University of Massachusetts Amherst
ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Doctoral Dissertations | Dissertations and Theses

Spring August 2014

‘SAFE SPACE FOR HARD CONVERSATIONS’: COLLEGE MEN’S EXPERIENCE IN DIVERSITY EDUCATION

Rachel L. Wagner
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2

 Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, and the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Wagner, Rachel L., "'SAFE SPACE FOR HARD CONVERSATIONS': COLLEGE MEN'S EXPERIENCE IN DIVERSITY EDUCATION" (2014). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 138.
https://doi.org/10.7275/9r3d-9307 https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/138

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

‘SAFE SPACE FOR HARD CONVERSATIONS’: COLLEGE MEN’S EXPERIENCE IN DIVERSITY EDUCATION

A Dissertation Presented

by

RACHEL L. WAGNER

Submitted to the Graduate School of the

University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 2014

Student Development

© Copyright by Rachel L. Wagner 2014

All Rights Reserved

‘SAFE SPACE FOR HARD CONVERSTATIONS’: COLLEGE MEN’S EXPERIENCE IN DIVERSITY EDUCATION

A Dissertation Presented

by

RACHEL L. WAGNER

Approved as to style and content by:

_____

Maurianne Adams, Chair

_____

Elizabeth Williams, Member

_____

Stephen Olbrys Gencarella, Member

_____

Christine McCormick, Dean

College of Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to a number of people without whom this would never have been accomplished. First, thanks are due to my outstanding and patient committee members. To Steve and Liz: I value your insights and am in deep admiration of your staggering intellects and generosity throughout this process. To Dr. Maurianne Adams: It's a bit surreal to have the opportunity to work closely with someone whose scholarship I hold in such high esteem. Thank you for the time and energy you selflessly dedicated to this project, for nudging me along when I was stalled, and for providing an apprenticeship in scholarly writing that has left an indelible mark. You are an expert in your craft, and I am overwhelmed with gratitude and not a little bit of awe.

To the lunch crew at the University of Dayton, Daria, Debra, Steve, Trent and Brian – your strength and laughter buoyed my spirit and helped me persist. I drew on your wisdom heavily, and the experience of our community validates the values of justice and love I hold most dear.

To my family, thank you for your love and support, and not asking, too often, when will you graduate? To Linda Wagner and Bernice Jetter, who is with me, though no longer of this plane of existence, thank you for your example of hospitality and service to others as acts of love. Your earliest lessons serve as the foundation of my educational philosophy and political agenda.

Thank you to Toni Crist for welcoming me into your family and being a stalwart source of support and to Vikki Otto for laboring tirelessly over transcripts and making this day possible.

Thank you to the community of scholars who have deeply touched my heart, ignited my mind, and influenced my point of view, Chase Catalano, Z Nicholazzo, Tracy Davis, Jason Laker, Keri DeJong, Frank Harris, Keith Edwards, Shaun Harper, Jane Fried, Ryan Barone, Barbara Love, Ximena Zuniga, George McClellan, Brian Reed, and Susan Marine.

A special thanks to Jason, Z, Chase, Tracy and Keri D for listening to all of my thoughts, wonders, and pet theories, and providing invaluable feedback and excellent inspiration.

Thanks feel insufficient to the number of colleagues who have supported this work, especially Pete, Bill, Cindy, Linda, Christina, Lisa, Lynn, Roger, Sally, Kurt, Sarah, Susan, Mary Beth and Dave. To Dean Schramm and Dr. Schaller I can only offer an unending supply of coffee in perpetuity for their unfailing kindnesses and supportive energies that literally willed me through a journey I felt incapable of completing.

To Keri and Chris, who opened their home during many trips to Amherst, I am blessed by your warmth of welcome and charitable spirit. Please come to Iowa soon.

To the incredible men who agreed to be a part of this journey, Alex, Billy, John, Josh, Jeff, William, Liam, Elliott, Ian, Gerard, Tom, Johannes, Ari and Chris, you humble me. Your willingness to share your experience, your hopes, your fears and your dreams so that those who come after you might have a better learning experience is a gift that I hold with the utmost reverence. I hope I honored your stories and the indomitable spirits they represent.

Finally, I dedicate this dissertation to my wife, editor, collaborator and co-conspirator, Keri, and in her name, to all the little girls who grow up fangirling writers, and discover, much too late, that they have a future as scholars.

ABSTRACT

'SAFE SPACE FOR HARD CONVERSTATIONS': COLLEGE MEN'S EXPERIENCE IN DIVERSITY EDUCATION

MAY 2014

RACHEL L. WAGNER

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Maurianne Adams

Current research on college men portrays patterns of maladaptive and antisocial attitudes and behaviors. Studies show correlations between college men's problematic behavior and their adherence to unexamined gender roles. Educators have few examples of men's pro-social behavior nor the masculine ideology that accompanies it. This study explored college men's pro-social behaviors through their engagement in educationally purposeful activities operationally defined in the literature as diversity education. Milem, Chang and Antonio (2005) defined diversity education as meaningful engagement with diversity through coursework or purposeful cross-culture interactions in pursuit of educational outcomes. Using an interpretive qualitative methodology, I addressed two primary research questions: (1) How do college men who have been engaged in some form of diversity education describe their experience, and (2) How do college men who have been engaged in diversity education understand and perform masculinity? Expert nominators identified participants. I conducted in-depth interviews and analyzed the resultant transcripts using open and axial coding procedures. Themes derived reflected men's socialization of masculinity and their experiences in diversity education. Themes included: (a) the persistence of hegemonic masculine ideology, (b) experiences of gender socialization, and (c) the emergence of resistant and aspirant masculinities. Themes associated with the second question included

(d) how these college men found their way into diversity education, (e) the challenges and supports they encountered, and (f) their advice for professionals and educators who seek to design effective diversity education experiences. Findings confirmed other studies that demonstrated the influence of hegemonic masculine ideology on college men (Davis, 2002; Edwards, 2007; Harris, 2006). This study adds to the literature by ascertaining how hegemonic masculine ideology permeates the diversity classroom and workshop, heightening men's concerns about safety and psychological threat. Implications offer insights for educators who design diversity and social justice education for college students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

ABSTRACT vi

LIST OF TABLES xiv

CHAPTER

1. MASCULINITY AS CULPRIT 1

    Rationale 4

    Purpose of the Study 6

    Significance for the Researcher 7

    Research Questions 9

2. LITERATURE REVIEW 10

    Masculine Ideology and Socialization 10

    Hegemonic Masculinity 11

        Defining Hegemonic Masculinity 12

            Understanding Hegemony 13

            Hegemony and Masculine Ideology 14

        Gender Role Socialization 15

        Male Gender Role Conflict 17

        Summary of Hegemonic Masculinity 20

    From Masculine Ideology to Behaviors 21

        Collegiate Context 21

            College Men's Campus Judicial Offenses 23

            Guyland 23

        Men's Gender Role Conflict and Campus Environments 25

Men and Educational Engagement 26
Men's Pro-Social Behaviors 27
Summary of College Men and Masculinity 28
Diversity Education 28
Diversity on Campus 30
Student Attitudes 31
Student Outcomes 33
College Men and Involvement in Diversity 36
Summary of Diversity Education 38
Conclusion 38
3. METHODOLOGY 39
Statement of Research Questions 39
Methods Overview 40
Key Terms Defined 40
The Case for Qualitative Studies 42
Rationale for a Basic Qualitative Approach to these Questions 43
Basic Qualitative Methods 44
Sampling 45
Identification and Selection of Participants 45
Nominations 46
Participant Contact 47
Participant Questionnaire 48
Selection of Pool 48
Setting and Context 50
Data Collection 50
Interviews 51

Interview Procedures 52
Confidentiality 53
Trustworthiness 54
Peer Debriefers 54
Transferability 56
Inquiry Audit 56
Data Analysis 57
Limitations of the Study 59
4. THE "BRO TO FEMINIST" CONTINUUM 61
Participants 62
Gender as Identity and Practice 67
Hegemonic Masculinity 68
It's Not Just What is Masculine; It's What Isn't 73
The Socialization and Policing of Masculinity 76
Anticipating the Consequences of Failing at Masculinity 80
Finding Like-Minded Men 84
Resisting and Reimagining Hegemonic Masculinity 88
From the Masculine Stage to the Diversity Classroom 92
5. "IN COMPANY WITH EACH OTHER:" MEN IN DIVERSITY EDUCATION 94
Pathways to Diversity Education 94
Course Requirements 95
Favorable Conditions 95
Testimonials 96
Appealing Educational Opportunities 96
Informal Interactions 98
Motivation 99

Practicality 99
Content 99
Process 100
Rewards and Benefits 101
Instructor's Role as a Facilitator 102
Takeaways from Diversity Education 106
Knowledge 106
Skills 107
Self Awareness 111
Attitudes about Diversity Education 113
Critiques 113
Acknowledging the Challenge of Design 115
Not/Meeting Expectations 117
What Helps and What Hinders Learning 118
Safety 119
Stories and experiences 121
Experiential Education 122
Peer Influence 123
Advice for practitioners and educators 124
Conclusion 126
6. GENDER AS A WAY OF PROVING: MASCULINITY 127
Hegemonic Descriptions 128
Fear of Femininity 130
Emotional Restrictionality 130
Success and Status 132
Sex and Competition 133

Summary of Hegemonic Descriptions 134
Masculinity Socialization 135
Masculinity is Never Proven 136
Alcohol, Sex and Competition 136
Policing 138
Consequences of Inept Performances of Normative Masculinity 139
Challenges to Socialization 142
Summary of Socialization and its Consequences 143
Fissures and Breakages 144
Summary of Fissures and Breakages 146
Conclusion of Masculinity Discussion 146
7. "SAFE[R] SPACE FOR HARD CONVERSATIONS" 148
Pathway to Diversity Education 149
Knowing Others 150
Familiarity with Authority 150
Testimonials 151
(Overcoming) Masculine Socialization 152
Fear of femininity 153
Policing and its Consequences 154
Learning in Diversity Education 157
Men, Safety and (Re)Framing Diversity Education 159
Cognitive Dissonance 160
Personal and Systems Level 162
Education as the Practice of Freedom 163
Conclusion 164
8. RECOMMENDATIONS 166

Participant Recommendations for Practice 166
Researcher Recommendations for Practice 167
Encourage and Sustain Participation 168
Employ Engaging Pedagogical Principles 169
Carefully Consider Providing Safety and Support 170
Future Research 172
APPENDICES
A. FOR NOMINATIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS 174
B. PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE CONSENT FORM 178
B-2. DEMOGRAPIC AND INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE 180
C. CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH STUDY 183
D. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL 188
E. NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PARTICIPATION EMAIL 190
REFERENCES 191

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Participants 66

CHAPTER 1

MASCULINITY AS CULPRIT

"*But it's not men on trial here; it's masculinity, or, rather, the traditional definition of masculinity, which leads to certain behaviors that we now see as politically problematic and often physically threatening*" (Kimmel, M., 2004a, p.565)

Christina Hoff Summers argued "How to Make School Better for Boys" in the September 13, 2013 edition of *The Atlantic*. She is one of the many voices calling the public's attention to the plight of boys, specifically, their educational underachievement (Kristof, 2010; Von Drehle, 2007; Williams 2010). For instance, the October 2, 2011 edition of the Chronicle of Higher Education warned readers about, "Saving the 'Lost Boys' of Higher Education." In it, Robert Smith advocated for establishing a White House council on "Boys to Men" to defray the shrinking numbers of men enrolled in college and remove challenges facing boys in educational settings.

The alarmist tenor of such arguments follows a fairly predictable path. Several points of evidence are first identified. Women are more likely to complete high school and pursue some form of post-secondary education (Kristof, 2010; Ryan & Siebens, 2012). In a disturbing trend that begins in grade school and continues in college, boys are disproportionately engaged in disciplinary proceedings (Ferguson, 2000; Harper, Harris and Mmeje, 2005). Compare this to young girls who read more books, and college women who spend more time in educationally purposeful activities than their male counterparts (Harris & Lester, 2009; Kristof, 2010; Sax, 2008; Weaver-Hightower, 2010). The number of degrees conferred is also pointed to at times - men have earned only 45% of the masters degrees and

among ages 25-34 women are more likely to hold a Bachelors degree or higher (Ryan & Siebens, 2012).

After painting a bleak descriptive picture, articles examine possible explanations for boys' poor performance on measures ranging from enrollment to policy violations. Pointing to the "evidence" of underachievement for boys and young men or their lack of gains in comparison to female counterparts, the "culprit" is often a failed educational system, which perhaps not coincidentally is staffed primarily by women, particularly at the earlier and less prestigious levels, ie. Early childhood education. More insidiously, some authors posit a zero-sum equation wondering if the gains of feminist movement in educational policy haven't perhaps provided more access and attention to young women at the expense of young men. Some even assume that pedagogies that work for young girls are not as successful with young boys because of an essentialist difference that is sometimes cloaked in physiology and other times genetics (Kristoff, 2010).

While the higher education literature, as a whole, tends to be less alarmist than news articles, similar tendencies towards painting a descriptive portrait of men's difficulties prevail. A cursory perusal of the higher education literature on men offers scant assurance that such disturbing data points regarding men's enrollment and co-curricular participation are the whole of the problem for college men. Indeed, the situation appears far worse than diminished access and poor grades. Drawing upon and extending broader studies in the fields of education, psychology, sociology and women's studies, student affairs and higher education scholars have chronicled a number of the difficulties and personal, social and academic challenges experienced by college men. They are less likely to utilize physical and mental health services, they drink more and in riskier ways than their female counterparts, they commit the majority of bias-related incidents that occur on campus, and they hold rape-positive attitudes (Capraro, 2000; Courtenay, 1998, 1999, 2000; Davis & Laker, 2004;

Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowtiz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2010; Harper, Harris & Mmeje, 2005; O'Neil, 1981, 2008).

In summary, the data on college men's behavior suggest numerous dysfunctional adaptations to the social environment. The implications of this are considerable. College men who are involved in maladaptive behaviors do not do so in a vacuum. As some feminist scholars have noted, when masculinity is in crisis, men suffer, and they tend to direct the suffering outward upon others more vulnerable, in the form of gender, sexual and race violence (Hooks, 2004; Hong, 2000; Rich, 1994). As such, men's behavior in college has significant consequences for members of the university community, including other men, women and queer individuals.

A second narrative that describes college men's disengagement has also been established in the higher education literature. Student engagement or the quality of effort that college students commit to educationally purposeful activities has been demonstrated to have a strong correlation with learning and personal development (Hu & Kuh, 2002). Engagement has been measured by factors ranging from time spent preparing for class to participation in high impact educational practices such as study abroad or service learning. In their examination of student engagement that utilized responses from over 50,000 participants across nine years of administration of surveys, Hu and Kuh (2002) noted that men in college are more likely than women to be disengaged. They are also much less likely than their female peers to participate in co-curricular activities aside from athletics and fraternities (Kellom, 2004; Sax, 2008). They do not participate at the same rates in key, educationally purposeful activities such as service learning and study abroad opportunities and are less likely to attend pre-college programs (Kellom 2004). Collegial men spend less time preparing for class than their female peers and earn poorer grades (Sax and Arms, 2006).

Rationale

What accounts for men's challenges in college? In light of the preceding evidence it is tempting for pundits to suggest either defective policies, or more troubling, broken people. Some scholars have noted that such an analysis is flawed (Kimmel, 2004b; 2008; Sax & Harper, 2006; Weaver-Hightower, 2010). Rather than positing an explanation rooted in biological essentialism, or that indicts current social policy, sociologists have investigated young boys and men's gender socialization as a possible source of the behavioral problems and disengagement facing male students in K-16 schooling. Kimmel (2004b), for instance, pointed out that there is a crisis of masculinity, rather than a crisis of men on US college campuses. Socialized by a normative masculinity that promises entitlement, eschews effort and valorizes risk, college men find themselves underprepared for college coursework, underengaged outside of it, and overrepresented in college judicial proceedings.

It is imperative that college administrators become aware of these gendered trends. The trends document a persistent problem that needs to be addressed. Men in college have been linked with a number of destructive and unproductive attitudes and behaviors that constitute a reckless climate for them and their female peers. Not surprisingly, many of the difficulties that college men encounter are linked to a hegemonic masculine script that strictly circumscribes "authentic" masculine behavior. Several authors have also pointed out how many of those behaviors are associated with masculine identity conflicts (Davis & Laker, 2004; Harper & Harris, 2010; Kimmel, 2004a; O'Neill, 1986).

Gerschick and Miller (1995) documented the centrality of masculine ideology in their exploration of men with disabilities. Stipulating that the social construction of disability

violates hegemonic ideology of masculine strength and self-reliance, they noted that men with disabilities reconciled this in one of three ways,

> Reformulation, which entailed men's redefinition of hegemonic characteristics on their own terms; reliance, reflected by sensitive or hypersensitive adoptions of particular predominant attributes; and rejection, characterized by the renunciation of these standards and with the creation of one's own principles and practices or the denial of masculinity's importance in one's life. (Gerschick & Miller, 1995, p.351).

In men's descriptions of their lives the researcher's found evidence of both the salience of hegemonic masculinity and its ideologic inadequacy.

The work of Gershick and Miller (1995) is distinct because most scholarship on college men has not progressed past counting destructive behaviors or depicting the harmful associations of gender role conflict. Harper and Harris (2010) noted that very little is known about men in college who engage in productive behaviors or embody positive attributes. Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2010, explain, connecting behavior and masculine ideology:

> Although we know much about "rape proclivity", we have scant information about the characteristics of men who are unlikely to rape and who are uncomfortable with the entire continuum of behaviors representing typical American masculinity. Most researchers have failed to examine both the healthy, nonviolent behaviors and attitudes of men, and the potential inaccuracies of perceived male norms. (p.106.)

Purpose of the Study

While further definition of the problem might continue to enrich our understanding, the purpose of this study was not to add to the literature that chronicles unhealthy, maladaptive or potentially problematic trends in college men's dispositions, attitudes or behaviors. Rather, I was interested in identifying examples of men who have defied, resisted or transformed the composite that encompasses the majority of the literature on men in college. In doing so, I hoped to create a description that can inform how we create and employ educational programs and services on campuses for men throughout the United States.

I conducted a study that adds to the literature providing insight based on men who have engaged in an educationally meaningful practice, through their participation in diversity education (DE). Diversity education refers to both curricular and interactional focus on diversity, workshops, coursework or sustained interpersonal interactions that include multicultural or cross-cultural subject matter.

For this study of men who have engaged in educationally meaningful practices, I chose diversity education as my illustrative case for three interrelated reasons. There is a growing literature that point to the pattern of college men's lack of predisposition towards and engagement in diversity education. At the same time, diversity education has been powerfully linked in empirical scholarship to increases in learning and democratic outcomes (Gurin et al, 1999, 2000). Finally as a researcher and practitioner in the field of Social Justice Education I am troubled by the relatively small number of men compared with women engaged in diversity education (Kellom, 2004; Sax 2008; Whit et al, 2001). I am stalwart in my conviction that the democratizing pedagogies and liberatory content of the field are relevant and beneficial to all students. It is my hope that by identifying men who have

participated in diversity education, and employing the tools to more richly understand their experience, I might be able to glean insights for other social justice educators to make learning experiences more appealing, engaging and productive for college men.

In addition to documenting college men's experience in diversity education, I explored how men in the study understood their identity as men. Since the higher education literature is replete with studies that associate college men's destructive behaviors with gender role traditionalism or hegemonic masculine ideology, it was instructive to see how men who engage in highly constructive behaviors like diversity education construct their masculine self-concept. Just as the social construction of disability troubled hegemonic norms for some men, there was an interesting potential that engagement in diversity education might disrupt traditional masculine ideology.

Significance for the Researcher

As a new professional in student affairs, I managed a residence hall that housed 500 First Year men and 250 First Year women in gender segregated towers from 2001-2003. I spent the majority of my intellectual and physical energies responding to behavioral-related issues from the men's towers. I went to a professional conference in the spring of 2002 looking for answers for why college men were so likely to transgress the rules in ways that risked their futures and harmed other men, women and queer identified people who shared classroom and co-curricular space with them.

I found complicated answers. Several scholar-practitioners discussed the concepts of gender role conflict theory (O'Neil, 1981; O'Neil et al, 1986) and its implications for college students. Very little of the discussion disaggregated groups and teased out the differences in

social experiences, for instance, the wide gulf in social experience between affluent, White men and queer or working class men of color. In a field struggling to understand the politics of identification and the existence of oppressive social systems, there emerged a reluctance to talk openly about the difficulties of college men because as an aggregate the only identity that tied the group together was gender, which constituted a privileged status. An undercurrent of suspicion existed wherever conversations about college men as men were held – how might this be re-centering the experiences of men?

I don't believe that discussing the experiences and perceptions of men will in itself reinforce a dominant system that wields social power through the use of violence, marginalization, exploitation and cultural imperialism (Young, 2000). I know that failing to talk about men's gender identity renders it unmarked and thereby secures its centrality in a system of social relations. As such, I have noted elsewhere that there are intriguing possibilities for consciousness-raising about gender identity among college men (Wagner, 2011).

However, I do so knowing that I have experienced the pervasive impact of unequal power distribution along gendered lines within institutions, my workplace and social networks, and the intimate confines of my family. I have survived and named how sexism functions within my family of birth to divide labor and render women silent and invisible. I have also had my social experience bounded by the threat of male violence and the obligation to care for men's emotional health. I continue to understand how those two dynamics impact my ways of being, knowing and doing in the world, and in particular, how it may shape the direction of my work as a scholar.

In part, my understanding of social relations, and the identification of gender in a field of power, has influenced the trajectory of my research towards chronicling men's

experiences in projects that foster more equitable social relations and the constructions of masculinity that accompany such investments of time and energy. I believe in the capacity of humans to create liberating environments, but feel we have far too few stories and examples of college men who do so. I hope my research can begin to excavate those narratives and share them with a professional audience who might capitalize upon their insights, and in so doing, create richer coalitions towards a liberatory present and future.

Research Questions

The study explored the phenomenon of college men's engaging experiences of diversity education and described how they made meaning of masculinity. Specifically, I propose the following research questions: (1) How do college men who have participated in diversity education describe their experience in diversity education, and (2) How do college men who actively participate in diversity education define, experience and perform masculinity?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Two very different questions frame my research study. However, their intersection offers insight into the question, How best to go about engaging young men in diversity education at a time when it is essential and also challenging, to do so. To inform both questions, I offer a review of two distinctive and potentially interrelated bodies of literature. First I address masculine ideology, hegemony, socialization and gender role conflict. I conclude the first review with a picture of the current empirical scholarship depicting men's behavior on college campuses. I then make a transition to an exploration of the impact of diversity education on college campuses, noting its clear gendered effects. I conclude the second review of literature with a consideration of the attitudes and behaviors associated with diversity education.

Masculine Ideology and Socialization

What does it mean to study men as men? How does masculine gender socialization mediate a man's day-to-day experience, his meaning making, and his behavior? Ostensibly academic research in the social sciences and education has provided us with a wealth of analysis that should offer insight into men's development. However, several of the landmark developmental studies that inspired classical developmental theory recruited exclusively male participants and thus mistakenly identify male lifespan developmental processes as universal (Erikson, 1994; Kohlberg, 1976; Perry, 1970)). Meth and Pasick (1990) explain the misapprehension that simply using men as participants will yield an understanding of men:

> Although psychological writing has been androcentric, it has also been gender blind [and] it has assumed a male perspective but has not really explored what it means to be a man anymore than what it means to be a woman. (p. vii)

Brod (1994) responds to this concern and proposes that one reason to focus on men's standpoints, particularly normative and hegemonic views of masculinity, is "to find out how and why they exclude women…to identify processes through which men create rituals, reaffirm symbolic difference, establish internal hierarchy, and exclude, belittle, dominate and stigmatize women and nonconforming men (p.56)." Davis and Laker (2004) lament the application of a gender neutral perspective because it results in either reliance on stereotypical gender scripts or failure to consider men as gendered beings. Instead, they assert that ignoring the salience of gender or race in White male students re-secures their privileged status.

This chapter will explicitly foreground a constructionist view of gender in order to define and describe hegemonic masculinity. A constructionist perspective assumes that gender is a socially *developed* and *practiced* status, not an innate biological or physiological characteristic (Lorber, 1991). It is learned and deployed, and as such, subject to change.

Hegemonic Masculinity

I begin this review of the literature on hegemonic masculinity with Male Gender Role Conflict (GRC) (O'Neil, 1981), a construct that has been ubiquitously employed in psychological and educational literature to explain the conflicts that men in the United States experience if they feel they do not adhere to a particular kind (hegemonic) of masculinity. Characterized by four components of hegemonic masculinity (with their attendant prohibitions), this construct suggests that men are socialized to (a) be emotionally restrictive, (b) seek power, control, and competition, (c) avoid affectionate and sexual

interaction with other men, and (d) define personal success through work status and financial gain. The degree to which an individual man either embraces the confining masculine script or fails to embody it to the satisfaction of his social environment is likely to be the source of his gender role conflict.

In the section that follows, I review how hegemonic masculinity is defined (Connell, 1987; Kimmel, 2004), socialized (Weber, 2001; Kimmel, 2001; Kimmel & Messner, 2004; Leaper and Friedman, 2007; Plummer, 1995, 2005), and performed (Kimmel, 2001; West and Zimmerman, 1991) as well as the consequences for men of their failing to meet the criteria for masculinity (O'Neil, 1981).

Defining Hegemonic Masculinity

Brod (1994) pointed out that the concept of hegemonic masculinity was developed in order to emphasize both the social construction of gender and the existence of multiple masculinities. As a social construct, masculinity refers to the social roles, behaviors and meanings prescribed for men in a given society at a given time (Kimmel, 2001). In accounting for this social construct, masculinity is understood as being produced in a field of social relations, through interactions with institutions and individuals in multiple social contexts. Kimmel noted (2001) that social contexts for gender differ over four dimensions: time, geography, lifespan, and social identity axes. This approach suggests that we examine masculinity/ies as a plural, because how masculinity is embodied today in the United States looks different from 250 years ago, or in comparison to masculinity in China. Similarly, an octogenarian may see masculinity as dramatically different than an adolescent boy, or an able-bodied, White teenager may experience masculinity in a way unavailable or unappealing to a disabled, Native American veteran.

Of course, if all masculinities are created equal, the differences may inspire intellectual curiosity only. They are not. Masculinity(ies) exists in a field of power, marginalizing some masculinities, all femininities, and any third (or more) genders (Brod, 1994; Kimmel, 2003).

> It is particular groups of men, not men in general, who are oppressed within patriarchal sexual relations, and whose situations are related in different ways to the overall logic of the subordination of women to men (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 2002, p. 110).

These masculinities stand in relation to a singular hegemonic masculinity that is privileged above the rest, and its existence ensures that most men do not measure up.

Understanding Hegemony

What, then, do we mean by "hegemonic"? An understanding of the genesis of the term "hegemony" may be helpful. In fascist Italy of the 1930s, Antonio Gramsci was bewildered by the political reality that so many individuals actively accepted circumstances and ideologies that were not in their best interests (Lather, 1991; Kaufman, 2003). Gramsci developed a theory of hegemony to explain how implicit, largely unconscious consent functioned to secure systems of domination. It didn't make sense to him that the majority did not overthrow the numeric minority intent upon oppressing them. While violence and the threat of violence clearly worked in some cases, they appeared insufficient to undermine revolution by the many opposed to a fascist regime. Gramsci theorized that something other than force --consent – was needed to account for the maintenance of political power. Those who were disadvantaged by the system must in some way accept their experience as normal, estimable, and unchangeable. Essentially, Gramsci theorized, an advantaged or powerful group accomplished this by, "dominating the society's systems of meaning, building …

hegemony –the way that idea systems come to legitimize, or support, the interests of ruling groups in society" (Kaufman, 2003, p. 258).

This concept of social consent to systems of domination that can be understood to be in the best interests neither of the dominator-group or the dominated-group, has been valuable to explain the maintenance of oppressive systems through "business as usual." Young (2000) argued that a tyrannical regime is not necessary to cause suffering, that social structures are arranged so that "everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society" accomplish the same outcomes (p. 37).

Hegemony and Masculine Ideology

In this sense, using a Gramscian concept of "hegemony," Connell (1995) defined hegemonic masculinity as "the configuration of gendered practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (p. 77). First, he placed emphasis on a constellation of attitudes, behaviors, and expressions that are socially situated and generally accepted as masculine. Masculinity is understood to be a performance, a dynamic practice that is created within certain parameters, changeable but not arbitrary. Additionally, it is a practice that embodies the "currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy." (Connell, 1995, p, 77).

Connell allowed for the fact that whatever is passing for the hegemonic standard of masculinity at a given time is conditional, and may shift depending upon the prevailing socio-cultural winds. In Connell's scheme, hegemony is fluid and able to shift in response to changes in authority and conditions, as well as challenges to its foundational principles. The dynamic interrelationship of authority and consent maintain the hegemonic standard. A given set of attributes and behaviors assume the authoritative Masculinity (capital M) of a

cultural group. Simultaneously, subordinated masculinities consent to the pre-eminence of the standard. Hegemonic masculinity's flexibility is part of what ensures its continued dominance.

An idea cannot maintain dominance without assistance, however. Hegemonic masculinity's stranglehold on men's lives does not occur overnight. Rather, it depends on the mobilization of society's institutions to introduce, train, reward and reinforce the standards of hegemonic masculinity.

Gender Role Socialization

Despite the considerable disagreement about the role of hormones in shaping predispositions, there is general agreement with the "constructivist" view that men aren't born with specific predispositions toward identifiable attributes and behaviors. Socialization, the social process by which a given society teaches its members its ways of being and doing, provides the curriculum for masculinity. Gender self-concept, roles, norms and subsequent inequities are "informed and transformed by families, peers, the media and schools" (Leaper & Friedman, 2007, p. 561).

At the same time, this socialization provides the materials out of which identity is forged but does not result in a fixed identity that dictates conventional performances of gender. Theorists have noted that gender is a product of our interactions (Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 2001; West and Zimmerman, 1991). As Kimmel (2001) contended, "We are constantly 'doing' gender, performing the activities and exhibiting the traits that are prescribed for us" (p, 9321). To understand this more fully, we need to excavate where the prescription is written.

Leaper and Friedman (2007) chronicled four categories of theoretical frameworks of gender socialization: social-structural, social-interactive, cognitive-motivational and biological. Each framework acknowledges the social nature and influence upon children's understanding of their gender. The *social-structural* framework emphasizes how structures, such as media and schools, and power and status based on social group membership, influence what we learn as appropriate for our personal practice of gender. The *social-interactive* framework illuminates how culture is integral to the formation of gender concepts and gender roles. Certain attitudes and behaviors are prioritized within a cultural group, given air time, and rewarded, while others are ignored, rendered invisible or punished (Harro 2000; Rogoff, 1990).

Cognitive-motivational theories capture the processes that enable individuals to engage in self-socialization. Children apply meaning to their experiences and observations and take initiative to self-regulate gender self-concepts and roles (Moll, 1990; Leaper & Friedman, 2007). Finally, *biological* processes influence gender role socialization. Researchers have noted that small sex-related biological differences increase over the lifespan suggesting that relatively small biological differences may be first exaggerated and then reinforced by social practices as children mature.

The social context for childhood socialization reflects and also perpetuates the gender roles already existent in society. Social science researchers note that children demonstrate their ability to consistently ascribe gender appears between the ages of three and six years and that by age ten they apply stereotypes to abstract qualities such as gender specific occupations and characteristics (Leaper and Friedman, 2007). Additionally, aspects of group dynamics can notably influence gender role socialization. For instance, children are more likely to act in stereotypic gender-typed ways in the presence of their same-gender peers. Same gender peer groups in particular promote within group pressure to assimilate to

conventional gender roles and attitudes. Similarly, peer group dynamics are impacted by group size. Larger groups tend to be more competitive. Interestingly, boys are more likely to socialize in larger groups while girls are more likely to choose dyads (Leaper & Friedman, 2007). As such, groups of boys are likely to be inclined toward competitive dynamics within the peer group.

