

Marginalized Masculinities and Hegemonic Masculinity: An Introduction

CLIFF CHENG

The Journal of Men's Studies. 7.3 (Spring 1999): p295.

Copyright: COPYRIGHT 1999 Sage Publications, Inc.

<http://www.sagepub.com.proxy.lib.pdx.edu>

Abstract:

Many groups of men have been marginalized by discrimination. These include African Americans, Asian Americans, gay men, Native Americans, poor men, old men, and non-Christian men. The essentialist argument that biological gender and race determine behavior is too simplistic to account for much human activity. Gender is best seen as culturally prescribed, learned behavior.

Full Text:

This essay reviews the masculinities and intergroup relations literatures while introducing the authors whose research is highlighted in this special issue. The complexities of identity group politics are also examined. Not only does intergroup conflict occur in society, so does intragroup conflict. Marginalized people have multiple group memberships--some marginalized, some dominant. Some marginalized people commodified their marginalized performance of masculinity. Others seek escape by passing or forming their own group where their marginalization is normative.

What could be more interesting than taking a "zoo" approach to editing a special issue dealing with marginalized men--that is, publishing one article on those identity groups that are marginalized. For instance, the zoo approach would examine the marginalized masculinities of the obvious identity groups like African Americans, Latinos (Hispanic Americans), Asian Americans, Native Americans, homosexuals, the elderly, non-Christians, working-class, and the poor.(1,2) It is impossible though, within the page limits of a special issue, or even within a large book, to explore all of the theoretical and empirical possibilities that our topic raises. Instead I will do the more manageable: introduce what we were able to do, while encouraging further study.

As marginalization based on gender performance is the focus of this special issue, we need to be clear about the term. When we speak of "marginalization," we are broadly referring to intergroup and/or intragroup relations, "activities between and among groups" (Alderfer, 1987, p. 190). Specifically, marginalization means peripheral or disadvantaged unequal membership, disparate treatment.

In the articles that follow we find Michele Dunbar's study of Dennis Rodman, the cross-dressing, African-American basketball player and MTV host, and how he exemplifies multiple marginalizations. Next, Judi Addleston writes about, among other things, women who perform hegemonic masculinity. Then, Lori Kendall writes about computer nerds; while Peter Chua and Diane Fujino's survey deals with how Asian-American men's masculinity is perceived by themselves and others. Steve Kurtz studies gay men of color, specifically Cuban and Puerto Rican gay men living in Miami, Florida. And last, my own contribution focuses on organizations that endorse hegemonic masculinity, while at the same time permitting non-hegemonic or "marginalized" masculinities and femininities.

STUDYING "GENDER" AND NOT ESSENTIALIST "SEX"

Conventional thinking suggests that "masculinity" could not possibly be marginalized.(3) Such a view, known as "essentialism," argues that biological sex (and race) determines behavior. Basically, essentialists think there are only two sexes (female and male) and two bi-polar gender roles (masculine and feminine).(4,5) "Masculinity," as seen from this perspective, is at the center, never the margin, always dominant, never subordinated. If one is to study gender, though, one should not assume that "masculine" behavior is performed only by men, and by all men, while "feminine" behavior is performed only by women, and by all women.

Gender and sex are not equivalent, and gender as a social construction does not flow automatically from genitalia and reproductive organs, the male

physiological differences of females and males (Lorber, 1994, p. 17).

Gender is neither sex organs nor sex acts, but the socially constructed ideal of what it means to be a woman or man. Gender exists outside of us in our culture, but also resides inside of us, and our everyday activities provide opportunities for expressing, and perhaps transforming, the meaning of gender (Coltrane, 1994, p. 1).

A gender scholar takes into account that there may be multiple versions of masculinity and femininity. It is conceptually more accurate to speak of masculinity and femininity in the plural--that is, masculinities and femininities, rather than their singular essentialist form.

The essentialists would like to claim they study "power." "Power" for them is based on two, and only two, sex categories. Biological males have power, and women do not.(6) At the macro-level this may have been generally accurate in most Western societies, and some Eastern ones as well, in centuries past. This crude level discounts the micro-level, and discounts marginalized groups that have existed throughout history.

[Gender is] an institution that established patterns of expectations for individuals, orders the social processes of everyday life, is built into the major social organizations of society, such as the economy, ideology, the family, and politics, and is also an entity in and of itself (Lorber, 1994, p. 1).

There is a lack of empirical gender research, especially studies that examine face-to-face interaction at the micro-level where social order, including bi-polar (masculine and feminine) gender roles, is produced and reproduced.

As odd as it may sound, masculinity is somehow invisible. Gender, particularly in organizational behavior, is synonymous with studying women (Brod, 1987; Cheng, 1996a; Cox & Nkomo, 1990). There is no shortage of criticism of men (for example, see: Dworkin, 1974). Criticism is not the same as empirical study. Men as gendered beings usually are not studied, though (Brod, 1987; Cheng, 1996a). When men are studied, they are generally studied from an essentialist perspective, as if their biology predetermined their behavior, as if all men were the same. However, I argue that those who study gender can ill afford to approach their subject from an essentialist position, for it is an empirically unsound position.

It may appear strange that this special issue of The Journal of Men's Studies is not about men in particular, although most of our subjects are men. It is about gender, culturally prescribed learned behavior that most men and increasingly many women reproduce in their momentary behavior.

If gender is to be defined as the culturally established correlate of sex (whether in consequence of biology or learning), then gender display refers to conventionalized portrayals of these correlates (Goffman, 1976, p. 69).

We assume and expect gender behavior based on the appearance of our attribution of a particular person's sex.

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY

The type of masculinity the dominant group performs is called hegemonic masculinity. As history changes, so does the definition of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987). Hegemonic masculinity is a "culturally idealized form of masculine character" (Connell, 1990, p. 83). Hegemonic masculinity then is the current ideal. Most men's gender performance varies to some degree from the prescribed hegemonically masculine gender role (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985).(7) "The hegemonic model ... may only correspond to the actual characters of a small number of men. Yet very large numbers of men are complicit in sustaining the hegemonic model" (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985, p. 92). "A discourse of 'masculinity' is constructed out of the lives of (at most) five percent of the world's population of men, in one culture-area, at one moment in history" (Connell, 1993, p. 600).

