

**The construction of masculinity in homosocial environment: A case study**

by

**JoAnn Lynn Watkins Rogers**

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

Major: Sociology

Program of Study Committee:  
Jill Bystydzienski, Co-Major Professor  
Jacquelyn Litt, Co-Major Professor  
Cynthia Anderson  
Sharon Bird  
Deborah Kilgore

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa  
2006

Copyright © JoAnn Lynn Watkins Rogers, 2006. All rights reserved.

UMI Number: 3217309

### INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

---

UMI Microform 3217309

Copyright 2006 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company  
300 North Zeeb Road  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Graduate College  
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation of

JoAnn Lynn Watkins Rogers

has met the dissertation requirements of Iowa State University

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**Co-Major Professor**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**Co-Major Professor**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**For the Major Program**

*This dissertation is dedicated to my husband Shane and my three children Jordan, Nathaniel, and Cassandra. The last couple of years have been some of our toughest yet. Still we have prevailed and have started new adventures as a family. Shane has always shown me unconditional love, encouraged me when I needed it, and told me to stop whining because I need to get this dissertation done - when I needed this also. Shane, along with my three beautiful children, are the constants in my life, they ground me and keep me sane. The four of them are the reason I have finished what seemed to be a daunting task and the reason that I continue on the path of changing the world one person at a time!*

# Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Chapter I: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Organization of the Study .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Theoretical Considerations.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Review of Literature.....</b>	<b>4</b>
Hegemonic Masculinity.....	4
The Fraternity .....	7
<b>A Brief History of XYZ Fraternity.....</b>	<b>11</b>
The Setting .....	11
Background.....	11
<b>Chapter II: Research Methods and Experience.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Research Aims .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Methods .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>The Participants .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Securing Consent .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Participant Observation.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Semi Structured Interviews.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Analyzing the Data.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Reflections on Gender and Race in the Research Process .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Chapter III: Creating the Image of Hegemonic and Complicit forms of Masculinity.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Creating Followers/ Creating Men.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Choosing “Mr. Right”: Recruitment .....	33
<b>The Social Contract/ Creating Attitudes and Beliefs.....</b>	<b>40</b>
Rejecting Old Stereotypes and Creating New Ones: Rejecting and Accepting Alcohol .....	43
Rejecting Old Stereotypes and Creating New Ones: Rejecting and Accepting Hazing .....	47
<b>Summary and Conclusion.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Chapter IV: Managing the Image of Hegemonic Masculinity.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>The Image Maintenance Process .....</b>	<b>54</b>
The Image of Masculinity.....	55
When the “Image is not upheld” .....	60
<b>Maintenance through Competition.....</b>	<b>66</b>
Competition Between Members .....	67
Competition Between Fraternities .....	68
Maintenance and Paternalistic Chivalry .....	71
<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Chapter V: Creating and Managing Subordinated and Marginalized Masculinity .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Creating and Maintaining Heterosexual Imperatives .....</b>	<b>79</b>
Heterosexual Rituals .....	80
Gender Scripts and Social Events.....	84
<b>Marginalized Masculinities.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Subordinated Masculinity .....</b>	<b>92</b>

Racial and Ethnic Diversity .....	93
<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Chapter VI: Negotiating Competing Forms of Masculinity .....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>Masculine Typologies .....</b>	<b>102</b>
Active Hegemony .....	103
Knowledgeable Complacency .....	103
Non-Knowledgeable Complacency .....	104
Active Anti-hegemony .....	106
<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>Chapter VII: Conclusion .....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>Appendix A: Letter to Fraternity House .....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Appendix B: Letter to Individual Members .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Appendix C: Informed Consent .....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>Appendix D: Questions for Fraternity Members .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Appendix E: Data Sheet .....</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>119</b>

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank my major professors Dr. Jacqueline Litt and Dr. Jill Bystydzienski who encouraged and guided me from my master's program through my Ph. D. Special thanks to my committee, Dr. Sharon Bird, Dr. Cynthia Anderson, and Dr. Deborah Kilgore for their support and input on my dissertation. I cannot thank enough Marla Perry who helped edit my dissertation and who motivated me in many ways. My work would not have been able to be accomplished without the support, encouragement, and the filing and running of paper work from my two very good friends, Julie-Snyder-Yuly and Christina Gallup.

## **Chapter I: Introduction**

Among scholars who study masculinity it has been widely recognized that there is not a singular form of masculinity or one universal way in which it is practiced (Fausto-Sterling 2000; Connell 1993; Coltraine 1994; Bird 1996; Messner 1993; Kimmel 1992; Conway-Long 1994; Chen 1999; DiPeiro 2002; Connell and Messnerschmidt 2005). Throughout history there have been competing forms of masculinity each unique to structural, psychosocial, and cultural norms. Masculinity practices are also embedded in the social construction of race, class, and region (Connell and Messnerschmidt 2005). Although within every category there are archetypes that are ideals prescribing how men should act and react, men's lives and social locations are different and complex and there is not one mode of being a man (Messner 1992; Stacey 1993). Often these archetypes are constructed in such a way that there is not any one man who can fulfill these ideals, yet, the line between what is real and what is fantasy is somewhat confusing and can become blurred (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005).

This research seeks to understand how a specific form of masculinity is produced, reproduced, negotiated, and maintained. The fundamental questions that drive this case study are: How do men in a college fraternity teach, learn, and negotiate hegemonic masculinity, and how do they ensure conformity to hegemonic practices?

### ***Organization of the Study***

Chapter one is a short introduction to the organization of this study. It discusses the theory that frames the research and provides a brief review of literature on hegemonic masculinity, discusses what contemporary research has indicated about men's social fraternities, and briefly describes the history of Fraternity XYZ. Chapter two explains the methods of data collection along with the methodology of the data analysis. It addresses my own social location, as well as my experience while conducting this study. Chapter three is the first empirical chapter and focuses on how the fraternity men in this case study actively seek to define ideal practices of hegemonic masculinity in which many are already engaged. Hegemony, as with all forms of masculinity, varies across context. Chapter four discusses how the men in fraternity XYZ learn specific hegemonic practices through their indoctrination rituals and how a social contract is formed between the fraternity and the men. Chapter five



is an extension of chapter four; it demonstrates how the men negotiate the imperatives of hegemonic masculinity through their everyday performances. These performances revolve around maintaining the values that have been created through the image of the fraternity and through competition. Chapter five also describes how the fraternity maintains the practice of heterosexual imperatives through their homosocial environment. Chapter six examines how subordinate and marginalized masculinities are created against the dominant image of hegemonic masculinity in the fraternity. Chapter seven introduces a new typology for examining hegemony by; “active hegemony,” “knowledgeable complacency,” “non-knowledgeable complacency,” and “active anti-hegemony”. This typology helped me to examine and understand the fluidity of hegemonic masculinity. Chapter eight is the conclusion and discusses the broader implications this study has for the study of hegemonic masculinity and the field of inequality.

### ***Theoretical Considerations***

Masculinity is often constructed as an essential nature of a man. It is often considered an ordinary biological phenomenon, or taken for granted reality (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Nonetheless, it should be understood that the use of the terms male (sex) and masculinity (gender) are problematic (Hearn and Collinson 1994). The concepts of gender and masculinities are complex in their constructions and embedded in hierarchal, historical, and cultural meanings (Kimmel and Messner 2001). The definitions of gender and masculinity are further complicated based on the intersections of age, class, race, ability, and sexual orientation. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) have stated that masculinity or “masculinities are configurations or practice that are accomplished in social action and, therefore, can differ according to the gender relations in a particular social setting” (p. 836).

In Western cultures, particularly in the United States, the medical community has set up a false dichotomy of the male sex and the female sex. Researchers such as Ann Fausto-Sterling (2000) argue that there is not an either/or, but only variations of one or another; she states that there are not just two sexes but five. According to Fausto-Sterling the body’s sex is extremely complex and a simple dichotomous labeling process of male or female is based on a “social decision” (p.3). She has demonstrated through research on individuals born with ambiguous genitalia that medical doctors often decide to change the

“sex” of a child based on arbitrary guidelines, such that a baby who is born with XY chromosomes but does not have a penis that is in line with the average size for male infants (less than .06 inches) may have his penis removed and may have the genitalia reconstructed into female genitalia. Judith Butler (1993) argues that if male and female are in fact arbitrary constructions designed by the medical community to simplify science, “[i]t would make no sense, then, to define gender as the cultural interpretation of sex, if sex itself is a gendered category” (p.11). Gender is internalized both consciously and unconsciously and then becomes a social practice through which different societal constraints are superimposed on the human body.

To understand how gender is practiced or acted on at the interactional level, I will rely heavily on the concept of “doing gender” which is described as “a routine, methodical, and recurring accomplishment” (West and Zimmerman 1987:168). West and Zimmerman state that “doing gender” is unavoidable because of social consequences tied to allocation of resources in all the domains of our lives: economic, political, and social (p.185). The accomplishment of gender is also inexplicably tied to power dynamics. The hegemonic group in U.S. society are white, middle-to-upper-class, and able-bodied men. In order to obtain this power, a male must first prove that he is part of this regime or “group”; this includes demonstrating that he is, in fact, a “man.” This process does not involve proving that he is genetically or biologically male, but showing or demonstrating through his actions, behaviors, and even attitudes, that he is masculine. This, in turn, signifies to the rest of society that the biological category follows.

Society has constructed physical signifiers of femininity and masculinity that supposedly mark female sex and male sex, respectively (Butler 1993; Haraway 1991). These signifiers are breasts and a narrowing waist for women, and broad shoulders and more muscular build for men. These markers identify those who are in the “in group” or the dominant culture, and those who exist outside the dominant culture. Butler (1993) argues that the body is not only material, but is also discursive. Bodies are materially as well as socially, constructed. For Butler, the ways in which society understands the body are meshed in tradition, laws, and institutions that are based in the past. These laws and norms determine what is acceptable or appropriate, in terms of feminine and masculine, and are structured in such a way that when people try to go against the norm, in terms of “doing gender” (West and Zimmerman 1987), the system sanctions them. This research focuses on the daily interaction of how masculinity is “done.” More specifically, it describes the ways

in which men in a college fraternity teach, learn, and negotiate how hegemonic masculinity is “achieved” and how they ensure conformity to the hegemonic practices within their fraternity.

## ***Review of Literature***

### **Hegemonic Masculinity**

One way to gain an understanding of how the dynamics of power are formed, why inequality exists, and how it is maintained, is to examine and understand those who are in power. Men have been at the center of social research since its inception; “social scientists have historically taken men to be the ‘normal subjects’ of research” (Emslie, Hunt and O’Brien 2004:207). However, from the 1970s through the 1990s, there was an evolution in the way men had been studied. The 1970s and 1980s brought about a focus on “being a man” and how it differs from “being a woman” (Coltrane 1994, Kimmel and Messner 2001, Stacey 1993). Feminists and pro-feminist men, during the 1990s, examined the power dynamics between men and women and the multiple locations of men’s lives. Men were no longer the general or the “normal”; their invisibility as gendered beings soon became a legitimate research topic. Researchers began examining men’s lives in the context of gender roles and how institutions influence the way men do gender (Coltrane 1994; Kimmel and Messner 2001; Stacey 1993; Emslie et al. 2004). Yet, most early studies focused on middle class white males (Emslie et al. 2004).

Messner (1993) has identified three categories of masculinity; they are hegemonic (dominant ideologies of masculinity), stigmatized (gay men), and marginalized (men of color and lower class men). Almost any man can and may experience one of these forms of masculinity depending upon the intersections of his social characteristics. For example, a young, white, able-bodied gay male may hide his sexual orientation while at work and benefit from his perceived hegemonic status; however, having to hide part of his identity disadvantages him emotionally. To gain balance in one part of his life, he may sacrifice economic and “status” security in another.

Hegemony, “while having general qualities as a form of social power, may take on many valances and nuances depending on the social setting and the social actors involved” (McGuffey and Rich 1999:609; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Hegemonic masculinity

can be described as the hierarchal relationship of men over women (Connell 1987), or as DiPiero states;

[A] position in the social order--one that is seen as worthy, complete, and superior--rather than a fixed set of essential characteristics. The content of hegemonic masculinity varies extensively across time and place, which is a vital source of its strength. (DiPiero 2002:587)

Hegemonic masculinity requires men who maintain hegemonic ideals and practices and men who benefit from patriarchy without demonstrating glaring hegemonic practices, otherwise known as “complicit masculinity” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Men who are complicit are often white men who do not fit into the “ideal type” of masculinity yet receive all the benefits and rewards of hegemony (Connell 1993). Often, hegemonic masculinity and complicit masculinity will overlap (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Yet, hegemonic masculinity also needs people that participate in it without gaining direct benefits, such as heterosexual women who support men’s power over women (McGuffey and Rich 1999; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Men from subordinated or marginalized groups may regain power through the hegemonic bargain. Men who enact the hegemonic bargain share or take on characteristics of the dominant group, such as oppressing women, while negotiating or ignoring characteristics of subordinated groups (Chen 1999). Researchers have come to understand that men and masculinities are complex ideas and that, even within the hegemonic norm, masculinity fluctuates.

Thus, hegemonic masculinities can be constructed that do not correspond to the lives of any actual men. Yet these models do, in various ways, express widespread ideals, fantasies, and desires. They provide models of relations with women and solutions to problems of gender relations (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005:838).

This research seeks to understand how hegemonic masculinity is created, practiced and maintained within certain historical and social institutions. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) trace the formulation of when and how the concept of hegemonic masculinity was first applied and how it has functioned in research in subsequent years. They have identified the arguments and problems researchers have acknowledged with the term hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity was first proposed during the 1980s by researchers from Australia in the field of social inequality (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005: 830). “The concept of hegemonic masculinity served as a frame work for much of the developing research effort of men and masculinity, replacing sex-role theory and categorical models of patriarchy” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005: 834). The focus on masculinity

has expanded so that researchers began asking the questions that centered on the consequences and costs of masculinity not only on women but on men themselves (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005).

Researchers have critiqued the concept of hegemonic masculinity and there are those who believe that the concept of masculinity is not stagnant and that current research has a tendency to deemphasize the power dynamics of men over women and over other men (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005:836). Others believe that contemporary research has a tendency to essentialize masculinity and to overemphasize the differences between men and women (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005:836). Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue “[m]asculinities are configurations of practice that are accomplished in social action and, therefore, can differ according to the gender relations in a particular social setting” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005:836).

Messner (1992) states that fraternities, along with organized sports, were formed in resistance to changing gender roles and the status quo of the upper- to middle-class white male; “[they] served to define the gender order by differentiating men from women and high-status men from lower status men” (p.18). Research has already identified fraternities as a source for masculine identity development. However, this dissertation seeks to clarify how contemporary fraternities construct meaning around gender, and how hegemonic masculinity is indeed situational. University social fraternities are a unique site because they are one of the last all-male spaces on college campuses. Within the institution of the fraternity, hegemonic masculinity imperatives are constructed and perpetuated. Yet it is this same male-only environment that also allows for alternative or resistant forms of masculinity to arise. This research examines masculinity within a specific social context and must be prefaced with the assumption that both “whiteness” and “masculinity” need to be culturally and historically contextualized. These masculine imperatives are all in relation to the dominant form of masculinity: hegemonic (Emslie, Hunt and O’Brein 2004:207). The different forms of masculinity; hegemonic, subordinated, and marginalized, help guide the analysis of my research. The question of how gender practices and ideals are reproduced and/or subverted is central to the scholarship in social inequality. This research demonstrates that hegemonic masculinity, as other researchers have stated, is not static. Masculinity practices and patterns are negotiated and shaped based upon the situation and or institution that men are involved in (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005).

## **The Fraternity**

The two types of social fraternities that are located on college campuses are those with national affiliations and those without national affiliations. Those with national affiliations are given a charter membership and are guided by a national organization (James 2000).

“Most college fraternities were formed when higher education catered predominantly to white Protestant men” (James 2000:303), and as other types of social organizations were formed in reaction to the loss of economic and social power white men were feeling. Opening dates of college fraternities paralleled mass economic and social upheaval in U.S. history. Many fraternities at one time had written into their bylaws statements mandating that the men who join a college fraternity must be white and Christian. The Phi Delta Theta chapter at Amherst and Williams College was suspended in 1953 because of its constitutional clause that stated only those of “full Aryan blood” could pledge the chapter (McClung Lee 1955). Fraternities that did not have these specific written rules often had “gentlemen’s rules,” which were verbal agreements to exclude non Christians and men of color (James 2000). These fraternities were formed in response to the growing insecurity white men had about the changing roles of women and the new found freedom of black men (Messner 1992).

Fraternities were important to many early college campuses because they provided more than half of the students with housing (Lawrence 1955). Segal (1965) states that fraternities were formed to provide two major functions, the first was to train men to become adults and the second was to obtain marriage partners for the local white elites which helped to maintain high status for some of the men in fraternities. Segal goes on to say the fraternities helped to maintain differences in men’s ascribed statuses by taking into account family characteristics when recruiting individual men.

It was not until the post-World War II era that fraternity men began to question the exclusionary practices of college fraternities. After World War II, with the increasing awareness of the need for the extension of civil rights, many white men began actively speaking out against the racial segregation in college fraternities. With the help of the American Veterans Committee, fraternity members began protesting the restrictive clauses found in fraternity bylaws. “Many of the veterans who attended college and joined fraternities had experienced interracial interaction during wartime” (James 2000:304) which allowed them to see racial minorities as equals. There was strong resistance to integration by both white fraternities and fraternities belonging of men of color. White fraternities

wanted to keep the privileges, such as social capital (i.e., powerful social networks) they gained from fraternity memberships for themselves. Fraternities of color did not want to integrate mainstream (i.e., white) values and norms into their ethnic and culturally distinctive organizations. The argument from Jewish fraternities was that they would lose their Jewish traditions and culture if they were to integrate their fraternities (Lawrence 1955).

Race based fraternities (other than white) began as a “subculture environment” for students of color who attended predominately white schools (Fox, Hodge, and Ward 1987:522). Although there are fraternities that cater to certain racial groups, many fraternities are working hard to become more inclusive. Yet, in some academic institutions, such as the University of Alabama, fraternities and sororities are highly segregated and students of color do not want to join all white fraternities because they believe them to be racist (The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education 1998).

Fraternities have set up extensive social networks that give them the ability to contact alumni who are in a vast array of fields. One of the most social elite fraternities is the Skull and Bones founded at Yale in 1832. Both current President George W. Bush and 2004 Presidential nominee John Kerry are examples of the prestigious and powerful alumni associated with this social fraternity ([www.cbsnews.com](http://www.cbsnews.com)). Fraternity XYZ has its own list of famous and prestigious alumni. There are several who have formally sat or are sitting in the U.S. House of Representatives. This type of networking is why many men claim to join social fraternities, besides the brotherhood they experience. Preference for members of one’s own group is one reason that many job markets are still segregated by race, sex, and class. People have a tendency to hire those they “feel” they would be most comfortable with; those who are most like themselves. This preference can influence recruiting practices, where employers hire on the basis of referrals from current employees (Padavic and Reskin 2000). Hiring practices are a reason that social networks can be so important and influential when it comes to finding a job.

Since the inceptions of fraternities there has been much speculation about the need for secret social societies on college and university campuses. My study examines how gender is maintained and negotiated in an institutional setting of a college fraternity amongst individual men; it does not critique the secretive nature of social fraternities. To a great extent, contemporary research on collegiate social fraternities focuses on two main topics: alcohol use or abuse and sexual assault (Pace and McGrath 2002; Foubert and La Voy 2000; Goodwin 1990; Neuberger and Hanson 1997; De Parle 1988; Davis and Liddell 2002;

Walton 1996; Lackie and de Man 1997; Sanday 1990; Koss and Gaines 1993; Kalof and Cargill 1991; Yancey-Martin and Hummer 1989).

There have been vast amounts of research dedicated to the topic of college drinking and fraternity involvement (McCabe et al. 2005; Wechsler et al. 2000; Wechsler et al. 1998; Pace and McGrath 2002; Capraro 2002; Bosari and Cary 1998, Cashin et al. 1998; Harrington et al. 1997; Larimer et al. 2001). Drinking has been shown to be highly correlated with the ideals of masculinity within college and university settings. Studies indicate that the group with the highest rate of alcohol consumption and diagnosable alcohol related disorders are those between the ages of 18 and 29 (Larimer et al. 2000). One of the most current examples of research on substance abuse and Greek involvement is by McCabe et al (2005). They examined how membership in fraternities and sororities relates to substance abuse using a nationally representative sample of full time U.S. college students that was based on longitudinal data encompassing two follow-up waves of college students. McCabe et al. (2005) found that students who belong to fraternities had higher levels of heavy drinking, marijuana use, and cigarette smoking. Their research indicates that students who joined fraternities and sororities were more likely to have used alcohol, and smoked marijuana and cigarettes prior to their enrollment in college than those who did not join. This research suggests that alcohol and drug abuse problems existed before Greek affiliation and that preventive measures for substance abuse should be addressed earlier in a student's academic career.

According to Lackie and de Man (1997) there is a direct correlation between sexual aggression, alcohol use, and high scores on masculinity indexes, and a moderate correlation between belonging to a fraternity and sexual aggression. A team of researchers, Dabbs, Hargrove, and Heusel (1996), investigated differences among fraternities by using salivary testosterone levels, descriptions of the fraternity chapters by university officials, fraternity officers, photographs, and field notes. These researchers determined that a difference existed between houses with average testosterone levels that were elevated compared to those with lower average levels. They label the houses with higher testosterone levels "rambunctious" and state that they were less socially responsible and had lower academic achievement than their more altruistic, less testosterone level counterparts who were labeled "behaved." This research, along with the studies on fraternity drinking, indicates that men are selecting an environment more suitable to their



own personalities or value systems, allowing them to freely construct/develop their masculinity in a socially acceptable environment.

Researchers such as Sanday (1990) have shown that fraternity affiliations can have negative consequences for women who visit fraternities with atmospheres that condone large amounts of alcohol consumption. These chapters also promote attitudes of male superiority and are more likely to have a higher incidence of rape (Humphery and Kahn 2000; Boswell and Spade 1996). Boswell and Spade (1996), through their ethnographic study, found that some fraternities could be considered high risk for sexual aggression toward women while there are other fraternities that hold more respectful attitudes toward women. These fraternities are normally considered low risk. Other researchers believe that while such findings may hold true, negative and sexually predatory attitudes and behaviors can be changed for the better with diligence and educational programs (Foubert and La Voy 2000; Neuberger and Hanson 1997; Davis and Liddell 2002).

Although I draw heavily on the research that has been done on gender, masculinity, and social fraternities, I seek to determine how men in a college fraternity teach, learn, and negotiate hegemonic masculinity and how they ensure conformity to hegemonic practices. This study examined the institution of the fraternity including the customs, practices, relationships, and behavior patterns of the men in the fraternity and some formal and informal social patterns of the Greek community. Inequality and power are found within all social institutions. However, it is not the individual alone who is the agent for inequality but the individual who is a participant in a larger system (Douglas 1986). Institutions produce labels that stabilize the flux of social life and even create, to some extent, the realities to which they apply. Institutions may have individual authority or they may have a common agreement on some general founding principle. Fraternities as institutions have a unique history based on exclusion of certain groups who are non-Protestant and nonwhite. Although fraternities allow for individual power, it is always practiced within the constraints of the overall governing principles or rules and regulations that have been in place since their founding. For the governing principles of the fraternity, I relied on the Manual of Fraternity XYZ.

## ***A Brief History of XYZ Fraternity***

This section discusses the setting and participants and the national organization of fraternity XYZ. I also briefly discuss the reorganization of fraternity XYZ because it helps to establish why the fraternity has chosen to create and maintain certain images of masculinity.

### **The Setting**

The fraternity I studied is located on a large, state funded, land-grant University in the Midwest, with approximately 26,000 undergraduate students. The University was founded in 1868. The first fraternity at this University, Delta Tau Delta, was organized in 1875, six years after the college was opened to students. A sorority was established on campus in 1877 and took the name of I.C. Sorocis. Later, I.C. Sorocis became the first national sorority Pi Beta Phi (Greek History website; due to confidentiality issues, I have chosen not to disclose the web address because it has the university name listed in it).

During the latter part of 19th century, a nationwide movement began against fraternities. Opponents believed the fraternities were selective and exploitative. Because of the fraternities' secrecy, some believed them to be undemocratic. During this time, fraternities were banned on some campuses, including the campus where this fraternity is located. At the turn of the century, the anti-fraternity movement was losing ground. The ban on fraternities at this university was lifted in 1904. Many national fraternities were established and numerous non-Greek clubs were formed. Among these were the Dragon Society, Arcade Club, Ozark Club, and many more. Most of these clubs petitioned national fraternities and later became Greek societies. Today there are 32 fraternities and 18 sororities recognized by the University. Approximately thirteen percent of all undergraduates are members of the Greek community, with over 2,000 students maintaining residence in Greek chapter dwellings (Greek History website).

### **Background**

It should be noted that my research does not aim to generalize XYZ fraternity men's experiences to those of all men who participate in a fraternity. Although there are common experiences that all fraternity men may go through, such as recruitment, initiation, and living with a large group of same sex peers, each member's experiences and perceptions are unique. Every fraternity creates its own image that is distinctive to that particular group's

experience within set rules, guidelines, and norms handed down from previous generations, the academic institutional settings, and the national organization. National organizations set the precedence for actions that are permitted or not allowed within the multiple chapters in their organizational structures. The national organizations' main concern is for the safety and image of its chapters. Each individual chapter or fraternity acts accordingly, either accepting or rejecting those guidelines.

The chapter I studied almost lost its charter five years ago when the national organization, along with the educational institution, came into chapter XYZ to deal with the major and minor infractions committed by the fraternity members. These infractions included a range of issues from drug and alcohol abuse to academic probation. During my interviews these infractions and the chapter's reorganization were discussed at length by a few of the older members. Below is an excerpt of one such conversation.

They were going to remove our charter. I didn't know that. Well, when this hazing thing came out, there was binge drinking and... highly involved umm, paddling, umm, a lot of stereotypical things. You know, sleep deprivation, you name it. Guys were like hiding behind the... like, furnace, downstairs in the boiler room to sleep because we were getting maybe an hour of sleep a night. When all that stuff came out, and it was reported to the University, the only way that we were going to save our chapter is by going dry; because we were wet at the time. We could have alcohol and there were a lot of jungle juice parties, which is a big no-no in fraternities, but none of us young guys ever knew it (Dale).

Upon finding out about these infractions there were two things that could have been done by the national organization: the first was to close the chapter down and disband its membership; the second, to interview all the members, find out who the trouble makers were, and "clean house." The latter option was chosen and in a matter of a few months the chapter was "reorganized," leaving a chapter that once had a membership of over forty men with eleven. The members who were left were underclass men. There were only four members of the original reorganized chapter remaining when this study was conducted. One important outcome of this reorganization is that the house is now "dry," meaning that alcohol is not allowed on the premises.

The new members of this fraternity, along with the guidance of the original four members, have rejected the traditional "animal house" image that many fraternities on college campuses have succumbed to, in part because their survival demanded it, and in part because they embraced a new image.

This research demonstrates that masculine imperatives, although shaped by the institution, are regularly negotiated and reconstructed to fit the image and goals of the

individual fraternity and at the interactional level by the members. In the chapter three I will discuss how masculinity is created and maintained inside the homosocial setting of a college social fraternity.

## Chapter II: Research Methods and Experience

### *Research Aims*

In this ethnographic study of one fraternity I am seeking to understand how masculinity is created and maintained in male homosocial environments. This study seeks to examine “macro level accounts, which emphasize structural factors, and micro-level accounts, which focus on social actors” (Pierce 1995:4). At the macro level I will explore the relationship between the institution of the fraternity and the members, although, this is not a study of institutions. Douglas (1986) states that institutions are the barriers to equality, instead of individuals’ prejudices and discrimination being the source of inequality. Douglas argues that observed rules, regulations, and guidelines are the source of inequality. An example of this would be a company’s hiring practice, by which employees are hired through word of mouth or informal networking. Informal networking allows, although somewhat unintentionally, the company to hire people most like themselves; this practice may lead to the exclusion of women and other underrepresented groups in certain occupations. Informal recruiting by word of mouth is also practiced by fraternities when they recruit new members.

This study examines the norms of a university fraternity. Because macro level accounts often neglect human agency it is important to understand how the individual, on the micro level, either accepts and incorporates those norms into his daily actions or rejects and transforms those norms in daily interactions. Although this study is examining the individual in the context of the institution and within a homosocial environment, it is also important to examine how the individual “does gender” at the interactional level. Using West and Zimmerman’s concept (1987) of “doing gender” and Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical approach, examining how gender is performed or accomplished. This study seeks to understand how “micro-level interactions are tied to larger social institutions and embedded within historically specific contexts” (Pierce 1995:5).

“Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world” (Denzin and Lincoln 2003:4). I employed qualitative methods because I wanted to gain an understanding of how fraternity members view their own experiences through the subjective experience of masculinity in this homosocial environment. I used the ethnographic approach (Devault 1999) while conducting this study. Data collection procedures included interviews, participant observation, and gathering of relevant documents (Corbin and

Strauss 1990). Throughout the study I relied heavily on the Chapter Manual, which is given to all new recruits and contains the rules and regulations of fraternity life.

The main focus of my research is how men construct meaning around gender, or in this case masculinity, in an institutional setting of a homosocial environment of a college fraternity. I totaled 405 hours of participant observation with the members inside and outside the fraternity house. This chapter is configured into five main sections. The first section focuses on the participants and the background and setting. The second revolves around the participant observation. The third section discusses the semi-structured interviews and the fourth section discusses the methodology used to interpret and analyze the data. The fifth section closes the chapter with a discussion of my reflections on issues of race, class, and gender in my own life and how they affected the data collection procedures.

## **Methods**

Sandra Harding (1987) states that there is a difference between methods and methodology. Methods are the techniques used to gather the data, but methodology is “a theory and analysis of how research should proceed” (Harding 1987:2). Devault (1999) explains that methods are practices we use that help us understand the social world (p. 21). I will begin by discussing the methods I used in the data collection process.

Ethnography is a tool that allows the researcher to examine the interactions of the participants in their particular settings (Devault 1999). This method allows the researcher to observe interactions of daily occurrences that are normally taken for granted. Ethnography is the best way for me to gain the information I need as an “outsider” (Devault 1999; Naples 2003). By outsider I mean that I did not have any previous personal knowledge or experience with the Greek community or with fraternities in general, aside from what I have seen on television or heard from students. I also expand the ethnography experience by using auto-ethnography (Ellis and Bochner 2003). Auto-ethnography not only includes traditional ethnography, but also the researcher’s experiences as an important aspect of the research and the analysis.

