stereotyping of sorority women. Biernet, Green, and Vescio (1996) only surveyed respondents from the University of Florida. The present study surveyed sorority women from three different universities in order to create a more diverse sample.

There is limited research on selective-self stereotyping. Further research on this form of stereotyping will broaden the understanding of where stereotyping is mainly coming from and who is doing the stereotyping. In current literature, the members of the out-group are commonly viewed as the ones creating and continuing stereotypes, mainly negative, about other groups. To address a current gap in literature, I hypothesize that this study will identify members of the in-group as the ones creating and continuing stereotypes. If researchers specifically concentrated on studying the stereotyping that is occurring within the in-group and only the in-group, then the theoretical idea of selective-stereotyping will be more commonly used to understand stereotypes in society.

I hypothesize that people often identify only with positive attributes, and do not identify with the negative ones. If this is true, the respondents would identify the positive stereotypes as characteristics to their specific sorority and also self-descriptive of them as individuals. But, the sorority member would categorize negative stereotypes as attributes of other sororities and sorority women in general, but not herself. If the hypothesis proves true for the research respondents, then it is hypothesized that other groups, not just

sororities, partake in selective self-stereotyping as well.

The study consisted of three central questions. The research questions were: 1) Do members of an in-group endorse the stereotypes of that group? 2) Do sorority women engage in self-stereotyping, selective self-stereotyping, or neither? and 3) How do certain characteristics influence whether sorority women endorse sorority stereotypes in general and/or for themselves?

Chapter III: METHODOLOGY

In order to answer the proposed research questions, the research method for this study was a survey. The survey had fifty questions and was administered to 150 sorority members from different sororities and universities in central Texas. The survey consisted of multiple-choice questions. The Institutional Review Board of Texas State University-San Marcos approved the survey and research design.

The survey responses were input into a data set and quantitatively analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Inc.) software application. The data set used each survey participant as the unit of analysis. Each sorority member was coded as a number, because names and sorority chapter membership were not noted or identifiable by the survey answers.

In order to form a large and diverse sample of the Greek community, surveys were passed out to six different Panhellenic sorority chapters from three different public universities. The surveys were passed out during the sorority's chapter meeting and were randomly passed out to twenty-five different women in each meeting. This eliminates surveying women with the same college classification.

The sororities were chosen based upon my relation to someone at each specific sorority. I asked someone I was acquainted with from each school and sorority if I could administer an anonymous survey at random to chapter members. I did not note what

university or specific sorority they were from, so that the results would not be evident to me how each specific university answered.

Because Greek life varies at different universities in different regions due to school size and/or emphasis on sorority involvement, the sorority chapters were all chosen from schools that had similar Greek life. The population of all the schools used were between 35,000 and 50,000 students and had a minimum of six Panhellenic sororities chartered at that university. This prevents surveying women from a large university that has a strong emphasis on sorority involvement and comparing it to a woman at a small college that does not have high support of the Greek community. This decision to limit the sample prevents the data from being skewed by one sorority chapter.

I chose to only survey sororities that were part of the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC). The NPC consists of twenty-six member organizations. This choice was made because NPC's sororities are considered the stereotypical Greek sororities. These twenty-six sororities are not based on religion, race, or service. They are considered social organizations that are open to women of all races and backgrounds and all place a strong emphasis on academics, philanthropy, and sisterhood.

I chose to do a study on selective self-stereotyping because it is not a popular concept that is studied, and I believe it is an important one to research. Understanding how groups stereotype can lead to understanding why they stereotype and who are endorsing the stereotypes. Deeper research of self-stereotyping and selective self-stereotyping will broaden the understanding of stereotyping in general and underscore the importance of considering stereotyping as a negative attribute of society and as

detrimental to the well being of the groups and individuals stereotyped. Because of societal views of sororities, the members face both positive and negative stereotypes. This study explores the ways in which sorority women themselves engage in self and other stereotyping.

The survey provided the respondents with a list of characteristics (positive and negative) that might describe college women. The list was generated by themes found in the current literature. I deliberately included traits commonly assigned to sorority women. They were asked to what extent these characteristics described four groups/individuals: themselves, women in their sorority, women in other sororities, and non-Greek college women. Additional demographic questions and more general questions about sororities were also asked. These questions were used to analyze if they were selective self-stereotyping, if in-group and out-group biases were occurring, and to determine if different characteristics made the respondent more likely to stereotype. A copy of the survey questionnaire is included in the appendix.

The questionnaire asked the respondents about both negative and positive stereotypes. A variety of stereotypes of sororities were presented but were not categorized as positive or negative. For example, rich could be positive, negative, or neutral. But of the stereotypes, some are more positive (pretty) and some are more negative (sexually promiscuous) and the findings will look at the level of positive or negative connotation each stereotype has.

Once all the data were entered into SPSS, I performed univariate and bivariate analyses. The univariate analysis is the predominant analysis. I looked at all the questions

to see the extent to which sorority women use the stereotypes to describe themselves, their sorority, other sororities, and non-Greek college women. This explored whether sorority women will only identify with the positive stereotypes and the extent to which they stereotype various groups. Frequencies were used to analyze the univariate analyses. The bivariate analysis used characteristics, such as race and ethnicity, classification, leadership position, length of time in the sorority, GPA, and whether they live in the sorority house, to see if these factors affect the tendency to selectively stereotype. The bivariate analyses consisted of three chi square tests and three independent samples t-tests.

The survey asked the same types of question four times: for the respondent, the respondent's specific sorority, the respondent's view on sororities in general, and the respondent's comparison of sorority women to non-Greek women. The respondents were asked if each of the following was a characteristic of the group/person in question.

