HIERARCHY WITHOUT HEGEMONY: LOCATING BOYS IN AN INCLUSIVE SCHOOL SETTING

MARK McCORMACK
Brunel University

ABSTRACT: *In this article, the author details how 16–18-year-old boys ascribe to the tenets of inclusive masculinity in a U.K. secondary school that the author calls "Standard High." Drawing on five months of participant observation and twelve in-depth interviews, this article demonstrates that the boys' masculinities are predicated in opposition to the orthodox values of homophobia, misogyny, and aggressiveness. Accordingly, the practices of subordination and marginalization described in hegemonic masculinity theory are not used to regulate masculine behaviors or obtain dominance in this setting. At Standard High, boys ascribing to different masculine archetypes can each maintain high social status. Nonetheless, a social hierarchy still exists. Here, boys are stratified in accordance to a popularity ranking, which is determined by the possession of a matrix of variables: namely, charisma, authenticity, emotional support, and social fluidity.*
Keywords: homophobia, masculinities, gender, popularity, homohysteria, friendship, school, students

INTRODUCTION

Previous research has shown that school-aged boys are hierarchically stratified according to a hegemonic mode of masculine dominance (Mac an Ghaill 1994; Stoudt 2006). Here, boys are compelled to conform to orthodox gender norms by exhibiting homophobic, misogynistic, and aggressive attitudes and behaviors (Nayak and Kehily 1996; Plummer 1999). These masculine behaviors are found in several studies of educational institutions (Epstein 1997a; Jackson 2006; Salisbury and Jackson 1996), and schools are shown to be complicit in the re/production of these dominant gender norms (Epstein and Johnson 1998; Plummer 1999). However, Anderson (2009) argues that a decrease in cultural homophobia results in young men enacting radically different gendered behaviors. According to Anderson's *inclusive masculinity theory*, diminishing cultural homophobia can result in multiple masculinities being esteemed in one setting.

Address correspondence to: Mark McCormack, Brunel University, West London, Uxbridge, UB8 3EL, UK; *e-mail*: mark.mccormack@brunel.ac.uk

Sociological Perspectives, **Vol. 54, Issue 1, pp. 83–101, ISSN 0731-1214, electronic ISSN 1533-8673.**
© 2011 by Pacific Sociological Association. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website, at http://www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintinfo.asp. **DOI: 10.1525/sop.2011.54.1.83.**

In this article, I detail how 16–18-year-old boys maintain the tenets of inclusive masculinity in a U.K. sixth form[1] that I call "Standard High." Drawing on five months of participant observation and twelve in-depth interviews, I show that the boys' masculinities are predicated in opposition to homophobia, misogyny, and aggressiveness. Therefore, in contrast to the traditional literature (Epstein 1997a; Mac an Ghaill 1994; Robinson 2005), practices of subordination and marginalization are not used to regulate masculine behaviors or obtain dominance in this setting (cf. Connell 1995). At Standard High, boys ascribing to different masculine archetypes (e.g., jocks, emos, geeks) can all maintain high social status.

Nonetheless, a social hierarchy still exists. Rather than being ranked by masculine capital, however, boys are instead stratified by "popularity." I show that this ranking of boys is determined by the possession of a constellation of variables: namely, charisma, authenticity, emotional support, and social fluidity. Importantly, these variables are not used to stigmatize boys who do not maintain high levels of popularity—boys are not marginalized for being "unpopular." It was not possible, however, to explicate how these inclusive views developed—it seems that the boys held these attitudes before reaching Standard High. Accordingly, in this ethnography, I show the ways in which popularity is maintained, examining the social matrix of a setting where inclusive masculinities predominate.

Theorizing Masculinities

The most prolific theory for masculinities studies has been Connell's (1987, 1995) hegemonic masculinity theory. From a social constructionist perspective, hegemonic masculinity theory articulates the social processes by which a masculine hierarchy is created and legitimized. Connell (1995) describes two key mechanisms that produce this hegemony: *domination* conceptualizes the material acts that subordinate specific groups of boys and men, while *marginalization* represents the discursive challenging of the legitimacy of particular masculinities. She argues that these processes combine to produce just one culturally esteemed form of masculinity.

These mechanisms are of fundamental importance to Connell's theorizing. In the second edition of *Masculinities*, Connell (2005) reconfirms the centrality of these social processes in her theory of gendered relations. Furthermore, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:844) maintain that "to sustain a given pattern of hegemony requires the policing of men." Indeed, they argue that "the concept of hegemonic masculinity presumes the subordination of nonhegemonic masculinities" (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005:846). It can therefore be reasonably concluded that hegemonic masculinity will not adequately describe a setting where these social processes are absent.

Hegemonic masculinity theory has been a successful heuristic tool precisely because most studies show boys are stratified in this way (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). These processes of oppression are used by boys and men to maintain or improve their position within male hierarchies (Jackson 2006; Stoudt 2006). And because heteromasculinity is traditionally privileged, boys have been forced to distance themselves from homosexuality and femininity (Connell 1987; Pronger

1990). Accordingly, homophobia, violence, and misogyny have regularly been shown to be integral aspects of the dominant mode of masculinity (Mac an Ghaill 1994; Pharr 1997).

However, these gendered behaviors are not fixed, and hegemonic masculinity theory is only one lens through which the social construction of masculine hierarchies may be understood. Scholars have warned that an over-reliance on Connell's theory leads to selective accounts of masculinity and diminished lines of academic inquiry (Rowe 1998). Indeed, Moller (2007) argues that academics see patterns of hegemonic masculinity even when the social dynamics are in fact far more complex. Yet by stereotyping men in this regard, it is possible that we fall back onto hegemonic masculinity theory as a default way of understanding men's behaviors. This is problematic because broader cultural changes may impact on the stratifications of boys and men in ways that this theory cannot address.[2]

This is important because, in recent years, a rapid rise in gay visibility has coincided with a sharp decrease in cultural homophobia (Loftus 2001; Ohlander, Batalova, and Treas 2005; Weeks 2007). Anderson (2009) examines how these changing levels of homophobia directly impact on the social hierarchy of masculinities, arguing that the diminution of marginalization and domination allows men the opportunity to discuss their feelings and provide each other with social and emotional support. Anderson presents *inclusive masculinity theory* to argue that the gendered behaviors of boys and men will be radically different in settings where cultural homophobia has diminished.

