Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Isabel Goddard   April 1, 2019

College Friends: Promoters or Subverters of Gendered Social Reproduction?

by

Isabel Goddard

Pablo Montagnes

Adviser

Quantitative Sciences

Pablo Montagnes

Adviser

Bruce Knauft

Committee Member

Xochitl Marsilli-Vargas

Committee Member

2019

College Friends: Promoters or Subverters of Gendered Social Reproduction?

By

Isabel Goddard

Pablo Montagnes

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Sciences with Honors

Quantitative Sciences

2019

Abstract

College Friends: Promoters or Subverters of Gendered Social Reproduction?

By Isabel Goddard

The American college experience is often portrayed as the ultimate equalizer, promising both economic and social mobility. In this study, I interview and survey students at Emory University to observe the way in which students make their friends and whether these networks traverse barriers of habitus, class, culture, race, and gender. Through this analysis, I seek to explore the extent to which friendship, widely perceived as a non-utilitarian relationship, is in fact constructed amid and deeply rooted within hierarchies of gendered social capital, the cornerstone of social reproduction.

College Friends: Promoters or Subverters of Gendered Social Reproduction?

By

Isabel Goddard

Pablo Montagnes

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Sciences with Honors

Quantitative Sciences

2019

Acknowledgements

       I would like to thank my mom, Carla for her ceaseless mentorship in anthropology and life; my dad, Robert, for his deeply valuable advice in helping me to articulate the age-old question of "why does this project matter, anyway?" and helping me to think through this project's implications for a wider audience; my advisors Dr. Marsilli-Vargas, Dr. Knauft, and Dr. Montagnes for all of their ethnographic, statistical and professional advice since I began this project three years ago; my sister, Alice, for her continual enthusiasm in the project and confidence in me to pursue it, and all of my Emory friends and peers who were generous enough to let me interview and survey them and whose shared passion for and investment in this study are the reason this research was possible.

Table of Contents

Abstract

The American college experience is often portrayed as the ultimate equalizer, promising economic and social mobility to every student, regardless of their respective background. While higher education is now much more accessible to students from lower socio-economic statuses (SES) that it once was, studies still question the degree to which the university education truly levels the playing field of opportunities for upward mobility for students from less privileged backgrounds (Bartik &Hershbein, 2018). Numerous scholars have examined this from an economic perspective, focusing on examining the jobs and income levels of students from different SES after graduation (Chetty et al, 2017; Armstrong, 2013). However, strikingly little discourse has been addressed towards examining friendship as a locus for why social reproduction persists even within the environment of the university, which prides itself on promoting a diverse, meritocratic and egalitarian community. In other words, the friendships undergraduates create often far outlast their student years, simultaneously providing useful professional and social networks. Thus, the story America tells itself is that college is a vehicle for professional *and* social mobility through the educational skills and the social networks one develops as an undergraduate. The American college experience therefore purports to provide not only economic but also social mobility. However, after conducting forty interviews and a survey with Emory students, I found that friend-networks are heavily shaped by hierarchies of class, culture, race, ethnicity, and gender. Through this study, I explore the implications of undergraduate friendship networks for social reproduction. In this way, I will illustrate how undergraduate friendship, a purportedly non-utilitarian and selfless relationship, is in fact constructed amidst hierarchies of gendered social capital, the cornerstone of social reproduction.

Introduction

I first became interested in friendship networks as a freshman at Emory. Coming from a relatively homogenous private Atlanta high school, I was struck and excited by the vast diversity I experienced when I arrived at Emory. In search of making friends from diverse backgrounds, I even elected to have a randomly assigned room-mate from China. I had imagined that students would arrive at Emory excited to meet and become friends with others from vastly different backgrounds to themselves, as I had done. However, I instead observed that the freshman around me gravitated towards other students who dressed and acted similarly to themselves. I became curious about why this attraction towards others like oneself, or homophily, persisted even at a liberal arts university like Emory, which prides itself on fostering a diversely integrated community. In this study, I thus sought to illuminate the nuances of how Emory undergraduates make their friends and the larger implications these friend networks have for socio-economic mobility after graduation.

I began this study with ten investigatory interviews, before I had a specific research question, in order to understand the landscape of friendship among undergraduates at Emory. Through these interviews, I gained insight into the topics that most preoccupied the students. Certain themes arose again and again, primarily, the organization of Greek life. Students described Greek life as both a mechanism to aid in the difficulty of finding close, loyal, and authentic friends as well as the heart of social life on campus. It was thus based on these responses that I chose to focus on the role of Greek life in shaping undergraduate friendships for my honors thesis in order to investigate my two overarching research questions, "Are undergraduate friendships, purportedly non-utilitarian and welcoming of diversity, in fact

vehicles for social reproduction?" and "Are the friendships facilitated by Greek life inherently gendered due to the gender segregation of members into fraternities and sororities? If so, what are the implications for these gendered social networks?"

I approached these overarching research questions as a member of Greek life myself. Although I was aware of the dominant presence of Greek life on campus as a freshman, it was not until rushing in my sophomore year that I began to uncover how deeply Greek life was entrenched within undergraduate conceptions of social capital. As a new member, I was struck by the highly structured yet deeply nuanced architecture of Greek life. There were countless etiquettes and social norms to be observed, all according to the unspoken but ever-present hierarchy of the Greek organizations. Furthermore, as a new member of a "top" sorority[1], I found I was immediately treated differently by my peers. Students would stare when I wore a sweatshirt bearing my letters. I could feel the curiosity, envy, awe and desire in their gaze. Furthermore, I began noticing that non-Greek friends started introducing me by mentioning the sorority I was now in, right after saying my name. My sorority became a status symbol, but not without nuance. Former male resident advisors (RAs) began reaching out to me, hoping to reconnect or introduce me to their male friends. Members of my own sorority started trying to set me up with members of "top" fraternities who needed dates to various parties. It was through experiences like these that I began to fully comprehend what I had gotten myself into. I hadn't just joined a sorority. I had joined *the* sorority. The "top" sorority. And as such, my social identity on campus had changed. I became more self-aware, something that my interview subjects also discussed. Now that I knew more people and had a reputation to uphold, I cared more about what I wore, how I looked, who I met, and what events I went to. In this way, my own experience as a member of a Greek organization informed my research in both guiding the questions I asked interview subjects and in providing me with a vast network of Greek and non-Greek students alike to interview. I am aware that being a member of a top sorority permitted me greater access to Greek interview subjects in the sense that I was myself a member of their group and this put my subjects at ease. Furthermore, I was able to recruit more interview subjects through my assurance that I was not interested in studying hazing, binge drinking, or rape culture, all topics that could negatively implicate Greek members. Rather, I explained that I sought to understand undergraduate friendships shaped through Greek life. Interestingly, all interview subjects were fascinated by this topic and intrigued to hear my results. It was their interest in the subject that confirmed my hunch that I was on to something.

Most college students spend the majority of their time not in classes but with their peers, socializing. However, although students were vaguely aware that clubs and Greek life divided the undergraduate social community, few truly understood how this operated and why associations with certain organizations brought prestige while others brought stigma. I found that at the end of the day, the focus for all of my interview subjects was to find close friends. If this was the case, why did the undergraduate community become so rife with social hierarchies of

---

[1] Greek life is inherently hierarchical, and for this reason, "top" sororities and fraternities are perceived by the undergraduate student body as the most prestigious on campus. At Emory, there are considered to be two "top" sororities, Tri Delta and Theta, and one "top" fraternity, Sig Chi. Although the hierarchy of Greek organizations is dynamic, these top organizations tend to remain constant. They are the most competitive to be admitted into and are also associated with having the most wealthy, high-achieving, well-connected, physically attractive and popular students on campus.

social capital? Furthermore, what were the implications of these social hierarchies constructed by Greek life? Who did they benefit, and at what cost? These were the questions with which I began my research.

Methods

This research project involved two parts, the first being 40 in-depth interviews with students at Emory University and the second being a quantitative survey administered among Emory students via student Facebook pages with 49 respondents. Through the anonymous survey, I hoped to illuminate how representative my interview results were for the larger student population at Emory. Although the response rate was not as large as hoped, totaling 49 students, the number of female responses (32) was large enough to extrapolate to the undergraduate community and therefore serve as a point of reference for corroborating interview findings.

All interview subjects were chosen via snowball sampling. I asked students who I knew from classes, study abroad, the symphony orchestra, clubs, student government, and my sorority. Thirty Greek as well as ten non-Greek students were interviewed. In this way, I was able to observe whether the same friend-network experiences in Greek life were also prevalent in non-Greek life. These interviews were recorded on my password protected iPhone and saved in my password protected laptop, as were their transcriptions. Furthermore, all interview subjects selected a pseudonym. A code-book matching their real names with their pseudonym was saved on my password protected laptop.

I conducted my research from an emic participant observer perspective, as a member of a "top" Greek organization myself. Therefore, I had unique access to interview participants and survey respondents as well as unusual insight into the experience of being in Greek life and an Emory undergraduate more generally, which informed my interview questions and my over-arching research questions.

Key Concepts: The American University Experience, Friendship, Greek life, Bourdieu's Theories of Capital and Habitus

The American University Experience

The first American university, Harvard, was established by puritan ministers in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1636 (Geiger, 2014). Since then, thousands of universities have been founded cross the country, providing a wide range of different educational options depending on a student's interests and professional and social aspirations. This plethora of higher education options has thus opened the doors to economic mobility for many Americans. In this way, the American university has grown from being a domain solely for the elite class to being a locus of social mobility for students from a vast variety of different back grounds (Haveman & Smeeding, 2006). To some extent, the aspiration to achieve the American Dream through higher education has been found to be substantiated through several economic studies. For example, a study conducted by Harvard researchers demonstrated that, at elite universities, students from low socio-economic statuses

achieved almost the same socio-economic status as their peers from higher socio-economic backgrounds after graduation (Chetty et al, 2017). However, acceptance to these elite universities is significantly skewed to favor students from higher socio-economic statuses. For example, this same Harvard study found that at five Ivy League schools, more students were from the top 1% than from the entirety of the bottom 60%. In this way, university education is both a means for upward mobility and a site of persistent social reproduction[2].