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Rich			
Tan			
Blonde			
Pretty			
Not Intelligent			
Dates Fraternity members			
Partier			
Sexually Promiscuous			

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Self-Stereotyping

This section examines the extent to which sorority women self-stereotype. Table 1 presents how the respondents classified sororities in general, their specific sorority, and themselves as individuals.

Table 1: Frequencies						
	Sororities (General)		Specific Sorority		Individual	
	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Most Important Trait						
High GPA	32.0	48	84.0	126	76.7	115
Good Looks	68.0	102	12.7	19	21.3	32
Being a Legacy	0.00	0	0.00	0	2.0	3
Rich	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Other	0.00	0	3.3	5	0.00	0
Most Emphasized Aspect						
Social Events	71.3	107	8.7	13	12.7	19
Academics	7.3	11	59.3	89	26.0	39
Philanthropy	21.3	32	32.0	48	61.3	92
Recruits Attractive Women						
Yes	98.0	147	96.0	144	38.7	58
No	2.0	3	1.3	2	35.3	53

Table 1 Continued						
Don't Know	0.00	0	2.7	4	26.0	38
Rich						
Yes	49.3	74	32.0	48	28.7	43
No	36.7	55	44.7	67	68.0	102
Don't Know	14.0	21	23.3	35	3.3	5
Tan						
Yes	65.3	98	42.0	63	26.7	40
No	29.3	44	58.0	87	73.3	110
Don't Know	5.3	8	0.00	0	0.00	0
Blonde						
Yes	45.3	68	44.70	67	43.3	65
No	47.3	71	51.30	77	54.0	81
Don't Know	7.3	11	4.0	6	2.7	4
Pretty						
Yes	87.3	131	73.30	110	82.7	124
No	0.00	0	26.70	40	17.3	26
Don't Know	12.7	19	0.00	0	0.00	0
Not Intelligent						
Yes	16.7	25	10.7	16	6.7	10
No	79.3	119	89.3	134	93.3	140
Don't Know	4.0	6	0.00	0	0.00	0
Dates Fraternity Men						
Yes	94.0	141	80.7	121	47.3	71
No	4.0	6	10.7	16	50.7	76
Don't Know	2.0	3	8.7	13	2.0	3
Partiers						
Yes	95.3	143	85.3	128	53.3	80
No	4.7	7	13.3	20	46.7	70

Table 1 Continued						
Don't Know	0.00	0	1.3	2	0.00	0
Sexually Promiscuous						
Yes	88.0	132	55.3	83	4.7	7
No	12.0	18	39.3	59	90.7	135
Don't Know	0.00	0	5.3	8	4.7	7

The majority of sorority women describe sororities according to negative stereotypes. The majority of the respondents agreed that sorority women date fraternity men, are partiers, and are sexually promiscuous. The only negative characteristic that the majority of the respondents did not identify to be true was “not intelligent.” 16.7% of the respondents said that sorority women in general were unintelligent, but 79.3% disagreed with the stereotype. Overall, they are heavily endorsing the negative stereotypes to be true.

In addition to the negative characteristics that were being endorsed, the women answered that academics were not the most important aspect of sorority life. For the traits, 71.3% said social events were the most important aspect, 21.3% said philanthropy was, and only 7.3% answered that academics were the most emphasized aspect of sorority life.

Also, the respondents agreed to negative recruitment strategies. 68% of the respondents said that good looks was the most important trait to have to get into a sorority, and 32% said a high GPA was the most important trait. When it came to recruiting women, 98% of the surveyed women answered that sororities look to recruit attractive women, and 2% denied that they do so. By the way they answered, the results

indicate that sorority women are negatively stereotyping themselves by saying they only recruit attractive women for the most part. This recruitment strategy is a negative stereotype that is being endorsed by the vast majority.

Although sorority women do accept the negative stereotypes to be true for sororities, they might deal with this is by viewing themselves and their sorority as not fitting the profile of the “typical sorority.” The analysis indicates that the respondents participate in selective-self stereotyping the closer the stereotype gets to them as an individual. The pattern that occurred was that sororities in general were the most often negatively stereotyped, followed by the specific sorority, and the individual was the least negatively stereotyped. Only one trait did not have this pattern. For the case of “Pretty,” 87.3% of the respondents said sorority women in general are pretty, 73.30% of the respondents categorized their sorority as pretty, and 82.7% of the respondents said they were pretty. This was the only case that did not see a gradual decrease as it became closer to the individual. This indicates that sorority women are more likely to selectively self-stereotype negative stereotypes instead of positive stereotypes.

The most significant difference from the sororities in general to the individual was the category of “sexually promiscuous.” Eighty-eight percent of the respondents said sorority women in general are sexually promiscuous, 55.3% of the respondents identified their specific sorority as sexually promiscuous, and only 4.7% of the respondents view themselves as sexually promiscuous. The percentage change between sororities in general to the individual sorority woman was an 83.3% decrease.

In addition, the stereotype of being sexually promiscuous was accepted the least by the individual compared to the other stereotypes. Only 4.7% of the respondents said yes they were sexually promiscuous, 90.7% said no they were not sexually promiscuous, and the remaining 4.7% did not know if they were sexually promiscuous or not.

In-Group Versus Out-Group Stereotyping

This section compares how the respondent stereotyped sororities (in-group) in general compared to non-Greek women (out-group). Table 2 reports how sorority women described sorority women in general compared to non-Greek college women.

