

ABSTRACT

SAPPIE, ALISON MARIE. Objectification of Women in the Greek System: Intersectionality and Cross Council Comparisons (Under the direction of Dr. Edwin Gerler).

Examining the phenomenon of objectification of women in Greek life through the lens of intersectionality, the first step toward making impactful changes that are effective for all members of the Greek community. This research study uses a phenomenological approach to depict the essence of objectification in the four Greek councils. The research questions of “What role does council membership and race play in male college students’ experiences of objectification of women in the Greek System? What role does council membership and race play in women college students’ experiences of self-objectification in the Greek System? In what ways is objectification similar and different when comparing Greek councils?” are examined through the voices of the participants. Eight Greek students, two from each council, participated in individual in-depth interviews to capture how objectification in Greek life is impacted by the intersection of gender and race in the councils. At the conclusion of the data analysis, six themes emerged to structure their experiences: (a) new members joining, (b) social status, (c) structures that support objectification (d) segregation of councils by race, (e) diverse versus monolithic, and (f) protective factors against objectification. These six structural themes included textural subthemes describing the phenomenon within each structure. The findings were presented comparing and contrasting the gender, race, and intersection of these two demographics for the participants. By examining the relationships between Greek councils and looking at objectification from different lenses in one study, a fuller picture of objectification in Greek life emerged. Both racial and gender factors shaped how women in Greek life were objectified and self-objectified. The implications of these research findings can be applied to the counseling profession, professionals on a college campus, and empirically supported interventions.

© Copyright 2018 by Alison Marie Sappie

All Rights Reserved

Objectification of Women in the Greek System: Intersectionality and Cross Council
Comparisons

by
Alison Marie Sappie

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Counseling and Counselor Education

Raleigh, North Carolina

2018

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Edwin Gerler
Committee Chair

Dr. Marc Grimmett

Dr. Helen Lupton-Smith

Dr. Angela Smith

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Paul and Kerry Sappie. Without your unwavering support and unconditional belief in my dreams from the moment I was born, this dissertation would not have been possible. When I was young, I thought everyone had parents who did all the things you have and continue to do for me. I have come to realize the significance and rarity of your incredible love and type of parents you are, which molded me into the woman I am today.

Throughout this process I have reflected on who I am as a scholar and counselor and how so many people have paved the way for me to be in this moment and write this dissertation. I could never name all the activists, researchers, family members, friends, and support systems that have led me here, but I will use the words of my grandmother, Patricia Lee Sappie, from her diary and editorial she wrote to offer a glimpse into what they have taught me.

I believe very strongly that God gives to each of us a gift and I believe mine was to see the goodness in others. Part of seeing that goodness is celebrating what makes each of us different and valuing those qualities equally. When I was ten or eleven and attending a church service in Kentucky, a woman stood up and thanked God she was not born black. Even at my fairly young age, God gave me the wisdom to see this as wrong. I'm sure changes must be made.

In the workplace, are women not worth as much as a man if we perform the same tasks? Will we be given the opportunity to prove ourselves? In places of worship, aren't we taught in the Kingdom of God there is no male no female? Then why is our Holy *Mother* Church so dominated by men? Women make no decisions at the highest levels. I don't think God really approves of this.

On my journey through life, I've failed, big and little, but the times I've been lukewarm is my greatest regret. I am proud that I am a woman and especially proud that many women have found the time to support the rights of a large segment of our population. Change can be accomplished through love, peace, understanding, and probably a little firmness.

Her thoughts and words in her diary and local editorial regarding gender and racial equality still apply today and continue to inspire me to continue this work into the rest of my career.

BIOGRAPHY

Alison Sappie pursued a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from North Carolina State University. It was during this time as an undergraduate student where she first identified her passion for helping others through her coursework, career assessment, and work with the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Lab. Following the completion of her bachelor's degree, she began graduate coursework in counseling at East Carolina University. During this time, she assisted in opening the McClammy Counseling Laboratory, the counselor education program's first on-site counseling training clinic. In addition, she served a diverse range of clients in both community mental health and university settings. She earned her master's degree in Clinical Mental Health Counseling from East Carolina University in the summer of 2013.

As a doctoral student at North Carolina State University, Alison engaged in diverse experiences to expand her teaching, research, and counseling skills. She counseled students on academic probation, worked with college students below the national poverty level, and in the Fraternity and Sorority Life office at Duke University. There she was able to serve Greek students through mentorship, advising, and programming. Alison was able to combine her research interests with her practice through (a) programming that addressed cultural norms that promote gender violence, (b) organizing a luncheon series for Greek women that brought together women of all ages and roles on campus for fellowship and discussion with the Duke Women's Center, (c) teaching a Greek emerging leaders course focusing on social justice and bystander intervention, and (d) supporting the It's On Us campaign in the Greek community.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There have been so many people who have provided me with guidance and support throughout my journey as a doctoral student and during the dissertation process. I cannot thank them enough for believing in me or the ways they have touched my life.

To my father, Paul, thank you for showing me how women deserve to be treated by the world and passing along your love of planning.

To my mother, Kerry, thank you for modeling selfless compassion and how to be there for others unconditionally.

To my brother, Brian, thank you for teaching me to always stand up for myself and what I believe.

To my grandparents, Edgar and Elaine, thank you for instilling in me the importance of education and helped me in endless ways to reach my goals.

To my grandparents, Paul and Patricia, thank you for fighting for gender and racial equality and passing that legacy on to me.

To Brendan, thank you for challenging me to grow and the encouragement to step outside my comfort zone to experience all life has to offer.

To Madison, thank you for teaching me you don't always have to be perfect, you just have to show up for the ones you love.

To Robin, thank you to showing me that self-care really matters, leading me to grow, and being a shining example of the important work of our counseling profession.

To Aisha Al-Qimlass, Beth Davis, Beth Vincent, and Giovanni Haertel, my amazing NCSU classmates, thank you for being by my side every step of the way through the ups and downs of this journey. I would not have survived without you.

To my fraternity and sorority life colleagues, thank you for welcoming me into your world with open arms and pushing me grow.

To my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Edwin Gerler, thank you for your dedication, encouragement, and steadfast belief that I could do this, along with your sacrifice of not retiring before I finished.

To my committee members, Dr. Marc Grimmert, Dr. Helen Lupton-Smith, and Dr. Angela Smith, thank you for your invaluable perspectives on my dissertation and endless compassion throughout this process.

To the greater Counselor Education faculty and staff, thank you for your time in and out of the classroom and for turning me into a researcher.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Need and Rationale for the Study.....	2
Significance of the Study.....	2
Research Questions	3
Key Terms Defined	3
Organization of the Study.....	7
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
Greek Life: History and Culture.....	8
Background: Formation of the Four Councils.....	8
Individual Aspects of Greek Life	12
Cultural Aspects of Greek Life.....	16
Objectification Theory.....	22
Theoretical Model	22
Assumptions and Usefulness.....	24
Research Supporting the Theoretical Model	25
Generalizability and Integration of Multiculturalism and Diversity Concepts	26
Objectification in Greek Life.....	28
Gender Roles in Greek Life.....	28
Masculine Status and Fraternities: Predominately White	30
Self-objectification of Sorority Women: Excludes NPHC and MGC.....	30
Intersectionality	30
CHAPTER 3: METHODS	33
Phenomenological Research Methods.....	33
Research Questions	35
Participants	35
Population of Interest	35
Sample	36
Instrumentation.....	36
Demographic Questionnaire.....	36
Question Construction	37
Procedure.....	38
Participant Recruitment	38
Data Collection.....	38
Data Analysis.....	39
Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research.....	40
Credibility.....	40
Dependability	40
Transferability	41
Confirmability Through My Positionality Statement.....	41
Summary.....	44
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF DATA.....	45

- Individual Themes 45
 - Individual Themes: Garrett..... 46
 - Individual Themes: Jack..... 53
 - Individual Themes: Anthony 59
 - Individual Themes: Lilly 66
 - Individual Themes: Wesley 72
 - Individual Themes: Jasmine 77
 - Individual Themes: Faith..... 82
 - Individual Themes: Sophia..... 93
- Composite Themes 98
 - Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining..... 101
 - Structural Theme 2: Social Status 106
 - Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification 108
 - Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Council by Race 115
 - Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Homogenous 120
 - Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification..... 122
- CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND OUTCOMES 124
 - Summary..... 124
 - Summary..... 124
 - Findings that Differ from Literature Review..... 125
 - Limitations..... 129
 - Implications 130
 - Implications to Society 130
 - Implications to Profession 130
 - Implications to Education..... 132
 - Implications to Researcher 133
 - Outcomes 133
 - Future Studies 133
- REFERENCES 136
- APPENDICES 144
 - Appendix A. Participant Demographic Questionnaire 145
 - Appendix B. Initial Interview Questions 148
 - Appendix D. Interview Protocol After Expert Panel Input 152
 - Appendix E. Recruitment Email..... 156
 - Appendix F. Informed Consent 158

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Composite effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 1: new members joining.....	120
Table 2	Composite effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 2: social status.....	121
Table 3	Composite effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 3: structures that support objectification	122
Table 4	Composite effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 4: segregation of councils by race	124
Table 5	Composite effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 5: diverse versus monolithic	125
Table 6	Composite effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 6: protective factors against objectification	126

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Greek life at American universities consists of social fraternal organizations that are primarily single sex organizations divided into four councils. The Interfraternity Council (IFC) and Panhellenic Association (Panhellenic) consists of historically and predominately White fraternities and sororities, respectively. The National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) encompasses the historically and predominately Black fraternities and sororities, also known as Black Greek Letter Organizations (BGLOs). The Multicultural Greek Council (MGC) is typically a council for all other Greek Organizations including Asian and Latinx fraternities and sororities and may be known by different names depending on the university.

Each Greek council has a unique culture and set of norms for how they operate, due to the history of their formation, identities of their members, and goals of the organization. Research referring generally to fraternities and sororities usually only studies IFC and Panhellenic groups and does not address the other two councils (e.g. Armstrong, 2015; Corprew & Mitchell, 2014; Harper, S. & Harris, F. III., 2010). Research on BGLOs and Multicultural organizations typically examines the culture for those groups separate from their involvement in the larger Greek community (e.g. Allen, W. R., 1992; D'Augelli, A. R. & Hershberger, S. L., 1993). Aspects of Greek culture that describe the experience of Greek life include recruiting their members, the pledging process, hazing, rituals, values of the organization, and social life. These characteristics occur in all four councils, but can be described using different terminology and can be displayed in distinct ways. Commonly IFC and Panhellenic groups are not aware of the cultural differences in NPHC and MGC, as NPHC and MGC's knowledge of IFC and Panhellenic often comes from popular culture images of Greek life.

Reflecting the larger college campus community and society in general, objectification of women occurs in the Greek community. Fredrickson and Roberts's (1997) objectification theory

is a model used to describe the social and cultural factors that lead to women being reduced to their bodies as objects. Objectification is propagated through interactions between men and women, the media, and cultural messages. As a result of objectification, women internalize this scrutiny as their own view of their physical selves. Objectification and self-objectification do not occur in the same way for everyone or result in the same negative consequences because of the different identities, such as race, that exist within the framework of objectification (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

Need and Rationale for the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine objectification of college women in the Greek system through an intersectional lens. This study uses a phenomenological approach to gather experiences of objectification and self-objectification through the voices of members of the Greek community. Greek life is organized into four councils with organizations segregated by gender and predominately one race. There are both common cultural norms across all four councils and distinct cultures within each council. If objectification of women in the Greek system is only studied by looking at the predominately White Greek organizations, the intragroup differences in Greek life are ignored and the full scope of this phenomenon is not captured. By observing what objectification looks like across all four Greek councils, we can begin to fully understand how objectification occurs in this environment.

Significance of the Study

Understanding the phenomenon of the unique ways gender and race interact within the culture of the Greek system to produce objectification of women is the first step in being able to create interventions aimed at shifting this norm. Past studies have examined objectification of college women, the impact of gender and race on objectification, and Greek culture, but how these processes interact in the four Greek councils has yet to be studied. Previous research on

objectification of women in the Greek system has only described the experience in predominately White Greek organizations (e.g. (Basow, Foran, & Bookwala, 2007; Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017; Rolnik, Engeln-Maddox, & Miller, 2010). These studies have only looked at one aspect of Greek culture such as parties and have reported either male or female perspectives. By incorporating many facets of Greek life and both objectification and self-objectification within a community, we can see how these pieces interact to create a larger phenomenon. Studies on the culture of BGLOs have not examined objectification and research on multicultural Greek organizations is extremely limited.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

What role does council membership and race play in male college students' experiences of objectification of women in the Greek System?

Research Question 2

What role does council membership and race play in women college students' experiences of self-objectification in the Greek System?

Research Question 3

In what ways is objectification similar and different when comparing Greek councils?

Key Terms Defined

Objectification

The construct of sexual objectification is proposed as when “a woman’s body, body parts, or sexual functions are separated out from her person, reduced to the status of mere instruments, or regarded as if they were capable of representing her” (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 175). Self-objectification is when individuals “internalize an observer’s perspective on self” and “view

themselves as objects or sights to be appreciated by others” (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 179-180).

Objectifying gaze

Objectifying gaze is defined as being looked at with “sexually evaluative commentary” (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 175). This concept of objectifying gaze manifests itself in interactions between men and women, is modeled in advertisements with men looking directly at their female counterpart while the woman is looking elsewhere, and through displaying women in the media with the focus on the body or body parts more often than men. Habitual body monitoring is described by persistent checking of the body’s outward appearance (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 180).

Intersectionality

Situated in Critical Race Theory and Black feminist conceptions of power and identity, intersectionality is the notion that different identity lenses, such as race and gender, interact to describe the experiences of marginalization and privilege for individuals. Intersectionality is rooted in the examination of how racism and sexism function together to compound the oppression of Black women (Crenshaw, 1991).

Council

The self-governing body over a group of social fraternities and sororities on a college campus that is connected nationally depending on the council. Colleges typically have four different councils.

Interfraternity Council (IFC)

Historically White fraternities’ council with seventy-five different fraternities nationally (Enanoza, 2013).

Multicultural Greek Council (MGC)

Council for any chapters that do not fit into the other three councils. MGC is not connected to a national governing body and may go by a different name depending on the campus. Chapters in this council tend to have separate national councils grouped to the racial interest of the chapter.

National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC)

Historically Black fraternities and sororities' council with nine international Greek letter organizations (Enanoza, 2013).

Panhellenic Council

Historically White sororities' council with twenty-six different sororities nationally (Enanoza, 2013).

Brother

Name for other members of the fraternity (Enanoza, 2013).

Sister

Name for other members of the sorority (Enanoza, 2013).

Soror

NPHC sororities' term for other members of the sorority Name for other members of the fraternity (Enanoza, 2013).

Neophyte (Neo)

An abbreviated term for the Greek work "neophyte." A neophyte is a new member.

Prophyte

A prophyte is someone who has been a member of the organization for a year or more, or someone who has initiated members.

AKA

A member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.

Alpha

A member of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc.

Delta

A member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

Iota

A member of Iota Phi Theta Fraternity, Inc.

Kappa or Nupe

A member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc.

Omega or Que

A member of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc.

Sigma

A member of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc.

SGRho

A member of Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority, Inc.

Zeta

A member of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc.

Intake

The process NPHC and MGC chapters perform to recruit, interview, choose and educate new members.

Line Sister/Line Brother

Someone who went through the intake process with you.

Recruitment

The process in IFC and Panhellenic of selection between a prospective member and an active chapter. Recruitment used to be referred to as rush.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation consists of five chapters. The first chapter provided an introduction to Greek life and the theoretical frameworks of objectification and intersectionality used in this study. This chapter also identifies the need and rationale of this study, the significance of the study, the research questions, and definitions key terms. The second chapter presents the historical and cultural context of Greek life and reviews previous literature on objectification, and intersectionality. The third chapter outlines the methodology of the study, including research questions, participant selection, instrumentation, data collection and analysis procedures, and measures to establish trustworthiness. The fourth chapter reports the findings of this study. The fifth chapter discusses the results in relation to previous research and presents limitations and areas for future research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Greek Life: History and Culture

Background: Formation of the Four Councils

Interfraternity Council (IFC). Fraternities originated from the Freemasons in the 1300s with traditions of housing, rituals, secrecy, social discrimination, and being open only to White men that are still reflected in their culture today. Fraternities can also be traced back to literary societies, with the first being an academic debate club at Yale University in 1753 that promoted intellectualism, writing, and speaking skills that were not included in the college curriculum at the time. When these academic skills of analysis were moved into the college classroom and the original purpose of literary societies was no longer needed, the societies became more social to fill another void in the university experience (Enanoza, 2013). Since these precursor organizations were structured around male social identity they “promoted solidarity among men, reinforced men's separation from women, and thus validated and facilitated the exercise of masculine power” (Clawson, 1986, p. 41). These fraternal orders had rituals for joining similar to rituals of today where the men are blindfolded, dressed in a uniform way to separate individual identity, vulnerable and required to pass some test to be transformed (Clawson, 1986).

As women began to form their own social organizations, auxiliary fraternal women's organizations were created and were tied to the existing fraternal organizations. Many men were opposed to women's organizations being formed, but through persistence women fought for their right to socialize in public and self-govern their organizations. Generally, women who joined had to have a familial connection to a man in the fraternal order connected to their organization instead of being evaluated for her own qualities. The fraternal women's organizations had joining rituals that did not place them in a vulnerable position or require them to display courage

and only focused on the lessons, signs, and passwords of the organization, a difference also seen in sororities today (Clawson, 1986; Becque, F. D., 2002).

The first official fraternity was Phi Beta Kappa, established at Wesley and Mary College in 1776 and expanded to other American universities over the next decade. Many of the cultural aspects of historically White fraternities were present at this time, including providing social support away from home, advocating students to the university administration, consuming alcohol, having parties, and casual sex. Other cultural traditions of fraternal organizations also existed at this time and modeled after the Freemasons, such as rituals, pins, badges, initiation, and mottos. Much like university administrations of today, they questioned the elitism and benefit of these organizations on campus (Enanoza, 2013).

Panhellenic. In the 1830s as college and universities became co-educational, fraternities decided generally not to admit women, resulting in the first national women's fraternal organization, Pi Beta Phi, in 1867 at Monmouth College. Sororities mimicked the same elitism and traditions of fraternities and were only open to White women. Seven sororities in 1891 formed the first umbrella organization to serve to regulate the recruitment process and is now called the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC). A few years later the fraternities of the time formed their own umbrella organization that is presently called the North-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC). On campus, this group of fraternities is typically called the Interfraternity Council (IFC) and the NPC sororities are called Panhellenic. Both of these governing bodies implemented policies that excluded racial and religious minorities from joining. These policies remained until 1960s, so excluded students formed their own fraternities, sororities, and councils. This culture of discrimination still influences fraternities and sororities today, with the majority of students in Panhellenic and IFC organizations being White (Enanoza, 2013).

National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC). The Black fraternity movement developed from the rejection of Black students in predominately White Greek organizations, which reflected the larger culture at the time of racism, discrimination, and classism (Brown, 2013). The first African American fraternity was Alpha Kappa Nu in 1903 at Indiana University, also known under the name of Kappa Alpha Nu, which then changed to Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. in 1911. Other African American fraternities, Sigma Pi Phi, Gamma Phi, and Pi Gamma Omicron, were also formed during this period, but do not exist today. Since Alpha Kappa Nu did not become Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. until later, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., established in 1906 at Cornell University, holds the title today as the first African American fraternity. During this time at Cornell, Black students were not allowed to use student housing, university facilities, or participate in athletics or White social groups. The purpose of the Black Greek letter organizations (BGLOs) formed at primarily White institutions (PWIs) was to create a community of support in the racist culture of the university. At historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), BGLOs originated with the first African American sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. at Howard University in 1908 to support women through the stress and challenges they faced. Five other BGLOs were formed over the next thirty years, Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. in 1911, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. in 1913, Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. in 1914, and Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. in 1920 all at Howard University, and Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority, Inc. in 1922 at Butler University. Four of the BGLOs at Howard University formed the governing body, National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), in 1930 and were joined by the other four BGLOs over the next decade. Iota Phi Theta Fraternity, Inc. was formed in 1963 at Morgan State University and joined NPHC in 1997 when these BGLO became known as the Divine Nine (Enanoza, 2013).

Multicultural Greek Council (MGC). The next racial minority fraternal groups to develop were Asian Americans with 11 fraternities and sororities existing between 1915 and 1970 and were divided by national origin. After these organizations closed down Pan-Asian groups emerged on the West coast in the 1980s and 1990s with Lambda Phi Epsilon Fraternity, Inc. and alpha Kappa Delta Phi Sorority, Inc. As the Asian American population on college campuses grew, so did Asian American fraternal organizations to serve as supportive communities with similar cultural values. Today there are over 64 Asian American fraternal organizations under the governing body called the National Asian Pacific Islander American Panhellenic Association (NAPA) (Enanoza, 2013).

Following a similar timeline to NAPA fraternal organizations are the Latinx fraternal organizations that existed between 1898 and 1973 when a period of inactivity existed until they resurfaced and grew in the 1980s and 1990s. The first Latino fraternity was Phi Iota Alpha Fraternity, Inc. that originated under several different names. Lambda Theta Alpha Latin Sorority, Inc. and Lambda Theta Phi Latin Fraternidad were formed in 1975 at Kean University followed by Lambda Sigma Upsilon Fraternity, Inc. in 1979 at Rutgers University. In the 1980's the following organizations were founded: Alpha Psi Lambda, the first co-ed Latino fraternity in 1985 at Ohio State University, Lambda Theta Nu sorority in 1986 at California State University Chico, Sigma Lambda Beta International fraternity in 1986 at University of Iowa, and Kappa Delta Chi sorority in 1987 at Texas Tech University. In the 1990s, two Latino fraternities and seventeen Latina sororities were founded.

Originally there were two governing bodies for Latinx fraternal organizations, that were established in 1991 and 1998, but they merged in 2001 and are called the National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (NALFO). Like the organizations that came before them, they fulfilled the need of social support that was lacking due to racial discrimination and cultural

differences. Latinx fraternal organizations modeled their Greek culture after NPHC organizations with call signs, letter jackets, stepping, strolling, and line numbers and also incorporated the Spanish language into their traditions (Enanoza, 2013).

Individual Aspects of Greek Life

Recruitment and Intake. While there are several different reasons students choose to join fraternities and sororities, common themes include bonds of friendship, a community of support for the unique challenges students face based on their identities, familial traditions, and social status. The rituals and requirements for joining are designed to forge deep bonds with members and connect them to the traditions of the organization. Members are held to higher expectations than just friendship through brotherhood or sisterhood (Handler, 1995). Recruitment and membership into Greek organizations continues the history of “reproducing racial/ethnic, sexual identity, class, and gender inequalities through their practices and organizational structures” (Berkowitz and Padavic, 1999; Stompler and Martin, 1994). People of color who join predominately White organizations typically use a strategy of cultural “accommodation to a Eurocentric, dominative, and oftentimes sexist order” (Chen, 1998, p. 56) and their ethnic, racial, and gender identities are suppressed to be a part of the organization. Non-White members struggle with “their ability to frame themselves as equal and belonging Greek brothers and sisters” (Hughey M. W., 2010, p. 653) and “patterned reproduction of their racial and ethnic identities as essentially different and inferior” (Hughey M. W., 2010, p. 653).

Joining a Greek organization was once formally called pledging, but National organizations have moved away from this terminology because of its negative association with hazing members in order to join. Informally, this language is still used and the same practices are still happening, but these activities have moved underground. Officially pledging is now called recruitment for IFC and Panhellenic organizations and intake for NPHC and MGC organizations.

For IFC and Panhellenic organizations, recruitment is typically structured in rounds where potential and current members from all the organizations meet and gradually narrow how many chapters they are meeting (Armstrong, 2015). For NPHC and MGC organizations, it would be very taboo for potential members to express interest in more than one organization. The culture of these organizations values a strong commitment to the values of one organization because membership extends beyond the college years. Explicitly expressing interest to the organization is also frowned upon, so there is a mutual and subtle communication process by which potential members and organizations show interest in one another (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011).