Emory University

In light of this, Emory University provides a unique site to study social mobility in that the institution ranks five out of the top 65 elite U.S. colleges for the percentage of students from families that made about $20,000 (the bottom fifth income bracket in the U.S.) or less in the last year, at 6% of the undergraduate student body. About 58% of Emory students are from families that made about $110,000 or more per year and are therefore from the top fifth income bracket in the U.S. 13% of Emory students move up at least two income quintiles after graduation, ranking 26 of the top 64 elite U.S. colleges for upward mobility. Over the past 20 years, the number of students at Emory from the bottom 60% has risen from 20% to 30% while the number of students from the top 10% has dropped from 55% to 45%. Given the diversity of Emory's undergraduate student body and high rate of socio-economic mobility post-graduation relative to other elite universities, I was curious as to how integrated students from different back grounds were within friendship networks. While previous research on social reproduction has often emphasized the economic status of students, I sought here to instead focus on friend networks as a site for either social reproduction or social mobility. A study conducted by Harvard Professor and Opportunity Insights Director Raj Chetty found that all students at elite universities have relatively equal socio-economic prospects after graduation. My question is thus the following, "Does this economic mobility also imply that *social* mobility is equally as attainable for all students, regardless of class, race, and gender?" Does the elite liberal arts university truly provide a unique environment where students are equally as likely to become friends with someone of a different class, race, or gender as they are to find friends from the same back grounds and identities as themselves? In essence, does economic mobility imply social mobility and thereby the subversion of traditional hierarchies of class, race, and gender among undergraduates? This was the question I sought to answer through an examination of the friendship networks of Emory university students.

Friendship

The word "friend" is from the Indo-European root meaning 'to love,' shared by the word, free (Oxford English Dictionary, 2018). In this sense, the idea of friendship evokes connotations of loving, and perhaps, more specifically, loving freely. According to Aristotle in his *Nicomachean Ethics,* in an ideal friendship, equality of rank and similarity in virtue should ensure disinterested choice: loving the friend for himself, not for what he can do for you. A friendship based on utility lasts for a short amount of time, as the friends do not care for each

---

[2] The preferential attitude towards legacy students, especially at elite universities, can also explain a degree of the persistence of social reproduction within higher education. For example, at Harvard, 14% of the undergraduates are legacy students (Larkin & Aina, 2018).

other but rather what they get from one other. Aristotle saw this as a reflection of one's personal integrity, "inferior people will make friends for pleasure or for use, if they are alike in that respect, while good men will be friends for each others' own sake, since they are alike in being good" (350 B.C.E). In this way, Aristotle distinguished a friendship of virtue from a friendship made for instrumental gain or pleasure. A virtuous friendship, by contrast, was distinguished by its aim: the realization of the human potential of each participant in the friendship. However, virtuous friendships were rare. Lastly, Aristotle believed that virtuous friendships sustained and upheld the Grecian city state. In this way, Aristotle portrayed friendship as both a private and a public contribution. Perhaps, then, a study of the friendships of Emory students will provide not only insight into relations between students but, more fundamentally, a locus through which to examine American society today.

In this study, I thus sought to examine undergraduate friendship as the site of either the reproduction or the subversion of traditional social hierarchies of class, race, and gender.

Greek Life

The first modern day Greek organization, the Phi Beta Kappa Society, was founded at the College of William and Mary in 1776 (Lombardi, 2012). The first sorority was founded about 100 years later in 1870, called Kappa Alpha Theta, at Indiana Asbury College, now DePauw University (Theta Heritage Website, 2018). Historically, fraternities were founded to foster socializing opportunities for predominantly white, Christian, male students. This spurred the forming of Greek organizations for the students excluded from the original fraternities, leading to the establishment of sororities and Jewish, African American, Asian, and Latino fraternities.

Currently, Greek organizations, especially at large state schools, are often associated with binge drinking, hook up culture, and various forms of social exclusion and stratification (DeSantis, 2007). They have become somewhat controversial sites in the public eye, promising strong social communities but also associated with dangerous practices such as hazing, binge drinking, and sexual assault (Bruni, 2017). In this way, Greek life has a complicated reputation in America, associated with both life-long social bonds and the perils of hazing, binge drinking, and sexual assault.

Perhaps most importantly, however, is the prestige associated with Greek life, particularly at elite universities. To elaborate, 40 of the 47 U.S. supreme court judges since 1910, 85% of Fortune 500 executives, 76% of all Congressmen and Senators, and all but two U.S. presidents belonged to a fraternity since they were founded in 1825 (New Jersey Institute of Technology, 2018). In this way, Greek life represents a powerful harbinger of power and prestige in American history up to the current day. Thus, it is in these organizations that students gain social capital through the formation and solidification of both their social and professional networks. I should note that since most universities did not become co-ed until the 1950's, leading to the formation of most sorority chapters on campus, fraternities have had a much longer and more established history than sororities. For this reason, in my research, one of my principle aims was to examine whether there were observable differences in the networks facilitated by fraternities and sororities and specifically whether fraternities fostered more powerful social and professional networks than did sororities.

Lastly, Greek life is most frequently studied from an outsider perspective that emphasizes its negative associations. This study thus takes a vastly different approach in examining, from an insider perspective, a less studied side of Greek life: the way that it shapes friendship networks and the larger social implications that these networks have.

Emory University's Greek life

Fraternities:

In Emory alumnus Henry Bullock's *History of Emory University,* he writes that fraternities were established at Emory in 1888 and the first chapter house was constructed in 1891 for the Kappa Alpha chapter, soon followed by the Phi Delta Thetas in 1892. In 1909, a large group of Emory students singed a petition arguing for the abolishing of Greek life on campus. However, to these students' chagrin, the fraternities continued to play a dominant role in Emory's social life, comprising from 55-60% of Emory students during this time. The chapters active during this period were the Chi Phi, Kappa Alpha, Phil Delta Theta, Sigma Nu, Delta Tau Delta, Alpha Tau Omega, and Pi Kappa Phi. In 1929, the fraternities established an even more permanent place on campus by building their own houses. The Sigma Alpha Epsilon Chapter house was built first, followed by the Sigma Chi, Chi Phi, and the Kappa Alpha Houses. Subsequent fraternity houses have been constructed since them, and the road on which the fraternity houses and sorority lodges are located is called colloquially as "The Row." Greek life still has a dominant presence in undergraduate campus life today, comprising 30% of the student population before rush, in the Fall semester and likely closer to 40% after rush in the Spring.

Sororities:

The national sororities at Emory evolved from social clubs organized soon after the Emory College of Arts and Sciences became a coeducational institution in 1954. These clubs were overseen by the Interclub Council. In 1958, ten of the 12 clubs were recommended by the Student Organizations and Activities Committee of the Student Council to become chartered chapters of national sororities. The Panhellenic Council was then organized to oversee the activities of these chapters. The Inter-sorority Council is now the representative body that governs sororities at Emory. Of the original sororities that were established, four are still present on campus today: Delta Delta Delta, Kappa Alpha theta, Kappa Kappa Gamma, and Alpha Delta Pi (Panhellenic Council, 2018).

Recruitment:

Greek life, in employing a rush process to admit new members, is inherently a mechanism for stratifying and sorting students. At Emory, admittance in Spring 2016 was 68% for both fraternities and sororities. Therefore, 32% of students who rushed were not admitted to any organization. Even accounting for the few potential new members who may have dropped out during the rush process, let's say 2%, 30% of students who rushed for the entirety of the process were not admitted anywhere. This means that 1,172 students rushed and were rejected from every Greek organization. Furthermore, this number cannot account for the number of students who may have wanted to rush but did not because they believed they did not have a good chance of being admitted. This decision would likely be based upon students feeling that they do not possess certain characteristics that the Greek organizations look for. Based on

interview data, this admittance criteria was likely related to physical appearance, sociability and popularity, athleticism, and possessing a higher socio-economic status. The rush process itself generally involves a slide show in which each potential new member's (PNM) picture is held up and the current members weigh the advantages and disadvantages each PNM would bring to the chapter. Although this study will not focus on the rush process of Greek life at Emory, this will be covered briefly in order to explain the differences of sorority and fraternity organization and resulting friend networks. First, however, I seek to outline the ways in which the highly selective nature of Greek life, especially top Greek organizations, creates a hierarchy of social capital among the undergraduate student body.

Greek Life and Pierre Bourdieu's Theories of Cultural, Symbolic, Social, and Economic Capital and Habitus

Cultural, Symbolic, Social and Economic Capital

Today, universities are upheld as sites which equalize class, race, and gender differences, thereby providing opportunity for upward mobility to every student. Furthermore, in recent years, universities have made significant efforts to increase the diversity of their student populations to represent greater proportions of students from lower income and minority backgrounds (Leonhardt, 2017). However, theorists including the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu have questioned the extent to which universities truly provide a level playing ground to students (1971).

Bourdieu wrote in his 1971 paper 'Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction,'

> [...] among all the solutions provided, throughout the course of history, to the problem of the transmission of power and privileges, probably none have been better dissimulated and, consequently, better adapted to societies which tend to reject the most patent forms of hereditary transmission of power and privileges, than that provided by the educational system in contributing to the reproduction of the structure of class relations and in dissimulating the fact that it fulfills this function under the appearance of neutrality. [18]

Here, Bourdieu described the way in which institutions of education, prized as objective class-equalizers, can in fact serve as the most potent sources of social reproduction in the purportedly-meritocratic Western world today. In this study, I examine specifically whether the relationship of friendship itself reproduces social hierarchies of class, culture, race, and gender. Furthermore, due to the prevalence with which Greek life was mentioned as a locus of social life by students, I centered this study around the way in which Greek life shapes friendships according to these social hierarchies.

Reproductions of social structures of class, culture, race and gender are closely tied to systems of cultural, economic, and social capital. Bourdieu described economic capital as the capital one has which can immediately be converted into money, for example, property rights. Cultural capital, on the other hand, is convertible only under certain conditions into economic capital. An example of cultural capital may be a college degree. Furthermore, cultural capital functions as a form of symbolic capital in that it is recognized as resources available to an individual on the basis of honor or prestige. Cultural capital as symbolic capital is thus recognized as a legitimate form power, the ability to articulate, categorize, and delineate matters

of culture, politics, economics, or any other topic. In this way, cultural capital is not recognized explicitly as a form of capital but rather as an inherent right based on honor or prestige. This honor or prestige can be achieved by becoming a war hero or indexed by having a royal title. In the context of Emory's undergraduate social life, cultural capital is tied to membership in certain "top" Greek organizations. Lastly, social capital is made up of social connections which can be converted, also only under specific conditions, into economic capital (1986). On Emory's campus, social capital is also indexed through membership or association with members of "top" Greek organizations. Each of these forms of capital are thus intrinsically enmeshed within one another. I will however focus on social capital in particular due to its ability to map how social hierarchy and prestige are constructed and negotiated amid Emory student friendship networks.

