



Climate Survey Report with Recommendations

November 28, 2020



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Background for the Project	2
Overall Analysis	3
Summary of Findings.....	5
Focus Area: Revision of the <i>Panhellenic Community DEI Plan</i>	5
Recommendations.....	5
Focus Area: Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity Education and Capacity Building	6
Recommendations.....	6
Focus Area: Support and Access for Marginalized/Minoritized Identity Groups	6
Recommendations.....	7
Focus Area: Community Accountability Measures	8
Recommendations.....	8
Focus Area: Education for Advisors, Alumnae, and House Directors who interact with the Collegiate Members	8
Recommendations.....	9
Final Thoughts	9
Social Responsibility Team Members for the Project	10
Reported Demographic Breakdown of the Community	11

Background for the Project

In September 2020, the University of Southern California's (USC) Panhellenic community partnered with Social Responsibility Speaks to conduct a climate assessment as part of the [Panhellenic Community Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion \(DEI\) Plan](#). The USC Panhellenic Executive Council and the nine (9) National Panhellenic Conference Chapters and one (1) affiliate chapter initiated action steps towards addressing barriers to achieving an equitable and inclusive community. The Panhellenic Executive Council engaged in self-work and initial communal building steps by seeking feedback from within the community to inform the DEI Plan, and reading *Blackballed: The Black and White Politics of Race on America's Campuses*. The use of a Community Accountability Tracker to move from optics to actual change also fosters transparency with your efforts. While the current movement related to Abolishing Greek Life and the events happening within the country compelled the community to push for the dismantling of systemic policies and other barriers on a chapter, community, and national level, there is evidence to demonstrate the USC Panhellenic community began this work prior to the summer of 2020. The use of an assessment to create a baseline for the entire community to build from together and engage in data-driven planning is an essential step in the process.

The Community Culture Survey launched October 5, 2020 and closed October 26, 2020. There were a total of 670 respondents who began the survey with 518 respondents completing the survey through the final question, excluding each of the demographic questions. The USC Panhellenic Executive Council determined that all demographic questions would be optional for participants. The number of respondents to the demographic questions ranged from 443 to 518, with disability status having the lowest response rate and gender identity the highest. Based upon membership numbers available on November 22, 2020, the community total is 1411 resulting in a 36.71% (N=518) of the Panhellenic Community completed the survey.

The confidence level for a survey tells you how sure you can be that information gathered within the survey is representative of the community, or population. The higher the confidence level percentage, the more assured you can be that the results reflect the population's attitudes meaning you can draw informed conclusions. The confidence level for this survey is above 99%. The confidence interval (also known as the margin of error) is the plus-or-minus figure that you can feel confident that the population's responses may deviate from the sample's conclusion. In our survey, the margin of error is +/-4.51%. The breakdown by chapter further reinforces that the results of this survey are based upon a representative sample of the Panhellenic community at all levels.

As seen in Table 1., there were four chapters (Alpha Phi, Delta Gamma, Kappa Alpha Theta, and Pi Beta Phi) whose response rate was less than the representation they hold within the community. Eight of the ten chapters had a quarter or more of their chapter respond which allows for viable interpretation of the data on the chapter level. There was not an official goal set to achieve designated response rates by chapter. With that said, it strengthens the applicability of the resulting recommendations. The confidence level and interval provide reassurance that the recommendations will work for the community based upon the sample. Table 1 provides insight into the specific breakdowns of the percentage of the total respondents in comparison to the percentage of the community each chapter represents. Further the aggregate data for the total number of members for each chapter and the percentage of each chapter's membership responding were all above 16% which further offers reassurance that no one chapter overly influenced the data, and subsequently the community can feel confident in their ability to draw conclusions and plan based upon the results.