Gender as a Relational Construct. Hegemonic masculinity is constructed in relation to femininities and subordinated and marginalized masculinities (Connell, 1987). "The white man's masculinity depends on the denial of the masculinity of blacks" (Baldwin, 1963, p. 91). Since hegemonic masculinity is thought to be superior, a characteristic of the in-group--the out-group is thought to be "feminine" or some kind of non-conforming, or even failed masculinity. "Emphasized femininity" is a kind of gender performance that accommodates hegemonic masculine interests and desires while preventing other femininities from gaining cultural articulation (Connell, 1987). The function of emphasized femininity is to please hegemonically masculine men and make them appear more hegemonically masculine--to make them feel stronger, wiser, more competent. For instance, the late Princess Diana, who was only a half-inch shorter than Prince Charles in her bare feet, was depicted as a full head shorter than him in their royal wedding commemorative postage stamp (Brownmiller, 1977).

Characteristics of Hegemonic Masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is characterized by numerous attributes such as domination, aggressiveness, competitiveness, athletic prowess, stoicism, and control. (8,9) Aggressive behavior, if not outright physical violence, is important to the presentation of hegemonic masculinity. This gender performance must be constantly validated by "proving" itself as dominant and in control of itself and others. One way to "prove" hegemonic masculinity is to act aggressively or even violently toward what is regarded as "feminine," for example, women, homosexuals, and nerds.

A key part of the self-control necessary to present oneself as hegemonically masculine is to conform to rules of stoic emotional display. Love, affection, pain, and grief are improper displays of emotion. "Any male [or women trying to be hegemonically masculine] who fails to qualify in any one of these ways is likely to view himself ... as unworthy, incomplete, and inferior" (Goffman, 1963, p. 128).

Hegemonic masculinity is the defining gender performance of Euro-American males; in addition to being white and male, important demographic characteristics include being able-bodied, heterosexual, Christian (or, perhaps Jewish), first world (as opposed to colonized men), and ranging in age from 20 to 40 (although the upper end is rising as baby boomers get older). Some women can and do (especially since the women's movement and affirmative action) pass as hegemonically masculine. If women desire to become successful managers, they must make a gender presentation of hegemonic masculinity (Baril, Elbert, Mahar-Porter, & Reavy, 1989; Cheng, 1997b; Ely, 1994).

Sex-gender Segregated Division of Labor. The bi-polarization between hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity is reproduced in the division of labor. Certain occupations are hegemonically masculine, such as the military, law enforcement, construction, and firefighting. Emphasized femininity has its own occupations, such as nurse, social worker, secretary, and teacher. Technology is also associated with this bipolarization (Game & Pringle, 1983), as are earning differentials and status. Hegemonic masculinity is associated with heavy, dangerous, dirty, skilled, and interesting work, as well as with mobile and/or moving machinery, e.g., fighter planes, aircraft carriers, tanks, lathes, and welding torches (Game & Pringle, 1983). Emphasized femininity is associated with light, less dangerous, clean, boring, and unskilled work with immobile machinery, e.g., calculators, copiers, faxes, and telephones (Game & Pringle, 1983). In the U.S. military in WWII, an African-American male soldier was called "boy" and not allowed to serve in combat roles, since combat was for hegemonically masculine males (Shilts, 1993). African-American men could only serve in racially segregated units as stewards, cook, and laborers--roles that were associated with emphasized femininity (Shilts, 1993).

Can People of Color and Homosexuals Be Hegemonically Masculine? As shall be discussed later, we are simultaneously members of multiple groups, including dominant and marginalized groups. One may be marginalized by a visible marker, such as race, sex, or the display of behavior generally regarded as "gay," or wearing religious adornments of a non-Christian group, but this does not mean one is marginalized based on gender performance. In fact, many members of these marginalized groups perform hegemonic masculinity in order to gain patriarchal privileges within their group, if not the larger society. Performing hegemonic masculinity by a marginalized person is seen as a passing behavior that distracts from her/his stigma.

Wallace (1979) states black men are as patriarchal as white men are. While this may be so, as Staples (1979) says, black men do not have the institutional power of white men. Within African America, black men and women

are in a struggle to gain dominance (Franklin, 1984). For bell hooks (1990), black liberation has not developed a black patriarchy, so that black men, instead of white men, dominate black women, and I would add that this holds true for any kind of liberation. Further, this is not just a case of getting men to reject patriarchy. As odd as it may sound, women must reject it, too--in all parts of their lives, especially in interpersonal and romantic relations, hooks (1994) points out that progressive black men want to reject patriarchy but are in turn rejected by black women (and feminists) for not being hegemonically masculine enough. Black women want black men to "take charge, take care of business, be in control." (10)

Stylistic Variations and Domination. There are stylistic variations of hegemonic masculinity that have changed over history. Prior to WWII, John Wayne, Humphrey Bogart, Clark Gable, and James Cagney exemplified heroic hegemonic masculinity that was "naturalized in the form of the hero and presented through ... sagas, ballads, westerns, thrillers" (Donaldson, 1993, p. 646). Currently, Arnold Schwarzenegger and Sylvester Stallone perform a more physical, muscular, violent, and sexual version of the hero. In everyday life, the model for the action-hero wannabes is the weightlifter. All of these variations perform dominance by physical size and strength, if not outright violence, against smaller and physically weaker men and women, homosexuals, and third world peoples.

Domination by physical size and strength is old fashioned. Not all men and women are physically big enough and strong enough to intimidate and dominate others. They seek substitutes for physical size and strength and find it in hierarchical organization (Cheng, 1995b). Managerial hegemonic masculinity is a popular form of domination, for it allows some individuals to dominate others without having to be physically larger and/or stronger. Managers enact a hegemonically masculine role by manipulating rewards, threatening punishment, and using coercive organizational power. Another style, which is less obvious than others, is the technical/ professional form of hegemonically masculine domination. Computer technicians, physicians, lawyers, and other knowledge workers use their technical knowledge to gain and maintain power over others. In Lori Kendall's (this issue) article, her subjects are undergraduate computer "nerds" who use hidden surveillance cameras in a sorority house to gain symbolic sexual control over the women being observed.

Most people would not probably be physically intimidated by Microsoft CEO Bill Gates, whose physical stature is slighter than most Euro-American men. (11,12) Gates, once spurned as a "nerd," rose to power through a combination of both managerial and knowledge-based variants of hegemonic masculinity. Gates's computer operating systems gave him knowledge-based power that he aggressively grew into what the U.S. Justice Department's anti-trust suit alleges as a monopoly gotten by predatory capitalist practices of driving competitors out of business, which is hegemonically masculine dominance. Hegemonic masculinity is about "the winning and holding of power" (Donaldson, 1993, p. 644).