Anderson (2009) develops his theory using the concept *homohysteria*. This is defined as the cultural fear of being homosexualized, and there are two key factors that affect a culture's level of homohysteria: The awareness that anyone can be gay, and the level of cultural homophobia. For Anderson (2009:8), these factors impact on "the need for men to publicly align their social identities with heterosexuality in order to avoid homosexual suspicion." He argues that in the period since the emergence of masculinities studies, Western cultures have been highly homohysteric.

In this zeitgeist, hegemonic masculinity theory captures the social dynamics of male peer group cultures, where homophobia is the key mechanism in stratifying men (Connell 1995; Kimmel 1994; Plummer 1999). This is because in a homohysteric culture, it is possible for *anyone* to be socially perceived as gay, even against their self-identification (Anderson 2008a). However, Anderson (2009) argues that the heuristic utility of hegemonic masculinity theory is diminished when levels of homohysteria decrease. Anderson theorizes that when homophobia no longer acts as a policing mechanism to the dominant form of masculinity, the esteemed attributes of boys and men will not rely on control and domination. Accordingly, masculinity is not the primary way of ranking boys and men in such contexts. Here, multiple forms of masculinity can be equally esteemed, and the subordination of particular forms of masculinity will not be a requirement of any given stratification. Alongside Anderson (2008a; 2008b), I have shown (McCormack 2010; McCormack and Anderson 2010a) that tactility and emotional intimacy are esteemed attributes of heterosexual men in settings of low homophobia. Even so, the social dynamics of settings with low levels of homophobia remains under-researched.

The Social Hierarchies of Boys in Homohysteric Cultures

Given the high levels of homophobia in the 1980s and 1990s (Loftus 2001) and the associated fear of being socially perceived as gay (Anderson 2009), the great majority of research on the social dynamics of male peer group cultures has occurred in homohysteric settings. This is one reason why homophobia has been particularly significant in regulating masculine boundaries (Kimmel 1994; Plummer 1999; Rivers 2011). Epstein (1997a) and Mac an Ghaill (1994) highlight that heterosexuality and masculinity are produced *simultaneously* through the deployment of homophobic discourse and the condemnation of anything perceived as feminine or gay (see also Hillier and Harrison 2004; Phoenix, Frosh, and Pattman 2003; Rivers 2001).

Pascoe (2007) theorizes the co-production of masculinity and heterosexuality by discussing a "fag discourse," where homophobic epithets are continually hurled between boys and men as they jockey for masculine position. This discursive policing of orthodox sexual and gender norms promotes one's own heteromasculine capital (Anderson 2005; Epstein 1997a). The power of homophobia in the regulation of masculinity means that boys and men learn to reject all behaviors coded as homosexual (Anderson 2009; Kimmel 1994; Plummer 1999).

Bullying is seen as inevitable for boys who transgress heteromasculine codes within this model, particularly for boys who rank poorly in the masculine hierarchy (Martino and Pallotta-Chiarolli 2003; Rivers 2011). Alongside reaffirming the masculine hierarchy, bullying also serves to bring "deviant" boys back in line with the norms of a particular setting (Steinberg, Epstein, and Johnson 1997), limiting the range of permissible behaviors available to boys. Indeed, the rules of masculinity are so restrictive that Mac an Ghaill (1994:56) describes boys' legitimate behaviors as limited to "three F's": football, fighting, and fucking. Francis (1999:357) describes a slightly expanded list, including "'having a laugh,' alcohol consumption, disruptive behavior, objectifying women, and an interest in pastimes and subjects constructed as masculine."

Scholars have also focused on the ways in which stratifications of masculinity are dependent on factors other than homophobia. Robinson (2005) shows that boys sexually harass girls to raise their own masculine capital, while athleticism and sporting participation are also key factors in maintaining a masculine persona in school settings (Burgess, Edwards, and Skinner 2003). For example, Light and Kirk (2000) demonstrate that masculinities are primarily stratified in accordance with how closely boys embody the practices of the rugby players in the school they studied. Of course, sport has long been entwined with macho versions of masculinity and implicated in the promotion and reproduction of homophobia (Messner 1992).

It is important to note that while a substantial amount of research examines the social dynamics of male peer groups, there is notably little scholarship on the social hierarchies of heterosexual boys and men in settings where overt homophobia is absent (McCormack 2010; McCormack and Anderson 2010a). For example, while Jackson (2006) partially examines popularity rankings of male students, she focuses on how popularity is interlinked with (homophobic) orthodox masculinity. This focus on "laddish" behaviors prevents the multiplicity of masculinities that exist in school settings from being fully recognized (cf. Francis 1999; Jackson 2006). As Lyng (2009:463) argues, this means that empirical studies of secondary

schools do not "grasp the variety of student groups and the relations between them." To overcome this issue, it is necessary to investigate the social processes by which boys are stratified when homophobia is absent. Accordingly, I theorize the social processes of the ranking of boys in a school setting where I empirically demonstrate that inclusive masculinities are predominant.

METHODS

Participants

Data for this research come from a five month ethnographic study of a sixth form in the southwest of England. Data collection occurred between March and July 2008. The participants are the 16–18-year-old boys attending the sixth form, "Standard High." The student population at Standard High comes from Standard town, which is situated seven miles from a major British city. There are 200 pupils in total, evenly split between boys and girls.

The sixth form was strategically selected because of its demographic similarity to the population of the U.K. Accordingly, these students reflect the race and class profile of the country as a whole. Students come from working to upper-middle class families; 90 percent of the students are white, and the remaining 10 percent comprise a variety of other ethnic and racial groups. Furthermore, the scholastic achievement rankings of the school rest at the median of the U.K.'s formalized testing results. It is important to note that students can leave school at 16 in the U.K., so all participants have opted to stay in full-time education. This may mean that some of the more disruptive students have already left the setting.

It is also important to note that the great majority of male students at Standard High are white, middle class, and heterosexual. This means that the dominant discourses of race, class, and sexuality in the school are aligned with the students' own social identities (cf. Taylor 2007) and seem to impact less on these students. For example, while I undertook a class analysis, it did not prove to be a fertile coding of data. Accordingly, I call my participants "principally privileged," highlighting that participants' heterosexual masculinities and friendship groups are inextricably linked to their privileged class and race positions.