Finally, status influences the structure and content of groups. Members of high status groups are more interested in maintaining group boundaries than other groups. This is demonstrated in the United States by the relatively non-existent social sanction for girls who choose dress that is commonly associated with boys' apparel, i.e. pants or ties. Conversely, their boy peers face significant social penalty if they express interest in wearing traditional female dress such as skirts.

Gender role socialization for young men encourages them to act in ways prescribed as masculine by the culture. They are inundated with media messages that promote and make attractive a particular kind of masculinity. Rewards await those who comply and punishments, those who resist. The learning environment is so pervasive that youth begin to enforce its lessons themselves, making internal the previously external responsibility of transmission of gender norms and performance. This is exacerbated by group dynamics that seek to maintain the high status of masculinity. Young boys strictly police the boundaries of an understanding of masculinity that we will see is confining and actively anti-feminine.

Male Gender Role Conflict

Growing out of gender socialization, role conflict specific to male gendered individuals emerges. Writing in the field of counseling psychology, O'Neil (1981) introduced

a conceptual model that explained the negative outcomes of conventional gender socialization for men in the United States. Since then, gender role conflict (GRC) has been identified as an important conceptual link between traditional scripted gender roles and individual adaptations (Thompson, Pleck and Ferrera, 1992). In essence, men understand that there is an accepted gender performance, and an individual man's ability to embody (or not) the scripted (hegemonic) performance results in gender role conflict. Therefore, a man who strictly adheres to the scripted (hegemonic) performance experiences conflict. In the context of my study, an exploration of how this conflict is experienced and impacts participants' performance of masculinity is particularly salient.

O'Neil (2008) defined gender role conflict as a "psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences for the person or others" (O'Neil, 2008, p. 362). Conflict occurs when rigid and narrowly constructed gender roles for men result in operationally defined areas of harm, such as devaluation, restriction, or violation. Central to O'Neil's theory, literally what holds the patterns together, is a fear of femininity.

There is a long history in the psychological literature of the concept "fear of femininity." Theorists since Freud have argued that men recoil from or experience anxiety over being associated with stereotypically feminine attitudes and behaviors such as emotional expressiveness, showing fear, or valuing cooperation over competition (Connell, 1995).

O'Neil originally theorized six patterns of gender role conflict, but empirically validated four patterns that affect men cognitively, emotionally, behaviorally, and/or unconsciously: (a) restrictive emotionality, (b) success, power and competition, (c) restrictive affectionate behavior between men and (d) conflict between work and family relations (1981, 1982, 1990). In 1986 a team of researchers, O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David and

Wrightsman, developed a Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) to assess the degree to which an individual respondent experienced GRC in the four pattern areas.

Restrictive emotionality refers to the collapsing of appropriate emotional expression amongst men to feelings of anger, lust or amusement. "Boys are encouraged by patriarchal thinking to claim rage as the easiest path to manliness" (hooks, 2004, p. 44). The lesson is easy: big boys don't cry, they are never vulnerable no matter what the cost. Don Sabo (1998) argued that boys are taught that bearing pain is a courageous act, urging them to "become adept at taking the feelings that boil up inside us – feelings of insecurity and stress from striving so hard for success – and channeling them in a bundle of rage which is directed at opponents and enemies" (in Rothenberg 1998, pp, 326-327). Men who are proficient in the practice of restrictive emotionality fail to understand that emotional expressiveness is part of being a whole human being. One of the goals of this study is to explore whether diversity education is a site where men feel empowered to be emotionally expressive.

The boy who internalizes socialized *control, power and competition* learns early that vulnerability, indecision, compromise and interdependence are unmanly. He forfeits emotional and interpersonal flexibility, limiting his ability to communicate, negotiate conflict and maintain intimacy. Disassociation and isolation become realities, as he must engage in a subject to object relationship in order to maintain control (Johnson 1997). He is neither subject to, nor dependent upon, anyone. As a man, he decides what can or should happen, and the object of his decisions is usually a woman, though other men may be affected depending upon how much social or physical power he wields.

The third feature of gender role conflict as described by O'Neil is *restrictive affectionate behavior between men*. Physical and emotional intimacy among men is strongly prohibited. Sex is a measure of stamina, achievement or performance and,

reinforcing heterosexual norms, is properly focused upon women. While masculinity may be a homosocial enactment – men perform it for one another – it is decidedly oriented toward heterosexuality (Kimmel 2013). Gestures of sexual desire and affection are only suitably directed at women. Amongst men, some touching is permissible, in highly regimented and often hyper-masculine circumstances. Warriors may hug after prolonged battle. Athletes can sling an arm about one another or slap a fellow teammate on the butt on the road to victory. In collegiate circles, it is not unusual to hear a young man qualify an affectionate gesture towards a male friend with the tag line, "no homo," indicating that while he likes the other person, he does not mean it as having any kind of sexual affiliation. Acceptable sexual and affectionate gestures are restricted to the arenas of physical domination or the demonstration of (hetero)sexual prowess.

Finally, *obsession with achievement, work and success* requires men to forgo connections, fulfillment and desires associated with interpersonal caring relationships, domestic entanglements and self-knowledge. Since their self-worth is tied up in career success, defined competitively, they experience an intense pressure to succeed that leaves little room for collaborative engagements. Furthermore, any activities that do not foster career importance and success are viewed as superfluous or lazy. Famously, bell hooks (2004) maintained that a man's value is determined by doing rather than being. In the GRC model, only those activities that result in financial success, fame or victory are valuable.

Summary of Hegemonic Masculinity

Male Gender Role Conflict, as outlined by O'Neil, provides a detailed picture of some of the ideologies prized by hegemonic masculinity. These ideologies are central to the maintenance of dominant patriarchal culture; they secure the current social order. Grounded

by fear of femininity, the four patterns of hegemonic masculinity, restrictive emotionality, success, power and competition, restrictive affectionate behavior between men and conflict between work and family relations, constitute an undisclosed curriculum to which all men are subjected. Though, not all men have the same experience.

From Masculine Ideology to Behaviors

The preceding section defined hegemonic masculinity and the conflict it engenders as described in the men and gender studies literatures. A smaller, but important, literature has emerged in higher education chronicling men's behavioral trends in college that are fairly consistent with empirical studies on MGRC in the wider population. Disengagement, poor help-seeking, and high rates of alcohol and substance abuse are disproportionately associated with male students (Kellom, 2004; Harper, Harris and Mmeje, 2005; Hong, 2000; and Sax, 2008). Furthermore, alarming rates of sexual assault, harassment, and bias-related incidents, as well as overrepresentation in college judicial proceedings, are present amongst college men (Berkowitz, Burkhart & Bourg, 1994, Carpraro, 1994; Heisse, 1997, Hong, 2000; Katz, 1995; Kimmel, 2004; Harper, Harris and Mmeje, 2005). These factors provide the foundation and importance for exploring my research questions. There are real, observable and measurable negative outcomes related to the persistence of hegemonic masculinity in higher education.

Collegiate Context

College men are as susceptible to hegemonic masculine ideologies as their counterparts outside of college. MGRC suggest that most men are subjected to confining gender scripts that narrowly define what is appropriately masculine. Failure to fit into the

rigid roles constructed by hegemonic masculinity results in psychological conflict that is well documented (O'Neil, 2008). Furthermore a wealth of empirical literature exists that suggests that something is troubling in the world of college men.

Edwards (2007) noted that despite a history of advantage in higher education, recent trends in college male student enrollment, retention, and academic performance have evoked alarm amongst higher education leaders. Men enroll in higher education at lower rates than women; though when enrollment data is disaggregated by race, the disproportion is negligible amongst middle-class, white and Asian populations (Kimmel, 2004). For instance, African American women outnumber African American men two to one. Harper found that amongst state flagship institutions, African American Men's enrollment averaged twenty to thirty points lower than population rates (Harper, 2006).

A few studies have charted the lack of engagement in healthy or enriching activities among college men as an aggregated group. In a literature review of multiple studies examining issues facing college men Kellom (2004) noted that men study less, participate in study abroad, service and precollege programs less, utilize campus services including career placement less and are less likely to vote than their female peers. Men are more likely to miss a class, attend class unprepared, turn homework in late and fail to complete assignments altogether (Sax & Arms, 2006). In a comprehensive study of the gender differences between college men and women, Sax found that men are more likely to engage in leisure activities in general, and high risk leisure activities specifically than college women. Additionally, on average their grades and GPAs are lower than their female peers.

College men are also more likely to be required to charged with a policy violation and receive sanctions through campus judicial and mediation processes than women. Though it may be true that the vast majority of college men do not violate the rules,

men commit the vast majority of violations. Men are far more likely to be responsible for violations of the student code of conduct including incidents of alcohol misuse, violence, bias, and vandalism (Capraro, 2004; Davis & Laker, 2004).

College men's physical well-being is also at risk. Men are more likely to be the victims of violence (excluding sexual assault), suffer greater rates of depression, and are much more likely to commit suicide (Courtenay, 2000; Courtenay, McCreary, & Merighi, 2002; Pollack, 1999). They are also less likely to engage in healthy behaviors or see a doctor or seek help for psychological concerns (Courtenay, 1998, 1999, 2000).

College Men's Campus Judicial Offenses

Men are more often the victims and violators of campus judicial offenses (Dannels, 1997; Harper, Harris and Mmeje, 2005; Hong, 2000). Harper, Harris and Mmeje (2005) produced a model to explain the overrepresentation of men as campus judicial offenders. They hypothesized that several factors pertaining to college men's precollege socialization, experience of socially constructed and confining gender scripts and desire to develop competence and self-efficacy result in risky behaviors and an expectation of avoiding detection. They illuminated how a cultural script of masculinity requires men to transgress the rules. As a former senior conduct officer on a college campus, I have often witnessed the dissonance that young men experience between their perceptions of acceptable masculinity and the administration's expectations of behavior articulated in campus policies.

Guyland

In his aptly titled *Guyland* sociologist Michael Kimmel offered that contemporary society in the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy and Australia has integrated a new lifestage in human development (2008). Citing examples from sociology and psychology, he noted that a liminal space exists between adolescence and young adulthood, which he

demarcated as “Guyland.” He argued that Guyland occupies both temporal and geographical space. Spanning basically age 16-26, it occupies the time period between “dependency and lack of autonomy of boyhood and the sacrifice and responsibilities of adulthood” (p.89). He noted that young men are making up the rules as they go along with no or little guidance and simultaneously playing by the rules someone else invented and that they don't understand.

Guyland does have some consistent expectations for the young men who inhabit it. Bound by its motto to place the consideration of male friends (bros) before those of significant others (hos), Kimmel compiled the ten most commonly articulated tenets of Guyland that he came across in his extensive study of young men passing time between adolescence and adulthood:

1. Boys don't cry
2. It's better to be mad than sad
3. Don't get mad, get even
4. Take it like a man
5. He who has the most toys when he dies, wins
6. Just do it; Ride or die
7. Size matters
8. I don't stop to ask for directions
9. Nice guys finish last
10. It's all good

The overwhelming emotional sentiment of the list reminds guys that real men are stoic, controlled, independent, winners and strangers to weak emotions like kindness, sympathy and compassion. Kimmel noted that the list constitutes a normative definition of masculinity

that can be traced back to the work of David and Brannon (1976) and O'Neill (1981), the latter of which was cited earlier in this chapter.

Men's Gender Role Conflict and Campus Environments

O'Neill postulated as early as 1981 that masculine gender role conflict was related to male psychological problems, "the negative outcome of adhering to or deviating from culturally defined and restrictive masculinity ideologies," (O'Neil, 2008, p. 364-5). Failure to live up to the ideal, to embody a masculinity that is consistent with the four patterns articulated earlier has consequences. GRC has been documented in the literature when men deviate or violate masculine norms (Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L., Celentano, E, Cozz, T., Hill, S. & MacRachorn, M., 1992; Mahalik, J.R., Locke, B.D., Ludlow, L.H., Diemer, M.A., Scott, R.P., & Gottfried, M., 2003) or experience a discrepancy between an "ideal" masculine self-concept and their real self-concept (Garnets & Pleck, 1979; Liu, Rochlen, & Mohr, 2005).

Higher scores of gender role conflict have been associated with a multitude of psychological complaints. GRC is significantly correlated with depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, and stress across racial, cultural and sexual orientation samples and seven separate studies have linked it to substance use and abuse (O'Neil, 2008). Furthermore, a meta-analysis of studies using the gender role conflict scale demonstrated that GRC is associated with: (1) sexually aggressive behaviors and likelihood of forcing sex, (2) abusive behaviors and coercion, (3) dating violence, (4) hostile sexism, (5) hostility toward women, (6) rape myth acceptance, (7) tolerance of sexual harassment, and (8) self-reported violence and aggression. Funk and Berkowitz explain how college men's notions of masculinity have a real impact on the climate for women and queer people.

> The scholarly literature has thoroughly documented the difficulties that men in college encounter. Several studies have indicated a connection between masculinity and violence. Men in college are as susceptible to the lessons of hegemonic masculine ideologies as their counterparts outside of college. Homophobia and violence against women, both social justice issues, are part of the sexist culture that several scholars have pointed out is the foundation of the continuum of violence (Funk and Berkowitz, 2000).

What does this mean on our campuses? Kimmel indicated that young men in college are likely to prescribe to a normative definition of masculinity that closely reflects the four patterns of masculinity empirically validated by O'Neill and associated with a range of negative outcomes. This study seeks to build on past scholarship in order to further clarify possible opportunities to address the obstacles associated with hegemonic masculinity in the experiences of college men.

Men and Educational Engagement

A few studies have charted the lack of engagement in educationally purposeful or enriching activities among college men as an aggregated social identity group. In a literature review of multiple studies examining issues facing college men, Kellom (2004) noted that men study less, participate in study abroad, service and precollege programs less, utilize campus services including career placement less and are less likely to vote than their female peers. Men are more likely to miss a class, attend class unprepared, turn homework in late and fail to complete assignments altogether (Sax & Arms, 2006). In a comprehensive study of the gender differences between college men and women, Sax (2008) noted that men are more likely to engage in leisure activities in general (and high risk leisure activities

specifically) than college women. Additionally, on average men's grades and GPAs are lower than their female peers.

Furthermore, men's lack of engagement with diversity-related activities is clearly documented in the higher education literature. Several authors have noted that women are more likely to enter college predisposed towards diversity efforts, to pursue diversity related activities in college, to value the importance of promoting racial understanding, to have a social activist orientation, and, once in college, to reap more benefits from exposure to diversity activities (Millem & Umbach, 2003; Sax, Bryant, & Harper, 2005; Sax, 2008; Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella & Nora, 1996; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001). If diversity education experiences are an entry point for conversation about the impact of normative masculine ideology in higher education, what does that process look like from the perspective of male students? That is what this study seeks to explore.

Men's Pro-Social Behaviors

While there are challenges associated with hegemonic masculinity and the behaviors of men in higher education, there are also positive experiences and aspects worth considering. This section explores how men have engaged in constructive social behavior that resists or transcends hegemonic masculine ideology. A few scholars have investigated college men's pro-social behaviors (Huong, 2000; Harper 2006).

For instance, Luoluo Hong (2000) conducted an extensive case study of eight college men on the executive board of a student leadership and activist group organized to promote violence prevention, Men Against Violence (MAV). Hong classified the students' rejection of, reformulation of and reliance upon four metaphors of hegemonic masculinity identified by David and Brannon (1976): (a) No Sissy Stuff, (b) Be a Big Wheel, (c) Be a Sturdy Oak, and (d) Give 'em Hell. While ostensibly the men in the organization would have adopted a

counterhegemonic positionality as it relates to masculinity in order to advance their political agenda, she found that students still relied upon aspects of traditional formulations of masculinity.

Summary of College Men and Masculinity

For college men, in particular, hegemonic masculinity has significant drawbacks. It encourages behaviors that endanger young men and puts our communities and community members at risk, in particular, young women. Gender role conflict, an operationalization of hegemonic masculinity in the counseling and psychological literatures, is associated with a multitude of unhealthy and dysfunctional adaptations. Young men are socialized into an ideological custom of gender performance that monopolizes their attention, actively works against their best interests and demands that they reproduce and enforce its conventions. Nonetheless, some scholars have begun to chronicle prosocial behaviors of college men. More understanding of such cases is warranted and this study represents one avenue of developing a clearer understanding of this aspect of the male college student experience.

Diversity Education

A number of research studies have examined different aspects of diversity in higher education (Chang, 2001; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2002; Levine & Cureton, 1998; Milem, Chang, and Antonio, 2005; Milem and Umbach, 2003). That said, an overview of all the empirical studies that capture the existence, influence or impact of diversity in higher education is beyond the scope of this chapter, although portions of that literature are helpful

here. The American Association of Colleges and Universities has stipulated that "meaningful engagement with diversity benefits students educationally" (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005, vii). Essentially, there are positive implications for student learning if our campuses employ and recruit a diverse population, if multiple cultural perspectives are reflected in the curriculum, and if students positively interact across social group membership. This provides part of the foundation and context for my study.

To begin with, Milem and Umbach (2003) offered a helpful organizer that describes experiences that address meaningful engagement with diversity. They noted that three types of diversity appear most frequently in the higher education literature as it relates to student attitudes and outcomes: Structural diversity, diversity initiatives, and diverse interactions. *Structural diversity* refers to numerical representation of traditionally underrepresented groups. It can refer to the number of students of color, or African-American faculty at a given institution. *Diversity related initiatives* can include general education requirements within the core curriculum, ethnic studies concentrations, and electives that explore experiences of historically marginalized groups. It also captures the programs or workshops provided outside of the classroom in a leadership series, for instance. Finally, *diverse interactions* encompasses informal exchanges between individuals of differing social group membership, i.e. White students and students of color working together on an athletic team, classroom project, or within a campus organization.

Research has consistently indicated that structural diversity is necessary but not sufficient to achieve educational benefits. (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2002; Hurtado, 2005; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). Diverse representation in the student body increases the likelihood of interaction across difference and offers a necessary but insufficient first step. To be effective, interactions must be meaningful and positive if they are to reap the educational benefits associated with diversity. Students have to opt in, and that depends on

the institutions purposeful and strategic deployment of opportunities for engagement.

Interestingly, some studies that have addressed the three types of diversity described above have found that men and women appear to be differently engaged in diversity activities on their campus. For instance, several authors have noted that women are more likely to enter college predisposed towards diversity efforts, to pursue diversity related activities in college, to value the importance of promoting racial understanding, to have a social activist orientation, and to reap more benefits from exposure to diversity activities (Millem & Umbach, 2003; Sax, Bryant, & Harper, 2005; Sax, 2008; Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella & Nora, 1996; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001).

In general, empirical research has noted that gender has a conditional effect, that is, gender is associated with or predicts certain differences in the college experiences of men and women. It has not, however, ascribed/attributed sociological, biological or cultural factors that explains the observed differences (Sax 2008). We know that men and women experience college differently, and as a result, experience exposure to diversity differently, but we do not know why.

Diversity on Campus

Given the substantial empirical and anecdotal evidence of gender differences in response to diversity efforts as well as outcomes associated with them, it is imperative that we begin to understand what other factors may be at work to account for these gendered responses to diversity. In essence, why aren't higher education's diversity efforts as attractive to or effective with young men? To introduce this discussion, I will review the current literature regarding the influence of campus diversity on student attitudes and

outcomes.

Student Attitudes

There are a number of studies that measure students' attitudes towards diversity, and interestingly, many have documented gender differences. Researchers have explored pre-college attitudes (Millem & Umbach, 2003; Springer, Palmer, Ternzini, Pascarella & Nora, 1996; Whitt, Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001), the influence of diversity coursework, cross-race interactions and cultural awareness workshops on attitudes (Springer et. al 1996; Milem, Umbach, & Liang, 2004), and students' ability to conceptualize privilege and oppression (Chizhik & Chizhik, 2004).

Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini and Nora (2001) conducted a multi-campus, longitudinal study on the influences upon college students' openness to diversity in college. Among other findings, they noted that pre-college openness was the strongest positive predictor of college openness to diversity and challenge. Based on their findings, women were more likely to be open to diversity before college, and regardless of their pre-college attitudes, women were also more likely to become more open during their first three years.

Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella and Nora (1996) assessed the attitudes of White students toward diversity on campus, examining pre-college differences and the effects of racial and cultural awareness workshops. The authors found that women and individuals in liberal majors (social sciences, humanities and education) had more favorable, pre-college attitudes toward diversity. Women were more open to diversity and challenge than men, and in the study men were less supportive of civil rights, less concerned with social inequities, and possessed significantly less positive views of diversity on campus than their female peers. Furthermore, individuals who participated in racial or cultural awareness workshops reported the development of more favorable attitudes than those who did not

participate irrespective of gender.

Chizhik and Chizhik (2004) conducted two mixed-methods studies to investigate what they termed students' preconceptions of social justice concepts. Open ended questions about individuals' conceptions of their own status as privileged, oppressed or both made up the qualitative section. In the results, White men were most likely to see themselves as solely privileged, regardless of their socioeconomic status. For the quantitative section, they used case scenarios that introduced characters with varying levels of social consciousness and economic privilege. Scenarios were randomly assigned to respondents, who read them and then answered questions that were designed to assess their beliefs about, "the hypothetical other" (p. 129). White men had significantly different views of the cases than other participants: They were more likely to see all characters as privileged in some way. The authors concluded that White men were more likely to see oppression as an issue that everyone experiences, and therefore, not a result of asymmetrical power relations, but a ubiquitous human condition.

Millem and Umbach (2003) investigated the predictive ability of various characteristics on students' intentions to (a)participate in groups or activities that reflect one's background, (b) take a course related to diversity issues, (c) join an organization that promotes cultural diversity, and (d) make an effort to get to know individuals from diverse backgrounds. They found that White students were less likely by half to indicate they had plans to pursue diversity related activities in college than their counterparts among students of color. Furthermore, women and individuals with a Holland Typing of "Social" major were more likely to report intending to pursue diversity activities. This held true for women across all racial categories studied.

Some scholars have raised questions about the utility of using the measurement of

attitudes towards diversity as an indicator or predictor of student's behavior. In 2005, King and Baxter Magolda argued that current, conceptual models of multicultural competence in higher education are inadequate due to reliance upon attitudes as a proxy for competence. Survey research is frequently reliant upon gauging students' attitudes and intentions. However, occasionally researchers have surveyed participants about both their intentions and recent behaviors. Milem, Umbach and Liaing conducted a follow up to the Milem and Umbach (2003) study summarized earlier and found relationships between diversity-related experiences and plans before White students entered college and their actual diversity experiences in college. They found that White women were more likely to interact across race during college, engage diversity in their coursework, and participate in extra-curricular activities related to diversity.

The measurement of attitudes toward diversity has occupied a significant portion of the higher education research agenda. However, a more recent focus on the impact of college experiences has surfaced in the literature on diversity as scholars attempt to understand what practices result in the educational benefits of diversity.

Student Outcomes

College experiences have a demonstrated effect on students' attitudes and behaviors (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). A range of college outcomes has been associated with both structural diversity and diversity experiences on campus. Gurin, Dey, Hurtado and Gurin (2002) explored the influence of campus diversity upon two broad categories of learning and democratic outcomes. Scholars have also examined the influence of certain college experiences on students' commitment to promoting racial understanding (Sax, Bryant & Harper, 2005; Sax, 2008) and social activism and community orientations (Sax, 2008). Other studies have investigated behaviors such as reduction of bias or motivation for social change (Chang, 2001; Zúñiga, Williams & Berger, 2005).

Gurin, Dey, Hurtado and Gurin (2002) conducted a study using both single institutional data from the University of Michigan and national data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) to understand the relationship between students' experiences with diverse peers and educational outcomes such as critical thinking, motivation for learning and citizenship engagement. According to their analysis of national data, classroom diversity and informal interactions with diverse others had positive influences on learning outcomes such as active learning and intellectual engagement as well as democratic outcomes for citizenship engagement and racial/cultural engagement. In the part of the study that focused on a single institution's dataset they found that Whites benefited most consistently among the four racial groups studied. Additionally, the largest effects on learning outcomes for White students were the result of campus facilitated diversity experiences including classroom diversity, attendance at multicultural events, and involvement in intergroup dialogues.

The broader educational relevance of reducing students' racial bias has been empirically documented. Chang (2001) connected reduced levels of racial prejudice with enhancing students' abilities to adapt to change and clarify ethical standards and values. Using an instrument to measure racial bias he also noted that women were significantly less likely to have racial prejudice than men.

Zúñiga, Williams and Berger (2005) investigated the influence of student involvement in campus diversity experiences on democratic outcomes. Specifically, the authors evaluated the interrelationship between participation in cross group interactions, diversity coursework and diversity programming and the motivation to: (a) reduce one's own bias and (b) take direct action to promote social justice. They found that, in terms of campus diversity initiatives, participation in diversity coursework and cross-group interactions had the strongest influence upon action outcomes. However, gender had more influence than diversity-related experiences. Again, females were more motivated to promote inclusion and

social justice than their male peers.

Sax, Bryant and Harper (2005) found relationships between faculty interactions and gains in cultural awareness and commitment to promoting racial understanding. They found that faculty interaction predicted a pronounced increase in liberalism, political engagement and social activism for men. Specifically, talking to a faculty member outside of class was associated with gains in cultural awareness, commitment to promoting racial understanding and liberalizing of political views. There was also a positive relationship between faculty support and political engagement, liberalism, cultural awareness and commitment to promoting racial understanding. While faculty support was associated with gains for both men and women, there were more pronounced effects for male respondents.

Sax (2008) reviewed a large longitudinal sample from the Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) annual student survey that provided a number of insights. Introducing her study, Sax reviewed twenty years of Freshman Survey data from HERI and noted that women reported higher levels of community orientation than their male peers, including a stronger willingness to help others in difficulty, influence social values, volunteer and promote racial understanding. Sax concluded that "helping others may not be a strong factor in motivating men" (p.43).

In her study cited above, Sax demonstrated that women rated three of the four measures of social activist orientation higher than their male peers. The one exception was "influencing the political structure;" for which men were more likely than women to see an important goal. Interestingly, while men valued influencing the political structure, they were more likely to believe that an individual can do little to bring about change in society. Taken together, these two data points suggest a curious political cynicism. Men may be particularly susceptible to myths of individual achievement and thus experience a sense of powerlessness

when faced with complex societal issues. They may not conceive of or value the power of collective action.

Sax (2008) also constructed a scale to capture predictors of student's orientation towards social activism. The researcher found that exposure to diversity, volunteer work, support by faculty, enrollment in a women's studies course and social diversity experiences were all associated with an increase in students' social activist orientations. Additionally, cultural awareness was associated with living on campus, being enrolled in an ethnic or women's studies course, attending a racial or cultural workshop, and peer interactions. For men, many of the above factors were stronger than for women suggesting that though the impact on both genders is statistically significant, it is greater for men.

College Men and Involvement in Diversity

When it comes to diversity education, men generally appear less willing, interested and engaged than their female peers. As we have already seen, men are less likely than their female peers in college to self-select into opportunities to explore diversity related topics (Milem & Umbach, 2003; Milem, Umbach & Liang, 2004; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini & Nora, 2001). This is consistent with other national datasets that suggest that men are less likely to become involved in educationally purposeful experiences and activities (Sax, 2008; NSSE, 2009). Student involvement or engagement positively affects a range of outcomes including cognitive and skill development (Baxter Magolda, 1992; Kuh, 1995; Pike, 2000), college adjustment (Carbrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedorn, 1999; Paul & Kelleher, 1995), leadership outcomes (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000) psychosocial development (Harper, 2004; Pascarella, Smart, Ethington, & Nettles, 1987), and persistence rates (Braxton, Hirschy & McClendon, 2004; Leppel, 2002; Tinto, 1993).

Interestingly, while documenting men's under-engagement, the literature on college involvement has also demonstrated that men, if engaged, are more strongly impacted by their involvement than their female peers (Sax, 2008; Whitt, Pascarella, Nesheim, Marth, and Pierson 2003). Sax (2008) in particular noted in her exhaustive study of over five hundred variables of college effects, that significant relationships were both stronger and more prevalent for men. While one possible explanation is that current research methods are more adept at measuring impact for men than women, an equally plausible explanation is that men garner more benefits from their involvement than their female peers, even though females are more likely to be involved. Yet, patterns of under-engagement for men that begin in high school persist in the college environment (Hu & Kuh, 2002; Hu & Kuh, 2003; Kinzie, Gonyea, Kuh, Umbach, Blaich, & Korkmaz, 2007). Given the potential importance of diversity education's impact on male experience, studies like the one conducted here are imperative in order to make more meaning of the significance of these experiences on our college men.

Furthermore, men appear less inclined to actively participate in their learning inside and outside the classroom. In a review of the literature on men's involvement, Kellom (2004) noted that college men were less likely to spend time studying, participate in study abroad or volunteer programs, or utilize campus health or career services. Similarly a 2009 report from the National Study on Student Engagement (NSSE) indicated that men are less likely than their female peers to engage in educationally purposeful or high-impact experiences, such as study abroad, service learning, internships or a senior capstone course (Retrieved on 2/1/2011 from http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE_2009_Results/pdf/NSSE_AR_2009 .pdf#page=10). These reports are consistent with Sax's findings that men were less inclined towards an activist orientation than their female peers (2008). While it's entirely possible that men have more to gain from involvement if and when they are involved, they are less likely to participate.

Summary of Diversity Education

Consistent with their under-involvement across most college experiences, men are less likely to self-select into diversity-related activities that are associated with a range of positive outcomes from critical thinking to enhanced self-confidence and cultural awareness (Gurin et. al, 2002; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005; Sax, 2008). Diversity education, as it is currently conceptualized and deployed is less appealing for college men. They aren't as predisposed to take advantage of it, are less likely to become open to diversity while in college, and are less motivated to promote racial understanding and inclusion than their female peers.

Conclusion

It follows, that college men do not reap the intended educational benefits of engaging with diversity that are suggested by the college literature on diversity education and outcomes. This study seeks to create a description of men who have chosen to participate in diversity education, both of their experience and how their socialization as men influences that experience. As such, I hope to provide a set of practical recommendations to improve the design and delivery of diversity education that is effective for young men in college.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Statement of Research Questions

The study sought to understand how men who have participated in diversity education (a) perceived their experience *in* diversity education and (b) understand their gender identity as men. Specifically, I asked the following research questions, and their sub-questions:

- How do college men who have participated in diversity education describe their experience in diversity education?
    - What attracted them to diversity education?
    - What examples of meaningful or memorable experiences do they highlight?
    - What sustains them?
    - How do they describe this?
    - What understandings about privilege, oppression and social justice, if any, have they acquired?
    - What challenges did they encounter?
    - What advice or suggestions do they have for teachers and facilitators of diversity education?
- How do college men who actively participate in diversity education define, experience and perform masculinity?
    - How do they define and describe what it means to be a man?
    - What examples of masculine behavior do they depict?

- How do men define and describe their own masculinity?
- How have they adhered to, transformed and/or resisted hegemonic masculinity?
- What performances or characteristics do they ascribe and/or employ as men?
- What personal and social rewards or consequences have they experienced as a result of their performance of masculinity?

Methods Overview

This chapter describes the methods that were used to discover how men who have participated in diversity education (a) perceived their experience *in* diversity education and (b) understood their gender identity as men. I will introduce qualitative inquiry and explain the reasons for its appropriateness to my research questions. I will also discuss the general methodological approach -- basic qualitative study -- chosen for its relevance to my research questions. I will identify the selection criteria used for participants as well as the type of data collection methods including in-depth interviews that I employed. A discussion of the data analysis procedures that I used and an explanation of the trustworthiness measures I employed conclude the chapter.

Key Terms Defined

Before a discussion of the methods that were employed for this study, a few key terms require defining. *Engagement with div*ersity and *diversity education* are used interchangeably throughout this study. I have chosen these two phrases to distinguish the kinds of experiences with diversity that are central to this study.

As indicated in the literature review, most studies of campus diversity have limited their study to structural diversity. The number of students or faculty of color has long served as a measure of campus diversity. However, several scholars have noted that the number of students, staff and faculty of color, or other historically marginalized groups, is necessary but not sufficient to analyze the educational benefits of diversity (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin; Hurtado, 2005; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). The American Association of Colleges and Universities noted this in their call for campuses to reorient their efforts toward inclusive excellence,

> We hope to move the discourse about diversity from one that conceptualizes diversity as a demographic outcome to one that views diversity as a process that influences a set of critical educational outcomes (p.3, Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005).

