

August 2015

Phallacies: Constructing a Critical Space and Pedagogy for College Men to Engage Across Non-Hegemonic Masculinities

Taj Smith
University of Massachusetts Amherst

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



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Smith, Taj, "Phallacies: Constructing a Critical Space and Pedagogy for College Men to Engage Across Non-Hegemonic Masculinities" (2015). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 406.
<https://doi.org/10.7275/6922316.0> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/406

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.

PHALLACIES:
CONSTRUCTING A CRITICAL SPACE AND PEDAGOGY FOR COLLEGE MEN
TO ENGAGE ACROSS NON-HEGEMONIC MASCULINITIES

A Dissertation Presented

by

TAJ SMITH

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 2015

Education

PHALLACIES:
CONSTRUCTING A CRITICAL SPACE AND PEDAGOGY FOR COLLEGE MEN
TO ENGAGE ACROSS NON-HEGEMONIC MASCULINITIES

A Dissertation Presented

by

TAJ SMITH

Approved as to style and content by:

Bailey W. Jackson, III, Chairperson

Joya Misra, Member

Martha Stassen, Member

Christine B. McCormick, Dean
College of Education

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to all the dreamers and the survivors
The ones like my grandfather who never learned how to read
The ones who valued education but who were told they couldn't achieve
This is for all the African-American men who I had hoped would sit beside me
In predominately White or women heavy classrooms
This is for those of you who didn't give in to hegemonic expectations
And allowed yourself to be masked in liberating inclinations
Lastly, this is to myself who despite starting from the bottom
The lonely nights, and hopeless years
The do-it-yourself mentality and you ended up here?
You admitted you needed help so you listened to supportive peers
This speaks to your dedication
So don't forget that struggle
Respect it, because it keeps you humble

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my family, friends, and Phallacies' former and current members. You all have been so patient and supportive of me on this long journey. To my family, we have lost so much time. While this degree can make you proud and serves as new possibilities for our family lineage, I look forward to spending more family time with you. To my Social Justice Education friends and colleagues, you have been so important in motivating me to finish this work. You have been pushed me to complete this degree over dinner chats, emails, or Facebook messages. A special acknowledge to Dre, Keri, Marjorie, Jen Matos, Nini, Molly, Reese, Chris Hughbanks, and Tyson. You all have been especially crucial in my development as a social justice educator.

To my good friend and co-founder of Phallacies, Tom Schiff. I could have not done this without you literally. Without your vision for Phallacies years ago, we wouldn't have been able to come together to do "God's work." You have been an outstanding friend and also a valuable male role model and mentor. You have been so supportive through this process, even when I was really at the brink of calling it quits. I say with great pride that I love you, man! I also love all of the young men that have come through the Phallacies experience, because without you, this dissertation would not be possible. It was your willingness to dare to be different with Tom and me that made this assessment of the Phallacies program a successful initiative that other colleges have sought to appreciate and replicate. You are all my brothers in struggle, in change, and in liberation!

I would like to thank my chair, Professor Bailey Jackson, for guiding me through the doctoral process. You have been a great academic role model, and I appreciate all of your efforts to keep the Social Justice Education program alive and thriving. Your hardy

laugh and sense of humor has always been appreciated. I wish you well in the next stage of your life as you can enjoy retirement. Thanks for staying committed to seeing me through before you head off into the sunset.

A big shout out to my awesome committee members, Martha Stassen and Joya Misra. Martha, we don't spend much time together, but when we do I enjoy your presence. You bring a nice balance of seriousness and joy to the work. Joya, I am forever grateful for your timeliness in providing me with thoughtful feedback even when you struggled through personal challenges. I admire your commitment to getting students through this grueling process known as doctorate work.

A final acknowledgment to the Social Justice Education program, especially to Ximena Zuniga and Maurianne Adams. Both Ximena and Maurianne have been tremendous supporters of my intellectual and practitioner development. I would not be successful in teaching around 240 undergraduates over the years or in conducting a number of trainings without your mentorship and teachings. Maurianne, like Bailey, I wish you well as you enter retirement officially, though I know you will still be a leading voice in the field of Social Justice Education. Ximena, you are my Chilean aunt, who through our long hours in the IGD office pushing and pulling developed a life-long bond.

ABSTRACT

PHALLACIES: CONSTRUCTING A CRITICAL SPACE AND PEDAGOGY FOR COLLEGE MEN TO ENGAGE ACROSS NON-HEGEMONIC MASCULINITIES

MAY 2015

TAJ SMITH, B.A., RUTGERS UNIVERSITY NEW BRUNSWICK

M.P.S., CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Emeritus Bailey W. Jackson III

Peer groups are one of those critical social organizations within our cycles of socialization that assist in regulating culturally acceptable practices of masculinity (Connell, 2005; Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998; Mac an Ghail, 1994). Men's peer groups are viewed as primary social commitments that should not be broken and maintained through performances of masculinity that are influenced by gendered expectations (Migliaccio, 2009). Unfortunately, the regulation that comes with joining such groups often requires collective and individual oppressive practices that result in some men policing other men's attitudes and behaviors (Flood, 2007).

As a response to Harris and Barone's (2011) call for next steps in developing programs and services for men, this study introduces Phallacies, a peer theater and dialogue program for traditional-aged college men, a program that challenges male-identified participants to think critically of how they and collegiate male peers outside of this space limit their self-definition and expression of masculinity. I am one of the co-founders and co-directors of Phallacies. Using an action research methodology, I assess my own practice to 1) identify areas of improvement for the program and 2) determine

how this all-male space encourages men to think about gender and helps to combat some “men’s adherence to unproductive masculine conceptions such as sexism, homophobia, violence and anti-intellectualism which are often requisites for their access to male peer groups” (Harper & Harris, 2010, p. 70). Data were gathered and triangulated through semi-structured interviews of 14 current and former Phallacies participants, pre-post surveys of 8 current Phallacies participants, and a survey of 17 control group college men.

Findings from this study confirm the existing research that suggests the powerful influence of peer groups in the constructing hegemonic masculinity attitudes and behaviors on a college campus needs to be challenge by dialogic facilitated peer group spaces. The end result is that Phallacies empowers young men to challenge the hegemonic masculinity discourse at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, by re-constructing a sense of gender identity that is their own through dialogue, interactive activities, reflective writing, and becoming change agents through their role as peer theater educators.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background of Study	1
Statement of Purpose	8
Significance of the Study	8
Research Questions.....	8
Organization of the Dissertation	9
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	10
College Peer Group's Discourses of Masculinity	10
Culture of Entitlement.....	11
Fear of Femininity/Being Gay.....	12
Hyper-masculine Performance	16
Alcohol Consumption1	16
Competition.....	17
Violence	18
Culture of Silence and Protection	20
Resisting the Dominant Discourses	21
Critical Pedagogies: Developing Critical Men and Diverse Masculinities	27
The Four Pedagogies.....	30
Feminist Pedagogy.....	33
Critical Masculinities	35
Social Justice.....	39
Intergroup Dialogue.....	43
Five Core Pedagogical Principles for College Men's Programming.....	47

	Recognizing Men as Gendered Beings	47
	Male-identified Students Only	48
	Men Modeling Alternative Masculinities	49
	Dialogic Interaction	50
	Encouraging Self-change and Social Justice Allyship.....	51
3	METHODS	54
	Methodology	55
	Site Selection	56
	Participant Selection	57
	Data Collection Methods	61
	Surveys.....	62
	Interviews.....	64
	Data Management and Analysis	65
	Trustworthiness and Threats to Validity.....	67
4	DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES BETWEEN CONTROL GROUP AND PHALLACIES	71
	Defining a UMass Hegemonic Man	73
	Comfort Discussing Masculinity	77
	Encouraging Social Change and Being Allyship.....	84
5	CHALLENGING THE FALLACIES WITH PHALLACIES.....	99
	Building Confidence	99
	Discovering a Safe and Dialogic Peer Counter Space	101
	Unmasking: Seeing Selves as Gendered Beings.....	104
	Adding to the Shift I: Assignments and Interactive Activities	107
	Adding to the Shift II: Modeling Alternative Masculinities	111
	Life After Phallacies	116
6	DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	119
	Introduction.....	119
	Research Questions	119
	Re- or Un-defining Masculinity.....	120
	Pedagogical Principles' Influence in Challenging Hegemonic Masculine Discourse.....	122
	Improving Phallacies	127
	Implications for Student Affairs Future Research on Men-centered Programming.....	129

APPENDICES

A	EMAIL FOR INVITING PARTICIPANTS TO INTERVIEW	133
B	DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE (For Phallacies Members Past and Present)	134
C	INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Interviews).....	136
D	INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Pre-Post Semester Survey).....	138
E	INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Control Group Survey).....	140
F	PRE-POST SURVEY (Phallacies Participants)	142
G	COLLEGE MASCULINITY SURVEY (For Control Group)	145
H	INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	147
	REFERENCES	148

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Overview of Four Critical Pedagogies.....	31
2 Current and Former Phallacies Participants.....	59
3 Control Group Members	61
4 Assignments and Interactive Activities	108

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of Study

Astin (1977, 1991) and others (P. Kaufman & Feldman, 2004; Pascarella, 1985; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) have long asked the questions, how does college impact or not impact students' personal, social, and vocational development/change? Astin (1993) points out that there is very little known about *how* college students are influenced by peer groups and *what* kind of developmental processes college student peer groups impact. Yet, it is clear that peers or other people with whom we are close help to influence who we are and how we behave and think. Research by Marcia (1980), Chickering and Reisser (1993) and Josselson (1996) on college identity development serves as the basis to understanding this developmental process of college men as being in a crisis of adolescence.

College men bring with them this crisis of trying to figure out their identity as men. Men with different personalities, experiences, and social identities have long felt like they did not fit into the "man box," yet they also felt compelled to attempt to adhere to that limiting structure. Reeser (2010) refers to such masculine identified men as being in disguise. Effeminate, queer heterosexual, gay, bisexual, transsexual/gender men, and racialized men would be included in this group. Kimmel and Messner (2001) explain that without an intersectional analysis "we risk collapsing masculinities into one hegemonic version" (p. xvi).

Hegemonic masculinity refers to a currently culturally accepted type of masculinity that claims and sustains a leading or dominant position in social life

(Connell, 2005). Thus, masculinity as a relationship of negotiation between different kinds of self and socially identified men is an ongoing and contextual process that bears witness to multiple representations of masculinity fighting to be heard, understood, and valued. Men's identity and experience are not limited to being in opposition with women. They are also engaged in an ongoing negotiation with other men about how to be their own man while wanting to identify with other men.

Reeser (2010) states,

It is not simply that I as an individual go about making meaning of the male body on my own, but various discursive formulations around me also make that meaning for me... [and] have a particular influence on that cultural influence. (p. 75)

It is through external and internal dialogue (or a group and individual phenomenon) within which we need to re-examine our definitions of masculinity, so that we can allow the male body and our individual selves to be less influenced by socially limiting discourses. I choose the word "less" to point out that I do not mean to communicate that identifying with a group of like-minded people is inherently problematic and that we all just need to view ourselves as individuals. Yet, we must make room for more diversity among men, who can all fit under a more inclusive definition of masculinity that seeks to expand rather than to confine to hegemony.

Peer groups are one of those critical social organizations within our cycles of socialization that assist in regulating culturally acceptable practices of masculinity (Connell, 2005; Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998; Mac an Ghail, 1994). Men's peer groups are viewed as primary social commitments that should not be broken and maintained through performances of masculinity that are influenced by gendered expectations (Migliaccio, 2009). Unfortunately, the regulation that comes with joining such groups often requires

collective and individual oppressive practices that result in some men policing other men's attitudes and behaviors (Flood, 2007). Some men intentionally join peer groups to help themselves to feel a sense of belonging and practice the hegemonic masculinities, while others unintentionally pick up those practices by being in close proximity. Even within one peer group, the men who adhere to or chase after this hegemonic ideology of masculinity are rewarded with in-group favoritism (Sherriff, 2007).

Colleges can and should serve as a space for students to think critically about their gender identity, performance, and expression in spite of the hegemonic lessons socially constructed within and outside of peer groups. We know from the work of O'Neil (1981), O'Neil, Helms, Gable, Davis, and Wrightsman (1986), Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995), Blazina and Watkins (1996), and Davis (2010) that college men do think about their masculinity but are engaged in a gender role conflict in which they largely fear being perceived as less of a man or more like a woman.

In Kimmel's *Guyland* (2008), he discovered, after interviewing 16-26 year olds, that young men today continue to feel compelled to "try on" a masculinity that is not their own. Kimmel goes on to suggest that in order to challenge the hegemony of *Guyland* we must challenge the collusion and provide alternatives within the culture of manhood. While the research on understanding the development of college masculinity is picking up steam, there is still little research being done on ways to challenge the culture, the very discourse that keeps young men in a gender role conflict and unable to develop a masculinity that is healthy and true to one's self identity. Our attention needs to focus on space and pedagogy as tools for empowering young men to diverge from hegemonic definitions and performances of masculinity.

In 1997, Kimmel argued for more visibility of men in the curriculum. He mentioned that while it has been accepted at the academic level that gender, like race and class, are a part of an individual's identity, scholarship and curriculum on understanding men's experiences are insufficient or non-existing. These men are represented but only as "public" individuals who exist without the need to reflect on how gender influences their attitudes and behaviors (Kimmel, 1997). Unfortunately, 16 years later we have not come very far. While there are certainly more conversations taking place in fields, such as Sociology, Women, Gender and Sexualities Studies, the field of Higher Education and specifically student affairs still we seem to lag behind. Higher education scholars, Davis (2002), suggested 7 years after Kimmel's findings that "college men seldom considered how or what they have learned about becoming a man" (p. xi). Harper and Harris (2010) critiqued student affairs journals that claimed to be about gender but actually focused on studies of women or gender differences between men and women. In 2011, Laker calls out Student Affairs when he says, "The field must concede an inability to address male student [identity] development, or it must confront a vacuum in the knowledge about male identity development. Neither the graduate preparation programs nor the workplace professionals are filling this knowledge gap" (p. 68).

It is evident that the call for more thinking around college men's development is needed and has been answered by some recently. Harris and Barone (2011) remain hopeful that we are heading in the right direction as more spaces are being developed to discuss this gap in the field. They found in their research that,

increasingly more programs with "men" or "male" in the titles have been observed at the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) conferences. Men and masculinities courses are more common on campuses, and programming around

“men’s issues,” is no longer aberrant. Discussions encouraging the establishment of “Men’s Centers” are also increasingly common. (p. 54)

In a special issue of *The Journal of College and University Student Housing: Promoting Learning and Development with College Men* (Vol. 39, #1), many masculinities scholars and student affairs professionals advocated for non-disciplinary spaces in residential buildings. It was argued that promising practices within housing are: living-learning programs (LLPs), and process/psychoeducational groups (Scott, Livingston, Havice, & Cawthon, 2012). It is unclear how many LLPs or psychoeducational groups have been specifically created for men’s identity development, but residential life professionals have seen positive outcomes when using it for other issues, not specifically related to masculinity.

One study makes the claim that “Living-learning communities (LLCs) provided men with a safe haven from rigid gender role expectations, offered a plethora of involvement opportunities, and fostered relationships with faculty and peers” (Jessup-Anger, Johnson, & Wawrzynski, 2012, p. 168). Unfortunately, the research is limited in its data collection methods, as it did not explicitly focus on capturing data on men’s meaning-making of masculinity. This assertion is based on anecdotes. At the University of St. Thomas, Klobassa (2009) put together a men’s development program, Masculinity Dialogues. This program takes place in the first-year, all-male residence hall, and he found that through training the undergraduate residential advisors to facilitate conversations that “put gender on men’s radar screens, and challenge them to think critically about the advantages, and disadvantages of being male” (p. 4). Based on the limited research, it seems the facilitators also reflected on their masculinity, some for the first time.

Another space that shows promise is The Center for the Study of Masculinities and Men's Development, which is located on the campus of Western Illinois University. The center aims to provide quality scholarship, advocacy, and programming that positively influence college men's development in a manner congruent with gender equity and social justice (Davis & Harper, 2012). It serves as a physical and virtual space, as its blog allows for people to discuss issues pertaining to men. Both LLPs and men's centers are ideal spaces for young men to be introduced to peer group settings that challenge the dominant discourse of masculinity on their campus rather than feeling like they have to collude with peer groups that promote hegemony. Despite this growth in new programming, I am left wondering why it has taken the field this long to think about programming geared toward challenging hegemonic masculinity on campus? What is the guiding framework that influenced student affairs professionals not to seek out this approach earlier?

Laker (2003), Capraro (2004), and Harris and Barone (2011) suggest that educators and student affairs professionals must look in the mirror and stop adhering to hegemonic masculinity and believing that "boys will be boys" or that they are "bad dogs" as Laker coined. This traditional approach or "crisis" as Kimmel (1994/2002) calls it is incomplete, narrow, and disempowering for grasping the complexities of masculinity that young men face on or off campus. This complexity can be further explained by M Kaufman (1994), when he talks about men's contradictory experience with power:

There is, in the lives of men, a strange combination of power, privilege, pain and powerlessness. Men enjoy social power, many forms of privilege, and a sense of often-unconscious entitlement by virtue of being male. But the way we have set up that world of power causes immense pain, isolation, and alienation not only for women, but also for men. This is not to equate men's pain with the systemic and systematic forms of women's oppression...An understanding of men's

contradictory experiences of power, enables us when possible, to reach out to men with compassion, even as we are highly critical of particular actions and beliefs, even as we challenge the dominant forms of masculinity. This concept can be one vehicle to understand how good human beings can do horrible things, and how some beautiful baby boys can turn into horrible adults. And it can help us understand how the majority of men can be reached with a message of change. (p. 59-60)

We, as student affairs professionals, must move from an exclusive biological and socio-political understanding of masculinity that downplays college men's complex identity development and relationship with power, privilege, and pain. Wagner (2011) argues that this is easier said than done based on conversations and conference sessions she has been a part of, in which people often "react uncomfortably when she has spoken sympathetically about men" (p. 210).

Adopting M. Kaufman's demand for a paradigm shift can promote new approaches for working with college men on campus that will provide opportunities for men to be listened to, challenged, and supported (Laker, 2003). Getting these young men to explore the reasons that they might engage in behaviors that are hegemonic and problematic, such as binge drinking, misogyny, homophobia, violence, disengagement in student activities/positions of leadership, and overrepresentation in the judicial system, is crucial to supporting them to embrace an identity that goes against the dominant discourse on campus. We know that identity is influenced by outside forces, and so by addressing these negative aspects of hegemonic masculinity, we can encourage men to develop a better sense of self, healthier masculinities, and take a more pro-active approach to challenging the culture of binge drinking and sexual assaults on many campuses (Courtenay, 1998; Harper, Harris, & Mmeje, 2005; Hong, 2000; Ludeman, 2011; Sax, 2008).

Statement of Purpose

This study introduces Phallacies, a peer theater and dialogue program for traditional-aged college men, as a program that challenges male-identified participants to think critically of how they and collegiate male peers outside of this space limit their self-definition and expression of masculinity. I am one of the co-founders and co-directors of Phallacies. Using an action research methodology, I will assess my own practice 1) to identify areas of improvement for the program and 2) to determine how this all-male space encourages men to think about gender and helps to combat some “men’s adherence to unproductive masculine conceptions such as sexism, homophobia, violence and anti-intellectualism which are often requisites for their access to male peer groups” (Harper & Harris, 2008).

Significance of the Study

I plan to respond to Harris and Barone’s (2011) call for next steps in developing programs and services for men. They ask us: How successful are existing programs in challenging hegemonic masculinity on campus? By assessing Phallacies, a men’s health peer theater and dialogue program, I will contribute to this field of knowledge and offer a model of how to conduct assessment research of programs geared to challenge peer hegemonic masculine discourse.

Research Questions

The specific research questions to be explored are:

- How do participants define the hegemonic masculinity discourse at UMassAmherst?

- How comfortable are men discussing masculinity in college peer group settings?
- In what specific ways were the male students able to re-define their masculinity as a result of being in this program?
- How successful is the Phallacies program in encouraging participants to challenge hegemonic masculinity on campus?
- What pedagogical principles (i.e., dialogic interaction, men's-only space, men modeling alternative masculinities, encourage systemic change and allyship, and seeing selves as gendered being) contribute to a participant's self-reflection, and/or re-definition of masculinity?
- What aspects of the curriculum (i.e., readings, assignments, in-class activities) contribute to a desire to critique hegemonic masculinity on campus?

Organization of the Dissertation

The following chapter provides a literature review about college male identity development theory and the peer group discourse of masculinity. In Chapter 3, I present the methodological approaches I use to analyze this study. In Chapter 4, I present key findings about the specific peer group discourse of masculinity at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and Chapter 5 provides the ways in which Phallacies encourages the participants to challenge the dominant discourse and a new sense of masculinity. Chapters 6 provide an in-depth discussion, analysis of the key findings, and recommendations for future research and practice.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

College Peer Group's Discourses of Masculinity

The pre-college external pressures of male peer groups unfortunately do not simply get left behind for most college men. As an institution, college can and does reinforce the learned performances of hegemonic masculinity(ies) by allowing the dominant cultural discourses to operate without challenging them and providing alternative models. Expanding upon their K-12 experience, college men continue to negotiate their masculinity in what Kimmel (2008) refers to as Guyland.

Kimmel (2008) describes Guyland as “a place in which young men live. It is both a stage of life, a liminal undefined time span between adolescence and adulthood. It’s a place where guys gather to be guys with each other” (p. 4). While I disagree with the assumption that young men will grow out of this stage simply due to their entrance into adulthood, I do agree that there are discourses that pass through these hegemonic living quarters to every young man that enters college. The Guy Code, as Kimmel refers to it, functions based on three discourses or cultures: culture of entitlement, culture of silence, and culture of protection. In addition, I would argue that discourses of homophobia/misogyny and hypermasculinity also exist.

Through the interaction with the aforementioned discourses that shape peer culture, college men establish peer groups that produce and reproduce particular masculinities on campus. When these practices go unchallenged, we provide college men with a pass and miss out on the opportunity to understand how gender expectations of masculinity influences the campus issues, such as binge drinking, violence against

women, and violations of campus code of student conduct. In the next several sections, I discuss each of these cultures and how they play out for men in college. While most of the research tends to focus on what men do in men spaces, I would argue that multi-gendered peer group settings can also replicate hegemonic attitudes and behavior.

Culture of Entitlement

Within this culture, college men have little capacity for empathy or compassion and carry around a strong sense of male superiority (Kimmel, 2008). On the surface, this culture of entitlement unifies groups of men within a “bros before hos” or men before women mantra; yet, the sense of superiority in which some hope to find within male peer groups is unstable and not accessible to all men. Nevertheless, in theory, male-to-male relations are given primacy over all other types of relations. Men are expected to collude with one another to ensure as a social group that they do not lose their power and privilege. The choice to display or perform the discourse of entitlement requires that men showcase to other men, women, and non-gender conforming people on campus that they are “real” men.

The entrance into the male entitlement club often gets negotiated through joking. Lyman (1987) said, “Male bonding frequently takes the form of a group joking relationship by which men create a serial kind of intimacy to ‘negotiate’ the latent tension and aggression they feel toward each other” (p. 148). Lyman goes on to say that such humor or joking often comes at the expense of women and other racial groups. The jokes directed at women are often presented in a sexual aggressive manner to place emphasis on the power-based relationship between heterosexual men and women. This is where the

concept of “bros before ho’s” (Kimmel, 2008) becomes so important. Not only are the men who abide by this “code” aligning themselves with men’s power over women, but they are also clearly stating the terms of the relationship in which men are superior to women who are viewed as second class hyper-sexualized citizens.

According to Harris (2008), this misogyny also gets framed as “passing the time” in their peer groups (p. 466). These men passed the time by objectifying women and sharing sexual conquest stories not only because they might feel it is fun but that it is normal behavior of Guyland. The sharing of sexual encounters was often a marker for these men to achieve status in their male groups, especially depending on the number of women he realistically or mythically had sex with. One participant said,

Here’s a good story. One time, literally, like four of us were all just going through people in Facebook and running them down, like head to toe, and say, “Well, you know, I don’t like her face. Her forehead is too big; her hair is nappy or whatever. She’s got some big tits, she’s got a big ass, she’s got a small ass, small tits.”
(Harris, 2008, p. 466)

Through this storytelling, these four young men are not only objectifying women’s bodies, they are simultaneously constructing their masculinity through a shared ritual in which each individual is faced with proving his allegiance to one of the major dominant masculinity discourse: compulsory or assumed heterosexuality.

Fear of Femininity/Being Gay

Some men, often heterosexual men, tend to define their manhood by devaluing women and gay men’s performance of gender due to the hegemonic masculine ideology fearing all things stereotypically defined as feminine. The work of O’Neil et al. (1986) highlights the role that femininity plays in how college men think of themselves. To be

feminine is not to be masculine. O'Neil et al. suggest that these men have been socialized to fear femininity. This fear of femininity is a result of their internal inability to adhere to the hegemonic masculine standards that would gain them in-group status within peer groups. The internal inability reflects the reality of some men being in a state of conflict and what O'Neil et al call a gender role conflict. This conflict is outwardly displayed by some men by not participating in academic or cultural student organizations and refusing to pass up an opportunity to drink and/or party because these activities are seen as being feminine (Harper et al., 2005). The discourse of hegemony is so strong that this fear of being less of a "man" brings in women and femininity as bystanding causalities of this negotiation between men. By that I mean, women and the socially prescribed feminine characteristics are used to question a man's masculinity while maintaining women's second class gendered place. Indeed, some women are not complete bystanders in this negotiation process because they too have been socialized to expect men to be "masculine" in the hegemonic sense and thus in cross-gendered peer groups could insist on the performance of hegemonic masculinity.

Davis' (2010) work found that the fear of femininity was a huge factor in college men curbing their preferred behavior. Not only are men who do not fit the standards viewed as being feminine, they also have their sexual orientation questioned. Gender and sexuality are seen to merge, in that gender performance determines sexual desires, which we know to be not true of all people. Men with stereotypical "gay or feminine traits" become examples of how not to be a man. Davis found that openness to talking, wearing lots of cologne, and clothing choices often led to this assertion. This was also exemplified in Kimmel's (1994/2002), *Sociology of Men and Masculinities* course, in which a student

said the following on the first day of Spring, “I had this really nice pair of new Madras shorts. But then I thought to myself, these shorts have lavender and pink in them. Today’s class topic is homophobia. Maybe today is not the best day to wear these shorts” (p. 105). We can see that this student was having an internal dialogue grappling with his early childhood/adolescent messages of purple and pink equaling being gay, which is perceived as undesirable. This male student remains compelled to perform the dominant discourse of both peer and systemic cultural pressure, given priority over his desire to wear a nice piece of clothing and to be comfortable in the temperature.

