

## **Boys and masculinities: Negotiating the contradictions and tensions of the practice of masculinities in schooling**

Blye W. Frank ([Blye.frank@dal.ca](mailto:Blye.frank@dal.ca))  
Dalhousie University  
Room c-115, 5849 University Avenue  
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, B3H 4H7  
Michael D. Kehler ([mkehler@uwo.ca](mailto:mkehler@uwo.ca))  
The University Of Western Ontario  
1137 Western Road  
London, ON, Canada, N6G 1G7

### **Abstract:**

In these papers, both authors explore the everyday experiences of boys in secondary school. The data comes from a number of qualitative research studies using in-depth interviews with boys between the ages of 16 and 20. In particular we examine school conversations and the daily interactions that occur between men. The research sheds light on the difficulties of resisting hegemonic masculinity. Emerging out of this data are several striking contradictions between the gender work displayed by men and the prevailing images of a heteronormative masculinity within many schools. The analysis attempts to collapse the often theorized split between hegemonic and subordinate masculinities to make visible the messiness of the lives of boys as they negotiate the complex and often contradictory terrain of what it means to be a young man.

These papers further extend arguments regarding competing and overlapping constructions of masculinities within a high school setting and directly shed light on the ways some young men unsettle past conceptions of masculinity. We highlight the tensions involved for high school young men who reject a heteronormative offer of masculinity. Being unlike the rest of the boys and actively disrupting masculinities are examined, in addition to the specific risks for doing so. We conclude these papers by suggesting the possibilities for supporting a broader repertoire of ways for expressing a much richer and complicated understanding of high school masculinities. We offer some strategies for administrators, teachers, curriculum developers, and policy makers in relation to gender, and more specifically, masculinity and the education of boys.

## Introduction

There's definitely sexism in school. I'm sure it's been there as long as school has been around...you know the guys that tell jokes about keeping the women barefoot and pregnant in the kitchen. And a lot of guys joke about that kind of stuff but they don't actually believe that women should be kept in that kind of position. They kind of act that way in front of their friends. They kind of try to impress their friends. . . . .

I think a lot of the sexism in school is kind of under the table. Kind of like not overt, like archetypal sexism . . . It's kind of that under the table covert sexism as opposed to right out in the open. (Philip, Senior High School student)

Being a high school young man is complicated. As Philip has pointed out above, it involves acting certain ways with friends even though their beliefs run contrary to the public and visible expressions of masculinity displayed in school hallways and classrooms. It involves knowing what it means to be a man and second, knowing how to display one's masculinity in an open arena such as a school setting. The intent and rationale behind the sexist behaviours of some young men may not be surprising to teachers, but what is worth examining is how high school young men resist conventional norms of masculinity. In other words, how, for example, do young men reject highly valued ways of being a man in high school and instead, opt to be unlike the rest of the boys? This opens the door for seeing high school young men as possible agents and allies for gender equity. It allows one to ask the question, When and how do young men unsettle or disrupt conceptions of masculinity? And what are the costs for young men who resist the prevailing conventions and norms of masculinity? Are men able to, and/or willing to, in bell hooks words (1998), "expose, confront, oppose, and transform the sexism of their male peers" (p. 587)? If so, what are teachers

doing to support this counter current by some high school young men? How are teachers allowing alternative versions of masculinities to co-exist in classrooms?

In this article we take up some of these questions but leave others unanswered. And while we would like to respond to them all, due to limitations of space, we will address two central ones. Specifically, we will examine competing understandings of masculinity and second, the tensions involved when young men resist conventions of high school masculinity. We begin this article by examining both conversations and school interactions between young men. This data sheds light on the messiness of boy's school lives as they perform specific versions of masculinity.

The data for this paper comes from a number of qualitative research studies involving both in-depth interviews, and participant observations of students. The young men ranged in age from 16 to 20 years old. Conducted both in Canada and the United States, the studies offer a broad look at the kinds of conversations and types of interaction common among high school young men.