Table 1. Chapter Breakdown for Completed Responses

Chapter Designation	Total # of Members**	Total # of Respondents*	% of Chapter Membership Responding	% of Community**	% of Total Survey Respondents*
Alpha Chi Omega	126	59	46.83%	8.93%	11.39%
Alpha Delta Chi	U	1	U	U	0.19%
Alpha Delta Pi	162	80	49.38%	11.48%	15.44%
Alpha Phi	155	40	25.80%	10.99%	7.72%
Delta Delta Delta	139	75	53.95%	9.85%	14.48%
Delta Gamma	176	46	26.13%	12.47%	8.88%
Gamma Phi Beta	156	75	48.08%	11.06%	14.48%
Kappa Alpha Theta	176	29	16.48%	12.47%	5.60%
Kappa Kappa Gamma	141	68	48.22%	9.99%	13.13%
Pi Beta Phi	179	45	25.14%	12.69%	8.69%

*Total Completed Responses N=518

**Total Community Membership N=1411

Overall Analysis

The data revealed there is significant work to do within the USC Panhellenic community related to the fundamentals of equity, inclusion, and diversity (EID), including, but not limited to, the creation of shared language for each of the EID terms. With 38% (*n=198*) of respondents indicated that the concepts of diversity and inclusion are the same or somewhat the same, and 34% (*n=176*) believing that the concepts of equity and equality are the same or somewhat the same, there will inevitably be flaws in execution of this work. The top four areas for educational programming were microaggressions, engaging others in EID conversations, anti-racism, and bias. While the bottom four areas were identity, power and privilege, cultural appropriation, and disrupting and interrupting problematic behaviors. Social Responsibility Speaks defines the areas of identity exploration, power and privilege, implicit bias, inclusive language, and initial disrupting and interrupting strategies as foundational elements to endeavoring to cultivate a more equitable and inclusive community. Our philosophy is that the ability to obtain, maintain, and retain diversity within an organization or community is directly tied to having a foundation of equity and a practice of inclusion. The fact that more than a third of respondents lack the knowledge of how different these terms are in definition translates to how they would show up in execution. The top four education areas indicated above are important; however, it would be a challenge to effectively engage in microaggression and anti-racism education without first understanding the basics of identity and how it impacts those areas. Power and privilege also impact the power of microaggressions and racism on individuals and our country as a whole. The same concern exists with bias as it would be crucial to understand identity, because it is directly tied to bias. We also, as humans, want to get to the "doing" - engaging in conversations - but need to engage in the education first (i.e. education on identity and power and privilege). As we sought to reconcile the data with the level of work engaged in by the USC

Panhellenic community to date, we began examining how members were feeling within their chapter and the community.

Perhaps, the gap in the foundations may be why 18% of respondents indicated a lack of encouragement by their chapter to “own” their identities, even when they may be different from the majority of our chapter. The aggregate data shows that this issue is across the community, as these members were not concentrated within any one chapter. Further, nearly 12% of respondents indicated they felt they have been treated differently within the chapter because of one or more of their identities with another nearly 15% responding neutral to that same question. Neutral in this category could mean a split within the chapter; i.e., feeling some of the chapter treated them differently, while others did not; or, it could translate to a feeling of being treated differently, but being uncertain as to the “why” of that treatment. This would be something to continue to monitor moving forward. Another item of note in this area is a lack of awareness by some about the identities present within their chapter as 15% could not affirm an awareness. A consideration in this area of awareness is the impact of moving to distance learning and virtual sisterhoods in the wake of COVID-19. Some strain could be placed on awareness with the lack of in-person connection a member who affiliated in January 2020 would have of their sisters. This may explain why 28% of those who could not affirm an awareness were sophomores or second-year students. While we asked about academic classification, we did not ask about length of membership so we cannot assess the scope of that impact. Additionally, this does suggest the need to do identity exploration and development work within the community for the purpose of understanding one’s own identities and recognizing how to support those of others within the chapter. Related to disability status and religion/spiritual belief, there appears to be a higher percentage of members who believe there are positive interactions, compared to a low rate of feeling excluded or unsupported which is the relationship we would expect to see in an inclusive environment for a given aspect of identity.

