UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING

Pacific Sociological Association

GENDER, SOCIAL CLASS, AND EXCLUSION: COLLEGIATE PEER CULTURES AND SOCIAL REPRODUCTION

JENNY M. STUBER
University of North Florida

JOSHUA KLUGMAN
Temple University

CAITLIN DANIEL
Harvard University

ABSTRACT: *This article explores gender and class exclusion among college students. The authors use qualitative data to explore how students talk about gender and class exclusion and quantitative data to model patterns of exclusion within the Greek system. The Greek system serves as a site for social reproduction. Students constructed young women as elitist and prone to class exclusion, while typifying young men as unconcerned with such matters. Quantitative analyses complicate these findings. Within the Greek system, women are less exclusive than alleged and men more so. This discontinuity may reflect gender stereotypes and gender differences in the embodiment of social class. The authors argue that these patterns reinforce male privilege through the assertion that they are not engaged in social class exclusion while lacing undue blame on women as agents of class reproduction.* Keywords: social class, gender, social reproduction, higher education, Greek system

Gatekeeping—defined here as efforts and ability to control access to valued social positions—is central to processes of social reproduction. Within educational and occupational settings, gatekeeping has obvious consequences in that gaining access to valuable positions generates increased material rewards. Yet because stratification is maintained through multiple, conceptually distinct hierarchies (Bourdieu 1984; Lamont 1992), gatekeeping also has important consequences in social settings, where the symbolic resources that flow through social networks, associations, and friendships play a unique role in structuring social inequality.

Collegiate peer cultures provide one window into gatekeeping within social settings. Although adolescents and young adults possess little economic or political power, they have the power to construct peer status systems (Milner 2006; Stevens, Armstrong, and Arum 2008). On many college campuses, Greek life operates as a highly visible and formalized system of peer status and a source of stratification (Domhoff 2010; Horowitz 1987; Karabel 2005; Mills 1956/2000; Turk 2004). While students are typically drawn to Greek life due to the social opportunities it offers, it also provides an opportunity for students to gain academic support and hone leadership skills. After graduation, students can use the social and cultural capital that flows through Greek membership as a tool for navigating occupational, marital, and social marketplaces (Armstrong 2008; Stuber 2009; Domhoff 2010; Sermersheim 1996). Gaining entrée into these peer cultures, however, depends upon earning approval from existing members.

While researchers understand that social class plays an important role in gatekeeping processes—namely by shaping access to the human, social, and cultural capital necessary to pass through the gate—less is known about how gender intersects with social class in this process. Little is known, for example, about whether men and women are evaluated according to different criteria or whether one gender undergoes more rigorous scrutiny than the other. Examining this intersection provides insight into whether and how men and women play different roles in social reproduction and sheds light on class and gender privilege.

We use a mixed-methods approach to examine gatekeeping and social exclusion within the collegiate Greek system. The Greek system at Benton College[1]—a private liberal arts college in the Midwest—is ideal for exploring patterns of exclusion because more than 70 percent of students are members of Greek organizations. Due to the narrow range of variation on our dependent variable (Greek involvement), Benton College provides a rigorous test of our hypotheses. The question that guides our research is: How is gender related to college students' understandings of and experiences with social class exclusion? By exclusion we refer to an interactional process wherein elites restrict access to valued social positions and non-elites opt out of situations where they feel culturally or socially ill-equipped (Lamont and Lareau 1988).

First, we use qualitative data to explore students' understandings of class-based exclusion. Second, we use quantitative data to model patterns of exclusion within the Greek system. The qualitative data show that students construct women as vigilant social class gatekeepers while men are constructed as operating in class-neutral ways. Although the quantitative data confirm some aspects of these assertions, they also show that women may be less engaged in exclusion than thought and men more so. We conclude that these patterns reinforce male privilege through the assertion that young men are not engaged in social class exclusion and place undue blame on women as agents of class reproduction.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Gender and the Reproduction of Social Class

Although studies of social stratification are a dominant focus of sociological inquiry (Kerbo 2009), noteworthy is the paucity of research on women's roles in

the class structure. This gap reflects researchers' assumption that class position is reducible to occupation. Thus, early mobility researchers assumed that women's class position is mediated through their relationships with men and that husband's occupation serves as a proxy for women's class position (Blau and Duncan 1967). More recently, stratification researchers have analyzed mothers' influence on mobility (Beller 2009; Kalmijn 1994), the class identification and educational and occupational attainment of women (Davis and Robinson 1988; Heath and Britten 1984; Sorensen 1994; Walby 1986; Wright 1997), and the ways in which men's class experiences are linked to the women in their lives (Reay 1998; Stanworth 1984). Despite these contributions, we believe that status attainment and social mobility research—by treating social class merely as a variable, and one defined solely by occupation—has provided only partial insight into the role of gender in the dynamics of social reproduction.

Like other cultural sociologists (Bourdieu 1984; Willis 1977), we argue that class needs to be examined as a process, not just a variable. The focus on class as a process has brought greater attention to the cultural and symbolic underpinnings of social reproduction. It has also generated greater insight into women's roles in the class structure. For example, researchers have documented wealthy women's participation in cultural institutions and philanthropic organizations (Domhoff 1970; Ostrander 1984; Ostrower 2002). In these positions, affluent women serve as "trustees of culture" (Ostrower 2002), where they wield political power—sometimes engaging in moral crusades (Beisel 1998)—and affect social change (McCarthy 1991). Yet their actions simultaneously preserve class privilege, in part because they use these roles to establish "social and cultural standards" that legitimate their class positions (Domhoff 1970:34).

Cultural scholars have also examined women's roles in class reproduction by looking at parenting. These scholars have highlighted the ways that middle-class women actively promote their children's interests within schools and other institutional settings (Brantlinger 2003; Lareau 1989; 2003; Reay 1998). Because they are able to advance their children's interests in institutionally recognized ways, affluent women effectively preserve their children's educational and social advantages. Similarly, researchers have documented women's efforts to construct respectable class identities through their self-presentation and domestic labor—especially in circumstances where their material circumstances fail to generate respect. In shifting their attention to working- and lower-middle-class women, these researchers show how women attempt to gain respectability by looking "classy" (Skeggs 1997) and maintaining homes that are meticulously clean (Collins 1992) and yards that are attractively landscaped (Kefalas 2003). British scholar Diane Reay (1998:162) refers to these efforts as the "dirty work of class," drawing attention to the unrecognized, menial labor performed by women that maintains class boundaries and privileges.