In their research for the amicus briefs in support of the University of Michigan's Supreme Court cases on affirmative action, Gurin, Dey, Hurtado and Gurin (1998) indicated two kinds of diversity that resulted in learning outcomes: one was curricular diversity, such as coursework requirements, and the second group was interactional diversity, positive and substantive cross-cultural interactions between two students of differing identities. For the purpose of this study, educational diversity and engagement with diversity refer to the opportunities for members of a campus community to engage meaningfully with diversity through coursework or requirements and purposeful cross-cultural interactions. Defining diversity education is essential because it will inform how I identify appropriate informants for the study. I have selected diversity education experiences as the educationally rich

activity that will serve as a context for college men's involvement in prosocial behaviors. I am using the experience of having participated in diversity education as a primary criterion for participation.

The Case for Qualitative Studies

Locke, Silverman and Spirduso (2004) argued that there is no single best approach to research. Rather, there are "good questions matched with procedures for inquiry that can yield reliable answers" (p.131). Therefore methods, or a set of procedures for inquiry, should match the type of research questions that compel the researcher. Several authors have indicated that qualitative studies allow for the kind of rich, detailed, in depth description that is reflective of lived experience that I hope to achieve in this study (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Jones, Torres, and Arminio, 2006; Kuh and Andreas, 1991; Lincoln and Guba, 1985.)

Patton (2002) described qualitative research as,

> An effort to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a particular context and their interactions there. This understanding is an end in itself, so that it is not attempting to predict what may happen in the future necessarily, but to understand the nature of that setting – what it means for participants to be in that setting, what their lives are like, what's going on for them, what their meanings are, what the world looks like in that particular setting – and in the analysis to be able to communicate that faithfully to others who are interested in that setting (p. 1).

Implicit in the explanation is a philosophical tradition that maintains that truth is individual and knowledge is contingent (Jones, Torres and Arminio, 2006). Qualitative research's most compelling quality for me as a researcher is its genesis in interpretive and constructivist perspectives. As an epistemology, constructivism assumes that knowledge and meaning are constructed in and through the experiences of individuals involved with a phenomenon rather than as the direct result of an objective reality that is stable, observable and measurable (Merriam, 2009). Guba (1990) noted that in qualitative research the relationship between the known and knower are integrally linked, allowing for various experiences of reality to coexist. As such, qualitative methodologies inform procedures where "individual constructions are elicited and refined hermeneutically, and compared and contrasted dialectically, with the aim of generating one (or a few) constructs on which there is substantial consensus" (p. 27). Participants' meanings are interpreted and examined to identify shared perceptions.

Rationale for a Basic Qualitative Approach to these Questions

Jones, Torres and Arminio, 2006 described methodology as "a strategy that guides the actual research plan" providing guidance about the nature and order of the research procedures to be followed (p, 41). A basic interpretive and descriptive qualitative research design was selected for this study on college men's experiences of diversity education. Merriam (2009) argued that basic qualitative studies "are probably the most common form of qualitative research found in education" (p.23). The researcher who conducts a basic interpretive study is interested in how

individuals interpret their experiences and what meanings they attribute to their experiences. In such a study "the overall purpose is to understand how people make sense of their lives and their experiences" (Merriam, 2009, p. 23). Consequently, the aim of this study was to listen to what participants had to say about their understanding of themselves as men as well as what attracted and sustained them in diversity education.

Basic Qualitative Methods

To execute a study of men's experience of diversity education and masculine identity, I conducted in depth interviews with a purposeful sample of college men. I chose to concentrate my interviews in two geographic regions that were accessible to me and which had a reasonable concentration of institutions that value diversity education. To understand how men who have participated in diversity education describe their experience in the activity and as men, I needed to assess whether potential participants had participated in diversity education and had been reflective about their gender identity as men. To increase the potential pool, I pursued participants who reflected a broad demographic profile. Through a questionnaire that includes open-ended questions related to gender identity, I further narrowed the potential pool of participants to include individuals who had demonstrated the capacity to reflect on their gender identity as men. All decisions regarding context, site selection, sampling and interviewing methods were made to increase the likelihood of identifying rich cases for in-depth understanding of the basic qualitative inquiry I have undertaken.

Sampling

Qualitative research requires knowledge of the experience under study so purposeful sampling is appropriate. Mertens (2010) noted that purposeful sampling is suitable to qualitative methods because the goal is to identify information rich cases that allow one to study a phenomenon in-depth. Merriam (2009) explained that purposeful sampling assumes "that the investigator wants to discover; understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (p.77). To identify college men who have participated in diversity education and are reflective about their gender identity I need to purposefully select individuals who meet a particular set of criteria. The criteria are described below. I employed two strategies to assist me. First, I utilized the reference of diversity educators who have access to men who are involved in a sustained diversity education experience, that is a quarter or semester length class or student organization. Second, I employed a questionnaire that provided questions that solicited evidence of some level of reflection about their gender identity by participants.

Identification and Selection of Participants

Fourteen undergraduate men were selected for participation in the study. To identify eligible men, I used a type of purposeful sampling that provided criteria for inclusion. At the time of participant recruitment and data collection, the following criteria were used to identify potential participants:

- Self identify as men
- Have participated in some form of sustained diversity education that the nominator facilitated or can confirm

- Are current undergraduates from a select geographical region in New England and the Midwest
- English speaking
- As much as possible, a range of racial, ethnic, sexual, class, and other salient social identities

Nominations

Criterion sampling allows the researcher to stipulate what experiences are relevant to the study and select participants accordingly (Patton, 2002). References provided by self-identified diversity and social justice educators increased the likelihood of identifying participants who met the criteria enumerated above. I asked knowledgeable informants to nominate participants that they believe met the selection criteria.

Potential nominators were faculty, graduate teaching assistants and administrators who delivered some form of campus-based diversity education and had ongoing contact with men who have participated. I contacted social justice educators through access points I had to three listservs. The listservs I chose all have membership composed of faculty and practitioners who value social justice and diversity education: (a) the Social Justice Education listserv for current students, faculty and alumni of the University of Massachusetts Amherst program of the same name, (b) the Social Justice Training Institute listserv for graduates and friends of an independent train the trainer institute that is popular among higher education staff and faculty, and (c) the listserv for American College Educators International's (ACPA) Commission for Social Justice Educators. While these listservs have

memberships that overlap, each also serves a distinct population. Moreover, I had posting access, through a moderator, to each service.

I sent repeated calls for nominations for study participants through the listservs, inviting practitioners and faculty to consider young men they have worked with and identify potential participants who they think meet the criteria (see appendix A). Nominators were encouraged to identify participants from a diversity of social group identities and a variety of college experiences. I provided in the call for nominations detailed information of the study, rights of the participants, and answers to frequently asked questions including how to end participation (see appendix B). I also invited listserv members to share the email and my contact information with potential participants as well as solicited contact information of individuals they wished to nominate.

Participant Contact

Thirty-seven students were nominated through the call for participation. I disqualified three nominations from the study because I had a supervisory relationship with them that presented a conflict of interest. I was uncomfortable requesting that they participate, if, despite the declaration of their rights not participate in the informed consent documents, they felt compelled as an employee. I personally extended thirty-four invitations to participate in the study via email, which will also include information about the study (Appendix F). Potential participants were informed that a faculty member or administrator had nominated them but that participation in the study was entirely voluntary. Twenty-three students responded expressing interest and were asked to fill out a questionnaire.

Participant Questionnaire

Prior to selecting the final sample each participant was asked to complete an eligibility profile form and questionnaire and was sent an accompanying document that detailed informed consent (see Appendix B and C). The questionnaire requested him to list all trainings, workshops, curricula and organizations related to diversity education and social justice that he had participated in, note and explain the benefits that he has ascribed to the participation, and indicate any continued engagement with diversity or social justice issues (ie. Involvement in an activist or advocacy organization).

A key consideration for the study was to identify participants who have been reflective about their gender identity. It is possible that college-going men who otherwise meet nomination criteria may not have previously considered questions about masculinity. Davis (2002) noted in his study of college men's gender identity that several participants had never considered their gender identity prior to his interview. To account for this, the questionnaire form also included two open-ended questions based upon Davis' study to help me as researcher have some evidence of potential participants' reflection about issues of gender and masculinity: (a) What are characteristics that you associate with being a man, and (b) How would you describe yourself as a man?

Selection of Pool

Nineteen students completed the questionnaire. I carefully reviewed the forms for indicators that the men met the selection criteria regarding experiences of diversity education and reflection upon gender. Participant self- description and demographic information, derived from the questionnaire, informed the final

selection ensuring that a wide variety of experiences and identities were included in the participant pool. My intent was to select the most purposeful and insightful sample (Merriam, 2009). However, I made no assumptions that men who have engaged in different experiences or who have differing identities have had similar or divergent experiences.

I excluded two students because they had already graduated from college. Participants who were not selected were contacted via email (see Appendix E). Seventeen participants who were selected for the study were contacted through email and invited to schedule an introductory phone conversation. Some students opted to continue to correspond by email. Whether on the phone or by email, the correspondence served to answer questions or concerns about the research, to inform the participant that an electronic version of the consent form for the interview would be sent to him electronically (a paper version will be brought to the interview), and to establish initial rapport. We identified mutually agreed upon times and dates for the interview. I inquired about locations where the student would feel comfortable and reserved private rooms in libraries and centrally located academic buildings on their respective campuses.

One of the seventeen students who was contacted chose not to schedule and did not respond to a follow up communication. Sixteen participants scheduled an interview. One student did not show up for his interview and did not respond to a request to reschedule. Fifteen participants completed an interview ranging from 53 minutes to 157 minutes in length. One of the fifteen disclosed in the interview that he was currently a graduate student. I later learned that he had mistakenly filled out the

questionnaire. His interview transcript was not included in the final analysis for this study. Fourteen participants' interviews were conducted, transcribed and included in analysis.

Setting and Context

I chose campuses that have strong traditions of diversity to ensure a viable pool of men engaged with diversity education. Some indicators that a campus valued diversity education included the value of diversity articulated in campus mission statements, diversity requirements in the general education program, and significant resources dedicated to diversity-related co-curricular programming. Campuses in New England and the Midwest which could demonstrate a commitment to diversity through their mission and curriculum were selected. The regional limitation was based on financial limitations for travel and my preference for face-to-face interviews.

Data Collection

Creswell (1998) indicated that the primary method for collecting data in qualitative studies is through the use of in-depth interviews. The approach uses open-ended questions, explores participants responses and aims, "to have the participant reconstruct his or her experience within the topic under study," (Seidman, 2006, p. 15). Polkinghorne (1989) noted that in depth interviews can last up to two hours and thus encouraged a reasonable sample size in order to manage the data.

Interviews

A full list of specific questions and my interview protocol can be seen in Appendix D. The protocol was designed to solicit detail about the experiences of men who were engaged with diversity, addressing as many of the research questions as were relevant to each respondent. Adapting each protocol to suit individual participants through modifications to specific questions, changed order, and the introduction of unique follow-up questions kept the interview conversational and resulted in rich responses.

One important consideration regarding the interviews that must be acknowledged before proceeding to interview procedures is my identity as a woman who is doing gender-based research with an exclusively male participant pool. Interviews, much like fieldwork, rely upon rapport that is mediated by "cultural norms and expectations based on various biological and socially defined characteristics of the people in them" (Mertens, 2010, p. 252). It is incumbent upon the researcher to be sensitive to these norms and expectations and consider how they might affect the researcher-participant relationship, and thus the data collected. I employed multiple strategies to sensitize myself and create transparency between myself and the participants in the study. First, I deployed the strategy of bracketing, described in greater detail later, to surface the worldviews, identities and lenses that I bring to the topic of men's experience of diversity education. This identification assisted me in being conscious of any preconceived notions or biases I may bring to the field. Second, I solicited the assistance of two peer debriefers (also described in a

later section) who were socialized as men to minimize the potential of fitting interview data to my preconceived notions rather than allowing the participants' to speak for themselves in the results section. I made a deliberate decision to contact men for the study over the phone in order to establish rapport. I inquired into the appeal of the study for them, and I shared briefly about myself so that they had an understanding of my positionality as a researcher and social justice educator. Finally, I began each interview with a short explanation of why I embarked upon the study so that the participants had a clear understanding of my purpose in conducting the research. These last two steps were particularly important to demonstrate my earnest interest in conducting research that creates possibilities rather than engage in a study that formalizes critique about men's shortcomings.

Interview Procedures

Each of the men in the study was invited to do a face-to-face interview in the fall of 2012 or Spring of 2013. I conducted follow up inquiries via email. A semi-structured interview technique was used in the face-to-face meetings to elicit responses from the participants regarding the phenomenon under study. Semi-structured interviewing technique allows for flexibility while pursuing a particular objective such as the essential structure of the phenomenon of interest (Merriam, 2009). I asked each participant to reflect deeply on the experience of diversity education, inviting explanation about what drew them to the topic, what benefits and challenges they encountered, what they have gained, and what conceptions of masculinity have accompanied their participation in diversity education. All

interviews with participants were transcribed verbatim from audio recordings. Full transcripts were reviewed and corrected using recordings.

Confidentiality

Several considerations were given to the protection of data and participants' privacy and all considerations were outlined in the informed consent document that each participant was provided for their review prior to the interview (Appendix C). Interviews were recorded on my laptop using voice recording software. I transferred the interview to my password-protected desktop after the interview to ensure that the information was not lost and copied each interview to an external hard drive that I kept locked in a file cabinet. Each interview was saved under the pseudonym chosen by the participant and all audio and transcribed files on both my desktop and the external drive were filed under the pseudonym. Any handwritten interview notes taken during the interview were typed into a computer document (and saved under the pseudonym), and the paper copy confidentially shredded.

In addition to all digital files of the interview, documents, notes, memos, and transcriptions were saved under the participants' chosen pseudonyms, not their real names. All paper copies of interviews, recordings, and paper transcripts were kept in a locked file cabinet drawer. Upon completion of the study I will keep the data, data analysis, and digital transcripts of the interviews for at least three years or the minimum amount of time dictated by the University of Massachusetts, whichever is greater, and all paper copies of transcripts, audio copies of interviews on my computer and the backup external drive files of interviews will be destroyed.

Trustworthiness

The conceptual basis through which qualitative research is evaluated, its credibility, is described as trustworthiness (Creswell, 1998). Several steps were taken to ensure the trustworthiness of the study. I utilized peer debriefers to examine assumptions, solicited the assistance of an inquiry auditor, and applied thick description to increase transferability.

Peer Debriefers

Several steps were taken to strengthen the inquiry including the use of a peer debriefer. Guba and Lincoln (1989) describe and extol the advantages of engaging with an external peer in lengthy discussions of one's findings, conclusions, next steps and stresses.

> [The] peer poses searching questions in order to help the evaluator understand his or her own posture and values and their role in the inquiry; to facilitate testing working hypotheses outside the context; to provide an opportunity to search out and try next methodological steps in an emergent design; and as a mean of reducing the psychological stress that normally comes with fieldwork—a means of catharsis within confidential, professional relationship (p. 237).

Because my study seeks to understand the lived experiences of men, which is an identity that I do not claim, I availed myself of two peer debriefers who were both in

touch with literature regarding masculinities. One peer debriefer identified as a man and the other identified as gender non-conforming, but was socialized as a boy. Thus, although both peer debriefers did not identify as men at the time of my study, they had both personal and intellectual connections to the field of masculinities. They also had demonstrated, through their work and scholarship, a commitment to issues of social justice, allowing them to speak to the diversity education component of my study. Spillett (2003) encourages student researchers to consider where their peer debriefers fall on the insider/outsider continuum, indicating that, "An insider refers to someone who has prior understanding or experience with the topic or setting under study," (p, 3). Employing a peer debriefer who is an insider to a population can have certain advantages making comprehension of the study easier and offering insights connecting the data to conceptual ideas in the field of study. I used additional criteria to select each colleague: a man who has been reflective about his own gender socialization and performance; has an academic background in higher education; works in a field of practice different than my own (fraternities and sororities and senior administrator, respectively); actively produces scholarship and/or surveys best practices on college men and gender; shares an analysis of sexism and the sex and gender system with me; and is familiar with my research and writing and comfortable giving me critical and constructive feedback.

My initial work with my peer debriefers included discussion of my research questions and the appropriate methodology, the creation of an interview protocol and selection criteria to ensure participants have the requisite experiences to inform the phenomenon under study. After I conducted data analysis of my transcribed

interviews, I provided a copy of my themes to my peer debriefers. They independently reviewed my interpretation of student responses and generation of themes and provided feedback. We compared our findings to ensure the meanings and themes that I have identified are distinctive and exhaustive. I also completed researcher memos to chronicle discussions of and decisions about the data analysis.

Transferability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) urged that the results of a study were capable of being appropriately applied to other settings. The responsibility of determining transferability ultimately lies with the reader, but the researcher must provide adequate information to insure the reader can make an educated decision. Therefore, it is my responsibility to provide a comprehensive description of all aspects of the study so that others can make an informed determination of the extent of transferability. A thorough discussion, or thick description, of the theoretical perspective, methodology, methods employed, and actions taken serve as a resource for the reader and future researchers.

Inquiry Audit

Dependability seeks to ensure that procedures are followed and the data accurately reflect the experience being studied (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Throughout the proposal, collection and analysis process, I made use of research memos to document and review my subjectivity as a researcher. In addition, I employed an

inquiry auditor who is familiar with qualitative methodology. The auditor ensured that sampling, data collection, procedures and analysis are conducted according to the procedures outlined in the dissertation proposal and consistent with basic qualitative methods. The auditor assisted me in identifying areas where I departed from the proposal and articulating my rationale for the emergent collection and analysis procedure.

Data Analysis

Interviews were recorded using the Garage Band™ application on my MacBook Air laptop computer. I saved the recordings as a "song" and exported them to my personal itunes account that is locally stored on the same laptop computer. These interviews served as my primary unit of analysis. I created a playlist of each interview "song" which allowed me to listen to the interview, for now a second time, the first occurring during the interview itself. While waiting for transcriptions to be completed, I listened to each recording to re-familiarize myself with interviews that transpired over a nine month period.

After obtaining transcripts from the professional transcriber I employed, I listened to each interview a third time while reviewing the respective transcript to correct for errors. After transcripts were corrected, I reviewed each interview, noting in the margin my explanations for concepts that participants' raised. I conducted this "bracketing" as an exercise to make explicit the assumptions and explanations I brought to the dataset. Making these explicit allowed me to separate my assumptions from statements made by participants and was a step I conducted in order to reduce the likelihood of reading data through the lens of my preconceived ideas.

I reviewed the transcripts again, this marking the fifth time I either listened or read through an interview, breaking the data apart into "chunks". Merriam (2009) refers to these as segments or units of data. She indicated that two criteria assist the researcher in determining units of data: (a) They are relevant to the questions the study has undertaken to answer, and (b) they represent the smallest piece of data that can stand alone. I segmented the data so that I could take one idea or concept at a time as articulated by the participants and compare it against other pieces of information or "chunks." After fracturing the data into meaning units I derived initial labels of meaning units or "codes," for bits of data, a process called "open coding" (Merriam, 2009).

I opened an excel spreadsheet and created a row for each "chunk" of text. Within each row of "chunks" of text were columns that identified the participant, the corresponding interview question, and any codes that I associated with the "chunk". Organizing a spreadsheet in this manner allowed me to create pivot tables through the excel application that sliced the data and made it possible to retrieve data in multiple combinations. Therefore, I could produce a table that contained every answer to the question, "Tell me about a recent experience in diversity education," or every response made by an individual participant, "Chris," or every response that was labeled with the code, "bullying." Arranging the data in this way resulted in over 1000 "open" codes which I grouped into 34 initial categories, a process that is sometimes called "axial" coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2007). Initial categories were reorganized, identifying subcategories and collapsing like categories into larger patterns to yield findings.

Findings from the study were rendered in the form of two sets of organized descriptive accounts or themes. The first set of themes, presented in chapter four, includes men's responses to the gender portion of the interview protocol: (a) the persistence of hegemonic masculine ideology, (b) experiences of gender socialization, and (c) the

emergence of resistant and aspirant masculinities. The second set of themes, presented in chapter five, document men's experience in diversity education, including: (a) how men found their way into diversity education, (b) the challenges and supports they encountered, and (c) their advice for professionals and educators who seek to design effective experiences.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations of the study suggest cautious application of the findings. Despite efforts to diversify the study, time and financial constraints required that I limit the geographic reach. Furthermore, the type of study I undertook was reliant upon nominations which significantly limited the pool of potential participants. Almost half of those nominated did not respond to initial inquiries. Additionally, the inclusion of an informational questionnaire appeared to have a chilling effect on the number of participants who persisted in the study. Two potential explanations for the lack of persistence may be attributed to the content of the study and the time demands for participants. The content may have concerned potential participants who were suspicious of the political agenda behind the research questions. Students might have been reluctant to participate in a study that they worried might expose an unflattering view of men. The time demanded by both the interview and filling out the questionnaire may also have had a chilling effect on the participation of those nominated. Of the participants who persisted despite possible concerns or demands or other variables, eleven of the fourteen identified as White. While I would have preferred a more racially diverse sample, this study does not seek to make race claims regarding the findings.

The primary instrument for qualitative research is the researcher. A second limitation of the study relates to my skill acquisition and development as a researcher. Throughout the review of my transcripts and writing of my findings, I encountered incidents of the questions I did not ask and the stories I did not pursue during interviews. Though each successive interview improved, skills for slowing down the conversation and asking probing questions would have enhanced the dataset.

CHAPTER 4

THE "BRO TO FEMINIST" CONTINUUM

I undertook this study in order to better understand a group of undergraduate men who were noticed by their instructors and facilitators for their involvement in diversity education. Undergraduate men who are involved in diversity education constitute a small population, compared with the number of undergraduate women involved in diversity education. As a diversity educator, I have long been troubled by the low numbers of men who participate in diversity education experiences on college campuses. To account for their absence and understand how to enhance undergraduate male participation in diversity education, I thought it prudent to talk to some men who had opted into these experiences. I did not stop at just their experiences of diversity education, however. I also wanted to know how they made sense of their identity as men, since it was likely that their initial assumptions about gender identity might have been challenged by diversity education. I wondered what it might be, in their understandings of themselves as men that interacted with their experience of diversity education.

For this chapter I start by introducing the participants, using self-selected pseudonyms. The fourteen participants fall between the ages of nineteen to twenty-four, and at the time of interviews were enrolled in one of three public or private colleges, ranging from first year to senior. Their gender identities include male, queer, and gay. They identify racially as White, Black, Hispanic/Multiracial, and ethnically as White, African American, Jewish, and Puerto Rican/ Dominican. In sexuality, they identify as heterosexual, queer, or gay, and their identified class of origin includes working, middle and upper class.

I then present themes associated with the latter half of the interview protocol: College men's description of masculinity. Following that I present themes associated with the first half of the protocol: College men's experience of diversity education. I made the decision to provide themes of the second half first because as I reviewed transcripts it became increasingly clear that how students understood and performed their identity as men influenced their experiences in the diversity workshop and classroom. I begin with participants (see Table 1).

Participants

Alex

Alex is a nineteen year-old sophomore who attends a large public university in the northeast where he studies business. Alex is a White middle class man who identified himself as a heterosexual. Alex was enrolled for a semester in a survey course that explored systems of oppression.

Ari

Ari is a twenty-one year-old, senior, philosophy and women's studies major who attends a mid-sized private, religiously affiliated university in the Midwest. Ari identifies as a man who is gender/queer. Ari is the former chair of the diversity week programming for the university's student government and a former president of the student body gay-straight alliance. He has taken several women studies courses and was one of the participants who was nominated by multiple faculty members in women and gender studies and sociology. He intends to go to graduate school after he finishes his degree.

Billy

Billy is a twenty year-old, African American male sociology major in his junior year. He attends a private, religiously affiliated college in the Midwest. Billy is an active member in his fraternity and has had leadership roles in student orientation and various affinity organizations at the institution. He spent a semester participating in an intergroup dialogue on race and racism. He works in the multicultural student affairs office, is a junior, and comes from a working-class family.

Chris

Chris is a twenty year-old junior, and a multiracial man who identifies as Puerto Rican, Dominican and White. He is a sociology major and attends a private, religiously affiliated university in the Midwest. Chris enrolled in multiple sociology courses that had a race or gender focus. Chris comes from a middle-class background and identified himself as heterosexual.

Elliott

Elliott is a twenty year-old, white man in his sophomore year. He attends a public mid-sized institution in the northeast. Elliott was captain of his high school football team and student body president. He is a practicing Catholic for whom faith is very important. Elliott was enrolled for a semester in a survey course that explored systems of oppression. Elliott was raised in a working class home where his family experienced periods of economic uncertainty and unemployment.

Gerard

Gerard is a twenty-four year-old, white Jewish man in his senior year at a midsized, public university in the northeast where he has a self-designed social science/interdisciplinary

major. Gerard identifies as gender/queer and was raised in an upper middle class home. He is very active in local and national radical politics and participates within a community of local activists. Gerard was one of the few participants in the study who was nominated by multiple faculty and staff members. Gerard is an RA on an all male floor and is a peer educator in a campus performance troupe.

Jeff

Jeff is a twenty year-old white man in his sophomore year at a midsized, public university in the northeast. He identifies as gay and was raised in a middle class home. Jeff is an RA on a gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered themed floor and is a peer educator in a campus performance troupe. Jeff also was enrolled for a semester in a survey course that explored systems of oppression.

Johannes

Johannes is a twenty-one year-old white man in his sophomore year at a midsized, public university in the northeast. He was raised in a middle class home. Johannes has dual citizenship in the US and Germany. He is a social science major and active in campus intramurals. Johannes has enrolled in multiple courses that focus on systems of oppression and hegemony, and he spent one semester in a service-learning course that explored community activism.

John

John is a twenty-one year-old senior who studies English at a midsized public institution in the Midwest. John is an African American man who identifies as gay. He has been extremely active in student government, has been an RA, and is often asked to serve on university

committees. He has been enrolled in multiple diversity courses. He chose not to return as an RA in his third year so that he could assume a diversity chair with his student government.

Josh

Josh is a twenty year-old white man and former transfer student. He is a social science major in his senior year at a midsized, public institution in the northeast. He identifies in the LGBT community and was raised in an upper middle class home. Josh has taken several courses that explore systems of oppression and hegemony.

Liam

Liam is a twenty-two year-old transgender man in his senior year at a midsized, public institution in the northeast. He identifies as queer and was raised in a middle class home. Liam serves in a leadership role in the campus GSA and is a social science major. He has enrolled in several courses that explore systems of oppression and hegemony.

Tom

Tom is a twenty-one year-old senior who studies philosophy at a midsize, private, religiously affiliated university in the Midwest. Tom is a White man who comes from a middle-class background. He serves as a supervisor for a campus, student-run business. Tom has taken multiple philosophy and women studies courses that focus on race, class or gender. After graduation, he is unsure about next steps and is applying for retail management positions.

William

William is a nineteen year-old first year student at a midsized, public institution in the Midwest. He is a White man who comes from a middle-class background. William is a physics major who intends to go to graduate school after finishing his bachelor's degree. In

his first year, he participated in a men's group on campus dedicated to ending violence against women.

Table 1 Participants

Pseudonym	**Age**	**Class Year**	**Gender**	**Race/ Ethnicity**	**SEC Background**
Alex	19	Soph	Man	White	Middle Class
Ari	21	Senior	Man, gender queer	White	Upper Middle Class
Billy	20	Junior	Man	Black, African American	Working Class
Chris	20	Junior	Man	Multiracial Puerto Rican, Dominican	Came from a poor family
Elliott	20	Soph	Man	White	Working Class
Gerard	24	Senior	Man, gender queer	White, Jewish	Upper middle class
Ian	19	Soph	Man	White	Middle Class
Jeff	20	Soph	Man	White	Middle Class
Johannes	21	Soph	Man	White	Middle Class
John	21	Senior	Man	Black, African American	No Response
Josh	20	Senior	Man	White	Upper Middle Class

Liam	22	Senior	Man, Trans	White	Middle Class

Gender as Identity and Practice

In talking to the young men and asking them to describe masculinity, I heard them describe many of the messages and characteristics that are remarked upon in the literature on male gender roles and masculinity (Connell, 2000; Kimmel, 2008; O'Neill, 1981). Characteristics and dispositions of men as stoic, problem solvers, providers, strong, and capable dominated. An absence of vulnerability, uncertainty, and emotionality emerged. Participants described masculinity as the capacity to do what is necessary, to be physically fit, to have sex frequently (but only with women), and to be able to handle a lot of alcohol and drugs. Accompanying these characteristics was a concern or an expression of what happens when they don't measure up to these gender expectations which likely pose difficult goals to accomplish. Yet, failing to measure up can result in shaming, shunning and the threat of violence, from other men.

Several themes captured the intensity of masculine socialization in the participants' responses. After establishing the contours of hegemonic masculinity performance as summarized above, participants described the socialization processes that actively maintain hegemonic norms. Perhaps it is inevitable that such indoctrination results in self-monitoring and policing. Having learned through the threat of violence and shunning practices what is and what is not successfully masculine, men begin to anticipate outcomes and pre-empt other men's evaluation of them as less masculine by adhering to an established script.

Other reactions to the confining scripts of hegemonic masculinity emerged. Because socialization happens within an interpersonal environment networks become important. Since these participants had been recommended as young men engaged in diversity

education, it was interesting to hear, at several points in their descriptions of masculinity, critiques or departures from hegemonic norms. For instance, belying popular images of men as stoic, some participants shared their stories of feeling sentimental towards their romantic partner or crying openly from happiness. Additionally, intersections carved out spaces for new interpretations of hegemonic masculinity and capacities for resisting hegemonic masculinity. The section on masculinity themes concludes with some elaborations on men who have begun to conceptualize alternative or aspirant masculinities.

Hegemonic Masculinity

In this study, the male participants described masculinity in fairly hegemonic terms. They were thorough, detailed and thoughtful in their depiction of what it means to be a man. They reported that a man takes care of business, knows what needs to be done and executes. He is stoic, strong and capable. At times, these qualities would manifest in examples of heroes. The perspective of strength and competence persisted in interviews even when men admitted uncertainty or confusion about whether such an expectation was achievable.

Several participants described men as strong and stoic, people who know the answer to any situation. If he had to explain masculinity to an alien, Tom indicated his response would be strong and stoic. He explained,

> I mean just like the generic list of characteristics would be like courageous, strong, I'd say strong is probably the top, the top of that list. Um like the stoic you know, leaving emotion out of it. Um I'd say probably strong and lacking emotion are probably the two I guess that is what I would say to the alien cause a strong person who lacks emotion is masculine.

He went on to provide an example in popular media of the stoic action figure, John McClain, from the Die Hard franchise. His alternative? Clint Eastwood. Tom described it as "being able to do what's necessary in like any given situation. Seems to, I don't know, and that has very little to do with gender, but that seem to encapsulate masculinity for me." By pointing to McClain he is describing a self-sufficiency that against all odds wins the day. Chris pointed to some of the same ideas.

> I'd say brave, strong, uh I guess take charge. Take the lead of things. Um things that you see on TV like the heroes. The heroes are seen as guys and usually their saving someone who can't really care for themselves, and that's usually a female. And uh so I think this kind a like media I guess plays a huge role in how society sees how like guys are supposed to be.

The message is men are saviors; men are brave and strong. Men know what to do and how to take charge, and they save the day. It's an extremely demanding responsibility. Elliott reiterated this perspective and then engaged in a mild critique:

> I think um it's too often that masculinity is associated with just the stoicism and you know I have to, I have to be there for people, I must protect, or the reverse of just like that guy looked at me funny, I must go like fight or like protect this girl's honor and stuff like that where it's I mean I've never been one to do those sort of things, and I find myself like confused a lot of times um in those sort of situations, but like when guys acting hyper masculine like that um I never really saw the benefit to it.