Hazing. Hazing has a long history in fraternities and sororities that can be traced to hazing of freshman on college campuses. When this practice was banned in the 1920s because of student pressure, hazing was incorporated into the secret pledging process of Greek organizations (Peoples, 2011). According to the 2008 National Survey of Student Hazing, seventy three percent of fraternity or sorority members experienced at least one hazing incident (Allen & Madden, 2010). Hazing is justified as a way to bond members as they join the organization and prove members are willing to sacrifice for the organization. Alumni send mixed messages around hazing, where they publicly denounce this practice, but make it known within the organization that this process is required. Alumni pressure to haze is typically stronger than the pressure from members in the organization because of hazing's historical significance in the traditions of the organization. Alumni view the experience of being hazed as a critical step in the process of joining and creating a similar experience.

While hazing is a part of the culture of Greek organizations, there are some differences across the councils in how members are hazed. Hazing across fraternities and sororities include sleep deprivation, isolation, sex acts, rape, beatings, paddling, skin brandings, forced drinking games, forced consumption of toxic substances, water boarding, and psychological trauma

(Armstrong, 2015). There are also behaviors that are classified as lighter forms of hazing with the intent to embarrass new members or put them in a position of servitude (Armstrong, 2015). In NPHC organizations, hazing typically manifests by standing in single file lines, dressing alike, marching around campus, running errands, paddling, carrying bricks, and more physical hazing than their White counterparts. NPHC organizations use hazing as a tool to promote the value of the organization over the individual by using humiliation to strip away individual pride and develop loyalty. If one pledge does something wrong, the whole line is punished to reinforce the need for unity and the understanding that their actions will affect the whole group, which is particularly salient for the Black community (Peoples, 2011). In Panhellenic sororities, hazing is more commonly exhibited by the behaviors classified as lighter hazing, but can cause just as much harm as other hazing behaviors (Armstrong, 2015).

Social Life. The social structure of Greek life and the value placed on brotherhood and sisterhood encourages friendships within the organization and can limit outside friendships. The exclusivity of Greek life created by social status, access to resources, social events for members only, and costs of membership foster a divide between Greek and non-Greek members (Handler, 1995). Greek life also plays a large role in promoting and structuring the relationships between men and women (Handler, 1995).

In primarily White organizations, men are the focal point of sorority life by being paired with big brothers in fraternities during pledging and weekly mixers. Mixers are parties open only to the fraternity and sorority involved and attendance is required for members regardless of their relationship status outside the organization, therefore promoting relationships within the Greek community. These mixers are only held in fraternity controlled environments because of national rules not allowing sororities to host parties with alcohol, creating a potentially dangerous power dynamic where women do not have control over the safety of the environment. This system of

mixing generates the exchange of alcohol provided by fraternity men for sex with sorority women (Handler, 1995; Stompler & Martin, 1994). Parties open to students outside of the Greek community are typically also hosted by the fraternities and typically only non-affiliated women are allowed to attend, further reinforcing an unsafe environment where fraternity men are in control. Formals also promote the culture of forced heterosexual relationships where sororities gain social status based on how many of their sisters are invited and the social status of the fraternity hosting the formal (Handler, 1995).

Personal Development. Greek organizations are self-governing, which gives members the opportunity to serve in leadership positions and develop their leadership skills (Armstrong, 2015). The support, resources, and sense-of-belonging offered by these organizations aid in students' degree completion and membership is correlated with higher educational gains (Astin, 1993; Braxton, 2000; Oseguera & Rhee, 2009). Greek membership also increases citizenship within the local community, philanthropy, cognitive abilities, and interpersonal skills compared to non-affiliated students (Pike, 2003). Research on these benefits of Greek life fails to address the impact of the unique culture of the four councils and what the influence of Greek life is specific to the type of organization (Brown, 2013, p. 102).

How the college campus administrators, who help support and develop Greek students, perceive and treat members differs between primarily White Greek organizations and BGLOS. In one study, both campus administrators held greater role expectations for being social and serving as a mentor/resource for members of BLGOs than members of primarily White Greek organizations. Members of BGLOs also perceive they are held to a higher standard as "students, leaders, community servants, disciplinarian, and campus supporters" (Tyler, 1990), but campus administrators did not report this difference. Interestingly, when asked how members of the different race Greek organizations were held to these standards, both groups reported that they

felt campus administrators were more stringent with their own groups in all areas except for discipline. Campus administration holding higher and unrealistic expectations for Black Greeks will lead to conflict and distrust between them and mirror the other systemic practices that disadvantage these students (Tyler, 1990). When examining overall treatment by the university (Ray & Rosow, 2012), IFC privileges such as large community size, centralized housing, and financially influential alumni offer “a hyper level of invisibility and unaccountability” (Ray & Rosow, 2012). In contrast, the small community of NPHC fraternity men and “obligation Black fraternity men perceive having to be the ideal Black student” (Ray & Rosow, 2012, p. 66) creates the opposite effect of hyper visibility and accountability (Ray, 2012; Ray & Rosow, 2012).

Cultural Aspects of Greek Life

Interfraternity Council (IFC). A commonly held view of these fraternity men is they are “drunken, promiscuous, academically disengaged lovers of pornography, sports, and video games who rape women, physically assault each other, vandalize buildings on campus, and dangerously risk their lives pledging sexist, racially exclusive, homophobic fraternities” (Harper & Harris, 2010, p. 10). This negative stereotype does reflect some of this fraternity culture accurately, with research showing that predominantly White fraternity cultures “produced and reinforced negative beliefs, attitudes, and behavior towards women and gay male students” (Rhoads, 1995) and a long-standing history of racial discrimination in recruitment practices and social events (Chang & DeAngelo, 2002; De Los Reyes & Rich, 2003; Gist, 1995; Horowitz, 1952; Lee, 1955).

Research has also shown alternate cultural norms in some White fraternities that “espoused an ethic that embraced racial diversity, disdained homophobia, and required its members to treat women with respect” and “members were observed consistently enacting these virtues” (Harris & Harper, 2014, p. 705). These IFC fraternities foster productive masculinity

through a strong commitment to values of respect and responsibility, genuine care for one another's growth, and a desire to challenge the negative stereotypes about fraternities. In these fraternities, the brothers hold each other accountable and pride themselves on disrupting problematic behaviors, such as sexism, homophobia, and racism, that do not align with the fraternity's values (Harris & Harper, 2014). When examining the culture of IFC fraternities, a monolithic view of the community misrepresents the various ways that the idea of brotherhood exists and the behaviors IFC fraternity men promote (Handler, 1995).

Panhellenic. Similar to the ways that predominately White fraternities shape and reinforce ideas about masculinity, predominately White sororities influence members' construction of womanhood and their relationship to men. Within this structure, women are faced with the conflicting messages of supporting one another through sisterhood and internalized sexist ideas of competition. Sorority women struggle with viewing their sorority sisters as both someone they can lean on when facing the unique challenges of being a woman and distrust when navigating power and romantic relationships. The bonds of sisterhood serve as a social contract as a way to navigate competing for male attention based on "assumptions about women's nature (they are competitive and backbiting), scarcity of resources (men), and the need for at least some social form (the sorority) to regulate a natural tendency toward bloody competition" (Handler, 1995, p. 242). The sorority collectively works to attract men and members tend to view the sorority as an asset in pursuing quality romantic partners. These social rules promote the idea that the sorority members are allies when navigating gendered competition while reinforcing negative gender stereotypes about women (Handler, 1995).

While Panhellenic women view their bonds of sisterhood as a strategy to dating, they perceive brotherhood as an even stronger bond that is unaffected by relationships with women. Panhellenic sorority women gain social value through monogamous relationships with fraternity

men and have to balance a very narrow range of acceptable sexual behavior. The idea of a collective sexual reputation creates a culture where sisters police one another for their sexual activity. Fraternity men do not face this same stigma and use brotherhood to devalue their relationships with women. This double standard reinforces the unequal power dynamics between predominately White fraternities and sororities (Handler, 1995). This power dynamic that reinforces sexism also influences these sororities to adopt some of the same practices of racial discrimination and heterosexism in their organizations (Edwards, 2009; Schmitz & Forbes, 1994).

National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC). NPHC fraternities and sororities have many characteristics that distinguish them from IFC and Panhellenic organizations. Their history has always been tied to civil rights activism, protesting government policies through the formation of the American Council on Human Rights (ACHR), partnerships with the NAACP, gathering of resources, and efforts to educate Black communities. This activism has been criticized for being too passive and representing only economically privileged African Americans who were too involved in extravagant social events. Membership into BGLOs was shaped by colorism, and restricted to those with who came from elite families, certain occupations, and were well educated (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011).

Membership into BGLOs is a uniquely lifelong experience compared to other Greek organizations that extends the community far beyond the collegiate years. BGLO are an important part of many Black communities, offering “refuge, networking, and pride, and have given thousands of men and women a sense of purpose and mission” (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011, p. 114). A majority of BGLO members are also heavily involved with their churches and report that their Christian faith is central to their approach to life, despite the false assumption held by some outside the Greek community that a commitment to BGLOs is

incompatible with Christianity. Many of the values of BGLOs are congruent with Christianity and offer members an avenue for enacting their religious beliefs.

Research has long shown the challenges for Black students in higher education and specifically at PWIs (Allen, 1992; D'Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996). BLGOs offer a way for Black students to navigate “their identities as members of their respective organization and being a member of an underrepresented student population at a PWI” (Brown, 2013, p. 106), and also benefit the larger Black community on campus. BLGOs “foster a sense of collective social support, collegiate engagement, and life purpose in members” (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011, p. 97), but can also have negative consequences of “emotional and physical stress or trauma, cognitive issues, and sociocultural policing” (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011, p. 96). Black Greek Letter Fraternities (BGLFs) “endorse an ideal image of African American men as in control, unemotional, and invulnerable” (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011, p.101-102) where members are pressured to be hypermasculine, aloof, and authentically Black. Masculinity in these organizations rewards verbal and physical violence in hazing and members use rituals to prove themselves as men. This image of Black masculinity creates conflict between Afrocentric and White views of masculinity, along with restrictive stereotypes of African American men (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011).

BLGOs have a deeper connection and sense of pride associated with cultural signs of their organization than their White counterparts. Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc. is connected to Egyptian imagery to represent their historical linkage to Africa, Kappa Alpha Psi, Fraternity, Inc. is known for using a cane in their step shows, along with being nicknamed playboys or pretty boys, and Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. is identified by references to a dog. Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc. is also associated with the image of an ape, which is problematic given the history of Black people being dehumanized by comparing them to apes. These symbols show up

in branding, step shows, line names, and chants of the organizations. The idea of Kappas as pretty boys is portrayed when members “affirm their aesthetic qualities or projections, demonstrate dominance, exploit women’s sexuality, and assert their own competitive edge over other fraternities and other non-Greek-affiliated men” (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011, p.126). The term “pretty” contradicts the ideas of masculinity expected of BGLOs, but is deemed acceptable by pairing it with language that asserts their status, opposition to femininity, and heterosexual commentary. Similar to the negative associations with ape imagery, Omegas being associated with a dog has been rejected by the national organization and is a metaphor for “bad boys” who are hypermasculine (Hughey, Parks, & Skoepol, 2011).

Multicultural Greek Council (MGC). With the current wave of MGC organizations established in the 1980s, organizations in this council are still in the early stages of developing their identity and structure compared to the other three councils. Since most of their founding members and alumni are younger, these organizations do not have the cultural history and financial resources that older alumni and time bring (Rodriguez, 1995, p. 2). Many long-time Chicano and Latinx campus activists propose the reason Latinx Greek life did not take hold until the 1980s is because of “discrimination, segregation and the long history of anti-Black and anti-Latino actions by Greek-letter organizations” and campuses nationwide (Rodriguez, 1995, p. 3). Since MGC consists of organizations divided into several different cultures, does not have a national council, and looks very different depending on the college campus, they struggle with feeling unified and lack a strong bond to their council compared to the other councils. Some MGC organizations will host events to teach members about the history of their racial or cultural group, but typically only members of that group attend, further dividing the council (McCabe, 2011). MGC is a council for all social Greek organizations on campus that do not fit into IFC, Panhellenic, and NPHC councils, but most Asian and Latinx organizations would prefer to be on

individual councils with NAPA and NALFO organizations (Hunter, 2011). This usually is not possible with only one or two organizations from those national councils present at a college and without the resources to support multiple very small councils. While some MGC organizations embrace the traditions adapted from NPHC organizations, others want to distance themselves from traditions such as stepping and strolling and believe it makes them appear to be ghetto, hard, and focused on superficial activities (Hunter, 2011, p.17).

Many MGC organizations differ from their counterparts with mission statements “promoting multiculturalism, focusing on education, and promoting social change” (McCabe, 2011, p. 526). Members of MGC organizations typically join because of multiculturalism or ethnic pride, whereas their White members join organizations for the activities they are known for (Hunter, 2011, p. 26). MGC members also perceive their brotherhood and sisterhood as more sincere and that they are more committed to service than members of IFC or Panhellenic organizations (Hunter, 2011, p.27). MGC members are more likely to recognize the impact of race, gender, sexual identity, and religion than IFC and Panhellenic organizations and strive to celebrate these differences. Specifically, individual organizations that are multicultural work to breakdown the race and gender divide present in other Greek organizations. One organization studied demonstrated this by informal interactions across race, gender and culture, formal education programming, and by having more friendships and relationships across racial and cultural lines than the larger student body (McCabe, 2011). Multicultural organizations spend time learning about different cultures, but because of their nature, they don’t provide a safe cultural space in the same way the other three councils do. In contrast, MGC groups that are structured around a racial or cultural identity offer the same sense of support and place to call home among the stressors of navigating a PWI as a person of color that NPHC groups do (Chen, 1998).

Objectification Theory

Theoretical Model

Fredrickson and Roberts's (1997) objectification theory is a framework used to examine the experiences of women being sexually objectified through a sociocultural lens. Objectification is perpetuated through an objectifying gaze, which is defined as being looked at with "sexually evaluative commentary" (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 175). This concept of objectifying gaze manifests itself in interactions between men and women, is modeled in advertisements with men looking directly at their female counterpart while the woman is looking elsewhere, and through displaying women in the media with the focus on the body or body parts more often than men. According to this theory, others view women's bodies as objects primarily for the use by others and women typically internalize this perspective as their own view of their physical selves.

This self-objectification leads to habitual body monitoring, shame, anxiety, decreases in peak motivational states, and lowered awareness of internal physiological sensations. Habitual body monitoring is described by persistent checking of the body's outward appearance (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 180). These negative effects may contribute to the increased rates of depression, sexual dysfunction, and eating disorders and these mental illnesses tend to emerge when there are developmental body changes in women (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997).

The three main ideas that objectification theory proposes are that "women's bodies are looked at, evaluated, and always potentially objectified" (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 175), women then internalize this perspective on their physical self, resulting in self-objectification (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 177), and the "psychological and experiential consequences of sexual objectification" are shame, anxiety, lowered ability to be completely absorbed in an challenging activity due to habitual body monitoring, and decreased sensitivity to internal

physiological cues (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, pp. 181-184). Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) are careful to state that within these generalizations, women have unique experiences and factors that influence how they respond to sexual objectification, the extent to which they have internalized this perspective, and the amount of exposure of sexual objectification due to the variable contexts they come in contact with throughout their life (p. 180).

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) then posit that the framework presented by objectification can manifest in two ways: the consequences of objectification and self-objectification described earlier and “actual sexual victimization, whether through rape, incest, battering, or even sexual harassment” (p. 186) “where a woman’s body is literally treated as a mere instrument or thing by her perpetrator” (p. 186). They propose that these two sets of experiences may contribute to the increased rates of depression, sexual dysfunction, and eating disorders in women (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 185).

Assumptions and Usefulness

This theory assumes that the experience of objectification is either different in women than in men or that it does not exist for men because men are not addressed by this theory (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997). Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) also believe that the act of having a reproductively mature female body creates vulnerability for objectification for all women even though experiences and responses vary uniquely (p. 175). When using objectification theory to examine Greek life, the unique ways women are objectified will be explored.

Objectification theory is useful for describing what being objectified is and the multitude of effects it has on women. The theory is only applied to societies where objectification occurs as a part of the culture such as the United States. The article does not specify which society or culture it refers to when discussing this dimension, but being published in the United States with

authors affiliated with an American university and American college implies the United States is the society being referenced. This makes objectification theory an appropriate frame to examine this study's population. While the authors attempt to include findings on women of color and women with varying socioeconomic status when supporting their theory with evidence, they also acknowledge that most of the empirical data in existence focuses on White, middle class girls and women (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 175). Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) propose that objectification theory can be applied to all women, but that factors such as "ethnicity, class, sexuality, age, and other physical and personal attributes" (p. 174) need to be considered when doing so. This study will show the differences in how women of color in Greek life are objectified and how these experiences impact a wider range of women.

Research Supporting the Theoretical Model

Women's bodies are looked at, evaluated, and always potentially objectified" (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 175) is an idea that has already been tested and supported through research. "Studies have shown that (a) women are gazed at more than men (for a review, see Hall, 1984); (b) women are more likely to feel "looked at" in interpersonal encounters (Argyle & Wesleys, 1969); (c) men direct more non-reciprocated gaze toward women than vice versa, particularly in public places (Cary, 1978; Fromme & Beam, 1974; Henley, 1977); and (d) men's gazing is often accompanied by sexually evaluative commentary (Gardner, 1980)" (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 176). This article also cites a wealth of research that has also shown these ideas of women being observed and sexual objectification are also reflected in the media by males shown observing females and "women's bodies targeted for sexual objectification more than men" (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, pg. 176).

The concept that objectification leads to women internalizing the observer's perspective would be more difficult to measure than the previous hypothesis. Women having the viewpoint

that they are objects to be looked at could be measured through self-report data, but it would be more challenging to test the influence that objectification had on this internalization because it is proposed as a cumulative effect over time. Women would need to be observed over time at the age when they begin experiencing sexual objectification, but factoring out other variables could be an obstacle.

The emotional effects of shame and anxiety proposed by objectification theory could be measured once they are operationalized by the researcher and compared between women and men. For examining the hypothesis that because women have to habitually monitor their physical appearance they are less likely to be able to fully engage in a challenging mental or physical activity, which allow for an optimal experience and improves the quality of life (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 183), the researcher could give participants a challenging and rewarding tasks. They could then compare the experiences of men and women for their ability to be fully absorbed and gain satisfaction. For the proposition that women have lowered awareness of internal bodily states due to habitual body monitoring, studies have already supported that “in the absence of relevant contextual cues, women are less accurate than men at distracting internal physiological sensations” (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 184). While there are clear methods for testing differences between women and men with these constructs, it would be very difficult to test if sexual objectification is why these differences are present.

Generalizability and Integration of Multiculturalism and Diversity Concepts

Objectification theory attempts to be generalizable to all women who are a part of American culture, while noting that the empirical evidence is largely representative of White, middle class women (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997). Whether or not objectification theory can be generalized to girls, women of color, women of all sexual orientations, any person who would be sexually objectified by men, other socioeconomic statuses, and other cultures has not been

shown in this article. Research has been done in some of these domains, but that is beyond the scope of this paper. Expanding this research through phenomenology will be the first step in gaining understanding of objectification theory in Greek life and examining the impact of racial and gender identity in this community.

Multicultural and diversity concepts are addressed a few times throughout objectification theory. Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) caution against blindly applying this theory to women of color and other diverse subgroups since the majority of evidence presented is based on White, middle class women (p. 175). They also address that while having a female body results in a common experience, unique “combinations of ethnicity, class, sexuality, age and other physical and personal attributes undoubtedly create unique sets of experiences across women, as well as experiences shared by particular subgroups” (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 174). The theory addresses that objectification for women of color often includes racial stereotypes and that in the media the concept that the focus of women is more often on their bodies or body part and men have more focus on their faces is also reflected when comparing White versus Black individuals (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 176). When discussing the value of attractiveness, they acknowledge that the impact and power of attractiveness varies for women of color, women of lower socioeconomic status, and lesbians because they face other forms of oppression as well (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 178). Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) also report that Black women are more adept at separating observers’ evaluations from their own concept of self and propose it could be an adapt function to cope with racism (p. 179). The article also discusses that although there are differences in rates of depression across races with lifetime prevalence lower among Blacks than Whites and Hispanics, “the 2:1 gender ratio appears to hold across all three ethnic groups” (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 186). They also consider that eating disorders have often been viewed as a White, middle class problem, but the data is now showing increases

in women of color (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 190). A large portion of this article addresses the cultural ideals and values of American culture surrounding women's bodies (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997). This study will explore if these assertions hold true in the unique culture and structure of Greek life.

Objectification theory alludes to historical contexts through referencing trends in feminist theory. Political aspects of objectification theory are very briefly addressed when mentioning a Supreme Court case that showed how women might suffer discrimination in the workplace based on an unfeminine appearance (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 178). Objectification theory expands on the sociocultural concept of "the body is constructed from more than just biology" (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 174) and the social experiences and consequences of being objectified. It addresses the economic impact objectification can have on women when their power comes from their outward appearance (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997). Objectification theory also looks at the variation of prejudice and discrimination between individuals due to a wide array of factors, at the institutional level through "women's social and economic prospects can be determined by their physical appearance" (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 178), and a cultural level throughout the whole article by presenting the cultural ideals and norms for women (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997). This study hopes to hear from participants how objectification has changed since the theory was originally developed and how the social and institutional policies of Greek life impact objectification.

Objectification in Greek Life

Gender Roles in Greek Life

The gender divide in Greek life promotes traditional gender roles that will impact the existence of objectification. College is a period of exploration and formation of identity for many and the "Greek system functions effectively as a mechanism for traditional gender role

socialization” (Risman, 1982, p. 232) when college students are learning what it means to be a man or woman. The social pressures of Greek life facilitate a system upheld by the organization, college, and nationals that has different rules for IFC and Panhellenic organizations (Risman, 1982). IFC membership has been associated with hypermasculinity, which perpetuates a narrow definition of what it means to be a man in a fraternity (Corprew & Mitchell, 2014). This inequity between fraternities and sororities has not been examined in NPHC and MGC, nor has the impact of a mixed gender council on gender roles.

Studies examining how sororities enact gender roles refer to studying sorority women, but do not include participants from NPHC or MGC sororities, or specify that they are excluded as participants. One example looking at appearance in the recruitment process discusses how potential new members desire to look like members of the sororities in order to be accepted and gain the status associated with membership. The members joining predominately White sororities felt pressure to conform to stereotypical gender roles in order to be chosen for membership (Arthur, 1999).

Power differences by gender in fraternities and sororities have been examined, but again they fail to address the difference of NPHC and MGC. “Sorority women are often more affluent (similar to fraternity men) than women who are unaffiliated with a sorority, on campus, sorority women do not possess the same level of power as fraternity men because they lack essential resources” (Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017, p. 91). In the party environment between IFC and Panhellenic, fraternities are the only ones who are allowed to host parties due to Panhellenic national rules, meaning they control the theme, music, transportation, alcohol, and who can attend. Panhellenic sororities who refuse to participate in this process risk the fraternity not pairing with them for socials in the future and decreasing their social status on campus.

Only one study shows the differences between how Black and White fraternity men approach women and found that Black fraternity men display more romantic approaches and White fraternity men display more sexual approaches. Some reasons given for this distinction were the difference in community size and housings. Understanding more about the social practices of these organizations, other areas of Greek life, and from a female perspective is lacking (Ray & Rosow, 2010).

Masculine Status and Fraternities: Centered around Predominately White Organizations

A few parts of Greek culture have been examined for objectification, but again only for IFC fraternities. IFC fraternity men are more likely to possess objectifying images of women and sexist cultural artifacts (e.g., life-size inflatable dolls; (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998) and use degrading sexual language to refer to women's bodies (Bleecker & Murnen, 2005; Murnen, 2000). Expanding the context to where this shows up and if it occurs in NPHC and MGC fraternities is key to understanding the whole picture of objectification by fraternities.

Self-objectification of Sorority Women: Research Excludes NPHC and MGC Differences

Comparing women who participated in Panhellenic sorority rush and those who did not, rush participants showed higher levels of self-objectification (Rolnik, Engeln-Maddox, & Miller, 2010). Looking at self-objectification once Panhellenic women are members, they continue to experience higher levels of self-objectification compared to their non-affiliated counterparts (Basow, Foran, & Bookwala, 2007). Hearing the stories of how the recruitment process and membership could lead to increases in self-objectification and comparing to intake in NPHC and MGC would add to the understanding of this phenomenon

Intersectionality

Objectification of women in Greek life has yet to be examined through an intersectional lens. Introduced by Kimberle Crenshaw (1991), as a way to address the marginalization of Black

women, intersectionality works to examine how multiple identity categories come together to produce a unique experience and address intragroup differences. Without intersectionality, contemporary feminist and antiracist discourses ignore how these identities interact. Crenshaw (1991) started by examining how racism and sexism interact to shape the experiences for Black women, but acknowledged this was a starting place and framework that could be used for other identities and identity categories. Systemic marginalization occurs for Black women when their identities of gender, and class make them more likely to be poor, due to unfair employment practices, pay discrepancies, and child care responsibilities, which is compounded by racially discriminatory employment and housing practices. Intervention strategies cannot just be based on one of these systems of oppression in order to be effective. The standards for services to help women who have been raped are normed on affluent White women and fail to address the different needs for women of color. Funding is allocated in a way that does not serve women of color who need more support finding resources such as housing and less funding for a victim advocate in court because they are “less likely to have their cases pursued in the criminal justice system” (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1251).