The cultural pressure that the young man faced above is not exclusive to college. Pascoe’s (2007), *Dude You’re A Fag*, provides us with a bird’s eye view of how the “fag” discourse (or its variations of “No Homo,” “That’s So Gay”) takes place in high school. The fag discourse is embedded into the adolescent development of young men, women, and gender non-conforming people. However, among young men, the fag discourse disciplines the minds, bodies, and souls of any male-bodied person to note how they have failed at achieving masculinity.

Harris (2008) informs us that while these hegemonic discourses exist on college campuses, there are a range of responses by college men about having a gay friend that included acceptance, discomfort, and intolerance. The peer groups of student athletes and fraternity members in his study expressed the most intense homophobia. One of them said, “I’d be really surprised if [a male student athlete] would really have the audacity to come out or have the courage to do that. I think a lot of people would be offended and uncomfortable” (p. 468). In this case, you can see that the peer group discourse

influences the student's answer. It has been communicated that in a student athlete peer group to be gay or perceived to be gay is seen as unacceptable.

The fear of being gay, and therefore feminine, also influences seating patterns and conversation topics. Despite a desire to be among men, some men have quite a challenge with opening up about their feelings with other men in a peer group setting (Davis, 2010). Davis argues that if men are not in a group setting with other men and have the opportunity to have a one-on-one conversation with a good friend then they are more likely to be more open about their true feelings. Seating patterns are also masculinized in that some men refuse to sit face-to-face to express their intimacy and innermost feelings with other men (Davis, 2010). In this regard, some men look to women and femininity to provide this role. Side-by-side sitting is the preferred masculine means of in-person communication. I am not arguing that all men should face each other when speaking about personal feelings but simply to note that it is hegemonic masculinity that influences this conscious and unconscious behavior rather than preference or the circumstances of the space. If there is seating side-by-side, generally men have to be doing some type of activity (i.e., playing video games, building something) to maintain the appropriate spacial intimacy (Davis, 2010).

This fear of gay men's femininity and advances as well as fear of failing to be a man shows the instability of masculinity. The fact that a group of men would feel threatened by one man who displays his masculinity in a different way is interesting to say the least. If one has to fear something like another person's gender performance, then it must be true that such a fearful person is not comfortable in his own performance of his gender identity. Socially constructed feminine traits that often get used to devalue gay

men's expression of masculinity also force heterosexual men who attempt to live up to the unattainable standards of hegemony to realize their definition of gender is much more complex than they first understood it to be. It may provide some with a mirror on how they might have wanted to perform their gender for years, however, they colluded with their imposed cycle of socialization rather than constructing their own.

Hyper-masculine Performance

In response to avoiding or dealing with the fear of being linked to women and gay men, some college men take on a hyper-masculine gender performance. Harris (2008) finds the hyper-masculine performance to be the default and unconscious way of expressing one's masculinity. This is done in spite of some college men verbally preferring espoused masculinity: portraying good character, respect, integrity, and taking care of responsibilities (Harris, 2008). A few of Harris' participants had expressed that they embrace espoused masculinity because being a man is to accept responsibility for your own faults, to have integrity, and to admit when you are wrong as well as standing up for what is right (Harris, 2008). However, when probed about their daily performance of masculinity, these men showed the complexity or contradictions of theory and practice. In the following paragraphs, three main representations of hyper-masculinity are discussed: alcohol consumption, competition, and violence.

Alcohol Consumption

Alcohol consumption probably puts the "hyper" in hyper-masculinity. College men drink in groups not only to be social but because drinking alcohol is what college

men “do.” It is the ultimate rite of passage for a college man to measure his bond with college masculine norms almost every college weekend (Harris, 2008; Kimmel, 2008). Through this peer group activity, young men are making sometimes life-threatening choices to obtain acceptance and to enact male privilege and dominance. Kimmel says, “Beneath the surface of all that ‘fun’ is chronic insecurity, a desperate need for validation, and the sometimes sadistic cruelty with which that validation is withheld and then conferred” (p. 97). There is a belief that heavy consumptions of alcohol serve as a source of power for men. Through this avenue, men who may not live up to collegiate gendered expectations on a daily basis can acquire hegemonic masculine attributes of being strong and assertive (Capraro, 2000). After “drinking up” these characteristics and getting validated by their peers, albeit fragilely, these young men have lived up to one part of dominant masculinity.

Competition

Competition for college men serves as a developmental process in which they negotiate their relation to the dominant masculinity on campus. One of Harris’ participants describes the role that competitive culture has on his sense of masculinity.

When you have to sit down and take a test and be like, I’m counting on doing better than these guys so I’ll get a better grade and do well in life, this is like what I have to do to be a success in life. It’s not like a joke. It’s not a game of horse that you’re playing outside. This is for real. That’s the competitive nature of [the institution]. I think that spills over into a lot of other things and you kind of want to compete with people. (Harris & Edwards, 2010, p. 49-50).

The competition that exists within the college culture and within this male college student’s mind encourages him simply not to worry about his own grade but to keep in mind how other men might be doing. This male student is always in negotiation with the

male peer group, even if they are not physically in his presence or a part of his circle of male friends. Hegemony requires those who live under it to be in a constant state of competition in order to climb the hierarchical ladder. In college, men do not just compete over doing better than the next man, but in some academic cases, they compete to see who can do the poorest. Other college men compete by hosting the best parties, hooking up with lots of women, consuming the most alcohol, or who can be the most destructive (Harris, 2008; Harris & Edwards, 2010). Of course, college male athletes or men who play in intramural sports are stuck in a web of competition because it is not only a part of their job but also it is built into their pursuit of masculinity. Hyper-masculine sports in the US, like football, basketball, wrestling or hockey, create a type of competition in men that when they win a game, they have won both their status of masculinity and the game. If they lose a game that status is taken away in a heartbeat again showing the instability of hegemonic masculinity.

Violence

Violence and masculinity are expected to go together like bricks to a building. Boys grow up untrusting of other men, and as they get older, violence becomes a more accessible and accepted means of obtaining masculine status. Much like all of the aforementioned discourses of masculinity among college peer groups, discourse of violent masculinity happens before they attend college. K-12 school violence has long been a problem among all students, but especially for male students. In the context of masculinity, peer groups discipline the boundaries of hegemonic masculinity by using violent tactics, such as bullying, hazing, or fighting to guard against “attacks” on one’s

masculinity. Stoudt (2006) argues that boys are more likely to discipline masculine boundaries rather than living within them. Based on Stoudt's findings, it is important to note that some boys have negotiated that it is easier to discipline other's masculinity via violence than it is to expose one's inability or lack of desire to embrace dominant masculinities.

In college, the teasing and bullying continues, but violent masculinity is often a result of the competitive drinking games in which a young man may be using the consumption of alcohol to feel and be perceived as more manly, and as a result may access other masculine characteristics to gain even more status. Indeed, it can work the other way too, and another man who may have had his masculinity questioned can use violence as a means to acquire its temporary benefits of presenting one's self as strong and not to be messed with. Using violence against other men is not the only way to obtain hegemonic notions of masculinity. Women have been the victims of sexual assaults on campus for too many years. The discourse about college women painted by college men are that women are unworthy of human dignity, viewed as subordinate and as sexual objects (Rhoads, 2010). While it is often noted that fraternities are the biggest perpetrators of sexual assault, indeed, there are many men outside of them that engage in this criminal gendered act (Rhoads, 2010).

However, through my reading, observations and discussions, many college men do not see it as a criminal act but as a misinterpretation of a ritual of conquest that empowers heterosexual college men to feel they are or have become a man. Sandy's (1990) work describes how this takes place in some fraternity groups as their pledges adopt values and attitudes that encourage the oppression of women and promises a sense

of masculinity and superior power. Masculinity as a pledge of violence against women and other men is not only unacceptable behavior but constructs performances of masculinities that are dehumanizing regardless of the social or interpersonal rewards that may come with this identification.

Culture of Silence and Protection

As a silent discourse, college men as a peer group construct a masculinity that not only supports all of the aforementioned discourses but it does so by contradicting key elements of other performances of masculinities. For example, if a culture of silence encourages young men to ignore much of the violence that takes place in Guyland and abroad, then it also is in conflict with the belief that men should be responsible and protectors. Kimmel (2008) argues that it is the fear of other men, the original foundational discourse, that leads to the perpetuation of the various types of problematic performances of masculinity. The fear turns into a culture of silence that encourages men who seek entrance into the men's club to remain silent and not to challenge the hegemony that exist. Of course, their fears are not unwarranted, as their silence represents their own fears of being outcast or marginalized from obtaining culturally accepted notions of masculinity (Kimmel, 2008). Thus, a culture or discourse of protection is also created as a result of being silent. Individual men and boys as describe by Stoudt (2008) seek to protect the sanctity of masculinity by disciplining others and themselves to abide by an unspoken law of protecting hegemonic masculinity by any means necessary. Kimmel points out that this culture of protection is not only displayed by all men but also by women and various social institutions. This larger societal discourse seeks to protect

hegemonic masculinity and the patriarchy that informs it because they too have internalized that masculinity should go unchallenged and should occupy its perceived natural dominant status.

So, how can college serve as a means to deconstruct the discourses of hegemonic masculinity that influences the social organization of male peer groups in particular? How can college men no longer be invested in having power over others, disciplining others, and their own masculinity to fit into hegemonic performances in order to embrace the alternative definitions that reside inside each boy and man?

Resisting the Dominant Discourses

Based on Davis (2010) and Edwards and Jones (2009) research, we know that not every man is comfortable with having to wear a mask or put on the man face of culturally accepted masculinity. These college men go through 3 phases: feeling the need to put on the mask, wearing the mask, and experiencing and recognizing consequences of wearing the mask (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Prior to wearing the mask, these college men are mostly conscious of how they do or do not measure up to expectations of being a man. This often leads to men feeling insecure about who they are, and they make decisions to cover up those “flaws,” which represent their authentic selves.

These men wear the mask of binge drinkers, academic procrastinators, and rule breakers to fit into the dominant discourse on campus. Edwards and Jones (2009) found that until the college men reflected on their behavior they had not been aware that they were contradicting their own values, degrading women, and were not having meaningful relationships with other men. Once some of the college men became aware of the

consequences of their behavior, they were able to begin to resist and transcend the dominant expectations of masculinity.

Those who choose to transcend and reclaim their authentic selves did not do so overnight. Many of the men in the study were now aware of the impact others' expectations of masculine performance had on them, but they also struggle to leave those expectations behind, that is, removing the mask and stepping away from the peer groups is a process. A number of suggestions were offered as things that helped them make a shift in their performance of masculinity(ies): personal motivation to take back their authentic selves, critical events, courses that encourage critical reflection, dialogue and historical information, and having older men model alternative or "well-rounded" concepts of masculinity all of which can be accomplished within a peer group (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harris & Edwards, 2010).

The personal motivation requires the individual man to reflect on their own insecurities and why they feel the need to be something they are not. Some of the critical events that some of the men mentioned were being raped by another man or listening to stories from women raped by a man, being in a meaningful romantic relationship with a woman, and being interviewed for a study (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harris & Edwards, 2010). Experiencing rape as a man whether as a victim or being told about the experience by women close to them seems to create the opportunity for some men to stand up against hegemonic masculinity. Of course, men should not have to rely on these methods, but they did prove to be useful for a few. Other men benefited from being interviewed about their performance of masculinity (Edwards & Jones, 2009, p. 221). According to Edwards and Jones, the interviews forced these men to reflect on their behavior and

resulted in them becoming more accountable as well as getting their friends to do the same.

In the study, other men attribute their resistance and transcendence of hegemonic masculinity(ies) to courses they have taken. One student who took a gender studies course said,

I took this feminist class and realize that I kind of fulfill all the [male] stereotypes [and] the ideology of what is the masculine form in American society. I am muscular, athletic, fairly successful, all these sorts of things I kind of fit the mold ...but that's all a socially constructed thing. I don't think that is necessarily the essential component of being a man. (Harris & Edwards, 2010, p. 55)

It is inspiring to see how a course of this nature can impact a college man to think about his masculine behavior and how that is influenced by external expectations. Once realizing that was the case, he was able to ask questions and rethink his performance.

Role models who practice alternative masculinities, such as Malcolm X, older men in a college man's life, and men of different social backgrounds, also have a similar impact on their desire to resist and transcend (Edwards & Jones, 2009). By learning from these stories of change, the hegemonic masculinities that plague college campuses can be overcome by creating and encouraging alternative critical spaces that develop new discourses that lead men out of Guyland and into spaces where they can be themselves.

Laker (2003), Schiff (2003), Capraro (2004), and Harris and Barone (2011) suggest that educators and student affairs professionals assist in that process by looking into the mirror and stop adhering to hegemonic masculinity and believing that "boys will be boys" or are "bad dogs" as coined by Laker. This traditional approach or "crisis" as Kimmel (1994/2002) calls it is incomplete, narrow, and disempowering for grasping the complexities of masculinity that young men face.

A shift in paradigm of how professional staff and faculty understand gender is needed. We must move from an exclusive biological understanding of masculinity that suggests that attitudes and behaviors are unchangeable or at the very least modifiable by punishment and focus on gender role socialization that promotes the need to view gender as something learned and therefore changeable through education. This shift is not only necessary for professionals to incorporate a more complex understanding of the male gender, but infusing this into student affairs work would encourage the development of meaningful holistic programmatic interventions that will provide opportunities for men to be listened to, challenged, and supported (Berkowitz, 2002; Laker, 2003). Getting these young men to explore the reasons that they might engage in behavior that is hegemonic will not only help these young men resist such behaviors and limit their gender role conflict, but also allow for the college to take a more pro-active approach to the binge drinking or sexual assaults (Harper et al., 2005; Hong, 2000; Ludeman, 2011; Sax, 2008).

Davis and Laker (2004) suggest that another reason that student affairs programs and services have paid little attention to male development and masculinity-related issues is that a great deal of attention is given to students of color and women. While I agree that men's identities have not been explored by many colleges until late, this is a hard line to walk because while the study of masculinity is needed, it should not come at the cost of removing or lessening the services, programs, and courses dedicated to addressing the issues of women, people of color, or other underprivileged/underrepresented groups. Based on my reading of other works, I do not think Davis or Laker mean to downplay the struggles of underrepresented students, but this particular statement also seems to suggest that they neglect the reality that we all carry multiple intersecting identities.

Some college men's identity development is surely being highlighted in the literature, such as gay men and African American men (Berila, 2011; Ford, 2011; Harper & Nichols, 2008). Harris and Barone (2011) remind us that most of the traditional research conducted about men at college tends to focus on the "over-served," White, heterosexual, middle-class men. Nevertheless, while there is certainly much to do about the intersectionality of various identities, I am not going to focus on that in this work. I agree with Davis and Laker that men on campus, despite their multiple, intersecting identities, are being underserved when it comes to creating critical spaces and pedagogy that allows young men to be viewed as having a gender that is worth exploring in developmental and complex ways.

Critical spaces that encourage young men to reflect on their development are beginning to emerge. In a special issue of *The Journal of College and University Student Housing: Promoting Learning and Development with College Men* (Vol. 39, #1), many masculinities scholars and student affairs professionals advocated for non-disciplinary spaces in residential buildings. It was argued that promising practices within housing are: living-learning programs (LLPs), and process/psychoeducational groups (Scott et al., 2012). In these spaces, dialogue was found to be crucial to challenging and creating support in non-combative ways that goes beyond the "bad dog" phenomena.

It is unclear how many LLPs or psychoeducational groups have been specifically created for men's identity development, but residential life professionals have seen positive outcomes when using it for other issues, not specifically related to masculinity. One study makes the claim, "Living learning communities provided men with a safe haven from rigid gender role expectations, offered a plethora of involvement

opportunities, and fostered relationships with faculty and peers” (Jessup-Anger et al., 2012, p. 168). This same research study’s data collection did not explicitly focus on men’s meaning-making or critical reflection of masculinity

Another space that shows promise is The Center for the Study of Masculinities and Men’s Development, which is located on the campus of Western Illinois University. The center aims to provide quality scholarship, advocacy, and programming that positively influence college men’s development in a manner congruent with gender equity and social justice. It serves as a physical and virtual space, as its blog allows for people to discuss issues pertaining to men. Both the LLPs and men’s centers are ideal spaces for young men to be introduced to peer group settings that challenge the dominant discourse of masculinity on their campus rather than feeling like they have to collude with peer groups that promote hegemony.

Capraro (2004) and Harris and Harper (2008) tell us that if such programming is not mandatory, many college men have refrained from participating in on-campus courses, programs, and services that go against the expected forms of engagement, because of the hegemonic discourse and perceived punishments (i.e., name calling, physical violence, and isolation) that are known to come along with stepping outside of the “man box.” Some college men acknowledge the social privilege that comes along with staying in the “man box” on campus and choose not to behave in non-hegemonic ways (Harris & Edwards, 2010).

It is clear that student affairs professionals are beginning to consider men as gendered beings in need of development, but what continues to be lacking is a clear critical pedagogy that explains how we go about challenging hegemonic masculinity

development. It is nice to know that we “think” LLPs can create a difference because they are dialogic spaces, but what does that actually mean? What is the skill set student affairs professionals should have when engaging with men? In the next section, I focus on the following questions: What critical pedagogies and components might be useful for student affairs professionals to be aware of when trying to challenge hegemonic attitudes and behaviors on campus? What impact might the critical pedagogies have on college men who are engaged with it?

Critical Pedagogies: Developing Critical Men and Diverse Masculinities

Critical pedagogy can be summed up by the question, “Why?” Asking why, shows that people do not simply accept what has been told to them. Henry Giroux, one of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy, uses it to suggest that academia or education in general should be about ensuring discussions of social change and democracy. “Critical pedagogy [also] asks how and why knowledge gets constructed...and how and why some constructions of reality are legitimated and celebrated by the dominant culture while others clearly are not” (McLaren, 2009, p. 63). It has been proven that critical, radical, or transgressive pedagogies of various kinds can lead toward a more socially just, self-reflective, and transformative process that minimizes or ends hegemony (Adams, 2007; Giroux, 2009; Wink, 2011). I intend to discuss critical pedagogy in the latter for the purposes of this study.

In the case of hegemonic masculinity, educators and students need to ask themselves, why? Why isn’t there more questioning of hegemonic masculinity? Why do we accept that hegemonic masculine behaviors have to continue being the norm on

college campuses? These questions can be answered by the reality that the dominant pedagogical practices on college campuses in an era of neoliberalism (a.k.a. “corporatization” and “post-social identity”) are usually not geared toward self or group consciousness raising and critique. The mainstream pedagogies that espouse neoliberal tendencies and banking models of teaching and learning, intentionally or not, phase out ethical pedagogical practices, like democratic education, yielding to a profit-driven view of education that devalues the application of ethical theories and restricts students from questioning and transforming a world in which oppression exists (Feigenbaum, 2007; Freire, 2000).

Nevertheless, critical pedagogy is exactly what student affairs professionals should be invested in when it comes to the social and personal identity development of young people. Student Affairs has done a decent job in trying to empower underrepresented and underprivileged groups of students, such as women, Black, Latino, disabled, and LGBTQ students. While there is much more that can be done for those underprivileged groups, there is minimal discussion about creating critical pedagogy that invites a more complex understanding of some college students as being simultaneously privileged and marginalized. Critical pedagogy for the oppressor or over-privileged student can encourage them to become aware and critical of their social location and also helps them explore their identity development as a contradictory relationship between power over, powerlessness, self and others (M. Kaufman, 1994).

Kimmel (2002) uses the metaphor of the wind to articulate why it is important to develop pedagogy for the oppressor.

Being white, or male, or heterosexual in this culture is like running with the wind at your back. It feels like just plain running, and we rarely if ever get a chance to see how we are sustained, supported, and even propelled by that wind. (p. 1).

Here, the wind goes unnoticed not only to the social location that privileged people experience but also happens because they have not been provided with the analytical tools to notice how that wind sustains them or accelerates the speed or ease with which they move through the world. On campus, male students who engage in hegemonic masculinity are unlikely to see that it propels their attitudes and behaviors because of the normalization and dominant characteristics of hegemony.

Considering male-identified students as a simultaneously privileged and socially constructed group that marginalizes non-hegemonic abiding men might prove to be a cognitive and experiential challenge for many men or women. However, it is absolutely critical for the field of student affairs to incorporate this framing into their practice if hegemonic masculinity discourse is to be interrupted. Davis and Wagner (2005) add that this cognitive and experiential challenge might be especially hard for men who have other identities that are marginalized (i.e., Muslim men, gay men, Black men). This presents a challenge for these men because they can readily identify the oppression they face when their marginalized identities are made salient; however, accepting that they have male privilege is harder to accept, in part, because of viewing themselves with a mono-identity lens (Davis & Wagner, 2005).

By embracing this critical pedagogy, student affairs professionals and educators can develop more nuanced and holistic programming. Pease (2002) suggested that when men are presented with opportunities to question their gender identity and expectations, they report better health, sense of self, and overall satisfaction in their relationship with

others. So, how do we assist them to question or have a better sense of their development as men? There are four critical pedagogies that I believe offer insight on this: feminist, critical masculinities, social justice, and intergroup dialogue.

The Four Pedagogies

I begin by briefly defining each of the four pedagogies, providing a rationale for using them in a hegemonic masculinity context, and offering pedagogical principles from the four pedagogies for student affairs professionals to consider using in their work with men. All of these pedagogies can help to critique hegemonic male identity development and begin to inform us of alternative ways of identifying as a man in college. As individual pedagogies they are not exactly ideal, but together they can serve as a foundation for creating a critical space for men on campus to develop into critical, diverse and gendered men.

These pedagogies are not the only ones out there that might be beneficial in this process of deconstructing hegemonic masculinity. They are influenced by pedagogies and theories, such as human relations, conflict transformation and peace building, democratic education, laboratory trainings, social identity development, contact hypotheses, multicultural education, and cognitive development. The four pedagogies also influence one another and share common themes, such as student-centered learning, bridging theory and practice, valuing personal experiences, promoting affective learning, inspiring social change and consciousness raising.

I chose these respected pedagogies not only due to their well-documented historical roots and commonalities but because they provide “a framework that enables us

to think clearly about our intentions and the means we use to actualize them” when dreaming up critical spaces for challenging hegemonic masculinity (Bell, 2007, p. 2). By having a common language around which pedagogies are effective for men on college campuses, student affairs professionals will be better able to question and challenge whether the programs they are offering or will be offering for men are making an impact on hegemonic masculinity.

Table 1

Overview of Four Critical Pedagogies (continues onto the next page)

	Feminist	Critical Masculinities	Social Justice	Intergroup Dialogue
Origin	critical pedagogy, pedagogy of the oppressed, participant centered pedagogy, democratic education, feminist theory	feminist pedagogy, feminism, critical pedagogy, masculinities scholars and Men’s Studies, critical pedagogy, social identity development theory, democratic education	conflict resolution, training group education, multicultural education, social identity development theory, cognitive development theory, psychology, laboratory training; critical pedagogy; democratic education; popular education	dialogue, facilitation, conflict transformation and peace building; democratic education; laboratory trainings, t-groups; social justice; critical pedagogy
Key Components	a community of learners who share power, and care for and trust one another; teacher and student engage in reflexivity about ways of learning and teaching; values personal experience; notices gender but doesn’t limit itself to it; exist in multiple academic spaces; shouldn’t be confused with feminism; demands critical reflection of self; encourages	male-identified space; facilitator and student engage in reflexivity about ways of learning and teaching; male peer-facilitators; interactive learning including dialogue; values personal experience; focuses on gender socialization of men; challenges patriarchy as it relates to sexism and hegemonic masculinity; seeks to empower men to be allies to women; invested in	values emotional and cognitive components of learning; values personal experience; encourages systemic analysis of identity development and oppression; pays attention to social relations/interpersonal interactions in the classroom; encourages self-reflection; rewards changes in awareness and efforts to work toward change; invested in identity development; pedagogy and	co-facilitated sustainable learning experience; encourages dialogic communication as means for bridging differences and unearthing commonalities; examines the nature and impact of societal inequalities and conflicts between groups; promotes alliance building; emphasis on consciousness raising;

	dialogue	constructing alternative, diverse and healthy masculinities	curriculum is culturally relevant; values experiential learning; invested in developing allies; focuses on multiple identities and oppressions	values emotional and cognitive components of learning; values personal experience; encourages systemic analysis of identity development and oppression
Rationale for Use	introduces men to critical pedagogy; and experiencing what it means to learn as a community; provides men with a chance to listen to women's experiences and share their own experiences around gender; to engage in a process of reflection that might challenge them to ask why; empowers men to take action about their male privilege, historical/current dominance; challenges biological only understandings of women's oppression	identifies for men that they have been socialized into identifying with hegemonic masculinity; that masculinity is contextual, fluid and intersectional; shown that men can talk critical about masculinity even in all male settings; supports men to take responsibility for their learning about oppression rather than relying on women; models different way a group of men can behave/interact; encourages men to remove the mask, and be their 'own man'	encourages men to adopt a systematic analysis of sexism or men's oppression against women, and to understand ways in which they internalized dominance; provides men with a map for becoming an ally and understanding their male privilege	introduces and provides practice opportunities for men to develop dialogic skills, which is often a new mode of communication in male peer groups or even in one-on-one situations; it allows for men to have deeper, more vulnerable and intellectual relations with each other where they can be their entire selves; the role modeling potential of co-facilitators across differences as male facilitators is important for promoting diversity amongst men, but also as a gateway to engaging in other identities and oppressions; the acquisition of dialogic skills can also help in challenging sexism and hegemonic masculinity outside of the classroom

Feminist Pedagogy

There are many key components of feminist pedagogy. It should not be equated with feminism. Feminist pedagogy may have started in feminist or Women's Studies but was adopted by other academic disciplines and settings (Cohee et al., 1998; Shrewbury, 1997). Feminist pedagogy does have an interest in gender but is said to not exclude masculinity or any other identity for that matter. This was a major new learning for me, as I confused being in a feminist space as the same as feminist teaching and learning. Feminist pedagogy focuses on six principles of teaching and learning: 1) reformation of the leader-participant relationship, 2) empowerment, 3) building community, 4) privileging the individual voice, 5) respect for diversity of personal experience, and 6) challenging traditional views (Webb, Walker, & Bollis, 2004).