There are significant concerns about the frequency with which members in the community are feeling excluded or unsupported. Identities that showed up most frequently as experiencing some level of exclusion were socioeconomic status, body size/type, political ideology, and mental health status. With a majority of respondents identifying as White and heterosexual, we do not want to lose sight of the marginalized/minoritized identifying respondents in those areas who indicate they are experiencing exclusion, or a lack of support. In fact, 48% ($n=204$) of Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) indicated they experienced some level of exclusion, or lack of support based on their race/ethnicity with 9% saying it happens often or very often. When examining the aggregate data for sexual orientation, respondents 58% ($n=38$) of those identifying as LGBTQPA+ indicated experiencing some level of exclusion or lack of support based on their sexual orientation with 21% ($n=8$) indicating it happens often or very often. This corresponds with the data for a belief that the chapter interacts with people who share these identities with 9% of those who identify as BIPOC ($n=204$) indicating they disagree or strongly disagree that the chapter does not interact well with individuals across differences of race/ethnicity and another 18% selected neutral. With the parameters mentioned earlier about the neutral option, there is much to learn about why respondents did not feel they had enough information to feel more confident with their individual chapters’ abilities. Juxtaposing these numbers against those identifying as White ($n=425$) who felt more positive about their chapters’ abilities with only 5% and 11% respectively feeling the same. The data demonstrate a distribution across chapters for tackling representation within and support for BIPOC and LGBTQPA+ members within the community. With that said, the level of satisfaction with the diversity of respondents’ chapters relative to these two identity groups is more pronounced for some chapters. These chapters should use this information to inform their specific chapter’s plan for fostering a more equitable and inclusive chapter.

One additional item is how the data from this Community Culture Survey drives the Community DEI Plan. There is nothing in the plan that speaks to encouraging members to engage in self-work on the topics identified to tackle equity, inclusion, and diversity within the community. Further, for chapter and community sponsored education, a greater emphasis should be given on how to apply the lessons learned, or key takeaways from programs. Engaging in discussions about the application of EID concepts to real-life situations should be prioritized as 21% indicate doing so randomly or not at all. A promising note to support the EID education is found in the question about whether knowing more about cultural norms of marginalized/minoritized groups would help them be a more effective leader on campus and beyond. The data show 94% ($n=487$) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this concept.

Based on survey responses, our recommendation includes a focus on the following areas:

- Revision of the Panhellenic Community DEI Plan
- Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity Education and Capacity Building
- Support and Access for Marginalized/Minoritized Identity Groups
- Community Accountability Measures
- Education for Advisors, Alumnae, and Housing Directors who interact with the Collegiate Members

Summary of Findings

Focus Area: Revision of the *Panhellenic Community DEI Plan*

The *Panhellenic Community DEI Plan* indicated a focus on education tackling issues of current social injustices. The plan articulates a commitment for each chapter to engage in education. As we examine the data from the Community Culture Survey, we believe the gap in foundational education is impacting the ability to initiate sustainable change within the community. The ability to apply the concepts from this level of education is predicated upon an understanding of core concepts of identity and power and privilege, along with bias. The revision of policies and procedures that serve as barriers, and demonstrations of historical exclusion e.g., composite photos within the chapter facility are steps toward progress. With that said, we would offer that it is essential for the concept of intersectionality to not get lost in the established plan. Intersectionality refers to the impact that aspects of identity come together to affect the way any one human interacts with the world. Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term intersectionality in 1989 when she wrote [“Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics”](#) for the *University of Chicago Legal Forum* journal. Crenshaw expanded the definition in a [2017 Columbia Law School interview](#), she shared, “Intersectionality is a lens through which you can see where power comes and collides, where it interlocks and intersects. It’s not simply that there’s a race problem here, a gender problem here, and a class or LGBTQ problem there. Many times that framework erases what happens to people who are subject to all of these things.” Moving from optics to action requires the establishment of expectations, education, and enforcement, and an ongoing evaluation of the work. Equity, inclusion, and diversity should be an ongoing process.