In political marginalization, “the failure of feminism to interrogate race means that the resistance strategies of feminism will often replicate and reinforce the subordination of people of color, and the failure of antiracism to interrogate patriarchy means that antiracism will frequently reproduce the subordination of women” (Crenshaw, 1991, p.1252). For example, when examining the conceptualization of rape, the false view of “all Black men as potential threats to the sanctity of White womanhood” (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1266) with animalistic violence has been used to legitimize policing of the Black community and women who allege rape are blamed for being sexually assaulted through intense scrutiny of their actions. When race and gender intersect for Black women who are raped, they are viewed as both asking to be raped because of

assumptions of promiscuity and unable to be raped because they are subhuman. Black women who accuse Black men of rape may also be ostracized by their community because of the history of violence, oppression, and false accusations of Black men surrounding rape of White women through disproportionate sentencing.

Since Crenshaw's (1991) seminal work, intersectionality research has expanded to cover other types of identity, populations and different areas of study. Dorothy and Jesudason (2013) proposed how intersectionality can bring together different marginalized groups to fight against oppression. Cho (2013) argued for intersectionality to move beyond the field of law where it originated to continue to expand to other identity categories, such as sexual orientation. Building off of Cho's (2013) ideas, Artiles (2013) proposed intersectionality being applied to disability identities and the effects the interaction of race and disabilities. Changing disciplines, Goff and Khan explain intersectionality in the context of social psychology, bias and how past research on racism and sexism has been distorted by focusing only on Black men and White women. Some researchers, including Rose (2013), Ocen (2013), Carbado, and Gulati (2013), caution against moving intersectionality beyond Black women's experiences, and implore us to gain more knowledge of their experiences.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

In order to examine the intersectionality of objectification in the Greek System, this qualitative study utilized phenomenological research methods. This chapter includes the purpose of the study, participant information, instrumentation, and procedures for pilot testing, participant recruitment, participant selection, data collection, and data analysis. Then, the measures taken to ensure the study's trustworthiness along with the researcher's statement of positionality are presented.

Phenomenological Research Methods

The goal of phenomenology is to study and describe a particular aspect(s) of the human experience. This is done by viewing the phenomenon through the perspective and experiences of participants and recognizes the unique ways that a person inside the experience construct their own perceptions. Phenomenology focuses on the viewpoint of participants through rich descriptions and participant quotes. Phenomenology was chosen for this study because of the importance of exploring the experience of objectification and self-objectification relative to Greek students and capturing the distinct voices of participants from different councils.

For phenomenology, Edmund Husserl (1931) formed the philosophical system of transcendental phenomenology which has the goal of discovering the meaning and essence with phenomena as the "building blocks of human science and the basis of all knowledge (Moustakas, 1994, p. 26). Husserl asserts "a relationship exists between what exists in conscious awareness and what exists in the world" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 27).

When examining something with intentionality, the object is perceived and influenced by the vantage point of the individual, called the noema, and is the appearance of the phenomenon. Noesis is how we are experiencing the phenomenon and interconnected with noema. Then through intuition and reflection one can discern the fullness and clarity of the phenomenon.

Husserl's transcendental phenomenology "emphasizes subjectivity and discovery of the essences of experience and knowledge" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 45). The researcher refrains from making assumptions, focuses on a specific topic with a fresh, unknowing perspective, raises a question to guide the study, and derives findings that will provide a foundation for further research and contemplation. Transcendental phenomenology provides a methodology for understanding objects as they appear to the researcher. Husserl (1931) proposes that the meaning of a phenomenon comes from the act of experiencing it. By continually perceiving and reflecting on these acts, the researcher understands the meaning of the phenomenon. Husserl (1965) explains that the perceptions that emerge from evaluating the phenomenon from different angles creates horizons, with every perception being of equal value and adding knowledge. Then the researcher uses judgement to evaluate if the horizon from that angle is possible (Moustakas, 1994).

The first step of phenomenological research is Epoche, the freedom from suppositions. In the Epoche "we set aside our prejudgments, biases, and preconceived ideas about things" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 85). By suspending previous knowledge and experience, the researcher can focus on the natural attitude toward the data with every quality given equal value. With Epoche, what is left is "only my own perception, my own acts of consciousness as pointers to knowledge, meaning, and truth" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 88). Epoche can never be perfectly achieved, but the energy put into trying significantly reduces judgments and bias (Moustakas, 1994).

Then phenomenological reduction occurs, in which the research perceives and describes the phenomenon. This process involves "a prereflective description of this just as they appear and a reduction to what is horizontal and thematic" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 91). Through prereflection, reflection, and reduction, horizons emerge as statements of equal value, that are constructed into the description of the phenomenon, clustered by themes. After reduction occurs, the researcher examines the themes for possible structural themes that cluster how the

phenomenon occurs. Through the textural horizons and structural themes, the essence of the phenomenon emerges.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

What role does council membership and race play in male college students' experiences of objectification of women in the Greek System?

Research Question 2

What role does council membership and race play in women college students' experiences of self-objectification in the Greek System?

Research Question 3

In what ways is objectification similar and different when comparing Greek councils?

Participants

Population of Interest

The population of interest for the current study is university students in the United States who are members of social fraternities or sororities. This population includes students who are members of the Interfraternity Council, Multicultural Greek Council, National Pan-Hellenic Council, and Panhellenic Association. The Interfraternity Council, National Pan-Hellenic Council, and Panhellenic Association are national governing bodies. Since the Multicultural Greek Council is typically composed of all fraternities and sororities that do not belong to another Greek council on campus, it is not connected to a single national governing body, but instead several national governing bodies depending on which chapters exist at a particular university. Not all Multicultural Greek Council chapters are members of a national council. The national governing bodies that are likely to be connected to the Multicultural Greek Council are

the National Asian Pacific Islander Desi American Panhellenic Association, National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations, and National Multicultural Greek Council.

Sample

Participants were eight students from a large southern public university. The sample size was determined based on recommendations from phenomenological scholars that suggest three to ten participants (Dukes, 1984, p. 200; Munhall & C.J. Oiler, 1986, p. 85-105) are sufficient to understand their experience and to gather enough information for the researcher to view the phenomena through the eyes of the participants. Purposeful criterion sampling was used to ensure participants were representative of the four Greek councils, different chapters, and different genders. Since the purpose of the study was to understand the phenomenon of objectification in the Greek system across the four Greek councils, students who reported no experiences with objectification in the context of their Greek experience were excluded. One male and one female from each council was interviewed with every participant being from a different chapter. Participants were between the age of 20 to 22 and included one junior and seven seniors. The length of time in Greek life for participants was three with two years and five with three years. Two participants identified their ethnicity as African American or Black, four identified as Caucasian or White, and 2 identified as Hispanic or Latino. Four participants identified their gender as female and four identified their gender as male.

Instrumentation

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic information presented above was collected through a demographic questionnaire that also made sure participants met the population requirements for the study. The questionnaire was administered through Qualtrics and the link to the survey was sent in the email used to recruit participants. Open-ended questions requested participants indicate how many

years they were a member of the Greek community and the name of their chapter. The survey informed participants their chapter affiliation would not be included in the study and the purpose of this question was to have participants from different chapters. The remaining questions required forced choice responses and covered gender, objectification, ethnicity, student classification, and Greek council membership. Each forced-choice question included an option for participants to self-identify a response, except for questions about objectification which included options to not respond. Participants were also asked for either their phone number, email address, or both depending on their preference in order to contact them for participation (See Appendix A for Demographic Questionnaire).

Question Construction

Questions were constructed by the primary researcher based on interview protocols from related research (See Appendix B for original interview questions). An expert panel of three counselors with a doctorate in counseling and counselor education, one counseling doctoral student, four professionals who work in fraternity and sorority life at a university, and two professionals who work at a university women's center then reviewed the initial questions. The panel members were given a brief overview of the study and research questions before evaluating the topics and phrasing of the interview questions. Based on the panel's feedback, the researcher edited the questions (See Appendix C for edited set of questions) and then pilot tested them with eight Greek students from all four Greek Councils the researcher knows from working in fraternity and sorority life at a university. Questions were finalized based on the student feedback about clarity, applicability to their experience, and alignment with the purpose of the study (See Appendix D for final interview protocol).

Procedure

Participant Recruitment

The study was approved by the North Carolina State University Institutional Review Board prior to beginning the research study. Participants were recruited through an email sent through a listserv to all Greek students by the university's Department of Fraternity and Sorority Life. The email included a brief overview of the study, compensation information, and the web address for filling out the demographic questionnaire if the student is interested in participating (See Appendix E for Recruitment Email). Two responded after the first time the email was sent. A follow up email sent one week later with the same message, along with in person recruitment and elicited eight more responses. Out of the ten total responses, eight qualified based on their responses to the objectification questions and were sent a web link to online scheduling software, You Can Book Me, to set up an individual interview. Participants were sent two reminder emails, at one week and at one day, prior to the scheduled interview.

Data Collection

Interviews took place in a private room in the university's library. For each interview, the participant was given a copy of the informed consent (See Appendix F) to read and sign and then answered approximately 32 questions from the semi-structured interview protocol in Appendix A. All interviews were conducted by the researcher and lasted 47-77 minutes. Participants were given a \$25 gift card as compensation for their interview.

All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim within one week of the interview. Immediately after the interview was completed, the audio recording was saved as a password protected file on a password protected computer. Participants were assigned individual identification numbers to link demographic data with qualitative data. A key containing

identifying information was kept in a locked office separate from the data to prevent the participant's identity from being connected to the questionnaire or interview.

Data Analysis

All individual interviews were transcribed using the transcription service Verbal Ink, which provides transcription services for a variety of industries including academia and research. Once the interview transcripts were received, the researcher compared the transcripts to the audio recordings to verify their accuracy. All identifying information was then removed from the transcripts and the transcripts were sent to participants to review. This process of member checking increases trustworthiness of the research by confirming the participants' responses were captured correctly. Two participants responded to the request for member checking and both participants stated the transcripts were accurate with no changes needed.

The process for data analysis was modeled after Moustakas (1994) steps for phenomenological data analysis. First, the researcher bracketed their own experiences with the phenomenon through a written description so the focus could be on the participants' viewpoint and the researcher was more aware of their potential biases. During initial coding, the researcher found significant statements by participants that capture their experiences related to the phenomenon. In this initial stage, horizontalization occurred by giving all of these statements equal value. Next the researcher grouped the meaningful statements into meaning units that capture the essence of the phenomenon. Then a textural description of what the participants experienced was constructed, followed by a structural description of how the phenomenon occurred. Finally, the textural and structural descriptions were integrated to fully describe the phenomenon.

All data analysis was conducted by the researcher, but two auditors were used to offer a perspective that was more removed from the data and participants. The auditors checked the

initial codes and final themes for biased or missing conclusions by the researcher. The auditors were two counselors with a doctorate in counseling and counselor education that authored qualitative dissertations. Based on the auditors' recommendations 5 codes were added and 3 were removed during the initial coding stage. All of the researcher's themes were supported by the auditors.

Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research

Trustworthiness is a key component to qualitative research and is used to establish that the results presented by the researcher fully represent the data shared by participants. Lincoln and Guba (1985) defined four facets of trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. This section outlines how each of these areas of trustworthiness are addressed along with the researcher's positionality statement.

Credibility

Credibility verifies that the results of the study are believable from the participant's perspective. Member checking was utilized to confirm that the transcription of the interview represented the participant's perspective. Peer debriefing helped establish that the interview questions would accurately illicit responses to describe the phenomenon. External auditors were used to support the accuracy of the codes and themes.

Dependability

Dependability demonstrates the thoroughness of the research process and the suitability of methods selected. In order for readers to be able to evaluate the study for dependability, the researcher recorded all procedures and steps in the research process. Memos were used to ensure each step was accurately recorded and anything that deviated from the original research plan was updated. This allows the study to be replicated by future researchers.

Transferability

Transferability refers to how the results can be applied to other circumstances. To promote transferability, the researcher utilized a positionality statement to identify biases that may influence the study. The research also incorporated as much rich and detailed description about the participants and environment as possible, so the reader can determine if the results are applicable elsewhere.

Confirmability Through My Positionality Statement

My personal motivations for choosing this topic come from my work with college students in Greek life, past coursework and research on objectification, and a passion for supporting marginalized communities while advocating for change. I feel objectification impacts everyone and it is intriguing how variables such as sex, race, and culture impact individual's experience with objectification. Women are generally scrutinized and valued for their bodies more than men, but men are beginning to be objectified more than they were in the past. Racial and cultural values surrounding features such as skin color, ideal weight, and ideal body type create the intersectionality between gender, race, and culture for objectification. The influence of the media is also a prevalent influencer of objectification, shown by studies examining culture before and after western media is introduced. Examining objectification and self-objectification through the lens of intersectionality combines one of my areas of passion with the desire to help one of the populations of students that I currently serve. My desire to provide counseling services on a college campus after I graduate drives my inspiration and motivation for identifying this phenomenon in the Greek system. Examining the impact of pervasive objectification and the differences across the Greek community is the first step in working towards a solution.

My identity as a woman has influenced on my choice to research this topic since these issues are more prevalent in women than men. The messages that the media and our culture send

about women's bodies impact me as a woman. I can relate to the female participants of my study and the population that I want to work with because of my age and identity as a student, which increases my interest in them. My racial identity of Caucasian limits my interpretation and understanding of the experiences of people of color. Being multiculturally competent through awareness, knowledge and skills reduces this bias, but I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the influence of my racial identity.

In examining whether I am an insider or outsider in my population of interest, as a graduate student at the same university where I got my undergraduate degree, the participants are from an environment where I am very much an insider. Also, as a woman close in age to the undergraduate students, I feel it is likely that I will have common experiences with my participants. I think it will be very important that I do not jump to conclusions about what the participants share with me and really devote time to understand what they are trying to convey. I think being an insider makes it easier to make assumptions about what participants mean. I also think as an insider I will need to be extra vigilant when doing my observation. There will be more of a chance of not noticing things because I am in that environment every day. It would be helpful if I position myself as a person totally foreign to this environment and evaluate what I would need to know to really grasp what is occurring that would be helpful. I also think I will have some advantages being an insider. Participants may be more willing to share in depth or personal information with me because I can relate to their experiences. Even visually looking similar to some of my participants could help them be more open to me than an older researcher. It could lessen their fear of me not being able to understand their reality.

Alternatively, I will also appear different from participants who are male or people of color. Their identity combined with the secretive culture of Greek life may create a barrier between us. Acknowledging this and building trust will be key in obtaining meaningful

responses to my questions. Another area where I am not fully an insider is in the Greek community. I am not a member of a Greek organization, so I do not have those experiences in common with my participants. I have worked in Fraternity and Sorority Life at a university for four years, so this has provided insight, but I recognize this perspective of the community situates me differently than a member.

It is important to identify my assumptions that may affect my research to start identifying how to control for them. I have the assumption that objectification affects everyone in some way in American culture because of the persistent messages surrounding appearance that we encounter. I also assume that objectification influences women more than men because of the cultural message that women are judged more by their appearance than men and the increased number of negative messages surrounding physical appearance women face. My personal experience with objectification, working with clients on body image and objectification, and my knowledge about these constructs may influence how I interpret or understand my participants' experiences. My work with Greek students may also guide how I view the participants' experiences. I may assume I understand what they are communicating or jump to conclusions that could be inaccurate. Examining who I am as a professional and researcher will help me try to eliminate bias and also show readers my perspective when conducting this study.

Summary

Chapter three provided an overview of phenomenological research, and then it outlined the ways this approach was used to study the culture of objectification of women in the Greek system across the four Greek councils. Specifically, this chapter presented the research questions, participant information, instrumentation, and procedures. Finally, this chapter outlined the implementation of trustworthiness within the qualitative research study. The methods outlined in this chapter were used to conduct a rigorous qualitative research study.

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF DATA

Individual Themes

All of the themes present in each individual interview are presented below. They are organized first into textural themes to describe what is happening in the phenomenon of the unique ways gender and race interact within the culture of the Greek system to produce objectification of women for these participants. The textural themes were constructed from the horizons or meaning units from each interview. The theme titles describe the focus area of the interview content covered.

Individual Themes Outline

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes

Textural theme 3: recruitment and intake

Textural theme 4: reputation

Textural theme 5: unspoken

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 1: appearance focus

Textural theme 4: reputation

Textural theme 5: unspoken

Textural theme 6: change over time

Textural theme 7: status and diversity

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus

Textural theme 4: reputation

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification

Textural theme 9: self-objectification

Textural theme 10: trading sex for alcohol

Textural theme 11: trading sex for status

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 1: appearance focus

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils

Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Monolithic

Textural theme 13: different contexts

Textural theme 14: different people

Textural theme 15: cognitive dissonance

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification

Individual Themes: Garrett

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. When choosing members for his fraternity, appearance was not a top priority for his chapter. Garrett felt proud and lucky that appearance did not dictate their approach to recruitment and had a variety of men along the spectrum of attractive or not. His fraternity “knows in certain situations when [they] accept guys that people of the opposite sex will probably find them to be unattractive and not want to be associated with them, but [they] also realize that part of [their] obligation is finding a home for some of these men and offering them a bid into the organization” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. When looking at the hierarchical tiers of status in the IFC fraternities, the guys who are the most attractive and party the most are at the top tier of fraternities and prioritize recruiting members who fit those qualifications.

Textural theme 4: reputation. For Garrett's fraternity, the first event brothers have for new members is about asking pledges questions about their lives. These questions often start as general questions that lead into asking them to objectify women such as, "Who's your favorite Disney character? Who's your favorite Disney princess and would you have sex with them?" (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). This sets the understanding that objectification of women is part of everyday conversation in the fraternity and a tool for building relationships. Garrett also discussed that sorority recruitment can be frustrating and challenging time for his sexual pursuit of women. If he starts hooking up with a freshman who then goes through recruitment and joins a sorority where he has a reputation for hooking up with many women in the sorority "older sisters just warn the younger sisters to not hang out with [him]," (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). Garrett views this situation as either a challenge to overcome or an exasperating position that is not his fault.

Textural theme 5: unspoken. During the process of recruiting new members, it is not explicitly said that by joining a fraternity you will have access to certain women, but it is implied. Throughout recruitment the fraternity holds parties where women attend and interact with the potential new members as a way to promote their fraternity.

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. When looking at the status of Panhellenic sororities, each chapter has stereotypes tied to appearance and objectification. When Garrett's fraternity talked about women in sororities they were viewed as a monolithic group with

superficial descriptors such as “those girls are crazy, those girls are all from Jersey and spray tan, that group of women love to drink, that sorority’s super hot, and that sorority’s cute with the girls you want to take home to your mom” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Textural theme 4: reputation. For IFC fraternities, there is a ranked hierarchy of tiers within their council that is typically “closely associated with getting laid,” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). When looking at his own fraternity and IFC fraternities at his university Garrett said, “I’ve never really known where my chapter falls in that. I’ve just known we’ve always been considered the nice guys. But there are certain chapters where I could tell you have more of a rape-y culture with drugs and drinks and so forth. Or the guys who just are flat out nerdy and nothing happens with them,” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). These reputations recruit men who support objectification at different levels and can lead to normalizing of these behaviors within the fraternity. When asked what having a reputation for being a fraternity of nice guys, Garrett explained:

We’ve always made sure that women go home safely after our events and so forth and if women show up to our events too drunk, then we’re also addressing that right away.

There was one time last year where we had a woman who pre-gamed too hard and we made the call and drove her to the hospital within probably getting 45 minutes to our house. We were just like, “No.” And that’s the nice aspect. Plus, we’re just generally nice guys to work with for sober functions, for board game night, or pumpkin carving, or Greek week, because we’re not assholes. (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018)

Garrett also described it being difficult to be stigmatized or outcast for treatment of women because there are so many men in the IFC community, but that you could gain a reputation with one or two sororities that your fraternity interacts with regularly. He did observe

that stigmatization on a larger scale by fraternity chapter. The reverse reputation can also occur on the fraternity level based on personal relationships formed that make women feel safer at their parties. “That’s why you’ll notice certain women will always go to the same fraternities because they end up knowing 20 of those guys and in the end, 20 of those guys are looking out for their wellbeing at those events” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Textural theme 6: change over time. The evolution of social media as a tool to objectify women or self-objectify is something Garrett observed in his fraternity and sorority community. Social media has always been used by his fraternity to look up girls, but the more popular platforms moving from Facebook to Instagram and Snapchat has a more visual heavy focus. The use of private and direct messages to send sexual images has also increased over time in his chapter. The newer popularity of dating apps with college students has also altered their access to women and the ability to start forming a relationship before seeing them in person at a social event. The changes in Instagram and dating app usage have increased judging women solely for their appearance and as a large pool of women to shuffle through as objects to evaluate.

Garrett has also noticed a change in how women present themselves on Instagram. Before it was a more realistic representation of who they are, but now the images are edited, staged, and faked to present a certain image. Women are self-objectifying and trying to conform to the societal pressure to visually present themselves in a specific way to be valued.

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. The one example Garrett described of being objectified involved a part of a date auction or a pageant to raise money for philanthropies. Men from each fraternity would go on stage and “would put on a talent and have women or people in

the audience bid for [them]” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). Depending on the fraternity, they used different criteria to select which men would participate.

Usually, it’s the guys who are the most well connected on campus and are the most outgoing. I think that’s the criteria my chapter uses which is generally why it would fall on me or some of my closer friends to do that because we are well known. I also think in other fraternities, it’s the guys with six packs who will, in the end, take off their shirt during the auction and wave it around and then all the women are like cheering for them in the audience. My claim to fame is I raise the most money without taking my shirt off. So very proud of that. (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018)

When Garrett talks about women he has hooked up with to his fraternity brothers he uses nicknames because there are so many of them and his brothers “don’t want to remember their names unless I find them to be somebody I’m serious with. And so, they’d rather have nicknames, so it can trigger the stories I share with them” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). Using nicknames devalues the women and defines them by their sexual activity.

The morning after a party if a brother hooked up with someone, it is discussed amongst the fraternity and typically one of three conversations can happen.

One, she’s ugly. Two, she’s really hot. Or three, she’s closely associated with another brother. I know you didn’t know that, so we just want to let you know that drama might happen because of this. And so, I think that will happen. What those conversations look like if she’s hot, it’s kind of like a congratulations. If she’s not, it’s kind of like, do better. And if it’s the third one where there’s drama associated with it, we’re just like good luck. Let us know how we can support you. (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018)

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification. Garrett talked about during the pledge process, women being hazed where fraternity men sit on a chair with a metal bowl of whip cream on their lap and the pledges have to lick the whip cream out of the metal plate on their laps. The fraternity men were given a fifth of alcohol for participating. This is a clear example of women being objectified and self-objectifying one another to appeal to fraternity men.

Another context that promotes objectification was during every weekly chapter meeting someone was deemed brother of the week. The brother of the week would be chosen for putting on a great event for the organization, or doing something great on campus, but it could also be for a sexual accomplishment. The fraternity would put them in front of the room and the rest of the fraternity would ask whatever questions they wanted. For example, if it was “a sexual conquest [the brothers] usually ask [the brother of the week] to kind of recap it for [them] if they like. And so, then they’ll just give us whatever amount of details they want and then guys just ask about it, what the experience was like, how did they get into a position where that happened, was it fun or enjoyable” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). The amount of detailed shared would depend on the personality of the brother of the week and the event that happened. “The guy who lost his virginity was obviously more modest and sharing details because that’s not something generally someone shares. Whereas the guy who walked into an orgy is happy to share that” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). If someone in the fraternity is a virgin, they are usually open about it and ask their brothers for advice on losing their virginity. The mentality of the chapter is rooting for that brother to lose his virginity and celebrate him when it happens.