The experiences and words included in this article reflect the importance of hearing the voices of young men because it is they who are the experts in the description of what it means to be a man. (see Frank, 1996). Their words provide insight and descriptions of what these young men saw and understood about being a man within a high school context. We offer this up first to give some texture to the daily lives of young men and second, to argue that high school masculinity emerges out of choices made to either resist or take up, what

Bob Connell (1995) refers to as “the project of a hegemonic masculinity”. The second section provides a look at the conversations of these men. We include conversations and reflections that shed light on how they resisted a hegemonic masculinity but equally as important, we offer their words to suggest what the costs are for going against the grain in schools that largely accept conventional ways of being a man. We conclude by arguing that teachers and teacher educators need to begin listening, looking, and perhaps responding differently to what appear as counter-currents of masculinity from among “the boys”.

### **Seeing and hearing differences: Who are “the boys”?**

Until more recently theories of sex-role socialization and bio-determinism have propped up arguments to explain gendered interactions and ways of being. In subtle ways these theories are commonly heard in school staff rooms and offered unquestioned as “Boys will be boys” and “it’s their hormones.” The arguments, as well as some teacher’s explanations, are deeply grounded in a static and uni-dimensional concept of gender. Noted gender and education researchers Myra and David Sadker (1994) have argued that

boys confront frozen boundaries of the male role at every turn of school life. They grow up learning lines and practicing moves from a time-worn script: be cool, don’t show emotion, repress feelings, be aggressive, compete and win. (p. 220)

Lacking agency and any possibility for challenging prevailing norms of masculinity, sex-role socialization essentializes “the boys” by denying differences among the school experiences of young men and second, by relying on passive acceptance of “scripted roles.” Current debates within men’s studies and profeminist scholarship (see Connell, 1995; Mac an Ghail, 1994; Hearn 1996;

Kaufman, 1994; Kehler, 2000; Martino & Meyenn, 2001; Messner, 1997), have argued for a fluid and more dynamic conceptualization of masculinity. They have problematized masculinity as a social construct wedded to cultural practices. They have moved an argument forth that both theoretically and practically provides a richer and deeper acknowledgement of masculinity as a set of competing and overlapping values and beliefs or “gender politics” that inform taken for granted ways for being young men. Their research, built on in this paper, widens the lens for seeing and hearing how men negotiate, with intent, ways of doing gender.

We offer the experiences of high school young men whose individual and collective stories stand in contrast to the already privileged “grand narratives of men’s lives [which] have resulted in partial and fragmented accounts [that] elevate certain ways of seeing and understanding men and boys over others, in part by allowing some voices to go unheard or to be misrepresented by others” (Frank, 1996, p. 115). This intellectual lens for seeing and hearing the enactment of masculinities has also allowed me as a teacher and teacher educator to better understand the complexity of being a man among a familiar group of “the boys” in addition to understanding what is involved for young men to resist conventional norms of masculinity that typically underscore sexist behaviours and gender stereotypes within high schools.

There is emerging a conceptual shift that re-envisioning masculinity with an eye on the active construction of gender relations in different social contexts. (see Frank, 1996; Imms, 2000; Kaufman, 1994; Kehler, 2000; Kimmel, 1994;

Messner, 1997) West and Zimmerman (1991) aptly highlight the process of *doing gender* and, most importantly, the significance of maintaining and managing gender identities that are routinely scrutinized or policed as appropriate. Men and women—particularly those in high school—are accountable to their peers to outwardly project appropriate signs or displays of masculinity and femininity.

Carefully mediated and negotiated, high school young men jockey for positions of authority and status among other men. (see Mac an Ghail, 1994; Nayak & Kehily, 1996) Understanding masculinity thus is not a simple case of identifying and codifying behaviours among “the boys”, but it involves acknowledging and unpacking the overlapping and competing ways that boys enact what it means to be a man. There evolves a much more complex and messier understanding of masculinities underscored by competing sets of understandings. As this article shows, not only do high school young men know what it means to be a man, but they are also able to articulate and demonstrate how gendered understandings are expressed in daily school interactions. Thus, while schools are implicated in the production of specific forms of masculinity (see Connell, 1982; Mac an Ghail, 1994; Mandel & Shakeshaft, 2000) this article sheds light on the ability and willingness of some young men who, according to Philip, “as guys...are able to avoid that male stereotype of ‘Hey, he’s hugging that guy, he must be gay. . . that kind of attitude’. The next section draws on conversations to highlight what men understand about doing masculinity within a

high school context. The following conversations provide a foundation for seeing and hearing the active construction of being a high school man.