In this space, teacher and student act as subjects, not objects, who seek to establish and grow within a liberatory environment. Feminist pedagogy engages the self in a continual reflective process and empowers the student to find their voice as they address issues of gender and power (Shrewbury, 1997). In order to establish this environment, pedagogues must also think about how the number of students and layout of the room help to create a safe space in which students feel encouraged to dialogue, discuss, and share their personal experiences and challenge power relations (Webber, 2006). The feminist teacher must also be open to approaching her/his practice in a less authoritarian way by inviting students to take more ownership in driving discussions and utilizing student experiences. Lastly, feminist pedagogy, if performed holistically, also demands that the pedagogue engage in self-reflection about his/her own identities. As we

move to discussing other pedagogies, I found that feminist pedagogy is sort of the foundation on which the others build.

The rationale for using this pedagogy to encourage college men to examine their performance of masculinity on campus can be explained by the work of Kahn and Ferguson (2010). These scholars found that there are four core areas in which feminist pedagogy helps men achieve a new gendered awareness: 1) acknowledging privilege and systematic power, 2) activating self-reflection, 3) incorporating a diversity of new topics and perspectives, and 4) pursuing social justice. By encouraging men to reflect on their status as privileged group members, it introduces college men to new and contradicting perspectives as they compare it to what they had previously come to understand as masculinity. In some ways, an unaware male student recognizes for the first time that the masculinity he has supported and performed is actually harmful to others. He could certainly reject this reality, but he has at least been introduced to a new consciousness that critiques patriarchy and sexism as problematic.

There are not many limitations of feminist pedagogy in assisting college men to think critically about maleness on campus. Stereotypes about feminism and being a feminist might hinder some men from enrolling or participating in such a space because of the fear of being verbally attacked by women who “hate” men. As a result of this misframing of the pedagogy, male students miss the opportunity to be introduced to a student-centered learning style.

Another limitation is that feminist pedagogical spaces tend to have an enrollment that is usually made up of salient-identified marginalized groups and perhaps mostly women. As a result, a male student who has privilege as a man, and perhaps in other

social identities, would be fearful of bringing up ways sexism or gender roles has limited him when in the presence of women. Feminist pedagogy's emphasis on power and privilege dynamics (regardless of oppression) encourages an analysis of only some aspects of the male student while putting less of a focus on how hegemony limits college male identity development.

Critical Masculinities

Laker (2011) suggests that we should learn from feminist pedagogy and apply the gendered analysis that it offers to interventions for boys and men. In addition to feminist pedagogy, critical masculinities pedagogy is based in Men's Studies and student affairs practitioners' experience working with individual men. Critical masculinities pedagogy is specific in its focus on gender by zeroing in on understanding and challenging men and masculinity(ies). Capraro (2004) argues that the theory and pedagogy involved in Men's Studies is the answer to creating an alternative masculine discourse on campus to help us better understand and serve college men. The key components of critical masculinities pedagogy are:

- male-only-identified space
- reflexivity
- male peer facilitators
- interactive curriculum
- value of personal experience
- challenging patriarchy's impact on men and women
- empowers men to be allies to women and imagine constructing alternative, more healthy masculinities

Pollack (2001) elaborates on these components as he suggests a number of pedagogical and advising strategies in working with men:

- create a safe space
- give men time to feel comfortable with expression
- seek and provide alternative pathways for expression by being active
- listen without judging
- avoid shaming
- give affirmation and affection

Capraro (2004) adds that “a male-centered pedagogy that involves an all-male space and that which is required, peer-facilitated, interactive, and experientially based will lead to shifts in college men’s understanding and performance of masculinity” (p. 23-24). I will not address all of these components, but I do want to highlight active participation and the role of the instructor in these spaces.

Both Pollack (2001) and Carpraro (2004) identify active or interactive participation as key for when designing a program or space for men to engage. Much of male hegemonic culture is centered on being active with one another. For example, Davis (2010) found after interviewing a few male undergraduates that in group settings, men interact by performing or being active. Activities that facilitate conversation for those college men were: engaging in humor or putdowns, drinking, going to the casino, taking a trip in the car, playing video games, and watching sports. In another study, it was discovered that men tend to engage in undirected learning style, which is defined as “a lack of regulation, ambivalence and a preference for stimulating education” (Severiens & Ten Dam, 1997, p. 83). As alluded to by Pollack and Capraro, we must use pedagogies

and develop curricula that consider men's learning style in a group (of course recognizing there will be exceptions) as one that is dependent, at least at first, on doing activities as a way to spark engagement in issues of hegemonic masculinity and sexism. In that space, the instructor and participants, over time, can work toward challenging these modes of communication, especially when humor or putdowns are used to perpetuate hegemonic discourses of masculinity.

As was the case with feminist pedagogy, the role of the instructor is crucial to the development and institution of critical masculinities pedagogy. Unfortunately, there is not much research on the role of a male instructor in a critical masculinities pedagogical setting. Most of what is out there is how male instructors operate as allies by using feminism and a feminist pedagogical approach (Pease, 2002; Whitehead, 2001). Breeze (2007) talks about how a male feminist pedagogy can be developed, which is important in a critical masculinities space in which you are attempting to be pro-feminist in your analysis of male dominance and privilege, yet also speak to the negative impact of gender conformity for men.

In a feminist pedagogy, the role of a male instructor is a tricky one, as he represents the oppressor and authority. Breeze (2007) found that the male teacher must be aware of three discourses: speaking as, speaking for, and speaking with. In a feminist space, it is important for the male teacher to speak as a man (i.e., owning up to his privilege and position of power) rather than to attempt to speak for women because in such a space his authority as a teacher of this subject matter is limited, given that his male identity represents the oppressor and privileged person within the very subject matter he may be trying to teach.

Critical masculinities pedagogy requires that the male instructor, instead, use his cultural capital of having been socialized in a hegemonic masculine discourse to speak as a man who has “been there” and who is able to shed light on why it is important for men to think critically about gender. At the same time, a critical masculinities space, in which men might make up the majority, the male teacher must not only be less authoritarian but also hold himself accountable for ensuring that the space does not turn into an “old boy’s network,” where men are sitting around maintaining sexism or patriarchal practices despite the presence of a hegemonic masculinity critique. The male teacher must bring into this space a feminist analysis of gender and power yet also engage in a critical masculinities pedagogy that empowers men to speak from their male perspective in an open fashion.

The rationale for using this pedagogy is largely about exposing male students to the idea that masculinity 1) is influenced by individuals, institutions, and culture; 2) is contextual and can shift over time and space; 3) is intersectional and therefore individuals, groups, and societies can have alternative meanings; and 4) is acquired via development and not exclusively based on biology (Gaffney & Manno, 2011; Kimmel, 1997).

The limitations of critical masculinities pedagogy are: lack of first person accounts from women and their experiences with sexism and patriarchy, the male instructor’s balance of critiquing hegemonic masculinity and honoring aspects of hegemonic masculinity, and recruitment. If a critical masculinities space sticks to the idea of that space being made up of male students only, then it could be argued that by not having women in the room, the men will not hold themselves accountable to addressing

issues of power and privilege. This is why the role of the male instructor is crucial, as he must promote discussions and a critical analysis of power and privilege. Often it is a Catch 22, as marginalized groups often want to ensure that there are conversations of power taking place in privileged spaces yet often get tired of or refuse to take on the role of educating the privileged individual or group about how they benefit from oppression out of the fear of being tokenized. There is also the challenge for the male instructor to empower the male students to engage in self-reflection about their socialization into hegemonic standards of maleness. Balancing these two analyses is important for the critical masculinities space.

Recruiting male participants is probably the biggest hurdle for any pedagogy discussed in this paper as well as any class that is considered to be a “soft” science course geared toward talking about diversity. Figuring out ways to recruit men who represent a spectrum of masculinity is important for making this space as beneficial as possible. In my experience, men who are on the margins of hegemonic masculinity on campus are more likely to be invested in participating in this space. However, trying to get the men who embrace hegemonic masculinity in the room will be challenging, so creative measures should be taken, such as making it a part of the judicial intervention process (Ludeman, 2011).

Social Justice

Social justice pedagogy is similar to feminist and critical masculinities pedagogy in the sense that it (Adams, 2007):

- seeks to balance the emotional and cognitive components of learning

- acknowledges personal experiences while making connections to systemic analysis
- pays attention to social relations in the classroom
- encourages self-reflection as a tool for learning
- rewards changes in awareness and efforts to work toward change (p. 15)

Bell (2007) states,

The goal of social justice education is to enable people to develop critical analytical tools to understand oppression, and their own socialization within the oppressive system and to develop a sense of agency and capacity to interrupt and change oppressive patterns and behaviors in themselves and in the institutions and communities of which they are a part. (p. 2)

It is the sense of agency and capacity to interrupt as allies is what I want to highlight about this pedagogy. The other pedagogies previously mentioned certainly get at allyship, but it is the social justice pedagogy that has been more detailed in its description of how one becomes an ally. Social justice pedagogy realizes that “social justice poses cognitive developmental challenges” for oppressed and privileged groups, as it forces students and facilitators to grapple with the values, beliefs and stereotypes they bring into such a space (Adams, 1997, p. 18).

So, the rationale for using this pedagogy is that a student affairs professional should consider allyship development as a key factor when planning a program for men, so that they do not end up perpetuating patriarchy or sexism especially within an all-male space (Edwards, 2006). The cognitive challenge of becoming an ally is represented well by Love’s (2000) liberatory consciousness model as well as Edwards (2006) aspiring social justice ally identity development model. Love’s model suggests that there are four elements of developing your cognition to think in a social justice or liberatory way: awareness, analysis, action, and accountability/allyship. These elements suggest that in

order to develop liberatory men, we must begin with awareness or the capacity to notice oppression in others as well as themselves.

Awareness is likely the most important element in this journey for

unacknowledged privilege is a considerable barrier for promoting social justice attitudes and actions with men...Since male privilege inhibits men from understanding themselves as men, understanding oneself as person with multiple dimensions of identity is not even experienced as a developmental process. (Davis & Wagner, 2005, p. 31-32)

Once the skill of awareness has been introduced and practiced, a college male could move toward analyzing what he is now aware of and adopt a systemic view of the world. The third element comes into play once awareness and analysis have inspired him to feel like something must be done about the inequalities he now experiences and sees as valid. The final element is where a sense of being accountable to others comes into play and thus the beginning stage of identifying as an ally.

Edwards' (2006) model of the aspiring ally extends the conversation on Love's (2000) ally element by suggesting that it is natural for a person who aspires to be an ally to wrestle with the new worldview that comes with enhancing one's awareness about injustice, because many allies begin by feeling like the world is a fair and just place. It is crucial for this ally to develop from the starting point of being an ally for self-interest to one that becomes an ally for social justice issues. During this process of development, a male ally can get stuck in feeling good about not being sexist, however, miss the larger point which is his role in helping to end the systemic nature of oppression from which he is privileged even if he is not personally discriminatory. Finally, Edwards encourages us to be mindful that it is important that an ally's motivation for doing this work be

grounded in an emotional connection and one that recognizes how the system of oppression negatively impacts his identity, in this case his identity as a man.

One limitation of social justice pedagogy that comes to mind is the extensive emphasis placed on a privileged or agent member/group in understanding one's role in oppression. Wagner (2011) elaborates,

The dominant discourse in social justice maintains that isms are largely written on the body, and that one can easily fit into a category of "dominant" or "subordinate." Such assumptions obfuscate intersections and ignore how oppression is secured and maintained within cultural norms that render a particular view of the world as inevitable and reasonable. (p. 211)

Wagner's emphasis on expanding our discourse to include more diversity in how we define the experience of oppression as either dominant or subordinate is much needed. However, there is a careful balance in that we should not go to the other extreme of saying intersectionality is the way to go, because that too can play down the experience of being privileged and yet harmed by systems of injustice.

We can promote using intersectional social justice pedagogy if we encourage men of color as well as men in general to explore how they are both privileged and harmed by patriarchal socialization. Violence prevention programs that use social justice as their moral compass navigate this complexity by focusing on changing individual men's behaviors and therefore systematic oppression by devoting considerable attention to emphasizing the role that male socialization plays in how violence is manifested (Berkowitz, 2003; Hong, 2000).

Intergroup Dialogue

Intergroup dialogue (IGD) was developed in the 1980s at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, however, “dialogue as a communication practice has been used in many cultural and discourse traditions to support inquiry and explore shared concerns” (Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler, & Cytron-Walker, 2007, p. 5). It originates and borrows components from democratic education, dialogue theory, facilitation praxis, conflict transformation and peace building, laboratory trainings, training group, social justice pedagogy and critical pedagogy.

IGD can be defined as,

face-to-face facilitated learning experience that brings together students from different social identity groups over a sustained period of time to understand their commonalities and differences [by examining] the nature and impact of societal inequalities, and [exploring] ways of working together toward great equality and justice. (Zúñiga et al., 2007, p. 2)

The key components of IGD can be summed up as consciousness raising, building relationships across differences and conflicts, value of co-facilitation, and strengthening individual and collective capacities to promote justice. Through this model of sharing experiences with one another, participants “become clearer and more reflective about the meaning of their social identities and their group’s relationship with other groups” (Zúñiga et al., 2007, p. 11).

The rationale for using this pedagogy with men is twofold: importance of dialogue and co-facilitation. Traditionally, when it comes to working with men, and especially young men, there is a tendency to flex the authoritative muscle so that we get men to change their problematic attitudes and behaviors. “Research shows that deficiency in dialogic skills is associated with violence and that teaching men these skills may

decrease the likelihood of future violence when the acquisition and maintenance of these skills is encouraged in a supportive environment” (Low, Monarch, Hartman, & Markman, 2002). IGD’s primary pedagogical emphasis on dialogic communication requires participants to critically engage with each other in a meaningful and respectful manner by paying attention to both content and process. The dialogic approach tends to push people to acquire new skills of communicating about “difficult topics” that will encourage them to think about who they are, what they say, and how they say it when communicating across differences (Nagda & Maxwell, 2011). They will be forced to, perhaps for the first time, examine traditional dysfunctional patterns of interactions that exist between conflicting social identity groups (Nagda & Maxwell, 2011).

In the case of working with men and interrupting the dominant discourse coming from male peer groups on campus, dialogue represents a foreign way of communicating with men. For example, Davis (2002) found that after interviewing a few students in his study that within male culture, on or off campus, there is a struggle to express one’s self emotionally through words. The example he uses is of a son and father interaction. The son describes the events as,

the way I show affection, like the first thing I do is come in the house and he [the father] just grabs a hold of my shoulder, squeezes it a little bit and then I punch him in the stomach a little bit and that’s—I mean I’ve told my dad I love him like maybe four times in my entire life—I mean that’s just how we show affection. And that’s basically the way I am with all guys too, like if I don’t feel like I can punch you, you’re not my friend. (p. 515)

As we see in this example, hegemonic masculine discourse polices the attitudes and behaviors of this young man. The son decides that in order to express his love for other men in his life, he must do so in a physically violent manner rather than use words to express how he feels about these important men in his life. On campus, similar modes of

communication occur within groups of men, and this is why training them in dialogic skills and using the setting of an intergroup dialogue can possibly help challenge traditional behaviors around communicating with men. Engaging in dialogue on this difficult topic of hegemonic masculinity will require time and practice so that men can acknowledge their dysfunctional patterns of interactions, adopt a dialogic form of communication, and challenge hegemonic college masculinity identity development on campus.

The facilitation of dialogue in a co-facilitator manner is also relevant for student affairs professionals to consider when building a program for men. An intergroup dialogue facilitator points out and guides people's process of interaction so that they can be authentic with themselves and others in order to co-create an inclusive and critical learning environment across differences (Nagda & Maxwell, 2011). Co-facilitation, a major component of IGD, is used to help model intersectionality, alliance building, and gets away from the idea that one educator has all the answers. The IGD co-facilitators acknowledge their social identity, as well as personal identity, differences, and are paired together because of their diversity. For example, one male facilitator could be gay, White, and working-class, and another could be bi-racial, heterosexual, and wealthy, which represents two different models or experiences of masculinity.

It is assumed that IGD co-facilitators can then use their differences in life experience to "support and challenge participants from their own identity groups empathetically and, at the same time, model for participants ways of connecting across social boundaries" as well as to create a meaningful dialogue (Nagda & Maxwell, 2011, p. 9-10). It should also be known that through this working across differences, similarities

often arise of which each co-facilitator becomes aware and that students begin to take note of as well. The very presence of having these male-identified co-facilitators leading the dialogue would be modeling alternative masculinities as well as a positive cross-cultural interaction around different representations of masculinity.

There are two limitations or challenges for incorporating intergroup dialogue into the work we do with men: the intergroup model's focus on dominant versus oppressed group conflict and dialogue as a new communication practice. Like social justice pedagogy and feminist pedagogy, the goal of intergroup dialogue is to encourage social interactions across intergroup conflict. While that is valuable, this pedagogy and curriculum does not highlight the value of men focusing on their hegemonic development. It again limits them to a privileged/oppressor role without acknowledging the importance of encouraging men to engage in a critique of their socialization and performance of hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, more intragroup dialogue spaces could be useful for encouraging people who share a common identity, such as being men, to come together, and dialogue about both their similarities and differences.

Despite making the case that dialogue would help to transform dysfunctional communication patterns among men, introducing dialogue at first will be a challenge for men on campus. Dialoguing instead of debating or remaining silent about hegemonic masculinity would be a foreign mode of communication. However, the hope is that once they learn how to dialogue with one another, they will be able to use those skills to challenge the influence of male peer group discourse on campus that tends to promote hegemonic attitudes and performances of masculinity.

Five Core Pedagogical Principles for College Men's Programming

After student affairs professionals have grounded themselves in the aforementioned pedagogies, they will have a rationale for using the following principles. This section provides a rationale for each principle and ways it can be implemented. The principles for student affairs professionals to consider when developing effective programs and services for men on their campus are: 1) recognizing men as gendered beings, 2) male-identified students only, 3) men modeling alternative masculinities, 4) dialogic interaction, 5) encouraging self-change and social justice allyship.

Recognizing Men as Gendered Beings

In order for there to be a greater value placed on having college men engage with their masculinity, a shift in culture must take place on many college campuses. Administrators, student affairs staff and faculty tend to be “unaware of the centrality of gender in men’s lives, which in part helps to perpetuate inequalities based on gender” (Kimmel, 1997, p. 186). It is through understanding pre-college socialization and the dominant discourse of masculinity on campus that will lead to a re-socialization that will allow us to transform the culture and individual attitudes and behaviors of college men who buy into or are impacted by the hegemony on their campuses. For example, recognizing that men do feel pressure to “fit in” with campus masculinity might encourage administrators and student affairs professionals alike to consider socio-cultural reasons for the binge drinking on their campus. They could use strategies other than disciplinary to address cultural norms around masculinity and excessive drinking. It

would not only help the institution in their tactics but also empower individual men to challenge peer pressures to drink large amounts just because they are a man.

Male-identified Students Only

One of the few spaces available for men to think critically about gender has been the feminist classroom. Despite having positive outcomes when men are in feminist spaces, men's entrance into them has largely been viewed as problematic and met with "suspicious glances, tension, and male bashing" (Flood, 2011, p. 21). Therefore, having an all-male identified space might encourage men to feel more comfortable to explore their gender, and to listen to critique more easily than if they were in predominantly women, feminist identified spaces where they might perform "political correctness," take up space, engage in resistance discourses or be stuck in a conversation only about their identity as a privileged and/or socially dominant group member (Alilunas, 2011; Flood, 2011; Pleasants, 2011).

Feeling safe to communicate with men differently is another way to look at why an all-male space is preferred. A space in which men can connect with other men and feel compelled to share deep-seated fears and concerns about their identification with masculinities seems to be the thing that makes men eventually more comfortable to explore gender in a critical fashion in male peer groups (Laker, 2011). As a result, these alternative spaces will serve as practice for individual men to challenge their perceptions of how and what men are supposed to talk about outside of the classroom.

Men Modeling Alternative Masculinities

In addition to having all male students, Davis, LaPrad and Dixon (2011) found that college men are very responsive to gender-related interventions as long as they are facilitated by male educators whom they trust (or come to trust), who will not judge them and who are transparent about the challenges they have faced with respect to gender. Being able to tap into their socio-cultural capital, a male facilitator is in a better position than a woman to convince and model how to resist dominant discourses for the young men on campus. However, that male role model must be open and able to incorporate feminism in this space and into his consciousness because part of the modeling requires thinking differently about how men can interact with women, especially for heterosexual men.

Harris and Edwards (2010) elaborated on the desire to have a male facilitator by discovering in their research that male students identified deceased (i.e., Malcolm X) or living elders whom were well rounded and received respect for being themselves. Thus, it is important for student affairs educators to have a good sense of how they are negatively and positively impacted by masculinity. “They must embody the very processes they are describing when they discuss the centrality of gender [and] do not think that students don’t also notice the gender of their professors” (Kimmel, 1997, p. 191). Besides using their socio-cultural capital to encourage the exploration of gender, male student affairs professionals must model alternative attitudes and behaviors of different kinds of masculinities. The modeling provides young men with a sense of confidence that they can be ‘successful’ in stepping outside the bounds of how masculinity is commonly defined on campus.

Dialogic Interaction

Pollack (2001) suggests that we must give men time to feel comfortable with expression and create an atmosphere that supports active listening and that encourages affirmation and affection. Too often men “bond” in groups by using humor to build intimacy (Davis et al., 2011). While humor or comedy can be a useful tool to unite men initially, it can sometimes undermine the type of interaction that encourages them to be critical. Humor can become another mask by which some men deal with their discomfort with sharing thoughts and feelings about hegemonic masculinity. Sharing openly or showing affection are uncommon ways of interaction for some men, especially those who buy into hegemonic masculinity. It is often said in stereotypical ways that men who talk about their emotions must have feminine characteristics and are often referred to as “acting like a girl/woman” or “acting gay.” As found in Davis’s research (2010), many men fear being associated with femininity and even in communication styles this holds true. Men just are not familiar with methods of communication that require them to open up and talk about their inner most feelings like that required of dialogue. This kind of communication is seen as more common for women.

For example, in Wantland (2005) found that in an all-male course on rape that the college men were concerned about the emotional intimacy and vulnerability they would have to display with other men, especially those in other fraternities. It is quite interesting, almost amazing, that these fraternity boys live and socialize with each other throughout the year, but when you put them into a space that on some level forces them to open up, it becomes uncomfortable. If dialogic interaction were a more common way

of engagement among men, then I believe being vulnerable in front of other men would be less of a concern.

Encourage Self-change and Social Justice Allyship

In order to impart the value of self-change and social justice allyship to college men, student affairs professionals must first re-imagine men as gendered beings who are negatively impacted by gender based oppression. Davis and Wagner (2005) argue that by “helping men understand that they both benefit from and are harmed by patriarchy can provide motivation for understanding and the development of social justice perspectives” (p. 36). M. Kaufman (1999) describes this complexity as men’s contradictory experience of power. Pedagogies that address that complexity via supporting activism/allyship, stressing empathy and assisting privileged groups in recognizing their privilege within a system of oppression should develop men who are vested in self-change, support women’s liberation, and are empowered to challenge hegemonic discourses.

In order to accomplish this space, educators must think about who their students are in terms of social identity and social location. They must understand how oppression works from a binary gender context. College men who enter such an activist minded space will be confronted with having to deal with their male privilege and recognize women’s disadvantage position in a patriarchal society. Davis and Wagner (2005) find that in order for men to develop social justice attitudes, acknowledging privilege is the first step and that can be accomplished through a number of pedagogical techniques. They offer three methods: conducting step-forward group activities, offering Brown Bag talks/discussions, and creating courses. All three of these methods bring conversations of

privilege to the forefront of the minds of male students who are unaware of these dynamics. Once the men are made aware of their privilege, then becoming an ally is achievable. As Davis and Wagner (2005) point out serving as an ally can come in many forms: acknowledging your receipt of privilege, learning about systematic violence, and engaging other men in conversations of misogyny and sexism.

Student affairs professionals should also ensure that men embrace self-change. Davis and Wagner (2005) said, “If men are not simply the agents of oppression, but also affected negatively by it, men’s investment in change takes on a new meaning” (p. 37). In order to maximize the potential of men engaging in helping women to end patriarchy and sexism, then we must make room for them to dedicate time to self-reflection and provide them with avenues for realizing they don’t have to identify with hegemonic representations of masculinity. Rather than just telling college men that they are the “bad” guy when it comes to gender, it helps strategically to ensure their commitment to justice by showing/supporting their feelings of being trapped or in conflict with masculinity.

This is particularly true for when we consider the multiple and intersecting identities of men. “For men who have targeted or disadvantaged identities (Jewish men, Black men, gay men), it may be easier for them to focus on the realities of oppression but harder for them to accept the privileges associated with being a man” (Davis & Wagner, 2005, p. 31). It is through a combination of becoming aware of one’s own privilege that empathy is built. Once that occurs, the passion for social justice is better realized and maintained if men recognize the cost of patriarchy and gender role conformity to them.

Student affairs administrators and practitioners need frameworks, guides, and tools for creating successful dialogic programming. It was my attempt to provide one

blueprint that might be considered useful to student affairs professionals in order to advance the field's ability to promote alternative "hegemonic gender values and norms that promote a full range of human expression" (Davis et al., 2011, p. 151). By using the four framing pedagogies and the five core pedagogical principles that are informed by the frame-working pedagogies, they can challenge their own biases toward men as gendered beings who experience negative socialization and develop programming that challenges the hegemonic discourses that pervades many of our campuses.

However, student affairs just cannot stop there. More research must be conducted to assess such programs and pedagogies that are invested in developing men as critical, diverse, and gendered beings on campus (Harris & Edwards, 2010). Harris and Barone's (2011) call for us to specifically examine how successful existing programs and their pedagogies are in challenging hegemonic masculinity. This study hopes to contribute to this call.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

In responding to college masculinity development scholars, Harris and Barone's (2011) call for next steps in developing programs and services for men, this study assesses the impact Phallacies, a men's peer theater and dialogue program, has on the gender identity development of college-aged men and their understanding and resistance of hegemonic masculinity. Researching this program also provides insight into whether the aforementioned five pedagogical principles in the literature review are relevant to participants' experience in Phallacies. In addition, I hope to gain feedback on how the program can be enhanced for future participants in this site. The specific research questions being explored are:

- How do participants define the hegemonic masculinity discourse at UMassAmherst?
- How comfortable are men discussing masculinity in college peer group settings?
- In what specific ways were the male students able to re-define their masculinity as a result of being in this program?
- How successful is the Phallacies program in encouraging participants to challenge hegemonic masculinity on campus?
- What pedagogical principles (i.e., dialogic interaction, men's-only space, men modeling alternative masculinities, encourage systemic change and allyship, and seeing selves as gendered beings) contribute to a participant's self-reflection and/or re-definition of masculinity?
- What aspects of the curriculum (i.e., readings, assignments, in-class activities) contribute to a desire to critique hegemonic masculinity on campus?