Recommendations

- Review the basic data report and the formal report with recommendations by the Panhellenic Executive Council and Panhellenic DEI Council to revisit the *Panhellenic Community DEI Plan* for gaps and opportunities for enhancement.

- Chapter review of the basic data report and the formal report with recommendations to determine specific chapter plan adjustments needed.
- Determine ways to infuse the focus areas presented here in the revisions of the plan, along with sharing the “why” specific changes, or updates are being made.
- Use this Community Climate Survey as a baseline and replicate the survey on an annual basis.

Focus Area: Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity Education and Capacity Building

While 93% ($n=484$) of respondents shared their chapter has a common definition for diversity, equity, and inclusion, 38% ($n=198$) felt the concepts of diversity and inclusion and the same or somewhat the same, and 34% ($n=176$) felt the concepts of equality vs. equality are the same or somewhat the same. These responses identify the opportunity to further build upon equity, inclusion, and diversity foundations from education occurring at the chapter and Panhellenic levels. The following topics have been least covered through chapter education: Disrupting and interrupting problematic behaviors; Cultural appropriation; Advocacy and allyship; Identity; Power and privilege. Additionally, 3% of respondents shared their chapter has not held any discussions or educational programming on equity, inclusion, and diversity topics.

Respondents indicated the desire to see the Panhellenic community implement equity, inclusion, and diversity programming for chapter members (84%) and leaders (78%).

Recommendations

- Provide equity, inclusion, and diversity educational programming for chapter and council leadership, including guidance for response to bias incidents/exclusive behaviors, inclusive language in policy and procedures, and implementing EID responsibilities into all officer roles and chapter/council processes.
- Provide educational programming for members that include strategies to apply concepts learned.
 - Identify campus and community partners to create a list of available or upcoming trainings and educational programming.
 - Topics should include identity, power, and privilege, disrupting/interrupting problematic behaviors, cultural appropriation, and advocacy and allyship.
- Complete a benchmark study to identify equity, inclusion, and diversity training being provided at the local chapter and inter/national organization for each member group.
- Include DEI education as a requirement in the standards and accreditation process.

Focus Area: Support and Access for Marginalized/Minoritized Identity Groups

Over 80% of respondents would like to see the Panhellenic community institute support for Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) and other marginalized/minoritized identifying members. Additionally, 79% of respondents would like the cost of membership to be addressed by the Panhellenic community.

When asked a series of questions around individual experience and perspectives, there was a noted difference in results from all respondents when compared to respondents of specific identity groups. This is an important consideration as there is a high probability for dominant identifying chapter members to be placed in situations to support members from marginalized identifying new members. Therefore, education is needed for those who serve as “big” sisters, or mentors. The emphasis on preparing members to foster more inclusive recruitment procedures and practices may result in an increase in representation of marginalized identity group members. The chapter needs to be positioned to support the members they have as well as prepared for a change in demographics.

Table 2. Perception Comparison Data of All Respondents to Designated Identity Groups

I believe that my chapter interacts positively with people across differences of...	Race/Ethnicity	Socioeconomic Status	Sexual Orientation
All Respondents	82% strongly agree or agree	72% strongly agree or agree	81% strongly agree or agree
By Identity Group	75% of BIPOC identifying respondents strongly agree or agree	57% of respondents with family income <\$100k strongly agree or agree	64% of LGBTQPA+ identifying respondents strongly agree or agree

When asked how often in the past year they have felt excluded or unsupported because of an identity,

- 26% of BIPOC identifying respondents felt excluded/unsupported sometimes to very often based on their race/ethnicity.
- 38% of respondents with family income less than \$100k annually felt excluded/unsupported sometimes to very often based on their socioeconomic status.
- 43% of LGBTQPA+ identifying respondents felt excluded/unsupported sometimes to very often based on their sexual orientation.