Table 2: Frequencies (Sororities compared to Non-Greeks)						
	Sororities in General			Non-Greek Women		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)
Rich	49.3	36.7	14.0	6.0	15.3	78.7
Tan	65.3	29.3	5.3	9.3	.7	90.0
Blonde	45.3	47.3	7.3	6.0	7.3	86.7
Pretty	87.3	0.00	12.7	32.0	4.0	64.0
Not Intelligent	16.7	79.3	4.0	6.0	26.7	67.3
Dates Fraternity Men	94.0	4.0	2.0	2.7	37.3	60.0
Partiers	95.3	4.7	0.00	2.7	42.0	55.3
Sexually Promiscuous	88.0	12.0	0.00	9.3	34.0	56.7

The results indicate that the respondents were more likely to answer “Don’t Know” to questions concerning non-Greek members (out-group) than sororities in general (in-group). In all the cases, a higher percentage of respondents answered “Don’t Know” to the non-Greek questions. This was vastly different than how they answered the

questions about sororities in general, and when they did answer they were much less likely to assign negative traits to non-Greek women compared to Greek women, despite the fact that they are part of this group.

Factors Related to Self-Stereotyping

Chi-Square Analysis

The data were analyzed to answer the question “how do certain characteristics influence whether sorority women endorse sorority stereotypes in general?”

A chi-square analysis (Table 3.1) was conducted to compare race/ethnicity and if the women agreed or disagreed with the stereotype (rich, tan, blonde, not intelligent, dates fraternity men, partiers, sexually promiscuous) for sororities in general. The vast majority of the respondents were White and Hispanic. Thus a Hispanic/White comparison is the only one possible with these data.

Table 3.1: Chi Square Analysis (Race/Ethnicity)				
<i>Dependent Variable</i>		<i>Independent Variable</i>		<i>Significance</i>
Date Fraternity Men		Race/Ethnicity		.000*
		Hispanic	White	
	Yes	50% (6)	100% (135)	
	No	50%(6)	0% (0)	
Rich		Race/Ethnicity		.373
		Hispanic	White	
	Yes	30% (3)	59% (70)	
	No	47-% (7)	41% (48)	
Tan		Race/Ethnicity		.039*
		Hispanic	White	

Table 3.1 Continued				
	Yes	27% (3)	72% (94)	
	No	73% (8)	28% (36)	
Blonde		Race/Ethnicity		.072
		Hispanic	White	
	Yes	9% (1)	52% (66)	
	No	91% (10)	48% (61)	
Pretty		Race/Ethnicity		.828
		Hispanic	White	
	Yes	100% (11)	100% (119)	
	No	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Not Intelligent		Race/Ethnicity		.000*
		Hispanic	White	
	Yes	8% (1)	18% (24)	
	No	92% (11)	82% (108)	
Partiers		Race/Ethnicity		.706
		Hispanic	White	
	Yes	100% (12)	95% (130)	
	No	0% (0)	5% (7)	
Sexually Promiscuous		Race/Ethnicity		.856
		Hispanic	White	
	Yes	92% (11)	88% (120)	
	No	8% (1)	12% (17)	
<i>*Significant at the 0.05 level</i>				

In Table 3.1, results reveal several statistically significant relationships between race/ethnicity and sorority stereotypes. Hispanic women in sororities are significantly less likely to describe sorority women as dating fraternity men, tan and not intelligent compared to White sorority women. There is no statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) between race/ethnicity and if sorority women are stereotyped to be partiers, rich, blonde, pretty, or sexually promiscuous.

A chi-square analysis (Table 3.2) was conducted to compare if the woman holds a leadership position (yes, no but plans to, and no and does not plan to) and if the women agreed or disagreed with the stereotype (rich, tan, blonde, not intelligent, dates fraternity men, partiers, sexually promiscuous) for sororities in general.

Table 3.2: Chi Square Analysis (Leadership Position)					
<i>Dependent Variable</i>		<i>Independent Variable</i>			<i>Significance</i>
Date Fraternity Men		Leadership Position			.129
		Yes	No, but plans to	No, and does not plan to	
	Yes	93% (77)	100% (11)	100% (53)	
	No	7% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Rich		Leadership Position			.000*
		Yes	No, but plans to	No, and does not plan to	
	Yes	35% (29)	100% (11)	100% (34)	
	No	65% (55)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Tan		Leadership Position			.000*
		Yes	No, but plans to	No, and does not plan to	
	Yes	49% (42)	100% (11)	100% (45)	
	No	51% (44)	0% (0)	0% (0)	

Table 3.2: Continued					
Blonde		Leadership Position			.000*
		Yes	No, but plans to	No, and does not plan to	
	Yes	14% (12)	100% (11)	100% (45)	
	No	86% (71)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Pretty		Leadership Position			.000*
		Yes	No, but plans to	No, and does not plan to	
	Yes	78% (67)	100% (11)	100% (53)	
	No	22% (19)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Not Intelligent		Leadership Position			.000*
		Yes	No, but plans to	No, and does not plan to	
	Yes	29% (25)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
	No	64% (55)	100% (11)	100% (53)	
Partiers		Leadership Position			.065
		Yes	No, but plans to	No, and does not plan to	
	Yes	92% (79)	100% (11)	100% (53)	
	No	8% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Sexually Promiscuous		Leadership Position			.369
		Yes	No, but plans to	No, and does not plan to	
	Yes	88% (76)	100% (11)	85% (45)	
	No	12% (10)	0% (0)	15% (8)	
<i>*Significant at the 0.05 level</i>					

Results reveal several statistically significant relationships between whether the woman holds a leadership position and stereotypical views of sorority women. Women

in leadership roles were significantly and substantively much less likely than women not in leadership positions to state that sorority women are rich, tan, blonde, and pretty. However, they are considerably more likely to state that sorority women are not intelligent.

There was not a statistically significant relationship ($p < 0.05$) between if the woman holds a leadership position and if sorority women are stereotyped to be partiers, date fraternity men, and/or to be sexually promiscuous.