Today, most Greek organizations at Emory have specific reputations that place them within a hierarchy of prestige. To elaborate, based on my interview data, the "top" sororities and fraternities are known to have the most physically attractive, personable and popular, smart, and higher socio-economic status students. In this way, the most prestigious fraternities and sororities are, as reported by interview subjects, associated with possessing the highest degree of economic, social, and cultural capital on campus. For example, several students discussed how they thought differently about someone after learning that they were in one of these, as they call it, "top" organizations. Others discussed how they believed members in top Greek organizations were treated the best on campus due to the way in which this association had social capital on campus. Based on these responses, I thus sought to examine the ways in which the social capital indexed by membership in certain top Greek organizations implicitly reproduces social hierarchies. In order to explore this, however, I must first examine the role of Bourdieu's theory of habitus in shaping friendship networks.

Habitus
I would like to begin my discussion of habitus and the way in which habitus can shape friendship with a quote from my interview subject Julia, an Indian-American, non-Greek Emory junior, who described her friends in the following way,

> "I mean like as I explained earlier […] I guess it's just important to me that the person I'm with or the person I'm friends with understands that when I get excited over an Indian movie and I send the link to my friends, they like already know the actors they know, you know, whatever history that's involved in that movie and those kinds of things, I think it'd be more work in another friendship" [23:54].

What Julia describes explicitly here, having a shared knowledge of Indian actors and movies with her friends, implicitly indexes how shared habitus allows for friendship. Although I will elaborate on this quote in the results section, I wanted to use this section of her interview here to illustrate the way in which habitus influences the friends one is drawn to. In all but one of my forty interviews with both Greek and non-Greek subjects alike, students described choosing friends who enjoyed the same activities, conversation topics, and had the same cultural knowledge and overarching values to their own. These shared attributes stem from a common niche socialization and internalized set of practices, what Bourdieu terms habitus. Bourdieu wrote in his book *Distinction* that,

"The *habitus* is necessity internalized and converted into a disposition that generates meaningful practices and meaning-giving perceptions; it is a general, transposable disposition which carries out a systematic, universal application- beyond the limits of what has been directly learnt- of the necessity inherent in the learning conditions. That is why an agent's whole set of practices (or those of a whole set of agents produced by similar conditions) are both systematic, inasmuch as they are the product of the application of identical (or interchangeable) schemes, and systematically distinct from the practices constituting another life-style (175)

Bourdieu thus conceptualized habitus as an internalized set of practices, learned from one's socializing in early childhood. Furthermore, habitus is reproduced between generations through the modes of being one comes to experience as second nature. What I specifically seek to explore is how Julia's interview illustrates the way in which students are drawn to friends with the same habitus. Here, she described enjoying being able to send a link to a new Bollywood film to a friend and knowing that they would already know the historical context and the actors in the film. What she searches for, in friends, is thus a collection of shared and culturally specific practices that have been internalized through one's socialization, in this case, as an Indian-American upper middle class American woman. In this way, habitus is fundamental to the way in which individuals relate to one another in the sense that it shapes the very rituals and behaviors one comes to understand as normative and appropriate. Individuals thus seek out others who, due to sharing the same habitus, have internalized the same sets of rituals and practices, in a sense speaking their same niche language of being in the world.

Results
I Friendship and Habitus
II Friendship, Gender, and Greek Life
    i.   **Social Capital and Greek Life**
    ii.   **Gendered Prestige within Greek Life**
    iii.   **Difference in Sorority and Fraternity Friendship**
    iv.   **Gender Difference in Greek and non-Greek Friendship**
    v.   **Friendship and Gender**

I Friendship and Habitus

Aristotle described ideal friendship as that between two alike in virtue. Thus, inherent in his conception of friendship is the idea of similitude. Countless studies in a range of disciplines have since demonstrated the ways in which people form social networks with others similar to themselves, often through examining demographic commonalities such as race or gender. However, in focusing on broad demographic identity groups, these studies fail to connect day to day practices of individuals with larger observations of social homophily. To elaborate, none of my interview subjects explicitly described searching for friends from the same socio-economic, racial, ethnic, religious, and gender identity as themselves. However, students often gravitated towards friends who shared these characteristics. Homophily among Emory students was never a conscious choice. However, even when students do not intend to construct their social lives with

others similar to themselves, homogenous social groups are nevertheless observable and prevalent on campus. For example, the international Chinese students can be seen traveling in groups speaking to one another in Chinese. There are also certain sororities where the vast majority of the members are from the North East and often attended the same Jewish Summer Camps growing up, thus already knowing one another before even arriving at Emory. Furthermore, among my forty interview subjects, only one described making friends from vastly different backgrounds to her own. Every other interview subject focused on what they shared in common with their friends. I would thus argue that in their search for friends who value and enjoy doing the same activities as themselves, students unconsciously search for friends from a shared habitus. In this way, students are drawn to friends who have been raised in social environments similar enough to their own that they had internalized the same social practices as themselves. In this way, I would argue that shared habitus smooths the way for the development of close friendship. This is not to say that friendships between students from different habitus is impossible. However, by my observations, they were less common. I will unpack how exactly shared habitus facilitates close friendships through two quotes from interview subjects in which they described how they found their closest friends at Emory.

Several interview subjects described meeting their closest friends through ethnic or religious organizations. One subject, Ted (pseudonym), described meeting a friend in the following way,

> "My first very close friend I met through a Jewish youth group called BBYO we like kind of knew who the other person was like through the networks because we were both fairly involved, at one point we actually met like before my senior year of high school we had no idea that we were going to Emory but he happened to visit a program that I was currently on cause he knew like the coordinator who was my roommate ah we got pretty close over the course of those ten days like the three of us were just hanging out and I was playing like a little guitar. And you know I thought I'd never like see him again. And then we ended up coming to Emory and like kind of reconnecting over that. Like really hit it off- and he's still one of my best friends- one of my roommates actually." [16:01]

Furthermore, when I asked him to elaborate on what he looked for in his friends, he responded,

"Loyalty, sense of humor is really important to me, being well read, music taste is ideal, but not necessary, something like that."

In this way, Ted was socialized in the same habitus as his friend, internalizing the same practices of participating in intellectual conversations, playing and listening to the same genres of music, and participating in Jewish youth groups like BBYO. Sharing the same habitus thus encompasses all of these similarities in tastes and values that Ted had with his friend.

It is important to note that these attributes do not exist in a vacuum. Rather, they are inculcated from a young age through being raised in a particular habitus. To elaborate, Ted's enjoyment of reading widely, his specific form of humor and involvement in the Jewish group BBYO and passion for specific music genres were likely fostered by his parents and immediate social circle growing up. His family must have therefore had the economic, cultural and social capital that allowed Ted to experience and value these practices. Specifically, later in the

interview, Ted described taking a road trip with his college friends to visit his dad in Nashville, where his dad is a prominent scholar on Bluegrass music. Here, Ted demonstrates both the intellectual and music-centered background from which he was raised and also the shared tastes his friends clearly have in the sense that they enjoyed taking a road trip with him to spend time with his dad and discuss, among other things, Bluegrass music. Thus, in gravitating towards friends who share these tastes, Ted is seeking out friends who also internalized these practices from an early age, and who in so doing shares the same habitus.

This facilitation of friendship through shared habitus was also illustrated in my interviews with non-Greek students. To illustrate this, I would like to return to the quote I provided earlier from Julia, an Indian-American non-Greek interview subject, as she described finding her friends at Emory,

> "In terms of class like I grew up in a very liberal bougie um neighborhood and then Emory's kind of the same […] um but I do think a lot of my friends, or the vast majority of my friends, are Indian. […] I was thinking about this in terms of dating just because I am very open to dating guys of any race, but I have only dated Indian guys, just because, there are things that you don't have to explain, you know. Like I can't go on a date because my parents won't let me. And like to someone who might have been raised in a more like you know their parents are chill kind of household, they might be like, 'what do you mean?' like I don't even, the concept of curfew doesn't exist in my house because I don't leave the house after eight o'clock […] and it's not like my parents are jailers or anything [laughing] it's just an understanding in our house that we don't just go places at night. Um, things like that, I've never had to explain to my boyfriends of Indian descent because they've grown up in households like that too. Or just like Indian culture, like I've never had to explain Indian food to them or why I'm so obsessed with Bollywood movies. I mean like as I explained earlier […] I guess it's just important to me that the person I'm with or the person I'm friends with understands that when I get excited over an Indian movie and I send the link to my friends, they like already know the actors they know, you know, whatever history that's involved in that movie and those kinds of things, I think it'd be more work in another friendship" [23:54].

Although Julia began by describing most of her friends as Indian Americans, as she continued, it became clear that the foundation of her friendships was not their shared ethnic identity, but rather, their corresponding shared cultural norms, enabled by their mutual habitus. In this way, Julia demonstrates how shared cultural knowledge, practices, and norms allowed for her to feel comfortable with other Indian-American students, thereby facilitating close friendships with these students and making these friendships harder with students from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. In her case, Julia's identity and upbringing as a middle class Indian-American had a dramatic influence on her internalized set of cultural norms and expectations, such as not going out late at night, not dating, and knowing both the Indian actors and the historical context of the latest Bollywood movie. It is important here to note that it is not exclusively the shared racial and ethnic identity Julia has with her friends that allows her to feel close with them. Rather, the associated cultural practices tied with her suburban professional and upper middle class Indian-American socialization are what lead to her becoming friends with other Indian-Americans. In this way, a shared habitus, which can be (but is not necessarily) tied

with ethnicity and racial identity and upbringing, is a critical enabler of close friendships. As she articulated so succinctly, "It'd be more work in another friendship." In this way, close friendships with those from a different habitus to one's own are simply more effort and therefore appear to be less common or desirable for Emory students.

These quotes illustrate a prevalent theme that arose in almost all of my interviews: students unconsciously desiring and seeking out friends from the same habitus to themselves. At this point, I would like to broach the following questions: What are the implications of desiring friends from a similar habitus to one's own? Does this desire for similitude reproduce divisions and hierarchies of class, race, gender, culture, and ethnicity? In this next section, I will explore the implications that friendship can have for reproducing social hierarchies specifically with respect to class and gender.

II Friendship and Greek Life

Based on the results of my survey, which had 49 respondents, I found that 98% of students (48/49) discussed personal issues with their friends. Furthermore, 92% (45/49) also discussed their classes and even political topics with their friends. Lastly, all students described "hanging out" and talking with friends as one of their top three most common social activities. The second and third most common were eating and studying. Partying and "playing sports/going to the gym" were also common. In this way, we can understand that most students talk about their personal lives and enjoy talking and simply spending time with their friends. We can thus understand that enjoying the same conversation topics and pass-times are crucial components of friendship for the vast majority of Emory students. However, what the survey was not able to detect was the nuance of how students relate to one another within these conversations and times spent together. It was thus through my interview data that I was able to gain a deeper and more nuanced understanding of why students had chosen their friends and how they spent time together deepening these relationships. Based on the survey responses, a significant majority of students had met their friends through Greek life. Specifically, 31% of students reported meeting their closest friends through Greek life, 25% on their freshman hall, 16% in classes, 14% in clubs, and 14% in another way not listed on the survey. This makes sense given the fact that Emory reports 30% of the undergraduate student body are involved in Greek life. However, the fact that Greek life was the *largest* source of friends for survey respondents suggests that the organization likely plays the most dominant role on campus in shaping social networks. Furthermore, what is even more interesting is that 65% of respondents reported being members of Greek organizations. Thus, only about half of respondents who were in Greek life reported that their closest friends were also in Greek life. My interview data provided insight into why certain students were able to make the majority of their friends within their Greek organizations while others found this more difficult. The dramatically divergent organization and purposes of sororities and fraternities contributed to this difference in social networks.