Procedures

A triangulated approach was adopted, with participant observation, in-depth interviews, and passive observation of lessons[3] providing three perspectives of the students' attitudes and behaviors (Bogdan and Biklen 2003). I spent five months at Standard High, spending five hours a day on average in the setting, totaling over 500 hours of participant observation. Multiple classes were observed, and I socialized with the students across the school site. However, the most illuminating data were collected in the students' common room.

The common room is reserved for use by the 16–18-year-old students only. It has computers, a vending machine, and a stereo system. It is open all day, so students use it on their breaks or when they have a free period. The majority of students spend at least some of their day in the common room, and boys of all social groupings use

it. It is also an unsupervised area, with the only adults being part-time employees who sell snacks and drinks; I rarely saw teachers or administrators in the common room. I spent a large proportion of time with students in this setting, as it provided the opportunity to observe boys of various sub-groupings away from institutional regulation. Indeed, perhaps because of this freedom from teacher regulation, the common room turned out to be the richest source of observational data.

While participant observation provides insight into behavioral patterns, interviews provide data about participants' attitudes (Brewer 2002). In addition to numerous casual conversations, I conducted twelve semi-structured, in-depth interviews, strategically selecting self-identified heterosexual boys from various subcultures. Interviewees' race and class mirror that of the school population. Interviews were conducted at the end of the participant observation, so that rapport had developed between us. Interviewees were selected from one grade level, meaning that twelve out of fifty boys from this age bracket (16–17) were interviewed.

Much of the interview schedule was created from the thematic coding of the participant observations. This included issues of bullying and harassment, friendship groups, attitudes toward homosexuality and homophobia, as well as perceptions of masculinity and popularity among peers. The interviews averaged fifty minutes and were recorded, transcribed, and coded using a constant-comparative method of emerging themes (Goetz and LeCompte 1984). A portion of coding was cross-checked by another researcher, who had also spent time in the school to strengthen the rigor of my interpretations of participant observations.

The nature of qualitative research prevents grand claims of statistical generalizability. However, this does not mean that the substantive theoretical findings will not be replicable elsewhere. As Willis and Trondman (2002) argue, the strength of ethnographic research is in its ability to move from qualitative descriptions to conceptual analysis that informs existing theory. Accordingly, I discuss how my findings impact contemporary understanding of popularity among male students in educational settings.

Social Distance and Researcher Effect

Given the critiques of the subjective nature of ethnographic research, the relationship between researcher and participants is of increased significance in ethnography (Wax 1971). In school-based ethnographies, there are two main approaches to negotiating the relationship between participants and researcher. In one, ethnographers retain an adult, expert role (see Pascoe 2007). In the other, researchers actively place themselves into the students' world (see Ferguson 2000). I refer to these two ethnographic forms as *formal* and *informal*, with the names characterizing the interactions and relationships that the researcher maintains with participants.

The predominant style of ethnography in school settings has traditionally been that of the formal model (Mac an Ghaill 1994). Here, ethnographers maintain social distance from their participants, as they seek to project a professional and knowledgeable self-image. For example, Pascoe (2007:180) documents the strategies she uses to define herself as "an outsider, albeit a privileged one, an expert, someone who knew more about the boys than they knew themselves." While formal ethnographies

minimize the likelihood of going native, this ethnographic style has serious implications with regards to the richness of data collected and can lead to the researcher being detached from their research setting (Goetz and LeCompte 1984).

In contrast to the formal ethnography, the informal approach requires social distance between researcher and participant to be minimized (Adler and Adler 1998). Perhaps the best example of informal ethnography in the educational literature is Ferguson's (2000) study of the intersection of race, gender, and schooling. Here, Ferguson aligned herself with her participants, actively situating herself in their world, maintaining distance from teachers and administrative staff. This minimized social distance with her participants, decreased researcher power, and enabled Ferguson to collect data otherwise unobtainable in school settings. Proponents of this style of ethnography maintain that decreased social distance between researcher and participants leads to richer data and increased validity (Hoffman 2007).

It is because of the richness of data collected from informal ethnographies that I adopt this form of data collection. To facilitate this, I sought to minimize social markers of difference between myself and my participants. I adopted the male students' colloquialisms and talked about the same television shows they enjoyed. This was made easier by my similar age, ethnicity, and class status. Accordingly, I was familiar with most of the cultural references that many of the students used. For example, I already shopped in the same clothes shops as many participants (such as River Island and Topman). I also watched some of the television shows they enjoyed (such as Skins and Family Guy), and I listened to similar radio stations (such as Kiss and BBC Radio 1). These similarities enabled me to join in the informal discussions that pervade daily life.

However, I did not try to present myself as a student. As Wax (1971:49) argues, participants can view assurances that the researcher is one of them as "rude, presumptuous, insulting, or threatening." Accordingly, I presented myself as sympathetic to students' views, eager to get to know them, and appreciative of their engagement with me. To support this, I also distanced myself from the administration while in the presence of students. This meant that I did not reprimand students who engaged in minor rule-breaking behaviors: I did not comment on the copying of homework or when students left campus. This complicity was agreed with the administration before data collection commenced. Overall, while I recognize the complexities of engaging with teenagers, I believe I was successful in maintaining good relationships with a broad range of students.

It is important to note that this was not covert research. When meeting new students, either in lessons or the common room, I would introduce myself by saying I was a university student "writing a book on what it means to be a guy in school today." I said that I wanted to hear their opinions and views, and to get to know them as well. The extent of participants' knowledge of my research (beyond my introduction) was dependent on how much they asked.

Reflexivity

While I worked to decrease social distance, it is necessary to recognize the impact of the researcher on the research process (Wax 1971). The relationship between

the researcher and participants can have complex and unexpected effects. The strength of reflexivity, as Willis (1978:197) argues, is in the ability of the researcher to "analyze the intersection of his own social paradigms with those of the people he wishes to understand." While a thorough methodological account of my position in the field has been produced elsewhere (McCormack 2010), I detail here some of the steps I took to examine the effect of my presence on the statements and behavior of participants.