A chi-square analysis (Table 3.3) was conducted to compare where the woman lives (sorority house, dorm room, or off campus apartment/housing) and if the women agreed or disagreed with sorority stereotypes in general.

Table 3.3: Chi Square Analysis (Live Where)					
<i>Dependent Variable</i>		<i>Independent Variable</i>			<i>Significance</i>
Date Fraternity Men		Lives Where			.067
		Sorority House	Dorm	Off campus apartment/housing	
	Yes	100% (67)	92% (34)	87% (40)	
	No	0% (0)	8% (3)	13% (3)	
Rich		Lives Where			.000*
		Sorority House	Dorm	Off campus apartment/housing	
	Yes	38% (26)	73% (27)	88% (21)	
	No	62% (42)	27% (10)	12% (3)	
Tan		Lives Where			.000*
		Sorority House	Dorm	Off campus apartment/housing	
	Yes	59% (41)	73% (27)	86% (30)	

Table 3.3 Continued					
	No	41% (29)	27% (10)	14% (5)	
Blonde		Lives Where			.000*
		Sorority House	Dorm	Off campus apartment/housing	
	Yes	18% (12)	70% (26)	86% (30)	
	No	82% (55)	30% (11)	14% (5)	
Pretty		Lives Where			.000*
		Sorority House	Dorm	Off campus apartment/housing	
	Yes	73% (51)	100% (37)	100% (43)	
	No	27% (19)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Not Intelligent		Lives Where			.000*
		Sorority House	Dorm	Off campus apartment/housing	
	Yes	31% (25)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
	No	69% (55)	100% (11)	100% (53)	
Partiers		Lives Where			.065
		Sorority House	Dorm	Off campus apartment/housing	
	Yes	90% (63)	100% (37)	100% (43)	
	No	10% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Sexually Promiscuous		Lives Where			.369
		Sorority House	Dorm	Off campus apartment/housing	
	Yes	86% (60)	100% (37)	85% (35)	
	No	14% (10)	0% (0)	15% (8)	
<i>*Significant at the 0.05 level</i>					

Results reveal several statistically significant relationships between where the woman lives and stereotypical views of sorority women. Women who live in their

sorority house are less likely than women who live elsewhere to stereotype sorority women to be rich, blonde and tan. Although the majority of the women considered sorority women to be pretty, the women living in their sorority house are less likely to agree with the stereotype of sorority women being pretty than women living outside of the sorority house. In addition, women who live in their sorority house are more likely than women who live elsewhere to stereotype sorority women as unintelligent. Women who live in dorms were significantly and substantively much less likely than women not living in dorms to state that sorority women are rich, tan, blonde, not intelligent, and pretty.

There was not a statistically significant relationship ($p < 0.05$) between where the woman lives and if sorority women are stereotyped to be partiers, date fraternity men, and/or sexually promiscuous.

Independent Samples t-Test

An independent-samples t-test (Table 4) was conducted to compare three factors (classification, GPA, and length of time in the sorority) and if the women agreed or disagreed with sorority stereotypes. The stereotype “pretty” was not used in the t-test, because none of the respondents stated that sorority girls in general were not pretty.

Table 4: Independent Samples t-Test			
	Classification (1-4)	GPA (1-5)	Length of Time in Sorority (1-5)
	<i>Mean Classification</i>	<i>Mean GPA</i>	<i>Mean Length of Time</i>
Rich			

Table 4 Continued			
Yes	2.07	3.54	2.74
No	2.05	3.76	2.95
<i>Significance</i>	<i>.926</i>	<i>.127</i>	<i>.191</i>
Tan			
Yes	2.14	3.79	2.90
No	2.11	3.66	2.98
<i>Significance</i>	<i>.838</i>	<i>.420</i>	<i>.623</i>
Blonde			
Yes	2.16	3.63	2.85
No	2.07	3.85	2.99
<i>Significance</i>	<i>.493</i>	<i>.151</i>	<i>.382</i>
Not Intelligent			
Yes	2.00	4.36	3.00
No	2.20	3.64	2.97
<i>Significance</i>	<i>.249</i>	<i>.000*</i>	<i>.900</i>
Dates Fraternity Men			
Yes	2.19	3.78	3.00
No	2.00	3.50	2.50
<i>Significance</i>	<i>.565</i>	<i>.461</i>	<i>.185</i>
Partiers			
Yes	2.19	3.71	2.98
No	2.00	5.00	3.00
<i>Significance</i>	<i>.537</i>	<i>.000*</i>	<i>.952</i>
Sexually Promiscuous			
Yes	2.12	3.67	2.92
No	2.61	4.50	3.44
<i>Significance</i>	<i>.013*</i>	<i>.000*</i>	<i>.018*</i>
<i>*Significant at the 0.05 level</i>			

For the majority of the stereotypes, classification did not have a statistically significant impact on if women agreed that the stereotype was true. The classification level (freshman, sophomore, junior or senior) of the respondent did not impact the answers regarding rich, tan, blonde, not intelligent, dates fraternity men, or partier. However, the classification of the respondent did affect how often they answered that sorority women in general are sexually promiscuous. The independent-samples t-test that was conducted to compare classification and if respondents view sorority women as sexually promiscuous indicated that there was a significant difference in the scores for sexually promiscuous ($M=2.12$, $SD=.80$) and not sexually promiscuous ($M=2.61$, $SD=.50$); $t(148)=-2.52$, $p = 0.013$. The higher the grade level you are in makes you more likely to deny that sorority women are sexually promiscuous.