**Conversations about masculinities: The “typical male” and being “normal”**

You can be who you are. You don't have to portray this image in front of people. Like, sometimes when I played football I felt like I had to project this image of myself, at least while I was on the field. But in the arts I can be who I am, I can do what I want and not feel like I have to answer to anybody. I can just be me. (Philip)

It's like you have to come up and say the right things and do the right things in order to be cool. You can't just be yourself and you can't goof off in being cool. (Hunter)

Conversations among high school men provide a frame of reference and way for making sense of their experiences as men. Similar to bodily practices then “language does not simply mirror gender; it helps constitute it, --it is one of the means by which gender is enacted” (Johnson, 1997, p. 23). The performativity of gender as a series of repeated acts in accordance with masculinized norms is further illuminated by various styles of talk. A re-examination of how young men talk and about what forces us, in Cameron's (1997) words, to “attend to the ‘rigid regulatory frame’ within which people must make their choices—the norms that define what kinds of language are possible, intelligible and appropriate resources for performing masculinity and femininity” (p. 49). Definitions of masculinity emerge out of the conversations that commonly take place between students, both men and women. Taking up this argument then, we offer the voices of these young men to show how masculinities are spoken and written into existence. (see Cameron, 1997; Frank, 1996, Haywood, 1996; Lyman; 1987; Martino, 2000; Nilan, 2000) Through daily

conversations, young men actively negotiate social identities that are both historically and socially embedded.

Definitions and understandings of masculinity preceded the conversations that follow. What does it mean to be a man? How is masculinity mirrored in the conversations and surroundings of these four young men? Thurston points out that images of masculinity extend beyond the school. They are pervasive and encompassing.

The typical male, like what they've seen since they've been growing up of what guys are supposed to be like. You see guys on t.v. who are afraid to express their feelings. So they sort of are afraid to break from that. Like they feel the need to be normal. And I think they are just afraid to because they might be ostracized from some sort of community of friends. (Thurston)

Young men are shackled by media images that define masculinity. The television provides clear messages of "what guys are supposed to be like". The inability to express feelings among men is framed by a need to be normal and accepted by a community of friends. Acceptance and membership within groups of boys is grounded in fitting within broader popular images of masculinity. For high school young men, these images of masculinity are largely unquestioned. The careful representation or fashioning of the masculine body among high school young men is noteworthy. Prevailing media images in particular provide an authoritative and highly valued context from which to define masculinity while at the same time routine policing or monitoring by other young men becomes the impetus to conform. (see Davison, 2000; Kimmel, 1994; Mandel & Shakeshaft; 2000; Martino & Meyenn, 2001) "The way a young man styles his body through gestures and actions is central to the performance of masculinity, where there is

always the threat of being labelled gay” (Nayak & Kehily, 1996, p. 216). Not only are the images clear, but the consequences for not adhering to or living up to these images are similarly powerful.

These young men understood, and were aware of specific norms of masculinity that operated in their school. This section opened with a comment by Philip who captures the tension for young men how actively display their masculinities in competing and conflicting ways depending on the context, be it the football field or the theatre class. In his words, he had to “project an image” as an athlete different from what he displayed in the arts context. David similarly explained that in his high school one model of masculinity was preferred over others.

Not being huge but being bigger would be encouraged, just by what’s attractive. I think it’s just the way guys compare one another against each other. It’s like, how much they can bench press. It’s different ways of sizing people up. (David)

Echoing Connell et al (1982) in which they argued schools support and perpetuate a “hierarchy of forms of masculinity” (p. 96), David highlights physical prowess as a central attribute underscoring high school masculinity. Numerous other occasions during this study confirmed this preoccupation with muscle magazines and physical comparisons of “pythons” or muscles among high school men. This was but one element of the physical body as a vehicle for defining masculinity at their high school. Toughness, fighting, and sexual talk were also common means for defining what it meant to be a man.

High school masculinities emerged from what these men saw and knew of the rules of masculinity. As Gilbert and Gilbert (1998) argue

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. (p. 51)

Definitions of masculinity and the imbedded sets of understandings that supported these ways of being men were heavily centred on comparisons and proving oneself in relation to other men. A competitive framework existed in which these men actively demonstrated their manliness at the expense of their male counterparts. The next section provides conversations as a means of further understanding how masculinities are routinely informed by daily talk among the boys.

