

Masculinity Crises and the Education of Boys

ROB GILBERT AND PAM GILBERT, *James Cook University*

ABSTRACT *This paper considers connections between debates about the education of boys and popular concerns about the nature of masculinity. It discusses popular understandings of masculinity as a context for and an influence on proposals for the education of boys, finding them to be inadequate in their reliance on essentialist concepts. To open up opportunities for boys, schools need to promote diverse ways of being male. Strategies for such a project are considered, which lead to a need to reject approaches which are based on ideas of the masculine self. The question then addressed is what, if any concepts of masculinity or masculinities can usefully contribute to decisions about boys' education.*

A fascinating aspect of the boys and education issue is its connection with debates about masculinity, and in particular with proposals for the reform of masculinity among contemporary men. These proposals range from a rejection of negative aspects of dominant masculinity to a revival of what some believe is a lost tradition of masculine virtues.

That this connection should exist is not surprising, since educational issues and priorities are commonly part of broader social agenda. Just as some strands of the men's movement are motivated to combat violent and anti-social tendencies of certain forms of masculinity, similar motives account for educational attempts to address bullying and harassment among boys and to make them more committed to schooling and more willing to treat others respectfully. Equally, concerns for the social pressures on men and the threats to their status and sense of worth are paralleled by fears that boys lack direction and appropriate role models for their development. In both cases there is a connection between broad social issues and key educational debates.

This paper considers aspects of the debate about masculinity as a context for and an influence on decisions about the education of boys. It shows how the discussion of masculinity has been applied to recommendations about the education of boys, and how some of these prescriptions are misguided. In particular, the paper rejects essentialist calls for the reinstatement of some lost centre in the development of men and boys. It then considers the question of what educational approaches might be appropriate, and what implications the argument has for the concept of masculinity and its significance in the boys' education debate.

Despair and revival: Masculinity and men's welfare

The western world has seen a period of widespread concern for the social position of men, where old certainties have been destabilised by a range of economic and social changes which are said to have undermined their status. Some commentators attribute these problems to the economic changes of post-industrialism. Others emphasise the challenge to men's social position in private and public spheres, as gender relations have changed along with the place of women in society. Yet others believe that the diversity of postmodern culture has robbed men of clear models of masculinity to which they can aspire.

The result has been a spate of popular expressions of concern for men's welfare. Typical of these is Biddulph's best seller *Manhood* (1994, pp. 3-4), where men are said to be 'in a mess', with 'very little sense of their true selves', lonely, compulsively competitive and emotionally timid. 'The reality for most men in the Nineties is that *life is just not working*' (p. 7, emphasis in original).

The diagnoses of these problems tend to take the following form. First, they argue that men have lost a sense of identity because they do not bond with each other. This is ironic in an Australian culture which has been criticised for its sexually exclusive cultural traditions of mateship, segregated clubs and bars, dominant male sports, and which still has one of the most sexually segregated workforces of the world's advanced economies. Second, they define masculinity over and against femininity, and argue that men need to pull away from women in order to become men, a scenario reminiscent of the Garden of Eden myth, as if women will corrupt the natural growth of virtuous manhood. The prescriptions here are often for male initiation rites and greater intimacy among men.

These views present a picture of men as an homogeneous group, whose essence is distinctive to them and at risk of being lost if it is not kept pure and separate. Such arguments have parallels in education in the views that boys have lost their way, schools have been feminised, and that boys need special treatment so that they will feel better about themselves.

However, this despair for men's fate has more recently been replaced by a confidence that a solution is at hand, and that it lies in a return to the sources of masculinity. This, we are told, is where we will find a sense of identity and a sense of direction for men and boys.

To understand what boys are 'made of', we must consider what shapes them: the powerful forces of biology, the uniquely masculine psychological tasks, and the moist, dark, mysterious call of the masculine soul (Elium & Elium 1992, p. 17).

The references to biology here are a powerful form of the essentialist belief in the uniqueness of masculinity, as is the image of its ineffable, even mystical nature, which places it beyond analysis or change. A related view sees the essence of masculinity as under threat from fragmentation and division.

In being divided against themselves, men face many personal and collective difficulties. Most important of all, men get cut off from direct contact with the 'essential self' and this then means that great problems arise which inhibit the kind of psychological development leading to maturity (Formaini 1990, p. 38).

If men are cut off from some inner essence and 'divided against themselves', the obvious need is for a reuniting of men with their inner essence, a return to some pre-existing centre, a recreation of some singular whole.