According to the results, the GPA of the respondents did not make a difference on how they answered to the characteristics rich, tan, blonde, and dates fraternity members. But GPA did have an effect on if they stereotyped sorority women to be unintelligent, partiers, and sexually promiscuous. There was a significant difference in the scores for not intelligent ($M=4.36$, $SD=.49$) and intelligent ($M=3.64$, $SD=.94$); $t(142)=-3.74$, $p = 0.00$. Women with higher GPAs are more likely to consider sorority women to be unintelligent. Also, there was a significant difference in the scores for partiers ($M=3.71$, $SD=.88$) and not partiers ($M=5.0$, $SD=0.00$); $t(148)=-3.87$, $p = 0.00$. This suggests that women with a higher GPA were less likely to classify their in-group to be partiers. Lastly, there was a significant difference in the scores for sexually promiscuous ($M=3.67$, $SD=.84$) and not sexually promiscuous ($M=4.50$, $SD=.99$); $t(148)=-2.82$, $p = 0.000$.

Women with a higher GPA were less likely to stereotype sorority women as sexually promiscuous.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare length of time in the sorority and the stereotypes the respondents were questioned on. There was not a significant difference between lengths of time and how the respondents answered for rich, tan, blonde, not intelligent, dates fraternity men, or partiers. However, there was a significance relationship between length of time the woman was in the sorority and if they thought sorority women to be sexually promiscuous in general. The results reported that there was a significant difference in the scores for sexually promiscuous ($M=2.92$, $SD=.92$) and not sexually promiscuous ($M=3.44$, $SD=.51$); $t(148)=-2.39$, $p = 0.018$. These results suggest that the longer you are a member of a sorority, the less likely you are to stereotype sorority women to be sexually promiscuous.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

The present study addressed four research questions: 1) Do sorority women endorse the existing stereotypes of sororities (self-stereotyping)? 2) Do sorority women engage in selective self-stereotyping? 3) How do sorority women stereotype their in-group (sororities) compared to an out-group (non-Greek women), 4) Do certain characteristics influence whether sorority women endorse sorority stereotypes?

The results indicate that the in-group does perpetuate the stereotypes, both positive and negative, of the group. This research provides evidence of self-stereotyping because the individual was partaking in stereotyping her own in-group members. There has been research about this effect (Oswald and Lindstedt 2004), and research on sorority women in particular (Handler 2005). The present study supports these studies. Eighty-eight percent of sorority women describe sorority women (in general) as sexually promiscuous. As well, 95.3% endorsed partying as a stereotype. These stereotypes could be argued to be negative ones that affect the image of sorority women, and yet the sorority women themselves accept them to be true. The sorority women repeatedly accepted stereotypes (e.g. promiscuous, rich, partiers) to be true of sorority women in general, but they did not endorse the stereotypes to be true of non-Greek women. This supports the hypothesis that stereotyping of groups is not limited to out-group members, but includes the in-group as well. This finding adds to the current literature on not only sorority women and how they

stereotype, but also the theories of in-group and out-group stereotyping.

The findings also supported the hypothesis that sorority women will engage in selective self-stereotyping. The respondents tended to reject negative stereotypes for themselves and to some extent their own sorority, but consider them true for the most removed in-group (sorority women in general). For example, 88% of the respondents accepted the stereotype “sexually promiscuous” to be true for sorority women in general, whereas 55% of the respondents accepted it for their specific sorority, and only 4.7% of sorority women said they as an individual were sexually promiscuous. The vast majority of sorority women interviewed stopped endorsing the stereotypes as they became closer to her as an individual. There was not such a wide discrepancy in opinions for the stereotype “pretty.” Eighty-seven percent of the respondents said sorority women in general are pretty, 73.3% said their specific sorority is pretty, and 82.7% said they, as an individual, were pretty. Because the women allow the negative stereotypes to be truer of sorority women in general, and then still truer of their specific sorority sisters than themselves, the women are engaging in selective self-stereotyping. They are more likely to identify themselves as the more positive stereotypes (pretty) and denounce the negative ones (sexually promiscuous) more often. The sorority women are self-stereotyping by accepting traits of their in-group to be true of themselves, but in this case they are selectively self-stereotyping by picking and choosing which traits they want to find true of themselves based upon the positive or negative connotation each stereotype has on self-image. This is supportive of previous research on the topic of selective self-stereotyping (Biernat, Green, and Vescio 1996). This present study is adding more evidence that selective self-stereotyping is happening within in-groups, specifically, in

this case, in Panhellenic sororities.

The present study has a new finding that is a significant contribution to current literature on stereotyping and to the debate on what group is the one stereotyping. In Biernat, Green, and Vescio's study, the respondents stereotyped members of the out-group. They did not necessarily negatively stereotype them, but they did place judgments and stereotypes on the members of their out-group. In the present study, respondents are not as willing to stereotype the out-group as they are their own in-group. Because a majority of the respondents answered, "don't know" or "no" to the traits for non-Greeks, this indicates that in this case the out-group is not the one stereotyping the other-group. This is a new finding to sociological literature on stereotyping and in-group/out-group biases. It is evident that members of the in-group are stereotyping their own group and, as a result, allowing stereotypes, even negative ones, to continue to dictate common perceptions and misconceptions of their group.

Whitt (1996) found that the Greek community was homogeneous since they did not welcome diversity within their in-group. Although the Panhellenic council reports that they do not discriminate against any race and/or ethnicity and that all collegiate women are welcome to join a NPC sorority, results do not indicate that the NPC is strongly diverse. Only 13 out of 150 respondents answered that they identified as a race/ethnicity other than white. However, the finding that there were minority respondents does show that sororities are not completely homogeneous in terms of race/ethnicity. In regards to race/ethnicity, Hispanic women were less likely to endorse stereotypes than the Caucasian respondents. This is possibly due, in part, to the likelihood that a Hispanic sorority woman does not physically meet the stereotypes (blonde and

Caucasian) of a typical sorority woman. The argument that sororities and fraternities are opposed to diversifying their in-group and creating change (Plous 2003) may have to do with the reason why Hispanic sorority women answered differently than Caucasian respondents. Hispanic chapter members are diversifying the in-group and creating change, and because these women are the result of change, that may be why they are willing to view sorority women differently than the typical, stereotyped women that the other respondents endorsed more willingly.