It is important to note here that my survey sample was not representative of the larger Emory undergraduate student body. Where 59% of the student body are women, within my survey, 75% were women. Furthermore, where around 30% of the Emory student body are involved in Greek life, among my survey respondents, 65% were members of Greek

organizations. The Emory undergraduate population is also 40% white, whereas my survey respondents were 69% white. Additionally, 49% of my respondents were seniors and 33% were juniors whereas 25% of the undergraduates at Emory in Spring 2016 were seniors and juniors, respectively.

Social Capital and Greek Life

Within Emory's undergraduate community, social capital is indexed by membership in or affiliation with members of a few "top" Greek organizations. Today, most Greek organizations have specific class, racial, cultural, and behavioral reputations and are known for recruiting students with corresponding characteristics. For example, the Emory University student paper, *The Wheel,* described the rush process for sororities as "classist, homogenizing, and generally exclusive" (2015). Furthermore, based on interview results, the most popular and prestigious fraternities and sororities are associated with possessing the highest degree of social capital on campus. One interview subject, Alex, described the dynamic in the following way:

Alex: "I think that people have this like mental ranking of Greek life. So like, whatever fraternity or sorority that you're in, they automatically categorize you as like, you know, more social, less social, anything like that- but they'll never admit to it." 28:40

Me: Do you think there are other things, in addition to sociality, like attractiveness?

Alex: "Oh yeah, like, attractiveness, probably like socio-economic status maybe, um, just like, it's almost just this like, label that says like, 'I'm well off socially,' like, 'I am like attractive, like nice clothes, I dress well.' And then like obviously that's associated, like each sorority will have its own reputation; each fraternity will have its own reputation. And no one will ever be like, unless they're like shallow or very blunt, they won't ever admit. Or like another thing is when someone says, 'oh I'm in this fraternity,' and you know it's a good fraternity or 'I'm in this sorority' and you know it's a good sorority, people are naturally more inclined to be like nicer to them or to be friends with them because then that's their way in to hanging out with more people in those fraternities in those sororities, and I think no one will admit that, but a lot of people do that."

In this part of his interview, Alex described several crucial components of Greek life at Emory. Firstly, he described a hierarchy among the Greek organizations. Membership in the most prestigious organizations indexed, in Alex's words, being "well off socially." Alex elaborated to explain that this membership signaled physical attractiveness, dressing well, a high socio-economic status, and popularity. He even believed that students were treated better when others learned of their membership in top Greek organizations. In this way, membership signals social capital in that members are treated specially by other students in the hope that they may gain admittance to the social circles of the top Greek organizations. Membership in top Greek organizations also signals economic capital, as Alex noted and other interview subjects also described. This can be seen both in the kinds of clothing and self-presentation the members engage in, as Alex described, and by items like the cars they drive, which other interview subjects mentioned. There are even memes posted on Emory meme pages that describe the brand of cars and clothing items associated with each Emory fraternity and sorority. Lastly, Alex also describes membership in top Greek organizations as indexing cultural capital in the sense that the

label of being a member of the top Greek organizations in and of itself carries prestige on campus. Alex's interview expressed the way in which membership in the, to use his words, "good" Greek organizations indexes social, economic, cultural, and symbolic capital on Emory's campus.

Another interview subject, Clara, described the difference between Greek and non-Greek students at Emory,

> "I think it's more like a, if you're Greek, you're very self-conscious of your social scene. I think maybe it's because you know a lot more people and so maybe you're going to be more aware if you like do this or- because you know- or you perceive- that more people are watching you whereas when you're not in Greek life, it feels a little bit more anonymous because you're not engaging in all these activities, you're not having mixers or whatever where you're getting to meet- even if you're not really meeting people at mixers, you're seeing familiar faces or whatever, um, … and I think that is the divide- is the not feeling anonymous and feeling anonymous. And like your actions when you feel anonymous versus not anonymous can be drastically different. I think if you feel like you're not anonymous, you're going to be more self-conscious or you're going to be more watchful of what you say and who you hang around or whatever. Whereas if you feel like you're not really known on campus, then, who cares what you do or what you say or how you react because it's not gonna really affect anyone but you and your close circle of friends, you know?" [17:05].

In this way, echoing Alex, Clara described both gaining a more extensive social network and becoming increasingly self-aware of her behavior and social scene when she became a member of Greek life. Furthermore, the forms of capital that both Alex and Clara describe members of top Greek organizations as having are tied to habitus. Specifically, the ways in which these students in top Greek organizations index their belonging to this elite group is through their clothing and self-presentation, their having friends within this elite group, their subscription to specific form of social interaction and social practices, their specific form of self-aware self-presentation, and their having close friends within this same elite group. In this way, the attributes that Clara and Alex describe top Greek members as possessing are in fact internalized practices that are learned unconsciously, shaped by one's habitus. In joining a top Greek organization, Clara indexes her possession of these internalized practice, thus proving that she truly belongs among the elite members of top Greek organizations on campus. Clara's parents are from the Spanish-speaking Caribbean and she grew up very closely tied with both her church community from the Caribbean as well as her elite private girls school friends, thus somewhat straddling two distinct cultural habitus. She spoke of the way in which the dynamics she encountered in her sorority reminded her of her experiences at her private girls high school and the way in which she had learned to thrive in that environment very early on, thus preparing her well to flourish in a "top" Emory sorority. In this way, although Clara came from a unique cultural context, she had internalized the same habitus as her fellow sorority sisters through attending a predominantly white and upper middle class private school, where she made some of her closest childhood friends and where she also internalized the very habitus involving dress, comportment, and way of interacting with the world that her privileged friends and later sorority sisters at Emory shared. Thus, through embodying and enacting specific forms of cultural, social,

economic, and symbolic capital, Clara enacts the natural habitus of students with social capital. I thus believe that much of her ability to fit in with and be accepted by her predominantly all white and elite sorority sisters was due to both her similar class background and her exposure in high school to girls of similar habitus to those in her sorority at Emory. However, even still, she was aware that she behaved differently after joining her sorority, as she felt more self-conscious about what she did and said and who she spent time with. In this way, students' habitus is enacted through their practices, which in turn index social, economic, symbolic, and cultural capital on campus. Furthermore, for students from more diverse backgrounds such as Clara, emphasizing the specific habitus of their fellow "top" Greek members gains them social capital on campus. The associated success of these efforts likely lies in how well these aspirational students manage to become integrated socially with their peers with greater social capital. In the next section, I will explore the ways in which these dynamics of capital and prestige are gendered within the top Greek organizations.

Gendered Prestige Within Greek Life

The interviews with Emory students revealed a hierarchy of prestige existing within the Greek organizations. Interestingly, however, this hierarchy was premised on different criteria for fraternities than it was for sororities. One interview subject described the difference like this:

> "Different organizations have different ideas of what's good for girls- one frat is known as like the boyfriend frat, another bases it off of going to the gym and being really aggressive with girls" [13:29].

> "I think sororities, at least for guys, for fraternities, it's like certain types of girls, you either hook up with or date, like that's a lot of the dialogue. So, these types of girls are better for girl-friends, these types of girls are better for parties. … But I would say that affects a lot of people's mindsets, especially in Greek life, possibly outside of it too, at least for guys."

> "It's focused on almost like how desirable they are to fraternity members as opposed to the fraternity's (reputations) are based around behaviors" (17:24).

Another interview subject, Lily, described the hierarchy in the following way,

> "My sorority isn't top of the food chain- we don't mix with the most popular frats […] the biggest influence is the people who are accepted- the reason some frats don't mix with us is because we accept people of all sizes"

Both Ted and Lily thus perceived the hierarchy of prestige for sororities as being defined by how attractive the sorority women appeared to the fraternity men. By contrast, Ted viewed fraternity reputations as being defined by the behaviors associated with the members. Although the degree to which interview subjects characterized fraternities and sororities by behavior varied, physical attractiveness and popularity were almost always discussed in conversations of sorority reputations. By contrast, physical attractiveness was generally only associated with one fraternity. Instead, fraternities were often categorized based on the socio-economic status of their

members, the degree to which the fraternity was known to party, and the kinds of extracurricular activities the fraternity members were known to participate in. For example, certain fraternities had reputations for having many varsity athletes whereas others were known to attract more artistic and creative fraternity members. In this way, Greek organizations are characterized according to gendered conceptions of prestige: sororities are predominantly categorized based on how attractive their members are to fraternity men, whereas fraternities are perceived based on reputations of behavior.

The rush processes of sororities and fraternities may explain some of the stark differences between the social structures and perceptions of these organizations. To elaborate, a staff editorial published by Emory's *The Wheel* characterized sorority rush as "objectifying, superficial, discriminatory and in need of vast reformation (2015). The editorial goes on to describe the sorority rush in detail, which prohibits women from talking about the five B's: booze, boys, Barack (politics), Bible (religion) and bank accounts (money). The article argues that this encourages women to be unopinionated, thereby undermining their own agency and individuality (2015). The article also highlights the five to fifteen minute conversations that PNMs (Potential New Members) have with women in each sorority, by which their admittance or rejection is determined as the PNMs are otherwise forbidden from speaking to existing sorority members during the recruitment process. Lastly, the editorial describes the cost of dues as preventing students from lower socio-economic backgrounds from even applying or being able to afford membership in the first place, inherently stratifying students based on class. In conclusion, the editorial argues that "Recruitment de-emphasizes complex conversations and over-emphasizes appearance. As a large aspect and attraction for EPC sorority life may be fraternity interactions through date parties and mixers, the flaws in the EPC recruitment process play into patriarchal notions of competition among women for male attention" (2015). Although this is a more reactionary take on Greek life, the facts that it states regarding the recruitment process and rules for sororities are in fact true and still followed today. The article's conclusion that sororities are oriented around gaining attention from fraternity members rather than building friendship among women may be somewhat unnuanced. However, my interview results did show that fraternity members were more likely to have close friends within their fraternity than were sorority women. Thus, although close friendships certainly can arise in both fraternities and sororities, the fraternities appeared to be much more successful at fostering these ties than were the sororities. This may arise in part due to the divergent natures of the sorority and fraternity recruitment processes, the former of which relies on short and thus somewhat superficial interactions between existing members and PNMs whereas the latter centers around informal evenings in which PNMs gather at fraternity houses to get to know their members.