As Mauthner and Doucet (2003) suggest, I allocated specific times and places each day to reflect on the collection of data. Here, I examined the ways in which my personal influences impacted on my analysis of data, and my emotional experiences in the field. I also investigated the extent to which participants acted differently when I was present (Wax 1971). First, I spoke to two key participants about my findings, strategically presenting some false findings to see if the students were willing to challenge my interpretation. Both students disagreed with these findings, validating my belief that other students did not act markedly differently around me. Secondly, I spoke to members of staff who spent time with students but maintain little authority over them: the caretaker, cleaner, and those who staff the common room food shop. These adults all commented that they noticed no difference in how students acted in my presence or absence.

Ethical Issues

Ethical guidelines have been followed to ensure that no harm comes to the participants in this research. Permission for interviews was obtained from the Head Teacher (i.e., the Principal), the student, and a parent/guardian of each student interviewed. Participants were also told that they were under no obligation to talk with me and that they could inform myself or a member of staff if they did not want me to interact with them. To ensure the anonymity of participants, all names have been changed and any identifying characteristics of participants removed. The openly gay student (who could potentially be identified by other participants) gave permission for his interview data to be used in publications resulting from the research.

An Inclusive Masculinity Setting

The total absence of overt homophobia is the most striking finding at Standard High. Throughout the five months of data collection, including over 500 hours of participant observation, I *never* heard the term "gay" used in derogatory ways. Additionally, phrases such as "that's so gay" are not used by these students. Instead, the word "gay" is only used in its literal sense when referring to homosexuality. Homophobic pejoratives have fallen out of usage altogether. To verify that the absence of homophobic discourse was not due to my presence, in addition to speaking to key informants and teachers, I interviewed the canteen staff that work in the common room, but who maintain little authority over students. They confirmed that students do not use homophobic discourse.

Tom provides more data supporting an absence of homophobia at Standard High. As the only openly gay student in the sixth form, he insists that he does not

hear homophobic discourse and does not feel subordinated by his peers. "I like it here," he says. "The other guys are cool with it. … Nobody is bothered." While Tom is shy (he has just two close friends at Standard High), he insists that this is because he spends most of his time in the library. "It's not because I'm gay," he says. "I'm a quiet guy. That's just who I am."

Furthermore, the boys at Standard High stand firmly and publicly against homophobia. When the issue of homophobia is raised in interviews, *all* participants position themselves against it. They maintain this is true of their fellow students, too. For example, Matt, a sporty and popular boy, suggests that if someone was homophobic, he would be policed by his peers. Justin adds, "They wouldn't get away with homophobia. We'd tell them it's not on." Sam, a quieter student, agrees, "You might find homophobia before [sixth form], but not here. It's just not acceptable anymore." Thus, it seems that rather than homophobia being an integral part of masculinity the way Kimmel (1994) describes, boys at Standard High instead stigmatize homophobic behaviors.

Other tenets of orthodox masculinity hold less significance at Standard High, too. Boys rarely employ misogynistic language or engage in behaviors that sexually degrade women (cf. Epstein and Johnson 1998; Robinson 2005). The (hetero)-sexualized discussions of sex tend to focus on the boys' own potency, rather than girls' traditionally stigmatized behaviors. While discussion of one's heterosexual potency is also found in traditional forms of masculinity (Mac an Ghaill 1994), these discussions are notable in that they are not used to marginalize or dominate other students. While this may have socio-negative effects in relation to misogyny, it is further evidence that students do not marginalize or bully each other.

Male students also do not appear to express misogynistic attitudes, and girls who have sex with several boys are not stigmatized for having done so. For example, one free period, Matt, Liam, and Ant (three of the most outgoing boys) walk into the common room and overhear a group of girls discussing oral sex. The boys walk to the other side of the common room, where they continue their conversation. They do not label the girls as sluts or whores, as previous research suggests they might (Lees 1993). This example is typical of the way boys at Standard High do not publicly invoke misogyny. While I did not have access to the boys' private sexual talk (where sexual objectification of women is more likely to occur), girls at Standard High appear to have greater freedom from sexualized harassment than other research suggests (Epstein 1997b; Robinson 2005).

The male students at Standard High also do not exhibit the aggressiveness traditionally associated with school-aged boys (cf. Stoudt 2006). For example, no fight occurred between sixth form students in the five months I collected participant observations. Indeed, participants say that there have been no physical altercations between students in the sixth form throughout the academic year. They attribute this to the view that fighting is no longer part of "being a man." Sam says, "It just wouldn't be cool. Fighting sucks." Jack agrees, "Guys are now more laid back—they depend on their wit, rather than strength."

Finally, a requisite characteristic for boys at Standard High is that they are inclusive of other boys. There are countless examples of this, but particularly noteworthy is the active inclusion of Tom, the openly gay student. Jack recalls a sixth form

trip where he saw Tom sitting alone on the bus. Knowing Tom's shyness, Jack felt sorry for him. He gathered a few friends, and together they sat around Tom for the rest of their journey. Jack explains, "I mean he was there on his own. You can't just let him sit there."

The boys also play sports together, regardless of athletic ability. For example, Dan is not particularly popular at Standard High, and he walks with a limp. Nonetheless, when passing a group of sporty boys playing tennis, they ask him to join their game. Where this invitation would once perhaps have been designed to humiliate him, these boys are sincere in their offer. They welcome him to the court and, after rallying back and forth for several shots, Ian offers Dan advice on improving his serve. After, Ian says, "If we were playing another school and it was competitive, you want your best team. But if it's just for fun, then anyone can play. Why not?" So whereas boys once avoided association with marginalized or less popular students, this is not the case at Standard High. Instead, these inclusive acts have been normalized, with friendliness both expected and esteemed.

A Popularity Ranking at Standard High

Boys are no longer stratified according to an aggressive and domineering form of masculine dominance at Standard High, yet a hierarchy of boys is still evident. Put simply, certain boys are more popular than others. This popularity, however, is not maintained through peer diminution, domination, or risk-taking behaviors (cf. Jackson 2006). Instead, many boys ascribing to a wide range of masculine archetypes can maintain popularity. These boys come from both privileged backgrounds and areas of socio-economic disadvantage; they include students of various ethnicities and boys of various athletic abilities. Dominant discourse is based on white, middle-class norms, yet these do not stratify boys *within* the school. Instead, a boy's popularity is dependent on the extent to which he maintains other characteristics. In this hierarchy, I identify four main categories of behavior that increase one's popularity at Standard High: charisma, authenticity, emotional support, and social fluidity.