When asked to rate their satisfaction with the **overall sense of sisterhood** within their chapter,

- 82% of all respondents were very satisfied or satisfied.
- 79% of respondents with family income <\$100k were very satisfied or satisfied.
- 78% of LGBTQ+ identifying respondents were very satisfied or satisfied.
- 76% of BIPOC identifying respondents were very satisfied or satisfied.

Based on prior work of Panhellenic leadership and survey responses, there is a noticeable desire from the community to provide a more equitable and inclusive experience for members. Responses from members with marginalized identities also indicates the opportunity to create change so all members have a sorority experience that is supportive and fulfilling.

Recommendations

- Ensure “big sister”, or mentors within the chapters are educated and resourced accordingly to support members from marginalized/minoritized identities.
- Consult with identity-based offices on campuses to discuss/implement affinity groups for Panhellenic members with marginalized identities.
- Review current website, social media, resources, and programming through an EID lens, including representation of membership, universal design, and ADA compliance, and make changes accordingly.
- Consciously work to avoid tokenism in any communications, including social media and websites.
- Consider banning the use of fines as they are not shown to be a deterrent and may further disadvantage those from lower to mid-SES identities.
- Conduct a comprehensive EID review of policies, procedures, and practices to identify and eliminate any barriers to joining. Policies, procedures, and practice should be audited regularly through an EID lens.

Focus Area: Community Accountability Measures

Survey responses show an opportunity to help prevent, disrupt/interrupt, and address bias-related or problematic behavior. 77% of respondents have heard exclusionary or problematic language used by a member of the sorority/fraternity community. 67% of respondents have witnessed exclusionary behavior in their chapters, with 7% witnessing this behavior very often to often.

75% of respondents felt issues of bias and/or hate within the Panhellenic community are caused by lack of education or knowledge about bias, hate, and social injustice. 65% of respondents felt they were caused by individuals being unintentionally harmful. However, 50% felt some instances were from lack of care and 17% felt individuals were being intentionally harmful.

When asked about changes they wish to see from the Panhellenic community, 78% want to see accountability measures implemented. While respondents had a stronger belief that change is possible at the chapter level (95%), the level of agreement decreases when examining the Panhellenic community as a whole (77%), the inter/national organization (71%), and the USC sorority and fraternity community (65%).

As measures are taken to implement EID initiatives, it will be important to provide transparency, establish more inclusive policies and practices, and to uphold them consistently. This will help meet EID goals while building trust within the Panhellenic community.

Recommendations

- Update policies and expectations to include guidance for members who make racist, homophobic, or other bias-related statements or social media posts.
- Communicate process to report bias incidents and exclusionary behaviors through Panhellenic and through individual inter/national headquarters.
- Continue to provide transparency on Panhellenic and chapter equity, inclusion, and diversity initiatives through progress updates, benchmarks, and achievements.
- Provide training and tools for individual accountability amongst members to help disrupt and interrupt problematic behaviors.

Focus Area: Education for Advisors, Alumnae, and House Directors who interact with the Collegiate Members

While there is work to be done with the chapter leaders and members within the Panhellenic community, we would be remiss if we did not acknowledge that 17% ($n=503$) of respondents indicated that they heard exclusionary or problematic language used by advisors and 9% ($n=495$) indicated the same for alumnae. The *Panhellenic Community DEI Plan* does not specify evaluating expectations for advisors, or alumnae. Further, there is a definitive gap in the provision of providing and/or advocating to the international organization for education to be provided to those sub-populations. This work should also include House Directors or any other volunteer/staff member who interacts with the collegiate member. In the open comments, there were specific references to house directors being the source of problematic language and actions. While the USC Panhellenic Executive Council is addressing accountability of collegiate members through the institution's process, care should also be given to prepare to address instances from advisors, alumnae, house directors, chefs, or other support team members for the collegiate chapters. This education should focus on identity, power & privilege, bias, and general disruption/interruption strategies. Respondents seem to indicate a lack of knowledge and unintentional practice of causing harm as the source of why problematic incidents are occurring.