Sorority women would also give information about their fellow sorority sisters to fraternity men that they know, “like that girl gives a lot of blowjobs, or she likes to put out, or

she gives terrible blowjobs, don't do it" (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018). He also explained that his closest female friends were allies in helping him meet women in their sorority who would put in a good word for him with new members he found attractive.

When talking about women, Garrett framed them as accomplishments or challenges to overcome. He took pride in making out with multiple women at the same party in different rooms or giving women the impression, he was not a guy who was hooking up with multiple women, even though he was. He described having a lot more access to women in college and not having to take them on dates to have sex with them. He would typically only have sex with a woman a few times and then was on to the next one. Garrett also had a personal philosophy that if he made out with a girl drunk then he would make out with her sober as a follow up.

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. Garrett's view of diversity within his has to do with diversity of dress, which is a very limited representation of true diversity. He discussed his attire being khaki shorts, Sperry's, and a button down, but others wearing cargo shorts and a hoodie. He also felt it would be very easy to identify a group of fraternity men walking around campus "if [he] sees eight to ten guys wearing short khaki shorts with a polo shirt and Sperry's or New Balance shoes, [he] will be able to say, yes, they belong in a fraternity" (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. Looking at IFC fraternities you will see very little diversity in the way people look, with members being primarily white men. Within the IFC community chapters will also tend to segregate based on where the men lived before college. Garrett explained that a lot of the men from one of the top chapters were from New Jersey and another top chapter having members primarily from Richmond, Virginia. Also, because IFC fraternities primarily interact with Panhellenic sororities,

all the women that Garrett has hooked up with are white women and very similar and the majority of guys he was friends with were also white. The beauty standards that Garrett uses to evaluate women are ones associated with white women and the stereotype of a “basic white girl” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Monolithic

Textural theme 14: different people. Some IFC chapters are very homogenous in terms of activities on campus and preferences, but Garrett’s fraternity “ has guys who are in the honors program, guys who are not, guys who excel academically, guys who do not, guys who remain sober, guys who drink, guys who do weed, guys who are virgins, not virgins, guys who like to party, not party, and [they] bring them altogether in this unifying organization” (Garrett, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Individual Themes: Jack

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. Jack comes from a fraternity in the top tier of chapters in his IFC community and appearance does give men a big advantage when trying to join their organization.

You have a lot more leeway if you come to a rush event and you're a really good-looking 6'2" white guy. Like you almost have to do something that people are like "Wow, I really don't like that kid" for you to get a bad impression whereas I think the opposite is true is if you come and you're like just kind of an odd ... like if you just looked odd.” (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018)

Textural theme 5: unspoken. During the recruiting process Jack’s chapter wanted to make sure that the girls who are attractive attend their parties. The goal was to send the implicit message that if you join their chapter, these hot girls are who you are going to party with.

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 4: reputation. The reputation of higher status fraternities is that they wear clothes that show off that you are in shape. They also communicate their socioeconomic status by wearing more expensive clothes, especially when interacting with sororities. The reputation of Jack's fraternity compared to the other two fraternities in the top social tier is that they are more genuine, good friends who care about people at their events, with very tight friendships. The attractiveness of their members gives them a reputation of being privileged. When compared to other students at the university, "there is a pretty good chance [the brother] looks a little bit more scraggly. [Jack] thinks it's also not only appearance, but the way that [they] walk and handle [themselves]. [He] thinks that that's part of appearance. [He] thinks that guys in [his] fraternity are just kind of goons in the best way. Their personality is not to take themselves too seriously" (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018).

Textural theme 5: unspoken. In terms of social status, Jack feels people in the Greek community are really good at putting on different faces around different people. He thinks men are good at coming off genuinely and using their social status to convince women they are interested in more than a one-night stand when that isn't their true intentions.

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. Jack talked about making assumptions in conversations with his brothers about women based on their appearance and grouping them into stereotypes instead of viewing them as individuals. His brothers talk about "blonde girls from New York who wear designer clothing and what comes to [him] is they wear designer tops and black jeans and carry around expensive purses and wear makeup that makes them look like pompous" (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018).

For mixers, how much effort Jack's fraternity put into their appearance and the event depended on the type of girls they were mixing with. "So, if it's a group of girls that lots of guys think are really attractive and pretty and they want to try to hook up with them that night, then they're going to put out more decorations for a mixer than, say, another group that people don't feel that strongly about" (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018).

Textural theme 4: reputation. When Jack's fraternity talks about women's sexual reputation it is very different than the badge of honor given to men. Certain women are defined as sluts, easy, someone who gets around, or someone who will have sex right away.

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification. When talking about having sex with girls among his fraternity brothers "people talk about sex as like something that you achieve. Like people talk about girls in a way that objectifies them" (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018). He describes it as a normalized frame that they talk about sex with women that is done automatically or without recognition that they are objectifying the women being discussed.

Jack also talked about planning party themes being ones that intentionally objectify women and ones that are unintentional, but lead to objectifying women because of the norms in the community. Some examples of themes that directly objectify women are golf pros and tennis hoes or CEOs and office hoes. Other themes don't directly imply objectification, but themes like school nerds or high school stereotypes where women show up in revealing interpretations of that theme.

When going to parties they are always held in fraternity spaces where they control the environment and alcohol. When asked about alcohol at their parties, Jack said,

I've never had a girl, for example, be like 'Were these handles opened before we got here?' or like skeptical questions like that which I mean I don't know if that's happening

at other places or not but I think in our events I never had that question. I never had that question as president. We made punch one time and people were fine which is really not what I would ... if I had a daughter, I would want that daughter to be like what the fuck is this punch, not just drinking it. People were genuinely trustworthy of what was in the punch, just stuff like that. I think that's how it influences the norms. (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018)

Since fraternities control the space, they also control who gets in the party. The person at the door makes sure to maintain a ratio of more women than men and if a guy not in the fraternity wants to get into a party, he needs to bring multiple women.

Textural theme 10: trading sex for alcohol. In Jack's fraternity and the larger IFC culture of parties he is aware of the structure creating an environment where men provide the alcohol and women get it for free in the hopes the women will have sex. As a leader in his fraternity, Jack realizes "You don't want to reinforce the fact that like there's a huge power dynamic when girls show up en masse to somebody's apartment where there is open alcohol and music and a bunch of guys. Well [when thinking about a party theme], let's not have them show up in scanty clothing" (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018), even though that is often the reality of what happens.

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. Within Jack's chapter he is aware that there is very little diversity in terms of socioeconomic status and religion, along with no real racial diversity. Jack feels he looks like pretty standard white kid and because he never really had to worry about his appearance hurting his chances of joining a top tier chapter, that it unconsciously helped him.

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. The Panhellenic sororities that IFC interacts with are also predominantly white. Jack gave some examples that “there are stereotypes to what is attractive to white guys from the Northeast and there are stereotypes of what is attractive to a group of white guys, a group of five white guys from Texas. That colors how people see the women and their attitudes towards women and what is attractive based on those stereotypes” (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018). This contributes to the segregation of chapters by geographical location and what organizations of the opposite sex they want to socialize with. Jack’s fraternity nationally and locally has some negative stereotypes surrounding southern values, identifying with the confederacy, and racism. His whole fraternity is white except for two members and they held a formal called Old South. These traditions, culture and make up of his fraternity do not make it a welcoming space to men of color. Jack feels because of this stereotype and reputation, when picking themes for events, their chapter is more concerned with not being racially offensive than themes that objectify women.

Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Monolithic

Textural theme 13: different contexts. The setting that fraternity members are in has a big impact on how they present themselves. Apart from the non-Greek students on campus, Jack’s brothers and other Greek men dress up more for class by not wearing sweatpants to present themselves as put together and intellectual. At parties, they want to appear as attractive as possible and socially put together. If they are doing a philanthropy event, then the brothers dress much more casually with little priority given to how they look.

Jack also notices a difference in how his brothers act depending on the type of relationship they have with a woman.

He may come off as sort of more goofy and vulnerable around girls that he's comfortably friends with whereas I think that if you put him in a scenario around a girl that he's trying

to hook up with, I think he may be less vulnerable and less goofy and more sort of serious and take himself more seriously and also try to act more masculine or mature with someone like that that may seem more attractive in the hookup sense. (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018)

Textural theme 14: different people. Jack's fraternity is homogenous in terms of race, socioeconomic status, values, and religion. The brothers are diverse in thought and experience along with different backgrounds before college and their interests.

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification. One of the values of Jack's fraternity that is present through their rituals and mottos is reverence towards women. Jack feels that this messaging influences the way his brothers treat women as a pervasive value for their fraternity.

One thing that we try to pride ourselves on is like don't be a shithead around girls. And I think that is also evident in the way that we talk to younger guys in the fraternity about girls. It's like we have no expectation to hook up or have sex with people. That's not something that we believe in. That's not something that we're trying to push for you. That's not okay. (Jack, personal communication, February 20, 2018)

They have conversations with their new members when explaining some of their fraternity traditions about the importance of this sentiment and the reasons behind respecting it.

Individual Themes: Anthony

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils. Being from a Latino fraternity, Anthony described how different the process of getting new members is for their fraternity than IFC fraternities because of their councils' historical traditions. His fraternity and those in his council do not do rush periods, they have an interim process that is done privately, the size of

their chapter is much smaller, and they don't have Greek houses to host events. Compared to the predominately white IFC fraternities, he feels their process is a lot more intimate and familial instead of being about networking and numbers. When meeting with leaders in IFC fraternities they had very different goals and concerns about recruitment because of the size difference and access to formal housing.

Textural theme 4: reputation. When coming to college, Anthony had a stereotypical view what Greek life was based on media portrayals. He met someone in his fraternity who brought him to a week of events and he realized that there was a lot of focus on building a cultural community and service instead of drinking and partying. His fraternity also takes professionalism very seriously, so when looking at new members, their reputation and attire are important factors in being able to join the fraternity.

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 6: change over time. Anthony talked about other Latino fraternities who started out with a culture that objectified women. More recently, men in those chapters have started speaking out and trying to have conversations within their fraternity to change it. In MGC he has also noticed more partnerships between fraternities and sororities change how women are treated on college campuses, whereas before it was more something only sororities were concerned about. There has also been a shift in what brothers tolerate from one another when talking about women, especially with Neos, a name for newest members in MGC and NPHC. There was recently a group chat where group shot of a sorority was shared and alumni brother started "conversation on how hot she was or whatever. And one of the Neos immediately responded with a long message on how this is problematic, and wrong, and whether we should check ourselves. If we don't hold each other accountable, what's the purpose of brotherhood" (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018).

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. Within MGC, sororities have been doing programming around natural hair and educating others on the issue around asking to or touching their hair. The fraternities in MGC would joke about this programming and suggest that the women look much better with weave. In programming or discussions around sexual misconduct, some brothers would comment and say, “well look at what she was wearing” (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018).

In Anthony’s fraternity if a brother hooked up with a woman that was unattractive based on their cultural beauty standards they would be make fun of and tease that brother. In one example of talking about women in this way is “someone said does [hooking up with her] count as community service” (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018). On the flip side, when getting ready for a party they would discuss the women who were attending based on their physical and sexual attributes. At the party, his brothers would make sexual comments about the women loud enough for them to hear. There are websites and content on the internet that rank sororities and women based on their attractiveness. There have also been email threads or chats meant just for the fraternity that have been accidentally sent that comment on sorority women sexually. One example Anthony gave was a forwarded email about an event hosted by Asian American women where someone accidentally asked everyone who received the invite if Asian women actually have breasts.

Textural theme 4: reputation. Since MGC is relatively small, sororities generally did not have reputations surrounding their sexual behavior. These reputations were more on an individual level and “there were particular women, even before that they joined that were already stigmatized about being promiscuous” (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018). In Anthony’s fraternity, one of their values is chivalry. This manifested in them being “the ones

who were more likely to open the doors, and have set rules, women appreciation type events, whether that was randomly giving candy to women at the library who were studying or holding a dinner to appreciate the work that they're doing on campus, or the research that they're doing” (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018). This also led them to have the reputation of being respectful to women and the other MGC fraternities being sleazier. Some of his brothers would not go to parties with the other fraternities or put themselves in social situations where they could be implicated for mistreating women.

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification. When talking to women in Anthony’s sister Latina sorority, they shared there are fraternities they will not host programs with or invite to their parties because the men dance and grind on them even though the women make it clear they do not want the men to touch them. These other fraternities in MGC would have multiple brothers at different parties dancing with women in ways that made them feel uncomfortable and then that stigma was on all the brothers in that fraternity. The Latina sorority would ask the brothers, “Why did you feel comfortable to grab me like that, and grind on me? Why did you feel like you can have an attitude with me when I tell you no?” (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018).

There are also men in Anthony’s fraternity who “hold machismo values predominately in Latin American culture, where the where the man is the provider, and the woman cooks and cleans” (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018). Some of his brother were very open and vocal about these values and would say “Yeah, I like her. She knows how to cook. She's smart and she wants to work, that's great. But she still has to take care of the home” (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018). Anthony and some of his other brothers would try to discourage brothers with this attitude from sharing it especially with people who are not Latinx, but it did not prevent it.

Anthony discussed a current situation in his fraternity where a brother had been accused of sexual misconduct on social media by his ex-girlfriend. From the woman's perspective, a while after they broke up

He was trying to get her drunk to do this, he invited himself against her will into her apartment, he tore off her clothes, and he tried to hook up with her, but didn't. She's insinuating that he should have known that there was no consent for him and that she wasn't sober enough to give him consent to feel comfortable sleeping in her bed with her, especially since her clothes were off. (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018)

His brother told him a different version of events and he thinks he has been unfairly tried in the court of public opinion. Anthony feels torn between standing up for his brother and making sure not to disempower the woman. He thinks that for both parties the details of what happened can get misconstrued the more they are discussed amongst other members, instead of through a formal investigation.

Textural theme 9: self-objectification. One aspect of objectification that was confusing for men in Anthony's fraternity that led to unwanted sexual treatment of women, was that for the same behavior some women "would clap back to say that's not okay. But other times it was encouraged with a smile and a laugh, and like, "Tell me more" (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018). Anthony and his brothers were left confused about what was acceptable behavior and what they should do in certain scenarios.

Textural theme 11: trading sex for status. In Anthony's fraternity, if a brother hooked up with or started talking with a woman in their community who had high social status or came from a top sorority, the other brothers would congratulate him and they would encourage him to leverage that relationship to build a relationship with the women's sorority.

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. Anthony felt there was more grouping by appearance in NPHC organizations than MGC, with the AKAs being known as the light skinned pretty girls and the Kappas as the pretty boys. With Latinx organizations the members are grouped more regionally. Usually all the women from the Bronx would be in one sorority and all the women from Los Angeles in another. Anthony's fraternity in MGC was stereotyped in a positive way as the woke chapter that is more respectful to women and more invested in the community than other fraternities in their council.

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils. Anthony was a leader in his council and often met with leaders from the other four councils. Anthony felt these meetings were a waste of his time because the issues discussed were only relevant to the larger, historically white organizations. "There was no reason for me to be there, because the meeting was about Greek houses, or insurance for the house, or getting enough recruitment to fill your bed, and stuff that just didn't apply" (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018).

Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Monolithic

Textural theme 13: different contexts. Since Anthony is a leader in his fraternity, maintaining a good reputation among sororities in terms of collaborating on events was important for him. He did not want a negative reputation socially to impact his professional and academic goals. This led him to choose romantic and sexual relationships outside of Greek life because he did not want those to interfere with his work in the Greek community. When having parties with sororities, appearance of the women is the most important criteria, but when doing philanthropy or non-social events, appearance did not matter. With those types of events, the sorority's reputation for good programming, leadership, and easiness to work with was what determined the fraternity's preferences.

MGC's size being much smaller than their white counterparts influenced their social events. Since MGC does not have formal housing, they had to rent space on campus to host larger events to raise money. Alcohol is not permitted in these spaces, so members would pregame before or sneak in their own alcohol. Typically, the university required campus security or campus police at these events. Other parties held within the community are usually at an apartment off campus where a group of people from one organization live. IFC and Panhellenic have enough resources and formal housing to be able to host all of their events off campus without oversight from the university and no police presence.

Textural theme 15: cognitive dissonance. Anthony feels his chapter respects women through the values of chivalry. While some aspects of chivalry can empower women, other parts can objectify them if the behaviors treat women as though they are incapable of doing certain things that only a man can do. When discussing how his chapter values treating women with respect and their safety, the motivation behind it is fear of being labeled or negative consequences for their chapter, not because they believe women deserve safety and respect. Andrew also struggles reconciling the positives of social media being a tool to call out sexual misconduct or assault that gives women a voice with protecting his brothers from false accusations.

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification. Anthony has noticed a shift, even within the past year "particularly because of the #MeToo movement, with discussion around toxic masculinity and sexual misconduct" (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018), in how fraternities are tackling these issues publicly and internally. "I think now more than ever, my chapter is very cognizant of what that means, and how they need to treat and interact with women" (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018). Some of this is motivated by

awareness and a genuine realization that things need to change, but is also from “fear that any little mishap” (Anthony, personal communication, March 21, 2018), could harm them or their chapter.

Individual Themes: Lilly

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. Lilly’s sorority compared to the other MGC sororities has a reputation for being the one with pretty girls. Lilly and her friends wanted to join her organization for the popularity and wanting to be grouped in with the women deemed most attractive. Once Lilly joined, overall, she fit with the appearance of her sisters,

but what made me I guess a little bit different from the majority of my sisters is that I'm thick. I'm way curvier than any of them are, you know, it was one of those things where I always think I'm fat. I realize I'm not fat, I'm actually really fit. I have a big butt and hips, but when you're around twigs, it's very easy, and I'm not a giant, I'm not super, super tall; I'm just 5'6". But a lot of my line sisters are 5'3", 5'4", so I always feel bigger, I always feel like the big one, but I'm not the big one, nowhere near it. (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018)

The pressure to conform to her sisters and what she measured her own appearance against influences how she viewed her worth surround her appearance.

When evaluating new members to join, the very attractive women were much more likely to get in.

The really pretty girls got really rave reviews, you know? And their resumes could've just been mediocre, but it was, like, "Oh, well, she really looks like she has so much potential, and she really sounds like she's really interested in our service." Whereas, the girls that maybe were not as pretty, then you heard less of that and it was more so the sisters that

had a sense of morality would be, like, "No, you guys, she's a really good fit. look at her resume, like, let's be real. (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018)

Her sorority is motivated to have attractive members because of the status it gave them in MGC and the ability to be the top recruiting Latina sorority.

Textural theme 4: reputation. Going into joining a sorority, Lilly knew very little about Greek life and Latina sororities. All of her friends were trying to join a particular sorority and so she decided to do it with them. After being in the sorority she is so glad she did, but she wished she was more informed about sorority life after graduation. Her sorority is local to her college, so if she joined an organization that was nationally connected, she would have more opportunities to continue her experience after graduation no matter where she lives.

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. In MGC appearance of sorority women played a big part in status. In high school, Lilly was a part of the popular group and a cheerleader. The sorority she joined had all the best internships on campus, were well connected and were the girls running the school from the student side so it fit with her social status from high school.

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. For Lilly, she is always sexualized by the men and receives comments about having a big JLo booty. Her line sisters are not as curvy and are more attractive to the brothers because of this. "They want the girls that are just, like, you could basically throw them over your shoulders, you know? Very petite and short, very light skin, long dark hair, and almost like submissive" (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018). Lilly also gets treated differently because she is outspoken and blunt, but the fraternity men are looking for women to be quiet, submissive, and something nice to look at.

There are also members in her sorority that get treated differently because of their weight or appearance. The men would view these women as one of the guys where she would think she was making progress toward romantic relationships. In one example, instead of just seeing the brothers at parties, “she goes in the middle of day, like, she was hanging out over there, and she cooks for them, and cleans for them. And to her, she doesn't see a problem with it, because to her, those are her friends and she's just taking care of them. To me, I just see it as, like, you're trying to make yourself relevant. You know, you're trying to make it so that they see you and might say, wow, she can really cook and she can take care of me, I might be interested in her” (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018).

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification. Lilly’s discussed the emphasis on professionalism during their philanthropy events. Her sorority is very invested in the causes they are working towards and how this impacts their community. Lilly’s sorority takes a lot of pride in appearing professional. They have an added pressure that is not on their white counterparts to present in a certain way. At their weekly meetings they dress in business attire with rules about wearing closed toed shoes, not showing their shoulders or cleavage, and not wearing jeans. During the pledging process, the Neos had to wear uniforms, they needed to wear their hair in the exact same style and be matching down to the brand of socks they wore. For their hairstyle, if a neo had a different textured hair, this was very difficult for them.

Textural theme 9: self-objectification. When Lilly and her sisters go out appearance played a big role. Getting ready is a whole process of straightening your hair, doing makeup, finding a cute dress, and heels that you could survive the night in. There is added pressure because Lilly knows that someone is going to be taking pictures at all time and she thinks “I'm not about to be the one looking crazy in pictures. I'm not going to be the one to make the sorority look bad. There is always competition to maintain this hierarchy of we're the baddest bitches, so,

you need to look good, because if there's these other girls from the other sororities there, we need to make sure we look better than them" (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018).

For their sorority fundraisers, they typically have a partnership with a restaurant where the sorority gets a certain percentage of the proceeds so the more people who attend the more money they raise. So, the sorority would dress in a sexually attractive way, go out and flirt, and bring as many men to the restaurant as possible. They also have date auctions where women walk on stage, are announced with information about them, and men bid to take them on a date. There was a lot of anxiety for the women being auctioned off.

We're putting women out there as objects that can be bought and sold, and as the woman, your job is to make sure you look good and appealing and appetizing, so that someone will buy you. But not just buy you, buy you for a high price, you know? And the girls, if you got bought for over \$100.00, that's how you knew you were hot shit. But then I was, like, what about the girls who no one is fighting over them, you know? And so, in those situations, it's really sad because, as active sisters, every active sister has to participate in that, and some girls really don't want to. (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018)

If there was a woman who did not get a lot of male attention because of her looks she would make sure there were male friends in the audience who would bid on her and would tell them if the bidding went over a certain amount she would pay the difference.

Textural theme 10: trading sex for alcohol. For all of their parties, the men are responsible for providing the alcohol and the parties take place in off campus apartments rented by a group of fraternity brothers. A lot of the women are underage and the sororities do not have access to spaces to hold parties. At the parties, there is social portion just for Greeks and then it opens up to people who are not in MGC organizations. At this point based on their relationships

with the fraternity controlling the space, they go into their rooms where they have access to more alcohol and shots instead of the large batches of mixed alcohol or kegs. For women to access the stronger alcohol they have to go into more private spaces with the fraternity men.

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. Lilly also talked about the differences and separation within the Latinx community. She had fraternity men tell her she was not as Latina as other Latinas or be questioned why she did not know how to dance to certain types of music. Lilly brought up the tension between Mexicans and Central Americans for immigration reasons and the history of how and why Central Americans came over. She also recognized colorism in her community and Central Americans being treated differently because they are a lot more mixed with indigenous and African ancestry than their Mexican counterparts. Being Guatemalan she was reminded by Mexican fraternity men that she did not fit the mold or told she would be perfect if she was Mexican. A lot of the Latina girls in MGC came from east LA so compared to Lilly, they have an east LA accent, they speak differently, and their slang is different. Even with music, everyone listens to mainstream English music, but also Spanish songs that Lilly does not know because she grew up around West Coast gangster rap.

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. Prior to college Lilly was not normally around people who identified as Hispanic or Latinx and she grew up around primarily black people. Coming to college was the first time she was really immersed in a Latinx community, which is how she heard about her sorority. Lilly's sorority is made up of light skinned, thin Latina women and the other Latina sorority is known by the nickname *las sexy gorditas* meaning sexy fat girls. The other sorority also had Latinas with darker skin.

I think that there's so much intercultural – between African Americans and Latinos, or black people and Hispanic people, there's so many similarities, right? But there's also so

much separation. And it really, really makes me sad, because I'm actually a quarter black, and I grew up in mostly black areas. I didn't really even super identify as Latina until college, because then I was around all these Latino people, all the time. And so, I think in many ways, even though I very much look Latina, like, if you look at me, beyond maybe the fact that I'm a little bit curvier and my hair has some curl to it, you probably would never ever know that I have any kind of any black in me. (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018)

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils. In terms of social status there is never any crossover or comparison with white sororities as they operate so separately.