Elsewhere, Formaini (p. 18) says that boys are damaged very early on in life by society's requirement for them 'to work and be profitable and to uphold the male systems which have been in place for what must be thousands of years', with the result that 'half of its members are damaged to the extent where they are split from their essential selves'. Biddulph finds men's spirit in an inheritance from Cro-Magnon man, who 'lives

somewhere deep inside our hearts and minds and calls to us'. Cro-Magnon man represents 'what is best in the spirit of manhood':

Indomitable and invincible and wild, ready to protect and defend and compete, his instinct and perceptions necessary to ensure the survival of the human race, this primitive man at the center of our psyches must be allowed room to live and breathe and express himself. If this rudimentary part of us dies, male identity dies (Biddulph 1994, p. 186).

Again there is the image of a lost centre, a repressed cultural memory which must be freed if men are to be secure in a male identity. Elsewhere, Biddulph finds a different provenance for an ideal masculinity and a model for raising boys, this time in the cultural practices of historically more recent men.

In nature, all development follows a laid-down sequence. In a man's developing, the sequence has been forgotten and the process largely left to chance. If we look at older cultures we see immense and focused efforts going into the raising of boys—rituals, teachings and processes which have only feeble equivalents in our culture...The Sioux hunter, the Zulu warrior, the Aboriginal elder and the Mediaeval craftsman lived glorious lives and cared for and protected their people and their world. Why should modern man be any less a man than his ancestors? (Biddulph 1994, p. 12).

This passage shows the confusion of the essentialist literature. If the sequence is naturally laid down, as Biddulph claims, how can it be forgotten? To equate such a diversity of cultures is to create a selective, narrow and romantic caricature of history and culture. The admiration for the security men found in the rituals of the past is a common feature of such views. However, masculinity rites in traditional male-dominated societies imposed conformity and control, and involved misogynist myths, the exclusion of women, deference to hierarchical authority, and fear, violence and pain (Miles 1991, Sabo & Panepinto 1990). How such rituals would improve men's lot in contemporary society is not clear, but such questions are not raised in this romantic view of the past.

These theories, when applied to the situation of boys, construct a picture of boys riven by conflict, plagued by images from ancient cultures, and corrupted from a natural development by modern civilisation. The prescription which follows is that boys need to be encouraged to re-establish their connection with this lost masculine identity. However, on closer inspection, this psychic essentialist analysis is not helpful, because it is based on a series of false premises.

First, it starts with the assumption that conflicting pressures are unnatural, and that a singular harmony is necessary. Yet both boys and girls, and adults as well, are constantly faced with complex choices, conflicting loyalties, and perplexing dilemmas about preferred futures and the kinds of people they want to be. To suggest that this is some historical aberration which we can abolish is to create a false hope. What we must do is understand that complexity, diversity, change and conflict are an inevitable part of life, and that we need a flexible, open and responsive approach to it. This is quite the reverse of psychic essentialism, with its promotion of a unified and unchanging harmony.

Second, psychic essentialism suggests that there is only one true way for men, and that to depart from it is to reject the only model of humanity to which men can aspire. To

reduce masculinity to a singular unvarying essence is to deny men the capacity to recreate themselves in new, diverse and imaginative ways. Rather than lament a split in men's psyche, as if the solution was some universal unity, we need to promote different ways of being men.

Third, such views assume that men and boys form a homogeneous group. The implication of the essentialist argument is that all men, from the modern industrial worker to the Brazilian hunter-gatherer to their prehistoric ancestors, face similar problems, and that there is a common solution in a universal masculinity. Whatever the merits of arguments about the nature of masculinity in small scale pre-industrial societies, it is surely naive to suggest that this should be a model for boys' upbringing in the complexity of the modern (or postmodern) world. If the possibilities for men are to be recognised, we need to value the diversity of human cultures which sustains these possibilities, rather than neglect them for some historical fiction.

Finally, such arguments focus on men as oppositional to women, arguing for the need for men and boys to pull away from women; the Garden of Eden myth. Such a view rests on and accentuates a categorical distinction based on gender which ignores the diversity of men and women and the many facets of their experiences which are not classifiable in this way. The long history of sex difference research has contributed to this way of thinking, but the outcomes of this research actually show that the overwhelming feature of men and women is their similarity in a common humanity rather than their group difference (Lott 1997).

The idea that all social and cultural situations require a common notion of masculinity is simplistic. To promote a single model of manhood based on some fictional stereotype creates more problems than it solves. We need a more open and flexible notion of being a boy/man which is attuned to the change and complexity of contemporary society.