At the macro level of cultures and nations, shame by Christian missionaries and intimidation by military power has been replaced by post-colonial domination--neo-colonial economic and cultural supremacy of the first world (the world of the dominant group). The economies and cultures, and especially masculinities and femininities of the third world, are inferiorized and marginalized through western consumerism through advertising, cinema, MTV, and music (Cheng, 1995b; Said, 1992; Wolf, 1982).

MARGINALIZATION OF GENDERED IDENTITY GROUPS

It is important to realize that both masculinities and femininities are extremely diverse; not homogenous, unchanging, fixed, or undifferentiated (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985). (14) Different versions of masculinities and femininities coexist at a given historical period and even coexist in the same organization (Connell, 1996). It is this diversity that is the basis of intergroup and intragroup conflict. The dominant group needs a way to justify its dominance--that difference is inferior.

"Although it may be true that men, as a group, enjoy institutional privileges at the expense of women, as a group men share very unequally in the fruits of these privileges" (Messner, 1997, p. 7). "In the case of black men, their subordination as a racial minority has more than cancelled out their advantage as males in the larger society" (Staples, 1982, p. 7).

All masculinities are not created equal; or rather, we are all created

equal, but any hypothetical equality evaporates quickly because our definitions of masculinity are not equally valued in society. One definition of manhood continues to remain the standard against which other forms of manhood are measured and evaluated. Within the dominant culture, the masculinity that defines white, middle class, early middle-aged, heterosexual men is the masculinity that sets the standards for other men, against which other men are measured and, more often than not, found wanting....

The hegemonic definition of manhood is a man in power, a man with power, and a man of power. We equate manhood with being successful, capable, reliable, in control. The very definitions of manhood we have developed in our culture maintain the power that some men have over other men and that men have over women.

Our cultural definition of masculinity is thus several stories at once. It is about the individual man's quest to accumulate those cultural symbols that denote manhood, signs that he has in fact achieved it (Kimmel, 1994, pp. 124-125).

Generally, one's membership in either the dominant group or a marginalized group is based on our conformity to hegemony. Conformers often belong to the dominant group. Non-conformers usually belong to a marginalized group.

The main reason marginalized masculinities are suppressed is that they are a threat to hegemonic masculinity. Any nonconformity, particularly with regard to gender, which is supposedly natural, is a threat to hegemonic masculinity. The nature of a dominant discourse is to present itself as all there is, as "natural," and "normal." Black lesbians threaten the Euro-Americans' definition of normality--for they "are not white, male, or heterosexual and generally not affluent" (Collins, 1991, p. 194). The threat must be neutralized by rendering the alternative gender performance invisible. The margin is there, but invisible.

Marginalized Men, "Feminism," and Privileged Women. The relationship among marginalized men (marginalized because of their performance of marginalized masculinities), feminism, and privileged women is complicated. Messner (1997) recounts a personal experience:

In the early 1980s, at one of the first National Conferences of Men and Masculinity, I sat with several hundred men and listened to a radical feminist male exhort all of us to "renounce masculinity" and "give up all our male privileges" as we unite with women for a just and egalitarian world. Shortly after this moving speech, a black man stood up and angrily shouted, "When you ask me to give up my privileges as a man, you are asking me to give up something that white America has never allowed me in the first place! I've never been allowed to be a man in this racist society." After a smattering of applause and confused chatter, another man stood and said, "Yeah--I feel the same way as a gay man. My struggle is not to learn how to cry and hug other men. That's what you straight guys are all hung up on. I am oppressed in this homophobic society and need to empower myself to fight that oppression. I can't relate to your guilt-tripping us all into giving up our power. What power?" (pp. 6-7)

Black feminists, like bell hooks (1981, 1994), criticize (white) "bourgeois feminists" for merely inverting dominant group values (see also Fouque, 1980; Saffioti, 1967). Rich (1980) faults heterosexist feminism for erasing lesbianism. White women as a group are more socially advantaged than blacks (Maguire, 1980). "Bourgeois feminists" are opportunistic careerists who are interested in "civil rights" for only their group. "Civil rights" for them

means gaining white male hegemonically masculine economic and political privileges for college educated heterosexual middle- and upper-class white women--and women of color who conform to white values.(15)

CAPITALIZING ON MARGINALIZATION THROUGH COMMODIFICATION

Few marginalized individuals intentionally commodify (i.e., sell) themselves because by definition (with few exceptions), marginalization means no one wants to buy. One exception is the African-American professional basketball player Dennis Rodman. Rodman (1996), who wrote in his autobiography, which is another artifact of his self-commodification, that he is "just being himself." Dunbar (this issue) argues that Rodman's "own commodification as a consumer product revolves around his self-proclaimed ability to 'be himself' rather than merely an image created by the NBA." However, there is a contradiction here. "Regardless of his seemingly contradictory discourse that assigns the basis of his 'bad boy' image to both his 'true self' and unfair targeting by the NBA, interestingly the two images work together to create a desirable object of commodity culture in the media personality of Dennis Rodman."

SOCIAL CATEGORIZATION AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Thus far we have examined marginalization based on race and the complexity of marginalization in intragroup relations. This section examines intergroup relations that marginalization produces.

MASTER STATUS AND CLASS

Traditionally, Park (1950; Park & Burgess, 1921) defined race as a master status. When we first encounter one another, we socially categorize each other based on race.

Race replaces ethnicity most completely in slave and postslavery societies, above all in the United States. Many of the ambiguities of American race relations stem from the fact that two principles of social division, race and ethnicity, were compressed into one (Blauner, 1972, p. 117).

Later Lorber (1994) argued that at first glance we also socially categorize one another by sex. Both race and sex are then thought to be overarching categories that we use to categorize one another.

Marginalization means one will be stereotyped and seen as unidimensional (Madrid, 1988). Maleness, as previously mentioned, is assumed unless it is otherwise stated that the subject is a woman. People look at strangers to define them by skin color, gender, age, companions, clothing, and jewelry to determine if they are safe. Children are usually categorized as safe, followed by whites, then blacks (Anderson, 1990). Black men are suspected more than they are respected (Anderson, 1990).

When Hughes (1944), and later Becker (1963), argued that deviance was also a master status, the concept was extended beyond visible social categories that the individual's appearance betrays. Deviance as a social category may not be readily visible for interpretation on first glance. For instance, "out-of-the-closet" homosexuals who display stereotypical "swishy" membership characteristics of a sub-group of the larger homosexual group may have this gender display considered as a master status, but closeted homosexuals who do not display "swishiness" cannot consider their homosexuality to be a master status.

