BEYOND BAD DOGS: TOWARD A PEDAGOGY OF ENGAGEMENT OF MALE

STUDENTS

by

Jason Aaron Laker

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

The University of Arizona

2 0 0 5

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation

prepared by Jason Aaron Laker   entitled Beyond Bad Dogs: Toward a Pedagogy of

Engagement of Male Students and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the

dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Gary Rhoades)_____   Date:__ 3/24/05_____

(Tracy Davis) _____   Date:____ 3/24/05_____

(Jenny Lee)   _____   Date:____ 3/24/05____

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's
submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and
recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

_____Gary Rhoades   _____
Dissertation Director   Date

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

Signed: _____ Jason A. Laker

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am first, foremost, and always grateful to and for my wife, Leah. Her love, compassion, dedication, tolerance, and support have been the most defining feature of my adult life. She has given me what I have needed, and she has kept giving even more. This dissertation would not have been completed without her superior transcription skills, her patience when I procrastinated, her kind words (or at times a kick in the pants) during my moments of self-doubt, and her willingness to share her genius thoughtfully about the subject matter at times when it was as exciting to her as watching corn grow. Thank you Thank you Thank you. I pray that I can reciprocate what you have given to me.

To our children, whose brilliance and beauty have been a profound source of comfort and delight to me. Their acceptance of my hours at the computer were beyond what any parent should request or expect, yet they are unwavering in their love, in their willingness to bring their art and little notes to me, and in believing without hesitation that daddy being a doctor is a good thing without even a hint of belief that it would require a stethoscope to be important.

To Dr. Gary Rhoades, who increased my knowledge and ability to see invisible things, and to predict and respond to issues in my professional life that would have otherwise been missed. He has been progressively more nurturing as my need increased, and his encouragement has been healing. To my amazing friend, Dr. Tracy Davis, whose willingness to be on my committee, belief in my message, and great ideas have fueled much of this work. To Dr. Jenny Lee, who I did not meet in person until the week of my defense, but who took a leap of faith based on a phone conversation to be on my committee and help make this project a reality. To Dr. John Levin, who introduced me to qualitative methods, and in so doing helped me find my scholarly voice. To my mother-in-law, Anne Browning, for her critical eye and technical support. To my favorite high school teacher, Jerry Whitlock, who wisely advised: "Give 'em small doses Jason."

To my friends, George McClellan, Matt Helm, Rachel Wagner, Stephanie Parker, Harry Brod, Jane Fried, Terry Piper, Kathleen Kerr, Michael Kimmel, and Rob Longwell-Grice. Each of these colleagues provided something important to me personally, and to this project-insight, the occasional argument, mentoring, and support.

To Abayomi, Pete, Christopher, Jamelia, Kelly, Maalik, Susie, Miguel, Rick, Cassandra, Bob, Sheila, Nina, Maggie, Amanda, Nathan, and Hannah for sharing their stories with me. I hope I can honor each of you through the telling.

There are more things to admire in men than to despise -Albert Camus

DEDICATION

To Jason Laker, age 7, in partial fulfillment of a promise. To little boys and grown men who long for humanity and have the courage to actively seek it. To women who have the vision to see through the masks and the compassion to tug at them gently.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

ABSTRACT

As Student Affairs has developed as a profession, scholars and practitioners have identified deficiencies in classical identity development theory pertaining to women; gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, or trans-gendered people; people of color, people with disabilities; and other historically underrepresented identities. Further, the school of thought is that student development theory is primarily based on research subjects who are middle/upper-class Caucasian men and thus is applicable to this population primarily. Thus, newer scholarship has emerged to explain identity development in particular minority groups and women. This project argues that classical theory not only fails to capture salient developmental processes of marginalized groups, but in fact fails to capture elements of male identity development. While the theories are gendered male per se (due to the subjects studied), they are resonant with hegemonic (socially constructed and imposed) masculinity rather than an authentic human masculine identity. There are consequences to this for men and women.

The Student Affairs field has established knowledge, values, and best practices, which is inculcated into new practitioners through the professional socialization process. The purpose of this constructivist inquiry was to examine this process, its underlying values and norms, and its effect on professionals' conceptions of male students. Seventeen Residence Hall Directors with graduate degrees in Student Development or related disciplines were interviewed about their socialization into the field, thoughts about male students, and reactions to a case example depicting an incident on a college campus. Findings suggest a lack of theoretical or conceptual understanding of male gender identities, and consequently a difficulty in viewing male students developmentally. Moreover, without such understanding, new professionals' conception of marginalized identities can unwittingly reify rather than interrupt stratification and privilege.

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW

I'm Not Making This Stuff Up, Folks…Or Why I Chose This Topic

I was recently contacted by a male colleague who had received a call from a woman working for the local school district. The district was planning a "boys' career day" and wanted to know if he knew of someone who could speak to a group of boys between the ages of eleven and thirteen about what it means to be a man today. When the woman contacted him, he said that he immediately thought of me and wondered if I would do it. I was struck by the strange irony associated with a woman calling a man for this purpose, and his referring her to another man. What is it about being a man today that is so mystifying that a person living that experience would defer to another?

The event, which was organized by the public school district, took place in the community room of a church, which had been sectioned off into smaller rooms by moveable walls, and which had a very large cross and Bible verses posted on its walls. I remember wondering why an organization that owns so many buildings (which were not in session that day due to teacher in-service training) would choose such a venue. After I checked in and affixed my name tag, I was directed to an area of the main section where the boys were making crafts and playing games. Several of the speakers were either setting up displays or mingling. One man was setting up a display about the Financial Services industry, and another was a military recruiter who was preparing to show a video about being a soldier. Still another man was preparing to discuss being a mechanic.

I poured myself some coffee and went over to a couple of men who were standing quietly in a corner. One of them was a tall, beefy guy with a jacket embossed with the name of a gym where he was employed. I introduced myself and asked him what he was speaking about, to which he replied, "the Health and Wellness Services field." I found myself puzzled by this. I couldn't help but wonder how those words could be represented by the large musculature of his frame and the ways in which similar images have been used to create a stereotypical male ideal. "Healthy" and "well" just didn't fit for me as authentic descriptors for this kind of masculinity. The other man was employed by the local community college, and he was there to talk about their vocational and technical programs.

It has been my experience that when I meet a man, the first thing I get asked after my name is "what do you do?" This, of course, is an inquiry about my employment, but it is also a tool to determine my place in a hierarchy that can be felt but is rarely discussed. I generally make it a point to avoid the question, change the subject, or to give a vague answer. I also try not to ask other people (regardless of gender) this question, since I do not want to be complicit in legitimizing this sizing up process. When the Health and Wellness guy asked me the question, I simply told him that I worked at Saint John's (the private, Catholic, liberal arts, university where I am the Dean of Campus Life). He pressed further, "oh, what do you do there?" I told him that I work with student housing and discipline, and that I do a little teaching there and at Saint Cloud State (a comprehensive public institution). He asked what I teach, and I said mainly Women's Studies courses. He got a conspiratorial look on his face, with one eyebrow

arched, leaned in slightly, and, with a little snicker said, "I went to Saint Cloud State, and I took a Women's Studies class, but it didn't turn out to be what I thought it was." Then, proud of his joke, he stood back up straight. In this "joke," he was basically suggesting that he thought Women's Studies courses would be a great place "to pick up chicks," so to speak, but it had not worked out that way. More deeply, he was announcing his heterosexuality, asserting and re-inscribing his dominance within a patriarchal hierarchy, denigrating women, and denouncing men (including me) who did not fit within the hegemonic masculine paradigm-not too shabby to accomplish this so early in the morning. He was, of course, not consciously aware that he had done all of this with one "little" comment. I suspect, though, that he was viscerally aware.

As the time approached to begin the event, I was directed to a large, round table where I would have my "life station." There were laser-printed signs above the different tables with brief descriptors of the topics, "A Military Career," or "Financial Services," etc. My table didn't have a sign, which was an apparent oversight, but I thought apt since one is not supposed to examine what it means to be a man. This reminded me very much of the movie, *Fight Club*, in which the narrator, Jack, played by Ed Norton, and his flamboyant alter ego, Tyler Durden, played by Brad Pitt, establish an underground organization that encourages men to beat each other up, and whose first two rules are "You do not talk about Fight Club." Nonetheless, after inquiring about this, a woman hastily prepared a handwritten sign with a pen and note paper which read, "What does it mean to be a man today?"

Groups of 8-10 adolescent boys would soon arrive at each table for a 25-minute presentation, and this would happen twice before speakers were free to go. The sociological complexity of the phenomenon of being asked to tell these boys what it means to be a man in 25-minutes cannot be overstated. In any event, I had decided that instead of ME telling THEM, I would instead ask THEM to tell ME.

So it was that little boys with awkward confusion on their faces shuffled through, looking for their life station. Soon I had 8 of them sitting at my table. Since they didn't all know each other, we did brief introductions. As we began, I asked them why they chose this particular table, and determined that they were in fact all assigned to it because their first choices were full. Pressing on, I asked them," what do you think it means to be a man today?" Sheepishly, one of the boys said, "provider," and like dominoes, several of the others chimed in, "good job," "wife," "have kids," "make a lot of money," "strong," and variations on these themes. I then read the entire list back to them and asked how they felt about doing all the items on the list, and one pudgy little boy said, "overwhelmed," and then immediately looked embarrassed at having been the only one to say anything-perhaps especially at revealing a vulnerability. But, several boys nodded in agreement. I asked them what they thought about the fact that they had all given similar responses for the list-how did they think that happened? In our conversation, several of the boys talked about how different sources such as TV, friends, parents, school, church, and others each gave them a little bit of this list. I then inquired whether any of them had ever been picked on for not being manly in the way their list described. All of them raised their hands. I asked one of them to say more, and he told a brief story

of being teased by another boy because he was hanging around with a particular girl-and so other boys called her his girlfriend and made fun of him. (Here is an instructive story about how boys and men are encouraged or even coerced into proving their heterosexual masculinity by having sexual relations with women, and at the same time being ashamed of, and hostile toward anything and anyone who is deemed feminine). Several of the boys shared similar stories of teasing, except for one very attractive blonde-haired and blue-eyed boy wearing fashionable clothes and a sterling silver chain on his neck. He said this kind of thing hadn't happened much to him in recent memory. I suspected that he was quite popular. He was the tallest, and he carried himself with more confidence than the assortment of boys with shorter, and/or fatter bodies and less pristine skin sitting around the table.

I then shared a personal story about how I felt similarly (with the exception of the one boy who I just described) to them as a boy. I told them that they should not forget the reasons why they had similar items to put on the list, that there is a script we are not usually aware of, but that forces us to act in ways that don't feel real. And, I reminded them that the things each of them shared shows that they are not alone in their experience and it's just that we are taught not to talk about it-so it doesn't change. I asked them if they would be willing to not tease other boys about not being manly enough. They said they would agree to that. I asked if they could remember to try to do what their heart says they should instead of trying to fit someone else's script. They said they would try to do that. Finally, I asked how many of them had ever had a conversation like this, and none of them had. Then, it was time for them to go.

The next group was the same.

I wonder what these boys will be like if and when they get to college. I wonder if anyone else will take 25 minutes to find out.

Introduction to the Project

The field of College Student Personnel Administration (CSP), also known as "Student Affairs," has an espoused mission to facilitate students' identity development, especially psychosocial identity development. As in other fields, new CSP professionals are socialized via the apparatus of professional associations and standards, graduate preparation, recruitment, retention, evaluation, and promotion (or removed through dismissal or attrition) to perform the work in a manner deemed "good" by their organization/field. I contend that the definition of "good" work in the field of Student Affairs, and the socialization process by which new professionals are inculcated to produce it accordingly, has several potential problematic results:

1. The field does not adequately or effectively enact its espoused values relative to work with male students.

2. Graduate preparation and training provided to newcomers does not prepare them to view or advance male students developmentally, primarily because masculinities generally, and men's gender identities specifically, are rarely discussed overtly in any segment of the socialization process.

3. The culture of the field conceals this problem by more often discussing "gender" as pertaining to women's identities rather than to both women's and men's identities. When "gender" and "men" occupy the same conversation, the

tendency to employ a binary, overly-simplistic, essentialist, and negative description of men is being employed.

4. Male students may be alienated or otherwise "turned-off" by Student Affairs practitioners when approached as I describe here.

5. The invisibility of gender, relative to men, may have the effect of re-inscribing men as center and thus reifying the phenomenon of male privilege and sexism.

6. The field of Student Affairs, to the extent that men's gender is invisible, perpetuates negative ramifications (to men and to women) of male identity/male privilege/patriarchy.

In this chapter, I will provide some background information and a summary of the issues that shape my argument. Statistical and descriptive data about men's relationships to college will be utilized to frame a problem in the education of men. The field of Student Affairs and an overview of its culture will be discussed and connected to the gendered lenses I will employ later. I will also begin a discussion about male identity and corresponding developmental needs of male students.

In Chapter Two, I will build a theoretical framework by first providing a brief review of the mission of CSP and an inventory of some of the technical knowledge, espoused values, and historical elements that inform the socialization of new professionals into the field. I will interrogate that material by invoking gender theory, essentially pointing out a problematic blind spot that undermines effectiveness with male students. From there I will review literature on male identity, primarily as it is socially constructed, but with

attention to the voices that suggest certain innate characteristics in males. I will also feature a discussion about how boys and men are socialized, and some of the manifestations or effects of this in a college environment.

Chapter Three will provide an account of the methodology employed to conduct a qualitative investigation of new Student Affairs professionals' socialization into the field and its impact on their work with male students. I will describe Residence Hall Directors as emblematic, and key, representatives of the issues being discussed in the project. I will also discuss some newer work in qualitative methods that impacts validity and breadth of knowledge claims.

In Chapter Four, I will introduce 17 talented and fascinating participants, and discuss the themes that emerged from the interviews conducted with them in their role as Residence Hall Directors. This, in turn, will build upon the analytical and theoretical framework by adding lived experience of professionals to the breadth and depth to the contentions raised in the project.

Finally, in Chapter Five, I will discuss the implications of the project. This will include not only some thoughts about my findings, but a call for more investigation and serious discussion, both in the national field and in the discreet places (e.g. graduate programs and campus Student Affairs divisions) about the nature of the enterprise and how to fill in blind spots revealed in my project. I will also give some attention to secondary and tertiary implications that follow from, but are not directly connected to, this study.

A Little History

Over the last sixty years, the numbers of women arriving at and completing college have steadily risen and have eclipsed those of men (Mortenson, 1999). In fact, the numbers of Bachelor's Degrees awarded to men by state has declined between 8.1 and 22.3 percent (depending on state) during this time. As it pertains to the shifting percentages in gender makeup of college campuses, researchers such as Mortenson (2002, in Kirk) explain this widening gap in terms of three perspectives. First, much of the problem begins before boys reach college age. Boys are disproportionately failing in the K-12 system (Pollack, 1999), which undermines the ability of higher education to reverse the decline in male enrollments (except, perhaps, through outreach to younger prospective students). Second, this issue is exacerbated by shifts in the racial and ethnic makeup of the U.S. population. In particular, the racial makeup of the U.S. will continue to significantly increase in the percentage of people belonging to races other than Caucasian (Bureau of the Census, 2000). The structural barriers that affect the persistence of students of color in high-school and also college-bound trends will thus further exacerbate the gender disparity since boys of color persist in smaller numbers than girls of color (Tierney, 2000). Third, shifts in business and industry are increasing jobs that utilize skills traditionally seen to be stronger in women (e.g. communication, human capital analysis, teaching/training) and decreasing jobs that emphasize physical labor, which are seen as skills held by men. Related to the third issue is the increase in women's presence within traditionally male-dominated fields such as medicine and law (Mortenson, 2000).

A focus on trends in the K-12 school system is generally outside the scope of this dissertation, but suffice it to say that as a policy issue, Higher Education has a vested interest in partnering with K-12 institutions, industry, government, and communities to address the issues which will preclude having a strong pool of male applicants in the future. Thus, I will return to this subject in the implications chapter.

Once on campus, students generally and men in particular navigate a campus defined by its culture. Theorists such as Tinto (1993), Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), and Kuh, Schuh, and Whitt (1991), among others point to the importance of this interaction. Tierney (2000) indicts the functional nature of the discourse on departure. In addition to affirming earlier points about population and enrollment trends, he asserts the need to reframe "dropping out," which inherently looks at an individual, and move our gaze to the culture in which the behavior called "dropping out" happened, with a focus on groups, power, and oppression.

Critiques of campus cultures relative to diversity and identity issues, particularly by Student Affairs scholars and practitioners, often focus on the term "patriarchy." However, much like Tierney's analysis of "dropping out," there is a focus on how individual men are privileged in society and on campus. And, like Tierney's other concern, there is an inordinate focus on individual men (who do not tend to feel powerful, particularly at 18-22 years of age) and not enough focus on how the campus climate not only marginalizes people of color; women; Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Trans-gendered (GLBT) people; etc., but indeed it perpetuates the rigid gender scripts that men receive in their socialization (Johnson, 2001).

The important fact of men's lives is not that they are biological males, but that they become men. Our sex may be male, but our identity as men is developed through a complex process of interaction with the culture in which we both learn the gender scripts appropriate to our culture and attempt to modify those scripts to make them more palatable. (Kimmel, 1998, p.xx)

These words provide an articulate conception of the developmental journey men undertake in search of a salient masculine identity. College attendance and completion is one of the few formal rites of passage available to men as they reach adulthood.

As one of the few rites of passage existing for young adults, college attainment, retention, and completion trends suggest an emerging crisis of identity for American men. One of the fundamental missions of Student Affairs staff is to facilitate the developmental transition of students from adolescence to adulthood. Since fewer men are coming to college, this removes an additional opportunity for men's guidance through maturity.

College faculty and staff have a limited role in addressing whether adolescent males actually attend college. It is therefore incumbent upon academicians to be purposeful in working with the men who actually do enroll at postsecondary institutions. Student Affairs staff have an especially significant role to play in the retention and psychosocial development of male students. Yet, it is my contention that this responsibility and opportunity is being underutilized, if not squandered. This is curious to me, since questions about Student Affairs' efficacy with male students have been

asked for at least the last 15 years. In their landmark book, *Changing Roles for Men on Campus*, May and Scher (1988, eds.) specifically engaged the question, "How can the busy and concerned student affairs professional understand the prevailing campus climate and identify ways and means of assisting men struggle free from what Goldberg (1976) calls the conditioned harness of confining male gender roles?"

Instead of seeing an increase in the discourse about male identity development within the field, there has been a stunning absence of meaningful dialogue in the associations and graduate programs. Relative to both student development and retention theory, the implications I will now discuss will be amplified by the population shifts discussed earlier.

Men Behaving Badly

Students, staff, and faculty arrive on college campuses with particular purposes in mind, and the expectation that they will be able to achieve these aims without interference. However, incidents of sexual harassment and assault, violence, alcohol and drug abuse, and other community disruptions can quickly undermine opportunities to achieve academic or personal goals on campus. Male students cause these community disturbances with disproportionate and alarming frequency (Berk,1990; Downey & Stage, 1999; Herek & Berrill,1992; Levin & McDevitt, 1993).

Specifically, researchers have shown that compared to female students, college men exhibit significantly greater rape myth acceptance and propensity to rape (Quackenbush, 1991); and men are more likely to blame women for being sexually harassed, believe that sexual harassment issues have been exaggerated by the media, and

are far less inclined to see certain behaviors (e.g. sexual remarks and propositions) as

sexual harassment (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1992). Further, fraternity members engage in

the "heaviest, most frequent, and most problematic drinking in college" (Kuh & Arnold,

1993) and they exhibit lower capacity for moral reasoning than non-greek-affiliates

(Sanders, 1990). Finally, male students exhibit far more racist and homophobic attitudes

and perpetrate significantly more hate-motivated assaults than do women (Qualls, Cox, &

Schehr, 1992; D'Augelli, 1991).

Such behaviors often result in forcing both perpetrator and victim out of school.

Further, perceived lack of safety on campus can interfere with enrollments of new

students. Finally, these problems undermine the persistence of students who are on the

border of a decision to stay or leave.

Boy Meets Student Affairs

Since College Student Personnel (CSP) administrators (especially those at the

entry-level) interact with students to facilitate individual development, they are in an

ideal position to address this problem and the underlying developmental issues. A central

focus of Student Affairs professionals is to promote students' psychosocial development,

and indeed the field claims expertise in this area. It is therefore incongruous for CSP

staff to have such little impact on the behaviors described earlier. Either CSP must

concede an inability to address male student development (which would necessarily have

implications pertaining to its efficacy with other students), or it needs to confront a

vacuum in the knowledge about male identity development. Neither the graduate

preparation programs nor the workplaces of new CSP professionals are filling this knowledge gap.

Let me illustrate the problem using a case example such as would occur in a residence hall or other social space on a college campus. It is not uncommon for young male students to use the term "gay" or "fag." It has been my experience that young men will use these terms in two general ways. First, something that is said or done by a peer which a male student finds to be "stupid" may result in the phrase, "That's so gay." Second, when a male peer acts in a manner that makes the first male uncomfortable (almost invariably through behavior seen as feminine, such as being sensitive), he may be called a "fag." It has been my experience that a Hall Director or other CSP practitioner will respond by saying something to the effect of "I would appreciate it if you wouldn't use that word/phrase" or perhaps, "that is homophobic and completely unacceptable." I refer to both responses as "Bad Dog" approaches to male students because they are behavioral and sharp rebukes, and/or shaming, depending on the language used and the context. I think it is important to point out that I do not condone homophobic, racist, sexist, or other denigrating language or behavior, nor do I believe it should be tolerated. However, the responses not only fail to challenge the young man to excavate the meanings of the phrases/words and why he said them, but they also alienate him from the practitioner. I contend that the student learns only one thing-don't say that in front of him/her. If practitioners are to promote psychosocial development, they must channel personal offense strategically and create engaging spaces for young men to explore their socialized paradigms. Being offended and wanting to say so does not engage students in

a learning process. An alternative response to a male student who uses the phrases/words

mentioned earlier might be, "have you noticed that you call guys 'fags' when they open

up? What's that about? Are guys necessarily gay if they talk about their feelings?" The

part about the word "fag" being offensive and perhaps hate-speech is relevant, but the

student who uses that word may be initially unprepared to understand that. By starting

with a means of grappling with the underlying assumptions, the practitioner can bridge a

connection that can eventually transform the student. If we snap at the student, he may

go to a peer group that affirms this language and perspective rather than engage in critical

thinking. The "Bad Dog" approach, therefore, makes practitioners complicit with bad

behavior-because we could have intervened in an effective way, but instead allowed our

needs to construct a barrier for the student.

Making the Connection

CSP Professionals, like their counterparts in other fields, look to a variety of

resources in order to do their work effectively, and prioritize those resources according to

perceptions of utility (Young & Coldwell, 1993). The resource-seeking choices young

professionals make are influenced by graduate preparation, workplace socialization and

personal attributes such as curiosity and temperament (Reio, 1998). While formal

research and theory exist relative to male identity development, such information is not

generally included in graduate preparation programs (King, 1994) or in new staff

training. This would suggest that professionals do not see the value (utility) of learning

about male identity. I believe this is related to a feminization (McEwen, Williams, and

Engstrom, 1991) of the field , which I will discuss shortly. Rather, the issues of women

and people of color are often discussed overtly (e.g. invoking the identity dimension), while men's issues are often overlooked or seen as implied in discussion of general student developmental models. Thus, in order to integrate formal knowledge of male identity issues into professional practice, one must engage in additional, self-initiated pursuit of this information.

I have wondered whether it may be that the historic oppression of particular groups may be seen to justify this. I recall, for instance, being at a professional conference and overhearing two young women professionals commenting on the men's committee table they just passed. One said to the other, "Men's committee? Why do they need that…they already have everything!" Over the years, I have heard similar sentiments in professional settings, and I wonder how this may impact the work of professionals who are expected to (and indeed committed to) serve male students.

Further complicating the resource-seeking question is the fact that, even though CSP programs include developmental theory primarily based on research on male subjects, such studies have not viewed their male subjects as gendered beings (Coltrane, 1994; Morgan, 1981). Meth and Pascik capture this issue particularly well when they note, "although psychological writing has been androcentric, it has also been gender blind and it has assumed a male perspective but has not really explored what it means to be a man any more than what it means to be a woman." (vii).

The reason this is an important point is that gender carries undue importance in the social world, and is a primary organizing principle whose salience "tends to reinforce men's power over women" (Coltrane, 1994, p.43). If the theoretical underpinnings of the

Student Affairs profession neglect to frame student development with due consideration

of gender identity, then the profession cannot adequately do its stated job, which is to

facilitate student social and intellectual development (ACE, 1949; ACPA, 1994; Barr, M.

& Keating, L., 1985).

What are They Looking At?

Researchers such as Pope and Reynolds (1997) and Young and Coldwell (1993)

speak to CSP staff's own assertions that understanding of multicultural and diversity

issues are of paramount importance for professional practice. However, most attention to

gender in affiliated literature focuses exclusively on women and their development. Reio

(1998) and Moore (1969, in Goslin, 1969) discuss both direct and indirect effects of

curiosity and motivation to learn on the quality of job performance. Without such

curiosity (and subsequent information-seeking), CSP staff's effectiveness with male

students will be limited. Finally, Garland (1986) speaks to the criticality of Student

Affairs staff dedicating attention to developmental needs of a changing student

population. Without treatment in professional preparation programs or via expectations

in organizations (enacted through workplace socialization), entry-level student affairs

staff are left unprepared or at least under-prepared to address male student development.

There appears to be a dissonance between Student Affairs' apparent belief in its

relevance to and impact on student development on the one hand, and the lack of

information and purposeful application of theory to male students on the other hand. In

the absence of specific background in men's issues or male identity development, the

"information-seeking choices" are reduced to the utilization of templates provided by the

subjects' respective departments. These templates are designed to assess the success of students' developmental progress. In most cases, the templates for assessment are based upon criteria that I argue aren't "naturally occurring" among students. For example, campus departments often define "community" in terms of participation in department-sponsored activities. In addition, many departments focus on individual success (versus "development") relative to utilization of its services. If Student Affairs departments seek to tell students what to do in order to be successful, how does this resonate with males, who traditionally are socialized to be independent? Even when men are personally engaged, such as in counseling settings, the assessment of effectiveness is rooted in hegemonic (e.g. societal social expectations) assumptions (Nylund & Nylund, 2003). Thus, the mechanisms designed to facilitate "development" are using barometers that perpetuate rather than challenge existing gender scripts. Given the disproportionately negative behaviors cited earlier, the interventions (programs, therapy, etc.) are not going to be fully effective unless they critically engage gendered assumptions in the organizational structure (e.g. department, institution, practitioner).

Control

Would male students be resistant to the legalistic and behavioral/directive approach of student affairs staff? If so, what might be the consequences? A resistant posture from males could manifest not only in a lack of participation (which departments often equate with a lack of success regarding men's psychosocial development rather than a shortcoming in the department's means of engagement), but also in disruptive, defiant, and angry behavior. Residence Life departments often specifically define

"healthy/positive communities" in terms of respect for property and quiet for study. If the disruptive or dangerous behaviors of male students are even partially rooted in their reaction to the efforts of Student Affairs staff's approach or efforts, the implication would be that some of the behavior is in fact provoked by the actions of the very people who aim to prevent it. Since this is a provocative assertion, in that it could be construed as victim-blaming, let me offer a more concrete example to clarify the point. If there is a spate of vandalism in a residence hall, there may be a psycho-social and/or community-related reason for it. Perhaps there is a tension in the building between residents, or between residents and staff members. Or, perhaps it is a stressful time because of the academic cycle, such as mid-terms or final exam week. If the primary response to this vandalism is to make a pronouncement about the seriousness of the violations (e.g. vandalism policy) rather than to attend to the tensions, it essentially escalates the situation and could provoke more vandalism. The additional vandalism might have been prevented, and perhaps the primary vandalism could have been stopped by approaching the matter more reflectively, such as through discussion, stress-relieving activities, etc. To draw a line in the sand, so to speak, can activate the transgressive script that has been inculcated in men by virtue of their gender identity. The behavior is bad; it should not be tolerated; men can do better; **and** the practitioner should engage it developmentally whenever possible   Therefore, this is not an assertion of a one-to-one equation in which the practitioner is responsible for the bad behavior of the male student. Rather, it is an indictment of the effectiveness, and the congruence with professional values, of the current approach socialized into new professionals.

Invoking Gender at Work

Keyes and Simmons (1992) found that men learn differently about gender than do women:

> *It seems that men are more comfortable initially with intellectual discourse on gender. Such discussion seems to make personal revelation less risky. On the other hand, experience with women's groups, even with academically gifted students, shows that they are willing to share personal experience fairly soon and then to construct intellectual frameworks to conceptualize their understanding. These findings point to the need to develop gender issues programming designed for college men on American campuses (p. 275).*

This suggests that men take a head then heart approach to understanding their identity versus women's heart to head method. It seems essential that CSP staff understand this distinction in order to effectively guide male student development. Such discussion has been absent in the preparation of CSP staff and thus serves as a barrier to addressing the problems described at the beginning of this paper.

Feminization of Student Affairs

McEwen, Williams, and Engstrom (1991) found a "clear shift toward greater proportions of women in student affairs." They cite five ramifications for this: (1) concern for diminished credibility of the profession; (2) attrition [of men] from the profession contributing to increased gender imbalance (now 70% women); (3) concern about the effects of the current sex ratio on role modeling for students; (4) the profession needs to acknowledge, accept, and reaffirm the value of men for the profession,

particularly those men who share "the feminine voice;" and (5) the profession must consider the impact on itself and on individual women if women (and nurturing, caring men) must give up their gifts and talents to become more like the traditional male sex-role stereotype.

Bellas (1997) discusses implications of feminization for the people in a field. In particular, feminized fields tend to pay lower salaries and are less prestigious than other fields. Feminization of Student Affairs, therefore, is creating some unintended consequences for professionals in the field as well as for male students. While the infusion of feminist principles is a virtue of the field, such values are often simultaneously alien to male students. Moreover, there is no concerted effort by the field to bridge this gap.

The dilemma, then, is how to identify a means of engaging male students without compromising the values of the field. I do not suggest or believe that a primarily female staff can't do this, but if young men come to campus without having given critical thought to their gender identity, feminist language may be foreign or disagreeable to them (not that all females espouse or use such language). I would argue that CSP needs male and female staff who are prepared to address student development in a way that resonates intellectually with young men, and then model a safe path toward emotional engagement. Without informed knowledge of male identity development, the approach CSP staff have with men can't help but be superficial. If the staff person continues to root their work in an archaic standard of masculinity, I believe it will result in a controlling orientation ("bad dog") toward men. If a "feminine" approach is used, this may be threatening to a

young man who is still trying to understand his sexuality and gender identity. There is a price that women and men pay for the current state of affairs, some of which has already been discussed, and some of which will be explored later.

Masculinity

There is an insidious hegemonic standard of masculinity that young men bring to college with them:

> *In an important sense there is only one complete unblushing male in America: a young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight, and height, and a recent record in sports. Every American male tends to look upon the world from this perspective, this constituting one sense in which one can speak of a common value system in America. Any male who fails to qualify in any one of these ways is likely to view himself-during moments at least-as unworthy, incomplete, and inferior. (Goffman, 1963, p.128)*

In order to make any progress with student development theory generally, we must prepare CSP staff and scholars to understand the theoretical basis of this standard, and we must provide training and support in educational and supervisory relationships so that this knowledge informs practice. It is my view that the foremost task to be accomplished in order to facilitate male student development is to help CSP practitioners and male students identify and come to terms with hegemonic masculinity. For male students, it's a matter of making identity choices for themselves rather than blindly or unreflectively accepting hegemonic standards. For CSP practitioners, it's a matter of

viewing men's behavior within a developmental and theoretical context rather than

relying on stereotypes and defeatist "boys will be boys" conceptions of men.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Entering the Field

Given the questions raised in Chapter One regarding the connection between problems of practice and the socialization of new professionals in Student Affairs, it is important to start with literature about entry into the field. However, scholarship that specifically discusses the socialization of new professionals in student affairs is quite limited. There are a couple of newer texts that specifically discuss this from the perspective of the new practitioner (Amey & Reesor, 2002; Magolda & Carnaghi, 2004) and some texts that are written for supervisors within the field (Janosik, Creamer, et. al., 2003; Cooper, Saunders, et. al., 2002; Winston & Creamer, 1997). In general, these volumes tend to discuss the nuts-and-bolts of socialization (e.g. pre-professional internships, recruitment, selection, position orientation, supervision, professional development, and performance appraisal) rather than critically analyzing the process. These aspects of socialization are not particularly salient to this project since they do not provide an examination of how identity politics generally, and gender in particular, shape Student Affairs practitioners.

One of the books, *Beginning Your Journey* (Amey & Reesor, 2002), departed from this model by discussing some of the conflicts, incongruous experiences, and knowledge gaps that one finds upon entry into the field. One such example is a discussion about the discrepancies in perspectives between the graduate faculty and the new professional's supervisor, illustrated by the authors through a narrative:

My classes in the master's program were fine; I learned a lot from my assistantship too-a ton. But it was like living in two different worlds! The faculty hadn't been in practice for a long time, some of them not at all, and the supervisors, well, they just kept saying, 'Don't give me theory. This is real life!' I wish we'd had more of an opportunity to bridge the gap. Sometimes it was hard to know which way to go…(p.18).

Later in this chapter I will discuss how the graduate preparation programs do not overtly discuss men's gender identity, and I will assert some consequences for this, both to men and to women. For now, suffice it to say that whatever theoretical literature that is included in the graduate program does not appear to be particularly welcome fodder for discussion in the first professional position. Thus, even if men's gender identity were to be included in the graduate programs, it is arguable that the discussion would not continue at work.

The authors discuss the importance of understanding the organizational culture of their workplace, stating that it: "provides administrators with a means not only for assessing their institutions and departments, but also for identifying tasks and appropriate roles for themselves, thereby reducing some of the dissonance created by role conflict and role ambiguity. So, the new professional interprets the instructions given to them, and the non-verbal cues and norms, to identify what is expected, and to perform accordingly.

Amey & Reesor (2002) spend some time discussing the environments (departmental, divisional, institutional, surrounding community, societal, and relative to

professional associations, among others) within which the professional works, and their importance to the work and its effectiveness. They indicate, for instance:

New professionals who believe that they only work for their direct supervisor are taking a very shortsighted and narrow perspective. Supervisors help define the environments that are most important, which is helpful, but often new professionals become so engrossed in performing tasks for which they were hired that they fail to grasp and understand the larger contexts, (p. 20).

In Chapter One I discussed how temperament and curiosity, and perceptions of utility, inform resource-seeking choices by new professionals. With this addition above, it seems that even temperament and curiosity can be overcome by the daily grind of the work, such that the focus is on survival and immediate problems. This does not appear to leave much room for the assimilation of new information, but I prefer to remain optimistic that this is just an example of potential hazards facing new professionals, and that seasoned supervisors can assist in ameliorating the problem. As the current chapter unfolds, I will be discussing the ways in which the field is gendered, framing it as problematic. Given that it is new professionals who most closely work with students, I am interested in how these potential pitfalls might contribute to the problems of practice that I will be elucidating. Even without these vulnerabilities, the process of socialization is expressly intended to indoctrinate the newcomer into the norms, beliefs, and values of the organization (Tierney, 1991). I will be discussing the norms, beliefs, and values of the field in further detail as well.