## ***The Participants***

The fraternity I studied and named XYZ, is part of a national organization that was established in 1856 and has grown to be one of the largest and oldest in the country (1954, *The Manual of XYZ Fraternity*). This particular fraternity's inception was at a military institute in Vermont. The total membership of the fraternity house I studied was 38; all the men were residing in the house. The ages of the respondents ranged from 18 to 22 with the mean age of 20. All members identified themselves as white or Caucasian except for one, who identified himself as Asian American. The Asian American member was adopted by his white missionary parents as an infant in the Philippines and was brought to the US at the age of six. The reason it is important to note his adoption is because he was raised in an all white family and moved to a small town in the Midwest where there were few racial or ethnic minorities; he defines himself as Asian American on paper only. He does not see himself as different from his white counterparts. Most of the members came from middle class or working class backgrounds. To determine their class standing I used occupational prestige scales based on the men's fathers' occupations, since many of their mothers do not work outside the home (Rothman 2002). Around half of the respondents came from small farming communities and the other half came from more urban settings. Although two members came from larger cities (St. Paul, Minnesota and Austin Texas), others came from small size cities located in the Midwest. Location and or community are important in identity formation from an individual standpoint as well as from a cultural one. People from small towns have different daily lives and interactions, which can be, at times, dramatically different from those who live in larger urban settings (Warren 1988; Brint 2001; Durkheim 1964). Because I am concerned with the men's interactions once inside the fraternity and how they define masculinity, home town was not a major factor in this study.

## ***Securing Consent***

The process of designing this study and contacting the proper authority to gain access to the research site was time intensive. I wanted to get a feel for any resistance I might encounter, especially since I had no affiliation with the Greek community prior to this study. I started by asking people that I knew who belonged to fraternities how comfortable they would feel about an outsider coming into their chapters, asking questions, and observing. Many of the people I talked to were very encouraging and did not see a problem

with the research I was proposing. However, every person I encountered said I needed to gain permission and acceptance from the Dean of Greek Affairs, who once was Greek as an undergraduate. They believed that if I had her approval for the project, then any of the Greek chapters would allow me access to their houses. The Dean was highly respected and known for working very closely with the Greek community. The Dean knew many of the students by name and was also very aware of the reputation of each chapter. At the university where this research was conducted there is a close relationship between university administrators, such as the Dean of Students and the Dean of Greek Affairs, and the Greek community in general.

I emailed a letter with the intentions of my study to the Dean of Greek Affairs asking for a meeting. At the meeting I discussed my interests in the Greek Community, explaining that my knowledge of fraternities was limited to what I was told by the students I ran across and the stereotypes built by the media. We discussed at length my intentions, research protocol, and the direction the Dean felt the Greek Community was going. She believed that many national organizations were pushing their chapters to reject older "animal house" stereotypes because of the liability factors. "Social host liability is a legal doctrine that may impose liability on private hosts for serving alcohol to a party guest who is afterwards involved in an alcohol-related accident" (Walton 1996: 29). Since the 1970s Greek organizations and their home universities and colleges have been under investigations and fined for numerous social host liability factors (Walton 1996:30). The U.S. courts determined that all fraternity members of a chapter can be held liable as accomplices if they are hosting a fraternity party on or off campus; the educational institutions and the national fraternity foundations thus far have been exonerated from liability (Walton 1996). There also is growing concern from both faculty and administration on a nationwide level about the implications Greek life has on the conduct of students (Neuberger and Hanson 1997).

The Dean and I discussed the changes that fraternities and sororities are making, as some fraternities are going "dry". We also discussed how the media perpetuate the stereotypical animal house image and how different media sources (television and magazines) have sought permission to gain access to this particular campus. Each time they have been denied, with much encouragement from the Dean of Students Office. The Dean explained that most media sources are seeking the negative stereotypes about Greek life and like to sensationalize and over-dramatize what really happens in fraternities and



sororities. At the end of our meeting the Dean agreed to be my contact with the fraternities on campus and with the rest of the University.

One of the major reasons that I was granted permission to do this study was because my research was to be academic and I was not a reporter trying to get a story. The Dean was familiar with the protocols in conducting research and with the rigors a researcher has to go through in order to gain permission from the Institutional Review Board concerning Human Subjects. She told me that she trusted I would conform to those rules and protect the identity of the fraternity I was studying and its members. She understood that I was not looking to “dig up dirt” but had a valid question about fraternities and construction of gender. The university and the Greek fraternity in general have been approached several times by people from the media, such as MTV and Cosmopolitan, to do stories on Greek Life. But these types of stories are often sensationalized and concentrate on the behavior that many Greek communities and academic institutions are trying to eliminate, such as partying and underage binge drinking. In our discussion I sympathized with the Greek community and the image of fraternities and sororities that TV shows like this portrayed, reassuring her that was by not my view.

The Dean of Greek Affairs approached her immediate supervisor, the Dean of Students, and gained further permission and support for my study from the University. She sent out an email I had drafted to see if there were any chapters that would be interested in participating in my study. Finally, the Dean identified a fraternity. This formal process was very important to me; I wanted to have support of the trusted authority figures within the Greek community. It was also important because I was told by a few colleagues that I would not be granted permission to conduct my study and that I would have difficulty getting a fraternity to agree to participate in the study. These colleagues believed the resistance was due to the secretive nature of the Greek community, and also because I was a woman wanting to do research in a male space. During this process also I submitted the required forms to the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Approval by the IRB took longer than expected, perhaps due to the sensitivity of some of the research questions (see appendix). I believe the questions I asked concerning rape and violence that held up the approval process. I asked “Have you ever been the victim of mental or physical violence while living in your house? (stalking, harassment, rape)” and “Do you know anyone who has been the victim of mental or physical violence while living in a Greek house? (man or woman) If so

was that person a Greek member? If so did you seek counseling?" These are sensitive issues and can cause trauma in some students if they have been victimized.

Before the Review Board would approve my study, I had to have a formal agreement from the fraternity which had decided to be in my study. The president of the fraternity wrote me a letter stating he had granted full access and permission to complete my study in his chapter. The entire process beginning with identifying how to gain access to those in authority and ending with gaining permission to conduct the study from the Institutional Review Board took approximately four months.

I contacted fraternity XYZ's president to set up our first meeting and to go over the study so he would understand exactly what it was that I was requesting. This meeting took place the second week of the fall semester of 2003. I was introduced to the men in a chapter meeting where I explained my study, my presence in the chapter, and that I would be seeking volunteers for interviews. At this first meeting I recognized one of the students I had originally mentioned to the Dean. This student was a well respected leader in the house and within the Greek community at large. I do not know about the interactions that happened before my appearance in the house and whether the student that I knew had any influence on the decision to accept my presence in the fraternity.

### ***Participant Observation***

"Ethnography involves an ongoing attempt to place specific encounters, events, and understanding into fuller, more meaningful context" (Tedlock 2003:165). I played the role of researcher and also participated in some of the events with the fraternity members, as much as was possible being a woman in a man's social setting. The reason I defined the fraternity as a "man's" social setting is because of the historical context in which these institutions were formed, by men and for men only. The institution where fraternity XYZ was formed was a military school that consisted of all men, and fraternities are to this day exclusively for male participation. During the time I was at the fraternity other women were sometimes present but often I was the only woman there. The contact I had with other women within the fraternity was via the men's girlfriends and the fraternity's cook. Participating with the members permitted me a better understanding of the members' world view, although the members and I were always aware of my outsider status (Schacht 1996; Tedlock 2003; Roberts and Sanders 2005).

Even though my access to the fraternity seemed uncomplicated, I had the feeling of being on a reality television show.

I have also decided- I'm really not sure, but I feel like I am on reality T.V...It's a surreal experience for me- everything is hyper magnified while I'm here. I'm always trying to be aware of my surroundings and what is happening- boundaries of researcher and participant are blurred... I must admit I like just sitting around and shooting the shit... (Field notes)

I was given the entry code to the fraternity house so I could enter at will. This code changed periodically, and each time I was given the new code by a member of the house. I attended three chapter meetings and was invited to the ceremony where the new pledges were paired with their big brothers. The chapter meetings are mandatory, participation is very high and often alumni and the alumni advisor are present. Not only did I go to these chapter meetings for data collection, but I wanted to be visible and show the men that my presence in their chapter was approved by those with more authority. Because I was told by those outside the fraternity that my presence may be unwanted and that the men might not cooperate with my research, I thought that if my presence was approved by authority figures there would be less resistance to my presence in the house. I also assumed because I am a woman researcher and a novice at fieldwork, I might be questioned regarding my legitimacy as a researcher. I needed validation from those in authority, the men. My first inclination was not to have personal contact with the men, except for the interviews. My objective was to sit and observe unobtrusively. It did not take long for me to discover that this was not going to work in this particular setting. I found that the men were trying to interact and talk to me when I was there, or at the very least, they directed their comments in my direction when I was writing in my journal. I then decided to approach some of them individually and sign them up for interviews. This approach worked much better than being a silent observer. As time went on, some of the men sought me out for an interview and wanted to hear more about the study (Roberts and Sanders 2005).

I showed up on different days and varied times, but towards the end I found myself eating lunch with the men, between 11:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., almost daily. Lunch was the time when most members were either getting up or they were transitioning to and from classes. Many times I was their ride to campus. I also participated in a dinner exchange between the fraternity and a sorority. Towards the end of my participation I went to the end of the year formal as a "date" of one of the members. I was not a "date" in the traditional sense, but I attended as a friend, or a stand in, for someone whose date could not attend at

the last minute. By the time of the formal I had become more than a researcher with a particular group of men. We would hang out in the house watching movies and chatting, often in the men's personal living spaces. There were power dynamics involved in these situations also, which I discuss in chapter five in the section on competition.

Throughout this project I found myself becoming attached to, and forming opinions about the members. I tried to be nonjudgmental and to leave any biases at the door that would affect my opinions or my relationships with the men or affect the analysis of the research itself. This was not easy. As with most people one meets in life, relationships are formed based on personal tastes and interests, and experiences people might have in common; it was no different for me here. Although this was a research project, this fraternity and the men, for a time, became a focal point of my life. Their concerns and interests soon became mine. I would have to remind myself that "this" (meaning the research) was not "real," which begs the question what is reality to the researcher. It was hard for me to compartmentalize my role as researcher from that of wife and mother. Occasionally I would get a call from my oldest son asking questions about when I was planning on coming home, reminding me that I had another role while I was in the fraternity. It was easy to lose myself while I was in the house, chatting with the men about issues of little concern in my own life: who had met whom and what bar they were planning on visiting that night or if they were going to play golf the next day. The normal complaints of college students who believe at times they know more than their professors or how much home work each professor expects, were shared with me. Their lives seemed so uncomplicated on the surface and sometimes I would envy these young men who had so much of their lives ahead of them and who seemed more together than I was at their age.

I also have to admit I enjoyed the focus of their attention, making me feel I was eighteen again and not a more mature woman. I would spend time with these men and then I would go home to my children and husband, to cook dinner, do laundry, and finish up course work. These daily activities always grounding me when my "other life" as researcher would get away with me; it was the mundane activity of housework and being with my family that reminded me that I was in the fraternity as the means to an end, my goal of collecting data for my dissertation so I could finish my own college career. I was there to make a future for myself and my children and it was those tasks that kept me going. As stated earlier, at times I felt like I was on a reality television show. After a load of laundry, giving the kids a bath, and staying up to finish my own work, that feeling would soon leave. These

same tasks that grounded me are also the tasks that recreate gender dynamics in my personal life. Performing daily “mothering” chores allowed me to view myself as a “good mother,” replacing the guilt I often felt when I was away from my children (Litt 2000; Rogers and Litt 2004).

### ***Semi Structured Interviews***

I conducted interviews with twenty members of XYZ fraternity (52.6% of the total membership). Each completed a demographic questionnaire as well as a face-to-face semi-structured interview. The interviews lasted one to three hours. The interviews and participant observation were conducted over a nine-month period from September of 2003 through May of 2004. All twenty primary interviews were conducted in the fraternity’s conference room. I cannot readily identify why some chose to participate in the study and others did not; I can only extrapolate from my interactions with the men themselves. I believe that, for the most part, the twenty men I interviewed were more open to speaking to an outsider and believed my presence was a good chance to demonstrate that the stereotypes of fraternities are not true. I speculate that they saw this as a good opportunity for public relations work. I also believe some of the men were bothered by my presence and did not want to participate in the study because they saw it as an invasion of their privacy. There were several men with whom I did not interact at all. One reason for the lack of interaction was that certain individuals were not present in the house when I was there. For example, there was one man who was doing an internship with a company out of town and only visited the fraternity periodically. In the initial paperwork for the Institutional Review Board I only requested twenty interviews.

Prior to beginning the interviews I asked each participant if he understood what my research was about, thus giving him the chance to communicate any misconceptions he might have had. I then explained the terms and purpose of the study, along with answering the men’s questions. I told the men that I was interested in how gender was “done,” or accomplished, and that I was particularly interested in how masculinity was negotiated in all male spaces within the confines of a social institution. Most of the men’s questions revolved around why I chose their chapter and about confidentiality. I told the men that their fraternity was recommended to me by the Dean of Greek Affairs and that anything that was discussed in privacy during our interview was confidential and would not be discussed with other

members of the house. I reiterated the statement of confidentiality that they were signing. Typically, at the beginning of the interview the men did not have particular questions. Whenever they felt they were discussing something that someone in the house might not like or understand, they became hesitant. I would reassure them that no one would be able to identify them when my research was completed and published. I would not discuss their responses with anyone.

The questioning of confidentiality at times revolved around the issues of masculinity in the homosocial environment of the fraternity. During one of the interviews, a member told me that one of the other fraternity's president confided in him that he is gay. Since I discuss what it means to be gay in a presumed heterosexual environment, disclosing that someone in a fraternity is gay is a serious and potentially dangerous; "dangerous" in terms of the hierarchal system of Greek organizations and potentially losing one's position within the Greek community.

All respondents who participated in the interviews signed a consent form and received a copy, along with a letter explaining what the study was about (see appendices). They each agreed to the terms of the study before the interviews began. Not only did I have each participant sign the consent form, but on tape I again read the terms and conditions and had them agree verbally so their acceptance would be recorded before each interview. All procedures and forms were viewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the researcher's home university.

Each participant was asked about his attitudes, feelings, and experiences involving the Greek community. I started with general questions as to why he decided to join a fraternity, then moved to more specific questions, about the running of the fraternity. I also asked the men more personal questions such as how they defined masculinity and what their personal experiences of living in the fraternity were like. The last group of questions revolved around issues of violence. I asked them if they or anyone they knew had experienced violence while living in the house. I defined violence as physical or mental, including harassment and/or stalking.

At the end of the interviews I asked them again if they had any questions, comments or concerns. I also asked them if there were questions that I did not ask about them or the fraternity that they felt I should have. Most of the men answered that they could not think of anything, but a couple gave me some good suggestions. One suggestion dealt with whether the men felt that they could leave their possessions out in the open or their doors

unlocked, as well as if they felt that the house was secure from intruders when they were not present. Another suggested question revolved around issues of diversity. This respondent had a valid point simply because a house is not diverse does not mean that diversity is unimportant, and active recruitment of ethnic minorities does not in and of itself signify a true belief in the importance of diversity. I incorporated suggestions and comments into future interviews.

After a day of interviewing, I went home, read my field notes and revised my questions accordingly. All interviews had some of the same questions, such as, "Why did you decide to join a fraternity?" However, because I modified the questions during the course of the study, the interviews varied. In seeking to gain the confidence of the men, I stayed away from questions concerning their initiation rituals. I was told in advance that initiation rituals were the only "taboo" subject that they were not allowed to discuss.

Although I believe seeing the rituals first hand would have added depth to this study, I do not believe my conclusions would have changed. The rituals might have shown a variation on the way masculinity is practiced but initiation rituals are about indoctrination and maintaining a hegemonic norm. I did let the men know I was aware that their private rituals were not held at the house. The private initiation is held in a cabin in the woods and the men go to a formal dinner afterward. I was also told by two of the members that the men have a secret handshake. I was told this came about during the Civil War so members from the North and South could identify who their brothers were. I do not know whether there is some historic basis to this, but all members at the national level know this hand shake. There is a level of secrecy and a code of silence among fraternities in general. When I asked questions about date rape and the use of ruffees (rohypnol and other date rape drugs) within the Greek community, most of the men said they had not heard about it. During this point in time, however, there was a formal investigation going on in one particular house for using ruffees during parties. When I told the men that I already knew about the use of the drugs, some of them were a little more open and talked about how that house gave the Greek community a bad name. Most still said they had not heard about the investigation.

Although I had developed a systematic approach for this study I recognized that the dynamics of ethnography are not static. Interactions between the participants and myself changed the course of the interviewing process and how the field observation was conducted. According to Weis (1994), interviews that can sacrifice uniformity can often be

more dynamic. Some of the interviews went well and lasted much longer than anticipated because the respondents and I made instant connections. Others, mainly the shorter interviews, seemed like they would go on forever. I found that the more at ease the respondent was the more fun and informative the interviewing process became. There were interviews that were more difficult than others. During one interview, the member wanted to use the interaction as a therapy session. This member was one of the youngest in the fraternity, both in age and in grade, and it was apparent after a few moments into the interview that he really liked to talk and wanted to analyze his life. I wanted to give each man the opportunity to discuss whatever came to mind, as well as answer the questions I constructed in advance. Therefore, I did not stop this young man from telling me about his life. After two hours I finally told him that it was late and that if I had any other questions I would contact him.

Eight of the fraternity interviews were transcribed by an outside source who ran a transcription business and was familiar with confidentiality issues. The transcriber had no affiliations with the institution where the research was conducted nor with the researcher or any of the participants. The transcriber also lived in a city that was not the setting of the study. These transcriptions were paid for by a small grant given through the Women's Studies Program at the researcher's home university. The rest of the interviews were transcribed by me. A total of 24 tapes were transcribed, including the interviews of the original 20 men and 4 follow up interviews. To ensure confidentiality the following measures were taken: the fraternity is noted as fraternity XYZ (none of these letters correspond to a Greek organization) and a pseudonym was given to each participant. During the initial interview each participant was asked if he would like to choose his own pseudonym, but most declined. I have one copy of this system on a computer disk and a hard copy locked in a secure place in my home along with all field notes, interviews, and other documentation.

### ***Analyzing the Data***

In analyzing the data, I tried to take an "interpretive interactionist framework that attempts to capture the core meanings and contradictions of the [fraternity's] experiences by examining [the members'] language and actions" (Schacht 1996:552). Interpretative practices are "the constellation of procedures, conditions, and resources through which reality is apprehended, understood, organized and conveyed in every day life" (Gubrium and



Holstein 2003:214). I examined my field notes, along with the semi-structured interviews I conducted, for the development of themes. In interpreting the data I started with the general question of “How do fraternities construct meaning around gender and how do men in homosocial environments create different forms of masculinity.” I started with highlighting the more obvious sections that included code words pertaining to gender such as “man” or “masculinity.” I also categorized topics that were repetitive throughout the transcribed interviews; topics such as responsibility and chores were talked about in almost all the interviews. There were events that perplexed me while I was doing the observation in the house. I made sure to highlight these social phenomena in my field observation log book and then to ask about them in follow up interviews. These also became important themes (e.g., the role a particular member played in the house).

I developed four over-arching themes and divided them into the following empirical chapters. The first theme, “Creating and Maintaining Hegemonic and Complicit forms of Masculinity,” focuses on homosocial reproduction which consists of practices of recruitment, initiation, drinking rituals, and some forms of hazing. The second theme, “The Image of Hegemonic Masculinity; Performance and Maintenance,” concentrates on how the men maintain the image of hegemonic masculinity through impression management and how masculinity is performed through competition and the patriarchal bargain. The third theme developed, “Managing/ Creating Subordinated or Marginalized Masculinity,” discusses how hegemonic masculinity is created in opposition to other forms of masculinity. The last theme, “Moments of Consciousness: Ideals and Practice,” concentrates on moments where the men consciously became aware of hegemonic masculinity.

### ***Reflections on Gender and Race in the Research Process***

Reinharz (1992) and Devault (1999), as other feminist researchers, believe that the problem with some social research is that it is done by privileged men who often miss the dimensions of gender, race, and inequality. It is important for social researchers to understand that we do research with preconceived categories and frameworks. Feminist sociologists, in their formulation, must refuse to put aside their bodily existence and activity as a “starting point” for inquiry (Devault 1999:19). Feminist researchers believe that you cannot separate out relationships, interactions, and interpretations from social location and context. It is also my contention that by allowing for the experience of the researcher to

become part of the research process, the social location of the researcher should be also under investigation, which allows for the process of transparency to be maintained.

Riessman (1987), in examining interview data from a white middle class researcher who interviewed women on their experiences of divorce, found that gender was not enough to promote rapport with a respondent. She states that race and class differences caused barriers for the interviewer when the interviewer could not relate to the cultural differences of her poorer Hispanic respondent. Litt (2000), in her book *Medicalized Motherhood*, states that “because of my feeling of affinity with the Jewish women’s perspective I was especially blinded to the normative race, ethnic, and class power that medicalization contained” (p. 14). She goes on to explain that it was her differences with African American women that allowed her to become aware of medicalization as a racial and class orientation. She also discusses the difficulty of interviewing poor African American women where her status as middle-class, educated and white was considered a representation of the medical profession. She states, “[i]n essence, I represented the very culture whose meanings I was asking women to scrutinize” (p. 15). Litt’s research is an example of how the power dynamics between the interviewer and the respondent need to be explored and identified by the researcher. Had she not understood this and explored these issues through her own self exploration, her analysis might have overlooked these subtle nuances of power. According to DeVault (1999) “researchers should treat questions of racial-ethnic positioning as integral to the developing analysis in a qualitative study and ‘hearing’ race and ethnicity in our talk with informants requires active analysis rather than passive listening and recording” (p. 85). Ferber (1998:4) argues that race shapes the lives of everyone and that those who experience privilege through their race also must be investigated, just as those who are oppressed by it. In my case, race, at first, seemed invisible.

I am white, middle class, and a woman; these intersections did not prove to be problematic in gaining entry into an all-white male space. Although my entry was not complicated it did not mean that it was not gendered (I will discuss gendering later in this section). In many ways, this dissertation explores the fraternity’s white racial identity. The racial identity of the fraternity and myself proved to be an unconscious source of identification and privilege. My whiteness, along with my middle class status, allowed me the use of my cultural “toolkit” (Swidler 1986). The “toolkit” allows individuals to act in society based upon various cultural scripts available to them (Swidler 1986). Culture can be defined “[a]s people interact over time, they come to develop a shared reality; a perspective;

a working consensus; a common definition of what they believe to be true, moral and worth while" (Charon 2005:195). My racial identity, being part of dominant society, allowed me to identify and communicate with the men, for race and class become ways of knowing; ways of viewing and identifying the world. One is then identified through a set of accomplishments, as well as by markers on the body (Di Peiro 2002; West and Fenstermaker 1995; Butler 1993; West and Zimmerman 1987). It is not that the men recognized my "whiteness" or thought anything about it. As with most forms of privilege it was invisible (this invisibility is only attributed to those who belong to the dominant group), and therefore taken for granted. This tool kit can be labeled "cultural capital." "Cultural capital is familiarity with the configuration of knowledge, attitudes, and social skills that place [people] at a distinct advantage in the school setting. Cultural capital includes linguistic style, aesthetic preferences, and styles of social interaction (2002:230). I, along with the men, never had to negotiate the rules and norms of dominant society because we were part of it.

Upon first entering the house I thought that my age might be a barrier in communicating with the men. Although I am nearly twice the age of some of the younger members, people often guess my age to be around 25. This may have allowed me to appear much closer to the age of the respondents. Being a college student myself, I often blend in with the rest of the students and can identify with many of the same issues and complaints they have with class work and time constraints. Therefore, age did not appear to be a barrier.

I was under the assumption that my sex and/or gender would be a constraint that would affect the interaction between me and the men when the interviewing process began, but I did not find this to be true. Research by Alissa King (2003), a female who interviewed football players and fraternity members, found that being a woman did not pose a problem during the interviewing process. She states that men may feel more comfortable in revealing sensitive information to a woman, rather than a man (36-37). It seems that "women interviewing men is the second most common preference amongst in-depth interviewers" (Williams and Heikes 1993: 281). The first would be same sex interviews. Williams and Heikes (1993) state that "[m]any of those who use "same-sex" interviews base this preference on the intuitive notion that rapport is more easily achieved in these contexts" (p. 281). However, as they demonstrate in their study of male nurses, that rapport was achieved by both men and women interviewers with their male subjects, although the interview subjects did monitor their language and responses according to the sex of the

researcher. They also found that the overall responses by the men were in agreement with the responses obtained by both the male and female researchers.

Although my being a woman did not pose complications with the interviewing process, gender was always being done. Betsy Lucal (1999), through her own experience, has pointed out that we are always doing gender. This gendering process is also “done to us” by others. People attribute gender to us depending on how they have interpreted our own performance or displays. The most obvious way in which I displayed gender was through the way I dressed. I was very conscience of the clothing I chose to wear inside the house. I wore clothes that emphasized “youthfulness”; blue jeans and trendy shirts that young women on campus would wear. I did this because I did not want my interactions with the men to be constrained by my age.

My intent was to observe how “others” did gender, yet I became all too aware of how pervasive and practiced gender was in my own daily interactions (Lucal 1999). I became self-conscious every time I performed gender either purposefully or by habit, thinking that I was being evaluated by those around me. I started analyzing my daily interactions to the point where I became frustrated and even exhausted thinking about performativity and who is rewarded and sanctioned in our society for either accepting the gender norms or rejecting them (“queering” them, as Butler would say). Everyone around me and everyday interactions, such as grocery shopping, became potential research subjects and sites. The everyday truly became problematic. I became hyper aware of the interactions around me and it became hard for me to just be “in the moment.”

I try not to allow this hyper awareness to affect my interactions with others. I would remind myself to act “naturally”. However, I envisioned how others saw me, always reminding myself of the “role” I was taking on before I walked into a room as a teacher, researcher, student, wife and mother (to name only a few identities or roles I have taken on or constructed for myself over the years).

While I was in the fraternity house I looked for signs that this male space might be a hostile environment for women, as pointed out in studies of fraternities (e.g., Borsari and Carey 1999). I had not seen evidence of drugs or alcohol in the chapter, nor had I seen evidence that a woman would be in any kind of danger inside the house. I wanted to believe that this house, my guys, were the good ones. Yet, I also know that my reality was only a part of the story. There were certain men I never had interactions with and I was not there twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. I only saw snippets of the “truth” and my vantage point was still as an “outsider,” as a researcher, and most importantly as a woman.

However, I believe the interviews and field notes gave an accurate portrayal of the dynamics of the house and the men.

Although I enjoyed my time doing this project I was relieved when the study was over. I could stop analyzing the daily interactions of myself and others and go back to the normalcy of my life with my family. The data from this project are almost overwhelming and this dissertation cannot explore everything. I found that it was the distance of being away from the research setting, both in time and in space, which has allowed me to step back and look at the data I collected from a more critical perspective. When I first read the interview notes I would find myself getting lost in the memory of the moment. The distance allowed me the perspective I needed to reflect critically.

I also learned that even though feminist researchers acknowledge the complexities of ethnography, one cannot really be prepared for the uncertainty of the research experience. Once the researcher is in the field it is all improvisation. There are no guidebooks to consult in order to see if one is interacting with people correctly. It is all done from an intuitive level. There are no formulas to follow or look up that will guarantee the same results as those obtained by others who have been in the same field. Human interaction is very unique and each interaction must be contextualized within the time, space, and historical context of the setting. However, there are also patterns of behavior that I have discovered through this study which allow me to generalize from this particular study to other settings.

## Chapter III: Creating the Image of Hegemonic and Complicit forms of Masculinity

That's the reason why XYZ has been around since 1856, because people believed in the principles and beliefs and building better men... We took care of things because we had to get them done. Along that line, we've created followers and now these followers are going to be expected to step up as leaders. (Dale)

This chapter examines how fraternity men are actively seeking to define ideal practices of hegemonic masculinity in which many already are engaged. Hegemony “refers to an advanced mode of domination in late capitalist societies that is characterized by [a] combination of force and consent that is used to promulgate a view of the world to which the oppressed and the oppressor both submit” (Gramsci 1971:80 reprinted in Chen 1999:585). Complicit masculinity refers to men who benefit from patriarchy, although they do not actively contribute to its maintenance (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). I examine what I believe are important processes for defining the hegemonic form of masculinity and investigate how certain cultural or institutional ideologies are reproduced and maintained within the homosocial environment of the fraternity. The focus of this chapter is on how hegemonic masculinity is maintained through homosocial reproduction using the mechanisms or practices of recruitment, initiation, drinking rituals, and some forms of hazing.

Masculinity can be situational depending on the actor and the context. According to West (2001), “[m]asculinities are beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors associated with what it means to be a male in a society” (p. 372). Homosocial environments are situations in which there are clear distinctions between men and women through segregation and where there is no expectation of sexual attraction to those of the same sex (Bird 1996:121). I am not implying that same sex attraction does not occur, but only that the attractions are normally not acknowledged.

Bird (1996) argues that men in homosocial environments incorporate a variety of meanings into their individual identities. Some of these identities may not be congruent with the hegemonic form of masculinity while other meanings and practices are part and parcel of the hegemonic norm. She points out that the structural order of gender is maintained by shared meanings of hegemonic masculinity that are perpetuated and performed in male

homosocial environments. Bird indicates that men maintain masculinity through creating norms around gender that are in line with the image of hegemonic masculinity and that actions outside of these norms are “suppressed.” Research has indicated that individuals who resist or “go outside the norm” often run the risk of alienation (West and Zimmerman 1987; Bird 2003:580). The shared meanings in Bird’s study included emotional detachment, competition, and the sexual objectification of women (Bird 1996:122). The shared meanings of masculinity for the men in fraternity XYZ are those of responsibility, leadership, and also, competition. These shared meanings help in creating the ideal fraternity man. My research reveals that the young men are constantly negotiating their masculinity during their interactions with others. At times, the men resist hegemonic norms, but most often they are making sure that the version of masculinity that is being practiced by an individual coincides with the image of the fraternity. These ideals are immersed in the notions of responsibility, leadership, and competition. One of the most important characteristics of being a good leader is holding the ideals and beliefs of fraternity XYZ and being able to introduce and indoctrinate other members into those same beliefs and practices.