The emphasis that both my interview subjects and The Wheel article described on the importance of appearance when categorizing the prestige of sororities resonates deeply with art historian John Berger's argument in his book, Ways of Seeing. He writes,

> "Men act and women appear. Men look at women. Women watch themselves being looked at. This determines not only most relations between men and women but also the relation of women to themselves. The surveyor of woman in herself is male: the surveyed female. Thus she turns herself into an object – and most particularly an object of vision: a sight " (Berger, 1972).

Here, Berger articulates the ways in which the appearance of women determines how they are treated. By contrast, men are perceived and treated based upon their personalities and behavior. If these are the ways that men and women are treated in western society, then having an attractive appearance that subscribes to cultural expectations of beauty and self-presentation is essential for a woman to be treated with respect. Within Berger's framework, Emory students' admittance to top sororities is in itself a public approbation of their physical attractiveness. Thus, if physical attractiveness garners admittance to top sororities and top sororities possess social capital on campus, one can infer that, for women, physical attractiveness is essential for the possession of social capital. By contrast, for men, social capital is gained through personality and behavioral attributes, such as athleticism, which thereby gain them admittance to top fraternities. In this way, students perceive social capital as gained through physical attractiveness for women (which is often facilitated by economic, social, and cultural capital) and through behavior for men and as indexed by admittance to top sororities and fraternities. In this way, we can observe that Greek life reproduces gendered social hierarchies in the sense that women gain social capital through physical attractiveness to top fraternity members, which gains them acceptance to top sororities. For men, social capital is achieved through acceptance to top fraternities. However, this is accomplished due to behavioral traits such as athleticism rather than relying on physical attractiveness. Due to the gendered structure of Greek life and social capital on campus, one has to question whether the social and professional networks developed within Greek life are also gendered, and what the implications of this might be for students' future professional lives.

Difference in Sorority and Fraternity Friendship:

Among the most significant trends I found in the interviews was the striking difference in the social experiences of women in sororities compared to men in fraternities. The majority of the fraternity men I interviewed had found not only their closest friends but, in fact, their entire friend group within their respective fraternities. However, only a few of the twenty women found their closest friends within their sororities. For this reason, their social networks appeared more dispersed than those of the fraternity men. I became curious as to why this was. Did the nature of Greek life encourage strong homosocial bonds between men but not women? Or did this trend reflect a gender difference in social networking that was independent of Greek life? I decided to interview ten non-Greek Emory men and women in order to compare their social networks with those of students in Greek life to analyze whether these gender differences in social networking existed outside of Greek life. Students not involved in Greek life, for the most part, do not attend the mixers, date parties, crush parties, and formals that students within Greek life attend. In this way, the non-Greek platform for socializing is significantly different. Thus, I sought to understand the extent to which this difference in friend networks between sorority and fraternity members was due to Greek affiliation and the extent to which it was due to gender.

Before interviewing non-Greek students, I began by investigating whether the different ways in which sororities and fraternities are structured was responsible for fostering close friendship only within the fraternities. The short nature of the rush process, as described by interview subjects, inherently required sororities to admit women based on superficial characteristics including physical attractiveness. By contrast, interview subjects described fraternity rush as much more relaxed and as drawn out over a longer period of time, providing fraternity men with ample time to get to know their prospective new members in casual settings

at their houses over months rather than a few days, as is the case for sororities. In this way, fraternities have more time and opportunity to get to know their prospective members and ensure they admit men whose interests, personalities, and behavior truly resonate with their organization and existing members. Based on my own experience in a sorority and conversations with both sorority and fraternity members, I also observed that, due to the fact that most fraternity members live in a house together, whereas only about a third of sorority women live in a lodge together, fraternity members spend a considerable amount more time around one another than do sorority women. Furthermore, more fraternity-only events appeared to be organized for the fraternities than for the sororities. By contrast, most sorority events were in conjunction with various fraternities. Additionally, based on conversations with administrators in the Emory Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life, I learned that quotas for the total number of members required are much higher for sororities than they are for fraternities. In this way, sororities are forced to admit women based on more superficial characteristics both due to the short time they have to meet prospective new members and due to the higher quotes of members they are required to admit. One interview subject, Roger, mentioned that, after comparing his socializing with that of his girlfriend, who is in a sorority, he noticed that he spends a lot more time just with his fraternity brothers, whereas when his girlfriend spends time with sorority sisters, it is more frequently in the context of mixers with fraternities or going out together always with the expectation of meeting and spending time with men as well. He said,

> "The sorority, the social setting doesn't create much of a social fabric for girls to actually create strong bonds, whereas in the fraternity house, you have a very homey environment where people can gather together and hang out a lot more. There's also a lot more women in sororities so it's harder to get to know each other, whereas in fraternities there are fewer guys so we can get to known each other. I feel like it [sorority life] is less about that [getting to know each other] and more about the going out" (Roger, 13:38).

Thus, fraternity socializing is homosocial whereas sorority socializing more frequently involves men and women, generally with the implication of eventual romantic interaction. Sororities thus appear to be oriented around facilitating interactions and relationships with fraternities whereas fraternities are focused on homo-sociality. The disparity in close friendships within fraternities compared to sororities suggest that these organizations have different social aims. Furthermore, these differences in sorority social networks compared to those of the fraternity likely have longer-term implications on professional networks and thereby socio-economic advancement after graduation. In this way, interviews with Emory students in Greek life suggest that traditional gender roles and hierarchies persist by fostering close friendships among men and precluding close friendships among women in favor of facilitating romantic relationships between men and women. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to presume that closer friend networks within fraternities as compared to sororities are likely to lead to tighter knit professional networks after graduation among fraternity members than among sorority members. A longitudinal study that examined the professional implications of undergraduate social networks comparing those of fraternities to sororities would be a useful way in which to measure this hypothesis.

Gender Difference in Greek and Non-Greek Friendship

Among my ten non-Greek interviews, I was struck that there appeared to be an increased proportion of students with friends of the opposite gender. In fact, every non-Greek interview subject reported having close friends of the opposite gender, striking a noticeable contrast from the fact that almost every Greek student reported only having close friends of the same gender. Additionally, there was no observable difference in the attributes that students looked for in their friends between the Greek and non-Greek students. Rather, the most significant differences appeared in the sense that students in top Greek organizations were considered to have more social capital on campus and that the students in Greek life were less likely to have close friends of the opposite gender than non-Greek students.

Friendship and Gender

As previous research has indicated, I observed a striking gender difference in the degree of emotional intimacy that students had with their friends (Way, 2011). However, the modern-day prevalence of lack of emotional intimacy within male friendship is a historically new phenomenon. To elaborate, in classical thought, friendship lay exclusively in the domain of elite men. Friendship then became a key tenant of the romantic sphere when writers including John Milton began applying the concept of friendship to heterosexual marriage as a spiritual journey of equal partners. Although, in principle, this implied gender equality in marriage, in reality it only served to re-center marriage as the dominant social relationship, rather than homo-social friendship. Since then, some theorists such as Lionel Tiger, a Darwinian behaviorist, have returned to arguing for the inherently masculine nature of friendship, even going so far as to argue that women are genetically encoded to bond to their children rather than with other women. Speaking to this claim, other scholars including Janice Raymond have argued that friendship amongst women is not only a real phenomenon but actually a form of social and political power within a patriarchal society (Anderson, 2012). In this way, the relationship between gender and friendship is deeply controversial. It is for this reason that I anticipated a comparison between Greek and non-Greek friendship networks would provide a unique vantage point from which to study whether gender and gender segregation change the nature of friendship among undergraduate students, i.e. whether female-female friendships differ significantly from male-male friendships or male-female friendships, and if so, why.

Jude and Calliope

Although all students described wanting close connections with their friends, female students were much more likely to describe having emotional intimacy in their friendships. Furthermore, most of the male students who did have close emotional friendships said that these relationships were only with their female friends. Only a few male students, of the 20 total whom I interviewed, described having close male friends with whom they could talk with about personal emotional events in their lives. In contrast, every female student described having friendships in which they continually opened up emotionally to one another.

Jude, a fraternity member, explained his emotional connection to friends in this way,
"I almost feel like I talk about more serious or not necessarily serious but like more important or like meaningful things with my female friends" [11:01].

He then described a poignant moment with one of his close male friends,

"Even like one of my like best friends like I'm living with him next year. … but there was one day, I came back, like late at night, really late, I had been like having a, a serious talk with my girlfriend at the time and it was like bad, and he could tell I was upset, and I could tell he was upset about something, and I was like- I'm like pretty open about feelings to an extent, where I can be like yeah like it was bad, or whatever, and he was just like, I think he was a little bit drunk so he was being honest, but he was just like, 'yeah like, dude I don't have anybody I can talk to about this stuff' [laughing] and I was like 'do you want to talk about it' and he was just like 'naw.' And I like tried to talk to him in the morning and I was like, 'dude you ok' and he was like 'yeah, yeah, I was just upset about something.' Like that I think is more prevalent with dudes than people would think" 14:35.

Here, Jude articulated the lack of emotional vulnerability the vast majority of my male interview subjects described having in their male friendships. Furthermore, this difficulty in opening up emotionally was pervasive for male students regardless of Greek affiliation. Interestingly, this trend became apparent both through interviews with male students and in the comments that female students made about their male friends.

A non-Greek female interview subject, Calliope, described having many male friends who saw her as their only friend with whom they have emotional or personal conversations, because they could not be as forthcoming with their male friends. Calliope articulated it in the following way,

"There are definitely some people that like tell me more than I tell them, and I don't necessarily like that like it makes me feel like it's a little imbalanced um but like often I don't like to tell people about my stuff if I feel like they're having a really hard time […] and so there are some friendships now and definitely more in the past where I've kind of become like a therapist I think"

Me: Kind of on that note, have those friendships been with equal gender ratios of guys and girls?

Calliope: "Only dudes" [17:47].

Thus, in the accounts of these two students, we can observe male students having trouble connecting deeply with other male students. Consequently, these male students often turn to female students as confidants and friends. This unequal division of emotional work required on Calliope's part, serving as a kind of therapist, in her words, to her male friends, illustrates gendered emotional labor in the sense that she provides an emotional service to her male friends that they in turn do not reciprocate. In this way, we can observe gendered emotional labor extends to the sphere of friendship. Emotional labor has traditionally been coded as a natural trait to which women are predisposed. For this reason, it often becomes the woman's job to meet the emotional needs of those in her environment, whether it be at her place of work with clients and co-workers or in the home with her family (Hochschild, 1983). In the interviews with Jude and Calliope, we gain insight from both a male and female perspective of the emotionally labor-intensive and one-sided role female friends serve for their male friends. Based on Jude's experience, he felt he could only be emotionally intimate and vulnerable with his female friends. For this reason, Jude reserved what he believed to be some of his most valuable or important

conversations for his female friends, with whom he knew he could open up emotionally. However, Calliope described that her friendships with men tended to be very one-sided in the sense that, although her male friends opened up emotionally to her, she reserved her most intimate conversations for her closest female friends. In this way, the women in female-male friendships provide emotional labor, allowing men to benefit by opening up emotionally in ways they cannot with their male friends.

