INTEGRATING MEN INTO THE CURRICULUM

MICHAEL KIMMEL*

I. INTRODUCTION

This article has a provocative title because its intent is to address the invisibility of men in the university as a first step towards developing strategies to integrate men into the contemporary collegiate curriculum. There is a general failure to see men, or more accurately masculinity, at every level of the educational endeavor—from what is taught, to who the teachers are, to the gender of the students, and to the gender of classroom dynamics. At every moment in the process, men are invisible.

"But wait," you will say, "men are not invisible. They are everywhere!" Quite true. Men are ubiquitous in universities, in professional schools, and in the public sphere in general. Most people would not dispute that men constitute the overwhelming majority of corporate executives and CEOs, attorneys and law professors, members of collegiate boards of trustees, and state, local, and national legislators. And of course it is true that in college curricula, every course that does not have the word women in the title is about men. For example, in the social sciences there may be courses called Women in Politics or Psychology of Women, but the courses with more generic titles like Social Change or Public Administration are courses in which the entire syllabus is organized around men. The course materials, however, focus almost exclusively on men in their public activities: men are discussed as political leaders, military heroes, scientists, writers, artists, and the like. By contrast, when women are discussed at all, the class almost always includes a discussion of femininity, about how the women's experiences as women influenced their experiences in their public activities. Can one imagine a literature course in which the experience of Jane Austen or the Brontës, or a physics course in which the experience of Marie Curie was discussed without a discussion of their lives as women, about how their femininity contributed to, affected, or even determined their work? Can one imagine that same British literature course examining Charles Dickens' or William Thackeray's experience of masculinity, or that physics course examining Albert Einstein's or Sir Isaac Newton's efforts to prove their masculinity? It is in this sense that men themselves are invisible as men. Rarely, if ever, are there courses that examine the lives of men as men.[1] What is the impact of gender on

Copyright © 1997 by Michael Kimmel.

* Professor of Sociology, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

1. My own course, Sociology of the Male Experience, first offered at Rutgers University in 1983, was the first such course in that state, and one of only a handful in the nation. *See* Diane Petzke, *Men's Studies Catches on at Colleges, Setting Off Controversy and Infighting*, WALL ST. J., Feb. 11, 1986, at 35; Eloise Salholz et al., *The Book on Men's Studies*, NEWSWEEK, Apr. 26, 1986, at 79; Alvin P.

the lives of these famous men? How does masculinity play a part in the lives of great artists, writers, presidents, etc.? On this score, the traditional curriculum suddenly draws a big blank. Everywhere one turns, it seems, there are courses on men, but little or no information on masculinity.

II. MAKING MASCULINITY VISIBLE

Listen to the voices of the men themselves. Take a cultural figure like composer Charles Ives, who rejected what he heard as the "sweet" or "feminine" music of the impressionist composers—"Easy music for the sissies, for the lily-pad ears,"[2]—and instead derived a masculine musical idiom, incorporating the dissonance of strong sounds and virile patriotism.[3] He exhorted himself to keep going, and not to "quit because the ladybirds don't like it."[4] At the end of one composition he wrote that his goal was "[t]o strengthen and give more muscle to the ear, brain, heart, limbs, and FEAT!"[5] What about the famous architect Louis Sullivan, describing his admiration for architecture displaying "a virile force," with "red blood; a real man, a manly man . . . an entire male[]"?[6] Of the Marshall Field Warehouse, Sullivan said, "Here is a man for you to look at. A man that walks on two legs instead of four, has active muscles . . . lives and breathes . . . in a world of barren pettiness, a male . . . ."[7] His most "male" form? Sullivan created the modern skyscraper.[8]

Consider also a few political figures in the parade of presidential hopefuls who have both proclaimed their own manhood and raised questions about their opponents' manhood. During the 1840 presidential campaign, for example, William Henry Harrison's supporters chastised Martin Van Buren as "Sweet Sandy Whiskers," a man with "effete tastes" who was the first president to install indoor plumbing in the White House and who ate off French china.[9] Harrison, apparently deceived by his own hypermasculine hype, eschewed a topcoat while taking the oath of office on the coldest day in several years, and died one month later of pneumonia.[10] Or consider Andrew Jackson's manly rage at effete bankers and infantilized Indians.[11] Or Theodore Roosevelt, who over-

---

Sanoff et al., *The American Male*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., June 3, 1985, at 44. I have been offering the course continuously since 1983, at the State University of New York at Stony Brook and at the University of California, Berkeley.

2. HENRY COWELL & SIDNEY COWELL, CHARLES IVES AND HIS MUSIC 10 (1955).

3. *See id.* at 9.

4. *Id.* Ladybirds refers to "white-livered weaklings who cannot stand up and receive the full force of dissonance like a man." *Id.*

5. *Id.*

6. *See* ROBERT TWOMBLY, LOUIS SULLIVAN: HIS LIFE AND WORK 400 (1986).

7. Sullivan used the Marshall Field Warehouse "as the fundamental inspiration for his own mature design." *Id. But see* TWOMBLY, *supra* note 6, at 400 ("But his imagery was never entirely masculine . . . . He tried to bond[] 'male' structural forms to 'female' ornament.").

8. *See* VINCENT SCULLY, MODERN ARCHITECTURE 19 (1974). Sullivan designed the Wainwright building in St. Louis in 1890-91.