Masculinity and schooling

Rejecting essentialist notions of masculinity is important in clarifying aspects of the boys and education debate, but the question remains of whether there is a concept of masculinity relevant to these issues, and, if relevant, how the concept of masculinity might contribute to their solution.

In her valuable program for working with boys, Forsey (1994) identifies two sets of concerns about the behaviour and attitudes of boys in schools, which are an implicit characterisation of aspects of masculinity. The first set of concerns is behaviour which results from the power imperative, including bullying, sexual harassment, aggressive and destructive behaviour, domination of space and teachers' time, fighting, competition and attitudes to females. The second set comprises behaviour which results from the denial of self, and includes poor social skills, fear of exhibiting weakness, intellectual and social problems and sexual responsibility.

These concerns mirror typical binary conceptions of femininity/masculinity in which the key attributes of gender are identified by their oppositional character based on the relation of dominant/other. In this model, the masculine tradition/discourse/identity is typically described as being rational, cold, unsympathetic, competitive, aggressive and individualistic, in contrast to femininity which is variously described as emotional, warm, caring, cooperative, submissive and communal (Smith 1996). Such dichotomous models have been useful in identifying a structure within which certain dominant forms of gender identity have been constructed and understood, but their value has always been limited in

the extent to which they describe actual forms of masculine identity or practice. For instance, there is nothing in principle that would prevent someone from being rationally cooperative, or emotional and individualistic, or cold but submissive. In addition, there are situations and relationships in which it might be appropriate to be individualistic and others where a communal practice would be preferred. In these post-structuralist times which are more attuned to difference and diversity, simple dichotomous models are less appealing.

In terms of directions for working with boys, the result of this dichotomous approach is to characterise masculinity as essentially negative, and its strategic implication is to make boys more feminine in ways understood in the oppositional terms of the model. In principle, this has the danger of proposing just another stereotype to which boys would be encouraged to conform. In practice, 'masculinity as pathology' gives a negative tone to work with boys to which they are unlikely to respond.

An alternative strategy is to focus on the positive elements of the masculine ideal, for there is a strong tradition of human virtues associated with traditional masculinity. In fact, we can construe the problems of masculinity as arising from occasions in which these traditional virtues are misinterpreted in practice.

For instance, strength can be applied in inappropriate ways if it is understood only in terms of physical aggression, of proving one's strength by pitting it against another's in some contest. Independence, which can be interpreted as resisting conformity because of one's commitment to principle, can be misinterpreted as forming one's own view in neglect of any understanding of or care for others. Courage can be seen as endorsing confrontation or risk taking. Endurance can mean ignoring pain in self and therefore others; leadership can be equated with domination; and self-control can encourage a lack of connectedness with others, an inability and unwillingness to empathise.

Rather than masculinity as pathology, it is possible to propose a masculinity which is potentially virtuous, but corrupted in some of its dominant versions. In similar vein, Jordan (1995, p. 81) argues that we need to define masculinity in such a way that violence and aggression are seen as weak and cowardly. We need to propose 'the idea that true masculinity lies in self-control and moral courage, and using as the subordinate term lack of volition in behaviour – being swayed by impulse and rage'.

Jordan argues that selfishness and impulsive aggression can be countered by promoting:

the ideals of fatherhood; the sort of commitment to the community that impels men to fight bushfires, search for lost children, join in rescue operations; the public spirit that leads them to devote themselves to union activity, conservation campaigns, righting what they see as legal injustices. Some of these definitions are built around physical courage and strength, while others that are not nevertheless involve some sense of the battle between good and evil that underlies the 'warrior' definition of masculinity and the little boys' superhero play. With all of them it is possible to use male greed, selfishness, and lack of public spirit, rather than female passivity, as the subordinate term (Jordan 1995, p. 81).

The idea of 'true masculinity' has connotations of a masculine essence to which only boys could aspire, and needs to be rejected. More importantly the social action so much admired is, of course (with the obvious exception of fatherhood), also done by women, and this needs to be emphasised. However, the central point is a valuable one, that certain

values of dominant masculinity, like strength, courage, public leadership and independence, can be interpreted in action in different ways. Much of the anti-social behaviour of boys and men is rationalised by a very narrow, self-interested and ultimately oppressive interpretation of these values. If, for instance, it is seen as strong to react to insult or offence with impulsive aggression, rather than to take control and deal with the situation in ways which do not simply escalate violence, then the masculine value of strength will be anti-social. For this reason, focusing on the positive image of masculinity can be a useful strategy.