Methodology

As a change agent, I share Paulo Freire's (1968/2000) worldview that education either functions as an instrument of conformity or as the practice of freedom. A college education should and can serve as a transformative tool for encouraging young men on campus to feel free to challenge, express, and value multiple ways of identifying as a man. Therefore, the research design and practice I chose is action research. I fully acknowledge that this research is value-laden and that biases may arise as I assess Phallacies, a program I co-founded and co-coordinate. I have witnessed firsthand the impact Phallacies has had on the audiences, participants, my co-coordinator, and myself since its beginning in the summer of 2008. By conducting assessment-based research in a systematic fashion, I hope to confirm my experiential learning as well as be challenged by new insights in order to improve the program's effectiveness. During this research process, I was not be involved in facilitating the program on a weekly basis in part due to increased responsibilities at my full-time job and because of questions regarding the trustworthiness of this study. While my exit did not impact the data collection phase, it did have an impact on the findings, which I explore in the coming chapters.

Assessment is "the gathering of information concerning the functioning of students, staff, and institutions of higher education...the utilization of that information for institutional and individual improvement" (Astin, 1991, p. 2). Allen (2004) echoes the importance of program assessment as a best practice in higher education because it "allows for us to determine which pedagogical approaches work and for whom" (p. 3). Using action research as the methodological lens to conduct my assessment of Phallacies, I seek to determine Phallacies' effectiveness and areas in which the program can be

improved . . . As an action researcher it is important for me to view my research as something that can be used to inform my practice and work with others. Incorporating assessment measures that were indirect (i.e., self-reporting surveys and interviews) and qualitative, I was hoping to validate the primary learning outcome of the program, which is to encourage college men to critically reflect on their performance of masculinity.

Site Selection

In the summer of 2008, the Phallacies program was created. Tom Schiff, a health educator at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, hired me as a graduate assistant to build a men's health program. After co-facilitating some small group dialogues in a few residential halls, Tom and I decided to develop the program further by bringing in Dennis Canty, a non-traditional undergraduate student and peer theater educator during his time at UMassAmherst. Over the past four years, Tom and I have expanded the curriculum as well as showcased the theater component of the program to a number of colleges, conferences and universities (i.e. UMassDartmouth, Williams College, Hampshire College, Springfield College, and UMassAmherst).

We define Phallacies as a pro-feminist, male-positive, and intersectional men's health dialogue and peer theater program designed to challenge hegemonic masculinity(ies) and to provide alternative ways of being a man. It was designed with the intention of challenging the dominant discourse on the UMassAmherst campus. As noted the program has two components: peer educational theater and dialogue. During the academic year, we met every Monday for 3 hours as a group. Half of our time together was in dialogue and the other half was used for writing and rehearsing for the peer theater

performance that occurred on and off campus. The facilitated dialogues covered a range of topics: father and son relationships, male gender socialization, gay and heterosexual men relationships, and risky behaviors on campus.

Participant Selection

For the purposes of this study, I have included various men-identified participants across time and space. Participants came from the Fall 2013 Phallacies participants, former UMass graduated participants and from two courses at UMass that have historically served as locations from which Phallacies participants have been recruited. In addition to the courses, many of our other students also were referred to the program by residential assistant co-workers and supervisors. Referrals were determined based on interest in social justice or the referrer identifying a participant's need needing to analyze sexist or homophobic attitudes and behaviors.

Overall, there were a total of 9 current Phallacies participants and 8 former Phallacies participants totaling 17. On average, the men involved in Phallacies were involved for multiple semesters, which is evident by having a total 32 participants since its inception 5 years ago. It was rare for anyone to join the program for one semester unless he just happened to join during his final semester of his senior year. Phallacies participants tended to be fairly racially diverse, and all of the demographic information collected was based on self-reports. This was the preferred method to validate how people identify themselves rather than be exclusively defined by others, which speaks to the essence of the program I am assessing. In terms of this study, there are 10 White men and 5 men of color, and 2 bi-racial men. Asian men have seemed to be our most

represented men of color population lately. We have had mostly cis-gendered, middle-class and heterosexual participants take part in the program, which generally speaks to the university's demographics. With that said, the past two years we have seen a slight growth in our gay participants. This increase can be explained by the inclusion of gay-identified facilitators and gay-identified participants' role in recruiting students of a similar sexual identity.

Table 2**Current and Former Phallacies Participants**

Name	Race & Ethnicity	Class	Sexuality	Current or Former	Time in Phallacies
Carter	White & European	Upper-middle-class	Hetero	Current	1 Semester
Justin	White & European	Middle-class	Hetero	Current	5 Semesters
Jon	Asian, Cambodian, Thai & Chinese	Poverty	Hetero	Current	3 Semesters
Pete	White, Irish, English, Swedish & Polish	Middle-class	Gay	Current	2 Semesters
Jimmy	Asian & Vietnamese	Working- class/First-generation	Gay	Current	6 Semesters
Sam	White & Portuguese	Middle-class	Hetero	Current	2 Semesters
Fabian	Black & Haitian	Middle-class	Hetero	Current	2 Semesters
Kanye	Pakistani-American	Lower-middle-class	Hetero	Current	3 Semesters
Francis	White, Polish & Canadian	Upper-middle-class	Hetero	Current	1 Semester
Christian	Black & Native American	Middle-class (Single parent)	Hetero	Former	3 Semesters
Jackie	Bi-Racial, German & Bolivian	Upper-middle-class	Hetero	Former	5 Semesters
Parker	White & Italian	Working-class	Queer	Former	2 Semesters
Neil	White & Russian	Lower-middle-class	Hetero	Former	4 Semesters
Picasso	White	Middle-class	Hetero	Former	2 Semesters
Larry	Asian & Korean	Working-class	Hetero	Former	6 Semesters
Rudy	White & Israeli-American	Lower-middle-class	Hetero	Former	7 Semesters
Keith	White & Israeli-American	Upper-Middle-class (growing up), Lower-middle-class (now)	Hetero	Former	4 Semesters

To make the claim that Phallacies is a unique space, a control group of participants were included in this study. Seventeen enrolled students who identified as men were selected from two Fall 2013 courses at UMassAmherst: Voices Against Violence & Social Diversity in Education (across 6 sections). Both of these courses are Gen Ed and were identified as sites to construct a control group because they often serve as the gateways for young men getting involved in Phallacies. Instructors of each course and section offered extra credit to any student for completing the electronic survey. For the purposes of this research, I only made use of the men-identified responses and in future work, I will incorporate the mostly women-identified responses. The majority of these participants identify as White, heterosexual, sophomore, and middle-class men. There were a few members who did not provide their identities for unknown reasons.

Table 3**Control Group Members**

Name	Race & Ethnicity	Class	Sexuality	School Year	Course
Channing	White	Middle-class	Hetero	First Year	Social Diversity in Education
Kyle	White	Working- class	Hetero	First Year	Social Diversity in Education
Shawn	Black & Native American	Middle-class	Hetero	Junior	Social Diversity in Education
Richard	African American	N/A	Hetero	Junior	Social Diversity in Education
Charles	White, Greek & Macedonian	Middle-class	Hetero	Junior	Social Diversity in Education
Paul	N/A	N/A	N/A	First Year	Voices Against Violence
Peter	White, Scottish & French Canadian	Middle-class	Hetero	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education
James	White & Portuguese	Middle-class	Hetero	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education
Kevin	White, Irish & German	Upper-middle-class	Hetero	First Year	Social Diversity in Education
Ethan	White, Polish, Russian, German & Jewish	Middle-class	Hetero	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education
Michael	White	Upper-middle-class	Hetero	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education
Brian	Cape Verdean	N/A	N/A	Junior	Social Diversity in Education
Gavin	White & Irish	Middle-class	Hetero	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education
John	White	Middle-class	Hetero	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education
Louis	N/A	N/A	N/A	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education
Nathan	White	Middle-class	Hetero	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education
Thomas	White	Middle-class	Hetero	Sophomore	Social Diversity in Education

Data Collection Methods

In agreeing to participate in this study, all Phallacies participants and control group members were asked to complete an informed consent form (see Appendix C, D,

and E) and demographics questionnaire (see Appendix B). Neither current Phallacies or control group participants were penalized academically or socially for choosing not to participate in this voluntary study. This was reiterated during any in-person or online communication with participants. There were two data collection methods used in this study that were triangulated: pre-post semester survey and interviews.

Triangulation, or use of multiple methods to collect data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008), were used to answer the research questions and hopefully provide this study with more validity. As stated earlier, I used direct and indirect, largely qualitative, developmental and formative measures to collect useful data. To align with my action research inquiry, I used a concurrent transformative data collection strategy, where both quantitative and qualitative data were collected in one phase (Creswell, 2009).

Surveys

Participants who attended weekly Phallacies meetings (usually about 10-12 per semester) during Fall 2013 at UMassAmherst were asked to complete a pre-post survey. This pre-post survey was explained and presented as optional during an in-person visit early in the Fall 2013 semester. The informed consent form (see Appendix D) was reviewed and distributed during the first meeting date in early September 2013. The pre-survey (see Appendix F) was distributed during the second meeting, and the post-survey (see Appendix F) was distributed during mid-December 2013. The control group participants were asked to review their informed consent form (see Appendix E) and complete a one-time survey (see Appendix E) that was distributed to them in December via sending a Google Forms (survey) link to the instructors. Each control group

participant received extra credit from his respective instructors for completing this survey.

The current Phallacies and control group surveys both attempted to get a general understanding of how men define masculinity on campus and to gauge how these culturally accepted definitions differed or supported their individual sense of manhood. All participants who took the survey were also asked to respond to four scenarios created to determine the participant's ability to name the scenario as problematic in regards to hegemonic masculinity and to invite them to consider ways in which they might challenge it. The goal was to determine whether or not Phallacies encouraged participants to identify hegemonic attitudes and behaviors as well as to consider if they were more likely to move beyond a bystander role in these scenarios compared to control group members.

Here are some specific questions asked in the pre-post survey:

- Based on your observations and conversations with other students, what does it mean to be a man on this campus?
- How do you define your masculinity?
- How often do you talk about being a man among your male peers?
- How ready are you to talk with and share emotions with other guys in Phallacies?
- How comfortable are you with being emotional with men outside of Phallacies?
- Has your definition of your own masculinity changed as a result of being involved in Phallacies? If so, please explain.
- Since being involved in Phallacies, are you more likely to talk about being a man among your male peers? If so, what about Phallacies contributed to that shift.
- At this point in the semester, how comfortable are you with sharing emotions with other guys in Phallacies?

- At this point in the semester, how comfortable are you with being emotional with men outside of Phallacies?
- To what extent has Phallacies encouraged you to call out a male friend for his sexist attitudes or behaviors?

Here are some specific questions asked in the control group survey:

- How would you define what it means to be a man at UMass? Feel free to use sentences or list words to describe.
- Do you find anything problematic about the way men at UMass are generally defined? Please explain your answer.
- In what kind of peer groups do you find yourself in on campus? Please describe the specific demographics of each peer group.
- What topics do you tend to talk about in each group?
- In which of the peer groups you listed above, are you most likely to talk critically about masculinity? Please explain what makes you feel able to discuss that topic in that group.
- If you identify as a male/man, how often does a conversation about critiquing masculinity at UMass or in society come up in male-only peer groups?
- How comfortable are you with sharing your emotions with men in your life?
- Do you feel more comfortable talking about masculinity with a close friend or in a group setting? Please explain your answer.

Interviews

The semi-structured interviews consist of current and former Phallacies members. I was only able to interview 14 of the 17 total Phallacies participants for this study. The other three participants did not respond to emails asking for their participation in the interview process. They were contacted via email or Facebook private messaging (see Appendix A) to determine interest in being an interviewee. A second interview specific consent form was required of current Phallacies participants once they agreed to

participate (see Appendix C). All participants chosen for the interview were asked to partake in one 45-60 minute audio-recorded, semi-structured interview (see Appendix G). I conducted all of the interviews using Skype, and the majority of them lasted for about 40 minutes. Interviewed participants were chosen based on availability, diverse range of years of involvement in the Phallacies program, and the deadline the researcher set for completing the data gathering via interviews. Most of the interviews were conducted at the end of the Fall 2013 semester through mid-March 2014.

I asked questions that required participants to describe their general Phallacies experience and then more specific questions related to the research questions for this study. Here are some brief examples of interview questions:

- Describe what it means/meant to be apart of Phallacies.
- What made you want to join Phallacies?
- What are two things you learned about masculinity as a result of being a participant in Phallacies?
- Describe the importance of being in a men's-only space.
- During your time in Phallacies, what role did the facilitators play in modeling alternative and diverse masculinities for you?

Data Management and Analysis

To protect the confidentiality of the participants, all email exchanges, pre-post surveys, informed consent forms, and interview audio-recordings/transcripts were stored on my password protected email and personal laptop or locked in a file cabinet in my home. Participants were informed that co-founder, Tom Schiff, would be provided with relevant feedback that would improve the program for the semester after which these data

were collected. Though I provide pseudonyms, I cannot guarantee that other participants in the study will not be able to identify other participants in the study, given the small sample size of students and familiarity with one another. In addition, I cannot promise that readers of my dissertation would not be able to assume or clearly identify some participants due to their seeing some of the participants perform in the theatrical part of *Phallacies*. This was mentioned in the informed consent form.

Using qualitative data analysis requires a multi-layered process that involves organizing data, creating categories, coding the data, making sense of the data, and writing of memos (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). My analysis of the data consisted of systematic and phenomenological approaches to collecting, organizing and interpreting. A systematic approach (Huberman & Miles, 1994) seeks to provide detailed steps in the gathering and analysis of data. A phenomenological approach (Moustakas, 1994) consists of suspending judgments to describe the universal experience of a phenomenon experienced by individuals.

I decided to cluster the information from the surveys and interviews using different approaches. For the surveys completed by the current *Phallacies* participants and the control group, I created themed memos to organize the responses. Once organized, I began to take note of commonly reported responses to designate quantitatively, when possible, and recorded how many responded to each coded theme to determine significance in reporting as a finding. From this process, I compared these responses to that of the current *Phallacies* participants pre- and post-survey. This process was useful in determining a collective definition of what it means to be a man at UMassAmherst and to identify the commonly reported types of peer groups men at the university in which they

find themselves discussing masculinity. I also drew contrast between how control group participants and those in Phallacies responded to problem-solving scenarios.

As for the 14 interviews, I began by transcribing and coding each transcript by hand to determine if the literature review-based categories, the five pedagogical principles, fit with the data collected. I chose not to use a computer software program to help transcribe or code the data, mostly because of the low sample size and a personal preference. Notes were made in the margins of each transcript to identify the categories or additional themes. The first round of interview content analysis confirmed that the five pedagogical principles were relevant, which makes sense since I had tailored some of my interview questions to specifically address them. During a second round, I engaged in a more phenomenological and inductive approach to discover additional findings and sub-categories that became relevant to share as a finding. I also wrote memos for each code that emerged from the interviews. Once I had the data coded from the interviews I was better able to triangulate the research memos and initial findings with mostly the post-survey and the control group survey to provide a deeper understanding of relevant findings.

Trustworthiness and Threats to Validity

Issues of validity can certainly be raised in this study. I will address four areas of concern: researcher bias, instrumentation, history, and testing. The most obvious concern is my bias as an action researcher, a co-founder and facilitator of the Phallacies program. I am definitely invested in the success of the Phallacies. Assessing whether or not the

program meets its most crucial goal of encouraging participants to challenge hegemonic masculinity peer group discourse is a finding to which I wanted to bear witness.

My experience in conducting this research led me to believe that my familiarity with the Phallacies participants did not negatively impact the data collection process. After considering an outside interviewer, I concluded that it would more effective if I served as the primary interviewer for this study. My rationale was that an outside interviewer would require building new relationships and, therefore, gaining the trust of the participants would be a lengthy process. This would especially ring true for having a woman-identified researcher, who might not receive honest participant responses due to her perceived biological sex and gendered presentation. We had a few women come into the space a few times during a session, and I watched some of those young men revert back into hegemonic thinking and behavior, and so I definitely wanted to avoid that, for I felt like their responses might be a bit skewed, which was confirmed in the finding about how valuable it is to have a men's-only space. In addition, serving as the researcher is allowed me to follow up an interview question with intimate knowledge I have about the curriculum, each participant, and general experience. The decision to serve as primary researcher also meant I chose against including a critical reader for this study, which was also an issue of finding someone to work with my frantic schedule since I work full-time while finishing my degree. In hindsight, I would include a critical reader to add more validity to concerns that my analysis of the findings was fair and complete.

During the actual data collection, I found that interviewing the participants felt like old friends catching up as we laughed and experienced moments of personal connection, which created an atmosphere in which participants shared their honest

opinions about the value of the program. A few former Phallacies participants had responded to my formal email or Facebook private message invitation to participate in the study with jokingly questioning my formal approach. I think they approached this research with open arms because of our positive working relationship and their overall appreciation for the program and the experience it provided. Even with the new Phallacies members with whom I had never worked, it was a joy to interview them, and I felt like through their peers speaking highly of me, I was granted a sense of trustworthiness that someone with no prior relationship to the program would not have had.

Then there is the threat of validity in instrumentation (Tomal, 2003). Not only am I the researcher who has a bias, I was conscious of the possibility that my participants might too feel compelled to provide me with a positive outcome based on the relationship we have built. This was perhaps the only real concern I had going into the data collection process. In particular, I wondered if they would answer the interview question about the role of facilitators in a truthful manner. I have to say that I was surprised in how forward many of them were in naming ways in which Tom, I, and other facilitators over the years could have been less hegemonic in our attitudes and behaviors at times. There were one or two participants with whom I had not worked who were concerned about giving me helpful information as they said a few times, “I hope that is what you are looking for,” but that was in the minority of responses.

A third validity concern would be history. History in this context is defined as the “effects on data when collected at different points in time (Tomal, 2003, p. 82).” In other words, because I used participants who span different phases and time periods in the

Phallacies program, there was the likelihood that different types of data would be obtained. After completing the study, I believe that collecting data over time allowed for more nuanced information of success, failure, and improvement. While I found that all Phallacies participants involved in the study did grow as a result of the program, a challenge was comparing the growth of each participant in an equitable manner. Since Phallacies participants spanned different levels of involvement in the program, it would have been ideal for capturing a common starting point in the program to determine if the program makes an impact on participants in their first semester, which would have also made a better comparison to the control group participants who were in their first semester of thinking about gender identity, multiple identities, and oppression.

The final validity concern is testing. Testing in this context refers to “the negative effects of a pretest on data collection” (Tomal, 2003, p. 82). This negative effect is centered on the belief that participants taking a pre-test assessment might figure out for the post-test what the researcher might be looking for and therefore not be authentic in their reflection on their growth over the course of the semester. In addition, participants who are experienced with school testing or a banking type of learning will be able to manipulate a researcher’s outcomes because they are “test-smart.” While there were issues of distributing the pre-test survey among participants who had experienced Phallacies, I do not believe the pre-test as a method of capturing data posed an authenticity and testing smart issue to the participants.

CHAPTER 4

DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES BETWEEN CONTROL GROUP AND PHALLACIES

Using data from the current Phallacies participants' pre-post survey and control group survey, the purpose of this chapter is to compare and contrast the findings to determine whether Phallacies is a meaningfully unique space that makes a difference in the lives of the participants who enter and graduate the program. The survey questions used to collect and compare the findings were the following:

(Pre-Survey for Phallacies Participants)

- Based on your observations and conversations with other students, what does it mean to be a man on this campus?
- Define hegemonic masculinity (you can use sentences or a list of words).
- How do you define your masculinity?
- What kind of peer groups other than Phallacies do you find yourself talking about masculinity in?
- How often do you talk about being a man among your male peers?
 - a. Never b. Rarely c. Sometimes d. Most of the time e. Every moment I get
- How comfortable are you with being emotional with men outside of Phallacies?
 - a. I'm not b. Not sure c. I'm ok with it d. Comfortable e. Very comfortable
- Have you ever called out a male friend for his sexist attitudes or behavior? Please provide an example if you have.
- Have you ever called out a male friend for his homophobic remarks? Please provide an example if you have.

(Post-Survey for Phallacies Participants)

- Has your definition of your own masculinity changed as a result of being involved in Phallacies? If so, please explain.

- Since being involved in Phallacies, are you more likely to talk about being a man among your male peers? If so, what about Phallacies contributed to that shift?
- At this point in the semester, how comfortable are you with being emotional with men outside of Phallacies?
 - a. I'm not b. Not sure c. I'm ok with it d. Comfortable e. Very comfortable
- At this point in the semester, how comfortable are you with sharing emotions with other guys in Phallacies?
 - a. I'm not b. Not sure c. I'm ok with it d. Comfortable e. Very comfortable
- To what extent has Phallacies encouraged you to call out a male friend for his sexist attitudes or behaviors?
 - a. Not at all b. Somewhat c. A lot
- To what extent has Phallacies encouraged you to call out a male friend for his homophobic remarks?
 - a. Not at all b. Somewhat c. A lot
- Compared to other spaces in which you've discussed gender and/or masculinity, how does Phallacies compare to that experience?

(Control Group Survey)

- What does it mean to be a man in U.S. society? Feel free to use sentences or list words to describe.
- How would you define what it means to be a man at UMass? Feel free to use sentences or list words to describe.
- How did you come up with that definition of a UMass man?
- Do you find anything problematic about the way men at UMass are generally defined? Please explain your answer.
- List 2-3 types of peer groups you are a part of on a regular basis. Please provide the typical racial, gender, and sexual orientation composition in each group.
- What topics do you tend to talk about in each group?
- In which of the peer groups you listed above are you most likely to talk critically about masculinity? Please explain what makes you feel able to discuss that topic in that group.

- How often does a conversation about critiquing masculinity at UMass or in society come up in male-only peer groups?
- How comfortable are you with sharing your emotions with men in your life?
a. I'm not b. Not sure c. I'm ok with it d. Comfortable e. Very comfortable
- Do you feel more comfortable talking about masculinity with a close friend or in a group setting? Please explain your answer.

There were some questions that were not included in the analysis because they were asked in only one of the participant groups. Those questions are: Do you believe violence among men is an issue to be concerned with? Do you believe men's violence against women is an issue to be concerned with? What does it mean to be a man in U.S. society? How did you come up with your definition of a UMass Man?

Defining a UMass Hegemonic Man

Both Phallacies and control group participants often come to define hegemonic masculinity on campus based on their observations and interpersonal experiences. The majority of participants in the study typically define a University of Massachusetts Amherst (UMassAmherst) man as studious, strong, confident, and a partier who "gets girls." Louis of the control group sums this up in his definition,

getting girls, grades, and having a lot of friends. A confident person who is always willing to lead the charge in any endeavor. Usually these are the high risk takers and usually the kids who go pretty hard on weekends. People admire them for being so fun and think, "Wow, he's the man."

According to this generic description, college-aged men are supposed to be good at almost everything. They are to gloat about their heterosexual prowess and acquire women as badges of honor on their route toward entry into the hegemonic masculinity club on campus. Some participants argue that men are to be studious or to get good grades and be

the most liked among their friends by being that “cool guy,” chugging heavy amounts of alcohol at parties. The fact that some of the participants define a UMass college man as studious might challenge what some current research studies and mainstream media have to say about college men’s lack of academic engagement in college. According to Pew Research, in 2012 young women’s enrollment in college was 71%, which has increased over the past few years. Young men have remained unchanged at 61% (Hugo Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2014). This difference in percentage is often attributed to a number of factors that include institutions not engaging men enough, men having more options to succeed outside of college compared to women or supporting women and students of color too much. While these numbers might have significance on a larger scale, I would point out that this study uses a small pool of men involved in this study and so making comparisons to national numbers might not be effective. Perhaps if there were more men in this study, studious would not have been an important marker of hegemonic masculinity. While we certainly had a range of students in the program, we often received strong interest in Phallacies from high achieving men on campus who took their academics and student leadership positions seriously. Perhaps they saw Phallacies as a space in which their intellect could be valued. Unfortunately, I do not have additional data to dig deeper into the student’s rationale on why studious was an important characteristics.

Strength was another characteristics of an ideal man at UMass. Strength was defined by all participants in this study refers to mental, emotional, and physical. A UMassAmherst man is suppose to be emotionally and mentally strong and are applauded for not letting hard times get him down. The expectation is that a college man on this

campus must present a confident presence and assert his muscular strength and athletic abilities over other men and women. A non-Phallacies participant, Kyle, defined this masculinity as what “normal guys do.”

A few men from the control group (3 out of the 17) did not find this to be normal behavior. Peter said,

I believe there is a lot of freedom of choice and that there is no set definition. Personally, I believe that to be a man at UMass simply means showing your true self. I have never witnessed any stereotyping of men on the UMass campus and have always seen wide acceptance and flexibility with the term man.

This participant is in the minority. Such deviation can be attributed to several factors, but most discussed in this study was the role peer groups played in shaping one’s understanding of masculine performance at UMass. Pete, a current member of Phallacies expanded on this idea.

I think that on campus, masculinity is defined based on the circles of people a man surrounds himself with...because my friends are socially conscious about the same issues I am. I don’t feel the pressure to fit in and act in a certain way around other men as I did before coming to college. However, I can see the way that masculinity plays out on campus. For example, when I go to the gym, it is easy to recognize men’s need to assert their dominance and over-emphasize their masculinity to other men.

Charles of the control group also recognized that a dominant discourse exists but is critical of the impact when trying to define all men on campus when he said,

I believe being a man at UMass puts you in a sticky situation. When a problem occurs in a domestic setting or in almost any setting, the male is usually seen as overpowering and raging, which is not always the case.

This participant recognizes the limitation of the discourse in the context of domestic violence or sexual assault, wishing not to be associated with that kind of masculinity; rather, he seeks to remind us that there is individuality within group membership. This

quote exemplifies the importance of viewing men as complex gendered beings rather than as “bad dogs” as Laker (2003) argues.

When prompted to explain whether or not the dominant discourse regarding a UMass man is problematic, there was almost a 50-50 split among the control group members. Those who found this definition not to be problematic saw themselves fitting into that masculinity and felt it was universal. Those who found it problematic felt the definition was too general and that constant competition around issues of drinking was often exhausting and limiting.