These newer contributions hearken back to Thorstein Veblen's (1899/1994) classic analysis of the class structure and the rise of the "leisure class." During the Industrial Revolution, Veblen argued, as men began working in factories and offices, they became increasingly invisible within the community; in turn, women's consumption practices became the public representation of the family's class position. His work highlighted the unique roles that men and women play in the

reproduction of social class. One hundred years later, Julie Bettie (2003:34) echoed this point by noting that within the dominant sociological literature, "women make the stage as class subjects . . . when they represent consumption and leisure, not work."

Although this research has produced more nuanced understandings of the role of gender in the class system, limitations remain. First, because researchers have for so long privileged men's economic roles, research on the non-economic aspects of class reproduction is still needed. Social class identities are not bestowed only when adults enter the labor market, nor does social reproduction take place only within occupational settings. Social class is embodied in every social actor (Bourdieu 1977; 1984), which means that social actors engage in class processes wherever they are. Second, to the extent that researchers have examined gender and the reproduction of class inequality, it appears that men have been situated as gatekeepers within the occupational realm while women have been situated as gatekeepers within the cultural and symbolic realms. Although researchers have begun examining women's roles within occupational settings, we know little about men's roles within cultural and symbolic domains.

Gender and Exclusion within Peer Cultures

Examining peer cultures within educational settings provides a window into cultural and symbolic processes of class reproduction. Within middle and high schools, students vie for membership in cliques at the top of the status hierarchy, what Coleman (1962) called the "leading crowd." Both classic (Waller 1937) and recent research suggests that popularity and membership in high-status activities—like student government and yearbook, and athletics for boys (Adler and Adler 1998; Coleman 1962; Milner 2006) and cheerleading for girls (Bettis and Adams 2003; Eder 1995; Eder and Parker 1987; Merten 1997)—are strongly correlated with affluence. When affluent students dominate these activities (Bettie 2003; Brantlinger 1993), they are able to exclude those deemed unsuitable—a judgment that often has social class connotations (Bettis and Adams 2003; Eckert 1989). Because membership may prove difficult (or undesirable) for students lacking economic, social, and cultural capital, they may develop an oppositional stance (Eckert 1989; Stuber 2009; Willis 1977), thereby excluding themselves.

Research on peer cultures and social exclusion has also provided gendered accounts of these processes. Scholars argue that young women's hairstyles, clothing choices, and accessories are not superficial pursuits or meaningless accoutrements; rather, they are tools used to declare their own class status and read the class status of others (Bettie 2003; Chase 2008; McRobbie 1994; Pomerantz 2008; Proweller 1998). Those who have the resources to groom themselves in class-specific ways are marked for inclusion in high-status activities like cheerleading (Bettis and Adams 2003) and sorority life (Armstrong 2008), while those who are unable or unwilling to adopt these classed forms of femininity are excluded.

For boys and young men, adherence to hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995) figures prominently in gatekeeping processes, where athletic success and (hetero) sexual conquests declare one's masculine credentials (Chase 2008; Kimmel 2008; Messner 1992; 2009; Pascoe 2007). Those who are unable or unwilling to participate

in "manly" behaviors like sexual banter, drinking, and violence are marked for exclusion. Thus, while boys and young men do face challenges in developing appropriate social identities, much of the literature implies that social class is a secondary—if not irrelevant—factor in their identities and social experiences.

With nearly 70 percent of high school graduates entering some form of post-secondary schooling (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] 2009), adolescence has been extended and adulthood deferred. Consequently, there is greater need for research on class processes that take place after high school and outside the labor force. To address this gap, we examine understandings of and experiences with class exclusion—that is, "gatekeeping"—among college students. In doing so, our research yields insights into the cultural and symbolic aspects of class reproduction while also shedding light on the gendered aspects of class reproduction.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

In order to explore the relationship between gender and class in processes of exclusion among college students, we use a mixed-method research design, drawing on qualitative and quantitative data. We use qualitative data to tap into Benton College students' understandings of social class, gender, and exclusion, and quantitative data to model processes of exclusion, namely as they play out within the Greek system. We believe that these two forms of data provide unique, yet complementary, windows into gender and social reproduction.

Research Setting

During the 2003–2004 academic year, *U.S. News and World Report* listed Benton College as one of the nation's top 40 liberal arts colleges. Benton enrolls 2,300 students, 88 percent of whom are white. The students tend to come from economically privileged backgrounds, given that annual costs of attendance are on par with the most expensive institutions in the country.[2] Because of generous financial aid policies and targeted scholarship programs, however, there is a sizable population of less-advantaged students on campus. This includes an estimated 9 percent who are Pell-eligible (an indicator of "low-income status") and 20 percent who are first-generation (neither parent holding a four-year degree)—a rate that compares to about 34 percent of those entering four-year institutions nationally (Choy 2001).

Qualitative Analyses

Sample and Recruitment. In order to gain insight into how students understand and experience the relationship between gender and social class exclusion, the first author conducted in-depth interviews with thirty Benton students. All were white, traditional-aged sophomores and juniors (19–21); sixteen were female and fourteen male. Sixteen students were from upper-middle and fourteen were from working-class backgrounds. Students were classified as upper-middle class if the primary wage earner in their family—usually their father—held an occupational position characterized by higher levels of skill, pay, and supervisory

capacity; conversely, students were classified as working class if the primary wage earner in their family—equally likely to be their father or their mother—held an occupational position characterized by lower levels of skill, pay, and supervisory capacity (Gilbert and Kahl 1982).

In order to capture the cultural dimensions of social class (Bourdieu 1984; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977/1990), respondents were simultaneously selected on the basis of parents' educational attainment. The sixteen upper-middle-class students grew up in families where both parents held at least a four-year degree; the fourteen working-class students grew up in families where neither parent had completed a four-year degree. Together, these selection criteria capture the economic, structural, and symbolic aspects of social class and ensure that the two groups represent different social class locations.

Interviewees were recruited using systematic random and snowball sampling (Berg 2007). Initially, potential respondents were identified from an exhaustive list of students. After generating an initial sample of 100 students (selecting every n^{th} sophomore or junior), the first author invited students to participate via e-mail. After responding, students were formally screened to see if they fit the selection criteria described above (parental occupation and educational attainment). Twenty-two respondents were recruited using this method. Because random sampling did not efficiently produce sufficient representation of male or working-class students (who are present at Benton in lower numbers), I recruited eight additional students using snowball sampling.