### **When Men Talk: “Shooting the shit” and “good buddy talk”**

I think it's easier for guys to communicate like that. Like, especially with things that are wrong. Or like when girls walk by and guys are like, “David, I would really like to have sex with that girl. So they kind of say it as a joke and other guys go “Yeah, yeah, I can relate to that. (David)

With Drew asking me about sex. We weren't joking around anymore, it was serious. It was like, if I am in his shoes I would want to know. I mean, like, I was there once. I am going to tell him seriously. But usually it's alone, either one on one or like with Drew, it was three people who were really good friends. Almost always in those situations you are not afraid to really talk about anything. (Hunter)

High school young men draw on different types of talk as opportunities to define their masculinity. Sports talk, sex talk, and various other conversations become the foundations for many social interactions among high school men. (see Cameron, 1997; Haywood, 1996) In this section we draw on data that illustrates when young men are “shooting the shit.” These conversations frequently occur between classes and during class times when the teacher was not in close proximity to the students. The conversations generally focus on

common day-to-day happenings. We also provide data that allows the reader to hear when young men talk openly, freely, and honestly. Hunter describes these conversations as “good buddy talk.” We use these examples of conversations among men to add a more textured understanding about the construction of masculinities and the levels at which they operate. Masculinities thus are fashioned both in how young men display themselves as well as by what they say when they are with other men.

David and Hunter’s provocative comments above suggest that conversations are a medium for expressing deep-seated ideas about masculinity. These views are expressed and variously accepted or rejected depending on the size of the group in which they are expressed. Likewise, the topic of choice is carefully selected according to the context and participants. Secondly, masculinities operate through conversations. Joking, for example, becomes a vehicle for sex talk and other means for talking about sex. It gives some young men license to talk about topics that are not typically spoken about in the company of other men. Hunter’s description of his conversations highlights the fact that some men talk about sex in a different manner—one that is supportive and understanding. These situations allow men to “really talk about anything”. Each of these men suggests that there are different types of conversations that occur in the company of their male counterparts, as well as different underlying reasons for engaging in specific conversations with other men.

Talk among men becomes an opportunity not so much to express feelings or share ideas, which is typically associated with being feminine, but yet another

context in which many (but not all men) attempt to affirm and reaffirm their masculine identities. (Haywood, 1996) Some of David's friends, for example, used talk among other men as a way of displaying their sexual interests in women. Routine exchanges such as "Hey David, did you get some this weekend?" or references to who was getting together with whom were not uncommon topics of conversation among these men. Daily conversations allowed them to construct specific kinds of social identities that focussed on heterosexual desires. Conversations such as these were an opportunity to, in David's words, "get a rise out of [him]." Sex talk also operates as "a technique to police and regulate normative assumptions about gender sexualities" (Haywood, 1996, p. 230). And though the four young men in this study did not actually initiate sex talk, masculinities were nonetheless being negotiated through such conversations.

In addition to finding that "particular styles of talk enable young men to locate themselves inside various positions of heterosexual masculinities" that consolidate their social identities, Haywood (1996) also found that there is a "lack of opportunities for males to talk seriously or privately about sexuality, emotions and relationships" (p. 245). Conversations are a venue for confirming specific versions of masculinity. But as Hunter pointed out, different types of conversations occur in and outside of high school. As a social context schools provide a context in which young men are more likely to talk about masculinized topics such as cars, sports and sexual exploits. Hunter explained that intimate and honest conversations between men, rarely occurred in school.

Good buddy talk does not occur much in school. At least not in the classroom, maybe in the car...I would almost say not at all in school except maybe at lunchtime.

So when do high school young men share their emotions, feelings and uncertainties with other young men? Can we assume young men are willing to do so? Hunter explained that these types of conversations occur when they “go out for dinner or just go and sit on a hill together. So like [a friend] would call me up and say “hey, can we go talk?” These types of conversations, however, occur very infrequently between high school young men. The absence of opportunity for more intimate conversations to occur as well as the lack of willingness to engage in these conversations among men speaks to an antifeminine norm prevalent in schools in which boys work hard not to show any feminine behaviours. (see Mandel and Shakeshaft, 2000)

Students rarely find the chance to be open and unguarded in their conversations. Too often, it appears, young men are busily constructing those walls that protect them and keep them from being hurt. The mortar that cements these walls in place and prevents young men from talking openly and honestly is captured by revisiting the underlying fears of young men.