There is a more robust body of literature about faculty socialization and culture, which I believe will be helpful for understanding some important dimensions of Student Affairs socialization. There is also a good deal of literature about factors that influence the experience of working in the field of student services (as opposed to socialization specifically). In order to establish a conceptual framework for understanding socialization into the field of Student Affairs, it is necessary to draw upon either workplace socialization literature in comparable fields outside higher education (such as teaching in K-12 schools, corporate culture, etc.) or at the literature addressing academic field socialization in higher education, or both.

In making this choice, I relied on my belief that higher education is a unique enterprise, different from the private and government sectors. Kashner (1990) frames higher education's distinctive character in this regard:

Centuries of social tradition accord colleges and universities great regard as the chief vehicle for instruction in the historic liberal arts, as the primary provider of advanced learning in the realms of general and specialized knowledge, and as the principal educational means toward a better life for its citizens. So regarded, higher education occupies a special place in our society's truth, value and worth. The distinctive regard in which academia is held confers special status on it and reinforces the influence of the customary values with which it is associated. This is so even though new circumstances-such as a persistent demand for student customers for preparation to enter careers, which is antithetical to the old liberal education ideal that learning should be prized for its own sake-clash with what is traditional.

The innovator in higher education must thus proceed from an understanding of the ways in which novel conditions interplay with the inherited academic culture and must seek to find a means of reconciling the two so as to enable change.

Similarly, Seagren (1993) adds, "institutions of higher education differ from many organizations, requiring leadership to be a more shared phenomenon than in most profit-focused enterprises." Thus, in order to effectively analyze the influence of graduate preparation and workplace socialization for professionals working in higher education, one would be best served to review literature informed by the idiosyncrasies of the post-secondary context. Therefore, I will draw upon faculty socialization literature for my analysis rather than literature from other sectors.

At its heart, this question is very much like the nature or nurture debate. The question seeks to address the extent to which the two influences (graduate preparation or workplace socialization) take ascendance in shaping the work of the professional on a college campus. The reality I face in answering this question is the need to start with an unequivocal assertion that "it depends." My ultimate argument can't be as simple as stating that graduate preparation is **x%** of the influence, while workplace socialization is **y%**. Instead, I will argue that there are particular factors comprising the recipe that answers the question. This recipe seems to contain the following ingredients: stature of the professional's field; the stakes of graduate preparation; individual commitment and skills; administrative division where the work unit is situated; number of people in that function on the campus; professional association influence; relationships with other fields on the campus; and demographics of the professionals themselves. Other contextual

influences, such as institutional type (e.g. public, private, liberal arts, research, elite/ivy, religious, technical) and political climate will be discussed according to their role within these factors. I will discuss each of these as I develop an argument for their role in graduate preparation and workplace socialization, relative to professional performance.

Status of the Field

To some extent, "status" is an oversimplification in that the factors listed earlier influence the attainment of a field's prestige and power. I will elaborate on those later. Instead, for now suffice it to say that fields generally (and the people working in them) will seek to claim and regulate an area of expertise and authority (Brint, 1994; Kashner, 1990; Mintzberg, 1979 in Brown, 2000; Schon, 1983). Those fields with higher status will have more powerful indoctrination and regulation processes at both the graduate and professional level, not only to ensure "proper" application of field expertise, but also to continue to legitimate and advance the field's status.

Further, I would argue that in higher status fields there is more coordination and continuity between the pre-professional indoctrination and workplace socialization experiences of the practitioner. For example, in the high status fields of medicine and law, the faculty, senior practitioners, and professional associations share the development and regulation of internships and placement activities. These higher status fields produce practitioners who enjoy more autonomy, and so the graduate preparation must be especially rigorous in order to assure that the practitioner will continue to enact the values of the field. I will elaborate further on this point in the next section. Practitioners in lower status fields will receive more external influence, regulation and supervision, and

so the criticality of graduate preparation relative to practitioner performance is greatly reduced.

A good deal of the power and status of a field is derived from the extent to which it is regarded as a formal profession. In the field of student affairs, for instance, there is considerable debate as to whether it is in fact a profession. Merely wondering about this question is itself an indictment of the legitimacy of the field, and in turn an undermining influence on its status. Bloland (1992) notes:

> *Implicit in the question, and justification for its continuing examination is a sense of marginality, of subordination of student affairs staff in the academic enterprise. Implicit also is the suggestion that to be recognized as a profession would confer additional status along with concomitant benefits. The resolution of the question, therefore, is not just an academic exercise but, as is true of many other quasi or emerging professions, one which strikes at the heart of the identity and self-concept as well as the morale of the people who constitute the field (p.2).*

So the status of a field has a significant impact on the experience and performance of the person in the field, and so does the position of the professional within the field. Abbot (1988), for instance, asserts "the front line professionals who make the first professional contacts with clients, and whom the public usually venerates, are generally at the bottom of status rankings within their professions, precisely because they work in environments where professional knowledge must be compromised with client reality" (p. 118). Student Affairs in general is a lower status field on a campus than the academic disciplines, or even the finance division, in large measure because it deals directly with

the client-the student, and is more susceptible to influence by the clients than the other fields on the campus. For instance, a student can successfully demand changes in procedures for residence hall room assignments or student organization rules more easily than demanding changes in academic curricula or fees. For graduate preparation in student affairs, I argue that there is an inculcation of this self-consciousness that persists at the practitioner level (Forney, 1994). In the workplace, this translates to a constant comparison to, or "sidling-up" to the faculty in search of affirmation that rarely comes to fruition. This bears an interesting analogy to the discussions about academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) and other Marxist and Neo-Marxist critiques of Higher Education.

Whereas such critiques connect academic unit status to capitalist market proximity, student affairs gains its status from an alignment to the academic units on the campus. For student affairs practitioners, this has contributed to "student learning outcomes" becoming the coin of the realm for legitimacy. The foundation of the field, psychosocial development, has lost its place as the central endeavor for practitioners. Since they do not enjoy the autonomy and status conferred on other practitioners, student affairs professionals can be left with the choice of getting on board or leaving the field.

Terms such as "co-curricular," for instance, are in my mind more political in nature than relating to practice. Implicit in this term is that the deliverables produced by Student Affairs practitioners are organized, purposeful, and not only legitimate, but equally so to the academic program of the institution. For faculty to accept this term would say just as much about themselves (e.g. a cost to their legitimacy and stature) as it

would about Student Affairs (e.g. a gain to legitimacy and stature). Moreover, the shift

from attention to students' emotional development to students' intellectual development

leaves one wondering who is actually attending to that important dimension of the

students' identity. Ironically, the biggest contribution that Student Affairs can make to

supporting student learning may be to ensure that their emotional lives are being

advanced, but this is not valued under the rubric of technical rationality pervading

academe (Brint, 1994; Schön, 1983). Later, I will also cast a gendered lens on this

phenomenon, arguing that emotional and intellectual work are gendered in a parallel

fashion-with corresponding devaluation and elevation.

The "Stakes" of Graduate Preparation

Earlier, I discussed how higher status fields will place more emphasis on graduate

preparation. Since the student will eventually enjoy a great deal of autonomy as a

practitioner, it becomes increasingly important to socialize meticulously. This is integral

to maintaining the stature of the field.

An associated investment in this rigor is that failure to get this part of the

socialization "right" will interfere with the survival of the graduate program. In other

words, if the values of the profession are not thoroughly instilled in graduates, they will

not perform as expected once in the field. Since the graduate programs, practitioners and

professional associations are so entwined in high status fields, word spreads quickly. The

accreditation demands on graduate preparation programs by the licensing or professional

associations ensures this compliance.

Again, the student affairs field stands in contrast with medical and legal graduate preparation. Since this is a lower status field and thus less organized, there is not the same level of accountability for core knowledge to be taught to future practitioners. Not only is there debate about whether student affairs is a profession, there is even more debate about what the practitioner must know. For example, Saunders and Cooper (1999) surveyed Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) about the skills that ought to be taught in College Student Personnel (CSP) doctoral programs. Although there was a general consensus about which knowledge should be taught in these programs, many of the results are not solely germane to CSP work (e.g. budgeting skills, administrative soundness). Further, there were significant differences in priority of the skills based on respondent gender.

For CSP to emerge as a profession, with the benefits alluded to by Bloland (1992), it would seem there must be agreement about core competencies that are required by the field and a mechanism (through a licensing or professional organization) for accreditation and regulation. This must be combined with some level of coordination by the practitioners and organizations in the field. These are central requirements for a field to be a profession (Bloland & Stamatakos, 1989-90; Stamatakos, 1981a & 1981b; Wrenn & Darley, 1949).

Currently, there is little consequence to CSP graduate programs for variations in quality or curricular foci relative to the hiring and achievement of their graduates. There has been an attempt by the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) to move CSP programs toward an accreditation model (Coomes et al., 1991), but this has not yet

come to fruition. In fact, there is some disagreement within the professional associations about whether this is a good idea.

Pertaining to the individual experience of graduate work in CSP, Forney (1994) studied characteristics, attitudes, and learning styles of CSP Masters students in 16 different programs around the U.S. The results indicated that the students saw value in what they were learning, utility for future work, and a sense of personal comfort and affirmation in their experience. Yet, the majority also reported that their field was not among the more respected areas for graduate study. Well over a third reported their belief that their field of study was less rigorous than other programs. In addition, Coomes, et. al. (1991) looked at CSP doctoral students and found that 63% of the students in the programs are part-time.

This has two implications about stakes and stature. First, the faculty isn't in a position to instill rigid standards in the students (because of part-time status and because the students are often already working in the field). Second, programs that can be completed on a part-time basis are not generally viewed as rigorous. In many ways, the M.A. and Ph.D. become mere stepping-stones to advancement in the field. Affirming this, Richmond and Sherman (1991) reported "those who expect to remain in the student development profession tend to have published and to have gained work experience before earning a master's or doctoral degree" p.12. For the highest status fields, the graduate/professional degree is a requirement to even be allowed entry.

Individual Commitment and Skills

Put simply, those who are highly motivated to enter and advance in a profession are more likely to apply themselves in this endeavor. This is a key attribute of the professional socialization process. Weidman, (et al., 2001) calls this element of role identity development "investment." In describing this process, Stein (1992 in Weidman, 2001) asserts:

To invest in a role is to commit something of personal value such as time, alternative career choices, self-esteem, social status, or reputation to some aspect of a professional role or preparation for it…During the formal stage of socialization, the novice enrolls in classes that provide specialized knowledge. This investment in learning specialized material and skills that are not usually transferable to other occupations can be considerable in terms of time and money spent. During the informal and personal stages of socialization, more specialized knowledge is acquired that creates an even greater investment (p. 17).

The cyclical growth (or decline) in commitment frames the individual as an equal participant in the constructed nature of the socialization process. Thus, at all stages (whether in a graduate program or at work) the individual student/practitioner is a vital element in determining the effectiveness of the process. Researchers are paying more attention to the important role professionals play in organizational socialization (Grbich, 1998; Trowler & Turner, 2002; Trowler & Knight, 1999). Tierney and Rhoads (1994) describe the interplay: "in addition to being ongoing, socialization is bi-directional. Not

only do people adapt to organizations, but organizations must continually adapt to their members," p.3.

Another aspect of the impact of graduate preparation in the socialization process is the congruence between student and faculty perceptions of their roles and expectations. Brown-Wright (et al., 1997) found discrepancies in this area, particularly as it pertained to graduate assistants (G.A.s). G.A.s expected more teaching opportunities while faculty expected them to take on more administrative tasks (especially in the area of research support). Such inconsistencies will invariably affect both motivation and evaluation of the students. Yet, faculty in the human services tend to be more attentive to interpersonal and teaching skills than those in technical fields (Stark, 1987), which may be why CSP masters students studied by Forney (1994) generally found their professors to be imparting information with utility in human service and doing so in a supportive manner. This would suggest that CSP students have stronger relationships with their faculty than students in other fields. Stark also describes constraints faced by professional preparation faculty who wish to instill broad skills but do not have adequate time in a program to broaden curriculum.

It follows then that a chasm forms within CSP during the socialization process since there is often little or no communication between the graduate faculty and a student's prospective employer. This further creates a disjoint between the graduate preparation and workplace socialization process. The stakes in being an uncooperative or uncommitted student are far less pronounced for this and other lower status fields. However, Coleman and Johnson (1990) articulate methods for organizations to employ in

providing purposeful and overt socialization of new professionals. Thus, while the field

itself does not impose formal socialization processes with practitioners, some

organizations within the field do so.

In fairness to students, it should be pointed out that commitment is also affected

by the ability to balance other life issues with work and school. This is especially true in

student affairs given the prevalence of part-time graduate study. Champaign (1995)

describes efforts to provide training, assessment and support to student affairs

practitioners regarding balancing work and life roles. These issues have gained greater

attention, particularly as the gender and racial composition of the field has changed over

time.

Administrative Division

CSP researchers who have addressed the question of whether student affairs is a

profession (Bloland & Stamatakos, 1989-90; Canon, 1982; Penney, 1969; Rickard, 1988;

Wrenn & Darley, 1949) propose that it is rather a conglomeration of professions

functioning within an administrative division. The positioning of the units is an

administrative convenience. Penney (1969) argued that student affairs is not a particular

entity possessing an "identifiable point of view that can be identified as a profession."

Bloland and Stamatakos are clearly in the "not a profession" camp:

How can student affairs be evaluated against the Wrenn and Darley (1949) or any

other set of criteria of professionalism when the field is comprised of such disparate

work activities as academic advisement, psychotherapy, career development,

medicine, student activity advising, paraprofessional counseling, residence hall

advising, management, orientation, and the like? (p.32).

Without a coherent professional identity (or perhaps so long as there is a dispute regarding whether there is one), the workplace culture will be subject to administrative location. Units reporting in the Provost's area will arguably enjoy higher status and influence on the campus than those reporting in a Student Affairs V.P.'s portfolio, even though that person reports to the Provost. However, since the impact on performance in CSP is greater from workplace than graduate training, it is plausible that an influential administrator will have a great deal of impact on the practitioner's socialization experience regardless of division.

Similar again to the market/Marxism analogy used earlier, the closer the unit to the center (e.g. President), the more influential it is. Working in a more influential unit will shape socialization in that workplace. I would argue that the protection that is concomitant to working in a unit seen as vital to success (which generally means it is positioned accordingly) would shape the professional's perception of the work and therefore the performance of that work.

Number of People Doing the Work

In his study of technicians, Barley (1996) discusses how the work of this unique group is often puzzling to their supervisors. In part, this is because the work they do is very different than that of their manager. Also, there is not a critical mass of people doing the work. For computer technicians, it is essential to remain current in order to be successful in the performance of the work. Given that there is little training in the

workplace, professional preparation and interface within the field is essential to performance. The workplace for such a person is a lonely one since the people served by the function do not fully understand the work.

Within Student Affairs, it is not uncommon (particularly on small campuses) for there to be only one person staffing an office that delivers a particular program or service. For example, I worked on a campus where the Director of Career Services worked alone in her own small house-like building on the campus. Since the role of facilitating student job searches is tied heavily to the college's perceived effectiveness, she was perhaps the safest person working at the college. Feeling that one's job is secure will influence one's experience in the workplace, and impact the safety one feels to experiment with new ideas. Without co-workers, one needs to communicate with colleagues in the field in order to remain knowledgeable about the work. In this sense, the workplace socialization becomes more relevant to issues of selling one's services versus quality of performance (even though some would argue these two things are connected).

Murray (1998), in his discussion of Chief Law School Placement Officers, attributes the attitudes and professional statuses of these professionals to their academic background and institutional type. The vast majority of these staff hold advanced degrees, with over a third possessing the J.D. The impact of having the J.D. was more often reported in terms of enjoying credibility with students. Interestingly, many of the subjects said that counseling skills were more useful in doing the work. This reinforces my earlier point about the disjoint between professional preparation and workplace socialization in student affairs staff performance. Given the earlier comparison to the

Law profession, these findings are ironic because many of the professionals in the study are doing lower status work, though possessing the higher status credentials.

Librarians are another group of professionals in higher education worth discussing here. At the university level, the librarians are few in number and must have a specific ALA-accredited graduate degree. Given the formality of the socialization process and the pivotal role played (particularly at a research university), librarians occupy a field more prestigious than student affairs. They are also in an identifiable profession whose functional heterogeneity is significantly lower than student affairs.

Like Medicine or Law, librarianship has sub-fields (e.g. reference, special collections) and technicians that enjoy varying levels of prestige. Winter (1988) describes librarianship as a collegially controlled occupation whose primary players are the graduate programs, institutions (libraries), and the professional association. The institutional type is useful in predicting the normative influence of these constituencies in that a research university will have more librarians (as in those possessing the MLA-accredited degree) than a non-research school. For other institutional types, particularly community colleges, there are more technicians with the department head often being the only MLA-accredited degree holder.

Another influence on the prestige and power of a small librarian pool is the occasional state requirement to employ such a person in order to have an accredited library (and thus certain licensing and funding benefits). Thus, the lucky employee becomes more powerful due to state influence (which was in turn successfully lobbied by the MLA). The field of student affairs does not have such an arrangement, and so this

creates another barrier to formalizing socialization at the graduate level and in turn influencing workplace acculturation.

Professional Association Influence

On behalf of student affairs, national organizations such as the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) are beginning to take an interest in governmental affairs, and in fact have shared a contract with a lobbying firm in Washington, D.C. However, the agenda of the lobbyist is currently more issue-dominated than for the purposes of profession advancement and formalization. The reluctance to formally establish state/federal standards is another reason why student affairs may be seen as either not being a profession, or being a very young one.

Marcus (1999) studied the impact of national agenda initiatives disseminated by student affairs professional associations on activity and discourse within student affairs at four community colleges. His findings indicated that there was little if any effect. In fact, the campus presidents hadn't heard of the effort, nor had most of the professionals. Related to this, Johnson and Stamatakos (1991) propose a maturation model for student affairs professional organizations. In their conception, both ACPA and NASPA are relatively immature (compared to what is proposed as possible, which would by definition exert more influence on practitioners, institutions and graduate programs). While they propose additional longitudinal research, it is clear that at this time the associations do not exert the influence that other fields have from their trade

organizations. This, too, influences the process of socializing practitioners and the role of student affairs as a profession.

Relationships with Other Fields on Campus

There are two different angles under this heading. On one hand, the relationships between units within the student affairs division affect the socialization of those in the units. The other slant pertains to relationships between student affairs units and business or academic units.

Referencing the first perspective, consider the case of psychologists. There is a relatively rigid graduate preparation process followed by a contiguous internship and subsequent job placement, all of which are regulated by the APA and state licensing bodies. This would give psychologists access to higher prestige and more formal socialization in their work experience. However, to embrace APA often is to abandon ACPA and NASPA. By doing this, the psychologist accesses more occupational prestige but potentially loses influence in the coalition of Student Affairs units, being viewed as prima donnas. Sherry (et al., 1991) discusses the formal role of ethical standards in the professional performance of psychologists and counselors. Adherence to national and state standards (e.g. confidentiality, informed consent) places these professionals in closer alignment to faculty culture. This creates a bind in relationships with other student affairs colleagues, who are less likely to possess terminal degrees. The conducting of research by counseling centers further exacerbates this dynamic.

Cross-divisional relationships can have very significant influence on workplace socialization. For example, it is common within campus auxiliaries such as residence life

and student unions for there to be either dual reporting or department split. Specifically, the revenue units and facilities staff often reports to a Business V.P. whereas the educational and program staff often report to the Student Affairs V.P. First, this places the educational staff in the position of relying on other fields for their budget (which can be demoralizing, bringing us full circle to the status issue). Second, the Business V.P. usually enjoys a closer alignment with the campus president. Magnifying this issue is the acknowledged problem in student affairs-that CSP staff are relatively inexperienced in areas of budgeting and finance (Delworth, et al., 1989; Saunders and Cooper, 1999). In order for CSP managers to have credibility and to be effective, they need to have these business-related skills. It is therefore not uncommon for integrated residence life departments (those that also control facility maintenance and construction) to be headed by a chief housing officer (CHO) with a Master of Business Administration (MBA) rather than the M.A. in College Student Personnel. Having worked in such a department, I found the culture among the managers to be stifling relative to student development issues since such is ethereal and difficult to confine to a spreadsheet.

Sutton and Dobbin (1996) highlight another aspect of the inter-divisional milieu. In their article, there is a discussion about the exchange between Human Resources and Legal professionals (and the State) within Higher Education relative to domain control. Both professions are highly developed and seek to apply rigid control over a body of expertise and authority. Similarly, the Student Affairs field is in an interesting place at the moment as the student learning outcomes discussion unfolds. Obviously, student

learning has typically been seen as solely owned by faculty. However, state involvement in the funding of higher education opens up new negotiations in this regard.

The public accountability being imposed upon higher education results in administrations and governing boards looking within the portfolio of units for silver bullets. Levin (2000) describes the clawing that administrators do in their quest for the panacea during a turbulent period. Beverley (in Derber, 1982) and Olswang (et.al., 1985) also connect these accountability demands to central administration's increasing control over professionals' work in higher education. Gaither (et.al., 1995) discusses the movement toward performance indicators in higher education:

Accompanying this movement [toward assessment and accountability in the 1980s and 1990s] was a subtle shift from growth in funding, principally though formula funding, toward funding 'outcomes,' 'results,' and 'performance.' This focus on performance, using funding incentives as motivators, helped encourage policy makers and the academic community to explore the use of a system of indicators to raise warning signs about the efficiency and effectiveness of higher education (p.2).

Gaither ties this movement with increased attention to the enterprise of undergraduate education. Perhaps this creates an opportunity for student affairs to enhance its standing on campus, build coalitions and create a sense of empowerment for talented staff. This discourse also affects the perception of CSP's role in promoting institutional effectiveness generally. Marcus (1999) reports on an inter-association effort to set an agenda in this regard. Among the recommendations is to conduct applied

research in order to identify the ways in which student affairs promotes particular student outcomes. It would behoove CSP staff to connect with faculty to produce this research. Such an alignment could add to an academic atmosphere within the student affairs division, which in turn places new staff in an experience of being socialized as (pseudo) academics.

The growing body of literature about the effects of out-of-classroom experiences effects on student cognitive development is a result of this collaboration (Love, 1995; Terenzini et al., 1996). Similarly, discourse about translation of theory to practice and the proliferation of literature and institutes about this topic (Piper, 1992; Upcraft, 1994; Young & Coldwell, 1993) is motivated not only by a desire to be more effective, but also by an underlying interest in status acquisition. It is my prediction that if stature rises, the roles of both graduate preparation and workplace socialization will become more pronounced in their effect on performance. This is a bit of a chicken and egg proposition because it is reasonable to argue that either one would be a precursor to the other.

Demographics of Professionals

Literature on feminization and racial composition of fields generally and student affairs specifically (Aguirre, 2000; Bellas, 1997; McEwen et al., 1990, 1991; Wilson, 2000) indicate differences in the experiences of professionals based on their demographics. Bellas (1997) attributes lower salaries to faculty fields with higher percentages of women. Student Affairs, as a feminized field (McEwen et al., 1990) happens also to be a relatively low paying one. This affects the socialization at both the graduate and professional level, in part because it expedites the departure of men. As the

field has aligned more closely with feminist principles, the men in the field are inculcated with these values and must either perform thus or risk losing their job. This creates a somewhat coercive socialization process, particularly within the workplace, and particularly for men. This is not to suggest that feminist values are inherently going to conflict with male work patterns. Rather, it suggests that women are socialized to perform more consistently with these values and thus are less likely to encounter conflict during the socialization process. Komives (1991) discusses hall director leadership styles with findings consistent with my assertions.

The relationship between personal demographics and field expectations (and thus the indoctrination process) can be mitigated by institutional type. For example, Shriberg and Wester (1994) studied employment satisfaction of non-Catholic CSP professionals at Catholic institutions. About a quarter of the non-Catholic respondents reported discomfort in their work setting, whereas less than half that number of Catholic subjects thought their non-Catholic colleagues were experiencing discomfort. Both groups reported that it was at least somewhat problematic to be non-Catholic working at a Catholic institution. There is some other work about insider/outsider issues-Tillman (1999); and Smith & Davidson (1992) in their articles about African-American academicians' survival and advancement; Croteau and von Destinon (1994) and their work on job experiences of LGBT professionals, for example. Although these articles do not attempt to generalize to other insider/outsider situations, such research is warranted because of the centrality of the issue to professional acculturation.

There is also work on generational influences in academic fields, and these issues play out in student affairs as well (Corcoran & Clark, 1984; Reynolds, 1992; Schneider, 1997). In particular, the old guard of any profession eventually cedes control of socialization to a new generation and its new style. As generations fade in and out within a field, there is inevitable tension in both socialization and credibility of professionals.

What's The Work About?

Gertner (1991) begins his article, *Men and Student Development*, with the assertion that almost goes without saying, "Student Development Theory serves as the foundation of student affairs work." He goes on to list some of the most well-known theorists whose contributions occupy the majority of real estate within the textbooks used in graduate preparation programs (e.g. Chickering, 1969; Erickson, 1968; Heath, 1968; Kohlberg, 1969; Perry, 1970; and Sanford, 1962). He also acknowledges that these theorists were men, and that most of the theories were based on research on college men. Gertner then discusses the criticisms that arose about these theories:

Criticism has been levied, as a result of these facts [the prevalence of affluent, white, male subjects] that points to problems with existing theories of student development...They reflect what Schaef (1981) refers to as the 'white male system' which neglects female, Black, Chicano, Asian-American and Native-American systems. It also negates any deviation by men from this system which is sustained by a set of 'myths'. Clearly, the limited purview of student development theory is a weakness to the credibility and effectiveness of student affairs practice.

This criticism stimulated a proliferation of scholarship on women (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Gilligan, 1982; Josselson, 1987); white and minority racial identity (Cross, 1991; Cross, 1995; Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 2001; Ferdman & Gallegos, 2001; Helms, 1990, Kim, 2001); Sexual Orientation and Sexual Identity (Broido, 2000; Brown, 1989; Carter, 2000; Cass, 1979); and other marginalized groups, which have been woven into seminal texts (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Komives, Woodard, et. al, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991) used in graduate preparation programs.

It is important here to pick up a point made in Chapter One. Namely, that developmental writing has been androcentric, but gender blind (Gertner, 1991; Meth & Pasik, 1990). Student Affairs literature recognized a legitimate concern about the absence of non-dominant voices, and action was taken to promulgate new scholarship that explicitly examines their perspectives and experiences, but it did not question "the effects of this male bias on the very men who might appear to be its beneficiaries" (Gertner, 1991). This is particularly interesting given that the first program session relating to men was offered at the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) conference in 1978 (May & Scher, 1988). This opened a discussion that led to the formation of the Standing Committee for Men (SCFM), which was supported by members of ACPA's Standing Committee for Women, particularly Dr. Jane Fried. At that time, ACPA was a section of the American Counseling Association (ACA), and thus the SCFM was primarily led by psychologists. When ACPA spun off and disaffiliated from ACA in 1992-1993, many of the founding members of SCFM stopped attending

ACPA in favor of ACA and the American Psychological Association (APA), which

formed Division 51, The Society for the Study of Men and Masculinity. Despite the

regular presence of general sessions about men at the ACPA national conference, and a

smaller, but still active group of men populating the SCFM, the subject did not become

prominent, having been overshadowed by discourses about men's over-representation

and domination in the literature and thus an unwelcome posture, or perhaps a reluctance

due to political correctness, toward discussion of men's issues. When I became Chair of

SCFM in 2000, I found that the Executive Board (of which I was a member by virtue of

serving as a Standing Committee Chair) and other ACPA leaders were willing to listen to

my concerns about this issue, but no action was taken (e.g. invite a major speaker, release

a major publication, form a task force, incorporate the subject into newly promulgated

standards, etc.)

In terms of the literature, we see that in 1988, Jossey-Bass released a monograph

entitled, *Changing Roles for Men on Campus*, edited by Ronald May and Murray Scher.

This small monograph seems to be the first major work in the Student Affairs literature

(meaning, by a well-known publisher and distributed nationally) to revisit and challenge

the long-held view that men and their gender identities were understood by the field. May

and Scher (1988) open the book by setting the context:

Changes in men's and women's roles have been one of the most significant social

phenomena of the seventies and eighties. Initially, men struggled with their defensiveness

and confusion in reaction to the women's movement. Before long, however, men began

to see more clearly the limits imposed on their own lives by traditional gender roles. The

constraints surfaced in such areas as difficulties in relationships with women, distress

experienced in work roles, truncated male friendships, and poor health habits (p.1).

Though discussions began informally in the late seventies, and activity intended

to bring this discussion into visible locations within the field has continued through to

this day (e.g. conference choice sessions, journal articles, and committee activities), these

issues are still not discussed in the most influential locations of the field.

The tensions described by May and Scher are important to consider, and so too is

that which precipitated it. Pasco (2003) puts it simply, stating that "three waves of

feminist activism …have challenged traditional notions of patriarchy while

simultaneously empowering women." I mention this here to give credit where it is due,

and also to acknowledge a possible context for resistance within Student Affairs toward

spending any considerable time or location on men. I will argue later that it is in the

interest of women (and marginalized groups in general) to spend the time, in prominent

locations. For now, I will focus on the current state of the discussion.

In terms of prominence within the field, there has not been a major speaker at

either ACPA or NASPA who explicitly discussed men's gender identity development,

and primary textbooks used in graduate preparation programs in Student Affairs still do

not explicitly discuss men's gender identity development or masculinities, per se. Rather,

where gender is discussed, the authors tend to be discussing women and when men are

mentioned it is for the purpose of illustrating that the issue about women being discussed

is different for women than for men, but rarely is this elaborated upon. For instance, a

cursory glace at the index within the text, *Student Services: A Handbook for the*

Profession (Komives, Woodard, et. al., 2003), reveals the entry, "*Men students: climate for, 48; diversity and, 47-48.*" A review of these two pages in a text containing 724 pages shows approximately one page of text, beginning with an overview of an increase in the number of women attending and completing college; women increasing their presence in previously non-traditional fields (e.g. business, law, communication); issues of chilly climate and sexual harassment; and in the last paragraph:

> *Recently, attention has turned to the way that the college environment affects men students; here too, the concern is that college and university climates are hostile and unsupportive to male students in some systematic ways. Some data have suggested that men are less likely than women to enroll and make progress toward successful degree attainment. Recent research on the experiences of African-American men has been especially troubling…(p.48).*

The remainder of the paragraph discusses comparisons between experiences and college attainment of African-American men versus African-American women. There are two things that are particularly notable about this brief entry about men. First, the problematic behaviors that are cited as being problematic for women (e.g. sexual harassment, chilly climate, forms of bias) discuss the object, women, but do not explicitly mention those perpetrating the acts, men. This makes the women the focus of discussion about the problem, which sounds at first blush like a pro-feminist position, yet consider that the men who commit the acts are an invisible abstraction, which prevents critical analysis of the men or the function of their behaviors. This is a typical problem of gender in the public sphere and in the literature, whereby destructive acts by boys and men are

either discussed in terms of the victims (very often women), or as gender-neutral phenomena. Katz (1999) describes this latter dynamic as it pertains to violence committed by boys:

But when the perpetrators are boys, we talk in a gender-neutral way about kids or children, and few (with the exception of some feminist scholars) delve into the forces - be they cultural, historical, or institutional - that produce hundreds of thousands of physically abusive and violent boys every year. Instead, we call upon the same tired specialists who harp about the easy accessibility of guns, the lack of parental supervision, the culture of peer-group exclusion and teasing, or the prevalence of media violence (p.E1).

The second notable issue is that where men are discussed explicitly, it is in terms of a subordinated identity (e.g. racial, sexual orientation, etc.) whereby the exception (to the invisible hegemonic man) is the object of discussion. Does this function to re-inscribe men as center, and hegemonic men in particular? And, what is the cost to women, people of color, homosexuals, and other marginalized groups? Finally, what is the cost to men whose particular identities are closer to the hegemonic center?

In the same text (Komives, Woodard, et al.), a review of the index for entries explicitly about women shows six major headings and 21 sub-sections, comprising 29 pages after removing duplication. Finally, entries in the index about gender add six pages not mentioned in the sections about women specifically, or men specifically. None of the six pages explicitly discuss men, but most discuss gender as an important thing. Ironically, on page 171, the authors espouse the very point I have been making:

Examining the ways in which a theory is socially constructed means making the invisible social constructions visible, the hidden purposes explicit, and the camouflaged populations for whom the theory is intended known and acknowledged. This challenge also means revealing the social constructions of the concepts included in the theory. Further, it is necessary for us to examine ourselves to make known what lenses and filters we are using to understand, portray, and apply theory (p.171).

Another major Student Development text, Student Development in College: Theory, Research, and Practice (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998) has no index entries about men, one entitled, "*Women's development*" with six sub-categories (three referring the reader to specific theories of women's development that have their own index reference), and two entries under "Gender differences" which refer to brief discussions about two theories and how women and men have differences in scores or typologies, but the implications for men (or women) are not discussed.

Pascarella and Terenzini's, *How College Affects Students,* is similar with regard to these issues. There is one entry in the index entitled, "*men's colleges*," which refers the reader to a mention about how some selective men's colleges have produced Nobel Laureats. Whereas, the index entry entitled, "*Women*," has 25 sub-categories, and another entry entitled, "*Women's institutions*," has one sub-category and referral to another entry.

Interestingly, Blimling's (2003) well-known textbook, *The Resident Assistant*, does discuss men explicitly. The index entry on men offers 11 sub-categories; and the index entry on women offers 12 sub-categories. While the actual discussions are

relatively brief, they not only describe developmental issues in men, but there are some ideas about how to address those issues. For instance, in his discussion of the first year of college, Blimling describes a dynamic wherein new students put forward a protective appearance that they have already acclimated to the campus. He then goes on to say:

For men this is especially true. Men, as defined by our culture, are supposed to be self-reliant, exhibit independence, and confront new tasks with little difficulty. The freshman male often has difficulty admitting that he really does not understand everything about his new environment. To ask simple questions such as, 'Where is the dining hall? Or 'What do I do if I get locked out of my room?' is an admission that he is not in control of his environment. When one's ego is fragile and one's self-image is closely tied to the perceptions of other students, a person may be reluctant to ask simple and basic questions (p.106).

A second example in Blimling (2003) worth noting is the entry entitled, *Fear of Homosexuality*:

Men in particular undergo a crisis in discovering their sexuality that often includes wondering whether they may be attracted to other males. Some may experiment with casual sexual contacts with other males, and some may overcompensate by continually declaring loudly and publicly how heterosexual their relationships are. Although the majority of students are able to establish a satisfying sexual identity, some students experience much anxiety in resolving this issue…By being an understanding listener, you may help the student better understand some of the questions surrounding sexuality. If early in the year you berate a certain sexual orientation or defend your own

sexual identity to students in your unit, you may lose a student who needs to talk to you

(p.115).

These two examples are striking, both because of the matter-of-fact accessibility that is embedded with much of the complex theory available from women's and men's studies; and also because it reads in a non-judgmental (e.g. non-shaming) manner, while offering insights into good practice with male students. It is, at best, peculiar that this information is available in a textbook written for undergraduate peer educators while the major texts used to educate their professional supervisors do not include it. How, then, might this useful information be reinforced so that it is applied?

The discourse in the field about the need to expand the foundational literature to include previously invisible voices (e.g. voices other than men's) essentializes men and masculinity as if it were one phenomenon/voice, which, in turn had been fully represented. However, a failure to explicitly consider men as gendered beings, or of masculinities as they are performed by men and women, has the effect of perpetuating the very invisibility that inscribes men as center. This is ironic since the espoused values of the field are pro-feminist, and the perspectives that have obscured men's gender identity have been ones that have repeatedly asserted the importance of gender, race, sexuality, and other salient dimensions of identity. In other words, if men are not known as gendered beings, then the ways that their gender identities privilege them and oppress women are left un-interrogated. Furthermore, the way that hegemonic masculinities stratify men relative to other dimensions of identity (e.g. race, class, sexual orientation, etc.) is not explored, understood, or ameliorated.