Throughout the rest of this chapter I will demonstrate how the men are indoctrinated into the fraternity. In the successive chapter I will discuss the qualities the men feel are important in being a leader in the fraternity, and how ideals of responsibility and leadership often lead to competition between individual men and competition between fraternities in the Greek community.

### ***Creating Followers/ Creating Men***

The creation of the “right” fraternity man does not begin with a blank slate. The men who are joining fraternities have their own preconceived notions of masculinity and what it entails, which they have acquired through the processes of their own socialization. The socialization process includes many different institutions. Gender socialization is learned and enacted in various institutions including, but not limited to; family, game, religion, education, law, media, and ceremony and sports teams (Douglas 1986). Connell (1993) states that “masculinity is an aspect of institutions and is produced in the institutional life, as much as it is an aspect of personality or produced in interpersonal transactions” (p. 602). Therefore individuals behave according to institutional norms that prescribe how gender, in this case masculinity, is done.

I believe that fraternities are institutions that help in the development of masculinity, refining skills useful to negotiate the trials and tribulations that encompass adulthood in a world where most social organizations and institutions are embedded in a masculine ideal (Connell 1987; Kaufman 1994). Creating and maintaining hegemonic and complicit masculinities is often done invisibly and through the various forms of accommodation by the men on a daily basis. Although there are many forms of hegemonic masculinity, masculinity is not a buffet which men are allowed to choose from or adopt any form of gender or masculine image but are constrained by the institutional history of the setting in which they are involved (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005:824-843). Their actions and appearance are highly monitored through the rules and interactions that guide them into what type of masculinity or manhood is being accomplished. This type of masculinity is found in their mottos and creeds along with their rituals and rules that keep men “being men.”

Kimmel (2003) argues that men “do masculinity” for other men in order to gain approval or acceptance. Often men who do not perform the hegemonic form of masculinity are segregated into marginalized or subordinated groups (Bird 1996). This research demonstrates that in creating and maintaining certain forms of hegemonic and complicit masculinities the fraternity men must first “create followers.” As Dale stated during our interview “we’ve created followers and now these followers are going to be expected to step up as leaders.” Leadership is highly stressed in a fraternity setting but not every member can be a leader. Leadership in this case is about taking on positions of authority within the house and serving as good examples of how a fraternity man is suppose to behave. Leadership positions in the Greek community are elected positions and are normally held for one year terms. In this process there is a social contract formed between these men whereby certain ideals, attitudes, values, and behaviors are created and maintained, and at times negotiated.

### **Choosing “Mr. Right”: Recruitment**

Our goal is to basically recruit people that are better than we are and make the house better in the future. (Dan)

The creation of followers or the creation of the “fraternal man” begins with the process of recruitment. According to Borsari and Carey (1999), joining a fraternity is a reciprocal endeavor; men are more likely to choose a fraternity that has values which are in line with their core beliefs, whereas many fraternities look for men who have the potential to adopt that particular fraternity’s belief systems. Dan states that through the recruitment



process the fraternity makes the house better. "Better" for Dan means stronger, including more men, larger numbers, the ability to win in Greek competitions, and the ability to attract high status men. This is the beginning of homosocial reproduction. Homosocial reproduction in a fraternity, as in the work force, is about recruiting people who have social characteristics like those who already are members (Padavic and Reskin 2001).

Tiger (2004) likens initiation to courtship. He titles his research "Males Courting Males" and states,

[i]nitiation is a courtship in the same sense that privileged [heterosexual] men are more likely to marry equally desirable women. The superior males groups can attract the best candidates, can insist upon the most rigorous entrance ordeals, and provide the greatest satisfaction for the membership (p. 15).

The choosing process is about recruiting the "right type of men"; men that demonstrate that they will adhere to the practices of the fraternity or already have a belief system in place that "fits" within the vision of what masculinity looks like in this homosocial setting. The process of recruiting also makes sure that the "wrong types" of men are not joining the homosocial environment of the fraternity. The wrong types of men are the ones who demonstrate qualities or actions that do not uphold the belief system of the fraternity. Previous occupants of this particular fraternity, before its reorganization, demonstrated such behavior with drug use. It is the job of the fraternity members to then take the beliefs and attitudes of the new recruits and make them "fit" into what the fraternity believes is appropriate demonstration of manhood. In fraternity XYZ the appropriate demonstration of masculinity includes responsibility with the intent to become a leader.

Recruitment is essential to the livelihood of a fraternity. In order to keep a fraternity running, the members who have graduated must be replaced. Not only do the fraternity men want to recruit in terms of numbers, they want to recruit men who will "fit" into their ideology of what it means to be a man. I use the term "fit" loosely because there are various ways to weed out members who might not come from the appropriate socio-economic, racial, ethnic, or other backgrounds. Initiation fees, standard of living, dress, and types of extra-curricular activities or entertainment the men partake in can determine which men can afford to live in which houses (Tiger 2004:15). While I did not observe any recruiting during my study, recruiting was discussed during the interview process. The men come from upper middle class to working class backgrounds (as defined by their fathers' occupations), and there are some members who hold down part time jobs in order to help pay for the extra expenses of living in the fraternity. These extra expenses are in the form of dues that help

pay for extracurricular activities and recruiting expenses. Most extracurricular activities are not compulsory.

When discussing those who “fit,” or those who are similar to them, the men talk in general terms using phrases such as “good people” or “right guys,” on which I will expand later in this chapter. An example of this came up in a discussion with Dale about the reorganization and who was left in the house after the “reorg.” Dale mentioned only five of the men “were the right type of guys and were good people because they fought the hazing [that was going on inside the house] and were guys that I would go and talk to and that would really help me out.” The men that were left were considered responsible individuals. Fraternities in general “weed out” men who they feel do not “fit” with their fraternity image. In fraternity XYZ, the ideology of the member or new recruit plays an important role. The men who were recruited were like those who were already there, and thus the new recruits were perceived as less different than those who were weeded out.

A major recruiting technique of fraternities is to identify potential recruits through alumni, family members, current members, and women who are involved in sororities. Often the alumni and current members are also family members. Alumni often identify young men through their associations with others in their community and pass along names to the fraternity. During the time of my study there were two sets of fraternal brothers in the XYZ chapter. One set had an older brother who had previously graduated and sat on the executive board. Thus, all three sons from one family at one point in time had lived in the house.

Potential recruits are often identified and contacted while they are still in high school. Fraternities normally elect a recruitment chair and that person is in charge of event planning involving new recruits and contacting the initial recruit once he has been identified. None of the men mentioned how they identify a new recruit, but I believe the men who were recruited were recruited by those most like themselves or men who had qualities that the fraternity admired such as good grades. One question I asked every fraternity member I interviewed was, “why did you decide to join a fraternity?” The responses ranged from having been heavily recruited and always wanting to join a fraternity to never having thought about joining one until being approached.

Well. It all started back with my brother. He graduated from here [and was a member of the fraternity]...Our [alumni] advisor became really good friends with my parents. So, I always came up to [name of school] because my whole family graduated from here, so we are all kind of interconnected. I kind of got brought along to everything. He knew about me from, I don't know, 14, and started

recruiting me then. That was a good push towards this chapter and then one of my good friends, [name], came into the house, too. I went to high school with him and played football with him. (Travis)

Travis' case clearly illustrates homosocial reproduction. Travis knew the alumni advisor before being recruited into chapter XYZ. The alumnus contacted Travis and his family asking if he would be interested, as his brother had been, in joining fraternity XYZ. He was encouraged to engage in some of the recruitment activities. Because of his association with the alumni advisor and his older brother being an alumnus of the chapter, the members could feel comfortable in recruiting him. In this case, the advisor knew what type of family Travis came from and what his history and background were. The advisor probably felt that Travis would "fit" the image that the newly reorganized fraternity was trying to promote.

Um in my first three weeks I was I was in [dorms] and I really hated it there and my brother was here already- in this chapter, yea {in this particular house} YA- and um so it was just kind of a last resort kind of thing I really didn't give it much thought and it wasn't actually to be in a fraternity it was just more to live some where. (Troy)

I decided to join one [a fraternity] because one of the guys that is a senior now [in the house], was a senior in high school when I went to high school with him and he recommended me [to the house]. When I came to the "experience [University name] thing" and I slept in the dorms and I didn't really like them. With this being a pretty new house, I guess it appealed to me a lot more and it was cheaper [than the dorms] and I didn't really like the dorms. It was kinda a thing where you know it [the house] had a lot of amenities I liked, like free laundry and stuff and I also knew some people here so it was kinda of a comfort zone thing as well. (Tony)

Neither Troy nor Tony had planned on living in a fraternity before coming to college, but both were good recruitment candidates because of their affiliation with members of the fraternity. Troy, like Travis, had a brother who was a fraternity member. Unlike Travis, Troy's brother was a member of the fraternity while he was being recruited. Tony was recruited through a friend of his who went to the same high school. Not only were men being recruited because of the affiliations with other members but they were being recruited because they were most like the members who were already there, men from the same home towns, same schools, and even the same families.

Yancey -Martin and Hummer (1989) found that when fraternities search for the "right men" they often avoid recruiting men whom they consider the "wrong" men who might tarnish the image or reputation of a particular fraternity. According to Yancey-Martin and Hummer the wrong types of men are the men who might be considered effeminate, such as

men with long hair, or men who have majors in the fields of humanities because these majors are associated with women's fields. I am not sure if it was intentional, but none of the men in XYZ fraternity majored in the humanities, except for one who was a double major in theater and pre-med. I believe the pre-med major was regarded as more legitimate than the major in theater in the eyes of the men in the fraternity. Being a doctor was the man's ambition; theater was just a hobby. Most of the men I interviewed were engineering or agriculture majors. One man was pursuing a business degree and two studied Community and Regional Planning. All the men were training to enter a very gendered work force, all the occupational "choices" of the men in fraternity XYZ are occupations heavily dominated by men, and for the most part, considered male occupations (Padavic and Reskin 2002). When I asked one member "When you guys are recruiting, what type of man do you look for," his response was, "Not like a... well, probably a person that wants to like be good and look good, as in like clean and not be a show-off ..." (Brad). Brad says they recruit men that look good, meaning appearance is also important to these men. He also states they need to "be good" referring to their behavior. He does not believe they should act like the men who were in the house before the reorganization--men who drank, smoked, did drugs openly and allowed their grades to fall below the fraternity's academic standards.

I knew about [a fraternity] because of their overwhelming reputation [name of fraternity]. I was recruited by them since my junior year in high school and about 2 weeks before I came [to school] my freshman year they decided not to give me a bid-um which kinda left a bitter taste in mouth about the Greek community but I still wanted to be involved. Well, [I guess it was] a little psychological motive to spite them. I kept looking around. Alumnus advisor and I have professional contact. I mentioned the situation to him and he said I should come over and check it out. At that time this chapter was in a very interesting place it was right after reorganization. (Alex)

In Alex's case it was not the way he looked or his major that led to his not being the "right man" for another fraternity. Alex is an agriculture major and was raised on a family farm. Alex states that after he graduated from high school the house that had been recruiting him told him that his GPA was not high enough to become a member of their fraternity. Many of the fraternities have GPA standards; in XYZ one can drop down below a 2.0 before being placed on academic probation. Alex's family also had business connections with the alumni advisor. After Alex told the advisor about what happened with the other fraternity, the advisor invited Alex to consider XYZ. Alex eventually joined fraternity XYZ, after meeting with the men, and was one of the first members to join after the chapter was reorganized.

The reorganization was a topic of conversation for many of the men I interviewed. They wanted to reassure me that their “new chapter” was nothing like the old one. Here Scott discusses the “old members”:

Well, I don't know exactly what rules they cracked down on or anything, but I do know a lot of the people who were in the house during that time or right before the reorganization were very-- I don't know how to put this -- just not good guys-- they wouldn't pay their house bills they like one guy had a duck in his room and {a live duck} which is funny but it sprayed water and pooped all over the walls- it did not treat the house well- oh what else- guys who didn't pay their house bills and drink and come home drunk and punch a hole in walls and it just didn't sound like a very good time here to me. (Scott)

Scott states that the old members were just not “good guys”--the same language that Brad used. The men are not quite sure what a “good guy” looks like but they do know what a “bad guy” acts like. Scott is talking about the “wrong” type of men, men who belonged to the chapter before the reorganization. For Scott, their behavior was unacceptable, their actions were not respectful to the house nor were they responsible to the chapter. Based on what they told me, I believe the men feel that they are the “good guys.”

It's not that we are recruiting large amounts of people. We recruit 10 or 15 in the summer, we just don't lose them. We recruit the right type of people for the right reasons and they want to be here and they don't move out. They don't move out because they can't drink and they don't move out because... you know... or, they don't get kicked out because they got caught smoking pot in the parking lot or in their room or something like that. (Dale)

Dale uses the wording the “right type of people” for the “right type of reasons.” He is explaining that even though more men were needed to fill space in the fraternity, the members did not recruit for those reasons. He did not say what the right reasons were, but he did describe the “wrong type of men” or the wrong type of actions. The right type of men would be ones who would not get kicked out or move out because they could not abide by the house rules, such as no smoking or drinking in the house and paying bills on time, as well as, meeting academic standards. The pledge manual specifically states that respect for the house is a high priority for a brother and so is paying his bill on time. Both of these actions, according to the pledge manual, are ways of showing respect for one's fraternity. Most importantly paying your bill on time demonstrates that you are responsible, which I have identified as a key characteristic in the behaviors of masculinity within fraternity XYZ.

I didn't initially think I was going to do the fraternity thing, I planned on living in the dorms at least a semester, maybe a whole year- one of my good friends from high school was in the house and he invited me up to one of the recruitment events I came to the house, and met some of the people. We seemed to click really well. (James)

I lived in [the dorms] when I first started and when I got to my second semester and one of my friends, a girl, was good friends with one of the guys in the house. I guess he was probably pushing her hard to find anybody you can and bring them over and stuff and she told me about this chapter. I'm like I wouldn't mind going over and so I went over and met the guys they were pretty cool and everything. I really, I really liked [name] I really liked him in the beginning; he is probably one main reason I came over in the first place. We have a lot in common as in [he does not drink]... once I got here I mean it's a dry house and I don't drink. (Kent)

In trying to understand how hegemonic masculinity works inside the fraternity it is important to examine the relationship that the men have to the "collective images" they have created or are creating "rather than simple reflections of them" (Connell and Messnerschmidt 2005:841). It is through the recruitment process that fraternities are beginning the first step in creating and maintaining their hegemonic ideals. They first recruit or "choose" the right type of men, men who in some way look like they do, act like they do, and seem to have the same or similar beliefs.

The "right type" of man is often invited to a recruitment event, which is normally held in the summer. The current members who are in town, and those who can make it from out of town, will "hang out" and get to know the new recruits. The recruitment events for this chapter are normally informal and often take place around typical masculine events such as a baseball game or golfing. Since this chapter is dry, alcohol is never involved in the recruiting of new pledges. However brief or long the recruitment process is, the new recruits find something in the other members that they recognize in themselves. For Kent, who was a non drinker, the house being dry was a major contributing factor to his joining, along with identifying with a current member who also did not drink. He saw the congruence between this (non-drinking) at the house and among its members and his core values and beliefs.

I mean its the cliché' answers are the brotherhood and the leadership and all that but its- living in the dorms- I met guys in the dorms and I see them still on campus and they are kind of like, hey, how are you, but it's way different- it's a stronger bond with the guys who are actually in the house with you because even though we have different backgrounds and everything; we all have something in common with one another, we all share this fraternity together. (Jack)

Jack is talking about why he joined a fraternity. For Jack the "right men" are the members of his fraternity. For him it is not what they had in common before joining the fraternity that is important but it is what they have in common now that supersedes previous relationships, it's the experience of the fraternity itself that is important. They form this bond through their proximity; they live together, work together, and play together. Many of their rituals and

activities are meant to foster a bond or a cohesive unit in which the men become loyal to the fraternity and each other. The men in turn create beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors, otherwise known as masculinities, that are constrained by the institutional setting of the fraternity (Bird 2003; West 2001). As different as their backgrounds seem, from my research I have attributed that they have many characteristics in common; they are white, heterosexual, middle to upper class, and able bodied. According to Travis "most people are from small farming towns and [state name] have generically the same backgrounds." Additionally, many of them have the same majors and most of them are local to the area. This perceived sameness creates a sense that they have had similar experiences in their lives allowing them to attribute their core values and beliefs to each other.

### ***The Social Contract/ Creating Attitudes and Beliefs***

The charter is more than a document. It is a promise, a contract, a set of rights and responsibilities. It is a road map, a vow, objectives, ideals, and commitments. (*The Manual of XYZ Fraternity* 1998: 21)

In addition to recruiting, homosocial reproduction occurs by making sure the men hold the same attitudes and beliefs that the organization does. The men who are the leaders of the fraternity set the goals and standards that the other members of the fraternity must achieve. Goffman (1959) suggests that in order for a role, or in this case an identity, to be believed, the actor must surround himself in the appropriate settings and wear the right costumes. Roles can be defined as "sets of rights, obligations, associated with status. Roles guide our behavior and allow us to predict the behavior of others" (Knox and Schacht 2005:17), whereas the "creation of identity is thought to arise from social interaction, and ongoing social interaction is understood as central to the whole socialization process" (Charon 2001:24). Sweet (2004), a sociologist, explains how fraternities develop new identities for their pledges. His explanation includes props that the new pledges are given to help reinforce their new identity, which is affiliated with the fraternity (Goffman 1959). These new material items include such things as pledge pins, t-shirts, sweatshirts, rings, books, and paddles all with the name or letters of the fraternity on them. The members surround themselves with these new items replacing old material items that were part of their old identities and therefore taking on a new identity that is affiliated with the fraternity (p. 6). As

men develop these new “collective identities,” they begin to accept ideals, attitudes and beliefs associated with the fraternity, if they had not held them before (De Parle 1988).

After the wooing and “choosing” of the appropriate recruit, and if the recruit has demonstrated in some way that he holds the core tenets and beliefs of the fraternity, he is given a bid card. A bid card is the formal invitation to become a member of the fraternity and the member becomes a pledge. In XYZ’s language the neophyte is called an “initiate” (*The Manual of XYZ Fraternity* 1998:156). In this pledging process the initiates (depending upon the fraternity) either stay living in the dorms or move into the fraternity house. During this time they are given a pledge book containing the history of their fraternity, who the founding “fathers” were, and how many chapters (chapters) are now in existence. Chapter XYZ’s pledge book also lists policy statements, risk management standards, symbols like the coat of arms, plus resolutions against practices such as hazing, among other important topics about Greek life in the particular organization. This pledge book also gives reasons and explanations as to why the initiation ritual is performed, but does not have the ritual itself. Rituals can be explained as:

Our routine observations of such interpersonal ritual or common courtesies demonstrates our commitment to a vast array of shared rules of interpersonal conduct. In an important respect, what we commonly call etiquette is a complex code of ceremonial or ritual prescriptions and proscriptions governing our interactions. (Charon 2001:195-196)

There is only one initiation ritual but there are many public rituals (*The Manual of XYZ Fraternity* 1998:156). Below is a partial description of the ritual practices as described by Alex. Alex is explaining to me what rituals are because I insinuated that certain practices, such as parings, are rituals.

First let me say there are public and private rituals- there are fraternities that have no private rituals – for example they have no private ritual you can go to their initiation as long as your invited- our ritual is private- you gain admittance through a pass word and handshake-as with many other systems – and private rituals – I am talking very broad terms... if that is okay with you {that is fine} from what I have gathered through other members of the Greek community past and present alumni- most private rituals are a journey of sorts almost a play- that is what I would equate it to a play - put on by the initiated members and alumni to the new members to illustrate certain factors that are of importance to that individual organization and rituals are based on founders and most are based on Christian beliefs or have some basis in them and most are also based on what type of institution your organization your organization started at... they are metaphorical lessons dangerous things to avoid- how to avoid them maybe they include secret signals cause in most rituals date back to the founding... (Alex)



This member is stating that there are different rituals, ones that are private and ones that are open to the public through invitation. I attended the “Big Brother ceremony.” This is when the new pledges find out the identity of their big brothers. The ritual was held in the chapter’s basement with hardly any lighting and the new pledges stood in a square while the marshal read out loud about the importance of becoming a brother. Then the pledges were joined by the members, the members lining up behind their new “little brothers.” When the pledges turned around, they were face to face with their “big brothers.” The ceremony seemed to be taken seriously, despite a few outbursts of nervous laughter. The men were standing almost nose-to-nose when they finally turned around. Most of the men did not even remember that I was at this ceremony because they had been so focused on the ritual.

You talked about the square-we call it the hollow square which is symbolism really of the new members being included with the members and it symbolizes that we are close as brothers... I think the formality of it and the way it is presented is really what is important. An example [of the psychological pressure] here is, we had a new member that was so nervous during his formal pledging that he had to sit down because he thought he was going to faint, just from the stress he was putting on himself. I think it’s a motivator for some and deterrent for others. (Alex)

The process of creating attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors based on the social contract between the new initiates and the fraternity is lengthy. It begins with the pledge book and continues with new member classes. These new member classes last eight weeks and are often held late at night (normally between 10:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m.) after regular academic classes and fraternity business are finished for the evening. The new member classes are instructed by the Marshal. The pledge book describes the Marshal as “...a leader, a counselor, a teacher, an officer and a coach” (p. 3).

It has been said that the example the Marshal sets and the attitude he inspires will be apparent in the chapter for five to seven years after he serves in that position. His feelings about XYZ, his philosophy of leadership, and his attitudes will be reflected in all New Members. (*The Manual of XYZ Fraternity*, 3)

The Marshal’s position is taken seriously and it is important; only a person who upholds the core tenants of the fraternity can serve in this position.

A normal part of joining a fraternity is that old friends and contacts are soon replaced with members of the fraternity who become the initiate’s friends and family. The men are paired up with older members of the fraternity to help show them the ropes; often they are called pledge dads, fathers or brothers. Sweet (2004) states that fraternities “deliberately and systematically limit the social relations of their pledges, forcing [the men] to form tight

groups with intimate contact” (p. 6). One of the members even stated that he joined the fraternity for its family atmosphere, “the environment which I relate to the family and other stuff is why I joined the house” (Mick). The fraternity, through their recruitment, initiation, and ritual practices, make formal lessons of value and identity explicit, while those of us outside this system learn these lessons in less formal ways.

### **Rejecting Old Stereotypes and Creating New Ones: Rejecting and Accepting Alcohol**

I call the recruitment and initiation processes a type of indoctrination because of a conversation I had with one of the members. He was trying to explain to me, metaphorically, how joining a religion and joining a fraternity were closely related.

I equate [joining a fraternity] to religion – almost as- you when you enter into – I am basing this on Judeo Christianity - you go into believing that there is some end result you have a very vague concept of how to get there the intricacies of it – and its one of those things you develop on your own- your faith is your own- you can be any denomination you like- you can believe whatever that denomination does but eventually it is something you have to accept for your self and live by that choice and I think that Greek life over – I suppose Greek life is the way to say that I don't know- is similar in that it's the individual choice of how you live your life based on being a fraternity man I guess in that case but its governed by outside beliefs as well- outside factors – and a I think that to answer the new member question- no they don't – not everyone I mean there are some people that kind of get it that its something that through your involvement in you come to the understanding of it - which relates to a lot of other things why you don't feel a lot of self ---- why you don't see a lot of people the first time after they have been exposed to a ritual really get the concepts that are important it takes time to see in action to apply situations to their life and see how they can adapt what they have learned to real life situation. (Alex)

This conversation with Alex came about when I asked him if new pledges or initiates really understood what fraternity life is about and what would be expected. He states that when one enters into it, one has a vague concept, but how one gets to the end result is on his own. In this case, the end result is embracing the ideals and values of the fraternity. It is a social contract between the fraternity and the member who becomes the type of man he feels is appropriate for the fraternity and for society. The fraternity, in turn, gives the member friends, family, a place to live, and contacts for the rest of his life. Alex's viewing fraternity life as parallel with membership in a religious community is interesting in that as with religion, fraternities construct meaning around symbols and ritualistic type of practices. As the men surround themselves with the new symbols, their new identity is formed. Alex implies that as with people who belong to religious organizations, the men begin to filter their

understanding of the “outside world” through a lens the fraternity provides. The ritualistic observances of the fraternity along with the social interaction between the men are part of the “collaborative manufacture of selves” that happens inside the fraternity (Charon 2001:188).

Fraternities tend to resemble what Goffman (1959) calls total institutions because all aspects of life are completed under one roof; the members eat together, work together, sleep and play together, always with the goals of the fraternity in mind. Through this togetherness the men’s original identities can be stripped and remade. Their sleeping arrangements are such that half the men sleep in one room on one floor and half sleep in another room on another floor. The symbols and ritualistic practices along with the living conditions allow the older fraternity members to teach the pledges how to practice the fraternity’s image of masculinity. The rituals and the close living conditions also help to ensure conformity to the hegemonic practices of the fraternity.

The process of indoctrination makes sure that the men in the chapter accept many core beliefs of the fraternity as their own, if they do not already hold them. Indoctrination is part of the identity shifts and development that happen to the men once they have committed to the fraternity. The ritual of drinking or not drinking becomes important to the identity of this fraternity because drinking has been highly tied to masculinity formation and to fraternity men’s identity in general (Capraro 2000). In the case of XYZ fraternity, the social etiquette or ritual that is being observed is maintaining the illusion that the men are somehow more responsible because alcohol is not allowed in the house. Through their indoctrination and new rituals the members are soon taught that their actions are no longer a reflection of their own individual identities--their actions reflect on the chapter as a whole.

Your actions- what you do, what you don’t do, what you say, what you withhold- all reflect upon the brothers and New Members, your chapter as an entity, and our Fraternity at large. Before, you could quite literally think for yourself. Now, you must think and act for all of us, as we do for you (*The Manual of XYZ Fraternity 1998*:. 2).

When you walk in these doors, you don’t represent yourself alone anymore. You represent yourself and something greater. (Dale)

Dale exemplifies how indoctrination works; he sounds exactly like the fraternity manual. (The representation of the fraternity is something I will discuss further under “image maintenance”).

As this edition of the Manual of XYZ Fraternity goes to press, alcohol-free housing is among the most significant changes occurring in men’s national

fraternities on campuses. Some of our chapters have already volunteered to become alcohol free- that is, to eliminate the possession or use of alcohol in the chapter house, lodge, designated structure, and on the property of the chapter. (The Manual of XYZ Fraternity 1998:33)

The wording does not state that members cannot drink but only that alcohol is not allowed on the property of the chapter. As Neal states “the chapter house is now a dry chapter house, although we still have functions with alcohol but we follow [guidelines] that properly manage our drinking.” The University has guidelines that any organization that has alcohol at a party must follow, such as having someone check the I.D.s of the guests, making sure all guests are of legal drinking age and having the proper balance of food and nonalcoholic beverages to go along with the alcoholic ones. Chapter XYZ strictly adheres to the no alcohol rule. If men are caught with alcohol on the premises, they will lose the right to membership and be asked to leave the chapter. As demonstrated earlier, part of the belief system that the men adhere to is the importance of drinking and partying in experiencing college and fraternity life. Since this chapter is dry, the men who are seeking serious membership either have strong opinions about not drinking, or drinking does not occupy a significant place in their social lives. Because previous research has found that drinking is synonymous with college men’s lives, especially those who join fraternities, I thought it was important to ask the men if having a dry house affected their decisions to join chapter XYZ.

I was kind of indifferent when I came to [a dry house]. I didn’t want to be in a completely wet house. I wouldn’t mind being in a damp or dry but I really wasn’t turned on to the fact that there would be alcohol in the house 24/7. I think that would be too much of a distraction for me. I don’t think I would be able to handle it. I’m saying, I enjoy going out and drinking but if I’m around it like, 24/7, I don’t think my academics would be up to par. (Jack)

I really liked the house. I wanted to join a dry fraternity. {Why?} I can’t live in an environment where it is just drinking all the time like some chapters do... I can’t do that, I need like a definite distinction between work and play, I guess, you would say. I don’t know, I think this environment is a lot more cognizant of my success, academically. (Travis)

{Before coming here you knew it was a dry house?} –Ya- {Did that impact your decision at all?} Well to be honest, I thought you know, am I missing out – on a wet house – I mean there is going to be lots of fun there but then I realized once I got here that... I mean I have been to parties at wet houses and I have seen stuff that goes on and just the total disregard in the house for other people’s stuff- they wander into your room and sometimes houses are just kind of a mess. I mean I have seen houses that are just really dirty after a party I don’t want that in that house. I mean this it’s the newest house on campus and you have to treat it with respect its your house and you don’t want people coming in here and messing it up there you know especially going through your stuff – I mean like your computer- you don’t want people

coming in like spilling beer on your computer and stuff like that – at first it didn't really impact it but now I am glad- I appreciate it (Ethan).

Jack, Travis, and Ethan all believe that living in a dry house is better for them. None of these men are saying that they do not drink or that they are opposed to drinking; what they are opposed to is the party-like atmosphere that seems to go on at “wet” houses. Jack and Travis believe that they would not do as well academically living in a fraternity where alcohol was readily acceptable. Ethan discusses the physical image of the chapters where drinking takes place; he seems to believe that the men who live in “wet” houses and party all the time do not take care of their things as well as the fraternity men at XYZ do. Through the rituals and indoctrination processes the men come to believe that they are “better men” because they adhere to and now agree with the no drinking policy of fraternity XYZ. This indoctrination helps in solidifying ideologies which are soon passed to new members.

Capraro (2000) states that college men drink because drinking is related to men's power and powerlessness (p. 308). Drinking allows men to “enact male privilege but it also helps them negotiate the emotional hazards of being a man in the contemporary American college....Drinking is male dominated, male identified and male centered” (Capraro 2000: 308). A study done on drinking behaviors of college students shows that fraternities hold favorable opinions about drinking and drinking behaviors (Bosari and Carey 1999). It is not that drinking is not part of most of the XYZ fraternity men's college experience; it is just not part of the daily activities that go on inside the house. The majority of the men drink, although many of them are still underage. The underage men of the fraternity can be found drinking at other fraternities that are “wet,” at private house parties, and even at times in the dorms where drinking is also prohibited.