Recommendations

- Ensure advisors, house directors, and other support team members for collegiate chapters understand the business and humanistic cases for equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- Advocate for the provision of equity, inclusion, and diversity ongoing developmental programming for alumnae, advisors, other volunteers/staff, house directors, and others interacting with collegiate members.
- Identify the accountability process for alumnae, advisors, other volunteers/staff, house directors, and others interacting with collegiate members.

Final Thoughts

The responses from this survey can be used as a benchmark to help measure progress as the USC Panhellenic community engages in equity, inclusion, and diversity initiatives. The survey can be conducted annually to track progress and trends in the community. Our team would also highlight the need to examine a zero-based budgeting method to attempt to address affordability for membership. Panhellenic Council and chapters should identify a reasonable cost of membership. This allows the establishment of a baseline. Determine how much money that will bring in based upon your total membership. It is not simply a matter of identifying opportunities for financial assistance, consideration for controlling costs must be addressed. Resources and considerations for this advocacy should also include collaborating with house corporations, as well. Consideration of the total cost of membership and how to make it accessible must be given in order to remediate the current treatment and feelings of those members who feel marginalized by their socioeconomic status, and to create a more accessible sorority experience.

With 63% ($n=505$) of the community indicating they have witnessed an incident of bias, there will likely be some level of skepticism for those from marginalized identities to seek membership within the community. Sustainable change takes time and ongoing effort. Therefore, the focus should be one healing, reconciling, and cultivating inclusive chapters and Panhellenic community. With that said, the Panhellenic community does not exist in a vacuum. Given the relationship with the IFC community, the Panhellenic leadership should consider how to leverage their connections to encourage action by that aspect of the community. One respondent commented about problematic, exclusionary behavior they encountered from IFC community members. The other element that can be seen playing out within the data is the unofficial tier system and impact of platforms such as *Greek Rank* in how “lower tier” chapters and members from those chapters are treated. There are a number of power and privilege dynamics at play here that are worth exploring in more depth.

As the community continues to explore its approach to tackling equity, inclusion, and diversity, attention must also be paid to the intersectionality with mental health and disabilities. More than 50% ($n=443$) indicated they identify as having depression with nearly 30% identifying as having anxiety. There were specific comments from respondents stating that they do not feel their chapter is prepared to support them relative to mental health. Further, research shows that microaggressions are linked to worsening of depression and heightening of anxiety. This is why we suggest the need for an intersectional approach to education, resource development, and policy and procedure reviews. The Community Climate Survey demographic question on disability comprehensively by inquiring about mental, physical, psychological, medical, and learning. Many of these can be invisible aspects of identity. This fact coupled with only 26% of respondents indicating “none” for disability requires care be given when referencing those with disabilities in the community.

Equity, inclusion, and diversity work is not simple, it is complex and ongoing. The dismantling of systems often leads to the creation of new systems which may lead to further disenfranchising. Root cause analysis must be the strategy the USC Panhellenic community employs in its approach. Treating symptoms and not the cause(s) of exclusion and problematic behaviors will not lead to sustainable change needed within the USC Community. We want to encourage ongoing dialogue within the community that centers the voices of those coming from marginalized identity groups. Our team's belief is that the USC

Social Responsibility Team Members for the Project

- Syreeta N. Greene, Ed.D.
- Christina Parle, M.S.
- Cristina Pérez-Simmons, M.Ed.
- Suzette Walden Cole, Ph.D.