Some men of color in Phallacies found the campus definition of manhood to be problematic based on race. They felt that to be masculine meant being White. It was more likely for the men of color to have more of a salient experience with racial identity than White men in or outside of Phallacies. This makes complete sense, given that students of color have to navigate the historically White campus culture, and therefore be conscious of identities intersecting. Jimmy said, “Since being on this predominately White campus, I have begun to lose sight of what it means to be a man from Vietnam...my once multi-culture immersion has dissolved into more or less a homogenous ideology of manhood-mainly White, and what it means to be a White man.” He went on to describe that White male culture is defined as valuing big as better, dishing out and enduring pain, displaying emotional silence, having a knowledge of sports, and rejecting femininity.

The rejection of femininity is also a direct attack on Jimmy’s sexuality. As a gay man, he desires to embrace some of his feminine attributes and still be considered a man. He finds it problematic for himself and the campus to have “heterosexuality as the favored form of sexual expression,” which causes him to experience “a mess of

insecurities” in which he tries to deal with his internalization of the hegemony so that he can begin seeing masculinity as fluid and self-defining. Jimmy’s experience and analysis suggest that men of color and queer men are encouraged or perhaps forced to socialize themselves against the hegemonic standard of White, American, heterosexual maleness on campus.

With that said, we should not ignore the ways in which racial minorities or different ethnic groups, regardless of their racial identification, set up hegemonic masculinity standards within their own groups. In summary of this section, there was no significant disparity between Phallacies and non-participants in defining the hegemonic discourse on campus. A few Phallacies members, largely because of their experience in the program or due to their identification as racial and sexual minorities, provided more insight on how race and sexuality might complicate the hegemonic discourse at UMass compared to the predominately White control group pool. Those few would see masculinity on campus as being dictated by White, heterosexual men.

Comfort Discussing Masculinity

One might assume there are various spaces for men to talk openly about masculinity; however, according to the young men in this study, only some of them are designated for critical in-depth conversations regarding their identity as men. The following spaces were identified as peer spaces both Phallacies and control group participants often find themselves in in general: living spaces (i.e., floormates, housemates, dormitories), athletic spaces (e.g., gym buddies, intramural and student-

athlete affiliated teammates), among bandmates, leadership communities¹ (e.g., residential advisors, CSP, CEPA & Shaha), among classmates, gendered friendship groups, racial/ethnic friendship groups, and fraternities. Based on these spaces, control group participants were asked to identify specific settings where masculinity gets discussed. Here are some,

I feel like I could have a masculinity talk with my teammates because we all have that tough guy role and all of us are masculine and fit into stereotypes. (Shawn, Black-Native American, Heterosexual, Junior)

Due to the nature of the fraternity we talk about how we see ourselves as men and how we can improve ourselves. My brothers are in the same boat I am in [so it makes it easier to talk to]. (Charles, White, Heterosexual, Junior)

In White, female, and heterosexual peer groups [some homosexuals as well] may more easily be able to access different viewpoints and have a serious discourse. (Peter, White, Heterosexual, Sophomore)

With other men I am most likely to have serious conversation about masculinity because women don't have the same concerns and doubts as men do. (Brian, Cape Verdean, Sexuality Unknown, Junior)

I would most likely have a serious conversation about masculinity with my education classmates. My education class is the right environment for talking about masculinity as it is encouraged to bring the subject up and see any inequalities associated with masculinity. (Thomas, White, Heterosexual, Sophomore)

Many of these responses are hypothetical in nature and show that masculinity rarely gets discussed. With that said, the control group participants seem to be open to having broad to specific discussions about masculinity, given the right context as they recognize the influence hegemonic discourse surrounding masculinity can have on a

¹ Leadership communities are often the nurturing sights for men-identified students to build up an interest in social justice education and leadership, and often they join Phallacies as a sight to expand on that interest. This is especially true of the Residential Life leadership role of Residential Advisor. This is also the place where colleagues of the facilitators and co-founders reside so lots of recruiting pitches are made through this network. CEPA stands for the Center for Educational Policy & Advocacy. Shaha is a peer theater education model that focuses on doing performances about various social justice issues and identity development. CSP stands for the Citizen's Scholar's Program.

particular space. Having a sense of brotherhood is important for some of the control group participants, while others would be more likely to talk about masculinity in mostly women or in a class setting that addresses gender in a critical manner. When asked to get more specific in the kind of conversations regarding masculinity they have, some control group participants expressed being tentatively comfortable with expressing themselves or sharing emotions which is different from having a generic conversation about what it means to be a man.

Out of the 17 control group members, 10 said they would be okay with sharing their emotions with other college-aged men, and most of them said that would only be with a close friend rather than in a peer group setting. Close friend settings were defined as comfortable, more personal, and more trusting settings compared to the group setting. “I feel more comfortable with a close friend. A group setting could be a little more threatening and cause people to act out differently from if they were talking to just a close friend,” said Ethan. For similar reasons, there were a handful of participants who felt that one-on-one interactions with a close friend or roommate would motivate them to share their emotions. Thomas said, “I would be fine with talking about masculinity with a close friend, but it would be an unusual conversation as it almost never comes up in common conversation.”

Before entering the program, 7 out of the 9 current Phallacies participants rarely-to-sometimes felt comfortable talking about being a man among their male-specific peer groups outside of Phallacies. This tempered level of comfort shifted gradually depending on how many semesters a current participant had been in the program. Building confidence over time is what pushed some participants to sometimes, and a few to

engaging in such conversations most of the time. The spaces in which they were more likely to discuss masculinity were: residential life settings, among women, the classroom, social justice leadership communities, and racially mixed groups. Eight out of 9 current Phallacies participants tended to be super excited or ready to share their emotions in Phallacies, but 7 out of 9 reported being comfortable or okay with sharing their emotions with men outside of the program.

Just as we saw a narrowing of settings with sharing emotions among men in the control group and Phallacies, we see more nuance with the survey question, “In which of the peer groups you listed above, are you most likely to talk critically about masculinity? Please explain what makes you feel able to discuss that topic in that group.” By adding the word “critical” to the type of conversations in which they engage with other men, we see a more glaring difference in the level of comfort. In the control group, 10 out of 17 participants said they would very rarely/rarely/never have these type of conversations, while 5 participants would have them often/frequently. This is the exact same number of participants who previously acknowledged that they would be okay with talking with other men about their feelings. This indicates that there might be a desire for more meaningful or intimate conversations but that critical conversations rarely take place. Here are some different responses from the control group participants who rarely discuss masculinity critically,

I think that we rarely critique masculinity, and we just kind of accept how the UMass culture and society in general is. I tend to find that people who critique masculinity have different peer groups and have different conversations from one's I participate in. (Ethan, White, Heterosexual, Sophomore)

I would be fine with talking about masculinity with a close friend, but it would be an unusual conversation as it almost never comes up in common conversation. (Thomas, White, Heterosexual, Sophomore)

Not too often, I think the people I'm friends with are confident in themselves and who they are. There is no need to talk about masculinity because nobody is trying to prove theirs. (Louis, Race & Sexuality Unknown, Sophomore)

Not very often, most guys do not feel the need to talk about it, perhaps because talking about such as critiquing masculinity is not considered manly. (Nathan, White, Heterosexual, Sophomore)

As these quotes indicate, talking about masculinity in a critical fashion is not happening as often as one might think in individual or peer group settings. Perhaps it is also a lack of desire or need for men to engage in this manner. It is important to note that just because 7 control group participants indicated they are having critical conversations often that does not mean they are challenging or being critical of the dominant discourse of masculinity on campus. For example, James said, "We often tell each other to "be a man" and do something that we may be very apprehensive about and if we don't do it, the insults come rolling out." In other words, being critical is taken to mean by some participants as engaging in or receiving criticism about not fitting into the hegemonic notions of maleness on campus.

Some Phallacies participants also experienced difficulty in engaging in critical conversations about hegemonic masculinity, which holds true prior to, during, or after their time in the program. Christian, a former Phallacies member, reflects on his involvement with a fraternity during college and his current living arrangement,

Most male peer groups that I hang out with don't really feel the need to check ourselves or examine what we do...In (the fraternity) circles it's always fun, brotherhood, saying hi, laughing, fighting, things like that but never about checking ourselves. I live with two male roommates now, and we don't really get a chance to talk about these things. We don't really want to because all we are going to talk about is kind of the light stuff.

By not having a space where men feel comfortable critically engaging in discussions of masculinity, colleges and student affairs professionals specifically contribute to the

continual perpetuation of pre-existing dominant notions of what it means to be a man. Parker described his experience in a group of intellectual men who engaged with various social justice issues yet felt critical conversations about masculinity were missing or difficult to start. He said, “For the most part they were sympathetic to these ideas and call themselves feminist supporting but that space was still hyper-masculine, and there was a lot of intellectual fighting or dominating.” Parker’s description suggests the importance of not just focusing on being anti-sexist but also a desire to work on definitions and performances of gender that moves away from hegemonic behaviors.

The racial, ethnic, and gendered friendship groups that some of the participants indicate as spaces in which they find themselves provide a sense of comfort or normative behavior around challenging hegemony or oppression. Some of the White, male-identified, Phallacies participants² talked about recognizing that they often found themselves in White women or people of color friend circles when they engaged in critical conversations about masculinity or at least were more encouraged to think about social justice issues in general. It could be fair to suggest that across multiple racialized identities that it is a little more culturally acceptable for men to engage in a critique about masculinity when among women, especially those who acknowledge and speak out against oppression directed at women-identified people and their collective values. Sexuality of the woman might also be a factor in determining the level of comfort with discussing men’s identity development. A few of the Phallacies participants specifically stated that the women groups they find themselves in are predominately heterosexual women.

² This was largely the case because I asked more detailed questions of the Phallacies interview participants.

With that said, a few men have critical conversations in their men of color or multi-raced friend groups. Francis, a first-semester, White, male participant in Phallacies, said, “Sometimes I do find myself talking to Black, Asian, or Indian men about it more than with White men because conversations with them [people of color] can often surround prejudice and oppression and sometimes discussion from this subject will segue into masculinity.” Francis’ experience is an interesting one. It points out that through active listening and perspective taking, a White man can be exposed to a new discourse that not only triggers a racial awareness but that can lead to insight into one’s gendered attitudes and behaviors. Francis’ discovery is crucial in identifying how dominant discourse can be countered with counter-narratives provided by alternative peer group settings.

Another Phallacies White, male-identified participant, Justin, expanded on Francis’ observation, when he described his hesitation of critically examining masculinity. “My other groups of friends that I talk about masculinity with are mostly White males. I’m nervous to talk about it at first, but it usually goes well, and they are receptive.” Having known Justin since his first year of college, I can say that he has struggled to get to a place where he would overcome his sense of discomfort and perhaps fear of inviting his White male peers from back home to be more critical in their discussions of masculinity because he does not want to be cast out of the peer group. Jon, an Asian man involved in Phallacies, mentioned that he does talk about masculinity across different groups, but he notices that in his people of color peer groups where masculinity is discussed, there are often no Latino/Hispanic or Black men engaged in these conversations. I find in my own work similar to Jon that Black and Latino men are

often absent from conversations about gender and hegemonic masculinity. Without conducting additional research, I assume that there are many variables as to why these raced groups of men are less likely to critically discuss masculinity. One such variable might include that Black and Latino men use more of an intersectional lens to discuss masculinity and argue that they cannot separate their racialized and gendered experiences. Another variable might be that Black and Latino men are not as willing to explore their gender, their sexism, or hegemonic male behavior as a result of prioritizing race and racism over other forms of identity development and oppression.

Without an intervention, these young men in this study describe a lack of collective support among their collegiate peer groups to critically discuss hegemonic masculinity and to consider the possibility of performing multiple types of masculinities. Even after Phallacies, many of our former participants struggle as individuals to find a space in which they can be authentic in their performance of masculinity. This tells us that the peer groups are absolutely crucial to men's development on and off campus. Educators concerned with this must figure out ways to challenge peer discourse by introducing new or highlighting alternative peer group spaces that provide a level of comfort for young men on campus to shift the peer discourse among men and bring in the things that encourage critical dialogue in residential, women, classroom, or social justice leadership communities.

Encouraging Social Change and Allyship

In addition to the questions in the surveys, current Phallacies participants and control group members were asked to respond to four scenarios in order to determine

whether or not Phallacies participants were more likely to take action against sexual assault, homophobia, sexism, and hegemonic masculinity. Both groups of participants responded to the same scenarios. Current Phallacies participants had the opportunity to respond to the scenarios in the pre-survey with the hope of demonstrating growth in their original responses in the post-survey. As a result, the follow-up questions provided to Phallacies participants in the post-test to all the scenarios were different in order to capture growth. In total there were four scenarios. Three out of the four (1, 2 & 4) scenarios were found to be informative in comparing the findings between the two groups.

Scenario 3, which asked the participant about their ability to talk with a friend about their having a bad day, in hindsight, did not clearly ask them about social change at the interpersonal and cultural level, which as the researcher, I was hoping to achieve with these scenarios. Here is how it read:

Scenario 3: You are having a bad day and want to talk about how you are feeling with some of your male peers. How might you respond to this scenario? Would you share what is going on for you? Explain why or why not.

When I originally created this scenario, I was thinking that I might include change at the individual level as to what I meant by encouraging social change, but after coding and analyzing the data, I realized my intention should have been focused more on determining Phallacies ability or inability to develop young men who can take action at the interpersonal, systemic, and cultural levels. The majority of the responses to this scenario had similar results to the previous section, in which participants expressed a willingness to share their emotions with a close male peer or a father figure. Others

acknowledged that some of their male peers tend to “rough it out” or are “closed off” and would either keep it inside or share with a woman in their life.

Scenario 1: A man and a woman go on a date. He pays for everything. They go to his apartment or dorm room afterward. He keeps pressuring her to have sex. She says, “I think we should stop,” but they continue to engage in sexual intercourse.

The control group was asked to respond to the scenario above by addressing the following questions:

- If you heard about this scenario from a friend who identified as a woman, what would be your response?
- Would your response be different if you had to respond to a male-identified friend? If so, how would you respond?

Phallacies participants were asked to respond to the same questions in the pre-survey.

Here are the follow-up questions that Phallacies participants responded to in the post-survey:

- What do you think about this situation?
- Would you have thought about this differently if you had not been a part of Phallacies?
- If Phallacies played a role, what about the program led to a change in your attitudes and behavior?

In Scenario 1, participants were asked to share their thoughts regarding a heterosexual sexual assault scenario in which the woman can be perceived as the victim and the male as the perpetrator. Current Phallacies participants generally saw this scenario as problematic in their pre-test and their willingness and approach to challenge depended on the gender of the person. Most of them were fine with empathizing with the woman involved, identifying it as rape and ready to assist her in finding campus resources. If the man in the scenario was the one who said no or committed the act of

sexual assault, some of the Phallacies participants described how their responses might be different:

I would encourage the woman to re-evaluate the relationships and talk to the male-identified person about how what he did was unacceptable. (Carter, White, Heterosexual, 1 semester)

I think I would react in a supportive manner to the woman by inquiring about her consent and his dissent and try to connect her with resources. If it involved the same coupling, and the man requested that they stop and continued, I would be less concerned about the immediate safety of the man. (Jimmy, Asian, Gay, 6 semesters)

I would be upset. If my female friend was upset, I would refer her to resources on campus. If I heard it from the male's perspective, and he told me he pressured a female into having sex with him, I would probably lose it. I would explain why that was an issue. (Pete, White, Gay, 2 semesters)

If I heard this story from a woman, I would ask her if she considered that rape. I would encourage her to take any action that she felt was appropriate. I would tell her to stay away from that man. If I heard this from a male friend, then I would tell him that he just put me in a horribly uncomfortable position, and that if he ever did that again, then I would have to talk to the woman. I'm afraid that I would not know what to do if the guy was my friend. (Francis, White, Heterosexual, 1 semester)

The responses to the scenarios shows that these young men agree that the situation is problematic for the women involved. Some would support the woman in the scenario by providing advice or suggesting resources. These responses indicate that some participants have learned ways to support women victims of sexual violence, while others might not have been able to name the situation as sexual assault but still felt it was wrong. With that said, I am not able to identify as the researcher what contributed to that approach, given that some of our participants have been in Phallacies for some time, and their responses might have been influenced by their time in the program or by other variables.

As we turn our attention to the man in the scenario, many of the Phallacies current participants either directly challenge the man in the scenario to think of this situation as

unacceptable or crossing the line or they take less passive ways of calling out the behavior. For example, Jimmy mentioned that if the situation were reversed and the man wanted the sexual intercourse to stop, he would be less concerned about his safety. While I did not ask a follow-up question to Jimmy regarding his response, I assume that he believes that women need more support and protection than men—the assumption being that men can and should take care of themselves in this and likely in all situations. It might be the case that Jimmy has learned about ways to support women in this situation more so than he has learned about ways to support men victims of sexual violence.

Another current participant, Francis, talked about calling a man out for the sexual assault but acknowledged struggling to challenge the man in the scenario if it were his friend.

Here are some examples of Phallacies participant post-survey responses:

I would consider this rape after spending time in Phallacies. Before, I would have considered this consensual because of the ambiguity. (Carter, White, Heterosexual, 1 semester)

I don't think I would say anything before Phallacies. (Jon, Asian, Heterosexual, 3 semesters)

Before Phallacies, I wouldn't think anything of it. A lot of the skits in Phallacies talk about what rape is, and it made me more aware of this issue. (Sam, White, Heterosexual, 2 semesters)

I think I would have thought about the situation the same way regardless of Phallacies because I've taken other social justice courses at UMass. (Pete, White, Gay, 2 semesters)

Even before Phallacies, I would have found this scenario to be problematic. However, being a part of a space that is safe and supportive has allowed myself and others to share their personal lives and stories and that has encouraged me to be more sensitive to issues regarding rape and sexism. (Justin, White, Heterosexual, 5 semesters)

These responses show how important it is for young men and others to be involved in critical spaces that engage issues of gender and sexual assault. As participants allude to in both the pre- and post-test, Phallacies does not have to be the only space in which young men can learn to consider this scenario as problematic. However, for some, the program creates an environment in which these important personal reflections and conversations can happen as a result of feeling supported to speak out and simply being made aware that behavior they might have normalized prior to Phallacies can be problematic among other men.

Control group participants were on a continuum in their responses to the scenario, but compared to Phallacies participants, they were more critical or judgmental of the woman's actions than that of the man involved. Here are some of their responses:

If my friend was a girl, I would tell her the man was wrong, but if it was a guy, I would say the girl was being overly sensitive. I would basically tell everyone what they wanted to hear and stay out of it. (Channing, White, Heterosexual, Middle Class, First Year)

If it was my female friend, I would be hurt by the male's actions but also think my friend was naïve. If it was my male friend, I probably wouldn't have discussed much other than how far did you go. (Shawn, Bi-racial, Heterosexual, Middle Class, Junior)

If you [the girl] really wanted to stop, then you should have not continued to engage. I would ask the male more about the situation and what specifically the woman said. I would tell him he should be careful about pressuring women to have sex. (Paul, First Year, Other Identities Unknown)

While these three participants and a few others were not the dominant perspective among the control group, it is important to note that Phallacies participants across the board were more supportive of the woman, even if they did not speak out against the men's behavior before Phallacies. Perhaps, if the young men in the control group who expressed more critique of women were enrolled in the program, they might change their perspective

and/or willingness to interrupt the situation like some of the Phallacies participants. Due to a research limitation, it would have been helpful to follow up on control group participants who felt the actions of the man was wrong and inquire about what experience influences their stance.

Scenario 2: You are playing a video game in a friend's room, and he says, "That's so gay," in reference to a move he disagrees with in the game. How might you react to this situation? What would you say or not say?

The control group was asked to respond to the scenario above by addressing the following questions:

- If you heard about this scenario from a friend who identified as a woman, what would be your response?
- Would your response be different if you had to respond to a male-identified friend? If so, how would you respond?

Phallacies participants were asked to respond to the same questions in the pre-survey.

Here are the follow-up questions Phallacies participants responded to in the post-survey:

- What do you think about this situation?
- Would you have thought about this differently if you had not been a part of Phallacies?
- If Phallacies played a role, what about the program led to a change in your attitudes and behavior?

In Scenario 2, there was a difference between the control group and Phallacies participants. This scenario focused on using the phrase, "That's so gay." They talk about this scenario or specific phrase happening so much on campus that they or their peers just say it without thinking. Others describe the modern day intent and meaning of "gay" as not being associated with homophobia like it might have been in the past. Luis of the control group said, "It's so common I probably wouldn't say anything unless there was a

gay person in the room. I feel if I did say something to the other player, I would have no effect on their behavior.” Luis’ point about having an effect speaks to another layer of apathy that is focused on one’s inability to influence change in another person. Here are some additional control group responses,:

I would not say anything because I would not really care about it and would not want to cause a big scene. (Kevin, White, Heterosexual, First Year)

I would probably assume he was just frustrated and wouldn’t think much of it. (Richard, Black, Heterosexual, Junior)

Honestly, I would probably laugh because I know he is probably not attempting to offend anyone. (Shawn, Black, Heterosexual, Junior)

Changing a person’s language is extremely difficult and most of the time not within my power and responsibility to do. I will express my disagreement with the phrase but not demand that they not use the word “gay” in an offensive manner. I have many homosexual friends who use the word in a humorous way. (Peter, White, Heterosexual, Sophomore)

Phallacies participants carried less apathetic attitudes and did make attempts to challenge this statement earlier in the semester in which this research was conducted.

Here are their pre-survey responses:

I have had a lot of trouble in the past with coming up with a non-confrontational way of calling people out on this poor use of language. I’ve learned to ask what exactly does that phrase mean to people. I follow up by informing them that is not what gay means and ask them not to use that language around me. (Justin, White, Heterosexual, 5 semesters)

It depends on the friend, but I would be more inclined to ignore it just because we’ve talked about it before. In friends, who I haven’t confronted about it, I would ask them not to use it. (Sam, White, Heterosexual, 2 semesters)

I would say that I understand that you think the game is lame, but it is not nice to refer to this as gay. (Fabian, Black, Heterosexual, 2 semesters)

I’d use a casual dissent and a disapproval of this expression. I have heard the word used in so many contexts and with such frequency that I may have either become hardened to the sentiment or fluent in the way of addressing it with my friends. (Jimmy, Asian, Gay, 6 semesters)

It is hard to determine if Phallacies played a role in shaping these responses or if other variables were at play since many of the participants quoted above have spent some significant time in Phallacies. With that said, some participants shared that they would indeed take action in this scenario, but a few struggled with being able to be confrontational and thereby choose to use a “casual dissent” to approach the men in their lives about the use of this phrase. Over the course of the semester, some Phallacies participants reported an enhanced ability and belief in creating change in a more serious or confrontational manner. Here are some responses from the post-survey:

Before Phallacies, I wouldn't have had any reaction to “That's so gay.” I have learned to not let this type of language slide. I've learned to be more passive [less judgmental] or [to use an] educational approach when confronting negative language rather than in an aggressive or angry way. (Justin, White, Heterosexual, 5 semesters)

I would take action before joining Phallacies. (Jon, Asian, Heterosexual, 3 semesters)

Yes I believe Phallacies has allowed me to be more confident. (Francis, White, Heterosexual, 1 semester)

I would have probably thought the same because of my involvement in Res Life and because I have a progressive group of friends. (Carter, White, Heterosexual, 1 semester)

Before Phallacies, I would most likely have told him that was messed up or ignored the comment. Through skits, I have developed a much better response. (Kanye, Asian, Heterosexual, 3 semesters)

These Phallacies participants represent a majority of current and former members' ability to specifically name that an increased sense of confidence and/or practicing a more firm educational response through our dialogues and performance pieces as making the difference in their responses. In the pre-survey, the majority of the participants reported challenging the use of the phrase or wording but usually in a way that was not “super

confrontational” and did not take place on a consistent basis. They would challenge their friend but usually not a stranger by asking him to stop using the word and hope that it would not arise again. In the post-survey, I noticed more participants talking about an increased sense of responsibility to challenge the use of this language on a regular basis and in a less casual manner. I would attribute the times when we spent breaking down language in dialogue and in creating skits on offensive language as the prompts that created a new awareness and firm educational ways to engage their peer in critical reflection as leading to some members’ increased likelihood to challenge the comment.

It is important to note that Jon and Justin both had different experiences with each of the last two scenarios. Jon was very aware of and ready to take action against this particular aspect of homophobia, but in the previous scenario, he admitted to not thinking much about the sexism and sexual assault scenario until joining Phallacies. For Justin it was the opposite, and he needed to have his level of awareness raised in regards to a homophobic statement and was uncomfortable with the sexual assault scenario prior to Phallacies. If control group participants were a part of Phallacies, perhaps they would have experienced a change in viewing this scenario as one related to homophobia and of need of action as some of our Phallacies members did.

Scenario 4: You are at a party and you overheard a comment being made about another man being called a “pussy” for drinking a Mike’s Hard Lemonade instead of a beer. What do you do? What is your gut reaction? What emotions might come up for you?

The control group was asked to respond to the scenario above by addressing the following questions:

- If you heard about this scenario from a friend who identified as a woman, what would be your response?

- Would your response be different if you had to respond to a male-identified friend? If so, how would you respond?

Phallacies participants were asked to respond to the same questions in the pre-survey.

Here are the follow-up questions that Phallacies participants responded to in the post-survey:

- What do you think about this situation?
- Would you have thought about this differently if you had not been a part of Phallacies?
- If Phallacies played a role, what about the program led to a change in your attitudes and behavior?

In Scenario 4, participants were asked to respond to a situation in which a college man at a party had his gender and sexuality questioned by his peers for drinking a Mike's Hard Lemonade instead of a beer. The majority of the control group members saw this scenario as common, funny, and not a big deal. However, there were a few control group participants who would challenge the heckler in different ways:

I would have probably joined him in drinking Mike's Hard Lemonade, not because I enjoy it but because I would do it so he isn't the only one. (Kevin, White, Upper-Middle Class, Heterosexual, First Year)

I think I would laugh at the joke because most guys don't drink Mike's at a party. If the joking got out of hand, then I would remove myself from the situation. (Shawn, B-racial, Middle Class, Heterosexual, Junior)

I would tell him to stop babysitting the drink and just down it like a champ. If he wants to drink it that is up to him, but he shouldn't babysit it. (Brian, Cape Verdean, Junior)

If the individual wasn't gay, I wouldn't do anything, but if he was, I would ask the person making the joke to chill out. (Richard, Black, Heterosexual, Junior)

These control group members use interesting strategies to take action against offensive terminology and hegemonic masculinity. Kevin takes a supportive approach despite not

liking the alcoholic beverage too much. In his action, he hopes to address bullying, and though he might not articulate it this way, he also challenges the idea that a man can enjoy this type of non-beer beverage. Shawn supports the dominant discourse through his belief that men do not drink Mike's Hard Lemonade. He suggests that this non-normative behavior is laughable, but at the same time depending on how far people took the "joke," he would make the choice to step in. Brian attempts to be encouraging of this young man's choice of drink, but at the same time questions his non-hegemonic drinking style when he takes issue with his peer "babysitting" or drinking the beverage slowly.