Park's (1950) notion of master statuses is sociological. At a psychological level, when we first meet someone our survival instinct is to varying degrees operative. We want to know whether this person is a threat to us: If we answer negatively, a political-economic sub-instinct (of our survival instinct) compels us to ask ourselves--can this person help us? In short, we want to know the person's class. A high-class person is not perceived to be as physically dangerous as a low-class one, or one from a racial minority. It is assumed someone with money lacks a motive to rob us. Class also is often based on appearance as are race and sex. However, unlike race and sex, in which our social categorization was almost always right, social categorization of class is more fallible.

More specifically than class, we want to know how much power and wealth this individual we are interacting with

has. Money and power are large determinants of class. Although one can have a social class inconsistent with that class's income level and social influence, this is not typical. The amount of money one has is often unknown to fellow interactants. Money is a referent attributed by interactants, which sometimes can be wrong. Power is more elusive. Interactants may defer to, or comply with, an individual they attribute as having power out of fear of punishment, or to build up reciprocity. Marginalized peoples are thought to be powerless, so they are treated poorly.

"Success," Class, Race, and Masculinity. One historical shift in the definition of hegemonic masculinity in post-industrial western capitalist societies has been from physical strength to wealth as a power source, e.g., Bill Gates. Domination is still the underlying principle. Physical domination, by physical size and strength, though, has been replaced by social-economic-political-legal-technological domination. Social-economic-political-legal-technological domination can buy or coerce, control, and use muscular hegemonic masculinity.

Class is a hidden injury to male hegemonic masculinity, for men are supposed to assume the provider role (Sennett & Cobb, 1973). If class prevents the fulfillment of this role, then the male becomes marginalized, because of his inability to provide. "The discourse of black resistance has almost always equated freedom with manhood, the economic and material domination of black men with castration, emasculation" (hooks, 1990, p. 75). Black capitalism and self-determination are not the same thing (hooks, 1994). Capitalism values domination, which is gendered as hegemonically masculine. Black women who have contempt for black men who are unwilling or unable to assume the "breadwinner" role are embracing patriarchy (hooks, 1981). Concepts of class, particularly of "masculinity" and "success," are used as a gendered organizing principle.

WHITENESS, MALENESS, AND CLASS

Whiteness and maleness are supposed to be the membership characteristics of the dominant group. Each characteristic "confers dominance because of one's race or sex" (McIntosh, 1990, p. 33). Rather, there are more membership characteristics that are important, among them, class (especially wealth and power), sexual orientation, physical ability, and age. In some circles, religion and nativity are also important. Working class Euro-American males whose class status gives them relatively lower income and power than higher class groups refuse to examine class issues. If they did, they would discover their claim to dominant group membership is weakened.

To assert their claim to dominant group membership, the working-class men studied by Weis, Proweller, and Centrie (1996) looked for scapegoats:

While white working class men are privileged via their color, they are relatively less privileged than their economically advantaged white male counterparts. They believe they are currently losing the edge that they had in the economy over men of color. White, working class men represent a position of privilege at one and the same time as they represent the loss of such privilege. It is the simultaneous moment of privilege and loss that we excavate when we turn our attention to the production of white masculinity. It is their whiteness and maleness that privilege them. But it is also in this space of historical privilege that they begin to confront the realities of loss. (p. 3)

Working-class Euro-American males actually work in a class system to sustain a patriarchal class order, but they are not the main beneficiaries; they are in fact expendable (Weis, Proweller, & Centrie, 1996). These men did not hold dominant class males--who made decisions about paycuts and plant closings--responsible. Instead, they blamed affirmative action's preferential policies on why they were not working at jobs "they deserve" (Weis, Proweller, & Centrie, 1996, p. 8). For men who aspire to be like their bosses, blaming affirmative action, and not their bosses, and more importantly, not blaming capitalism and its class divisions, is logical. Not only did these men espouse that only "merit" should be the basis of employment and academic decisions, but also they believed the essential biological fact of being white and male entitled them to dominant class privileges.

When dominant class males would not share wealth and power with them, working-class Euro-American males did not rebel, because dominant class males have wealth and power to retaliate against them.(15) Working-class Euro-American males instead choose to look for groups against whom their essential biological claims can be used to advantage. The other groups are women, peoples of color, homosexuals, non-Christians, and colonized peoples. The attack on affirmative action is due to the fact that women and people of color are protection groups under Title VII Civil Rights legislation. Homosexuals have gained protection in some jurisdictions, but non-Christians and colonized peoples have no voice to resist the "angry white male" backlash (Lynch, 1989).(16)

NERDITY

Not all Euro-American men need to be like the working-class men in the studies of Weis and her colleagues to be marginalized. Kendall's (this issue) article finds that Euro-American men who are socially categorized as "nerds" are Euro-American middle-class males who are marginalized. "Nerds" are marginalized because their gender performance differs from hegemonic masculinity.

Kendall defines a "nerd" as usually a male Euro-American (may also be Asian-American), heterosexual (more likely asexual), who is a high achiever in education (especially math and science), highly skilled with computers and has a high IQ, but who is socially inept, collects objects associated with knowledge (especially computers), is a science fiction fan, has poor personal hygiene, wears uncoordinated clothing (especially "flood" pants that are too short), and whose home is decorated in a haphazard manner (like a college student's with castoff furniture)--emphasizing functionality (computers constantly humming like a workplace instead of sentimental and sensual decor).

ASIAN AND ASIAN-AMERICAN MEN

Asian and Asian-American men are often stereotyped as nerds (Cheng, 1996b; 1997b; Espiritu, 1996).(17) Their marginalization as nerds is an example of the complex intergroup relations between sex, gender, sexuality, race, religion, coloniality, and class. Typically Asian and Asian-American men are portrayed as being physically smaller than Euro-American men, who are "the standard of masculinity." The typical physical size of Asian and Asian-American men is close to, or smaller than, average Euro-American women.(18) Since hegemonically masculinity values physical dominance, and Asian men are smaller in size, they are regarded as unmasculine, they are inferiorized (particularly if Euro-American women are the same or larger size than them). Attributions by Euro-Americans, which many Asian and Asian-Americans have internalized, that Asian and Asian-American men's gender performance is inferior, e.g., nerd-like, reinforces these biological differences in physical size.