The ability to be emotionally intimate is not an exclusively female trait. As the following section from Calliope's interview illustrates, men are just as capable of being emotionally expressive and vulnerable, however they only do so with their female friends,

"And I have another friend and, I'm pretty close with him, I'd say it's pretty balanced, and, I've been friends with him since freshman year, and, uh, I remember talking with him freshman year and I don't know how it came up but it came up how, when you hook up with someone, who do you tell and what level of like information do you give- And he was like, yeah, I mean, if it comes up I mean I'll mention it but like *if* someone asks me. And I was saying, like, especially with like my best friend from home, it's like: the moment it happens, who it was, what their name is so I can look them up on Facebook, all of the details, too many details, and I was explaining to him like I know all the details. And he was like really taken aback by that […] like he was like real not cool with it. And then, like the next week, he was like intrigued enough that he like asked if he could like tell me about it [his most recent hook up] and I was like sure. And, then, like the fucking flood gates like opened and I was like wow this is like way more information than I wanted right now […] and he's generally pretty open like pretty in touch with his emotions. And since then every time he like hooks up with someone he calls and tells me. And it's so interesting to me that like because I am the person who told him it's okay to do that I am now the person who is defaulted who like knows all of these things" [21:56.]

Here we can observe that although Calliope's male friend had the desire to open up and volunteer stories of hook-ups with a friend, he only did so to a minimal extent and only when prompted among his male friends. In this sense, he did not feel at liberty to volunteer this intimate information whenever he wanted to. Rather, he waited until a male friend expressed interest in hearing about it, which did not seem to happen that frequently. However, when he began discussing his hook-ups with Calliope, as she describes, 'the fucking flood gates opened and I was like wow this is way more information that I wanted right now.' In this sense, Calliope was overwhelmed by the detail of the hook-up stories that her male friend wanted to tell her. Her friend had held in the majority of these experiences for so long that once he was finally provided an outlet to recount them, he actually opened up so much that he sometimes made Calliope uncomfortable with his level of detail. This interaction reveals two components of the gender of friendship: 1. Calliope's male friend had not been provided the opportunity to express and recount his hook-up experiences to remotely the same extent with his male friends as he was with Calliope, and 2. He made Calliope somewhat uncomfortable by providing, as she says, 'too much information' about his hookups. Calliope, furthermore, never discussed her hook-up encounters with this male friend. Instead, she reserved her most intimate conversations for her few close female friends. In this way, their relationship is unbalanced in that she provides the emotional service of listening to and showing interest in his romantic pursuits while he does not

do the same for her. In this way, male-female friendships are unique in that they provide men with an outlet for emotional vulnerability that they often cannot find with their male friends. However, these relationships are not equal in that the women are the sole providers of emotional labor. Thus, we can observe that women's emotional labor extends not only to the home and workplace but also to the realm of friendship.

This inequality in male-female friendships arises because men have been socialized to not express emotion from a very young age. In fact, Calliope mentioned a male friend of hers expressing just this,

> "I had one [male friend] tell me that he feels emasculated when he talks to me about this stuff and I was like I'm really sorry like I never meant to push you and he was like, 'no' cause he would volunteer it and he'd be like, 'no it's like good like I need to talk about it.' But like it was really startling to me that he felt like being vulnerable and expressing, not only feeling his emotions but expressing them to someone else was like an emasculating experience." [18:35.]

Here, Calliope's conversation with her male friend speaks to the larger theme of a starkly contrasting sense of comfort and permissibility between male and female students in having emotionally vulnerable friendships despite both genders' need and desire for these close emotive connections. If emotional expression and vulnerability is fundamental in the formation of close interpersonal relationships, how are male students managing their need to be emotionally vulnerable with their deep sense of an impermissibility of doing so? Calliope and Jude's interviews reflect the primary strategy that male students discussed in managing this conflict: having female friends with whom they are permitted to be emotionally vulnerable. However, if Greek life is premised on dividing students, amongst other characteristics, based on gender, this social structure inherently circumscribes the ability of students to have cross-gender friendships. Jude, for example, was in a fraternity. However, he was not able to find friendships where he could be emotionally vulnerable among his fraternity brothers. Rather, he was only able to be emotionally open with his female friends outside of his fraternity. Furthermore, several of Calliope's male friends were also in fraternities. We can thus gather that it can be difficult for fraternity men to find close friendships in which they can be emotionally candid with one another within their fraternity. Furthermore, the fact that of the thirty Greek and ten non-Greek students I interviewed, all of the non-Greek students had close friends of the opposite gender whereas almost none of the Greek students did suggests that many if not most fraternity men do not have any female friends and thus likely do not have any emotionally intimate friendships.

The Lack of Platonic Relationships Between Sorority and Fraternity Members

Over the course of the forty interviews I conducted, only a few of the 30 members of Greek life had close friends of the opposite gender, whereas all 10 non-Greek students had close opposite gender friends. Due to the scarcity of platonic friendships across gender within Greek life, we can surmise that the underlying relationships between fraternity and sorority members must have been primarily romantic. The implications for this are that, over the three years in which students are members of Greek life, they are socialized to only see members of their same gender as friends and to see members of their opposite gender as exclusively romantic prospects. Furthermore, fraternity men without female friends are less likely to have emotional intimacy in

their male friendships and are thus forced to reconcile with the consequences of this lack of an emotional outlet.

The lack of truly platonic *friendships* between women and men may not be unique to Greek life, but it appeared to be heightened among members of Greek organizations. This is likely due to the inherent social structure of Greek life. To elaborate, members of sororities and fraternities interact in the context of mixers, date parties, crush parties, and formals. The hierarchy of Greek life is explicitly indexed through these parties: top sororities and fraternities only mix with one another and Greek organizations lower down in the hierarchy in turn only mix with one another. These mixers are hosted at fraternity houses and often involve risqué themes such as ABC, or, Anything But Clothes, in which students may dress themselves in newspapers or recycled beer cans. Some girls have been known to dress themselves in zoomed in headshots of all of the fraternity brothers she had hooked up with. Mixers provide convenient contexts for fraternity men to meet and express interest in women without risking being turned down because everyone in the given sorority and fraternity is invited and expected to be there, thus, a man does not have to individually invite any woman. Crush parties, by contrast, involve fraternity brothers "crushing," or secretly inviting one or several girls to an off-campus party, often hosted at bars or clubs. The invited girls will receive an email that they have been crushed by someone in the fraternity. Sometimes girls will be able to guess who crushed them, however this is not always the case. Crush parties thus avert the risk of rejection on the part of the fraternity members because the invites are anonymous. Date parties are hosted by both sororities and fraternities often in off-campus venues, generally rented out clubs or bars. These are formal evenings in which an individual date is invited. Fraternity men often ask their brothers to be set up with dates when they cannot find one themselves. Lastly, formals are weekend trips to the beach hosted and paid for by fraternities in which each female invitee is expected to decorate and fill a cooler of alcohol in order to thank her date for the trip. Invites to formals for prestigious fraternities are highly coveted by sorority women and they directly influence a woman's social capital. In each of these contexts, copious amounts of alcohol are consumed by most participants. Due to the fact that these events comprise all sorority-fraternity interaction, it does not seem surprising that sorority and fraternity men find it difficult to form close friendships with the opposite gender. However, the implications for this gender segregation in friendship among members of Greek life are troubling. Firstly, if men and women only have friends of their own gender, they are more likely to exclusively view those of the opposite gender as romantic prospects. This means that Greek students are socialized to view and behave differently around students of the opposite gender.

The implications of this gender-divergent socializing likely impact the relations these students go on to have in both their personal and professional lives after graduation. Furthermore, if male-male friendships are less likely to be emotionally intimate, as described by interview subjects, then for male students who only have male friendships, as is the case for fraternity men, it seems reasonable to presume that they often lack emotional closeness in these friendships. This could have profound psychological and other repercussions both in college and later in life for these men. A longitudinal study that follows fraternity men and sorority women into adulthood might provide valuable insight into the long-term implications for gender differences in emotional intimacy in friendship and the ways in which this may shape both personal and professional relationships in adulthood.

Professional Implications for Gendered Friendships

My finding that fraternity men were more likely than sorority women to form their close friend networks within their Greek organization has not only social but also professional implications for the networks of these students after graduation. Specifically, if fraternity men are closer to one another than sorority women, then it seems reasonable to presume that fraternity men would be more likely to provide helpful professional connections for one another than would sorority women. In fact, I observed this through my own participant-observation data. On the Facebook page for my sorority, the jobs that were shared were generally in fashion, babysitting, Sunday school teacher positions, event planning and PR. By contrast, based on interview data, I learned that the vast majority of members of fraternities had either business, economic, math, or public policy majors and thus their internships and jobs tended to be more concentrated within the fields of finance, law, and business. One interview subject, Jude, mentioned this because, as a Creative Writing major seeking to go into the film industry, he bemoaned the fact that the professional network he sought was not provided by his fraternity, which tended to instead only provide useful contacts for corporate and banking positions. If friend networks within Greek life tend to be gender segregated, then it seems reasonable to conclude that professional networks are also likely to be gender segregated. Given the gendered professional networks of sorority women compared to fraternity men, I would argue that the gender-segregated friend networks within Greek life promote gendered professional networks. This is not to say that I did not speak to any sorority women who hoped to enter corporate or banking professions or that all fraternity men necessarily sought these lucrative and traditionally gendered career paths. However, I did observe that there was a tendency for fraternity men to seek to enter finance, corporate, law, or public policy professions. By contrast, the sorority women were more likely to pursue more creative but lower earning positions such as conservation, entertainment, or health related fields. I found similar results for a sociology survey conducted in my sophomore year studying the relationship between gender, major, and career aspirations, as have other studies such as one conducted by the Harvard Business School, (Carmichael, 2017). In this way, we can observe the reproduction of traditional gender norms and expectations practiced among Emory students through their friendship networks and their associated professional networks. The fact that this is observable at a competitive and elite private university suggests that even among high achieving students, gendered practices and expectations for not only social but also professional performance and achievement are still very much prevalent today.