Analytic Procedure.   Respondents were asked to participate in two interviews, each lasting about 90 minutes. The research protocol required two interviews because, as part of a larger study of college life, the interview schedule covered an extensive array of questions. On average, the first author spoke to each student for 165 minutes.

Interviews followed an open-ended, active interview approach (Holstein and Gubrium 1995). The instrument was constructed to allow analytic concepts to emerge organically and in response to predefined interests. In order for data to emerge organically, students were asked open-ended questions like: "Tell me about the people you met when you moved into your residence hall as a freshman" and "What was your experience like going through sorority rush?" In order to prompt students to talk about the specific themes—namely, social class and exclusion—they were asked directive questions such as: "Do you think that social class matters on this campus" and "To what extent do you think the Greek system is exclusive or elitist?"

All interviews were taped and transcribed verbatim; they were analyzed using Atlas.ti, a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis program. As a modified form of grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1998), data were analyzed in an iterative fashion, using both deductive and inductive methods.

Quantitative Analyses

Data and Measures.   In order to model processes of exclusion within the Greek system, we used data provided by Benton College's Office of Institutional Research.

We use these data to test three hypotheses derived from students' discourses on gender and exclusion; these hypotheses are presented in the Findings section below. The data include information about all sophomores, juniors, and seniors enrolled during the 2003–2004 academic year. Benton has a small percentage of non-white students (12 percent) and a small black Greek system, but because this analysis focuses on class exclusion in Benton's largely white Greek system, we limit the sample to white students. Thus, we do not know if these processes extend to other racial and ethnic groups. Our final sample includes 827 women and 658 men; 599 of these women are members of sororities and 522 of these men are members of fraternities.

Our analyses are based on a limited set of variables, namely race, gender, first-generation status, and Greek involvement. The data on Greek involvement indicate whether a student is involved in Greek life and, if so, with which of Benton's eleven fraternities and seven sororities the student is affiliated. These data provide a snapshot of exclusion within the Greek system. Typically, Greek recruitment occurs in four rounds. After each round, rushees and active members rank one another; a computer processes the data to find instances where rushees and active members are interested in each other. Although relatively rare, students may "drop out" of rush if they are not pleased with their choices; in addition, students may be "cross cut" if there is no overlap between their rank-order of Greek chapters and the Greek chapters' rank ordering of potential members. Our data do not provide insight into processes of exclusion during the first three rounds of recruitment; they provide data only on the final outcome.

Because our dataset does not include information about parental income or occupation, we use education as a measure of social class. We classify first-generation students as "working class" and second-generation students as "non-working class." Researchers find that first-generation students are substantially different from second-generation students in terms of parental social class (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, and Terenzini 2004) and cultural knowledge of higher education. Bourdieu (1984) also notes that educational credentials, as a form of cultural capital, reflect an individual or family's position within the class structure. Thus, our measure allows us to explore the impact of social class on Greek involvement.

We use chi-square tests and odds ratios to explore the relationship between class and Greek membership. Chi-square tests are a common measure of statistical inference for the relationship between categorical variables.[3] We also use odds ratios in order to express the likelihood that a working-class student will choose a particular Greek house over remaining independent (relative to a non-working-class student). Odds ratios are useful for comparing, with a single number, the propensity for members of two groups to choose a particular outcome.

FINDINGS

When talking about class differences and experiences with exclusion—especially within the Greek system—Benton students constructed narratives in which males were unconcerned with status or social class and, consequently, uninvolved in processes of exclusion; female students, by contrast, were constructed as playing—and enduring—a "ruthless" game of class exclusion. Although quantitative data confirm some aspects of these discourses, they uncover some discontinuities in how college students understand exclusion and how they seem to behave.

It's a Girl Thing: Evidence from Qualitative Analyses of Students' Discourses

Benton students routinely asserted that concerns about social class are a uniquely feminine domain. Such claims often emerged when students were asked whether they thought that fellow students were aware of class differences on campus. Although working-class students were more likely than upper-middle-class students to claim a sense of class awareness (Stuber 2006), both working- and upper-middle-class students claimed that the extent to which students are aware of or interested in such things depends on their gender. When asked if he thought that "social class matters at Benton," Blake Bechtall, a junior athlete from an upper-middle-class family, responded:

> I think guys are a little bit more nonchalant about it. It doesn't seem like guys let it get to them as much. . . . My experience is that girls take social class and appearance and things like that much more personally than guys. I mean, guys don't care what they wear to class—they'll wear sweatpants to class and could care less, but girls, they don't like to wear sweatpants to class, they think they look like crap.

Working-class junior Susanne Sorensen echoed this point when she was asked if she thought that upper-middle-class students recognized the presence of lower-income students on campus:

> I think they recognize it, but I . . . I don't think it really matters to guys. But like to girls, you see them together with all the same stuff on—Kate Spade, Ralph Lauren, Tiffany necklaces, Gucci. Guys could care less . . . they're like, if you don't have a lot of money, big deal, come party, you know. But for girls, most of 'em are daddy's little rich girls.

Indeed, students' descriptions of social class differences were dotted with references to privileged women's brand name clothing, handbags, jewelry, and accessories. Rarely did these referents have a male equivalent. Thus, a shared discourse emerged in which women's bodies were clearly marked by social class messages, while men's bodies were seen as class-neutral.

Students' experiences with exclusion were also gendered. Jodie Brewer, for example, was on a dance squad with "a lot of girls . . . who would be classified as upper class and they kind of show it and they're kind of really snobby." This experience, she said, made "it so hard to do something that I love so much . . . feeling so uncomfortable about myself and looked down on all the time." Like other working-class females, Jodie had many privileged male friends; she described privileged females, however, as mean and stuck up. When asked if she felt "more comfortable with guys who are upper income or girls who are upper income," working-class sophomore Leah Hecker said: "Guys. Just because girls are always talking about stuff they have and all the shopping they did and all the stuff they bought. . . . And guys, they don't talk about it as much." While Leah had dated men from privileged backgrounds, she said that it was privileged females who "looked down on" her when she worked at the cafeteria. Not a single student—male or female—described feeling judged or rejected by a male student.

Throughout our interviews, male and female students—regardless of their own class status—characterized privileged college women as superficial, competitive, and materialistic. Alissa Brennan, the only upper-middle-class woman in this sample who was not a member of a sorority, described her lack of involvement this way: "I don't identify with a lot of girls—at least the typical ones who are really image-conscious and into partying and that sort of thing. I think among women, in general, there's always this animosity, almost, and competition. That's just something that annoys me." Eric Carpenter, a working-class male, typified female students as "conformists" who put "emphasis on the wrong things, like clothes or who you're dating or what fraternity you hang out at"—which, he said, "causes them to raise their noses a little bit."