When discussing what it means to be a man, William emphasized knowing what your life's work will be and having a plan. He explained, "to be a man would be to have an understanding of where you are going," but he worried that he was not living up to this, "because presently I have no idea what my, I mean I have short term goals, but I don't have

like a long term plan for my life…" He felt very disconcerted and self-conscious because he was still figuring out who he wants to be and in his mind part of masculinity is knowing and perhaps not being caught in this exploratory, uncertain phase. From this perspective, masculinity is characterized by certainty and confidence in what you have already chosen and not the difficult and uncertain place of not knowing. His takeaway message was that real men know who they are and what their place is in the world.

Josh was rather adept at summarizing quickly some of the consistent characterizations of masculinity that occurred throughout the interviews. He began by articulating that in order to be a man you have to qualify through the existence of a male sex organ, ("Well, first of all, you have to have a penis.") He asserted that trans and gender queer people and women do not have the primary asset that connotes masculinity. He spoke very bluntly about the fact that not having a penis excludes you from being able to be a man by virtue of being unable to demonstrate credible masculinity. He then went on to discuss what attributes men should exhibit having qualified as convincingly male: be fit, be confident, and be able to handle the consumption of large quantities of alcohol and drugs. These insights that he provided are noteworthy in terms of their consistency throughout the interviews.

> Like the ideal is like you have to I guess assertive and confident to be like physically able and fit to like, and to have that be represented in your like pheno type in your body, in like with muscles and like fat and um to be um able to do anything and bounce back, like binge drinking, smoking um like heavy drugs, be able to do that, you know you can get your hang over day to like chill on the couch with Bros, but you gotta be able to be ready to go you know what I mean, to drink and then like take your 12, like wake up at 12:00, sit on the couch until 3:00 and then start drinking at 4:00 again. You know what I mean, you have to be able to bounce back and do what you want, whenever you want.

In addition to strength, control, and intestinal fortitude, another theme that emerged from these interviews with young men, still in college, had to do with promiscuity. Several participants commented on the importance of having lots of sex with women. Billy talked about how men are told to be promiscuous and Tom agreed, commenting that they were told to be such, in terms of being a man. William characterized it as a womanizer, a wealthy bad ass. He pointed to media figures like Tony Stark from the Marvel universe, recently chronicled in the blockbuster franchises of Iron Man and the Avengers. As one of the preeminent models of the messaging around masculinity, Tony Stark is a wealthy, highly intelligent super hero who is also a womanizer. Played by Robert Downey Jr., he characterizes for some men what all men are told they should be. The message is for young men are to be a man you have to have slept with women, multiple women, attractive women, women that other men would find attractive. That that is part of what it takes to prove yourself. Tom sums it up succinctly: "You're less manly if you're having less sex." Later he estimates that "maybe about 50% of my friends think that way or at least express it outwardly."

Johannes reflected the same trope, and he tentatively wondered how emphasis on men's promiscuity may feed into a rape culture.

> I think a huge part of um rape culture is about, it's not really gender, but about…masculinity and the ideas, and ideas that are constantly um maintained and about that men should be like, they need to go out and they need to get laid and do whatever it takes to do that um, whether or not the male student even you know has, if they, if they really, if that's what they're actually wanting to do…and that can vary from different levels of severity I guess um you know ranging from being, pressuring uh young women into doing things or not asking for consent um of course all the way

to rape. It's all part of the same system. I think that's a big one, I think that's really pervasive on our campus.

Appearance was identified as a mechanism for signaling to others that you are a womanizer, attractive and fit. And to do that you have to work out. Of course, there are certain types of working out that can lead to being less masculine. Chris related a story where he was at the college fitness center with several of his friends and they noticed a young man who was running on the treadmill. The treadmill at the gym on this particular campus and perhaps others is considered an aerobic exercise that is more appropriate for women than men. Chris explained that he and his friends laughed and joked and made comments about the young man who was running on the treadmill. Instead of lifting weights or participating in other sanctioned activities that were deemed more masculine, he was the only young man making use of the treadmill equipment in the gym. In a veritable sea of treadmill machines, perhaps thirty or more, a single machine was being used by a man. And when he was using it, it was remarked upon and noticed in a manner that did not positively reinforce or condone his use.

William added to the appearance theme, noting how certain types of apparel get coded as masculine. On his campus, salmon-colored, chino-type pants tucked into Patagonia boots are a frequently seen uniform for male students. He noted that this dress code is not only popular, but essential, "[I]n order to be accepted you have to be these things to be perceived positively by like females and the rest of the males who matter."

Drinking behaviors also factored into several students comments about masculinity. In order to be a man you needed to be able to drink and you needed to be able to drink as much as your friends. Josh talked about how important it was to be able to drink, and to use heavy drugs and to not really be impacted by it. That you were supposed to get up in the

morning and be able to utilize these substances that can have a tremendous chemical and physical impact on your system and bounce back. Ready to drink more and use more the next day. Hangovers may be inevitable, but a real man can shake it off after a few hours' rest. The recovery period or lack thereof needs to be able to demonstrate one's ability to handle intoxicants and their repercussions:

> [U]m to be um able to do anything and bounce back, like binge drinking, smoking um like heavy drugs, be able to do that, you know you can get your hang over day to like chill on the couch with Bros, but you gotta be able to be ready to go, you know what I mean, to drink and then like wake up at 12:00, sit on the couch until 3:00 and then start drinking at 4:00 again. You know what I mean, you have to be able to bounce back and do what you want, whenever you want.

Jeff picked up on this same thing, contending, "like a lot of guys feel the need to get super drunk and, like, act super crazy because that's the masculine thing to do, like I can drink 10 beers in an hour and be fine…" Tom commented on how much alcohol was used, especially during his first year of college to differentiate between those who are masculine and who is not. Several men commented on the equation of ability to outdrink others with masculinity. William talked about men being seen as more masculine in his community if they went to a lot of parties or were seen frequently at parties where alcohol was free flowing.

It's Not Just What is Masculine; It's What Isn't

Several students described what was not masculine. Some examples of this were to be emotional. Multiple students, including Chris, Liam and Tom indicated that showing one's emotions was unacceptable or undermined one's masculinity. Stoicism was more commonly

associated with masculinity. Liam explained what the terms "man up" and "grow some balls" mean:

> They're saying do not be emotional, men are not emotional, men don't want their feelings control their actions, they're rational beings, um yeah and, and that man up, meaning like uh tough, be tough, have a thick skin on you always, um men are seen as leaders, groups because they're rational, because they're seen as, so yeah I just think strong and that your not suppose to be sensitive.

Sometimes even the topics that men discuss can be coded as more masculine or less masculine. Jeff pointed out how at family functions the men in his family are more likely to engage in small talk around topics that could be considered masculine. He contended that an example of a more masculine topic included sports. He went on to note that sometimes he purposefully rejects this and instead brings up art exhibits or other interesting details of things that are happening in the city, that he specialize or pinpoints the interest of the men in the space based on background information. He told the story that during a family event where an uncle who is interested in art and architecture was present, he brought up a recent show rather than rely on the more common (and socially acceptable) topic of sports.

Celibacy surfaced as an item that is not very masculine. One of the participants, Chris, talked about a sibling who is choosing to go into the priesthood, and the fact that his decision to be celibate is something other than masculine. When he talked about his friend, he admired that, not that it was masculine, it was uncommonly masculine. His friend's decision to be strong and withstand the pull of sexual intimacy was a strength that Chris recognized and as a strength cued him as masculine but not one that most men would engage.

Chris also talked about how that he takes things personally or he takes things to heart. That he is overly helpful and that this is something that his girlfriend had pointed out was more feminine. He shared,

> I guess I'm pretty like emotional I guess, or like I don't know, I kind of let people walk all over me kind of thing. Where, like, I feel that kind of, like, less masculine because I kind of, just like, do things to help people, like, if they ask me or I felt, like, so like I don't know (laughter), like, my girlfriend always says I'm kind of emotional, like, I take things to heart some times too much. More than I should, and, like, that's more a feminine trait, I guess.

This is interesting because the quote illuminates both what is perceived as masculine and who participates in enforcing a hegemonic script. Masculinity as a social construct gets affirmed and enforced within a social context. It could be a young boy's peer group, it could be his parents, his father and grandfather and uncles or other male role models but it also can happen amongst the women in a young man's life. For Chris, one of the key relationships that informs him or stood out to him as having an influence on how he sees masculinity is his relationship with his partner and what she says about whether or not he qualifies as masculine or not.

Elliott picked up on the theme of emotional expressiveness, exposing its connection to a deeper misogyny.

> Like homophobia and all that, um I think like a lot of it is just cause of uh, cause of the necessity to be like emotionally tough and you know be able to like take a punch, like take a hit and be able to get up and be fine, physically tough, um and being able to like push yourself mentally. I think there's a lack of association um of people who are gay

> with those sort of qualities because um people who are gay are often seen as more feminine, which is associated with that sort of more emotional, more um moody…

Intellect became another point to which some of the participants talked about what is masculine or not. William talked about how certain kinds of intellect are not as appreciated. He differentiated between an ability to navigate the natural universe successfully with being a scientist.

> Like they don't really, they don't classically portray men as being intellectuals. They portray them as being rugged. I mean they have intellect to a point, but they don't have intellect to the point where they would be like a scientist, there's a big difference.

William distinguished between men of ability and men of scientific intelligence. He didn't perceive that most men consider being a scientist masculine.

Joshua also pointed out how masculinity can get coded as anti-intellectual. He remarked, "You don't' have to be smart as long as you can keep up with the pack. You don't need really need to be academic, you don't need to be engage(d) with school at all." In fact, he intimated that if you try too hard, that can come across as problematic.

The Socialization and Policing of Masculinity

Having spent some time identifying the shape and texture of the hegemonic script that dominates masculinity performance, participants began elaborating on how those scripts were maintained. They were rather self aware of the socialization, ascribing certain behaviors and attitudes to the category of what gets rewarded and others to the category of what gets punished. They appeared to be adept at differentiating between performances that

are likely to be celebrated and those that are likely to be condemned as highly problematic, usually by being coded feminine. In articulating the rewards and sanctioning process and by emphasizing the punishing repercussions of the socialization process into masculinity, participants illustrated the dynamic of policing that occurs within male peer groups. Their stories are consistent with scholars' assertion of the surveillance and demands to repeatedly prove one's masculinity that can characterize men's social interaction (Connell, 2000; Kimmel, 2008). Every social interaction becomes a new opportunity to have one's masculinity interrogated and found wanting, or successfully defend one's claim to masculinity. Several examples of that emerged.

Part of the conversation about masculinity involved stories that depicted various mechanisms for policing that they had experienced were employed. Elliott expanded upon the ways that certain attitudes and behaviors that are coded as masculine get reinforced, returning to the earlier theme of emotionality. He explained:

> I had a really like strong background in sports, um so I mean with that it sort of requires you to be you know emotionally tough, if your just like down about stuff and like, oh like I can't believe I messed up that play, it's just like, all right the next play's coming up, you have to get over yourself, there's no time for, for um, to be like emotional and if you are I mean that's gonna affect you, that's gonna affect your performance. Um as far, I mean in relation to girls I don't think they really want somebody who's overly emotional where a guy is, I mean it wouldn't prevent them from being with someone, it would just be seen as like, all right they're a girl, that's fine. Um I think it's less than just like a, I think it's a societal thing, I don't think it's just like um things were like instilled, I don't know, but um I think guys are less rewarded in general for those sort of qualities I think.

Josh shared a story from the time he was as young as eight or nine. He was playing in the backyard when his father came to the door and called him inside to give him instruction about how little boys run. Up until that moment Josh hadn't coded his running as gendered in any way. He ran naturally in a way that felt good for him running across the back yard. It wasn't something he thought about necessarily, but with his father's intervention, Josh had been introduced to a new understanding: Boys run differently than girls. Boys are supposed to run differently. When I asked Josh to explain how boys run, this is what he said:

> um just running, uh I ran across my backyard once and my dad stopped me and told me that I wasn't running right cause I looked like a girl, I was running like a girl, um and yeah told me like how to run.

Josh shared this example to point out consequences he experienced in grade school because of his gender presentation. He learned a lesson from his father: That it is important that boys not run like girls. So important, that decisions about how you hold your hands, how you control your legs, the height of the kick, and the pace itself, all contribute to defining what is appropriately masculine and gendered on a little boy's body. Since gender is constructed and how a man runs is not an innate physical quality or reaction, a boy needs to get it right, or be set straight by his father.

Josh pointed to this story as something that he can remember very clearly. There were not many stories shared by participants about their experiences from primary or elementary school regarding being gendered. This story was clearly seminal for Josh in terms of delineating for him what is permitted and what is not.

Chris also told a story about a junior high dance he was invited to attend by another little boy in his grade and he shared that story in response to my question about have there

been times when you have felt more or less masculine. He shared it in terms of rejecting this overture in a way that better met the expectations of his peers. Chris's merely rejected the boy's invitation and explained that he was not interested, but he would have won more points and confirmed his masculinity if he had not merely rejected the invitation to the dance, but taught the other little boy a lesson about daring to invite him by punching him or beating him up for having the gall to ask. I pressed Chris to inquire if anyone had supported his position. He thought for a moment before he replied, "no, not really." Eventually he conceded that his mom was proud that he didn't get in a fight but perhaps by their silence the teachers, his coaches, the other students were enforcing for Chris what his responsibilities in maintaining masculinity for the boys in his peer group.

While giving advice about diversity education Johannes wondered if, "an entrance point for a lot of male students may be about gender policing of males." Johannes used the word *policing* to explain the role of friends and acquaintances in the social environment to create expectations of masculine behavior and enforce limits. He elaborated:

> Yeah, um, the way that people you know, that male students or, and expect other men to dress, to eat, that they should go to the gym, that they should be, have a certain level of fitness or strength, a lot of activities they should be involved with, often not explore artistic, or they should be more involved with you know the flag football, intramurals team rather than you know the theater group for example…you have to do this to prove yourself to be a man, and like whatever, whatever it takes.

Tom talked about how policing could happen through language, noting how words are used amongst his friends. He shared that he regularly was called names like pussy, or "same with faggot to a lesser extent but I mean it's mostly the um, to be honest it happens in such mundane everyday circumstances that it's kind of hard to even come up with like a

specific example of like what I would have been doing in any of those situations." It was really too commonplace to be remarked upon. In the course of a conversation he shared with me that he had probably been called those things already that day and that was fairly typical within his interactions. He also discussed how in his first year it was important to demonstrate masculinity to the other men on his floor or in his community. He talked about how men drank to demonstrate that they were man enough. He talked about a student on his floor who smoked marijuana as a way to show the other young men that he was meeting the expectations of masculinity. Tom had difficulty recalling specific situations and behaviors for which he was called "pussy" or "faggot," and finally settled on a couple of hypotheticals. He explained, "just for comparison sake it's like if I, if I thought it was cold outside or something, and it wasn't that cold out, or like I was wearing more layers than my friends thought necessary, actually the big one now that I think about it is drinking. Yeah, can't drink fast enough or enough of quantity, then those (slurs) will get thrown out for sure."

Anticipating the Consequences of Failing at Masculinity

Participants returned again and again to examples and stories that illustrated the potential consequences of failing "to get it right" when it came to masculinity performance. They described both real and imagined responses. Present day experiences were drawn upon as well as stories from middle school and high school. Throughout a few themes prevailed, such as threats of isolation, intimidation, and violence, all of which constituted the anticipated outcomes of falling short of hegemonic norms and expectations.

Johannes described one of the more passive consequences, that of being rendered invisible. He explained:

> I think that getting shut off from being in the inner kind of boys club, that, that I think happens frequently. And I think that I have experienced that to some extent, although

> it's not with hostility but it's more of just kind of being ignored in some ways. For example, the guys that I was trying to hang out with in my first two years of high school, for example, especially first two years, I was never really accepted, I wasn't shunned, but I was just kind of there, but I wasn't taken into the fold and like okay your not one of us. Um so, and I think that performing masculinity or hyper masculinity is often kind of like initiation, um not that it, I don't think usually stops there, like it, then it continues and you have to continually prove yourself.

Bullying and intimidation characterized several of the more overt consequences of failing to prove one's masculinity to the satisfaction of others. Ian offered a few stories of intimidation from his peers in high school. He provided insight into how personalities can create an environment of fear and intimidation. He shared a little bit about a bully he encountered and his response. Ian anticipated that the outcome of the encounter would be violence. He decided to confront the young man who wanted to copy his homework, but expected to suffer as a result thereby in a no win situation. Either he allows the other to benefit from work Ian conducted, or he is harmed. He noted that his father's advice was to use his words to fight back and establish himself, "after being bullied, going home and then um my dad, he didn't tell me to fight back, um he told me to fight back with my words or um basically manipulate the situation differently."

Ian provided a second more specific instance of bullying, and it's rather surprising result.

> He was this really big kid, really strong and um he was already balding and like sophomore year of high school and um, um he wanted my homework, the classic, he wanted my homework and um I told him to fuck off, and then he just kind of looked at me because no one ever talked to him that way. And um I mean in high school I

> wasn't like this huge kid…yeah, I would blow away in the wind so um, and so I thought maybe he was going to hit me but he just kind of sat there and he's like okay, you're cool…

His story is particularly striking because, while there was an initial threat of violence, the other kid accepted his vigorous refusal to go along ("fuck off" … "okay, you're cool"). As his father had predicted, he was able to hold his ground in the face of the threat and intimidation of the bully. The positive outcome begs the question: How frequently do young men experience their social interactions anticipating a no win situation or violent outcome?

Fear of violence was present in several of the other participant's conversations. Two of the young men in the study who identified as gender queer and trans, respectively, talked openly about their fear of violence. While neither of them had actually experienced a situation where they were physically harmed, they experienced a number of uncomfortable dynamics that they read as threatening. Ari returned to his experiences of threat repeatedly during his interview, underscoring the venomous stares that he attributed to violating passersby expectations of how he should present his gender. He described the looks as disapproval that bordered on disgust and loathing, and he interpreted the stares as a social cue prefiguring violence.

> I don't feel safe on this campus, on a day-to-day basis, I just don't. Um even if it's not an idea of physical attack, emotionally, verbally, something along those lines. I've never really had it happen, I never really had anything more than stares.

Ari feels well served by his physical size and his prowess in hand combat, but that doesn't offset how frequently he takes into consideration his relative safety on campus. Ari explained the strategy he employs to protect himself psychologically and physically.

> What route, depending on how I'm dressed, depending on how I look that day, what route I'm going to take that's going to expose me the least to people that I don't want to deal with. Because again I'm really good at a one on one but like just driving by I don't want to hear anything, I don't want to deal with someone being an asshole, I don't way to deal with anything, I just don't.

Although Liam has not directly experienced violence, he actively anticipates it. In response to my question of whether or not he has experienced violence as the result of his gender performance he responded:

> Not yet, but I always come up with scenarios in my head where that could happen. Um especially in [City], sometimes, I haven't been in a situation yet, but, no I haven't, I've been really lucky, I can't say I've been in a situation where I felt by other men that I've, can't say that I've felt unsafe, just uncomfortable, which um that's, I'm really lucky, definitely, um very, very lucky to have that, so, yeah.

He has imagined various scenarios of violence that act as a filter that determines his overall comfort levels, and he considers himself exceptional in that he has not yet been subjected to violence for how he manifests his gender identity.

Josh's story from grade school is striking for a few reasons. First, it illustrates how early significant events occur that shape men's expectations of negotiating gender in public spaces. It also illuminates how violence, bullying and intimidation can be constructed and sanctioned within the structures of an institution, in this case the middle school physical education classroom.

> [L]ike the sports thing, I was made fun of in school for that, um the um, yeah that tied in with being called fat, even though I wasn't fat, I mean compared, comparatively, I

was a little chubby, and so the um, same the, there's a time in middle school I remember, one of like the most abrasive like guys who I went to school with um he, we were playing football, the dreaded sport um and you know being on this line you know, on lines on the other side of the team and he picked me to be the kid he was going to line up in front of me every single time and right before like you know the "hike" he would always be just like derogatory, kind of with language, like calling me fat, and bad at stuff, and that kind of language and just like it kept happening and um I just kept getting madder and madder and, kind of trying more and since I had like no skill, the trying more just made it worse and so it just got worse and he was laughing at me, and it was very visible and you know it's, it's football…so this is all a group of men and, so I'm on this team and no one, there was no, this was like maybe sixth grade or something, there's no interference of that interaction, there's no one who supports me because I was bad at sports, and I wasn't friends with any men um at the time and you know, no one defended me…

Finding Like-Minded Men

Several men confided their dissatisfaction with social interactions with friends and peers that enforced a particular kind of (hegemonic) masculinity, and noted the many ways that hegemonic norms didn't fit or feel comfortable. Others described their efforts to locate like-minded others who were troubled by or resisted hegemonic norms.

Tom, for instance, was disturbed by comments made by a friend regarding the Steubenville rape case, an incident where two high school students uploaded photos on social media of their raping a heavily intoxicated female classmate. He didn't agree with the

position his friend took on the case, but he assumed that his friend would not be receptive to an actual conversation. Here is how he described that interaction:

> At this point in college it's gotten to the point where um there's a lot of contention between my views and like my friends views and I just don't feel like addressing that. Like for instance the recent Steubenville thing brought up a lot about like rape and everything and I was kind of appalled at some of my friend's views to be completely honest. It came up in a bar setting and I was just, not the noble thing, but I mean I was just like I'm going to walk away from this conversation.

Tom notes the disconnect but felt that he was in the minority in his opinion. He was confident that a productive conversation would not be possible.

William introduced an interesting construct to differentiate between the men on his all male residence hall floor. He situated a continuum, where on one end there were "Bros" and on the other end were "Feminists." For William, this dichotomy distinguished the different archetypes and interests of his male peers. William was sometimes troubled by the "Bros" in his social environment, and he ended up rejecting some of the extreme attitudes of the individuals he categorized as Bros. He described one guy who for him embodied the "Bro" designation:

> The guy he would always, he would always wear a wife beater 100% of the time, and um he would normally come home drunk on week days around 3:00 am and then he would do various things such as slam doors, knock on doors, and play loud music. He'd open the main entrance door so that they start to buzz, sound off an alarm so someone has to go down and shut the door, and other aggravating things, and he had quite the reputation for just being a character at parties, so he just did his own thing.

This example is in contrast to William's resident advisor, whom he placed squarely in the feminist camp for the RA tendency to correct other men's language and espouse a politically correct ideology. William was disturbed by the Bro's tendency to tease the RA by publicly expressing pro-rape views. William noted that this man's behavior was extreme, but he also noted the ubiquity of such joking, "Oh all the time, I mean it's what guys do. They always make rape jokes. They just offhandedly make rape comments. Not meaning to be spiteful about it, but like jokingly. But it's still aggravating when it happens."

Although William didn't go so far as to suggest he was a feminist, he did convey his aggravation with the Bro archetype. He expressed his own discomfort with the joking of some of his peers, citing how rape had affected some of the women in his life, and attributed his experiences with why he pursued membership in a campus organization to end violence against women,

> Okay being a part of (organization) it's nice to know that other people think in a similar manner that I do and that it's pretty ridiculous the way that men are perceived and also how a very small number of men can ruin it for the rest of us. So it was good to see that there are other people that feel that way and want to do something about it.

Similarly, Jeff explained his decision making process for why he joined a peer education troupe. Finding other men who are interested in the conversations that he wants to have has given him confidence to consider taking those conversations to spaces outside the relative comfort of his organization.

> But I also, I never really felt comfortable talking with heterosexual guys because I'd feel like, like for them I need to prove myself. Um I guess like [Organization} was my first experience talking with guys and actually like hearing what they had to say

> unrelated to sports, because there's only certain spaces where they feel comfortable to do that. Like I would never like just strike up a conversation with some random guy and be like "so what do you think about like this" because it's not that type of space, but with (Organization) it's really um it just like really makes me think like wow like I can.

Gerard was especially scathing about the conditions of patriarchy that situate his experience daily, and he expressed his appreciation for a campus organization that brought men together to unpack their experiences. He contended:

> [P]atriarchy is like a pretty psychotic society living for anyone, and um I mean, I mean you know, your studying this so like you know men and wow that was like not a place, to, like express our emotions, like wow like it's hard to, just whatever topics that men wouldn't really have a way to talk about, so like anything from like sex to relationships, the family issues to like personal problems, just like, just a space to talk in an emotional way, it's really important I think.

Later on the same topic, Gerard expressed frustration with the level of conversation that is common in the organization, "I often feel like very left unfilled because I want our conversations to go to that macro level." He explains that he wants to move beyond exploring examples of masculine privilege, such as "your parents not always expecting you to do as much for the family as like your sister," to the resulting alienation that is an unintended outcome: "it makes you like really alienated from like doing work to serve others, like it disconnects you from other people."

It's interesting to note that at least three of the participants, Ari, Gerard and Josh, all of whom self-identified in the queer continuum, highlighted the relationships they had with women whom they considered part of their support network. Ari emphasized the importance

of feminism and his women's studies major in providing him with a cohort of female friends and supporters. While discussing the activist circles he spent a great deal of time in and that supported him in his radicalization process, Gerard remarked that he was the only man in the group. Josh talked about the women friends that supported him from grade school through college. Similarly, Liam confided that he did not have any regular contact with straight, cisgendered men. His support network almost exclusively consisted of women, the exception being a few gay or queer men in his circle.

Students in the study had differing perspectives on their male peers. Some men shared their disappointment and disagreement with the attitudes of the men in their circle. Others purposefully cultivated relationships with peers who might share their misgivings with masculinity; though they might desire more from the discussion. For a few participants, developing friendships with women offered the safety and support they were searching for in a relationship.

Resisting and Reimagining Hegemonic Masculinity

Throughout our conversations of masculinity men shared examples and stories that contradicted traditional, hegemonic masculine scripts. They neutralized characteristics that have historically been characterized as masculine or feminine. Some problematized notions of stoicism and restrictive emotionality through intersectionalities that reformulated masculinity through a racial or sexual orientation lens. Others spoke of what they wished masculinity to be and drew a picture of what they aspired to as men.

Tom, Elliott and Chris rejected on principle the idea of masculine characteristics. Tom asserted, "I've never really gotten a good handle on what defines like a man or a woman.

I was just kind of, I like to deal with people's individuals I guess." Similarly, Elliott reasons that masculinity and femininity should be replaced with a gender neutral set of virtues. He elaborated,

> The thing is it shouldn't be truly much different from what femininity is. It's really just about being loving, being caring, being that nurturing figure, um being able to, to be accepting, um being a source of strength, being emotional, being like, being a caretaker, making sure that, you know, being a protector, like these are all sort of like things that um like I associate with both and I think those are all sort of things that need to be like a good person in general.

Several men complicated hegemonic masculinity through intersections of marginalized identities based on race or sexuality. For instance, Jeff contended that he didn't experience bullying in high school which he attributed to how much he does not embody feminine qualities that can get interpreted as gay. John rejected some of the black masculinity stereotypes that he found problematic, such as the view that black men do not care about their families. His experience of black men's masculinity as lived by his father and grandfather portrayed just the opposite. John's models prioritized being a provider and caring deeply for and empathizing with their children. He noted that the men he knew cared for their families and expressed their care through their words and actions. He juxtaposed his personal experience with the image of the absent black father that is perpetuated in the media.

Ari pointed out how his queer identity benefitted him in that it released him from some of the expectations of masculinity. He pointed to getting to be himself everyday. Not having to pursue life in the suburbs and a car and 2.2 kids.

> You know as much as those systems of power benefit them they also put on them this, this two ton weight where they are expected to bring home the bacon, where they're expected to have a family, to pay the mortgage, to have you know 2 ½ kids and they beautiful home in the suburbs. It's you know the dreams and expectations of both of them and their wives I guess are sort of put on them, the men and we do that as a society to them.

At the same time his decision to dress in drag on a Friday night and walk through the campus neighborhood, primarily filled with students, produced a sense of anxiety for him. It reminded him that on a day to day basis he doesn't feel safe on campus. How he chooses to present his gender: wearing heels, wearing skinny jeans, wearing shirts that he found in the women's department of various stores provides a sense of freedom that he is not constrained to wear what others find acceptable, but simultaneously makes him more susceptible to violence. At the same time, Ari talked about how his gay and queer identity removed him from some of the more blatant objectification of women that he sees amongst heterosexual men.

Josh picked up on this same theme and talked about how one of the benefits of his identity as a queer man is that he gets to be an insider to women's culture in ways that he does not perceive heterosexual man to have access. He hypothesized that this is because women of his acquaintance do not perceive him as a potential intimate partner, so they feel no need to hide aspects of their lives such as their menstrual cycles that male sexual partners may find unattractive. While he is flattered to be included, he is also troubled by his inclusion, and his sense that it is because his female friends have dismissed him from the category of man due to his sexual orientation.

Billy identified certain behaviors as hyper-masculine, "like I'm the strongest man ever, I can do everything, all women want me, blah blah…" He then proceeded to reject such attitudes and performances, "It seems to be like a put on, like it's a show. Like no one is ever really that masculine in like real life. I personally don't think you'll get anywhere being like that." He spoke eloquently about his vision of what masculinity should embody. He noted that it doesn't have to be about being perfect, or achieving a material goal, but rather how you conduct yourself, the integrity with which you choose to live. He explained:

> I think it would be taking responsibility for your actions. So you know you've done something wrong being able to really own up to it. And I would say to whomever, that I messed up, but I want to try to fix it and so I think that I have done it a lot in life, period. You just mess up and you have to be able to admit that. "Yeah I messed up and I'll try to make that better."

Chris's notion of an aspirational masculinity also appealed to strength of character. He beamed as he describes his brother, who "kind of doesn't care what people think of him, but if he thinks it's right he'll just do it." Tom agreed, and points to his father's humility as indicative of "something that I don't necessarily live up to but that I try to strive toward, the humility part."

Johannes and Elliott drew some of the same conclusions as the other men, pointing to a sense of personal strength that has little to do with physical ability. Johannes spoke of the friends who demonstrate for him the kind of man he most admires:

> I have, I have friends who are, rather than being loud, they're quiet, rather than being straight, they're gay or bi or another sexual identity, um I have friends who instead of wanting to play football, they do theater, or sing uh rather than focusing on, you know

> there's, I have friends who instead of wanting to focus on physical strength, wanting to focus on intellectual strengths, um or other, all sorts of different strengths…

Elliott built on the notion of inner strength, clarifying that the kind of masculinity he aspires to comes from within and is not dependent on others for legitimacy. Describing the man he admires, he contended,

> It's not how strong you look or how big you look, it's like maybe like inside he's stronger, like stronger willed, which defines masculinity for me more than physical. Um, by sticking by what you believe that's one example. So I think more and more for me personally I think it's more internal than external. That defines masculinity.

From the Masculine Stage to the Diversity Classroom

Participants were clear in their enumeration of the contours and the consequences of masculinity performance. They asserted tropes that are commonly associated with hegemonic masculinity: Stoicism, power and control, promiscuity, risk-taking and physical dominance. They also revealed a view of the consequences that loom before the young man who does not meet the prescribed script. Ample lessons in intimidation, isolation and the experience of violence work to circumscribe a young man's behavior to maintain a cycle of socialization that rewards some behaviors and punishes others. Still men shared examples of how they had turned away from or resisted hegemonic pathways and provided insight into the kinds of masculinities they aspired to embody.

Despite the hopeful conclusion of the interviews, I am struck by the intensity of this social experience and the psychological ramifications of masculinity for college men. I believe that the socialization process into hegemonic masculinity imprints powerful lessons

into the subconscious of men students. These are lessons they take with them and transfer to a new setting such as the workshop on racism, the men against violence peer education program, the feminist classroom, an intergroup dialogue. In a classroom or organizational meeting setting, this may create untold obstacles as commonly very different expectations and assumptions reign. Diversity educators need to have an understanding of this so that they can inform the construction of the class and its facilitation to expect young men to resist being vulnerable, to resist being ignorant, to reject new information that is not consistent with their previous world view, because to change directions in one's point of view, is to admit that one was ignorant before, or did not have all the information. And not having the information and not knowing and not being able to predict and control a situation is extremely dangerous, psychologically and physically.

As we will see, in the course of the diversity education conversation, men in the study returned over and over again to their concerns about being blamed. Their reluctance to be responsible for the system of oppression and the emphasis that they placed on this I think is directly tied to how they have understood and internalized their expectations of themselves as men.

