PURPOSE OF THE MEN AND MASCULINITIES KNOWLEDGE COMMUNITY

The purpose of the Men and Masculinities Knowledge Community is to provide a venue for discussion, research, and the distribution of information about men’s gender identity development in the context of college campuses. The goals for this KC are:

1. To make gender identity(ies) a salient lens for viewing and working with male staff and students.
2. To develop and distribute resources that will enhance student affairs professionals’ ability to respond to the needs of male students.
3. To inform the profession about new research and practices regarding the development of masculine identities as manifested in people in general, and men in particular (e.g. inclusive of masculinities performed by Trans/Queer, women).
4. To offer technical and creative assistance to colleagues as they develop programs and services for male students.
5. To assist Student Affairs professionals in navigating the tensions between male privilege and men’s personal needs (e.g. challenge and support), including support through the professionals’ personal frustrations in this regard.
6. To create guides to best practices in teaching male students about diversity, gender identity, and other critical issues affecting their personal growth.
7. To promulgate and/or distribute men’s issues and development scholarship for use in graduate preparation programs.

This KC was founded upon a pro-feminist, anti-racist, gay-affirmative agenda with the hope of providing resources to increase multi-cultural competence among male students by providing the NASPA membership with tools to invite and engage men into this process. The underlying assumption is that men in general are interested in social justice, capable of enacting it, and that they need language and a connection to the process.

Hello Men and Masculinities members!
We are getting excited for the upcoming National Conference next month in Boston. Please look for the following Men and Masculinities Knowledge Community Activities! Please also look forward to the second edition of the MMKC newsletter, which should be available in early March, just before the conference. As always, please let us know if you have any suggestions, and we hope to see you all at our events in Boston!

Sunday March 9th:
10:00 a.m. -- 12:00 p.m.
Scholar/Practitioner address discussion with Dr. Frank Harris III & Dr. Jason Laker (Hampton - Sheraton).
3:00 p.m. -- 3:45 p.m.
Men and Masculinities Informational Meeting (Beacon A - Sheraton)

Monday, March 10th:
7:00 p.m. -- 8:30 p.m.
MMKC Business Meeting (Vermont - Marriott)

Monday, March 10th:
9:00 a.m. -- 10:15 a.m.
"Where Do We Go From Here? Identifying and Responding to Group-Specific Concerns Among College Men" (Room: 111 - Convention Center)
3:30 p.m. -- 4:45 p.m.
"Charting a Course for Men’s Development: Strategies for Successfully Engaging College Men." (Room: 206 - Convention Center)

Tuesday, March 11th:
10:30 a.m. -- 11:45 a.m.
“Promoting College Men’s Development: Personal Cost for Professional Women?” (Room: 203 - Convention Center)

Wednesday, March 12th:
8:30 a.m. -- 9:45 a.m.
(Room: 305 - Convention Center)

Also:
Monday, March 10th
12:00 Noon - 1:15 PM
Identity-Related Knowledge Communities Gathering
Commonwealth-Sheraton
REFLECTIONS ON SCHOOL SHOOTINGS
As we all mourn the recent tragedy at Northern Illinois University, I feel the strong urge to reflect on an aspect of the shooting not being covered by mainstream media; the gender of the shooter. Explorations of gender and school shootings have been virtually non-existent over the past decade, save a few articles from feminist and pro-feminist scholars. As we look at some of the more highly covered and prominent shootings over the past few years, the perpetrators seem to have one major identity in common, they are all men.

Media outlets are calling for an examination of our violent society. We are discussing movies, books, television shows, and of course the popular scapegoat of hip-hop (while simultaneously ignoring the classism and racism present in this chastising). What we are not asking however is what it is about hegemonic masculinity that perpetuates a society where virtually all school shootings are committed by men (and overwhelmingly white men). If the shooters were all women would we be asking what is wrong with our girls/women? If the shooters were all Latino or Black, might we be asking what's wrong with these People of Color? Present-day sexism and racism often operate through the invisibility of agent group identity; as if men do not have a gender and white people do not have an ethnicity. It is our responsibility as scholars in Student Affairs to re-frame the issue, and take ownership for educating our campuses and society about the harms of contemporary hegemonic masculinity on an individual and group level.