In our conversations, working- and upper-middle-class students referred to wealthy females as "daddy's girls," or "daddy's little angel" who "drives around campus in a car that daddy bought" and has "mommy and daddy pay for their credit card bill, their cell phone bill, all that stuff." Only one student—a working-class female—applied this discourse to male students, describing fraternity men as "cocky, like mommy and daddy paid for everything." Otherwise, students used these pejorative terms in a gendered way, heaping moral condemnation upon "status-obsessed" young women and leaving young men unblemished.

"Girls Are Ruthless": Gender and Exclusion within the Greek System

While much of the existing literature portrays Greek life as elitist and intimately linked to class exclusion (Domhoff 2010; Horowitz 1987; Karabel 2005; Mills 1956/2000; Turk 2004), Benton students generally rejected the notion that their Greek system operated in this way. Perhaps the most frank articulation of this belief came from Jesse Miller, a working-class junior and fraternity member, who claimed: "It's hard to see [the Greek system as elitist] when 75 percent of the people are Greek." Austin Murphy, a pre-business major from an upper-middle-class background, argued that the sheer scope of Benton's Greek system made it uniquely democratic:

> On other campuses I would say definitely [that the Greek system is elitist]. Here, I think people can find the house that they want to be in, and I think they'll be comfortable and quite happy with it. Because of our high percentage of people in Greek houses, I think that it's more accepting here. It's not elitist like other places.

The fact that Benton is inhabited by a relatively affluent and homogeneous group of students provides the context for Austin's assertion that the Greek system is not a site for social reproduction. Upper-middle-class sophomore Brooke Marshall similarly characterized the system, saying: "I think there are some houses that are more competitive to get into, just 'cause they have stronger reputations, so maybe they're more elitist, but overall I don't think it's exclusive. For every person who wants to rush, there's a spot in a house for them."

Although Benton students generally characterized their Greek system as open to anyone who may want to join, they often followed up these claims with a qualification: If there is any exclusiveness within the system, it is found among sororities, not fraternities. Because female students were typified as more judgmental and superficial in matters of status and social class, the sorority system was constructed as the setting in which they exercised their exclusion; fraternity men, however, were seen as simply wanting to have a good time.

When asked if he thought the Greek system was exclusive, working-class sophomore Josh Elliott made a spontaneous distinction between the fraternities and sororities. This gregarious campus leader and fraternity member said: "Fraternities, I definitely wouldn't say are exclusive, considering like two hundred guys rushed last year and only seven got cross cut. I mean, there's a place for everybody, except for those seven guys. So fraternities, no; sororities, definitely." Working-class sophomore and sorority member Tiffany Morrison offered a similarly gendered distinction when talking about gatekeeping within the Greek system: "Fraternities aren't as image related. . . . For fraternities, the guys get to pick what house they want to be in; for sororities, the house picks you." Jesse Miller, a working-class fraternity member agreed, saying: "Guys' rush, for the most part, we take a guy, we talk to him and ask, Do I have a reason to cut him? Girls' is pretty much the opposite. They go out and talk to them, and they're like, Do I have a reason to keep her?" Although male and female students participate in the same structure of Greek recruitment—and have equal opportunity to select the organizations with which they hope to affiliate—students believed that females experienced greater scrutiny in the process. Further while Jesse characterized his own rush experience as unaffected by his working-class background, when asked what sorority he would be a member of if he were female, he replied: "Whichever one would take me, because they're ruthless." In Jesse's mind, a working-class background is not a liability within the fraternity system, but within the sorority system, it may be cause for exclusion.

Students typically described fraternity rush as a laid-back process where young men travel from house to house, simply looking for the place that best suits their interests. Upper-middle-class sophomore Rachel Thomas said that each fraternity has a reputation based on "their interests, like in sports and just kind of who they are as people. Like, Zetas are just laid-back, great guys; Alpha, they have some stoners, some alcoholics, some baseball players; Omicron, you got the football players, Upsilon is the soccer guys." After Thad Farmer spontaneously characterized Sigma Rho as the "rich girl sorority," the first author asked this upper-middle-class sophomore whether there was an equivalent within the fraternity system. He replied: "Guys are not as focused on that. Guys build more upon the people they know, you know, whether it's the sports teams they play on or the towns they're from, but not so much the actual social class." Although Thad recognized the importance of hegemonic masculinity vis-à-vis athleticism, he drew no connections between someone's social class, the sports he plays, or where he grew up and how that may impact his fraternity membership.

Consistent with their characterizations of females as being overly concerned with status and social class, students described sorority rush as highly exclusive.

When asked if he saw Benton's Greek system as elitist, Blake Bechtall—an upper-middle-class junior—said: "I see some sororities as very elitist and exclusive. . . . Sigma Zeta is so damned elitist. I have some really close friends at Zeta and I love them to death, but then there are some girls there that I just don't want to be around, 'cause they're two-faced, materialistic girls." Indeed, Sigma Zeta and a few other houses were routinely named as having members who were especially privileged and prone to exclusion. Carly Beck, an upper-middle-class sophomore, said that some sororities are "stereotyped as being the rich ones"; others called them "girly-girls" and "spoiled princesses" who "have daddy's credit card." One student referred to Sigma Zeta as "Visa Visa Mastercard," making a play on the name of a large national sorority. Maggie Glazer, an upper-middle-class sorority member, characterized Sigma Zeta, Sigma Rho, and Sigma Tau as houses where social class and "driving a car that daddy bought you" are "important." While two sororities carried the reputation of being home to "bigger girls" and "music geeks," these organizations were largely invisible in students' spontaneous descriptions of exclusion within the Greek system.

The fact that male students were seen as affiliating on the basis of shared interests and female students were seen as selecting on the basis of social class was not a morally neutral distinction. Indeed, students asserted that judging someone on the basis of social class was morally suspect. A working-class sophomore with little involvement in the Greek system (neither as member nor party-goer), Melanie Gerber said that it would "drive [her] crazy being around people who could throw money away so carelessly like the Sigma Taus." When asked if she saw the same dynamics within fraternities, she said:

> I think a lot of it is less class-oriented and more hobby or personality oriented; like the jocks from this certain sports team are in the same fraternity. You can be a basketball player and be absolutely rich or absolutely poor, but you have your basketball friends in your fraternity because you have that common bond, which is more important. The fraternities aren't nearly as, I don't want to use the word superficial, but, you know, as concerned with appearances as the girls seem to be.