More recently, the singular and binary conceptions of men/women and masculinity/femininity has been replaced in the Social Science literature (especially in contributions from Queer Theory, Transnational Feminisms, Critical Race Theory, among others) with the plural, "masculinities," and "femininities," referring to multiple versions of this construct that exist at times apart from a connection to men's and women's bodies. This movement from singular to plural has been fueled by several important stimuli. Pasco (2003) argues, for instance, that "three waves of feminist activism …have challenged traditional notions of patriarchy while simultaneously empowering women." Yet, Student Affairs, with few exceptions, has not incorporated this material into the field's scholarship. Student Affairs, by virtue of calling for and enacting a focus on women's identities, has already asserted that gender matters (both in terms of students' development and in terms of professional effectiveness). Thus, by not integrating the growing body of scholarship about men's gender identities, the field has fallen further behind in its ability to understand and to be effective with men (and perhaps by extension this has limited its effectiveness with women, since men and women affect each others' experiences). My earlier discussion about professionals' perceptions of utility leaves one wondering why Student Affairs has not become more attuned to this literature. This is particularly strange, and concerning, given significantly disproportionate incidents of rule violations, violence, and other negative behaviors committed by men, and a shrinking population of men attending and completing colleges. Schuh (2002) prepared an article for the NASPA journal in which he provided an

overview of foundational literature from the field and in particular how the field sought to establish itself as a profession. In it, he quotes Lloyd-Jones and Smith (1954):

Personnel work is described not as a collection of services to students, provided by a group of specialists who are administered by a 'head,' but rather as the extension and depending on an educational program for the development of whole men (sic) for life in a demographic society (1954, p. 349).

The use of "(sic)" in Schuh's quotation of Lloyd-Jones and Smith is important for at least two reasons. First, it reflects that by contemporary standards, the use of the word "men" to either mean **men only**, or to imply inclusion of men **and** women, is inappropriate because it is inherently sexist and thus contrary to Student Affairs' current practice and ethos. Second, I believe this demonstrates how the particular remedies to the essentialization (by using "men" as a standard name) of people by explicitly naming women, people of color, and other marginalized groups, has also had the effect of re-inscribing men in the center by not discussing them as gendered beings and instead naming other groups **relative** to men. The descriptor "whole" in this context connotes an appreciation for acknowledging and developing the parts that comprise it (Rodgers in Creamer, 1990, p.27). Indeed, Blackhurst and Hubbard (1997) connect the notion of attention to the whole student with the assertion:

"Since the mid-1980s, researchers studying women's development, and the status of women in higher education have demonstrated the importance of gender as a variable influencing cognitive, moral, identity, career, educational, and personal development. Such research has also highlighted the limitations of theories developed in the late 1960s,

many of which were based primarily on research conducted with male subjects and failed

to examine gender differences or women's experiences (p.453).

Meth & Pasik (1990) acknowledge this, while at the same time pointing out that

the seminal research (alluded to by Blackhurst & Hubbard here) did not study men as

gendered either. Women (and other marginalized groups) have indeed been essentially

ignored in the earlier literature, and this has interfered with the field's ability to serve

them (and perhaps this has further privileged men). Consequently, scholarship about

women and their development have increasingly been included in CSP preparation

programs, within core and elective courses, and more such efforts are still needed

(Blackhurst & Hubbard, 1997). Nonetheless, the field and its scholarship have moved in

this important direction without fully exploring how the concerns that precipitated these

changes also mitigate our understanding of men, or our work with them. In other words,

the assumption was/is that men are sufficiently understood, yet the connections between

the behavioral and attrition issues discussed earlier suggest otherwise.

About That Patriarchy Thing…

There is much discussion within the Social Sciences around the concept of

patriarchy, and I will discuss a little later how this discussion has influenced discourses in

Student Affairs around the issues of gender. Johnson (2001) defines patriarchy as: *"a*

kind of society in which men and women participate…a society is patriarchal to the

degree that it is male-dominated, male identified, and male-centered. It also involves as

one of its key aspects the oppression of women" (p.5).

Johnson elaborates by noting that key positions in such a society (e.g. political, economic, religious) are reserved for men. Kaufman (1999) adds:

in a world dominated by men, the world of men is, by definition, a world of power. That power is a structured part of our economies and systems of political and social organization; it forms part of the core of religion, family, forms of play, and intellectual life. On an individual level, much of what we associate with masculinity hinges on a man's capacity to exercise power and control (p.59).

Male dominance, in Johnson's (2001) view, also "promotes the idea that men are superior to women. In part this occurs because we don't distinguish between the superiority of positions in a hierarchy and the kinds of people who usually occupy them." So, patriarchal societal systems (and I believe that ours is one) perpetuate not only a disproportionate number of men in positions of power, but also situate men as more important and better than women.

Michael Kaufman (in Kuypers, 1999), however, discusses an important paradox in men's relationship with power:

Though men hold power and reap the privileges that come with our sex, that power is tainted. There is, in the lives of men, a strange combination of power and 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. Rather, it is to say that men's worldly power-as

we sit in our homes or walk the street, apply ourselves at work or march through history-comes with a price for us. This combination of power and pain is the hidden story in the lives of men. It is men's contradictory experiences of power (p.59).

One of the complications of this discussion has been that "patriarchy" and "men" have been used interchangeably as if they are the same thing (Johnson, 2001). Patriarchy, as earlier discussed, is a system. Men are people who are affected by the system's arrangement, and women are as well. Clearly, it is important to note the differences in the ways men and women are affected by the system-and they are significant differences. By making these two words (e.g. men and patriarchy) synonymous, whether de facto or overtly, we do a disservice to efforts to promote social justice since the frame pits men and women against each other, rather than as potential co-collaborators in addressing the structural inequalities that affect everyone in particular ways.

For instance, hooks (1984) proposes:

Men are not exploited or oppressed by sexism, but there are ways in which they suffer as a result of it. This suffering should not be ignored. While it in no way diminishes the seriousness of male abuse and oppression of women, or negates male responsibility for exploitative actions, the pain men experience can serve as a catalyst calling attention to the need for change (p.73).

Another notable manifestation of the current discourse about patriarchy is that it also ascribes positive and negative qualities to women and men, respectively. In other words, the structure of the conversation suggests men are powerful and bad, and women

are powerless and good. Aside from questions of women's agency (e.g. are they completely powerless and thus must wait for men to change, or might they have capabilities to influence change, and can we discuss this without abdicating men's responsibility and culpability in this regard?), Barbara Ehrenreich (2004) raises a provocative set of questions in her reflection on the recent Abu Ghraib prison abuse scandal:

Even those people we might have thought were impervious to shame, like the Secretary of Defense, admit that the photos of abuse in Iraq's Abu Ghraib prison turned their stomachs. The photos did something else to me, as a feminist: They broke my heart. I had no illusions about the U.S. mission in Iraq -- whatever exactly it is -- but it turns out that I did have some illusions about women. Of the seven U.S. soldiers now charged with sickening forms of abuse in Abu Ghraib, three are women: Spc. Megan Ambuhl, Pfc. Lynndie England and Spc. Sabrina Harman... A certain kind of feminism, or perhaps I should say a certain kind of feminist naiveté, died in Abu Ghraib. It was a feminism that saw men as the perpetual perpetrators, women as the perpetual victims and male sexual violence against women as the root of all injustice. Rape has repeatedly been an instrument of war and, to some feminists, it was beginning to look as if war was an extension of rape. There seemed to be at least some evidence that male sexual sadism was connected to our species' tragic propensity for violence. That was before we had seen female sexual sadism in action (p. M1).

Ehrenreich's analysis is important because it troubles the binary and essentialist discussions about men and women in general, and I argue that it provides important

inroads to reframing discussion about gender within Student Affairs. I must say, as my 13th consecutive ACPA Convention attendance draws closer, this is the first sense of direction I have for how to frame my concerns about our field's current conceptions of men and of patriarchy.

Speaking more broadly, for context, major societal institutions (e.g. Church, families, media, schools, etc.) serve to reproduce (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) the culture that corresponds with this patriarchal system. Each generation of men and women perpetuate, re-inscribe, and perhaps challenge and refine it (alluded to in my earlier discussion of hegemony) relative to social conventions of the day. However, for a single individual man, this process arguably begins as soon as his parents become aware that he is growing in the womb. A simple glance through product catalogs containing baby clothing, or a cursory review of situation comedies will reveal innumerable sources of influence relative to gendered messages.

A local newspaper in St. Cloud, Minnesota (where I am currently residing), for instance, printed an obligatory article in the Local/State section on January 2nd, 2005 about the first "new year's baby" born in the area. One of the notable aspects of the story was a quote from the mother, which was the only quote printed in large text, alongside a photo of the infant: "He's a dare-devil. He had the umbilical cord wrapped around his neck twice." This framing of physical risk as not only something that the baby himself did, but also spinning this clearly horrible aspect of his birth experience as a positive characteristic, is emblematic of the socially-constructed identity that lays out expectations for men's behavior. It would be a fair criticism to suggest that this particular example is

too nit-picky. And that is one of the complexities of examining patriarchy, or hegemony for that matter. It is the conglomeration of these small instances that synergistically have power to shape lived experience. Thus, an additional tool of the system is the ridicule or dismissal of the discrete evidence suggesting the system's very existence.

Enter Men and Masculinity

Given its complexity, one is hard pressed to decide where to begin a discussion about masculinity, or even to judge its adequacy. On the one hand, invoking a definition would seem the logical place to start. But, without some context, such as some discussion of gender in general, or perhaps patriarchy, the definition would not have foundation. In Chapter One, I quoted sociologist Erving Goffman's (1963, in Kimmel, 1996, p.5) invocation of one complete, unblushing male (e.g. straight, white, Northern, Protestant, etc.).

This standard has remained fairly stable, or at least dominant, since Goffman proposed it over 40 years ago. Masculinity has been discussed in Social Science literature as an identity facet that is attained through performance rather than by birth. Kimmel (1998) describes it thus:

T*he important fact of men's lives is not that they are biological males, but that they become men. Our sex may be male, but our identity as men is developed through a complex process of interaction with the culture in which we both learn the gender scripts appropriate to our culture and attempt to modify those scripts to make them more palatable (p. xx).*

A primary fuel keeping this standard viable is hegemony, which is "a particular form of dominance in which a ruling class legitimates its position and secures the acceptance if not outright support of those below it (Johnson, 2000)." In other words, this dominant form of masculinity is enforced through the participation of society's members, men *and* women, who accept and then underwrite, through their behavior, this definition as "normal," "natural," and in some discourse, "G-d's will." (The spelling, "G-d" is used in this dissertation for personal religious observance prohibiting the writing of the complete name) There are three important expansions of this assertion. First, it should be noted that these adjectives are not necessarily discussed overtly, since to discuss "why" the model of masculinity exists is itself a violation of the rules put forth by the standard. Kimmel (2004) discusses male privilege as something that requires such invisibility: "the mechanisms that afford us privilege are very often invisible to us. What makes us marginal (unempowered, oppressed) are the mechanisms that we understand," (p. x). To merely (overtly) discuss gender relative to men is to interrogate the construction of masculinity since it is cobbled to privilege. If one questions the trappings of masculinity, one is not only breaking a rule, but as discussed earlier, one is indicting that which is seen as a given. This will evoke discomfort, and perhaps punishment, from others.

Thus, the invisibility of gender vis-à-vis men is, itself, part of the apparatus of enforcement. I would argue that the notions of "natural," "normal," and "G-d's will" may be invoked when the standard is questioned, and it is expected that the person questioning the standard will accept this answer. Any further questioning can be socially

dangerous. Second, hegemony as coined by Antonio Gramsci (1971, in Landy, 1994) and as I assert it here, acknowledges:

> …*the fact that men [sic] can become conscious of their conditions, organize to struggle against them and in fact transform them-without which no active politics can be conceived, let alone practiced-[and] must not be allowed to override the awareness of the fact that, in capitalist relations, men and women are placed and positioned in relations which constitute them as agents (p. 75).*

Thus, while the masculine script is fairly rigid, there is the ability, through agency, activism, and politics, to modify it. For instance, three waves of feminism have influenced changes either to the standard, its application, or in the evolution of legitimate alternatives and subaltern social locations. This leads to a third extension, that the standard is contextually mediated. This is to say that the behavior and performance described in the hegemonic standard is aggregate. So, for instance, a man can be tender with his children and this is not seen as violating the standard; whereas tenderness with other men would be a violation (Johnson, 2000).

I think it's important here to explicitly state that I will not be reviewing literature about innate biological or psychological differences between men and women. As Pinker (2002) notes:

> *There is, in fact, no incompatibility between the principles of feminism and the possibility that men and women are not psychologically identical. To repeat: equality is not the empirical claim that all groups of humans are interchangeable; it is the moral principle that individuals should not be judged or constrained by*

the average properties of their group…In any case, what we do know about the

sexes does not call for any action that would penalize or constrain one sex or

another (p. 340).

Pinker continues with the point that general intelligence is the same for men and

women, and that virtually all psychological traits are found (in varying degrees) in people

of both sexes. Johnson (2000) complicates "sex" by discussing the binary, opposing

nature of the descriptor. He points to cultures that have more than two of the thing

Western culture calls "sex," just as he describes gender as a mechanism of social control,

as I ascribed to it earlier. In any case, even if there are biological and/or psychological

(e.g. innate) differences between men and women (and I believe there are some), I argue

they are not germane to this project because they do not mitigate my particular claims

about social constructions or the appropriateness or effects of particular behavior.

Men's Studies…Studying Men

The field of Men and Masculinity Studies is still a fairly new discipline (and

arguably it may be a subset of Women's and/or Gender Studies rather than a field unto

itself). As such, there are a relatively small number of seminal works-the things that

would be included on a "must-read" list. I will review some of the most influential

literature, with particular attention to discussions of the masculinities relative to the

current generation of students and their parents. This approach is chosen since the more

distant history is embedded (both explicitly cited and implicitly shaping) in current

literature and the more current state is immediately relevant to the field's work with, and

experience of, college men.

Goffman's (1963) reference to "one complete, unblushing male," quoted ealier, represented the hegemonic standard that shaped baby-boomers' gender identities, and arguably stands its ground today in shaping young men's identities, with contemporary nuances. It is critical to point out that, for instance, that even today this standard is imposed on all men, regardless of their other characteristics (e.g. sexual orientation, race, class), and it is the relative impact (not multiple standards) that defines the differences in this regard. There are debates and discussions about whether the women's movement stimulated such efforts to understand men and their experiences, or whether there was a Men's movement that precipitated the formation of a discipline (Baumli & Williamson, 1997).

There is a more recent evolution of discussion invoking the term "masculinities," referring not to the male archetypes in Jungian psychology, but rather to sociological descriptions of various social structures (Brod, 1994; Weeks, 1985). For the purposes of this project, it is not important to resolve this historical question. Ethically, however, I think it is important to do two things. First, one should acknowledge the contributions of feminist women and women's studies relative to their early examinations of the construction of gender and its consequences. Brod and Kaufman (1994) point out that these women had good reason to do so, stating "men's efforts to live up to some vaguely defined notions of masculinity had some disastrous consequences for women." The earlier discussion about the disparate number of violent acts committed by men (many against women) illustrates this point.

Men's Studies, then, has the critical task of "investigation of interactions between men, with particular emphasis on how men experienced these interactions as men, and not simply as generic human beings, the way in which patriarchal scholarship has viewed men (Brod, 1994)." Brod (1997) elaborates on this distinction:

In inverse fashion to the struggle in women's studies to establish the objectivity of women's experiences and thereby validate the legitimacy of women's experiences as women, much of men's studies struggles to establish the subjectivity of men's experiences and thereby validate the legitimacy of men's experiences as men (p.6).

Brod (1994) discusses a complex self-consciousness in the development of the study of men and masculinity. In particular, how can the field evolve without colonizing women's studies or space, or asserting a dominant method of studying gender that devalues the means by which it is done in women's studies? If Student Affairs is indeed a feminized field (McEwen, Williams & Engstrom, 1991), then this dilemma might possibly explain some of the reasons for the absence of men's studies literature in its graduate preparation programs and discourse within the field. In other words, there may be an unacknowledged suspicion or fear hidden behind the notion that to invite discussion about men as men would somehow detract from important discussions about identities and experiences of women, people of color, and other marginalized groups; or to abdicate responsibility to engage and dismantle privileges (and corresponding oppressions) associated with the system(s) of patriarchy. It is fair to be suspicious, as Brod explains, "although men's studies scholarship intended to overcome these dichotomies [between structures and individuals], slippage occurred such that it became

possible to sometimes speak of the experiences of men without paying sufficient attention to the institutional embodiments of patriarchy (p.86)."

The second thing that must be done in order to create applicable scholarship for Student Affairs is to synthesize the literature about men and masculinities, and how they shape experiences and enact the socialization of men (and those of women) prior to arrival on campus, and then how it plays out in a college context. This will need to be done carefully, ensuring that scholarship and discussion about men does not implicitly or explicitly suggest a binary, that men's experiences and social locations are separate from those of women. With this caution addressed, one could construct a salient lens through which to understand, and a set of strategies to effectively engage, college men.

Robert Brannon (1976), a psychologist, was among the earliest to elucidate an accessible model for understanding the unwritten rules of manhood. He summarizes manhood with four phrases: "No Sissy Stuff!" referring to the importance of acting opposite of feminine; "Be a Big Wheel" referring to the importance of attaining power, status, and wealth; "Be a Sturdy Oak" referring to the imperative of hiding one's emotions and staying calm and rational in a crisis. The saying, "boys don't cry" would be an extension of this; and "Give 'em Hell" is a call for men to exude danger and aggression, and to take risks.

Kimmel (1994) describes the intersections and interdependence of the facets of masculine identities:

Our culture's definition of masculinity is thus several stories at once. It is about the individual man's quest to accumulate those cultural symbols that denote manhood,

signs that he has in fact achieved it. It is about those standards being used against women to prevent their inclusion in public life and their consignment to a devalued private sphere. It is about the differential access that different types of men have to those cultural resources that confer manhood and about how each of these groups then develop their own modifications to preserve and claim their manhood. It is about the power of these definitions themselves to serve to maintain the real-life power that men have over women and that some men have over other men (p. 125).

The aversion to femininity that is so powerfully represented in the masculine ideal serves to codify sexism, homophobia, and competitive aggression as centrally important to masculine gender performance. Kimmel (1994, in Brod & Kaufman, 1994)) constructs a powerful theoretical framework wherein he first describes a sense of inadequacy residing within men that instills a fear of being exposed as a fraud, of being ashamed, humiliated, or dominated by other men. Kimmel thus asserts that men are afraid of other men, which he describes as the "great secret of American Manhood."

Consequently, he frames homophobia as an irrational fear of other men, and thus the word, "faggot" is asserted not as something related to homosexual experience or even a fear of homosexuals (as contemporary definitions suggest). Rather, he argues that it is a function of contempt for those who are weak, social outcasts, or timid. He says, "homophobia is the fear that other men will unmask us, emasculate us, reveal to us and the world that we do not measure up, that we are not real men…our fear is the fear of humiliation. We are ashamed to be afraid," (1994, p. 131) Finally, Kimmel describes this homophobia as intimately connected to sexism, heterosexism, and racism. So, in

terms of lived experience, Savran (1992, in Brod & Kaufman, 1994) describes the application in this way:

Being seen as unmanly is a fear that propels American men to deny manhood to others, as a way of proving the unprovable-that one is fully manly. Masculinity becomes a defense against the perceived threat of humiliation in the eyes of other men, enacted through a 'sequence of postures'-things we might say, or do, or even think, that, if we thought carefully about them, would make us ashamed of ourselves," (p. 135).

This is an exaggerated performance of masculinity in which women and gay men are put down, and racial minorities are seen as less-than because of a perceived inability to measure up to the masculine ideal. This construction of masculinity interferes with, or prevents a man from revealing an authentic self, and encourages him to perform a boorish caricature to the detriment of himself, women, gay people, and people of color, provides an analysis of such behavior that might prove useful to Student Affairs practitioners, but which is absent from their professional training.

Connolly (1991, in Brod & Kaufman, 1994) offers a postmodern examination of this process in terms of how it functions and what it serves to achieve: "An identity is established in relation to a series of differences that have become socially recognized. These differences are essential to its being…Identity requires difference in order to be, and converts difference into otherness in order to secure its own self-certainty (p.221)."

The privileges and dominance associated with hegemonic manhood thus require that individually and collectively, men (and women) participate in a process that separates people and stratifies by ascribing desirability to certain identity features and

unfavorable connotations to others. Hence, in order to secure patriarchal power, men (and arguably women in certain cases) must perform their gender identities in a manner that is demeaning to others (meaning, to women and to other men). This must not be construed to mean that individual oppressive behaviors should not be repudiated, or even punished. Rather, it is to contextualize it with an understanding that the oppressive behaviors are situated within a quest to achieve a masculine identity that is unattainable, because it is merely a nebulous social construction. With this viewpoint, one can choose to attack the individual who commits the oppressive act, and/or choose to connect with the individual as a co-participant and, together, examine the power relations that stimulated the problem and possibly find more egalitarian modes of relating. It is important to acknowledge that one's social identities necessarily impact navigation of the framework proposed in the last sentence, as well as the level of agency and cost/benefit analysis with which it would be enacted. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile for the reader to consider because it might expand the interpretation and choices as oppressive acts are considered, experienced or witnessed.

When I first began this project, I struggled with the question, "When I am arguing that Student Affairs does not adequately understand or serve men, am I talking about men in general, or am I talking about heterosexual, white, middle-class men?" Beyond the loaded politics of such a question, I wanted to be clear in demarcating the territory of the project. Brod (1994, in Brod & Kaufman, 1994) provided a helpful perspective:

What I propose is that non-hegemonic masculinities must always be simultaneously theorized along two axes, the male-female axis of men's power over

women within the marginalized grouping, and the male-male axis of non-hegemonic men's relative lack of power vis-à-vis hegemonic men. Furthermore, the analysis must show the interrelationships between these two axes-the tensions, trade-offs, and contradictions experienced by non-hegemonic men as they try to position themselves in this terrain. Men of non-hegemonic groups are torn between the different and conflicting norms and standards of masculinity and patriarchy of their own and hegemonic culture. Finally, women must be portrayed in this process as active participants who respond in various ways to men's positioning themselves in and at various sites, in varying degrees of resistance and accommodation, and as initiators of their own gender strategies (p. 89).

I have already argued that the hegemonic standard is imposed upon all men and women, and it is their various identities (including, but not limited to sex) that mitigate the ways in which this shapes their realities. The statistics about violence, rape, and other harmful acts play out similarly across race and class. Ferguson (2000, in Kimmel & Messner, 2004) summarizes: "Though girls as well as boys infringe the rules, the overwhelming majority of violations in every single category, from misbehavior to obscenity, are by males. In a disturbing tautology, transgressive behavior is that which constitutes masculinity," (p. 154). This gender performance creates harm for both women and men, including the men who commit the acts.

Brod discusses certain tensions between men, and between men and women, and he also argues that everyone is participating in a variety of ways. So, discussions about internalized racism, sexism, and the like do not mitigate the importance I assert about examining masculinity explicitly in order to apply this knowledge to do a better job with

male students. Hence, I am speaking about men in general when I say that men's gender identity is not understood sufficiently by the field of Student Affairs. And, I am acknowledging the importance of examining how men's gender identity intersects with other dimensions of their identities.

Human Beings and Human Doings

In my discussion about a dearth of literature within student affairs that overtly examines men's identities, I make the distinction between this and literature that describes men's behavior. Studies of the behaviors or differences between men's and women's scores on assessment instruments, certainly provide possible entry points to understanding men, but it does not itself constitute theoretical understanding.

One important way to build a case about what is missing from a body of literature is to discuss some things that are not missing. In the case of student affairs, one of the assertions embedded in my argument is that **gender matters**, and quite a bit. Blackhurst and Hubbard (1997) amplify this point in their discussion of the scholarship of women: "Since the mid-1980s, researchers studying women's development, the experiences of women college students, and the status of women in higher education have demonstrated the importance of gender as a variable influencing cognitive, moral, identity, career, educational, and personal development," (p. 453). They go on to discuss the limitation of primary literature in explaining women's development, which I have covered as well. Interestingly, they also talk about the growth in numbers of courses about women's identity development within professional preparation programs. I argue that these are very important, and so too would it be important for the hegemonic masculinity that is

represented and privileged in existing courses not only to be critiqued, but also to be replaced with forms that are more congruent with lived experience of men.

I have already said that I do not believe that men are oppressed, the definition of which is "a relationship of dominance and subordination between categories of people in which one benefits from the systemic abuse" (Johnson, 2000, p. 293). I do argue, however, that something bad is happening with men in Western (U.S.) culture, but I am cautious about the words I use in my exploration since it is fraught with political dimensions that threaten to detract from a thoughtful examination of the problem. One provocative but important example is an article in the December 14, 2003 edition of the *Washington Post*, written by a high school teacher, Patrick Welsh, who describes something he is observing in white boys:

I...see some white boys infected with a hard to define malaise that often presents itself as laziness or apathy. For all the Feminist advocacy for teenage girls, it seems to me that the girls are generally light years ahead of most boys, who are often assumed to be doing just fine, especially if they're white and from well off families. Yet I often feel that the competition to find areas where they can shine has gotten harder for these boys. From what I can see in the classroom and many extracurricular activities, girls who might have taken a back seat 20 years ago are steamrolling guys today (p. B01).

The Association for Student Judicial Affairs picked up on this article, referencing it in a Law and Policy Report, entitled *Confused White Boys,* and suggested it would be helpful for campus judicial officers, especially "on social norms and attitudes that may contribute to hazing, substance abuse, and the on-going phenomenon of 'post-game'

riots.'" After describing the article written by Welsh, they also quoted psychiatrist Erich Fromm (1973):

Man's awareness of himself as being in a strange and overpowering world, and his consequent sense of impotence could easily overwhelm him. If he experienced himself as entirely passive, a mere object, he would lack a sense of his own will, of his identity. To compensate for this he must acquire a sense of being able to do something, to move somebody, to 'make a dent"...In studying depressions and boredom one can find rich material to show that the sense of being condemned to ineffectiveness, i.e. to complete vital impotence...is one of the most painful and almost intolerable experiences, and man will do almost anything to overcome it, from drug and work addiction to cruelty and murder (p.2).

This experience of manhood as being lost, perpetually at risk of being consumed by the powerlessness, and the concomitant coercion to transgress, both extends and synthesizes the elements of masculinity that have been discussed so far. On a more basic level, it provides some insights into the propensity of some men to misbehave, rejecting the malice that is typically attributed to him, and revealing a fear and desperation that the man himself may not even recognize.

Capraro (2000, in Kimmel & Messner, 2004) discusses this theme in the contexts of men's drinking behavior:

In general, I conclude that when college men drink, they are simply being men in college: that is the best context for understanding why they drink. I further conclude, in what is perhaps my central insight in this article, that college men's drinking appears to

be profoundly paradoxical in a way that seems to replicate a larger paradox of

masculinity itself: that men's alcohol use is related both to men's power and men's

powerlessness…my interpretation of a variety of evidence suggests that many college

men may be drinking not only to enact male privilege but also to help them negotiate the

emotional hazards of being a man in the contemporary American college (p. 190).

West (2001) situates this assertion in historical context of prohibition, asserting

that "American male drinking became an expression of masculine protest against

feminization at the same time as it was an artisanal protest against prolitarianization," (p.

373). Kimmel (1996) calls this "masculinism" aimed at "restor[ing] manly vigor and

revirilize American men by promoting separate homosocial preserves where men can be

men without female interference," (p. 50). His analysis describes women's entry into

these spaces, and how military and fraternity settings continue to offer a place for this

expression and assertion of manhood. West (2001) elaborates: "*…drinking cultures are*

places where a variety of masculinities get worked out in homosocial leisure activities

associated with drinking. These activities include drinking games, particular forms of

male joking and bantering, watching or playing sports, sexual encounters with women,

and the act of 'being drunk," (p. 371).

In his cultural analysis of college drinking, Workman (2001) examined fraternity

drinking stories in order to identity themes that explain the propensity of its members to

drink. He identified five such themes, all of which involved drunkenness: The Adventure

Story: Drunkenness as Risk Taking; The Stupid Story: Drunkenness as Entertainment;

The Naked or Puking Story: Drunkenness as Physical Exploration; The Regretted Sex

Story: Drunkenness as a Sexual Trap; and The College Story: Drunkenness as Contextual Behavior.

He concludes that fraternity members have "constructed a set of meanings surrounding excessive drinking that frame it as a positive, functional, and necessary activity," (p. 442). This counteracts messages created by the institution to challenge the behavior, and precludes critical self-reflection. It is no wonder, therefore, that Student Affairs literature that examines intellectual or moral/ethical development tend to find restricted progress in those men who join fraternities (e.g. Whipple, 1998), or even elevated risk factors associated with sexual assault (Davis & Liddel, 2002; Lenihan & Rawlins, 1994). These factors play out similarly in male athletes, and include a lack of openness to diversity (Wolniack, Pierson, & Pascarella, 2001). These homosocial locations (athletic teams, fraternities) can further reinforce an already rigid gender socialization process.

While the male identity literature demonstrates clear links between masculinity and violence, many if not most programs intended to reduce or end violence fail to take men's socialization into hegemonic stereotypes into account, and thus do not tend to be effective (Hong, 2000). Moreover, many of the interventions and programs either take women's time and energy (e.g. support groups, self-defense workshops); completely ignore men (e.g. facility improvements like more lighting and installation of emergency phones); or use rape-myth reduction programs that assume first that there is rational decision-making preceding an assault; and second that the intervention will "stick" when the man returns to a normative environment that supports the rape-myths (which is not

what happens). This is not to say that the prevention programs are useless, but rather that they are compromised for lack of attention to men's socialization.

There are certainly efforts on the part of some institutions and offices to understand and engage men with overt attention to gender identity. O'Neil (1988) provides important insight in his development of the idea of "gender role conflict," which occurs when "rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles learned during socialization result in the restriction, devaluation, or violation of others or oneself," (p. 193).

Conclusion

It is clear that for higher education administrators generally and CSP professionals specifically, workplace socialization is more influential on professional performance than is graduate preparation. This fact is tied to the lower status of the field because of the concomitant lack of rigidity of graduate preparation. For that matter, one need not have a CSP master's degree to enter the field, so organizing a more rigid arrangement is likely to be impossible. To some extent there is a check-and-balance relationship between the two socializing processes in higher status professions, such a medicine or law.

The primary negative consequence of this is a lack of accountability for workplaces in student affairs to adhere to an identifiable set of ethics and standards. There has been increased attention to the need for such (Dücker & Dücker, 1994) and the student affairs field risks a decline in legitimacy unless this is addressed. In particular, this can (and does) allow inconsistent and mediocre supervision to flourish, which makes for dysfunctional socialization of new professionals into the field. It also allows for

erratic and even harmful relations with students. Under these circumstances survival and

advancement become reliant more on mastering the peculiarities of one's supervisor than

attaining proficiency in the work. So, socialization can become an exercise in training for

compliance with personalities instead of professional standards. Bunker and Wijnberg

(1988) affirm this by elaborating on managerial style's influence of professional work in

higher education. This is a significant threat to the field and to the success of those in it.

In fairness to student affairs, Tierney (1997) finds similar problems in the faculty

ranks. Both Tierney (1997) and Imel (1995) suggest involving professionals more

overtly in the socialization process rather than relying on a top-down "fill-in-the-gaps"

process.

Since CSP Professionals look to a variety of resources in order to do their work

effectively, and prioritize those resources according to perceptions of utility (Young &

Coldwell, 1993), it is of increasing importance to involve them in the socialization

process. The choices young professionals make relative to seeking new information are

influenced by graduate preparation, workplace socialization and personal attributes such

as curiosity and temperament (Reio, 1998). Reio (1998) and Moore (1969, in Goslin,

1969) discuss both direct and indirect effects of curiosity and motivation to learn on the

quality of job performance.

In order to better understand how the experiences in graduate programs and

workplaces affect performance, more research is needed using new frameworks. Becher

(in Clark, 1987) points out that most research on professions is rooted in Sociology. So,

while I can generally demonstrate the relative impact of graduate and professional

socialization on performance, it would be difficult to construct a more thorough matrix

explaining this without more study.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Introduction

This constructivist inquiry was intended to explore the social construction of male college students by new Student Affairs professionals, particularly relative to their gender identity, and how professional socialization into the field (e.g. graduate training, professional organizations, and workplace training and norms) may influence this conception. I chose to approach the study from a constructivist epistemological perspective (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) in which knowledge is acquired, and created, through engagement with the people and phenomena being studied. The purpose of constructivist inquiry is "to produce depth of understanding from a particular topic or experience (Manning, 1999, p.12). Manning (1999) further proposes that this type of research "is well-suited to knowledge discovery about campus life" and that a case, if it evokes emotions from the reader, can render a vicarious experience impossible through statistical and quantitative analysis (p.12). Davis (2002) discusses knowledge as something that "does not and cannot produce representations of an independent reality, but instead is rooted in the perspective of the knower (p.511)." Thus, I sought to elicit knowledge as it is constructed through the lived experience of my participants, and to understand this experience phenomenologically, through my participants' perspectives. I will discuss my interpretive framework in more detail a little later. But, for context in the meantime, I will note that I drew heavily upon grounded theory as promulgated by Glaser & Strauss (1967) and Glaser (1992; 1994) informed by critical gender theory, particularly as it is represented in Pro-Feminist Men and Masculinity Studies (Brod, 1994; 1997;

Connell, 1987; Gertner, 1991; hooks, 1984; Kimmel, 1996; Kimmel & Messner, 1994; Morgan, 1981; Nylund & Nylund, 2003; O'Neil, 1995). As someone who has worked within Student Affairs in a variety of institutional types over the last 13 years, I was also able to draw upon my knowledge of the profession (e.g. jargon, position titles, professional organizations, departmental structure, etc.) to quickly establish rapport and trust with participants and to discern appropriate follow-up questions.

The fundamental question in my research pertains to what resources new Student Affairs professionals draw upon in their work with male students. I ask this question having indicted the field's effectiveness with male students, and thus I situate this question within the context of professional socialization. I have been particularly interested in what new professionals were taught in graduate school and at their employer's staff training with regard to men. Conversations with colleagues, friends, partners, students and mentors are also relevant here. Furthermore, characterizations of experiences with male students round out theory-practice aspects of work with male students and inform motivation for further information-seeking.

I began this project with certain assumptions about what would be found. Some of these assumptions were based on my own graduate school experience and anecdotal information about CSP graduate programs. I assumed, for example, that CSP (and affiliated fields such as counseling) graduate preparation programs offered at least one course about adult/student development and at least one course about minority identity models, but that none of the courses discussed male identity development overtly, except for the occasional journal article about men from particular minority groups. I expected

that most if not all discussion or consideration about men would be related to negative behaviors (e.g. alcohol/drug abuse, sexual assault, violence) and that CSP staff perceptions of males would be overtly neutral or positive, but further questioning would reveal negative underlying ideas about men. Finally, I expected to find that CSP professional socialization as manifested in my study's participants promoted behavioral rather than developmental engagement of men. By this, I mean that when meeting with male students, staff would be most likely to focus first and primarily on problematic behavior and/or immediate concerns rather than first building a personal connection in order to determine the underlying reasons for that behavior (Implicit in this is the assumption that this is different from encounters between staff and female students). I expected that this process would prevent staff from moving beyond superficial relationships with male students. These assumptions were important to state explicitly since I wanted to design the study in such a way that my assumptions would not be imposed (or that this could be mitigated) upon the participants. I felt it would be essential that I stay aware of these assumptions in order to avoid selective observations. I do, however, recognize the importance of contradictory observations. Such data would allow me to identify resources that commonly exist in professional practice, and to focus on the impact of those resources on CSP practice with male students.