CHAPTER 5

"IN COMPANY WITH EACH OTHER:" MEN IN DIVERSITY EDUCATION

This chapter details themes that surfaced during my conversations with my college-age male participants about their experiences in diversity education. Specifically, I inquired into their reasons for participating, their takeaways, dynamics that supported their learning and advice they had for social justice educators. I reasoned that since college men's participation in diversity education is lower than college women's, educators need to understand why the men in this study – identified by faculty as young men who participated in a sustained form of diversity education – do in fact participate and what makes that experience positive. Following are themes that emerged to explain how men found their way into diversity education, the challenges and supports they encountered, and their advice for professionals and educators who seek to design effective experiences.

Pathways to Diversity Education

To understand men's experience in diversity education, I first inquired about the nature of the diversity experience itself. Men in college have a number of entry points and pathways to diversity education. Experiences ranged from elective and required classes to peer theatre addressing critical issues. Participants described their pathway to as well as their motive for participation in a diversity education experience. Course requirements, favorable conditions, appealing opportunities, and testimonials surfaced as themes. Additionally men extended the definition of what constituted diversity experiences to include informal interactions.

Course Requirements

Several students enrolled into a particular course because of a requirement. Sometimes these requirements were direct. In order to successfully complete the general education course of study a diversity course was required. For instance, a major in sociology or gender studies dictated a number of classes that fit into under the "diversity" heading. In addition to requirements, participants also pointed to courses that qualified as an elective that met progress standards towards completion.

Favorable Conditions

Interestingly, for some men requirements and progress towards completion were only part of the equation. Favorable conditions enhanced the utility of progress towards graduation. Chris's familiarity with the instructor augmented his decision to enroll. He explained,

> Yes it's required. It was actually an elective, you have to take I think fourteen credits or fifteen. And uh it just looked interesting. I really liked the teacher, the professor because I had her the semester before, and uh, so I was kind of looking at what classes she was teaching and, but overall I really liked the class.

For Elliott, the favorable condition was the convenience of the timing and location of the course offering. For a busy college student on a large campus, being in proximity to the instructional location was highly desirable. He explained, "Um, honestly I heard it was a good class, but the main reason was because it was, I just needed a class in that time slot and it was a floor above me, so that's truthfully why I took it." For him, the course met two necessary circumstances: It fulfilled a requirement, and it was conveniently located in his residence hall.

Testimonials

Some students relied upon a proven resource to inform their decision to participate in a given DE experience. Students repeatedly pointed to peer testimonies about the effectiveness of a particular diversity experience. Johannes described the importance of his peers advising him, indicating that he found the course appealing for its content and instructor, but that testimonies were the most compelling factor. He noted,

> Um, testimonies was probably the biggest thing. I had some friends who had taken the class in previous semesters …I had people said overwhelmingly "wow this is, this is one of the best things [at school] best class I've taken," um, it's a very unique experience for a number of reasons … the professor …plus training for facilitation and um there's the alternate spring break component of it, and it's all of these things so those are some of the reasons why, but it was really the testimony

The content, the process and the instructor herself mattered, but the advice of other students had the strongest influence on his decision.

Appealing Educational Opportunities

Appealing educational opportunities accounts for several students' decision to participate in a particular diversity experience. Ari spoke about the appeal of feminism, his interest in gender studies, and his appreciation for the points of view and personalities of the instructors in the women's studies department. Tom also mentioned his appreciation for the ability and style of the instructor as well as his interest in the class content. Billy's decision was particularly strategic. He saw the diversity experience as an opportunity to increase his chances to secure employment in a select campus program. He explained,

> Um, part of it was the person teaching the class. I had been in the, I had been in the office before then I know a few people that were also taking the class. I know people who were going to be in the class and I also wanted to get my current job working in the office, so I figured it would be good to have my face be more familiarized with a person who would potentially hire me.

For other students, appealing opportunities encompassed experiences that spoke to some intrinsic interest. Jeff chose to be a part of thematic residential community with an attached course prior to his first year because it had a service learning component that he was drawn to after having a positive experience during high school participating in extensive volunteer work. John signed up for a diverse learning community with an attached course because he wanted to ensure that he would come into contact with a racially diverse group of people while attending his predominantly white institution.

William had a slightly more complicated pathway to his engagement in a campus organization. He was exposed to a peer education troupe after a troubling incident on his residence hall floor. William didn't necessarily agree with the information that the peer education group provided, but he had been disturbed by the actions of his floormates, and as a result wanted to get involved. He began attending meetings of the campus group. Becoming a part of the solution was the impetus for his participation.

Gerard wanted to find courses that nourished him as a student. He strongly articulated his "hunger" for "consciousness-raising" and the personal value to him of the course material. Gerard was the oldest student in the study and the only man who had taken time off during his pursuit of a bachelor's degree. He had given a lot of thought to the type of learning he wanted.

> I'm in a gender, feminism and science class right now…and that's awesome, and that's filling this hunger I have had, a niche I have wanted to look into, in terms of you know from consciousness raising sure to get this feelings and experiences are valid knowledge too and then its omigod, all this other knowledge is really valid and we totally subjugated it and so I was really interested in that.

Informal Interactions

Gerard also contended that formalized DE experiences did not account for all that he learned about diversity and social justice. He explained how informal interactions with others who share his interest in diversity issues has made an impact,

> I've done a lot of those , a good number of those SJE kind of workshop things and various organizing trainings, and I feel in conversations I have with friends that I'm pretty politically active and aware, I mean its sort of a constant topic of conversations, just the political nature of our lives, and so I don't know I feel much of my diversity education comes as much from formal classroom settings as it does from just you know conversations with friends who are hungry to think about this stuff more."

Tom described some of the same sentiments as Gerard, noting that meaningful conversations about diversity accompanied a trio of linked courses on race class and gender in a global setting he took while studying abroad,

> I don't know if its been so much in the classroom as much as its been what immediately comes to mind, well not immediately, what comes to my mind is that trip to London, talking with my classmates about it outside of the setting of the classroom, um cause a lot of times the discussion is kind of driven in a way, I mean

just personally it doesn't feel it is productive. I'm sure for other people it may be, but, so I find it happens more outside of the classroom.

For both Gerard and Tom, more organic conversations had greater meaning. As a result they asserted in interviews that some of their most impactful diversity experiences were not bound to a course or program, but rather occurred within informal interactions.

Motivation

Related to why students joined the course, as a researcher I was very interested in what motivated men in the study to continue participating in a prolonged diversity education experience. Expert nominators had pointed to these students as individuals who participated in diversity education. So what about the experience was compelling enough to sustain their involvement? Students explained themes of practicality, useful content, desirable process and overall benefit.

Practicality

Billy made a functional argument for his participation pointing out the salience of course credit, "I didn't want to fail the course." Similarly Gerard conceptualized and executed a peer course to meet the requirements of his capstone experience. Course requirements and grades are a strong motivation for men to continue in diversity education experiences.

Content

Interesting content emerged as a theme for men's motivation. Diversity education experiences offered opportunities to engage with topics that they wanted to explore with others in a classroom or organization. For Chris, the course provided a place to have

conversations that might socially be considered more taboo, "I just kind of those awkward questions where people are 'Oh your not suppose to talking about that' and that kind of intrigues me, I guess." William also pointed to the content, indicating that he took a lot away from the workshops and seminars the organization hosted. Ian stated that the course offered the service learning subject matter he had been missing since high school, and that he didn't find in coursework or student organizations in his first year.

Alex expanded upon the content theme, noting the applicability of the course material,

> [I]t's the most relatable. In business classes, okay so if you get a job, eight hours of your day you're going to be applying the things that you learned, but as a member of society you're constantly surrounded by these things and learning about them and knowing about them, you're going to be applying, or at least thinking about what you've used or learned, um your whole life in the class I think. So I mean um, I mean as a business student I've learned a lot, but it's not about the world around me, it's how I can improve my own skills and not relate to people around me, which I think an equally important skill, so um yeah.

Process

Process also emerged as a key theme for why students stayed engaged in their diversity education experiences. Jeff noted the appeal of the physical set-up, "Um it's I love the, sitting in a circle and I feel that's more conducive, not only for learning but just in terms of class discussion, I feel you're more likely to raise your hand and talk, or just talk, um I think that's really effective." Elliott pointed to the differences between his social justice course and the others he takes for his accounting major, "um just the course material itself is gonna incite more conversation, where um I take managerial accounting, there's nothing really to

talk about, to discuss what uh accounting regulations and stuff, but um, yeah definitely, definitely more conversation."

Ian largely agreed with Jeff and Elliott elaborating on how power and expertise in the classroom was situated,

> So it's, it's a lot, it's a friendlier process, basically uh teachers are learning with the students, there's not this authoritarian view, even though professor's ultimately and teachers ultimately have the power, um, power's also given to the students to learn from each other and learn from experiences, not just memorizing facts and listening to lectures. So it's a lot more participatory and engaging and, and if, it's a lot more um, it asks for a lot more accountability too.

Liam picked up on this empowerment theme, expressing his appreciation for how power is diffused within his major, applying some of the collaborative and egalitarian models he studied in coursework.

Rewards and Benefits

Participants described the number of rewards and benefits they received personally from the class as motivating factors. Jeff pointed to the feeling of making a difference and the energy of others' motivation, whether it is his fellow students or the instructor. He noted, "it's just really rewarding to know that there are people who are interested in the same things and I think for me I just feed off of that. Just having conversations, it's really motivating..,"

Discussing the organizing work he also participates in, Gerard described at length the pleasure of being in a community of activists, the vitality of learning while doing, and the satisfaction of resisting the system while creating alternative ways of doing.

> …I mean we're all in company with each other, we all feel we are getting to resist and stick it to the system and maybe you know exploit the resources they give to us in some sense, and then to take advantage of them to overturn them and create some spaces for people to be critical and challenge what's going on. I think that's what makes it a good day you know, an especially good day for me at least.

Instructor's Role as a Facilitator

I asked what helped their learning and sustained their attention in conversations that are often emotionally and intellectually taxing. Several participants pointed to the instructor as either directly tied to their understanding of the impact of the course or indirectly through the pedagogies executed in the classroom. As indicated in a previous theme Ari, Billy, Tom and Chris in part chose the experience because they were familiar with instructors. Several participants described their instructor's decisions in the classroom as conducive to their positive experience. Facilitator's skills created conditions where difficult or "taboo" topics as named by Chris could be examined productively, enhancing students' learning in diversity education.

Participants discussed the role instructors played in enhancing the environment where difficult or loaded topics could be explored productively. Students emphasized the concern they had of discussing topics that could get risky in the classroom, where an opinion might offend someone, or an individual would feel accused of being wrong. This is consistent with Adams' (2007) observation that participants in diversity education place a high value on respect when discussing emotional topics. Students lauded their instructors for intervening and managing divergent opinions and intense emotions. Resultant themes included facilitator's ability to manage conflict, create safety and invite voice.

Elliott shared how his teacher was able to take a topic that could be risky to talk about and encourage participation in the discussion. He noted that it can be uncomfortable for students to state their views, and that his instructor was able to demonstrate listening while shaping the conversation to solicit others reactions. He appreciated the technique his instructor employed to promote group input that was situated in their own feelings rather than judgments or evaluations of one another's point of view. He explained,

> I think that she does a good job of listening to it and being, okay, and then sort of shaping the conversation to how do people feel about this and some more people engage, more people give their perspective, um but it's never, it's never ever a, you're wrong, their wrong, I'm right, she's right, it's always just a conversation, and I think that's really important, um, within a classroom. Uh the students are extremely respectful of other people's opinions, other people's statements, um, and yet it's, uh, it, I mean sometimes it's a serious environment, but a lot of times just sort of a, you know, a light environment and it's a nice conversation.

Ian offered that the dynamics in the diversity education classroom can be intense. Reflecting on his own experience and what has worked for him, he offered that diversity topics can appear daunting to a young man who finds himself in several privileged categories based on his social group membership. He described instruction that shapes the learning experience to slowly scaffold so that he can absorb it in meaningful ways without being overwhelmed.

> I think it's mainly um about breaking down barriers and doing that effectively. Um I mean no person wants to hear that they are responsible for something awful and um being a straight white male you're responsible for a lot of things being awful. Um so effectively breaking down piece-by-piece um is probably what's gotten me farthest because I started off one way and then through the journey I've ended up with

> another way, but I'm still going, um, and so when making these programs, making these experiences, that is the biggest thing. Um and then also making that safe space for hard conversations and um keeping good assumptions basically. Um knowing that whatever someone says um in a hard conversation they're not saying it by trying to be mean but just saying it because they don't know anything else.

Later in the same section of the interview, Ian counseled against instructors allowing a conversation to devolve into a fight. Describing an experience in high school where the discussion involved homosexuality and some of his fellow students indicated that they just didn't like people who are gay, Ian concluded,

> And um, and so that's where the instructor needs to be prepared to take the
>
> conversation in a certain route that way it's not an argument, that way it's not a fight, which reaffirms uh the way that they believe and it will end up being um a way to sort of correct them nicely uh, without them knowing that you are correcting them, thinking that they are correcting themselves basically, I think."

For Ian, argumentativeness in the classroom reinforces students starting positions and precludes changes in attitudes or perspectives. He contended that once a fight ensues students dig in to their own perspective and stop being open to other opinions and points of view.

Johannes also picked up on the nuance of instruction that is necessary to push students to their learning edges without causing them to shut down. He began the conversation talking about safe space and how as a participant it's tempting to withdraw from a conversation because one's privilege is not safe. He mused about what such a circumstance can demand in terms of good facilitation,

> Um it's a fine, I think it's a fine line, kind of an art I mean of, if your sitting on the side of the table where challenging another person of saying things, doing things that, you know to, what are the goals, where is it to change behavior, to raise awareness, recognizing that in having some sort of um behaviors, there's words that are, that stimulate that sometimes agitate, sometimes are inflammatory, but then where does a person start to shut down and reject because I don't know it's, in some ways maybe a change in a person's mind, my own mind included, sometimes I think that it might have to be kind of an insidious approach where if it's so, if it's very um blunt and, um what is the word that I wanted to use, um abrasive, that often, often people just totally reject it.

Billy reported that his instructor allowed time in the discussion to unpack group dynamics as they were happening. When in the course of making a point about racism, he mistakenly assigned the race of another student, the conversation shifted to process his statement.

> I think it was because that we were in the space and we had been in there for, this was either the 4th or 5th week of the class when it happened so I was very familiar with everyone in the class so when it came up it was kind of I don't get it, and then I asked someone else and then they would try to explain it, but I still wouldn't get it, so then I would keep asking people I don't get it. What just happened and finally the instructor pointed out kind of what happened and how it happened and I said, "Okay now I get it".

He trusted the instructor and could accept her perspective on the exchange.

Takeaways from Diversity Education

As men in the study described their time spent in diversity education, they acknowledged that the experience cultivated within them new insights and abilities. Responses clustered around several themes. During the interview, they articulated emerging understandings, perspectives and skills they acquired or practiced in diversity education experiences.

Knowledge

Participants contended that diversity education exposed them to new ways of looking at the world. John acknowledged that his experience gave him a way to name and explain comments that he was troubled by. Coming from a highly diverse hometown to a predominantly white college campus, he experienced microagressions that left him uncertain about what just transpired. Learning about oppression and privilege gave him a lens. He explained,

> I just didn't understand how that would happen. And when things that did happen I had no idea how to respond. Diversity education gave me the technical information I needed to be able to specifically identify certain things about cultural incompetency that made my ability to express my experiences more lucidly so I knew that people would say things to me, I knew what it felt for somebody to say something um "oh you know that's where all the black people sit at [college]." Wow.

Ari made a similar point,

> It's always been this sort of intuition you'll go around the world is obviously not as egalitarian as we would like it to be at times, equal as we would like it to be. I think we all kind of have an intuition we all have an inclination that, that is true. I think very often though we are at a loss for words and maybe at a loss for evidence for how we can explain what is happening around us. [Taking the diversity education course] gave me the tools and the ideas, the thoughts, the philosophies to express what I was seeing in the world around me in a meaningful way, not only for myself but to other people.

Specific concepts of dominance, privilege or isms peppered students' discussion of diversity education. Billy recounted a conversation in a class about the marginalization of Black women in feminist movement and its impact on his understanding of intersecting social identities, "I think it came when we started talking about intersectionality, back in the 80's and the girls in the class were saying how hard it is to be a Black woman. And so, I had to really gauge what she meant by being a black woman, how is that harder than just being black or being a woman have to do with it?"

Skills

Students repeatedly commented on the conversational skills they acquired through diversity education experiences. An outcome of the experience was practice in the art of having difficult conversations. Billy stated that he had the opportunity to practice self-control in his dialogue course. He explained,

> It kind of taught how to kind of not get, not angry, but how to not let your emotions take control of you when you're trying to have a talk with someone about something racism, which can be a very sensitive topic…how to recognize when you're starting to

> get a little over emotional and to keep yourself calm in order to still have the dialogue.

Ari attributed his courses in women studies and philosophy with giving him ways of engaging in a conversation with someone he disagrees with,

> [T]aking [name's] class, some of the philosophies that were laid out showed me and gave me the tool kit to say "well you can have that belief that's fine, but what about these different things?"…So it's beautiful because [name's] class, [other name's] class, which is my modern, who teaches modern philosophy I have the capacity, I have the tools to take from both courses the teachings that I've learned and say to someone who I don't agree with "well you can have that belief, but what if you think about it this way?" And it's not to tell that person he or she is wrong, it's simply to say that what if we think about it differently.

Later in the conversation Ari attributed his ability to navigate polarizing conversations to the skills he acquired in coursework on diversity. He stated,

> I attribute my diversity education, I do attribute you know [professor's] role, I attribute my education in philosophy department, I attribute my involvement in, it's not, uh, true, in my involvement in SGA, my involvement in volunteering in the Greater (city) Community and the LGBT communities, I attribute all of that to having a more moderate stance, truly in my heart of hearts I'm a raging liberal, but that's not functional for the real world.

John learned how to more effectively communicate between and amongst groups. His experiences put him in a position as an RA and student leader to hear stories and share them with different populations. He elaborated,

> I said if I had this position I can, because I'm bilingual in terms of, of knowing the minority and the majority experience I can translate what both think to each other and I can get the majority to understand on a much broader scale what the minority thinks and I can get the minority to understand how to communicate the experience to the majority so we have our sort of grass roots effort going on there, and then I can have conversations with the [Administration] about how to reframe what they're saying so that they don't ostracize people and make things worse for minorities

Josh shared a story of leaning into the discomfort as a person with class privilege during a difficult conversation. He noted how essential it was for him to lean in when the conversation was difficult. He disclosed,

> um, it was really hard to talk about my own experience in that setting, especially when the feeling is, cause what happens is, I had, it's hard to not feel guilty and uncomfortable with it, but this class is really, it pushes the idea of leaning into the discomfort and um one of the best phrases I've pulled out from one of my facilitators was that, you know, being guilty isn't a productive emotion to have and I think that's one of, when it comes to hard conversations, I think that's one of the things I always bring up for myself and other people, is that when we feel it's hard, a lot of times, you know, discussing those things it's - because we feel guilty because we don't like the way that the conversations going, because we can get taboo – um, but all those emotions are unproductive to actually addressing the problem, and learning about it and, yeah it's hard, I think I'll never not feel guilty, but the guilt has to be on the side in the hopes of um you know presenting myself in an open way and being aware of where I come from and how that is not, I, you know taking up too much space engaged in, or how people feel I just oppressed them because I have all this money

> maybe that they don't have and that makes them really angry. And that's just something I guess you have to talk about, so yeah.

The experience of persisting in the conversation even though he was uncomfortable makes things speakable and thus able to be addressed. Josh understood that in order to get somewhere in the conversation he might have to experience some discomfort. Opening himself to the discomfort and being present to the other students in the class, and possibly their anger, isn't pleasant, but necessary to the process. The skill he practiced was to not have answers in the face of someone else's experience of the system of oppression. He learned to be present to the possibility that a system of oppression existed that others were hurt by while that same system benefitted him.

Johannes noted that his takeaway was to appreciate the need to go slowly and to avoid debate. He found himself often in a position where the systems of oppression being discussed happened to be systems he benefitted from as a straight white man with more access to class privilege. He noted

> Um heightened awareness, focus um, greater appreciation for you know going slowly um, placing a higher importance on um going slowly so that voices can be heard and, or all voices hopefully, and that's I guess the goal in an equal manner, um and really focusing on creating dialogue um in contrast to debating, which I think especially in this line of education is debate and then it really becomes about defensive, being defensive and people then are more likely to then people to deflect and then shy away or retreat um, or even worse probably then be aggressive, you know people who are coming from an oppressor um, oppressive identity um and then being aggressive towards um an identity that is marginalized, so that's even worse.

Self Awareness

Students discussed the changes in their own understanding of self that occurred through diversity education. Not only did students practice skills or acquire new understandings about the world they lived in, but they understood themselves in the world in new ways. Billy noted how thinking about his privileged identities was an important and novel experience. "I think I recognize my privilege as a man. I never really thought about it before, that was part of the, the, what's one of the benefits of having a privilege that you don't think about it, so when you're in the class the first thing I thought about being a man or being able to walk was a privilege, but it actually is."

Gerard illuminated how difficult it can be to unpack the assumptions about the world that his upbringing instilled,

> I've been thinking a lot as much as there many experiences where I can, you know I grew up in [suburb], so it's a pretty white, upper middle class uh area, so pretty insulated from a lot of the rest of the world so to speak, so I think much of the things that I learned about life I'm actually, much of the things that I learned about how the world operates I'm still not aware of, because it's part of the way that I learned how to be White, I learned how to be middle class, um and I'm learning all that..

Jeff's experience in diversity education encouraged him to see differences in how he was treated and extrapolate that to others who hold subordinated identities. He pointed out that his understanding of masculinity and being exposed to masculinity conversations have heightened his expectations of what he is deserving of in terms of treatment. For instance, at a recent doctor's visit when the doctor spent more time making assumptions about his sexual orientation and jumped to conclusions about his susceptibility to sexually transmitted

infections instead of treating his sore throat, Jeff equated the experience to a microaggression tied to his gay identity. He explained,

> [W]hen um my partner went in he didn't know what was wrong with him so he went in and then they tested him for strep throat so they didn't ask any of these questions, because I said my partner has strep throat, instead of saying my girlfriend has strep throat, how I was discriminated against because of that, and the fact that she asked me all those questions and it seemed if this would have happened to me a year ago I would have thought nothing of it, I would have just been oh yeah, that's normal to ask these questions, but I guess just being aware of how other people treat me based on my identities I'm then thinking about how the relates to how other people are treated based on their identities that I might not even be aware of…

Liam noted how far he still needs to go, noting the distance between apprehending how racism functions and then noticing he and his peers upholding racist assumptions. He indicated,

> Um yes, uh that I, even though my education would say otherwise, I don't have, surprising how I can't talk about race in a very constructive way and that some of the comments that I was making along with my peers could definitely be seen as racists. Um, which was a really eye opening experience for me because I thought that I had at least some of the tools to see what I was doing and how I was making decisions …Um the things that I'm not seeing, I feel I have a kind of heightened awareness about gender, just because of my transgender identity, but as far as race goes, I just don't. Um, so, so yeah that was interesting.

The new lenses he gained in diversity education help him to see where his analysis is more sophisticated and where he has much more to learn.

Attitudes about Diversity Education

While students provided many insights into aspects of diversity education that have enhanced their learning, they also spent notable time during the interviews, teasing apart elements of DE that were less than effective. Participants explored elements of diversity education that were less than effective. They noted that some courses or approaches to diversity education were poorly executed, and they were openly critical. Others wrestled with the difficulty of effectively engaging folks.

Critiques

Several critiques of diversity education emerged during the interviews. These male interview subjects had multiple stories and perspectives about what was effective in conversations and education about diversity, and what was not. Approaches that caused defensiveness, blamed students, or encouraged guilt were most frequently cited as ineffective.

William argued that the violence prevention message that his university uses could be improved, "Overall I feel if they change the way that they portray sexual assault and rape to college kids, because at the beginning of the year they give you a whole bunch of statistics about how everyone is screwed once they get to college, and that's probably not the best way to do it I feel." The message that is intended to raise students' awareness instead has a counterproductive effect. He elaborated on current approaches to sexual assault prevention education aimed at male audiences,

> Yeah I mean that's exaggerating a bit but that's basically the message that they're trying to put forth is that you shouldn't be doing this and to avoid it at all costs. And

> the people who that is aimed at will not take anything from it, but the people who would not have had a problem with that before who used to be oblivious to the situation were now afraid of the situation and then they wouldn't be as willing to take an active part in working in situations, they would rather remain a bystander to where they have no affiliation with it at all.

He continued, explaining, "I could see points where people were very uncomfortable about the presentation and how they didn't want to hear anymore about the presentation and how that could have a negative effect on them." John made a similar point regarding defensiveness in an example about race. "All it does is make them more defensive, build up walls, get pissed off, get angry and the second you say something about diversity they go out and kill somebody. You know, that's what happens. That is the recipe for disaster, telling somebody that they should feel guilty." His argument was that a pedagogy of guilt creates more problems than it does solutions. Interestingly, he also empathized with students in what he would call the majority, saying, "But in a way that makes them feel they are being told that they should feel guilty for being who they are." He compared this to his own experience and how he would feel in a similar situation,

> [I]t dawned on me that Administrators, especially the office of Residence Life, oh my God continues this message of it's bad to be white, it's bad to be the majority. Well if you, that's no better than telling me it's bad to be black…You know no one, no one, no one should ever feel badly about who they are, no one. So I said this has got to change, this has got to change, people have got to stop telling these people that they should feel guilty because what's going on is that is making them build walls.

Tom raised the issue that it was difficult to engage in conversations about diversity because his dominant identities were not invited into the conversation. He shared,

> Um I guess the other thing and this is just a minor thing, but um I mean the demographics that I represent gets kind of alienated in those conversations sometimes because when all I really ever want to do is just listen and understand what's going on, but in that classroom it was a lot of , it was I really couldn't contribute, and not that I was trying to contribute but there was definitely an atmosphere of problem, you-are-the-problem kind of thing…

Later he surfaced that he preferred being a listener to others' frustrations with diversity, the black man he befriended on a trip abroad, while dismissing his own ability to contribute to the conversation, "I mean I just listened cause I don't – middle class, white male – I don't have much chance at that. So I guess that's the thing, honestly, I just listened in those circumstances and a lot of time it comes up in that kind of thing, someone's just frustrated, and we'll just start talking about it."

Acknowledging the Challenge of Design

For Gerard and Ari, the effectiveness of diversity education is complicated by the expertise and engagement it requires. Gerard attempted to design and implement a workshop course that would deconstruct gender hierarchies for his capstone project. He explained,

> So let's address masculinity in the classroom. Let's learn about how we affect others in classrooms basically, and we talk about that some times, but in some sense there's a limit to what we could do…the other question was though. How do we work together as men to challenge, or you know as different masculinities though to challenge gender hierarchies? And, you know, bring in analysis of not only masculinity but race, and class and sexuality and building, bringing these different, recognizing that we all comprise all these different axes…and then also the question

> was uh you know, what is a classroom space that's democratically run? What does it feel to get to decide the topics ourselves? Where the teacher's not giving you control. Or what is it just to simply say our experiences are just as important as what we're going to read in those books? Let's talk about them.

The range of issues to be managed in one space for a couple of hours each week over the course of a given semester is daunting.

Gerard also noted that intersections disrupt the ability to focus on a single-issue masculine privilege. He stated,

> One of the ways we did it I mean, I'll give you my straight out answer, a group of men um is not very good itself at examining it's privilege as men, no way. In [campus organization] we gain some awareness, begin some awareness of our privilege, not a great deal, we spend a lot more time sort of recovering from the, you know brutality of masculinity for men, I think that's much more the function it serves.

Ari noted the importance of diversity education for individuals who may already consider themselves diverse. He hints that membership in a group does not equate with facility with diversity issues. He contended,

> But I think its really important people are educated in diversity, and not just people who are conservative, not just people who maybe don't have the most liberal point of view. I think even people who are liberal, need to be educated in some kind of diversity because I think they're so, you know there's on campus, on the campus the um ally training and I hear so often from people who are LBGT, well I don't need to be an ally, I don't need to go to that I'm already LBGT. But you do because the fact of the matter is that there are things I, even in the LBGT meetings I see so often um, it's kind

> of elitism, this sort of rejection of people who are straight allies, they're guilty until proven innocent and I think that's fascinating because again there's still a lot of cross over there.

Not/Meeting Expectations

Men in the study indicated that their experiences in diversity education were, at times, not exactly what they expected, although this was not necessarily either a critique or a pleasant surprise. John, for instance, expected his diversity themed LLC to reflect the ethnic diversity of his hometown and was disappointed. Tom enrolled in a study abroad trip to talk about race and global diversity issues, and was surprised to instead tour working class neighborhoods and view street art. Alex indicated that he didn't really have expectations, though he hinted that any expectations he had were "all the wrong things."

For some students, they didn't know what to expect. Ian reported that he really didn't know what he was getting into when he applied for a scholars program that had a service learning and social justice component. Liam had a related though not entirely similar experience. He consumed the material of his social science major with its critical analysis of political economies not realizing it was controversial. He explained,

> I didn't really know and going into [major] that these were oppositional knowledges that people didn't necessarily agree, I mean that you can see it, people are um don't agree with these kinds of things, but I didn't think that what I was reading or what I was learning was revolutionary or it was in any way controversial…I just thought this is what I'm reading, this is what I'm doing and it has, I can read it and this has no place in my life and I can just kind of live my life.

For Johannes, the course didn't move as fast as he wanted it to. Upon reflection, he decided that was a good thing.

> Yeah, yeah, the first couple weeks uh of the course, uh I was thinking uh well you know, I don't know if it's quite living up, I still wasn't ready to drop it or anything, but I was thinking well I don't know if it's going to actually meet my very high expectations because I thought we were moving very slowly and um, and, and then in looking back on it I think that moving slowly and working on how our class would function, and working on an identity and building community um, and being open with differences and acknowledging those differences and um, really was the basis for why the class was so successful I think.

Students indicated over and over that their perceptions prior did not match the actual diversity experience. Some went into the experience anticipating more interactions across difference. Interestingly, several men went into the experience having low expectations and were pleasantly surprised by how much they enjoyed the course or how relatable they found the course content. Consistently there was a theme that expectations were either not met or exceeded, suggesting that there are opportunities to provide better information to students considering DE experiences.

What Helps and What Hinders Learning

As a researcher and social justice educator, I was fascinated by the conditions, dynamics or approaches that men perceived as helping the learning and growth process within diversity education experiences. This by far solicited the most feedback from participants in the first half of the interview protocol. They were eager to point out how

experiences, creating safe words and interesting pedagogical approaches supported their learning.

Josh said that he had had two really good but very different diversity courses. One focused on identities and self exploration while the other foregrounded systems of oppression. He contended that it was good that he focused on the theory first.

> I feel to focus on myself gets lost, when you focus on yourself it's important, it's a very important thing. I feel sometimes what happens is people, especially with forms of oppression people get lost in the in the identity politics of it and the single issue things, so you get lost in , all this happens to me, focus on yourself and if you don't have an awareness of what else is going on, it's becomes so centralized for you that you become a little blinded.

Class size was important for Alex. He noted the feasibility of having in depth discussions in a group of twenty, so different from the large lecture courses that otherwise populated his schedule. Johannes, as mentioned earlier in this paper, spoke about taking the time to get to know one another and building a foundation as a group so they could go deeper. While Chris and Elliott pointed to the variety of media that were employed in their classes, bringing in perspectives through music, video blogs and movies.

Safety

The importance of a safe space reverberated throughout the interviews. Over half of the participants remarked upon it in some way during our conversations. Alex, one of the younger students interviewed, explained,

> Um I think it was at a point, it was far enough into the semester where you would kind of gotten to know everyone's kind of personalities and how they thought a little

> bit and they would kind of react to certain things so, knowing that if you felt compelled enough and opinionated enough to actually voice your opinion then you wouldn't be, but even if no one said anything or no one supported you um, or if even people were against you, that you were still comfortable enough saying it. I don't know other than that, it was just the kind of environment where the people had done it before so it's not I was the first person to kind of disagree in a sense, but um, yeah it was just the environment that kind of doesn't motivate you, but it makes you feel comfortable to speak out.