The final control group participant to speak out against the dominant masculinity discourse is Richard. In a supportive manner, Richard would speak out if the person identified as a gay man but if not he would let the situation be. In that moment he would be a fine ally against heterosexism, but he is simultaneously perpetuating hegemonic masculinity. Why would he not stand up if a heterosexual person were drinking this beverage? Perhaps one can assume that Richard believes a gay man needs more protecting than a heterosexual man. Richard conflates sexuality and gender. He assumes that to drink such a beverage means his male peer is gay. While intentionally calling a man a "pussy" is a direct insult to his sense of masculinity, it also is a direct commentary about women's bodies being objectified and viewed as weak or less than men's bodies. In other words, men's and women's use of "pussy" to describe a man as less masculine is a common fear that men have when defining their gendered performance, especially among groups of men.

Many current Phallacies participants' pre-survey responses mentioned that if it were someone they knew who was being picked on, they would act but if not they were

more likely to let the joke run its course and avoid confronting a peer. Here are some pre-survey responses:

Most likely, I would do nothing but feel uncomfortable and perhaps avoid the perpetrator for the night. The drive to correct the person is muted by the party scene and the anticipated dissent from peers viewing me as a party-pooper. (Jimmy, Asian, Gay, 5 semesters)

Sadly, right now I probably wouldn't say anything unless I knew one of them. (Francis, White, Heterosexual, 1 semester)

Lately, I get upset when people talk about girly drinks and how men shouldn't drink them. Those drinks will probably get them drunk faster than the beer that men are supposed to drink. People should be allowed to order whatever drink they want without fear of being ridiculed. (Justin, White, Heterosexual, 6 semesters)

Here are some post-survey responses from Phallacies participants:

Before Phallacies, I would have laughed at the man drinking the Mike's Hard Lemonade, but now I understand that people should be allowed to drink whatever they want to. I've grown because some of our skits speak to this problem. (Sam, White, Heterosexual, 2 semesters)

I would have not had the confidence to talk about this issue had I not been in Phallacies. (Carter, White, Heterosexual, 1 semester)

Before Phallacies, I would have not said anything or maybe even laughed. Since Phallacies, I understand the health risks men take. I would probably tell everyone to chill out, but I wouldn't go into an in depth conversation about hegemonic masculinity. (Kanye, Asian, Heterosexual, 3 semesters)

There were a few other Phallacies participants who would have not taken any action prior to the program due to considering this scenario as a joke, just as many members of the control group did. Others did not take an initial response because of not feeling confident and/or knowing how to specifically challenge this scenario and having not given this situation much thought. Those who did take action noted how without Phallacies having built up their confidence, they would not have spoken up.

In summarizing this chapter, the hegemonic masculine discourse at UMassAmherst is centered on being confident, studious, mentally and physically strong, a party animal, and heterosexual. While this sense of identity does not hold true for everyone in this study, it is culturally accepted among Phallacies and control group participants. Despite having an ample number of peer group spaces on campus, the majority of the participants in this study expressed a modest level of comfort in having broad conversations regarding masculinity or in sharing their emotions with other men. When it came to engaging in critical conversations about masculinity, these were few and far between. With that said, hypothetically speaking, both control group and Phallacies participants identified specific spaces as being likely venues for them to participate in conversations that challenges the hegemonic discourse. Those spaces had to be representative of underprivileged groups, such as heterosexual women and men of color, especially for the White, male, heterosexual participants in this study. I have observed participants in Phallacies struggle with taking action at first. After they have spent an entire semester or more in the program, they are more likely to be allies and change agents—something that might also be the case if control group participants were a part of the program.

In Scenario 1, Phallacies participants mostly viewed the sexual interaction as problematic. Not everyone would name this as sexual assault prior to their Phallacies experience but did overall have a desire to support the woman in this situation. Once in Phallacies, the minority of participants who would not have seen the scenario as sexual assault changed their understanding, and many of them learned specific ways to have a challenging conversation with the man in the situation.

Scenario 2 asked Phallacies participants to challenge offensive language as it relates to sexuality. Most of the Phallacies participants would challenge people around this language despite its common usage on campus. There was some level of apathy regarding the impact they could make, but participants in the program did learn how to more effectively engage their peers in deeper conversations about their choice of language. Rather than just saying it was wrong to say, “That’s so gay,” the majority of Phallacies participants had developed the confidence and educational approach to ask critical reflecting questions. If I could change Scenario 2, I would want to discover if one’s sexual identity made a difference in response. With that said, some gay men might have been guilty of internalizing the message of using an identity as an adjective to describe a strange, weak, or ridiculous behavior associated with a video game move.

In Scenario 3, control group participants were likely to see this as common and not a big deal. There were a few control group participants who were willing to defend the person being picked on for drinking a Mike’s Hard Lemonade. Each of them chose different methods but did decide to stand out and be different. Some Phallacies participants laughed at this scenario and chose not to speak up, but similar to other scenarios, Phallacies participants who decided to stand up accredited building the confidence necessary to serve as a constructive bystander who is willing to call others out on their behavior.

In the next chapter, I share findings that provide insight on ways in which Phallacies is able to challenge dominant discourses of masculinity and create a space for young men to be supported in their desire for critical conversations.

CHAPTER 5

CHALLENGING THE FALLACIES WITH PHALLACIES

In this chapter, I share additional findings that address the ways in which the Phallacies program specifically challenges dominant discourses of masculinity and influences participants to change both their level of comfort engaging in critical discourse and changing their individual conceptions of masculinity. I have organized the chapter's findings into the following themes: building confidence, dialogic counter peer space, becoming gendered beings, role of assignments and interactive activities, and modeling alternative masculinities. I end the chapter discussing how former Phallacies participants report their application of Phallacies to their current life experiences. The findings presented in this chapter were pulled from pre-post surveys and interviews with Phallacies members.

Building Confidence

Overall, participating in Phallacies increased the desire of current and former members to commit to engaging in social justice work as it relates to gender, sexuality, and race, in particular. Picasso describes this influence of Phallacies when he said:

I really didn't know it at the time, but it was shaping my worldview and opening my eyes to the fact that things aren't black and white. That everything is grey. I [will] think post-college I [will] look back on it as something that changed my life. Phallacies was something that really opened my eyes and challenged me to think differently and be uncomfortable at first. Before Phallacies, I didn't really pay attention too much to ideas of social justice.

Pete added, "I think Phallacies had helped me become more comfortable approaching other men. In high school, I was intimidated by straight men, and now I'm more comfortable confronting them about their behavior." These two participants exemplify

how having developed a greater sense of self can lead to the confidence required to speak out. Once a strong sense of confidence and critical awareness skills have been established through reflective writing and dialogue, current Phallacies participants reported via the post-survey that the program made it more likely that they would call out male friends in regards to sexism and heterosexism.

An increased sense of confidence was a common thread for Phallacies participants' willingness to make change on campus, and perhaps no greater medium provided that than did the peer education theater performance. Neil described gaining the confidence to role model change:

Performance is an incredibly vulnerable thing. To stand up in front of strangers can be really scary. The performance bit helps to push us to see more of what we need to do as individuals or [no longer caring about] appearing weak because you have fundamentally redefined what it means to be vulnerable [as a man].

Rudy added how personally uncomfortable the performance part is but also saw its value in creating change. He said:

Well, I hated going up on stage! The way I was able to get myself on stage was telling myself that I'm not acting, I'm educating. The first few semesters, doing "Crossing the Line" alone on that stage in front of 400 people, you definitely become more confident in life. We are giving people an opportunity to talk about these taboo topics in a way that doesn't seem taboo at all with pieces like, "The Middle Stall" and "Bromance."

In addition to the confidence that was instilled, the peer theater medium allowed for participants to practice what the program preached. Just as the writing prompts encouraged personal reflection, they also contributed to students taking ownership of how they might try out comfortable and uncomfortable ways of challenging the dominant discourse of masculinity on campus. Through rehearsals and performances on and off campus, the young men were able to gain experience as allies and change agents.

Discovering a Safe and Dialogic Peer Counter Space

Phallacies participants all agree that they would be less likely to talk about masculinity in a critical manner prior to entering the program. Many discovered and decided to join Phallacies using a combination of the six methods: recruitment by current Phallacies participants, residential life referrals, facilitator recruitment, venue for activism, curiosity in a space for men, and seeing the performance. The majority of the participants took part in Phallacies because they were seeking a space to express their gender freely, and/or they had a strong interest in social justice issues, which was largely tied up in their roles as Residential Advisors (RAs).

The importance of Residential Life was of particular interest because many of our participants worked as RAs. The majority of them were recommended to check out Phallacies because woman-identified RAs felt their male peers would be personally interested in the subject. There were a few cases in which Area Residential Directors (ARDs) played a role in encouraging their men-identified student workers to join as a good personal and professional development opportunity. Many of the ARDs were also women. Some of the male RAs encouraged to join were identified as displaying some sort of sexist beliefs or behavior that would be detrimental to their leadership role on campus. It is the case that many of these ARDs were aware of the Phallacies program because of my personal and working relationship with them. Therefore, while women were not technically a part of this space, they often played key roles in influencing young men to consider participating in the program.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, critical discussions about masculinity are more likely to happen in non-all-men heterosexual spaces for both control group and

Phallacies participants. Specifically, men in this study often felt more comfortable expressing themselves in one-on-one interactions with women. The challenge that Phallacies provides is for college men to learn how to become comfortable being themselves among other men since it is largely men's peer group discourse that maintain hegemonic masculinity.

Part of the appeal of joining Phallacies for many of our participants was the fact it was an all-men's space. Some participants clearly stated that having a woman's perspective would be invaluable to their understanding of gender, but agreed that at this point having women and men discuss gender in the same space would not yield the best results for men being open. Rudy said,

At this point in our culture, spaces for just men are the only way to get the ball rolling. It allows us to come out of our shells in a way where if there are women in the room people wouldn't feel as comfortable, especially since I'm sure we have had some men who have done some of the horrible things we've talked about. The only way to counsel them is by having male peers holding them accountable but in a way that is about growth and learning.

Rudy's example touches on a point that is not unfamiliar to any privileged group needing their own space. In the context of race, people of color and White people need affinity spaces to speak openly and honestly. This situation is no different. It shows why privileged folks, in this case men, need a space to simultaneously talk through their male privilege and the ways in which they are limited by the gender binary. Neil added,

I think what made Phallacies what it was was that it was a safe space where you could go to be vulnerable. When you're among men outside of that safe space where you know the expectations are different, you almost have to perform masculinity.

Other Phallacies participants echoed this point. Often Phallacies is their only space on campus to be able to have a process that directly challenges the way that they have been

raised. Larry added, “To [be able to] share my emotions was great. It was also cool to see other people change as well. It might have been the one space where men didn’t have to hide without the impetus of alcohol.” Without Phallacies, these young men are left with no critical male peer group options and left with the options of feeling excluded or to collude with the hegemonic thinking and behavior. Justin added, “When I’m home, if you are acting or saying something differently, you are considered an outsider, like something is wrong with you.” Many of the former Phallacies participants spoke about the challenge of creating such an intentional counter space once they graduated from college and found themselves in new living and workplace communities. As a result, many of them revert to feeling like an “outsider” as Justin previously mentioned during his travels back home.

Some participants hinted at the importance of the space being intentionally set up as diverse and dialogic. Jackie said, “The fact that it was a diverse group of men made me sort of question that assumption of common experience.” Having a dialogic focus to the program seemed to be a real value for the participants as it allowed them to practice new behaviors, like sharing their emotions in a male setting that felt supportive. Parker explained,

It was awesome for me to really hear other men talk about other things that I’ve never heard other men talk about before. We’re not there to compete. It’s about being on the same level. It was nice to see that other men felt that same anxiety to perform or validate masculinity.

Parker’s description provides us with the insight that in the majority of his experiences with men, he has felt discomfort in constantly using competition as a means to prove one’s manhood when among men. As a non-athlete, Parker shared his feelings of not considering himself “man enough” when he either had no interest in participating in sports or when the realization set in that he was not good at it like his male peers.

Through dialoguing, Parker realized that other men too struggled with these societal pressures, which put him at ease.

Unmasking: Seeing Selves as Gendered Beings

As a result of being in a space of vulnerability and active listening, participants experience a shift in their own thinking. They move on from simply craving a space to becoming more engaged with others and self-reflective in how they perform or support hegemonic masculinities. Simply having peers who were willing to express similar or different challenges caused many of them to break through the need to hide behind the mask. As Edwards and Jones (2009) coined in their research, the process of unmasking one's "man face" requires a process of awareness and constant self-reflection. Jackie, a former participant, described the importance of self-reflection for him when he said,

I don't know if I ever gained as much insight into my own than I did with Phallacies. I've never thought to or had a way to critically analyze my masculinity. I think it significantly changed my perspective on a lot of things

Keith, a former participant, added, "Not every guy thinks the same way. I guess you can say that I'm an alpha man, but I learned that a guy can be a guy if he is not that role and you should appreciate the opinions from that person." As a result of increasing awareness via dialogue, participants become more likely to see their understanding of gender as problematic and gain confidence in developing a self-definition of masculinity that is not couched in feeling the pressure to confine themselves to hegemonic representations. Participants describe a sense of freedom to conceptualize masculinity on a continuum. Justin, a current participant, summed this up nicely when he said, "When I joined, I always thought we were about re-defining masculinity, but slowly I've learned that its

more about un-defining it.” Justin’s remark shows that over time participants can gain more insight into how they want to perform their masculinity.

Some participants engage in more critical reflection about their word choices and have come to understand how it can have negative connotations for others. It may seem peculiar that there is such a disconnection between using offensive language and yet not meaning it, but that is credited again to the powerful influence a dominant peer discourse can have on any individual. We also spend a great deal of time in monitoring offensive language and creating theatrical pieces (e.g., Masculinguistics) that speak directly to that kind of self-reflection. Neil said,

I think the next thing I learned was being mindful of language we use. Earlier in this [interview] conversation I caught myself thinking about why I chose to use girl instead of woman. Every time I use the word “bitch,” I get mad at myself.

Larry, a former participant, continues to find it challenging to reconcile this new awareness as he listens to Hip Hop music, “I really enjoy Hip Hop music, and I have the privilege to bump really problematic song lyrics. I could pretend I’m not supporting patriarchy, and I’m supporting the artist instead.”

This process of unmasking is not an overnight task. It requires that these young men acknowledge their wearing of the mask, question their need to try on the hegemony, and perhaps even put the mask back on until they have developed a different sense of self that can challenge peer hegemonic discourse. This seems especially true in the context of men’s relationship with women as Larry described in his struggle with Hip Hop. Other former participants speak to this challenge. Christian said, “I’ve always wondered if I am misogynistic and if I perpetuate that power. So I’ve been trying to say things like, ‘people do this instead’ of ‘women do this.’” Neil went on to add that he rarely thought about

male privilege and the impact men have on women's attitudes and behaviors before Phallacies. Jackie added, "I see myself still struggling with hegemonic masculinity especially in my relationship with women. But of course the insight that Phallacies has given me puts me miles ahead of where I probably would have been otherwise."

There were a few men who pointed out that being in this space validated for them that it was okay for men to have their own space to talk about issues of gender and it not be seen as problematic or recreating oppression against women or trans people. Kanye said,

Before Phallacies, I had a lot of negative thoughts about masculinity because of all the privilege that comes with it. Since Phallacies, I've come to identify more with being a man. I think about how identifying as a man affects my daily life and others around me.

Kanye points to an important concern that many within and outside of Phallacies have expressed regarding male-specific programming. Throughout my time involved with Phallacies, we often get asked with those clueless or critical feminist glares, "Why does a space for men need to exist?"

As seen through all participants in this study, men need a space of their own to be vulnerable and to specifically engage with men related issues, which includes addressing male privilege and dominance. Kanye's resistance to identifying masculinity in a positive manner is a direct result of this rhetoric. I think the same is true for the young men who partook in the control group. Had they known about Phallacies and received the same encouragement to join Phallacies, perhaps their hypothetical desires to share their emotions with other men and to engage in critical conversations about male gender identity development would have been realized. With that said, the courses from which those participants were drawn were the gateway courses that many of our current and

former Phallacies participants took before joining Phallacies. Thus, it is possible they might end up involved in the program. There was no significant data to make any such claims between current or former Phallacies members. For some, the unmasking process is introduced, and for others, it is empowered by the program. It is the intentionality of Phallacies of engaging weekly with hegemony and identity development that has made it unique. Once outside of the program, the unmasking is more vulnerable to the pushes and pulls of hegemony.

Adding to the Shift I: Assignments and Interactive Activities

Besides communicating via dialogue, being held accountable by their peers, and personal reflection, there were some important activities, assignments, readings, or videos that led to shifts in the attitudes and behaviors of Phallacies participants (See Table 4, Assignments and Interactive Activities).³ Assignments and activities were defined as relevant for inclusion in this study based on how often they were referenced to by multiple participants.

³ Though readings and videos tended not to be as important as the dialogue, topics of conversation, writing assignments, and interactive activities, I wanted to share those that were referenced by one or two participants as memorable. Canada, 1995; Katz, 1999; Kivel, 2011; Landis-Schiff, 1996; Solotaroff, 2013.

Table 4**Assignments and Interactive Activities** (continues onto next page)

Assignments & Activities	Description of Assignments & Interactive Activities
Body Image Tracing	Participants were put into pairs and asked to outline their partner's body on large construction paper and post on the wall for all to see. Each participant answers the following questions about his body: What do you like? What would you change? What part of your body do you often compare with other men? Once that is complete, we then enter into a dialogue.
Take a Stand: Masculinity & Class	Participants were asked to identify their social class and how it intersects with their sense of manhood by locating themselves on a continuum that had end points of Agree or Disagree. Statements were read off by a facilitator, and for each statement a participant needed to locate himself on that continuum. Examples of statements are: Manhood is defined by the type of work you do or Being a breadwinner is a value you hold.
Race & Ethnicity Fishbowl/ Gallery Walk	Participants were asked to create a fishbowl, which consist of two circles (an inner and outer). The inside circle represents the talkers, and the outside circle represents the active listeners. The talkers get a chance to have a facilitated conversation in which facilitators of the program asked generic questions for each racial and/or ethnic group represented among the participants in the program. While the inner circle has a brief conversation with another participant or speaks as an individual, the outside circle listens to what is being shared. Example of questions are: How does your race impact your performance of masculinity back home? How does your race impact your performance of masculinity on campus?
What Does it Mean to be a Man?	Using the Man Box activity, the facilitators guide the participants through a brainstorm activity of what it means to be a man during the first or second meeting each semester in order to account for new participants. The inside of the box facilitators jot down the participants' responses to what they perceive the definition of masculinity to be. Facilitators challenges participants to reflect on what has be written and then proceed to define hegemonic masculinity and talk about the need to acknowledge alternative masculinities and the intersection of identities that create a hierarchy of masculinity. After this, facilitators return to the man box imagery and ask participants to share words or experiences they've had when they have tried to step outside of the boxed definition.
Engaging with Hegemonic Masculinity	This paper required participants to have a critical conversation with a man outside of the program as it related to campus or off-campus dominant discourse of masculinity. Participants were expected to

Outside of the Classroom	identify 1-2 people to communicate with.
Risky Behavior Paper Toss Survey	Participants each received an anonymous survey in which they were asked yes or no questions about their risky behaviors. After everyone completed the survey, the paper survey was crumbled up into a ball and then tossed across the room in order for each person to end up with a survey that wasn't his own. Then each participant opened up the crumbled paper, and we had people raise their hand if the response to each question read aloud was a yes.
Hugging: Assessing Male Intimacy	Participants wrote a hypothetical conversation they would like to have with a close male friend. Students were asked to have this conversation with another participant as if he were his friend. Once the speaker finished, they randomly chose a type of hug out of an envelope and had to enact that hug with the person to conclude their conversation.
Writing Prompts	These were writing assignments throughout the semester that each participant wrote as either homework or during in-class writing time. Participants were given a phrase or topic to write a performance piece about. Examples of prompts are: "Hook-up Culture," "The Long-Haul" (in regards to romantic committed relationships), or "Physical or Mental Health."

The most popular activity by far was the body tracing activity in which participants took a piece of large construction paper and had a peer outline their body as they laid on the paper. After this, each person identified parts of his body he were proud of and disappointed with. Kanye described his experience,

I never really was concerned about my body image but then as I was doing the activity and I became very concerned with how I was presenting myself. I remember drawing and being like, are my arms really that big? Do I have abs? How tall am I?

Justin talked about his experience with the risk-taking paper toss activity.

I thought about my sophomore year of college when I took an unhealthy risk with myself by drinking a lot. The activity got me to think about my behavior in a more serious way because before, I would joke about it, and friends would laugh. It got me to think more about my actions, especially during weekends on a college campus.

These activities were important for challenging assumptions about their sense of self and behavior, rather than engaging in hegemonic male behavior of laughing it off or being in denial about insecurities they have. These activities stood out to the students because they were relevant to their lives but even more so, they spoke to the larger research (Capraro, 2004; Pollack, 2001) that suggests that men learn better when using interactive and/or physical movement-based activities. As Kanye indicated, it was not until he was forced to look at this image and begin to draw and edit that he reflected critically about his body. For the paper toss activity, the young men had fun throwing paper around, which is like tossing the ball around, which is a familiar gendered play activity for some of our male-identified participants that creates a bond that allows them to take more risk with being vulnerable in that space. While this was not expressed by any of the participants, this interactive gender play might have brought up negative experiences regarding masculinity, athleticism, and sports. With that said, the activity provided some light-heartedness prior to engaging in a critical conversation about risky behavior. I recall many of the young men being amazed and sad that many of us in the space had been in a car with a drunk driver.

The use of writing assignments in and outside of class also were of importance to many participants, especially the former participants who had the time to reflect on their relevance over time. Two participants talk in detail about the importance of writing as critical reflection,

We wrote a letter to our fathers or our mothers, and I thought that was really interesting because I don't like to talk about either of my parents, but I can't avoid it forever. I like to pretend so often that I'm not impacted by my parents. Ya'll [Taj & Tom] asked me to write about my mom being a Tiger mom, and she was there [during the performance], and she cried. That was really unusual for me in

like empathizing with my mother and like trying to understand where she was coming from. (Larry, Asian, Korean, 6 semesters)

The writing gave me a chance to reflect, do research, and relate it to past and contemporary writings on feminism. It gave me the chance to dialogue with my friends in safe enough environments about the issues we talked about in Phallacies. This space has inspired me to definitely be more adamant about my beliefs and has given me this [avenue] to feel as though through writing I have a voice. (Keith, White, Israeli-American, 4 semesters)

Writing, especially reflective writing, is not always associated with men as a means of expression, but these young men developed an appreciation for using Phallacies as a mirror to empower themselves to address familial relationships or to find the confidence needed to voice their thoughts and feelings in a productive manner that encourages dialogue and meaningful learning. Sean also pointed out how an additional learning outcome of writing: to become academically engaged with material covered in other spaces on campus that addresses issues of gender. Prompts to prepare participants for the upcoming week's dialogue topic and/or to turn our conversation into a theater monologue or skit were the most impactful kinds of writing in the program. For example, participants were given the writing prompts "Hook-up Culture" or "The Long-Haul" as we prepared to translate our dialogue about romantic and sexual relationships into performance pieces.

Adding to the Shift II: Modeling Alternative Masculinities

In addition to these interactive activities and writing assignments, the role and identities of the facilitators in modeling alternative masculinities was important for participants in shifting their attitudes and behaviors about masculinity. Through sharing personal struggles, possessing different personalities and social identities, and using different facilitation styles participants came to appreciate the impact these older men had

on them. Facilitators included Tom Schiff, Dennis Canty, Michael Schurter, Anders Minters, and myself.

Tom and I served as the founders and original facilitators of this program. Dennis Canty was a non-traditionally aged, White, gay undergraduate student, who also served in the theater director role during the program's first two years of existence. Michael Schurter has been our theater director for the past two years and is also an actor and instructor in the Isenberg School of Management at UMassAmherst. Michael identifies as Canadian, White, mid-aged, and heterosexual. Anders Minters, during the time of this study, was a Master's student in the Social Justice Education program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and identifies as White and queer. He served as a facilitator for one semester in my absence, which was also the semester I was collecting most of these data. The majority of the former and current participants experienced Tom and me as the main facilitators and thus had the most to say about us as co-facilitators and as individuals.

Individually, we each made an impact. Participants appreciated Tom for his brashness, expression of a wide range of emotions, and personal growth. Picasso said, "I think Tom was a great role model for me because we shared a lot of experiences. I think that something as simple as Tom hugging me and telling me its okay to cry was affirming." Often participants referred to Tom as the grey, the elder, or the uncle. I, on the other hand, was seen more as the older cousin and referred to by some as the prophet. Participants spoke mostly to my reserved and thoughtful approach.

Overall, participants valued the importance of facilitators sharing personal struggles with hegemonic masculinity. Jackie said, "Seeing you both as vulnerable in the

space broke the ice and invited us to start talking. You guys put yourselves out there and took risk[s] and for us to see you do that was a powerful example of leadership.” Rudy added, “I think the fact that you all took part in the script writing, directing, and performing went a long way in modeling our roles as partners in this process.” This was echoed by a number of participants as being crucial to their ability to be vulnerable in the space. Without leveling the playing field or creating a feminist pedagogical space where the traditional student-teacher relationship is challenged, these young men might not have opened up. Kanye pointed out how our participation and modeling made him believe that changing one’s sense of gender identity and performance was possible. He said,

I look at the facilitators who live normal lives but who critically think about how they act. It’s cool to see older men facilitate and kind of challenge us. It gives assurance that I don’t have to live life the way that society kind of expects me to.

The fact that we are older men who are modeling alternative ways of being manly was important for the majority of the participants. We represent possibilities for these young men to take a different path in the gender socialization process. Our ability to live “normal lives” while being critical suggests that we are an exception to the rule and are not representative of a commonly (mis)understood male-identified masculinity.