It should be recognized that popularity is a concept that is both complicated and nebulous (Cillessen and Rose 2005). At one level, popularity is self-evident to the extent that it is visible as a set of relations between peers (Adler and Adler 1998). However, popularity is also firmly entrenched in discourses of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Despite the complexities behind this deceptively simple term, popularity remains a useful and enduring concept. Indeed, Francis, Skelton, and Read (2010:3) comment that "for all its fragility and inherent contradiction, the concept bears great resonance and recognition in schools." The participants in this research discuss popularity themselves, and it effectively describes the social dynamics of Standard High.

Charisma

A boy's popularity at Standard High is primarily maintained by entertaining his peers through high-octane, energetic behaviors. Accordingly, *charisma* denotes the extroverted and "fun-loving" acts that increase popularity. For example, the

primary entertainment in the common room one week was based on the use of a skateboard. Different boys would use it to perform tricks, each trying to outperform the others. The success of the trick, however, was less important than the energy and exuberance with which it was executed. The most popular performances were the funniest and most physical, not necessarily the most skilled. Thus, boys displaying the most charisma received the most praise.

Charisma has always been important in boys' behaviors, but in this setting it does not manifest as violent or aggressive acts that are usually associated with teenage boys (Salisbury and Jackson 1996). For example, one day, Matt, Joe, and Ben enter the common room where loud music is playing. Hearing it, they jump on two empty tables in the middle of the common room and start dancing and singing along. After a crowd has gathered, Joe lies on his back, cradling his legs in his arms. Matt and Ben spin him around for several seconds, and the other students chant Joe's name. Dizzy, Joe jumps off the table and stumbles. The other students cheer, and Matt stops him from bumping into a wall. This example is typical of esteemed masculine behaviors at Standard High. The students are energetic but fundamentally unaggressive.

Charisma is also important when the boys play sports. For example, a group of students often play an informal game of cricket during their lunch break. The players always want a good bowler because this ensures that everyone gets a chance at batting. However, even though Matt has the most skill, the favorite bowler is Jack. This is because while Matt ensures a fast (though not too fast) turn-over of batters, Jack provides more entertainment when bowling. Where Matt concentrates on his bowling, Jack uses his charisma to entertain the other players in various ways. He imitates famous cricketers, moves in funny ways, and banters with other players. Jack is esteemed for his extroverted behaviors when playing cricket and is always a central player in these informal games.

The centrality of charisma in rankings of popularity is also supported by interviews. Alex, a quiet student who plays in a rock band, highlights the importance of charisma to popularity. "The bigger the character you are, the higher up you are." He adds, "Take Joe, he's really out there. But he's popular because he's a big character." Sam agrees, "I would be more popular if I was loud and outgoing, but that's not really me." Ian suggests that this is because extroverted behaviors raise the spirits of *all* students. "Say it's a wet and rainy day and everyone's down," he says, "You can always rely on someone doing something, just to make everyone laugh again, and feel a bit better."

Authenticity

The most popular boys at Standard High are also seen by other students as being genuine and open. This characteristic is conceptualized by the variable *authenticity*. Indeed, the presentation of a "truthful" and "honest" self is a valued attribute for boys at Standard High. For example, Jack argues that authenticity is highly important. "It is ultimately about comfortability with yourself," he says, "And a lot of guys are a lot less secure than they portray."

One way authenticity is displayed is through clothing. The most esteemed clothing style is that of a group of sporty students who dress to display their physique

(Filiault and Drummond 2009). They wear tight t-shirts and low-hanging trousers, revealing their underwear—stylish fashion accessories with designer labels on show. Although this dominant clothing style exists at Standard High, several popular boys differ from this norm. For example, Jack wears garish clothes even though style is highly valued. Yet his difference is championed, and his popularity high. This is partly attributable to his charisma but also due to his self-confident, individualistic fashion choices. Similarly, Ant wears clothes symbolic of lower class groups, while Nick wears sports clothes. These clothing choices correspond with the students' self-image, and they therefore display authenticity through their difference—helping them maintain their popularity.

However, while authenticity cements the popularity of the more charismatic boys, it is also important for those who lack charisma because it provides these boys with an opportunity to increase their popularity. For example, while talking about differences between students, Ian comments, "Take Sam, he's a bit different. But I got to know him, and he's really cool. I like his individuality."

The importance of authenticity is also demonstrated by boys who do not engage in the charismatic behaviors of the most popular students. In other words, boys who follow their own interests are respected for doing so. Ant says, "Some guys don't dance on tables and stuff, but that's them. They want to get on with their work, and I respect them for that." Ant's statement is supported by participant observations. Standard High has silent workrooms where students can choose to study when they do not have lessons. Students have to cross the common room to reach these workrooms, and many low ranking students, including Tom, spend their free time there. Yet I did not observe students being heckled or bullied for going to these rooms; rather, their work ethic is praised. Justin says, "I wouldn't do it. I mean I don't think it's fun. But good for them if they want to get good grades."

The importance of authenticity to popularity rankings is further evidenced by discussions of boys deemed lacking in it. For example, Jack suggests that Ben does not maintain authenticity. Jack says, "I know he's insecure, but he comes across as false." When asked about Ben, Steve agrees, saying, "It's annoying. He talks about football loads, but I know he's not really into it. I don't know why he pretends." Matt concurs, "Yeah, he tries too hard. He's a good guy, but he puts too much effort in." Accordingly, Ben's lack of authenticity limits his popularity.

Emotional Support

The giving of *emotional support* between boys is an ordinary interaction at Standard High. Here, boys regularly offer each other reassurance and advice. Indeed, boys at Standard High maintain that support is a crucial part of friendship. In interviews, several boys say that their friends provide emotional comfort and practical help. Discussing his friends, Ian says, "I could have a serious chat with any of them, but at the same time still have a laugh." Matt agrees, "I love my friends, and I could rely on them if I needed to." Boys speak of their close friendships openly, without the threat of being feminized for this (cf. Kehler 2007).