The higher the GPA of the respondent, the more likely they were to stereotype sorority women as not intelligent. This indicates that the respondents were performing selective self-stereotyping. Possibly, the reason the women did this was to make themselves seem more intelligent compared to their in-group. This creates personal gratification for the individual by separating herself from the in-group.

Results revealed that the women who live in their sorority house are less likely to endorse the stereotypes whether positive or negative. In addition, those with leadership positions answered differently than those without. Having a leadership position and/or living in the sorority house make your involvement higher in sorority life than those who do not hold a leadership position or live in the house. Based upon the results, it shows that the women who are more involved stereotype differently than those who are not as involved in sorority life. The more involved the woman was, the less likely she was to endorse stereotypes (with the exception of viewing sorority women as not-intelligent). This can be seen in two ways: 1) the woman is trying to protect her in-group from current stereotypes because she is more involved and she may have more investment and hope to change the stereotypes or 2) the women who are not as involved as the women who hold

leadership positions and/or live in their sorority house are not as aware if stereotypes are in fact true or not because they are more distant from the in-group.

This study brings new literature to sociological research. There is not any current data on factors associated with self-stereotyping and this is something new that is unique. Being able to specifically determine what factors make a member of a group endorse or denounce stereotypes is beneficial to understanding why and how stereotypes exist. It is important for the research of societal stereotyping to be done at greater length, such as the ones of this study, to determine all of the many factors that contribute to the act of stereotyping and the idea of in-group and out-group biases.

Suggestion for Future Research on Self-Stereotyping

A suggestion for future research on self-stereotyping and selective-stereotyping would be to analyze whether male respondents report only positive stereotypes as identifiable characteristics of themselves, and leave the negative stereotypes to describe others including their in-group. The present study and the studies by Biernat, Green and Vescio (1996) and Oswald and Lindstedt (2006) only identified females as the ones selectively self-stereotyping. It would be beneficial to know if the theory is specific to only to females or if both males and females subscribe to self-stereotyping practices.

An interesting study that could be based off the present one would be one that looks even more into the in-group and how they stereotype. Because this study indicated that the women who live in their sorority house do stereotype differently than those who live elsewhere, it would be intriguing to look at how those women who live in their house compare specifically to those in their sorority who do not live in their house. The present

study did not note which sorority chapter each respondent was a member of, but it would be interesting to record and compare within each chapter how the women responded.

Along with suggestions for future research, a larger and more diverse sample size would be ideal to elaborate on this type of study. Although the surveys were distributed at random, the majority (93.33%) of the respondents identified white as their race/ethnicity. It would be beneficial to the study to enlarge the sample size to reach a more diverse sample size. Perhaps an interesting route to take would be to see if race/ethnicity is more diverse in different regions of the United States.

In order to investigate the broader topic of this study (self-stereotyping and selective self-stereotyping) I encourage future researchers to replicate this study but use other groups instead of sororities or fraternities. This study determined some of the stereotypes sorority women employ—but it is not clear that being in a sorority is a driving factor behind these stereotypes. The same beliefs and actions may be true of the population at large and it would be beneficial to the idea of self-stereotyping and selective-self stereotyping to research other groups to see if and how the results are similar to the ones found in this study and others like it.

NOTES

1. Sorority members are often referred to as “sorority girls” and “sorority sisters.” For this study, the term “sorority woman/women” was used. Since all the respondents were over the age of eighteen and college students, they were identified as women.
2. In order to receive membership to a NPC letter sorority, women must participate in formal or informal recruitment. These recruitment procedures are referred as both “rush” and “recruitment” in this study. They are the same event.
3. Rush usual consists of a few rounds. During these rounds, active sorority members meet the potential new members (often referred to as rushees). The sorority members perform skits, sing songs, and share personal sisterhood stories with the rushees. As each round ends, the rushees and sororities list their choices in order of preference. The rushees who are ranked high enough will be invited to the next round. At the end of all of the rounds, the sororities give out invitations (also known as bids) to the desired rushees to gain membership into their sorority.

APPENDIX

Survey Questions

1. Classification:
 - a. Freshman
 - b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior
2. Race/Ethnicity:
 - a. Hispanic
 - b. Black or African American
 - c. Asian or Pacific Islander
 - d. American Indian
 - e. White
 - f. Other
3. What is your GPA?
 - a. Below 2.0
 - b. 2.01-2.5
 - c. 2.51-3.0
 - d. 3.01-3.5
 - e. 3.51-4.0
4. How long have you been a member of your sorority?
 - a. This is my first semester.
 - b. First year, but not first semester.
 - c. Second year
 - d. Third year
 - e. Fourth year +
5. Where do you live?
 - a. Sorority house
 - b. Dorm
 - c. Campus apartments
 - d. Off campus apartments/housing
 - e. Home with family
6. Who do you live with? Check all that apply.
 - a. A non-Greek student
 - b. A member of my sorority
 - c. A member of a different sorority
 - d. Family
7. What was the main reason you joined a sorority? Pick the option that best fits you.
 - a. I am a legacy of my pledged sorority.
 - b. I wanted to make friend.

- c. I liked the community service aspects of sororities.
 - d. I was persuaded by family/friends.
 - e. Other _____
8. For each of the following members of your family, indicate if they were members of a Greek fraternity or sorority.