Homosocial reproduction still occurs in “dry houses” around the rituals that surround drinking in wet houses; drinking, however, does not occur in the house itself. One example of the importance of drinking rituals is that the men are given shot glasses with the fraternity emblem on it as a reward for getting good grades. Because masculinity is tied to drinking in college cultures, the men of fraternity XYZ have had to change the way they act out masculinity; part of this process is in the rules and regulations surrounding a dry house. They believe themselves to be “better men” because they are able to control or better monitor their own behaviors than men who belong to “wet” or “damp” houses. As I demonstrated previously in this chapter, an important part of the masculine identity found in fraternity XYZ are the ideals surrounding responsibility. Temperance and controlling when

and where alcohol is consumed are part and parcel of being a “better man” in Fraternity XYZ.

### **Rejecting Old Stereotypes and Creating New Ones: Rejecting and Accepting Hazing**

As with drinking, the practice of hazing has been a point of contention in and outside of the Greek community. Hazing, too, can be seen as a tool for indoctrination in most fraternities. Hazing is a prevalent ritualistic practice found in many homosocial environments: it is found in major and minor league sports, high school sports, all branches of the U.S. military, and in fraternities and sororities. The degree of hazing and what practices are done vary with each individual group. Hazing rituals are used in homosocial reproduction to create character, weed out the “wrong” types of men, promote brotherhood or build unity, and keep certain members in line (De Parle 1988; King 2004; Nuwer 2004; Sanday 1990). The ideology and image that fraternity XYZ is trying to create is that hazing is no longer a part of their value system. For many fraternities, hazing and drinking are part of the rituals surrounding the practices of masculinity (DeParle 1988; Nuwer 2004; Sanday 1990).

As stated earlier, joining a fraternity is an indoctrination practice. It has been likened to a religious experience by Nuwer (2004) as well as by the member of XYZ fraternity quoted earlier. For Nuwer, a journalism professor, it is the Greek hazing practices that he considers “cult like.” He cautions that one major difference between hazing fraternities and cults is that there is no “deity” in a fraternity. He does not say that fraternities are not unlike a religious institution, but it is important to remember that there is no religious worship in fraternities.

Since its reorganization, XYZ fraternity has had a strict no hazing policy. It should be noted that the XYZ national chapter has a no hazing policy as well, which was in place before and after the chapter’s reorganization. Not only was hazing a particular problem in this local chapter, but on a national level XYZ fraternity was in trouble for its hazing activities, as many other chapters have been nationwide. According to Nuwer’s (2004) account, hazing was condemned by The National Interfraternity Conference (NIC) as early as 1928. It was again brought to the attention of the fraternity community in 2000 by both the NIC and National Panhellenic Conference (p. xxvi) after decades of serious injuries and deaths among members of college fraternities.

Hazing is such an important topic that the Manual of XYZ had it listed five different times as its own topic under each particular heading, such as membership and risk management standards. Here is an illustrative excerpt from their manual:

The hazing of pledges or associate member is perhaps the largest challenge for men's fraternities to overcome... Aside from the injuries and deaths of young men that can be attributed to hazing, the practice of hazing generates the exact opposite of what it supposedly accomplished....Seven colleges and universities have abolished their fraternity systems within the past fifteen years... And in each case thus far, hazing was a primary factor in the decision....Hazing is illegal in the XYZ Fraternity, in any form, at any time... (*The Manual of XYZ Fraternity*, Pp. 39-40).

Because of the reputation XYZ fraternity had gained on campus from its recent past members, hazing was something that almost every member discussed. Although hazing is forbidden in this chapter, I still believed that I would find out through the interviews or just hanging out with the men that they still practiced this particular ritual. Sweet (2004) indicates that some hazing practices send pledges signals that they are of lesser status and assign them specific tasks or duties that they might normally resist (p. 7). The closest sanctioned practice XYZ fraternity has to hazing is making the younger members pick up the older drunk members at the bar. While this is a practice that not many would object to, the reason it could be considered hazing is because it is normally the initiates who are picking up juniors and seniors. The men are not supposed to have or do anything that may separate the new pledges from the older members.

There were incidents of hazing that were discussed during the interviews by members who were hazed before the reorganization and there were incidents of hazing against one particular member discussed after the reorganization. Although I label some of their actions as hazing, the men did not recognize their behavior toward the member as such (I will discuss the member who was being hazed in the next chapter). Hazing was something that most members felt very strongly about. There were three members of the fraternity who were initiated before and during the reorganization. Because of the timing of their initiation, old practices were still being adhered to and they did indeed experience a form of hazing. These members who are all current and past leaders of the house were emphatic about the "no hazing" policy.

During our initiation our Marshal was really adamant about no hazing—he was like if there is any hazing you tell me- cause we are cracking down – I guess back in the past they have had problems like one of our houses, was the reason why they said no hazing. (Ethan)

Ethan is explaining that he was not worried about hazing because he was reassured that it would not happen. He also knew that the fraternity was trying to rebuild and it was partly the hazing practices that got the fraternity reorganized in the first place; thus he was pretty certain he would not be hazed.

During my interviews I asked nearly all the men if there had been hazing would they have joined the fraternity. Much to my surprise their responses varied greatly. There were men who said definitely not, while others had stipulations on what type of hazing they would be willing to go through. The non-drinkers in the house said they would not have joined only if the hazing ritual had involved drinking “I would have been gone--I am very strong about not drinking,” said one member. Otherwise, the fraternity members were open to the idea. Some members had expected to be hazed and had already prepared themselves mentally for it. There were a few of the youngest members and the newest pledges who were disappointed and wanted to be hazed. Hazing was openly talked about by all members and was the topic of conversation during meal times. The first time I heard members talking about hazing was when some of the new pledges were complaining about the no hazing rule. This was a topic of contention in the house and almost a war of wills between the older members and the younger ones. It is also openly known that even though the University has a strict no hazing policy, many chapters on campus still practiced it.

That I had no idea and you have no way of knowing that until you know of other people in those houses {if they did they probably wouldn't tell you anyway} or if your friends with them he is in [name of house] – they have missions every Wednesday and what that is they have time to go get something done in [name of town] or around the house or something and if they don't get it done they all get water dumped on them or they all get thrown in the snow bank or such type thing (Scott).

I asked the members who said hazing was not a good thing about arguments from others that support hazing which they felt builds unity within the house and solidifies men's commitment to the national chapter.

I think pretty stupid you know what are you- you're here to get an education and to learn how to become a leader and how do you [do] that by being thrown in the snow bank. (Scott)

Well, I don't think hazing is the... is that important but I think... I think being... I think going through something like initiation week and like doing something as a whole group, I mean just a... like bs-ing at that dinner like... is just... you know at... being, you know, just stuff like that is... I think... I think, you know, helps grow you... grows together... Well, I think... I think for the most part, hopefully, I think, like the people who don't want to do it will out number the people that do want to do it. (Brad)



Brad does not support hazing but he does believe there needs to be something in place to bring about group cohesion or to build a sense of community in the house.

ya I did – I thought that there might be some hazing along with drinking I didn't know if a dry house meant that we were going to actually be dry all the time (or a little damp) a little bit here and there but it proved not to be that way I think the most preconceived notion is the one that weighs on my mind the most was probably the hazing. (Scott)

Scott was answering a question about preconceived notions he had about fraternity life. Stereotypes about fraternity drinking and hazing have been so ingrained in our culture through movies like *Animal House* and reality television shows that initiates did not believe it when they were told that this house was dry and did not participate in hazing rituals. But why should they reject hazing when these events have been around since the inception of the fraternal organization?

Not really because they said that they weren't going to haze and if they were I kinda didn't really have a problem with it. I've been kinda hazed before for other activities like football, sports. {A lot of sporting teams use... Some people call it hazing, some people don't, but I know that a lot of... especially... male sports use that for bonding} Well, it makes you feel like you earn a spot on the team. {Does it work, you think?} It gives you more respect. It makes you feel like you've accomplished something that other people wanted because of that. (Tony)

For many of these men, as with Scott and Tony, initiation practices surrounding hazing were part of their experiences as boys and they believed it was part of the process of becoming a man. Neither of these men were opposed to the practice of hazing. As Tony states, to be hazed is like earning your place on the team.

A survey conducted in 1999 by Alfred University (cited in Nuwer 2004:xv) determined that almost half of the University's basketball players had been hazed in high school and some even in middle school. Often in high schools hazing is done to make others conform; either the student is an outcast by school standards or the athlete who has not assimilated to the team in a way that is found appropriate by the athletes themselves or the coaches (Nuwer 2004:xv). For people like Tony, it is also about the right of passage, proving that you are worthy and that you have earned the right to be there. It seems that the men who participate in hazing believe it creates character, keeps the "wrong men" from joining, and eliminates the ones who are not serious about being in a fraternity. Hazing as a right of passage also builds a larger network, where men can sit around and tell their stories; it is almost like war stories, each one remembering an event or circumstance where he

belonged to something that is larger than the individual. It is for some not only a right of passage into a fraternity, but a right of passage into manhood.

{So were you disappointed- were you one of the ones who wanted to have a little bit of that} I was a little bit cause I mean my brothers fraternity- he tells me about all these stories how they haze and he just told me over Christmas break they have this thing its like a ceramic goat or something and they have their new incoming members carry it around to classes like for a full day. Then at night they drink out of it and then I guess- that is technically hazing- but I can see where that would be kind of fun. Humorous, I mean seeing one of your pledge brothers walking around with a ceramic goat around to his classes. [but nothing dangerous that you heard of} No, well, the dangerous thing I have is when he was a freshman a he came home for Christmas break and he had made a wooden paddle and he flat out told me, well, I 'm making this cause me and my older brother are going to beat each other with it – like we're just going to line up and we are just going to take a good whack at each other. (Ethan)

Nuwer (2004:xx) states that hazing is part of an American culture that accepts casual violence and alcohol abuse. It is so embedded in our cultural practice that even George W. Bush's years in Delta Kappa Epsilon at Yale University have been highlighted publicly in the *The New York Times*. Prominent members of the media and writers for sports magazines such as *Sports Illustrated* have defended hazing practices. Is it any wonder why fraternity members like Tony or Jack defend hazing practices and believe that hazing supports cohesiveness among the pledges? It also should not come as a surprise to many that the alumni and many of the parents of students who were hazed defend the practice and chalk it up to harmless fun; and many of them point out that they are still around and they are better for it (Nuwer 2004:xxiii).

Because of the division of the house between those who oppose hazing and those who favor it, I asked the members if they thought once the old regime was gone the practice of hazing would start up again. There are those that not only believe that the practice will begin again, but who will welcome it because they believe hazing is a way for men to prove their manhood to other men, a way to prove that they are men. Kimmel (1994:129) states that having to prove your manhood to other men "is both a consequence of sexism and one of its chief proponents."

One of the reasons that hazing is such a contentious subject is because it is highly tied to masculine identity formation. According to Allan (2004) "hazing can serve as an opportunity for men to prove their masculinity (and heterosexuality), the elimination of hazing traditions can be quite threatening on multiple fronts" (p. 283). She goes on to say that "boys and young men who identify with predominant cultural constructions of

masculinity are likely to fear that their manhood will be called into the question if they resist an opportunity to prove their masculinity via hazing practices” (p.284). Allen’s analysis of how hazing is tied to masculinity explains why some of the members find it important that hazing practices continue. Hazing is more than about fraternal bonding; it is about proving oneself as a man.

### ***Summary and Conclusion***

I have shown that recruitment is essential to the homosocial reproduction of the fraternity and how it is important for the fraternity to recruit men who will “fit” into its ideology of what it means to be a man. In accordance with the fraternity Manual, it is the leaders of the fraternity who set the goals and standards that the other members of the fraternity must achieve. Some of the standards surround the practices of recruitment and the rituals of drinking and hazing.

I have demonstrated that recruitment and indoctrination are essential processes in how men in a college fraternity teach, learn, and negotiate hegemonic masculinity. Recruiting is a reciprocal process in that men who already hold some beliefs that the fraternity holds are attracted to the fraternity. The fraternity in turn recruits men who “fit” with their image of the hegemonic norm inside the fraternity. Once recruited, the men then go through an indoctrination process that solidifies the beliefs and attitudes of the fraternity.

Drinking and hazing are practices that have been renounced by fraternity XYZ, yet there are still remnants of both in the house. Along with the recruitment and indoctrination processes rituals such as drinking and hazing often ensure fraternity men’s conformity to hegemonic practices. Previous research has indicated that drinking is synonymous with college men’s lives because drinking rituals and events surrounding drinking still exist, but only outside the confines of the fraternity and away from the eyes of authorities. Keeping drinking at a distance allows the men to give the appearance that drinking does not affect them the same way it does other fraternity men. The rules surrounding drinking are, in effect, a way for the men to demonstrate that they can control their own behaviors and this facilitates the process of becoming “better men”. Both drinking and hazing are intimately tied to the ideal of hegemonic masculinity within the fraternity and both are used to prove one’s “manhood.” Although drinking occurs outside the house, it supports homosocial reproduction in that rituals are norms and are still played out at social events. Drinking is

highly tied to the fraternity man's identity. Hazing was something that most members felt very strongly about. There were members who were strongly opposed to hazing and there were others who were disappointed that they were not hazed. Some members wanted to bring some sort of hazing back to fraternity XYZ. Although the men do not say that hazing is about masculine practices, there are certain men who believe that hazing should be a ritual of indoctrination that is continued, even though it is against the rules of the University and their national organization. This illustrates how strongly the ideologies of masculinity, fraternities, and hazing are woven together.

In this chapter I have explained how fraternity men actively seek to define ideal practices of hegemonic masculinity. The shared meanings for the men in fraternity XYZ revolve around the issue of creating the ideal fraternity man. The processes through which shared meanings are created involve "choosing the right men" and creating a social contract between the men and the fraternity. The next chapter will focus on how the men maintain the image of hegemonic masculinity through impression management and how they perform masculinity through processes of competition.

## **Chapter IV: Managing the Image of Hegemonic Masculinity**

King (2004) found that impression management was important to men who belong to homosocial groups. Her study examined the boundary maintenance between groups of men who belonged to fraternities and groups of men who played college sports.

"Impression management" is an activity that controls the communication of information through a performance that generates an idealized version of the self to others (Goffman 1959: 206). I also found impression management to be important within the fraternity setting. However, I call this process of self monitoring "image maintenance," as image is important to fraternities in general because it affects homosocial reproduction and recruitment issues. In Chapter three, I discussed how hegemonic imperatives are constructed through mechanisms of recruitment, initiation, drinking, and hazing rituals. Here, I demonstrate how the image maintenance process is negotiated through various forms of leadership and competition. Competition between individual men and between fraternity houses is common and often includes paternalistic chivalry. Paternalistic chivalry takes the form of deference toward women who follow their prescribed social norms.

### ***The Image Maintenance Process***

The image maintenance process involves more than just eliminating the stereotypical practices around which Greek men organize their lives. It involves changing the definitions surrounding the fraternity and the daily lives of the men within the fraternity. Definitions need to be created in order for the men in the fraternity to become a collective. This means that normative terms that surround common understandings in their everyday practices and language (Goffman 1959) need to be established and maintained by all members of the fraternity. This process starts with the recruitment of the "right types" of men, continues through the pledging of the new members, and then is constructed around the definition of masculinity, as demonstrated in chapter three. The image maintenance process begins when the identity of the fraternity has been institutionalized (Goffman 1959) and then internalized by each member. The men of fraternity XYZ have internalized images of masculinity and incorporated their meanings into their daily practices.

Most of the tension in the house centers on responsibility and chores. In the social contract the men have with the fraternity, part of their responsibility is to maintain the everyday operations of the house, while the other part of the social contract centers on becoming the kind of man who represents the chapter. Viewing the social contract in this manner allows for the understanding that the contract is really about the everyday maintenance that comes to form part of the construction of masculinity. To be the right kind of man means building qualities of leadership and responsibility, which I have identified as the hegemonic norms in this homosocial environment. A member achieves these qualities by taking on leadership positions in the house, by maintaining the physical appearance of the house, and making sure that his and other members' chores have been completed. Image maintenance also is achieved through academic performance and striving for academic excellence at the individual level, as well as the chapter level.

Leadership is a sex/gender stereotype that has had positive consequences for men. Because men in our society are considered "good leaders" or supposedly possess the qualities of good leaders, such as emotional detachment, assertiveness, competitiveness, and analytical skills, men are frequently promoted to higher positions in the economic sphere as well as hold more positions of power in the political sphere than women (Bird 2003; Padavic and Reskin 2002; Williams 1989). Christine Williams (1989) found that men in nursing, a field predominately held by women, are often promoted to leadership positions above women because of gendered assumptions of men being better leaders than women.

Leadership and responsibility are closely related, but one does not necessarily equate the other. You can be a responsible member, as when you pay your dues on time and do your assigned chores, but this does not mean that a responsible member will hold a leadership position in the house. However, one would be hard pressed to be a leader in the house and not be responsible; leadership is about setting examples and precedents in and outside the fraternity so that other members will have a guide they can follow.

### **The Image of Masculinity**

The men in the fraternity value the image their fraternity has on campus and work hard at maintaining this image. Image for the men is about a particular form of masculinity, convincing the world that their house contains the "better men." How the outside world views the fraternity can directly affect the number of men and the type of men who are interested in joining fraternity XYZ. It can also affect the fraternity's standing within the

overall Greek community on campus and its relationship with campus authorities. University authorities can include, but are not limited to, administration, faculty, and campus police.

During my conversation with Dale he insisted that he is the man he is today because of the fraternity. In fact, it was his interview that prompted me to ask other men how belonging to fraternity XYZ helped them in becoming men.

Because of the opportunities that this fraternity has provided me, I totally believe that I am the person I am...We take pride in doing everything right. It's hard, it's a lot of work, but if you do it right, it pays off and that's like, the value we are trying to instill. And that's the reason why [XYZ] has been around since 1856, is because people believed in the principles and beliefs and building better men... (Dale)

Dale believes because of his involvement in his fraternity he is a better person and others that join will, in turn, become better men themselves. Part of the image maintenance process is making sure that the men "do everything right." This involves constant monitoring of each others' actions and behaviors. Although not every member of this chapter is as committed to the values of the fraternity as Dale is, he still equates his pride with that of the entire fraternity. According to Dale, part of the image the fraternity is to maintain is that of "better men." Becoming a better man means becoming a leader and being responsible, the qualities the fraternity is supposed to cultivate, which reflect the fraternity's core tenets.

Image maintenance is about "doing gender" correctly and it is also about the "stage" where the performance is set (Goffman 1959). The props that the men were given upon pledging are then placed in the proper setting-the house. How and where the men spend their time is just as important as what they do with that time. I believe that is why living in the house is crucial for the men of this fraternity. The more time they spend inside the house, the more they come to accept the stage and all that the stage encompasses that has been set for them. Being inside the house and achieving a collective identity comes into play with the help of supporting actors, their brothers. The time that is spent with the other members helps to solidify their relationships, and it allows for the older members (not necessarily in age, but those who have lived there longer) to indoctrinate the younger members with the core beliefs of the fraternity and guide them in important decision making processes. It is important for the newer members to be selective in choosing with whom to hang out, and to demonstrate appropriate behaviors that are acceptable in the portrayal of the image of the fraternity.

Image maintenance is not only about the fraternity. It is also about what defines a member as masculine or a fraternity man. During the interviews I asked some of the members how the fraternity helped them to become better men.

[Belonging to a fraternity is about] being better people and [about] stepping up and being a man and that means taking ownership —of things that are important to you so if that's your family or your girlfriend or your church or whatever and that's something we believe in through our creed and through our rituals its reinforced by our ceremonies... (Neal)

Neal states that being a man is about “taking ownership” of things that are important to you—things such as family, a girlfriend, or church. Ownership is not only about responsibility, but ownership is also about possessing something, that is, claiming what belongs to you. Neal also believes that it is the collective actions and rituals of the fraternity that help cultivate men. Research indicates that the rituals of sports, military service, and fraternities help to cultivate masculinity (Messner 1992). In the case of this particular fraternity, rituals cultivate more than masculinity—they help to create responsible men. Responsibility is an important value within this homosocial setting. Both Dale and Neal believe that it is belonging to their fraternity and adhering to the fraternity's values that helped in their long journey of becoming men. When I asked Scott, “what made you a man?” he replied: “I'm not sure... maybe just taking on responsibility and being accountable, and I guess if you're not responsible or accountable you're still just a boy.” The value placed upon being responsible and learning how to be a leader are important to the goals of the fraternity and it is clear from the men's responses that they have internalized these beliefs and attitudes and subsequently the goals as well. “I think it [the fraternity] does make you a better man, um, through responsibilities in the house, through leadership opportunities in the house um it teaches you responsibility” (Chad). Although responsibility is an overarching objective in becoming a man and living in the fraternity, the goals of leadership and success are both part of the equation. Again, not everyone in the house will hold a leadership position, but leadership is highly stressed and leadership positions are highly sought after. “I'm just trying to work up—I believe to do something like that you have to be in a leadership role, you have to be a leader” (Ethan). When explaining why they joined the fraternity, many of the men spoke of the intertwining ideas of values and leadership and how one must value responsibility, which reflects their desire to control the other's men socialization process.

One of my biggest challenges has been trying to build these young guys along, to build them into leaders, and I don't want to say they fight it, but they don't get it. They don't understand why they have to. They don't... it's... right now, I think, the top five



strongest guys in the chapter, two are freshmen, two are first semester freshmen. Because they have the values and morals, I really think fraternities... success in the fraternities are no different than anything else, you work hard and you prioritize, you are going to be successful. (Dale)

This excerpt of Dale's interview demonstrates the desire to control and shape the other members' belief systems into what the fraternity deems appropriate.

My first two interviews were done with Dale and Neal. During these two interviews I did not ask about masculinity, but both Dale and Neal equated belonging to the fraternity with manhood and masculinity. Dale is an older member of the house and has lived in the Greek system longer than some of the other members. He is very concerned about the leadership in the house because he will be leaving soon and wants the house to continue to function at the same level, with the same beliefs and attitudes that he and his pledge brothers worked hard to create and maintain. He believes it is his duty along with the responsibility of the fraternity at large to build good, strong leaders out of the younger members. Dale equates values and morals with those members he sees becoming leaders in the house and feels it is his responsibility to ensure that the newer members begin to understand the importance of the values of the fraternity. Troy, who is a newer member, also equates values and morals with becoming a man when he states "To be a man? Hmmm. I say it is standing up for what you believe in. Sticking to your morals and goals".

The significance placed on responsibility and the behaviors of doing chores and being a leader are transmitted to the new members via the membership manual, and less formally through the men themselves. The men are given chores and tasks inside the house that are rotated on a monthly and weekly basis; if these chores are not done correctly or on time, the men are sanctioned. They are told they need to see the steward, the one who assigns the chores. Normally the men are given another task or chore to perform inside the house. It is the members on the executive board that decide whether or not the duties are being performed correctly.

Leadership for these men is about more than just taking on the responsibility of the roles, it is about defining what the hegemonic beliefs and attitudes are and performing them. The leaders of the house are the ones who set the good examples of the performance of a fraternity man. They are the ones who have internalized the beliefs and attitudes established by the fraternity and make sure that they are upheld and the rules are being followed. The leaders are the ones who also make sure that the men maintain the appropriate image of the fraternity. This is one reason why there is so much concern from

the older members about the younger members' ability to lead. They are concerned that the younger members will not be able to uphold their responsibilities nor be able to enforce the hegemonic practice of masculinity that is required to maintain their "new image."

I asked one of the members during a follow up interview who he thought had the most power in the house.

The most power? Hmm, I suppose probably Dale. Just because he's the most... whatever Dale says is... even if it sounds like it's bull, he talks like it's real and everyone follows that. You know? {Do you think he has power because he's kind of pushy or because he's a good talker?} Both and that everybody knows of Dale and he is a respected person. {So they respect his decisions also?}. Because he's been a leader in the past and they know of him, even if they didn't really agree with him, they might go along with what he says because they all respect him. If he says it's true then people go along with him. (Brad)

In another follow up interview I asked a member who he thought had the most influence in the house.

Definitely Dale, he is very influential on what the house does- a lot of people listen to him. Because of not only of what he has gone through, because he came in as a freshman he was ready to about just quit – but as he stayed with it and he had leadership positions in the fraternity and on campus. I don't know if it's so much people listen to him cause of his experience or just the way he communicates. One thing I have learned about Dale is that he communicates with other people really well. I mean, when he gets up there, he is a good leader and he just stands up there and it's easy for him to sway their opinion. Whatever he says just seems to make sense. (Ethan)

Both Ethan and Brad think that Dale is an influential leader who holds power within the house. They both describe his ability to communicate his ideas effectively, in a way that persuades other members to commit to his ideas. They both agree he is an effective leader and leadership is a quality that is highly regarded in fraternity XYZ. Ethan and Brad state that Dale's leadership comes from his ability to communicate well with others and get his ideas across. I believe they are connecting communication with persuasion, the ability to get others to accept one's point of view or perspective. Dale is also known in the fraternity for his "tough" or aggressive demeanor and competitive "nature". Ethan also links Dale's leadership ability to that of perseverance, his ability to stick it out, to overcome obstacles and still succeed. This type of thinking is systemic in American culture; we are all taught that we can achieve anything if we try hard enough. This is especially true for young men who are taught to "buck it up," "tough it out," and to not act like a "sissy" (Savin-Williams 2004). Thus leadership is a quality of masculinity the fraternity tries to cultivate in their

members. The next section of this chapter discusses what happens when a member is perceived as not fitting the image of hegemonic masculinity promoted by the fraternity.

### **When the “Image is not upheld”**

The men in the fraternity use informal social sanctioning or what could be considered hazing practices in order to keep members in line. Through the experience of one particular member of fraternity XYZ who obviously does not live up to the hegemonic male image, I provide a glimpse of what happens when groups of men in a homosocial setting perceive that masculinity is not “being done” correctly.

Men who demonstrate that they hold the beliefs and attitudes of the XYZ fraternity and who are able to perform its hegemonic practices are highly regarded within the house. But what happens once a member is believed not to “fit” these hegemonic practices? When I first met Casey, I was unsure if I wanted to be around him. He was always polite, but he was also overbearing; I even nicknamed him “Mr. Mr.” in my field notes. In contrast to the other fraternity members, Casey fit my preconceived, media driven notion of what a stereotypical fraternity man was like. He is enthusiastic about his participation in the fraternity on our first meeting he showed me the tattoo of the fraternity symbol tattooed on his ankle. He takes being a fraternity member very seriously and tries hard to be an exemplary fraternity man. One could say that he “overdoes” fraternity masculinity. Unfortunately, the men of the house do not take him seriously. His overdoing the type of masculinity that is performed inside the house does not allow him to “pass” as a fraternal man, even though he belongs to fraternity XYZ. Casey has been the “butt” of many “jokes” and hazing practices inside the house, and his masculinity has been questioned on more than one occasion. During my interview with Scott, he stopped our conversation to make me aware of Casey as he was walking to class. Scott was laughing at the way Casey was dressed. Scott asked me if I had met Casey yet, implying that if I had I would understand and share in his amusement. This conversation took place before I had a chance to talk with Casey myself.

He just looks ridiculous he’s got his sun glasses on with his cd player, wearing a suit. He used to wear a sport coat with khakis and a backwards hat-we all were like, you can’t wear a backwards hat with a sport coat and khakis. (Scott)

I interpret Scott’s response as he believes that Casey is breaking a “social norm” of what it means to “look masculine” or like a fraternity man, by wearing his baseball cap backwards with a sport jacket and khaki pants. Yet, Casey was dressed in a very

stereotypical media driven image of a fraternity man. How we dress is a signifier to many people of our social status as well as the values that we hold. Through perception we catch clues of others' gender, class, and race via the clothing and or accessories they wear. For instance, it is socially acceptable for women to differentiate themselves from men by wearing skirts and dresses and accessories such as high heel shoes and long dangling earrings. Clothing labels can also be used to differentiate people by race, class, and gender (and/or sex). High priced fashion labels such as Ann Klein design for women, Tommy Hilfiger designs mainly for men, and labels such as Fubu were first worn by urban Black youth while the Nautica label is associated with more affluent, older white males.

The common dress for the men in this fraternity was blue jeans and "t" shirts and sometimes a baseball cap. Often the way one dresses provides clues to one's sexuality. One common stereotype is that gay men are supposed to be "better dressers" and more concerned about personal appearance than straight men. I, however, do not think it was necessarily what Casey was wearing that was the problem. The fraternity member I was talking to wanted to show that he was better than Casey and that he somehow outranked him. This member pointed to Casey's clothing as a way of showing that Casey does not follow the dress code of the fraternity men, and therefore Casey's masculinity comes into question.

In a place where individuality is not highly prized and conformity is, breaking social norms is an unwritten taboo. Image is stressed in all settings and is closely guarded by the men in fraternity XYZ. Casey's relationship with the fraternity often puzzled me. When I did follow up interviews, I asked about the fraternity men's relationships with him. In fact, I never had to mention his name, only to say something like, "Tell me about the particular member who seems to be the butt of all the fraternity jokes," and immediately the respondents knew who I was talking about.

He has his problems and... like actual, like, personal problems, like ahh, he's on medicine, I guess. But, all people pick on him because. *{Do the other members know he's on medication?}* I think a few do but probably most don't or don't care. *{I don't think there is a day that goes by that that man isn't the butt of somebody's joke.}* Yeah. Everyone's guilty of it though... here... if I say that I don't make fun of him, I'd be lying so... *{What is it about him that leaves him open?}* I think he tries too hard to fit in, or to, you know, be in the group and he says just off the wall stuff and people hear that and just like make fun of him for it. *{So is he a part of anybody's group?}* Like, no, we are friends with him, but he doesn't have his own clique. (Brad)

Even though a few of the men in the house understood that Casey may have been taking medication this did not impact their actions towards him. The men's hazing activities were in

reaction to Casey's over dramatization of fraternity masculinity. Casey has not learned or does not understand the rules of social boundaries. Social boundaries refer to knowing what types of conversations are appropriate at what times and to whom it is appropriate to tell certain things. Children normally learn these social cues from their parents, but until children understand social boundaries there are many embarrassing moments for the parents. After a time, children learn to control the impulse to say whatever comes into their heads and evaluate if the social setting is a place to disclose certain information. The men believe Casey has not learned to pick up these social cues yet and believe that he should not be a representative of their fraternity, fearing he might say something that is considered inappropriate in particular social settings. I was told jokingly that whenever they have new recruits or women over to the house, the men would like to lock Casey in the closet. However jokingly this might have been said, one thing is clear: the men see Casey as a "threat" to the hegemonic practice they have established. On the other hand, Dale is an exemplar of that practice.