Methods

The data was generated via interviews with seventeen Residence Hall Directors (see Appendices A & B), the selection and demography of whom are described in more detail in the next section. This constructivist inquiry utilized qualitative, semi-structured

interviews, each lasting approximately one hour. Burgess (1984) describes these as "conversations with a purpose." Mason (1996) discusses qualitative interviewing as informal in style, containing topics or themes to be explored through narrative, and assuming that data will be generated via the interaction because the interviewee or the interaction itself are the data sources. Survey and other quantitative data would not be sufficient to determine how specific resources are utilized in practice, and the subjective and reciprocal relationship between applying resources to student interactions and the feedback received after doing so (Burgess, 1984). I developed an interview protocol (see Appendix C) that would allow me to focus on the professional socialization process as it affected my participants, to explore it overtly and also via the use of a case scenario. I conducted one interview with each participant, with the exception of one person who expressed a desire to do a second one since he had been thinking a lot about the first one (which lasted over 2 hours), and was eager to continue the conversation. The interviews were audio recorded. All protocols and forms were approved by the Behavioral Science Committee of the Institutional Review Board of the University of Arizona.

The data consisted of transcribed text generated from the individual interviews as well as my own field notes taken during the interviews. My field notes included my own thoughts about the interviews, as well as observations of non-verbal expressions (e.g. facial expressions, inflections, changes in demeanor or voice) and in some cases the appearance or location of the participants' offices.

The vast majority of studies of college students have utilized survey methods (Stage & Russell, 1992; Tinsley & Irelan, 1989). Stage & Russell discuss the value of

methodological triangulation, which is the use of multiple methods in the study of a particular phenomenon, stating that it "offers Student Affairs practitioners a richer picture of the campus environment (p. 485). To study the resource-seeking and meaning-making attitudes and activities of entry-level CSP staff working with male students, I employed a pseudo-triangulated design.

To do this, I augmented the interview questions in the protocol with a case scenario (Appendix D) in order to prompt participants to think about the relevant issues to this study. The case was based on a real incident report provided by a colleague working in a Residence Life department at a Midwestern, private college. It is typical only insofar as it includes male perpetrators, and it is provocative in that it depicts behavior directed toward a female student. I did not define the incident content or the discussion about it with the participants as somehow "representative" of professional practice. However, this case serves as a "magnified moment." Hochschild, (1994) defines these as:

> *…episodes of heightened importance, either epiphanies, moments of intense glee or unusual insight, or moments in which things go intensely or meaningfully wrong. In either case, the moment stands out; it is metaphorically rich, unusually elaborate and often echoes [later], (p.4).*

Messner (2000) further states that "a magnified moment in daily life offers a window into the social construction of reality. It presents researchers with an opportunity to excavate gendered meanings and processes through an analysis of institutional and cultural contexts." In my study, I was able to both depict and evoke magnified moments

through the interview methods, in order to illuminate gendered themes in the

socialization process and professional practice within Student Affairs work.

The subject matter of the case illuminated gendered themes in the professionals'

responses. In addition to the more general questions, I asked participants about their

perceptions regarding the case, how they might address it, and what resources may be

beneficial to draw upon in order to respond.

Participant Criteria

I chose to study Residence Hall Directors for several reasons. First, they live with

students in the Residence Halls and are thus more likely to be encountered by, and to

encounter, students. Second, they have generalist responsibilities yet conduct the bulk of

disciplinary activities, which is the location of much of the direct work with male

students. Third, they extend their influence (directly or indirectly) because they recruit,

hire, and supervise the Resident Assistants, who are peer educators living on the

residence hall floor with students. Fourth, for residential colleges, virtually all students

will live on campus and thus be influenced in some way by the Residence Hall Director,

whereas the student may choose never to partake of the other Student Affairs services.

Finally, Residence Life Departments tend to have the largest staffs, with the biggest

segment being Residence Hall Directors. Because of these reasons I argue that Residence

Hall Directors are the most influential Student Affairs professionals in the aggregate and

thus studying them may produce richer data with broader knowledge claims than might a

study of another category of Student Affairs professional.

I utilized purposive, or theoretical sampling techniques, defined by Mason (1996) as "selecting groups or categories to study on the basis of their relevance to your research questions, your theoretical position and analytical framework, your analytical practice, and most importantly the explanation or account which you are developing" (p. 94). While my ability to travel and preference to interview the participants in person would necessarily have some influence on the study, I was fortunate to have an active travel schedule (conferences, speaking engagements) during the time in which I was conducting my study. This included points throughout the Eastern half of the U.S. and within the areas of the country most densely populated by people and higher education institutions. Thus, I was able to connect with participants at or near the places to which I traveled and so I had access to a diverse participant pool within my criteria. The recruitment process consisted of sending my call for participants (see Appendix E) via emails to professional staff at schools near my travel destinations, posts to professional listservs and residence life senior staff, which stated my participant criteria in order to allow prospective volunteers to determine their eligibility and to contact me. For the purposes of this study I defined "entry-level" as a full-time Student Affairs position during the first three years post-masters degree. I planned to interview 25 "bona fide" entry-level CSP professionals who I defined as meeting the following criteria:

1. Are professional Residence Hall Directors within their first three years of employment at a co-educational college (living with students increases the likelihood of interacting with them, and the disciplinary/administrative role makes them an emblematic case for study).

2. Hold Master's degrees in College Student Personnel Administration (or closely related field) and are not currently engaged in further formal (e.g. credit-bearing in their field) study.

3. Work at institutions that have such graduate programs (there would likely be some interaction between that academic unit and the residence life office, perhaps informing the socialization of the new professional).

4. Work at public or private institutions (without a formal religious affiliation) of greater than 5000 students (to avoid the confounding influence of an inherently more intimate or faith-based environment on the study of this phenomenon) which have a residential life program and live-on requirement for one of more year(s).

5. Are active (e.g. have attended at least one regional or national Student Affairs conference, and/or participate on a committee) members of one of the major regional or national professional associations (e.g. ACPA, ACUHO-I, NASPA).

In some cases, I also called managers in departments that matched my criteria in hopes of generating volunteers. I attempted, and was successful in recruiting a sample with the following attributes:

1. Approximately ½ men and women. Even though there are more women than men in the field, the research topic would benefit from a more equitable arrangement of participants.

2. Approximately ¼ working at private colleges, in order to illuminate any differences that might exist in this regard.

3. Approximately 1/3 people of color, in order to explore how the professionals' identity may mitigate their perceptions of students.

4. A variety of institutional locations and sizes (within the constraints outlined in the previous section, number 4).

The set of participants that were interviewed met this profile (see Appendix A and B). The volunteers almost invariably met the criteria, and so I only had to exclude a couple of people due to marginal meeting of criteria or because I did not want to interview more than a couple of people from a particular institution. In the latter case, I chose to interview volunteers whose gender, race, and/or ethnicity were not yet adequately represented within my pool relative to the criteria above.

Sampling and Saturation

One of the complex decisions to be made when conducting qualitative research pertains to sample size. Mason (1996) describes the processes of sampling, data generation and analysis as interactive throughout the research process, such that decisions about when to start and stop sampling are informed by analysis, theory, and explanation. As I stated, I initially intended to conduct 25 interviews, which was a number that I thought would provide a breadth of voices relative to my criteria. However, themes emerged early in the research and stayed consistent fairly early in the process. On the one hand, this was encouraging, since trustworthiness in the results would be enhanced by the consensus represented by participants from a variety of personal backgrounds and

identities. On the other hand, I did not want to take for granted that I had elicited data that would adequately explain the phenomena. For guidance, I turned to literature on standpoint epistemologies. Schwandt (2001) defines these as:

> *…ways of thinking about the nature of knowledge that begin with the assumption that there is no universal, Archimedean vantage point (no 'view from nowhere') from which we can know the world. All efforts to know, and all knowledge, are socially situated. Various kinds of standpoint epistemologies (e.g., from the standpoint of women, gays, lesbians, people of color, and people experiencing colonial oppression) share the assumptions that 'knowing' must begin in the experiences, interests, and values of some traditionally excluded group because in this way dominant knowledge claims can be effectively criticized and revised…all views are partial and incomplete... (p. 238-239).*

Thus, I could interview one person, or I could interview 1000 people, and never fully explain the phenomena of interest. But, the consistency in the themes generated from 17 interviews with participants from a variety of social identities and regional locations, allowed me to conclude that I had conducted enough interviews for my purposes.

Researcher Stance

Given the constructivist nature of the research, my own identity as a white, male, mid-thirties, heterosexual, Jewish, middle-class person (among other identities) would necessarily have some influence on the knowledge created (both in terms of how the participants offered it, and in terms of how I analyzed it). It is not possible to determine

precisely how this shaped the knowledge creation process in my research, though in Chapter Four I have occasion to reflect on this within the context of certain interview segments. It should be noted, though, that the consistency of data across my participant pool suggested that the "chemistry" did not interfere with trustworthiness of my data.

Analysis

In reviewing the text, I employed tactics for meaning-making as described in Miles & Huberman (1994). Specifically, they discuss conclusion-drawing and verification in this way:

> *From the start of data collection, the qualitative analyst is beginning to decide what things mean-is noting regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal flows, and propositions. The competent researcher holds these things lightly, maintaining openness and skepticism, but the conclusions are still there, inchoate and vague at first, then increasingly explicit and grounded (p.11).*

This treatment of the process really resonated with me, because indeed I felt fairly confident about what I was seeing early in the interview process, followed by a period of uncertainty (see, for instance, my discussion in Chapter Four about how men were described by the participants). Then, as I organized the transcript sections into thematic bundles, the picture that would be my conclusions became very clear to me.

My ability to analyze the data was informed and enhanced by utilizing a non-cross-sectional organization technique as described by Mason (1996). Specifically, Mason (1996) describes this method as involving:

ways of seeing and sorting your data which do not necessarily use the same lens

across the whole. Essentially, non-cross-sectional data organization involves

looking at discreet parts, bits, or units within your data set, and documenting

something about these parts specifically…it is a practice guided by a search both

for the particular rather than the common or consistent, and the holistic rather

than the cross-sectional (p. 128).

Mason (1996) argues for the value of non-cross-sectional data organization for the

researcher who wants:

…to gain a sense of distinctiveness of different parts or elements of your data set,

which a search for common cross-sectional themes might not provide" and also

when "you wish to understand intricately interwoven parts of your data set, or

social processes, or complex narratives or practices, for example, and you believe

that these are too complicated or elaborate to be amenable to categorical

indexing (p.129).

I found this to be an effective construct for engaging my data, since the richness

of many discrete pieces would have made it unwieldy and counterproductive to organize

in a simple linear fashion. In fact, I literally cut these quotes apart, having printed the

transcripts onto paper with continuous line numbers. I was able to physically move the

segments around, experimenting with different contexts, themes, and connections. As the

themes emerged, so the piles of paper sections grew. Some of the most powerful

interview segments were saved in a separate collection, and eventually were retrieved to

include as metaphorical bows on the packages each theme represented. Throughout the

process, I was very careful to check the context from which a quote was taken, so that its use in the location I chose did not change the meaning. For example, if a participant spoke of a conversation with a male student in a disciplinary meeting and that male student was belligerent, it would be reasonable to use the quote in my analysis of how male students are discussed, but not if the impression I gave indicated that a negative description was unprovoked (in this example, by omitting reference to the belligerent behavior).

In my analysis, references to particular resources were discussed in terms of reasoning and effect, rather than frequency of use. I sought to identify categories of resources as well as characteristics about specific ones used. Participants were told that the research pertains to the resources Student Affairs practitioners rely upon in order to do their work. The word, "resources" was loosely defined to include didactic, documents, personal and professional experiences, research, and organizational policies and procedures.

As discussed in the introduction, I employed grounded theory and critical gender theory as interpretive frameworks for examination of participants' construction of male students and their own professional socialization process within Student Affairs. Given that critical theory is typically deployed in the analysis and interrogation of power, it is important here to clarify how and why it is that I am deploying critical theory to study men's issues.

To situate the analysis, I drew upon Kincheloe and McLaren's (2000, in Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) treatment of the role critical theory plays in examinations of power:

Critical theorists understand that the formation of hegemony cannot be separated from the production of ideology. If hegemony is the larger effort of the powerful to win the consent of their "subordinates," then ideological hegemony involves the cultural forms, the meanings, the rituals, and the representations that produce consent to the status quo and individuals' particular places within it. Ideology vis-à-vis hegemony moves critical inquirers beyond simplistic explanations of domination that have used terms such as propaganda to describe the way media, political, educational, and other sociocultural productions coercively manipulate citizens to adopt oppressive meanings. A reconceptualized critical research endorses a much more subtle, ambiguous, and situationally specific form of domination that refuses the propaganda model's assumption that people are passive, easily manipulated victims. Researchers operating with an awareness of this hegemonic ideology understand that dominant ideological practices and discourses shape our vision of reality…Thus our notion of hegemonic ideology is a critical form of epistemological constructivism buoyed by a nuanced understanding of power's complicity in the constructions people make of the world and their role in it (p.283).

Brod (1997) elucidates this connection:

If I were to tell a group of people that we were going to discuss the issue of gender, most would assume that the ensuing discussion would be about women. But allowing "gender" to stand as a euphemism for "women" is a serious mistake. For what speaks here is not the voice of feminism, but rather the voice of

patriarchy. Having the generic term signify women rather than men in this case leaves women marked, but men unmarked by gender. This perpetuates the patriarchal standard by which women are "Other," and men are simply "normal" people, unremarkable and unremarked upon... Some may well object that the primary point of such things as women's studies and black studies is precisely that the traditional curriculum has always been what I am calling "superordinate studies." That is to say, the very existence of such new fields arises from the long overdue recognition that traditional knowledge has only been knowledge of, by and for dominant social groups. The central and essential difference between the new superordinate studies and the old lies not so much in what is being studied, but in how it is studied. These new perspectives are fueled by the fundamental insight that such things as race, class and gender are best understood not as properties of separate individuals, but rather as relationships between individuals and among groups, specifically relationships of hierarchy and power...These kind of relational and social constructivist understandings of these social categories highlight the need to study the superordinate as well as the subordinate. For if these are indeed relational, rather than individual entities, then one cannot come to understand the subordinate without also at the same time coming to understand the superordinate. To study men, for example, is therefore not to abandon the study of women. It is rather a necessary component of the fulfillment of the project of women's studies, which requires that we fully understand gender in all its dimensions. (p. 1-2)

In my analysis, therefore, I was especially interested in whether men would be marked as gendered by the participants through the participants' narratives. The absence of such demarcation would suggest that maleness is reinscribed as normal and center within the minds of the professionals, which in turn would influence their engagement of men and women students. In order to examine the narratives, the recorded interviews were transcribed and analyzed in concert with field notes, and in some cases while revisiting the recordings.

To deepen my analysis of the transcripts, field notes, and my experience of the interactions with participants, I also drew upon a Foucauldian discourse analytical framework as discussed by Gubrium & Holstein (2000, in Denzin & Lincoln, 2000):

> *Foucault considers how historically and culturally located systems of power/knowledge construct subjects and their worlds. Foucauldians refer to these systems as "discourses," emphasizing that they are not merely bodies of ideas, ideologies, or other symbolic formulations, but are also working attitudes, modes of address, terms of reference, and courses of action suffused into social practices (p. 495).*

I found the analysis of the data to be very complicated for two reasons in particular. First, several of my anticipated themes emerged very early in the process (both during the interviews and in reviewing transcripts), and it was important to me that I not project my own perceptions, ideas, opinions, etc. onto my subjects during the interviews, nor impose them via meaning-making of the interview data. Davis (2002) discusses this problem in his own analysis of data collected from male students whom he

interviewed in a constructivist inquiry to explore the impact of socially prescribed gender roles on college men's identity development. In particular, he cites Jones (2002) and her warning to qualitative researchers to "check their own subjectivity and theoretical stance so that decisions are indeed rooted in the research process as it unfolds rather than in the researchers' own points of view." This was particularly helpful to me because it both speaks to an important issue in the analysis of qualitative data, and also because Davis' article explored the other side of the equation from my own study- male students. His discussion about his own challenges in navigating the Self-Other issue resonated with my own experience in this project. This, plus my own self-consciousness about wanting to be as "clean" as possible, helped me to be mindful of these considerations throughout the process. I also acknowledge that this same self-consciousness creates a risk of being too tentative in the face of data that is important to present as supporting my assertions.

A second issue that I found challenging was the richness of many of the discrete quotes that I discussed earlier (e.g. multiple themes embedded). For me, this created difficulty in deciding where the particular quote should be displayed-under which sections corresponding with the themes. A more concrete explanation of this problem is that some of the participants talked about topics covered in their graduate programs, and how those topics were discussed. I was very interested in this relative to their socialization into the field, yet the very same quote could lend to an explanation about why things might go unchallenged or are reinforced within the field. I wanted to discuss graduate training early in the presentation, and the ways in which change is prevented at a later point, but this linear approach was not so easy to take because of this issue. I

decided that the most practical approach for me would be to progressively present the data, building upon and referencing what I had discussed, and to make contextual comments to offer a glimpse of how the particular data element will fit with things to come. Here, I acknowledge and appreciate that there may be countless ways to make sense of, and present the data. Thus, I will be transparent in saying that I am telling a story about something that I am observing in the field, and so I need to tell that story in a way that makes sense for me and how I perceive the reader will be able to understand what I am saying. I also hope to relate with integrity the stories being told by the professionals who graciously volunteered their time for this study.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Where Do I Begin?

In Chapter Three, I discussed some of the challenges I faced in analyzing and displaying the data. One of these challenges pertained to the richness of many of the quotes found in the transcripts. Specifically, I grappled with how and when to present a quote from an interview when that quote speaks to several themes or findings at once. I wish to provide an understandable presentation of the data relative to the story I am trying to tell, and the theoretical framework through which I viewed the data. The way that makes most sense to me to accomplish this is to begin with a brief summary of my thesis and framework, which in turn provides the larger context for the reader to understand each section of this chapter. Thus, I can present the material logically while also referencing how the data pertains to aspects I have already discussed or will address later. I hope this approach will reduce confusion, facilitating the ability to stay present and focused since the answer to "where is this going," has already been provided. At the same time, if the reader finds the thesis provocative without the benefit of the data, I am inviting her or him to keep an open mind since I believe the story is worth the reading.

So, let me now synthesize my fundamental thesis about Student Affairs and its conception of male students. This will clarify the basic conceptual framework through which I have viewed the data. I will then present the data collected during interviews of new professionals in a format that flows from the themes woven into the presentation.

A narrowly-defined, socially-constructed hegemonic standard of masculinity (with its concomitant privileges and corresponding oppressions) is reproduced within

Western culture's patriarchal system. This standard is inculcated within the society, via institutions, into individuals. Student Affairs is a feminized field which espouses pro-feminist, anti-racist, gay-affirmative values that profess to challenge this hegemonic standard. Moreover, Student Affairs situates itself as possessing knowledge about students' identity development, and as being effective in advancing it through programs and services. Given the espoused values and the specialized knowledge of its members, Student Affairs professionals may conceptualize their work as facilitative of student identity development and also of challenging (or even dismantling) privilege and oppression (Evans & Reason, 2001). Interestingly, Evans and Reason invoke the need for Student Affairs to be advocates and activists, "especially in light of the complex issues facing traditionally disenfranchised students." They did not happen to mention who is and who is not disenfranchised, or the relationship between the two. As this chapter progresses, this point will become more important.

While new literature about marginalized identities has burgeoned within Student Affairs journals, books, graduate programs, and professional training sessions over the last 30 years (e.g. women, African American, GLBT, etc.), this has not been the case for literature about men specifically. Thus, the field of Student Affairs has retained, without significant examination, the hegemonic construction of masculinity represented within foundational theory, and has socialized new professionals with this conception. This construction has been institutionalized via the notion that foundational student development theory captured the features of male identity development merely because the early subjects were male.

Thus, the construction of masculinity within the profession remains very much the same as it was when the foundational theory was created. This ironically has the effect of not only failing to challenge the hegemonic standard, but in fact to perpetuate it. Men's identities seem only to be overtly discussed when the men in question possess a marginalized identity (e.g. race, class, sexual orientation), and I would argue it is the marginalized identity that is being discussed rather than gender. Connell (1987) makes explicit the way in which this phenomenon serves to reify hegemony:

> *Hegemonic masculinity is constructed in relation to women and in relation to subordinated masculinities. These other masculinities need not be as clearly defined-indeed, achieving hegemony may consist precisely in preventing alternatives gaining cultural definition and recognition as alternatives, confining them to ghettos, to privacy, to unconsciousness," (p. 186).*

Almost invariably, the terms, "people," "students," and "individuals" were used by the participants to describe people who are male, whereas terms such as "she," "her," and "the woman" were used to describe people who are female. The exception to this would generally be in situations when the participants are discussing men from marginalized backgrounds (e.g. working-class, of color, gay, etc.). This is very important for the reader to know as s/he reviews this chapter, since I wish for this to remain in acute awareness for reasons I will discuss in more detail later. At this point, suffice it to say that I am arguing that the work of the new professionals reflects not simply the *espoused* values of the socialization process (pro-feminist, etc.), but rather the enacted values (e.g. hegemonic masculinity). I refer to this conception of men as one of the components of

my framework, "*Bad Dog*," and when the professional engages the male student in a manner consistent with this, I refer to that as "*Bad Dogging*." I will be explaining other components of the "*Bad Dog*" idea at various places within this chapter.

Some of the individuals I interviewed had more developed ideas about the components of men's gender identities, or had perhaps given a good deal of thought to it. Some (perhaps) even disagreed with or challenged what they were taught in the socialization process. However, something (or some things) tended to prevent them from raising questions or concerns about it in their work setting. When they raised the issue, something (or some things) consistently prevented them from pursuing more information about the subject.

I will begin the presentation with some of the participants' thoughts about their work, both in terms of personal experience and ideas about the profession. From there, I will explore the current state of participants' perceptions or knowledge about men and men's gender identity, women and women's gender identity, and the similarities or differences. Then, I will focus on the participants' thoughts, recollections, and experiences relative to their socialization into the profession, particularly (but not only) in terms of their graduate programs and workplace training. This will illuminate how the current situation came to be. In the interviews, I decided not to start with graduate school experiences or even new staff training since I felt it would taint participants' ability to share their current perceptions and approaches to their work. I will present my findings similarly, later in the chapter to return to their graduate programs or department training. This later discussion of graduate training also fits nicely with subsequent analysis

regarding the reification and social reproduction, within the profession, of the constructs I illuminate throughout this chapter.

As described in more detail in Chapter Three (and mentioned here for clarity), I have taken several measures to protect the identities of the participants and the institutions that educated or now employ them. The professional titles and department names for the people in the study varied, but all of them were professional, M.A.-level administrators with one or more residential units and undergraduate (and sometimes one of more graduate) staff members under their purview. They all worked in departments in which they had multiple peers and a specific hierarchical department structure that is typical in the field. They all had a master's degree intended for people who wish to work in Student Affairs, and so when referring to their degree, I will identify the subject matter as "*College Student Personnel Administration*," or "*CSP*." In order to protect the identities of the participants and their employing institutions, I have assigned them pseudonyms and will refer to their professional titles as "*Residence Director*," or "*RD*." Moreover, when referring to their department, I will use the name, "*Residence Life*."

Doing and Thinking About the Work in Student Affairs

The interviews began with the collection of some basic demographic and professional information, and then a case example was read aloud by me (See Appendices B and C). As discussed in Chapter Three, the two primary purposes of the case example were to place the interviewee into the mindset of their work, and the second was to specifically focus their thinking on issues relating to the study. After reading the case aloud to them, we spent some time discussing their reactions (e.g. realism, how

they'd approach it, expectations regarding outcome). The case (see Appendix D) is somewhat provocative, but all of the participants agreed it was realistic, though not routine. I found this to be an excellent device for eliciting the themes to be discussed in this chapter.

Before discussing reactions to the case, or the constructions of gender, I'd like to highlight some of the participants' general thoughts about the nature and purpose of their work. This speaks to the socialization process and will provide a good reference as the participants discuss the work they would perform in response to the case example.

My first interview was with Christopher, a 24-year-old Residence Director new to his position in a large public research university in the Mid-Atlantic. I met with him in his office just after RD training, but before the students arrived. It was interesting to me that Christopher, like most of the RDs I interviewed, had an office located in a basement or distant corner of the assigned residence hall. Few of the offices had new furniture; instead they tended to be filled with a collection of mismatched and/or well-worn pieces. This was certainly reminiscent of my own early professional experience, and it may be illustrative of some of the discussions about the relative lower status of Student Affairs as compared to other fields in higher education, excellent reviews of which can be found in Helm (2004) and McClelland (2003).

The frenzy to prepare for a new year, particularly when one is new to the job, was evident in that there were numerous piles of materials that Christopher hoped to organize or reference for training purposes before his staff returned. He had obtained his M.A. in CSP from a regional program with a good reputation.

When I first started the interview, I was collecting some basic information, and we had the following exchange, which I didn't really notice to be memorable until reviewing the tape:

> Jason: How would you identify yourself?
>
> Christopher: (confused) As far as…?
>
> Jason: In terms of your identity as a person.
>
> Christopher: My race is Caucasian (pause) if that's what you're looking for.
>
> Jason: Let me just write down your answer to that…

The reason this caught my attention during the analysis was because some of the female participants referred to their gender fairly often, and when the female was a person of color, she mentioned her race as well. There isn't enough here to make an empirical claim about Christopher or people of his race or gender. But, I found it particularly interesting that he combined mentioning being Caucasian with, "if that's what you're after." Some of his comments later on about issues of utility (both in terms of application with students and also in terms of career advancement) relative to seeking information about men really round out a theme about the invisibility and paradoxically the centrality of whiteness and maleness in the field literature and culture.

It was in the middle of the interview that we really discussed his thoughts about his work. I am glad that I chose to do that after, rather than before, the case example. I think to some extent it would have been a set-up to ask this and then ask him to respond to the case-it may have constrained the off-the-cuff nature of the case example response versus the more prepared nature of discussion about the field (e.g. of the kind one might have during a job interview):

Christopher: The reason why I'm here is to build the community that I have, and I do that through sanctions sometimes. So, for me, when I look at all this stuff [disciplinary work], I never destroy the community in my building. So, from my standpoint, I very much buy into my job….

Jason: Well, let me ask you…you know how there's the joke, "our parents don't know what we do." What do you think the aims of Student Affairs as a field would be, in general?

Christopher: That's funny…My grandmother would say [that]. I would like to think that Student Affairs [professionals work as] educators…because I think we are. But I think education, to some people, when you talk to the general public, education is what occurs in the classroom. Student Affairs, to me, is the education outside of the classroom…the résumé skills…the group-interaction skills. My job, in this position, is to empower my staff to build citizens of the earth...and to build citizens of the communities that we live in. And hopefully, when they leave whatever place I'm working at, they step into their communities and they're responsible, mature members of that community.

This notion of "education outside the classroom" is a recurring theme in how the interviewees described their work. Whereas they could describe themselves as educators and leave it at that, they would commonly frame their work relative to that which occurs in a classroom. This is illustrative of the importance within Student Affairs to legitimize its work on campus by comparing itself to Academic Affairs. In Christopher's case, he extends this considerably when discussing his work as something that facilitates the building of "citizens of the earth." This phrase really caught my attention because it does two things. First, it asserts (rather boldly) that the work is legitimate and important.

Second, it is embedded with the espoused egalitarian values that are a feature of my discussion. Some of the descriptors used by other participants were more subtle, but the theme that new professionals conceive of Student Affairs work as legitimate and facilitative of social justice emerged early and remained present throughout.

As we continued our conversation, Christopher invoked a model used by the department to propose a set of values for a residential community. These were shared with him during his recent training. I have changed the four items, and their title, to conceal identifying information:

Jason: …and tell me again, be prudent…

Christopher: Be careful, be polite, be helpful, and be engaged. Those are our four Residential Connection Values [or, RCV]. I can give you a photocopy of that before you go.

Jason: And so, you were just exposed to it, but you've indicated that it is very important to you. It must be something that fits for you philosophically.

Christopher: It does. I think, for me, I've been advocating that through my work in Residence Life without the Residential Connection Values title. I think, when students come into the community…one that, to me, is a good community...if you're building a community that's careful, if you're building a community that's very polite with each other, building a community that's very helpful [to each other], and engaged, and if you have involved residents, you don't have a high judicial load. You don't have vandalism problems. You don't have things like that. If you do, they're on a very limited scale. And that limited scale is easy

enough to track down, to where you could probably stop that, or at least sanction those people to where they're out of the community initially.

Christopher frames the possibility of some agency on the part of himself and his staff that can shape, at least to some extent, students' development, the quality of life and student behavior in the hall. This is hardly controversial. Indeed, it is a bedrock idea in Student Affairs that CSP professionals' work with students is intended to have, and does have positive influences on students' attainment of degree, as well as on a variety of developmental and social factors that can also influence behaviors (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Rentz, 1994; ACPA, 1994; ACE, 1949).

The Costs and Benefits of Becoming Professional

One of the things I also found interesting was Christopher's description of the RCV model that was recently introduced to him. He indicated that it was consistent with the professional philosophies he had prior to being hired, but now he has this "title" for it. On the audio tape, I noticed that Christopher's tone changed slightly when he spoke about the model. There was something I would describe as "official" in its quality. I wondered how moving from informality to the use of jargon connects with the professional's perception of their work and their relations with students. On the one hand, learning and using the language of the profession demarcates a place and role for the individual practitioner-Christopher's use of the word "title" was notable to me, like the bestowing of title, or legitimacy. On the other hand, what is the cost of this process to the espoused personal nature of the work?

One of the components of my Bad Dog framework is the notion that impersonal or mechanical communication (such as professional jargon) may be particularly off-putting to male students. Gehring (2001), for instance, discusses how legalistic language has increased in judicial proceedings and procedures on college campuses, stimulating an adversarial engagement of students. According to Gehring, this stifles students' learning and development. Given that it is male students who are more often involved in disciplinary actions (Berk,1990; Downey and Stage, 1999; Herek &Berrill,1992; Levin &McDevitt, 1993), I would argue that this problem disproportionately stifles *men's* learning and development (I distinguish this from discussions of oppression, which I am not asserting here).

Another important discussion later will be how this manner of engagement is codified and socially reproduced within the field. Consider how Christopher talked about the RCV model. He said, "those are *our* four Residential Connection Values." His use of the word, "our" is particularly notable given that he had only been on the job for about a month, and hadn't yet met his students. By "our," he obviously meant the collective staff of his department, into which he is being socialized. Right now I am focusing on the new professionals' construction of their work, and soon, of gender. Later, however, I will be discussing the elements that maintain that construction-and the new professional's desire to fit in and to be successful (and their perceptions about how to do so) will come up again.

I had an instructive and at times amusing interchange with another participant about a fairly common example of this issue. Cassandra is a 25-year-old Caucasian

woman in her second year as an RD at a large, public research university, also in the

Mid-Atlantic. I met with her in her office (also an out-of-the way space in the basement

of a large residential tower). She had been describing an experience in her own college

career, and happened to use the term, "dorm" to describe where she lived and then

corrected herself, replacing it with the words "residence hall." This is something I have

heard countless times and have not previously thought about it relative to college men. I

asked Cassandra to explain the reason for her correction:

> Cassandra: When I think of my undergrad (sic), I always think of, I lived in a
> dorm. And it was fine. I lived in [Name] Hall, and it was a dorm. It was where I
> lived, that was my home. And I was fine with calling it a residence…. [corrects
> herself] with calling it a dorm. And I'm still fine with calling where I live a dorm,
> and it was still a community of my house. But I know that some people get up in
> arms about using the word "dorm"; it's a real cultural change. I definitely believe
> in "residence hall" and the concept of using those words instead of dorms.

> Jason: Who gets up in arms about it?

> Cassandra: Other professionals. People outside of residence [life] don't really
> care.

> Jason: Students don't care?

> Cassandra: No. And they kind of get confused about why we have to call it
> residence halls to begin with. So when you explain it, nobody seems to really get
> it. You say, dorm sounds like a barrack, it sounds like a place you just lay your
> head. And that's not what we want. We want a "residence hall," you're a part of
> the community; you're not just going to sleep here. The concept behind it is

great, it's just that I don't think the message to students is getting out to the general public about it, necessarily, they just think it's kind of quirky.

Jason: Do you think that the students, when they hear the word "dorm," that they don't think about community, or engagement, or any of that, that they only think about laying their heads there?

Cassandra: I would say no. Because I didn't think about that, when I lived in my dorm, freshman year…it was home. But in college, it's a dorm, because that's your home in college. It's not a real home, because your parents aren't there, or your kitchen isn't there, or…

Jason: Where did you learn to call it a residence hall?

Cassandra: When I got into residence life, I was in student activities in my undergrad, and that's what got me involved in student affairs, and I went into residence life in graduate school. So I became a residence director after very little residence life experience, beyond just living on campus, and so I was really told it should really be a residence hall.

Jason: So your training was telling you that?

Cassandra: Yes. …

Jason: You used the word "quirky." Maybe students or others think it's "quirky." Do you think it makes any difference to students that residence hall folk insist on calling it that?

Cassandra: I think it helps residence hall people. I think it helps us as staff, helping our student staff see our interest is not a dorm, like a barrack-this is a residence HALL (emphasis), so it's sort of more of a training tool helping them get in the mind-set, of what is this, what are we striving to do? What is our mission in residence life? It is to create residence halls, not just dorms.

Jason: Do you think it makes your job sound more important?

Cassandra: Oh, I never even thought about that. Whenever I tell people my job anyway, they're like, so wait, what do you do? [Laughs.] And so…

Jason: So it's jargon.

Cassandra: It is.

At this point, the interaction felt more like we were commiserating together. We both seemed to agree that this "dorm" vs. "residence hall" discussion was not only alien to students, but that professionals may not all truly care about the term. Yet, failing to use the professional term could subtly undermine the professional's stature with peers and supervisors. This, then, becomes an apparatus of social reproduction within the field. The ostensibly minor nature of the issue is another barrier to critical examination since one could be accused of being nitpicky for bringing it up. I decided to explore this further because I believe it relates to my thesis in terms of how it might shape the tenor of interaction with students and professionals.

Jason: I'm just checking this out, I don't know, but if the only people who seem to be concerned about it are people who are doing that for a living, and it doesn't seem, as you said, it hasn't gotten out in all the years that this conversation has been happening, so what is the benefit of it? And I'm wondering, is it so a person who's a professional can have a professional term and it sounds professional and important?

Cassandra: That could definitely be one of the reasons. I think that's not sort of, my leanings towards it? Because even if you say residence hall…

Jason: Well, I'm not suggesting people sit in a meeting and say, how can we make people think we're important?

Cassandra: Right. But it definitely sounds better. I work in a residence hall, better than I work in a dorm, or I'm a dorm mother…that of thing.

Jason: A dorm mother is bad?

Cassandra: It has connotations of… job requirements that I don't fill. I'm not cooking dinner, cleaning toilets, doing laundry, OR making sure everyone's in bed at night…

Jason: Do you think a dorm mother is a menial position?

Cassandra: No, I think of it more as a parental position, where I am not a parent. I act in some aspects to act as an authority, sort of to help you check in with what you're doing, but I'm not your mom or dad.