Boys also support each other in times of stress. For example, Steve has been learning to drive for several months. Before taking his test, a group of friends

publicly offer him support. Oli says, "I know you'll pass first time, you're really good," and Jack says, "Good luck, man, I'll be thinking of you." As Steve prepares to leave, Ant embraces him for several seconds, and says, "I know you can do it."

Boys also provide assurance to each other in public events, such as assemblies and music performances. Even though ritualized events like these have traditionally been scenes for the re/establishment of masculine hierarchies (Pascoe 2007), this is not the case at Standard High. An example of this comes through the election of "student officers." Each candidate gives a three minute speech in assembly, and each is applauded as he or she steps up to the platform to argue for his or her election. Simon, who is somewhat socially awkward and not particularly popular, speaks hesitantly, making several mistakes. Nonetheless, he is equally applauded by his peers. Later in the common room, Simon walks past a group of the most popular students. Matt calls out, "Well done, Simon. It was good," and Ian adds, "Yeah, it's not easy to do." There was no heckling, and the boys praised Simon's willingness to take part.

Demonstrating the importance of emotional support, if it is judged by peers that a boy has not offered the right level of support, he is reprimanded for his behavior. For example, Dave is discussing with his friends the opportunity he has been given by an art teacher to help paint a mural in the common room. Dave says, "I think I will. I mean, I want to leave my mark on the school." As Justin and Kai are suggesting this is a good opportunity, Joe joins the conversation by commenting, "You can paint it with my dick!" However, no-one laughs at this, and there is a short silence until Kai comments, "Joe, don't be harsh, it sounds cool." Joe looks perturbed by this, and quickly replies, "Oh sorry man. You've got to go for it. I mean, you love that kind of stuff." Here, Joe was regulated for the cavalier and somewhat aggressive manner in which he contributed to the discussion. His failed attempt at humor resulted in him demonstrating his support of Dave so as not to lose social standing.

Social Fluidity

Research shows that boys' friendship groups are traditionally fragmented into heavily insulated social cliques (Stoudt 2006). In contrast to this, boys at Standard High valorize the ability to socialize with a range of students. Complementing both inclusivity and support, *social fluidity* denotes the ease with which students can move between social groups and how well they can befriend a broad range of peers.

The privileging of social fluidity means that there are no real cliques at Standard High—just groups of friends. That is, while friendship groups exist, they lack the exclusivity, competitiveness, and rivalry that characterizes many social cliques (Adler and Adler 1995). Furthermore, while these distinct friendship groups exist, there is often overlap between them. Nick says, "I'm friends with the sporty lot, yeah, but also other guys. I spend time with each, and that's important to me." Sam has a similar view of social groupings, "I'm friends with lots of guys. In fact, you'll see me hang out with different guys each week."

Many boys value this sociability. For example, in the last week of the summer term, approximately two-thirds of the students organize a five day holiday

together to the same seaside resort. About ten students carefully planned the trip, ensuring that the whole group stayed near each other. Matt, one of the main organizers, says, "It's important we go as a group, so we can all celebrate the end of the year together."

However, social fluidity is about more than having a large number or broad range of friends (Francis et al. 2010). It also involves being able to socialize with boys who are not part of one's own friendship group. For example, Ian presents himself as able to spend time with anyone: "I love spending time with my friends in the common room. But if my friends aren't there, I can talk to guys I don't really know. Just make conversation with them."

Students with less popularity agree. Alex, who perceives himself as being on the periphery of several groups, says:

> "When you enter the common room and your friends aren't there, you can just talk to other people. I'd be more popular if I did that more, but I find chatting to people I don't know difficult."

Indeed, social fluidity blurs somewhat with charisma. This is because charismatic boys are better socially equipped to talk to people beyond their friendship group. Of significance, however, is that popular boys who do not socialize beyond their immediate social network do not rank as highly as boys that maintain a broad range of friends. Notably, the most popular boys desire to mix with all students, and participant observations show the most popular boys are also happy for less popular students to join their friends.

Being Unpopular? A Hierarchy without Hegemony

The stratification of masculinities traditionally found in schools has been shown to be maintained by marginalizing students and stigmatizing particular boys as *un*masculine (cf. Mac an Ghaill 1994; Stoudt 2006). This is not the case with the popularity stratification found at Standard High. This ranking is not used by students to stigmatize their peers—it is not a *negative* ranking system. That is, while some boys at Standard High may maintain little popularity, they are not labeled unpopular and socially ostracized by their peers. When asked if anyone is unpopular, Ant says, "No, we all get along pretty well. I might not like everyone, but there's nobody I hate." Jack concurs, saying, "There are a few guys I can think of who don't have many friends, but I wouldn't say they were unpopular, no."

The boys recognize, however, that certain behaviors are unacceptable at Standard High. Ian says, "It wouldn't be okay if someone was rude all the time, or upset people." Sam adds, "Well, if you bullied someone, that would be bad." Nick sums up the boys views, by saying, "Basically you'd be unpopular if you were really mean to someone." Participant observation supports these statements, too. I did not come across a single student who was ostracized or labeled unpopular in my five months at the school. Indeed, the one time I witnessed a boy harassing another student (for sitting in his seat), other boys confronted the aggressor—who later apologized for his behavior. It seems that breaking the tenets of inclusive masculinity is the only way to be unpopular at Standard High.

Also, students who are not particularly popular appear happy with their position in the popularity ranking. For example, Sam recognizes he would be more popular if he was more extroverted, but comments, "That's not really me. I'm happy with my friends, and I don't want to be more popular." However, the less popular students do not desire to be like the esteemed forms. Alex says, "There are plenty of guys more popular than me, but that's because I'm not a joker. And it suits me fine." Similarly, Kai comments, "Look at Matt, he's really cool. But I like my friends and my group. I don't want to change." Accordingly, this is a social hierarchy without hegemony, and that requires new conceptual tools to understand its maintenance.

DISCUSSION

Research on school cultures shows that many boys' gendered behaviors are structured into a restrictive heteromasculine ethos that is heavily policed by homophobic discourse. In such a setting, heterosexual boys must conform to restrictive gender norms if they desire to maintain masculine status. However, this article finds that boys at Standard High position themselves against homophobia, do not publicly engage in misogyny, and do not exhibit aggressive or violent behaviors. Offering fresh insight into the gendered behaviors of boys in school settings, it supports Anderson's inclusive masculinity theory by showing that the set of acceptable masculine behaviors is greatly expanded in settings where homophobia is absent. When boys cease to be homophobic, misogynistic, and aggressive, multiple forms of masculinity can prosper, and masculine capital no longer serves as the main stratification of boys.