Extrapolating These Results to Similar Institutions

I would here like to comment on the ways in which the findings of this study may provide insight into friend networks and social life at similar peer institutions to Emory. I would suggest that the findings I gathered from this study may also extend to institutions with similar ranking, size, average academic standard for admission and presence of Greek life on campus. I evaluated whether an institution could be considered a peer university based on sharing similar demographics and therefore potentially similar social dynamics based on its ranking within the top 25 by the U.S. News and World Report, size, average ACT score of the current freshman class (31-35), and proportion of the student body involved in Greek life. I found that Cornell, University of Michigan, Duke, Northwestern, and University of Pennsylvania were all examples of schools that had similar demographics to Emory in these regards. For these reasons, an extension of this research at these similar peer institutions may provide more exhaustive insight

into how the observations my data suggested may extend on a larger scale. A contrasting study at schools that diverge from Emory in these key areas may also illuminate whether these social dynamics vary based on the kind of school students attend.

Implications for Future Research
The findings of this study also suggest further research on the interactions of Greek life, school ranking (being in the top 20 or not), friendship, gender, habitus, class-culture, diversity, and socio-economic outcomes after graduation may be extremely fruitful for understanding the persistence of social reproduction in the U.S. today and the ways in which the liberal arts university may offer a unique site of subversion of these traditional and gendered social hierarchies. Specifically, I suggest the following comparative studies for future research:
1. Do more elite universities have greater social hierarchy and stratification than do lower ranking universities?
2. Do more elite universities have more equal opportunity for social mobility than do lower ranking universities?
3. Do universities with Greek life have greater social hierarchy and stratification than do universities without Greek life?
4. Do universities with Greek life have greater sex segregation in friendship networks than do universities without Greek life?
5. Do universities with Greek life have less equal opportunity for social mobility?
6. Do students get different benefits (specifically, more emotional support) from their friendships depending on the gender of their friends?

Conclusion
The results of this study have far reaching implications for demonstrating how friendship, a purportedly non-utilitarian social relationship, in fact serves as a locus for gendered social reproduction. Specifically, friendships are navigated amid structures of habitus, hierarchies of social capital, and gender. For both men and women at Emory, access to social capital requires being admitted to top Greek organizations or being friends with members of these sororities and fraternities. Furthermore, acceptance to these organizations is markedly gendered: for men, admittance is often oriented around possession of certain attributes and behaviors such as an affable personality, athleticism, or being "good at getting to know girls" (Ted). By contrast, for women, admittance was gained primarily through physical attractiveness to fraternity men. Furthermore, interview subjects perceived sorority life as oriented around their interactions with fraternity men through mixers, date parties, and formals, whereas they saw fraternity life as oriented around inculcating close friendships among the fraternity brothers. In this way, fraternities at Emory appear to foster closer social networks than do sororities, potentially leading to more lucrative professional networks after graduation. I hope in the future to conduct a longitudinal study that can follow the long term implications of social networks in college on social mobility after graduation for students. I believe that this finding reflects not only differential organizational goals in the national structure of sororities as compared to fraternities but also reinforces gendered ways of forming social networks. To elaborate, the national sororities require their chapters to admit roughly twice the number of new members each year than do fraternities. This inherently means that in social gatherings between sororities and fraternities, there are twice the number of women than men, fostering a kind of competition

among the women that does not exist to nearly the same extent among the men. Furthermore, social events are always hosted either at off campus venues or at the fraternities, never at the sororities. This inherently creates an unequal power dynamic at these social events in that favors the fraternity men. In this way, Greek life at Emory reproduces gendered forms of social capital.

Among the most powerful aspects of Greek life was the way in which association with members of "top" Greek organizations provided students with social capital. In this way, being invited to date parties or formals by members of "top" Greek organizations provides social capital. Furthermore, many of these invitations are secured through a shared friend group, and in this way friendships with students with social capital reinforce an individual's social capital. In this way, friendships are strategic. Furthermore, friendships are based upon sharing the same habitus or internalized set of culturally specific practices. In this way, students are most likely to become close friends with others who have a shared habitus to their own. It is important to note here that habitus represents an unconsciously embodied complex social niche. For this reason, I did not find that students intentionally sought out friends from the same class, race, or religion. Instead, I found that students were more likely to become friends with others from the same habitus, indexed by shared practices, tastes, and values. Thus, for middle class, non-Greek, Indian-American student Julia, it was not the fact that her friends shared the same racial, class, and ethnic identity that she enjoyed spending time with them. Rather, it was the fact that they had the same cultural references points and had the same tastes that she felt close with them. For example, if a new Bollywood film came out, she could send the link to her friends and they would already know all of the actors and want to watch it with her immediately. In this way, Julia shared the same cultural capital and habitus as her friends and thus felt that being friends with non-Indian American students would simply, "be more work." Thus, although friendships are constructed strategically in order to maximize social capital, these kinds of beneficial friendships are only within reach for students who already possess the same habitus and associated cultural, socio-economic, and symbolic capital. In this way, friendship serves as a locus for social reproduction in that students are more likely to become friends with others from a shared habitus. Thread's friendships with other students involved in Jewish youth groups who also had the same music taste and senses of humor demonstrates just the way that socio-economic and cultural backgrounds play a role in shaping students' own habitus and their attraction towards others who share this specific habitus. Specifically, his friends were, like him, raised in families with the resources to educate their children about niche forms of music and also to pay for them to attend Jewish youth group retreats in Israel. In this way, students with the same forms of capital are more likely to become friends with one another. Thus, it is difficult for students with lower social capital to become friends with students who possess greater social capital, even though they may desire to do so, due to their divergent respective habitus. In this way, through friendship, students are attracted to others of a shared habitus, in turn reproducing social hierarchies. Lastly, and perhaps most strikingly, these social hierarchies are deeply gendered and are thus likely to have lasting implications for future social mobility and professional achievement. To elaborate, the more tightly knit friendships networks formed among fraternity brothers appear more likely to yield useful future professional networks than do the more disparate friend networks of sorority women. Furthermore, fraternity members only interact with sorority women in the context of mixers, date parties, and formals and are therefore much more likely to only establish non-platonic relationship with women, if they form any at all.

Most fraternity members appeared to only have close male friends. Strikingly, the few men who did have close female friends reported that they only felt capable of being fully emotionally vulnerable with their female friends. However, this emotional connection was often one sided because most women chose to confide in their other female rather than male friends. In this way, friendships between men and women appeared to require emotional labor on the part of the female friend. In this sense, the fraternity members who also had female friends appeared to benefit the most out of all of my interview subjects from their friend networks in that they gained the close knit community of their fraternity and the promise of future helpful professional networks from this fraternity group while also benefitting from their emotionally intimate (though one-sided) friendships with their female friends.

In conclusion, I observed that Emory students tend to form gendered friendships with others from the same habitus as themselves. Students are drawn to friends who have internalized the same norms, ranging from preferences for leisure activities and conversation to life goals and expectations. Although Greek life provides one mechanism by which students find these friends, non-Greek students were equally as likely to form friend groups with others of the same habitus, they merely used other means such as classes, clubs, and sports teams to do so. Implicit, furthermore, in this construction of friendship with others from the same habitus is the manifestation of social reproduction. This formation of friendship may explain why, in spite of universities' valiant efforts towards diversifying their campuses, integration of students from different identities and backgrounds in friendship networks is still not common. Based on the results of this study, true integration will require far more than simply admitting a diverse student body. True integration will require providing students with the opportunity to expand and grow their habitus and thus the breadth of people with whom they share tastes and values and in so doing, build close friendship with students from different habitus to themselves. However, the feasibility of such a task is hard to ascertain theoretically. Nevertheless, the greatest potential for growth of the habitus, I would argue, lies within the university setting, as this is often the first time Americans are taken out of their social orbits and provided with the opportunity to stretch themselves, expanding their world views, their tastes, and their values. In offering students the tools to reconstruct their way of being in the world, the American liberal arts university offers the greatest opportunity for deconstructing social reproduction, and I would argue that friendship is the best litmus test for evaluating the success of this integration. This study suggests that, as of yet, there is room for progress. Lastly, this research also points to a subtle reproduction of gendered practices and gendered labor within Greek life and the friendships of Emory students. The nuanced dynamic of male-female friendships among members of Greek life creates a simultaneous subversion of traditional gender norms by permitting male students emotional intimacy while concurrently reinforcing expectations for gendered labor in that the female students provide an outlet for emotional intimacy for their male friends that is not reciprocated. In this sense, I would propose that the male-female friendships observed in this study reflect a modern version of the power dynamic within the historical and traditional heterosexual marriage in that the woman provides emotional support while association with the man, even in the form of friendship rather than marriage, provides her with social capital, and even more so if he belongs to a "top" Greek organization. In this way, my study has begun to touch on the nuanced intersection of friendship networks, gender, habitus, and capital. I very much hope to pursue this topic further through incorporating literature from an even wider scope of disciplines ranging

from psychology to economics and including both a social network analysis and a longitudinal study for my future graduate work.

Bibliography

Anderson, Penelope. "The Absent Female Friend: Recent Studies in Early Modern Women's Friendship," *Literature Compass* 7, no. 4 (2010): 243. See also her more extended study, *Friendship's Shadows: Women's Friendships and the Politics of Betrayal in England, 1640–1705* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012).

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics.* (350 B.C.E.) Translated by W.D. Ross. Retreived from http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.html x
Bourdieu, Pierre. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Mauss, Marcel. (1954). *The Gift.* Routledge, UK: London

Athanasiadis, Georgios et al. (2016). Nationwide Genomic Study in Denmark Reveals Remarkable Population Homogeneity. *Genetics.* Retrieved from *https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5068857/*

Goffman, Irving. (1963). *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Ortner, Sherry. (1984). "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties." *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* Vol. 26, No. 1

Rubin, Gayle. (1975). "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex," *Toward an Anthropology of Women,* New York, Monthly Review Press

Berger, John. (1972). *Ways of Seeing.* New York, NY: Penguin Books

Emory Panhellenic Council (2018) Emory University. Accessed from: https://wayback.archive-it.org/6324/20180414155416/http://osfl.emory.edu/current_members/panhellenic/index.html

Way, Niobe. (2013). *Deep Secrets: Boys' Friendship and the Crisis of Connection.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Gender in Greek Life: Inside Greek U: Fraternities, Sororities, and the Pursuit of Pleasure, Power, and Prestige Alan DeSantis, 2007 University Press of Kentucky

2018 *Kappa Alpha Theta Heritage.* Retrieved from https://heritage.kappaalphatheta.org

Birdseye, Clarence Frank. (1907) *Individual Training in Our Colleges.* London: Macmillan & Co. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?id=Bv7ZFGz9MCYC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

Lombardi, Michael Ju. (2012). The Colonial Williamsburg Museum. Retrieved from: http://www.history.org/foundation/journal/winter12/phi_beta_kappa.cfm

Kappa Alpha Society (1892) *A Record of the Members of the Kappa Alpha fraternity.* Retrieved from: https://books.google.com/books?id=DEZNAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA11&lpg=PA11&dq=Kappa+Alpha+Society,+established+at+Union+College+in+Schenectady,+New+York+on+November+26,+1825+by+John+Hart&source=bl&ots=4CzZGQBCQ1&sig=LTHNWCauKeR-fpgZxVgZktQ_Rbs&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjN_KfktpfdAhWSTN8KHXE7BG0Q6AEwDHoECAgQAQ#v=onepage&q=Kappa%20Alpha%20Society%2C%20established%20at%20Union%20College%20in%20Schenectady%2C%20New%20York%20on%20November%2026%2C%201825%20by%20John%20Hart&f=false

Sanua, Marianne Rachel (2003) *Going Greek: Jewish College Fraternities in the United States, 1895-1945.* Wayne State University Press

Schweitzer, Ivy (2016) *Making Equals: Classical Philia and Women's Friendship.* Feminist Studies. Vol 42. No 2. 337-364

Bruni, Frank (2017) *Their Pledges Die. So Should Fraternities.* The New York Times.