Again, Melanie invoked the refrain that young women are superficial—although she seemed reticent to use that word—on account of their interest in wealth and appearance; meanwhile, young men are alleged to rise above and bond over things that truly matter. Although Tiffany Morrison described Upsilon as "the rich guy house," she did not use this to impugn the entire fraternity system; instead, she drew the following gender distinction, noting its consequences for the Greek system: "I think girls are a lot more willing to be fake to fit into a group than guys are. Guys tend to be more like, 'This is who I am, deal with it,' where girls are more, they need to be accepted." These examples echo Sarah Chase's (2008) findings on gender dynamics at a New England preparatory school, where young women were criticized for their conformity and young men praised for their independence.

Some sororities seemed to revel in their "snobby" reputations, as highlighted by their rush planning. For the sororities, this involves a tremendous amount of work, including selecting a theme and planning accompanying skits, food, and

decorations. It also involves designing t-shirts that members wear around campus in order to proclaim their "brand." During the year in which these data were gathered, Sigma Tau designed t-shirts proclaiming "It's What's on the Inside that Counts." In her interview, Sigma Tau member Leah Hecker laughed at the shirts, proclaiming: "That isn't even what we stand for!" During the same year, Sigma Zeta selected as their rush theme "Legally Blond"—the name of a movie about a rich sorority girl, Elle Woods. This comedy's plot line follows the fashion-obsessed blond as she rises to fame as a Harvard law student who cleverly solves a murder case by using sorority connections and her knowledge of hair care. These examples illustrate how particular sororities ironically embrace and reinforce their reputations as attractive, possibly superficial—and especially in the case of Sigma Zeta—privileged young women.

One of Benton's fraternities occasionally garnered a reputation as home to the preppiest, wealthiest men on campus. During the rush season, a rabble-rousing freshman male with an emerging reputation as a liberal non-conformist documented his rush experiences in the campus newspaper. He lampooned the men of Upsilon for taking over the Main Quad with their games of "campus golf"—where young men construct an ersatz golf course on the central quad. The year prior, the fraternity flaunted this reputation by hosting a theme party called "Upsilon Country Club." Yet when students discussed these instances, they did so with a sense of humor, rather than contempt or derision. These examples, moreover, always implicated a specific fraternity, rather than fraternity men, in general. This contrasts with students' narratives about young women, wherein generalizations about specific sororities bled into the sorority system as a whole, beyond which they became claims about college women, in general.

It is important to note that the structure of Greek rush partially set the stage for these dynamics. Although fraternity and sorority rush were similar in that all rushees were required to visit each house at least once, their processes differed in key ways. In general, sorority rush was more formal and structured, with teams of young women interviewing rushees, rather than engaging in the free flow of interaction that typified fraternity rush. Similarly, according to Leah Hecker, sorority women were admonished not to talk about "beer, boys, fraternities, partying" during recruitment, while fraternity men faced no such restrictions. Moreover, as Ryan Conners, an upper-middle-class sophomore said, with sorority rush, "you have to look the part." Indeed, each round of sorority rush had its own clothing guidelines, culminating in "Pref Night," which required formal wear. Fraternity rush, by contrast, did not have a dress code. Indeed, in contrast to the young women who expended considerable time and money planning their "rush wardrobes," young men embraced the fact that they could wear jeans, shorts, sweatpants, and flip-flops to each round of rush but the last, where they typically donned khakis, a white oxford shirt, and tie. The characterization of sorority women as superficial and prone to class exclusion, then, partially reflects the more formal structure of sorority life, which puts a high premium on appearances and propriety.

Throughout their discourses, students constructed young women as more concerned than young men about social class, and more likely to exclude others because of it. Their exclusion, moreover, generated moral condemnation. Male and female students, alike, ascribed pejorative labels to female students, calling them

superficial and materialistic, intimating that they care about the "wrong things." This discursive twist left college men unscathed by moral judgments of a social class kind.

Gender and Exclusion: Evidence from Quantitative Analyses

We use quantitative data to test three hypotheses about social class, gender, and exclusion within the Greek system. These hypotheses derive from the claims made by Benton students.

> *Hypothesis 1*: Working-class (first-generation) students should be less likely to affiliate with the Greek system than non-working-class (second-generation) students.

We test our first hypothesis by comparing the percentages of working- and non-working-class students who are affiliated with the Greek system, for both men and women (see Table 1). A majority of working-class students are affiliated with the Greek system: 59.9 percent of working-class women and 68.8 percent of working-class men. Despite these high levels of involvement, we find support for our first hypothesis: non-working-class students are 13 to 15 percentage points more likely to be Greek than are working-class students, regardless of gender. Chi-square tests show that the class difference is significant for both men and women.

> *Hypothesis 2*: The working-class disadvantage in joining the Greek system should be greater among women students than male students.

We find no support for our second hypothesis. Using the percentage point differences or Cramér's V (a measure of association between two categorical variables analogous to a correlation coefficient), the effect of class on Greek membership is nearly the same for males and females.

Our next hypotheses test claims made by our interviewees about patterns of exclusion among particular sororities and fraternities:

> *Hypothesis 3a*: Organizations that are exclusionary on the basis of class should be more prevalent among the sororities than fraternities.

> *Hypothesis 3b*: Only one fraternity (Upsilon) should be exclusionary on the basis of class.

TABLE 1

Effects of Class on Greek Affiliation, by Gender

	Percent Greek	
Class	*Women (N = 887)*	*Men (N = 710)*
Non-working class	75.3%	81.9%
Working class	59.9%	68.8
X^2 (*df*)	14.72 (1)	10.85 (1)
p	< .001	< .01
Cramér's V	0.133	0.128

Students perceive that class exclusion is more prevalent among sororities than fraternities; if we break down the data for each organization, this impression turns out to be correct. Tables 2 and 3 show the percentage of students affiliated with individual fraternities and sororities, respectively. Initially, they show considerable variation, especially among fraternities, in the percentage of working-class members. In Table 3, we transform these statistics into an odds ratio for each house, representing the ratio of the odds that a working-class student would affiliate with that particular house over remaining independent, compared to a non-working-class student. An odds ratio below 1 means that a working-class student is less likely than a non-working-class student to affiliate with that house over remaining independent; an odds ratio above 1 means that a working-class student is more likely than a non-working-class student to affiliate with that house over remaining independent. We define houses with an odds ratio of .5 or lower as especially exclusionary; for such houses, a working-class student's odds of affiliating with that house are half the odds a non-working-class student would affiliate with the house.