How we interact with others is often embedded in how we do gender. If one is a man, he is not supposed to be overly expressive, but should be able to communicate with other men. Men are supposed to enjoy talking about certain topics such as sports and not enjoy some activities such as shopping. Men in the XYZ fraternity have linked their masculinity to the ideas of responsibility and leadership. Previously in this chapter Dale was deemed a good leader because of his communication style and his ability to persuade others to accept his ideas. Casey, on the other hand, is known in the house for his lack of tact. He is also known for his inability to communicate with others effectively, more importantly, how to talk to women. I am not sure if Dale is known for his communication with women, but he is always dressed in fraternity fashion, blue jeans and a "t" shirt. Casey is seen as the "other," as an example inside the house of "what not to be" or "how not to act." He is perceived as exaggerating or "overdoing" gender, leading him not to "pass," as West and Zimmerman (1987) would say. By not passing, he somehow is not a man, even though he is biologically male. Through Casey, we can see that although one may be born a particular sex, one still may not fit the "sex category" (West and Zimmerman 1987). Because Casey is not "passing," his manhood is always being questioned and sanctioned.

When I was interviewing Casey about his role inside the house we talked about some of the "jokes" that were played on him.

For example, I was taking a shower and someone, I think it was [name] that stole all of my stuff so all I had was a wash cloth and I flipped out the first time, yelling and swearing, "get my damn stuff back in there." The next time they did it, well, I had my wash cloth still, I just walked out, walked out in the middle of the hallway they were facing –and I turned around and picked up my towel, instead of squatting down and picking up my towel I mooned them like crazy. *{So do you think they like to make fun of you because you say you're an emotional person and they know that?}* They love to play with me; they love to get a rise out of me. I'm easy.

In the statement above Casey is alluding to the problems he has in socializing with others, getting the "niceties" down. Casey is talking about a specific incident, where he learned not to give in to the negative treatment, thus adapting and taking control by purposefully showing the men his posterior, sending a clear message, "do your worst, because it does not bother me; see I am exposing myself to you." During the interview, Casey alluded to the fact that he was aware that he was the fraternity fool, but he also assured me that he knew his brothers would always be there for him and watch his back. Although this instance was labeled a "joke" and was thought of as "harmless" it is also an example of hazing.

The core tenet of responsibility is demonstrated by this "watching of the brothers' backs" and is a major part of belonging to a fraternity. Men learn to be responsible for the well being of their brothers. I was perplexed by Casey's loyalty to the other members and I was perplexed by their attitudes towards Casey. In follow up interviews I asked the members why they allowed Casey to join the fraternity. One member, Jack, indicated that Casey was allowed to join because, "[h]e has a lot of enthusiasm. He's really ecstatic about a lot of things. Other than that, I'm not really sure". Another member indicated that it was due to the fact that when Casey pledged they were really low in numbers and they needed someone who could help pay the bills. Dale had previously stated, however, that fraternity XYZ does not recruit men for the purpose of numbers.

Later in Jack's interview he indicates that he feels Casey is "a pretty good guy, but, as far as his social skills, I think that's where a lot of the jokes come in from." From Jack's response it is apparent that he knows that Casey is the butt of the jokes and teased because of his lack of social skills or Casey's inability to control his actions and reactions towards others. I then asked if he knew that Casey believed his brothers would always be there for him and if Casey's trust was misguided. He answered:

I mean, yeah, people say stuff and they make jokes but when it comes down to it, I think, if he had a problem or situation that he couldn't handle himself, I think, it

would be fair to say that pretty much anyone would help him any way they could. So, I think that trust would be genuine. (Jack)

Jack states that even though Casey is teased inside the house he should be able to count on his fraternity brothers outside of the house. Because Casey is a member, if there are conflicts outside the house he is still afforded the other members' protection. This is his right as a member and it is the responsibility of the other members to afford Casey protection. Unfortunately for Casey, he seems to pay for the loyalty of his brothers by putting up with their hazing.

In conversations with the cook, I was told that Casey was always asked about his sex life because it is "widely known" (assumed) in the house that he is a virgin. During one of my visits the men were questioning Casey about what his wedding night would be like; they were asking him what types of things he was planning on doing that night with his "bride." Casey ignored their questions. "To ignore a joke, even though it makes you feel hurt or angry, is to show strength or coolness..." (Lyman 2001:173). There are other members such as Travis who states, "I am planning on waiting till marriage until I have sex," but they are not teased or questioned. Yet, in Casey's case, the members believe he has not had sex yet because he is somehow defective, not quite a man. Even though Casey tried demonstrating his masculinity through ignoring the other men's comments, his "manhood" is still in question since he has not proven he is a man because he has not engaged in sex (vaginal penetration). Lyman explains that jokes that have homoerotic overtones are targeted at "drawing a line between the homosocial male bond and homosexual relationship" (p.174). I don't think that the men believe Casey is gay but they do use this implication to keep Casey in line.

Often joking is used as a way for people to bond. Lyman (2001) explains that in fraternities joking promotes fraternal bonding and suggests that hostile joking (hazing) among members is normative masculine behavior. This is the same in fraternity XYZ, but the joking directed at Casey could be a case of "othering." Instead of a real "outsider" being the target of their male bonding, the men may have created a symbolic "outsider," someone whom they have deemed not masculine enough to be an insider. Thus Casey becomes the object of their jokes. Joking can also be considered a form of "soft sanctioning" or hazing, letting the particular member, in this instance Casey, know he is not performing the appropriate type of masculinity.

Even members who treat him with kindness and “watch his back” use Casey for a good joke. Mick, on more than one occasion would come up to me and say, “I wish you were here last night; the guys weren’t very nice to Casey.” Casey is also known to go out drinking and become ill. Again, this image of drinking until one becomes ill is a media driven stereo type of fraternity of masculinity that Casey is emulating. Mick is normally the one who cleans him up and sits with him to make sure he is okay and does not become sick later in the night. Yet, the night of the formal Mick came running up to me and said, “You should see Casey, he is making a fool of himself on the dance floor.” Mick in doing this is also in some ways aiding Casey in performing the media driven image of the ideal fraternity man. Casey had been drinking very heavily and was dancing by himself; he was without a date. His behaviors are then used by other members in their “othering” of him and serve as a justification of their ill treatment of him. If he were to uphold the image of the fraternity and of the members’ version of masculinity, they would not tease or use him as the butt of their jokes. The men’s treatment of those who are different demonstrates how hegemonic power is used.

Bird (1996), in her study of masculinity, states that masculinities which are not in line with the hegemonic ideal are supposed to be acted out privately. Casey violates this norm of the fraternity by acting “inappropriately” in a very public space. He also violates the norm of emotional detachment. His emotional problems and his inconsistent behavior are constant reminders of this violation, and he is ostracized from the homosocial environment accordingly. Casey is a reminder that there are flaws in the hegemonic ideals of masculinity and manhood. Casey does not fit the hegemonic ideal of masculinity in this fraternity, and thus is placed at the bottom of the pecking order. Casey is the “other” inside this house. Although Casey claims to be heterosexual, his masculinity has become marginalized and his sexuality and masculinity have been questioned. The men have marginalized Casey’s masculinity by questioning his sexuality not because they view Casey as gay but because Casey does not fit their ideal image of masculinity.

The brutal teasing that the men in the fraternity use against Casey has been demonstrated in groups of adolescent boys. Teasing the weakest individuals of the group takes attention off the other individuals and their actions and behaviors. Boys who violate norms of not playing sports or hanging out with girls are often taunted and called “fag” or “gay” (Savin-Williams 2004). Although these men are older, I believe the reason behind the teasing of Casey is the same. This type of behavior can also aid in normalizing the behavior



of the person being teased and it allows for the “teasers” to be more comfortable around the teased individual as the behavior between the two diminishes and they become more alike. What this means is that hazing is used to bring the individual who is not performing masculinity correctly more in line with the ideal image.

The men’s relationship inside the house with Casey is a puzzling one, yet it demonstrates the various nuances in the way social sanctioning and hazing can be used to keep a member inside a particular group “in line” and how it is used to reinforce group norms. Casey for whatever reason has an over-exaggerated mental image of how masculinity is practiced inside a fraternity. His interpretations of what masculinity “looks like” or how it is “done” is not viewed the same by the men in Fraternity XYZ. In turn, the men have sanctioned Casey, or hazed him, in order to keep in line. The men in fraternity XYZ recognize Casey as one of their own; they believe these sanctioning “sessions” will help guide him to become the “right type of man”. Yet, these hazing practices only help to isolate Casey from the other members and reinforce his “difference.”

### ***Maintenance through Competition***

Men construct their masculinity through reference to other men, including being respected by other men (Emslie et al. 2004; Kimmel 1994). Competition is important for maintaining the social order and is part of many male homosocial environments (Schacht 1996; Bird 1996; King 2004; Yancey- Martin and Hummer 1989; Messner 1992). Competition between men is a common theme in many studies that examine different forms of masculinity (Schacht 1996; Bird 1996; King 2004; Yancey Martin and Hummer 1989; Messner 1992). Men use competition to establish their identities and to evaluate others. How one performs against his peers will determine where he will fit in that particular homosocial setting. Competition for men is not just about the performance of sports but the emphasis on winning and losing allows men in homosocial environments to establish the self both as an individual and appropriately masculine (Bird 1996:127). Therefore, competition is used as a mechanism for ensuring conformity to hegemonic practices. Through competition, men develop “pecking orders” (Bird 1996), which in the case of XYZ fraternity allows them to establish who the leaders are and what form of masculinity will be practiced. Not only does competition between the individual members of the fraternity play a part in the construction and teaching of masculinity, but competition between fraternal

organizations also plays a role in determining the conformity to the fraternities' masculine image. This chapter examines both types of competition.

### **Competition Between Members**

One afternoon at lunch a member who was talking about the pecking order inside the XYZ fraternity stated, "yeah, I am near the bottom, but thank God I am not at the bottom." Competition allows men to reference themselves against one another. It also is a way to instill achievement and success in individual men, making them strive for a better performance in all that they do. Competition can serve as a prestige mechanism, as well as a way to insure conformity, inside the fraternity.

Everyday experiences can become moments of competition between the men. The men are supposed to volunteer a certain amount of time to particular projects in the house. Even these mundane projects can be about gaining prestige inside the house. In a conversation with Alex, he explains that due to his hard work inside the fraternity, homecoming was seen as a success. He states, "I don't want to toot my horn, but I had a lot to do with the success of homecoming." I am not sure what Alex's contributions were, but he believes the success of homecoming, and his involvement in it, allowed the chapter to "look" better inside the Greek community and eventually it was chosen by a more prestigious fraternity for a future event (I explain this process later in this chapter).

Competition inside the house can be as simple as who has better grades. To highlight a man's social achievement, the men place "A" papers on the fraternity's refrigerator. Displaying the papers is not only about the individual success, but about the men's ability to perform as fraternity men. This is the same tactic many parents often use with small children to show they are proud of the child's accomplishment; it is there on the refrigerator for the world to see.

Living in the Greek community is in a sense about a dualistic way of life. The Greek community is supposed to represent a nurturing environment which helps each individual flourish and become the best man or woman they can possibly be. Greek life also gives members practical experience working in an organization and gaining leadership skills. Living in a Greek house, members will be given a chance to learn fundamentals in finance, budgeting, collections, maintenance, and planning (The Manual of XYZ Fraternity 1998:38). A fraternity is more than a place to live; it is also a business. As with any type of business, or communal type of living, there needs to be an environment of cooperation in order for the

day-to-day activities to be completed. Bird (1996:122) states that competition is not about cooperation but about separation and distinction. Yet, for the men in the fraternity, competition is very important; it is what motivates them to succeed. Competition at the individual level is a way to rank members. Competition is not only practiced at the individual level between the brothers, but it is performed at the organizational level through the Greek community. In the next section I will discuss competition between fraternities.

### **Competition Between Fraternities**

Competition between the houses has implications for the individuals within each house. There are many chances for the men of different fraternities to compete with each other throughout each academic year. University sponsored events such as homecoming and Greek sponsored events such as Greek week allow the fraternities to showcase their strengths. During homecoming there are competitions that involve building the best yard display and showcasing the school spirit, for example, in a contest called “yell like hell.”

I don't know if I should say this on the tape or not, but it's the whole male buying into 'mine is bigger than yours'. We [fraternity chapters] compete on everything, whether it is who is going to win the [name of event] float, or who is going to have better chapter grades, or who is going to win flag football intramurals. I don't know if it's just a male tendency to want to compete or what, but I think a lot of has to do with attention from the sororities. You know it's a big deal who sororities pick for Greek week or [name of event] or homecoming or something like that. (Neal)

Neal and I were discussing the atmosphere of Greek life, and from that came his statement about Greek life and competition. Neal states that males compete for everything, including women. The inference of “mine is bigger than yours” is not only about ideas of masculinity but how manhood revolves around proving oneself. Neal also states that some of the competition is about getting the attention of women, but, as I argue later, it is the women who are used to gain the attention of other men. Greek week is an all-fraternity and sorority competition where there are various games, activities and sporting events, for which members are awarded points. At the end of Greek week, the houses with the most points are awarded first, second, and third place overall and are given awards for specific events. They also are given awards for achievements of the individual chapters throughout the year. I attended the Greek awards ceremony where the former chapter president of fraternity XYZ received “president of the year” award, and the chapter itself fared well in honorable recognitions and overall awards that were being handed out. All of this helps in the overall “image maintenance” of the fraternity. Fraternities that win these events, contests, and

honors are considered the “best” or “dominant” fraternities in the Greek system. Dominant fraternities historically have had good reputations on campus and in the community. They also normally have high numbers, meaning they do not have a problem recruiting members. Dominant fraternities normally have a waiting list for membership, allowing them to “choose” the best men from potential recruits.

[name of one of the most prestigious fraternities on campus] picked us for Greek week so it [fraternity XYZ's image] must be half way decent – I think we could do better maybe if we'd participate in more stuff – you know we don't party that much, I mean most of us don't. I just think we are kinda well rounded; we are not the big partiers and our reputation is that we work hard. We worked our ass off at homecoming that is why I think [name of fraternity] picked us; its pretty obvious-okay- we didn't ask [name of fraternity] – [they] came to us. (Casey)

Casey is discussing how the image of XYZ fraternity is improving within the Greek community. XYZ was chosen to partner with a prestigious or dominant fraternity for the Greek week events; this is one of the measures the men use to see how they are viewed by other fraternities. Men compete and perform for other men, to gain their attention. Being chosen by a fraternity with a prestigious reputation means that all the hard work (or image maintenance) done by fraternity XYZ is finally paying off.

During Greek week, which is toward the end of the academic school year, the sororities and fraternities join various forms of competition and the culmination of all the events held throughout the year is a Greek awards ceremony. The individual Greek houses accumulate points throughout the year and awards are based on a point system. Competition also includes which chapter has the highest overall GPA and which ones can bring in the most money for the individual chapters' philanthropy projects. All of these levels of competition help chapters in the Greek communities to “get their name out” and establish them as dominant houses within the university's Greek community. Becoming a “dominant” house is a coveted position for a variety of reasons. I have identified four reasons that fraternities want to be considered a dominant house. First is image, it looks good when a fraternity is recognized on campus for being a house with “quality men.” Second, it helps in the numbers game so fraternity members have “better men” to choose from during recruitment. Third, it is easier to keep membership high so it can sustain the fraternity's business. Last, it provides prestige within the given chapter's national organization.

Because in something like yell like hell--I think that we weren't the biggest house but we were the dominant group and it was a lot easier to jump on the bandwagon and to try and succeed because we, like you know, in chapter we

would get the response, you know, you guys are doing great, you know, you have the most guys there—you guys have the lead roles. (Allen)

Allen believes that the reputation of the house is changing. Chapter XYZ is making a name for itself and becoming a dominant house on campus. He believes this because of the positive responses the members are receiving from men in other fraternities. During certain events such as homecoming, Greek Week, and “Yell Like Hell” the fraternities and sororities are paired together. Part of the process is a larger more prominent fraternity choosing a smaller fraternity to be paired with (I discuss this more fully in the following chapter). Part of the men’s beliefs come from their standings in the competitions during Greek week where for the past three years they have won many awards and recognitions and part of their beliefs come from comments of other members of the community.

I do know compared to other fraternities I think we are getting noticed. Myself, I have gotten compliments from the bigger houses that are always the dominant houses. - everyone thinks of them being the dominant houses and they are asking us how did you do this or like [name] for instance are always one of the big houses and they came to us and said they wanted to be with us for Greek week, But now we’re building our reputation. So we are getting back to be known and seeing that we are doing good things in the community. (Dan)

We were chosen by [name] [to be partnered (paired) with during homecoming]- which I think is a bit ridiculous to think that this is so cool to be chosen by another chapter and they are viewed as the power house for [two names of fraternities] are the power houses of all these {I have heard that and its been like that for decades} yes their entire existence here- so a I was very happy to be chosen by [name] because one of the comments made “when they chose us,” I think that’s redundant, was that they picked us because of what they heard about working during homecoming . (Alex)

Like Casey, Dan and Alex agree that being chosen by one of the dominant fraternities on campus is a good sign about the position of their fraternity within the given “pecking order” of the fraternity system. As previously stated, if a fraternity is at the top of the pecking order, it has better access to the selection of the “best men”, which is very important when trying to recruit and to the “image maintenance” process. It is all very cyclical; a house cannot be at the top of the “pecking order” if it does not have the right men or the right image, and it can not win events and have a good image without the right men. However, being “chosen” does not sit well with Alex, a member who would be considered a leader in his fraternity and the university at large. He recognizes the importance, but would rather the “choosing” was done by his fraternity; especially since the house that did the choosing is the same fraternity that rejected him before he joined XYZ. For Alex, as well as other men in the fraternity,

inter-fraternity rivalry is about more than good fun, it is about proving that your fraternity is worthy. By doing so you are also proving that you, the individual, are worthy, or, as Bird (1996) explains, it is about masculine self-conceptualization. The men are defining who they are in the Greek community through competition and rivalry. Competition, like hazing, can be seen as a rite of passage into manhood or a way to prove one's masculinity. Men are performing and competing against other men for their social positions. In the following section I demonstrate how image maintenance and masculinity are tied to the notion of chivalry.

### **Maintenance and Paternalistic Chivalry**

Another way for the fraternity members of fraternity XYZ to maintain their image is through their relationships with women. Some of the conversations with the men revolved around how women should be treated. The men, in vying for positions of leadership and power in the house, often use chivalry in their relations with women as a standard of "manhood." This exemplifies how the negotiation of hegemonic masculinity, as well as complicit masculinity, is practiced inside the house. Women are also used as another level of competition.

There is tension between affording women equal rights with men in the private and public spheres (however arbitrary these might seem) and wanting to preserve the breadwinner ideology of masculinity (Ciabattari 2001). This is especially true for more privileged males who will be able to live out this hegemonic masculine ideal. This tension comes into play when men have women in their lives who might experience gender discrimination: wives, mothers, and daughters (Ciabattari 2001). This tension has been labeled Paternalistic Chivalry by Viki, Abrams, and Hutchison (2003). The men who practice this type of chivalry venerate certain women such as wife and mother and they also believe that it is the responsibility of men to take care of women. The notion of paternalistic chivalry is important in this research because it emerged as a major theme in my respondents' definition of masculinity. It is also linked to the idea of competition. This section demonstrates how the notion of chivalry is practiced and maintains competition between the members in the fraternity.

I think fraternities and sororities are a reflection of society. I think if something in society...you know, that men are institutionalized to believe that, you know that they need to look after women, more so than other men, I think that's what you are going to find in fraternities... (Dale)

One of the ideal hegemonic images of masculinity in this fraternity is the notion of chivalry. According to Dale, the ideal of “looking after” women is something that is cultivated or institutionalized throughout the Greek community.

Paternalistic chivalry is a basis on which masculinity in the fraternity is judged. I think it goes back to the fact that, you know... if someone's going to shoot your mom! , you gotta choice to take a bullet. You are gonna take the bullet for your mom. But, you probably won't take the bullet for your dad and your dad, I guarantee, would never let you, you know... would never let you take a bullet.  
(Dale)

Dale discusses why men are chivalrous; he states that it is because it is men's responsibility to take care of women. Dale implies men can take care of themselves but women cannot. He states this in his example of “taking the bullet” for your mother but not your father. He also states a man would never let another man “take the bullet for him” but he implies that it is a man's duty to take it for a woman. Dale goes on to say:

It's... I think it's one of those things that there are exceptions out there but I think the instinct of most men, even like the men that go crazy and beat their wives! or something like that, is to look after them, to make sure that they are alright, to be their caretaker. And, I think everybody else kind of views it like he's a dude, he can take care of himself, you know? (Dale)

The roles of men and women are essentialized and he believes that men have an “instinct” when it comes to protecting women; he calls this “care taking.” Dale does not equate caretaking with emotional care; he is talking about physical care. He goes as far as to say that even a man who beats his wife would still lay down his life for her. Wife beating is not seen as chivalrous, but Dale is trying to make his point about protection by using an extreme example. He does not realize that by beating his wife a man is certainly not taking care of her, and the wife beater may even cause her death. Dale's analogy is about protecting “things” that are yours from other people who might harm them or want them for themselves, it is also about ownership. I believe there is a fine line between protection and control. Some women regard men being chivalrous as a way for men to demonstrate respect for women, although these same women are blind to the fact that the paternalism that accompanies chivalry is about control over women. It is about keeping women in more traditional roles, not allowing her the same freedom that men have. Women are regulated to being passive (Viki, Abrams, and Hutchison 2003).

During my time at the fraternity, there were two instances that illustrate where chivalry was performed and I was at the receiving end of the chivalrous act. I have already indicated that at times the boundary surrounding my role as researcher was blurred, but my

role as a woman was always very clear. Although I was not the men's mother, wife, or girlfriend, some of the men still felt they needed to protect me because I was a woman in their all male world/environment. The evening that I spent at the bar with four of the men was an example of the expressed need by the men to protect the women they feel are in their care. For most of the evening, a friend of mine and I sat on stools at the bar, near the pool table, where many of the men had congregated. Our escorts for the evening, the men from the fraternity, had strategically placed themselves between us and the other men in the pool table area. What stands out is that during the evening a dispute broke out between a "regular" at the bar and a college student. When it looked like the verbal attacks were going to turn to physical ones, one of the men looked at my friend and me and said, "Be ready and stay here". The fraternity men surrounded me and my friend, protecting us from the crowd, and making sure that when the fight did break out they were standing between the men who were fighting and us. I remember thinking that it was thoughtful of them, but in the process I missed all the excitement around me because I could not see through the men who were trying to protect us, thus we became the passive bystanders. In this instance we really did not need that protection and my friend and I were more than capable of moving out of the way had things gotten out of control. However, because the men had invited us to the bar, I believe they felt we were in their care. At the end of the evening, the men arranged for two of the younger members to come to the bar when it closed down and drive us home, again seeing to our physical safety.

This "chivalry" for some of the men was more than just an ideal about how to treat women--it was about the notion of control and power. The men wanted to take charge of the situation and to prove that they indeed could take care of those in their charge. More importantly it was about having the power to be in control.

The second time I became the focus of these men's chivalry was at the end of the year formal. When the men came to my room to escort me to the banquet room I was not ready. I told them that I would be awhile, to go without me, and I would meet up with them later. Being the "gentlemen" that they were, they refused to leave and waited for me to get ready. I took about another half hour. In the meantime, there was a phone call to one of the men's cell phones, telling them to hurry up because pictures would be taken before dinner was served. My escorts told the caller that I was not ready and to wait until we all got there. When we did finally arrive, the line had formed for dinner and pictures already were taken. My two escorts were not in those pictures. Once we got there, I was told to go to the front of



the line with the other women. The women were served first at the buffet and the men followed.

Later, I realized that the whole picture taking incident was not really about me being late; it was about the conflict between the younger and older members, once again. One of the men who accompanied me that night was a graduating senior and the other was an original member of the chapter during its reorganization. The two men who were my escorts were using the notion of chivalry to prove their importance to the fraternity, to show where they stood in the "pecking order." In the end, this strategy back-fired on the men, because the rest of the fraternity men did not wait for them but proceeded to take pictures and start dinner without them. This was a message to the two fraternity men that their presence was not required in order for the fraternity to run effectively.

Hegemonic masculinity is not only practiced in relation to subordinate and marginalized masculinities, but in relation to women (Messner 1993; Kimmel 1994). Scholarship on men cannot exclude women because hegemonic masculinity is practiced through men's relationships to women (Brod 1994). In order to demonstrate how hegemonic masculinity is dependent on women the dialectical relationship the men have with the sorority women on campus and other women around them must be explored. Sororities are there as the cheerleaders and support for the men in situations where "women's skills" are needed, such as sewing or choreographing dance routines. This type of relationship between sororities and fraternities was demonstrated when fraternity XYZ and the sorority they were paired in order to build a float for a University event. During this project the men did all the heavy construction projects and the women did all the sewing of the fabric that was required on the float.

Women are also used as "tools" of competition. The men always want to be paired with a top sorority which is known to win competitions but more importantly, they want to be paired and chosen by the "good looking" sorority women so that they are envied by other fraternities or other men. During the end of the year formal, a very drunk member came up to me and said, "Do you know what men think about women... they put them on a pedestal. Men love women." I thought that was an interesting statement because it places women above men but only as "show pieces" something to be admired and taken care of, but certainly not treated as equals.

According to Allen "every guy wants to be the knight in shining armor and to get a woman who is pretty confident." In most fairy tales, the knight saves the damsel from some

horrible fate that has befallen her, but Allen also states that every guy wants a woman who is confident. More than ever before, women are told that they can do anything, to be strong and confident, and Allen says that is what men want. Yet men still also want to play the role of the "chivalrous knight" who saves the woman, then marries her and she becomes his wife and the mother of his children. I believe this knight in shining armor image is also about competing with other men for women. To win the attention of a confident, independent woman is stating to the rest of the world (the men) that somehow you are a "better man" because she chose you. Ben agrees with this assessment. During our interview he stated "every guy wants a trophy girl- you know what I mean?" My reply to him was "no, tell me". He explains by telling me that I do know what he means but I am just asking then goes on to say "a guy wants a girl that other guys are going to think is attractive" I state "you want somebody that everybody else wants", he replies with a definite "yes". Ben does not talk about being a knight in shining armor but being a "trophy" and being "put on a pedestal" are one in the same. You are there for other men to look at but only one man to touch. Kimmel (1994:129) states that "women become a kind of currency that men use to improve their ranking on the masculine social scale."

For many of the men, there are certain women who deserve respect and other women who do not. The women who are to be respected are family members, girlfriends, and women who fit the idealized notion of how a proper woman should "act." Women who are overtly sexual are found to be attractive but somehow lacking because of the double standard that the men have accepted for themselves and for sorority women. They hold certain ideas of what is appropriate for women, but more importantly, is appropriate for Greek women.

Personally, I treat women in the Greek community differently because many of the Greek women I know ask me questions in a community sense, in a, what do you think of this...Also, I have higher expectations for, umm, for the gender expectations in high society type things of sorority women. {What do you mean high society type of things?} Like etiquette expectations or ladylike behavior {Why?} The whole concepts of fraternities make men and sororities make women. (Alex)

Alex treats Greek women differently because he believes he has much more in common with Greek women; they are part of the same community and participate in many of the same events. He also knows he holds gender stereotypes for sorority women--he expects them to act a certain way. Alex believes that sororities create a certain type of woman, one

who is more cultured, who maintain certain proprieties and have learned the niceties of proper etiquette.

The men I interviewed believe that sorority women are highly motivated but they also allude to stereotypes attributed to sorority women. The double standard that still exists between men and women is very pervasive in the Greek community. In chapter five, I discuss how women's sexuality is highly monitored in the Greek community, mandating different rules of engagement for men and women. The women who overstep the boundary of "proper sorority girl" are often labeled "loose" by men in the Greek community, which is another form of power used to control or restrict women's sexuality.

I have my own stereotypes {Which are what?} Well, ha, they are really ditsy a lot of them are kind of, this is, I mean they seem kind of smutty some of them- from what I have seen...I have gone to some dinner exchanges where I can see a couple of girls are really ditsy and stuff like that. I mean, I can't tell if she is kind of slutty, but I can tell the really ditsy... I can see that it has also changed and it's just like us; they have got a bad image, too, and it's not really fair they are more concerned about grades. I mean, they are producing some of the best students on campus, just like we. (Ethan)

Ethan came into the Greek community with stereotypes of what he believed sorority women were like, yet the more time he spends with them he also realizes, as with the men, that the women may not live up to the images of those stereotypes.

When I asked Travis about these stereotypes he said, "It depends on which one, because you can go from one extreme to the other like, um, like a conservative house or a liberal house, and some houses are known for being a brothel so to speak." When I asked him if he thought that image was really true about the sorority he had named, he said "no," but yet he still perpetuates the stereotype by stating it in conversation.

## **Summary**

For the men in fraternity XYZ, the image maintenance process involved more than just eliminating the stereotypical practices around which Greek men organize their lives. Image maintenance and competition allows the men to teach, learn, and negotiate hegemonic masculinity. Yet, both are another way to ensure conformity. This chapter demonstrated how a social contract is created between the fraternity and the men. This social contract involves incorporating beliefs and attitudes about responsibility and maintaining the everyday operation of the house, and becoming the kind of man the chapter

requires. The men become “the right type of men” and uphold this image through the internalization of the beliefs and attitudes and participation in the activities to achieve the prescribed goals of the fraternal organization.

I have shown how the image maintenance process includes the internalization of the goals of the fraternity and what it means to be a fraternity man. Although responsibility is the overarching goal in becoming a man and living in the fraternity, leadership and success are both part of the equation. It seems as though some of the men are trying to create a static version of masculinity or a composite of an ideal fraternity man. Yet, as with every type of masculinity, this is rarely achieved. The theoretical power that hegemonic masculinity holds is that it can adapt to and envelop different forms of masculinity. Not all men in this fraternity are always responsible. That is why the fraternity has standards boards that review infractions that the fraternity men have done. These infractions may include not paying the housing bill on time or allowing grades to slip below the prescribed GPA set for the house. Neither are all men leaders. Leaders are only the select few, the ones who are practicing the closest version of the fraternity’s ideal of what hegemonic masculinity looks like. Many men in the fraternity are complicit, neither trying to achieve the ideal practice of masculinity nor trying to resist it.