As we are searching for answers and thinking about prevention, we may be better suited to examine what it is about male gender socialization that teaches men and boys to be violent. We cannot, however, stop there; we must also explore how we foster our boys' emotional selves. How do we nurture healthy coping strategies for boys? How do we role-model healthy relationships for boys that are holistically fulfilling? How do we help validate our boys' feelings, and help them manage emotions? Many universities are devoting much time and resources to important crisis management and notification procedures. These reactive systems are important, but if we are truly interested in prevention we must examine the greatest common denominator, gender and male gender socialization.

Bryan Barone is a Residence Hall Director at the University of Connecticut at Storrs

MEN’S WORK BOSTON: BUILDING CONNECTIONS FOR ENDING MEN’S VIOLENCE
I received a phone call from a colleague early last year who informed me about conversations that were happening among men working to address men’s violence and build healthy fatherhood. With support from the Waitt Institute for Violence Prevention, these men had difficult conversations about what men doing this work needed in order to facilitate the social change we were all struggling towards. It was incredible to hear these men identify some of the same needs that I saw in my work – men doing this work in isolation from each other, the need to check male privilege, and a desire to have these honest and difficult conversations with other men.

This group worked together to organize a roundtable meeting to get to the heart of the question, and approximately thirty men from across the country were invited to participate June 6-7, 2007 in Boston. As the mission statement later read, “Thirty persons of conscience, from around the United States working in organizations committed to ending men’s violence against women, met over three days in Boston, MA to deepen our personal and institutional relationships and to expand our work challenging a culture of maleness that values domination and violence over compassion and connection.”

The conversation at the roundtable itself was amazing and challenging; participants expressed their reservations about creating another “organization,” about men’s – especially white men’s – tendency to take over space and use women and people of color to legitimize their work, and about what it meant to identify as a man in a sexist society. At the end of day one, participants discussed our hopes for the roundtable. Late into the night, we gathered together to determine what we wanted to see as the direction of our second (and last) day together. Through this, we developed what we saw as the next action steps and directions of coordinating and assisting men’s work across the nation. Excitedly, we worked together to identify ways to be accountable in this work, and what we would like to see. At the end of day two, we held in our hands a mission statement and the beginnings of a national something that would begin to link up men working to change what it means to be a “man.” In February 2008, we released a detailed overview of the roundtable.

Since June 2007, members of the Boston group have been slowly and deliberately working to define what to do. One central idea is to bring/repeat this dialogue regionally across the country – and to provide for funding so any man would be able to attend. Although this has yet to take shape, nevertheless, the report is an exciting opportunity for all of us to think critically about how we could define this work anew: rather than competition and dominations, working together in a spirit of cooperation and honesty. Indeed, I think this is what all of us – men and women – hope for the future of men’s work to address sexism.

For the full report, go to www.mensworkboston.org

Ross Wantland is the coordinator of sexual assault education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He can be reached at wantland@uiuc.edu
Not too long ago, I was teaching a course on social diversity, and one of my students, a young man, awkwardly stumbled into the vast territory of political incorrectness when he publicly voiced a common prejudice about sexual orientation being a choice. It was remarkable for two reasons: (a) No one had come close to making even a mildly intolerant comment to that point in the course, and (b) Neither had anyone missed the fact that I openly identify as queer. You might imagine the loaded silence that immediately descended. In the moments before I attempted to model certain helpful dialogue skills (embracing stumbles, practicing inquiry) it occurred to me that we need to seriously reconsider diversity education on our campuses.

Diversity education, for my purposes, refers to the preponderance of workshops, thematic weeks and months, (usually elective) coursework, presentations, retreats, institutes and assorted programs that attempt to address the way various isms or categories of oppression tend to impact one’s daily life. It has an array of intended goals that can usually be classified in three specific areas: (a) to increase one’s knowledge, (b) to develop one’s skills, and (c) to extend one’s self-awareness (Pope and Reynolds, 1997). You can find some example of it on every college campus, and, more to the point of this piece, much of it is not done very well.