For hooks (1994), blatant racism may not be as large an issue as white supremacist ideology, which itself need not necessarily take the form of the Ku Klux Klan, Aryan Nations, or other Euro-American hate groups. Rather, it is ethnocentric, androcentric (i.e., male centered), and heterosexist: the culture, and indeed all things and people who are white, are superior to that which is outside of this group. As Kovel (1970) states, aversive racism, the avoidance of marginalized group members by the dominant group, is more prevalent than overt forms that prevent marginalized group members from participating fully in the groups and organizations of society.

Sexuality is another form of marginalization. Some types of males, other than Asian-Americans, who are not hegemonically masculine are attributed to be homosexual. They are regarded as asexual (Espiritu, 1996; Wong, 1992) or homosexual. Asexuality in a bipolarized gender role culture is regarded as highly deviant, even more "deviant" than homosexuality.

There is a historical reason for the sexual projection of the dominant group since Chinese males, the oldest group of Asian immigrants, were imported as railway laborers to replace African-American slaves who were given freedom.(19) Chinese were "the cheap labor" who were indentured into servitude. They initially were easily deportable and could not become citizens.(20) Further, the dominant group did not allow Chinese males to bring their wives. Antimiscegenation laws prohibited men of color from marrying Euro-American women. There was a "bachelor society," a social system devoid of women, lacking sexual expression, nuclear families, and the ability to reproduce. Without female immigrant workers, Asian-American men had to do "women's work," something that not even African-American men were required to do under slavery. The attribution that Asian-American men are

sexless largely comes from this history.(21,22)

Some, particularly Euro-American males, regard Asian-American males as homosexual. While the attribution of homosexuality to heterosexual Asian-American males is considered highly offensive, it is only this way because, within Asian America, as with the rest of heterosexist society, homosexuality is marginalized. Gay and lesbian (GLs) Asian Americans face marginalization based on both race and sexuality. However, GLs themselves often marginalize those among them who do not fit neatly into GLs or straight gender roles.

Racism alone is insufficient to explain the complexities of the intergroup conflict between Euro-Americans and Asians and Asian Americans. The racism explanation is frequently a historical. Historical geo-political intergroup conflict must be understood (Cheng 1995b; Said, 1992; Wolf, 1982). In brief, by the 1930s, the Euro-Americans and Europeans conquered most of the Asian sub-groups. At the time, the masculinity projected upon Asian men by the dominant group to justify colonialism was that they were the "Yellow Peril," a devious threat to American and European national security (Espiritu, 1996). The Philippines were won in a war with Spain. While called a "commonwealth of the U.S.," it was a defacto colony. The Japanese were defeated in another war, and their country occupied. China was defeated by the British in the Opium Wars, after which the Western powers carved up China into territories. While there was less U.S. military presence in Asia, Christian missionaries, arguably with their use of shame toward the "heathens," were more powerful than an aircraft carrier (Cheng, 1995b). More sophisticated than Christianity are MTV, American cinema, Western fashion and advertising, and American higher education. These more sophisticated forms of colonialism are referred to as post-colonialism. In short, at the group level, Asian and Asian-American men are marginalized as conquered men.(23)

"Civilization" is a particular socially constructed discourse of the dominant group. It links the dominance of hegemonically masculine men to white supremacy (Bederman, 1995). Upper- and middle-class men used the civilization discourse to maintain class, gender, and race privilege. Civilized races have marked gender role polarization.

Civilization thus constructed manliness as simultaneously cultural and racial. White men were able to achieve perfect manliness because they had inherited that capacity from their racial forebearers. Black men, in contrast, might struggle as hard as they could to be truly manly, without success. They were primitives who could never achieve true civilized manliness because their racial ancestors had never evolved that capacity. (Bederman, 1995, p. 29)

By examining history, and in particular coloniality and its discourse of civilization and modernization, it is apparent that the present version of hegemonic masculinity is the latest reintegration of a long and complex series of domination against marginalized groups and alternative gender performances.

Class comes into play in the nerd attribution toward Asian and Asian-American men when we see an overrepresentation of these men in technical fields. Demographers and careers scholars account for this overrepresentation by saying that technical fields, in the case of newer immigrants, require a lower level of English language skills and less knowledge of Euro-American culture, which is the world's business culture. Asian-Americans who have been in the U.S. for longer periods often go into technical fields, into quantitative fields such as accounting, engineering, and computer science, which they believe will decrease the chance of being racially discriminated against (Baron & Newman, 1990; Featherman & Hauser, 1978; Shenhav & Haberfeld, 1992).

Chua and Fujino's (this issue) article reports on their survey of heterosexual undergraduates at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), on the topic of the gender performance of Asian-American and Euro-American males. Immigrant and U.S.-born Asian-American and Euro-American women clearly differentiate the masculinities presented by Asian-American and Euro-American men. All three groups of women perceive Asian-American men in highly stereotypical ways, such as their being more oriented toward traditional bi-polar gender roles, romantic, polite, nurturing, exotic, and likely to be college graduates. Further, women in the survey perceive

Asian-American men to be less masculine and less physically attractive than Euro-American men.

SEXUALITY AND MARGINALIZATION

Another way biological males can be marginalized is to be gay. "Gayness ... is the repository of whatever is symbolically expelled from hegemonic masculinity" (Connell, 1995, p. 78). Since hegemonic masculinity is a relational construct, it needs gayness as a contrast, as something to be more than, something to be against.

Heterosexuals tend to think of homosexuality as homogenous. It is more accurate, however, to speak of homosexualities. Steve Kurtz (this issue), for his article, studied Cuban and Puerto Rican gay men living in Miami, Florida, and finds even within Latin American homosexualities, there is sub-group variation. Kurtz's study found difference between the groups based upon culturally derived roles taken during sexual encounters.

GENDER PERFORMANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY BASED ON SEX

The performance of gender is not necessarily based on sex, although it appears that way, because most individuals conform to biologically essential definitions of what their gender performance "ought to be." Women ought to be "feminine." Men "ought to be masculine." The point this special issue makes is that there are multiple femininities and masculinities. There are entire groups in society who do not conform, not just as a matter of the intrapsychic level, but as a matter of culture.

Halberstam (1998) points out that "there is no word opposite to 'emasculatation,' no concept of 'effeminacy'" (p. 371). She explains this lack by saying female masculinity threatens motherhood. "Despite at least two decades of sustained feminist and queer attacks on the notion of natural gender, we still believe that masculinity in girls and women is abhorrent and pathological" (p. 371). Women can and do perform hegemonic masculinity.