I have certainly heard this discourse about "dorms" versus "residence halls" at all phases of my own socialization into the field, and like Cassandra, I have seen a variety of reactions to the issue ranging from apathy to strong insistence on the professional term. This example is illustrative of tensions associated with a newcomer's desire to fit into a field (perhaps exacerbated by an insecurity associated with Student Affairs being a lower status field) on the one hand, and a desire to connect with the student on another. Cassandra described her own experience of the "dorm" issue as something she tolerates in order to avoid problems with other professionals, despite believing that it is minimally considered weird to students and those outside of Residence Life. This is a fairly benign issue-dorm or residence hall, and yet perceptions of professional capabilities and knowledge are intertwined with it. Consider, then, how much more complex this becomes when identity politics enter the picture. Relative to my earlier discussion about men's socialized reaction to control, and how certain engagement is unnecessarily provocative, would not "correcting" how they describe their college home possibly problematize an otherwise benign interaction? If a student, and a male in particular, felt that they were being listened to with "editors'" ears rather than the heart, what would the costs be to the his perception of the institution and its employees? Embedded within this, then, may be particular ways of thinking and talking about identity inculcated and (re)enforced within the profession.

Time for Work

The case example I used in the interviews (Appendix D) allowed me to elicit perceptions about students and issues, as well as to display how the new professionals

were socialized to approach their work. Given that I interviewed people in several different regions of the U.S., I was amazed at how consistent the reactions were, both in terms of meaning-making and also in terms of the mechanics of their response. This suggests fairly powerful cultural influences within the field shaping how professionals interpret and respond to student issues.

The case describes an event in which a female student is walking on campus at night, and a group of five men come upon her. One of the men grabs her, throws her over his shoulder, and runs with her briefly before dropping her into some bushes and falling on top of her. Laughing, he gets up and runs away. A second male in the group is videotaping the incident. The men leave her in the bushes and run away. The event is captured on surveillance cameras as well, and the men are identified. This case is based on an event that actually occurred on a campus. After collecting some initial reactions from the participants, it is further explained that these men were emulating a popular television show, *Jackass*, which is shown on the MTV cable television network. The premise of the show is that the stars place themselves in public settings and perform pranks and stunts that are dangerous to themselves, embarrassing or disturbing to unsuspecting observers, or all three. Interestingly, most of the participants had at least cursory knowledge of the show.

Given that the case was provocative, I first asked the participants how realistic they felt it was. In making the decision to include the case, I wondered whether its content would open the door to criticism about the claims made through my analysis. Mason (1996) addresses this issue by pointing out:

The validity of your interpretation will be strengthened both if you can give some

sense of how your standpoint or analytical lens feeds into your interpretation, and

also if you can show why the other interpretive perspectives which you have

considered are less compelling than your own," (p. 150).

So, while the case is provocative because it involves several men accosting a

woman, there are two important elements supporting my analysis. First, I asked

participants, "in your experience, how realistic is this case?" Every one of them indicated

that it was realistic. Then, I asked them how prepared they felt to respond to the case.

Since I thought of the case as being of a nature that a new professional might encounter

(and thus it would be fair to pose), I wanted to determine if the participants saw it that

way. Again, invariably the participants indicated being "fairly well-prepared" to "quite

well-prepared" to address the incident.

Putting Out the Fire

There were several powerful themes derived from the case example portion of the

interviews. One of the first had to do with the sense of protocol about what actions to

take, and which resources to draw upon in responding to an incident. The responses were

almost identical in terms of the basic tasks to be done, and in what order. Some of the

participants immediately began their response as if this had been a completed sexual

assault (which it wasn't), but soon recognized that it wasn't, whereas others went a little

slower and recognized this nuance right away. I don't want to belabor the nuance, since

the case was indeed a physical assault with connotations of rape, and the resources

invoked would be similar. The point here is that the new professional in Residence Life

has to very quickly match pieces of information against scripts and procedures, in order to determine the "correct" actions to take. Schön (1983) speaks extensively about the specialized knowledge professionals invoke to both define and solve "our" problems, further stating that it is "through them that we strive for social progress" (p.4). I will frame this more specifically with an example of one participant's response, which as I said, was typical of my pool. Then, I will connect this to some other themes central to my project.

Kelly, a 23-year-old Caucasian woman, is a new RD at a large public research university in the Great Lakes. She obtained her master's degree in only 12 months, which accounts for her young age. In Kelly's case, there had been a recent spate of sexual assaults on her campus, mainly acquaintance rapes, and so perhaps this influenced her initial interpretation that it was a sexual assault. Like the others, Kelly found the case to be realistic and prepared to respond, particularly because she has recently worked with a female student who was assaulted prior to arriving at college, and there have been several such incidents on campus recently.

> Jason: And what resources would you draw upon in order to respond to this incident?
>
> Kelly: Definitely the Counseling Center, and a Women's Health Center here, I guess…I think there's a Safe Place (referring to emergency housing for women who have been assaulted)…Because I've only been here a month and a half, I'm still learning those resources. Those are probably the big ones I would draw upon. I mean, of course, the police department, but they've already been involved, it sounds like.

Jason: If you were going to respond to this incident, how would you approach it?

Kelly: Now, am I responding that night, or after it's been reported the next day… When am I responding to it?

Jason: How does that… I want to leave it broad so that you can tell me more about how you make those distinctions in terms of your response to it.

Kelly: Okay, well, either way, if I were responding to the individual, to the woman who was assaulted, I would be very careful to have her share what she wants to share. I think, for me, it's difficult because I want to be there and hold her hand and support her, but by giving her the autonomy to make the decision whether she wants to share any information, that's empowering her to have a sense of independence and a sense of control in the experience. So I think I would be very supportive, but definitely not push her, even though, it sounds like she's going to press charges, which, in my experience, doesn't always happen. I haven't always heard of them wanting to do that, but the fact that she didn't want to be named, I think that's fairly consistent with the experiences I've had. So just seeing where she's at and what she wants to share, and recommending the resources. But something else I've experienced is you can't force them. You can't MAKE them go to the Counseling Center. You can only recommend it. And then, if they're putting themselves in danger or someone else in danger…For instance, one situation, a resident was making suicidal comments and statements. And then I have to reassess whether she's in actual danger at that moment.

Kelly, like her peers, had a pretty comprehensive set of thoughts about what to do immediately after the incident. Contacting a supervisor, counselor, and medical assistance were routinely listed among the resources. One important element of this

narrative that I didn't notice until several iterations of this dissertation and a female

colleague pointed it out (which may or may not have been a coincidence) was the extent

to which she used support language. Phrases such as "be very careful," "want to be there

to support her," "supportive, but definitely not push her," were used in her discussion

about attending to the victim. It makes sense to want to offer such support to someone

who is hurt or scared, which is why I didn't at first find it remarkable. What may be

surprising, though, is how clearly prepared CSP professionals in my study seemed to be

to offer gentleness and support, yet how rarely they use such language when discussing

men in any of the interviews I conducted. Even if men who hurt others are not offered

support, what is happening with the majority of men whose behavior and intentions are

good?

Miguel is a 29-year-old RD at a private university in the Mid-Atlantic. He's thus

several years older than Kelly, and is starting his third year on the job.

> Miguel: Well, I would feel very prepared. I think that if the residence hall staff
> does respond, I think ultimately their first one to contact is to gather information in
> regards to the incident…well, first of all…is to de-escalate, you know, calm the
> person down, get as much information as possible, and then make any referrals, as
> far as bringing in counseling staff, or offering that person information, offering
> them if they want to go to another hall, a safe space somewhere, and those would be
> the resources that would kind of stand out.

> Jason: And what resources would you draw upon in order to respond to this
> incident. And you mentioned, certainly, counseling, and offering information,
> support, anything else that comes to mind?

Miguel: A safe room. Maybe she'd feel more comfortable being in another hall, since this was kind of where it went. Other resources could be seeing if she wants to file a police report, not just one with the university. Nothing else stands out to me.

Again, the resources and agenda drawn upon by Miguel were similar. But, there was a clinical quality to his description. He was more dispassionate than Kelly, who was certainly matter-of-fact, but in a softer way. While I think it is legitimate to consider, I do not want to simply assume that this is because Miguel is male and Kelly is female. He is also 6 years older than she, in his 3rd year on th job, and he was more "tasky" with me, wearing a staff shirt and informing his front desk staff that he would be in a meeting, whereas Kelly was in her first year, and was wearing a t-shirt and shorts (it was also a weekend in the latter case) and she appeared not to be busy that day. One response that was really striking came from Bob, a 25-year-old Caucasian man in his first year at a major research university in the Southeast.

Bob: I got a little policy here, and it's a pretty good strict policy, that any situation that would concern a supervisor, they should be notified. In a situation like, say if I was on duty and that happened, say an RA called me and that happened, and so… We'll go from the first. I'll go on the scene, meet with the girl, but on my way over there, I'd probably page the area coordinator. And then the area coordinator would probably page the assistant director. And so I never have to deal with anything by myself like that. So I have a vast amount of resources. And so, we do it together as a team. And I have a black book, a folder with scenarios in it. It's an emergency book. And every emergency is described in detail, step by step, what to do. Now, it's not that—I can react in my own way,

but there's a certain protocol that I have to follow. Something like this, a sexual

assault, I would've done exactly what I described to you…use that book, and call.

Each of the respondents had a vivid point-by-point response prepared. It was

interesting that Bob walked me through the procedures in the "emergency book" but

made sure to mention that he can react in his own way (which I took to mean relative to

his communication style rather than whether he could transgress the parameters in the

book). Moreover, he described the strict policy as a good thing. I interpreted this as

something he was proud of, not only in terms of being a professional himself (and he

spent some more time talking about his CACREP-accredited counseling degree), but also

in terms of his affiliation with his department. This was reminiscent of the points I made

about Christopher and his discussion of his department's community model. For Bob and

Christopher, and the others, there was significant investment in mastering professional

judgment, which was in evidence through their application of the models and protocols

provided to them in a manner deemed correct by their superiors. What became more

important to me than whether Student Affairs is a profession, in general, is that

regardless, there is clearly a set of dominant ideologies within the field and these are

socialized into newcomers. I will soon discuss the representations of gender within the

ideologies of CSP, as they manifest themselves in the socialization process.

The next thing that struck me was that after responding to the immediate issue-the

emergency, the participants would stop. In other words, they did not continue with any

discussion about what would happen the next day, or over the coming weeks. With only

one small exception that I will address later (one of the RDs talked about some

program/policy issues relevant to another theme), they did not discuss how they might respond more broadly (e.g. in terms of community discussions, programs, etc.) to the issue. There was a consistent and sophisticated set of protocols to help the victim, particularly in the immediate term. This consistency suggests to me that, despite debates about whether CSP is a profession (Bloland & Stamatakos, 1989-90; Canon, 1982; Penney, 1969; Rickard, 1988;Wrenn & Darley, 1949), there is compelling reason to believe that it is, or minimally that Residence Life work is that of a profession. But, the point I am making about the immediate response followed by silence raises questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the profession, which I will explore further.

Victims

After asking about how the RD would respond, my next question was, "in terms of working with the students involved in the incident, what would you expect to happen in the meetings with them?" I was intentional in my wording here, because the case involved six students. Invariably, the participants focused immediately on the one in the case whose role was that of victim, and they did not mention the other five unless and until I pursued it. The theme of victim orientation is consistent with Helm's (2004) findings in his study of the socialization process for new professionals in Student Affairs. He also characterized the ethos of the field as "touchy-feely," valuing the helping of students. The apparatus constructed to enact those values was, at least in part, was displayed by the new professionals in my study as they offered a response to the case.

Helm (2004) speaks of the profession's (and the professionals') quest for legitimacy in the field of Higher Education, and its consequences on the individual

meaning-making process and approach of professionals in their work. In particular, he cites Woodard, Love, and Komives (2000):

Professionals in student affairs have developed a 'self-marginalizing, disempowering, self-pitying culture, resulting in student affairs professionals who have a victim mentality and a sense of powerlessness' (p. 18). They note that it stems from the fact that we are not at the center of the mission of universities and that we have developed a 'woe is we' mentality...Woodard, Love, and Komives citing Woolf (1984) indicated 'that low self-esteem or low self-worth is problematic because a positive self-image is necessary for believing one can influence one's future. The challenge is to recognize this self-marginalizing tendency and to counteract it' (p. 19).

Helm (2004) was discussing the victim mentality in terms of its implications for the new professional's compliance with a set of implicit and explicit agendas, most particularly relative to a Marxist analysis of external influences on the profession. I draw upon this notion to illuminate how this victim mentality, embedded within the socialization process, codifies a professionalized (e.g. therefore comingled with notions of legitimacy-e.g. deftly fighting the good fight) affinity for victims. This, in turn, is enacted via an apparatus of protocols that formalize the embracing and support of victims (real or perceived). Put simply, to be a helper, one needs someone to help. To be a professional helper, one needs an injured client. The self-pity of the field, described by Helm (2004) and by Woodard, Love, and Komives (2000) would likely foster a personal, visceral identification with those who appear to the practitioner to be a victim, whether of

assault or of oppression. I will spend more time on this in terms of the construction of

gender within the profession, but first I will continue the story about the response to the

case, since the framework unfolded precisely in the way I posed here.

The Perps

I asked the participants how they would respond to the students, and as I

mentioned, they focused on the victim. This is not initially surprising, since obviously

the case itself featured the victim and her perspective. But, when I pressed further, I

found that many of the interviewees were puzzled by my question. Once they became

oriented to the idea that I was asking them to respond to the male students, there was a

fairly consistent set of responses, fitting either a "throw the book at them" approach,

entailing a litany of sanctions (this will be discussed in more detail later when I elucidate

the Bad Dog model); or that the response to the men was out of their hands and would be

handled by police or a judicial office. The only learning outcomes, if you will, that were

consistently expressed, were to make sure the men knew the impact of their behavior on

others, or what the judicial system entailed. In some of those cases, the participants

suggested using the device of asking how they would feel if their sister or mother had this

happen, which I would characterize as shaming tactics. None of the participants

suggested looking into how the men felt about the situation, or how this connects to their

gender identity.

> Kelly: With the young men who are being accused of doing this? I guess I would
> want their take, why they think that's acceptable. And then I would ask them to
> put themselves in the young woman's place. I would talk to them about respect,

about campus policy, how they've broken that, how they've not just violated the trust of that particular woman, but everyone who's living on campus, because now they no longer feel safe either.

Jason: How do you [expect] they'll react to that?

Kelly: I think that really varies with the situation. When I meet with students, I get the whole spectrum. I can see that these individuals could be very sorry because it could've been what they considered a harmless prank. Or they, perhaps, were intoxicated, or had been using drugs or narcotics, and don't realize what they were doing. Or I can see how they could possibly not see anything wrong with it. (Jason explains that they were emulating the show, Jackass)… I still think it's a serious offense. I think they were going into a situation thinking it was a prank, but it was a serious—I perceive it in the same light. (as she did before the Jackass reference was explained)

Jason: What do you suppose would be a just resolution to the case?

Kelly: I don't think these students should be living in the residence hall any more. I think if they're going to do something that violates a woman or an individual's personal space and ability to feel safe on campus, they should no longer be living on campus. I think they should be removed from the halls, I think they should go through the judicial process. I don't know that they should be completely expelled. I guess I would have to know more details surrounding the case. But I think they should definitely be removed from the halls on some sort of sanction or punishment.

Kelly's response was typical of the group, and it was noticeable to me that she mentioned the students doing "something that violates a woman or an individual's

personal space and ability to feel safe on campus." One of the complexities of an analysis is deciding when something is illustrative or when it is being nitpicky. In this case, I am interested in her language use, and she was likely not conscious of it, indicating that a woman herself can be violated or alternatively an individual can have personal space violated. Implicit is that the individual is sexed male, and that males can't be violated, except insofar as their personal space is invaded-but they themselves are impervious to this. I believe that if I had asked her overtly whether males and females could be violated she would probably say yes. My interest in her use of language (and pronouns especially) was less about her intentions, and more about my experience of it, since a student wouldn't necessarily ask her to clarify. This idea of invulnerability is entrenched within conceptions of masculinity (Brod, 1997; Brannon, 1976; Kimmel, 2004), and there are numerous representations of this in the participant's interviews, which I will explore in the next section. I asked participants what resources they would draw upon in working with the five men.

> Miguel: Oh. Well, I think it would depend on the school policy. Most of the institutions that I've worked with would leave that investigation with their public safety office's staff. I think in terms of investigations and follow-up, someone in a res. life capacity does have the expectation to be an advocate, so following up with those students, making sure that they have the resources they need, would be something else that I think would be expected of….

> Jason: The five guys, you mean? [Miguel: "Right."] What resources do you think you would…

Miguel: For one, I would think, offering them, if there's a judicial process, making sure that they're familiar with the judicial process, providing them with a list of lawyers, depending on kind of where things are at. A lot of institutions handle lots of those things in-house, and survivors of such incidents tend to want to stay with that as well. …Those would be the only things that stand out. I mean, you could always ask, generally speaking—

Jason: Well, let's say you're their resident director, and these five guys live in your hall. And you're going to meet with them about this. As you think about that, if that were the expectation, how might you approach it?

Miguel: Oh, well I would consider it strictly, I mean, there's due process, that's always a part of it, so if I'm there, doing some information-gathering, if that's not public safety's duty to do so, then I think it would be gathering evidence for a kind of judicially-related process. Informing them of their rights, as far as, you know, their innocence until proven responsible, I think I would also kind of talk to them, to get a sense of if they do admit to responsibility, just so that there's more of an educational side, as to why, you know, trying to get an understanding of what the motivations were behind doing this incident, perhaps beginning a developmental conversation in regards to them.

Jason: I'll give you a little more information about this incident…(explains that it occurred, and the Jackass connection…) For you, given these kinds of circumstances, what might that look like? What's the agenda for such a meeting?

Miguel: Well, I would think that, it would take more the shape of more an educational type of sanction. If I'm the hearing, I mean, I guess… As someone that's gathering information, this is, you know, it seems to me that I would even

make those educational sanctions, or… If I'm the enforcer, executor, you know, everything all at once, I would look at precedent as far as what it is.

I had heard the same types of answers consistently, and I was hearing words like, "educational" and "developmental" used to describe the conversations with the men in the case in which the explicit intentions were to prepare them for adjudication, trying to obtain evidence or admissions from them, or telling them about the impact of their behavior. This is in marked contrast to the earlier examples of support language, in that "educational" and "developmental" are being used in contexts here where their dictionary meaning is being replaced with a notion of doing it TO the male students versus the support language as being something one does FOR a student. There seems to be a vague awareness of the need to be educational in a supportive way with men, but there is no clarity about how to do so. In terms of eliciting some sort of psychosocial agenda, I began to wonder if perhaps my participants were distracted by how their position fits within the hierarchy of their department. So, I tried the device of asking how they would work with the men if the incident took place elsewhere, such as on Spring Break, and they merely heard their residents had done this. In other words, I situated the case in a manner that precludes judicial action, so I could determine if there was some other consciousness on the part of the RD.

I tried this approach with Jamelia, a 28-year-old African-American woman in her second year working at a mid-sized public university in the Great Lakes.

Jamelia: Yeah. And hearing that (the case), my first thought is, that's totally inappropriate here in college. Which, now hearing that, I guess initially, you

shouldn't run up and grab people and throw 'em over your shoulder, then fall on 'em and be videotaping it anyway. But, um… I guess, are you wondering, as far as sanctions or discipline, how to handle it? Or…?

Jason: I don't want to limit…I'm interested in your response to it—

Jamelia: Like if I met with them judicially? 'Cause something like that, I know that our Office of Judicial Affairs would meet with them just because of the level of it. So, RDs here wouldn't handle something like that. That would go to a higher level. But if I were to meet with them…Well, I wouldn't. Because I guess at that point, that type of incident would probably…one of their sanctions could involve them being removed from school.

Jason: When I asked you how you'd be involved with it, you asked for clarification about, if I meant discipline. Is there another capacity in which you would meet with them?

Jamelia: Probably not. Just because of the nature of that incident…Probably not. I'm just trying to think, if they were residents in my hall… 'Cause all their letters and stuff like that would come from higher up.

Jason: Suppose that these students live in your hall, but they did this at [Name of different university]. So, you became aware that it occurred there. Does that shape any…

Jamelia: No.

Jason: And I presume they wouldn't be subject to discipline at [Name of current university].

Jamelia: As our policies are, no, they wouldn't.

Jason: I guess what I'm doing there is I'm removing the discipline from the equation, and wondering if—

Jamelia: If I would approach them at all?

Jason: Yes.

Jamelia: I wouldn't. I really wouldn't. It would probably be something that I would file away in the back of my mind. I would definitely confer with my supervisor on it, like, "I heard this happened at another school. Is there anything that we do, should I, is it something that I should document and just have for future reference…"

Jamelia, like the other interviewees, did not conceive of a way to engage the men other than through disciplinary means, even when the behavior happened elsewhere. Clearly, the behaviors in the case were inappropriate, and the men would appropriately face some consequences-perhaps even as serious as expulsion. However, there was a consistent disconnect between the espoused values of the field and the actions prescribed by the participants relative to the men. Even when words like "educational" or "developmental" were used, there were no ideas shared about how to address these actions in terms of the underlying emotional or identity issues that would either motivate such behavior or minimally come along with a student's experience of facing judicial action. Not surprisingly, Polomsky & Blackhurst (2000) suggested that students who

have been disciplined perceive the college environment to be more hostile, based on their involvement with administrators in the judicial process. Given that the vast majority of students in the judicial system are men (Berk, 1990; Downey & Stage, 1999; Herek & Berrill,1992; Levin & McDevitt, 1993), and the enrollment and retention of men has been declining, (Mortenson, 1999), it would be interesting to explore this further.

Constructions of Men in the Minds of Student Affairs Professionals

I stated earlier that the participants found the case to be realistic, which may be useful for validity questions. Yet, what is more compelling is that, while we agreed that the case was atypical, the participants found it unremarkable. They simply listed the procedures for dealing with it. The image (or archetype) of men residing in the minds of the professionals is apparently such that the behavior is expected-indeed there are procedures in place to address it. On the surface, this is reasonable. After all, these behaviors do occur with many students, and more often than not, the students doing them are men. And these images and ideas pervade the public sphere (I am referring to the U.S. here, but there are parallel constructs in other locations) and are thus present in one form or another in most people's minds. CSP professionals are merely a subset of the general population, but they claim a particular expertise and purview-facilitating identity development. So, I was looking for information about how professionals work with these constructs, and then how professional socialization mediates that process. Katz (2002) describes how a hegemonic masculine standard is embedded within the professionals' notions of men. I asked the participants, "Obviously, the case I read to you is not typical. In terms of incidents involving male students, what are more typical things that you've

been dealing with?" The answers, again, were very consistent. The RDs cited various

and sundry behaviors relating to alcohol, drug use, vandalism, fighting, rowdiness, and

defiance. I spent some time exploring their thoughts about the underlying reasons for

these behaviors. Hanna, for instance, is a 25-year-old Caucasian woman in her first year

at a large public research university in the Great Lakes.

> Jason: Now, statistically, nationally, male students commit a lot more of these
> kinds of violations you just listed. They commit a lot more of them than female
> students. What's your sense about why?

> Hannah: You really want me to be blunt?

> Jason: I want you to be blunt.

> Hannah: [Laughs.] I think guys get really stupid when they're drunk. And I think
> they get the ego complex, and I think they get the…"I'm so-and-so, you can't do
> anything to me, especially when I'm drunk" type thing. And "Don't you know
> who I am?" And, "Go ahead and write me up, my dad'll take care of it for me."
> I've had idiots like that, who talk to me like that before. Or, "We just won the
> football game." I'm thinking more [Name of college], not [Name of current
> university], but, you know, "We just won the football game, so we're gonna go
> get trashed, and we're gonna go destroy, we're gonna throw trash cans around the
> buildings, and…" I think they just get stupid, and they just don't care, and they
> lose all their inhibitions, and they, the testosterone goes up and they wanna fight
> each other. And they want to show their manliness. And… and not every guy
> does that, but typically, the ones that get in trouble, typically, have done
> something stupid like that. You know, fight at the fraternity houses, and "I'm
> bigger than you are," and "Why are you looking at my girlfriend like that?" and…

Guys just get stupid when they're drunk. And they draw the attention to themselves. And then the next day, they're like, "We're really sorry, I didn't mean to do that." But they just get stupid.

Jason: You said they get stupid when they get drunk. What's that about?

Hannah: I think they just, I think they drink to the point where they think they're above everything. They're above college rules, regulations, coaches, Res Life people, their RA, their mentor. Some guys just lose all their judgment capabilities, and, "I don't care, do whatever, write me up, whatever." And then there are some guys who are just like, "Okay, yeah, I am being stupid. I'll stop. I am being ridiculous." But there are some guys that just… Something happens with the amount of alcohol, that they just can't control themselves, they don't want to control themselves, everybody's encouraging them. They probably have developed some sort of personality, or image, that everybody's like, "Yeah! Get him really drunk! He's so funny when he's drunk!" And it's kind of like an expectation. Like, "Oh, Joe over here always gets really wasted, because he's so much funnier, and he's so much more of a people-person when he gets drunk." Or, "Let's see what he can do when he's drunk tonight." Or, "I'm gonna get drunk and go over to this fraternity, and I'm gonna show 'em, and they really made me mad last time," or whatever.

Alcohol was frequently cited as an underlying reason for these behaviors. I will share more of Hannah's comments, because they were representative of the themes that emerged. What is particularly striking about Hannah's description of men in this particular narrative is the way in which they are essentialized as unpredictable, defiant, arrogant, and conspiratorial. Clearly, the behaviors she has encountered could reasonably be described in such terms. But, with her reference to testosterone, there is a certain codified belief espoused that men act this way as a function of biology-they can't help it

and so it is her role to somehow control or mitigate them. Absent is a critical examination about the underlying reasons for the behaviors, or how men's relationships might contribute to the problem, or how men who don't behave badly fit in this construct. And, Pete, a 29-year-old Caucasian man at the very beginning of his 4th year on the job at a large private university in the Mid-Atlantic, had some interesting things to say about this.

> Pete: I was about to say, the statistics can be very deceiving. 'Cause boys are more often louder about it. Young women are probably drinking, young women are probably using the drugs, doing many of the same things, but they're always much quieter about it. The boys get drunk, their testosterone kicks up, and they get loud, I would say that's probably one reason why the statistics are higher. Also, I think society gives men the "Oh, boys will be boys" kind of attitude sometimes, and you get a group of boys together, and their idea of fun is different than if it was girls getting together. And typically boys are more… Maybe that's stereotypical. No, the statistics would probably back it up…that boys are typically more violent in situations.

> Jason: It's true that the drinking statistics for women seem to be catching up with men's. (Pete: "Yeah, they are.") But in terms of acts of violence and destruction (Pete: "Not as much.") then men are far outpacing on those… I'm trying to get people's ideas about why, and you've talked about society giving people permission, giving, well, I should say, giving the boys, giving young men permission to behave that way, chalking it up to, "Boys will be boys." What does "Boys will be boys" mean? For you, what does that mean, when you say it.

> Pete: Boys do more physical things. They… are very interesting, actually.

I felt with many of the participants that I was chasing the answer all over the place, with a matter-of-fact answer given, and then my question caused more critical examination, followed by another possible explanation, and so on. After this interchange, for instance, Pete digressed to some discussion about how litigious society has become, resulting in a need to do more to stop these behaviors, and so the thing that is changing is that we can't be as tolerant of these behaviors that are apparently normal in males.

The conversations developed this layered dynamic, with a certain answer given and then my probing, "and why do you suppose that is/happens?" followed by another layer, and I rarely elicited an underlying set of factors explaining the behavior beyond "that's how guys are." A number of the participants would say that women do as many bad things, but are quieter and less likely to be caught, but then they would redirect this as well. This obviousness, this sense of it being a given, of men's behavior eventually became its own reason. A number of the participants sought a reason in a prevailing "boys will be boys" (and they used that term frequently) attitude on the part of "society," or other similarly nebulous external sources of this message. When I asked for clarification about the meaning of "boys will be boys," I was unable to elicit a definition. Regardless of whether an actual definition would cast men positively or negatively, the lack of a theoretical/conceptual model beyond a judicial/punitive model (rather than an educational/developmental one) is concerning given the stated aims of the profession and the belief by professionals that they are advancing them. So, these descriptions situated the professional in a position of needing to manage men's behavior through the use of sanctions, and then a process wherein the men learn of their impact on others, presumably

which would then prevent them from committing more infractions. The term, "getting it" was used very frequently in terms of who does or does not "get it."

> Christopher: It just seems like, and maybe I've been, I've had the bad guys, but there's been females that I've had, where I've seen 'em three, four times a semester. It gets back to [that] there are some folks who just don't get the picture…about living in a community.

> Jason: Well, do you notice, when you said, "Some people don't get it," when we actually unpack who the "some people" are, they're guys.

> Christopher: Yeah.

> Jason: Because you've said, women do. And I realize there could be discussions about how many different genders there are in the world, but if "some people don't get," and then, on the other hand, women get it, is the "some people"—guys don't get it?

> Christopher: For the most part. There are some that do. But I think, if I looked at my career with students over the years…where I think, "I'm gonna see that person again," 95 to 99 percent of the people that I've said, "I'm gonna see that person again," are males.

I come back to Hannah, because the drinking connection was common with the participants, and so I wanted to see if I could get a little deeper on this issue, and her thoughts were emblematic of what I was hearing.

> Jason: Now, women drink.

Hannah: Oh, yeah. Oh, yes they do. [Laughs.]

Jason: So that's kind of what I'm getting at is, how… Do you think it's the alcohol that's doing this? 'Cause men and women are both drinking, and yet the guys are the ones hitting each other.

Hannah: I think alcohol opens up the door for it.

Jason: So what's behind the door?

Hannah: I think…I'm gonna try to… I think alcohol opens up the door to…I think that guys can use it as an excuse to fight, and to be idiots, and to get that kind of, those frustrating feelings out of, "We won the game," or "We lost the game," or "My girlfriend screwed me over this week," or "So-and-so really made me mad this week." I think they use it as an excuse. "Well, I was drunk. That's why I did it."

Jason: Sure.

Hannah: Is that…?

Jason: Well, I understand that they're using it as an excuse, but you call it an excuse, I presume, because you're not believing that that's the reason.

Hannah: Um… I think they look for a way to get their frustration out, and alcohol just gives them that.

Jason: In terms of the frustration, what's that frustration about? Where's that coming from?

Hannah: Oh, I think it can come from anywhere. I think the frustration…the frustration from the guys can be… I don't know.

I asked Hannah and the others about situations involving men that weren't policy violations, such as personal issues. Some of the interviewees didn't have any examples of these. Others cited suicidal ideation, failing to take psychopharmacological medication and acting out, or inappropriate social interactions. When there were examples of men seeking help, it tended to be either a facility problem or an administrative question (e.g. procedure to drop a class).

A couple of the women talked about pressures they perceive men to have. Sheila is a 25-year-old Caucasian woman in her 2nd year working at a large, private university in the Mid-Atlantic.

Jason: Do you see, in society, that things are different or the same for men and women?

Sheila: I think there's a different pressure on males. I think it's changing, but I think they are the ones that feel they need to be, what do you call it…breadwinners and things like that... So I'm sure they feel more pressure in school; they need to get that high-paying job, they need to get that internship, they need to do all this because I think our culture teaches them that they need to be the one that's making the most and doing the most and not to depend on a female. I think that's still, even though we're in 2004, I think that's still…their goal is always to do better, and to be able to make it on their own. And females, it's like, well, I still hear… I mean, you go to school, but you always have that backup of getting married to someone who makes money. I feel. And I feel guys don't have

that in their heads at all, and females do. So I guess that would be a difference. In college, I mean, they're probably driven by different things. They're driven by that in their head, and by being taught that. And females, I think, have taken the initiative to be driven by that, but are not taught yet, even today, to really be thinking about what they can do for themselves, and they always have that backup of a male. And males don't have that backup.

Jason: Like Plan B, marry a guy with money?

Sheila: [Laughs.] Like my sister, she got this business degree, I mean, and he's great, but I'm like, "What are you gonna do?" and she's like, "Oh, have babies." Okay. Good job.

Jason: Do you suspect that that would be difficult? Not having… Like you said, guys don't have the backup? What do you suppose the impact of that difference would be?

Sheila: I think it must be hard. I mean, it's a pressure. I don't know what it is. I don't have that kind of pressure inside my head, more than what I've made myself feel, so I'm sure that it's harder for them to… It's more stressful. I think they probably…especially by the end of their schooling, if they don't feel like they have what they need to go out there and get a good job, in this market, I mean I have some RAs that graduated and are still really just doing in-between jobs, and not really knowing what they're doing, and I'm sure they feel more stressed-out just because that's what they've been taught, maybe they've already needed to get that job, to show everybody that they can have money, and support themselves, with no one else helping them.

This was such a powerful insight, so much so that I wondered how she applied this idea. So, I asked her what resources she draws upon in her work with her male students.

> Sheila: I guess I don't think of them differently, pretty much, I deal with them like I would deal with females. I mean, I guess I take every situation and deal with it as it comes. I know I probably… I don't know.

> Jason: If I asked you what resources you draw upon to work with female students, does a list come to mind, or is it the same?

> Sheila: I guess just being a female, maybe I have more to draw on, about how I think I would feel in this, her situation, and I probably don't do that automatically with males. But I don't think there's any other thing I would think of, off the top of my head.

Meet the Bad Dogs: Big G and Little G

When I began this project, I wondered if my being male would prevent the level of candor, particularly from females, that Hannah in particular exhibited- in the sense that perhaps they wouldn't want to offend me. At the time I spoke with her, I was relieved that she spoke so explicitly about her impressions, and of course there was an obvious "juiciness" to the remarks that I looked forward to sharing here. Now that I am reflecting on this, I am becoming more interested in why she *didn't* feel inhibition about saying such apparently negative things about men to me. I'm not interested in featuring an explanation that invokes some unfairness toward men, such as "man-bashing" being OK, etc. because I don't think it would capture the issue in a useful way.

Rather, what comes to mind for me as I reflect on Hannah and the other interviews with women especially is that I was thought of as "a good one," a man who isn't like the others. There is the external, grand notion of guys (which is more often the word to describe men in college-guys), the hegemonic standard, which I will call "*Big G*." Then, there are individual guys, "*little G*," referring to individual men. Each man is compared relative to this standard, as Goffman (1963) discussed. Big G is bad, and little Gs who don't act like that are exceptional. Big G was present in the interviews with both females and males. With female participants, they spoke in terms of others, presumably since they were not male. Cassandra demonstrated this as she considered approaching the five men in the case example:

> Cassandra: I think that, given they were my residents, I'd feel much more comfortable confronting them. You know, where they understand the residence life structure. I would just feel a little more comfortable confronting them and saying who I am. I think that that would be an interesting situation, and the five people, I definitely would see them individually. I've seen group mentality just sort of take over. One guy denies it, and the whole group just follows. Or, they're just belligerent, or…it's also intimidating to try and confront five people at one time, especially males.

> Jason: It's especially difficult, as a female, to confront a group of men, or men in general, individually, or ?

> Cassandra: I think that confronting groups makes me uncomfortable. Confronting groups of males can make me extra uncomfortable…depending on the group of males, too. It depends on the group of females, as well. But men just have an ability to… penetrate the comfort zone a little more than females. Just in terms of

size and sometimes just social structure. And when I say social structure, it's just about how they react, it's not how –I- would react, nor is it how I'm comfortable with people reacting, in terms of, yelling all the time, or trying to belittle me, or disrespect what I'm trying to say.

There would be these snippets in which issues of socialization, social structure, etc. would come up, but then it tended to fade out of the discussion. Cassandra attributed certain of men's behaviors to sociology, but she also talked a bit about biology:

Jason: You mentioned sociological reasons for the stats being that men are doing more of these things, and you mentioned biological reasons. If it's true that men are just genetically given to aggressive behavior, is that something that they're accountable for?