Like when we talk I wouldn't laugh at him or for something serious I wouldn't go and tell other people. He trusts me and he doesn't think you know, I'm going to go “Oh Kevin cried during a movie” or something like that. .Like, he knows he can trust me, and that I am here for him and I am not trying to screw him over. (Hunter)

Along with boys policing each other, Philip explained that he policed his own masculinity and ways for displaying it among his male counterparts. During

conversations for example, he was mindful of what he said and when he contributed.

I was trying to maybe think of something to say but not really having anything to say. I wanted to say something but I don't know what to say or how to say it.

In addition, boys generally refused to take the risk of stepping beyond established norms of masculinity. As mentioned earlier, schools contribute to specific models of masculinity. Thurston points out, understandings of being a man operate at a curricular level but they also extend beyond and infuse student definitions of masculinity.

Boys are afraid to express their feelings, that type of thing because, like, poetry is a very feelings sort of thing. Less guys are willing to be in plays and sing unabashedly and write and express their feelings. (Thurston)

Conversations among men thus were impeded by broader fears that might threaten to unveil a mask of masculinity. Boys had good buddy type conversations if a) their vulnerabilities or weaknesses were respected and not ridiculed, b) their male counterparts would listen in confidence, and not use the vulnerability as a lever for undermining or questioning his masculinity more broadly and ultimately, c) there was a considerable level of trust between the young men. The series of conditions for having good buddy type talk were consistent among these men. In part, the uncertainty of assuring all these conditions could be met might explain why these types of conversations occurred so infrequently for these young men.

The openness, trust, and respect required in order for good buddy talk to occur among most of these men was tenuous at best. Only among some men,

and oftentimes in very intimate settings, were they able to talk without fear of reprisals that challenged their masculinity. Assurances or requirements had to be in place before some men would talk freely with their male peers. Hunter affirmed that one of his male friends wanted to, in his words “tell me his life”. He went on to explain that in this situation Hunter became

his counsellor because he could tell me everything and I wasn't just like, one of his other friends , like smoker friends which is like, “Yo, let's get high!”

Young men sought out peers who supported them by being good listeners. As David mentioned earlier, the conversations were one way to be reassuring with other men, but there was also the physical contact of touching and hugging another guy that extended the repertoire of ways for communicating among men. These young men found different ways to communicate. From holding one's hand, to rubbing their shoulders or openly talking, each of the men in this study have, in many ways, crossed gender boundaries in their routine social practices and verbal communication.

### **Conclusion**

By denying differences within masculinity, teachers and teacher educators also deny possibilities among masculinities. The normalizing effect that has glossed over “the boys” as a coherent and undifferentiated category has left the voices and actions of some young men unseen and unheard. For teachers like myself it is not only important, but crucial to hear a polyphony of voices among and between men. It is also necessary to see the ways young men intentionally negotiate their masculinities in and outside of the classroom. These differences

across men can allow teachers to better respond to and support a multiplicity of masculinities in a classroom. We have tried to highlight prevailing attitudes and behaviours of a hegemonic masculinity that might dominate and threaten to overshadow the non-sexist ways of a less well-known masculinity in schools. Rather than succumb to “the unchanging identity profile of boys in schools,” (Nilan, 2001, p. 67) teachers need to look and listen carefully for differences among high school young men. In a classroom of ongoing negotiations between students, both young men and women, it is too easy to categorize “the boys” and in doing so simplify the complex lives of young men trying to be unlike their mainstream male counterparts.

High schools are potent and troubling arenas in which masculinities are constantly being worked out among the boys. While the voices and experiences of those quoted above may be emerging from a minority of young men willing to go against the grain, it is important nonetheless that their experiences be acknowledged and supported as legitimate ways of being young men. Through routine interactions and daily conversations they have displayed a broader repertoire and more gender progressive set of understandings for being men. They have crossed gender boundaries knowing full well the costs for doing so. And, rather than maintain and support “the wall” young men tend to build up to protect themselves, these young men have shown the possibilities for unsettling its very foundations to show sensitivity, intimacy, open honesty, and unguarded vulnerabilities. These young men have added a new dimension and a vastly

more complex definition for what it means to be a high school man among “the boys”.