Women are in occupations that are traditionally male dominated and gender-normed on hegemonic masculinity, such as the military (Barrett, 1997), military schools (Addleston & Stirratt, 1996), law enforcement (McElhinny, 1994), firefighting, and boxing (Halberstam, 1998). Judi Addleston (this issue) points out that women in the military need to prove their hegemonic masculinity in order to be accepted for membership by their reference group. Female police officers believe hegemonic masculinity natural in their occupation (McElhinny, 1994). Ambitious women in hegemonic masculine organizations "act pretty much like men" (female respondent in Ely, 1994, p. 221). Conformity to occupational and organizational hegemonic masculinity helps women produce the image that they are professionally capable and worthy of not only retention but also promotion.

Hegemonic masculinity, particularly in "male defined" occupations and organizations, is phallocentric. The penis is the absolute insignia of the male sex (Garber, 1992). Addleston (this issue) argues that the penis validates men who are marginalized by class, e.g., the characters in the films *Boogie Nights* (1997) and *The Full Monty* (1997), and validates a woman who is attempting to join the hegemonically masculine group through symbolic appropriation of a penis, e.g., G.I. Jane (1997). The penis is then a cultural artifact of gender performance.

HEGEMONIC AND MARGINALIZED MASCULINITIES COEXISTING

The authors in this special issue focus on men and women who perform a marginalized masculinity as a sub-group of a larger system. They have not studied the intergroup relationships between dominant and marginalized groups as they interact within a social system. In the last article, I explore how hegemonic and marginalized masculinities coexist in one social system.

The organization under study is The Group (a pseudonym), a charismatic cultic Christian revisionist communal social change movement. The Group is leader focused--on a Caucasian male to whom followers see as a charismatic and super-human, possessing spiritual wisdom and maturity. While claiming to have an original doctrine, The Group uses the Christian Holy Bible in a revisionist manner, while revising biblical stories and symbols to suits its charismatic purposes. The Group has twelve communes where members live, work, and worship together in accordance with the organization's discourse. The Group is a social change movement whose stated purpose is "assist in the spiritual regeneration of humankind."

Now that we have reviewed some concepts of marginalization and sex-gender, without further delay, here is the special issue.

NOTES

(1.) Despite repeated efforts I was unable to recruit scholarly contributions for this issue dealing with Native Americans, differently abled persons, or one's marginalization based on colonial status.

(2.) Thompson (1984) deals with marginalization by age.

(3.) Essentialism is so prevalent that it is impossible to completely cite. However there are prominent essentialists on both sides of the political spectrum ranging from radical feminist Andrea Dworkin (1974) to conservative George Gilder (1973).

(4.) National cultures, not only the groups within a society, may be considered gendered. Hofstede's (1980) highly cited intercultural dimensions are based on values surveys of a multi-national corporation (IBM?). The survey was done across occupation, gender, and age with 116,000 questionnaires, in 40 countries at two time points, 1968 and 1972. It includes a (hegemonic) "masculinity" scale. That is, how great is the distance between hegemonically masculine and emphasized feminine gender roles? Japan had the greatest distance at 95. The U.S. had a score of 62. Canada had a score of 52. Closest to the mean of 42.5 were Peru and Spain at 42, and France and Iran at 43. Sweden had the lowest score, five. Hofstede's (1984) reductionism must be taken into account; nevertheless, he is widely cited, and does offer us the most comprehensive means of comparison.

(5.) Essentialists marginalize intersexed individuals--thinking that there are two and only two sexes--male and female.

(6.) The essentialist (and false) concept that men are always the powerful ones marginalizes men who are physically and/or emotionally weaker than women are. Not only are men who are beaten by their spouses physically and emotionally injured, society emotionally injures them more, for these men have essentialistically "failed manhood." Some feminists deny the social problem of battered males--believing battered males detract from battered females. They play a zero sum game in which only women can be victims, and are therefore entitled to sympathy, donations, and political support. For an interesting overview of this research area, see George, 1994.

(7.) Carrigan, Connell, and Lee (1985) are correct in their criticism that sex-role theory does not fully model behavior. As a scholar of small groups and organizations, I see role theory as useful. Roles mandate the behaviors that reference groups, especially employers and supervisors, require of their members. These reference groups are organized to accomplish tasks. They are not interested in behavior that falls outside the role set. In our increasingly fast-paced, mechanized, and modernized society in the west, roles become increasingly important, due to the increased pressures to have efficient transactions. At the same time roles are becoming more important under modernity, the same forces are forcing their breakdown, as in recent years family-work balance has become a "hot topic." However, reference groups, which are also task groups still in social practice, use role theory.

(8.) The Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974, 1993) presents an extensive list of hegemonically masculine characteristics from a social-psychological perspective, such as: acts as a leader, aggressive, ambitious, analytical, assertive, athletic, competitive, defends own beliefs, dominant, forceful, independent, individualistic, masculine, self-reliant, self-sufficient, strong personality, willing to take a stand, and willing to take risks.

(9.) Essentialists believe that testosterone causes male aggression. Attempts to correlate testosterone and aggressive behavior have been inconclusive (see Fausto-Sterling, 1985; Kemper, 1990; Messner, 1997; Pleck, 1981).

(10.) Heterosexual women who are attracted to "Alpha Males," the leading hegemonically masculine males, are actually reinforcing hegemonic masculinity by rewarding this gender behavior with attractive validating responses,

if not dates, sex, love, and marriage. These women use men as objects of success, as hegemonically masculine men use women as sex objects (Gould, 1974). If gender behavior and gender relations are to change, so must rewards for those behaviors. Rewards, such as affiliation, love, and sex, must not be attached to behaviors that are no longer desirable. This motivator may not be as applicable to heterosexual women who perform hegemonic masculinity, for most heterosexual men may not be attracted to women who present themselves in this manner.

(11.) Gates appears to be shorter and weigh less than the average Euro-American male. It is hardly necessary to introduce Bill Gates since he is currently the richest man in the world, and the fifth richest man in all of American history.

(12.) Hegemonic masculinity can be attributed to a social system as well as an individual; i.e., Starbucks coffeehouse chain is also regarded as engaging in predatory capitalism.

(13.) There is a popular term used to describe marginalized men; "emasculated," is synonymous with "neutered." It is defined as a sense of insufficient hegemonic masculinity, which is a condition of millions of men without power or privilege (Bem, 1993). This sense is acute when a man must admit that a woman has more power or privilege than he does. Rather than use this popular term that has sexual overtones, we prefer to use the term "marginalized," for it describes complex intergroup relations rather than the intrapsychic level.