I have also demonstrated how the leaders define the appropriate image of masculinity and assure that the men are practicing and upholding that image. Through the images of Dale and Casey, I have demonstrated both what happens to men who are perceived as doing masculinity correctly and when the performance of masculinity does not fit the ideal. Dale is thought of as a “good leader” and is admired for his ability to communicate his ideas with others, while Casey is looked down upon and ostracized by the group. Casey is the example of “how not to do masculinity.”

This research, as that of others, has found that competition is an important part of the hegemonic norm within the fraternity. The men compete with each other and with other chapters for prestige inside the Greek community. This prestige brings the men the ability to recruit “better men” and to attract women to their house. Competition also allows the men to stratify a pecking order inside the house and gives the men standards by which to measure their own masculinity.

I have also shown that for the men in fraternity XYZ competition also comes in the form of paternalistic chivalry. Paternalistic chivalry displays a certain type of masculinity: masculinity which recognizes that men need to protect and take care of women, and which

views women not as men's equals. Chapter five will discuss subordinated and marginalized. forms of masculinity and how they are created in the fraternity.

## **Chapter V: Creating and Managing Subordinated and Marginalized Masculinity**

In this chapter I discuss how marginalized and subordinated masculinities are created and managed relative to the hegemonic ideals that the XYZ fraternity members have constructed and maintain in their house. Subordinated (homosexual men) and marginalized (men of color or poor men) masculinities are set up in relation to hegemonic masculinity. In the United States white, middle class, early middle age, able bodied heterosexual male is the standard by which other men and women are judged by (Kimmel 1994). Bird (1996) states that “homosociality promotes clear distinctions between hegemonic masculinities and nonhegemonic masculinities by the segregation of social groups” (p.121). In order to create these clear distinctions between groups the processes of marginalization and subordination occur through segregation, that is, the separating out of those who are deemed either sexually or racially different. Yet, it is important to understand that subordinated and marginalized masculinities are relational to hegemonic masculinity, that indeed they not oppositional. As stated earlier, hegemonic masculinity is not practiced the same way in all locations. A man can be a member of hegemonic, complicit, marginalized or subordinated masculinities depending upon the situation or institutional setting.

One mechanism in this segregation process revolves around heterosexual imperatives. In order to examine the heterosexual imperatives practiced in the house, the question “What would happen if a member came out as gay in the fraternity?” was asked to each member. The second part of this chapter examines marginalized masculinities through a series of questions pertaining to diversity in the fraternity chapter and recruiting men of color.

### ***Creating and Maintaining Heterosexual Imperatives***

In this section I examine the everyday practices that govern the maintenance of heterosexuality. According to Connell (1993:602), “masculinities as cultural forms cannot be abstracted from sexuality.” Denzin (1998) argues that not only does gender take on socially constructed meanings but so, too, does sexuality. This in turn means that what we find to

be sexual is determined by societal norms. Gender and sexuality are intricately linked, although they can and do generate different identities. One does not necessarily equal the other. This means that one can have the sexual identity of a homosexual, and still have a gendered identity of a man, although a marginalized man.

Social identities such as gender, race, class, disability, age, and sexual orientation are all “interlocking” (Hill Collins 1998). These identities are intersections that influence human development as well as interactions between individuals, which include multiple bases of oppression (Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 1999; West and Fenstermaker 1995). Each one of these is a category of social difference and each one has different characteristics, yet each can be used as a basis of social inequality (West and Fenstermaker 1995). In order for hegemonic masculinity to exist it must be created and maintained in opposition to other forms of masculinity which include subordinated (men of color, lower class men), and marginalized (gay men), and in opposition to women (Hearn and Collison 1994; Kaufman 1994; Brod 1994; Fine et al. 1997; Kimmel 1994; Pyke 1996).

Social fraternities are historically male settings and continue to be so. For years, men in fraternities have had reputations for binge drinking and womanizing. As bad as these images are, they serve to secure a heterosexual image for all who join fraternities. Hegemonic masculinity mandates heterosexuality (Connell 1993); therefore heterosexuality is a prerequisite of manliness inside the fraternity. In order to act out or perform heterosexually and manliness, men must use social scripts that maintain gender roles.

## **Heterosexual Rituals**

The social scripts that maintain gender roles also maintain the way in which fraternities and sororities are engaged with one another at the group and individual level. The Greek community incorporates rituals that are like those of mate selection, where males and females perform skits or serenades that incorporate larger social scripts or rules of engagement of how gender is performed.

The rituals or scripts of heterosexuality are part of the overall Greek communities' design. There are rules and guidelines in place about the pairings between fraternities and sororities. “Pairings” are done for the large events such as homecoming and Greek week; this allows for fraternities and sororities to interact and get to know each other. Other times “pairings” are done for more practical reasons such as sharing the work load and the cost of an event. Often, projects around school or Greek sponsored events can be time consuming

and costly, such as the building of a float. Because the Greek men's chapters outnumber the Greek women's chapters, the sororities are paired with both a small fraternity and large fraternity on campus. The larger fraternity's team up with a smaller fraternity, the pairing between the fraternities is normally based on past performance. A larger house will often look at the performance of a smaller house in previous years during certain events and ask a smaller house that has performed well to partner up with them. The sororities, on the other hand, must be wooed or must do the wooing; this process is called "serenading." Serenading is no longer done the old fashioned way where a group of men got together and sang in front of a prospective sorority's house. It is now done through skits and lip-sync performances. The women normally dance and lip-sync to a current song and the men often perform a goofy skit. Many of the sororities have a tendency to use sexual innuendos while performing their lip-syncs, while the men tend to use humor in wooing their potential partners. As Alex explains,

I think it is absolutely ridiculous the way that it is done- serenading used to be about actually having a group of members that were able to sing in a chorus style or barber shop quartet setting into sing songs that made some sense of who they were –sing your fraternity anthem- ...a woo you with their voice kind of style and they have come to be a parody of popular songs with sexual implications to try and recruit the other chapter in pairing with you. Things like "Join with chapter ABC- lets do Greek week together abc we will a sleep with you every night and shack up and blow jobs for everyone" that kind of thing {That is in their songs?} phrased in the parodies – they will take a popular song and rewrite the words – {And that is some of the wording?} things like that. (Alex)

Alex explains the way serenading used to be done. It can be seen from his response that there is a presumed heterosexuality between the men and women. Women use their bodies and sexuality to entice the men to choose them. They are presuming that the men are heterosexual and that this is what heterosexual men want.

It's kind of phony actually in some ways you might think its kinda of outdated-- you can see how it used to be they would go sing a song – now there is short little scripts that you do and you try to make them funny um its interesting to see the guys serenade the girls and the girls serenade the guys - for instance home coming last year, we were, we did the stupid goofy funny stuff for the girls and then they chose us, and the return serenade was kind of lude and full of sexual innuendo and say just because the want appeal to the male sense or in that type of stuff it is kinda of funny to see the different types, I think, if you look at the girls they are all kind like they appeal to their audience very well {which is men} yea- let me tell you the guys do the same to the girls, but the girls don't want to hear all the sex jokes; they want the little cutesy fun stuff like that so they play to their audience very well. (Dan)



Alex and Dan are describing the difference in serenades in today's culture versus the 1950s. Both of the men are voicing their disapproval over the way the women act out in their lip-synchs. For Travis, serenades were a way to showcase the dominant fraternities and sororities—it was about image. Dan also alludes to the presumed heterosexuality of sorority members of fraternity men and what types of skits will appeal to men. Bill states that these types of displays are “good for the guys.” He agrees that men like the sexual displays. In fact, he believes that “if you really want [to be paired with] the house then that is the way to go about it—sex sells.” I asked Bill about the assumption that women are making about men when they perform serenades (lip-synchs) that are sexual. I asked, “Do you think that it is a fair assessment of the house when women assume the men are only interested in sex.” He replied: “It is kind of degrading but, I mean, it is kind of the truth at the same time I mean guys think about sex and that is the bottom line.”

I think that there is a place for serenading. I think what it has become is rather ridiculous and then there are skits, too. Some people don't do songs, they do skits- like we did a skit for a serenade for this week's Greek week pairing and that was – I thought it was more appropriate and it talked about things that were fairly relevant – it was of course done in a completely satirical context—but, um, ... we are good builders, we can make a whatever it is and we can we have good looking guys who are single- we are nice guys, we won't rape your dog kind of thing. I don't I try to think of something completely off the wall--its more pertinent than let's go have sex kind of thing. (Alex)

While Alex does not necessarily appreciate the way the women serenade, many of the men do not mind the blatant sexuality expressed in the women's serenades. Even though Dan states that the serenades are outdated he believes the sexual innuendos appeal to the intended audience. Many of the men do not mind the provocative shows the women put on and believe that it is all in good fun and say they do not really take it seriously. These performances are emulating heterosexual norms. They are not unlike courtship rituals but at the group rather than the individual level.

Naturally I like it – {Do you pick the girls who use more sex in their skits then those who don't} Not necessarily, I mean it helps naturally, apart of it is getting to know people; meeting different people and if they are more attractive then your more inclined to pare with them. Because you want to get to know them better, I mean if all they do is if they are just really hot but they can't do anything right then you don't want to be with those guys. (Ethan)

I think if its all in good fun – if you don't take it literally everything is fine. (Kent)

You get to go over to another fraternity and be with them and goof around and try to think of something and then make a fool of yourself in front a whole bunch of girls...The girls, they are trying... I've only seen a couple, like two of them, and they came to try to be pared with us and so they were telling us that they were going to all of this stuff and then try to persuade us to be with them. I think that they are a lot of fun. That's about it. (Brad)

Gender scripts maintain how we perceive and perform sexuality. One's biological sex is often translated into prescribed gender and gender signifies to the rest of society one's perceived sexual orientation. Thus if one is a man he is perceived or assumed to be attracted to women and vice versa. The serenades are based on stereotypes of gender, sexuality, and presumed heterosexuality; men enjoy sex and watching provocative images and women do not, or, at the very least, they do not think about it. Women, on the other hand, enjoy humor. Although the women are the ones who are performing the skits that include sexual content, this performance is not necessarily for their own enjoyment (not to imply some of the women do not enjoy their own sexuality), but for the enjoyment of the men; these skits are done specifically so the men will be enticed into choosing their sorority.

Cultural scripts endorse gender roles by prescribing that women and men express different motives and behaviors within relationships. These behaviors have been cultivated and refined over time and though they have been temporal, they still exist within a binary opposition of "masculine" and "feminine." Not only are the types of serenades based on gender stereotypes, but so too, are the contents of the skits or songs. Both groups are trying to appeal to their audience; women appeal to men by emphasizing what they can do for men sexually, and men appeal to women by emphasizing their stereotypical masculine traits such as being good "builders." If appealing to the women's more domestic side does not work, then the men try another tactic and remind the women they are "good men." The women should feel safe with them; the men will not "rape their dogs." The serenades represent a much broader statement being made here about the roles of women and men in society. Not only are women seen as sexual beings but they are viewed as "sex" itself, they are an object. Men, on the other hand, are appreciated for the role of the provider or what that role encompasses: laborer and protector.

Another heterosexual ritual is that of dinner exchanges. These events are held so that the members of sororities and fraternities can get to know each other on a more intimate level. The idea is that a sorority and fraternity exchange members; half of the members go to the other house where they are entertained and the remaining half stays and

is joined by half of the other house. During the course of this research I was fortunate enough to attend one of these dinner parties.

The theme for the dinner exchange was Hawaiian. Most of the men wore Hawaiian print shirts and most of the women wore tank tops and printed skirts. It was not a traditional dinner exchange because only about fifteen of the women, which is less than half of that chapter, were in attendance at the XYZ house. Before the women arrived, the men set up banquet tables. They used white plastic table cloths and had vases of their fraternity flower, red carnations, surrounded by plastic leis, for centerpieces. Since it was not a traditional dinner exchange, the men cooked dinner and the women brought dessert. The men also served the women their dinner plates and they sat “boy-girl.” After dinner a couple of the men brought out their guitars and played for women while both men and women sang. When the singing was over the men then escorted the women back to the sorority house. The whole evening was an example of courting rituals at the group level.

### **Gender Scripts and Social Events**

Not only do “gender roles” prescribe the romantic relationship scripts that stipulate rules for women and men, they also set up rules for engagement in everyday experiences with members of the opposite sex. The fraternity hosts social events, including themed parties and formal dances, most of which are held away from the house because alcohol is involved. These events are important in defining heterosexual imperatives. Most of the men do not go to the events alone, because they are socially sanctioned or made to feel uncomfortable if they do not bring a woman. During one of the meetings I attended, the men were told by the president to make sure they brought dates to an upcoming social function. The following passage illustrates how men who do not or can not bring a date to a social function are treated. “Its kinda [people would say]- what couldn’t you find a friend to go with?... I don’t know how it would go over if somebody brought a male friend”. (Neal) Fraternity parties, often themed and formal dances are important in defining heterosexual imperatives.

Often the men who are not dating will be scrambling for dates the night before the event.

I have taken a date and I went by myself {Do you feel the pressure to take a date?} Especially formals – like yea- which last year I did go by myself because I didn’t have a date at the time. There is always that pressure even there was one function before that me and another guy didn’t have a date so some guys were like, you guys have to have dates. We just went over to [name] and knocked on

the door and said, hey, we need a date. We found two girls that came. We just met them that night and it was a fun time but I think there is pressure to get a date, where is the point that some guys might not want to go – without a date.  
(Dan)

Dan's response illustrates that the appearance of heterosexuality is important. The men are not told that they cannot come to these events without a date but they are made to feel uncomfortable if they do not have a date. It can be surmised from this statement that is not acceptable for men to be dateless. There is a perceived or inherent assumption that men who join fraternities are heterosexual.

All of the men with whom I talked in this fraternity defined themselves as heterosexual and when asked if there were any gay members, they often stated that to their knowledge none of the members were homosexual. Although I never asked about the participant's sexual orientation during the interviews, Allen responded to me by saying "I am heterosexual by the way." Even so, self identification is only one portion of sexual orientation. According to Lippa and Arad (1997), there are three major elements to sexuality: behavior, identity, and desire. These men identified as heterosexual, but I did not ask them about their sexual desires. Because sexuality is mandated in this homosocial environment and due to the way the men felt about homosexual members (which will be discussed further in this chapter), I do not think the men would have identified to me as gay, even if they were. Many of the men are in long term dating relationships. One member is engaged, and another already had a ring and was waiting for the appropriate time to ask his girlfriend to marry him. All the members I interviewed also said they hoped to get married someday and have children.

Upon going into this study, one of my assumptions was that fraternities are all-male spaces. They are indeed a masculine institution, founded and ran by men who have created and seek to maintain their version of hegemonic masculinity. There are sixty-six men's fraternities in the National Interfraternity Conference. However, there are an additional 26 sororities and nine traditionally African-American fraternities and sororities which are part of the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC- Pledge manual of XYZ:37). To say that the fraternity house is an all-male space is an oversimplification, and is incorrect. There are several women who are in the house on a regular basis, as well as others who frequent the house.

Rosie the cook is in the house nearly seven hours every week-day. Rosie is not only the cook, but she is also a confidante. Some of the men will often talk to her and confide in

her if they are having issues or problems in school or in the house. There are also the mothers of the men. Though they are not always physically present they make their presence known through the gift baskets of baked goods that they send to the house. The mothers also have their own organization and they help with fund raising events that defray some of the cost and meet the needs of the chapter. Most importantly, there are the sorority women with whom the men are friends on individual and group bases. These groups of women include girlfriends, who are seen regularly at the house and the occasional “shackers” (women that are one night stands or who do not rank the status of girlfriend). Although it is not typical to find groups of women inside the fraternity house, it is typical to find an occasional woman hanging around at anytime, day or night. It was not uncommon to find the men with their girlfriends having breakfast with the rest of the men.

The end of the year formal is an important event. It is high profile, because the men dress up and the women wear semi- to formal attire. There is also added pressure since this event is a mandatory over night stay. In part, this is a safety measure for the fraternity, making sure the men do not leave the premises after they have been drinking. Since this is an overnight event, there maybe undue pressure on some of the dates that the men are bringing, with the implication that sex might be the outcome at the end of the night. For those who are in long term committed relationships, staying overnight at a hotel is not a problem. For some couples, especially those who are last minute dates, this can be uncomfortable. I was told in a conversation with one of the men in the house that some of the sorority women resent being asked to the end of the year formals because of the sleeping arrangements. Apparently, all the fraternities, when they sponsor the event, have an overnight practice for all of their formals, while the women, when they sponsor the event, have a very strict policy which states that the women must sleep in their own beds after an event. The women rent buses that take them and their dates to and from their sponsored events.

There are many rules governing sororities that differ from fraternity rules. Most rules surrounding sororities deal with issues of safety, which may be both valid and necessary. However, it could be argued that sorority rules are there to curtail and control women’s sexuality, whereas the men have no such rules and sexual activity is encouraged in the “masculine” world. Although chapter XYZ is a dry house, that is not so for most men’s fraternities. Yet, all women’s sororities are dry. Sororities are never allowed to have alcohol on the premises and their members must sleep in their beds after a sponsored event. Most

sororities are not allowed to admit men beyond the common rooms (normally the first floor). Men are not supposed to “shack up” in the cold airs nor sleep in the women's private suites. On the other hand, women are allowed almost anywhere in the fraternity houses, at least in chapter XYZ. Most fraternity events require overnight stays, and because of the “no men” policies in sororities, the women are often found sleeping or shacking at fraternities. This is such a common practice that the sheets that hang around some of the beds, to help keep out the cold and to give some semblance of privacy, are called “shacker sheets.”

Sorority formals are completely different than fraternity formals. {I wonder why that is}. It just goes along with the tradition. Back in the 1900s or whatever when all those sororities were formed, they all are 80 years old, 100 years old, older than that, and they all had regulations, that's why any man can't go up on the second floor and whatever you do, you have to say, “there's a man on this floor.” It just goes back to the old traditions and traditional rules, I'd say. {Do you think it's time to change those, or no?} I'd say no, because it's good to have tradition. If you just changed it... you only have a four to five year window to stay in a sorority and live like that so I mean you can live in an apartment all the rest of your life and so I think that if you change the rules like that, you change the way, the environment and that's the end of the story. {So the no drinking, the no men, that type of thing} ah, it changes too. More an apartment style, I'd say. {But that's what you guys have here... you have drinking and women. Well, you don't have drinking but others do} Let me try to clarify. I don't know. Just the traditional roles in sorority. I think that if you... once you broke those and just the change to fit in with modern society I think it kind of takes away from where the sorority was, like were it was founded in the past. I think it was founded on these principles. (Troy)

Troy is trying to explain to me the different rules of engagement for fraternities and sororities. I reminded Troy that the men's rules allowed them the freedom of drinking (although not in their house) and that women were allowed anywhere in their house. This is not the case for sororities, whose member's actions are closely monitored. I suggested to him that living in a fraternity was like “glorified” apartment living, to which he said it was the brotherhood that made living in a fraternity different than living in an apartment; although he never drew the same parallels for sororities and sisterhood. What he is trying to state without saying it, is that the different rules for men and women are nothing more than a “double standard” for rules of engagement for men and women. I believe that men like Troy hold on to tradition because these double standard privileges men in our society. Men are allowed access to “certain” women's bodies and denied access to others through the rules that govern the sororities. In the long run, by controlling sorority women's bodies you are actually controlling the bodies of many of the fraternity men's future wives. The men have a tendency not to question the difference in rules. For fraternity men sexual activity is

encouraged, but only if it is heterosexual activity. The next section discusses what would happen if a man came out as gay in the fraternity.

### ***Marginalized Masculinities***

“Homophobia is a central organizing principle of our cultural definition of manhood” (Kimmel 1994:131). Homophobia is about not being seen as a sissy or a woman; it’s about the fear of not being recognized as a “man” (Kimmel 1994). Recent studies have shown that men are judged more harshly than women when they do not conform to social or cultural gender norms (Sirin, McCreary and Mahalik 2004). There are a variety of hypotheses for why this is the case, but what they all suggest is that gay men and women in our society hold lower status than heterosexual men. Thus, if a man is acting effeminate, he is viewed as behaving “gay” or like a woman. Either way, he has lowered his social position and will be sanctioned according to the infraction or what type of behavioral boundary he has crossed. According to Kimmel (2003) men often use the word gay or homosexual in order to ridicule other men. To use the word gay is to accuse the other person of not being a real man, of being a girl or feminine, not masculine. For instance, Schacht (1996) found that rugby players often used sexist and homophobic comments to reinforce the rules that are constructed around masculinity. I would also suggest that although XYZ fraternity men feel that using the word gay is harmless it is used as a mild sanctioning device. This demonstrated by Scott’s response when I asked him what it means when you say “you’re gay” or “that’s gay”, “what are you really telling that person?” He replied “that it’s stupid or you are stupid.”

The same question “what would happen if a member came out as gay” was asked to all of the men in the house. Jack’s response was:

I figure it would be kind of an awkward situation, at first. But, I’m sure, since we’ve been around them for a year... 3-4 years, I don’t really think there’d be much of a huge uproar or any situation that would escalate from it... I think it would definitely probably be awkward at first but once people realized that they’ve known this person for ever, I don’t think it would really affect their relationship too much. I mean, it would have somewhat of an impact, but I don’t think it would be severe to the point that they’d break off all contacts or anything (Jack).

Jack believes if someone came out as gay in the fraternity it would be awkward. However, he also believes that because the men have known and lived with each other for sometime,

this is something they could get over. For Jack, the familiarity of the member is implying that if a member lived in the house that long and no one knew about his sexual orientation, then the member who came out must be accepted. The assumption is that Jack can be assured that the member won't be "coming on" to him or any of the other members.

{What do you think would happen if somebody came out as gay?} I wouldn't care- at all {you wouldn't care but what about your chapter?} Um I don't see anybody who is offended with gay people actually-I mean some guys every once in awhile will just act flamboyant and people are just like "you're an idiot" and that's about it. (Kent)

"Acting flamboyant" to Kent means to be acting gay. Because the members of his fraternity only call each other idiots when someone is acting "gay," he views this as showing acceptance for those who claim not to be heterosexual. To call someone gay is not normally about their sexuality; it's about difference and men's response to those who don't conform to masculine norms. For Scott and others, the use of the word "gay" to socially sanction other members has become so "normalized" and embedded in everyday language that often they do not realize they are using the term in that way. The word "gay" is supposed to be harmless, but by telling a fraternity brother he is gay, one is telling him to stop whatever it is he is doing; the action or behavior is somehow inappropriate for a man.

When I asked Alex what would happen if a member came out as gay, he prefaced his answer with, "Let me preface this by saying I don't agree with lesbians, gays in the philosophical realm... I think it is a moral sin or whatever in religious terms, yet I am accepting of people that are gay and lesbian. I don't think they are wrong as people." He continues to say, "I wouldn't care at all." What I really wanted to know is what he felt the house response of the fraternity members on a whole would be.

{You wouldn't care, but what would happen to your house?} Well, there are some people here with a lot of isms and I think that those people have a lot of issues. There are some people here with very progressive views, I don't know if progressive is the right word, but that type of mindset of, umm, you know, times are-a-change'n kinda mindset and umm, I think depending on which person it was, which matters a lot, I don't... and I think that probably one thing that would change that I could say that would definitely change is people would start biting their tongues more (Alex).

Alex states that morally, from a religious standpoint, he believes being gay is wrong, yet, he states that he accepts gay people. I am not sure how he balances these two positions, but at times he has been actively involved with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Association (LGBTGA) issues on campus. Alex also believes that people in general are



becoming more accepting because “times are changing.” He states that he is not sure what would happen if a member came out as gay, but he does not have a problem with it. While I was in the house Alex started dating a bisexual woman. Alex was very intrigued with her sexuality.

In Alex’s response he indicated that people would monitor the type of language they used in the house. As we saw from some of the men’s responses, the term gay, or inferring a member is gay has been normalized in the house. Even so, men have given politically correct responses. They may truly believe what they say, but they live in a world (both inside and outside of the fraternity) that values the norm of heterosexuality. In chapter four we heard about Casey who was sanctioned because he did not “fit” with the hegemonic norm within the fraternity, to the point where his sexuality was questioned. The men are ignoring the heterosexual imperatives of the fraternity when they are making statements that they don’t think anything would happen if someone came out as gay in their chapter.

Every month the academic advisor arranges for an informational seminar that is supposed to make the men aware of issues they might face, such as sexually transmitted diseases or binge drinking. Before I started my research, the XYZ chapter had a guest speaker who was an ex-fraternity member who left the Greek community after coming out as gay to his fraternity. This seminar seemed to be fresh in Scott’s mind because during our interview he told me about it. “We had a speaker come in from the LGBTA and he said he belonged to a [fraternity] house when he came out. One day he came home to his room and it was just trashed and then he just had to get out before he actually got beat up for being gay.” Scott told me he thought something like “this,” a member coming out as gay, would divide the house. He seemed to believe that the house could not survive a member coming out. I believe his response is about the heterosexual norm associated with the fraternity and its members. If a house had a gay member it could no longer be “assumed” that everyone else was heterosexual. The sanctity and safety of an assumed heterosexual space would be violated and the member’s masculinity would be questioned.

Research also indicates that heterosexuality is highly correlated with gender conformity and that homosexuality is correlated with gender nonconformity (Lippa and Arad 1999). Fraternities are male spaces where gender conformity is a must, because if the men step out of line, then they are reminded by their brothers to get back in their place and “do masculinity” appropriately (Yancey-Martin and Hummer 1989). Because most of the fraternity members knew of my affiliation with the women’s studies program at the

University, I believe they wanted to make sure they were not going to upset me or make me think any less of them. Many of the men said they themselves did not have problems with someone being gay, but thought that the fraternity as a whole might have a problem. There was discussion that a man coming out as gay could divide the fraternity and have the members taking sides; those who were tolerant and open on one side and those who could not accept homosexuality on the other.

No, and you know – there's guys who try to make it a little hobby of theirs to try to pick out some guys who might be... who knows... um, we would be more receptive than a lot of chapters to a gay person, we bring in, um, programming and education from LGBTA. (Neal)

The most negative response I received to this question was from Casey. I was not comfortable in asking Casey these questions. I knew from previous conversations with him that Casey's views on homosexuality were negative. So negative, in fact, he could barely bring himself to say the word. I wanted to respect his boundaries, but I also wanted to see how he would respond to the question. He states "I get the heebie jeebies when I talk about that kind of stuff-- I just don't feel comfortable." In our conversation, Casey reassured me more than once of his masculinity and his sexual orientation. When I asked him about how he would respond if someone from the house "came out" his response was "I'm such a masculine man it would be hard to say." For Casey, the appearance of heterosexuality is important. Nevertheless, he states that if no one else in the fraternity community knew that a member of theirs was gay then he might be allowed to stay. Because of Casey's precarious position within the "pecking order" of the fraternity, heterosexuality is intricately linked to Casey's idea of masculinity. He does not want to be seen as gay nor does he want to be viewed as a "homophobic," which for some would be seen as politically incorrect. He states "I know I just want to say what is politically correct because I don't want to be labeled as a homophobe." His image is very important to him and the fraternity, which is understandable considering how his own masculinity and sexuality has been under attack. I did not understand this at the time of the interview. It was only until I started this analysis that I understood the impact the men's "jokes" had on Casey and how he internalized their remarks.

## ***Subordinated Masculinity***

Although chapter XYZ is a white and heterosexual fraternity, the subjects of subordinated and marginalized masculinities are important to this analysis on masculinity because “the absence of any category as well as its presence in any source can itself be problematized and made the subject of analysis” (Brod 1994:88). It would be an oversight to state that there is an absence of race in fraternity XYZ. Too often in society whites do not recognize “whiteness” as a racial category (Tatum 2003; Lucal 1996). Tatum (2003) states that “the parts of our identity that *do* capture our attention are those that other people notice and that reflect back to us” (p. 21, emphasis in original). Although I am not examining individual identity formation, it is important to note that because the racial make-up of the collective identity of fraternity XYZ is part of the dominant culture, it would be easy to think that race is not important in this study.

During the nine month research process I did not witness any interactions between the men of fraternity XYZ and men of color, except for the one Asian-American member. The Asian-American member did not feel he was treated any differently than any of the other members. Some of the men even stated that there was no “diversity” in terms of race inside their house. This does not mean that they do not recognize the race of the Asian American member. I understand the men to be saying that one member does not equal racial diversity. Even so, the men recognize diversity to encompass such things as rural vs. urban differences and different interests. I was not present at the house twenty-four hours a day or seven days a week, nor was I with the chapter members while they were taking classes, involved in intramural sports, or in their leisure activities outside of the house. I did not hear any racist humor that a few of the members refer to in their interviews, although Bonilla-Silva (2002) states that many college students admit to telling racist jokes when they are in all white settings. There are men of minority status who have joined the Greek community through other fraternities whose membership is predominantly white, but most of the men of color on this particular campus join fraternities associated with their race or ethnicity. “According to ‘minimal difference group theory’ people form social groups around minimal perceived differences. In-groups and out-groups are based on these differences” (Jay 2005:109). Jay (2005) states that as members of the dominant or subordinate group we base our perceptions about society on our own social position. With this in mind, I have come to understand that this section was the hardest for me to write because of my own racial identification as white. I have found it difficult to understand and deconstruct how the

men in fraternity XYZ were engaged in the performance of race, beyond the obvious; that they were a predominately white fraternity.

## **Racial and Ethnic Diversity**

Chapter four discussed how the men negotiate the imperatives of hegemonic masculinity through their everyday performances. One important part of that process revolves around “image maintenance.” The men, in the process of defining and forming a “new” or better image for themselves, rejected many of the old stereotypes associated with fraternities. It is evident from the section on racism in the pledge manual for fraternity XYZ that there is a problem with predominantly white fraternities being viewed as racist. The implied image of XYZ fraternity as a racist institution has caused some concern and the national organization wants to make sure that it does not continue. As with the notion of paternalistic chivalry, the men want their image in regard to diversity to be one that is more sensitive and cultured.

Racism: At no time since the 1960s has racism become more of an issue on campus than it is today. Accusations of racism are frequently leveled at fraternities as “Caucasian only” organization (The Manuel of XYZ Fraternity 1998: 40).