Cassandra: I think yes, because not every man goes around starting fights, or vandalizing the hall. If you do biological testing and you have more testosterone, well that means to me, someone needs to pay more attention to you, and help you sort of deal with those urges, rather than letting you run loose in society to hurt other people.

There were a few men and women in the study who mentioned hormones, testosterone in particular, as impacting factors in male behavior. But, none of them had a biology background nor cited any reading or source for this belief. For this reason (rather than whether there really are biological factors), I found this to be part of a system of mythologies that people brought to their work, and for which there was no examination in the profession.

I was also fascinated with how the male participants navigated the questions of men's issues. A number of them discussed these issues in reference to themselves. Male participants were not less likely to characterize men in the way Hannah did. Pete, for instance, in discussing his response to the case, wanted to meet with the men to determine whether the actions of the men were "premeditated stupidity [or] spontaneous stupidity." Christopher's analysis is also quite telling. He wondered if this particular case constituted "simply five guys being five guys, [and] simply made a bad decision." When we discussed what Christopher would do about the matter, he mentioned, "if the kid's not a bad apple, if he's somebody that I have not seen in judicial before and this was his first offense, my main goal will be educational, to say, this is what we're trying to do in this community, and you need to get on board with this." He then stated that an educational sanction would be to ride along with the police. This is the recurring theme of expected bad behavior, without critical examination of its foundation, and responses that do not appear to be connected to the underlying developmental issues.

One of my last interviews turned out to have a profound impact on me, and it really influenced my thoughts about this project and its importance. I attended a regional conference, and made arrangements to meet with Abayomi there. Abayomi is a black man, born in a West African country, and has been in the U.S. for seven years. He is 31, and is starting his third year as an RD at a large public research university in the Great Lakes. He is striking in his size-he's tall and has broad shoulders. Our interview lasted for about 2 ½ hours, and at times felt like we were wrestling-but in a way we both acknowledged as being very positive-it was sort of a grappling together over the issues.

Jason: …Now, you know, statistically, male students commit a lot more violations of policy…the alcohol, the violence, vandalism…than female students. What is your sense of why?

Abayomi: Sense of why, is… I believe that the hormones…the hormonal kind of…surges…

Jason: Surges?

Abayomi: Right, you know, the hormones, the way they act up for men is fairly different for women.

Jason: So you think there're some biological reasons.

Abayomi: I very much think so. I think if you look at the music, when you think about…how much techno music, heavy metal, rap, gangsta rap, how much that is… The media portrays man [a certain way]…and the way we perceive men in a culture where there is this machismo kind of feeling. You have to, to be a man, you have to be really be, at times, for lack of a better word, arrogant, a little bit…to be arrogant, to stand your ground, to be bold..to challenge authorities at times.

Jason: Your voice has been getting deeper.

Abayomi: [Laughs.] Right. Right.

Jason: Well, what's the difference between the men who do these things and the men who don't? Most men don't.

Abayomi: Absolutely. I think that you will find that it is very, very…the difference is very … Because I find myself in the category of a very big, manly man. You know, very bold, very sturdy, very muscular, masculine. But at the same time, I cry a lot; at the same, I tend to…my feminine side is much more active in terms of really…I sympathize a lot…I tend to really…I don't believe in those kinds of aggressive… You know, in terms of the institution, what are the implications of that. It is very hard, because I find out that even students that are like this, [have experiences like] myself. I do. I mean, I have assistants who want to see that man who has this muscle…who weighs 300 pounds.

Jason: Are you saying that you sometimes feel pressure to behave in that way yourself?

Abayomi: Absolutely. Absolutely. And when you don't, then, you know, you are a sissy. You're not man enough.

Jason: And so…what keeps you from acting that way?

Abayomi: For me, it's… I'm a learned individual. I don't think that I have to act a certain way because people [expect it].

Jason: …You don't rely on the other person's expectations to define you, these kinds of things. So for the students, for the male students, what is the difference between the ones who do that and the ones who don't?

Abayomi: The difference is some of the things we said already. One of the differences is that they may get shunned by their fellow men. They may be

treated differently, as less of a man. And that may affect them in different ways, because then they, it manifests itself—

Jason: All men, or just the men who behave this way? That we're discussing.

Abayomi: Well, we're talking about those males who don't behave in a typical, manly way, right? We're saying that those men would all behave like machismo. It may be some kind of backlash from most men around them.

Jason: A backlash for not acting that way?

Abayomi: For not being man enough.

Jason: Most men don't commit violence or…

Abayomi: Right. Well, what I mean by that, I don't really mean commits violence and things, but I mean, like being a man, for example, the kind of music you're listening to. For example, if you're a Black male. If you're not listening to gangsta rap, you're not cool enough. And for the kind of student who doesn't listen to gangsta rap, for example—that pressure might cause them to withdraw. Because, again, they can't find…it is not popular to be… I'm not talking about the kind of manifestation of the man who would buy into this by really being out…like breaking the law, or being violent, and things like that, but those kinds of social kinds of things like, you know, you want to go hang out and drink with guys, go to parties, you want to listen to a type of music and play music at a certain level. For example, if you have a roommate who is, "Oh, come on, I need to go to sleep. I have to do this." Or, "I don't want to listen to that music where they are swearing in the music." It may look like, okay, you have a roommate who doesn't want to do all those things. It's not cool. And I feel that. I feel that

from my own friends. I mean, as strong as I look, that kind of…especially that "What kind of music are you listening to, Abayomi?"

Abayomi was able to articulate some societal pressures facing men, and to express some ways in which he personally experienced them, and then a connection to how he incorporates this perspective into his work (for which there are professional risks that I will discuss later). We had a couple of conversations about how these dynamics play out in the U.S. as compared to his home country. He spoke about the domestic and community roles as they are assigned to men and women there, and they were fairly similar to here in terms of child-rearing, obtaining money and food, etc. The differences he really noticed between his home country and here had more to do with the enforcement of the roles.

> Abayomi: Yeah, kind of similar here, but it is like, for example, they (men in his home country) will make a joke, like, usually it's a joke. It's not…the difference between there and here is that…here, in a lot of ways, there is some kind of punishment for that, which is not deliberated. For example, I think that, when I talk about this around diversity I mean that, we should be deliberate about doing things that include men, because, you know, I think that we are punishing them by not doing that…by not including them. Or, you know, if you meet with your student, and you know, you're just jumping to conclusions because we have these notions, these mental models, to how they should react to this situation or that situation I think we are punishing them in this regard. Now the difference between here and [home country] is that those men who act like women, they will not be repudiated, they will not be, you know, punished or anything. They will just be, uh, you're not going to have the kind of situation where you go to school and you have other students ganging up on you or ridiculing you, or, fighting you,

because, you know, you're acting "gay" or acting like a woman, if you're a guy. In fact, that's unheard of as far as I know.

The ways in which Abayomi's cultural background interfaces with (and at times conflicts with) his professional socialization comes up several times. What really caught my attention in this segment was that Abayomi, as someone who came to the U.S. from another country, was able to articulate what he observed to be particularly strong and rigid enforcement of the masculine standard here. The relationship between Big G and little G is described as a rather direct and powerful one here.

Bad Dogs: Something's Not Quite Right

Recall that I earlier talked about Bob and his emergency book of procedures. Whereas he worked hard to master the tools provided to him, he had personal reflections on this issue which was representative of a few participants who had mixed feelings about issues with men.

> Bob: …Here's another example. Straight males are not usually very receptive, accepting, to homosexual males. And a policy here is, instead of making them kind of understand feelings and things like that, you're telling them that they need to, and if they write a bad word on a door, and this shit happens, we're gonna send them to the police and stuff like that. But it's so much dump dump dump, and there's no positive model. Do like this. 'Cause what're you gonna say, do like the women do? You know? It's so much negative modeling. Like DON'T do that, don't do this, you know, I had a hall director, he was a guy that was homosexual, he was like, you know, all the guys laugh when they see me come into the hall meetings and introduce myself to them and the RAs 'cause they know I'm gay. And I'm thinking, but that's the way they were brought up. Is there a way we could change that with them without just expecting 'em to just…

I mean, we gotta teach them how to act different. We can't just tell them not to do it.

Jason: And the policy doesn't work.

Bob: Well, what we're doing is lettin' 'em learn it through the judicial process. And that's not what I like to do. I don't ever want 'em to come through the judicial process. And that's our teachable moment. Is we're gonna wait for 'em to screw up, and we're gonna teach 'em from their mistake. [Half-laughs.] There's gotta be a better way to do it.

Later in the interview, we returned to this issue.

Bob: I don't think we reach out or do much for the guys. You know, our touchy-feely programming model is not really something that they're into. And we can act like they should be, but they're not. They're not coming to the, like, get-to-know-you programs, I mean, guys, and, you know, you need to pull up statistics. I'm thinking, maybe 15% of all males in a residence hall will show up for a program. Residence Life is not reaching out with programs for the guys. Because of the programming model, I'm thinking the stuff that works more with guys, would not even be included in the programming.

Jason: What would be some examples?

Bob: Well, you know, like sports. Say, out there (points out the window at a group of men playing on a field), you know, these guys out here play Frisbee ALL the time. I mean, that's a social program, and they're bonding and stuff, but, it's not really something you'd chalk up as a program. Girls can get together and do more programming, and it's just so much easier for them. And you know, and

I'm not real…I know theory and stuff, but I think it would be worth visiting and focus on guys and how to reach out to them and aid in their personal development. Also, guys are kind of independent like that. Like, I don't need personal development. You might not even do anything with that. That just might be the nature of the beast. As far as, like, alcohol violations, it's more socially acceptable to be drunk, I'm thinking probably 90% of all violations on campus are associated with alcohol. And so, it's part of the campus culture…guys getting drunk and causing trouble.

Jason: Why?

Bob: It's the culture of a college campus. It's just like, when you go into a coffee shop…it's a kind of a quiet place, kind of a hip place, you know, you wouldn't go in there and arm wrestle or nothin'. It's part…they're just trained, that's what you do when you go to college. And colleges have set themselves up to be…that's what you do. That's the environment. You know, on Animal House. It's perpetuated in society. It's perpetuated by parents, grandparents, TV… It's just part of the culture. Kind of like, when in Rome, do what the Romans do.

Jason: Well, I don't want to make an assumption, so we'll start with, do you think that that's all right?

Bob: No. I'm not… I'll totally against alcohol abuse because it leads to so much [death] on college campuses. I was talking to one of my RAs yesterday, 'cause they were doing a program on drinking, and date rape drugs, and I was like, I'm hoping that every kid that hits this campus, that their purpose is to come here to make a better life for themselves. And it devastates me when I hear that somebody's life is ruined by coming here. And it happens a lot. You know, we've already had six…I don't know how many other people. But it just bothers

me that that happens. It's not good. I don't like it. We get…I think that we as universities should get closer to the academics, instead of, we've been appealing to the masses by the fun and the atmosphere. We're pushing the wrong things, and we're getting the wrong response.

Jason: Now, you were mentioning that the program model tends not to be built for men. I don't want to put words in your mouth; that's what I heard.

Bob: Sure. That's what I'm saying.

Jason: Okay. …How'd that happen? I mean, what's your sense of…?

Bob: I mean, when you look at that programming model, and I'm thinking, your college student guys are gonna say, "This is a bunch of bullcrap." I mean, like, I don't know how it happened. But you know, when you're talking about counselors and stuff, though, it's kind of a touchy-feely world, and it's not something guys are into. The touchy-feely part of it all. I'm not saying we should—

Jason: Have you talked about this with anyone here?

Bob: No, I haven't, but I've thought about it a lot.

Kelly talked about this issue of programming models from an angle different than Bob's take on it.

Jason: What's your sense of male students' issues or needs?

Kelly: I think, in general… I see the male residents playing a lot of video games. And that's fairly consistent with my college experience still. So I think that's a

way that they socialize. And that's great, because it's something they can all jump in and do, but at the same time, there's not always a lot of discussion. And so sometimes that can be an obstacle, too. I have several of my male Resident Assistants come to me and say—we have requirements here, and one of them is personal well-being—and they're like, "Yeah, this poker game or this video game tournament is a personal well-being." And I'm like, "that's more social. Sure it's good for, to keep a sense of balance, and it's good for your well-being, but that's not everything. There should be other things happening on your floor." So I think just socializing, creating dialogue among the men…

Jason: About what?

Kelly: Just about life in general, about how classes are going. I think men in general tend to internalize or to…express their feelings differently than women, and more often, female residents or a female Resident Assistant will come to me and say, "I'm feeling this and this and this; I'm feeling overwhelmed; I'm feeling scared; can you do this for me?" Whereas, I don't experience that as often with the males. Sometimes they'll come to me and they'll be more indirect about it. They may say they're feeling overwhelmed, but they won't go into as much detail.

Jason: Do you think that's a bad thing?

Kelly: No. I think it can be a bad thing. I don't think in general it's a bad thing, because many times, they're finding other ways to share that information.

Davis (2002) mentions this issue specifically in terms of the tendency of men toward side-by-side communication. He elaborates by discussing how the way men sometimes communicate affection (e.g. sharing a task or game) are understood by the

participants but not by observers. This is not asserting that this is always the case, but notice how Kelly would not allow her Resident Assistants to "count" certain events toward their programming requirements since they did not fit her understanding of the purpose of the programs, that is, development. Nardi (1992) and Brod (in Laker, 1997) propose that friendship is often defined in terms of how women do it. In other words, a female standard defines what counts as friendship. The feminization of CSP might possibly include the adoption of this lens on relationships, and it is quite complicated because while it would be overreaching to suggest that men's engagement of each other should not be critically reviewed, it seems clear to me that the relationships are often dismissed out-of-hand.

The Other Invisible Man

Ralph Ellison's 1947 novel, *Invisible Man*, tells the story of a nameless, faceless, black man. The book's title does not connote a poltergeist or a man with transparent skin. Rather, he is invisible by virtue of how others react to him. They do not accept his reality and thus live as though they do not see him. This is a powerful metaphor for the ways in which the lives of people of color, women, and other marginalized groups are shaped relative to the experiences of those in privileged populations. When I was with Jamelia, I had an interchange with her that really stayed on my mind, in part because of her reaction when we engaged an invisibility of a different sort than the kind represented in Ellison's classic story.

> Jason: Now, in terms of your department or your staff, in your current job, do you recall any information, readings, or discussions in your department or staff that pertained to male students specifically?

Jamelia: I have to say no. …I think most of the information that we tend to give addresses students. It's not gender-specific...at all.

Jason: And do you recall any information, readings, discussions, or presentations in training, anything about women specifically here?

Jamelia: [Pause.] I do recall us having a training that had to do with how to address when a student has been sexually assaulted. And I remember the presenter was like, "The fact is, this is mostly a crime against women, and so…I would say, yes, in that we had that. But other than that, no.

Jason: Would you say sexual assault is a women's issue?

Jamelia: You mean, like as far as it occurring against women?

Jason: Well, I guess—

Jamelia: [Laughs.] Yeah! Yeah, yeah! I guess I would consider it's probably more of a women's issue than it is a men's issue. Just according to what I've heard, you know.

Jason: Well, here's where I'm going with that—

Jamelia: It's more of a crime against women than it is against men.

Jason: By whom?

Jamelia: By—it's more of a crime against women by men. Oh, okay! So I see what you're saying. So, is it more of an issue for men than it is…Okay.

Jason: Sexual—

Jamelia: I see what you're saying.

Jason: —is how it's talked about. So, it's typically—

Jamelia: But looking at it in the reverse—

Jason: —it's typically a crime against women. So who's absent in that equation?

Jamelia: Right. [Laughs.] I see what you're saying.

Jason: So if you're always working—

Jamelia: I never, I never would've, you know, thought of it as a men's issue in that way. But yeah, I guess it is.

Jason: If you keep working with the women…

Jamelia: Right. Right.

Rather than the oppressive and dehumanizing invisibility described by Ellison, this is the invisibility that codifies privilege, discussed by Peggy McIntosh (1988) through her well-known metaphor of an "invisible knapsack" containing benefits associated with being white or being male. On the one hand, I was excited to discuss this

intellectually. On the other hand, I recall a brief awkwardness (captured on the tape as Jamelia's interruptions, nervous laughter, and her saying "right right" as if eager to move on) during that exchange. This part of the interview was interesting, and it was also complicated. Jamelia's realization was situated within a discussion between herself, an African-American woman, and me, a Caucasian man. Jamelia did not realize that she was participating in something (e.g. allowing men to be invisible and thus their roles to be free of critical analysis) that oppressed women (including herself) and privileged men (including me). I don't know the level to which this affected her, beyond the recognition of the problematic framing of sexual assault-which would be a useful thing. For me though, it elicited some important insight into the complexity of a discussion about privilege and oppression. It seems to me that a thorough analysis of the ways in which men are allowed to enjoy benefits of, and abdicate responsibility for gender privilege necessarily requires some discussion of participation by women. Yet, this is politically loaded because implicit might be real or perceived blame of the very people marginalized by this dynamic. How are we to make progress on this issue, though, when men's gender identity isn't even on the radar screen of CSP professionals? One can't discuss their participation in a system of power (and then interrupt that participation) that is invisible (that is, the participation and/or the system are invisible). The common discourse in the CSP profession is that this system is invisible to those who enjoy its benefits. But the importance of this exchange with Jamelia is that socialization and internalization can in fact make the system, or parts of it, invisible also to those who are marginalized and

oppressed. Since we were able to bring men into the consciousness of the discussion, I continued with some questions about what to do next.

Jason: But, well, we'll get back to that. Now that you're thinking about gender, what's your sense of what men's developmental needs might be?

Jamelia: [Sighs.] Developmental needs of men. [Laughs.] Um. [Pause.] I don't know. One thing, I don't know how to say it, 'cause, when you said that, the first thing that came to mind is, just working with men as far as their maturity level, and as far as their perception of things. Because, it's seems sometimes when men are involved in situations, and this is just generalizing, they hadn't realized necessarily the impact of what it was they were doing. Like when you read that incident earlier, I was like, they probably didn't really give doing something like that the thought that it needed—you know, like, yeah, this is fun, but did you really think this all the way through. What is this gonna look like. How is this affecting this other person. Even if that had been another male student, you know, did you walk through that process.

Jason: Would it have been easier if I asked you what women's developmental needs are?

Jamelia: Not necessarily. …Right now, what I always think when I meet with women, and I'm helping them address issues, is, I think in…but I always tend to generalize. I always think in general, students need to learn to live together. And so I tend to think like that. I really don't separate, like, I always think the students as a whole need to, you know, learn how to talk to other people, how to communicate, how to live together, how to be personally responsible. That's one of the things that I come across a lot. I hear a lot of excuses, and I have to, at one

point, say, "What is your personal responsibility in this? You're an adult." And so I never really separate it as a man issue or a woman—

Jason: Do you think the goal of learning how to live with others, that makes sense. Do you think that how you would teach a male or how you would teach a female about those concepts would be similar or different?

Jamelia: I think it would be similar…I would start out that way. I would definitely start out kind of…with it being similar.

Jason: I was going to ask what resources you draw upon when working with male students. Maybe you answered that question, but I'd offer it anyway in case you had something to add.

Jamelia: I really don't draw— Really, when I deal with students, like, now you're saying male and female, I realize I really don't take the time to say, "I'm dealing with a male student. Let me address it in this way." Not to say that I probably don't address it in a different way, but…so I don't, I draw on, you know, my education, whether I'm dealing with a male or a female.

I had very few examples where the professionals overtly named and/or discussed identity issues of men. Pete and I talked about this, and he made a distinction that caught my attention.

Pete: Um… Men don't necessarily like to—and this is just an opinion, I suppose—men don't necessarily like to admit to their weakness, and admit that they're having problems, or issues…

Jason: Do you have a sense of what that's about?

Pete: Not as a professional, but as a man, I do. I mean, just, you're supposed to be the big tough one, and you're not supposed to have any problems, and we're supposed to be the one that fixes all the problems, and not necessarily the one that has the problems. I don't necessarily think that's RIGHT, but…[laughs a little]

Pete said he didn't have a sense as a "professional," but he did have a sense "as a man." This was significant to me because he had been at the job for a few years, and he had spent some time talking about his psychology background. Yet, he had not connected the personal experiences with the professional ones. When I met with Jamelia, I tried to use a device to elicit such a connection.

Jason: How do you perceive male students in comparison to female students in your job?

Jamelia: I really…. I really don't perceive them any differently. Like, is there more to that question, like…? I really don't perceive them differently. I feel like, the issues and things tend to be the same, regardless of the sex. Like I said, the only big difference that I've really noticed is when it comes to roommate things, I really tend to see more females. And I hear that males have the same issues, like in casual conversation, they'll say, "Oh, yeah, my roommate never takes out the trash." But they don't come and talk to me about those things. Like, they really address those things themselves.

Jason: To what do you attribute that difference?

Jamelia: I don't know. I really don't know. That's a good question. I really don't know.

Jason: In life, like outside of work, just in your travels or whatever, do you perceive men and women to be the same?

Jamelia: [Laughs.] Being married, I really can't say that. [Laughs.] No, I don't perceive men and women to be the same. I think…I think the way that… I guess I would have to say this more from a personal standpoint, and this is as it relates to personal relationships. Sometimes when I have an issue or a problem, I just need to kind of talk about it, and get it out, and just say the same thing over and over again. And I just need somebody to listen, and not, like, necessarily fix the problem, I just kind of need to vent about it and move on. And maybe that's what I tend to see, too, with females… You know, I do hear a lot of venting, and I always have to pay attention to, if it's something they want my help on, or it's something they're just kind of getting off their chest. Or is it something I need to address.

The discussions about the workplace training became redundant very quickly. In essence, there were no trainings about men specifically mentioned by my participants, with the exception of the occasional session on rape prevention. In those cases, when men were brought up, it was in one of two ways. First, there was discussion about educating them about consent laws and how drinking might create problems in this regard. Second, there would be a mention at the very end of a session on helping victims of sexual assault, to the effect of, "oh, and this happens to some men too." In the latter case, there wasn't any discussion about any nuances to responding, and there was an implicit suggestion that taking that time would not he useful since it was unlikely to

occur. I had the same "but who is doing the sexual assaults" conversation with a few of

the participants, and like Jamelia, they appreciated that men's involvement in the issue

(beyond being perpetrators-how does sexual assault affect men's experiences) was absent

from the conversation. Questions about what resources the RDs drew upon in their work

with men went similarly (with the caveats about utilization of police or judicial offices

addressed earlier). I had some interesting conversations about why men are not more

readily discussed, and this will connect with a later section on graduate training.

Jason: What do you make of the fact that it hasn't come up?

Pete: What do I make of the fact that it hasn't come up? I would say that, I would

say that, male issues are one of the least talked-about in society that we have. I

mean, you talk about female issues, you talk about African-American issues, you

talk about Hispanic… You talk about all those issues, and the things that people

deal with, but no one ever pulls these young men aside and says, "These are

typical, normal issues for you to have to deal with. And it's normal." We just

don't do it.

Jason: What's your sense of the reason for that?

Pete: [Sighs.] I think there've been whole books written on it. I would say it rolls

back to the male bravado, the John Wayne "I'm not supposed to have any

problems" kind of thing.

Jason: The implicit assumption there—like you said, if we're talking about

African-Americans issues—

Pete: The reason it hasn't come up in our department, I think it's just 'cause it's not thought of as, it's not a forefront topic that people say… Now we've had things that talk about what this generation's issues are, like how the students that are coming in, these freshmen have a totally different experience than the freshmen before them did before, but we don't ever specify that as to how young men have different issues.

Jason: It's the millennial thing.

Pete: Yeah, with the millennial thing. I mean, we've done that.

Jason: Have you talked about issues affecting gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender people?

Pete: Of course.

Jason: You say, "Of course." Okay. Have you talked about issues affecting African-American people?

Pete: Uh-huh (yes).

Jason: Any other groups you can think of?

Pete: Exchange students.

Jason: Hispanic? Latino? …Native American?

Pete: Uh-huh. Disabled students. It's all been… I can see… I can think that almost every one of those subjects, I mean, the subject of money, economic

status, all those things have been covered, but have we ever had a training session about the issues that young men have…

Jason: That's what I'm kind of getting at, is what do you make of that? Could be, the question is, why not?

Pete: It's not a forefront issue. It's not… I mean, it very well should be… But it's kind of like… [Sighs.] It's kind of like going into a room and saying, "I want to talk about the trials that young white men have." People are going to look at you and be like, "What?"

Jason: If you talk about… Well, is that to say that… When you talk about any of these other people, it's in terms of trials that they have?

Pete: Trials, discrimination, difficulties, fitting in, those kind of things.

Jason: Do you ever have conversations about strengths and talents of these particular groups, or only trials and discrimination?

Pete: [Pause.] I would say probably I've never heard it really put in that context, no. I would say different experiences more than anything. How young African-Americans, Hispanics, come from different experiences.

Jason: Different from what?

Pete: Than, probably, than your white male.

This exchange illustrated the way identity and identity politics are represented in CSP. Whiteness and maleness are invisibly located in the center, and it is against this

center that people are described, with extent of otherness shaping how they are discussed. Note that I also asked Pete whether gifts and talents of the marginalized groups were ever explored, and he had no recollection as such. This essentialist notion of men in general, white men in particular, and marginalized identities relative to white men not only cloaks the developmental issues of a significant number of students, but it reifies a patriarchal hierarchy of identity (hooks, 1984; Hurtado & Stewart, 1997; McIntosh, 1988). Pete was able to speak about men from his standpoint "as a man," and Jamelia from the standpoint of her marriage, but neither brought this into their professional viewpoint-in fact they overtly distinguished these locations during our interviews. Something is happening in the socialization of CSP professionals that either constructs, or minimally perpetuates the cloaking of men's gender identities and the concomitant privilege. This is augmented by an approach to discussing people of color, women, and other historically marginalized populations in terms of marginalization and the adverse effects of difference rather than on the value of such difference or the particular strengths and resilience associated with the identities. Does this pathologizing of difference reproduce and codify marginalization? Pete had more to say about where these ideas come from, and what keeps them from being examined or changed.

> Jason: So if we were to talk about white males, would we only be able to talk about them in terms of them having trials in life? Or…

> Pete: See, when I think of maybe the few times that I've heard white males talked about is in getting them to understand their privilege.

Jason: Now, do you identify as a white male?

Pete: Yeah.

Jason: So, have you been talked to about your privilege?

Pete: "Talked to" has a negative connotation. Have I been through exercises that have —

Jason: —that helped you illuminate the male privileges that you enjoy?

Pete: Helped me illuminate the male privileges, yes. But I also identify as an individual with a disability. As well. Because I'm dyslexic. And so I've had a lot of trials and tribulations through that. That I also identify with. I have kind of figured out, in my experiment of life, whatever the heck you want to call it, I've figured out that that gives me some insight into these other groups, that have had difficulties.

Jason: So you're able to understand something about…

Pete: Being discriminated against. That kind of thing.

Jason: Kind of just to jump back a second… Most of the vandalism and violence, assaults and the like, are being done by men. Okay? As someone with a psychology background, do you attribute those behaviors, by anybody, as developmental in nature? Or stemming from a developmental issue?

Pete: Oh, yeah.

Jason: And you work in student affairs. Do you consider student affairs a field that is about facilitating development?

Pete: Uh-huh. (yes)

Jason: So if the behaviors that… you're seeing man after man after man coming through your office, having exhibited behavior that's rooted in developmental issues, and you're in a field—

Pete: Why do we not do programming and developmental for men?

Jason: Well, that would seem like… I mean, you're smiling, so I mean…

Pete: It's a good question. It's a good question. But it's not one that…and it's not one that people think about. And I think I, I literally think I could walk into an office, and say, or walk into my boss's office and say, "I want to do a class on developmental issues for young men," and I think that would be received well. I also would say that not a lot of people… I'm in housing. I'm a straight white male. I'm probably a minority in my field. And so… I mean, you, would you agree or disagree with that statement?

Jason: It's true that the field of student affairs is populated by more women than men. And it's true that there's a lot of gay and lesbian people, and people of color in the field.

Pete: Because of the acceptance of the field.

Jason: Some would cite that, yeah. You're mentioning this for a reason. Like, does this mitigate how you—

Pete: No, I'm thinking that… The reason I'm saying that is because I don't feel, that if I went in saying I want to do this presentation, I feel that I would be supported. But…I would say that it's not done a lot because there's a minimal amount of white males, or even straight white males in the field, and therefore as people who are not straight white males, already have a soapbox to be on. Per se. Like if I'm an African-American male, I'm going to be, my soapbox that I want to do a presentation on, or a training on, is probably going to be African-American issues. Or if I'm a gay male. That's probably what I want to do presentations and training on. And so maybe the lack of, and I'm just stabbing here, [laughs], just stabbing…

Jason: It's confidential.

Pete: Maybe the lack of, and you can circle it all back into, the lack of the fact that there are not very many of these presentations or these trainings for young white men, or young men, is because, number one, there are not very many straight white men in the field, and I would think that if you were an African-American man, you're going to have a different perspective, and you would probably rather do…some sort of training or presentation on African-American men, and that would circle right back with, we probably wouldn't want to talk, we don't, we're… A lot of men are not real open about feeling and confronting their issues, and so therefore it wouldn't be at the forefront of our mind to say, Hey, let's do this training.

Jason: Couple different constraints there. Yeah. So an African-American hall director, or a lesbian hall director, is also encountering male students in their

office….Are you suggesting that people are choosing subjects that are personally relevant but not directly helpful to working with the students who are presenting issues for them? [Pause.] Did that question make sense?

Pete: That question makes sense. But I think you're giving intentionality to something that doesn't have intentionality. I don't think that…

Jason: So it gets more to just what people are drawn to, in terms of—

Pete: Of what their experience is.

Jason: Do you ever hear an African-American colleague suggest that they would appreciate it if people would stop assuming that they're only interested in talking about diversity, or that they're the ones who only get called for those things? I, I may also be stabbing.

Pete: [Pause.] Yes. And no. Yes in the sense of, why am I always the one that's asked about this question, but no in the sense of, I think all hall directors, or all of us in the field, are always pulled from someplace to do diversity training. Of all shapes and sizes.

Rick and I spent some time on considering what the men's issues might be if one were inclined to look into them. It was so strange to me, reading the transcript, how often the respondents would talk at length about developmental needs of women, of people of color, and lesbian and gay people, yet would clam up in one way or another on the subject of white males. Even more striking was that when I asked Rick if he had looked into his privileges, he immediately began to discuss his dyslexia-his oppression? Is this further evidence of a victim orientation? Is it possible that in order to have a legitimate

voice, or perhaps any voice within Student Affairs, that one must speak from the

perspective of oppression or victimhood? Is this a currency in the profession?

Jason: What's your sense of male students' developmental needs? What do you suppose they are?

Rick: I'm really, I'm always really hesitant to talk in kind of a general "male students" sort of way. You know, I've been doing that for some time now, but then I started to think, Okay, development-wise, I think development's such an individualized thing. I think, for the most part, every student should be required to take some sort of cultural awareness, some sort of who-you-are-as-a-person awareness sort of course, where you talk about what it means to be a white male or a black female or whatever. And I think it's important that you have mix of people in there, so that—

Jason: Well, what does it mean to be a white male?

Rick: I don't know. Because I never had an opportunity for a course like that. It's something that I struggle with, because I don't know, I think the answer is there isn't an answer. Because for every individual, it's gonna be something different. A lot of times, I find myself not, like if I compare myself to white male students that I generally meet, even to white males on RA staff, I don't, at their age, I didn't fit in in the same place that they were because I came from a rather poor family that had less value on education, these sorts of things. It wasn't predestined that I was going to college. My parents didn't pay for any of my college. These sorts of things. And so I never really felt like I connected with them. But to say, we're both white males, and we both have the same developmental needs… I didn't always see that. And I think it's important that people see that it doesn't mean, well, she's a black female. So that means that

she's poor, or that she's on welfare, or, you know, any of that. It's important people see that you have to look at the individual.

This is another peculiar example where maleness and whiteness are invisible. Notice that Rick started his answer to the meaning of being a white male with "I don't know," and then talked about the importance of dealing with people as individuals. When he mentioned black females, he mentioned avoiding mention of being poor and on welfare. Is it females about whom welfare assumptions are made? Clearly not-the stereotype pertains to African-Americans in particular. Rothenberg (2004) describes the ways in which whiteness is assumed, and difference is understood in relation to it. Whiteness, and maleness operate such that they are always being discussed, but couched in terms of "people" and "individuals." Christopher describes this similarly.

> Jason: Well, I had asked you about any readings or discussions in your graduate program, and based on what you said after that about the department, is it fair to say you don't recall any information, readings, or discussions in the department, at any of the schools you work at, on a professional level?

> Christopher: We've dealt with majority students, and I think we lump white males into that. But there's a lot more to it than that. I mean, I think we deal with things that are different from the norm, and white males are the norm, so we just assume we treat them normally. I know how to do that. But I don't think it's ever addressed. I think we just assume that what we do is going to be good enough for them because we base it on whatever kind of philosophies and outlooks. So there's got to be something else we can do.

The majority of the participants did not recall any readings, discussions, or information provided to them about men in their graduate programs. Rick described this in a manner that fits with my point about centering whiteness and maleness.

> Rick: It was more like, these are great general theories, especially for white heterosexual men. They won't always perfectly fit, but, you know, it was kind of like, one of these should work. And as you move down the spectrum into more minorities, into women, into people of different ethnic groups—I should say white American males, white heterosexual American males—as you move down the line into these groups, then it would be less likely to apply, to the point where if you get to counseling a Chinese woman, a homosexual Chinese woman in China, like, none of these theories, you'd be lucky if one applied, I guess is kind of the attitude. Because you have to understand that these are kind of for your culture, for your group, and the further you get away from them, the less likely you are to be able to use them.

It was his use of the phrases, "down the spectrum," and "down the line" that really typified my thesis-the same set of realities in CSP socialization both institutionalize hegemonic masculinity and simultaneously distance men's authentic needs from view. Maalik, who is an African-American man, constructed this similarly.

> Maalik: I know a lot of the theories that we studied were, they were based on research of predominantly white males...They were said to be used… they apply for both male and female students.

> Jason: This thing about the research being, where they used white males for their research subjects?

Maalik: Uh huh. (yes)

Jason: Was that a topic of discussion in your graduate program?

Maalik: Yes…I mean, the discussion focused mainly on the fact that these theories were developed based on research of white males, and they may not necessarily be applicable to Black males or to Asian males or to Latino males. Just that if these individuals weren't considered in the research, how can they necessarily be applied successfully to…the issues they're facing.

Jason: So it's not necessarily useful for Black males, or Black people, or Asian males, Asian people…Do you feel that the theories helped you understand white males?

Maalik: Sure. I think a lot of the theories are, can be applied to, I mean, certain, maybe certain parts of the theory may not necessarily work, but I think, in general, some of the ideas, as far as student development, can be applied to any student. 'Cause I think a lot of students deal with a lot of the same issues. I think that's fair to say.

Susie, a 24-year-old Caucasian woman working at a large research university in the Great Lakes, illustrated this set of points similarly:

Jason: Okay. Do you recall any information, readings, or discussions in your graduate training that pertained to male students specifically?

Susie: No.

Jason: What do you make of that? That it wasn't covered?

Susie: I gotta think…

Jason: Well, did you notice anything about women specifically?

Susie: We did do some…we read a couple articles about women's moral development. But we didn't spend a lot of time on that, either. I do remember at one point talking about how a lot of the classic theories, like Chickering and things like that, were all-male studies. So I don't know if that was the reason for reading another few articles on women's development, because so many of the traditional mainstream studies are based typically on males. I remember even, actually, in my leadership class reading some articles about women's leadership. The rest were general, but nothing specific that differentiated between men and women.