Billy elaborated on how you build that kind of safety. He pointed to the strategies that the instructor employed to render the classroom more safe.

> You kind of establish the rules and guidelines the first day so you kind of know what to expect, and everyone kind of knows you are not suppose to get angry or mad at each other and if you do you kind of have to talk about it. For the most part it was just knowing the people in the room so I was already familiar with everyone and then knowing there was no room for judgment in there.

Gerard picked up on the judgment theme exploring how important it is to welcome questions and ensure that all students feel they will not be dismissed or diminished for having asked something.

> Yeah, I think recovering that innocence of, yeah, I don't know it, how am I suppose[d] to experience that? How do I know what that is? I fucking grew up in the society just like you did, you know, I didn't realize that, forgive me I'm learning. You know I think that's crucial in these spaces being in a space where people are going to trust to put themselves out there cause if you can't ask that stupid question, that's your learning, the question that's - wait, what is race, …that will turn the whole conversation

around. So that, that need for non judgment, that need to have humility that no questions are really bad questions.

Johannes pointed out the benefit of safety. Beyond providing the freedom to ask questions and say the unspeakable, he noted how safety begets the vulnerability to do the deeper self-work.

> When that safe space is, is built um and empathy is shown between the members of community I think it's easier to be real with one another and expose of oneself and be vulnerable, and when there's things that need to be challenged, worked on, say, okay I'm ready to make myself vulnerable so I can in some way…um have in within a group process work on ourselves or have feedback to work on ourselves.

He noted also that safety can be used as a shield, and while that may be problematic, it still merits a compassionate response.

> Yeah um I think I, I think there are, I think that, I think that having the safe space, again back to that difference between a comfortable versus safe I think is, can be helpful um cause when a person doesn't feel safe that often, I think that it's not productive. But I think that on the other hand people can use it as a kind of cop out. It's "oh I don't feel safe at all, I don't want to participate anymore". When in reality it's, it's because their—one's privilege, my privilege, is not safe.

Stories and experiences

Discussing what helped their learning students mentioned panel discussions and other storytelling structures that they found useful. Stories helped to situate the experience in a readily accessible format for participants. For instance, Alex recounted a panel of speakers on the topic of heterosexism and the engaging discussion he had leaving the panel

with the other guys he carpooled with. Chris agreed emphasizing the conversations that he encountered in his class, "I mean the statistics was just, I mean it was shocking to see that but then it was another part to actually get personal stories, I guess involved in it, which just kind of put a picture in your mind of this." Gerard advocated for the kind of sharing that happens when people talk from their lived experience.

> I think it's gotta start from the personal, it's gotta start with something you can latch on to. We had a conversation about the Boston shooting…Well we got into all these conversations about truth and freedom and uh war and all these things and …my insights about the whole, my feeling about the event came as much from hearing the person who I'd say is less politically conscious in the way that he frames something as it did for my own understanding of the event, you know and so we were able to in that space because we could just respond to the conditions around us that people were engaging in with already…we were able to talk about the hypotheses and the contradiction of feeling insecure here, but yet this going on at the expense of our country everyday and other places and we were able to just talk about the day to day, wow I used to work down there, that's frightening you know, so get very real with it, so one condition would have to be it's relevant, it relates to current events that are going on that are important to people in their lives you know.

Experiential Education

A few students affirmed the power of experiential education as positive factors in their experience of diversity education. Johannes discussed his community organizing class and its effect upon the classroom discussion: "[T]here's one day where we really honed in on about race and how that was playing out in our classroom and also how we are seeing that in

the work that we were doing with a community partner in (city) working on transit justice issues." For Jeff, service learning offered more personally relevant insights than the readings from his social justice course. He specified,

> Um I don't, well we have, we've had a lot of discussions about um about our service sites so just, I don't know, I feel bad saying that cause I think social justice in theory is really great but I just feel service learning is so much more powerful for me, I'll say for me personally because it's, you're hearing about these experiences and even, even just sharing when we go around the class and share about our experiences at our service sites I think to me that's invaluable

Peer Influence

Chris and Billy both indicated that other students and peers have a strong impact on men's experiences in diversity education. Chris commented on how the openness of the other students made it easier for him to feel comfortable. Billy mentioned how well he knew others in the class and how that helped him. For Liam conversations continued after class was over as he spent social time with his classmates extending the discussions and getting more personal. A peer audience didn't always provoke conversation, however. Tom related how he wasn't always comfortable talking about issues and that depending upon the people and circumstances, there were some topics he avoided.

> I was definitely raised under the impression that talking about um talking about problems, specifically my problems wasn't the way to deal with things. Um but I don't know, I guess I mean in general I like to please everybody as much as I possibly can and um and that's just one more way that I wouldn't be pleasing people if I was talking about my problems and then talking about bigger, more societal issues it's just the same thing…but it's also at this point in college it's gotten to the point where

> um there's a lot of contention between my views and my friends views and I just don't feel addressing that.

Advice for practitioners and educators

The diversity section of the interview protocol concluded with a request for advice on how to create diversity education experiences so that they were more useful and appealing to college men. A few participants referred back to early comments to shape their advice. John reiterated that telling majority students to feel guilty was not a sound strategy:

> The majority feels people are telling them…that they should feel this way and that shit's rough for minorities and they should feel guilty about it because there's a problem…You ask people in the majority, you ask people outside the majority, many people, across many identities have made shit rough for minorities and that has been the history and as we move forward shit's still rough because it hasn't been properly corrected and it's not any ones fault that things are still rough, it's the fault of the culture that has perpetuated the roughness, it…is that we have not recognized that things are still rough so no one should feel guilty, we should only work to recognize that people have unfair disadvantages…and I essentially told them flat out you've no right to feel guilty, you have every right to learn how your society, our society, our country is not the best it should be.

Josh suggested that faculty and staff utilize office hours to require individual meetings if the class is small enough to accommodate the tactic. He maintained that such time is good for students who are having very different experiences in the classroom, "I think that's good for people who feel they might be marginalized in the classroom, to bring that up, but then also to maybe say, you know to just address, to get people to talk more." He felt that

individual time could provide an opportunity to give feedback about an individual's participation and explore how the class is not/working for them.

Gerard circled back to his earlier comments about making things personal. In regards to the difficulty in having a cogent conversation about the complexities of gender hierarchies, and specifically a culture of rape, Gerard indicated that a tactic he drew upon was to have a read around of a written account of a sexual assault to encourage reflection among the all male class,

> [Y]ou know here we were hearing from this woman about uh you know her experience at the hands of this someone, you know that was very provocative, I think that was, we had to have outside materials though, so I think in that sense you have to have the perspective of women, honestly duh, but does it have to be women saying this is how it is for us. I mean there's lots of books written and stuff but I just think it, I think it's actually quite difficult to create opportunities for that contradiction because how do you become aware of yourself, you can't step outside yourself as an experience, and I can't step outside my experience as a man, how do I do that?

He continued, explaining that it shouldn't fall on women to educate men about sexism unless there is value for women in the conversation.

> I probably can learn a lot from white privilege workshops and what not cause I know sort of attack it in some ways, but how do you really begin to understand how your masculinity manifests in the day to day, in the way you embody it, and the way you speak, maybe not being conscience about the impact you have on others when you act just in your embodiment that is to me so much of your masculinity is to you know…just point some of these things out to me you know, so hey you know are you

> aware that this is the kind of space you're taking up when your acting this way, are you aware of that, you know, oh no I wasn't you know, thank you okay.

Gerard then began to muse about what designers of diversity education experiences can do.

> So I'm perplexed, I have a lot of questions about, I don't think the class should be all men. The environment should not be all men um which then leaves the question now, is it women's responsibility to learn or teach men about what it means to be you know men?

Wrestling with the "correct" strategy to engage men in diversity related topics, Gerard noted that there are benefits and drawbacks to both single gendered and mixed groups.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided themes that emerged from interviews of college men's experiences in diversity education. Students engaged in a variety of diversity education experiences in the classroom and in leadership roles on campus. They shared the motivations that drew them to the experiences and their perspectives of instructors and facilitators. They revealed attitudes they had toward the classroom and the content and shared their takeaways. Through stories and examples they explained the obstacles they encountered and what helped their learning, providing insight to educators who wish to shape meaningful and effective diversity education experiences for college men.

CHAPTER 6

GENDER AS A WAY OF *PROVING*: MASCULINITY

If gender is a kind of doing, an incessant activity performed, in part, without one's knowing and without one's willing, it is not for that reason automatic or mechanical. On the contrary, it is a practice of improvisation within a scene of constraint. Moreover, one does not 'do' one's gender alone. One is always 'doing' with or for another, even if the other is only imaginary. What I call my 'own' gender appears perhaps at times as something that I author or, indeed, own. But the terms that make up one's own gender are, from the start, outside oneself, beyond oneself in a sociality that has no single author (and that radically contests the notion of authorship itself) (Butler, 2004, p.1).

Several authors have contended that gender is a kind of doing, an activity that is performed rather than an innate and essential list of characteristics and dispositions (Butler, 2004; Connell, 2002; West and Zimmerman, 2000). This approach offers a frame for understanding how the men in my study learned how to "do" masculinity. Throughout the interviews students provided a wealth of information describing how they understood masculinity, how it was defined by the broader society, and how it functioned within their own lives. In the following chapter, I directly address the research question: How do college men who actively participate in diversity education define, experience and/or perform masculinity. In this chapter – as throughout – the criterion "participate in diversity education" is put aside (although understood as a shared characteristic of these research subjects) so that I can focus on their masculinity. I have organized the response into five distinct but related answers to the question.

First, the participants in my study articulated an understanding of masculinity that fit hegemonic characteristics that have previously been widely discussed in the literature. The demanding expectations of hegemonic masculinity are noteworthy and will be explained in

what follows. Second, masculinity performance is both "caught" and "taught" through a multitude of social interactions with family members, peer groups and institutions. Third, this indoctrination at some point becomes internally generated. That is, young men self-police, anticipating how even minor stylistic decisions might be read by others as more or less masculine. Fourth, this process of policing, whether conducted by others or internally located, is sustained through the threat of social and personal consequences that young men seek to avoid. Shaming, shunning and the threat of violence work to ensure that young men obey a particular normative "script" that differentiates appropriately masculine behaviors and attitudes from inadequate performances. Finally, despite the intensity of the social forces encouraging the adoption of hegemonic forms of masculinity, fissures develop providing moments of transgression and resistance. I conclude with a discussion of these momentary disruptions.

Hegemonic Descriptions

Men in the study define masculinity very similarly to men who are not necessarily involved in diversity education activities on campus. The frequency of their depictions of a normative masculinity they must contend with was striking. Tropes about demonstrating physical strength and dominance while minimizing emotions and vulnerability typified much of our discussion in these interviews. Such tropes are abundant in the literature (Kimmel, 2008, O'Neill, 1986; Davis, 2000). I concluded that regardless of what a young man learns in the classroom or what his predispositions towards diversity are, these traditional notions of masculinity remain. In fact Kimmel (2008) asserts that what is truly surprising is how little these ideas of masculinity have changed over time. He notes that in the 1950s Goffman argued that there is one unblushing male in America. He proceeded to describe a John

Wayne type character who was tall, fit, muscular, able bodied, white, physically attractive, financially affluent and able to demonstrate his physical superiority and prowess through a recent successful record in sports (Kimmel, 2002).

Participants in the study underlined, and at times extended, this description of hegemonic or normative masculinity in ways that confirm the literature. Brod (1994) points out that the concept of hegemonic masculinity was developed in order to emphasize both the social construction of gender and the existence of multiple masculinities, which he contended were not created equally. Connell (1995) described hegemonic masculinity as "the configuration of gendered practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (p. 77).

This definition reinforces Butler's earlier contention that masculinity is a performed activity. Furthermore Connell signals that masculinity adapts and shifts to maintain a status position to secure and preserve its preeminence, valuing competition, hierarchy, individualism, sexual prowess, physical toughness, rationality, emotional distance, dominance, aggression, and risk-taking (1995).

O'Neill (1981) first described the characteristics currently associated with hegemonic masculinity. He operationalized four components of hegemonic masculinity. In short, the model contends that men are socialized to (a) be emotionally restrictive, (b) seek power, control, and competition, (c) avoid affectionate and sexual interaction with other men, and (d) define personal success through work status and financial gain. Furthermore, O'Neill maintained that these restrictions are circumscribed by a worldview that actively fears and rejects anything perceived as feminine. The degree to which an individual man either

embraces the confining masculine script or fails to embody it to the satisfaction of his social environment are likely to be the source of his gender role conflict.

Fear of Femininity

Fear of femininity is particularly toxic for a number of reasons. It narrowly circumscribes the performances that are legitimate, and in doing so, it precludes a freedom of performance that a human spectrum of emotion and experience requires. It casts doubt and makes marginal and invisible certain performances of masculinity, embodiments that do not subscribe to the small, selective sets of characteristics that constitute hegemonic masculinity. It codes human behavior as either masculine or feminine and in doing so, creates a hierarchy of which is estimable and which is not. In constituting masculinity by denigrating femininity, those human actors who are assigned woman or feminine are automatically perceived as less than.

Thinking about masculinity this way creates the conditions for patriarchy: To understand and achieve what it means to be a man, women have to be viewed as bad, wrong, problematic, less than, incapable, lacking, and not whole.

Emotional Restrictionality

Fear of femininity is described by O'Neill as a rejection of all things coded as feminine within the broader society. Tears and crying are perceived as feminine so it is un-masculine for men to cry. Chris speaks to this when he is discussing his relationship to his partner. She indicates that he is the "girl" in the relationship, because he is emotional about their partnership. He talks about his feelings, and that emotional transparency and vulnerability is considered by her, and I would argue the larger society, as unmanly.

Chris's tendency toward sentimentality is teasingly pointed to by his female partner because he is operating outside a proscribed normative performance for men. Feeling sentimental, communicating his feelings of warmth about their intimacy through tears or sentiment categorically disqualifies him from the field of masculinity.

What is said about Chris being a girl also brings to mind what is left unsaid, that in western society in a gender binary, the dialectic of gender ensures that talking about one form can only be understand in to its correlate or opposite. When we talk about what is masculine, what is not is thereby feminine and, notably the inverse is also true. Of course, these floating opposites are not neutral in terms of their significance. Deployed in a field of power shaped by patriarchy, these gender correlates have a corresponding marker of superior or inferior. In social relations, masculine is considered superior and feminine inferior.

In this moment, Chris's significant other is merely manifesting and enforcing the larger societal story of what it means to be a man. She is participating in the rampant policing that is intertwined into human experience. Chris's partner is perhaps not intentionally diminishing him, but she is complicit in a larger system that strongly imposes a narrow range of performances that are allowable as authentically masculine. Her act of checking Chris's masculinity is not necessarily intended to be harmful. It speaks to the common practice of socially censuring acts that don't reflect the script ascribed to one's gender. Furthermore, Chris's partner did not create the expectations of what is "appropriate" masculine behavior. She simply enforced the messaging that is ubiquitous around young men. What makes her action effective is that she had to say very little to nudge Chris into a certain set of behaviors. The entire volume of masculine socialization exists as prior experience for Chris to reference in receiving her social cue.

Success and Status

I was struck also by participants' description of men as being in control, as powerful, and as strong. Strength came up over and over again. Men in the study pointed to super heroes and stoic action figures from comics and movies, such as Tony Stark as explained by William and John McClain as noted by Tom, as representations of what society constitutes as appropriate or normative masculinity. Media supplies a lot of ready stories of men who are models for other men, creating characters for men to emulate. Tony Stark, the sarcastic genius, playboy millionaire with super human powers born of his innate intellect is one such creation that was cited by William as an example of the "ideal" man. Tony's appeal is that he embodies a hegemonic ideal of success through professional status and financial gain. For Tom, John McClain from the *Die Hard* franchise personified the man who was able to do what is necessary in any given situation. Reeser (2010) argues that representations of masculinity, like that of the superhero, should be considered in two ways. They reveal a form of masculinity that already exists in culture while they also construct the masculinity that they depict. An exchange occurs wherein the representation both reflects and contributes to the culture that surrounds it.

When the young men in my research study talked about strength, it was almost as though these are things that are so commonplace, so true, that they don't necessarily have to speak it, it is just an understood. Men are strong, emotionally as well as physically. Men don't cry, real men can withstand physical pain. Real men are not subject to emotional pain. That presumes a vulnerability and attachment that are not masculine.

Immunity from vulnerability seeps into O'Neill's perspective on defining personal success through work status and financial gain. William illuminated the centrality of this demand through his concern about his being so uncertain about a college major. For him, college was not a time of exploration. Rather his failure to identify what he wanted to do

with his life, to have it all figured out, was an indictment of his masculinity. Real men knew what was next. Real men didn't have the uncomfortable feeling of not knowing what they were good at, what they would find fulfilling and what would pay the bills. Incidentally, these three things are difficult to string together on the best of days. It takes a lot of self knowledge, a lot of trial and error to figure one aspect, and then to align those with what society is valuing economically in a certain era is rather challenging.

Sex and Competition

Participants commented on the importance of having frequent sexual encounters with women. This isn't at all new in terms of scholarship. Michael Kimmel (2008) does an excellent job of explaining how college men are preoccupied by sex and its significance in achieving the approval of their male peers. Sleeping with many women demonstrates to other men you are sexually desirable and able to use your looks, your powers of persuasion, and your tools, entrée into a popular or attractive social life, a nice car, whatever to parlay into a sexual relationship with women. It cannot be one woman either. Sexual relationships with many different women demonstrate one is not succumbing to the feminine tendency towards romance or attachment. More important than intimacy is the next conquest, itself another measure of one's masculine prowess.

Michael Kimmel makes a strong argument about this in his piece, "Masculinity as Homophobia" (2013), where he argues that men are under constant scrutiny from other men who "watch us, rank us, grant our acceptance into the realm of manhood. Manhood is demonstrated for other men's approval" (p. 329). This surveillance evaluates the degree to which an individual man successfully enacts the ideologies of masculinity. One type of performance that provides evidence of one's masculinity is (hetero)sexual conquest. In

order to demonstrate one's masculinity through the vehicle of sex, women become the currency whereby other men's approval is achieved. Sprague (2002) notes that "boys who do not display some sexual power over girls have their own sexuality called into question" (p, 5945).

Summary of Hegemonic Descriptions

Regardless of how an individual man desires to define masculinity and regardless of how liberating a diversity education experience may be in terms of causing one to question the authenticity, the effectiveness, the capacity or viability of these particular scripts, *they are the norm*. They constitute the expectations that most men feel measured by (Connell, 2002; Laker and Davis, 2011; O'Neill, 1986). There is very little invitation to depart from normative conventions.

The literature affirms – and my subjects confirmed—that hegemonic masculinity is not about individual men nor the natural consequences of their decision-making. They did not sow the seeds of masculinity performance and its concomitant expectations. They are instead players in a script already written that they have to permission to improvise within as long as they maintain the same genre. We can begin to extend this metaphor, thinking about ways that we participate as parents, friends, teachers, and administrators to enforce the realities that constrain, circumscribe particular attitudes, behaviors and choices as more or less masculine. How do we create environments that allow, give permission, invite, and model a vaster array of allowable performances. How can we increase the likelihood that men will feel safer to experiment with these performances and will not be as susceptible to incessant shaming and continued threats of violence for violating societal and institutional prescriptions of gender performance? How do we create microclimates that are conducive to

resisting and recreating non-hegemonic forms? (Nicholazzo, 2013). To do so, we must first acknowledge how a particular form of masculinity gets naturalized.

Masculinity Socialization

Men in diversity education are no more exempt from the strictures of hegemonic masculinity performance than any other man on a college campus. Masculinity socialization is so intense and extensive, so much a part of their everyday life and their everyday encounter, that these men are just as susceptible to its expectations, it's limitations, and more insidiously, the consequences of not living up to it. In fact, it is dangerous not to embody hegemonic masculinity, and while they have fears and concerns and stories of not fitting it, they have reconciled this in various ways.

Ian's story of bullying presents a useful instance. We recall that Ian was confronted by another, larger young man who demanded his homework. Ian's father's advice was to fight with his words and his mind since Ian was not a physical threat to his bully. Ian told the other boy to "fuck off" and in doing so surprised his would-be bully, earning the other young man's respect. His response to a challenge was to engage in bluffing, utilizing rough language to assert a bravado that might offset the likelihood of becoming a target. Others, I suspect cope by shrugging it off, not overly drawing attention to how they have struggled to live up to the demands of hegemonic masculinity. Others engage in silence, the example of Tom being appalled by the comments of his friends, but unable to forge a response. Kimmel notes that, "shame leads to silence – the silence that keep other people believing that we actually approve of the things that are done to women, to minorities, to gays and lesbians in our culture" (2013, p, 330). Regardless of the type of mechanism employed, their very existence begs the question: Where within the social stage of everyday life, the classroom, the

cafeteria, the hallway, the residence hall, the football game, the party, or living room do college men get to stop performing? Both to their own satisfaction and that of others?

Masculinity is Never Proven

Socialized by a traditional definition of masculinity, none of the students in the study indicated that their masculinity was unassailable. There was never a suggestion that they didn't have to demonstrate masculinity to someone else's satisfaction, sometimes their own, sometimes their partner, sometimes a family member, sometimes other men. Curiously, there was no indication that men in the study felt as though a particular demonstration was final proof, to others, or even to themselves. Rather the intimation seemed to be that a young man's masculinity was on trial repeatedly and challenges could come from any direction.

Alcohol, Sex and Competition

The number of ways the young men in my study identified to prove their masculinity is instructive. They discussed consuming vast quantities of alcohol, having a lot of (hetero)sexual encounters, athletic participation, and avoiding behaviors that could signal feminine characteristics to others. Tom provides insight into this in his recollection of how first year students strive to impress one another and assert their viability as men through their alcohol consumption or disclosure of sexual prowess. He also addressed the extent to which drinking behaviors might be judged by others to be more or less masculine. In particular, he noted the speed with which you drink a particular drink, how long you nurse a drink, if you are playing a drinking game and as a consequence you have to drink a beer, not drinking it quickly enough. These are things that could expose you, put you in a position to be ridiculed by other men. Perhaps these are mechanisms that have been adopted to cope with the constant scrutiny that can be experienced when as Butler (1990; 2006) states, they

are always doing what is not automatic. Butler's point that masculinity is performed and is never actually owned by the person but is instead a relational response enacted upon a social stage is key.

Sports competitions provide an arena for men to demonstrate their athletic ability as a definitively masculine characteristic. Sabo notes, "winning at sport meant winning friends and carving a place for myself within the male pecking order" (1992, p, 158). Josh's story of his difficulties in gym class as a boy illuminate the role that athletics can play in (dis)qualifying boys and men as masculine. Josh's disinterest in athletics and his lack of physical coordination combined to make him an ineffective participant in the football play during the class. He notes how another young boy purposefully lined up against him, teasing him about his lack of physical ability and acumen. Embarrassed and unable to escape the activity, he became frustrated further undermining his ability to tackle his opponent.

This example underlines the specificity of athletic ability. Josh's designation as a boy didn't equate to effectiveness on the football field. However, the expectation exists that he, or any little boy, be capable of reacting to the snap of the football and executing a block or tackle. His struggle becomes an opportunity to deride and shame him for his lack of masculine qualities. Equating masculinity with athletic ability in this way elevates to prominence men with a select set of capabilities while prohibiting a range of men from qualifying as masculine. Qualities of physical toughness, agility, endurance, coordination, and timing, all of which are extremely variable across any given population, serve as criteria to stratify individuals, coding men with certain abilities as "more masculine" than others. Athletics provides an avenue for men to signal their masculinity by the very narrowest definition. Males whose talents lie in artistry, creativity, music, dance, or poetry are not given the same masculine stamp of credibility.

Policing

Name calling functions to police certain "non-masculine" behaviors, and was cited by participants as a reason for avoiding behaviors that are not widely construed as manly. Tom indicated how frequently words like "pussy" or "fag" are used to denote how an action in a given circumstance is not correct, or not judged as masculine by others. In response to my question of what actions could lead to such labels, Tom indicated that it could be anything, that it was so commonplace, it was very hard for him to disentangle. He shared that he had probably been called those things that morning. Then he created a hypothetical, if he were to put on a coat and other men construed that it wasn't cold enough to necessitate a coat, then his ability to bear the cold temperature and withstand its discomfort, needing the assistance of weather appropriate clothing to offset the cold, could be construed as less than masculine. In addition he cited some of the drinking behaviors described earlier, such as consuming large quantities over an evening or consuming quickly during drinking games to demonstrate the strength of one's tolerance, that could result in name calling.

Policing of gender was commonplace and it could take place in a variety of ways. In addition to name calling, participants noted how other's teasing and ridicule served to remind them that they were acting outside of the bounds of approved masculinity performance. In a memorable story, Chris shared how his friends and teammates relentlessly hassled him for his lack of violent reaction to another boy's invitation to a school dance. He indicated that it was a topic of conversation for weeks in school and on the soccer field that he had not punched the other boy for liking him.

The purpose of policing is to remind a young man that some behaviors and choices are considered more masculine than others. And maybe, more to the point, that some

behaviors appear more feminine than others, and thus decidedly not masculine (Lorber 2001). It's important to note that the words associated with name calling, "fag" and "pussy" connote a contempt for women, sometimes masked as homophobia (Kimmel, 2013). Their use not only directs young men to a certain set of performances; it also communicates that the alternative is less than, easing the way for misogyny and hate.

The danger of policing is particularly acute when it becomes internal. Like Foucault's (1977) image of an internalized *panopticon* -- or Vygotsky's (1981) account of how the "external" becomes "internal" --young men may have internalized the sense of being watched, and as a result begin to monitor themselves such that self-discipline replaces coercion as a form of social control. They don't need to continue to have the remonstrations from other peers, the teasing of their partners as in Chris's example, or the instruction of a parent as in the case of Josh being told to run differently. These lessons have been learned and they are recreated and enforced by the young men themselves.

Consequences of Inept Performances of Normative Masculinity

Men in the study shared multiple stories of how their gender role socialization anticipated dire consequences for failure to credibly enact masculinity to the satisfaction of others. In describing time spent in a peer education group that explores gender, Gerard commented, "we spend a lot more time sort of recovering from like the, you know, brutality of masculinity for men."

Students shared how adept they had become at making adjustments or aligning their behavior with hegemonic norms in order to avoid or preempt ridicule. Johannes enumerated several expectations of masculinity that are open to policing by others including how to

dress, what to eat, work out behavior, and types of hobbies or interests. He indicated that the consequence for not living up to other men's standards was to be ignored, sharing, "I think that getting shut off from being in the inner kind of boys club, that, that I think happens frequently." For others, an undercurrent of violence loomed large in interactions. Elliott related a story about a friend who would concede arguments when they were disagreeing, alluding to the fact that Elliott was bigger and could physically hurt him if they continued. He shared that it always struck him as odd, because he would never seek out violence, but he admitted that he would not run away from it either should a physical altercation present itself. Unlike Elliott, Ari and Liam personally experienced a threat of violence. Ari stated, "I don't feel safe on this campus…Even if it's not an idea of physical attack, emotionally, verbally, something along those lines." Masculinity under threat had implications beyond one's self-concept; it had material consequences in terms of disparagement, social exclusion or violence.

Concern about ridicule permeated the stories students shared. While Tom didn't speak directly to how peer reactions could shape his behavior, he did hypothesize about several seemingly innocuous decisions that could result in being called a name, such as wearing a coat when the weather wasn't that cold. As such, name calling functioned as one way to remind men that minor decisions or seemingly innocuous behaviors could be coded as un-masculine and thereby source unwanted or negative attention. Josh's story of running across the backyard depicts the extent to which their daily activities or practices could be gendered. When Josh's father called him to the door to explain that boys run in a particular way, he was doing more than increasing the speed and efficiency of Josh's stride. His father was communicating what is masculine and what is not. He confirmed the importance of efficiency and speed over the pleasure or exultation to be enjoyed by freedom of movement. His correction encouraged Josh to conduct his body in a way that would be interpreted by

others as masculine. Josh's father could have been anticipating the teasing or threats Josh would experience should his peers suspect that his approach to running didn't fit their assumptions of what is an appropriate running style for a boy. His father's coaching implores Josh to be aware of and discipline his body to conform to a gendered expression. Left unsaid is what will happen if he doesn't learn the lesson.

Much of what students talked about in terms of their careful attention to masculinity related to positioning themselves so that they were not the person excluded, not the person who was picked on, or subject to other folks' judgment, teasing, and verbal battery. They also provided commentary on managing circumstances in order to minimize the potential of being a victim of physical violence. Ari noted that he carefully chose his route to classes or evening activities based on what path would leave him the least vulnerable to attack because of his choice of dress. Ian depicted multiple encounters with bullies where he battled with words or provided a listening ear in order to manage their response, attempting to limit the likelihood of being a target while fully anticipating a violent conclusion.

This is an extension of Marion's (2002) contention that traditional masculinity is characterized both by the normativity of the impulse towards violence as well as a willingness to enact violence on others. A third attitude toward violence that I will characterize as an assumption of its inevitability surfaced in the interviews. This seeming ubiquity is consistent with Michael Kimmel's notion, "violence is often the single most evident marker of manhood" (p. 132, 1994) Establishing oneself at the top of the pecking order is one way to achieve self-protection. Men have been socialized to accept and in fact to expect violence. Young boys are told to "take it like a man," and that experiencing suffering without complaint is a laudatory trait (Sabo, 1992). One of the impacts of intense gender socialization and an experience of constant policing is for men to begin to accept the confining scripts and consider their disappointment or chafing with the expectations to be

viewed as whining (Davis and Wagner 2005; Kimmel, 2008; Sabo, 2004). If accepting pain as natural and inevitable and enduring it without complaint is a foundational tenet of hegemonic masculinity, then as I will discuss later, this has significant implications for the design and facilitation of diversity education.

Challenges to Socialization

The intensity of masculine socialization fascinated me because I expected more men to reject some of these tenets, and the fact that they didn't surprised me. There were a couple of people who did reject aspects of hegemonic masculinity: Gerard, Liam, Josh, and Ari. It is interesting to note that each of these young men identify somewhere in the queer spectrum. But the fact that more did not reject aspects of masculinity is less a comment on participant awareness or personal fortitude than it is a recognition of the strength of the gender system that dictates their social responses and negotiations. Hegemonic masculinity performance is widely upheld within the media and within institutions. It's more entrenched, and therefore more influential and powerful, than perhaps an individual man's resistance regardless of the fact that it might be deeply uncomfortable for that man. As we shall see in the next section, even those who communicated their rejection of masculine ideology fully expected to pay consequences.

One student who identified as trans also shed some very interesting light on masculinity and the extent to which it is performed and understood at an early age. Liam talked about being assigned female at birth and, raised as a girl. At 7, he took his gendered clothing and toys, put them into the living room and told his parents to give them to his little sister. I think this is a really interesting window into how extensive masculinity is and the

early binary gender acculturation among children. At a very early age Liam could make these distinctions and then assert where he felt that he fell within them.

Ari talks a little bit about how badly he feels for men who are called toward traditional performances of masculinity, which he perceives as extremely confining and unfulfilling. He notes his own distance from it, which he attributes to his queer identity. This is consistent with Reeser's (2010) argument that since masculinity functions as ideology, it may be easier to view from a distance, as is the case of the man who does not fit the masculine ideal or the woman who is hurt by masculinity.

Ari dismisses what he sees as the hallmarks of traditional masculine success, such as working to support a wife and children, or striving for a big house and a big car. Curiously, in being pleased with how he is different, Ari may be exhibiting some of the same status seeking that he attributes to other men his age. For him the marker of status is not succumbing to the hollow dream of the big house and nuclear family. He conveys an attitude of superiority and in doing so, may simply reinforce the aspiration to locate oneself at the top of the pecking order.

Summary of Socialization and its Consequences

As a researcher I was struck by the participants' concerns about the negative consequences of failing to signal one's masculinity convincingly. The looming consequences of not demonstrating to others' satisfaction one's masculinity appeared to inform everyday interaction to the extent that young men articulated how they policed themselves. Fear of what would happen should a young man slip up and perform something that called his masculinity into question was frequently cited by men in the study. Unfortunately, the sheer

breadth and ease with which one's masculinity could be evaluated and found wanting was apparent. Their stories communicated the circumstances under which their masculinity was policed and the potential consequences of not measuring up. Early experiences with ridicule, shunning and violence served as reminders that the stakes for performing hegemonic masculinity convincingly were high.