In her book *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria*, Tatum (1997) states that racism is “a system of advantages based on race” (p. 7). She says that racism is a system of “cultural messages and institutional policies and practices as well as the beliefs and actions of individuals” (p. 7). She uses this definition because it demonstrates that racism is not only about individual practices but about larger social systems. Tatum also believes that by not acknowledging how racism advantages whites we are perpetuating that system. There are different varieties of racists: those who are active, such as white supremacists, and those who are passive or complicit. Passive racists are those that are not considered active, but yet do nothing to stop racism. As with complicit masculinity passive racists benefit from white privilege and do nothing to change the system that advantages or disadvantages people based on race. There are whites who are advantaged by the system who actively seek to change social practices by individuals and institutions that privilege whites-- they are called active antiracists. As with masculine privilege, all whites do not benefit from white privilege in the same way.

At the same time, our chapters and those of other men’s fraternities have a growing number of minority members, indeed, on many campuses the word, “minority” has no real definition, because of the expanding number of students

from all races and nationalities. Recently, several [XYZ] chapters have become embroiled in controversy and have been criticized, picketed, and sanctioned because of the thoughtless acts of a few members which were ,or interpreted or constructed as racist... (The Manuel of XYZ Fraternity 1998: 40)

I am not sure what controversies the fraternity manual is referring to but whatever it is the national organization of fraternity XYZ is worried that certain members may have caused "outsiders" (non fraternity members) to believe that the national organization and the fraternities belonging to it are racist institutions. The national organization of fraternity XYZ has stated that the word "minority" has no real definition, since there has been an increase in the number of people of different races and national origins who are attending college. While it is true that the numbers of racial and ethnic minorities attending college increased from 16% in 1976 to 26% in 1998, this statistic does not warrant the argument that the word minority has no "real definition" (The Digest of Education Statistics 1998:187-188). The statement made by the National Organization could lead one to believe that they are not truly interested in inclusiveness in their chapters. It implies that members involved in the controversial actions were misjudged by "outsiders," and may absolve fraternity members from taking the issue of racial and ethnic diversity seriously. This statement is not about being an active antiracist or about promoting an antiracist agenda, rather, it supports passive racism. I am not implying that fraternities which only recruit racial and ethnic minorities are any more inclusive than their white counterparts. The manual does continue to say:

In each case, the situations were completely avoidable had members stepped forward before or as the situations developed to confront or deter other members whose actions led to the problems. (The Manual of XYZ Fraternity 1998:41)

The manual is implying that it is the responsibility of each chapter's members to monitor each other's actions and make sure that members are acting according to the standards that have been set by the national organization. The guidelines outlined by the national organization do not strive to promote change within individual fraternity chapters. The fraternity as a whole is what Smith (1990) refers to as "textually-mediated," promoting a stated ideology that is not practiced. The manual promotes image maintenance, not building more diverse chapters. Not many whites want to be seen as racist or belong to a racist organization, yet they are complicit (Tatum 1997, Bonilla-Silva 2002). Many whites believe that racism is something in the past and that race has nothing to do with them (Jay

2005). Problems of racism are often seen as individual problems of people of color, not as institutional or cultural, especially by those in the dominant group (Sullivan 2003).

I did not specifically ask the fraternity members about race; what I did ask was if they had diversity in their chapter. I wanted to give the men the freedom to define diversity for themselves. Most of the members automatically assumed I was asking about racial diversity.

*{What about diversity in your house?}* Diversity in race that would be [name] - I get along with him just fine. *{Do you think it's important?}* I think so because it shows that your fraternity is open to whoever comes to the door. *{Do you think they are?}* I would hope so- I know there is some racism like racist remarks that do go along in the house but its just because of their background and stuff like that - I would be willing to say if we want to meet our membership and make our members better by being diverse in race and culture then this needs to stop.  
(Mick)

Mick starts to answer the diversity question with an answer about racial diversity. He equates diversity with a specific person who is not white. I did not ask Mick about his relationship with this particular member, but he proceeded to tell me that he got along with this member "just fine." I believe he was bringing up his relationship with this particular member to demonstrate how he sees his relationship with other men of color. This is an example of "color blind" racism language. Bonilla-Silva (2003) illustrated how many white respondents often mentioned they had friends of certain race or ethnic backgrounds, therefore they could not be racist. Often times they claimed their friends of color before making a racist remark. For Mick, racial diversity in the house would be a demonstration of the "openness" of the chapter, which also encompasses part of the image maintenance. Mick recognizes the importance of diversity; he believes that by having a diverse house it will make the members "better." He also recognizes that in order to attract men of color, the members of the house must cease making racist comments about others. I did not ask him for an example of what a racist comment might be. However, he links these racist remarks to the backgrounds of the individuals who have made them. Again, racism, in his view, is a problem of individuals, not institutions. Although Mick does not believe himself or his fraternity to be racist, he does not acknowledge his own or the other fraternity members' white privilege, nor is he actively seeking to change the system. Mick is an example of a passive racist. Bonilla Silva (2003) calls this "racism without racists." Mick's complacency does not stop at race but he has demonstrated through his friendship with Casey that he is also complicit in terms of hegemonic masculinity inside the fraternity.

Like Mick, some of the other men were more aware of diversity and issues concerning race in the Greek community and in the house. Some of the members said they actively try to recruit men of color. Travis is one of them:

I wish there would be more ethnic diversity because we only have one guy who is not Caucasian. I've had guys come over and I try to recruit him and they look at the composites in the basements and see white guy after white guy. I think it's a down point... {So you guys have actively recruited men of color}. Yes by no means is the house racist. We'll take anybody as long as they are a good guy and they fit in well. (Travis)

Although Travis states that he is actively recruiting men of color he does not try to change the way in which white privilege has been institutionalized within the Greek Community or his own house. Brad and Travis both agree that anybody with the qualities they are looking for would be allowed to join the fraternity. These qualities are related to the hegemonic norm that the fraternity has identified and practiced. Because the construction of masculinity and race are so intertwined the masculine norm is "whiteness." Dominant groups are often seen as the norm of humanity and in this case they are seen as the norm for fraternity (Tatum 1997:24). The men of the fraternity do not challenge the norm of whiteness because it has been taken for granted and has become invisible (McIntosh 1992, Lucal 1996). Bonilla-Silva (2003) discusses how "color blindness" often leads whites to ignore how whites are often self-segregating, but yet will call attention to how it is people of color who self segregate. This also happens within the Greek community. Believing that blacks or other men of color are not comfortable in all white settings and prefer to be in the company of people like themselves allows whites to ignore the very issue of segregation and racism within their own communities.

Although the fraternity members recognize race as an issue, they do not recognize the issue of racism. Travis also states that the members need to "fit". As I have already discussed, "fit" means many things to these men. Not only does it mean that you need to "look" like us, but it also means you must hold the same ideals and values that fraternity XYZ promotes. I do not know if the men really desired diversity or if they were just saying things that might sound good or look good on paper. No one wants to be labeled racist, "[t]he word *racist* holds a lot of emotional power. For many white people, to be called racist is the ultimate insult" (Tatum: 1997:10, emphasis in original). To say you want diversity is something entirely different than working on the issues within the Greek community of why more men of color do not join predominately white fraternities.

When I asked if Brad sought diversity, he replied, "I think we try to get anybody that we think is the best person with the best qualities to come in. I think more whites are attracted to the fraternities than the other races are." During our conversation Brad was trying to rationalize why his and most other fraternities at the university are predominantly white; he has essentialized the joining of a fraternity to race. Brad's last comment about how whites are attracted to fraternities is an example of denying or minimizing the problem of racial and ethnic diversity inside the Greek system (Jay 2005). When the men respond with answers like "we try to attract the best man" they are trying to ignore race. It is like the saying "I don't see color, I just see people." "The declaration of color blindness assumes that we can erase our racial categories, ignore differences, and thereby achieve an illusory state of sameness or equality" (Jay 2005:111). Stating that race does not matter is like stating that people of color don't matter (*ibid.*).

Travis talked about the composites that are hung downstairs in the house; these are the pictures of each class (membership year) that has pledged the fraternity since its inception at the university. When I was there, the fraternity had about thirty years of composites hanging in the basement. I went down and looked at the composites and noticed that almost every man in these pictures was white; there were a couple of people of color mixed in, but it was impossible to identify their specific race or ethnicity, they just looked different. This also shows that I was judging who is white and non-white by distinctive body markers. It also demonstrates how institutionalized "whiteness" is within this fraternity.

The construction of the racialized body is made against the "other" (Hall 1996; Ferber 1998); "othering" is done by creating markers (normally on the body, e.g., phenotypes such as skin color, hair color, and physical bodily features) that identify who are the people outside one's group, and then knowing that one is not like them. Hall (1996) sees this identification process as constructed through recognition of common origin or shared characteristics with others who are more similar to oneself than "others." "I know African Americans that act like they are very white and I think those guys would be more likely to join the house" I asked Travis, "Do you mean that they fit into the image of the "dominant" culture better?" His reply was "I don't think they view themselves as being a minority." Travis believes African-Americans who "act" white would "fit" better in the fraternity than those that do not. I believe that for Travis "acting white" is about vernacular, dress, and leisure activity. You must talk a certain way, and your dress must represent the



image of the fraternity--no bagging clothing, dew rags or gold chains-- and rap music is defiantly the music of choice within the fraternity. I think he believes that African Americans who don't follow stereotypical dress are "acting white." Perry (2002) in her book demonstrated that high schoolers often segregate themselves into certain groups, and many are identified by their clothing, hair styles, and the music they listen to. Many of these high school groups were also divided by race and ethnicity. Acting white is diluting as much "difference" as possible. This is a statement of privilege and dominance. Although Travis does not say that he is color blind, he is making the same assumptions about being able to abandon one's race.

I specifically asked Troy if he thought men of color would feel comfortable in the house. His answer:

I don't know, I think black people would feel... I guess not just black people, any minority would feel alienated because they are coming into this white dominated society and no matter what you do, you would stand out. Usually when you come to college, you'll hang out with people that are like you and chances are, I mean, if you are an African-American or Asian you are just not going to have that connection with a bunch of white dudes. {Do you think diversity is important?} It really makes no difference to me because I'm not like, conservative, but it's just the lay of the land, I guess. (Troy)

Troy defines the fraternity and the Greek community as a "white dominated society." He also states that any minority man would feel uncomfortable in this white dominated society and that no matter what a man of color does he will always stand out. Troy fails to recognize that the U.S. has historically been, and still is; a white dominated society and that people of color must negotiate their daily lives around the hegemonic norm of whiteness. Troy's statement implies that men of minority status will not feel comfortable in XYZ fraternity because they have nothing in common with its white members; they have no shared norms, they are the "other." He states that African-Americans and Asians will not have connections with a bunch of "white dudes." The word "dude" implies ordinary guys, "white guys," the norm. Troy also goes on to say that the issue of diversity in the house does not really make a difference to him, he is not conservative. The issue does not have to matter to him because he is the hegemonic ideal of masculinity in the house. As for why he used the word "conservative," I believe he is trying to say that he is not an "old school" racist white guy, and that if someone of color joined it would not be an imposition on him, but the fraternity is what it is, a white male setting. He also is not being active in recruiting members. At best he is apathetic.

I hate to use the term, but sometimes birds of a feather flock together and I believe people are more prone to talk to people of their own race a little easier. So, and even as far as recruiting concerns, you tell people to talk to people in their classes stuff and you know your going to probably if you're Caucasian or Asian, you're probably going to talk to people who are Caucasian, then you're going to start recruiting more Caucasians. (Tony)

Tony is the only fraternity member who did not identify as white, yet his response was really not different from the other members of the fraternity. Di Piero (2002) states that "A hegemonic position... quilts together portions of garments of meaning from different realms, in the process forming a way of knowing that becomes a world view for a given community" (p. 12). Tony held the same world view as most the other fraternity members. I think Tony's response displays a sort of "this is just the way things are" attitude. Again Tony is complicit or passive buying into the hegemonic norm. I believe Tony is an example of how institutional and cultural racism can be internalized. I asked Tony about men of color who join traditional African-American or Latino fraternities.

I don't know, that's just one thing that bothers me [a fraternity for a specific race], my girlfriend is African American, and what if you called our fraternities all white fraternities, you'd get a lot of flack for that. I wish those guys wanted to be in a fraternity. (Tony)

During the interview, my initial reaction was one of surprise. I was grouping Tony and all ethnic minorities on campus together, thinking that because of their minority status they would have more in common with Tony. I was discounting individual agency and knowledge and failed to see that everyone does not experience race and racism the same way. I was also discounting how complex masculinity is and that one's social location is dependent upon other identities such as class, sexuality, religion, and nationality, to name a few. My assumption was as wrong as Troy's assumption that all white men would have something in common. It is also interesting that Tony stops in mid sentence to tell me his girl friend is African-American before telling me that he was bothered by racially segregated fraternities. I believe he meant to say, "Hey I'm not racially prejudiced; I can't be, I date African-American women." This is a technique often used by whites to allow them not to be labeled a racist; they will mention their black friend in one sentence, but will follow with something racist in another (Bonilla-Silva 2003). In Tony's response, Tony ignores his previous statement about "birds of a feather"; he does not acknowledge that most fraternities on campus are made up of all white men or that whites may self segregate, but he does state that he wishes the Greek community in general were more integrated. Tony's position is

unique in the house, it helps the image of the fraternity; by claiming his minority status, the men of XYZ fraternity can say they are open to diversity and do not deny membership based on race or ethnicity.

## ***Summary***

This chapter focused on how hegemonic masculinity is created in relation to other forms of masculinity both subordinated and marginalized. The fraternity, along with the Greek community, hold heterosexuality as the norm and the men are encouraged to participate in events that are guided by heterosexual norms and follow heterosexual scripts. I have also demonstrated that the double standard between men and women still exists in the way sexuality is played out in their skits. These events encourage heterosexuality at the group level, such as the pairings and serenades and at the individual level such as dances, which in turn reinforces it at the face-to-face level between the men of the fraternity and the women in their lives.

Although portions of the data for this chapter come exclusively from interviews with the men, we can get a solid picture of how the men view issues surrounding diversity. This chapter has also revealed through the men's responses and the chapter manual of fraternity XYZ that the men are somewhat ambivalent about race and are fine with the status quo. I demonstrated through Tony that just because one is given a label by society it does not necessarily mean that one identifies and internalizes that label.

Chapter six examines what I call moments of "consciousness" and the emerging resistance to hegemonic privilege. In this chapter I will introduce a new typology within the already existing hegemonic and complicit masculinity and illustrate with examples how the typology works.

## Chapter VI: Negotiating Competing Forms of Masculinity

This dissertation has illustrated how men in a college fraternity teach, learn, and negotiate hegemonic masculinity, and how they ensure conformity to hegemonic practices. Chapter three discussed how the image of hegemony is created, chapter four how the image of hegemony is maintained, chapter five how subordinated and marginalized masculinities are created and maintained in relation to hegemony, and this chapter will discuss how individuals negotiate competing forms of hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity requires those that maintain it and those who are rewarded while not directly trying to maintain it. This is called complicit masculinity. (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Hegemony is simply those in power. Hegemonic masculinity refers to a system of power based on gender relations; where men have power over women and at times other men: men of color, poorer men, and gay men. Hegemonic masculinity is not static and “men can adopt hegemonic masculinity when it is desirable: but the same men can distance themselves strategically from hegemonic masculinity at other moments” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005:841).

In this particular study, I have found that many men do not overtly resist dominant ideals of masculinity because in doing so they might lose access to the privileges of masculinity. By engaging in hegemonic masculinity, men link themselves into systems of power, status, and privileges that appear to be the “birth right of real men.” This being said, masculinity is not created in a vacuum, and each type of masculinity, hegemonic, subordinated, and marginalized, is not practiced independently and is created in relation to each other and to femininities. At times, different forms of masculinity can be practiced within the same homosocial context; the same individuals who are complicit at one moment may practice forms of resistance at another time and within another context (Bird 1996).

Some of those who study masculinity have recommended that we need to re-examine the heterosexual image of masculinity because it, too, is more fluid than previously suggested (Heasley 2005; Hearn and Collison 1994; Kaufman 1994; Brod 1994; Fine et al. 1997; Pyke 1996). This chapter examines moments where some men in fraternity XYZ’s discursive practices may have not been aligned with the norm of the fraternity, and where alternative approaches to masculinity were implied, discussed, or practiced.

## ***Masculine Typologies***

I could see from the start that the men in fraternity XYZ were working hard at creating a new image for the organization and for fraternity men in general. The more time I spent with the men of XYZ fraternity, the more it became apparent that some of the men engaged in contradictory or ambivalent practices. To say that this fraternity was not informed about diversity issues or was unsympathetic to women, gays, and racial minorities would be a misrepresentation. However, to say that they were a group of proactive men working for change would be an exaggeration. I found them to be somewhere between apathetic or complacent and active. For instance, several of the fraternity men are involved with various causes and issues on the University campus and within the Greek community. One of the members is in the Student Government and actively participates in many campus events focused on LGBTQA, feminist, and minority issues. Another member belongs to the Young Democrats on campus and actively seeks fair representation in politics. Yet another is involved in the National Panhellenic Council and actively participates in diversity awareness conferences on and off campus, and tries to understand his “whiteness.” Still others had been known to sit in on women’s studies classes. These are just a few of the men who, at times, actively seek change, yet they still conform to hegemonic ideals in and outside of the house. It is hard to label or place many of the men into clear categories. Currently the language to explain what categories of masculinity these types of behaviors fall under is inadequate, at least for this study.

Tatum has introduced a typology of racism that allows us to see that racism is not stagnant and is more complicated (1997) and fluid than once thought. Masculinity, too, is more complicated and fluid. In order to explain some of the inconsistencies that I found within the patterns of masculinity in my research I have combined the ideas from Tatum’s typology, active racist, passive racist, and active antiracist with two categories of masculinity: hegemonic and complicit. I have identified four types. I call these new types or categories “active hegemony,” “knowledgeable complacency,” “non-knowledgeable complacency,” and “active anti-hegemony.” I will describe how each of these types work and follow with brief illustrations of each from this research. I find that the typology I have devised helps me in understanding the subtle nuances of the men’s ideologies and practices.

### **Active Hegemony**

The first type or category is that of “active hegemony.” These are men who understand the benefits of male privilege and who actively seek to keep those benefits for themselves or others like them. During one of my visits to the house there was a guest speaker from the women’s center on campus. The presentation coordinator encouraged the men to discuss the types of actions, behaviors, and/or opinions that could be potentially dangerous for women in society. Part of the conversation was about “what are women’s roles in society?” Neal, one of the most respected leaders in the fraternity, stated that he believed that a woman’s place is in the home, as long as it is a choice; his mother and grandmother both stayed home and he hoped that some day his wife would do the same. He frames this as a “choice” but he truly believes that a woman’s place is in the home. In many of our conversations he has stated that he believes that women are the “nurturers” and men are the “providers.” As quoted in the Paternalistic Chivalry portion of this dissertation, he has as stated belief that it is a “male thing” to put women on a pedestal. Neal is a man who believes women should be worshipped and does not really see them as equals; they are to be taken care of as long as they perform the proscribed roles designated by society, that of wife and mother. In chapters three and four of this dissertation, I described how the image of hegemonic masculinity is created and managed. I have also discussed how it is hard for any one man to engage in hegemonic practices all of the time. Many of the men at moments participated in hegemony, but there is a difference between understanding male privilege and how it works and being naïve about this privilege. Hegemony is fluid and thus, men can participate or practice more than one of these forms of masculinity.

### **Knowledgeable Complacency**

The second type or category is that of “knowledgeable complacency.” These are men who understand male privilege, yet do not actively seek out activities to make sure they do not continue receiving it, nor do they actively seek to go against the hegemonic norm. One of the best examples from my research is that of Troy. Troy is a member who was actively recruited by the alumni advisor, and whose brother was a previous member, as with Neal. Troy is also a member I identified as a passive racist. Troy believes that men of color and women have reached parity with white men in the United States, and that it is individual achievement that is important. He is also a member that understands that women who belong to sororities do not have the same privileges as men in fraternities. He understands

that by not allowing women to drink in their houses and have male guests in their rooms establishes a double standard for men and women. He believes that these rules for women should not change because it is part of the “tradition” of sororities. As I argue earlier, what he has left unsaid is that these rules for women not only help in keeping them safe, but they monitor women’s sexuality. I do not believe Troy would actively oppose the women in sororities who did want to change the system, but he would not be happy if it changed. He would then lose the benefit of having a potential partner’s or future wife’s sexual activities being monitored.

### **Non-Knowledgeable Complacency**

The third type is that of “non-knowledgeable complacency.” These are men who benefit from hegemonic masculinity, but do not understand the privilege they receive from it. Masculinity is typically defined as everything a woman is not, yet, three of the fraternity members discussed being in touch with their feminine side. They still believe that being feminine involves stereotypical traits such as nurturing qualities and some not so typical behaviors such as watching certain television shows. They feel they are more feminine because they have the ability to not only be in touch with their own emotions but to verbally express them as well. I received these responses when I asked the men to define manhood and masculinity.

When I think of men I think of masculine... I guess I think of myself as more feminine... you start out as being a jerk and a man as just a person because, I mean, you can be a man whether you are masculine or feminine. A man can have different qualities and I think those qualities whether it is sensitivity or how they act or, I don't know, their tone of voice. There is two sides of a man, a masculine and a feminine side...(Mick)

During our conversation, Mick said he identifies with his mother more than his father and even thinks his singing voice is feminine. He is trying to articulate that when one thinks of masculinity, one automatically thinks of men. He goes on to say that men have two sides, a masculine and a feminine side, and that he identifies more with his feminine side. However, later in the conversation he reassured me he does like to do more stereotypical masculine things like work on cars and go fishing.

I consider myself to be a little feminine and like to, I watch day time television. I watch the design shows like *Rally Around the House* and that would be considered kind of femmy and most guys do... but I mean just because you're a man doesn't necessarily mean you have to be masculine...(Ethan).

As with masculinity, femininity was discussed as “doing” feminine activities rather than “being” feminine. Ethan suggests that certain activities such as watching day time television are a “femmy” thing to do, especially talk shows and soap operas. He enjoys designer shows that demonstrate how to fix up a home, something that women are supposed to be interested in but not men. Like Mick, Ethan states that because one is a man does not mean one has to be totally masculine.

Kent is a member who does not engage in any drinking rituals. In fact, he does not drink at all, which also is a type of resistance in a fraternity setting where drinking rituals are used for male bonding. One of the major reasons he chose to pledge this fraternity is because it is a dry house. He views his personality as being quiet and nurturing which are stereotypically feminine traits, and he states, “I would think if it comes down to it I might actually be a stay at home dad.” This was surprising because during our conversations most of the men stated that they see their primary roles as providers. If they mentioned nurturing or childcare it was always considered secondary to the provider role. All three of these men are living a quiet resistance; all acknowledge more stereotypical feminine behaviors. These are not behaviors that were discussed in depth and are not defiantly cultivated inside the fraternity. I placed these men in the category of non-knowledgeable complacency because none of them are actively seeking to create change or go against the hegemonic norm of the male provider in society at large. Yet, they believe that they may want to participate in the raising of their children more than the average male, or they believe that they have qualities that may not be considered advantageous for men to possess.

At times men may experience a moment of consciousness, in which they become aware of the privilege afforded by their complacency. When this occurs they may shift to “knowledgeable complacency” or they may engage in a practice that may be considered “active anti-hegemony.” One such moment occurred when the campus men’s outreach coordinator came to visit the fraternity at one of the meetings (as discussed in the moments of active hegemony). This meeting was not mandatory, the men did not know I was going to be there, and about half of the members showed up. I had previously invited this particular person to talk to my classes; his presentation was the same as usual and the men’s responses were about the same as those of my male students.

Eventually the conversation turned to how life was easier for women because they could stay at home and did not have to work. Then, one of the members stated that if all



employers felt the way these men did, women would not have a chance to get hired. To me, that was a moment of resistance from the young man who spoke up; his statement changed the direction of the conversation and brought about awareness of more complicated issues than if a woman wants to stay home or not. This moment could have been precipitated by self realization or by someone who was practicing active anti-hegemony.

### **Active Anti-hegemony**

“Active anti-hegemony” is the fourth type. Active anti- hegemony is when men understand the system of male privilege and are actively seeking and working towards new paradigms of masculine practices and also may encourage others to do so. An example of active anti-hegemony that illustrates the fluidity between knowledgeable complacency and anti-hegemony is when, Alex, a member who is actively involved in a variety of issues on campus, one day brought to the fraternity a t-shirt that said “this is what a feminist looks like.” He told the men who were around that “feminism is the radical idea that women are people too.” Then the conversation turned to equal rights. At this moment, some of the men that were there were engaged in conversations that may opposed masculine privilege. Here is a moment in which the men’s thought processes about equality took a spotlight and they were resisting the hegemonic power structure.

The following is a portion of a conversation I had with one of the fraternity members about the changes he sees happening in the Greek community and the world at large. Dale is also one of the exemplary males in the house, which illustrates how fluid hegemonic masculinity is.

As far as gender and race and things like that, umm, right now, I think, something pretty cool is going on. And that is that the leaders of this generation, this age group, are looking past those, and I think sororities are going to continue to build the type of woman that can succeed in any type of world. The fraternities are doing the same and I think that they... raise awareness of gender issues and, you know, sexuality issues, and race and ethnicity issues. I think that’s one thing that people are missing when they are out on their militant struggles, you know, to do this, is that, you know, those 3-4 people that you have touched in your classes, they’re going out and if they get to 1 or 2 and they get to 1 or 2 and when they, you know, you wait ten or fifteen to twenty years, and these people start working up into the upper executive offices, it’s not... I think there’s becoming a greater understanding and I truly think that the Greek community helps lead that because not only... the people that are in your fraternity and sorority or the people that are in other Greek chapters, that you get to know so well, are so different. (Dale)

Dale is excited about the changes he sees in the Greek community; he believes that sororities do not just cultivate traditional women, but women who can go out into the world and succeed in any type of environment (I believe he is talking about the work force). He also sees fraternities and sororities as places that build awareness around issues of gender, sexuality, and race and ethnicity. The reason I placed Dale in this category, although he is an exemplar male within the house, is because Dale uses his leadership position in the house and in the Greek community to promote change. Dale does not believe that social awareness is brought about by activist groups, but that it is accomplished on the individual level, where lives are used as examples to touch other lives. Dale tries to use his leadership position in the house as an example of change. He consciously is involved in workshops and conferences that discuss white privilege. He also seeks out classes that discuss and teach about issues of diversity. Often he is uncomfortable and stumbles in his own awareness when it comes to hegemonic privilege. But he does not quit in his knowledge of others and continues to work on his own self improvement and self awareness. Dale uses the tools he has to affect social change and that is his leadership ability inside the fraternity. Dale talks about social change and is aware of issues of difference, but he still struggles with his own hegemonic identity that has been defined by Chapter XYZ. Because of his involvement with issues of diversity and his own journey of awareness and self discovery, he experiences moments where consciousness does exist, change is possible, and an emerging resistance toward hegemony can be seen.

## ***Summary***

This chapter has introduced four new types of masculinity: active hegemony, knowledgeable complacency, non-knowledgeable complacency, and active anti-hegemony. The demonstration of these forms of masculinity by several fraternity members shows that masculinity can at times be fluid and may require individuals to negotiate or reinvent what masculinity looks like and how it is practiced within their homosocial institution. All forms of masculinity are being practiced inside the house. Most of the men neither comply fully with the hegemonic practices nor do they try to resist them, therefore they are complacent. Within complicit masculinity there is a spectrum that can range from knowledgeable complacency, where men understand the privileges they are afforded, although do nothing to help or hinder the benefits they receive, to non-knowledgeable complacency, where the

men do start with the understanding of privilege but become aware through moments of consciousness. These typologies also illustrate that there can be resistance and that although this resistance is only showing signs of emerging, it can facilitate change.

## Chapter VII: Conclusion

In this ethnographic study of one fraternity I have sought to understand how masculinity is created and maintained in male homosocial environments. I have discussed how members in a fraternity perform and perceive masculinity within the confines of an institution that also governs their actions and behaviors. I have demonstrated that it is the fraternity that allows the performance of hegemonic masculinity to continue and it is this same predominantly male environment that also allows for the performance of “being a man” to be negotiated and changed. In addition, I have emphasized how the members’ actions and appearance are monitored. The rules that guide them into what type of masculinity or manhood is being performed is found in their mottos and creeds, along with their rituals and rules that keep men “being men.” Young men are always performing their roles for one another, always making sure that “people” are becoming men. If a young man does not conform to the ideals of manhood, responsibility, and leadership, the members are there to formally and informally sanction him, as exemplified by Casey.

This study has also demonstrated the steps in which a certain form of hegemony is cultivated, internalized, practices and institutionalized. A critique of studies on hegemony is that these studies do not allow for differences in the practices of masculinities and that there is a tendency to equate homosocial reproduction with hegemony (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). I have demonstrated through this research that, although certain men try to create and maintain a more static form of masculinity, that hegemony can adapt and absorb other practices while still maintaining its power. Men who might find themselves subordinated or marginalized still try to practice the hegemonic norm via the hegemonic bargain and still maintain power over women through the system of gender stratification. Homosocial reproduction does occur in the fraternity, but it is the constant monitoring of the men and the exclusion of women in this fraternal system that allows hegemony to continue and flourish (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005).

The men, in reorganizing their fraternity, have decided to reject old stereotypes and to embrace the principles that they believe the fraternity was founded upon. I have also demonstrated how the men use the notion of paternalistic chivalry as a form of competition, a way of distinguishing themselves from other men, or to establish a pecking order inside

the fraternity. The type of hegemonic masculinity that the men have created and practice inside fraternity XYZ also helps in guiding them in their interactions with women and how to negotiate the trials and tribulations of adulthood (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005).

I would argue that the masculinity that this fraternity is trying to establish is not unique, but the direction in which mainstream hegemonic masculinity is going in the United States. Authors such as Messner, Stacey, and Smith-Lovin who all contributed to a 1993 special issue of *Masculinities* discuss how masculinities are shifting and some forms of masculinity are more nurturing and cognizant of men's new roles than the ones in the past, as like the men in fraternity XYZ. It is not that this kinder and gentler romanticized version of masculinity is bad. It brings with it the ability for men to come in touch with their feminine side; it allows them the ability to cry in public, and to be responsible, productive adults. Women are often treated with more respect, and men's attitudes about women's roles are also changing. What is wrong with this version is that, for the majority, hegemony and privilege are not questioned; the men continue to be complicit. It is also a version of masculinity that is demonstrated and "done" by more privileged men in society (Messner 1993). This version of masculinity does not see women as equals, but as those who are to be respected and taken care of as long as they fulfill their roles as wives and mothers.