Jason: Did you find that the readings that were added were helpful to your understanding of women?

Susie: Yeah. I found I related to them a lot.

Jason: Did you find that the classic theories based on all men were useful to your understanding of men?

Susie: I found they were useful in understanding of people in general. Like, I didn't think they applied… I mean, I could see if that's what the study was based, it may not be perfect at all times, but I could see applying them to both.

Jason: Whereas the stuff you were reading about women was for women specifically.

Susie: Yeah.

Susie also talked about men needing to learn about their responsibility for sexual assault. I asked her what they needed to learn, and she said that some things that were acceptable at home are not acceptable at college, and they need to learn about consent and the law.

Only one of my participants specifically recalled discussing men as gendered beings in graduate school, and it turned out to be both hilarious and frustrating. Maggie is a new RD, only 24-years-old, and recently graduated from a well-known regional master's program. She is Caucasian, and works at a large public research university in the Great Lakes.

Jason: In terms of your graduate training. In this case, at [Name of University]. Do you recall any information, readings, or discussions, in your graduate training that specifically pertained to male students? And if so, what was it?

Maggie: Definitely. My professor, [name], is a big advocate for men's issues. And, I think that if I were ever to run into something where I was stumped about it, and in this conversation that we're having reminds me of discussions that we had about this in class. I would go to him. Because he… I think he makes me think about things in a way that I didn't. Because he talks about how we always have, like, women's centers, because stereotypically, the rest of the campus gets to be the men's center. So, we did do a lot of reading and discussing and presentations and…learning from each other. He did a program at ACPA that I attended with people from other institutions. So I have learned about it.

Jason: What were some of the… Can you say more about the kinds of things that he or other people in your program talked about? Particular items?

Maggie: He talked a lot about…they did sexual assault programs just for men in fraternities about consent and what that means.

Jason: That was the one at ACPA?

Maggie: No, that was just at our school.

Jason: Like rape culture or something.

Maggie: Yeah, kind of. I mean, I think it's, just kind of a guy to guy, what's okay, what's not okay, sort of discussion. I don't know, 'cause I wasn't there and just kind of heard about it after the fact, but…

Jason: Oh, it was something that he did on the campus.

Maggie: Yes.

Jason: And then discussed it in the class.

Maggie: Yes.

Jason: I got it. Okay.

Maggie: Um, and then, something that always sticks out in my head, the way that we're kind of socialized to deal with men is what he referred to as "Bad Dogging" them. Like, always saying, "Don't do that. That's wrong." But not having any

sort of discussion, or follow-up. So then, men learn that's wrong, or that's wrong in front of that person, but they don't learn really why. And women, it's more flowery, or like… We just don't bad dog women the same way that we do men.

Jason: What do you think of that notion?

Maggie: It's completely unequal.

Jason: What do you mean?

Maggie: It's not fair that we do that. It's not fair that we treat women in a more, like I said, flowery, I guess, way than men.

Jason: More gentle?

Maggie: Yeah…or delicately.

Jason: So, I've gotten, in grad school, now, you talked about the sexual assault programs for men in fraternities where men are talking with each other about it, this notion of the bad dog and not being as delicate or gentle with, or flowery with, the males. Any other things that came up in grad school?

Maggie: Not right now.

Maggie's professor is a friend of mine, and obviously I coined the term, "Bad Dog." I had great difficulty keeping a straight face during this exchange. Later, I had time to reflect on how, even though the concept was explicitly discussed in her graduate training, she had not been applying or thinking about the concept until I asked. The

training and socialization she experienced on the job buried the notion somehow. So

what prevents the issue from becoming discussed or pursued at work?

Perceptions of Utility

The issue of utility becomes complicated given the earlier conversation about

invisibility. Consider, for instance, what Amanda has to say about the prospect of

looking into men's development. She is a Caucasian woman in her 2nd year at a major

public research university in the Great Lakes.

> Jason: If you pursued information—the previous question was, if you wanted to,
> where would you go—if you pursued the information about male students'
> development, would it make any difference in your work with them?

> Amanda: Yes. 'Cause I think I would have a better understanding. I think often,
> though, it's a challenge to take that time and sit down and to pursue specific
> things unless there are issues jumping out at you…that you want to make a
> difference in.

> Jason: Would having many more men coming through the office [cause this to
> happen]?

> Amanda: Definitely, and if we were starting to see some trends in issues, I think
> that would definitely send some red flags up, like we need to figure out what's
> going on and start talking about this issue and ways to approach it and start to
> reduce some of the things that we're seeing.

It is typical that men populate the judicial meetings, and so it is not noticeable,

and so there isn't a stimulus to look into it any further. Toward the end of my interviews,

I got acknowledgements from most participants that it would be useful, or that their work would be improved if they look into men's identity development. Interestingly, few of those who felt that way said they thought that their work had been undermined or diminished for lack of having this information.

Jason: If you pursued information about male students' development, do you think it would make any difference in your work with them?

Hannah: Mm hm (yes). Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. I think so.

Jason: What has stopped you?

Hannah: [Laughs.] I don't know. That's a really good question. I never really stopped to think about…what am I doing to [do to] learn more about my male students? Since I came to [Name of university] I haven't…And I haven't sought out any resources, either. And I think it's because we've been so trained to overlook the white male students…or the male students altogether. Because we need to focus on our women's development, and also, me coming from [Name of women's university], I kind of have a soft spot for women's development and stuff, and women's empowerment, and focusing on that. But yeah, I think…I kind of feel guilty about it now. [Laughs.] You know. I've been doing, you know, 50% of my job where I've been looking at women, but not men. So… *(Hannah said she had been feeling guilty, and I need to stop for a moment to change tapes)*

Jason: Before I left, you said you were feeling guilty.

Hannah: [Laughs.] Yeah, I think it's just one of those things that I'm like, Okay, now I'm definitely going to have to keep an eye out for, and search, and see what else is out there. And make sure that that's an area that I'm paying attention to and not just turning a blind eye to.

Jason: Well, you said that it would make a difference in your work if you—

Hannah: Mm hm (yes).

Jason: So, looking backwards, how has your work been affected by NOT doing it?

Hannah: I think that I am guilty of falling into stereotypes as well…And I think that it's happened where, any kind of party night, or a night that you know is gonna be a little bit more rowdy or something, you typically, you watch the male floors. You don't watch the female floors. Being at [Name of previous university], with a smaller residence hall, about 200, where I had 75% male and 25% female, I was always on the male floor…Because I knew that that's where the issues were. I knew that's where the trouble was. I wouldn't go through the female floor…I would just peer down there. Where the male floors, I was like up to the door, being like, "What's going on in here?" I think I'm guilty of falling into those stereotypes.

Jason: What do you suppose the consequence of that would be?

Hannah: They know that I…they know. But I also remember being at [Name of previous university], and having really good relationships with all my students, whereas they knew that I was also going to ask them about their day and how things were going and stuff like that. But there were a couple strained

relationships because, because I knew them so well, I knew that they were partying, and I knew they were drinking, and so they knew I was gonna, like, pursue them and stuff. So I think it, I think there were some negative consequences because they knew that I would be up on the floors, they knew I would be looking for it, they knew that if they did bring it to my attention, I would pursue it, and I would knock on doors or whatever. And stuff. I don't want to give you the image that I was very militant up there, every night or whatever, but on the big nights, I was definitely up there, and making sure that they knew that my presence was there.

Abayomi had a number of experiences and thoughts that made him feel strongly that these issues are important. For instance, he shared a poignant reflection about a staff meeting he held, during which he became emotional.

Jason: Well, you know, for this work, do you think it's more relevant for guys who are soft, or guys in general, or what?

Abayomi: I think it's relevant for everyone, you know, be they parents, be they students, be they practitioners in the field, be they academic professors in the academic side too, be they women, you know, to understand that, um, for us to get out of this mentality of boxing people…we need to recognize that, you know, some of the attributes and characteristics that are ascribed to people by social norms, or, you know, the powers that be, [and these] can be misleading, you know…I mean that this work is good for all of us to demystify that myth, this machismo means that a man cannot cry, a man shouldn't do this, a man shouldn't do that, because personally I do cry. And for a long time I struggled with being able to cry, like I had a training session with my staff, and you know, it was one of those sessions where everybody talks about things that are very intimate to

them, and you know, I, I wept, like a baby there, and I'm getting to that point in my life where I shouldn't worry how people feel because I'm crying, which is…

Jason: (interrupting) What was their reaction to your weeping?

Abayomi: You know, some of them, came to me…it was very…I have a staff of 27 people, and lots of people wept because I was weeping, you know, I mean I had a number of…3 women were weeping because I was weeping and then, I have 3 African-American men on my staff who looked at me…they were really dumfounded, you know, in the meeting…in the place, but they came to me after the session and they told me that…well, you know, wow, Abayomi, you really touched…you really touched the part that you know…you really…they said you are very compassionate, they said it was very difficult for them…I didn't sense that by looking at their outward appearance and their countenance and all of that…I didn't sense that they were touched by my feeling, by me expressing my feelings by crying…I didn't sense that they felt it that way from looking at their countenance. But when the meeting was over and two of them, in fact, talked to me separately, that you know, Abayomi, I was so moved…I was so touched by you, and all of that, in fact [name] said, you know, I don't know…I just can't do it, you know, I can't cry like that in front of people. So it was like that, and then a lot of the staff, the women staff, there was dead silence in the room for a little while, but uh, but I didn't feel like, you know, I let anybody down like I usually did, which is something I always felt when I shed tears publicly…I always felt like, why did I do this? Why did this happen to me, you know, I should have gone to the bathroom or something, you know.

Lutz (1999) describes the ways in which crying is mediated by sex and culture, and men are often commended for their self control when not shedding tears in difficult situations, whereas women are actually censured for not doing so. He then cites a famous

study (Condry & Condry) in which identical photos of crying babies are shown to people. When the people are told the baby is male, they assume he is crying out of anger, and the girl baby is crying out of fear. The shame that Abayomi had felt, he said, was something he developed in the U.S., which is a testament to its rigidity and power given he has only lived here seven years. Nonetheless, he thought that modeling (albeit inadvertently) the expression of authentic emotion for his staff-particularly the males, was something that had great benefit to them and to him. The hegemonic masculinity imposes itself on men from all backgrounds (though this impact is nuanced by his particular set of identities). Abayomi's account of the three African-American men's responses to his weeping-that they were dumfounded, yet held a guarded expression concealing this during the meeting, is illustrative of the particular pressures facing men whose racial identity experiences necessitate an additional layer of self-protection (Williams, 1995). This armor has its emotional utility, but just as it locks potentially threatening people out, so too does it lock the man in.

A couple of participants were somewhat skeptical that they would find useful information if they looked into men's issues.

Jason: If you pursued information about male students' development, would it make any difference in your work with them?

Susie: It might. A lot of the things I've talked about have been on experiences, and life experiences, work experiences, some assumptions based on those things, and there definitely could be information out there that I'm not aware of that could, so definitely could shape or change the way I'm doing things. It could also be like, Oh, yup, you're right on track. It could be reaffirming. But since I

haven't done any reading, I don't want to say for sure if it would reaffirm, 'cause it could also dispel a lot of the things that I think are there.

Jason: Readings on women's development, have they been helpful for your work with women?

Susie: I think so. In understanding, the things that stick out in particular to me are with women's leadership development, and the different styles of leadership, and what it takes to be successful and how different styles of leadership are becoming more successful. And that's been particularly helpful, for me personally, but also in talking with my female students who want to, have aspirations, who want to be in business, or be in leadership positions.

Jason: So if there was an article about men's leadership development, do you suppose that would be helpful?

Susie: I guess, since I've read nothing on particularly men, I would say yes. But I would expect it see a lot of, what we think of when we think of traditional leadership. When we think of someone who is (voice deepens)…very assertive, very powerful, strong in opinion, very career-driven, but what you would think of when you think of your typical business CEO, would be what I would expect to read. But I could be totally wrong.

Jason: Well, what if the article talked about why the men's ways of doing leadership looked that way? I mean, like you said, there's this, the hierarchical, the assertive, whatever. Maybe if there were an article that explained how that happened, or why—

193

Susie: That would be helpful, to understand the why, 'cause definitely the women's leadership articles talk about why women have this different style of leadership, based on socialization and gender and society expectations. It would be very interesting to see why male's leadership is that way.

Jason: When you were describing what you thought might possibly be in the article, your voice changed a little bit, almost like, not something that you were happy about, or—

Susie: [Laughs.] Yeah.

Jason: Could you say more about that?

Susie: Sure. When I think about leadership and expectations, I definitely think that traditional leadership model that we associate mostly with men is very welcomed and expected from men, but when women try to lead that way, it [casts] them in a very negative sort of light. It's almost a double standard. Which is why my tone, I'm like, I'm talking about this, and this is successful for men, but I knew if I were to do that, I'd be looked at as, you know, to be colorful, I would [maybe] be looked at as a bitch, you know, that type of stuff. So it's very double standard. So I guess that's why my tone went…

Pay No Attention to the Man Behind the Curtain

Katz (2002) describes Masculinity with the device of the famous scene in The Wizard of Oz, when Dorothy and her companions pull back the curtain in the inner sanctum of the All-Powerful Wizard, to reveal a meek little man who had been hiding there, orchestrating the presentation of the menacing wizard. Dorothy reacts angrily, "You're a very bad man!" to which he responds, defeated, "Oh, no my dear, I'm a very

good man…I'm just a very bad wizard." Katz describes this metaphor as emblematic of the projection that boys and men learn very early in their lives must be done in order to achieve the moniker, "real man." Yet, it is unachievable. It took Dorothy a long time to bother looking behind the curtain because the projection demanded attention, and it demanded that she and her companions do a lot of work, which served to make the little man invisible for a long time.

> Hannah: …You know what's interesting, though, I did a practicum over in Judicial Affairs last year for my grad program. And I noticed that the students that were coming in the most in Judicial Affairs were white 18-year-old males. And I remember saying to my practicum supervisor, [Name], I remember saying to him, "That would be a really good research topic. To find out why these white male 18-year-olds are in here the most." And every once in a while, you know, we'd have a woman come through.
>
> Jason: What was his reaction?
>
> Hannah: He was…he talked about white males, 18-year-olds, typically come from middle-class families. A lot of them were pot smokers. A LOT of them were the marijuana kids. That, or the marijuana cases that came through were white 18-year-old males. But, that they come from middle-class families, they've had mom and dad around all their lives, they've been very protected, they haven't had much accountability, and then they come to college, thinking of the same thing, and then all of the sudden they're getting in trouble. And they haven't learned how to be responsible for themselves yet, and they haven't learned the rules, and they think that they're above the rules. And so, but I remember being in Judicial and just thinking, This could be a really interesting topic to look into, about why 90%

of our cases were white male 18-year-olds. They're first-year students. And the biggest infraction was the marijuana. They would come in with pot.

Jason: You mentioned to him that it would be a good research topic, and he, his response was to tell you about them being middle class and all that?

Hannah: Mm hm. Oh, yeah.

Jason: Did he think that you were on to something? Or…?

Hannah: Mm hm (yes). Well, he said that it would be interesting. And I don't remember if he said anything about, like, other resources that I could access. I don't remember that. I don't think he—

Jason: So he said it would be interesting, and then kind of…

Hannah: Like, it would be, but… Yeah, I remember sitting there going, "These guys that I'm meeting with are all the same demographic. They're first-year males, they're white, and they're all dealing with marijuana. Like, something, we gotta catch here. What's the link between all of these?"

Jason: Have you done any more since that time?

Hannah: No.

Student Affairs, like other professions, gives newcomers explicit and implicit messages about what is important, and what is legitimate. I asked my participants how they felt they would be responded to if they suggested at a department meeting that time should be taken to explore men's identity issues. Every one of them said that the response

would be that it would be interesting, or sounds like a good idea. But, none of them had ever heard anyone make such as suggestion (with the exception of how to teach them responsibility for privilege or sexual assault). In a nutshell, they were free to pursue it, but there was no encouragement to do so, whereas there was encouragement to pursue other things. The desire to be seen as competent and having a contribution to make impacted their decisions about how to spend their already severely limited time. Christopher and I explored this further.

> Christopher: I think I'm in the minority in student affairs, as far as how that goes. I've never heard anybody mention that there needs to be [attention] to white males. I think, to males in general, there needs to be something. Because I think it's a population. The fact that if we had, if our group of core students that we saw in judicials were African-American males, there would be an outcry on this campus of, what can we do to get to the root of this problem, What sorts of multicultural efforts can we throw at it…what sorts of issues are being raised in our multicultural students. Let's form committees, Let's do this, that and the other. But the fact that it's basically male majority students that are doing this, it's not a problem. It's just a part of the job. And I don't agree with that. I do it because it's part of my job. Maybe I've been brainwashed into thinking that, you know, what are you going to do? Somebody's gotta commit judicials, so based on the law of averages, it's probably gonna be majority males. But, I don't know.

> Jason: …But let's say you were saying, "You know, I was talking to this crazy dissertation researcher, and it occurred to me that we don't really get taught in our graduate programs anything about the identity development of white men. I'm not suggesting that we make a committee, mind you, but I think it would be worthwhile, given that most of our discipline involves them, that we dug more

deeply into it." Let's suppose you said it like that. What kind of reaction do you think you'd get to that?

Christopher: I think I'd get…and this is going to be completely the new person's perspective, but…Here at [name of university], we have a way of saying, "Hey, I'm thinking about this." "Great. Wonderful." So that would be what I'd be told. "Great. Wonderful. See what you can do…see what you can dig up." But I doubt very highly that anybody in the senior staff in this department would be interested in what I did because [it's not me who] is making the decisions. The senior staff…

Jason: It's a big department.

Christopher: It is. When you've got… The department would agree with what I have to say. They would listen to me…they'd make me feel like I was important. But, when it came down to them actually doing something about it…Those kind of things don't get you awards. You don't get awards for your commitment to white male students. You get awards for your commitment to diversity. You get awards for your commitment to the LGBT committee. And things like that. There's not any publicity that we can give ourselves for that. And I think that drives us a lot. And that's what I think…And that may be very cynical, but I think that's a lot of reality behind it. I question, if we didn't get…how many of the things that we do are genuine? And how many of them are simply so [name of university] says, "We're LGBT friendly. We're diversity friendly. We have a multi-cultural philosophy." If we didn't get those kinds of things, as far as…I question the motives behind some of those sometimes. I guess that's…

Jason: Maybe a superficiality to the way we treat diversity?

Christopher: I think so. There's a strong commitment to diversity, but there again, if we weren't recognized from ACUHO as being a very [diversity accepting] place, or one of the top ten schools that appreciate diversity…Do you see what I'm saying?

Where Would You Go?

Jason: Let's suppose the campus president said, "You know, I've noticed that the vast majority of these particular incidents are being done by male students. I'm going to convene a task force." And you get put on the task force. What would you, in terms of suggesting to the group, a direction of how to study the problem, or what to do about the problem, what might you suggest?

Miguel: I would try to tap into…I guess some of those things that I would consider genderized [sic] male notions, and see how you could kind of solve that, in a way that would become… I guess, I like the idea of the campus citizen, and if you kind of put, if you're a leader, if you want to lead, if you want to stand out at [name of university], exercising civility makes you stand out, and makes you prominent.

Jason: So reframing some desired behaviors as a way to achieve the things that a man is trying to achieve.

Miguel: Yeah. Standing out, and being in the lead, being a person of recognition. Because everything is based on motivation. People make choices. And I think that for lots of men, that's kind of why they make those choices. They want to stand out. They want to be different. They want to be on their own. They want to show that they can stand on their own two feet. And if others get in the way of that… But if you can do that in a way that, kind of like you were saying, you

reframe it so that good attributes, good qualities, good behaviors give you that same thing, then go with that.

The most common answer from my participants to the question of where they'd go to find out more information if they wished to do so, was to "Google" it, referring to the popular web-based search engine. Beyond that, they thought there might be some resources in the professional journals, the Chronicle of Higher Education, or in the Eric database. Some of them thought asking a supervisor or colleague would be good, but few were acquainted with anyone whom they knew to have an interest or expertise in the area.

Jason: If you wanted to learn more about male students' development, where would you look?

Kelly: Initially, I would probably go to the senior staff members within the complex who are male. And talk to them. I work with a couple really great people who would be good resources for me…The Counseling Center. I keep mentioning that because I know a man over there who's been a liaison for us, so I've worked with him a couple times… I guess just articles in general, looking at different studies and research, procedures that've been done.

Jason: If you pursued information about male students' development, would it make any difference in your work with them?

Kelly: I guess it would depend (on) the information I found out. Right now, I don't think there would be a big difference, but perhaps there would, depending on what I learned.

Jason: And things that have kept you from looking into it are, what are some of those things?

Kelly: Well, time. [Laughs.] In particular. One thing I guess I haven't mentioned is LGBT issues. You know, and I have met with a couple male students who've been in situations where they happen to be gay, and their roommates are very uncomfortable with that, and so they've come and talked to me about that. I just remembered that.

Most of the interviews ended with me feeling very much like I had changed my participant. There was a sense of enthusiasm and interest expressed by them that I was convinced would result in a shepherding of this subject into their department. I thought perhaps I'd get a call from some of them, or from their department wanting me to visit and conduct a training on this subject-it wasn't my agenda to do this, just a feeling I got from the interviews. I identified five participants to whom I sent a follow-up email about 6-8 weeks after our interview, asking about what they had done with the topic since we met. Four responded. Three of them indicated that they had thought a bit but had not pursued much more than a conversation (one said she was trying to pay more attention with students, but didn't specify how). Abayomi wanted to talk, and we held another 45 minute interview by phone. Some of the things he shared with me, such as the story about crying in his staff meeting, really rounded out my appreciation for what he had to say. As we wrapped up our call, he said some things that make me feel very hopeful.

Jason: Well, what's next for this issue for you?

Abayomi: For me, I really hope to write, I hope to really find…I was hoping during this break I was going to really try to pull some of your resources here, like references and so on, and other resources that might be out there, and try to look at this more critically and see if I could contribute to this in my own small way, from an international perspective, making reference to Africans specifically since that's an area which I think I know…I've traveled to about 8 different African countries from the north, south, and east of Africa. So, for me what it's led to is really looking at this and how applicable it is from an international perspective, but also to look at this conversation not just as a gender issue, but as a cultural issue, because I think there's that component which might be overlooked, but I think I can feel it based on the fact that I happen to come from a different culture, background.

Jason: Is there anything else that you want to add?

Abayomi: No, I just wanted to add that this is a very great work, Jason, and I really appreciate the fact that I can talk with you and I hope to really, by G-d's grace, if I get to see you again, I will have done some work independently and to have something concrete, even on paper on the, on what I want to call the non-traditional perspective on the issue, which I think that this applies to someone like myself who is from a cultural background that is hardly mentioned in terms of research and studies like this…but you know I should have something practical and concrete so that I could borrow ideas from you and try coaching it to develop myself.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The Bottom Line

> *Criticism is futile because it puts a person on the defensive and usually makes him strive to justify himself. Criticism is dangerous, because it wounds a person's precious pride, hurts his sense of importance, and arouses resentment...By criticizing, we do not make lasting changes and often incur resentment...The resentment that criticism engenders can demoralize employees, family members and friends, and still not correct the situation that has been condemned (Carnegie, 1937, pp. 5-6).*

These words are found in the perennially popular, "*How to Win Friends and Influence People*" by Dale Carnegie. Writing this chapter, reflecting on the question of what I found and what it means, I was drawn to Carnegie's statement because I think it encapsulates the points of my project. Student Affairs is a field that espouses a set of values with which I personally agree, namely the pursuit of a pro-feminist, anti-racist, gay-affirmative agenda in facilitating students' identity development. The ways in which the new professionals, or more specifically, Residence Hall Directors, in my study make meaning of their work in general, and their work with men in particular, provided a great deal of insight into a problem of practice. The problem that I believe has been illuminated is that a cadre of bright, young professionals are entering a field that espouses the set of values I mention, and indeed the graduate and workplace training seem to claim that these values undergird the experience-yet these locations do not seem to provide

newcomers with a venue for critical reflection about how they might engage men to advance these values in the context of a developmental intervention. In short, there appears not to be a conceptual/theoretical basis upon which to view men as gendered beings. Consequently, practitioners may be flying blind, so to speak, missing a fundamental category of analysis of lived experience in approximately half (and shrinking) their students.

I believe that fairly immediate benefits (both to the student and to the professional) would be realized if CSP professionals would be prepared to view men as gendered beings. Even if much of the work with men is in the context of responding to a problem (e.g. behavioral concern), if the professional engages the male student authentically without shaming him, they will likely achieve more in the developmental work with the student. This, in turn, has the potential to reduce problematic behavior and thus to increase time with students for its own sake rather than to merely stop a behavior—though I further argue more success in that regard could be realized as well.

Implications for Program Development

One of the toughest questions I have dealt with when considering the implications of what I have found is, how can I ask female, LGBT, or people of color in the profession, who have been and continue to be hurt by hegemonic masculinity (often enacted by males they encountered), to set aside or transform that hurt and find a tender place to meet a young man who has behaved badly? The young man in their office may not be the one who hurt the particular practitioner, but he likely benefits daily from the sexist, patriarchal structure of this society. My best answer is that the cost of overlooking

an opportunity to interrupt a sexist worldview (that might spare others from future harm

by this young man) is higher than the cost of subjugating one's own righteous indignation

for a short while. Moreover, since the young man is paying tuition, and the practitioner

has a social and legal contract to deliver a certain quality of service, it is perhaps a

fairness issue to expect a developmental approach.

Consider, for instance, how developing programs and services that function to

interrupt and challenge hegemonic masculinity specifically might in turn address racism,

sexism, and homophobia among college men. The current model, which I have billed,

"*Bad Dog*," not only deals superficially with the immediate behavioral stimulus for the

meeting, but it ignores the ways in which the male student has been inculcated into

normative gendered culture that encourages such behavior (e.g. homophobic, racist,

sexist). It ignores the man's unwitting participation in reifying hegemonic masculinity

that not only diminishes the humanity of the victim of the behavior, but also the humanity

of the man who carried out the behavior. Indeed, the practitioner has been socialized to

respond in this manner, and is also thus an unwitting participant in perpetuating this

vicious cycle. The current script for engaging the student, when followed, can activate

the shame in men described by Kimmel. This can distance the practitioners from that

vulnerable place inside the man that longs for connection and support, and that through

nurturing could profoundly change his participation in the community. The irony is that

the current approach is precisely opposite (unwittingly) the espoused values of the field.

I believe that my project offers an opportunity for Student Affairs to move past its

victim mentality (Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000) relative to its legitimacy on

campus. Many of the variables relating to student persistence fall within the domain of Student Affairs work. If Student Affairs can revisit the underlying assumptions and use a gendered view to look at men's development, then there can be a new relevance and concomitant authority of the field on college campuses. At the moment, victim status (in the practitioner and the student) may be a form of currency in the profession, such that it is the only voice that is heard. Clearly, this undermines any notion of agency on the part of historically marginalized groups relative to creating a more egalitarian society, and it eschews potential allies who can't shed their privilege, but who might be willing to trade on it to destabilize stratification.

Program models that "templatize" students ought to be discarded in favor of broader theoretical models with sub-units rooted in particular identities. This approach would allow practitioners to customize programs and other interventions according to the intended outcomes of the program. For example, a service-learning initiative should have components that correspond to men and women relative to their cognitive and psychosocial differences.

We must do better at promoting both individual male development and the normative culture that promotes adversarial and heterosexist relationships between men; and between men and women. These tasks are not easy. On the contrary, young men can be difficult to engage, perhaps because of societal reluctance to teach them to be more open (not for innate reasons). Nonetheless, left unchecked, CSP professionals and scholars become complicit in the problems discussed herein.

Many of my suggestions could begin implementation in work with homosocial locations such as Greek organizations and athletic teams. In my literature review, I dealt with the connections between these groups, alcohol abuse, and sexual violence and sexism. I believe an applied theoretical position rooted in gender research could make significant improvements to the benefits of these groups and reduce their harmful elements.

The profession of Psychology routinely utilizes supervision as a means of checking the personal issues of the individual therapist relative to the client. Do Residence Hall Directors have a support system in which they can discuss personal issues that are stimulated by their work? My experience has been that they are discouraged from referring students to their peers, in that it may give the appearance of incompetence. This raises interesting questions about professional practice and culture, and an opportunity to rethink staffing practices in Residence Life work. I believe some of the complex cost/benefit equations I have explored (e.g. asking a young professional to set aside or transform their own pain) could be eased by having a safe and supportive supervision model that is not necessarily the hierarchical kind (for instance, the availability of a consultant who is not in the supervision chain).

There are, of course, implications beyond those pertaining to Student Affairs work specifically. For instance, K-12 schools, parents, and community organizations ought to be engaged to think more critically about the ways in which boys (and girls) are raised and educated. There is a dire need to build capacity in boys and men to understand themselves as gendered beings, and to explore and express their gender identities in ways

that are meaningful and unencumbered by the stifling constraints of hegemonic masculinity. Given that the students we serve will become teachers, parents, businesspeople, clergy, spouses and partners, etc., there is certainly a place for Student Affairs to become more influential in this process via our work with students.

Implications for Research

The convolution of identity is further illustrated by various strands of critical theory that examine identities from a location that intentionally de-centers men and masculinity. For instance, Queer Theory grapples with sexism in power relations between gay men and lesbians through discussion about lesbians being "deprived of a political existence through 'inclusion' as female versions of male homosexuality" (Rich, 1986). Yet, at the same time, much of Queer Theory shares certain feminisms' arguments for the destabilization of patriarchy, in part through an end to binary notions of sex and gender (Jagose, 1996). This complicates the idea that gay men, who are stigmatized by, and excluded from hegemonic masculinity are thus comrades of lesbian women in the fight against heterosexism. Without a theoretical/conceptual framework for male gender identity, gay men are not given legitimacy as men on the one hand, but sexist behavior on the part of gay men toward each other and toward lesbians goes un-interrogated on the other.

Pertaining to retention theory, it seems ironic in a way, but there is a need for a new critical cultural perspective that deepens and broadens our understanding of campus climate issues. If a campus climate is indeed androcentric or hostile toward women, we need more complex language to describe and interrupt the phenomena in order to recruit

and retain male students in a manner that is not only beneficial to women, but to men as well. Obviously, the disproportionate representation of men in senior administrative and tenured faculty positions means *something*, but does whatever it means also include that male students are being encouraged more so than their female counterparts? If so, are CSP administrators and faculty doing this in equal proportion? In what ways are these things occurring?

In this study, I focused on the new professionals and their socialization. There is still a limited amount of scholarship on how this set of issues affects students, especially men. Davis (2002) identified some important experiences of men feeling left out on campus as they notice support services and efforts designed for women. What is the consequence of this? Polomsky and Blackhurst (2000) raised important questions about how disciplinary work may alienate male students. It would be important to examine the places where men are engaged compared to the places where they are not, and how this impacts development, satisfaction, behavior, and retention. For instance, where are men being supported in authentic, human ways that engage them more deeply than the superficial stereotype? Are there benchmarks to be found in this regard? As a Dean of Men myself, who intentionally invokes male gender identity in my meetings with students (including disciplinary as well as less formal), I am convinced by an overwhelming amount of anecdotal evidence that there is a rich body of knowledge that has not been captured in the Student Affairs literature. I would expect that it is possible to interrogate privilege and still do very personal and effective work with men.

Another question that should be explored is how the male students' experiences of the school as mediated by Residence Hall Directors may affect their perceptions of the institution and other administrative offices. For instance, given Polomsky and Blackhurst's (2000) findings, is it possible that men would decide not to participate in other campus activities (or some others) due to their experience with residence hall staff? This is clearly a provocative question, but it is a fair one.

McEwen, Williams and Engstrom (1991) explored the notion of feminization of the Student Affairs field. In their study, they discussed the mentoring and invitations offered to particular kinds of people who make personal connections with those already in the field, and they suggested looking into whether the population being recruited should be changed or expanded. They also cautioned that this is delicate, and that the values of the profession should not be threatened by too powerful a shift. Are the people who enter Student Affairs particularly different from those who do not? For instance, are the individuals representing identities that are more marginalized or wounded by the hegemonic standard than others? How does "who" enters the field mitigate the question of impact on male students?

I made an assertion that men of color are being viewed in terms of race, gay men in terms of sexual orientation, etc., rather than as men. It would have been interesting to change the case study to explicitly make some of the characters persons of color, gay, or other marginalized identity, to test out what would capture the attention of my participants. I think it would have complicated this particular study, but it would be beneficial to do in the future.

Despite overtly discussing identities such as race, gender, and sexuality, I could not adequately explore intersections in identities. I would be interested in exploring whether Student Affairs essentializes the feminism that is represented in the field, and which was represented in my analysis. Crenshaw (1989, in Wing, 2003) makes an important point in this regard:

> *I argue that Black women are sometimes excluded from feminist theory and antiracist policy discourse because both are predicated on a discrete set of experiences that often does not accurately reflect the interaction of race and gender. These problems of exclusion cannot be solved simply by including Black women within an already established analytical structure. Because the intersectional experience is greater than the sum of racism and sexism, any analysis that does not take intersectionality into account cannot sufficiently address the particular manner in which Black women are subordinated. Thus, for feminist theory and antiracist policy discourse to embrace the experiences and concerns of Black women, the entire framework that has been used as a basis for translating "women's experience" or "the Black experience" into concrete policy demands must be rethought and recast (p.24).*

In Chapter Four, for instance, I discussed my interview with Jamelia, who is an African-American woman. Specifically, I noted that she indicated she would not meet with the men who committed the assault in the case study if they had committed it elsewhere (and hence she had no policy authority with them). Also, she said that she didn't think of men and women students differently, but when asked about her husband,

she had more to say about gender differences. I would be very interested in interviewing more white women and women of color in Student Affairs about their experiences of gender issues, in order to tease out an analysis of the social construction of gender from a critical race and intersectional set of perspectives. To what extent are gender issues in Student Affairs rooted in whiteness? And how might this have shaped Jamelia's (and/or other women of color's) thoughts about the questions I asked? How might my own identities have mitigated this process? Does Student Affairs "do" gender in a way that not only re-inscribes men, but also whiteness? Even the way I am discussing this here could raise questions about binary notions of gender and their impact on a project like this one. I have not found the field to be particularly sophisticated in its use of identity theory, and so there is much room for new research and theory in this regard.

Implications for Graduate Preparation

There are several strategies that CSP can adopt in order to effectively engage developmental theory relating to male students and in turn to facilitate young men's psychosocial growth. The first is to critically augment primary student development theory as it is covered in graduate preparation programs, to overtly include male identity issues. In particular, such courses should include more recent works about male identity development and discuss their implications relative to traditional theories. Scholars such as Davis (2002) specifically address male identity development in the context of student affairs. Further, application to practice with male students should be addressed.

Male student development, in order to be understood, must be discussed in concert with (rather than instead with) other dimensions of identity such as race, sexual

orientation, ability, etc. (Jones & McEwen, 2000). Such convergence is important to understanding the phenomenon of identity development (particularly as extensions to multiple identity models), and would therefore inform good practice.

My suggestions include replacing or augmenting the foundational theory in CSP's graduate program curricula with some selections from a large and growing Men and Masculinity Studies, particularly the pro-feminist material that would be very compatible with the existing texts. These topics and materials should also be core items in new staff training, orientation and first-year experience programs. As an academic, I have found that men and women learn much about their own gender identity through exploration of men's and women's studies. Ideally, men and women would share core courses together on college campuses in which they could explore, examine, and interrupt patriarchal stratification and gender identity development.