However, if these values are admirable, then they are desirable for everyone, male and female alike. Their particular manifestations will vary across myriad sites and relationships, and will not be associated exclusively with one or other sex, gender or sexual preference. In this respect they supersede any concept of masculinity, and the relevance of the concept is again put in question.

What's in it for boys?

The strategic question is still significant. How do we address the negative and constraining effects of certain dominant forms of masculinity in such a way that boys will be attracted by alternatives? How can we discuss issues of masculinity, including the antisocial elements of some of its variants, without turning boys off or provoking a defensive reaction?

To begin, we need to show boys how their lives are constrained by some aspects of dominant masculinity. This will involve them in critically deconstructing the practices of dominant masculinity so that options can be opened up for boys. They can be shown how successful and rewarding lives can be found in a wide range of careers and leisure pursuits which run against the dominant image, and how pressure to conform can shut out possibilities for them. Some of them may sense a lack in their relationships with others and want more sharing and emotional intimacy. Some may want to participate in a wider range of activities without being labelled a 'wuss'. They may simply want a more peaceful atmosphere at home or school.

Part of this is the need to show boys that dominant masculinity can damage their relationships with others, including girls, women, teachers and other boys. Some boys may be experiencing personal crises such as domestic violence against themselves or mothers and sisters. They may have their own experiences of oppression under masculine power, such as the threat of violence, or being put down or bullied. They may recognise the harm that is done to others through sex-based harassment and bullying, or the exclusion from social activities of boys who are different. Again, there are aspects of boys' experience which they will readily recognise as constraining and in need of change.

Along with this, we need to acknowledge the positives in the masculine tradition, as Jordan advocates. For in criticising dominant masculinity, we need to be able to replace it with a sense of being male to which boys can aspire. Ridding the dominant image of its worst excesses is important, but it needs to be replaced by some alternative vision and sense of direction. This cannot be another exclusive model of masculinity, since this would be to endorse the categorical binaries which have been shown to be inadequate. The notion suggested above of universal human virtues manifested in diverse ways and contexts offers promise here. This will involve emphasising diverse ways of being human rather than singular ways of being masculine. Boys may be attracted to this inquiry by

appeals to such principles as 'be what you want to be', or that 'being different is being special', as long as these are couched in terms of the human virtues mentioned above.

Is the idea of masculinity obsolete?

Dealing with masculinity in this way will involve a different slant on the nature of masculinity. In the past, masculinity has been cast within two major paradigms: one based in biology and the process of maturation, the other in culture and the process of socialisation. Both have led to the essentialism described above, where nature or nurture are thought to have constructed relatively universal and stable (if repressed or corrupted) forms of masculinity.

Rather than maturation or socialisation, the paradigm which would flow from the present argument is one of negotiation. Becoming a man is a matter of constructing oneself in and being constructed by the available ways of being male in a particular society. It is a matter of negotiating the various discourses of femininity and masculinity available in our culture, those powerful sets of meanings and practices which we must draw on to participate in our culture and to establish who we are. Understanding boys is primarily about understanding how these discourses operate, and recognising a number of key points which have previously been omitted or not sufficiently emphasised in discussions of masculinity.

First, being masculine is an accomplishment which boys and men must constantly achieve in every situation they enter, a project by which they construct their life histories in particular social and institutional contexts (Brittan 1989). Butler (1990, p. 140) refers to gender as a performance, 'a re-enactment and a re-experiencing of a set of meanings already socially established'. It is 'the repeated stylisation of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being' (Butler 1990, p. 33).

Seeing masculinity as a performance is an important check on the tendency to attribute to men some underlying internal unity which is the source and cause of masculine behaviour. This is strategically important, because a search for some internal origin and cause can distract us from the real focus—what boys and men actually do. Masculinity as a performance, rather than some internal essence, also means that we cannot try to degender boys and men as if we could somehow rid them of hegemonic masculinity and discover some universal person underneath. Connell (1995) suggests a kind of 'gender multiculturalism' which would open up the possibilities of gender to all people. Seeing masculinity as performance demonstrates that this is not simply a matter of changing attitudes. It also requires a focus on material inequalities and power relations, and how these operate in everyday practices.