In fact, I feel rather certain that I have personally done some jacked up stuff in the name of diversity education, and that is what I wish to talk about here. Over the course of my career and with the best of intentions, I have forced others’ lived experience into my binary theory of oppression, used educational spaces to redress the wounds of institutionalized isms and assumed expert status without actually ever being credentialed as one. Sound familiar?

I’ve based numerous workshops and interventions on a binary conceptual framework of oppression. This means that for any given social group identity, race, class, etc, there is an up group and a down group. There are folks who are privileged and folks who are oppressed (Bell, 2007). This can be, and often is, over-simplified. Rather than see the up/down binary as a useful organizer, I’ve rendered it a defining and conclusive explanation of who has power and who does not – of who is the unmarked, unnamed norm and who is the marked, marginalized, other. Now of course, it isn’t as simple as all that. Feminists, critical studies folks and radical educators have been telling us repeatedly that social locations are the result of an inter-stitching of multiple axes of identity (Jones and McEwen, 2001; Kamberelis, 2000; Haraway, 1991; Hall, 1990; Anzaldua, 1987). How often, though, is such complexity pursued in the two hour residence hall program or student leader training session?

Furthermore, using workshops to heal has been a favorite pastime of mine. I’ve walked into rooms where a discussion of race or gender was imminent prepared to be pissaed off and more than ready to ventilate the frustrations of being repeatedly overlooked, under appreciated and outright harmed. I cultivated indignance, ready to skewer any unfortunate soul who made the mistake of saying out loud what they thought. Was I hurt? Sure, but I don’t know that walking into a workshop ready to take someone’s head off was a pathway to healing. Whatever catharsis I felt in such circumstances was fleeting. It’s not that I don’t think that oppression does damage to us; it’s just that I don’t believe we can do good for ourselves or others when we are firmly ensconced in our suffering. The universe, in its infinite wisdom, has provided family, therapy, ritual, friends and spiritual practice to address the multiple transgressions incurred while living in an oppressive society. I’m advocating that those of us who aspire to be social justice educators make use of a few of those before we step into our next facilitator role.

And while I’m on the topic of social justice educators, I want to quickly address my point about credentialing. There is a reason that counselors get licensed, that many of our professional positions require a graduate degree. There are good reasons why continuing education is required in K-12 and counseling settings, why we organize national conferences and webinars and quarterly institutes within our professional associations. As educators and intervention specialists, we are obligated to continue to grow in our understanding of ourselves, theoretical innovations and evidence-based, practical applications. Issues like environmental racism, ethno-religious oppression, and gender performativity are complex, in their historical construction, their daily implications and their shifting intersections. I’ve been in over my head on more than one occasion in a workshop, and I know I’ve done some damage. I don’t think I’m the only one. In fact, I’m pretty sure that the painful silence in the classroom that day a few months ago is considerable evidence that I’m not.


Rachel Wagner is an Assistant Director of Residence Education at the University of Dayton.
BRIDGING THE GAPS: AN ANALYSIS OF AN INTERVENTION DESIGNED TO ADDRESS GENDER DEVELOPMENT WITHIN OUR STUDENTS

At the University of Kansas a Women’s Leadership Conference has been held annually since 1996. The Women’s Leadership Conference is hosted by the Emily Taylor Women’s Resource Center (ETWRC), a department within the Student Involvement and Leadership Center (SILC) and Student Success. Since 1996, the Women’s Leadership Conference has consistently evolved attaining more participants and delving into deeper gender-based topics. Men were always welcome to attend but were unsure of their place at a conference established primarily for women.

Yet why are we as student affairs professionals so single minded on the development of women? What about the men? In this article we claim that student affairs practitioners must begin to include programming that accounts for both sexes. Given the fact that our culture currently is witness to two gender gaps that college students are affected by, we must design programs that address the role gender plays in student development. These two gender gaps being:

1. the college gender gap (where men are not performing to their highest leadership potential), and

2. the real world gender gap (where women are not gaining the same leadership positions men are).