Being large in comparison to other organizations of color, that mattered. And it was, again, maintaining status, like, which is the organization in charge, right? And the bigger you are, the more attention you have; the prettier you are, the more attention you have. The more involved you are on campus, the more attention you have. And you want attention because attention is going to make sure that when new people come in, they want to join your sorority. (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018)

Textural theme 4: reputation. When comparing Greek organizations with people of color, Lilly talked about being irrelevant to their white counterparts.

They are not threatened by us, they don't care about us, they don't look to us. We don't exist to them. And although they exist, we don't really pay attention to them, because we see and hear about the things that they do, and we have no respect for them, either, right? Like, there were stories about, one of the sororities, they had their rushees or you know, their pledging is kind of different from ours. And so, they had all these women basically strip down to their bras and underwear, and they had their brother fraternity come in with

permanent markers and circle all the areas on their bodies that were, like, wrong with them, you know? (Lilly, personal communication, March 22, 2018)

She also heard stories about white sorority women having sex with multiple men at once, but never saw that in her community. Her sisters would comment that white sorority women have no respect for themselves and that they were dirty.

Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Monolithic

Textural theme 15: cognitive dissonance. For Lilly, she struggles with her own values along with the chapter's values, around activism and the practice of auctioning women of color's bodies off for date auctions. The fighting for male attention and the parallels between slave auctions is in direct opposition of fighting for gender and racial equality.

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification. Being a mixed gender council offered some protection and respect from their male counter parts. Lilly's sorority is tied strongly with the male organizations and many of the sisters are dating brothers in the male organizations. Her sorority also had brothers help intervene if someone was treating them inappropriately.

Individual Themes: Wesley

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. When picking new members to join, Wesley's fraternity wants to make sure that the person is respectable with their appearance and dresses well because that visual will impact how the fraternity is perceived. His fraternity is known as the one with clean cut men in terms of their appearance.

Textural theme 3: recruitment and intake. Wesley talked about on an individual chapter level there are traditions or initiation rituals that are illegal from the national organization, but are still practiced. Some of them include having sex with a certain number of

women or doing something sexual with someone of the same gender regardless of your sexuality. A lot of these traditions still happen because people who are joining want to feel accepted, want to belong, and want to have a community especially at PWIs. “A lot of students are willing to disengage their morals or their values and do what they have to do in order to feel a sense of acceptance” (Wesley, personal communication, February 11, 2018). Also, the type of men joining is really influenced by the amount of men of color at that institution. If the fraternity has a large group to pick from then they want the most intellectually capable men that will uplift and lead the fraternity, but if the fraternity has a small group of potential candidates they may take someone less qualified to keep the chapter going.

Textural theme 5: unspoken. The popularity and status of Wesley’s fraternity influences who wants to join. It is not discussed as part of recruiting new members, but they have a reputation for women being attracted to their organization. When someone is considering the fraternity, “just by coming into the organization if they’re attracted to attractive women or whether they’re after the money, financial gain or the actual power, and I think for some individuals it was just that ideology that you know if I join this organization it will gain me access to these things that I can’t just really access right now as an individual” (Wesley, personal communication, February 11, 2018).

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 4: reputation. Wesley’s fraternity on campus is known for being leaders and large in size compared to some of the other NPHC fraternities. These characteristics made them popular with women of color on campus. They are dressed well or in suits, clean shaven, and take care in how they presented themselves. Wesley also talked about the number of rapes, sexual assaults, drug abuse, alcohol abuse associated with fraternity men. “This stigma is put on black fraternities, so you think we have higher rates of sexual assault, we have a higher

rate of drug abuse and higher rates of alcohol abuse. I don't see any of that. When you look at research and statistics by a large margin, white fraternity men, like they lead the way in these issues" (Wesley, personal communication, February 11, 2018).

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. The fraternity hosts a pageant to raise money, where women compete to win based on their physically appearance, intellect, service, and goals. The woman who wins gets a scholarship. The women who have won the pageant then serve as a group who does outreach or supports the chapter in holding events or conferences.

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification. With the increased focus of evaluating treatment of women in our culture, Wesley finds his chapter does things that are acceptable to them, but may not be acceptable to people outside his community. He described thinking "We live in a world, and not to sound like insensitive to the situation, but I think we're living in a world and a time now where everything is overdramatized that anything can be counted as sexual assault. Like I could look at somebody a certain way and they could be like that was sexual harassment or you hug somebody for too long and that is sexual harassment" (Wesley, personal communication, February 11, 2018).

In the party culture of his fraternity or other NPHC fraternities with drugs and alcohol involved, traditions can become very toxic, violent, and unwelcoming environment for women of color. "I think that's one of the biggest issues that we try to hide within our community but it's an issue, if nothing else within itself and we have some very different points of view to identify because – because these things are happening, and until we take actions towards them, like nothing will change" (Wesley, personal communication, February 11, 2018). With alcohol for parties, each NPHC organization has a mixed drink made in large batches and people are not

really aware of how much alcohol is in what they are drinking, by which the fraternity men create a potentially unsafe environment for women.

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. Wesley's fraternity's values surrounding how they present themselves come from a social and historical perspective. "Like as a black man and speaking specifically for me, if I had on jeans, a hoodie and boots, I would look more, I would look more of a problem or be feared more by my white counterparts, rather than if I wore a suit and tie to which them feel more comfortable. It also comes from a place of showing the world or showing our counterparts that we are just as good as you or even better in certain situations" (Wesley, personal communication, February 11, 2018). As Black men in America they are viewed as a problem from being brought here as slave, people of color being incarcerated in much larger numbers than white people, and being purposefully segregated and not given access to certain spaces. For Wesley's fraternity it is important they have a suit and tie to be perceived as non-threatening and a consideration that other demographics of people do not have to think about on a regular basis. "It's a constant to me like that's America, where you understand you're a black man, but you also understand that there's certain things that you can't do and have to work twice as hard as white people to get what they have" (Wesley, personal communication, February 11, 2018).

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. For Wesley and his fraternity brothers, generational treatment as a second-class citizens that still exists. This creates a desire to keep their fraternity a safe community and white men bring fear to into their lives.

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils. Wesley's fraternity was formed because they were not allowed to join IFC fraternities and was created because the men of color on campus never felt like they belonged. It was built out of struggle and trying to construct an

environment the men of color could thrive in. His fraternity's founding was to solidify for them and future generations the right to be in these spaces.

Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Monolithic

Textural theme 15: cognitive dissonance. Wesley has trouble recognizing how their chapters pageant objectifies women. Since the women willingly enter and are judged on other factors he does not see a problem with evaluating their appearance for a scholarship.

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification. Since NPHC organizations were built out of struggle and not being treated equally, this aligns them with the struggles women have faced and increased awareness of their struggle. When IFC fraternities were created, women were treated also as second-class citizens, so this creates level of understanding in NPHC around the importance of how women are treated in their community.

Individual Themes: Jasmine

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. For NPHC sororities, when they do step or stroll shows it is a way for them to attract new members. People want to associate with and join organizations that are having fun and doing cool showcases. Also, being part of a smaller chapter, especially compared to Panhellenic sororities, “we wanted to always make sure that we looked good, because that's a constant way of recruitment. And when you are smaller, you're always thinking about recruitment, where, I think if you're bigger, it's totally fine for you to maybe wear sweatpants or yoga pants multiple times a week” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018). When picking new members for her sorority, appearance plays a factor. “Ultimately, you want to bring people in who are going to help your chapter reach its goals, but appearance is an important part of that. I know that, with my chapter, appearance is

something we value, but we also recognize that it's something that can be taught. And then I think one thing is also, when you're dealing with college women, sometimes you can't always comment on someone's appearance and not be mean” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

Textural theme 4: reputation. Some of the other NPHC sororities were founded earlier than Jasmine’s and had time to build their reputation. They have more family members that were members of other sororities and many women want to be legacies and follow in those footsteps. When considering who to bring into their chapter, if the person has a negative sexual reputation there will be some debate about it. Some members will not want them to join because of it and other members feel it is okay if they have great grades and community service. It also depends on the chapter, because Jasmine has seen in larger chapters who have women with a reputation for being promiscuous that sexual reputation has no influence on someone being asked to join.

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 4: reputation. Nationally two NPHC sororities have a higher social status and this trickles down to the local chapter level. This two-tier status between the four NPHC sororities is really the only social hierarchy between them and there is not a huge divide in status between the groups. People will say things like “Oh, you're, like, really pretty for a [sorority name].” Or people assume that if you're a Zeta or an SG, you're not as pretty as the Delta and the AKAs” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

When interacting with a fraternity, even if her sorority is going to a community service event in sweats, they still make sure to have their hair and makeup done. “I definitely think that when we're interacting with fraternity members, there's kind of a new level of expectation of we have to not only impress them, but make sure that they think that we're impressive. I think, one, so that they want to connect with us again, whether it's through a social event or community

service, but you want to have that reputation of being a cool chapter, and I think appearance is a big part of that, so always, I guess, dressing to impress” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

With step and stroll shows, this gives them another opportunity to compete against the other sororities for status. “As someone in a sorority, our competition is other sororities, but you also want to kind of leave that lasting impression that the fraternities are going to take away. Still, again, you want to, like, this kind of idea of being able to run the yard and be the best on campus has a lot to do with how you perform and stroll and step. So, even though the goal is to perform, I think sororities, like, there have been times where we've even stepped in heels and stuff like that, to have that edge on other sororities and to be noticed by others” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

For chapters that are larger and can use their national popularity to recruit members, the impact of their actions and appearance is not as large as smaller chapters. “Other chapters can have a fight in a public space and they still have 15 girls who want join the organization. Whereas, we're winning awards and doing all these great things, and we might get only a few new members” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. When Jasmine goes out with her sorority sisters to interact with fraternities “We want to wear the tight dresses, and we want make sure our makeup and hair's done, we want to make sure we're wearing heels or something cute, even if it's slightly uncomfortable” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018). In step and stroll shows the sororities earn more points wearing dresses and heels because it adds to their difficulty and creativity scores. Around campus and at events having their hair and nails done and having nice outfits helps sororities gain status. Her sisters have conversations about what to

wear at different types of events and what looks good on different body types to fit in with the expectation of the sorority. If someone wants to change their hair or appearance they talk with the sorority about it first. Jasmine noticed a shift in how much emphasis she put on appearance once she joined a Greek organization and she sees that throughout NPHC. There is a lot of discussion especially when first joining about what they should wear in different settings from causal, party, or business and how tight the clothes should be.

All of the NPHC sororities value presenting themselves professionally at all times. Joining her sorority, Jasmine did not realize the impact it would have on how she presents herself. Sometimes just being in the Greek environment starts to influence the style trends and expectations women have for themselves. Jasmine did not join thinking one of the benefits would be learning how to dress herself, but it happened both naturally and through the education process of her sorority.

Textural theme 4: reputation. Since NPHC is so small it is very easy to be stigmatized for your sexual behavior and everyone is going to notice if you leave a party with someone or go in their room. With men in the community who had reputations for taking advantage of women, the sorors would tell each other “Okay, don't go with that person, or don't drink with him. We are friends with people who we know have reputations. We just, in a social setting, wouldn't get wrapped up in that” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification. Jasmine discussed in NPHC taking a lot of pictures that end up on social media and the added pressure of how her picture reflects on her organization. If someone is not conforming or looks bad people will come to the sorority saying someone get your soror and address it. In more extreme cases they may be called out on Instagram or Twitter. If you show up to an event not meeting the appearance standard set by the sorority, a sister will say ““Soror, you're out of order. You've got to go

change your clothes. This is not appropriate" (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

Sometimes fraternities throw theme parties that promote objectification on women. One example Jasmine gave was a fraternity throwing a beach theme party and women get in for free if they wear a swimsuit.

Textural theme 9: self-objectification. Jasmine does not have a problem with the beauty pageants hosted to win scholarships. She felt even though it is a way that women are valued for their appearance, the women who participate "are great people. There is always a scholarship component and a talent component" (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018). Since it is done in a structured environment with a judging system, Jasmine feels that everyone is comfortable who participates and it is not an unsafe environment for women.

Textural theme 10: trading sex for alcohol. Fraternities in NPHC are always the one who host parties in their spaces and if the official party is on campus then a fraternity hosts the pregame or afterparty. Fraternities are also in charge of the alcohol and usually provide their signature fraternity drink in coolers. Even if the main event or party is put on by a sorority, the space and alcohol are always managed by a fraternity.

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. In NPHC they are slowly trying to reshape the stereotypes around appearance for each sorority and recognizing that all four sororities in NPHC have women of all types. AKA's are known for being thin, light-skinned Black women with long, straight flowing hair. Competing socially with them are the Deltas who are more often dark-skinned Black women who wear their hair natural in either afros or braids. SGRhos and Zetas have less norms around appearance, but Zetas are known for larger women. The stereotypes are "fading and they're stopping to exist, and there are large women and

skinny women across all the chapters, and everyone's wearing their hair how they want no matter what. It's not like you're expected to straighten your hair if you're in this chapter and wear it curly if you're in another chapter” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018). In contrast to this, the grouping around appearance still very much exists and the fact “that everyone knows them I think says a lot about how we value appearance” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018). If a white woman is in one of the NPHC sororities she is not put into one of those appearance categories because she already stands out from the norm so much. “Their hair is straight and their body types are very different” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

In terms of personality, “AKA's are maybe sweet and sassy, and Deltas are kind of more of like the strong-willed black woman who will get in your face more aggressively” (Jasmine, personal communication, February 22, 2018).

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification. Breaking down the stereotypes of appearance in the four NPHC sororities is helping the women be viewed more as individuals and have the freedom of a wider standard of beauty in their sorority. Having strong relationships with fraternities in NPHC helps the women feel safe at parties on campus or hosted by their school’s chapters. Both help protect them from objectification, but also give them a false sense of security. When they are off campus the sorors look out for each other more in terms of safety and when they go to other schools they all come and leave together.

Individual Themes: Faith

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. As a chapter preparing for recruitment and being one of the lower status sororities, Faith’s sorority would openly acknowledge women in their

organization who were awkward or not as attractive. Those women would sit out and work behind the scenes, but were not allowed to talk to anyone the sorority was trying to recruit. When picking women to join Faith's sorority, appearance has increasingly played a big role. When looking at women, they would say "Wow, that one's really pretty. She would be a seven across campus, but an eleven in our sorority" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

When Faith went through recruitment, she felt nervous about her appearance. "I'm a little awkward, not having figured out the correct formula of gel to put in my hair or whatever. I had no impression that I was going go into the top three sororities, and that's exactly what happened" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). She also was constantly comparing herself in terms of appearance to each sorority she was interacting with. "For me, I recognized where my appearance was at and thought that I did not match. It was ridiculous. Having curly hair, I was like, I see everyone in this room, and they all have straight hair, normally blonde, or even if they weren't. But I don't look like these girls at all. My hair's in a ponytail. I'm a hot mess all the time. I don't look like the girls in this chapter" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Panhellenic recruitment has multiple rounds and the whole chapter wears the same thing with different outfits each round. If Faith went to a chapter and everyone was dressed very feminine, she felt she would not fit in. Being on the other side of recruitment she realized many members do not have a say in the outfits the chapter wears and it may not be a true reflection of who they are.

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. As recruitment begins, the biggest factor in what sorority someone joins is her appearance. "Watching people go through recruitment, especially the ones I know, I can kind of already tell by their appearance where they're going to go, right? I can take an educated guess that maybe they were going to rush a particular chapter and maybe they weren't" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

In Faith's sorority, if a woman joined who was very attractive her sisters were skeptical because of the chapter's social status. They would ask "why did she join this chapter if she could have joined another? I think there was a very big thought process that prettier people would not join our chapter, and when they do, it's really exciting. But maybe there was a mistake. Maybe she has a bad personality. People were trying to figure out why this girl who looks so pretty joined our sorority" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). The sorority would also drop someone from their list if they thought they were too attractive and unattainable for them to pick their sorority. That person could have wanted to genuinely join not for status, but how they looked hurt their chances.

Also going to meet the top three chapters, she knew she was not going to fit their vibe aesthetically. Even though my family is fairly well off, my parents are both doctors, but I'm not famous. I'm not of the [well known] family. There's just a large difference. So, I know beforehand the things they do together generally cost a lot more money, and the things they were wearing cost a lot more money than what I was wearing from Forever 21. Honestly, that was another thing where I was like, I'm probably better off than half the girls going through rush. But even I felt uncomfortable going through rush and thinking that I was not, I did not have the amount of money to maintain the lifestyle and that appearance also just in terms of how much money they have. It also impacted how I was viewed" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 6: change over time. Faith's sorority is fairly new on campus and she was in the first group of members to join. She was attracted to the idea that they were not as concerned with status and appearance. The sorority was diverse, under the radar and relaxed with an anti-sorority vibe. Over the few years this has shifted drastically, where her sorority cares

about appearance and status. Their culture has become more in line with the traditional sororities on campus. Their status is very tied to the status of the fraternities who mix with them. “last semester mixed with two fraternities we've never mixed before that are a bit higher. So, I think in the eyes of my sophomore class, we are progressing, if that's what progression means” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Textural theme 7: status and diversity. In the Panhellenic community, status is very tied to diversity. “So higher-status chapters having a different level of diversity than lower-status and relating that to appearance. I think not only is that something you notice, but then it's also the stereotype” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). The higher the social status of a sorority in Panhellenic, the less diverse the sorority has. For the top tier chapters, “Everyone is always looking at them like, oh, wow, so they took two brown girls this year and tokenizing. I don't like it. And when there is a woman of color in a higher-up sorority, then it's a little shocking. It's like, oh, did they actually like her? Did someone know her beforehand? Is she rich? Are her parents famous? Was she dirty rushed because they wanted to not seem incredibly white?” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). With Faith’s sorority, the more they are progressing in social status, the whiter the sorority becomes. When Faith joined 50 percent of the women were women of color. This year they only took two women of color who both were Indian.

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. In Faith’s sorority, they are encouraged at mixers to have sexual or romantic relationships with the fraternity. The leaders of the sorority ask them to look nice and desirable with the goal of always looking attractive to outsiders.

Textural theme 4: reputation. Women in the Panhellenic community are valued for promiscuous or extreme sex acts as objects, but also scrutinized. The women have to walk an

impossible line between being valued as a sexual object, but not a slut. They are also placed in categories of sexual objects who men go to for fun and women for long term relationships. “I know girls who had a foursome, three girls and a guy, and were talking about it. All of us looked at them the next time we saw them like, ‘Ah.’ You hear about it, which is absurd. I don't know these girls. I talked to them once. They posted a picture on Instagram about it right after. So, it was there. They wanted people to know. It's just the three girls and they're hugging each other. Then the caption is, ‘Well ...’ So that was the picture after, and some girls who knew them got the story behind it and spread the story and everyone found out” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). There are also sorority sisters that Faith does not know well who openly share private details of their sex lives and reputations quickly spread in the sorority. It is hard to navigate that balance of being valued for your sexuality and also criticized for it. One woman who Faith does not know very well was telling her “‘I had sex for the first time in a year, and this is everything that happened. I orgasmed. I did anal.’ I was thinking, I’m not close with you and other people are overhearing what you are saying” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). Faith was also surprised when she gained a reputation for being promiscuous. She was single and hooking up with someone regularly, and then had a one-night stand with someone else. She only told her closest friends, but the whole sorority knew. It was shocking to her that she was describes as promiscuous because she was single and it was consensual sex. It is also common knowledge between within the Panhellenic and IFC community who has had a sexually transmitted disease, who is bad at different sexual acts, and what people have done sexually. “So, you can tell anyone in that chapter, and they're all going know. They know most of the guys in the fraternities you might mix with. So, they'll know everyone. It's just perfect for spreading gossip” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification. The recruitment process is a time when Panhellenic sororities place a huge emphasis on appearance and objectification. “I think recruitment is such a superficial process. I absolutely hate the process of recruitment. It's superficial. You're signing up for this process where you pay money, and then you are being judged on a five-minute interaction. They're ranking you, and you're ranking them internally, and then that's it. It's all so superficial that your appearance and just if you seem to fit into a chapter, if you have the look of the chapter, then you're good. If not, then you're not going make it” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Leaders in the sorority enforce rules about appearance both during recruitment and the rest of the year. “It's always if you're wearing letters, don't wear them with sweats. You should do your makeup. If you go to rush, you must wear your makeup. They did a presentation why everyone else was made to wear makeup to the point where it was drilled into them so much that they must wear makeup that one girl just quit because of it. She dropped the sorority before recruitment because she was like, ‘I can't believe they want me to wear makeup. This seems like the wrong values. I'm dropping’” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Going to mixers, especially with higher status fraternities, leads to objectification. “Every single mixer theme you have, the women are trying to sexy it up a little. They're trying to make themselves still look attractive or wear a low-cut thing. I don't know, if you go to a state's champion mixer, I'm going be in a basketball jersey. Other people are going wear a crop top or whatever and then a basketball headband. People are constantly trying to look more attractive for these guys” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Textural theme 10: trading sex for alcohol. Fraternity men are always the ones who provide alcohol, whether it is for mixers, date functions, or formals. Panhellenic nationals do not allow sororities to host events or purchase alcohol and their insurance policies do not cover

events with alcohol, where fraternities do. "The fact that guys buy alcohol and girls don't is a big issue. Especially if you go to a date function or an away formal and someone bought you alcohol or invited you there or paid for your ride or whatever, there is a very big expectation that you repay the favor" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018), meaning you have sex with them. If someone is going to an away formal and they are not dating the person taking them, then the sorority will tell their sister "Hey, do you want to have sex with them? If you don't, you need to tell them before you go" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). Faith also said that because so many people are drunk at away formals, having that conversation before helps prevent the guy from being too handsy or aggressive. For most fraternity men, their goal on an away formal is to have sex with the date they brought as an accomplishment. When Faith went to an away formal with someone who she was just friends with she encounters pressure to hook up both from her date and the whole fraternity.

But he was kind of into me. He got very drunk. We were walking alone on the beach, and he started making a pass. I was like, "No thank you. Let's leave." We emerged from the beach alone, and his entire fraternity was there watching. They were yelling, "Hey," cheering him on, "Bring her up," stuff like that, which was really disheartening because I also know many guys in that fraternity. They were not there at the time and knew I wasn't into this guy. But that was demeaning. (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018)

Most of the social events in her community are where everyone is drunk and most women who do not drink leave the sorority. This can create unsafe environments for the women. "There's definitely a culture in the frats where it's like, "Get them all drunk. It's still consensual if they say yes. Just make sure they can talk" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Textural theme 11: trading sex for status. As the years Faith was in her sorority passed, status became much more important to the sorority. “They want us to look really nice when we go to mixers and have more of a sexual or romantic relationship with fraternities in order to increase the fraternities we mix with and mix with better fraternities” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). On the flip side, if a fraternity has a lower status the sorority has a very different approach to how they present themselves. “We were playing flag football and then we went and hung out after with that fraternity. It's someone we would say we've been mixing with and not exactly high on the totem pole, so no one really cared. But we would never do that with a different fraternity. We would have to dress up, and everyone would want to look nice, and they would care more” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Women are willing to put themselves in more dangerous situations or use sex to try to increase their social standing in the community. Since the main source of power in the community is their sexual appeal to fraternities, women feel obligated to put themselves in these situations to gain status. “One of the guys was talking about these parties where girls would be invited by fraternities to these rush events or during the fall pre-rush or during rushing events where they would set these sophomore girls up with freshman guys and be like, ‘Oh, these are the type of girls you'll get when you join our fraternity.’ The upperclassmen in the sororities would tell them to go and hook up with them because they wanted to maintain their relationship with those fraternities, and the fraternities wanted them to go with these freshmen to get the freshmen to join later” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). This mindset carries on with her sorority after recruitment. “A lot of times, especially my chapter, people are really trying to move ahead in the social standings, and so they are more likely to go to parties with frats maybe they don't know as well or we don't mix with. They don't know as many people there because our sorority isn't there. So, then they are alone, and they get very drunk. Also, some

people might get excited if they see someone making out with a guy that is from a popular fraternity. They're like, 'Oh, you can get us in that mixer later on'" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). Women in her sorority also determine a large part of their own self-worth based on the status of the fraternity men they are dating. If they are with someone from a top fraternity, they act as though they are more important than the other sisters and look down on their own sisters as that top fraternity would.