Reported Demographic Breakdown of the Community

Gender Identity (n=518)

Answer Choices	Responses
Woman	518 (100%)
Man	0 (0.00%)
Genderqueer or non-binary	0 (0.00%)
Agender	0 (0.00%)
No specified above, please specify	0 (0.00%)

Sex (n=515)

Answer Choices	Responses
Male	1 (0.19%)
Female	514 (99.81%)
Intersex	0 (0.00%)

Sexual Orientation (n=517)

Answer Choices	Responses
Asexual	2 (0.39%)
Bisexual	32 (6.19%)
Gay	0 (0.00%)
Heterosexual or straight	476 (92.07%)
Lesbian	1 (0.19%)
Pansexual	2 (0.39%)
Queer	1 (0.19%)
None of the above, please specify <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsure • -- • Bi-curious 	3 (0.58%)

Race or Ethnicity (n=503)

Answer Choices	Responses
Asian or Asian American	87 (17.30%)
Black or African American	13 (2.58%)
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	65 (12.92%)
Middle Eastern or North African	16 (3.18%)
Native, Indigenous American or Alaska Native	7 (1.39%)
Native, Indigenous Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	12 (2.39%)
White	425 (84.49%)
Another race or ethnicity, please describe below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greek American • Two or more • Prefer not to specify • Jewish • Afghan • Gg • Pakistani • Biracial 	12 (2.39%)

Academic Classification (n=518)

Answer Choices	Responses
First-year student	1 (0.19%)
Sophomore (second year)	130 (25.10%)
Junior (third year)	253(48.84%)
Senior (fourth year)	133 (25.68%)
Fifth year (or more) Senior	1 (0.19%)
Graduate/professional Student	0 (0.00%)

Total Family Income (n=462)

Answer Choices	Responses
Under \$15,000	5 (1.08%)
Between \$15,000 and \$29,999	10 (2.16%)
Between \$30,000 and \$49,999	7(1.52%)
Between \$50,000 and \$74,999	22 (4.76%)
Between \$75,000 and \$99,999	24 (5.19%)
Between \$100,000 and \$149,999	48 (10.39%)
Between \$150,000 and \$199,999	37 (8.01%)
Between \$200,000 and \$249,999	58 (12.55%)
Over \$250,000	251 (54.33%)

Disability (n=443)

OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)

anxiety/panic attacks occasionally, but not diagnosed

lyme disease

I have a rare blood disease known as hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia (HHT). It causes arterial valve malformations to form in my brain, lungs, and heart as well as some other issues.

Central Auditory Processing Disorder

refuse to answer

Scoliosis

Postural Orthostatic Tachycardia Syndrome

ADD

Muscular dystrophy (heart)

Alpha thalassaemia

hypothyroidism (kinda autoimmune?)

PCOS

none

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
ADHD	16.93%	75
Autism Spectrum Disorder	0.90%	4
Blind	0.45%	2
Low Vision	5.87%	26
Legally Colorblind	0.45%	2
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.68%	3
Deaf	0.45%	2
Hard of Hearing	1.58%	7
Auditory Processing	2.26%	10
Intellectual Disability	1.58%	7
Speech Language	1.13%	5
Tourette's Syndrome	0.68%	3
Learning Disability	3.84%	17
Learning Disability - Math	1.58%	7
Learning Disability - Writing	1.58%	7
Learning Disability - Reading	3.84%	17
Anxiety	52.60%	233
Bipolar Disorder	1.81%	8
Depression	28.44%	126
Eating Disorder	15.35%	68
Mood Disorder	2.93%	13
Obsessive Compulsive Disorder	7.45%	33
Other Psychological Condition	1.58%	7
Panic Disorder	5.19%	23
Post Traumatic Stress Disorder	3.84%	17
Allergy	13.54%	60
Asthma	11.51%	51
Autoimmune Disorder	3.61%	16
Cancer	0.45%	2
Cardiac Condition	1.13%	5
Celiac	1.13%	5
Concussion	2.93%	13
Diabetes	1.13%	5
Epilepsy/Seizure Disorder	0.68%	3
Fibromyalgia	0.45%	2
Gastrointestinal	5.87%	26
Insomnia	4.97%	22
Migraines	11.51%	51
Multiple Sclerosis	0.45%	2
Narcolepsy	0.68%	3
Paraplegic/Quadriplegic	0.23%	1
Spina Bifida	0.45%	2
Stroke	0.45%	2
None	25.73%	114
Other (please specify)	2.93%	13