9. *See* ROBERT GRAY GUNDERSON, THE LOG CABIN CAMPAIGN 101-05 (1957).

10. *See id.* at 266, 273.

11. *See* MARVIN MEYERS, THE JACKSONIAN PERSUASION: POLITICS AND BELIEF 19 (1957); MICHAEL PAUL ROGIN, FATHERS AND CHILDREN: ANDREW JACKSON AND THE SUBJUGATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN 206-48, 280-95 (1975); CHARLES SELLERS, THE MARKET REVOLUTION: JACKSONIAN AMERICA

came childhood infirmities and public perceptions of him as weak and ineffective, to thunder about the strenuous life while he prepared for invasions of Panama and the Philippines.[12] And what is one to make of President Lyndon Johnson's vainglorious claim during the Tet offensive of the Vietnam War, when he said that he "didn't just screw Ho Chi Minh. I cut his pecker off!"?[13] Or of former President George Bush, who proudly boasted after his vice-presidential debate with Geraldine Ferraro in 1984 that he had "kicked a little ass last night," and then squared off against television commentator Dan Rather in 1988 to dispel his image as a wimp?[14] From the founding of the country, presidents of the United States have seen the political arena as a masculine testing ground. In fact, the pursuit of manhood has been a dominant theme in American history, at least rhetorically or metaphorically, yet there are virtually no histories of manhood.[15] As far back as 1953, Simone de Beauvoir wrote that "[a] man would never get the notion of writing a book on the peculiar situation of the human male."[16]

Gender saturates other discourses as well, often as a way of speaking, as a metaphor for political struggle. Social conflict is often expressed in gender terms. For example, recall the terms of the debate between nineteenth century liberal reformers and their socialist adversaries. Each side described its vision of the poor working class in very different, yet equally gendered terms. To middle-class liberal reformers, the working class was subordinated, weak, helpless, and analogous to prostitutes. But the radical polemicists of the socialist working class, by contrast, pictured the proletariat as masculine: proud producers, strong and virile, protectors of wives and children, but exploited by greedy, effete, feminine (yet rapacious) capitalists. The question was thus posed as gendered, and whether the working class was feminine or masculine would be a depiction that would have dramatic policy implications.[17]

Thus gender is everywhere, and yet masculinity is oddly invisible. In part, this is because scholars and students alike have not known what questions to ask. In the past twenty-five years, the pioneering work of feminist scholars, both in traditional disciplines and in women's studies, has made us increasingly aware of the centrality of gender in shaping social life.[18] It is now understood

---

1815-1846 180, at 322-23 (1991).

12. *See* MICHAEL KIMMEL, MANHOOD IN AMERICA: A CULTURAL HISTORY 181-87 (1996) (examining Roosevelt's career); Bruce Curtis, *The Wimp Factor*, AM. HERITAGE, Nov. 1989, at 40, 44, 48 (describing Roosevelt's exaggerated virility). *See generally* THEODORE ROOSEVELT, THEODORE ROOSEVELT: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY (1929) (describing his childhood illness and his later years as President of the United States).

13. MARC FEIGEN FASTEAU, THE MALE MACHINE 174 (1974).

14. *See* Curtis, *supra* note 12, at 48-50; *see also Will George Bush Unravel?*, ECONOMIST, May 30, 1992, at 32 (describing Bush as "listless," "indecisive," and "lack[ing] leadership" during his campaign for a second term in office).

15. *See* Michael S. Kimmel, *Invisible Masculinity*, SOC'Y, Sept./Oct. 1993, at 28 (arguing that there are no histories of manhood and calling for such histories to be written). *See generally* E. ANTHONY ROTUNDO, AMERICAN MANHOOD: TRANSFORMATIONS IN MASCULINITY FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE MODERN ERA (1993) (attempting to develop a history of manhood).

16. SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR, THE SECOND SEX xxi (H.M. Parshley trans., Vintage Books 1989) (1952).

17. *See* JOAN WALLACH SCOTT, GENDER AND THE POLITICS OF HISTORY 48 (1988).

18. *See* DE BEAUVOIR, *supra* note 16, at 497-523; *see also* BETTY FRIEDAN, THE FEMININE MYSTIQUE (1963) (discussing the social function of gender roles).

that gender is one of the central organizing principles around which social life revolves, and one of the basic building blocks of an individual's identity.[19] In past generations, social scientists listed class and race as the major categories that defined and delimited social life.[20] In fact, if students wanted to study gender in the 1960s, they might have been able to take a course in marriage and the family in the social sciences, but there were no courses on gender. Indeed, the term had not yet acquired its present meaning. But today, gender has joined race and class in the basic understanding of the foundations of an individual's identity. Gender remains one of the basic criteria for allocation and distribution of rewards in society, one of the chief lenses through which to explain economic, social, or political inequality and discrimination. It is a major mode of explanation of everything from sexual behavior to voting preferences, and one of the fundamental ways in which to measure social responses (sex of respondent is nearly universal in survey instruments).

Most feminist scholars have properly focused their attention on women, primarily on the "omissions, distortions, and trivializations" of women's experiences, and the spheres to which women have historically been consigned, like private life and the family.[21] Women's history sought to rescue from obscurity the lives of significant women who had been ignored or whose work had been minimized by traditional androcentric scholarship, and to examine the everyday lives of women in the past—the efforts, for example, of laundresses, factory workers, pioneer homesteaders, or housewives to carve out lives of meaning and dignity in a world controlled by men.[22] Whether the focus has been on exemplary and famous women or the more ordinary everyday experiences of women, feminist scholarship has made it clear that gender, women's experiences as women, and the system of gender relations by which women are the subjects of discrimination together form the organizing principles in women's lives.