Given that both of these gender gaps occur, and both are equally as troubling, it is clear that this represents a cause for concern. Women’s Leadership Conferences, such as the one we have been hosting for years, while are a beneficial and successful program, are no longer enough. In this analysis we will explain how we used the two gender gaps, student development theory, and leadership theories to create a leadership development intervention geared towards both men and women.

THE COLLEGE GENDER GAP

Student Affairs professionals nationwide have identified a gap in the achievement and performance between male and female undergraduates. When compared to their female students, males have lower GPAs, lower retention and graduation rates, are less likely to serve as campus leaders, and constitute the majority of conduct violations. We argue that in a society where higher education is highly valued and colleges’ mission statements focus on enriching the lives of all students, that this is an issue that requires attention. Listed below are several facts about the college gender gap.

A recent study showed that 2 million men, ages 24 to 35, could have earned a high school diploma, a two-year degree, a four-year degree, or a graduate degree if they had chosen to stay in school.

According to a Newsweek report, the proportion of men attending college has declined 14% (58% to 44%) from 1970 to today.

Given what we know about this problem and the seriousness of it, and given our mission as Student Affairs professionals, not addressing this issue and designing interventions to these gender gaps is endorsing a culture of apathy on our campuses. Too often, however, we fail to account for gender in student development theory. While many student development theory researchers have used men as subjects, very few have considered men as “gendered beings” (Kellom, 2004). Despite the fact that “male” is just as much as category of “sex,” as “white” is a category of “race,” when our culture stresses gender, we focus on women as subordinate (Katz, 1999). This is a clear problem for, “If the theoretical underpinnings of the profession neglect considerations of men’s gender identity, the profession cannot adequately do one of its stated jobs, which is to facilitate student’s identity development” (ACPA, 1994; Barr & Keating, 1985; ACE, 1949 as quoted in Kellom, 2004). Therefore, it is imperative that today’s student affairs profession challenge student developmental theory to question and recognize the importance of men as gendered beings. In other words, we must engage men, as men (Capraro, 2004). We claim that to better engage men on campus we must first create an environment in which men can gather and safely discuss what it means to be a man, and become more self-aware and confident of who they are as men. They must realize that they are not alone; there are many men who share similar frustrations, visions, and goals. They must create a community; and creating a community of men and women on a co-ed college campus is a key opportunity.

THE REAL WORLD GENDER GAP

Yet, we cannot ignore the facts about the other gender gap, the gender gap in the workforce. Listed below are several facts about the gender gap in the workforce.

Imbalance is found in the workplace, where women make up 74% of the education field and men make up 84% of the engineering and architecture fields.

In the report, Behind the Pay Gap, the AAUW Educational Foundation found that one year after college graduation, women earn only 80% of what their male counterparts earn. Ten years after graduation, women fall further behind, earning only 69% of what men earn. Even after controlling for hours, occupation, parenthood, and other factors known to affect earnings, the research indicates that one-quarter of the pay gap remains unexplained and is likely due to sex discrimination. Over time, the unexplained portion of the pay gap grows.

AN INTERVENTION:

In response to these facts of both gender gaps, we have to recognize what happens to graduates once they arrive in the workforce. If we are able to form a community of men and women on campus, they may be more inclined to form a community in the “real world.” Furthermore, if we want a culture of higher education to operate on the premise of enriching and supporting all of our students, then these facts are hard (continued on next page) (continued from previous page) evidence that men are in need of help and support that they are not obtaining. We must determine what can and should be done to begin to address this problem.

With that in mind, we set out to address both of the gender gaps by creating an intervention that accounted for
the role gender plays in student development. Battle of the Sexes: KU Leadership Academy is a one-day intensive leadership institute addressing two gender gaps.

The Leadership Academy curriculum guides participants though a demanding, intentional, challenging, yet rewarding experience, attempting to develop a community of leaders who will work together to reverse the trend of both gender gaps and who will live up to their highest leadership potential. Through both large group and small group breakout sessions participants are exposed to a number of gender and leadership theories. Participants are encouraged to realize the role gender plays in our everyday lives, and realize how improper sex roles are taught to us, by our culture (i.e.: media), starting at a young age. The participants are asked to battle those stereotypes and consider living their lives as ladies and gentlemen who will not succumb to “manly” or “womanly” stereotypes. (It is important to note that the “battle” in the title does not actually refer to a “battle” between the genders – rather we wish to imply a “battle” that both genders need to fight together to diminish the present gender gap on college campuses and in the work force).