Second, we need to avoid exaggerating the significance of sex/gender as an aspect of human experience, as this will blind us to the importance of 'race', class, ethnicity and other dimensions of our humanness. It would also blind us to the simple experience of being human which men and women hold in common, with all that that implies about identifying and achieving a desirable way of life for all people. However, being human always involves being human in a particular way, and gender is a necessary part of that.

These intersections highlight a third aspect of masculinity—its relational character. Conventional masculinity is constructed along with, but in contrast to femininity, so neither can be studied independently of the other. As we have seen, the discourse of hegemonic masculinity has most often been analysed as a series of dichotomous relations

between opposing ways of being, with the two sets of dichotomous terms distinguishing stereotypical masculinity from stereotypical femininity. These implicit assumptions guide our view of what is natural, and 'construct men's thought and action in ways which often feel normative and compelling, rather than being simply one of a potential myriad of choices' (Smith 1992, p. 30). The obsessive exaggeration of these distinctions is one cause of the extremes of violent, misogynist and generally anti-social practices of some men.

This acknowledgment of the complexity and conflict that characterises the experience of masculinity is the fourth key point. There is no single consensual model for children to internalise, but rather a competitive and conflicting variety of styles of masculinity which are waxing and waning and combining and dividing as ways of being male change over time and place (Connell 1995). Becoming masculine or feminine is not a continuous process of developing an ever clearer and more refined internalised model which then expresses itself through or is applied to behaviour. Rather masculinity is constructed, negotiated and struggled over in the practices of everyday life. This accounts for the difficulty boys have in finding a place within the competing ways of being male, despite the fact that being male gives boys access to certain privileges. As Segal explains, 'men, although the favoured sex, with higher levels of self-confidence and self-esteem, may nevertheless experience a lack of certainty over their "masculinity", rather than a lack of satisfaction with it' (Segal 1990, p. 289).

Recognising this complexity brings us to the fifth point, the idea of multiple masculinities. Masculinity is not a unified discourse, though the hegemonic form of masculinity, like most dominant discourses, will usually be represented as coherent, rational and obvious. But in fact, masculinity is diverse, dynamic and changing, and we need to think of multiple masculinities rather than some singular discourse. When we talk about 'multiple masculinities' rather than 'masculinity' we do not mean that boys and men simply inhabit one of these and remain untouched by the others. Multiple masculinities are, rather, multiple possibilities opened up in our culture which expand rather than constrain the opportunities for men to live rewarding lives for themselves and others. Most boys and men will take up a variety of these possibilities at different times and in different contexts, but this diversity will always be constructed within the discursive frames of the culture, and some of these will be more powerful, pervasive and insistent in the pressures they create. These regulatory discursive frames produce and are reproduced in the symbols, stories and practices which embody our understanding of ourselves and others, in the institutions through which our society operates, and in the practices of the people we meet in our everyday lives.

The processes of the social construction of masculinity are replicated to varying degrees in every aspect of boys' lives—in school, the family, sport, play and a host of other daily activities. No one of these practices is all-powerful in itself. Boys will respond to them in active, selective and even oppositional ways, so the effect of any discourse on the construction of masculinity is contingent, tentative and unpredictable. However, if these practices are structured by a dominant view of what it is to be masculine, their combined effect will narrow the possibilities for boys rather than expand them. To construct and maintain a sense of who they are, boys must draw on the available terms, categories and ways of thinking, acting and interacting which these various contexts provide, including the specific forms of masculinity associated with them. The fact that these available forms of masculinity are complex, diverse and contradictory makes this a difficult task, but this very difficulty may make the strongest and most conspicuous form even more attractive. It is for this reason that one of the key problems boys face in becoming male is that of

dealing with the dominant image of what it means to be 'a man' - the discourse of hegemonic masculinity.

Some commentators have questioned whether there is a single dominant form of masculinity which warrants the label hegemonic, preferring to describe the stereotyped popular image as a culturally exalted rather than a dominant form (Walker 1988). In our view, it is reasonable to speak of a pervasive and powerful form of masculinity which is exalted *and* practised across discourses and social contexts, whose ideals and expectations regulate thought and action, and which therefore can be called hegemonic. This does not, of course, imply that this form is always dominant, that it is uncontested or that it is uniform in nature.

In particular, it does not imply that dominant masculinity is a mental or spiritual state. The tendency to think of masculinity in this way has been a major hindrance to conceptual clarity and to policy and practice in dealing with boys. On these grounds, Hearn has cast doubt on whether the concept of masculinity has any analytical value at all, arguing that it would be better to 'conceptualise the material discursive practices of and about men in terms of the extent to which and the ways in which they are 'masculinised' rather than to speak of some independent substance of masculinity itself' (Hearn 1996, p. 214).