Now it is time to go a step further to include men as men. Historian Natalie Zemon Davis urged her fellow historians to be "interested in the history of both women and men, that we should not be working on the subjected sex any more than an historian of class can focus exclusively on peasants. Our goal is to understand the significance of the *sexes*, of gender groups in the historical past."[23] The problem with such good advice is that, to men at least, gender often remains invisible. It may sound strange to say, but men are the invisible gender. Ubiquitous in positions of power, men are also invisible to themselves. Courses on gender in universities are populated largely by women, as if the term gender only applied to them.[24] Occasionally, one hears the story of the lone, brave,

19. *See* HILARY M. LIPS, SEX & GENDER: AN INTRODUCTION xi (1988).

20. *See* LINDA J. NICHOLSON, GENDER AND HISTORY: THE LIMITS OF SOCIAL THEORY IN THE AGE OF THE FAMILY 36 (1986) (describing how gender differences were considered relatively superficial in comparison to racial differences).

21. *See, e.g.*, CATHARINE R. STIMPSON, WHERE THE MEANINGS ARE: FEMINISM AND CULTURAL SPACES 74 (1988).

22. *See* KIMMEL, *supra* note 12, at 3.

23. Natalie Zemon Davis, *"Women's History" in Transition: The European Case*, FEMINIST STUD., Spring-Summer 1976, at 83, 90.

24. In my current Sociology of Gender class, about 65% of my students are women. Most of my colleagues tell me that they envy my ability to attract so many male students to the class. When

young man who enrolls in a women's studies class and spends much of the semester cringing in a corner, in anticipation of feeling blamed for all the sins of millennia of patriarchal oppression. "Woman alone seems to have 'gender' since the category itself is defined as that aspect of social relations based on difference between sexes in which the standard has always been man," writes historian Thomas Lacquer.[25] As the old proverb has it, "the fish are the last ones to discover the ocean."[26]

This invisibility of masculinity was first made clear to me at a meeting of an informal study group on feminist theory in which I participated in the early 1980s.[27] In a discussion between two female participants, I first confronted this invisibility of gender to men. I described that moment in the introduction to *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*:[28]

> During one meeting, a white woman and a black woman were discussing whether all women were, by definition, "sisters," because "all women," the white woman noted, had essentially the same experiences as women, and because "all women" faced a common oppression by men. Thus, the white woman asserted that the fact that they were both women bonded them, in spite of racial differences. The black woman disagreed.
>
> "When you wake up in the morning and look in the mirror, what do you see?" she asked.
>
> "I see a woman," replied the white woman.
>
> "That's precisely the problem," responded the black woman. "I see a *black* woman. To me, race is visible every day, because race is how I am *not* privileged in our culture. Race is invisible to you, because it's how you are privileged. It's a luxury, a privilege, not to see race all the time. It's why there will always be differences in our experience."
>
> As I witnessed this exchange, I was startled, and groaned—more audibly, perhaps, than I had intended. Being the only man in the room, someone asked what my response had meant.
>
> "Well," I said, "when I look in the mirror, I see a human being. I'm universally generalizable. As a middle class white man, I have no class, no race, no gender. I'm the generic person!"
>
> Sometimes, I like to think that it was on that day that I *became* a middle class white man.[29]

women teach the course, the percentages are likely to be even more highly skewed.

25. THOMAS LACQUER, MAKING SEX: BODY AND GENDER FROM THE GREEKS TO FREUD 22 (1990).

26. Don Sabo, *Gazing into Men's Middles*, *in* THE POLITICS OF MANHOOD: PROFEMINIST MEN RESPOND TO THE MYTHOPOETIC MEN'S MOVEMENT 64 (Michael Kimmel ed., 1996).

27. This was simply an informal group of faculty and graduate students at the University of California, Santa Cruz, 1980-81.

28. KIMMEL, *supra* note 12.

29. *Id.* at 3-4.

Of course, I had been white, middle class, and male for my entire life. But the categories of race, class, and gender had not meant much to me. Since then, I have come to see that race, class, and gender do not refer only to "other" people, those marginalized by race, class, or gender privilege. Those terms also describe me. I have enjoyed the privilege of invisibility. The very processes that confer privilege to one group and not another group are often invisible to those upon whom that privilege is conferred. Thus most white people do not see race as a central experience in their lives, while most people of color remain painfully aware of race.[30] And thus most middle-class people do not consider class to be of much significance in their lives, while many lower-class people would undoubtedly think otherwise.[31] What makes people marginal or powerless are the processes they see, partly because they are constantly reminded of them by others. Invisibility is a privilege in a double sense, describing both the power relations that are kept in place by the very dynamics of invisibility, and the sense of privilege as luxury. It is a luxury that only white people have in our society not to think about race every minute of their lives. It is a luxury that only men have in our society to pretend that gender does not matter.