Looking at odds ratios among fraternities, we see that six of eleven are fairly exclusionary. Among sororities, we find that five of seven are class-exclusionary (where working-class students are underrepresented). This supports Hypothesis 3a, the claim that class exclusion is more common among sororities than fraternities. Two exceptions to the pattern among sororities are Sigma Tau—where working-class women are barely underrepresented—and Sigma Omega—where working-class women are dramatically overrepresented. Although these findings are not surprising, given that Sigma Omega was generally considered the lowest status sorority, the finding for Sigma Tau is surprising, given that students considered it a high-status sorority and was routinely identified as a class-exclusionary organization within their discourses.

TABLE 2

Social Class Representation among Fraternities

Fraternity	Non-Working Class (%)	Working Class (%)	Total	Odds Ratio
Delta	66.7	33.3	100.0 (12)	1.200
Zeta	71.2	28.8	100.0 (59)	.971
Omicron	78.1	21.9	100.0 (64)	.672
Epsilon	80.0	20.0	100.0 (25)	.600
Alpha	81.8	18.2	100.0 (66)	.533
Rho	83.9	16.1	100.0 (31)	.462
Tau	83.9	16.1	100.0 (31)	.462
Gamma	86.8	13.2	100.0 (53)	.365
Omega	87.9	12.1	100.0 (58)	.329
Upsilon	88.4	11.6	100.0 (69)	.315
Iota	92.6	7.4	100.0 (54)	.192
Independent	70.5	29.4	100.0 (136)	—
Total	80.5 (530)	19.5 (128)	100.0 (658)	

Note: Odds ratio interpretation: A working-class student's chances of choosing Delta over being an independent are 1.200 times those of a non-working-class student.

TABLE 3

Social Class Representation among Sororities

Sorority	*Non-Working Class (%)*	*Working Class (%)*	*Total*	*Odds Ratio*
Σ Omega	61.1	38.9	100.0 (54)	1.742
Σ Tau	82.2	17.8	100.0 (90)	.592
Σ Upsilon	86.6	13.4	100.0 (82)	.424
Σ Gamma	86.0	14.0	100.0 (86)	.444
Σ Iota	88.4	11.6	100.0 (95)	.359
Σ Rho	89.6	10.4	100.0 (96)	.318
Σ Zeta	89.6	10.4	100.0 (96)	.318
Independent	73.2	26.8	100.0 (228)	—
Total	81.6 (675)	18.4 (152)	100.0 (827)	

Note: Odds Ratio interpretation: A working-class student's chances of choosing Sigma Omega over being an independent are 1.742 times those of a non-working-class student.

Respondents also claimed that class exclusion among fraternities does not exist or, if it does, it is limited to only one house. Our data do not support Hypothesis 3b (see Table 2). First, there is great variation among the fraternities in terms of the representation of working-class students. As noted above, four fraternities are fairly class exclusive, and two fraternities—Iota and Upsilon—are as class exclusionary, if not more so, as the most exclusionary sorority (Sigma Rho). Upsilon, it bears reminding, was the one fraternity that students did identify as "elitist" in their discourses. Although four fraternities (Delta, Zeta, Omicron, and Epsilon) have a representative share of working-class students (and, in the case of Delta and Zeta, a strong overrepresentation), no fraternity is as inclusive as the sorority Sigma Omega.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Our mixed-methods approach reveals discontinuities between how college students talk about social class exclusion and patterns of exclusion within the Greek system. Although quantitative analysis shows some congruence with students' qualitative depictions of class exclusion within the Greek system, students overstate the differences in exclusion between fraternities and sororities and fail to notice similarities. While there are more class-exclusionary sororities than fraternities, two fraternities are more exclusive than the most exclusive sorority. Thus, while young men are let off the hook by claims that they do not care about social class, their behaviors suggest that class mechanisms are at work. By typifying young men as laid back and interested in "who a person really is," this discourse relegates college men to the sidelines in games of social class exclusion while positioning women as vigilant gatekeepers.

There may be several explanations for the apparent disconnect between talk and action. First, students may believe that young men are engaged in class exclusion, but are reticent to admit it. Yet the fact that these students generally spoke openly about social class (Stuber 2006) offers little support for this explanation. Second,

gender expectations may be so strong that young men are defined primarily in relation to masculinity—defined in this context as being interested in partying and sports—so that awareness of class differences pales in comparison. Similarly, it is possible that young men do, in fact, behave in ways that are attuned to class distinctions, but do not define them as such. While students did occasionally claim that soccer is "rich boys' sport," they generally did not define the propensity to play a specific sport as related to social class. Being athletic, then, was perceived as an expression of masculinity—an expression largely devoid of class connotations.

These findings highlight the significance of Bourdieu's (1977; 1984; 1990) notion of *habitus*—a system of durable, transposable dispositions that structure thought, perception, and action. As a product of socialization, the habitus links individual action and the class structure; it is the embodiment of social class, making class present in all social interactions, however subtly. The notion of habitus suggests that young men are, in fact, attuned to class differences and act on the basis of these differences, but may not be aware of them as such. This research, then, raises questions about the embodiment of social class among young men and their ability to read class cues, apparently without an awareness of doing so. Our analyses point to the need for more research into how men's bodies convey social class and how these signals are interpreted and acted on in social interaction.

The results of our mixed-method analyses may incline the reader to find the "truth" in the quantitative results. That is, the reader may be tempted to conclude that young men "really" are more exclusionary than thought and young women less so. We caution against this. We believe that both sets of data provide a unique window into dynamics of class and gender privilege. On the one hand, the quantitative data provide an objective measure of social class representation within the Greek system. Like many social processes that are either too subtle or too elaborate to observe with the naked eye, these data capture the sorting of hundreds of students within a complex structure. These data show that students are not able to account accurately for the social class of every student on their campus or how these class identities map onto Greek involvement. Hence, we find discontinuity in their assertions of social exclusion and observed patterns of Greek affiliation.

On the other hand, we argue that our subjective qualitative analyses provide equally important insights. We do not regard these students' discourses as true only to the extent that they are validated by quantitative data. Rather, we argue that students' discourses represent a form of social action that has real force and consequences (Thompson 1984; 1990). When young women are labeled as superficial on account of their preoccupation with social class, they are cast into powerful roles in the game of social class reproduction, charged with policing class boundaries and orchestrating social class exclusion. Meanwhile, young men are able to rise above it all through the allegation that they value a person's individual qualities instead. Yet as the early sociologist W.I. Thomas (Thomas and Thomas 1928:572) stated, "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences." Thus, real men and women must deal with the daily interactional consequences of these constructions, thereby giving them material force.