## References

- AAUW (1999). *Gender Gaps: Where schools still fail our children*. AAUW Educational Foundation and National Education Association.
- AAUW (1992). *The American Association of University Women Report: How schools shortchange girls*. AAUW Educational Foundation and National Education Association.
- Cameron, D. (1997). Performing gender identity: Young men’s talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In S. Johnson & U. Hanna Meinhof (Eds.), *Language and masculinity*. (pp. 8-26). Oxford: UK, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. California: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1989). Cool guys, swots and wimps: The interplay of masculinity and education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 15, (3), 291-303.
- Connell, R. W., Ashenden, D. J., Kessler, S., & Dowsett, G. W., (1982). *Making the difference: Schools, families and social division*. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.
- Davison, K. (2000). Masculinities, sexualities and the student body: "Sorting" gender identities in school. In C. James (Ed.), *Experiencing Difference*. (pp. 44-52). Halifax: Fernwood.
- Frank, B. (1996). Masculinities and Schooling: The making of men. In J. R. Epp & A. M. Watkinson (Eds.), *Systemic violence: How schools hurt children*. (113-129). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.
- Gilbert, R. & Gilbert, P. (1998). *Masculinity goes to school*. London: Routledge.
- Gutterman, D. (1994). Postmodernism and the interrogation of masculinity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities*. (pp. 219-238). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hearn, J. (1996). Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept of masculinity/masculinities. In M. Mac an Ghail (ed.), *Understanding masculinities: Social relations and cultural arenas*. (pp. 202-217), Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hearn J. & D. Collinson (1994). Theorizing unities and differences between men and between masculinities. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities*. (pp. 97-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Haywood, C. (1996). ‘Out of the Curriculum’: sex talking, talking sex, *Curriculum Studies*, 4, (2), 229-249.
- Haywood, C. & M. Mac an Ghail (1997). Schooling masculinities. In M. Mac an Ghail (Ed.), *Understanding masculinities: Social relations and cultural arenas*. (pp. 50-60). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- hooks, b. (1998). Men: Comrades in struggle. In M. Kimmel & M. Messner (Eds.), *Men’s Lives*. (pp. 578-587). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Imms, W. (2000). Multiple masculinities and the schooling of boys. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 25, (2), 152-165.

- Johnson, S. (1997). Theorizing language and masculinity: A feminist perspective. In S. Johnson & U. Hanna Meinhof (Eds.), *Language and masculinity*. (pp. 8-26). Oxford: UK, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Kaufman, M. (1994). Men, feminism, and men's contradictory experience of power. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities*. (pp. 142-163). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kehler, M. D. (in press). High school masculinities: Unheard voices among 'the boys'. In B. Frank and K. Davison (Eds.) *Masculinities and Schooling: International Practices and Perspectives*. Halifax, N.S.; Fernwood Press.
- Kimmel, M. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities*. (pp. 119-141). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lyman, P. (1987). The fraternal bond as a joking relationship: A case study of the role of sexist jokes in male group bonding. In M. Kimmel (Ed.), *Changing Men: New directions in research on men and masculinity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mac an Ghail, M. (1996). Deconstructing heterosexualities within school arenas. *Curriculum Studies*, 4, (1), 191-209.
- Mac an Ghail, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling*. Buckingham; UK: Open University Press.
- Mandel, L. & C. Shakeshaft (2000). Heterosexism in middle schools. In N. Lesko (Ed.), *Masculinities at school*. (pp.75-103). CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Martino, W., B. Meyenn (2001). *What about the boys?: Issues of masculinity in schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Martino, W. (2000). Mucking around in class, giving crap, and acting cool: Adolescent boys enacting masculinities at school. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 25, (2), 102-112.
- Messner, M. (1997). *Politics of masculinities: Men in movements*. California: Sage Publications.
- Nayak, A. & M. Kehily (1996). Playing it straight: Masculinities, homophobias and schooling. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 5, (2), 211-230.
- Nilan, P. (2000). "You're hopeless I swear to God": Shifting masculinities in classroom talk. *Gender and Education*, 12, (1), 53-68.
- Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls*. New York: Touchstone.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1991). Doing gender. In J. Lorber & S. Farrell (Eds.), *The social construction of gender*. (pp.13-37). California: Sage Publications.