The multiple and intersecting identities of the facilitators have always been important. Tom and I were intentional about our pairing as facilitators and recruitment of participants. I believe Phallacies is unique because it makes a conscious effort to consider diversity, inclusion, intersectionality, and social justice. This is what I believe sets it apart from other male spaces designed to talk about being a male. I can only make observations about this, but based on the research in the field and programming at other schools, male spaces tend to take on a race- or sexuality-only focus. These spaces are important but so

is a space like Phallacies in which we can engage in a larger kind of identity cross-cultural developmental process.

In reflecting on participants' comments about Tom and me as facilitators, race and sexuality were the most mentioned social identities. Race was more tied to me; whereas, age was the focal point for Tom. Keith, a former Phallacies, White, Israeli-American, heterosexual participant said,

I think a lot of Black males would be like, "Oh wow, I see Taj and let me look into this program." I could see how new members not wanting to join if they only saw Dennis, as opposed to seeing Tom, Dennis, and you.

Jon, a current Phallacies, Asian-American participant also spoke to the importance of having a facilitator of color in the space, "I think just having a man of color like yourself, even if you don't say anything, means the world because it shows a man of color in a position of power."

Through the interview process and my personal check-ins with Tom during the semester, I discovered that my absence had negatively impacted the group. A number of students reported a sense of loss in regards to my facilitation style and racial identity. Sam said,

I thought you, Taj, played a really great role because you were speaking from your Black male experience, and I thought we learned a lot from that. When you left we lost out on your dynamic, which allowed us to take turns on what we wanted to talk about. In your absence, people were jumping all over each other, and it became more like a debate, and it was kind of scary.

Most of the conflict in regards to race arose during my absence and, specifically, as a result of a facilitated dialogue about race that semester. A White student in the program had made a comment about masculinity not being defined by whiteness. This led to two students of color not feeling particularly supported or comfortable in that space. One of

them disengaged mentally, and then physically removed himself from the program for the remainder of the semester. I don't want to downplay my absence, but this particular student of color was having a tough semester due to financial reasons. The conflict that surfaced does indicate the importance of having facilitators who have different personalities, different facilitation approaches, and different racial identities.

While my absence caused some negative interactions within the group, I also think it led to some positives as well. Anders, a White, queer graduate student in the Social Justice Education program at UMassAmherst, facilitated with Tom that semester. Some students made note that it was important that he was not a heterosexual facilitator. Pete said, "It was good to have Anders there because he opened up toward the end of the semester, and I started to relate to him in a way that I couldn't with Tom, Michael, or you." Even before my absence, Dennis Canty's involvement in the program and his willingness to share his experience as a gay man was important in shifting the attitudes and behaviors of some of our participants and forced Tom and me to be more mindful of our heterosexuality. Picasso, a heterosexual participant, found it valuable to be able to connect with Dennis as a means to work on his perceived homophobia and heterosexism. He said, "I connected with Dennis a lot. Just exploring homophobia with him allowed me to determine if I was homophobic or not. Having someone to explore that with and who can explain their experiences was important." Some of our gay participants expressed a desire to make Phallacies less heteronormative and more inclusive of gay or queer men's experiences, especially in the selection of readings and conversations topics.

Despite the constructive criticism of the participants, the facilitators made a significant impact on the participants' ability to challenge dominant discourses of

masculinity. This is evident in all of our participants as they navigated their multiple identities and differences while creating a brotherhood. Christian describes this best in his interaction with Tom, “I remember the first time he kissed me. I was like, ‘Is that okay? Did I just accept that?’ But it felt good to be kissed on the cheek. I mean what other grown White man has the ability to kiss a young Black man. Like that’s unheard of.”

Life After Phallacies

Phallacies as a program has been successful in instilling confidence, inviting critical reflection, and naming the negative impact that some peer groups can have on men’s gender identity development. However, the data show that these young people are still developing a sense of self and often struggle to avoid colluding with the dominant discourse on campus once they leave this safer dialogic counter space known as Phallacies every Monday night. Our former participants highlight the struggle to maintain an active allyship and change agent practice when re-adjusting to a hegemonic masculinity environment after graduation. No longer having access to a weekly peer counter-culture space, like Phallacies, former participants as individuals find it challenging to discover or re-create a space to continue to develop their gender identity, and allyship.

Nonetheless, a minority of former participants rose above the pressure to collude with hegemonic discourse by incorporating the lessons of Phallacies into their daily practice. Larry described a situation at his current place of employment in which he uses what he has learned to confront a teenager:

I asked a young man on the autism spectrum if he knew what the words pussy or bitch meant, and he said he didn’t. So I explained, and because he feels additional

pressure to fit in with the other guys, I try to take an empathetic educational approach with him.

Another former participant, Rudy, added:

I'm glad to have moved on and apply the things I've learned. I recently proposed to do an apprenticeship program on masculinity with middle school boys where they will be encouraged to address behavior issues that are related to hegemonic masculinity. And I got the go-ahead from the school principal and counselors!

Others have focused their energies toward shifting the perspective of friend circles they now find themselves in. Picasso explained:

I took what I learned from Phallacies and brought those components into my friend groups, and we are stronger as a result. We do talk about important things, and I challenge my friends because of the ways I learned how to challenge in Phallacies.

These former participants' stories show that the program is meaningful and applicable to their lives after college. Larry's choice to use an empathic educational approach is a direct outcome of how Tom and I approached facilitating this space. We attempted to model empathy by asking questions rather teaching in a masculine manner that was direct and ignored the emotions that people bring to the table. Rudy's interest in creating a Phallacies-like program at this middle school is very exciting and a revolutionary approach to dealing with boys who tend to live within the socially accepted mantra of boys will be boys and therefore you should not try to change their problematic attitudes and behaviors. It is also important for participants, like Picasso, to take action among their own peer groups. As discussed throughout this study, peer groups are the most influential group in shaping people's attitudes and behavior about identity expression and performance. What these former participants are indicating is that despite being one to two years removed from the program, they recognize that others and as well as

themselves need a program like Phallacies to help shift the hegemonic discourse outside of college.

In the next chapter, I offer my analyses of how Phallacies contributed to shifts in college student men's gender identity development and provide implications of how the program can maintain its effectiveness and grow.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

This study introduces Phallacies, a peer theater and dialogue program for traditional-aged college men, a program that challenges male-identified participants to think critically of how they self-define and perform masculinity when interacting with the dominant peer discourse in regards to definitions of manhood on campus. Using an action research methodology, I assessed the program that I co-founded to determine how this all-male space encourages men to think about gender and helps to combat some “men’s adherence to unproductive masculine conceptions such as sexism, homophobia, violence and anti-intellectualism which are often requisites for their access to male peer groups” (Harper & Harris III, 2010). Conducting this research also serves to inform my work as a practitioner in the context of identifying what works and what does not. This chapter explores the participants’ responses to the guiding research questions in two main themes as well as offers insight into improving the program and implications for how to carry forth the research of male-identified programs for student affairs practitioners.

Research Questions

The specific research questions explored are:

- How do participants define the hegemonic masculinity discourse at UMassAmherst?
- How comfortable are men discussing masculinity in college peer group settings?

- In what specific ways were the male students able to re-define their masculinity as a result of being in this program?
- How successful is the Phallacies program in encouraging participants to challenge hegemonic masculinity on campus?
- What pedagogical principles (i.e., dialogic interaction, men's-only space, men modeling alternative masculinities, encourage systemic change and allyship, and seeing selves as gendered beings) contribute to a participant's self-reflection and/or re-definition of masculinity?
- What aspects of the curriculum (i.e., readings, assignments, in-class activities) contribute to a desire to critique hegemonic masculinity on campus?

Re- or Un-defining Masculinity

Based on the research (Davis, 2010; Edwards & Jones, 2009), we know that men struggle with their gender identity formation before, during, and after college. We know these young men put on a “man face” or mask that hides their true attitudes and behaviors of how they wish to express their gender performance. However, there has been little assessment of programs geared toward college men's adherence to the hegemonic masculine discourse on campus. Phallacies offered the young men a facilitated vulnerable peer group setting in which they could try on new attitudes and behaviors that were more aligned with their sense of manhood. In Chapter 4, the dominant discourse of masculinity on UMassAmherst's campus, according to the participants, was largely understood as being about “getting girls, good grades, having lots of friends and partying hard on the weekends.” Phallacies challenges the common cultures of discourse referred to by Kimmel (2008) as the culture of entitlement, fear of femininity/being gay, hyper-masculinity, and culture of silence and protection. These narrow aspects of masculinity excluded many of the men who decided to participate in the Phallacies program.

Therefore, having an alternative space allowed many of the participants to re- or un-define the cultural expectations that had been set out for them by the dominant discourse (Harris & Edwards, 2010).

Pete, a Phallacies participant, said, “I think that on campus, masculinity is defined based on the circles of people a man surrounds himself with.” While Pete generally surrounds himself with like-minded people, he also recognizes the social pressures to conform to the standard. Some men of color in Phallacies identified the norm on campus to be limited to White men. Jimmy stated, “Since being on this predominately White campus, I have begun to lose sight of what it means to be a man from Vietnam...my once multi-culture immersion has dissolved.” Some gay men in the program also spoke to how heteronormative the campus feels and mentioned how at times Phallacies itself was perpetuating this norm of what it meant to be a sexual man on campus. For the most part, the Phallacies participants were no different from the control group participants in their collective defining of a UMass man. Where they did differ was that the Phallacies participants tended to recognize masculinity on campus as being an issue of concern and decided to participate in a program that would help them navigate their daily experiences of masking their inner sense of manhood.

In Chapter 4, it was discovered that critical discussions of masculinity rarely happen on campus. When they do, they are occurring in one-on-one, close friend spaces, or with some women in their lives. This is true for the majority of the participants in this study. Some of the White men in Phallacies talked about a tendency to find themselves in critical conversations regarding masculinity when among White women or men of color. By interacting across racial differences or immersed in White women spaces, these White

men were exposed to different perceptions about social justice issues in general, but it created within them a critical framework they could carry over to thinking about their gender identity. This was an intentional pedagogical principle that Tom and I had considered as we dreamt up the program, and so it is exciting to see that as an outcome Phallacies can provide White men and men of color with opportunities not only to engage across their differences but also to identify ways in which they experience commonalities in regards to their gender performance. Perhaps if the control group members, whom were predominately White, were more exposed to diverse friend circles or joined Phallacies they, too, would be more open to having critical conversations that challenge the dominant discourse on campus.

Pedagogical Principles' Influence in Challenging Hegemonic Masculine Discourse

As discussed in Chapter 2, it is important for student affairs professionals interested in working with men to think of them as people going through a gender identity development process in which they are socialized into hegemonic attitudes and behaviors. Some of these attitudes and behaviors become problematic on campus if they go uninterrupted and are allowed to flourish within the dominant discourse of student peer groups on campus. Doing one's homework of identifying critical pedagogies (i.e., feminist, critical masculinities, social justice, and intergroup dialogue) that support programming geared to any college student is crucial for addressing the concerns and nuances. In the larger field, there are a number of suggestions offered as things that help college men make shifts in their performance of masculinity(ies): personal motivation to take back their authentic selves, affirmation, ways to avoid shaming, critical events,

interactive curriculum, courses that encourage critical reflection, dialogue and historical information, and having older men model alternative or “well-rounded” concepts of masculinity all of which can be accomplished within a peer group (Capraro, 2004; Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harris & Edwards, 2010; Pollack, 2001).

Capraro (2004) adds that “a male-centered pedagogy that involves an all-male space and that which is required, peer-facilitated, interactive, and experientially based will lead to shifts in college men’s understanding and performance of masculinity” (p. 23-24). Understanding this while constructing Phallacies, Tom Schiff and I, intentionally built our program with these pedagogical principles in mind. We understood that we could not see our male-identified students as bad people and needed to honor their contradictory relationship to power as privileged, gendered group members and individuals limited by gender norms regardless of their intersections with marginalized identities (Davis & Wagner, 2005; M. Kaufman, 1999). In the coming paragraphs, I speak to responses to what I have summarized from the literature as five core pedagogical principles when working with men.

In Chapter 5, participants involved in Phallacies spoke a great deal about the value of having a space in which to talk openly and honestly. For many, Phallacies was their only space on campus where they could be critical of masculinity. Neil said,

I think what made Phallacies what it was was that it was a safe space where you could go to be vulnerable. When you’re among men outside of that safe space where you know the expectations are different, you almost have to perform masculinity.

A second principle is providing a dialogic space. At first, dialoguing with their peers was challenging and foreign, but overtime the participants really appreciated learning how to dialogue with other men in a open and caring fashion. The importance of dialogue was

expressed by Sam when he talked about my stepping down from the facilitation role of Phallacies. He said, “In your absence, people were jumping all over each other, and it became more like a debate, and it was kind of scary.”

As participants became comfortable in a dialogic space, they began to see themselves as complex, gendered beings, which is a third pedagogical principle to consider. Phallacies was intent on using a self-reflection-based approach to inviting these men to explore their gender identity development. Edwards and Jones (2009) found that until college men reflected on their behavior, they had not been aware that they were contradicting their own values, degrading women, and were not having meaningful relationships with other men. I found this to be true for some of our participants. While some entered the program with that kind of analysis, other participants were pushed to reflect on their attitudes and behaviors regarding gender and other subject areas. Jackie described the importance of self-reflection for him when he said,

I don't know if I ever gained as much insight into my own than I did with Phallacies. I've never thought to or had a way to critically analyze my masculinity. I think it significantly changed my perspective on a lot of things.

Jackie was one of our more hegemonic-behaving men in the group, and for him to make this transformation speaks volumes. He suggests that more men need help in learning how to be self-reflective about their gender identity, which makes a lot of sense because they have learned for so long how to suppress their preferred gender performance because of the hegemonic discourse they have been exposed to over the course of their lives.

A fourth pedagogical principle to consider when working with men is the modeling of alternative masculinities. Unfortunately, there are not enough spaces on

campus for men to think critically about gender, but there also seems to be a lack of individual and groups of men modeling alternative ways of being a man. This is not a surprise because many men go through a similar socialization process of being encouraged to collude with various hegemonic discourses from the communities from which they originate. Finding men who are in the midst of or who have spent significant time thinking about male identity development in the college context would be useful for considering when designing a program for college-aged men. In addition, these men must be able to balance the paradox of their social location as being privileged by gender constructs and negatively impacted by patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity. Facilitators or male role models must also be trained in dialogic facilitation, and ideally there will be two facilitators so that different styles can help to maximize the conversation and invite different people to share with either facilitator with whom they might feel more of a connection with in terms of communication style.

Related to facilitation style, the identities of the facilitators play a significant role. Kanye spoke to the age of the facilitators as being of particular importance. “I look at the facilitators who live normal lives, but who critically think about how they act. It gives assurance that I don’t have to live life the way that society kind of expects me to.” Another participant, Jon, spoke the importance of racial diversity and my role as a man of color in this space. He said, “I think just having a man of color like yourself, even if you don’t say anything, means the world because it shows a man of color in a position of power.” Ensuring racial, religious, or sexuality diversity might be a challenge for a campus depending on their staff or faculty diversity numbers, but it is important for student affairs professionals overseeing such a program to pull together all of their

resources to ensure that the facilitators to the best of their ability are as diverse as possible. Otherwise, programs open to all men, but led by a White facilitator will likely not be successful in recruiting men of color nor be able to connect with them on a meaningful mentoring level.

The fifth and final pedagogical principle is to encourage systemic change and allyship. Phallacies was intentionally set up for men to engage in systemic change and allyship through the ways in which the facilitators lead and wrap up conversations and through the requirement of all participants to hold themselves and each other accountable for their attitudes and behaviors. In addition, the theater component of the program provides practice for our participants to engage in culture change, on and off campus. Over our five-year existence, the theatrical performance has reached a number of regional colleges/universities, state government events, and an NGO in Albania. Through this experience, our young men have been provided with learning opportunities for their activism against hegemonic masculinity, racism, heterosexism, and sexism.

Despite operating in isolation, some of our former members continue to be critical of masculinity after the program and have incorporated ways of challenging the dominant discourse in their current workplace settings. Based on the post-surveys taken by current Phallacies participants, they all felt that the program made it more likely that they would call out male friends in regards to sexism and heterosexism. Comparing them to the control group, Phallacies participants were more likely to challenge scenarios that had gendered implications because they discovered ways to speak out and became empowered in knowing they had a group of peers in the program who felt the same way.

Improving Phallacies

Phallacies is doing a lot of good things by adhering to the pedagogical principles offered by men's scholars. With that said, the program could improve in the following areas: ensuring a diverse facilitation team and participants, holding more dialogue sessions, diversifying the readings and topic material, and figuring out a way to further support its former participants.

As we attempt to ensure our intersectional work, we must pay more attention to how and who we recruit as participants and facilitators. Many of our participants spoke to the value of having a diverse group of peers, and so that is something we must work hard to ensure. In the past, we have done pretty well with getting White men and Asian men from different walks of life to join, but a renewed and creative recruiting process for Latino, Native American, and Black men is needed. Tied to the recruitment of racially diverse men is making sure to identify interested men of color facilitators. As Keith said,

I think a lot of Black males would be like, "Oh wow, I see Taj, and let me look into this program." I could see how new members not wanting to join if they only saw Dennis, as opposed to seeing Tom, Dennis, and you.

The semester in which I stepped down and collected these data we began to see the group shift in part because I represented a person of color role model. When I was replaced by a White man, Anders, some students of color felt challenged to have someone to relate to racially. Therefore, in a multi-racial group of participants, we must be sure that one of the facilitators is of color. While Anders, the White male facilitator who replaced me, did not provide a positive addition in terms of race for participants of color, he did provide positive role modeling for our gay-identified participants, especially the White, gay men.

Some students spoke to wanting more dialogue. This desire for more is perhaps the most rewarding finding, personally, and serves as a direct challenge to hegemonic discourse. In Chapter 2, I made reference to Davis's (2010) point about hegemonic discourse devaluing an openness to talk and labeling it as feminine. Davis mentions in that same article that men tend to be more likely to engage in conversations while doing an activity, like playing video games. The fact that Phallacies provides an alternative mode of communication by sitting in a circle and looking at people as they share their vulnerability is a major feat and challenge to the hegemony. It does take a majority of the participants in the program some time to get use to, however. The value of this means of communication is that it allows participants to be their authentic selves and to gain the confidence to speak out against hegemonic male attitudes and behaviors. Figuring out a way to include more opportunities for dialogue is always a challenge because of the theatrical aspect of the program. About mid-semester we have to turn our attention to rehearsal, which eats into our time for dialogue.

The topics for dialogue need to expand. There is a tendency for many of our participants to re-enroll into the program for multiple semesters. As program coordinators and facilitators, we have not yet figured out the right way of balancing bringing new participants on board while continuing to nourish the veterans in the group. Veterans tend to have read and gone through some of the dialogues we have identified as crucial to have when bringing in new participants so it becomes unproductive and repetitive for them. Diversifying the readings or videos that supplement the dialogues is also in need of change. As discussed in Chapter 4, readings are often forgotten or merged together for current and former participants alike. There are a few that stand out, but for the most part,

it is the assignments and activities that participants tend to remember. This makes some sense since the literature suggests that men learn better by being active (Capraro, 2004; Davis, 2010; Pollack, 2001).

A final way the program can be improved is by figuring out a way to further empower former members as they enter the “real world” and find themselves less engaged with the subject and feeling less empowered to speak up compared to when they were on campus and involved in this program. After Phallacies, many of the participants involved in this study talk about the struggle to challenge hegemonic attitudes and behaviors, and at times, collude with the system because they are not in a weekly 3-hour environment that focuses specifically on gender identity and expression.

Implications for Student Affairs Future Research on Men-centered Programming

Other than making the aforementioned improvements, the assessment of the program helps to affirm that Phallacies has been shown to be effective in accomplishing its goal of challenging the dominant discourse on campus and empowering groups of men to re- or un-define their masculine performance and sense of identity. It was my hope to listen to the call of student affairs scholars Harris and Barone (2011) and make a contribution to the field by not only highlighting an effective program but to showcase ways in which one can carry out that action-oriented research. I would like to share in the next couple of paragraphs some of my reflections on the methods used and how I might improve this research going forward.

I found that the interviews with former Phallacies participants were the most rewarding methods of data collection, given the nature of figuring out the qualitative

experiences of the participants involved. It was particularly rewarding to catch up with former participants who I had not talked to in a while but whom were still making attempts to challenge the hegemonic discourse of masculinity in their own ways. If I could have done this research over, I would have conducted follow-up interviews with some participants to get them to elaborate and to ask clarifying questions..

This would have been especially useful in determining how their race and sexuality might have complicated some of their responses. I was not interested in having an intersectional lens drive this dissertation because it has been my practitioner experience that intersectionality in practice sometimes has a negative affect of ignoring commonality among people, and in this case, ignore the commonality among cis-gendered men across race, class, religion, and sexuality. Phallacies has been predominately a White, heterosexual, cis-gendered men's space despite the intention of making it a racially diverse space. In Phallacies, we had a decent representation of and deep sharing from our Asian men; however, our Black and Latino men were harder to recruit over the six years of the program and/or were harder to secure their involvement in this study due to lack of responses to my study invitation.

I have found in my personal interactions with men across many campuses that Black and Latino men are often not as encouraged to talk about their male privilege and sexism. People, often people of color, are often surprised that I (a Black man) even speak up about sexism, heterosexism, and male privilege. I think the assumption for and among Black heterosexual men is that they should only be concerned with racism. In future research, I would conduct follow-up interviews with Phallacies men of color participants in an attempt to discover the degree to which race influenced their experience in

Phallacies. I would also encourage other student affairs professionals to do more assessment of programs in which men of color are the focal point and determine the degree to which those young men reflect on their gender identity development and hegemonic masculinity.

Overall, it was helpful comparing the control group and Phallacies participants. It showed that prior to Phallacies some of those participants shared similar viewpoints in terms of defining a UMass man, willingness to critically discuss masculinity, and in speaking out against hegemonic masculinity. As a result, it confirmed that Phallacies is not the only variable in the lives of these young men that can influence them to think critically about masculinity, but it did highlight the need for Phallacies to serve as an a counter hegemonic all-men's space that was lacking from the pre-existing variables. With that said, if I could do the research over I would want to find a control group that was a bit more similar to the Phallacies program. Instead of pulling control group participants from courses that some Phallacies members came from, I would rather compare the program to all-men's peer group spaces on campus, like friend groups, sports teams, or fraternities.

An area of future research that would be interesting to pursue as it relates to understanding hegemonic masculinity discourse on campus would be to assess cis-gendered women's understanding of college men's gender identity development. As mentioned in this study, women have played a significant role in the recruitment of Phallacies members as well as serving as one of the few spaces in which men are comfortable having critical discussions about masculinity or sharing their emotions. While most of the men in this study reported positive experiences when they chose to

engage in critical discussions, it would be interesting to see if other men who do or do not reach out to women do so because some women perpetuate through discussions, stereotypes, and intimate heterosexual relationships hegemonic masculinity discourse. Most of the men in this study were White men who reported White, heterosexual, cis-gendered women as being important counter spaces for discussing masculinity, but what is absent from the data is the role that women of color and same-gender loving women play in shaping or countering hegemonic masculinity on a college campus and specifically within racial or sexual minority spaces on campus.

A final implication for future research is to interview men on various campuses who are serving as alternative role models for young men. Unfortunately, there is not much research on the role of a male instructor in a critical masculinities pedagogical setting. Most of what is out there is how male instructors operate as allies by using feminism and a feminist pedagogical approach (Pease, 2002; Whitehead, 2001). If we were to assess these male-identified faculty or student affairs professionals who engage in a critical masculinities approach, we might learn a great deal about additional pedagogical frameworks and strategies they use in their engagement with young men. My hope is that this research at the least will further challenge administrators, student affairs staff, and faculty to be more aware “of the centrality of gender in men’s lives, which in part helps to perpetuate inequalities based on gender” (Kimmel, 1997).

APPENDIX A

EMAIL FOR INVITING PARTICIPANTS TO INTERVIEW

Dear Participant:

Hope you are doing well! I am contacting you in an official capacity in regards to my dissertation.

I am conducting research that seeks to understand the impact Phallacies has made on your development as a man on a college campus. All participants will be asked to complete an informed consent form and demographics questionnaire. The interview will take about 45-60 minute with a possibility of a second follow-up interview. I would like to conduct interviews in person if possible, but Skype or Google's Hangout feature is a possibility, depending on your availability, access, and proximity.

Due to the fact that you all know me and have been a part of Phallacies, you should know that this doctoral work is not just about me. My dissertation is just a way to systematically assess the impact the program has had on your lives.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please reply by sending an email to tajs@educ.umass.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration in participating in this important research!

Sincerely,

Taj Smith, M.P.S.
Ed.D. Candidate
Social Justice Education Program
School of Education
University of Massachusetts Amherst

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

(For Phallacies Members Past and Present)

Thank you for your interest in participating in my research study. This questionnaire is designed to get some background information on you and will allow me to use identity markers to note commonalities or differences based on an identity.

Name:

Email:

Phone:

Skype Username:

Preferred Method and Time to Contact You:

1. The researcher will be using aliases in this study. You can provide an alias, or one will be assigned to you. Please indicate if you prefer to have one provided by the researcher, and if applicable provide a name.

Yes

No

Alias: _____

2. Define your social identity categories:

Gender _____

Race _____

Ethnicity/Nationality _____

Socio-economic Class _____

Sexual Orientation _____

3. Before Phallacies, how often did you think about what it meant to be a man?

Rarely

Sometimes

Often

Everyday

4. Are you a current participant of Phallacies?

Yes

No

5. How long were you part of the Phallacies program? Provide exact years or semesters if possible.

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Interviews)

Title of Study: Phallacies: Constructing a Critical Space and Pedagogy for College Men to Engage Across Non-Hegemonic Masculinities

Principal Investigator: Taj Smith

Purpose of the Research: My name is Taj Smith, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Social Justice Education Program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. I am conducting this research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral dissertation. In addition, this research study seeks to understand the impact Phallacies has had on your development as a man with the hope of using such information to improve the program.

Criteria and Protocol: You have been asked to participate because you are a current or former Phallacies participant. In agreeing to participate in this study, all participants will be asked to complete an informed consent form and demographics questionnaire. All potential interviewees will be sent an email of interest before receiving this informed consent form. The interview will be about 45-60 minute with a possibility of a second follow-up interview. I would like to conduct interviews in person, if possible, but Skype or Google's Hangout is a possibility, depending on your availability, access, and proximity.