Structural features of college life and Benton's Greek system may help explain the heightened levels of exclusion that women experience on this campus. Like

most college campuses, nearly 60 percent of Benton students are female. Assuming a largely heterosexual population, this gender imbalance generates competition among women. Consequently, women may become intensely focused on sorority affiliation and personal appearance in order to gain status and win male approval. Because there are six females for every four males, young men are in greater demand and may face less pressure to establish their status; thereby social class and appearance become less important. With respect to the structure of Greek life, there are technically enough spaces for each male and female student to affiliate with one of the eleven fraternities and seven sororities.[4] Yet the fact that there are fewer sororities than fraternities means that there is less differentiation within the sorority system than the fraternity system. As such, young women face heightened competition to affiliate with a smaller range of organizations, wherein appearance and popularity trump specific shared "interests." More broadly, this reflects patterns documented elsewhere, where adolescent girls react to status dynamics and pressures to attain popularity—an inherently scare commodity within schools—by engaging in "mean girl" behaviors (Merten 1997; Milner 2006).

These patterns also speak to the development of gender identities among adolescents and young adults. Following Susan Chase's analyses of gender dynamics at an elite prep school, these data may echo her documentation of a developmental process wherein young men and women obtain status by participating in highly polarized, extreme gender performances (Chase 2008). Yet these analyses should also be read in the context of broader societal messages about gender and the transformation of feminist movements. As documented by a Duke University (Keohane et al. 2003) task force, many young women today feel pressure to attain "effortless perfection" in their academics and personal appearance. In contrast to second- and third-wave feminism, the contemporary strain of "do-me feminism" emphasizes individualism and sexual attractiveness (Henry 2004). This version of feminism may, however, also result in women accepting hegemonic notions of gender and generating competition among women.

To understand these patterns, it is important to return to the concept of "exclusion." As defined in this article, exclusion is a two-way interactional process. The fact that working-class students are underrepresented within the Greek system and within particular organizations may reflect the fact that they are excluded by elite gatekeepers, and it may also reflect the fact that working-class students choose not to affiliate or choose to affiliate with specific organizations. Unfortunately, our data cannot speak directly to the question of who is rejecting whom. Scholars, however, have argued that this is something of a moot point (Bourdieu and Passeron 1979; Lamont and Lareau 1988), as social reproduction occurs through several mechanisms: while elites have the power to exclude those who do not possess desired forms of cultural capital (overselection), non-elites also engage in "self-elimination," opting out of situations where they feel culturally or socially ill-equipped. Ultimately, we conceptualize "exclusion" as a complex process wherein elites and non-elites collectively negotiate—albeit with unequal power—who passes through the gate.

Although the Greek system at Benton College is unique, we argue that these findings have broader relevance. First, while few campuses have Greek systems

as extensive as Benton's, all college campuses have peer networks and peer cultures. We believe these patterns may characterize peer dynamics within other educational settings, albeit in informal, rather than formal, settings. Similar patterns may shape which students participate in high-status groups and organizations as well as how students form friendships and romantic relationships. Moreover, we see parallels with recruitment processes that occur within the occupational sector and marriage markets. Beyond the campus walls, individuals make decisions about which employers or potential mates they wish to approach; employers and potential mates, in turn, size up applicants and determine who makes the cut. These decisions have implications for social stratification to the extent that they consolidate class-based networks and provide unequal access to valuable social, cultural, and financial resources. Our findings suggest that female applicants may be more rigorously scrutinized and may be perceived as harsher judges, while males are assumed to use relatively universalistic criteria in making their judgments.

Returning to the theoretical concepts that motivated this research, we find that women are not the sole gatekeepers within cultural and symbolic settings; men, too, are engaged in such processes—even if this is not discursively acknowledged. Instead, young women are accused by males and other females of doing the "dirty work of class" (Reay 1998)—though their hands are not as dirty as many believe. The absence of young men in these students' discourses of class exclusion sheds light on processes of social reproduction and the role of gender in the symbolic economy of social class. In particular, they highlight one mechanism of male privilege, in that "to ignore or to make class invisible is to abdicate responsibility . . . from the effects it produces" (Skeggs 1997:7). Thus, while male and female students co-construct college men as oblivious to social class, the end result is that male students uniquely benefit from this construction. Meanwhile, young women—who do not benefit from this privilege—face heightened pressures and burdens within the symbolic and cultural settings in which class stratification plays out.

NOTES

1. All names are pseudonyms. This includes, but is not limited to, college campuses, respondent names, and Greek organizations.

2. These costs were about $32,000 at the time the research was conducted; for the 2008–2009 school year, these costs were approximately $42,000.

3. Typically, the chi-square test is used to test whether a relationship in a sample reflects a relationship in a population or whether it is the result of random sampling variability. In this study, our data are of a population (i.e., all white students) rather than a sample. Thus, we use the chi-square test to determine if the relationship we observe in our data is real or if it is the result of some random error, such as measurement of fluctuations from year to year at Benton.

4. Neither the fraternity nor the sorority system operated at full capacity. Although the fraternity system had more unmet supply than the sorority system, I estimate that the sorority system could accommodate at least seventy-five additional women. Further, the fact that Benton was home to fewer sororities than fraternities should not be interpreted as a lack of demand among females nor as a factor that increases competition among women. On college and university campuses across the country, it is typical that Greek systems have sororities that are fewer in number but larger in membership compared to the fraternities on the same campus.

REFERENCES

Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. 1998. *Peer Power: Preadolescent Culture and Identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Armstrong, Elizabeth A. 2008. "Exclusion: Class, Gender, and College Culture." Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Department of Sociology, Culture Workshop.

Beisel, Nicola. 1996. *Imperiled Innocents: Anthony Comstock and Family Reproduction in Victorian America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Beller, Emily. 2009. "Bringing International Social Mobility Research into the Twenty-First Century: Why Mothers Matter." *American Sociological Review* 74(4):507–28.

Berg, Bruce L. 2007. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, 6th Edition. Boston: Pearson.

Bettie, Julie. 2003. *Women without Class: Girls, Race, and Identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bettis, Pamela J. and Natalie G. Adams. 2003. "The Power of the Preps and a Cheerleading Equity Policy." *Sociology of Education* 76(2):128–42.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

——— and Jean-Claude Passeron. [1977] 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*, translated by R. Nice. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

——— and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1979. *The Inheritors: French Students and their Relations to Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brantlinger, Ellen A. 1993. *The Politics of Social Class in a Secondary School*. New York: Teachers College Press.