The process of gender socialization creates in them an expectation that it will be hard and at times uncomfortable to prove oneself a man, but that the alternative -- being found out as not man enough -- is worse.

Fissures and Breakages

Occasionally men in the study problematized the hegemonic ideology that dominated their description of masculinity. Several approaches surfaced. One way they problematized masculinity was through the neutralization of gender as a category. In doing so, they noted how characteristics commonly associated with masculinity such as strength or providing was actually a human trait. A second adaptation was to resist normative approaches by valuing a transformed approach to masculinity as exemplified by one's friend or family member. Finally, identity intersections accounted for a bending of the often inflexible strictures of hegemonic masculinity.

One example of having a role model for non-hegemonic masculinity is Chris's admiration of his brother's strength of will, valuing personal fortitude and commitment to principle over physical strength. Billy's approach is similar, in that he is impressed by the men of his circle who are willing to admit and take personal accountability for making mistakes. Johannes pointed to friends also. He powerfully illuminated the men he knew that

enacted performances that seemed to resist hegemonic forms. He notes the men of his acquaintance who are quiet and passive or who choose to express themselves in art or poetry. The importance of examples of men who transgress hegemonic forms cannot be overstated. Given the overwhelming socialization of masculine ideology, exceptions and ruptures provide models that can expand the liberatory potential of men's lives.

John's explorations of the caring and involvedness by his father and grandfather counters popular narratives of absent black fathers. His assertion of personal examples that interrogate stereotypes of black masculinity provide an entrance point for further interrogation of hegemonic tropes. Similarly, Billy observes how masculinity connotes a kind of access to privilege that gets mitigated by racism for men of color. The intersection of race and gender provides Billy a glimpse of the inconsistencies and injustices of current social structures making it more likely for him to further question or deconstruct his place in the world. Both of these men's life circumstances invite them to be skeptical of normative ways of being and doing that maintain the status quo (Young, 2013; Tatum, 1998). In essence, if hegemony rests on culturally persuading individuals that a certain way of being and doing is reasonable and inevitable, then examples that challenge the inevitability and reasonableness can be leveraged to further deconstruct hegemonic forms.

As explained earlier, Ari notes how free and liberated he perceives himself from the prisons of masculine ideology. However, this liberation came at the cost of his having to pay constant attention to his personal safety. The hyper vigilance with which he experienced social encounters as potential threats to his body and his psyche were evident in his stories. His experience of the omnipresent threat of violence evokes the situation of women within a rape culture.

Finally, we must be careful in thinking about alternatives as fracturing traditional narratives and performances. Robinson (2002) states:

> Focusing on men who embody alternatives to the dominant construct of masculinity will help us to pluralize masculinities but does a strategy actually work to abolish male privilege? Multiplying masculinities does not necessarily fragment the hegemonic and can often do the opposite, religitimize the hegemonic by cordoning off difference, safely containing it within the alternative" (pp, 146-147).

Summary of Fissures and Breakages

In the study participants offered some examples of men who had resisted or transformed attitudes and behaviors associated with hegemonic masculinity. These models offer important departures that could be expanded upon in order to create fractures in the hegemony of masculine ideology. However, we must proceed cautiously with this analysis, as these breakages might serve the reverse process, by resecuring normative masculinity. Robinson (2002) reminds us that adding alternatives does not in itself remove or de-center hegemonic forms. The strength of masculine ideology and its entrenchment within institutions cannot be underestimated.

Conclusion of Masculinity Discussion

The notion that masculinity is not individually conceived and deployed is supported by the overwhelming similarity of the expression of participants of what society expects men to be. The idea also removes some of the responsibility (and fault?) of masculinity from the thin shoulders of the college aged young man. The idea that college men have not created the

harrowing world of confining scripts and narrowly defined performances that are their lot is some, inadequate solace. It also perhaps engages practitioners' sympathies such that we might provide them some space and patience to interrogate the necessity of a masculinity performance that will be adequate enough for them to pass muster with others ready to penalize them for un-masculine portrayals.

When you consider the amount of shame and the practices of policing that happen among young men or how much time and attention they have given to a performance of masculinity that cannot afford vulnerability or mistakes, the implications for diversity education begin to emerge. Finding themselves in a diversity education experience where they might need to be vulnerable or open themselves up to critique seems anathema. To consider that they have participated in actions or behaviors that have harmed others or been harmful to others is a frightening proposition because a number of these young men haven't had good experiences with making themselves vulnerable. In the next chapter I will build upon the understandings of how masculinity functions in these young men's lives to consider its consequences for diversity education.

CHAPTER 7

"SAFE[R] SPACE FOR HARD CONVERSATIONS"

The academy is not paradise. But learning is a place where paradise can be created. The classroom with all its limitations remains a location of possibility. In that field of possibility we have the opportunity to labour for freedom, to demand of ourselves and our comrades, an openness of mind and heart that allows us to face reality even as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress. This is education as the practice of freedom. (hooks 1994, p. 207).

A student affairs colleague recently commented that having worked in student affairs for quite a time, he has been through his fair share of diversity and social justice workshops. In the last few years, he has found himself growing more and more anxious the night before a training session where diversity education was the topic. He had not had good experiences. He was uncomfortable, and he was anxious that he would be attacked and alienated from his colleagues. His concern was not just for the time spent in the workshop, but for the impact it would have on his relationships with his peers over the course of the year. He admitted that he had begun to have panic attacks the night before a training session.

My coworker's admission was not surprising to me, though my heart hurt at his experience. As a heterosexual, white, cisgendered man who openly acknowledges his access to social privilege, his point was not that he would feel bad, or guilty, or be introduced to some hard truths about inequities of social reality that he disproportionately benefits from. Rather, his concern was that because of his privileged social identities, others in the room would not treat him as a person. Rather they would see him as the embodiment of a social system that does harm, diminish him in the moment, and ignore or shun him afterwards.

As a man socialized into hegemonic masculinity, my colleague's fears are well founded. As demonstrated in previous chapters, men have plentiful experiences that situate them to expect immediate and unforgiving consequences for mistakes. That such fears surface in a classroom or student club meeting dedicated to diversity is not surprising. For young men the stakes are always high.

The purpose of this chapter is to answer the research question, "How do college men who participate in diversity education (DE) describe their experience in diversity education?" The answers to this question emerge from elements of their experience that my interview subjects highlighted -- their pathways to diversity education, their trepidations and preoccupation with safety, their appreciation for good facilitation, and the evolution of their consciousness. Ultimately, they describe an experience that is circumscribed by their gender socialization even as they begin to question and interrogate that socialization.

Pathway to Diversity Education

I worked with educators and administrators to identify men who had been engaged in a sustained diversity education experience. Men in the study were involved in a variety of diversity-identified experiences. Examples ranged from enrollment in a women's study or sociology course on race to involvement in a peer education performance troupe. A variety of opportunities met the stipulation of a sustained learning experience of eight or more weeks that addressed topics of multiculturalism, diversity or social justice. Students identified men against violence groups, work in student government, experiences as resident advisors, courses in sociology, women's studies, education and ethnic studies, gender affinity groups, and intergroup dialogues as qualifying experiences. The variety was consistent across type and geographic location of the institutions. Students did not appear to suffer

from a lack of options on their campus. This suggests that diversity education experiences are widely available to college men at the three institutions that men in the study attended.

While availability did not appear to be a problem, a compelling pattern emerged from my conversation with men about their participation in diversity education experiences. Multiple participants connected two qualities of diversity courses they had enrolled into: (a) the course met a diversity requirement, and (b) the course was conveniently located in their residence hall. Considering the scholarship that has demonstrated repeatedly that men are less inclined to participate in or predisposed to diversity education than their female counterparts (Sax, 2008; Kellom, 2004; Whitt, et al., 2001, 2002), requiring engagement is a good first step, particularly since the benefits of diversity education have been extensively documented (Gurin, et al., 1999, 2001). However, from what these men told me, simply implementing a requirement may not be sufficient. Putting diversity education experiences in the pathway of students, locating courses in buildings that are easily accessed might increase the likelihood that men select into the experience.

Knowing Others

Knowing others in the organization or course or familiarity with the instructor was an important reason for engaging with a diversity course or workshop or other experience. The majority of participants chose activities and courses where they knew at least one other person. It could be that by ensuring a known individual would also be in the course, a young man is ensuring the presence of a potential ally. As discussed in a previous chapter, several young men shared stories of anticipating bullying or experiencing shunning or threat. This threat ranged from mild as in the case of Johannes' never feeling like he had proven his masculinity enough to be seen or actively included, to more explicit and threatening, as in the

threat of violence that lingered over Ian's confrontation of a bully and Josh's experience in gym class. Given the extensive concern that men had about being singled out, being alone, being blamed for something, and being harmed, it makes sense that if a young men considered a diversity experience potentially risky, he might want to be sure of a reliable ally to support him.

Familiarity with Authority

Similarly, it is interesting that men commented on their familiarity with the instructor as being a factor in their decision to take a course or join an activity. Gender did not appear to be salient, although it is often indicated in studies of effective violence prevention programming (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach & Stark, 2003). Both male and female instructors were noted but the emphasis was placed on their *prior knowledge* of the instructor. Identifying an instructor that one likes and then taking courses with that person is not an unusual practice among college students. However, in light of the significant concerns men in the study raised about their sense of safety within a diversity education experience, foreknowledge of the likely approach or behavior of the person teaching the class or leading the workshop might work to alleviate some of the nervousness a student has about the subject matter of the experience.

Testimonials

Testimonials comprised a third area of consideration for men's motivation to participate in a diversity education experience. A reliable friend or peer's perspective can be useful in many circumstances. Where to buy a car, the name of a trustworthy contractor, the

recommendation of a good book are just some of the ways that I have recently looked to benefit from someone else's experience. It makes sense that young men might take seriously the recommendations of the peers. Johannes noted that several peers had highly recommended the class, and that their endorsement had a strong influence on his enrollment.

However, the condition of the recommendation might vary among students as seen in the popularity of websites like *ratemyprofessor.com* that provide student commentary on instruction. Perhaps they were told that this is a good course because it was easy or required little effort to secure a good grade. However, it is also plausible that they sought recommendations of instructors and courses where they could be certain to benefit from the experience without sacrificing their dignity. Given participants' strong endorsement of situations where they felt honored for their participation and experience, as I will discuss next, this seems likely.

(Overcoming) Masculine Socialization

I take from my research findings the insight that several sociological factors associated with hegemonic masculinity interfere with young men's ability to extract the benefits of diversity education. Some of the elements of hegemonic masculinity noted by scholars– namely, fear of femininity, restrictive emotionality, gender policing, and obsession with power and control – are likely to disincline men from fully participating in diversity education and from deriving educational benefits (Berkowitz, 2011; Kimmel, 2008; O'Neill, 1986, 2008). Participants' stories of what facilitated and hindered their experience in DE illuminate how masculine ideology permeates the environment of the classroom and the workshop.

Fear of femininity

Socialization works in distinct ways to influence young men's experience in diversity education. The first is that hegemonic masculinity codes particular forms of emotional expressiveness as feminine and therefore anti-masculine. ONeill (2008) contended that restrictive emotionality was a pattern of men's gender role conflict. Restrictive emotionality (RE) is predicated on a rejection of emotions that are culturally coded as feminine. RE refers to masculine ideology's reluctance to acknowledge or express emotions associated with vulnerability. Sadness, fear, disappointment, compassion, and threat are gendered feminine, and thus conceived to be anti-masculine.

Within the study, there was largely an absence of associating masculinity with vulnerability or emotional expressiveness related to compassion, hurt, or sadness. In fact, Ian's tactic to respond to the bully who wanted his homework was to fight with words. He chose to curse at his abuser. Similarly, Chris was taken to task by his grade school friends because he did not respond violently to the young man who had the temerity to ask him to the school dance. Later, within the confines of Chris's adult intimate relationship, he was teased for "being the girl" because he was sentimental toward his partner. The pattern of restrictive emotionality encourages men to suppress emotions they consider "feminine."

Yet, many of these emotions are designed as processes or outcomes of diversity workshops and courses. Adams (2007) points out that a fundamental principle of practice for social justice education requires not just attention to emotions, but a balance of the emotional and cognitive components of learning. If men are reluctant to demonstrate publicly that they experience half of the human range of emotions for fear that such are not appropriately masculine, their likelihood of participating fully is diminished. For a young

man who has had lessons reinforced about what happens if he does not accurately or effectively embody traditional masculinity, walking into a diversity education course might provide some kind of dilemma. He might have been taught that to demonstrate any level of presumed "weakness," where weakness is a synonym for emotionally expressive, is not okay.

Yet, emotional expressiveness, and a level of openness, vulnerability and empathy is a significant aspect of diversity education (Brown, 2010; Davis & Harrion, 2013; hooks, 1994). Yet, that same level of vulnerability has consequences that are very material for the young man and in his experience have caused him to position himself so that he is not susceptible to those consequences. Such a young man may need to eschew any appearance of vulnerability or emotionality that might cue other students to his not performing hegemonic masculinity effectively.

Policing and its Consequences

The second way men's experiences in diversity education is influenced by masculinity socialization involves the expectation that men will be punished for their failure to embody certain aspects of masculine ideology. For instance for a young man to not demonstrate his athletic prowess, as in the case of Josh's experience as a young boy playing football during gym class, there are a couple of immediate consequences. He can anticipate being singled out as the target of physical harm. In this situation, another young man who has more athletic prowess purposefully targets him as an opponent, intent upon tackling him repeatedly.

It's worth highlighting that this repetitious physical assault occurred within the context of a sanctioned environment of the physical education class with presumably an educator present. The specificity of this environment only acts to reassert that there is

something approved, natural, okay about Josh being subjected to physical pain as a result of his lack of physical competence or coordination in comparison to his classmate. The failure of the educator to intervene and redirect the energies of the young man who taunted Josh in between tackling him to the ground, had the effect of normalizing violence within the school environment. Not acting to intervene sanctioned the behavior of Josh's classmate, signals to Josh and his classmates that it is appropriate and normal to experience the pain of contact sport. The lesson from this scenario is twofold: A young man can expect violence and he can expect that an authority within the classroom will allow it to continue.

Consequences articulated by men in the study entailed more than physical violence. Berkowitz (2011) argues that "men often conform to an ideal of masculinity that we don't like because the consequences of non-conforming can be serious. A minority of men act as "enforcers" to punish and ostracize men who are seen as deviant" (p, 162). Social consequences in the form of ridicule or rejection were pointed out by multiple participants. For instance Tom, Alex, and Elliott reflected on their fear that they would not have anything to say, or that their participation would not be valued. They anticipated being potentially shamed or diminished within the classroom.

Men in the study did not directly point to concerns about being policed within the DE experience. We know from the literature on gender socialization theory discussed in chapter two, that high status groups have a strong interest in preserving their high status (Leaper and Friedman, 2002). As already noted, men have been acculturated to police one another's performance of masculinity and administer subsequent consequences if the performance does not meet hegemonic standards. This can create a layer of unanticipated group dynamics in a course or workshop where a group of men are participating. Not only may the men in the course be reluctant to engage with the material because it requires an emotional response they have been trained to refrain from, but the male peer group influence may

further exacerbate their reluctance to appear vulnerable and thus unmanly.

Perhaps this accounts for the emphasis on psychological safety that was communicated throughout the interviews. Adams (2007) has spoken to this in the literature as she articulates the attention with which students in social justice courses have placed on feeling respected and feeling safe within the classroom. Safety was a key consideration conveyed by the men in my interviews.

During our conversations about masculinity, men talked directly about how they navigated physical safety through protective decisions. For example, Ari articulated how much he considered safety in his day to day experiences. Particularly as he acknowledged that his gender presentation challenged conventional notions of masculinity through wearing high heeled pumps, women's jeans, and make-up.

Participants tended to refer more indirectly to safety when discussing diversity education. For instance, several participants noted the importance of an instructor's ability to create a space where no one was diminished. As it pertains to the classroom or the workshop, components of safety emphasized in the interviews included being treated with dignity and respect as well as being exempt from ridicule and diminishment. Such a supportive environment allows for deeply introspective learning and psychological risk-taking that yields powerful educational outcomes. Johannes contended that when a safe space was built and empathy was extended he was more likely to be vulnerable and open to others' feedback.

I offer that prior training that encourages young men not to be vulnerable and an experience of isolation and physical harm that makes them hesitant to open themselves to the classroom are intricately linked to hegemonic masculinity performance for young men. Such lessons of protecting oneself when combined with an expectation of diversity classroom

and workshop space as a location for ridicule and psychological harm preclude opportunities for truly transformative growth and learning.

Learning in Diversity Education

Men in the study had much to say about their experiences in diversity education. In addition to details about what they learned, they shared their theories and perceptions of the learning experience. They responded to questions about what facilitated their learning as well as what hindered it. Their reflections can inform educators how to better design diversity education experiences.

Students shared that their learning in diversity education covered a variety of content objectives. Consistent with previous scholarship, they described advancing their knowledge, self-awareness, and skills through their participation in DE (Pope and Reynolds, 2002). Concepts such as privilege, intersectionality, and various manifestations of oppression were cited by participants. John argued that diversity education provided him with the terminology to name his experience. They also acknowledged the increase in personal understanding, ascribing it to DE. For instance, Jeff was able to recognize how homophobia impacted his interactions with health services on campus because of what he was learning in his social justice classes. Particular emphasis was placed on the dialogic skills students practiced in their activities. Skills that were identified included learning to slow down conversations to emphasize understanding, suspending judgment, leaning into discomfort, and striking a balance between practicing inquiry and advocating their (alternative) point of view.

As anticipated, students had much to say about what obstacles they faced in their learning. As discussed earlier, psychological safety was a primary concern. Participants were adamant that content that appeared to blame or accuse certain groups (Whites, men, White men) created defensiveness and hindered learning. Some participants even pointed to the need for classrooms and spaces that were free from judgment.

I wonder, however, how realistic the latter expectation is. Despite educators' best efforts, spaces that are entirely safe or free from judgment may well be impossible to maintain if educators are to challenge stereotypes or other unexplored assumptions held by students. Moreover, safe space should not be confused with comfortable space. Scholars have cautioned that learning occurs when individuals are uncomfortable with current views or explanations, often the result of encountering contradictions (Bell & Griffin, 2007; Davis & Harrison, 2010; Kegan, 1994). In fact, Lakey (2010) noted that individuals expressing that they are scared or uncomfortable is one of the ways that he confirms the space is safe. Otherwise, participants would not risk the vulnerability of acknowledging their fear.

However, educators can create conditions of safety that increase the likelihood of more conducive environments for discussing incendiary or difficult topics. Setting ground rules can be employed to create collective agreements about how individuals and the community negotiate the process of difficult conversations. Furthermore, students and facilitators can stipulate that a number of judgments will be made in a given conversation, both of ourselves and others. Emphasis can be placed on acknowledging these judgments and engaging in a practice of managing them productively.

I was pleased to hear a great deal of feedback from my participants about the approaches to pedagogy within diversity education that facilitated their learning. Storytelling and panels were mentioned repeatedly as effectively providing content and

stimulating empathetic responses. In addition men mentioned the appeal of experiential education, citing service learning experiences and simulation activities that helped them connect to material. Consistent with other scholarship, they noted the importance of reflection to make sense of the experience and place it within the context of concepts explored in DE.

Men, Safety and (Re)Framing Diversity Education

The frequency with which students discussed the importance of safety, of feeling comfortable to be themselves. led me to question the kind of diversity experiences that men were expecting. From there I worked backward to unpack what in their experience conditioned them to expect to be uncomfortable and/or unsafe. One possibility is a natural outcome of the intense socialization of hegemonic masculine ideology. Berkowitz (2011) notes two themes in the literature on college men that are relevant:

> Men are uncomfortable with the way that they have been taught to be men. This creates conflict between how one wants to be and how one thinks one is supposed to be a man. Another theme is that men want to be accepted and appreciated by other men, to be seen as "normal" and as "one of the guys" (p, 161).

Men experience conflict between what they want and what they are supposed to do, and this is exacerbated by the ever present demand to prove themselves to avoid negative social consequences.

A second, and compatible explanation, might consider college men's past experiences and assumptions about diversity education. It caused me also to think of the kinds of diversity education experiences that I have designed and implemented for half of my career.

These are the workshops that are eager to point out to white people, or to men, or to heterosexuals the ways in which their behaviors and opinions are wrong, racist, sexist, homophobic, diminishing to others and hurtful to me. I have shaped workshops and courses to painstakingly scrutinize social interactions to uncover expressions of oppressive attitudes and behaviors and denounce those "responsible". I doubt I am the only facilitator to approach diversity education in this manner.

Such a strategy is problematic for a number of reasons. Blame and accusation do not offer a supportive learning environment (Bell and Griffin, 2007). Additionally, over attention to personal interactions within group dynamics can minimize focus and obscure systemic conditions. Finally, liberatory approaches to diversity education encourage interventions that empower participants to interrogate their own lives and exercise agency regarding the meanings they construct rather than continue to be a passive spectator in the learning transaction (Lakey, 2010; Love, 2007).

Cognitive Dissonance

We know that students cannot learn when they are overwhelmed by dissonance or contradictions between what they are learning and what they have previously believed. Learning requires a balance of support to counteract the anxiety that dissonance produces, so that it can be leveraged towards transformation (Bell and Griffin, 2007). Things have to be uncomfortable enough for someone to consider a new point of view. Not enough discomfort and the learner is complacent, content to maintain old ways of knowing. Too much discomfort and the learner may shut down, defensively holding on and reluctant to give up old ways of knowing. Bell, Love, Washigton and Weinstein (2007) contend that, "In social justice teaching we intentionally create tension in order to disrupt participants' complacent

and unexamined attitudes about social life," (p,388)

White men present a compelling case for the acknowledgement of dissonance in the classroom. I have pondered whether I have been too concerned about white men's comfort in a classroom, and how that may implicate me as colluding in a system of sexist oppression. But shouldn't we be concerned about all people's comfort? Students don't learn when they are too uncomfortable (Kegan, 1998).

It is tempting to decide that if men fall into a privileged social group, then they experience more comfort than most and ergo we do not have to consider their comfort in the classroom. This is shortsighted. If men's lives were comfortable then we wouldn't have stories of young men who have suffered trauma or internalized policing in order to maintain a convincing performance of hegemonic masculinity.

It's worth noting that men walk into the classroom and the student organization meeting or workshop already experiencing a great deal of dissonance. The stress of justifying their claim to masculinity, and thus their safety, may in itself be overwhelming and taxing. Educators could capitalize on men's challenges in enacting masculine ideology as a location for disrupting unexamined attitudes about social life.

It is necessary to educate students about the personal, institutional and cultural levels of oppression that maintains advantage and disadvantage based on membership to particular social groups. This kind of oppositional learning, that which contradicts deeply held assumptions about the social world, creates personal disequilibrium (Bell & Griffin, 2007). Designers of DE must take care to employ strategies for learning that consider the psychological positioning of students and their readiness for learning.

Personal and Systems Level

There are good reasons to dissect microaggressions within intergroup dynamics such as the environment of a DE course. Systems of oppression provide the institutional structures to enforce and normalize stereotypes, prejudices, and discrimination directed toward targeted groups in society (Hardiman, Jackson & Griffin, 2007). Within the context of DE, facilitators must be sensitive to these oppressive dynamics and mitigate their proliferation. Such attention to process, the "how" of diversity education is as important as content, the "what" of diversity education (Adams, 2007). Intergroup dialogue practitioners have introduced the concept of multipartiality, to attend to the complicated dynamics of the DE environment. Multipartiality refers to the obligation of the facilitator to invite individual participation, while simultaneously challenge points of view that reflect dominant norms and narratives (Wing & Rifkin, 2001). This is one tactic that can attend to the dilemma of engaging participation while reducing the likelihood that oppressive dynamics are reproduced.

However, in the interests of not reproducing oppressive structures within the confines of the DE environment, I have confronted behaviors that enact oppressive attitudes and actions through assigning fault to the individual exclusively. This response insidiously links problematic behavior with a moralistic flaw, suggesting that not only is the behavior inappropriate, but that the person behind the behavior is bad. This is an overly simplistic conclusion that neglects to consider the ways in which all members of society are indoctrinated into a system of oppression that elevates dominant cultural values and practices and leverages institutions to normalize those ways of being and doing. I have often entered the room, more interested in drawing white people's attention to racism, or men's attention to sexism, than to start in an understanding of how each of us is indoctrinated and complicit in a system of oppression. By teasing apart how individuals are influenced by

institutional and systemic levels of oppression, we can de-personalize the fault for the existence of oppression and reduce men's fears about blame. This creates ample space for men to consider how their attitudes and behaviors are sourced in a system of oppression and what action they can take to discontinue a cycle of oppressive ideology.

Education as the Practice of Freedom

A laudatory goal in DE is to conceptualize education as the practice of freedom (hooks, 1994). That is, approach education as something that students *do* rather than something that is *done to* them. It starts with asking the questions about their own experiences, where have they been harmed by social demands to be men, where have they felt unempowered, where have they fallen short. Inviting the dissonance they have experienced through socialization into masculine ideology as a location for learning has rich possibilities. One might start by introducing material that exposes men to how masculinity functions so that they can look critically at their own assumptions and biases. Hill Collins (2013) notes that, "by taking a theoretical stance that we have all been affected by race, class and gender as categories of analysis that have structured our treatment, we open up possibilities for using those same constructs as categories of connection in building empathy," (p. 610).

Love (2013) argues that "a liberatory consciousness enables humans to live their lives in oppressive systems and institutions with awareness and intentionality, rather than on the basis of the socialization to which they have been subjected," (p, 601). The socialization process is dependent on individuals proceeding as passive consumers of a societal curriculum that maintains the status quo. If the norms of the culture structure learning and development in a way that forecloses agency, then the norms of the classroom or the workshop might attempt to counteract this by structuring learning in ways that empower.

Our strategies in DE can reject pedagogies and processes that encourage receptivity as a normal aspect of the learning process.

The question of safety in the classroom offers a compelling case for the practice of education as freedom. We can invite students to define and delimit the contours of safety within their learning environment. We can help them to pose questions about what is safe enough, and where does safety end and the discomfort that is necessary to learning begin. We can help them to explore what it feels like to feel emotionally and physically safe enough to "grapple with contradictions and seek more satisfactory ways to make sense of social reality," (Bell & Griffin, 2007).

Conclusion

This chapter answered the research question, "How do college men who participate in diversity education describe their experience in diversity education? Participants in the study pointed out of their experience that they their pathways to diversity education, their trepidations and preoccupation with safety, their appreciation for facilitation that treated them with dignity and respect, and the increase in knowledge, self-awareness and communication skills they gained. Repeatedly they unveiled experiences in diversity education that were informed by their gender socialization even as they began to question and interrogate that socialization.

For much of my time as a scholar of masculinities and social justice educator, I have wrestled with the questions of what is the appropriate amount of safety or attention to men's discomfort and unease in DE. I think those are the wrong questions. I am not sure that is my purpose as a scholar and practitioner. I think that we can draw men into an exploration of

how their daily, gendered lives are informed by masculine ideology. We can invite them to question it, but we need to start by creating a safe space where they can expect dignity and risk vulnerability. While an understanding of where one benefits within a system of oppression is a useful outcome of the diversity education experience, it holds less promise as a fertile location for learning at the outset of one's educational journey. Men's experiences of masculine ideology and the oppositional content of diversity education are threatening enough. Anything we can do to lower the stakes is useful.

CHAPTER 8

RECOMMENDATIONS

Participant Recommendations for Practice

As a part of this study on college men's experiences in diversity education, I asked students to give advice to faculty and staff who design and facilitate DE experiences. Their comments clustered around requests for patience and attention to dynamics of safety within the learning environment. They also made astute observations about less effective strategies.

- *Facilitators need to distinguish between attitudes and behaviors that are born of malice and those that are born of ignorance*. Recognize that growing up in our society provides very good reason for individuals to be ignorant about how oppression functions. Especially for those who are privileged by their gender or racial social group membership. Illuminate how systems and institutions obscure injustice through normalizing a select set of cultural norms.
- *Create conditions and structures in the classroom and workshop that normalize dialogue*. Great concern existed among students in the study that discussion will devolve into a fight where their social wellbeing is at risk. Lessening the stakes provides support. Introduce and practice conversational skills that do not rely on debate. While eliminating debate provides support, developing dialogic skills offers opportunity to cultivate abilities desperately needed for civic participation.
- *Develop skills that artfully balance raising awareness with providing support* so that students do not detach themselves from the learning process. This is consistent with Hardiman, Jackson and Griffin's (2007) advice to cultivate learning edges in the

classroom. They define learning edges as the productive space where students feel comfortable enough to engage with the dissonance created when their current assumptions and worldviews are insufficient to reconcile new insights or evidence.

- *Slow things down*. Participants appreciated opportunities that attended to the dynamics in the classroom, slowing down conversations so that individuals had an opportunity to reflect on their feelings about what was being said and how it was being said. Sometimes as facilitators we construct expectations about what learning objectives are accomplished, or what material is covered, in a given period of time. Building in time and flexibility to attend to interpersonal dynamics and emotions that surface in the discussion can achieve broader learning goals.
- *Change the way we educate about sexual assault and race*. Students were clear about interventions that they perceived as casting blame to be ineffective. Blaming tactics create defensiveness that allow students to distance themselves from the problem. Instead, present gross inequities as problems that individual students did not create, but that we are all called to solve as communities of integrity and purpose.
- *Safety is a necessary prerequisite to the vulnerability necessary for deeper self-work.* Attend to the conditions in the classroom or workshop that incline individuals to risk vulnerability. Consider using ground rules or collective agreements to guide participants' behavior and engagement in the workshop or classroom. Spend time arriving at consensus about how students will treat one another. Follow up when an agreement needs revision or enforcement.

Researcher Recommendations for Practice

In addition to students' advice, I have several recommendations for practice related to the discussion in chapter seven. My recommendations fall into three areas: encouraging

participation in DE, providing stimulating learning experiences, and ensuring safe and productive learning environments. While the recommendations below were sourced from this research study on men's experiences in diversity education, I maintain that the recommendations to follow will improve the learning experience for **all** students.

Encourage and Sustain Participation

- *Widely communicate the educational benefits of diversity education to all students*. Informing students of the gains to be achieved in critical thinking, democratic skills and perspective taking and connecting each to career and professional goals might particularly resonate with young men who have been socialized to emphasize work and success objectives.
- *Consider requiring diversity content credits* and conveniently locating measurably, high-impact courses near residence halls and bus lines. Making diversity education courses essential to progress towards graduation will increase the pool of students who benefit. Institutions shouldn't discount the pragmatic motives of students, but rather strategically address them.
- *Utilize testimonials and participants' networks to increase involvement.* Capture the reflections of men who have had a good experience on semester evaluations or feedback. Use on websites and brochures to provide current students with information as they are considering taking a course. Invite students who have tenure in the organization or are finishing the semester to reach out to three men who they think would benefit from a similar experience. Men in the study routinely commented on how the course or club meeting exceeded their expectation. Put before students the action project of addressing low expectations and misapprehensions of the course or club and ask them to identify solutions to increase student involvement.

- *Capitalize on high profile moments in the lives of students to recruit students into DE experiences.* Unfortunately, campuses will often experience diversity-related critical incidents. See these moments of heightened awareness of problems within the community as opportunities to channel community members' energies towards a peer education group that addresses relationship violence or an intergroup dialogue on race relations.
- *Develop courses that have components that offer engaging learning experiences* such as residential theme communities, service learning dimensions, adventure or other experiential content. Men in the study remarked upon active learning experiences as attractive incentives for their involvement.
- *Give grades and identify other material outcomes for involvement*. Some participants mentioned that their motive for staying in difficult conversations was that they wanted a good grade. Create participation expectations that consider a number of different learning styles and factor them into grade calculations. While some individuals are more comfortable talking in class, request that students provide journals or bring to class media examples that reflect course content. Consider identifying ways that sustained engagement in a co-curricular club or organization can result in internship credit, or material for a portfolio that documents products of student achievement of institutional outcomes.