Status of a fraternity also influences the type of women who are interested in hooking up with them. "a guy would be seen as more attractive if they're in a higher frat than if they aren't. So, I think a girl would be more likely to hook up with a less attractive guy in a higher fraternity than a more attractive guy in a lower fraternity. A lot of attractiveness is based on status. The first thing asked if a girl brings a guy in, 'What frat is he in?' And they do the same thing about girls. I think it is very important to a lot of people" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). "Then we went and hung out after with that fraternity. It's someone we would say we've been mixing with and not exactly high on the totem pole, so no one really cared. But we would never do that with a different fraternity. We would have to dress up, and everyone would want to look nice, and they would care more" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. In Faith's sorority there has been a larger shift from the first year they existed until now in terms of racial make-up. "My chapter was 50 percent minority when I joined, and that's the reason I did it" (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018), where this year only two members who joined were not white. Looking at recruitment from all the sororities this year, most of the women of color dropped out. Faith was part of the team working on recruitment with all the sororities, so she reached out to MGC and NPHC to see if she could figure out why this was happening. She did

not hear back and thinks this is partially because MGC and NPHC do not want to lose potential members to Panhellenic. Faith observed not very many women of color go through Panhellenic recruitment to begin with and when they start going through recruitment, the women of color see that the higher status sororities are whiter and all of the sororities are primarily white. These women see a mismatch between what is being said about finding your home in a sorority that matches your values and the culture of Panhellenic.

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils. Faith recognized some of the history behind why each council was formed influences their separation today. When IFC was formed, women and people of color were not allowed to go to college. When they came, women and people of color were seeking “sense of support, identity, and a community as a minority group” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). Faith talked about Panhellenic being formed first because women were allowed to go to college before people of color and their desire to have their own group to mirror the white fraternity men. For NPHC and MGC she talked about the cultural aspect of these councils. “I think it's more protecting their culture and protecting their identity. You don't really see many people that are not black join. You do, but those are very rare instances because it's really about identifying with that community. And if you don't, if you're just not there, then you sort of ruin the group by being there” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification. When Faith joined her sorority their culture around objectification was very different. Over half of the women who were offered bids dropped and almost everyone except for a few cried for being accepted into a chapter of low social status. The ones who cared about appearance dropped and the women left were able to form a bond based on common values. “We continued to get these girls that were under the

radar, just chill. All we wanted was chill. We didn't really care about looks as much. If we got a great-looking one, great. Everyone was a little excited, sure. But it was mainly just more about personality and digging the anti-sorority vibe, which is what the founders originally wanted” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

Faith’s sorority also has a support group for sexual assault and rape survivors. They are open about supporting these women. “A girl invited this guy to a date function that the sorority was hosting, and the sorority was like, ‘Hey, that guy has sexually assaulted someone in the past. That person does not feel comfortable with their coming.’ The girl is like, ‘Oh, of course. I had no idea.’ And then they made up a story like, ‘Oh, my big was supposed to find me a date. Sorry, you can't come anymore.’” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018).

If a sister discloses she has been sexually assaulted by someone in a fraternity, the sorority will either not interact with them socially or only do so if the man is prevented from coming by their fraternity. For the most part, fraternities have been supportive of this action, but often the brother is not told why he is not allowed to come and his behavior is not addressed. “It is difficult because the fraternities want to trust the guys, because you want to trust your friends. If they don't see them being creepy at all, then it's very hard to believe it. But at the same time, you need to take the girl's word pretty seriously and hope they aren't lying, there's a lot of gray area. It's a lot of he said, she said, unfortunately. That's why it's so difficult to enforce” (Faith, personal communication, February 7, 2018). There have also been cases where fraternity men have raped someone and is very publicly going through a judicial process on campus. When sororities said they would not mix with the fraternity unless the brother did not attend, the fraternity refused.

Faith also thinks the leadership in IFC has done a good job of trying to change the culture of how women in their community are treated and open conversations between the fraternities and sororities.

Individual Themes: Sophia

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. Sophia recognizes the role attractiveness to the opposite sex plays in her chapter choosing new members. “Inherently I think we all go for prettier girls because we want them to reflect our organization positively, because whether we're not we're willing to admit it, we're all trying to make our organization the coolest it can be, and so of course you want the prettier girls. I've heard comments from other chapters, they're like ‘She doesn't fit our aesthetic’” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018). The higher the social status of a chapter, the more matching a particular look will determine if someone is asked to join. “You can see all the girls going back to third and fourth round for [a top tier chapter] are wearing the exact same thing. It plays in. You fit the bill” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018).

Preparing for going through recruitment was a big process for Sophia. “So, I knew coming into college I wanted to be Greek because my mom was a [sorority name] here. So of course, we planned my outfits over Christmas break and like going from typical being like wearing jeans and boots or leggings and a t-shirt, like anything was a step in the right direction. So, the first day, I was like I have a cute outfit. I'm going to be great. I'm fairly cute. This is going to be fine and then you get there and see like oh, there's like an actual uniform you're supposed to be wearing if you're going to this chapter” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018). As soon as she entered her self-worth shifted and was comparing herself to all the women going through recruitment and the sororities. She also realized there was a social

capital that she was missing that other women had who knew exactly what to wear to get into those top chapters. Sophia knew that through most of the process the main criteria sororities were judging her on was how she looked and that made her, along with everyone going through recruitment, feel insecure.

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils. The process of recruiting members for each of the four councils is so different. Sophia talked about them operating in silos because the size of the chapters, what the chapters are looking for, and the process people go through to be initiated is so different in each council. She also mentioned because of the visibility and types of events hosted during recruitment, the councils have different levels of liability. She thought MGC and NPHC have the least amount of liability because of their size and privacy during intake. Sophia described Panhellenic having more liability because of the really strict rules they have during recruitment and the attendance of women at fraternity parties. Finally, she thought IFC had the most liability because a large number of their recruitment events and social events during that time have alcohol with large groups of people they do not know that well.

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 4: reputation. Sophia brought up how status and the importance it plays is very different in each council. “The whole social hierarchy thing is very Panhellenic specific. I don't think MGC or NPHC face that at all. IFC has a little bit of it” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018).

The importance of who you associate with or date also matters the higher the social status of your organization. For the top tier of chapters in Panhellenic at Sophia's school, the women are not supposed to date outside of the top tier of fraternities. The social ranking of sororities in her community have been longstanding and have a huge effect on who spends time together

between sororities and fraternities.

It's just kind of been set in stone for a while like who hangs out with who, and [her sorority] in a position where we've got our groups we hang out with, and we've tried to expand both ways. So [a fraternity] sits below us on the social hierarchy, and have reached out to us to mix, and we've considered it, but then the issue is we legitimately don't know people in that fraternity, so are women going to show up where they literally don't know anyone? Will they feel comfortable doing that? And then we've reached out to [a fraternity] which sits slightly above us and we go to their open parties and things like that and have friends, but they won't mix with us because we're not necessarily cool enough.” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018)

Then if that fraternity who has a higher status than Sophia’s agrees to mix with them, then the fraternity will be concerned that higher status sororities will think the fraternity no longer has enough status to mix with them.

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus. For philanthropy and sporting events, her sorority is still concerned about being sexually appealing to the fraternity men there, but just as much about how they will compare to other sororities.

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification. Sophia has noticed over her time in college that her desire to be valued as a sexual object has shifted. “Freshman year when I first joined the chapter, it was like yeah, we're going to a fraternity. Probably going to make out with a guy in the corner and then by junior year you're like I'm just going to dance with my friends and have fun and hang out with all of the new members and things like that. The goal completely shifts. I think it's becoming more secure in myself and who my friends are and just experience through college” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018).

Parties are always a big source of objectification in Panhellenic. “If there's a theme, we go all out. Of course, if there's no theme, then it's just the standard, like you just want to look pretty and good. I think we're compared to a lot of chapters and not hypersexualized as much as some of them” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018). Also, in the fraternity controlled space of parties and who gets in, the ratio is somewhere around 100 men to 500 women. Sophia said she and her sisters viewed this as more time to spend with women.

Textural theme 9: self-objectification. Competition between the sororities stems a culture of effortless perfection, where the women want to portray everything they are doing including how they present their appearance, is so easy. “Pretty much all the objectification based on appearance among women is between each other, like objectifying each other and being like ‘You are cool or not cool based off of this.’ And saying things that make you feel better, like ‘Oh, they're ugly in this regard’ or something. And we also tell ourselves that a lot just because we're so hyper competitive and want to see where we stack up” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018). Sophia also finds each sorority being given a negative reputation around objectification from being in competition. Some sororities, like hers, are called too wild and hard partiers, others are called sluts, and others are called boring prudes.

Textural theme 10: trading sex for alcohol. Depending on the time of year, rules around who can come to fraternity parties are different. Before recruitment, women are allowed to bring men with them to the parties, because the fraternities want to showcase their parties and women who attend them as a recruitment strategy. After recruitment, the parties are closed to only male members of their fraternity, because “the ratio [of more women for men] is ideal then, and they're not going to buy alcohol for non-members” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018), only on themselves and the women at the party.

Sorority women want to be able to host parties and be in control of the environment, people allowed in, and alcohol, “but the truth is we don't have houses and we don't have insurance policies to cover it. So, if a chapter wanted to go get a house and host parties, that's fine until something goes wrong” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018).

Another situation where fraternities hosting events becomes an issue in terms of expectations around sex and alcohol is away formals, “where you're going away to the beach or something like that, and you're expected to share a room and a bed with your date, then there's kind of this expectation. Fortunately, in all the situations my friends and I have encountered, we go with guy friends, and there's a very clear limitation there. I'm probably naïve in thinking none of the guys I know would expect that or push a girl that they took” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018). Women also have discussions with their sorority sisters on how to have conversations with their male friends who invite them and how to tell them they just want it to be as friends. The sorority sisters also question, “if you decide to go with him, do you trust this guy enough to know when you say no it will be fine?” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018).

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes. Separation by appearance is very clear especially once someone is a part of the Greek community. If there was a person of color in Panhellenic, she would most likely be in one of the bottom tier sororities. “Once you've been in Greek life for a bit, you can walk around campus and pick out who's in what organization” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018). There is also a lot of regional and socioeconomic separation between chapters. “You can look at [a sorority] and see that all the girls are from the northeast, with exception of three girls from elsewhere in the country, and they all come from wealthy backgrounds, and they're in the top chapter. And same

with [another top tier sorority], they're all international, or from New York and California. And then as you go down the hierarchy, it gets more and more diverse” (Sophia, personal communication, February 14, 2018). Sophia views her sorority as one of the most diverse, not by race, but by socioeconomic status and where they grew up.

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification. When it comes to being objectified by fraternity men, Sophia and her sorority sisters really rely on one another. They have conversations about how to navigate certain situations and keep themselves safe. They also have a group chat and if a man objectifies them or devalues them, the sisters go in the group chat to share their experience and support one another with both humor and compassion.

Composite Themes

A composite summary of each theme and how gender, race, and intersectionality shape those themes is provided in this section. Under each textural theme, there is the composite summary for those interviewees that discussed related content. Some of the individual themes are not listed in the composite themes because they were only present in one interview. While this section is broken down by gender, race, intersectionality, and council, it is important to keep in mind that these composite themes only reflect experiences from the eight participants and cannot be generalized beyond their experiences to other people who match that category.

Composite Themes Outline

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

Textural theme 1: appearance focus

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes

Textural theme 3: recruitment and intake

Textural theme 4: reputation

Textural theme 5: unspoken

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

Textural theme 4: reputation

Textural theme 6: change over time

Textural theme 7: status and diversity

Structural Theme 3: Structures that Support Objectification

Textural theme 1: appearance focus

Textural theme 4: reputation

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification

Textural theme 9: self-objectification

Textural theme 10: trading sex for alcohol

Textural theme 11: trading sex for status

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

Textural theme 1: appearance focus

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils

Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Monolithic

Textural theme 13: different contexts

Textural theme 14: different people

Textural theme 15: cognitive dissonance

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

Textural theme 16: combating objectification

Structural Theme 1: New Members Joining

See Table 1 for an outline of the effect gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership has on participants' experiences in structural theme 1: new members joining.

Table 1

Composite Effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 1: new members joining.

	Female	Male	Black and NPHC ^a	Latinx and MGC ^b	White	Black Female	Latina Female	White Female and Panhel ^c	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male and IFC ^d
Textural theme 1: appearance focus	Strong	Weak	Neutral		Weak	Strong	Strong	Strong	Neutral		Weak
Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes					Strong			Strong			Strong
Textural theme 3: recruitment and intake		Strong			Strong						
Textural theme 4: reputation			Strong	Strong							
Textural theme 5: unspoken											Strong

Note. If left blank there was no data for the theme related to this category.

^aNational Pan-Hellenic Council

^bMulticultural Greek Council

^cPanhellenic Council

^dInterfraternity Council

Textural theme 1: appearance focus.

Gender.

Female. For female members of the Greek community, appearance is one of the most important factors in choosing members to join. A woman going through recruitment is evaluated for her current appearance and physical traits that are out of her control. Appearance for women trying to join is not evaluated for potential in the future, just what currently is presented. This is

because for sororities, their ability to recruit and keep their chapter alive comes from being sexually appealing to fraternity men. Since fraternity men host parties, control the social scene, and have the most resources, sorority women gain their social status from how attractive they are to fraternity men. Their level of status then trickles down to their ability to sustain their chapter in getting new members to join.

Male. Appearance helps men in joining Greek organizations, but is not the most important factor because they gain their status in other ways. Appearance for men is viewed as being able to be altered if someone does not currently match the fraternity. Traits like dress and hygiene are viewed as appearance attributes that can easily be changed.

Race.

Black and NPHC. For Black Greeks and NPHC the common appearance theme when recruiting members is finding people who represent themselves professionally in their appearance because they know the barriers they face being Black and the importance of how they present themselves.

White. For the white interviewees, there are ways that their appearance could hurt or help someone joining their community but did not discuss the racial component to appearance and white beauty standards impacting recruitment. Their white privilege blinds them from including this in the conversation about appearance.

Intersectionality.

Black female. Appearance influenced who was chosen to join Jasmine's sorority because having fewer members due to being a minority population amplified the outside scrutiny on objectification. Individual women in smaller sororities have more impact than the much larger white sororities. To reach their goals and gain status through step or stroll shows, appearance was important when making decisions about membership.

Latina female. Lilly's sorority recruitment is very tied to appearance and each sorority has a very specific look. Their value and status as women directly correlate to their appearance and adherence Latina beauty standards. Being Latina, colorism influences how the potential new members are viewed in terms of appearance.

White female and Panhellenic. Appearance played a huge role in recruitment for both the mid and low social status sororities. Appearance was the primary deciding factor in which sorority someone would join. Insecurity about their appearance and how they compared to the sorority members, especially the high-status ones, was a big theme. Both interviewees being white and feeling like they did not match the appearance of those sororities shows how much more pronounced that feeling would be for a woman of color going through Panhellenic recruitment.

Black male. For William's fraternity, the only factor in picking new members around appearance was that they cared about how they presented themselves and looked professional and clean cut. This was motivated both by how it reflected on the fraternity and how Black men have to overcome the stereotype of being dangerous by society.

White male and IFC. When recruiting members, appearance had a limited impact on if someone was chosen. For both fraternities appearance was not a deal breaker. For the high-status fraternity, appearance played more of a role in giving an advantage, but could be compensated for by other qualities. Since both fraternities were primarily white, along with the men I interviewed, they had the privilege of not considering how the racial appearance impacted someone's chance of joining.

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes.

Race.

White. For historically White fraternities and sororities, people joining end up in

organizations that look like them and their level of attractiveness to the opposite sex. They had easy access to IFC fraternities because they match the demographics of those in power who formed these organizations long ago. The higher the status of an organization, the more attractive their members are overall.

Intersectionality.

White female and Panhellenic. Each Panhellenic sorority tends to recruit women who have a similar look. Going through recruitment, potential new members are comparing how they look to the different sororities and are most likely to end up in the sorority with women who look like them. For women of color trying to join a Panhellenic sorority, it is impossible for them to find a sorority or group that mirrors their appearance.

White male and IFC. For IFC, the trend is for more attractive men to be grouped together in the higher status fraternities.

Textural theme 3: recruitment and intake.

Gender.

Male. During recruitment and pledging, objectifying women is a persistent theme from the beginning as part of the acceptable culture for the fraternity. In conversations getting to know one another, brothers ask questions that objectify women as a way to bond. The fraternities also have pledging practices and traditions around having sex with women to become members.

Race.

White. Recruitment for historically White fraternities and sororities happens at the same time. Current fraternity members may lose a sexual partner because she joins a sorority that exposes the fraternity's and individual brother's reputation or because she joins a sorority of a higher status. New sexual relationships can also begin based on partnerships between White organizations.

Textural theme 4: reputation.

Race.

Black and NPHC. The first NPHC organization was founded over a century later than The first IFC fraternity. This time difference contributes to NPHC organizations having about half the time to develop their reputation. Within NPHC organizations that were founded earlier tend to recruit more members because they are more well-known and have more legacies who want to join the same organization as their older family members. Also, because NPHC is much smaller than the historically White organizations, IFC members, Panhellenic members, and non-Greeks usually know little to nothing about NPHC.

Latinx and MGC. Coming to college, both Latinx MGC members had very little knowledge about fraternities and sororities. The impressions they had were of White fraternities in popular culture and they did not personally know anyone in any type of Greek organization. They both came to know about MGC and their Latinx organizations through Latinx friends they met in college. MGC being founded much more recently than the other council, along with having different names and organizations depending on the school, leads them to be the least known of all the councils.

Textural theme 5: unspoken.

Intersectionality.

White male and IFC. When recruiting new members, they hold parties with women to interact with the men they are trying to recruit. The fraternities are implying that joining their organization will give the potential new members access to these women.

Structural Theme 2: Social Status

See Table 2 for an outline of the effect gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership has on participants' experiences in structural theme 2: social status.

Table 2

Composite Effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 2: social status.

	Female	Male	Black and NPHC ^a	Latinx and MGC ^b	White	Black Female	Latina Female	White Female and Panhel ^c	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male and IFC ^d
Textural theme 4: reputation	Strong	Neutral	Neutral		Strong	Neutral		Strong	Neutral		Neutral
Textural theme 6: change over time					Weak						
Textural theme 7: status and diversity								Strong			

Note. If left blank there was no data for the theme related to this category.

^aNational Pan-Hellenic Council

^bMulticultural Greek Council

^cPanhellenic Council

^dInterfraternity Council

Textural theme 4: reputation.

Gender.

Female. For Greek women, reputation rests solely on their appearance versus their behaviors.

Male. Greek men talked about the unfair reputation about how they treated women and that their fraternity did not fit the stereotype of having drinking or drug problems and sexually assaulting women.

Race.

Black and NPHC. NPHC members have a strong national reputation of status that is more universal from school to school than other councils. They also present a unified chapter image by wearing their colors and letter more often than IFC and Panhellenic. Having a lot fewer chapters than their White counterparts makes social status less important for NPHC and MGC.

White. Similar themes about reputation and how status is evaluated are common

through the whole Greek system, but the effect of status and ranking is stronger for White Greeks and their larger councils. Negative behavioral reputations have more of an impact on reputation on NPHC and MGC where IFC or Panhellenic groups are given a pass because of the protections their white privilege brings.

Intersectionality.

Black female. Even at service events or more causal events, NPHC women are using their appearance to convey their status. This stems from the more intense scrutiny they face from being black women and being a small group.

White female and Panhellenic. The importance of reputation and social status seemed most important and limiting for Panhellenic women.

Black male. False assumptions about Black males being a threat to women, and high rates of drug or alcohol abuse give NPHC men a negative stigma around these behaviors.

White male and IFC. Both IFC men interviewed felt other fraternities have a reputation of being concerned about their appearance, how women perceive them, and a culture that takes advantage of women, but not their fraternities. They both discussed status being a key factor in the prominence of these behaviors.

Textural theme 6: change over time.

Race.

White. Over time, there has been a shift to a more superficial focus on impressions given by appearance for some of the White Greeks. This manifests through how they present themselves on social media and the culture in the chapter.

Textural theme 7: status and diversity.

Intersectionality.

White female and Panhellenic. In Panhellenic status is very tied to diversity and the

Table 3 (continued)

Textural theme 11: trading sex for status	Strong	Weak
---	--------	------

Note. If left blank there was no data for the theme related to this category.

^aNational Pan-Hellenic Council

^bMulticultural Greek Council

^cPanhellenic Council

^dInterfraternity Council

^eThis effect applies to women even if it is strong.

Textural theme 1: appearance focus.

Gender.

Female. For Greek women, a lot of their power in the community comes from their value as sexual objects. How the sorority women appear to fraternity men is a constant consideration.

Male. Fraternity men tease and make fun of one another if one of their brothers hooked up with someone deemed unattractive. Group discussions around women are typically commenting on how they look. They also treated women differently based on how attractive they were. If a woman was not physically attractive to the fraternity, the fraternity would use her to perform tasks for them and take advantage of her desire to be accepted by the fraternity. If a woman was physically attractive, then the fraternity men would talk amongst themselves or to her with sexually evaluative commentary.

Race.

Black and NPHC. NPHC has some more formalized traditions that objectify women for their appearance including pageants and performances.

Intersectionality.

Black female. Black NPHC women have to be physically uncomfortable in

order to be more appealing to men. Even when participating in step or stroll shows, they are rewarded with higher scores for presenting in a sexually appealing way even though it may make the moves more challenging. Men and women are scored separately for these performances with sororities and fraternities being ranked in two groups. Outfits that make moves more difficult are not a factor for the fraternities. The emphasis on appearance increased after joining a sorority.

Latina female. Being Latina contributed to being sexualized as the stereotype of a Latina woman. The women would be valued by the fraternities in their council for being physically attractive, small, and submissive.

White female and Panhellenic. Panhellenic women are concerned about making their appearance sexually appealing to IFC men because this is a key factor in determining their status and worth as a sorority.

Black male. Unique to some NPHC fraternities is hosting pageants for women to win a scholarship that comes with responsibilities to do outreach for the fraternity and support the chapter. These women are evaluated on different things, but only an attractive woman is going to win.

Latino male. When MGC sororities did programming around their appearance within the framework of their race and gender, the fraternity men in their council would trivialize the topic especially if the message went against their view of ideal beauty.

White male and IFC. The way IFC men discussed women is in a way that dehumanizes them through nicknames, categories of women, or sexual acts with them as achievements. If a woman left a fraternity brother's room in the morning from a one-night stand, the whole fraternity would clap as she left, as if applauding her for the performance and the brother for his achievement.

Textural theme 4: reputation.

Gender.

Female. Greek women can be defined as sluts with a negative reputation for having sex with a lot of men. Being a virgin or someone who has few sexual partners gives them a positive reputation. Women walk an impossible line of being sexually appealing and exciting while also being virginal or pure.

Male. Greek men typically do not gain a negative reputation for having sex with many women, but may be teased if they are a virgin or are not promiscuous.

Race.

Black and NPHC. The smaller size of this council leads to individuals to be more easily stigmatized for their sexual behavior. Since this creates a smaller party environment, sometimes sorority women have more of a voice in protecting their members. Other times the community size can amplify fraternity brothers' solidarity to push back against the requests of sorority women.

Latinx and MGC. Similarly, to NPHC, MGC members are more likely to gain a reputation in the council for sexual behavior because the community is so much smaller than their white counterparts. Their size creates the same dichotomy of either giving sorority women more of a voice or fraternity brothers' unifying around their brother.

White. Since IFC and Panhellenic are much larger than NPHC and MGC, it is rare for an individual to have a sexual reputation known by the whole community, but more likely within their sorority and fraternities they mix with.

Textural theme 8: context that promotes objectification.

Gender.

Female. Women in Greek life are primarily evaluated for their sexual appeal to men

and in turn evaluate one another by the same standard. At parties, the sorority women are rewarded for presenting themselves in more revealing clothing. They are willing to participate in demeaning activities or put themselves in situations where they are more likely to be objectified and taken advantage to gain status.

Male. Men in Greek life are the ones who host the parties in their spaces and provide the alcohol. This gives women less control over their own safety and how they are treated. The fraternity men also make sure that there are many more women than men at parties to increase the odds that men can find someone to hook up with. All of this creates a party environment where men are “hunting” or pursuing women.

Intersectionality.

Black female. There is an increased pressure, especially on social media, on how an individual woman’s appearance reflects on the whole sorority. Her sexual appeal is viewed as representative of everyone in the sorority and if she looks bad, she is subject to intense scrutiny by the NPHC community.