Implications for Professional Associations

Professional associations (e.g. ACPA, NASPA) ought to do further examination of the impact of the gender imbalance in the field and on professional practice. I can't underwrite an assertion that a concerted effort should be made to recruit men into the field, because implicit is that only men can "do" gender work with men, which I do not believe. There are often discussions in K-16 education about the importance of male role models. I am deeply skeptical of the current level of analysis in this conversation. Referencing my opening narrative about my experience with a boys' career day, I do not want to increase the presence of men who perform hegemonic masculinity. For that matter, I do not want to perpetuate a conception of women that entwines their

predominance in a field with its lower status. We need to significantly change the profession's dealings with gender to interrupt the current power relations. I personally espouse men and women doing this collaboratively, but I am deeply aware of the difficulty in achieving such relationship.

Both ACPA and NASPA currently have elements (e.g. committees, task groups, research agendas, senior scholar programs, journals) that could take up a more complex discussion of gender as performed and socialized phenomena. My concern as an active member of both associations has been that the victim orientation has contributed to cultural differences between the two associations. NASPA, of course, is often described as the place where V.P.s, Deans, and Faculty go for professional development (and indeed I see many at the conferences); whereas ACPA is approximately 60% new professionals, and as such has a more youthful ethos. When I attended NASPA this year, I was introduced to someone as newly finishing a Ph.D., to which I was asked, "so, are you going to graduate up to NASPA?" The question connotes for me a stratification that is gendered, and I think both associations should be discussing this, especially in light of the latest iteration of a task force to consider merging.

Potential Limitations and Critiques of this Project

A possible critique of my general theoretical framework would be that the behavior on the part of professionals, being described by me as "bad-dogging" of male students (or shaming them, as the case may be) by female or "feminized" male staff, does not have the effect of complicity as earlier discussed. Rather, to challenge men, especially in strong ways, is transgressive of traditional gender scripts. Hence, it is

essentially "uppity" behavior and as such men will not only resist, but they may also react with indignation rooted in male privilege. Maybe the bad behavior *should* be treated shamefully? This tension embedded in my framework is one of the areas that would benefit from further study, though at the end of the day it would be difficult to "empirically prove" one way or another, and instead would in my view best be explored as a philosophical or sociological problem.

How might the findings come out if I had interviewed professionals from departments other than Residence Life? Do Student Activities or Career Services professionals consider men's gender identities? Does it matter whether they do or do not? I made the case that RDs are ideal cases, and that they have more likelihood of interacting with students than other professionals, but this does not mean that students don't encounter other professionals. Also, how does this issue play out in interactions with faculty? It would be useful to conduct a similar study with professionals from other departments and perhaps also faculty-especially those who teach first year required courses such as the basic writing class.

Since the case study was a significant part of the interviews, one might suggest that the initial reaction of the interviewees was simply a function of the nature of the case. In other words, if the perpetrators were women, would the reaction be similar? What if the victim was male? Since the participants found the case unremarkable, I would argue that it was precisely their conceptions of gender (men: perpetrator; women: victim) that suggests otherwise. I would expect that the hesitation and pause that followed the participants' discussion of their support of the victim would simply have

moved to an earlier location. I believe it would have been comprised of a need to adjust to an understanding that women committed these acts. As Ehrenreich (2004) described in her article, there is a collective expectation and often an acceptance of bad behavior by men, so much so that we often don't bother to mention gender when it pertains to boys' or men's bad behavior (Katz, 2002). The unearned privileges that men enjoy in a patriarchal system not only correspond with the oppression of women, but as Albert Einstein is credited with saying, "we can't solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them." To continue on in our work without critical introspection and analysis, CSP can unwittingly reproduce much of what we overtly wish to change.

Closing Thoughts for the Good of the Order

I began this dissertation with a story about going to a boys' career day and talking with them about the meaning of being a man today. The experience was so powerful that I found it necessary to call two of my close male friends to process the experience immediately afterward. I find myself in a very difficult and complicated personal situation as a straight, white man who sincerely wants to promote social justice and to interrupt racist, sexist, and homophobic oppression; and who wants to offer boys (including my own sons) the most nurturing encouragement to grow into compassionate, strong, intelligent, and successful men without abdicating criticality. The reason I say this is difficult and complicated is because the privileges afforded my sons and me are attached to us-it is not something we can throw away. So, since I can't simply disavow

my privileges, I have been seeking a solution that is not patronizing or diminishing to others and that does not leave me stuck in a guilty quagmire.

A particular situation that helped me to advance my understanding of the correspondence between privilege and oppression, and how I might navigate the tensions aspirations I have just mentioned, happened two years ago. It is an event that I will never forget and which I hope can be helpful to readers of this dissertation. Through a variety of circumstances, I became the Board President for a local non-profit organization whose mission is to assist Somali refugees with re-settlement needs. The organization's Executive Director is a Somali man and the Assistant Executive Director is an African-American woman. The insecurities I alluded to earlier were even more activated when I was asked to serve in this capacity. At a lunch with my two colleagues, I shared candidly that I felt awkward about being a white man and serving as Board President for this organization. It seemed to me that there should be Somalis, or at least African Diaspora, in the leadership of the Board. However, I also shared my understanding that the various privileges that I have might be useful to advancing the organization. Perhaps more than being white and male, my being a dean at a local college could open certain doors useful to the agency. Finally, I expressed my respect for their wisdom and experience. In sum, I understood it was my privilege more than a particular talent that might effect change, and I never wanted to diminish either of them personally or give an impression of arrogance on my part. They listened thoughtfully, and then the Assistant Executive Director leaned in, extended her hand, and said, "If you've got cards to play, you play 'em, brother!" It was a moment of mutual liberation.

It is this point that I believe is terribly important to the questions we are discussing here: The current arrangements and demarcations existing in the world cause, through the acts of individuals and groups, the distribution of power to occur in many different privileging and oppressing ways. It thus seems to me that any hope for equity begins with honestly seeking to understand the particular ways this distribution influences our various truths and our respective access to power, utilizing opportunities to exchange these currencies openly and communally when possible, and recognizing the imprecise and awkward dynamics that can arise. That may seem Pollyannish, but with respect to my aspirations for social justice ally work, it is the best I can do with my current identities and my current understanding. I'm told it has been helpful, and I am grateful for that.

So, I close with an invitation to consider offering your own "life station," 25 minutes or so, to boys and men you encounter. Together, make a space to explore what being male has meant for them, and for you. I don't know for certain what answers will come, but I sincerely believe a healing path will begin there.

Out beyond the field of wrong doing and right doing, there is a field. I will meet you there. –Rumi

APPENDIX A: TABLE OF PARTICIPANTS BY DEMOGRAPHY

NAME	AGE	GENDER	RACE/ETHNICITY
Abayomi	31	Male	Black, West-African
Amanda	31	Female	Caucasian
Bob	25	Male	Caucasian
Cassandra	25	Female	Caucasian
Christopher	24	Male	Caucasian
Hannah	25	Female	Caucasian
Jamelia	28	Female	African-American
Kelly	23	Female	Caucasian
Maalik	24	Male	African-American
Maggie	24	Female	Caucasian
Miguel	29	Male	Chicano
Nathan	27	Male	Caucasian
Nina	24	Female	African-American
Pete	29	Male	Caucasian
Rick	29	Male	Caucasian
Sheila	25	Female	Caucasian
Susie	24	Female	Caucasian

APPENDIX B: TABLE OF PARTICIPANTS' INSTITUTIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

NAME	INSTITUTION TYPE	TENURE (yrs)	CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT
Abayomi	L; Pu; GL	3	A-2; N-2; R1	N; A
Amanda	L; Pu; GL	2	A-1; R-1; H-2	A
Bob	L; Pu; S	1	J-4; S-1	J; A
Cassandra	L;Pu; MA	2	A-2; H-2	A; H
Christopher	L; Pu; MA	1	N-2; R-2	N;A;R
Hannah	L; Pu; GL	1	R-3; A-1; S-1	R-P3;R-2
Jamelia	M; Pu; GL	2	N1	N; S; S-V
Kelly	L; Pu; GL	1	N1	N
Maalik	M; Pu; GL	1	R3	N
Maggie	L; Pu; GL	1		N; R; R-C
Miguel	L; Pr; MA	3	N-1; A-3; R-2	N; A
Nathan	L; Pu; S	2	H-5; A-3; R-3	N; R-C
Nina	L; Pr; MA	1	A-1; R-1	R-C
Pete	L; Pr; MA	4	A-3; N-4; H-2	A; N
Rick	L; Pu; GL	1	A-1	N; A-C; S
Sheila	L; Pr; MA	2	A-1; H-3	A
Susie	L; Pu; GL	1	A-2; R3; S1; H1	H-A

Institutional Type:
L=Large (over 20k)   M= Mid-Size (10-20k) Pu=Public   Pr=Private
GL=Great Lakes MA=Mid-Atlantic S= South

Tenure: number denotes current year of employmen**t**

Conference Attendance (number denotes how many attended):
A=American College Personnel Association (ACPA)
N=National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA)
S=State Student Personnel or Housing Association (ACPA or Association for College and University Residence Halls (ACUHO) affiliate
R=Regional Student Personnel or Housing Association (NASPA or ACUHO Affiliate)
J=Association for Student Judicial Affairs (ASJA) national or regional
H= Student Residence Hall or Student Activities Conference (e.g. National or Regional Association of College and University Residence Halls (NACURH) affiliation or National Association for Campus Activities (NACA) affiliation

Professional Involvement (number refers to frequency):
Organization-Activity (if more than general member)
C=Committee Member; **V**=Advisor to Student Committee; **P**=Presented Session
(Example: A-C = ACPA Committee Participant; N=NASPA General Member)

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

INTERVIEW

INTERVIEWER: "Thank you for your willingness to participate in my research. I want to remind you that your participation in this study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. I am interested in new professionals' work experiences and their thoughts about their work with students. To begin, I'm going to ask you for some basic demographic and professional information.

Name:

Age:

Current Title:

Institution:

Years in Position:

Educational Background:
Bachelor's degree (major/minor/institution)
Master's degree (major/minor/institution)

Please describe your professional Activities (e.g. organizations, conference attendance, committees):

INTERVIEWER: "Now, I am going to read a case scenario to you, and then I am going to ask you some questions about your reaction to it. This case is based on an incident at another institution, and will be useful for our discussion"

READ CASE SCENARIO TO PARTICIPANT

In your experience, how realistic is this case?

How prepared do you feel to handle a situation like this?

What resources would you draw upon in order to respond to this incident?

If you were going to respond to this incident, how would you approach it?

In terms of working with the students involved in the incident, what would you expect to happen in the meetings with them?

What do you think would be a just resolution to the case?

Obviously, the case that I read to you is not typical. In terms of incidents involving male students, what are more typical things you have dealt with?
Statistically, male students commit a lot more violations of campus policies (e.g. alcohol offenses, violence, etc.) than female students. What's your sense about why that happens?

What about situations that aren't policy violations, such as personal issues? What are some of the things you have dealt with in this regard involving male students?

How do you perceive male students in comparison to female students when it comes to your job?

Do you recall any information, readings, or discussions in your graduate training that pertained to male students specifically?
        If so, what?
        If not, what do you make of the fact that it wasn't covered in your program?

Do you recall any information, readings, or discussions in your department or staff that pertained to male students specifically?
        If so, what?
        If not, what do you make of the fact that it hasn't come up?

What's your sense of male students' developmental needs? (What are they?)

What resources do you draw upon when working with male students?

(If none mentioned) If you wanted to learn more about male students' development, where would you go to do that?

If you pursued information about male students' development, would it make any difference in your work with them?

Is there anything I didn't ask about that you think is relevant to the issues we discussed?

APPENDIX D: CASE SCENARIO

On January 17, 2004 at 12:30am a security officer was dispatched to Baker Hall regarding a possible sexual assault. Upon arrival the officer spoke with the victim, Ms. X. Ms. X stated that she was walking home from Smith Hall when a group of five or six males approached her in front of the fountain. One male picked Ms. X up and threw her over his shoulder. He then threw Ms. X behind a bunch of bushes in front of Warner Hall and fell on top of her while laughing. Ms. X also advised that one of the males had a video camera and was videotaping the entire incident.

Ms. X stated that the males then left after they threw Ms. X into the bushes and ran toward Dunn Hall. Ms. X stated that she could not give a good description of the males, but if they were caught she wants to press charges. She does not want anyone to know about this incident. Ms. X also stated that she did not want this to be published in the paper. Ms. X filled out a witness statement describing the incident.

The security officer reviewed the video from the surveillance camera in the quad area and has a possible match of the males involved.

The security supervisor on duty was notified, as was the Residential Life on-call staff member.

APPENDIX E: CALL FOR PARTICIPANTS

CALL FOR PARTICIPANTS FOR DISSERTATION RESEARCH

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to ask for your assistance in identifying individuals who are employed as Residence Hall Directors and who would be willing to be interviewed for my dissertation research. This research pertains to professionals' experiences in their graduate and professional training, and their thoughts about working with residential students. People who fit the following criteria are eligible to participate:

6. Are full-time professional Residence Hall Directors within their first three years of employment.

7. Hold a Master's degree in College Student Personnel Administration (or closely related field) and are not currently engaged in further formal (e.g. doctoral or credit-bearing) study.

8. Work at a co-educational institution that has a Student Development, CSP, or related graduate program.

9. Work at public or private institutions, without a formal religious affiliation, of greater than 5000 students that has a residential life program and a student live-on requirement for one or more year(s).

10. Are active (e.g. have attended at least one regional or national Student Affairs conference, and/or participate on a committee) members of one of the major regional, state, or national professional associations (e.g. ACPA, ACUHO-I, NASPA).

The researcher will make arrangements to interview participants in person, either at or near their campuses or at a conference. If you, or someone you know, fits the above criteria and would be interested in participating in an interview of approximately one hour, please contact me for more information:

<div align="center">

Jason Laker
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Arizona
email address
phone number

</div>

REFERENCES

Abbot, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor.*
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Agliata, D., & Tantleff-Dunn, S. (2004). The impact of media exposure on males' body
image. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *23* (1), 7–23.

Aguirre, A. (2000). Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace:
Recruitment, retention, and academic culture. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher
Education*, (Identifier ED446723).

American College Personnel Association (ACPA). (1994). *The student learning
imperative: Implications for student affairs.* Washington, DC: ACPA.

American Council on Education (ACE). (1949). *The student personnel point of view*
(Rev.ed.) (American Council on Education Studies Series 6, Vol.13, No.13).
Washington, DC: ACPA.

Amey, M. & Reesor, L. (2002). *Beginning your journey: A guide for new professionals
in student affairs.* Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel
Administrators.

Barley, S. (1996). Technicians in the workplace: Ethnographic evidence for bringing
work into organizational studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*, 404–441.

Barr, M. J., Keating, L. A., & Associates (Eds.). (1985). Developing effective student
services programs: Systematic approaches for practitioners. San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass.

Baumli, F., & Williamson, T. (1997). The history of the men's movement. Feminist Utopia. Retrieved from http://www.amazoncastle.com/feminism/menhist.shtml

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Bellas, M. (1997). Disciplinary differences in faculty salaries: Does gender bias play a role? *Journal of Higher Education*, *68* (3), 299–321.

Berk, R.A. (1990). Thinking about hate-motivated crimes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5*, 334–349.

Blackhurst, A., & Hubbard, J. (1997). The "new" scholarship on women: Progress toward an inclusive curriculum in student affairs preparation programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, *38*, 453–460.

Blimling, G. (2003). *The resident assistant*. (6th Ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Bloland, P. (1992). The professionalization of student affairs staff. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services*. (Identifier ED347495).

Bloland, P., & Stamatakos, L. (1989–90). Student affairs: Profession of professionalism? *California Association for Counseling and Development Journal*, *10*, 29–35.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Society, Culture, and Education.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role-and what it's done for us lately. In R. Brannon & D. David (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority* (pp. 1–40). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts: The changing role of professionals in politics and public life.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brod, H. (Ed.) (1997). *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Brod, H (1997). *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Brod, H. (1997). The case for superordinate studies. *Transformations*, 8(2), 54-55.

Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (Eds.) (1994). *Theorizing Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 41–42.

Brod, H. (1994). Some thoughts on some histories of some masculinities: Jews and other others. In H. Brod, & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing Masculinities* (pp. 82–83). Thousand Oaks: Sage

Broido, E.M. (2000). Constructing identity: The nature and meaning of lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities. In R. M. Perez, K. A. DeBord, & K. J. Bieschke (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients* (pp. 13–33). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Brown, M.C. (Ed.). (2000). *Organization and governance in higher education*. Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Brown, L.S. (1989). New voices, new visions: Toward a lesbian/gay paradigm for

   psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *13*, 445–458.

Brown-Wright, D., Dubick, R., & Newman, I. (1997). Graduate assistant expectation and

   faculty perception: Implications for mentoring and training. *Journal of College

   Student Development*, *38* (4), 410–416.

Bunker, D., & Wijnberg, M. (1988). *Supervision and performance: Managing

   professional work in human service organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burgess, R. (1984). *In the field: An introduction to field research*. Boston: George Allen

   and Unwin, pp. 78–141.

Canon, H. (1982). Toward professionalization in student affairs: Another point of view.

   Journal of College Student Development, *23*, 468–473.

Carnegie, D. (1937). *How to win friends and influence people*. New York: Simon and

   Schuster.

Carter, K. A. (2000). Transgenderism and college students: Issues of gender identity and

   its role on our campuses. In V. A. Wall & N. J. Evans (Eds.), *Toward acceptance:

   Sexual orientation issues on campus* (pp. 261–282). Lanham, MD: University

   Press of America.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of

   Homosexuality*, *4*, 219–235.

Champaign, D. (1995). Balancing professional and life roles: A workshop for student

   affairs professionals. *Journal of College Student Development*, *36* (4), 384–385.

Chickering, A. (1969). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, B., (Ed.). (1987). *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Coleman, D., & Johnson, J. (1990). *The new professional: A resource guide for new student affairs professionals and their supervisors*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Coltrane, S. (1994). *Family man: Fatherhood, housework, and gender equity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Condry, J. & Condry, S. (1976). Sex differences: A study of the eye of the beholder. *Child Development 47*, 812–819.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connolly, W. E. (1991). Identity\difference: Democratic negotiations of political paradox. In H. Brod, & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing Masculinities*. (p. 221). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Coomes, M., Belch, H., & Saddlemire, G. (1991). Doctoral programs for student affairs professionals: A status report. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32*, 62–68.

Cooper, D. L., Saunders, S. A., et al. (2002). *Learning through supervised practice in student affairs.* New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Corcoran, M., & Clark, S. (date?). Professional socialization and contemporary career attitudes of three faculty generations. *Research in Higher Education*. *20*(2), 131–153.

Creamer, D.G. & Associates. (1990). *College student development: Theory and practice for the 1990s.* American College Personnel Association.

Cross, W. E., Jr., & Fhagen-Smith, P. (2001). Patterns of African-American identity development: A life span perspective. In C. L. Wijeyesinghe & B.W. Jackson, III, (Eds.), *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 243–270). New York: New York University Press.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1995). The psychology of Nigrescence: Revising the Cross model. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 93122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, W.E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Croteau, J., & von Destinon, M. (1994). A national survey of job search experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual student affairs professionals. *Journal of College Student Development*, *35*, 40–45.

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. L., & Liddell, D. L. (2002). Getting inside the house: The effectiveness of a rape prevention program for college fraternity men. *Journal of College Student Development*, *43*(1), 35–50.

D'Augelli, A. (1991). Gay men in college: Identity processes and adaptations. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32*, 140–146.

Delworth, U., Hanson, G., & Associates (Eds.). (date). *Student services: A handbook for the profession.* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Derber, C. (1982). *Professionals as workers: Mental labor in advanced capitalism.* Boston, MA: G. K. Hall.

Dietz-Uhler, B. & Murrell, A. (1992). College students' perceptions of sexual harassment: Are gender differences decreasing? *Journal of College Student Development*, *33*, 540–546.

Downey, J. & Stage, F. (1999). Hate crimes and violence on college and university campuses. *Journal of College Student Development*, *40*(1), 3–9.

Dücker, M., & Dücker, D. (1994). Educating staff on ethics and professionalism. *Journal of College Student Development*, *35*, 304–305.

Ehrenreich, B. (2004, May 16). Feminism's assumptions upended; A uterus is not a substitute for a conscience. Giving women positions of power won't change society by itself. *Los Angeles Times*, p. M1.

Erickson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Evans, N.J. & Reason, R.D. (2001). Guiding principles: A review and analysis of student affairs philosophical statements. *Journal of College Student Development,* 42 (4): 359-377.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *The development of college students: Theory, research, and application*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ferdman, B. M., & Gallegos, P. I. (2001). Racial identity development and Latinos in the United States. In C. L. Wijeyesinghe & B.W. Jackson, III, (Eds.), *New*

perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology (pp. 67–90). New York: New York University Press.

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

Forney, D. (1994). A profile of student affairs masters students: Characteristics, attitudes, and learning styles. *Journal of College Student Development*, *35*, 337–345.

Fromm, E. (1973). The anatomy of human destructiveness. In *ASJA Law and Policy Report*, *126*, 1–2.

Gaither, G., et al. (1995). Measuring up: The promises and pitfalls of performance indicators in higher education. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education*. (Identifier ED383278).

Garland, P. (1985). *A Critical Need for College Student Personnel Services*. ASHE-ERIC higher education report, (7). District of Columbia: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Gehring, D. D. (2001). The objectives of student discipline and the process that's due: Are they compatible? *NASPA Journal*, *38*(4).

Gertner, D. M. (1991). Men and student development: Emerging notions from the perspective of campus ecology. *Campus Ecology*, *9*(1).

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Glaser, B.G. (1994). *More grounded theory: A reader.* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology
Press.

Glaser, B.G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence vs. forcing.* Mill
Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.* New York:
Simon and Schuster.

Goslin, D. (Ed.). (1969). *The handbook of socialization theory and research.* Chicago,
IL: Rand McNally.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* London: Lawrence and
Wishart.

Grbich, C. (1998). The academic researcher: Socialisation in settings previously
dominated by teaching. *Higher Education. 36*, 67–85.

Gubrium, J.F. & Holstein, J.A. (2000). Analyzing interpretive practice. In N. K. Denzin
& Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 279-313).
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heath, D. (1968). *Growing up in college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Helm, M. P. (2004). Professional identity, sense-making, and the market effect:
Perspectives from new student affairs professionals. *Dissertation Abstracts
International, 65*, 04A. (Accession No: AAI3131603)

Helms, J. E. (1990). Toward a model of White racial identity development. In J. E.
Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice* (pp.
49–66). New York: Greenwood Press.

Herek, G. M., & Berrill, K. T. (1992). *Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

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.

Hochschild, A. R. (1994). The commercial spirit of intimate life and the abduction of feminism: Signs from women's advice books. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *11*, 1–24.

hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.

Hurtado, A. & Stewart, A. (1997). Through the looking glass: Implications of studying whiteness for feminist methods. In Michelle Fine et al., *Off white: Readings on race, power and society*. London & New York: Routledge.

Imel, S. (1995). Workplace literacy: Its role in high performance organizations. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Career and Vocational Education*. (Identifier ED383858).

Jagose, A. R. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Janosik, S. M., Creamer, D. G., et al. (2003). *Supervising new professionals in student affairs: A guide for practitioners.* New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Johnson, A. (2001). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Johnson, A. (2000). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology.* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Johnson, C., & Stamatakos, S. (1991). A maturation model for student affairs professional organizations. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32*, 525–533.

Jones, S. (2002). (Re)Writing the word: Methodological strategies and issues in qualitative research. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(4), 461–473.

Jones, S, & McEwen, M. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(4), 405–414.

Josselson, R. (1987). *Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kashner, J. (1990). Changing the corporate culture. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *71*, 19–28.

Katz, J. (2002). *Tough guise: Violence, media, and the crisis in masculinity.* [VHS Tape]. (Available from The Media Education Foundation, 26 Center Street, Northampton, MA 01060)

Katz, J. & Jhally, S. (1999, May 2). The national conversation in the wake of Littleton is missing the mark. *The Boston Globe*, p. E1.

Kaufman (1999). Men, feminism, and men's contradictory experiences of power. In J. Kuypers (Ed.), *Men and Power* (pp. 59–83). Halifax: Fernwood Books.

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

Keyes, L., & Simmons, M. (1992). Gender issues programming for men. *Journal of College Student Development, 33,* 274–275.

Kim, J. (2001). Asian American identity development theory. In C. L. Wijeyesinghe & B. W. Jackson, III, (Eds.), *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 67–90). New York: New York University Press.

Kimmel, M. & Messner, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Men's lives* (6th Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kimmel, M. & Messner, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Men's lives* (4th Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kimmel, M. (1996). *Manhood in america: A cultural history*. New York: The Free Press.

Kimmel, Michael S. (1994). Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, (Eds.), *Theorizing Masculinities* (pp. 119–141). London: Sage.

Kincheloe, J. L. & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 279-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

King, P. M. (1994). Theories of college student development: Sequences and consequences. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*(6), 413–421.

Kirk, L. M. (2002, January 15). Where the boys are. *The Providence Journal*, p. G1.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). *Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization theory and research*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Komives, S., Woodard, D., Jr., & Associates. (2003). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, S. (1991). Gender differences in the relationship of hall directors' transformational leadership and achieving styles. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 155–165.

Kuh, G. & Arnold, J. (1993). Liquid bonding: A cultural analysis of the role of alcohol in fraternity pledgeship. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*, 327–334.

Kuh, G., Schuh, E., & Whitt, E., & Associates. (1991). *Involving colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Laker, Jason A. (1997). *Keep your distance: Images of male friendship* [VHS Tape]. (Available from Jason Laker, P.O. Box 5766, Collegeville, MN 56321)

Landy, M. (1994). *Film, politics, and Gramsci.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Lenihan, G. O., & Rawlins, M. E. (1994). Rape supportive attitudes among Greek students before and after a date rape prevention program. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 450–455

Levin (2000). The practitioner's dilemma: Understanding and managing change in the academic institution. In A. Hoffman, & R. Summers, *Managing colleges and universities*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Levin, J., & McDevitt, J. (1993). *Hate crimes: The rising tide of bigotry and bloodshed*. New York: Plenum.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lloyd-Jones, E. M., & Smith, M. R. (1954). *Student personnel work as deeper teaching*. New York: Harper.

Love, P. (1995). Exploring the impact of student affairs professionals on student outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(2), 162–170.

Lutz, T. (1999). *Crying: The natural & cultural history of tears*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Magolda, P. & Carnaghi, J. (Eds.). (2004). J*ob one: Experiences of new professionals in student affairs.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America

Manning, K. (1999). *Giving voice to critical campus issues: Qualitative research in student affairs.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Marcus, L. (1999). Professional associations and student affairs policy. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(1), 22–31.

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative Researching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Massey, A. (1999). Methodological triangulation, or how to get lost without being found out. In A. Massey & G. Walford, *Explorations in methodology* (pp. 183–197). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

May, R., & Scher, M. (Eds.). (1988). *Changing Roles of Men on Campus*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McEwen, M., Williams, T., & Engstrom, C. (1991). Feminization in student affairs: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 440–446.

McEwen, M., Engstrom, C. & Williams, T. (1990). Gender diversity with the student affairs profession. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*, 47–53.

McClellan, G. S. (2003). Multiculturalism as a "technology of othering": An exploratory study of the social construction of Native Americans by student affairs professionals in the Southwest. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *64*, 05A. (Accession No: AAI3089979)

McIntosh, Peggy (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: a personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies.* Wellesley College, Centre for Research on Women. Wellesley MA. 02181. Working Paper No. 189.

Messner, M. A. (2000). Barbie girls versus sea monsters: Children constructing gender. *Gender & Society*, *14*(6), 765–784.

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

Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: California: Sage Publications.

Morgan, D. (1981). Men, masculinity, and the process of social enquiry. In H. Roberts, *Doing feminist research* (pp. 83–113). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mortenson, T. G. (1999, November). *The changing gender balance: An overview.* Paper presented at Fewer Men on Campus-A Puzzle for Liberal Arts Colleges and Universities, Baltimore, MD.

Murray, J. (1998). Profiling the chief law school placement officer: Implications for student development specialists in professional school settings. *Journal of College Student Development*, *39*(1), 1–17.

Nardi, P. (Ed.). (1992). *Men's Friendships.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Nylund, D. & Nylund, D. (2003). Narrative therapy as counter-hegemonic practice. *Men and Masculinities*, *5*(4), 386–394.

Olswang, S., & Lee, B. (1985). Faculty freedoms and institutional accountability: Interactions and conflicts. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education*. (Identifier ED284517).

O'Neil, J. M., & Carroll, M. R. (1988). A gender role workshop focused on sexism, gender role conflict, and the gender role journey. *Journal of Counseling and Development,* 67 (3), 193-197.

Pascoe, C. J. (2003). Multiple masculinities? Teenage boys talk about jocks and gender. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *46,* 1423–1438.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peake, D. (2005, January 2). 1st baby of New Year arrives during early morning hours. *St. Cloud Times*, p. 1B.

Penney, J. (1969). College student personnel: A profession stillborn. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, *47*, 958–962.

Perry, W., Jr. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development to the college years.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Pinker, S. (2002). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature.* New York: Penguin Books.

Piper, T., & Rodgers, R. (1992). Theory-practice congruence: Factors influencing the internalization of theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, *33*, 117–123.

Pollack, W.S. (1999). The sacrifice of Isaac: Toward a new psychology of boys and men. *The Society for the Psychological Study of Men & Masculinity Bulletin*, 4(1), Winter, 1999, 7-14.

Polomsky, J., & Blackhurst, A. (2000). The relationship between disciplinary status and the college experiences of male students. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *19*(2), 41–51.

Pope, R. & Reynolds, A. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, *38*(3), 266–277.

Quackenbush, R. (1991). Attitudes of college men toward women and rape. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32*, 376–377.

Qualls, R., Cox, M., & Scher (1992). Racial attitudes on campus: Are there gender differences? *Journal of College Student Development*, *33*, 524–530.

Reio, Thomas G., Jr. (1997). Effects of curiosity on socialization-related learning and job performance in adults. (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *58*/9-A, 3393.

Reynolds, A. (1992). Charting the changes in junior faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 63*(6), 637–651.

Richmond, J., & Sherman, K. (1991). Student-development preparation and placement: A longitudinal study of graduate students' and new professionals' experiences. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32,* 8–16.

Rickard, S. (1988). Toward a professional paradigm. *Journal of College Student Development*, *29*, 388–394.

Sanders, C. (1990). Moral reasoning of male freshmen. *Journal of College Student Development*, *31*, 5–8.

Sanford, N. (Ed.). (1962). *The American college*. New York: Wiley.

Saunders, S., & Cooper, D. (1999). The doctorate in student affairs: Essential skills and competencies for midmanagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(2), 185-191.

Savran, D. (1992). *Communists, cowboys and queers: The politics of masculinity in the work of Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Schneider, A. (1997, June 13). Empty tables at the faculty club worry some academics. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schuh, J. (2002). Foundational scholarship in student affairs: A sampler. *NASPA Journal*, *39*(2), 107–119.

Schwandt, T. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Seagren, A. (1993). The department chair: New roles, responsibilities and challenges. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education*. (Identifier ED363165).

Sherry, P., Teschendorf, R., Anderson, S., & Guzman, F. (1991). Ethical-beliefs and behaviors of college center professionals. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32,* 350–358.

Shriberg, A., & Wester, S. (1994). Employment satisfaction among non-Catholic student affairs professionals at Catholic colleges and universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, *35*, 109–112.

Slaughter, S. & and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, E. P., & Davidson, W. (1992). Mentoring and the development of African-American graduate students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *33*, 531–539.

Stage, F. & Russell, R. (1992). Using method triangulation in college student research. *Journal of College Student Development*, *33*, 485–491.

Stamatakos, L. (1981a). Student affairs progress toward professionalism: Recommendations for action: Part I. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *22*, 105–112.

Stamatakos, L. (1981b). Student affairs progress toward professionalism: Recommendations for action: Part II. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *22*, 197–207.

Stark, J. (1987). Professional education. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education*. (Identifier ED284527).

Sutton, J., & Dobbin, F. (1996). The two faces of governance: Responses to legal uncertainty in U.S. firms, 1955-1985. *American Sociological Review*, *61,* 794–811.

Terenzini, P., Pascarella, E., & Blimling, G. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development*, *37*(2), 149–162.

Tierney, W. G. (2000). Power, identity, and the dilemma of college student departure. In J. Braxton (Ed.). *Reworking the Student Departure Puzzle* (pp. 213–234). Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Tierney, W. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*. *68*(1), 1–16.

Tierney, W., & Rhoads, R. (1994). Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: faculty socialization as a cultural process. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education*. (Identifier ED368321).

Tillman, J. (1999). Lessons in survival. *Black Issues in Higher Education. 16* (8), 76.

Tinsley, D. J., & Irelan, T. M. (1989). Instruments used in college student affairs research: An analysis of the measurement base of a young profession. *Journal of College Student Personnel. 30*(5), 440–447.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Trowler, P., & Knight, P. (1999). Organizational socialization and induction in universities: Reconceptualizing theory and practice. *Higher Education. 37*, 177–195.

Trowler, P., & Turner, G. (2002). Exploring the hermeneutic foundations of university life: Deaf academics in a hybrid community of practice. *Higher Education. 43,* 227–256.

Upcraft, M. (1994). The dilemmas of translating theory to practice. *Journal of College Student Development*, *35,* 438–443.

Weeks, J. (1985). Sexuality and its discontents: Meanings, myths and modern sexualities. In Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (Eds.), *Theorizing Masculinities* (pp. 82–83). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Weidman, J., Twale, D., & Stein, E. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Welsh, P. (2003, December 14). Young, male, white, and confused. *Washington Post*, p. B1.

West, L. A. (2001). Negotiating masculinities in American drinking subcultures. *Journal of Men's Studies, 9*(3), 371–386.

Whipple, E. G. (1998). *New challenges for Greek letter organizations: Transforming fraternities and sororities into learning communities.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Williams, P. J. (1995). *Meditations on masculinity*. In M. Berger, B. Wallis, & S. Watson (Eds.), *Constructing masculinity*. New York: Routledge.

Wilson, M. (2000). Connection and transition: Influences of career mobility on the close friendships of women student affairs professionals. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(5), 529–543.

Wing, A. K. (Ed.) (2003). *Critical race feminism: A reader.* (2nd Ed.) New York: New York University Press.

Winter, M. *The culture and control of expertise: Toward a sociological understanding of librarianship*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Winston, R. B., & Creamer, D. G. (1997). *Improving staffing practices in student affairs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wolf-Wendel, L. (2000). Women-friendly campuses: What five institutions are doing right. *The Review of Higher Education*, *23*(3), 319–345

Wolniak, G. C., Pierson, C. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (2001). Effects of intercollegiate athletic participation on male orientations toward learning. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*(6), 604–624.

Woodard, D., Love, P., & Komives, S. (2000*). Leadership and management for a new century*. New Directions for Student Services, Number 92. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Workman, T. A. (2001). Finding the meanings of college drinking: An analysis of fraternity drinking stories. Health Communication, 13 (4), 427-447.

Wrenn, C., & Darley, J. (1949). *An appraisal of the professional status of personnel work (Parts I & II)*. In E.G. Williamson (Ed.), *Trends in student personnel work* (pp. 264–287). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Young, R., & Coldwell, L. (1993). Perceptions of the utility of professional education topics. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*, 63–68.

(NP-D1-A) Projections of the population by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin for the United States: 1999 to 2100 (Middle Series)-U.S. Bureau of the Census. http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/natdet-D1A.html