American men have come to think of themselves as genderless, in part because they can afford the luxury of ignoring the centrality of gender. Military, political, scientific, or literary figures are treated as if their gender, their masculinity, had nothing to do with their military exploits, policy decisions, scientific experiments, or writing styles or subjects. Those who are disenfranchised and oppressed are those whose manhood is believed not to be evident.[32] This is used to impugn the manhood of black men, gay men, Native American men, or ethnic men, in a sense providing a justification and legitimation for their social exclusion in gendered terms.[33]

The quest for manhood—the effort to achieve, to demonstrate, to prove masculinity—is one of the animating experiences in the lives of American men, as well as the history of the United States.[34] That scholars and students alike remain unaware of the centrality of gender in men's lives only helps to perpetuate inequalities based on gender in American society. This ignorance keeps in place the power of men over women, and the power of some men over other men, both of which are among the central mechanisms of power in our society.[35]

30. *See* Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault & Frances A. Maher, *"They Got the Paradigm and Painted it White": Higher Education Classrooms and Legal Discourse*, 4 DUKE J. GENDER L. & POL'Y 197 *passim* (1997).

31. *See id.* at202-03.

32. *See* KIMMEL, *supra* note 12 *passim* (discussing the historical perception of manhood with regard to black men, Native Americans, gay men, and the working class).

33. *See id.*

34. *See id.* at 2.

35. *See* Michael Kaufman, *Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experience of Power*, *in* THEORIZING MASCULINITIES 142, 142-63 (Harry Brod & Michael Kimmel eds., 1994); Michael S. Kimmel, *Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity*, *in* THEORIZING MASCULINITIES, *supra* at 119, 124-26; Joseph H. Pleck, *Men's Power with Women, Other Men, and Society: A Men's Movement Analysis*, *in* MEN'S LIVES 21, 21-29 (Michael S. Kimmel & Michael A. Messner eds., 1989).

III. THE MEANINGS OF MASCULINITIES

As just discussed, gender is a central mechanism in what is taught, gender issues saturate the content of courses, and gender itself has been historically invisible to men. The first task in integrating men into the curriculum is to examine the impact of gender on the lives of men, great and small. Yet when gender is acknowledged, writers often endow manhood with a transcendental, almost mythic set of properties that still keep it invisible. For example, in the works of Robert Bly, Sam Keen, and other popular authors, manhood becomes an eternal, timeless essence that resides deep in the heart of every man.[36] Manhood is thought of as a thing, a quality that one either has or does not have. Or manhood is considered innate, residing in the particular anatomical organization of the human male, or perhaps, as some transcendent tangible property that each man must manifest in the world, a reward presented with great ceremony to a young novice by his elders for having successfully completed an arduous initiation ritual. In the words of poet Robert Bly, "the structure at the bottom of the male psyche is still as firm as it was twenty thousand years ago."[37]

Definitions of masculinity, however, are not the manifestations of some inner essence, nor do they bubble up through biological composition. The search for a transcendent, timeless definition of manhood is itself a sociological phenomenon—society tends to search for the timeless and eternal during moments of crisis, those points of transition when old definitions no longer work and new definitions are yet to be firmly established. It is important to think of manhood in a different way: as a constantly changing collection of meanings that are constructed through relationships with themselves, with other men, and with the world. A social constructionist perspective[38] understands gender definitions as neither static nor timeless, but historically articulated within and through people's interactions with their worlds.[39]

There are four dimensions that comprise this social constructionist perspective on the development of gender ideologies. First, there is a cross-cultural dimension. As the pioneering work of anthropologists like Margaret Mead demonstrated over half a century ago, definitions of masculinity and femininity vary from culture to culture.[40] Some cultures, like Western culture, encourage manly stoicism and constant demonstration, while men in other cultures are even more

36. *See, e.g.*, ROBERT BLY, IRON JOHN: A BOOK ABOUT MEN (1990) (discussing the mythology inherent in the concept of manhood); SAM KEEN, FIRE IN THE BELLY: ON BEING A MAN (1991) (discussing new visions and definitions of manhood); ROBERT MOORE & DOUGLAS GILETTE, KING, WARRIOR, MAGICIAN, LOVER: REDISCOVERING THE ARCHETYPES OF THE MATURE MASCULINE (1990) (discussing the archetypes of the male psyche).

37. BLY, *supra* note 36, at 230.

38. *See* Kaufman, *supra* note 35, at 143-45 (discussing the difference between biological sex and socially constructed gender).

39. *See id.*

40. *See* MARGARET MEAD, MALE AND FEMALE: A STUDY OF THE SEXES IN A CHANGING WORLD (1949) (discussing the biological basis of gender distinctions in various societies); *cf.* MARGARET MEAD, AND KEEP YOUR POWDER DRY: AN ANTHROPOLOGIST LOOKS AT AMERICA (1965) (analyzing social roles in the United States); MARGARET MEAD, SEX AND TEMPERAMENT IN THREE PRIMITIVE SOCIETIES (1935) (examining the pattern of sex behavior from the standpoint of temperament).

preoccupied with demonstrating sexual prowess than American men.[41] Still other cultures prescribe a more relaxed definition of masculinity based on civic participation, emotional responsiveness, and the collective provision for the community's needs.[42] Most simply put, masculinity means different things to different peoples.