I have also introduced a new typology of masculinity active hegemony, knowledgeable complacency, non-knowledgeable complacency, and active anti-hegemony. I believe these categories will help in explaining the complexity and fluidity of hegemonic masculinity. These types are suggestions and need to be further investigated to see if they are reliable and useable in other studies on masculinity.

By examining gender, or in this case masculinity, through the macro level of the fraternity, and also looking at how gender is done or reproduced at the micro or individual level, one can also get a better understanding of how important social fraternities are in setting practices that are incorporated and transmitted into the economic realm of work and vice-versa. It is also important to situate the fraternity and masculinity in a historical context that allows us to recognize that both the fraternity and masculinity are not universal or stagnant.

Particular masculine behaviors are transmitted in fraternities through the ideology of leadership and responsibility and through ideals that glamorize behaviors that produce forms of competition. Fraternities indeed socialize boys into becoming men; not just any men, but men who are equipped to become CEOs, lawyers, and politicians. This is not to

say that many men or women who are not involved in social fraternities do not succeed in positions of power, but rather that social fraternities are a training ground for these future endeavors.

Studying how men maintain or transform hegemonic masculinity is also essential to the field of inequality. Those who hold hegemonic power are the ones who distribute or hold onto resources. Not all masculinities are rewarded by society at the same levels, and it is important to understand how masculinity is negotiated in order to gain access to rewards or resources. This study is also important because it adds to research on hegemonic masculinity and demonstrates that hegemonic masculinity is fluid and may shift depending upon situation and location where it is practiced, thus making the ideal of hegemonic masculinity harder for many men to accomplish. This study helps in the understanding of how practices of hegemony are perpetuated and how they can also lead to emerging resistance that can facilitate change.

This study also may be useful to university officials who, along with fraternities, can develop educational programs that help fraternity members develop a healthier, more egalitarian type of masculinity and to address some of the issues members are faced with in trying to adjust to changing views of what men are supposed to be. Fraternity XYZ can be seen as an example of how institutional practices such as drinking and hazing can be curbed and somewhat diffused when the National Organization, the academic Institution and the local chapter work together in obtaining a common goal. I believe that if fraternity XYZ continues with its dry house policy, and no hazing policies, and continues with its educational training on diversity and sexism, it could become a model of practice for other fraternities that are trying to change their image and become more inclusive. Although the men have not reached some of the members' goals of being more inclusive, I believe they are headed in the right direction. In order to do this they also need to understand the historical development of social fraternities, particularly how they were founded on reactionary practices of those who were afraid of losing social power. National organizations and academic institutions, as well as local chapters, also need to understand the complicated relations of class, race, and gender if they truly wish to implement change and have it be long lasting. More research needs to investigate proactive approaches to men's masculinity crisis rather than reactive measures.

## Appendix A: Letter to Fraternity House

Dear Fraternity or Sorority House:

You are invited to be in a research study of how Fraternities and Sororities perceive and construct meaning around issues of gender and violence at [name of university]. This study is being done by Jo Ann Watkins Rogers, a Ph.D. student in Sociology, at [name of university]. If you are interested in participating in this study, I ask that you read this document and ask any questions you may have before agreeing participate.

Fraternities and Sororities are old institutions that have definite histories surrounding why they were established. This study will review the history of [university name] Greek system, the ways in which this particular institution was developed, and how the participants have created meaning around the issues of gender and violence. The research seeks to answer the following questions: How do members of Fraternities and Sororities construct meaning around the issues of gender and violence. The participant's role in this study will be to help answer these questions.

If your house agrees to participate in this study, it will be a designated as a field observation site. The field observation does not require individual contact with the investigator. The investigator has interest in observing daily activities performed in Fraternity or Sorority houses. The investigator seeks permission to enter common rooms in each research site. After observing daily activities house members will be asked if they would like to participate in face-to-face interviews. Each member will be given a letter, like this, that will describe the research project and what is involved in the individual's participation. There will be no physical or emotional risk in participating in the field observation portion of this research project.

The records of this study will be kept private. Any report that might be published will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. A system of coding will be used to ensure confidentiality. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with [name of university] or the Greek Community. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with Iowa State University.

If, during the course of this research study, significant new findings are discovered that might influence your willingness to continue, the researchers will inform you of those developments. If you may have any questions you can contact me at [phone number] or by e-mail at [email address].

Sincerely,

JoAnn Watkins Rogers

## Appendix B: Letter to Individual Members

Date:

Dear Fraternity Member:

You are invited to be in a research study of how Fraternities and Sororities perceive and construct meaning around issues of gender and violence at [name of university]. This study is being done by Jo Ann Watkins Rogers, a Ph.D. student in Sociology, at [name of university]. If you are interested in participating in this study, I ask that you read this document and ask any questions you may have before agreeing participate.

Fraternities and Sororities are old institutions that have definite histories surrounding why they were established. This study will review the history of [name of university] Greek system, the ways in which this particular institution was developed, and how the participants have created meaning around the issues of gender and violence. The research seeks to answer the following questions: How do members of Fraternities and Sororities construct meaning around the issues of gender and violence. The participant's role in this study will be to help answer these questions.

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will include completing demographic information, as well as, one face-to-face interview that will last around one 1-hour. You also might be contacted for follow up questions to clear up any questions the researcher might have about the interview. At the time of the interview you will be given the demographic information to fill out and during the interview you will be asked questions regarding your attitudes, feelings, and experiences involving gender and violence. The interview will take approximately an hour, and the participant and researcher will mutually agree upon the time and location.

There will be no physical risk in participating in this research project. This study is not designed to evoke emotions; however, there may be some emotional risks due to the nature of the topic. First, participants may experience emotional discomfort when discussing the topics of gender and violence. Second, this study may also evoke strong emotions in cases where the participant is currently experiencing or has experienced any emotional or physical violence. If the participant feels a strong negative reaction, the interview will be postponed, rescheduled or terminated upon his/her request.

The records of this study will be kept private. Any report that might be published will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. A system of coding will be used to ensure confidentiality. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with [name of university] or the Greek Community. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with Iowa State University or the Greek Community.

If, during the course of this research study, significant new findings are discovered that might influence your willingness to continue, the researchers will inform you of those developments. If you may have any questions you can contact me at [phone number] or by e-mail at [email address].

Sincerely,

JoAnn Watkins Rogers



## Appendix C: Informed Consent

**Title of Study:** How does the Greek System construct meaning around the issues of gender and violence?

**Investigators:** JoAnn Watkins Rogers, primary investigator.

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to examine the meaning that Greek members construct meanings around the issues of gender and violence. You are invited to participate in this study because you are currently living in a Fraternity or Sorority and represent a portion of the Greek community

### DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will include completing demographic information, as well as, one face-to-face interview that will last around one 1-hour. You might be contacted for follow up questions to clear up any questions the researcher might have about the interview. The demographic information will be completed at the time of the interview. If you are interested in participating in this study, you will sign and receive a copy of the consent form. You will be interviewed regarding your attitudes, feelings, and experiences involving gender and violence.

The demographic questionnaire will take approximately 5 minutes to complete and will be given at the time of the face-to face interview. Prior to beginning the study the principal investigator will explain the terms and purpose of the study. If you are interested in participating in this study, you will sign and receive a copy of the consent form. You must agree to the terms of the study before allowed to begin. You may skip any question that you do not wish to answer or that makes you feel uncomfortable.

This study guarantees confidentiality. Your comments will be 100% confidential. Your name is not required. For the study you will be able to choose an alias. This alias will never be connected with your given name. Participants are urged not to give a nickname that can easily be associated with them. Upon completion of the study, all tape-recorded documents will be destroyed

### RISKS

There are no foreseeable physical risks from participating in this study. This study is not designed to evoke emotions; however, there may be some emotional risks due to the nature of the topic. First participants may experience emotional discomfort when discussing the topic of violence. Second this study may evoke strong emotions in cases where the participant is currently experiencing or has experienced issue involving violence. If the participant experiences a strong negative reaction the interview will be postponed,

rescheduled, or terminated upon her/his request and assistance from Student Counseling Services [phone number] will be recommended. Participation in this study is voluntary and a participant may refuse to participate in this study at any time.

### **BENEFITS**

If you decide to participate in this study there may be no direct benefit to you. A benefit is defined as a desired outcome or advantage. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will benefit the university and society in general because it is important to understand how individuals, as well as, institutions construct meaning. In this case the construction of gender and violence

### **COSTS AND COMPENSATION**

You will not have any costs from participating in this study. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

### **PARTICIPANT RIGHTS**

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or leave the study at any time. If you decide to not participate in the study or leave the study early, it will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

### **CONFIDENTIALITY**

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that review and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy your records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: the fraternity or sorority will be given a letter code that does not correspond to a Greek organization and a unique name chosen by the participant will be used during the interview.

The only person who will have access to the data is JoAnn Watkins Rogers the primary investigator. The documents will be kept in a locked cabinet. The data will be retained for five full years before erasure or destruction. If the results are published, your identity will remain confidential.

### **QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS**

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study contact JoAnn Watkins Rogers at [phone number]. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the Human Subjects Research Office [address], , [phone number]; [email address] or the Research Compliance Officer, Office of Research Compliance, [address], [phone number]; [email address]

.....  
**SUBJECT SIGNATURE**

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the signed and date written informed consent prior to your participation in the study.

Subject's Name  
(printed) \_\_\_\_\_

Subject's  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date  
Signed \_\_\_\_\_

#### **INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT**

I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and all of their questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the purpose, risks, benefits, and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent)

## Appendix D: Questions for Fraternity Members

Remember you have the right to refuse to answer any of these questions or at any time you feel uncomfortable you have the right to end this interview. This interview is 100% confidential.

1. Why did you decide to join a Fraternity?
2. Has it met with all your expectations?
3. What has your experience been like while living here?
4. What were perceptions of Greek life prior to joining? How have they changed?
5. Have you ever seen any of the reality TV shows that have Sorority or Fraternity members in them? (e.g. MTV's Fraternity or Sorority Life). How do you feel about these shows?
6. Do you think Media gives an accurate portrayal of Fraternities or Sororities?
7. How do you think this image affects the [name of university]?
8. How do you think this image affects you directly?
9. How do you view women who belong to the Greek system?
10. Do you think media images of Sororities effect the ways in which men may view or treat women who belong to a sorority.
11. Do you treat a woman differently if you know she belongs to the Greek system, if so how?
12. When dating, do you normally look for a partner within the system?
13. Do you do anything different when going to a party a Greek house vs. an establishment (bar) or a private house party or a dorm party?
14. How does the house get ready for a social gathering held at your house?
15. How do you get ready for social gatherings at your house (e.g. a Fraternity sponsored party)?
16. Do you remember the Pudding wrestling held in campus town?
17. If so what is your reaction to this?
18. Do remember the Katie Robb case?
19. Do you think this case impacted the Greek community? If so in what ways?
20. What types of violence prevention or educational programs do you have at the house?
21. Do you think that these types of programs are necessary in a Fraternity? Why or Why not?
22. Have you ever been the victim of mental or physical violence while living in your house? (stalking, harassment, rape).
23. Do you know anyone who has been the victim of mental or physical violence while living in a Greek house? (man or woman)
24. If so was that person a Greek member? If so did you seek counseling? (at this time if the person has not, strongly urge them to do so and give them the number to student counseling or access).
25. If so, has this changed the way you feel about your house, the Greek system, yourself? How so?
26. If so, has this changed the way you interact with others or your daily routines. How so?
27. Is there anything else you would like me to know about yourself or the sorority?

Thank you for your time and participation. If I need to clarify any of your answers may I contact you again?

## **Appendix E: Data Sheet**

JoAnn Rogers

### **Data Sheet**

Name:

House:

Age:

Year in College:

What city and state are you from?

Year in residence if different from college:

Does attending college require you to take out student loans or apply for grants? Which?

Mother's occupation:

Father's occupation:

Did either of your parents attend college? If so who and how many years?

Did either of your parents belong to a Fraternity or Sorority?

Do you belong to the same Fraternity or Sorority as another member of your family did (does)?

What do you consider your race or ethnic background?

## References

- Allan, Elizabeth J. 2004 "Hazing and Gender: Analyzing the Obvious". Pp. 275-294 in *The Hazing Reader*. edited by Hank Nuwer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Baba, Maretta Lynn. and Linda L.Darga. 1981. "The Genetic Myth of Racial Classification." Pp. 5-19 in *Science and the Question of Human Equality*. edited by Collins Margaret S., Irving W. Wainer and Theodore A Bremner, Boulder: Westview Press, Inc.
- Bird, Sharon R. 1996. "Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociability and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity." *Gender & Society* 10 (2):120-132.
- Bonilla- Silva, Eduardo. 2003. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield:
- Borsari, Brian E. and Kate B. Carey. 1999. "Understanding Fraternity Drinking: Five Recurring Themes in the Literature 1980-1989." *Journal of American College Health*. 48: 30-44.
- Boswell, Ayres A. and Joan Z. Spade. 1996. "Fraternities and Collegiate Rape Culture Why Are Some Fraternities More Dangerous Places For Women?." *Gender and Society* 10 (2):133-147.
- Brint, S. 2001. "Gemeinschaft Revisited: A critique and Reconstruction of the Community Concept". *Sociological Theory*. 19:1-23.
- Brod, H. (Ed.).1987. *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Butler, Judith P. 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.

- Capraro, Rocco L. 2002. "Why College Men Drink: Alcohol, Adventure, and The Paradox of Masculinity". *Journal of American College Health* 48:307:315.
- Cashin, Jeffrey R., Philip W. Meilman, and Cheryl A. Presley. 1998. "Alcohol Use in the Greek System: Follow the Leader?" *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 59:63-70.
- Charon, Joel M. 2005. *The Meaning of Sociology*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Pearson: New Jersey.
- Chen, Anthony S. 1999. "Lives at the Center of the Periphery, Lives at the Periphery of the Center: Chinese American Masculinities and Bargaining with Hegemony". *Gender & Society*. 13 (5):584-607.
- Ciabattari, Teresa. 2001. "Changes in Men's Conservative Gender Ideologies: Cohort and Period Influences." *Gender & Society* 15(4):574-591.
- Collins-Hill, Patricia. 1986. "Learning from the Outsider from Within: The Social Significance of Black Feminist Thought". *Social Problems* 33(6):14-32.
- Collison, D. and J. Hearn. 1994. "Naming Men as Men: Implications for Work, Organization and Management. *Gender, Work, and Organization* 1(1):2-22.
- Coltrane, Scott. 1994. "Theorizing Masculinities in Contemporary Social Science." Pp. 39-60 in *Theorizing Masculinities*. edited by Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Connell, R.W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept". *Gender & Society* 19(6):829-859.
- \_\_\_\_\_. R.W., 1999. "Making Gendered People" In Feree, Lorber and Hess (eds). *Revisiting Gender*. 45-69 thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- \_\_\_\_\_. R. W. 1993. "The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History." *Theory and Society* 22 (5):597-623.

- Conway-Long, Don. 1994. "Ethnographies and Masculinities" *Theorizing Masculinities*. edited by Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Corbin, Juliet. and Anselm Strauss. 1990. "Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons, and Evaluative Criteria" *Qualitative Sociology* 13(1).
- Dabbs James M., Mariane F. Hargrove and Colleen Heusel. 1996. "Testosterone Differences among College Fraternities: Well-Behaved vs. Rambunctious" *Personality and Individual Differences*. 30 (2):157-161.
- Davis, Tracy L. and Debora L. Liddell. 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.
- Denzin, Norman K.. and Yvanna S. Lincoln, eds. 2003 2ns ed. *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Edition. Sage Publications.
- Denzin, Norman K. 1998. "Sexuality and Gender: An Interactionist/Poststructural Reading." Pp. 199-222 in *Theory of Gender: Feminism on Theory* edited by Paula England. New York: Aldine DeGruyter.
- DeParle, Jason. 1988. "About Men; about Cold Beer, Willing Women, Hazing, Conformity- about Fraternities." *Washington Monthly* 20 (10): 38-48.
- DeVault, Marjorie L. 1999. *Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- DiPeiro, Thomas. 2002. *White Men Aren't*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.



Durkheim, E. (1893/1964). *The division of labour in society* (G. Simpson, Trans.). New York: Free Press.

Ellis and Bonchner. "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject. In Denzin and Lincoln (eds.) 2003 *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* Second Edition. Sage Publication.

Emslie, Carol., Kate Hunt, and Rosaleen O'brien. 2004. "Masculinities in Older Men: A Qualitative Study in the West of Scotland." *The Journal of Men's Studies*. 12(3):207-227.

Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. "Building Theories form Case Study Research." *The Academy of Management Review*. 14 (4): 532-550.

Fausto-Sterling Ann. 2000. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.

Ferber, Abby. 1998. *White Man Falling*. Maryland: Rowen and Littlefield Publishers.

Fine, Michelle, Lois Weis, Judi Addelston and Julia Marusza. 1997. "(IN) Secure Times: Constructing White Working-Class Masculinities in the Late 20<sup>th</sup> Century." *Gender & Society* 11(1): 52-68.

Foubert, John D. and Sharon A. La Voy. 2000. "A Qualitative Assessment of 'The Men's Program': The Impact of Rape Prevention Program on Fraternity Men." *NASPA Journal*. 38(1):18-28.

Fox, Elaine and Charles Hodge, Walter Ward. 1987. "A Comparison of Attitudes Held by Black and White Fraternity Members" *Journal of Negro Education* 56 (4): 521-534.

Greek Community History of (Name) University. Retrieved. August 18, 2005.  
([www.greek.\(university\).edu/history/](http://www.greek.(university).edu/history/)).

Goffman, Erving. 1959 *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York.: Anchor Books.

- Goodwin, L. 1990. Social psychological bases for college alcohol consumption. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 36, 83-95.
- Gubruim, Jaber F. and James A. Holstein. 2003. 2nd ed "Analyzing Interpretive Practice". In Denzin, Norman K. and Yvanna S. Lincoln, eds.. *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Edition. Sage Publications.
- Hall, Stuart. 1996. "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?" Pp. 1-17 in *Questions of Cultural Identity*. edited by Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay. London: Sage.
- Haraway, Donna. 1991. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century," Pp.149-181 in *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York; Routledge.
- Harding, Sandra. 1987. *Feminism and Methodology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hartmann, Heidi, 1979, "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union," *Capital and Class*, 8:1-33
- Hearn, Jeff. and David L. Collinson. 1994. "Theorizing Unities and Differences Between Men and Between Masculinities." Pp. 82-96. in *Theorizing Masculinities*. edited by Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- \_\_\_\_\_.2004. "From Hegemonic Masculinity to the Hegemony of Men". *Feminist Theory* 5(1). 49-72.
- Heasley, Robert. 2005. "Queer Masculinities of Straight Men: A Typology". *Men and Masculinities* 7(3):310-320.
- Hoffert, Sylvia D. 2003. *A History of Gender in America*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice HALL.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette and Messner, Michael A. (1994). Gender Displays and Men's Power: The 'New Man' and the Mexican Immigrant Man. In Brod, Harry and Kaufman, Michael. (eds). (1994). *Theorizing Masculinities*. London: Sage.

Humphrey, Stephen E. and Arnold S. Kahn. 2000. "Fraternities, Athletic Teams, and Rape: Importance of Identification with a Risky Group." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 15(12):1313-1322.

Jay, Gregory. (with Sandra Elain Jones). 2005. "Whiteness Studies and the Multicultural Literature Classroom" *MELUS* 30 (2):99-121.

James, Anthony W. 2000. "The College Social Fraternity Antidiscrimination Debate, 1945-1949" *Historian issue* :303-320 .

Kaufman, Michael. 1994. "Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experiences of Power". In *Theorizing Masculinities*. edited by Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Linda Kalof and Timothy Cargill. 1991. "Fraternity and sorority membership and gender dominance attitudes" *Sex Roles* 25 (7-8): 417 – 423.

Kerbo, Harold R. 2006 6<sup>th</sup> ed. *Social Stratification and Inequality*. Boston: McGraw Hill

Kimmel, Michael. and Michael A. Messner. 2001. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. *Men's Lives*. Neeham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Kimmel, Michael. 2000. "Saving the Males: The Sociological Implications of the Virginia Military Institute and the Citadel." *Gender & Society* 14 (4): 494-516.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1994. "Masculinity as Homophobia". in *Theorizing Masculinities*. edited by Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

King, Neal. 2004. "Knowing Women: Straight Men and Sexual Certainty." *Gender & Society* 17(6): 861-877.

King, Alissa Renee. 2003. "Locker rooms and chapter rooms: Hegemonic Masculinity and Masculine Identities among Subgroups of Men on a College Campus". Masters Thesis, Department of Sociology, Iowa State University, IA.

Knox, David and Caroline Schacht. 2005. *Choices in Relationships: An Introduction*. Thomas and Wadsworth: Belmont.

Koss, M. P. and J. A. Gaines. 1993. The Prediction of Sexual Aggression by Alcohol Use, Athletic Participation, and Fraternity Affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 8(1):94-108.

Lackie, Leandra. and Anton F. de Man. 1997. "Correlates of Sexual Aggression Among Males University Students." *Sex Roles*. 37(5/6) 451-457.

Larimer ME, and AP Turner, BK Anderson, JS Fader, JR Kilmer, RS Palmer, JM Crouce. 2001. "Evaluating a Brief Alcohol Intervention with Fraternities".

Lawrence, Charles R. 1955. "Movements for the Abolition of Fraternity Segregation at Thirty-Three Colleges". *Social Problems* 2 (3): 140-153.

Lee, McClung Alfred. 1955. "The Program of the National Committee on Fraternities in Education" *Social Problems* 2(3): 172-175.

Lippa, Richard. and Sara Arad. 1997. "The Structure of Sexual Orientation and Its Relation to Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Diagnosticity: Different for Men and Women." *Sex Roles* 37(3/4):187-208.

Litt, Jacqueline. 2000. *Medicalized Motherhood. Perspectives from the Lives of African-American and Jewish Women*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Lorber, Judith and Farrell Susan A., (Eds.). 1991. *The Social Construction of Gender*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Lorber Judith. 2003. "Paradoxes of Gender". in *Masculinities: Interdisciplinary Readings*. edited by Mark Hussey. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Lucal, Betsy. 1999. What it means to be gendered me: Life on the boundaries of a dichotomous gender system. *Gender & Society* 13:781-797

Marger, Martin N. 2005. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. *Social Inequality: Patterns & Processes*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

McCabe, S.E. J.E. Schulenberg, L.D. Johnston, P.M. O'Mally,, J.G. Bachman , and D.D. Kloska. 2005. "Selection and Socialization effects of Fraternities and sororities on U.S. College Students Substance Abuse Use; A Multi-Cohort Longitudinal Study." *Addiction* 100(4):512-524.

McGuffey, Shawn C. and Lindsay B. Rich. 1999. "Playing in the Gender Transgression Zone; Race, Class, and Hegemonic Masculinity in Middle Childhood". *Gender & Society* 13 (5):608-627.

McIntosh, Peggy. (2003). "The Matter of Whiteness". Pp. 147-160 in *Privilege*, edited by Michael S. Kimmel and Abby L. Ferber. Boulder: West View Press.

Messner, Michael A. 2001. 5<sup>th</sup>ed. "Boyhood, Organized Sports, and the Construction of Masculinities". in *Men's Lives*. edited by Kimmel, Michael. and Michael A. Messner. Neeham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1993. "Changing Men' and feminist politics in the United States". *Theory and Society*. 22: 723-737.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1992. *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Naples, Nancy A. 2003. *Feminism and Method: Ethnography, Discourse Analysis, and Activist Research*. New York: Routledge
- Neuberger, Carmen G. and Gail Short Hanson. 1997. "The Greek Life-Self Study; A Powerful Process for Change on Campus." *NASPA Journal*. 34(2):91-100.
- Nuwer, Hank. 2004. *The Hazing Reader*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Pace, Diana. and Patrick B. McGrath. 2002. "A Comparison of Drinking Behaviors of Students in Greek Organizations and Students Active in a Campus Volunteer Organization." *NASPA Journal*. 39(3):217-232.
- Padavic, Irene. and Barbara Reskin. 2002. *Women and Men at Work*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Peirce, Jennifer L. 1995. *Gender Trails*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Perry, Pamela. 2002. *Shades of White: White Kids and Racial Identity in High School*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Pyke, Karen D. 1996. "Class-Based Masculinities: The Interdependence of Gender, Cass, and Interpersonal Power". *Gender & Societ*. 10 (5):527-549.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1999. "The Gender System and Interaction". *Annual Reviews Sociology*. 25:191-216.
- Riessman, Kohler Catherine. 1987. "When Gender is Not Enough: Women Interviewing Women." *Gender & Society* 1(2): 172-207.

- Roberts, John Michael. and Teela Sanders. 2005. *The Sociological Review*. 53(2): 294-313.
- Rogers, JoAnn and Jacquelyn S. Litt. 2004. "Normalizing Racism: A Case Study of Motherhood." Pp. 49-74. in *home-grown hate; gender and organized racism*. Edited by Abby L. Ferber. New York: Routledge.
- Rothman, Robert A. 2002. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. *Inequality and Stratification: Race, Class, and Gender*. Upper Saddle River: New Jersey.
- Sanday, Peggy Reeves. 1990. *Fraternity Gang Rape: Sex, Brotherhood, and Privilege on Campus*. New York: New York University Press.
- Savin-Williams Ritch. 2004. "Memories of Same-Sex Attractions" in Kimmel, Michael and Michael A. Messner. 2001. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. *Men's Lives*. Neeham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schacht, Steven P. 1996. "Misogyny on and off the 'Pitch': The Gendered World of Male Rugby Players." *Gender & Society*. 10 (5): 550-565.
- Segal, Lynne. 1993. "Changing Men: Masculinities in Context". *Theory and Society*. 22 (5): 625-641.
- Segal, Bernard E. 1965. "Fraternities, Social Distance, and Anti-Semitism Among Jewish and Non-Jewish Undergraduates". *Sociology of Education* 38 (3): 251-264.
- Sirin Selcuk R., Donald R. McCreary. and James R. Mahalik. 2004. "Differential Reactions to Men and Women's Gender Role Transgressions: Perceptions of Social Status, Sexual Orientation, and Value Dissimilarity." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 12(2):119-132.
- "Skull and Bones"2004. 60 Minutes, CBS News. Retrieved September 22, 2005 (<http://www.Cbsnews.com/stories/2003/10/02/60minutes/main57332...>)
- Smith, Dorothy. 1990. *Texts, facts and femininity: Exploring the relations of ruling*. London: Routledge.

- Stacey, Judith. 1993. "Toward Kinder, Gentler Uses of Testosterone." *Theory and Society* 22 (5):711-721.
- Sweet, Stephen. 2004. "Understanding Fraternity Hazing". Pp. 1-13 in *The Hazing Reader*. edited by Hank Nuwer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Swidler, A. 1986. "Culture in action: symbols and strategies" *American Sociological Review* 51:(2). 273-286.
- Sullivan, Thomas J. 2003. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. *Sociology: Concepts and Applications in a Diverse World*. Ayllyn and Bacon.
- Tatum, Beverly Daniel. 1997. "*Why are all the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?*": *And other Conversations about Race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tedlock, Barbara. 2003. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. "Ethnography and Ethnographic Representation". In Denzin, Norman K. and Yvanna S. Lincoln, eds. *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Edition. Thousand Oaks:Sage Publications.
- The Digest of Education Statistics*. National Center for Education Statistics. 1998. Institute of Education Statistics U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved June 6, 2005 (<http://nec.ed.gov/programs/digest/d04>)
- The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*. 1998 (Spring). "The Racially Segregated Fraternity Row at the University of Alabama. 19:44-45. Retrieved April14,2005. (<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=10773711%28199821%290%3A19%3C44%3AATRSFRA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2>)
- The Manual of XYZ Fraternity*. .1959. Indianapolis: .XYZ Fraternity Inc.
- Tiger, Lionel. 2004. "Males Courting Males". Pp. 14-18 in *The Hazing Reader*. edited by Hank Nuwer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.



- Viki, G. Tendayi., Dominic Abrams. and Paul Hutchison. 2003. "The 'True' Romantic: Benevolent Sexism and Paternalistic Chivalry." *Sex Roles* 49(9/10):533-537.
- Walton, Spring. 1996. "Social Host Liability: Risks for Fraternities and Student Hosts." *NASPA Journal*. 34(1):29-35.
- Warren, Jonathan W. and Franc Winddance Twine. 1997 "White Americans The New Minority? Non-Blacks and the Ever Expanding boundaries of Whiteness" *Journal of Black Studies* 28 (20): 200-218.
- Warren, R. L. 1988 (1978). "The Community in America." In R. Warren and L. Lyons, Eds., *opcit.*, Pp. 152-157.
- Warshaw, Robin. 1994 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. *I never Called It Rape: The MS. Report On Recognizing , Fighting and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Wechsler H, Lee JE, Kuo M, Lee H (2000), College binge drinking in the 1990s: a continuing problem. Results of the Harvard School of Public Health 1999 College Alcohol Study. *J Am Coll Health* 48(5):199-210.
- Wechsler Henry, George W. Dowdall, Gretchen Maener, Jeana Glendhill-Hoyt and Hang Lee. 1998. "Changes in Binge Drinking and Related Problems among American College Students Between 1993 and 1997: Results of the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study. *Journal of American College Health* 47(2):57-69.
- Weis, Robert. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: The Free Press.
- West, Candace. and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference". *Gender & Society* 9 (1): 8-34.

West, Candice. and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender", *Gender & Society* 1: 125-151.

West, Lois A. "Negotiating Masculinities in American Drinking Subcultures." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 9(3): 371-392.

Williams, Patricia J. 1997. *Seeing a Color-Blind Future*. New York: The Noonday Press.

Williams Christine L. and Joel Heikes. 1993. "The Importance of Researcher's Gender in the In-Depth Interview: Evidence from Two Case Studies of Male Nurses". *Gender & Society*. 7(2). 280-291.

\_\_\_\_\_.1989. *Gender Differences at Work: Women and Man in Nontraditional Occupations*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Yancey- Martin, Patricia and Robert A. Hummer. 1989. "Fraternities and Rape on Campus". *Gender& Society* 3:457-473