Inclusive masculinity theory does not, however, explain how boys are ranked in an inclusive setting. This article contributes to the literature by conceptualizing a popularity ranking of boys, consisting of four variables: charisma, authenticity, emotional support, and social fluidity. It highlights that while toxic practices of masculinity have been shown to exist in many settings (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005), boys also engage in socio-positive acts that do not harm others.

An important finding of this research is that boys who provide emotional support are esteemed for doing so at Standard High. This stands in contrast with much existing literature. For example, Brannon (1976) highlighted how men must be a "sturdy oak," while Pollack (1998) showed that a code exists to severely restrict the emotional freedoms of boys. Nayak and Kehily (1996:224) also suggest that "talking about personal and emotional subjects can be problematic as it fractures the hard face of conventional masculinity." Yet the emotional support demonstrated in this study highlights how the understanding of boys as emotionally illiterate is based in work that is over a decade old and questions the extent to which work from a more homophobic era speaks to contemporary youth.

The social fluidity of male students is also an important and somewhat counterintuitive finding. Research on masculinities and student friendship groups demonstrates the ways in which friendship groups are consolidated by the exclusion of ostracized students (Poteat, Espelage, and Green 2007), yet this article suggests that this is not the case in settings of low homophobia. Here, the ability to socialize across friendship groups is an attribute that raises one's popularity. Accordingly,

it is necessary to contextualize processes of exclusion as dependent on existing within highly homohysteric cultures.

This article has not examined the genesis of the inclusive attitudes that exist at Standard High. This is because despite rigorous analysis, I have been unable to discern any substantial institutional influences unique to Standard High that should affect rates of homophobia and the construction of masculinities (see McCormack 2010; 2011). For example, there is no openly gay teacher, no gay student with high social capital, and no institutional pro-gay initiatives. To comprehensively explain the origin of these behaviors would be the topic of another article, but I suggest that reasons for it may be found at a cultural rather than institutional level (Anderson 2009; McCormack and Anderson 2010b; Weeks 2007).

The inclusive masculinities on display at Standard High may also be partly attributable to the dynamics of sixth form education. Students at Standard High are no longer compelled to be in full-time education, and thus some of the more disruptive students may have decided against joining the sixth form. Furthermore, Kehily and Pattman (2006) argue that sixth form students appropriate middle class norms—distancing themselves from homophobia would be one way of doing this. However, this factor can only be a partial explanation, because previous research has documented high levels of homophobia in sixth form settings (Epstein, O'Flynn, and Telford 2003; Salisbury and Jackson 1996).

While this research locates boys on a social hierarchy in an inclusive masculinity setting, it is only exploratory in certain other respects. For example, while it is apparent that boys at Standard High reject many misogynistic behaviors, the effect girls have on the construction of masculinity is undertheorized. Further research investigating the role women play in the construction of masculinity would be illuminating. While this is an important area of further study, I concur with O'Donnell and Sharpe (2000) when they stress the importance of the male peer group in the construction and stratification of masculinities. It is also interesting to note that there is only one openly gay student out of 200 students in the sixth form (although there are more openly gay children lower down the school). Given that it is reasonable to expect an increase in openly gay students in settings with little or no homophobia, further inquiry as to why there are not more openly gay students is required.

Nonetheless, I present in this research an alternative view of the construction of masculinities and the stratification of boys in a U.K. high school. I explicate the mechanisms of a gendered popularity hierarchy and examine the social matrix of an inclusive masculinity setting. By doing this, I show that not all schools are homophobic, misogynistic, and violent spaces, and that we therefore need a new theoretical lens for viewing male behavior in schools.

NOTES

1. Sixth form refers to the final two years of schooling in the U.K., with students aged 16–18.
2. See Anderson (2009) and McCormack (2011) for more detailed critiques of hegemonic masculinity theory, as well as the differences between hegemony and hegemonic masculinity.

3. I passively observed lessons at the start of the data collection process, before I had developed relationships with students. This enabled me to observe the different dynamics of classroom settings. In total, I observed eight separate classes over a period of two weeks and used the connections I made with these participants to meet other students in the social areas.

REFERENCES

Adler, Patricia and Peter Adler. 1995. "Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion in Preadolescent Cliques." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58(3):145–62.

———. 1998. *Peer Preadolescent Culture and Identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Anderson, Eric. 2005. *In the Game: Gay Athletes and the Cult of Masculinity*. New York: State University of New York Press.

———. 2008a. "'Being Masculine Is Not about Who You Sleep with...': Heterosexual Athletes Contesting Masculinity and the One-Time Rule of Homosexuality." *Sex Roles* 58(1–2):104–15.

———. 2008b. "Inclusive Masculinity in a Fraternal Setting." *Men and Masculinities* 10(5): 604–20.

———. 2009. *Inclusive Masculinity*. London: Routledge.

Bogdan, Robert C. and. Sari K. Biklen. 2003. *Qualitative Research for Education*, 4th Edition. New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Brannon, David. 1976. "The Male Sex Role and What It's Done for Us Lately." Pp. 1–45 in *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority*, edited by R. Brannon and D. David. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brewer, John D. 2002. *Ethnography*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Burgess, Ian, Allan Edwards, and James Skinner. 2003. "Football Culture in an Australian School Setting: The Construction of Masculine Identity." *Sport, Education and Society* 8(2):199–212.

Cillessen, Antonius and Amanda J. Rose. 2005. "Understanding Popularity in the Peer System." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 14(2):102–5.

Connell, Raewyn. 1987. *Gender and Power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

———. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

———. 2005 *Masculinities*, 2nd Edition. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

——— and James Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19(6):829–45.

Epstein, Debbie. 1997a. "Boyz' Own Stories: Masculinities and Sexualities in Schools." *Gender and Education* 9(1):105–15.

———. 1997b. "Keeping Them in their Place: Hetero/Sexist Harassment, Gender and the Enforcement of Heterosexuality." Pp. 154–71 in *Sexual Harassment: Contemporary Feminist Perspectives*, edited by A. M. Thomas and C. Kitzinger. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

——— and Richard Johnson. 1998. *Schooling Sexualities*. Buckingham, UK: Open University.