The second dimension of the social constructionist perspective suggests that masculinity means different things at different times. What it meant to be a man in the colonial era is quite different from what it means to be an American man today. Models for colonial men included the "Genteel Patriarch"—the rural gentry, who were devoted family men, caring, sensuous, refined, and sophisticated, or the "Heroic Artisan"—the urban shopkeeper, craftsman, or artisan who proclaimed his economic autonomy and political citizenship as a "son of liberty" during the Revolution.[43] This contrast in models is most remarkable when thinking of men like Thomas Jefferson or George Washington surveying their property as opposed to Thomas Paine or Paul Revere with sleeves rolled up and leather aprons over their shirts, standing at a printing press or pewter forge. Masculinity varies from culture to culture, and within any one culture over historical time. Thus the integration of masculinity must employ the tools of the social and behavioral sciences and also those of history to better specify the ways in which masculinity varies.[44] Integrating men into the curriculum requires not only studying the variations but the eternal verities.

The third dimension of the social constructionist perspective explores the multiple meanings of manhood in any one society at any one particular time. Not all American men are the same. Experiences depend, for example, on class, race, ethnicity, sexuality, age, even region of the country. Each of these axes modifies the others. What it means to be an older, black, gay man in Cleveland is, one would assume, radically different from what it means to be a young, white, heterosexual farm boy in Iowa. Sociology's emphasis on such axes of experience as the basis for the distribution of positions and allocation of rewards in society makes sociology a necessary discipline in the specification of the social constructionist perspective.

The fourth and final dimension of the social constructionist perspective involves individual development. Masculinity means different things to individual men as they age and develop. The issues confronting a man about proving himself and feeling successful, along with the social institutions in which he will attempt to enact those experiences, all will change throughout his life. For example, men often report a "softening," the development of greater interest in caregiving and nurturing when they become grandfathers than when they became fathers, often to the puzzlement and distress of their sons.[45] In their 60s and 70s,

41. *See* KIMMEL, *supra* note 12, at 5.

42. *See id.*

43. *See id.* at 13-78.

44. There are, of course, other elements in men's experiences that do not vary much under cross-cultural or historical analysis. The most obvious are men's biological inheritance: the combination of hormonal, physiological, and evolutionary imperatives that determine the wiring of these complex machines.

45. *See, e.g.*, David Gutmann & Margaret Hallie Huyck, *Development and Pathology in Post-Parental Men*, *in* OLDER MEN'S LIVES 65, 67 (Edward H. Thompson, Jr. ed., 1994).

when their children are having children, these men do not feel the same pressures to perform, to leave a mark, to prove themselves. Their battles are over, and they can relax and enjoy the fruits of their efforts.[46] The perspectives of the social and behavioral sciences, and especially developmental psychology, enable sociologists to chart these changes, while the humanities explore the symbolic record that such men leave as evidence of their experiences.

As articulated above, the meanings of masculinity vary across cultures, through history, among men within any one culture, and over the course of a man's life. Thus, one cannot speak of masculinity as though it were a constant, singular, universal essence, but rather one must approach masculinity as an ever-changing fluid assemblage of meanings and behaviors. In that sense, one must speak of *masculinities* in recognition of the different definitions of manhood constructed, articulated, and enacted in any society. By pluralizing the term, it is acknowledged that masculinity means different things to different groups of men at different times.

But at the same time it cannot be forgotten that all masculinities are not created equal. All American men must also contend with a singular vision of masculinity, a particular definition that is held up as the model against which all men measure themselves.[47] They thus come to know what it means to be a man in American culture by setting their definitions in opposition to a set of "others," including racial minorities, sexual minorities, and, above all, women. As the sociologist Erving Goffman wrote:

> [I]n an important sense there is only one complete unblushing male in America: a young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight, and height, and a recent record in sports . . . . Any male who fails to qualify in any of these ways is likely to view himself—during moments at least—as unworthy, incomplete, and inferior . . . .[48]

The integration of men into the curriculum must acknowledge these masculinities and at the same time take note of the way this one particular version, the hegemonic definition of masculinity, was installed as the normative one.

IV. PEDAGOGY AS A GENDERED PRACTICE

How do the centrality of gender and the plurality of gender constructions work themselves out in the everyday interactions of professors with their students? It is imperative that as pedagogues, professors acknowledge that they, too, are gendered actors. They embody the very processes they are describing when they discuss the centrality of gender.

The first thing to note is that all academics did not take the same gendered path to arrive at the same place. For many men, entering the world of higher education (especially the professoriate) is a model of gender conformity, an ac-

46. *See generally id.* (compiling essays on sociological changes men experience during the aging process).

47. *See* R.W. CONNELL, GENDER AND POWER: SOCIETY, THE PERSON AND SEXUAL POLITICS 47-54, 167-71 (1987); R.W. CONNELL, MASCULINITIES 67-71 (1995); KIMMEL, *supra* note 12, at 5-6.

48. ERVING GOFFMAN, STIGMA: NOTES ON THE MANAGEMENT OF SPOILED IDENTITY 128 (1963).

ceptance of one's intelligence, motivation, and calling to education. Male professors are expected to be intelligent, ambitious in their professional career, assertive with ideas, verbally confident, and secure. For example, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory developed in the 1960s and 1970s to measure psychological masculinity and femininity listed the following adjectives as masculine: aggressive, ambitious, analytical, assertive, defends own beliefs, independent, and individualistic.[49] In short, the male academic is a typical American man, conforming to gender expectations about being smart, verbal, and ambitious.