This talk of gender transitions into leadership, helping participants realize the role improper gender stereotypes play in hindering leadership. Loden’s Masculine Leadership Model and Feminine Leadership Model are introduced to participants which encourages students to live their lives on the axis between the two models (Loden, 1985). It is our wish to help participants realize that effective leaders live a healthy balance of masculine and feminizing leadership styles.

On college campuses, culture teaches us that getting involved in organizations can be seen by men as “domesticated” or “feminine,” and therefore, men stray away from co-curricular activities, which in return, severely hinders their college experience. After college, in the real world, culture, once again, creates an environment that is not taking advantage of the tremendous leadership potential women offer.

The curriculum facilitates participants to realize that as autonomous inspired thinkers who are at college to become more complex both cognitively and interpersonally in preparation for the “real world” they must work together to hold everyone accountable to high standards. The Battle of the Sexes curriculum introduces the universities mission statement as a means to challenge participants to realize the purpose of having a mission and the role our institution mission statement should have in our lives. When dissected and analyzed, there is an obvious call to leadership within our institution’s mission statement (and we are confident in assuming that a call to leadership can be found in the mission statements of all institutions of higher education). The curriculum encourages participants to think about the school’s mission statement, which asks everyone to be leaders, regardless of what traditional sex roles may teach us. It is the responsibility of every student, male and female, to ensure that all students are not only leading, but leading with integrity both while at college and after college.

At the end of the day, participants are asked to develop two commitments. They are asked to create an individual commitment professing how they, as an individual, will act to reverse the gender gaps. Following their individual commitment, each small group creates a group commitment – an oath as to how the entire group will hold each individual accountable for their own commitments. For example, each small group would meet for lunch once a month and discuss their efforts. This activity allows participants to reflect on what they can do to establish their own identity while also establishing a purpose; consistent themes in student development theory.

In looking back at Battle of the Sexes: KU Leadership Academy, we consider the first time initiative to be a success. There were 100 participants (60 women and 40 men). We are impressed that such a large number of student’s were dedicated to spending a day discussing the topic at hand. The most common response from students was that they no longer wanted to discuss the stereotypes or facts; they wanted to discuss plans for action. They showed a high level of commitment to diminishing the gender gap between men and women on college campuses.

BRIDGING THE GAP:

Looking at the response of participants, and witnessing the level of dialogue throughout the day, gives us thorough evidence that the first step to more effectively engage our college men, and college women, lies in creating a community for them. We must create a safe environment in which men and women can gather to talk about their feelings and about being a man and being a women. We must accept the fact that student development is a gendered phenomenon, and we must account for that in all our interventions in order to bridge these two gaps.

Although, time will only tell how much this weekend impacted the lives of these men and women, these students are more prepared to make the change happen, not because of anything that was taught to them, but because they realized themselves, through open dialogue, that their host institution needs more leaders, of both sexes, who are able to do lead not as masculine or feminine leaders, but as undifferentiated leaders, a term coined by Sandra Bem for leaders who are show low characteristics of both masculinity and femininity (Bem Sex Role Inventory, 2007). Most importantly, these participants understand the need to make change, and have the potential and confidence to make it happen. Though there are components of the program that we would change in the future, we look forward to implementing the program for a second time.


Tyler Blair and Stefani Gerson are both currently in the Higher Education Administration master's program at the University of Kansas.
A FEW MINUTES WITH INCOMING MMKC CHAIR BRIAN D. REED

Brian D. Reed is a graduate of Berea College with a bachelors of Arts in Elemental Education. He then went on to receive a Master of Arts from Appalachian State University in Higher Education. Brian is currently working on his Ph.D. in Higher Education at the University of Virginia. His professional interests include the intersections of class, race, and masculinity, interpersonal violence and masculinity, class and college access, liberal-arts education, and small independent colleges. When Brian is not busy burying his face in text books and writing papers, his personal interests include, but are not limited to snowshoeing, hiking and reading. One of his favorite pass times is listening to the radio. Yep! You guessed correctly- NPR! Two of Brian’s favorites shows are “Wait, Wait, Don’t Tell Me,” with Peter Sagal and and “This American Life,” with Ira Glass.