	Yes	No	n/a
Father			
Mother			
Brother(s)			
Sister(s)			
Child or children			
Grandparent(s)			
Aunt(s)/Uncle(s)			

9. How involved do you consider yourself in your sorority?
- a. Very involved
 - b. Moderately involved
 - c. Only slightly involved
 - d. Not at all involved
10. Do you hold a leadership position in your sorority?
- a. Yes
 - b. No, but I plan to in the future.
 - c. No, and I do not plan to.
11. Do you think being in a sorority is a more rewarding experience than other on campus organizations?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. They are the same.

*The following set of questions will be about your impression of all sororities **in general**. Not just your specific pledged sorority.*

12. Out of these statements, which one do you find the most true about sororities.
- a. Sorority women party more than non-Greek women.
 - b. Non-Greek women party more than sorority women.
 - c. All students party the same amount.
13. Who do you think does better academically?
- a. Members of a sorority
 - b. Non-members of a sorority
 - c. Sororities and non-Greek women are similar academically
14. Out of the following options, what trait is the most important to have to get into a sorority?

- a. High GPA
 - b. Good looks
 - c. Being a legacy
 - d. Having money.
 - e. Other _____
15. Is it important for sorority members to have hair and make-up done at all times?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Only for special events.
16. What is the most emphasized aspect of sororities? Pick one.
- a. Social events
 - b. Academics
 - c. Philanthropy
17. When recruiting new members, do sororities tend to recruit attractive women?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
18. Are the women of sororities rich?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Most, but not all.
 - d. Very few.
 - e. Don't know.
19. Sororities are stereotyped to be heavy partiers and sexually promiscuous. Do you think this stereotype is true for some sororities?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
20. Out of the following characteristics, in general are sorority members these characteristics:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Rich			
Tan			
Blonde			
Pretty			
Not Intelligent			
Dates Fraternity members			
Partier			
Sexually Promiscuous			

*The following set of questions will be about **your** specific sorority. These questions should only be answered in relation to your chapter.*

21. How do you think your sorority ranks on your college campus?
 - a. The best sorority.
 - b. One of the best.
 - c. Average.
 - d. Lower than most sororities.
 - e. The worst
22. Out of the following options, what trait is the most important to have to get into your sorority?
 - a. High GPA
 - b. Good looks
 - c. Being a legacy
 - d. Having money.
 - e. Other _____
23. When recruiting new members, does your sorority tend to recruit attractive women?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
24. What is emphasized as the most important aspect for your sorority?
 - a. Academics
 - b. Social events
 - c. Philanthropy
25. Are the women of your sorority rich?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Most, but not all.
 - d. Very few.
 - e. Don't know.
26. Which of these characteristics describe your sorority chapter in general:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Rich			
Tan			
Blonde			
Pretty			
Not Intelligent			
Dates Fraternity members			
Partier			

Sexually Promiscuous			
----------------------	--	--	--

27. Does your sororities hair and make-up always done well when in public?
- Yes
 - No
28. Out of the following options, what trait is the most important when your sorority is recruiting?
- High GPA
 - Good looks
 - Being a legacy
 - Having money.
 - Other _____
29. Sororities are stereotyped to be heavy partiers and sexually promiscuous. Do you think this stereotype is true for members of your sorority?
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know
30. Out of these statements, which one do you find the most true about your sorority.
- My sorority attends parties more often than non-Greek women.
 - Non-Greek women party more than my sorority.
 - All students party the same amount.

*The following set of questions will be answered based only on **you** as an individual member.*

31. What is the most important aspect of your sorority experience for you?
- Social events
 - Academics
 - Community service
32. When meeting potential new members, do you tend to recruit more attractive women?
- Yes
 - Never
 - Sometimes/Depends
33. Do you consider yourself rich?
- Yes
 - No
 - Maybe
34. Who do you think does better academically?
- I do.
 - Non-members of a sorority
 - Other sorority women.

- d. All do the same academically.
35. What trait do you hope your future sorority sisters have?
- High GPA
 - Good looks
 - Being a legacy
 - Having money.
36. Sororities are stereotyped to be heavy partiers and sexually promiscuous. Do you think this stereotype is true of you?
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know
37. When in public, do you always have your hair and make-up done?
- Yes
 - No
38. Do you consider yourself a "partier"?
- Yes
 - No
39. How do you typically study?
- Alone.
 - With classmates.
 - With my sorority sisters
40. Answer if these characteristics describe you:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Rich			
Tan			
Blonde			
Pretty			
Not Intelligent			
Dates Fraternity members			
Partier			
Sexually Promiscuous			

*The following set of questions will be about **non-Greek** women in general.*

41. Do you think sorority women are richer than non-Greek women
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know.
42. Does non-Greek women's hair and make-up always done well when in public?
- Yes

- e. No
43. In classes, is it obvious who is a non-Greek student?
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't Know

44. Answer if these characteristics describe non-Greek students in general:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Rich			
Tan			
Blonde			
Pretty			
Not Intelligent			
Dates Fraternity members			
Partier			
Sexually Promiscuous			