Of course, this stereotype of the male professor is not entirely true. There are often elements of gender nonconformity among men who teach in universities. After all, the ranks of the academy are populated by brilliant nerds, neither particularly aggressive nor sporting, rather bookish and effete—at least in the popular perception of egghead intellectuals.[50] Many academic men cultivate aggressive and ambitious personae precisely to thwart such perceptions.

The point is neither that academic men are "real men" nor that academic men are not "real men." It is simply that academic men can remain gender conformists and have successful careers in universities and professional schools. This is in itself different from the experience of women. Women do not enter the academy by fulfilling gender expectations but by rebelling against them at every turn.[51] To be smart, and visibly so, is already a sign of gender nonconformity. Adjectives that describe femininity in the sex role study include: affectionate, cheerful, childlike, compassionate, gentle, gullible, loyal, shy, tender, warm, and yielding.[52] How many female professors or female lawyers have heard a line like, "If you keep answering questions in class, you'll never get married. Men don't like smart aggressive women."[53] Or, "Don't act like a man . . . . [B]e quiet and mysterious, act ladylike, cross your legs and smile. Don't talk so much."[54] How many male professors or lawyers have heard anything remotely like that?[55]

In graduate school, my female colleague and I noticed a radical difference between the male and female graduate students in our department. The men seemed to get through the program in the usual number of years, fulfilling everyone's expectations that at least some of us were the golden boys of sociology's future. Meanwhile, a large number of the women collected incompletes the way I had collected baseball cards as a young boy. Most seemed to experience

49. *See* Sandra L. Bem, *Probing the Promise of Androgyny*, *in* BEYOND SEX ROLE STEREOTYPES: READINGS TOWARD A PSYCHOLOGY OF ANDROGYNY 47, 52 (Alexandra G. Kaplan & Joan P. Bean eds., 1976).

50. One need only look to comic books to find this cultural symbol: Dilton Doily as the egghead foil to Archie and Jughead, or Clark Kent as the foil to Superman.

51. *See* Jane Roland Martin, *Bound for the Promised Land: The Gendered Character of Higher Education*, 4 DUKE J. GENDER L. & POL'Y 3, 19-20 (1997) (discussing the experiences of women in the professoriate, or other nontraditional roles, as "living contradictions").

52. *See* Bem, *supra* note 49, at 52.

53. ELLEN FEIN & SHERRIE SCHNEIDER, THE RULES: TIME TESTED SECRETS FOR CAPTURING THE HEART OF MR. RIGHT 19 (1995).

54. *Id.*

55. When I pose these questions to my classes, the gender breakdown is astonishingly clean: approximately 90% of the female students say they have heard advice like that, while not one of my male students has ever heard such statements.

writer's block when it came time to write their papers, and many dropped out of the program before completing their dissertations. We wondered why.

It then dawned on my colleague, and she explained it to me. The men "knew" that they were smart and could therefore write the occasional bad paper and still not completely refute the opinion their professors had of them. By contrast, many of the women did not "know" they were smart, and, more importantly, believed that the faculty did not think they were smart either. Thus the first sign that they had not been brilliant, i.e., by writing a bad paper, would provide ample confirmation of this, and they would never be able to live it down or disprove it.

Male and female faculty members and administrators have taken different routes to arrive at the same destination: the university. Once they get there, they also have different experiences. The aftermath of the confirmation hearings for Justice Clarence Thomas's Supreme Court nomination taught America that sexual harassment is a rather commonplace occurrence in the nation's workplaces.[56] When I ask students or audiences at lectures how many of the women have experienced some form of unwanted sexual attention or contact in their workplace, well over half invariably raise their hands. Virtually all admit to having been physically afraid about safety in a university building, a parking lot, a laboratory, or a library at some point in their careers. Many indicate that they tried to change their jobs or their situations because of these fears.[57] What would happen if I were to ask those questions of male professors or male lawyers? How many men have experienced fear for their safety, or for their physical integrity?[58] And we wonder why male academics, faculty, and administrators can boldly move forward with their ideas?

Do not think that students do not also notice the gender of their professors. Because I am male, I can make far more sweeping statements about gender inequality than my female colleagues can. If a female professor (or a person of color) were to make a statement such as "White men are privileged in American society," her students might react with a statement like "Sure. Of course you would say that. You are biased." They would see her descriptive, analytic statement as revealing the inherent biases of gender or race, a case of special pleading. The reaction I would encounter as a white male would be markedly different, as one particular experience well illustrates. When I entered the lecture hall of a female colleague's course on the sociology of gender in which I was to be the day's guest lecturer, one female student exclaimed, "Finally, an objective opinion."[59] Her opinion has been reiterated in different forms by countless students. I consider myself neither more nor less objective than any of my colleagues, but to

56. *See, e.g.*, SUSAN FALUDI, BACKLASH: THE UNDECLARED WAR AGAINST AMERICAN WOMEN xvi (1991); WILLIAM PETROCELLI & BARBARA KATE REPA, SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON THE JOB i (1992).

57. The cumulative data from my classes are as follows: 58% of the female students indicated that they have had some unwanted sexual contact, pressure, or attention in the workplace; 95% have been afraid in a university building, parking lot, library, or laboratory; and 15% said they had either quit or tried to obtain transfers because of their fears.

58. I know of no study that even proposed to ask these questions of men, an indication of how little the issue actually resonates for men.