The idea that masculinity is a mental state or an element of an essential self has misdirected attention from men's and boys' relationships and actions in favour of an inward looking preoccupation with self concept and self esteem. 'Instead of wondering whether they should change their behaviour, men "wrestle with the meaning of masculinity"' (McMahon 1993, p. 691).

A further implication of this view is drawn by MacInnes:

To focus on reforming masculinity (whether as calls for anti-sexism, gender vertigo, refusing to be a man, or on the contrary, finding the 'deep masculine') or analysing masculinities seems to me to be a fruitless endeavour. Men simply do not possess such a thing as 'masculinity' as an aspect of their self produced by conscious socialisation processes of which people could become fully aware and that they might therefore reform under the guidance of a politics of identity...Rather than writing manifestos for masculine or feminine selves, which hold out the illusory prospect of finding a path to wholeness, integration and freedom from anxiety, limit or disappointment, we should pay more attention to equalising the material contexts of the development of males and females (MacInnes 1998, p. 149).

This is a salutary warning to those in education who would change boys' inner selves, for the risk is that we will simply be replacing one stereotype with another. We should resist the tendency to bureaucratic regulation in the practices of schooling, for diversity and openness are not achieved this way.

The problems of masculinity are best understood as the performance of a set of gender relations in a context where a narrow set of storylines and repertoires of action is culturally dominant and socially powerful. This performance is always complex and precarious, as it combines with other dimensions of social experience and division, like 'race' and class. The competitive and aggressive elements of masculinity are core elements of its dominant form, for difference is seen as a threat, and attempts to moderate these elements become attacks on its integrity. In this way, the exaltation of dominant masculinity heightens the

fear of failure and hostile rejection of alternatives, increasing misogynistic, homophobic and self-destructive behaviours.

As a result, we need to see the construction of masculinity as a process where boys are constantly presenting themselves to the world through whatever repertoire of behaviours, styles and forms of expression are most readily available to them and most appropriate to their context. The challenge for schools is to make available a variety of educationally and socially constructive positions and positive experiences, and to endorse these as acceptable ways of being male. To be distracted by calls for a revival of a singular, essentialist masculinity is to fail in this important task.

REFERENCES

- Biddulph, S. (1994) *Manhood: A book about setting men free*. Sydney: Finch Publishing.
- Brittan, A. (1989) *Masculinity and power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Butler, J. (1990) *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Connell, R. (1995) *Masculinities*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Elium, D. & Elium, J. (1992) *Raising a son: Parenting and the making of a healthy man*. Stroud, UK: Hawthorn Press.
- Formaini (1990) *Men: The darker continent*. London: Mandarin.
- Forsey, C. (1994) *Hands off! The anti-violence guide to developing positive relationships*. West Footscray, Vic.: West Education Centre.
- Gilbert, R. & Gilbert, P. (1998) *Masculinity goes to school*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Hearn, J. (1996) 'Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept of masculinity/masculinities', in M. Mac an Ghaill (ed.) *Understanding masculinities: Social relations and cultural arenas*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Jordan, E. (1995) 'Fighting boys and fantasy play: The construction of masculinity in the early years of school', *Gender and education*, 7, 1, pp. 69-85.
- Lott, B. (1997) 'Cataloging gender differences: Science or politics?' in M. Walsh (ed.) *Women, men and gender: Ongoing debates*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- MacInnes, J. (1998) *The end of masculinity: The confusion of sexual genesis and sexual difference in modern society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- McMahon, A. (1993) 'Male readings of feminist theory: The psychologisation of sexual politics in the masculinity literature', *Theory and society*, 22, 5, pp. 675-96.
- Miles, R. (1991) *The rites of man: Love, sex and death in the making of the male*. London: Paladin.
- Sabo, D. & Panepinto, J. (1990) 'Football ritual and the social reproduction of masculinity', in M. Messner, & D. Sabo (eds) *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*. Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics Books.
- Segal, L. (1990) *Slow motion: Changing masculinities, changing men*. London: Virago.
- Smith (1996) 'Dichotomies in the making of men', in C. McLean, M. Carey & C. White (eds) *Men's ways of being*. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.
- Walker, J. (1988) 'Romanticising resistance, romanticising culture: A critique of Willis' theory of cultural production', *British journal of sociology of education*, 7, 1, pp. 59-80.