———. 2003. *Dividing Classes: How the Middle Class Negotiates and Rationalizes School Advantage*. New York: Routledge-Falmer.

Chase, Sarah A. 2008. *Perfectly Prep: Gender Extremes at a New England Prep School*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Choy, Susan. 2001. *Students Whose Parents Did Not Go to College: Postsecondary Access, Persistence, and Attainment*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Coleman, James S. 1962. *Adolescent Society: The Social Life of the Teenager and Its Impact on Education*. New York: Free Press.

Collins, Randall. 1992. "Women and the Production of Status Cultures." Pp. 213–31 in *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, edited by M. Lamont and M. Fournier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Davis, Nancy J. and Robert V. Robinson. 1988. "Class Identification of Men and Women in the 1970s and 1980s." *American Sociological Review* 53(1):103–12.

Domhoff, G. William. 1970. *The Higher Circles: The Governing Class in America*. New York: Random House.

———. 2010. *Who Rules America? Challenges to Corporate and Class Dominance*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eckert, Penelope. 1989. *Jocks and Burnouts: Social Categories and Identity in the High School*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Eder, Donna (with Catherine C. Evans and Stephen Parker). 1995. *School Talk: Gender and Adolescent School Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

———— and Stephen Parker. 1987. "The Cultural Production and Reproduction of Gender: The Effect of Extra-Curricular Activities on Peer-Group Culture." *Sociology of Education* 60(3):200–13.

Gilbert, Dennis and Joseph Kahl. 1982. *The American Class Structure*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Glaser, Barney and Anselm Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Heath, Anthony and Nicky Britten. 1984. "Women's Jobs Do Make a Difference: A Reply to Goldthorpe." *Sociology* 18(4):475–90.

Henry, Astrid. 2004. *Not My Mother's Sister: Generational Conflict and Third-Wave Feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Holstein, James A. and Jaber F. Gubrium. 1995. *The Active Interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. 1987. *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1994. "Mother's Occupational Status and Children's Schooling." *American Sociological Review* 59(2):257–75.

Karabel, Jerome. 2005. *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston: Mariner Books.

Kefalas, Maria. 2003. *Working-Class Heroes: Protecting Home, Community, and Nation in a Chicago Neighborhood.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Keohane, Nannerl O. (and committee members). 2003. "Women's Initiative: Duke University" (Report). Durham, NC: Duke University.

Kerbo, Harold R. 2009. *Social Stratification and Inequality*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Kimmel, Michael. 2008. *Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men*. New York: Harper Collins.

Lamont, Michèle. 1992. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and the American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, Michèle and Annette Lareau. 1988. "Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps, and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Developments." *Sociological Theory* 6(2):153–68.

Lareau, Annette. 1989. *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education*. London: The Falmer Press.

————. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

McCarthy, Kathleen D. 1991. *Women's Culture: American Philanthropy and Art, 1830–1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McRobbie, Angela. 1994. *Postmodernism and Popular Culture*. London: Routledge.

Merten, Don E. 1997. "The Meaning of Meanness: Popularity, Competition, and Conflict among Junior High School Girls." *Sociology of Education* 70(3):175–91.

Messner, Michael. 1992. *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.

————. 2009. *It's All for the Kids: Gender, Families, and Youth Sports*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Mills, C. Wright. [1956] 2000. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Milner, Murray Jr. 2006. *Freaks, Geeks, and Cool Kids: American Teenagers, Schools, and the Culture of Consumption*. New York: Routledge.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2009. *The Condition of Education 2009*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ostrander, Susan A. 1984. *Women of the Upper Class*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ostrower, Francie. 2002. *Trustees of Culture: Power, Wealth, and Status on Elite Arts Boards*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pascarella, Ernest, Christopher Pierson, Gregory Wolniak, and Patrick Terenzini. 2004. "First-Generation College Students: Additional Evidence on College Experiences and Outcomes." *Journal of Higher Education* 75(3):249–84.

Pascoe, C. J. 2007. *Dude, You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Pomerantz, Shauna. 2008. *Girls, Style, and School Identities: Dressing the Part*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Proweller, Amira. 1998. *Constructing Female Identities: Meaning Making in an Upper-Middle Class Youth Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Reay, Diane. 1998. *Class Work: Mothers' Involvement in their Children's Primary Schooling*. London: UCL Press.

Sermersheim, Katherine L. 1996. "Undergraduate Greek Leadership Experiences: A Proven Method for Gaining Career-Related and Lifelong Skills." *Campus Activities Programming* 29(3):56–60.

Skeggs, Beverley. 1997. *Formations of Class and Gender: Becoming Respectable*. London: Sage Publications.

Sorensen, Annemette. 1994. "Women, Family, and Class." *Annual Review in Sociology* 20:27–45.

Stanworth, Michelle. 1984. "Women and Class Analysis: A Reply to John Goldthorpe." *Sociology* 18(2):159–70.

Stevens, Mitchell L., Elizabeth A. Armstrong, and Richard Arum. 2008. "Sieve, Incubator, Temple, Hub: Empirical and Theoretical Advances in the Sociology of Higher Education." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:127–52.

Strauss, Anton and Juliet Corbin. 1998. *The Basics of Qualitative Research*, 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stuber, Jenny M. 2006. "Talk of Class: Discursive Boundaries and Social Reproduction among Working- and Upper-Middle-Class College Students." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 35:285–318.

———. 2009. "Class, Culture, and Participation in the Collegiate Extra-Curriculum." *Sociological Forum* 24(4):877–900.

Thomas, William I. and Dorothy S. Thomas. 1928. *The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs.* New York: Knopf.

Thompson, John B. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

———. 1990. *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Turk, Diana. 2004. *Bound by a Mighty Vow: Sisterhood and Women's Fraternities, 1870–1920*. New York: New York University Press.

Veblen, Thorstein. [1899] 1994. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Dover.

Walby, Sylvia. 1986. "Gender, Class, and Stratification: Towards a New Approach." Pp. 23–39 in *Gender and Stratification*, edited by R. Crompton and M. Mann. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Waller, Willard. 1937. "The Rating and Dating Complex." *American Sociological Review* 2(5):727–34.

Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning to Labour: How Working-Class Kids Get Working-Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wright, Erik Olin. 1997. *Class Counts: Comparative Studies in Class Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.