59. The course was Sociology of Gender, at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, offered in Fall, 1989.

that student I *appeared* to be objective—the disconnected, disembodied, deracialized, degendered voice of objectivity. I am what objectivity has traditionally looked like.

Part of the integration of gender into the curriculum will therefore need to explore the way gender structures the experiences of professors as actors within the context of higher education. How does gender influence the way academics and professionals see things, or how they act as academics and professionals? How does it affect the way in which students see them?

V. GENDERED STUDENTS

Students are gendered as well. What happens in the classroom is indelibly branded with the mark of gender. One might, for example, profitably inquire about the ways in which the interactions of faculty and students reflect gender issues. In what contexts do professors see their students only as students,[60] and in what contexts do professors see their students as gendered?

When educators survey their classes, they often work hard to degender their students. Although many attempt to see their students as equals, they also attempt to see them as different, to see both equality and difference simultaneously. They may see students with different experiences based on different life circumstances, but equal in ability, talent, and motivation, and certainly equal in educational opportunity.[61] However, educators assign papers and grade exams based on universal criteria that assume each student has had equal experiences and has had equal access to the tools of the educational trade. Is such putative equal treatment actually a subtle form of sex discrimination? Can educators continue to grade papers without acknowledging the different experiences students bring to the class? Can papers continue to be graded as I was taught to grade, by turning the cover page over so as to conceal the identity of the student? Does the failure to use such abstract and universalizing criteria render invisible the very experiences of which this article is trying to take account?[62]

My female students do not always have the same educational opportunities as my male students. For example, many of my male students tell me that they do what I do when I am working—take long walks, uninterrupted, where they can lose themselves in their thoughts without giving even the most casual regard for their surroundings. My male students are able to work late, alone, without interruption, in the library or in the chemistry lab, utterly devoted to their work, without having to pay attention to the time, whether they are alone, or whether they are safe.[63]

60. One example of a professor seeing students as not merely students was when a colleague confessed to me that he learns the names of his students rather quickly, but always seems to get the black women's names mixed up. By contrast, he told me, he never forgets the names of the attractive white women.

61. *Cf.* FRANCES A. MAHER & MARY KAY THOMPSON TETREAULT, THE FEMINIST CLASSROOM: AN INSIDE LOOK AT HOW PROFESSORS AND THEIR STUDENTS ARE TRANSFORMING HIGHER EDUCATION FOR A DIVERSE SOCIETY 7-15, 109, 166-70, 180-85, 191-92, 239 (1994) (compiling field research on professors confronting their students with race and gender issues).

62. I confess that I continue to grade papers in this "old fashioned" way, in part because I have not found a better way to do it. But the questions linger nevertheless.

63. *See generally* Cheris Kramarae, *Technology Policy, Gender, and Cyberspace*, 4 DUKE J. GENDER

Female students have a different experience. They do have to think about where they are, whether they are alone, and whether they are safe. For example, they cannot completely bury themselves in their work because they always must keep one eye and one ear alert to possible danger on the library floor, on the lab floor, during the walk in the woods, or even during the walk across campus. They may worry about getting back to the dorm safely, so they may stop working earlier than a male student might. They may not go at all to the library at night, choosing to work there only during the day. Or they may work less effectively, because they often have to be alert to their surroundings, and cannot devote themselves to their studies.[64]

Pretending that male and female students are experiencing the same things, professors apply the same standards to the finished products offered by each. This is, of course, the standard approach to grading, and I believe in it. But this system is also discriminatory because women have not had educational opportunities equal to those that the men have had. No doubt women are penalized by this system in ways that are less apparent than more blatant forms of discrimination to which people have become sensitive.

This article offers no answer to this educational dilemma about grading, but uses it as an example of the ways in which integrating gender into our curriculum will raise other issues about the abstractness and universality of the criteria by which work is evaluated. One might, perhaps, read each paper twice, once "blind," with the identity of the student concealed, and then once again with some acknowledgment of the student's identity. Such a policy might facilitate some recognition of the subtle biases that each pedagogue brings to his or her profession, and also might sensitize the teacher to the ways in which such different experiences might manifest themselves in the work of his or her students.

This example also suggests that women's safety is not only a matter of lifestyle, but it is also a matter of educational opportunity. A perceived lack of safety may detract from the educational experiences of female students, indelibly marking those experiences as gendered. To address inadequately women's safety as an issue of access to equal educational opportunities, universities may be reproducing institutionally the very inequalities that their admission programs, classroom policies, and administrative decisions are designed to remedy or ameliorate. While women's fear on campus has not yet been grounds for a class action sex discrimination suit, which could be premised on a violation of the Equal Protection Clause[65] and Title IX,[66] it might very well be only a matter of time.

L. & POL'Y 149, 152-55 (1997) (discussing aggression against women in computer labs and in cyberspace generally).

64. It may be true that some male students also feel fear, especially on campuses where a racially or ethnically charged atmosphere permeates educational experiences, or where students and non-students from dramatically different class backgrounds tend to collide. I would not suggest that such fears do not need to be addressed. An adequate understanding of gender issues will include not only women's fear of men, but also men's fears of other men.

65. U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1.

66. 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-88 (1994).