Leonhardt, David (2017) *A Welcome College Diversity Push.* The New York Times. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/07/opinion/a-welcome-college-diversity-push.html

Sorority Record Collections (1933-1995) *Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library,* Emory University. Atlanta, GA. Retrieved at https://findingaids.library.emory.edu/documents/eua0124sorority/.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1986). The Forms of Capital. Richardson, J. (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (1986), Westport, CT: Greenwood, pp. 241-58

Editorial Board, The Wheel (2015). *Sorority Recruitment Disempowers Women.* Retrieved from https://emorywheel.com/sorority-recruitment-disempower-women/

Fraternity and Sorority Facts, New Jersey Institute of Technology; retrieved from: https://www.njit.edu/greeklife/directory/facts.php

The Princeton Review College Ranking Methodology. Retrieved From:
https://www.princetonreview.com/college-rankings/ranking-methodology

Paying for the Party: How College Maintains Inequality" Elizabeth A. Armstrong; Hamilton, Laura (2013). Harvard University Press

Geiger, Roger L. *The History of American Higher Education* (2014)

Haveman, Robert; Smeeding, Timothy. (2006) *The role of higher education in social mobility* Smeeding The Future of Children Vol. 16, No. 2, Opportunity in America. Published by Princeton University. Retrieved at
https://www.jstor.org/stable/3844794?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

Wermund, Benjamin (2017) *How U.S. News college rankings promote economic inequality on campus.* Politico. Retrieved at:
https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/top-college-rankings-list-2017-us-news-investigation/

Hotchkiss, Michael (2017). *Movin' on Up? Views on Social Mobility Shape American's Faith in the Status Quo.* Woodrow Wilson School of Public & International Affairs. Retrieved at:
http://wws.princeton.edu/news-and-events/news/item/movin-views-social-mobility-shape-americans-faith-status-quo

Bolyard, Melissa (2017) *Emory University 2016-2017 Academic Profile: A profile of the Schools and Academic Resources* Retrieved at:
http://opb.emory.edu/documents/data/Emory-AcademicProfile-2016-2017.pdf

Carmichael, Sarah Green (2017). *Women Dominate College Majors That Lead to Lower-Paying Work.* Harvard Business Review. Retrieved at:
https://hbr.org/2017/04/women-dominate-college-majors-that-lead-to-lower-paying-work

Chetty et al "Mobility Report Cards: The Role of Colleges in Intergenerational Mobility" *Opportunity Insights.* Dec 2017. Retrieved from
https://opportunityinsights.org/paper/mobilityreportcards/

Bartik, Timothy J.; Hershbein, Brad J. "Degrees of Poverty: The Relationship between Family Income Background and the Returns to Education," E.W. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. Retrieved at
https://research.upjohn.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1302&context=up_workingpapers

"Economic diversity and student outcomes at Emory University." *The Upshot.* The New York Times. (2017). Retrieved at https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/college-mobility/emory-university

Larkin, Max; Aina, Mayowa (Nov 4, 2018) "Legacy Admissions Offer An Advantage – And Not Just At Schools Like Harvard,". Retrieved from: https://www.npr.org/2018/11/04/663629750/legacy-admissions-offer-an-advantage-and-not-just-at-schools-like-harvard

Interview Subjects Quoted:

Roger (Fraternity Member Interview Subject)

Calliope (Non-Greek Woman Interview Subject)

Jude (Fraternity Member Interview Subject)

Ted (Former Fraternity Member Interview Subject)

Julia (Non-Greek Female Interview Subject)

Steph (Greek Interview Subject)

Lily (Greek Interview Subject)

James (Greek Interview Subject)

Bess (Greek Interview Subject)

Interview Guide: Interviews for Gender Differences in Friendship Networks in Greek Life

1. Can you tell me your pseudonym name, year, and major.

2. What are your interests in college- what are you involved in?

3. What takes up the most time?

4. How do you remember making your closest friends at Emory?

5. Are your friends doing similar majors to you?

6. Are most of your friends in the same Greek organization as you?

7. Are all of your friends in the same friend group?

8. What make someone a close friend versus a less close friend? How many do you have of each?

9. What do you look for in your friends? If you had to give a general description, how would you distinguish your closest friends from your less close friends?

10. Do you have more male or more female friends? How many of each? Which are you closest to?

11. What do you do with your friends?

12. What do you talk about? Are there things you don't talk about?

13. Do you have friends for different purposes? For instance, some who you study with, others who you go out with?

14. Why did you choose your Greek organization?

15. Did Greek life help you make friends? How?

16. Are most of your friends in your Greek organization?

17. Do you think your friendships in your fraternity/sorority are different from your non-Greek friendships?

18. Do you think friendships in sororities are different from those in sororities?

19. Would learning someone is in a specific fraternity or sorority affect how you view them?

20. Is it possible to have friends of the opposite gender?

21. Do you think your friendships with girls are different from your friendships with guys?

22. Do you think guys have different ideas of what friendship means than girls?

23. Have certain friendships or relationships changed you/had a big impact on you?

24. What do you think about hookup culture?

25. Do you feel comfortable talking about guys/girls with your guy/girl friends?

26. Do you talk about hookups/romantic interests with your friends? How frequently, does it come up a lot or not that much?

27. Do you think it's possible to be friends with someone you have hooked up with? Do you participate in hookups? Do your friends?

28. Do you want a relationship in college? Do your friends?

29. Would it matter if the person you started dating were in a specific Greek organization? Or if they weren't?

30. Anything you would like to add?

Interview Guide for Non-Greek Emory Students: Gender Differences in Friendship Networks

1. Can you tell me your pseudonym name, year, and major.

2. What are your interests in college- what are you involved in?

3. What takes up the most time?

4. How do you remember making your closest friends at Emory?

5. Are your friends doing similar majors to you?

6. Are most of your friends involve in Greek life or not?
7. Are most of your friends in the same friend group?

8. What makes someone a close friend versus a less close friend? How many do you have of each?

9. What do you look for in your friends? If you had to give a general description, how would you distinguish your closest friends from your less close friends?
10. Do you have more male or more female friends? How many of each? Which are you closest to?
11. Do you have friends for different purposes? For instance, some who you study with, others who you go out with?

12. What do you do with your friends?

13. What do you talk about? Are there things you don't talk about?

14. Do you think friendships in Greek life are different from your non-Greek friendships?
15. Do you think friendships in sororities are different from those in fraternities?

16. Would learning someone is in a specific fraternity or sorority affect how you view them?

17. Is it possible to have friends of the opposite gender?

18. Do you think your friendships with girls are different from your friendships with guys?

19. Do you think guys have different ideas of what friendship means than girls?

20. Have certain friendships or relationships changed you/had a big impact on you?

21. Do you feel comfortable talking about guys/girls with your guy/girl friends?

22. Do you talk about hookups/romantic interests with your friends? How frequently, does it come up a lot or not that much?

23. Do you think it's possible to be friends with someone you have hooked up with? Do you participate in hookups? Do your friends?

24. Do you want a relationship in college? Do your friends?

25. Would it matter if the person you started dating were in a specific Greek organization? Or if they weren't?

26. Anything you would like to add?

Survey Guide:

1. What year are you?
   aa. Freshman
   bb. Sophomore
   cc. Junior
   dd. Senior
2. What school are you in?
   a. College of Arts and Sciences, Humanities
   b. College of Arts and Sciences, Sciences
   c. Nursing
   d. Business School
3. What is your current GPA?
   a. 3.7-4.0
   b. 3.4-3.6
   c. 3.0-3.2
   d. 2.9 or less
4. What gender do you identify as?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other
5. What race do you identify as?
   a. White
   b. Asian
   c. Black
   d. Hispanic
   e. Other, please specify _____

6. Where did you spend your high school (Which country, state, city)?
   _____

7. Where did you make the majority of your closest friends on campus? Choose all that apply.

       a. Clubs
       b. Greek Life
       c. Freshman Hall
       d. Classes
       e. Knew them before Emory
       f. Other

8. How frequently do you see them?
       a. Every meal
       b. Once every day
       c. A few times a week
       d. Once a week

9. List three things you do with your best friends on campus
       i. _____
       ii. _____
       iii. _____

10. What do you talk about with your friends? Select all that apply
       a. Sports
       b. Politics
       c. Gossip
       d. Pop-culture
       e. Hookups/Romantic Interests
       f. Classes
       g. Personal/Family
       h. All the above

11. What gender are most of your friends?
       a. Male
       b. Female
       c. Equal Ratio

12. Did you rush a Sorority or Fraternity?
       a. Yes
       b. No

13. Did you join a Sorority or Fraternity?
       a. Yes
       b. No

14. Why or why not?

_____

_____

15. If yes, are the majority of your friends in your specific Sorority or Fraternity?
       a. Yes
       b. No
       c. I am not in Greek life

16. If yes, was Greek life what you expected it to be?

a. Yes, please explain briefly:

_____

_____

b. No, please explain briefly:

_____

_____

c. I didn't join.

17. If yes, are you still an active member of your Greek organization?
    a. Yes
    b. No, I dropped
    c. I was never a part of Greek life

18. Are most of your friends involved in Greek life?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. About half of them are

19. In your experience, what is the most important single quality/factor that distinguishes Greek life from non-Greek life at Emory?

_____
_____
_____

20. How long do you anticipate staying in touch with (communicating on an every day or every few days basis) your current Emory friends after graduation?
    a. Less than 5 years
    b. 5-10 years
    c. More than 10 years

21. In your opinion, is an Emory student better off joining or avoiding Greek life?

_____
_____