Employ Engaging Pedagogical Principles

- *Maintain and expand aspects of DE that depart from conventional, lecture-style practices.* Students pointed to features of their DE experiences as "more friendly" and "relatable." Attend to the structure and environment of the classroom or organization. Keep faculty to student ratios low, reserve campus space that allows for flexible configurations, and sit in circles that allow students to face each other.

- *Employ pedagogical principles that center students' relationship to content and involve students in the development of the content*. For instance, give extra credit for students who find a video, meme or media example of the course content. Purposefully situate learning in the lived experiences of students and utilize problem posing and cases studies to engage students in reflecting upon their own experience and connecting it to learning objectives. Employ storytelling and panels to personalize concepts and create opportunities for empathy and perspective-taking.
- *Develop problem solving projects to realize the action dimension of student's learning and engagement* in diversity education (Bell & Griffin, 2007; Love, 2013). Providing opportunities for students to address the disparities they are learning about prevents the emersion of hopelessness and depression that can emerge from diversity education. Help students to learn not just what inequities persist, but what they can do about them.
- *Involve students in decision making processes in a department* of what courses are developed and required. Create student advisory boards and add students as voting members to decision making bodies who determine course approval or curricula. Empower students to point to deficiencies in current programs and identify courses for expansion that have had a profound influence on them.

Carefully Consider Providing Safety and Support

- *Facilitators need to create conditions where difficult topics can be examined productively.* In addition to identifying ground rules, spend time building trust by conducting activities that develop relationships amongst participants. Model the normality of emotions of frustration, sadness and anger that can accompany topics in DE.

- *Experiment with structures in the classroom and student organization that increase the possibility of supportive networks for participants*. Utilize TAs who have been through the course to recruit and engage students of their acquaintance. Set up opportunities for sponsorship or mentoring in an organization. The purpose of both of these strategies is to create circumstances where new participants have a trusted ally who they know that they can rely upon for support.
- *Help students to take responsibility for social injustice*. As Hardiman, Jackson, and Griffin (2007) have noted, fixing blame is not helpful. Helping students to take responsibility shifts the conversation from, "Am I a bad person for not noticing how I benefit from privilege?" to "How can I reduce the likelihood of injustice within my sphere of influence?"
- *Remember that students are watching to see how others are treated.* Every opportunity to demonstrate that vulnerability is rewarded, though misinformation will be corrected in a way that maintains students' dignity, is vital. Additionally, redirecting the groups' attention to where misinformation was learned or the ubiquity of stereotypes can lesson feelings of personal inadequacy and fear that limit students' participation.
- *Start conversations in DE that are situated in students' lives.* For instance, invite men to excavate how dominant narratives have shaped their lived experience, and ways it has been confining or damaging. Illuminate how oppressive meaning systems and ideologies have impacted their lives as an entrée into exploring how institutions, systems, and culture symbols and meanings can be leveraged into disparately structuring the choices and life chances of particular groups.
- *Help students anticipate judgments in the classroom*. Explain that it is inevitable that the material will surface judgments: Ourselves of others, others of us, and us of

ourselves. The key is to anticipate these and engage in framing and self-work that allows students to notice judgments and still persist in understanding others and themselves.

Future Research

Through the process of conducting this study, I identified several areas for future research. These research implications are related to the intersection of masculinity performance and DE, understanding of effective pedagogical environments for DE and further appreciative inquiries on the pro-social enactments of college men.

- Explore with men in diversity education how masculinity performances emerge in diversity education environments. For instance, what hegemonic performances surface within the ethnic studies course or peer education organization? Do alternative performances of masculinity emerge in those contexts?
- Studies that vary the demographics of the current study offer an interesting perspective. Given the small sample of men of color in the study, future researchers could purposefully sample a comparison group of white men and men of color to tease out how race intersects with masculinity ideology in diversity education spaces. Similarly, men who are in graduate studies with a diversity focus, such as social justice education, or ethnic studies, might offer a compelling glimpse into how masculine ideology is reconciled with the process or outcomes of diversity education.
- Longitudinal studies of men who have taken DE to have a better understanding of how masculine ideology is internalized and (possibly) transformed over time.
- Pedagogy emerged as an important element in men's positive experiences of diversity education. In depth exploration of this particular aspect of the study could

provide fruitful ground for future researchers. A case study of the tensions, structures, experiences and outcomes of a group men engaged in a gender-focused consciousness raising group is one suggestion. Another is an experimental study within a social diversity survey course to test the efficacy of various pedagogic interventions.

- Finally, an exploration of other prosocial enactments of college men to understand conceptualizations of masculinity that transgress and transform hegemonic masculine ideology is encouraged. Populations might include men involved as peer educators or resident assistants, men involved in service learning or activist communities, or men serving in leadership roles in altruistic clubs and organizations.

APPENDIX A

FOR NOMINATIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Call for Nominations!

LOOKING FOR COLLEGE MEN (Current Undergraduates) WHO ARE WILLING TO TALK ABOUT THEIR EXPERIENCE IN DIVERSITY EDUCATION AND THEIR GENDER IDENTITY AS MEN.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to explore how men in college who have participated in diversity education describe their experience in diversity education as well as their identity as men.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE?

I am inviting participants who meet the following criteria:

1. Self identify as men

2. Have participated in some sustained form of diversity education that the nominator facilitated or can confirm (eight weeks or longer)

3. Are current undergraduates from a select geographical region in New England and the Midwest.

4. English speaking

WHAT DO I NEED FROM YOU?

I need nominations of men you have worked with in diversity education settings, coursework, programming, leadership workshops, service learning, etc. who have been engaged in the material and, in your opinion, derived some benefit from their

involvement in the form of increased knowledge, skills or self-awareness. If you would be willing to provide:

(1) A response to the following question: What benefits in the form of knowledge, skills or self-awareness has the potential participant demonstrated to you?

(2) Contact information for the potential participant

I will notify them and indicate that they have been nominated as well as provide them with further information about the study and their possible participation. Feel free to share this material with them, as well as answers to frequently asked questions below.

***Frequently Asked Questions**:*

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO?

If you agree to participate in the study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire to provide information on your identities, type of college or university you attend, experience with diversity education and thoughts about gender identity. Selection of participants will be based on completion of questionnaire and demographic information. If you are selected, I will set up a quick 10-minute phone call to answer any questions you have about the study and set up a date, time and location for the interview. I will travel to you to complete a 1.5 to 2 hour interview. After your interview has been transcribed (turned from audio format to text document) you will be contacted to review the document and provide clarifying information as needed.

HOW WILL MY PERSONAL INFORMATION BE PROTECTED?

The following procedures will be used to protect your confidentiality. The researcher will keep all records and data in a secure location. Only the researcher will have access

to the audio-recordings, transcripts, and other data. You will be provided with an Informed Consent form before the interview process, which will allow you to choose your own pseudonym (fake name). All digital, audio, and other data will only identify you through your pseudonym, and any specific information about your college/university will use vague descriptors such as "a small New England College" or "a large public university in the Midwest." Your email address and personal demographic information will never be shared with any other individual. At the conclusion of the study, the researcher may publish her findings. To protect your identity and confidentiality, any publications or presentations about this research will only identify you through your pseudonym and vague descriptors of your college or university.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

I will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have any further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the student researcher, Rachel Wagner (rlwagn@gmail.com or 937604-1482) or the faculty sponsor/principle investigator, Dr. Maurianne Adams (adams@educ.umass.edu or 413.545.1194). If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact the University of Massachusetts Amherst Human Research Offfice (HRPO) at 413.545-3428 or humansubjects@ora.umass.edu.

CAN I STOP BEING IN THE STUDY?

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. If you agree to be in the study, but later change your mind, you may drop out of the study at any time. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide that you do now want to

participate. My primary concern as a researcher is to ensure that you are comfortable with your level of participation.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please contact me, Rachel Wagner at rlwagn@gmail.com

Please feel free to pass this along:

To friends who might be interested in participating!

Colleagues who may know students who would be interested in participating!

Colleagues or friends at colleges and universities in Connecticut, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Ohio!

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE CONSENT FORM

Dear Participant,

This questionnaire is for college students who are interested in being a part of qualitative research study. The purpose of this study is to explore how men in college who have participated in diversity education describe their experience in diversity education as well as their identity as men. Items on the questionnaire are intended to gather demographic information (race, school attended, sexual orientation, etc.) about possible participants and information about experiences in diversity education and as men. Before turning to the questionnaire, read the items listed below. If you are willing to participate, please sign the bottom of this sheet where indicated (or type your name if done electronically) before returning the completed questionnaire. If you have any questions, please contact Rachel Wagner at: rlwagn@gmail.com.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

My signature (or typed name below) indicates that I understand the following:

- This is a voluntary questionnaire and I am under no obligation to complete it.
- Filling out this questionnaire has no potential benefits to me, and the potential emotional risks of responding to the questions is minimal.
- The information that I provide will be kept confidential and will only be seen by the researcher, Rachel Wagner.

- By completing this questionnaire and signing this form, I am in no way obligated to participate in the research project.
- If Rachel Wagner contacts me, I am free to decline her offer of participation in the study.

My signature below simply signifies that Rachel Wagner may contact me to set up an interview.

Participant Name

Signature

APPENDIX B-2

DEMOGRAPIC AND INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

*Please note that the space provided below is unlimited. Please write as much as you feel is appropriate

* Required

Name *

Age *

Email Address *

Cell Phone Number *

Home Phone Number

Which number is best to reach you?

What is the name of your college or university?

Where is your college or university located (city & state)? *

Please tell me why you are interested in participating in this study.

What is your year in school? *

First Year Student

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Graduate Student

Which of the following would you use to identify your gender? *

(Check all that apply)

Man

Genderqueer

Transgender

Please use this space if you checked more than one above to explain.

How do you racially/ethnically identify?

Please choose all that apply

Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander

Black/African American

Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Chicano/Puerto Rican/Dominican

Native American/American Indian/Indigenous/First Nation

South Asian/Middle Eastern

White/Caucasian

Multiracial/Multiethnic/Biracial

None Listed Here

Please use this space if you checked more than one to explain.

If you identify with a group that was not listed above, please consider using this space to explain or expand upon how you identify.

Religious Identification

Socioeconomic Class Background

Current Socioeconomic Class

Please list any courses that you have taken related to diversity and provide a brief description

Please list any diversity-related trainings, workshops, leadership or service opportunities you have experienced and provide a brief description.

What benefits have you received from your participation in diversity education (classes, workshops, trainings, organizations, leadership activities)?

What activities do you currently participate in that have diversity, multiculturalism, or social justice as a primary goal or focus?

The following questions are intended to learn more about your experience of gender. There are no right or wrong answers.

How would you describe yourself as a man?

What has shaped your understanding of yourself as a man?

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH STUDY

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Student Researcher: Rachel Wagner

Study Title: Exploring College Men's Experiences in Diversity Education

Faculty Sponsor/P.I.: Dr. Maurianne Adams

WHAT IS THIS FORM?

This consent form will give you information about the study so you can make an informed decision about participation in this research study. This form will help you understand why this study is being done and why you are being invited to participate. It will also describe what you will be asked to do as a participant and any known risks, inconveniences or discomforts that you may have while participating. I encourage you to think about this information and ask questions now and at any other time. If you decide to participate, please sign this form; you will be given a copy for your records.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE?

I am inviting participants who meet the following criteria:

1. Self identify as men

2. Have participated in some form of diversity education that the nominator facilitated or can confirm

3. Are current undergraduates from a select geographical region in New England and the Midwest.

4. Have demonstrated to the nominator that they have benefited from diversity education in terms of increased skills, knowledge or self-awareness

5. English speaking

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to explore how men in college who have benefited from diversity education describe their experience in diversity education as well as their identity as men.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO?

If you agree to participate in the study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire to provide information on your identities, type of college, community college, or university, experience with diversity education and asked to respond to two open-ended questions. Selection of participants will be based on completion of questionnaire and demographic information. If you are selected, I will set up a quick 10-minute phone call to answer any questions you have about the study and set up a date, time and location for the interview. I will travel to you to complete a 1.5 to 2 hour interview. After your interview has been transcribed (turned from audio format to text document) you will be contacted to review the document and provide clarifying information as needed.

HOW WILL MY PERSONAL INFORMATION BE PROTECTED?

The following procedures will be used to protect your confidentiality. The researcher will keep all records and data in a secure location. Only the researcher will have access to the audio-recordings, transcripts, and other data. You will be provided with an Informed Consent form before the interview process, which will allow you to choose your own pseudonym (fake name). All digital, audio, and other data will only

identify you through your pseudonym, and any specific information about your college/university will use vague descriptors such as "a small New England College" or "a large public university in the Midwest." Your email address and personal demographic information will never be shared with any other individual. At the conclusion of the study, the researcher may publish her findings. To protect your identity and confidentiality, any publications or presentations about this research will only identify you through your pseudonym and vague descriptors of your college or university. Although I do not expect this to be an issue, I cannot guarantee the confidentiality of disclosures about child abuse, neglect, sexual violence, or threats of suicide or homicide.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF BEING IN THIS STUDY?

By participating in this study, you will have the opportunity to share your experience as a man who has benefited from diversity education, which as of this time, has not be done before. Further, you will be able to provide your thoughts on recommendations you might have how college and university campuses could be more effective in their engagement of men in diversity education.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF BEING IN THIS STUDY?

By participating, you may be exposed to a small number of risks. You may feel emotional discomfort while discussing your experiences and thoughts.

WILL I RECEIVE ANY PAYMENT FOR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY?

You will not receive any payment for participating in this study.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

I will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have any further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the student researcher, Rachel Wagner (rlwagn@gmail.com or 937.604.1482) or the faculty sponsor/principle investigator, Dr. Maurianne Adams (adams@educ.umass.edu or 413.545.1194). If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact the University of Massachusetts Amherst Human Research Office (HRPO) at 413.545-3428 or humansubjects@ora.umass.edu.

CAN I STOP BEING IN THE STUDY?

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. If you agree to be in the study, but later change your mind, you may drop out of the study at any time. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide that you do now want to participate.

SUBJECT STATEMENT OF VOLUNTARY CONSENT

I have read this form and decided that I will participate in the project described above. The general purposes and particulars of the study as well as possible hazards and inconveniences have been explained to my satisfaction. I understand that I can withdraw at any time.

_____ _____ _____

Participant Signature Print Name Date

_____

Participant's Chosen Pseudonym

By signing below, I indicate that the participant has read and, to the best of my knowledge, understands the details contained in this document and has been given a copy.

_____ _____

Researcher Signature Print Name Date

(Person obtaining Consent)

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introductory Questions about masculinity:

How would you describe what it means to be a man?

If you were to give an example of masculine behavior, what would say?

How is it the same or different from how you think about your masculinity?

How do you think others perceive your masculinity? What are your thoughts about those perceptions?

Are there any factors that influence how you express or would like to express your masculinity?

What ideas, concepts, performances or images do you associate with your masculinity?

What kind of ideas, concepts, and images do you reject in constructing your masculinity?

What kinds of personal or social rewards have you experienced as a result of your performance of masculinity

What kinds of personal or social consequences have you experienced as a result of your performance of masculinity?

Questions about experiences in diversity education as a man

Tell me about a diversity education experience that has benefited you.

What attracted you to the experience?

How did it meet your expectations or not?

What kept you coming back?

What benefits did you receive? What did you learn?

What helped you (learn, achieve benefits)?

What hindered you?

What advice do you have for facilitators?

How have you applied what you have taken away?

Closing Questions

Is there anything you think I should know to understand your experience as a man who was engaged in and benefited from diversity education better?

Are there any thoughts about your experience that you would like to share that we haven't covered?

Is there anything you would like to ask me?

APPENDIX E

NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PARTICIPATION EMAIL

Participant does not meet initial selection criteria

Dear (Participant's Name),

Thank you for contacting me with your interest to participate within my research on men who have benefited from diversity education in college and masculinity. After review of your Demographic Questionnaire, I realized that you did not meet my initial selection criteria for the following reason: (insert reason here).

While you do not meet the criteria for selection in this study, I would like to request the ability to maintain your contact information for future research that I may do. Please contact me if you would be interested in future contact from me regarding my research college men and diversity education

Thank you again for your interest and the time you invested in the questionnaire. I hope to be able to have your participation in future research.

Respectfully,

Rachel Wagner

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Social Justice Education Doctoral Candidate

REFERENCES

Adams, M. (2007). Pedagogical frameworks for social justice education. In Adams, et. al., (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice*, (2nd ed., pp.15-34). New York: Routledge.

Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*, (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Archer, L., Pratt, S. D., & Phillips, D. (2001). Working-class men's constructions of masculinity and negotiations of (non)participation in higher education. *Gender and Education, 13*(4), 431.

Bannier, B. (2008). Education research in the public interest: Social justice, action, and policy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 51*(5), 436-438.

Bell, L., Love, B., Washigton, S., & Weinstein, G. (2007). Knowing ourselves as social justice educators. In Adams, et. al., (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 381-394). New York: Routledge.

Bell, L. & Griffin, P. (2007). Designing social justice education courses. In Adams, et. al., (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed., pp In Adams, et. al., (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 67-88).

Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Using how college men feel about being men and "doing the right thing" to promote men's development. In Laker, J. & Davis, T. (Eds.), Masculinities in Higher Education: Theoretical and practical considerations (pp. 161-176). New York: Routledge.

Berkowitz, A. D., Burkhart, B. R., & Bourg, S. E. (1994). *Research on college men and rape* John Wiley & Sons.

Biddle, I., & Jarman-Ivens, F. (2007). Introduction. In F. Jarman-Ivens (Ed.), *Oh boy! making masculinity in popular music* (pp. 1–20). New York: Routledge.

Biddle, I. (2007). "The singsong of undead labor": Gender nostalgia and the vocal fantasy of intimacy in the "new" male. In F. Jarman-Ivens (Ed.), *Oh boy! masculinities and popular music* (1st ed., pp. 125). London: Routledge.

Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E.,Jr. (1996). Masculine gender role conflicts: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(4), 461.

Bowman, N. A. (2013). How much diversity is enough? The curvilinear relationship between college diversity interactions and first-year student outcomes. *Research in Higher Education, 54*(8), 874-894. doi:http://dx.doi.org.silk.library.umass.edu/10.1007/s11162-013-9300-0

Brod, H., & Kaufman, M. (1994). *Theorizing masculinities* Sage Thousand Oaks, Calif.

Brown, (2010)

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Capraro, R. L. (1994). Disconnected lives: Men, masculinity, and rape prevention. *New Directions for Student Services, 1994*(65), 21-33.

Capraro, R. L. (2000). Why college men drink: Alcohol, adventure, and the paradox of masculinity. *Journal of American College Health [H.W.Wilson - EDUC], 48*(6), 307.

Capraro, R. L. (2004). Men's studies as a foundation for student development work with college men. *New Directions for Student Services [H.W.Wilson - EDUC],* (107), 23.

Carrigan, T., Connell, B., & Lee, J. (2002). Toward a new sociology of masculinity In R. Adams, & D. Savran (Eds.), *The masculinity studies reader* (pp. 99-118). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Connell, R. W. (1995). Masculinities. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., & Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics* Stanford University Press.

Cournoyer, R. J., & Mahalik, J. R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*(1), 11-19.

Courtenay, W. H., Mccreary, D. R., & Merighi, J. R. (2002). Gender and ethnic differences in health beliefs and behaviors. *Journal of Health Psychology, 7*(3), 219.

Courtenay, W. H. (1998). College men's health: An overview and a call to action. *Journal of American College Health, 46*(6), 279-290.

Courtenay, W. H. (1999). Youth violence? let's call it what it is. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(3), 141-142.

Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being. A theory of gender and health. *Social Science and Medicine, 50*(10), 1385-1401.

Courtenay, W. H. (2011). Best practices for improving college men's health: Designing effective programs and services for college men. In J. A. Laker, & T. Laker

(Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 177-192). New York: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dannels, M. (1997). *Fom discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education.* (No. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Vol.25, 2). Washington, DC: The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Davis, T. (2002). Voices of gender role conflict: The social construction of college men's identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(4), 508-521.

Davis, T., & Harrison, L. M. (2013). *Advancing Social Justice: Tools, Pedagogies, and Strategies to Transform Your Campus*. Hoboken: Wiley.

Davis, T. & Laker, J. A. (2004). Connecting men to academic and student affairs programs and services. In G. Kellom (Ed.) *Developing effective programs and services for college men*, New Directions for Student Services, (No. 107, pp. 47-57). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, T.L. & Wagner, R. (2005). Increasing men's development of social justice attitudes and actions. In R.D. Reason, E. M. Broido, T.L. Davis, & N. J. Evans (Eds.), Developing Social Justice Allies. New Directions for Student Services (No. 110, pp. 29-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln.Y. (2000). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.) Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp.1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Edwards, K. E. (2007)."Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. (Order No. 326043, University of Maryland, College Park), *ProQuest Dissertation and Theses*, 252.

Erikson, E. H. (1994). *Identity and the life.* New York: WW Norton & Company.

Fabiano, P., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health, 52*(3), 105-111.

Ferguson, A. A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of Black masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1997). Men and psychotherapy: An investigation of alexithymia, intimacy, and masculine gender roles. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 34*(2), 160-170.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Allen Lane.

Gerschick, T. & Miller, A. (1995). Coming to terms: Masculinity and physical disability. In D. Sabo & D. Gordon (Eds.), *Men's health and illness: Gender, power, and the body.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gerschick, T. (2011). Disability identity intersections with masculinities. In J. Laker, & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 130-144). New York: Routledge.

Glazer, N. (2007). The "crits" capture presidential power. *Education Next, 7*(1), 82-83.

Good, G. E., Dell, D. M., & Mintz, L. B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*(3), 295-300.

Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Stevens, M., & Bartels, K. M. (1996). The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75*(1), 44-49.

Goodman, D. (2001). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people from privileged groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gurin, P. (1999). Selections from the compelling need for diversity in higher education, expert reports in defense of the University of Michigan: Expert report of Patricia Gurin. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 32*(2), 37–62.

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 330.

Hardiman, R., Jackson, B., & Griffin, P. (2007). Conceptual foundations for social justice education. In Adams, et. al., (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice*, (2nd ed., pp.35-65). New York: Routledge.

Harper, S.R., Harris III, F. (2010) *College men and masculinities: Theory, research, and implications for practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

Harper, S. R., Harris III, F., & Mmeje, K. (2005). A theoretical model to explain the overrepresentation of college men among campus judicial offenders: Implications for campus administrators. *NASPA Journal, 42*(4), 565-588.

Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (Eds.). (2009). *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations*. New York: Routledge.

Harris, F. I., & Harper, S. R. (2008). Masculinities go to community college: Understanding male identity socialization and gender role conflict. *New Directions for Community Colleges [H.W.Wilson - EDUC], 142*, 25.

Harris, F. I. (2006). *The meanings college men make of masculinities and contextual influences on behaviors, outcomes, and gendered environmental norms: A grounded theory study.* (Order No. 3237744, University of Southern California). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.*

Harris, F. I., & Lester, J. (2009). Gender-specific approaches to enhancing identity development among undergraduate women and men. In S. R. Harper, & S. J. Quaye (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations* (pp. 99-116). New York: Routledge.

Heisse, L. L. (1997). Violence, sexuality and women's lives. In R. N. Lancaster, & M. di Leonardo (Eds.), *The gendered/sexuality reader: Culture, history, political economy*. New York and London: Routledge.

Hill Collins, P. (2013) Toward a new vision: Race, class and gender. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, C. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, & X. Zuniga (Eds.), Readings for diversity and social justice (3rd Ed., pp. 606-612). New York: Routledge.

Hoff Summers, C. (2013, September 13). How to make school better for boys. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com

Hong, L. (2000). Toward a transformed approach to prevention: Breaking the link between masculinity and violence. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(6), 269.

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress*. New York: Routledge.

Hooks, B. (2004). *We real cool: Black men and masculinity* Theatre Arts Books.

Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Being (dis) engaged in educationally purposeful activities: The influences of student and institutional characteristics. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(5), 555-575.

Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2003). Diversity experiences and college student learning and personal development. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(3), 320.

Hurtado, S. (1996). How diversity affects teaching and learning. *Educational Record, 77*(4), 27.

Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*(3), 595-610. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00422.x

Hurtado, S., Engberg, M. E., Ponjuan, L., & Landreman, L. (2002). Students' precollege preparation for participation in a diverse democracy. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(2), 163-186.

Jones, Susan R.,, Torres, Vasti,, Arminio,Jan L.,. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education : Fundamental elements and issues*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.

Kassing, L. R., Beesley, D., & Frey, L. L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, and education as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27*(4), 311.

Kaufman, C. (2003). *Ideas for action: Relevant theory for radical change*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The mentors in violence prevention project. *Harvard Educational Review [H.W.Wilson - EDUC], 65*, 163.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Kellom, G. E. (2004). *Developing effective programs and services for college men.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kimmel, M. S. (2001)

Kimmel, M. S. (2004a). Clarence, William, Iron Mike, Tailhook, Senator Packwood, Spur Posse, Magic...and us: A second look. In M. S. Kimmel, & M. A. Messner (Eds.), Men's lives (6th ed., pp. 565-579). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kimmel, M.S. (2004b). Introduction. In G. E. Kellom (Ed.), *Developing effective programs and services for college men* (). Thousand Oaks, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kimmel, M. S. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York: Harper.

Kimmel, M. S. (2013). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame and silence in the construction of gender identity. In, Adams, et al (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice*, 3rd edition (pp. 329-334). New York: Routledge.

Kimmel, M., & Davis, T. (2011). Mapping guyland in college. In J. Laker, & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 3-15). New York: Routledge.

Kinzie, J., Gonyea, R., Kuh, G. D., Umbach, P., Blaich, C., Korkmaz, A. (2007). *The Relationship between Gender and Student Engagement in College.* Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Louisville, KY.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. *Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues,* 31-53.

Koss, M., Gidycz, C., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.

Kristof, N. D. (2010, March 27, 2010). The boys have fallen behind. Message posted to http://www.nytimes.com

Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(6), 683-683-706.

Kuh, G.D., & Andreas, R.E. (1991). It's about time: Using qualitative methods in student life studies. *Journal of College Student Development, 32* (5), 135-148.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1).

Lakey, G. (2010). *Facilitating group learning: Strategies for success with diverse adult learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern* (First ed.). New York: Routledge.

Leaper, C., & Friedman, C. K. (2007). The socialization of gender. *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research,* , 561–587.

Levi, A., Chan, K. K., & Pence, D. (2006). Real men do not read labels: The effects of masculinity and involvement on college students' food decisions. *Journal of American College Health [H.W.Wilson - EDUC], 55*(2), 91.

Levin, B. (1993). A dream deferred: The social and legal implications of hate crimes in the 1990s. *Journal of Intergroup Relations,* 20.

Locke, B. D., & Mahalik, J. R. (2005). Examining masculinity norms, problem drinking, and athletic involvement as predictors of sexual aggression in college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(3), 279.

Lorber, J., & Farrell, S. A. (1991). The social construction of gender. *Newbury Park, 5*

Love, B. (2013). Developing a liberatory consciousness. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, C. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, & X. Zuniga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (3rd Ed., pp.601-606). New York: Routledge.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative reserach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maxwell, J.A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (Second ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative reserach: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2008). Social justice research: The power to reveal hidden agendas. *Educational Researcher, 37*(2), 102-104.

Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meth, R. L., & Pasick, R. S. (1990). *Men in therapy: The challenge of change.* New York: Guilford Press.

Milem, J. F. (2003). The influence of precollege factors on students' predispositions regarding diversity activities in college. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(5), 611.

Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. L. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective* Association American Colleges and Universities.

Milem, J., Umbach, P., & Liang, C. (2004). Exploring the perpetuation hypothesis: The role of colleges and universities in desegregating society. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(6), 688-688-700.

Miller, H. M. (2007). Education research in the public interest: Social justice, action, and policy. *Choice: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries, 44*(6), 1030-1030.

Miller, K. E. (2008). Wired: Energy drinks, jock identity, masculine norms, and risk taking. *Journal of American College Health, 56*(5), 481.

Moll, L. C. (1992). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* Cambridge University Press

O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel & Guidance Journal, 60*(4), 203-210.

O'Neil, J. M. (1982). Gender role conflict and strain in men's lives: Implications for psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human service providers. *Men in Transition: Changing Male Roles, Theory, and Therapy,* , 5–44.

O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the gender role conflict scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist,36*(3), 358.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*(5), 335-350.

Nagda, B. A. (2007). Intergroup dialogue: A critical-dialogic approach to learning about difference, inequality, and social justice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2007*(111), 35-45.

Pascarella, E. T., & Edison, M. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 174-195.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peralta, R. L. (2007). College alcohol use and the embodiment of hegemonic masculinity among european american men. *Sex Roles, 56*(11-12), 741.

Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Pfeil, F. (1995). *White guys: Studies in postmodern domination and difference*. London: Verso Books.

Pierce, C., & Richardson, J. W. (2006). Education research in the public interest: Social justice, action, and policy. *Encounter, 19*(4), 53-56.

Pike, G. R. (2009). The differential effects of on- and off-campus living arrangements on students' openness to diversity. *NASPA Journal (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.),46*(4), 629-645.

Pollack, W. S. (1999). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood* Owl Books.

Pope, R. L., Mueller, J. A., & Reynolds, A. L. (2009). Looking back and moving forward: Future directions for diversity research in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(6), 640-640-658.

Pope, R. L., Reynolds, A. L., & Mueller, J. A. (2004). *Multicultural competence in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reeser, T. (2010). Masculinities in theory. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Robinson, S. (2002) Pedagogy of the opaque: Teaching masculinity. In J. Gardiner (Ed.), Masculinity studies and feminist theory (pp. 141-160). New York: Columbia University Press.

Ryan, C.L. & Siebens, J. (2012). Educational Attainment in the United States: 2009. (Report No. P20-566). Retrieved from United States Census Bureau website at http://census.gov/prod/2012/pubs/p20-566.pdf

Sabo, D. (1998). Pigskin, patriarchy, and pain. *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study,* , 325-328.

Saenz, V. B., Ngai, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors influencing positive interactions across race for african american, asian american, latino, and white college students. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(1), 1-38. doi:10.1007/s11162-006-9026-3.

Sax, L. J., & Arms, E. (2006). The gender gap: Convergence or divergence over the college years? *American Educational Research Association,* San Francisco, CA.

Sax, L. J. (2008). The gender gap in college: Maximizing the developmental potential of women and men.

Schy, S. (2010, January 27, 2010). Super bowl ads cost big bucks, deliver huge audience. *Voice of America News.*

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in educatino and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sharpe, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). Gender role, gender-role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(3), 323-330.

Smith, H., Parr, R., Woods, R., Bauer, B., & Abraham, T. (2010). Five years after graduation: Undergraduate cross-group friendships and multicultural curriculum predict current attitudes and activities. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(4), 385.

Smith, R. (2011, October 2, 2011). Saving the lost boys of higher education. Message posted to https://chronicle.com

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? and other conversations about race*. New York: BasicBooks.

Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles, 27*(11), 573-604.

Umbach, P. D., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Student experiences with diversity at liberal arts colleges: Another claim for distinctiveness. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 169-192.

Von Drehle, D. (2007, July 26, 2007). The myth about boys. Message posted to http://www.time.com

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In. J. V. Wertsch (Ed.) *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology*, (pp. 144-188). New York: Sharpe.

Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (May/Jun 2010, May/Jun 2010). WHERE THE GUYS ARE: Males in higher education. *Change, 42*(3), 29-29-35.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1991). Doing gender. In J. Lorber, & S. A. Farrell (Eds.), *The social construction of gender*. London: Sage.

Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on student's openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2, Special Issue: The Social Role of Higher Education), 172-204.

Williams, A. (2010, February 5, 2010). The new math on campus. Message posted to http://www.nytimes.com

Williams, S. F. (2007). "A walking open wound" emo rock and the "crisis" of masculinity in america. In F. Jarman-Ivens (Ed.), *Oh boy! masculinities and popular music.* (1st ed., pp. 145). London: Routledge.

Young, I. M. (2000). Five faces of oppression. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters & X. Zuniga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 35-49). New York: Routledge.