———, Sarah O'Flynn, and David Telford. 2003. *Silenced Sexualities*. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham.

Ferguson, Ann. 2000. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Filiault, Shaun and Murray Drummond. 2009. "All the Right Labels: Gay Male Athletes and Their Perceptions of Clothing." *Culture, Society and Masculinities* 1(2):177–96.

Francis, Becky. 1999. "Lads, Lasses, and (New) Labor." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20(3):355–71.

———, Christine Skelton, and Barbara Read. 2010. "The Simultaneous Production of Educational Achievement and Popularity." *British Educational Research Journal* 36(2):317–40.
Goetz, Judith and Margaret LeCompte. 1984. *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
Hillier, Lynn and Lynn Harrison. 2004. "Homophobia and the Production of Shame." *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 6(1):79–94.
Hoffman, Eric. 2007. "Open-Ended Interviews, Power, and Emotional Labor." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 26(3):318–46.
Jackson, Carolyn. 2006. *Lads and Ladettes in School*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
Kehily, Mary Jane and Rob Pattman. 2006. "Middle-Class Struggle?" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 27(1):37–52.
Kehler, Michael. 2007. "Hallway Fears and High School Friendships: The Complications of Young Men (Re)negotiating Heterosexualized Identities." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 28(2):259–77.
Kimmel, Michael. 1994. "Masculinity as Homophobia." Pp. 103–9 in *Theorizing Masculinities*, edited by H. Brod and M. Kaufman. London: Sage.
Lees, Sue. 1993. *Sugar and Spice: Sexuality and Adolescent Girls*. London: Penguin.
Light, Richard and David Kirk. 2000. "High School Rugby, the Body and the Reproduction of Hegemonic Masculinity." *Sport, Education and Society* 5(2):163–76.
Loftus, Jenni. 2001. "America's Liberalization in Attitudes toward Homosexuality, 1973–1998." *American Sociological Review* 66(5):762–82.
Lyng, Selma Therese. 2009. "Is There More to 'Antischoolishness' than Masculinity?" *Men and Masculinities* 11(4):462–87.
Mac an Ghaill, Mairtin. 1994. *The Making of Men*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
Martino, Wayne and Maria Pallotta-Chiarolli. 2003. *So What's a Boy: Addressing Issues of Masculinity and Schooling*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
Mauthner, Natasha and Andrea Doucet. 2003. "Reflexive Accounts and Accounts of Reflexivity in Qualitative Data Analysis." *Sociology* 37(3):413–31.
McCormack, Mark. 2010. "The Declining Significance of Homohysteria for Male Students in Three Sixth Forms in the South of England." *British Educational Research Journal* iFirst:1–17.
———. 2011. *Gay Friendly High School: Masculinities, Sexualities and Friendship*. New York: Oxford University Press.
——— and Eric Anderson. 2010a. "'It's Just Not Acceptable Anymore': The Erosion of Homophobia and the Softening of Masculinity at an English State School." *Sociology* 44(5):843–59.
——— and Eric Anderson. 2010b. "The Re-Production of Homosexually-Themed Discourse in Organized Sport." *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 12(8):913–927.
Messner, Michael. 1992. *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Moller, Michael. 2007. "Exploiting Patterns: A Critique of Hegemonic Masculinity." *Journal of Gender Studies* 16(3):263–76.
Nayak, Anoop and Mary Jane Kehily. 1996. "Playing It Straight: Masculinities, Homophobia and Schooling." *Journal of Gender Studies* 5(2):211–29.
O'Donnell, Mike and Sue Sharpe. 2000. *Uncertain Masculinities: Youth, Ethnicity and Class in Contemporary Britain*. London: Routledge.
Ohlander, Julianne, Jeanne Batalova, and Judy Treas. 2005. "Explaining Educational Influences on Attitudes toward Homosexuality." *Social Science Research* 38(4):781–99.
Pascoe, C. J. 2007. *Dude, You're a Fag*. London: University of California Press.
Pharr, Suzanne. 1997. *Homophobia: A Weapon of Sexism*. Berkeley, CA: Chardon Press.

Phoenix, Ann, Stephen Frosh, and Rob Pattman. 2003. "Producing Contradictory Masculine Subject Positions: Narratives of Threat, Homophobia and Bullying in 11–14 Year Old Boys." *Journal of Social Issues* 59(1):179–95.

Plummer, David. 1999. *One of the Boys: Masculinity, Homophobia and Modern Manhood*. New York: Harrington Park Press.

Pollack, William. 1998. *Real Boys*. New York: Random House.

Poteat, Paul, Dorothy Espelage, and Harold Green. 2007. "The Socialization of Dominance: Peer Group Contextual Effects on Homophobic and Dominance Attitudes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 92(6):1040–50.

Pronger, Brian. 1990. *The Arena of Masculinity: Sports, Homosexuality, and the Meaning of Sex*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Rivers, Ian. 2001. "The Bullying of Sexual Minorities at School." *Educational and Child Psychology* 18(1):32–46.

———. 2011. *Homophobic Bullying: Research and Theoretical Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, Kerry. 2005. "Reinforcing Hegemonic Masculinities through Sexual Harassment." *Gender and Education* 17(1):19–37.

Rowe, David. 1998. "Play Up: Rethinking Power and Resistance." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 22(2):241–51.

Salisbury, John and David Jackson. 1996. *Challenging Macho Values: Practical Ways of Working with Adolescent Boys*. London: Falmer Press.

Steinberg, Deborah, Debbie Epstein, and Richard Johnson. 1997. *Border Patrols*. London: Cassell.

Stoudt, Brett G. 2006. "'You're Either in or You're Out.'" *Men and Masculinities* 8(3):273–87.

Taylor, Yvette. 2007. "Brushed Behind the Bikeshed." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 28(3):349–62.

Wax, Rosalie. 1971. *Doing Fieldwork*. London: University of Chicago Press.

Weeks, Jeffrey. 2007. *The World We Have One*. London: Routledge.

Willis, Paul. 1978. *Profane Culture*. London: Routledge.

——— and Mats Trondman. 2002. "Manifesto for Ethnography." *Cultural Studies: Critical Methodologies* 2(3):394–402.