Brian and his wife recently moved to Charlottesville, Virginia after a few years in New Hampshire, Nashville, and Dallas. Brian’s musical taste include: Grateful Dead, Buck Owens, Iron and Wine, Dwight Yoakam, Wilco, Sun Volt, Phish, Pixies, The Smiths, Gillian Welch, Old Crow Medicine Show, Beth Wood, Goose Creek Symphony, and Roscoe Holcomb. Some of Ryan’s favorite movies include: Rushmore, Royal Tennesbaums, Life Aquatic, A River Runs Through It, Legends of the Fall, The Big Lebowski, Evil Dead II, and Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid. Some of his favorite TV shows are Arrested Development (R.I.P), Survivor, This Old House, Campus Ladies, Strangers With Candy, and It's Always Sunny In Philadelphia. Phew! And he’s pursuing a Ph.D. with all this TV watching?

Brian hopes that during his tenure as Chair of the Men and Masculinities Knowledge Community that the Community will continue to expand its scholarly and practical efforts in meeting the needs of diverse masculinities and forge greater relationships with other identity related Knowledge Communities.

WE SUBJECT THE NEW CHAIR TO THE MMKC “PROUST” QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What do you regard as the lowest depth of misery?
Hopelessness and the feeling of despair that comes with the realization that despite your best efforts forces have conspired against you.

2. Where would you like to live?
A farmhouse in Vermont.

3. What is your idea of earthly happiness?
Picking blueberries or fly-fishing. There is something Zen about these things.

4. What is your most marked characteristic?
My southern accent/dialect. When I entered college I tried my best to hide it; thought it made me sound dumb, but thanks to Wendell Berry and others I learned to embrace it.

5. What do you most value in your friends?
Genuineness

6. The quality you most admire in a man?
Vulnerability

7. The quality you most admire in a woman?
Strength

8. What is your favorite virtue?
Humility

9. What is your favorite occupation?
If I weren't in higher education I would want to be a dairy farmer.

10. Is the glass half full or half empty?
Unfortunately, half empty.

11. Who are your favorite poets?
Wendell Berry, Walt Whitman, and though not technically a poet, Townes Van Zandt

12. What natural gift would you most like to possess?
I would like to be able to sing with some level of proficiency.

13. How would you like to die?
In some sort of selfless act, but then have a Viking funeral for dramatic flair.
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**In the News Stands & on the web**

**UNESCO RESEARCHES MEN AND MASCULINITY IN THE CARIBBEAN**
- [http://www.sknvibes.com/News/NewsDetails.cfm/4605](http://www.sknvibes.com/News/NewsDetails.cfm/4605)

**VOICES OF BLACK HISTORY MONTH**

**WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A MAN**

**MIND YOUR MANNERS**
- [http://www.afterthoughts.blogspot.com/2008/02/mind-your-manners.html](http://www.afterthoughts.blogspot.com/2008/02/mind-your-manners.html)

**DREAMS OF BOXING AND MASCULINITY**
- [http://www.afterthoughts.blogspot.com/2008/02/mind-your-manners.html](http://www.afterthoughts.blogspot.com/2008/02/mind-your-manners.html)

**MASCULINITY ON THE WEB**
- [http://jcarlozo.wordpress.com/2008/02/22/masculinity-on-the-web/](http://jcarlozo.wordpress.com/2008/02/22/masculinity-on-the-web/)

**BOYS TO MEN**

**JOHN MCCAIN AND THE CULT OF MASCULINITY**
- [http://www.blogheroes.com/feed/johnmccainandthecultofmas](http://www.blogheroes.com/feed/johnmccainandthecultofmas)