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, Judith P. 1987. "The Influence of Student Involvement by Sorority Membership." Bloomington, Indiana: Center for the Study of the College Fraternity.
- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice 25th ed.* MA: Addison Wesley.
- Ashmore, Richard D., & Del Boca. 1981. "Conceptual Approaches to Stereotypes and Stereotyping." *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (1-35). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berscheid, Ellen, Mark Snyder, and Allen Omoto. 1989. "The Relationship Closeness Inventory: Assessing the Closeness of Interpersonal Relationships." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57:792-807.
- Biernat, Monica, Michelle L. Green, and Theresa K. Vescio. 1996. "Selective Self-Stereotyping." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 71(6):1194-1209.
- Boschini, Vic and Carol Thompson. 1998. "The Future of the Greek Experience: Greeks and Diversity." *New Direction for Student Services* 81:19-27.
- Calogero, Rachel M., William N. Davis and J. Kevin Thompson. 2005. "The role of self-objectification in the experience of women with eating disorders." *Sex Roles* 52:43-50.
- Campbell, K. and R.A. Rosenfeld. 1985. "Job Search and Job Mortality: Sex and Race Differences." *Research in the Sociology of Work*. 3: 147-174.
- Copenhaver, Stacey, and Elizabeth Grauerholz. 1991. "Sexual Victimization Among Sorority Women: Exploring the Link Between Sexual Violence and Institutional Practices." *Sex Roles* 24:31-41.
- Dugan, John P. 2006. "Involvement and Leadership: A Perspective Analysis of Socially Responsible Leadership." *Journal of College Student Development* 47(3):335-343.
- Fiske, Susan T. 1998. "Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination." *The handbook of social psychology 4th ed.* (357-411). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fredrickson, Barbara L., and Tomi-Ann Roberts. 1997. "Objectification Theory: Toward

Understanding Women's Lived Experiences and Mental Health Risks"
Psychology of Women Quarterly 21:173–206.

- Govorun, Olesya, Kathleen Fuegen & B. Keith Payne. 2006. "Stereotypes Focus Defensive Projection." *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* 32(6).
- Gwartney-Gibbs, P., and J. Stockard,. 1989. "Courtship Aggression and Mixed-sex Peer Groups." In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships*. New York: Praeger.
- Handler, Lisa. 1995. "In the Fraternal Sisterhood: Sororities as Gender Strategy." *Gender and Society* 9(2):236-255.
- Heida, Debbie E. 1990. "Greek Affairs In Higher Education: Dilemmas In Philosophy and Practice." *NASPA Journal* 28(1):3-7.
- Kalof, Linda. 1993. "Rape-supportive Attitudes and Sexual Victimization Experiences of Sorority and Nonsorority Women." *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* 29(11-12). Retrieved October 28, 2010 (<http://www.taasa.org/library/pdfs/TAASALibrary128.pdf>).
- Kalof, Linda and Timothy Cargill. 1991. "Fraternity and Sorority Membership and Gender Dominance Attitudes." *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* 25:417-423.
- Kilgannon, Suzanne, and T. Dary Erwin. 1992. "A Longitudinal Study About the Identity and Moral Development of Greek Students." *Journal of College Student Development* 33:253-259.
- Koss, Mary P. and John A. Gaines. 1993. "The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 8:94-108.
- Kuh, George. 1985. "What is Extraordinary About Ordinary Student Affairs Organizations." *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal* 23(2):31-43.
- Kuh, George and Elizabeth Whitt. 1988. "The Invisible tapestry: Culture In American Colleges and Universities." *ASHE-Eric Higher Education Reports* 17(1).
- Kornblum, Jullian. 2006. "Study Guide for Social Problems by Kornblum."
- Lemire, Christy. (2004). "'Pledged' plays up Stereotypes." *The Associated Press* May, 2, 2004.
- Lippmann, Walter. 1922. *Public opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Martin, Patricia Y. and Robert A Hummer. 1989. "Fraternities and Rape on Campus."

Gender & Society 3(4):457-473.

- Mercurio, Andrea E. and Laura J. Landry. 2008. "Self-Objectification and Wellbeing: The Impact of Self-Objectification on Women's Overall Sense of Self-Worth and Life Satisfaction." *Sex Roles* 58:458-466.
- Moore, Gwen. 1990. "Structural Determinants of Men's and Women's Personal Networks." *American Sociological Review* 55:726-735.
- Oswald, Debra and Kara Lindstedt. 2006. "The Content and Function of Gender Self-stereotypes: An Exploratory Investigation." *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* 54(7-8):447-458.
- Pickett, Cynthia L., Bryan L. Bonner, and Jill M. Coleman. 2002. "Motivated Self-Stereotyping: Heightened Assimilation and Differentiation Needs Result in Increased Levels of Positive and Negative Self-Stereotyping." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82(4):543-562.
- Rolnik, Ashley M., Renee Engeln-Maddox, and Steven A. Miller. 2010. "Here's Looking at You: Self-Objectification, Body Image Disturbance, and Sorority Rush." *Sex Roles* 63(1):6-17.
- Scheele, Karla. 2003. "Sex (Roles) and the Sorority. A Story of Feminist Transformations." *Partial Truths and the Politics of Community* p.112-123.
- Sociological Theory* by George Ritzer. 8th ed. McGraw Hill, Boston. 2011.
- Unknown. 2010. "Welcome to NPCWomen.org." Indianapolis, IN: National Panhellenic Conference. Retrieved September 10, 2011 (<https://www.npcwomen.org/index.aspx>).
- Whitt, Elizabeth. 1996. "What Have We Learned from the First Year of the National Study of Student Learning?" *Journal of College Student Development*, 1996 37(2):182-192.

VITA

Kathleen Ann Lobban was born in Greenfield, Massachusetts on June 6, 1989, the daughter of Mary Margaret Lobban and Kevin Brian Lobban. After completing her work at James W. Martin High School, Arlington, Texas in 2007, she entered Texas State University-San Marcos. During the fall of 2007, she became a member of the Delta Gamma sorority. She received her Bachelor of Arts from Texas State in August of 2010. Her major was Mass Communications and a minor in Sociology. That same month, she entered the Graduate College at Texas State.

Permanent Address: 3601 Lake Pontchartrain
Arlington, TX 76016

This thesis was typed by Kathleen A. Lobban.