VI. CONCLUSION: BEYOND THE UNIVERSITY AS A "FIELD OF DREAMS"

Some of the changes in campus life in the past three decades or so result from dramatic changes in the university and society as a whole that are continuing to ripple through the university and society today. These changes are commonly referred to as "multiculturalism,"[67] which to some critics is seen as an all-out assault on the traditional canon.[68] But multiculturalism is not so much an assault by the philistines as it is a recognition that the university is a different place than it was when genteel upper-class white men were sent to various Ivy League colleges for proper breeding.[69]

To begin with, it is necessary to understand how the university has changed in the past thirty years. First, the students have changed. The demographic composition of students has altered dramatically. The racial diversity of the student body has been increasing steadily.[70] Also, close to one-half of all law and medical school students nationally are women and more than one-half of all graduate students are women.[71]

Just as the makeup of the student body has changed, so, too has the professoriate. An increasing number (although admittedly not enough nor at a fast enough pace) of faculty and administrators are women or members of an ethnic minority.[72] As the composition of students and teachers has changed, it makes sense that material being taught will begin to reflect the new concerns of new students and faculty. It is only in this context that claims for diversity and multiculturalism can be understood. This is not a demand for political correctness—

67. "The multiculturalists believe that the school, college, and university curriculum marginalizes the experiences of people of color and women . . . . They contend that the curriculum should be reformed so that it will more accurately reflect the histories and cultures of ethnic groups and women." James A. Banks, *The Canon Debate, Knowledge Construction, and Multicultural Education*, *in* MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION, TRANSFORMATIVE KNOWLEDGE, AND ACTION: HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES 3, 5 (James A. Banks ed., 1996). For another view on multiculturalism, see Evelyn Hu-Dehart, *P.C. and the Politics of Multiculturalism in Higher Education*, *in* RACE 243-56 (Steven Gregory & Roger Sanjek eds., 1994).

68. *See, e.g.*, ALLAN BLOOM, THE CLOSING OF THE AMERICAN MIND 31-32 (1987) (discussing the relationship between multiculturalism and a break in the balance between the majority and the minority).

69. Many of the Ivy League schools were founded as training schools for the religious elite, and several vigorously resisted coeducation. *See* AGAINST THE TIDE: PRO-FEMINIST MEN IN THE UNITED STATES, 1776-1990; A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY 99-143 (Michael S. Kimmel & Thomas Mosmiller eds. 1992) (containing a series of articles by various authors documenting the struggle for women's educational equality in 19th century America); *see also* BARNARD/COLUMBIA WOMEN'S HANDBOOK COLLECTIVE, THE BARNARD/COLUMBIA WOMEN'S HANDBOOK i-ii (1992) (listing the dates the various Ivy League schools became coeducational) (on file with the *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy*).

70. In 1978, of all college students, black students comprised 9.4%, Hispanic students, 3.7%, Native American students 0.7%, and Asian American students, 2.1%. By 1992, the representation of these groups had increased to 9.6%, 6.6%, 0.8%, and 4.8%. *See* BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, U.S. DEP'T OF COMMERCE, STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF THE UNITED STATES 181 tbl.281 (1996) [hereinafter STATISTICAL ABSTRACT].

71. Of 15,531 M.D.s conferred in 1992-93, for example, 5852 were to women. Of 40,302 law degrees conferred that same year, 17,120 were to women. *See* NAT'L CTR. FOR EDUC. STATS., U.S. DEP'T OF EDUC., DEGREES AND OTHER FORMAL AWARDS CONFERRED (1995). Slightly more than one-half of all masters degrees (290,315 out of 369,585) were awarded to women. *See* STATISTICAL ABSTRACT, *supra* note 70 at 193 tbl.303 (1996).

72. *See supra* note 51.

it is a movement for extension of the educational franchise.

More than that, it is not a matter of making "them," the newly admitted, like "us," those who have been traditionally privileged, that is, middle-class white men. This notion evokes the *Field of Dreams*[73] fallacy. In that film, the character played by Kevin Costner hears a whisper telling him "If you build it, he will come," referring to the construction of a baseball field carved out of his Iowa cornfield.[74] Well-intentioned university and professional school administrators may well have embraced this notion when designing inclusive administrative and admission policies. From the subsequent reaction against affirmative action, it would appear that these administrators did not then anticipate that classroom dynamics, student-faculty relationships, and the structure of the institution itself would have to change in the process. Instead, these educators assumed that when "they," the newly admitted women, students of color, and non-native students arrived, they would simply begin to act like "us," those who had been there before—white, middle-class, native American (but not Native American) men.[75]

What educators now confront is not just the possibility, but the inevitability that the middle-class white men who have traditionally dominated educational and professional institutions will also be changed in the process. It is now the traditional power holders who are confronted with the demands of change. Can they grow and change as well? Part of that change will require making gender visible to both women and men. Part of what has perpetuated traditional power relations has been precisely the invisibility of the mechanism of that power—race, class, and gender—to the middle-class white men who wield it. Changing the university to make it more accessible and welcoming to women and students of color will mean making these processes visible to the middle-class white males as well.

73. FIELD OF DREAMS (Universal City Studios 1992).

74. *See id.*

75. On this question of the specificity of seemingly universal criteria, legal discourse has led the way. From the development of the reasonable woman standard in sex discrimination cases, to passionate and complex feminist legal theorists' arguments about sameness and difference, legal theory has set an enviable standard for other social and political sciences to emulate. For background on the question of equality and difference, see the various articles by feminist legal theorists in FEMINIST LEGAL THEORY: FOUNDATIONS (D. Kelly Weisberg ed., 1993).