(14.) The National Organization of Women (NOW) claims it represents all women in America and is against sexual harassment. Only after there was an outcry against NOW's lack of support, after the law suit of Paula Jones (the former Arkansas state clerical employee who sued then Arkansas Governor, now President Bill Clinton, for sexual harassment) was summarily dismissed, did NOW make a public statement of support. "Bourgeois feminists" merely want privileged white men's high paying and powerful jobs. They do not want to change oppressive social structures. They merely want to substitute white heterosexual male domination with white female domination. In the words of the 1970s rock group, The Who, "meet the new boss, same as the old boss." It makes no difference whether the dominator is a white male or (bourgeois) "feminist" white female. They both are hegemonically masculine.

(15.) The American labor movement of the 1930s was more about economic issues, rather than its European counterparts which strove both for economic betterment and social change.

(16.) African-American comedian (and social critic) Chris Rock (1997) points out that: "There's nothing scarier than a broke white man. The broke they are, the madder they are. That's when white people start forming groups and blowing up shit. Freeman. Aryan nations. Klan. Poor, pissed-off white people are the biggest threat to the security of the country.... Broke-ass white people have it bad. I'll bet you a set of black satin sheets that 80 percent of the Ku Klux Klan makes less than \$13,000 a year. No wonder they hate black people, especially those who have any money. There's nothing a white guy with a penny hates more than a nigger with a nickel (p. 29)."

(17.) This section focuses on Asian-American men and not Asian-American women, because the latter are not usually stereotyped as a "nerd." A "nerd" is unmasculine and asexual. A current main stereotype of Asian-American women is that they perform emphasized femininity, a version of femininity that is pleasing to hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987). Typically, Asian-American women do not perform hegemonic masculinity. The classic stereotype of Asian-emphasized femininity is the "war bride," an Asian Pocahontas who awaits a great white savior (U.S. serviceman) and a hegemonically masculine Caucasian male to marry her. "Picture brides," Asian and other women who want to immigrate by marrying an American male, still exist.

(18.) Note that Euro-American women are typically physically smaller than Euro-American men.

(19.) Historically, since few Asian-American women were present in the early history of Asian America, Asian-American men were the targets of racist violence by Euro-Americans (Chan, 1991; Daniels, 1988). This trend continues to this day (Chan, 1991; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1986).

(20.) Caucasian immigrants from Europe were thought by the dominant group to be capable of assimilation, but not peoples of color (Daniels, 1968).

(21.) How many of these early Chinese men turned to homosexuality on a temporary basis, and how many were actually homosexual prior to their immigration, is unknown. Thus determining the population of a covert group is problematic.

(22.) Another projection which is more frightening for the dominant group to think about, except in movies like *Sixteen Candles* (1984), is that Asian-American men, having historically been a bachelor society, are sex-starved and sex-crazed--lusting after Euro- American women (Tajima, 1989, p. 312). Euro-American men have a history of projecting their fears of sexual inadequacy and envy off on men of color, especially African-American ones (Allport, 1954; Jordan, 1968).

(23.) Asian and Asian-American women and others are also conquered. Here I do not imply Asian and Asian-American men ought to be conquerors of Euro-Americans, and only to reproduce patriarchal hegemonically masculine intergroup relations. In fact, I favor non-hierarchical, non-cohesive social relations.

REFERENCES

Addleston, J., & Stirratt, M. (1996). The last bastion of masculinity: Gender politics at The Citadel. In C. Cheng (Ed), *Masculinities in organizations* (pp. 54-76). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Alderfer, C. P. (1987). An intergroup perspective on group dynamics. In J. W. Lorsch (Ed.). *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 190-222). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Anderson, E. (1990). *Streetwise: Race, class and change in an urban community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baldwin, J. (1963). *Fire next time*. Boston: Dial.

Baril, G., Elbert, N., Mahar-Porter, S., & Reavy, G. (1989). Are androgynous managers really more effective? *Group & Organizational Studies*. 14(2), 234-249.

Baron, J. N., & Newman, A. E. (1990). For what it's worth: Organizational and occupational factors affecting the value of work done by women and nonwhites. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 155-175.

Barrett, F. J. (1997). *Reproducing gender within a hypermasculine institution: Marginalizing practices*. Working paper. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.

Becker, H. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Macmillan.

Bederman, G. (1995). *Manliness & civilization: A cultural history of gender and race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lens of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Blauner, R. (1972). *Racial oppression in America*. New York: Harper & Row. *Boogie Nights*. (1997). Anderson, P. (Dir.). Technicolor. 155 mins. USA: New Line Cinema.

Brod, H. (1987). The case for men's studies. In H. Brod (Ed.), *Making of masculinities* (pp. 39-62). New York: Routledge.

Brownmiller, S. (1977). *Femininity*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.

- Carrigan, T., Connell, R. W., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 551-604.
- Chan, S. (1991). *Asian Americans: An interpretive history*. Boston: Twayne.
- Cheng, C. (1995a). Gender dialogues and gender ideologues: What happened to professorial responsibility to the profession of management? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 8(5), 67-73.
- Cheng, C. (1995b, April). Keeping 'em down through classical organizational structure: A postmodern critique of modernist organizational theory's conception of diversity. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Academy of Business Disciplines, Redondo Beach, CA.
- Cheng, C. (1996a). Men and masculinities are not necessarily synonymous: Thoughts on organizational behavior and occupational sociology. In C. Cheng (Ed.), *Masculinities in organizations* (pp. xi-xx). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cheng, C. (1996b). "We choose not to compete": The "merit" discourse in the selection process, and Asian and Asian American men and their masculinity. In C. Cheng (Ed.), *Masculinities in organizations* (pp. 177-200). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cheng, C. (1997a). A review essay on the books of bell hooks: Organizational diversity lessons from a thoughtful race and gender heretic. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(2), 553-574.
- Cheng, C. (1997b, October). Racio-ethnic masculinity discrimination against Asian and Asian-American men in the managerial selection process. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Conference of the Association for Asian Studies, Boulder, CO.
- Coltrane, S. (1994). Parenting and gender: New styles and old stereotypes. Paper presented at the XIII World Congress of Sociology. Bielefeld, Germany: July.
- Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1993). The big picture: Masculinity in recent world history. *Theory & Society*, 22, 576-623.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1996). Politics of changing men. *Arena Journal*, 6, 53-72.
- Cox, T., & Nkomo, S. M. (1990). Invisible men and women: A status report on race as a variable in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 419-431.
- Daniels, R. (1968). *Politics of prejudice: The anti-Japanese movement in California and the struggle for Japanese exclusion*. New York: Athenaeum.
- Daniels, R. (1988). *Asian American: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory & Society*, 22, 643-657.
- Dworkin, A. (1974). *Woman hating*. New York: Dutton.
- Ely, R. J. (1994). The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among

professional women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 203-238.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1996). *Asian-American women and men: Labor, laws, and love*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (1985). *Myths of gender: Biological theories about women and men*. New York: Basic.