White female and Panhellenic. Panhellenic women face the most intense objectification from other women during recruitment because they are being evaluated for how their appearance will appeal to IFC fraternity men who hold the most power in the Greek community. Women who are already sorority members are also held to the highest standard during this time to recruit the most attractive women.

Black male. Some cultural parallels exist in NPHC and MGC that make certain behaviors around objectification of women acceptable within their community that would not be to outsiders, such as dance moves, lyrics, and cultural gender roles.

Latino male. Machismo values around men being the provider and women taking care

of the home put women in a subservient position to be of service to men. The reputation of being a fraternity that takes advantage of women holds more weight in MGC than in IFC and fraternities work to avoid or change their reputation as a group that objectifies women. MGC having less of a hierarchy and fraternal power over sororities makes the consequences for MGC fraternities greater and creates fewer variables that the fraternity can use to outweigh mistreatment of women than their white counterparts.

White male and IFC. The culture of IFC is one that promotes objectification of women. IFC fraternity men described it as automatic, pervasive, and subconscious. Having sex with women was a goal to be achieved and the sexual reputation of different women was readily discussed in the fraternities in chapter meetings and around the sexual reputation of different women. Party themes, pledging events, and council policies around parties supported the culture of objectification of women by IFC fraternities.

Textural theme 9: self-objectification.

Gender.

Female. Greek women discussed the importance of gaining male attention by their looks and how this impacted their status and power in their council. Their self-worth was tied to how much money they could raise at a date auction or being noticed by men at a party. Status was solely determined by how sexually attractive the sorority was to fraternities in their council cause intense competition between the sororities.

Male. Greek men were confused by self-objectification because sometimes women would react negatively to being objectified and other times would welcome that response to their physical appearance. Men did not understand the struggle women faced between standing up for themselves and knowing the reality that being objectified gave the women power.

Intersectionality.

Black female. Some women did not see a problem with using pageants to objectify women. Jasmine felt that because the participants entered willingly and had a lot of other great qualities, being evaluated as sexual objects was acceptable.

Latina female. Lilly talked about the added pressure she put on herself because of the photos that would be posted on social media. It was as if they were going in a permanent record for the sorority that would be used to evaluate their status in MGC. She also talked about the power that presenting herself in a sexually appealing way would give the sorority when trying to raise money for philanthropy.

White female and Panhellenic. Sophia expressed most of the objectification and judgment of other women was by other women. The self-objectification was amplified in comparison to the objectification they faced because of the competition around social status. Panhellenic groups who were the most sexually attractive while appearing not to try to be had the most power and worth within Panhellenic and with IFC.

Textural theme 10: trading sex for alcohol.

Gender.

Female. Women talked about the trade off or expectations that came with attending parties. The more intimate the setting where alcohol was provided, the more expectations there were for them to have sex. Overall the goal of fraternities at parties are to get women drunk and increase the likelihood of having sex. Going into private rooms or away formals where specific men are giving alcohol to a woman comes with higher expectation that she will have sex.

Male. Being a leader in his community, Jack is more aware of the problem with men hosting the parties in their spaces and providing alcohol. This party structure is universal across all the councils.

Textural theme 11: trading sex for status.

Intersectionality.

White female and Panhellenic. Using sex to try to increase a sorority's status was a part of Panhellenic culture. IFC fraternities or fraternity men created dangerous situations for sorority women and upheld structures that required women to be in these environments or hook up with fraternity groups to maintain their social status established by the IFC fraternities. Women would go to higher status fraternity parties with men they did not know or try to leverage individual relationships for mixing between organizations. Panhellenic women are also more concerned with being sexually appealing at events with higher status fraternities.

Latino male. Anthony was the only male who talked about using individual relationships with high status sorority members to leverage relationships between their organizations.

Structural Theme 4: Segregation of Councils by Race

See Table 4 for an outline of the effect gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership has on participants' experiences in structural theme 4: segregation of councils by race.

Table 4

Composite Effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 4: segregation of councils by race.

	Female	Male	Black and NPHC ^a	Latinx and MGC ^b	White	Black Female	Latina Female	White Female and Panhel ^c	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male and IFC ^d
Textural theme 1: appearance focus		Strong		Neutral					Strong		Strong
Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes	Strong	Neutral	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong		Strong

Table 4 (continued)

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils	Strong	Strong	Neutral
---	--------	--------	---------

Note. If left blank there was no data for the theme related to this category.

^aNational Pan-Hellenic Council
^bMulticultural Greek Council
^cPanhellenic Council
^dInterfraternity Council

Textural theme 1: appearance focus.

Gender.

Male. Based on attire, fraternity men are easy to identify from non-Greek men if they are in a group on campus. Each council has a different way of presenting this, but the men have a common way of dressing that makes them identifiable as Greek.

Race.

Latinx and MGC. Within the Latinx community, colorism and cultural tensions between people from different parts of Latin America also show up in how Greek chapters segregate themselves.

Intersectionality.

Black male. In NPHC, fraternity men focus on presenting themselves in a professional and not threatening way. If they do not present themselves this way, the fraternity men are more likely to be perceived as threatening or judged more harshly than their white counterparts. Being a group of Black men, especially when they go out together in public, face a stigma and danger that does not exist when IFC men go out together.

White male and IFC. IFC men have a similar way of dressing and presenting themselves with a common uniform of khakis and polo shirts.

Textural theme 2: joining based on appearance or stereotypes.***Gender.***

Female. Sororities across all councils are segregated based on the appearance of their members. Councils segregated because predominantly white sororities are not welcoming to nor do they select women of color to join. Within the councils, each sorority has members with common physical traits that make it possible to guess fairly accurately what sorority a woman belongs to. Sorority women have stereotypes for their chapter based on personality characteristics, such as being wild, sweet, or assertive. These can exist at a national level or only with the local chapter.

Male. Fraternities are divided racially by council for the same reasons as sororities, but within those councils, different chapters are less likely to be grouped by physical traits. Fraternity stereotypes around treatment of women exist across all of the councils. Some fraternities have stereotypes that their members take advantage of women while other fraternities are viewed as being sensitive to creating a welcoming, safe environment for women.

Race.

Black and NPHC. NPHC members are primarily Black, stemming from the idea that these organizations were created as safe spaces that value Black culture and bringing in White members could be a threat to that goal. Members who are not Black tend to have been members of the Black social community in other ways prior to joining.

Latinx and MGC. Latinx organizations group themselves regionally and have bonds based on cultural norms from the areas of the country where they grew up.

White. IFC and Panhellenic both are primarily White with the lowest social status chapters being the most diverse. Similarly, chapters tend to group with members from the same regions of the United States and higher status chapters having the wealthiest members. Regional

preferences around appearance and stereotypes based on those regions lead to more segregation within IFC and Panhellenic. What men and women from particular regions find attractive leads to members grouping around these stereotypes and forming relationships with organizations of the opposite sex that fit those stereotypes.

Intersectionality.

Black female. NPHC sororities tend to group themselves around different physical characteristics like skin tone, wearing their hair natural or straight, and body type. While these stereotypes still exist, they are shifting and becoming less rigid.

Latina female. Like NPHC sororities, Latina sororities group themselves around similar physical characteristics.

White female and Panhellenic. Panhellenic women talked about the relationship between social status and diversity. The majority of their council is white, but there is a very strong correlation with the most diverse groups who have women color having lower social status. As organizations tried to gain social status their new members become more homogenous and have a larger percentage of White members.

Black male. Specifically, for NPHC fraternities, the societal threats White men bring to Black men creates a fear in accepting White members.

White male and IFC. IFC has very little racial and socioeconomic diversity. IFC men tend to come from wealthier families who can afford the cost of membership. This level of gender, racial, and socioeconomic privilege situates them as the ones with the most power in the Greek community. Within IFC, chapters segregate themselves based on regions of the country that they come from. Some of the stereotypes and traditions of IFC fraternities are very unwelcoming to people of color and women. This contributes to men of color not wanting to join IFC fraternities because it is not a safe place for them. With fraternities who have negative

stereotypes around racism, the concern for not appearing racist can be prioritized over considerations around objectifying women.

Textural theme 12: historical knowledge of councils.

Race.

Black and NPHC. Size and culture of different councils have made working on common goals across all of Greek life difficult. NPHC and MGC being formed out of struggle and lack of inclusion in IFC and Panhellenic make the culture and purpose of the councils very different. NPHC being considerably smaller and not having formalized housing are some examples that make the challenges and focus of different councils so distinct.

Latinx and MGC. For MGC, along with NPHC, their status and operations never crossed over to IFC and Panhellenic. Historically White organizations viewed MGC and NPHC as irrelevant to their Greek community. This view was reciprocal and the councils operate in silos.

White. For some IFC and Panhellenic members, especially leaders, knowledge exists about why the councils operate separately and how the values that councils were founded on support the segregation that exists today.

Structural Theme 5: Diverse Versus Monolithic

See Table 5 for an outline of the effect gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership has on participants' experiences in structural theme 5: diverse versus monolithic.

Table 5

Composite Effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 5: diverse versus monolithic.

	Female	Male	Black and NPHC ^a	Latinx and MGC ^b	White	Black Female	Latina Female	White Female and Panhel ^c	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male and IFC ^d
Textural theme 13: different contexts	Strong	Neutral	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Textural theme 14: different people			Neutral	Neutral	Strong						
Textural theme 15: cognitive dissonance				Strong			Strong		Strong	Strong	

Note. If left blank there was no data for the theme related to this category.

^aNational Pan-Hellenic Council

^bMulticultural Greek Council

^cPanhellenic Council

^dInterfraternity Council

^eThis effect applies to women even if it is strong

Textural theme 13: different contexts.

Gender.

Male. The setting where Greek members are interacting influences how they dress and present themselves. Greek men have more latitude concerning their appearance at philanthropy or sporting events than Greek women.

Race.

Black and NPHC. The increased scrutiny on the appearance of Black Greeks gives an added pressure to appear professional in all settings.

Latinx and MGC. The smaller size of MGC, along with NPHC, leads to a much higher percentage of members that are in leadership roles. A large portion of the community has to be concerned with how their social behavior will spill over into their role as a leader.

White. Since IFC and Panhellenic have a lot more resources and formal housing, they

can host large parties off campus without police oversight that is required for on campus parties that NPHC and MGC have because it is their only option.

Textural theme 16: different people.

Race.

Black and NPHC. NPHC's members are primarily Black, with diversity coming from region or country they are from. This exists both nationally and at the chapter level. Certain chapters are more likely to have members from Africa, but it is unclear whether the chapter values international students or they attract them because of their subset of international students. Being a mixed gender council creates gender diversity that does not exist in IFC and Panhellenic.

Latinx and MGC. MGC has a lot of racial diversity, but is segregated by race per chapter, with one chapter on the council being multicultural. Within each chapter there is diversity based on nationality along with region of the United States that the member came from. Similar to NPHC, MGC has gender diversity being the other mixed gender council.

White. For IFC and Panhellenic there is very little diversity. All chapters are predominately white and also tend to group by other demographics such as hometown and wealth.

Textural theme 15: cognitive dissonance.

Race.

Latinx and MGC. For MGC members, they struggle to make sense of their values around supporting marginalized populations and traditions in their organizations that may marginalize women through objectification or self-objectification.

Intersectionality.

Black male. The clash between the privilege of being a male and marginalized being Black prevents Wesley from seeing how women are marginalized through pageants.

Latino male. Similar to Wesley, Anthony struggles with balancing his male privilege if his brother is accused of sexual assault and values around believing women as a marginalized group.

Structural Theme 6: Protective Factors Against Objectification

See Table 6 for an outline of the effect gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership has on participants' experiences in structural theme 6: protective factors against objectification.

Table 6

Composite Effects of gender, race, intersectionality, and council membership on participants' experiences in structural theme 6: protective factors against objectification.

	Female	Male	Black and NPHC ^a	Latinx and MGC ^b	White	Black Female	Latina Female	White Female and Panhel ^c	Black Male	Latino Male	White Male and IFC ^d
Textural theme 16: combating objectification	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong							

Note. If left blank there was no data for the theme related to this category.

^aNational Pan-Hellenic Council

^bMulticultural Greek Council

^cPanhellenic Council

^dInterfraternity Council

Textural theme 16: combating objectification.

Gender.

Female. For Greek women, the biggest source of support against objectification is sisters in their chapter. They have programming and discussion on a formal level to combat objectification. In their day to day life they look out for one another's safety and well-being.

Male. Some fraternal values are around treating women with respect and have discussions about what is acceptable behavior towards women. These are taught during the pledging process and align with rituals and values from the national fraternity.

Race.

Black and NPHC. Having organizations that were formed around being marginalized creates an understanding around not marginalizing women through objectification. NPHC's culture around activism creates more awareness and sensitivity around how women are treated.

Latinx and MGC. For MGC, along with NPHC, coming from a mixed gender council gives women some protection from objectification and respect because of the close working relationship between the fraternities and sororities. The bonds and relationships formed in their smaller councils gives women more power and allies in the fraternities to fight against being objectified

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND OUTCOMES

Summary

Summary

In chapter one, the structure of Greek life into four councils and the overall culture of Greek life is presented. The framework of objectification theory and how it relates to Greek life is introduced. The need to examine objectification in Greek life through an intersectional lens to fully understand the phenomenon is shown as a gap in the literature on this topic and the first step in making effective interventions. The research questions of “What role does council membership and race play in male college students’ experiences of objectification of women in the Greek System? What role does council membership and race play in women college students’ experiences of self-objectification in the Greek System? In what ways is objectification similar and different when comparing Greek councils?” are raised, along with key terms needed to understand concepts throughout the study.

In chapter two, previous research is reviewed to describe the gap this study bridges. The history of Greek life, unique features of Greek life, and cultural norms for each council from previous research are described. The theoretical framework of objectification theory and studies done on objectification in Greek life are examined. Finally, intersectionality is presented as a key lens needed to reveal the full scope of objectification in Greek life.

In chapter three, the phenomenological research methods are explained for the reader to understand the theoretical foundations behind the methods utilized. The participants, instrumentation, and how questions were constructed are presented. The procedures for participant recruitment, data collection, and data analysis are explained to allow for replication of the study. Trustworthiness, to show the results reported fully express the participants’ voices, is present.

In chapter four, individual structural and textural themes for each participant are depicted with verbatim examples. Then composite themes framed through the lens of intersectionality are produced. Themes in this chapter are presented to show the phenomenon through the textures of what is happening and the structures of how objectification in all four councils occurs.

In chapter five, this phenomenological study of objectification in Greek life through an intersectional lens is summarized. How the findings differ from the literature review and the new areas this research reveals are distinguished, along with the limitations of the study. Implications of the findings for society, counseling profession, education, and the researcher are discussed. Future research areas and next steps as an outcome of the research are presented.

Findings that Differ from Literature Review

This study's findings used intersectionality to describe and explain themes around objectification in Greek life that were not examined previously when looking at this phenomenon. By examining the relationships between Greek councils and looking at objectification from different lenses in one study, a fuller picture emerged from this study. Both racial and gender factors influenced the nuances of how objectification of women occurs in Greek life and within councils. The impact of social status on objectification in Greek life was a large theme not presented previously. In the literature review, research around the history and culture of Greek life, objectification theory, objectification in Greek life, and intersectionality were examined. Below, the results of this study will be positioned in relation to each of these areas of the literature review.

Greek life: history and culture.

Background: formation of the four councils. The history of how each council was formed and how that shapes the cultural of Greek life today showed up in different levels of awareness for the participants. In this study IFC members have little knowledge about how and

when their council was founded, along with the other councils, and how this impacts the values of each council. Given the focus on ritual and tradition in all of Greek life, this was surprising, but looking at their white male privilege, the awareness around only their chapter's legacies make sense. Panhellenic participants from this study have a little more understanding that their council consists of single sex organizations because they were excluded from joining fraternities when they were founded. Similarly to IFC participants, they are more focused on the present culture of their council without the awareness of how their history influenced where their council is today. For NPHC and MGC, the members in this study have much more knowledge about how their council and individual organizations were created and the deep impact that it has on their values around advocacy and racial identity. This too differs from the literature review in this section, but makes sense within the framework of intersectionality.

Individual aspects of Greek life. For recruitment and intake, the struggles that people of color face joining historically White councils outlined in the literature matched with the experiences described by the White participants. While the participants were aware that people of color rarely joined their chapters and were tokenized if they did, the participants did not have the perspective of the cultural accommodation required for people of color to become members. Hazing was only brought up briefly by two participants, one NPHC male who described hazing activities that objectified women and one MGC female who described stories she heard about Panhellenic hazing that involved self-objectification. Given the protective nature of Greek life, especially around hazing traditions, it is not surprising that it was not discussed by the other participants and does not mean hazing that objectifies women does not occur in their councils. The social divide between councils and party structure was discussed by all participants. The findings of the study provided more insight into how the unique values of each council shaped the development of their members. NPHC and MGC members were aware of the increased

pressure and scrutiny they faced and described some of the ways this impacted their Greek experience. IFC and Panhellenic members were not aware of the privileges they had in being able to operate without so much oversight and how the size of their councils decreased the individual pressure to be objectified as a representation of their whole chapter or council.

Cultural aspects of Greek life. The findings of this study for IFC members were aligned with the research showing the negative culture of sexist and racially exclusive organizations that objectify women. The results also showed some of the positive shifts in distancing themselves from some of the traditions that make their organizations unsafe for women and people of color. IFC participants demonstrated new ways this dichotomy showed up in their organizations by both objectifying women and trying to be respectful men. The complex nature of sisterhood for Panhellenic women competing for male attention was present in the findings and was explained further than the literature through the rigid competition for status within Panhellenic caused by our patriarchal society. The interviews also showed how this competition influenced objectification and self-objectification through the power dynamics between IFC and Panhellenic. For NPHC and MGC members, the unique culture of each council presented in the literature was present, but the interviews went much deeper into how their racial and gender identity shaped the values and norms of their council.

Objectification theory.

Objectification theory including objectification, self-objectification, and negative outcomes were present in the findings of this study, but were expanded to show how intersectionality really shaped what these variables looked like in each council. The ways objectification and self-objectification showed up were different for each council. The psychological consequences of shame, anxiety, and habitual body monitoring looked different for the women in each council and were shaped by intersectionality along with the culture of

Greek life. This expansion provided by the findings was necessary to understand objectification in this context. This study helps add to the research on objectification for women of color that is missing from the literature. The findings also focus on objectification from the male perspective and how this shows up differently in Greek life along with each council. Looking at objectification in this study also shows the impact of status and power as other variables influencing this theory.

Objectification in Greek life.

The findings bridge the large gap of previous studies not examining objectification of women who are in NPHC and MGC as part of the Greek community. The ways objectification shows up in NPHC and MGC were a key part missing in previous research to fully explain this phenomenon. In studying how men objectify women in Greek life, these findings provide insight beyond the limited parts of Greek life studied before and includes all four councils, not just IFC. The interviews also demonstrate how self-objectification and recruitment versus intake look across all of Greek life, not just Panhellenic.

Intersectionality. Intersectionality research has expanded to cover different areas of study, but has not been applied to Greek life and objectification. By doing so with this study, the true phenomenon of objectification in Greek life emerges, instead of the previous findings using only White Greek participants. Understanding the distinct nuances of Greek life and looking at all four councils in this study provides a more accurate representation through the incorporation of gender, race, and intersectionality.

Limitations

Having two participants from each council allowed for equal voices for each council, but because NPHC and MGC were mixed gender councils this sometimes left only one perspective of a female or male from that council. Having a smaller participant pool from a variety of

chapters in terms of social status gave an assortment of perspectives, but sometimes lacked substantiation from other voices. The interviewer having experience in Greek life, but not being a member could have created some gaps in understanding the phenomenon. The protective and secretive nature of Greek life may have prevented interviewees from sharing openly everything surrounding this topic.

Implications

Implications to Society

This study will help bring awareness to the continued prevalence of objectification of women in Greek life and how it has evolved over the years. Sometimes society views objectification of women in Greek life as a problem in the past that no longer occurs today. Many of the experiences and structures that support them included in this study are present outside of Greek life and in our society. The ways race and gender intersect to create unique experiences around men objectifying women and women objectifying themselves discussed mirror some of the experiences and differences present in our societal culture. Especially in other institutions that have the same strong power differences present in Greek life, such as government, male dominated professions, some corporate settings, readers may find similarities to the culture presented in this study. This study also brings awareness to the impact the culture of objectification has on members of the Greek community. This impact does not just stay within the confines of college, but is then carried on after the members leave school. The interviews of these participants give voice to those who have been objectified and marginalized in the Greek system. Creating a deeper understanding of this phenomenon contributes to being able to change the culture in the future.

Implications to Profession

For the counseling profession, looking at objectification through different lenses will help

counselors empathize with clients who had similar experiences. This study will shed light on the different ways women are impacted by objectification and the different ways objectification occurs. The knowledge generated will help to design interventions and prevention programs around objectification in the Greek system that are more effective. For members of the profession who are not members or familiar with Greek life, this study provides a glimpse into some of the unique challenges that impact this community. For counselors on a college campus, when designing groups around objectification of women, the findings of this study provide insight to the unique needs of participants and how their council membership really impacts those needs. If designing interventions for women around self-objectification, addressing the concerns for Greek women will take a different approach and look different depending on the racial identity of the women who participate. When creating interventions for men around objectification, including portions about policies and culture of Greek life that support objectification will be needed to impact those participants. Understanding the diverse needs of each council can help counselors make informed decision about how to structure group membership for this topic, since for example, a Panhellenic woman will have different needs than an NPHC male. Many interventions and groups now address the Greek community as a whole and this may not be the best approach. If the counselor's goal is to bring the councils together to address these topics, it will be important to have knowledge about the phenomenon and deep-rooted challenges that keep the councils separate.

When working with individual clients in college, their experiences in Greek life may influence their worldview and struggles they are facing. Without the phenomenological perspective of objectification of women in Greek life, the client may not feel heard or understood. If a client is Greek and a survivor of sexual assault, the perspective provided by this study can help the counselor in the therapeutic process and as an advocate for their client.

Identifying the potential challenges the client may face within the structures of Greek life will make the counseling process more effective, both for men who may normalize objectification and women struggling with self-objectification. When working with clients after college, awareness of this phenomenon could help contextualize the impact their time in Greek life may have on current issues the client is trying to work on in therapy.

Implications to Education

This study can educate the many different roles that interact with the Greek systems and the nuances of objectification in each council. Campus administrators, campus police, women's centers, cultural centers, national headquarter, fraternity and sorority life staff, and parents are just a few examples of roles that could benefit in understanding this phenomenon. For example, Panhellenic nationals having insight into objectification in their community and the policies that support it is the first step to making changes. It can also educate members of the Greek community about how objectification manifests in different councils and help inform those trying to change this culture from within. All of these stakeholders can discover the common themes across councils and the need to create unique solutions for each council.

For training counselors in college counseling, educating them on the full picture of objectification of women in Greek life and variances due to intersectionality is important for them to be effective at addressing some of the challenges their students and campus face. Sexual assault prevention on college campuses is a large topic of discussion for campus professionals. Being a key issue for counseling centers, along with many partners on campus, it is important for those entering the profession to understand the magnitude and complexities of this huge issue.

Implications to Researcher

Hearing the stories of objectification in Greek life from the participants who were open and vulnerable in talking with me humanized this topic and gave a personal connection to how

the women I talked with were affected by this phenomenon. Discussing the culture surrounding objectification with the men I interview allowed me to gain deeper understanding from their perspective. Building the human connection when discussing this phenomenon increased my already strong passion around changing the culture of objectification. Understanding the structure and variables that contribute to objectification in the Greek system will help me articulate the complexity of the problem and advocate for effective change.

Outcomes

Future Studies

This study was conducted at one university and the culture of the university can greatly impact Greek life. Looking at school in other regions, schools with different percentages of students involved in Greek life, different housing systems, and comparing PWI's to HBCU's would increase the understanding of this topic. Having this study replicated with more participants from the same school, especially for mixed gender councils, would add to the depth of contextualizing this complex phenomenon. Future studies should also include participants from other MGC groups that were not represented here, such as Asian interest groups. Following participants as they leave Greek life to see if the impacts of objectification in Greek life are lasting and how they evolve could inform interventions for current students and people after they leave Greek life. Evaluating participants before they enter Greek life and at different stages of membership could also provide more insight into the changes over time for Greek members.