Confidentiality: Your participation in this research study is voluntary. Your confidentiality will be maintained by assigning an alias in place of your real name. All of the materials that I gather (i.e., audio or video tapes, emails, transcriptions, notes, codes, etc.) will be kept in my password protected email, on my personal laptop, and in a locked file cabinet to which only Tom Schiff (the other founder of Phallacies) and I have access to.

Participant Rights: You have the right to refuse to answer any question or to terminate your participation in this study at any time. You also have the right to review any of the materials to be used in the study and to request a summary of the research findings at your request. Additionally, you have the right to contact the Chair of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Bailey W. Jackson, III at any time should you have questions that I am unable to answer.

Benefits and Risks: As with any research study, a potential for risk exists. Questions about your friends, family upbringing, and college experience will be asked and that might result in feelings of discomfort and vulnerability. In addition, due to Phallacies being a unique, small program and originating out of a specific school, there might be people who read the dissertation or any other works produced as a result of it and guess your identity in spite of having an alias.

There are also benefits in participating in this study. The benefit of your participation is that you will be taking part in a study that will contribute to showcasing how effective Phallacies is. By participating in this study, you will not be offered nor will you receive any compensation in the form of gifts, monies, etc.

Statement of Voluntary Consent: You will be given two copies of this informed consent. If you are willing to participate, please sign both copies. You will keep one copy for your reference and records, and I will keep one copy for mine. In signing this form, you are consenting to: participation in this study; permission to use results of this study in my dissertation, at academic and conference presentations, in manuscripts for publication in academic and professional journals; permission to share the results of the study with members of my dissertation committee for the purpose of completing my dissertation and fulfilling partial requirements for the completion of my doctoral degree.

Questions: If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by email at tajs@educ.umass.edu or by phone at 973-800-9927.

You may contact the Chair of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Bailey W. Jackson, III, by email at bailey.jackson@educ.umass.edu. If you wish to contact someone who does not have direct involvement in this study, you may contact Dr. Linda Griffin, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at lgriffin@educ.umass.edu.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this consent form, and you understand and agree to the terms and conditions of participation in this research study.

Participant's printed name

Participant's signature

Date

Researcher's printed name

Researcher's signature

Date

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Pre-Post Semester Survey)

Title of Study: Phallacies: Constructing a Critical Space and Pedagogy for College Men to Engage Across Non-Hegemonic Masculinities

Principal Investigator: Taj Smith

Purpose of the Research: My name is Taj Smith, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Social Justice Education Program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. I am conducting this research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral dissertation. In addition, this research study seeks to understand the impact Phallacies has had on your development as a man with the hope of using such information to improve the program.

Criteria and Protocol: You have been asked to participate because you are a current Phallacies participant. In agreeing, all participants will be asked to complete an informed consent form and demographics questionnaire. In addition, you will be asked to complete a pre-mid-post semester survey.

Confidentiality: Your participation in this research study is voluntary. Your confidentiality will be maintained by assigning an alias in place of your real name. All of the materials that I gather (i.e., audio or video tapes, emails, transcriptions, notes, codes, etc.) will be kept in a locked file cabinet to which only Tom Schiff (the other founder of Phallacies) and I have access.

Participant Rights: You have the right to refuse to answer any question or to terminate your participation in this study at any time. You also have the right to review any of the materials to be used in the study and to request a summary of the research findings at your request. Additionally, you have the right to contact the Chair of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Bailey W. Jackson, III at any time should you have questions that I am unable to answer.

Benefits and Risks: As with any research study, a potential for risk exists. Questions about your friends, family upbringing, and college experience will be asked and that might result in feelings of discomfort and vulnerability. In addition, due to Phallacies being a unique, small program and originating out of a specific school, there might be people who read the dissertation or any other works produced as a result of it and guess your identity in spite of having an alias.

There are also benefits in participating in this study. The benefit of your participation is that you will be taking part in a study that will contribute to showcasing how effective Phallacies is, which will hopefully lead to more higher education institutions creating their own Phallacies program to encourage men on their campus to be reflective about

how their develop their male identity. By participating in this study, you will not be offered nor will you receive any compensation in the form of gifts, monies, etc.

Statement of Voluntary Consent: You will be given two copies of this informed consent. If you are willing to participate, please sign both copies. You will keep one copy for your reference and records, and I will keep one copy for mine. In signing this form, you are consenting to: participation in this study; permission to use results of this study in my dissertation, at academic and conference presentations, in manuscripts for publication in academic and professional journals; permission to share the results of the study with members of my dissertation committee for the purpose of completing my dissertation and fulfilling partial requirements for the completion of my doctoral degree.

Questions: If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by email at tajs@educ.umass.edu or by phone at 973-800-9927.

You may contact the Chair of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Bailey W. Jackson, III by email at bailey.jackson@educ.umass.edu. If you wish to contact someone who does not have direct involvement in this study, you may contact Dr. Linda Griffin, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at lgriffin@educ.umass.edu.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this consent form, and you understand and agree to the terms and conditions of participation in this research study.

Participant's printed name

Participant's signature

Date

Researcher's printed name

Researcher's signature

Date

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Control Group Survey)

Title of Study: Phallacies: Constructing a Critical Space and Pedagogy for College Men to Engage Across Non-Hegemonic Masculinities

Principal Investigator: Taj Smith

Purpose of the Research: My name is Taj Smith, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Social Justice Education Program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. I am conducting this research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral dissertation. In addition, this research study seeks to understand the impact Phallacies has had on the development of male participants involved.

Criteria and Protocol: You have been asked to participate as a controlled group member because you have not participated in the Phallacies program. The information that you provide in the survey will be compared to what participants, past and present, in the Phallacies program have provided in order to determine whether the program makes a difference in responses to the questions on the survey. In agreeing, all participants will be asked to complete this informed consent form, the demographics questionnaire, and the survey. Upon completion, you will receive extra credit from your instructor who has agreed to distribute this survey as an extra credit opportunity in the course you are currently enrolled in.

Confidentiality: Your participation in this research study is voluntary. Your confidentiality will be maintained by assigning an alias in place of your real name. All of the materials that I gather from you will be kept in a locked file cabinet to which only I have access. Direct quotes or a summary of your thoughts will be represented in the research findings, but again, there will be a fake name assigned to that quote.

Participant Rights: Your choice to participate or not participate in this study will not negatively impact your grade in the course in which this survey was distributed. You have the right to refuse to answer any question or to terminate your participation in this study at any time. You also have the right to review any of the materials to be used in the study and to request a summary of the research findings at your request. Additionally, you have the right to contact the Chair of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Bailey W. Jackson, III at any time should you have questions that I am unable to answer.

Benefits and Risks: As with any research study, a potential for risk exists. Questions about your friends, family upbringing, and college experience will be asked and that might result in feelings of discomfort and vulnerability.

There are also benefits in participating in this study. The benefit of your participation is that you will be taking part in a study that will determine how effective Phallacies is. By participating in this study, you will be offered the opportunity of extra credit and, therefore, can benefit by improving your grade in the course in which you are taking this survey.

Statement of Voluntary Consent: You will be given a hard copy of this form to sign upon your agreement to participate in the study, and then I will send you a PDF of the signed informed consent form. In signing this form, you are consenting to: participate in this study; permission to use results of this study in my dissertation, at academic and conference presentations, in manuscripts for publication in academic and professional journals; permission to share the results of the study with members of my dissertation committee for the purpose of completing my dissertation and fulfilling partial requirements for the completion of my doctoral degree.

Questions: If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by email at tajs@educ.umass.edu or by phone at 973-800-9927.

You may contact the Chair of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Bailey W. Jackson, III by email at bailey.jackson@educ.umass.edu. If you wish to contact someone who does not have direct involvement in this study, you may contact Dr. Linda Griffin, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at lgriffin@educ.umass.edu.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this consent form, and you understand and agree to the terms and conditions of participation in this research study.

Participant's printed name

Participant's signature

Date

Researcher's printed name

Researcher's signature

Date

APPENDIX F

PRE-POST SURVEY (Phallacies Participants)

Pre-Survey

1. Based on your observations and conversations with other students, what does it mean to be a man on this campus?
2. Define hegemonic masculinity (you can use sentences or a list of words).
3. How do you define your masculinity?
4. What kind of peer groups other than Phallacies do you find yourself talking about masculinity in?
5. How often do you talk about being a man among your male peers?
 - a. Never b. Rarely c. Sometimes d. Most of the time e. Every moment I get
6. How ready are you to talk with and share emotions with other guys in Phallacies?
 - a. I'm not b. Not sure c. A little nervous d. Ready e. Super excited
7. How comfortable are you with being emotional with men outside of Phallacies?
 - a. I'm not b. Not sure c. I'm ok with it d. Comfortable e. Very comfortable
8. Have you ever called out a male friend for his sexist attitudes or behavior? Please provide an example if you have.
9. Have you ever called out a male friend for his homophobic remarks? Please provide an example if you have.
10. Do you believe violence among men is an issue to be concerned with?
11. Do you believe men's violence against women is an issue to be concerned with?

Please answer the following scenarios as honest as possible.

Scenario 1: A man and a woman go on a date. He pays for everything. They go to his apartment or dorm room afterward. He keeps pressuring her to have sex. She says, "I think we should stop," but they continue to engage in sexual intercourse.

If you heard about this scenario from a friend who identified as a woman, what would be your response? Would your response be different if you had to respond to a male-identified friend? If so, how would you respond?

Scenario 2: You are playing a video game in a friend's room, and he says, "That's so gay," in reference to a move he disagrees with in the game.

How might you react to this situation? What would you say or not say?

Scenario 3: You are having a bad day and want to talk about how you are feeling with some of your male peers.

How might you respond to this scenario? Would you share what is going on for you? Explain why or why not.

Scenario 4: You are at a party and you overheard a comment being made about another man being called a “pussy” for drinking a Mike’s Hard Lemonade instead of a beer.

What do you do? What is your gut reaction? What emotions might come up for you?

Post-Survey

1. Has your definition of your own masculinity changed as a result of being involved in Phallacies? If so, please explain.
2. Since being involved in Phallacies, are you more likely to talk about being a man among your male peers? If so, what about Phallacies contributed to that shift.
3. At this point in the semester, how comfortable are you with sharing emotions with other guys in Phallacies?
 - a. I’m not b. Not sure c. I’m ok with it d. Comfortable e. Very Comfortable
4. At this point in the semester, how comfortable are you with being emotional with men outside of Phallacies?
 - a. I’m not b. Not sure c. I’m ok with it d. Comfortable e. Very comfortable
5. To what extent has Phallacies encouraged you to call out a male friend for his sexist attitudes or behaviors?
 - a. Not at all b. Somewhat c. A lot
6. To what extent has Phallacies encouraged you to call out a male friend for his homophobic remarks?
 - a. Not at all b. Somewhat c. A lot
7. Compared to other spaces in which you’ve discussed gender and/or masculinity, how does Phallacies compare to that experience?

Please answer the following scenarios as honest as possible.

Scenario 1: A man and a woman go on a date. He pays for everything. They go to his apartment or dorm room afterward. He keeps pressuring her to have sex. She says, “I think we should stop,” but they continue to engage in sexual intercourse.

What do you think about this situation? Would you have thought about this differently if you had not been a part of Phallacies? If Phallacies played a role, what about the program led to a change in your attitudes and behavior?

Scenario 2: You are playing a video game in a friend’s room, and he says, “That’s so gay,” in reference to a move he disagrees with in the game.

How might you handle this situation? Would you have thought about this differently if you had not been a part of Phallacies? If Phallacies played a role, what about the program led to a change in your attitudes and behavior?

Scenario 3: You are having a bad day and want to talk about how you are feeling with some of your male peers.

How might you handle this situation? Would you have thought about this differently if you had not been a part of Phallacies? If Phallacies played a role, what about the program led to a change in your attitudes and behavior?

Scenario 4: You are at a party and you overheard a comment being made about another man being called a “pussy” for drinking a Mike’s Hard Lemonade instead of a beer.

How might you handle this situation? Would you have thought about this differently if you had not been a part of Phallacies? If Phallacies played a role, what about the program led to a change in your attitudes and behavior?

APPENDIX G

COLLEGE MASCULINITY SURVEY (For Control Group)

Your name:

Your class year (i.e., first-year, sophomore, junior, senior):

Provide the name of the course you are taking this survey in:

Define your social identities for the following categories: race, ethnicity/nationality, socio-economic class, gender, and sexual orientation.

1. What does it mean to be a man in U.S. society? Feel free to use sentences or list words to describe.
2. How would you define what it means to be a man at UMass? Feel free to use sentences or list words to describe.
3. How did you come up with that definition of a UMass man?
4. Do you find anything problematic about the way men at UMass are generally defined? Please explain your answer.
5. List 2-3 types of peer groups you are a part of on a regular basis. Please provide the typical racial, gender, and sexual orientation composition in each group.
6. What topics do you tend to talk about in each group?
7. In which of the peer groups you listed above, are you most likely to talk critically about masculinity? Please explain what makes you feel able to discuss that topic in that group.
8. If you identify as a male/man, how often does a conversation about critiquing masculinity at UMass or in society come up in male-only peer groups?
9. How comfortable are you with sharing your emotions with men in your life?
 - a. I'm notb. Not sure
 - c. I'm ok with it
 - d. Comfortable
 - e. Very Comfortable
10. Do you feel more comfortable talking about masculinity with a close friend or in a group setting? Please explain your answer.

Scenario 1: A man and a woman go on a date. He pays for everything. They go to his apartment or dorm room afterward. He keeps pressuring her to have sex. She says, "I think we should stop," but they continue to engage in sexual intercourse. If you heard about this scenario from a friend who identified as a woman, what would be your response? Would your response be different if you had to respond to a male-identified friend? If so, how would you respond?

Scenario 2: You are playing a video game in a friend's room, and he says, "That's so gay," in reference to a move he disagrees with in the game. How might you react to this situation? What would you say or not say?

Scenario 3: You are having a bad day and want to talk about how you are feeling with some of your male peers. How might you handle this situation? Would you share what is going on for you? Explain why or why not.

Scenario 4: You are at a party and you overheard a comment being made about a man being called a “pussy” for drinking a Mike’s Hard Lemonade instead of a beer. What do you do? What is your gut reaction? What emotions might come up for you?

APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Describe what it means/meant to be a part of Phallacies.
2. What made you want to join Phallacies?
3. What are two things you learned about masculinity as a result of being a participant in Phallacies?
4. How does Phallacies differ from your male peer groups outside of this space?
5. Since being out of Phallacies, how often do you think about masculinity? How often do you find yourself resisting or speaking out against hegemonic masculinity? How often do you find yourself colluding with hegemonic masculinity?
6. Describe the importance of being in a men's-only space.
7. What specific in-class activities, if any, might have contributed to your thinking and of your own masculinity?
8. What specific readings, if any, might have contributed to your thinking and expression of your own masculinity?
9. What specific assignments, if any, might have contributed to your thinking and expression of your own masculinity?
10. During your time in Phallacies, what role did the facilitators play in modeling alternative and diverse masculinities for you?
11. Is there anything else you would like to add?

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. (2007). Pedagogical frameworks for social justice education. In M. Adams, L.A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: a sourcebook* (2nd ed., pp. 30-43). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Alilunas, P. (2011). The (in)visible people in the room: Men in Women Studies. *Men and Masculinities*, 14(2), 210-229.
- Allen, M. J. (2004). *Assessing academic programs in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1991). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press
- Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college?: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bell, L. (2007). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: a sourcebook* (2nd ed., pp. 1-5). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berila, B. (2011). Queer masculinities in higher education. In J. Laker & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 97-110). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berkowitz, A. (2002). Fostering men's responsibility for preventing sexual assault. In P. S. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing intimate partner violence: Developmentally appropriate interventions across the life span*. Washington DC: American Psychological Press.
- Berkowitz, A. (2003). Applications of social norms theory to other health and social justice issues. In H. Wesley Perkins (Ed.), *The social norms approach to prevention* (pp. 259-279). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance use, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43, 461-465.
- Breeze, W. (2007). Constructing a male feminist pedagogy: Authority, practice, and authenticity in the composition classroom. *Feminist Teacher*, 18(1), 59-73.
- Canada, G. (1995). *Fist stick knife gun: A personal history of violence in America*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Capraro, R. L. (2000). Why college men drink: Alcohol, adventure, and the paradox of masculinity. *Journal of American College Health*, 48, 307-315.
- Capraro, R. L. (2004). Men's studies as a foundation for student development work with college men. In G. E. Kellom (Ed.), *Developing effective programs and services for college men* (pp. 23-34). New Directions for Student Services, No. 107. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohee, G. L., Daumer, E., Kemp, T. D., Krebs, P. M., Laftky, S. A., & Runzo, S. (Eds.) (1998). *The feminist teacher anthology: Pedagogies and classroom strategies*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Polity 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, 11-19.
- Courtenay, W. H. (1998). College men's health: An overview and a call to action. *Journal of American College Health*, 46(6), 279-290.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- 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. (2010). Voices of gender role conflict: The social construction of college men's identity. In S. R. Harper & F. Harris III (Eds.), *College men and masculinities: Theory, research, and implications for practice* (pp. 49-66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, T., & Harper, S. (2012). Promoting learning and development with college men. Special Issue on Men and Masculinities: *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 39(1), 118-123.
- Davis, T., & Laker, J. (2004). Connecting men to academic and student affairs programs and services. In G. Kellom (Ed.), *Designing effective programs and services for men in higher education* (pp. 47-57). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, T., LaPrad, J., & Dixon, S. (2011). Masculinities reviewed and reinterpreted: Using a critical approach to working with men in groups. In J. Laker & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (p. 147-160). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Davis, T., & Wagner, R. (2005). In R. D. Reason, E. M. Broido, T. L. Davis, & N. Evans (Eds.), *Developing social justice allies* (pp. 29-39). New directions for student services, No. 110. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Edwards, K. (2006). Aspiring social justice ally identity development: A conceptual model. *NASPA Journal*, 43(4), 39-60.
- Edwards, K. & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on it": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(2), 210-225.
- Feigenbaum, A. (2007). The teachable moment: Feminist pedagogy and the neoliberal classroom. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 29, 337-349.
- Flood, M. (2007). Involving men in gender practice and policy. *Critical Half*, 5(1), 9-14.
- Flood, M. (2011). Men as students and teachers of feminist scholarship. *Men and Masculinities*, 14(2), 135-154.
- Ford, K. (2011). Doing fake masculinity, being real men: Present and future constructions of self among Black college men. *Symbolic Interaction*, 34(1), 38-62.
- Freire, P. (1968/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniversary ed.). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gaffney, K., & Manno, A. J. (2011). Navigating the gender box: Locating masculinity in the introduction to women and gender studies course. *Men and Masculinities*, 14(2), 190-209.
- Gilbert, R., & Gilbert, P. (1998). *Masculinity goes to school*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Giroux, H. (2009). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed., pp. 27-51). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harper, S. R., & Harris F., III, (Eds.). (2010). *College men and masculinities: Theory, research and implications for practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Harper, S. R., Harris F., III, & 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., & Nichols, A. H. (2008). Are they not all the same? Racial heterogeneity among Black male undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(3), 199–214.
- Harris F., III, (2008). Deconstructing masculinity: A qualitative study of college men's masculinity conceptualizations and gender performance. *NASPA*, 48(4), 453-471.
- Harris F., III, (2010). College men's meanings of masculinities and contextual influences: Toward a conceptual model. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(3), 297-315.
- Harris F., III, & Barone, R. P. (2011). The situation of men, and situating men in higher education: A conversation about crisis, myth, and reality about college students who are men. In J. Laker & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (p. 50-62). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harris F., III, & Edwards, K. E. (2010). College men's experiences as men: Findings and implications from two grounded theory studies. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 47(1), 43-62.
- Hong, L. (2000). Toward a transformed approach to prevention: Breaking the link between masculinity and violence. *Journal of American College Health*, 48(6), 269-279.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hugo Lopez, M., & Gonzalez-Barrera, A. (2014). *Women's college enrollment gains leave men behind*. PewResearchCenter. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/03/06/womens-college-enrollment-gains-leave-men-behind/>
- Jessup-Anger, J. E., Johnson, B. N., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2012). Exploring living-learning communities as a venue for men's identity construction. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 39(1), 162-175.
- Josselson, R. (1996). *Revising herself: The story of women's identity from college to midlife*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kahn, J. S., & Ferguson, K. (2010). Men as allies in feminist pedagogy in the undergraduate psychology curriculum. *Women & Therapy*, 33, 121-139.
- Katz, J. (Producer). (1999). *Tough guise: Violence, media and the crisis in masculinity*. Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation.

- Kaufman, M. (1994). Men, feminism, and men's contradictory experiences of power. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 142-164). London, England: Sage.
- Kaufman, M. (1999). *The seven p's of men's violence*. Retrieved from <http://www.michaelkaufman.com/1999/the-7-ps-of-mens-violence/>
- Kaufman, P., & Feldman, K. A. (2004). Forming identities in college: A sociological approach. *Research in Higher Education*, 45, 463-496.
- Kimmel, M. (1994/2004). Masculinity as homophobia. In E. Disch (Ed.), *Reconstructing gender: A multicultural anthology* (3rd ed., pp. 103-109). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Kimmel, M. (1997). Integrating men into the curriculum. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy*, 4, 181-195.
- Kimmel, M. (2002). Toward a pedagogy of the oppressor. *Tikkun Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.tikkun.org/magazine/index.cfm/action/tikkun/issue/tik0211/article/021113c.html>
- Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Kimmel, M. & Messner, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Men's lives*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kivel, P. (2011). *Uprooting racism: How White people can work for racial justice* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: New Society Publishers.
- Klobassa, V. (2009). Masculinity dialogues: A theory to practice program. *Standing Committee for Men Briefs, American College Personnel Association*. Retrieved from <http://www.myacpa.org/sc/scm/briefs.cfm>
- Laker, J. (2003). Bad dogs: Rethinking our engagement of male students. In P. Brown (Ed.), *Men on Campus*, Minneapolis Conference, ACPA Standing Committee for Men.
- Laker, J. (2011). Inviting and inspiring men to learn: Gendered pedagogical considerations for undergraduate teaching and learning environments. In J. Laker & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (p. 63-78). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Landis-Schiff, T. (1996). Sexual harassment: Why men don't understand it. *Initiatives*, 57(2), 15-25.

- Low, S. M., Monarch, N. D., Hartman, S., & Markman, H. (2002). Recent therapeutic advances in the prevention of domestic violence. In P. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships: Interventions across the life span* (pp. 197-217). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Love, B. (2000). Developing a liberatory consciousness. In M. Adams, W. Blumenfeld, C. R. Castañeda, & H. Hackman, *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 470-474). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ludeman, R. (2011). Successful judicial interventions with college men. In J. Laker & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 193-209). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lyman, P. (1987). The fraternal bond as a joking relationship: A case study of the role of sexist jokes in male group bonding. In M. Kimmel (Ed.), *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity* (pp. 148-163). London, England: Sage.
- Mac an Ghail, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- McLaren, P. (2009). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed., pp. 61-83). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Migliaccio, T. (2009). Men's friendships: Performances of masculinity. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 17(3), 226-241.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Nagda, B. R. A., & Maxwell, K. E. (2011). Deepening the layers of understanding and connection. In K. E. Maxwell, B. R. A. Nagda, & M. C. Thompson, (Eds.), *Facilitating intergroup dialogues: Bridging differences, catalyzing change* (pp. 1-22). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 60, 203-210.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles*, 14, 335-350.

- Pascarella, E. (1985). College environment influences on learning and cognitive development. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 1, pp. 1-61. New York, NY: Agathon.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects student: A third decade of research*. Vol. 2. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Pease, B. (2002). (Re)constructing men's interests. *Men and Masculinities*, 5, 165-177.
- Pleasants, R. K. (2011). Men learning feminism: Protecting privileges through discourses of resistance. *Men and Masculinities*, 14(2), 230-250.
- Pollack, W. (2001). *Real boys workbook*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Reeser, T. W. (2010). *Masculinities in theory: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rhoads, R.A. (2010). Whales tales, dog piles, and beer goggles: An ethnographic case study of fraternity life. In S. R. Harper & F. Harris III (Eds.), *College men and masculinities: Theory, research, and implications for practice* (pp. 32-49). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rossmann, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sandy, P. (1990). *Fraternity gang rape: Sex, brotherhood and privilege on campus*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Sax, L. (2008). *The gender gap in college: Maximizing the developmental potential of women and men*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schiff, T. (2003). Developing men's leadership to challenge sexism and violence: Working in university settings to develop "pro-feminist, gay-affirmative, and male-positive" men. In B. Wallace, & R. Carter (Eds.), *Winter Roundtable Series: Understanding and dealing with violence: A multicultural approach* (pp. 161-183). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, D. A., Livingston, W. G., Havice, P. A., & Cawthon, T. W. (2012). Men's identity development: Issues and implications for residence life. *The Journal of College and University Housing*, 39(1), 200-213.
- Severiens, S., & Ten Dam, G. (1997). Gender and gender identity differences in learning styles. *Educational Psychology*, 17(1 & 2), 79-93.

- Sherriff, N. (2007). Peer group cultures and social identity: An integrated approach to understanding masculinities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(3), 349-370.
- Shrewsbury, C. M. (1997). What is feminist pedagogy? *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 25 (1/2), 166-173
- Solotaroff, P. (2013). This is your brain on football. *Rolling Stones*. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://www.rollingstone.com/culture/news/this-is-your-brain-on-football-20130131>
- Stoudt, B. G. (2006). "You're either in or you're out": School violence, peer discipline, and the (re)production of hegemonic masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, 8, 273-287.
- Tomal, D. R. (2003). *Action research for educators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Wagner, R. (2011). Embracing liberatory practice: Promoting men's development as a feminist act. In J. A. Laker & T. L. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 210-223). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wantland, R. (2005). Feminist frat boys?: Fraternity men in the (Women's Studies) house. *Feminist Formations*, 17(2), 156-163.
- Webb, L. M., Walker, K. L., & Bollis, T. S. (2004). Feminist pedagogy in the teaching of research methods. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 7(5), 415-428.
- Webber, M. (2006). Transgressive pedagogies?: Exploring the difficult realities of enacting feminist pedagogies in undergraduate classrooms in a Canadian university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(4), 453-467.
- Whitehead, S. M. (2001). Man: The invisible gendered subject. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barret (Eds.), *The masculinities reader* (pp. 351-368). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wink, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world*. (4th ed.) Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. R. A., Chesler, M., & Cytron-Walker, A. (2007). *Intergroup dialogue in higher education: Meaningful learning about social justice*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.