Featherman, D. L., & Hauser, R. M. (1978). *Opportunity and change*. New York: Academic.

Fouque, A. (1980). Warnings. In E. Marks & I. De Courtwron (Eds.), *New French feminism* (pp. 117-118). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Franklin, C. W. (1984). Black male-black female conflict: Individually caused and culturally nurtured. *Journal of Black Studies*, 15, 139-154.

The Full Monty. (1997). Cattaneo, P. (Dir.). Technicolor. 95 mins. USA: 20th Century Fox.

Game, A., & Pringle, R. (1983). *Gender at work*. London, UK: Allen & Unwin.

G.I. Jane. (1997). Scott, R. (Dir.). Technicolor. 125 mins. USA: Caravan Pictures.

Garber, M. (1992). *Vested interests: Cross-dressing and cultural anxiety*. New York: Harper Collins.

George, M. J. (1994). Riding the donkey backwards: Men as the unacceptable victims of marital violence. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 3, 137-159.

Gilder, G. (1973). *Sexual suicide*. New York: Bantam.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1976). Gender display. *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication*, 3, 69-77.

Gould, R. E. (1974). Measuring masculinity by the size of a paycheck. In J. Pleck & J. Sawyer (Eds.), *Men and masculinity* (pp. 96-100). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultures consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. (1984, abridged edition).

hooks, b. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black woman and feminism*. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender and cultural politics*. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Outlaw culture: Resisting representations*. New York: Routledge.

Hughes, E. C. (1944). Dilemmas and contradictions of status. *American Journal of Sociology*, 50, 353-359.

Jordan, W. D. (1968). *White over black: American attitudes toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Kemper, T. (1990). *Social structure and testosterone: Explanation of the socio-bio-social chain*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kimmel, M. S. (1994). Masculinities as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 119-141), Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Kovel, J. (1970). *White racism: A psychohistory*. New York: Random House.
- Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lynch, F. R. (1989). *Invisible victims: White males and the crisis of affirmative action*. New York: Praeger.
- Madrid, A. (1988). Missing people and others: Joining together to expand the circle. *Change*, May-June, 55-59.
- Maguire, D. C. (1980). *A new American justice: Ending the white male monopolies*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- McIntosh, P. (1990). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent school*, 31-34, Winter, 31-34.
- McElhinny, B. (1994). An economy of affect: Objectivity, masculinity and the gendering of police work. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), *Dislocating masculinity: Comparative ethnographies* (pp. 159-171). London: Routledge.
- Messner, M. (1997). *Politics of masculinities: Men in movements*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Park, R. E. (1950). *Race and culture*. New York: Free Press.
- Park, R. E., & Burgess, E. W. (1921). *Introduction to the social science of sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs*, 5.
- Rock, C. (1997). *Rock this*. New York: Hyperion.
- Rodman, D. (1996). *Bad as I want to be*. New York: Delacorte.
- Saffioti, H. (1967). *Women in class society*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Said, E. W. (1992). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- Sennett, R., & Cobb, J. (1973). *Hidden injuries of class*. New York: Vintage.
- Shenhav, Y., & Haberfeld, Y. (1992). Paradigm, uncertainty, gender composition and earning inequity in scientific disciplines. *Research in the sociology of organizations*, 10, (pp. 141-172). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Shilts, R. (1993). *Conduct unbecoming: Lesbians and gays in the U.S. military*. New York: St. Martins.
- Sixteen Candles. (1984). Hughes, J. (Dir.). Technicolor, 93 mins. Universal: USA.
- Staples, R. (1979). The myth of black macho: A response to angry black feminists. *Black Scholar*, Mar./Apr., 24-32.
- Staples, R. (1982). *Black masculinity: The black male's role in American society*. San Francisco: Black Scholar Press.
- Tajima, R. E. (1989). Lotus blossoms don't bleed: Images of Asian women. In Asian Women United of California (Eds.). *Making waves: An anthology of writing by and about Asian American women* (pp. 308-317). Boston: Beacon.
- Thompson, E. H. (Ed.). (1994). *Older men's lives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1986). Recent activities against citizens and residents of Asian descent, 88, Washington, DC: Clearinghouse Publication.

Wallace, M. (1979). Black macho and the myth of the superwoman. New York: Dial.

Weis, L., Proweller, A., & Centrie, C. (1996). Re-examining a moment in history: Loss of privilege inside white, working-class masculinity in the 1990s. In M. Fine, L. Powell, L. Weis, & M. Wong (Eds.), *Off white* (pp. 210-228). New York: Routledge.

Wolf, E. R. (1982). *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wong, S. W. (1992). Ethnizing gender: An exploration of sexuality as sign in Chinese immigrant literature. In S. G. Lim & A. Ling (Eds.), *Reading the literature of Asian America* (pp. 111-130). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Cliff Cheng, cliff@almaak.usc.edu.

Cliff Cheng is a visiting scholar at the University of Southern California. He also works as an organizational effectiveness consultant and serves as expert witness on workplace gender issues. He has taught at UCLA, USC, and UCI. Cheng is interested in gender issues at work and Asian-American men and their masculinities. He has more than 130 publications, papers, and presentations, including a book, *Masculinities in Organizations* (Sage, 1996). His work has appeared in *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *Organizational Dynamics*, and *Academy of Management Executives*. Cheng also serves on the editorial board of the *Academy of Management Executives*. ([cliffc @almaak.usc.edu](mailto:cliffc@almaak.usc.edu))

Source Citation (MLA 7th Edition)

CHENG, CLIFF. "Marginalized Masculinities and Hegemonic Masculinity: An Introduction." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 7.3 (1999): 295. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 28 June 2016.

URL

[http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?](http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA54776375&v=2.1&u=s1185784&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&asid=aeb2e9ea00dce03b7fce6b0f59dd19b1)

[id=GALE%7CA54776375&v=2.1&u=s1185784&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&asid=aeb2e9ea00dce03b7fce6b0f59dd19b1](http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA54776375&v=2.1&u=s1185784&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&asid=aeb2e9ea00dce03b7fce6b0f59dd19b1)

Gale Document Number: GALE|A54776375