Building on the findings of this study, a quantitative longitudinal study could be done. The results of this study can inform instrument development for a quantitative approach to objectification of women in Greek life. Interventions could be designed based on the knowledge collected and tested for their effectiveness in combating objectification in Greek life.

When trying to expand this study to other topics, looking at other contexts outside of Greek life, especially ones that have a strong gender or racial divide like Greek life, would add to the larger picture of objectification of women on college campuses. Athletics has some parallels to the culture of Greek life and comparing objectification of women through the lens of intersectionality in athletics to Greek life would increase understanding in both communities. Outside of the college environment applying this study to male dominated professions would increase understanding of objectification in those environments along with the impact of intersectionality on participant's experiences. Another area to be examined in Greek life, athletics, professions, and society as a whole would be the history of policies and laws that impact the culture of objectification of women and how those policies impact different identity groups in unique ways.

Culmination

In bringing this study on objectification of college women in the Greek system through an intersectional lens to a close, considering the conclusions in the context of previous findings seems fitting. This study has reviewed existing literature to illuminate the gap this research fills and how it relates to previous studies. Having compared the findings of this study to the literature review, the comprehensive descriptions of objectification of college women in the Greek system through an intersectional lens add new and significant depictions to existing knowledge. This study distinctively captures the similarities and differences across councils allowing comparison and unique themes of understanding to emerge. By searching for awareness and cognizance into this phenomenon, this study provides a starting place to inform research and practice. The insight into the lives of the participants leaves a lasting impact on me as a scholar, counselor, and woman.

REFERENCES

- Allen, E.J., & Madden, M. (2010). The prevalence, tolerance, and significance of hazing on U.S. college campuses. *The Bulletin*, 78(3), 1-12.
- Allen, W. R. (1992). The color of Success: African-American college student outcomes at predominately White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 26-44.
- Argyle, M. & Wessely, M. (1969). Observer or observed: A reversible perspective in person perception. *Sociometry*, 32, 396-412.
- Armstrong, R. J. (2015). *Looking back, an alumnae perspective: A phenomenological study of the lived experiences of sorority life*. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A, 75.
- Arthur, L. B. (1999). Dress and the social construction of gender in two sororities. *Clothing & Textile Research Journal*, 17, 84-93.
- Artiles, A. J. (2013). Untangling the racialization of disabilities. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 329-347.
- Astin, A.W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Basow, S. A., Foran, K. A., & Bookwala, J. (2007). Body objectification, social pressure, and disordered eating behavior in college women: The role of sorority membership. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly*, 31(4), 394-400.
- Becque, F. D. (2002). *Coeducation and the history of women's fraternities, 1867-1902*. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 2002). Dissertation Abstracts International, 63(09A), 3123.
- Berkowitz, A., & Padavic, I. (1999). Getting a man or getting ahead: A comparison of White

- and Black sororities. *Journal Of Contemporary Ethnography*, 27(4), 530-557.
- Bleecker, E. T., & Murnen, S. K. (2005). Fraternity membership, the display of degrading sexual images of women, and rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles*, 53, 487 – 493.
- Braxton, J. (2000). *Reworking the student departure puzzle*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt Press.
- Brown, A. (2013). An overview of the history, research, and culture of historically Black Greek letter organizations. In J. S. Brooks, N. W. Arnold, J. S. Brooks, N. W. Arnold (Eds.), *Confronting racism in higher education: Problems and possibilities for fighting ignorance, bigotry and isolation* (pp. 83-110). Charlotte, NC, US: IAP Information Age Publishing.
- Carbado, D. W., & Gulati, M. (2013). The Intersectional Fifth Black Woman. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 527-540.
- Cary, M. S. (1978). Does civil inattention exist in pedestrian passing? *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 36, 1185-1193.
- Chang, M. J., & DeAngelo, L. (2002). Going Greek: The effects of racial composition on White students' participation patterns. *Journal Of College Student Development*, 43, 809–823.
- Chen, E. W. (1998). *The continuing significance of race: A case study of Asian American women in White, Asian American, and African American sororities* (Order No. 9913064). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304439398).
- Cho, S. (2013). Post-Intersectionality: The Curious Reception of Intersectionality in Legal Scholarship. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 385-404.
- Clawson, M. (1986). Nineteenth-Century Women's Auxiliaries and Fraternal Orders. *Signs*, 12(1), 40-61.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence

- against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
- Corprew, C. I., & Mitchell, A. D. (2014). Keeping it frat: Exploring the interaction among fraternity membership, disinhibition, and hypermasculinity on sexually aggressive attitudes in college-aged males. *Journal Of College Student Development*, 55(6), 548-562.
- D'Augelli, A. R. & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). African American undergraduates on a predominately White campus: Academic factors, social networks, and campus climate. *Journal Of Negro Education*, 62(I), 67-82.
- De Los Reyes, G., & Rich, P. (2003). Housing students: Fraternities and residential colleges. *The Annals Of The American Academy Of Political And Social Science*, 585, 118–123.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (1998). *Woman abuse on campus: Results from the Canadian national survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dukes, S. (1984). Phenomenological Methodology in the Human Sciences. *Journal Of Religion and Health*, 23(3), 197-203.
- Edwards, J. T. (2009). Sorority chapter members' perspectives of chapter racial integration. *Oracle: The Research Journal Of The Association Of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 4, 42–54.
- Enanoza, M. (2013). *Student perceptions and experiences: Deconstructing race in fraternity/sorority life* (Order No. 1551476). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1499056653).
- Feagin, J.R., Vera, H. & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at White colleges and universities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fromme, D. K., & Beam, D. C. (1974). Dominance and sex differences in nonverbal responses to differential eye contact. *Journal Of Research In Personality*, 8, 76-87.

- Gardner, C. B. (1980). Passing by: Street remarks, address rights, and the urban female. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, 328-356.
- Gist, N. P. (1955). Fraternal membership policies and minority groups: The case of Missouri University. *Social Problems*, 2, 165-172.
- Hall, J.A. (1979). *Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Handler, L. (1995). In the fraternal sisterhood: Sororities as gender strategy. *Gender And Society*, 9, 236-255.
- Harris, F. III., & Harper, S. R. (2014). Beyond bad behaving brothers: Productive performances of masculinities among college fraternity men. *International Journal Of Qualitative Studies In Education*, 27(6), 703-723.
- Harper, S. R., & Harris, F., III. (2010). *College men and masculinities: Theory, research, and implications for practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Henley, N. M. (1997). *Body Politics: Power, sex and nonverbal communication*. New York: Touchstone.
- Horowitz, H. W. (1952). Discriminatory fraternities at state universities: A violation of the Fourteenth Amendment? *Southern California Law Review*, 25, 289-296.
- Hughey, M. W. (2010). A paradox of participation: Nonwhites in White sororities and fraternities. *Social Problems*, 57(4), 653-679.
- Hughey, M. W., Parks, G. S., & Skocpol, Theda. (2011). *Black Greek-Letter Organizations 2.0: New Directions in the Study of African American Fraternities and Sororities*. Jackson, US: University Press of Mississippi.
- Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas* (W.R. Boyce Gibson, Trans.). London: George Allen & Unwin.

- Husserl, E. (1965). *Phenomenology and the crisis of philosophy* (Q. Lauer, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Hunter, J. S. (2011). *Navigating the multicultural imperative: The case of a multicultural Greek council*. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A, 71, 3051.
- Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma-Mosley, J. D. (2017). The Greek system: How gender inequality and class privilege perpetuate rape culture. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal Of Applied Family Studies*.
- Lee, A. M. (1955). *Fraternities without brotherhood: A study of prejudice on the American campus*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- McCabe, J. (2011). Doing Multiculturalism: An Interactionist Analysis of the Practices of a Multicultural Sorority. *Journal Of Contemporary Ethnography*, 40(5), 521-549.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ocen, P. A. (2013). Unshackling Intersectionality. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 471-483.
- Oiler, C. J., Munhall, P. L. (1986). *Nursing research: a qualitative perspective*. Norwalk, Conn.: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Oseguera, L., & Rhee, B.S. (2009). The influence of institutional retention climates on student persistence to degree completion: A multilevel approach. *Research In Higher Education*, 50, 546-569.
- Pike, G. (2003). Membership in a fraternity or sorority, student engagement, and educational outcomes at AAU public research universities. *Journal Of College Student Development*, 44(3), 369-382.
- Peoples, S. D. (2011). *Tragedy or tradition: The prevalence of hazing in African American*

- fraternities and sororities*. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A, 72, 3637.
- Ray, R. (2013). Fraternity life at predominantly White universities in the US: The saliency of race. *Ethnic And Racial Studies*, 36(2), 320-336.
- Ray, R., & Rosow, J. A. (2010). Getting off and getting intimate: How normative institutional arrangements structure Black and White fraternity men's approaches toward women. *Men And Masculinities*, 12(5), 523-546.
- Ray, R., & Rosow, J. A. (2012). The two different worlds of Black and White fraternity men: Visibility and accountability as mechanisms of privilege. *Journal Of Contemporary Ethnography*, 41(1), 66-94.
- Risman, Barbara J. (1982). College women and sororities: The social construction and reaffirmation of gender roles. *Urban Life*, 11, 231-252.
- Roberts, D., & Jesudason, S. (2013). Movement Intersectionality: The Case of Race, Gender, Disability, and Genetic Technologies. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 313-328.
- Rodriguez, R. (1995). Hermandades on campus: Elite Latino secret societies and fraternities of the past give way to today's 'Brotherhoods' and 'Sisterhoods'. *Black Issues In Higher Education*, 12(21), 26.
- Rolnik, A. M., Engeln-Maddox, R., & Miller, S. A. (2010). Here's looking at you: Self-objectification, body image disturbance, and sorority rush. *Sex Roles*, 63(1-2), 6-17.
- Rose, T. (2013). Public Tales Wag the Dog: Telling Stories about Structural Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 447-469.
- Schmitz, S., & Forbes, S. A. (1994). Choices in a no-choice system: Motives and biases in sorority segregation. *Journal Of College Student Development*, 35, 103-108.
- Stompler, M., & Martin, P. (1994). Bringing women in, keeping women down: Fraternity "Little Sister" organizations. *Journal Of Contemporary Ethnography* 23: 150-84.

Tyler, M. (1990). *Role expectations for Black and White Greeks at a predominantly White institution* (Order No. 9100244). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (303900089).

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Participant Demographic Questionnaire

1. Please select the gender you identify with.

Female

Male

Gender Non-Conforming

Prefer to self-identify: _____

If answer is Female:

1.a.1. Within your experiences in Greek life, do you feel your body and appearance is looked at and judged?

Yes

No

Prefer not to answer

1.a.2. Within your experiences in Greek life, do you feel others evaluate your body and physical appearance sexually or as a sight to be appreciated by others?

Yes

No

Prefer not to answer

If answer is male:

1.b.1. Within your experiences in Greek life, do you look at and or evaluate women's bodies?

Yes

No

Prefer not to answer

1.b.2. Within your experiences in Greek life, do you observe or evaluate women's bodies and physical appearance sexually or view them as a sight to be appreciated?

Yes

No

Prefer not to answer

If answer is gender non-conforming or prefer to self-identify:

1.a.1.

1.a.2.

1.b.1.

1.b.2.

2. Which of the following best describes your ethnicity?

African American or Black

American Indian, Alaskan Native, Indigenous, or First Nations

Arab or Arab American
 Asian or Asian American
 Caucasian or White
 Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish American
 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 Multiracial
 Prefer to self-identify: _____

3. Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?
 - Asexual
 - Bisexual
 - Heterosexual or Straight
 - Gay
 - Lesbian
 - Questioning
 - Prefer to self-identify: _____

4. What is your student classification?
 - Freshman
 - Sophomore
 - Junior
 - Senior
 - Other: _____

5. How many years have you been a member of the Greek community? (You can use decimal points if necessary.)

6. Which chapter are you a member of? (The purpose of this question is to have participants from a wide variety of chapters. The name of your chapter will not be included in the study.)

7. Which Greek council does your chapter belong to?
 - Interfraternity Council (IFC)
 - Multicultural Greek Council (MGC)
 - National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC)
 - Panhellenic Association (Panhel)
 - Unsure
 - Other: _____

The following questions are asked to contact you to set up a face to face interview if you are qualified to participate in the study. No identifying information will be used in the study.

8. What is your preferred method of contact?
 - Phone
 - Email
 - Either phone or email

If answer is phone:

8.a. What is your phone number?

If answer is email:

8.b. What is your email address?

If answer is either phone or email:

8.a.

8.b.

Thank you for participating in this survey. You will be notified via your preferred contact method if you are qualified to participate in the study and in-person interview.

Appendix B. Initial Interview Questions

1. When interacting with an organization of the opposite sex, what messages do you want your appearance to communicate? (Research question 2 and 3)
2. Does your appearance or the appearance of others play a different role depending on the context that you are interacting with members of the opposite sex? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
3. Do you interact with members of an opposite sex organization in a leadership role? If so, do you think this influences the importance of your appearance or other's appearances? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
4. Does the importance of your appearance or other's appearances differ based on if you are interacting individually or in a group? If so, describe this. (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
5. What is your knowledge about why four Greek councils exist? Do you think your council is culturally different in terms of values around appearance of women? If so, how? (Research question 1 and 2)
6. Would you describe your organization as diverse? If so, in what ways? (Research question 3)
7. How would you describe the status of your organization and why? (Research question 3)
8. What role does appearance play in status of an organization? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
9. Would someone be able to accurately guess if a person was a member of your organization based on their appearance? Why or why not? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
10. What are some stereotypes about the appearance of the members of your organization? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
11. Do you feel your appearance is a representation of other members of your organization in the college environment? If so, describe this and how it impacts you? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)

12. If you thought a member of your organization was not presenting themselves in a way that was attractive to the opposite sex, would you address it and how? (Research question 2 and 3)
13. How does the number of people in your organization and council influence others evaluation of your appearance? (Research question 2 and 3)
14. Do you see a relationship between status, appearance, and diversity in the organizations in your community? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
15. What role does appearance of sorority women play in choosing members to join your organization? Why are certain women chosen over others? How does this impact you? (Research question 1, 2, and 3)
16. What does your organization tell potential members about the appearance of sorority women in relation to your organization? (If needed, ask about access to “attractive” women) (Research question 1, 2, and 3)
17. What role does appearance of fraternity men play in choosing members to join your organization? How does this impact you? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
18. What role does appearance of sorority women play in your parties, mixers, or formals? How did and does this impact you? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
19. Why do sorority women attend fraternity parties in your community? (If needed, ask about alcohol, sex, and policies) (Research question 1 and 3)
20. How does the reputation of a fraternity influence the party norms in your community? (Research question 1 and 3)
21. What are the benefits and consequences to conforming to the norms of your organization surrounding appearance, gender, and sexual orientation? (e.g. men pursue women,

fraternities provide environment, sororities provide willing sexual partners) (Research question 1, 2 and 3)

22. As part of your organization are you expected to perform for other? If so, what role does your appearance play? (if needed ask about skits, stepping, or strolling) (Research question 1 and 3)
23. Have you witnessed or been a part of culture that objectifies women in your organization (e.g. messages or conversations about sex with women ignoring their own desires or goals pertaining to sex, party themes) (Research question 1 and 3)
24. Have your brothers or sisters told you that: (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
 - a. Your dates or girlfriends/boyfriends should have sex with you when you want
 - b. Ways to coerce someone to have sex who does not want to?
 - c. If a man does certain things (e.g. pay for a date or provide alcohol), the woman should have sex with him.
 - d. How to respond to sexual rejection?
25. What emphasis did your brothers or sisters place on having sex? Please describe this. (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
26. What are some ways that you talk about members of the opposite sex with members of your organization? (Research question 2 and 3)
27. Can you tell me any stories you've heard or told about hooking up that were funny or impressive? (Research question 2 and 3)
28. How would someone in your organization be treated if they were not interested in drinking and hooking up? (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
29. How is a member of organization your treated based on the attractiveness of someone they hooked up with? If they tried to hook up with someone and were unsuccessful? (Research

question 1, 2 and 3)

30. Do you sort members of the opposite sex or are you sorted (e.g. how promiscuous they are) and behave differently based on this (e.g. just for sex or a relationship)? What influences this decision? (Research question 1 and 3)
31. How easy or hard is it to be stigmatized based on your sexual reputation in your community? Does size of your community play a role in that? (Research question 1 and 3)

Appendix D. Interview Protocol After Expert Panel Input

1. When interacting with an organization of the opposite sex (fraternity or sorority), what messages do people want their appearance to communicate?
 - a. Does your appearance or the appearance of others play a different role depending on the context that you are interacting with members of the opposite sex? (i.e. in the classroom versus at a party)
 - b. As part of your organization are members expected to perform for other organizations of the opposite sex, or just in general? If so, what role does appearance play? (if needed ask about skits, stepping, or strolling)
2. What is your knowledge about why four Greek councils exist? Do you think your council is culturally different from other councils in terms of values toward appearance of women? If so, how?
 - a. Would you describe your organization as diverse? If so, in what ways?
 - b. How does the number of people in your organization and council influence others evaluation of your appearance?
 - c. Do you see a relationship between status, appearance, and diversity in the organizations in your council?
3. What role does appearance of sorority women or fraternity men play in choosing members to join your organization? Why are certain women or men chosen over others? How does this impact you?
 - a. What does your organization tell potential members about the appearance of sorority women in relation to your organization? (If needed, ask about access to “attractive” women)

4. What are the benefits and consequences to conforming to the norms of your organization surrounding appearance, gender, and sexual orientation (e.g. men pursue women, fraternities provide environment, sororities provide willing sexual partners)?
 - a. How would you describe the status and reputation of your organization and why?
 - b. What role does appearance play in status of an organization?
 - c. Would someone be able to accurately guess if a person was or was not a member of your organization based on their appearance? Why or why not?
 - d. What are some stereotypes about the appearance of the members of your organization? Are those stereotypes accurate or false? Accepted or rejected? How so? Or in what ways?
 - e. Do you think your appearance is a representation of other members of your organization? If so, describe this and how it impacts you?
 - f. Have you witnessed or been a part of culture that objectifies women in your organization (e.g. messages or conversations about sex with women ignoring their own desires or goals pertaining to sex, party themes)?
 - g. What behaviors have you witnessed that support a culture that objectifies women?
 - h. How would someone in your organization be treated if they were not interested in drinking and hooking up?
 - i. How is a member of your organization your treated based on the attractiveness of someone they hooked up with? If they tried to hook up with someone and were unsuccessful?
 - j. How easy or hard is it to be stigmatized based on your sexual reputation in your community? Does size of your community play a role in that?

- k. Is there an officer in your organization that makes suggestions about appearance to your members, such as a social chair, apparel chair, SWAG Chair, or GQ? If so, describe some of the messages they send.
5. What do some members of your organization talk about members of organizations of the opposite sex?
- a. If someone thought a member of your organization was not presenting themselves in a way that was attractive to the opposite sex, would you address it and how?
 - b. Why do sorority women attend fraternity parties in your community? (If needed, ask about alcohol, sex, and policies)
 - c. How does the reputation of a fraternity influence the party norms in your community?
 - d. Have your brothers or sisters told you that: (Research question 1, 2 and 3)
 - i. Your dates or girlfriends/boyfriends should have sex with you when you want
 - ii. Ways to coerce someone to have sex who does not want to?
 - iii. If a man does certain things (e.g. pay for a date or provide alcohol), the woman should have sex with him.
 - iv. How to respond to sexual rejection?
 - e. What emphasis do your brothers or sisters place on having sex? Please describe this.
 - f. Can you tell me any stories you've heard or told about hooking up that were funny or impressive?
 - g. Do people in your organization sort members of the opposite sex or are you sorted (e.g. how promiscuous they are) and behave differently based on this (e.g. just for sex or a relationship)? What influences this decision?
 - h. Has your social chair discussed or emailed ways to make it easier to have sex with someone?

- i. Has your social chair or other members of your organization sent emails or discussed types of women to have sex with or compiled information about sex with women to help identify these different types of women (i.e. who will put out and what they will do)?
- j. Has your social chair or other members of your organization sent emails or discussed how to present yourself to fraternities to be desirable or avoid being viewed as a slut?

Appendix E. Recruitment Email

Email subject heading: Seeking Participants for Study on Culture of Greek Life: Compensation is \$25 Amazon Gift Card

Dear Sir or Madam:

Interested in Participating in
Research on Culture of Greek Life
in each of the four councils?

\$25 Amazon Gift Card for Each Participant!

https://ncsu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8q8hLmNpbbYCJKd



**NC STATE
UNIVERSITY**

Alison
Sappie
M.S., LPCA

Dissertation
Advisor: Dr.
Edwin Gerler

I am a current doctoral candidate in Counselor Education at North Carolina State University and completing research for my dissertation. My research is on objectification in the Greek system and the differences in the culture surrounding objectification across the four councils. This study is conducted under the advisement of Dr. Edwin Gerler and has been approved by the Institutional Review board at North Carolina State University.

The purpose of this email is to invite you to participate in an in-person, 60-minute interview with me on campus at a convenient date and time for you. During this interview, participants will be asked to sign an informed consent and respond to a set of open-ended interview questions about their experiences in Greek life. The interview will be audio recorded and transcribed. To protect your identity and any information shared, all data will be secured in password protected files on a password protected computer. No information that would reveal your identity or your chapter will be used in the study. **As compensation for participating in the interview, you will receive a \$25 Amazon gift card at the time of your interview.**

If you would like to participate, please fill out the following survey at https://ncsu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8q8hLmNpbpYCJKd. Thank you for your consideration in participating.

Appendix F. Informed Consent

North Carolina State University

INFORMED CONSENT FORM for RESEARCH

Title of Study: Objectification of Women in the Greek System: Intersectionality and Cross Council Comparisons

Principal Investigator: Alison Sappie Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Edwin Gerler

What are some general things you should know about research studies?

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to be a part of this study, to choose not to participate or to stop participating at any time without penalty. The purpose of research studies is to gain a better understanding of a certain topic or issue.

You are not guaranteed any personal benefits from being in a study. Research studies also may pose risks to those that participate. In this consent form you will find specific details about the research in which you are being asked to participate. You must be at least 18 years old to participate. If you do not understand something in this form it is your right to ask the researcher for clarification or more information. A copy of this consent form will be provided to you. If at any time you have questions about your participation, do not hesitate to contact the researcher(s) named above.

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of the research is to examine the objectification of women in the Greek system across the four Greek councils. Objectification is the experience of being treated as a body and object that is valued for its use for others. According to objectification theory, “women’s bodies are looked at, evaluated, and always potentially objectified” (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997, p. 175), and women typically internalize this perspective as their own view of their physical selves. The goal is to gain more understanding surrounding the unique experiences of objectification in each Greek council.

What will happen if you take part in the study?

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to answer open-ended questions in a private room at the North Carolina State University library to understand your experiences with objectification in the Greek system. The interview will be recorded on a digital audio recorder and a laptop.

Risks

Sharing personal information about objectification could be potentially uncomfortable. To reduce this risk, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to and can stop participation at any point. Participation is voluntary and your decision about participating will not have any negative consequences or effects. If you feel any stress or anxiety associated with participating in this study and you would like to talk with someone about it, the North Carolina State University Counseling Center is a resource you can use. They are located at 2815 Cates Avenue, Raleigh NC 27965 on the second floor of the Student Health Center and can be

contacted at (919) 515-2423. Your responses to the interview and questionnaire will remain confidential and secure with no identifying information stored with the data.

Benefits

By increasing knowledge surrounding the relationship between body image, objectification, and academic performance, greater understanding of the impact these concepts have on college students and ways to better serve students who struggle in these areas can be developed.

Confidentiality

The information in the study records will be kept confidential to the full extent allowed by law. Data will be stored securely in a locked file box in a locked office, or in a password protected file on a password protected computer. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

Compensation

For participating in this study, you will receive a \$25 gift card to Amazon. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will only receive a gift card to Amazon for \$5.

What if you are a NCSU student?

Participation in this study is not a course requirement and your participation or lack thereof, will not affect your class standing or grades at NC State.

What if you are a NCSU employee?

Participation in this study is not a requirement of your employment at NCSU, and your participation or lack thereof, will not affect your job.

What if you have questions about this study?

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Alison Sappie, at amsappie@ncsu.edu or (919) 656-8096.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Deb Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919) 515-4514.

Consent to Participate

“I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study with the understanding that I may choose not to participate or to stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.”

Subject's signature _____

Date _____

Investigator's signature _____

Date _____