

White Guy Habitus in the Classroom

Challenging the Reproduction of Privilege

MICHAEL A. MESSNER

University of Southern California

A couple of years ago, junior faculty in our department—most of them people of color and/or women—requested a meeting with senior faculty and a senior administrator to discuss concerns they had with teaching. One of their main concerns was that they felt they were being judged negatively by students, especially when they taught emotionally charged and politically volatile courses such as social inequality or race and ethnic relations. Students, they stated, tended to ding them on course evaluations for “lack of objectivity” in lectures and assigned readings. Furthermore, they observed that students did not always give them the respect that they believed they deserved. They were concerned with these patterns, both for pedagogical reasons and because they knew that student evaluations were part of the way that they were compared to their colleagues for merit ratings, promotions, and tenure decisions. Students’ views of them were important, and they were consequential.

The administrator and senior faculty acknowledged that race and gender biases on the part of students—especially in a course on social inequality, sex and gender, or race/ethnicity—tended to place faculty of color and/or women faculty at a disadvantage. Their advice was to be rigorous teachers and to insist that their students use formal and respectful forms of address (e.g., referring to the teacher as Professor so-and-so, or Dr. so-and-so, rather than by the more familiar first name address). This advice, although surely intended to help women and/or faculty of color successfully navigate often subtly racist and sexist classroom dynamics, was not satisfying. It seemed to me that by ignoring the race and gender dynamics of the classroom in which white males are the professors, we were missing an opportunity to understand an important part of the reproduction of race and gender inequalities—

Author’s Note: *I thank Celeste Atkins, Michael Kimmel, Roberta Seid, Barrie Thorne, and Gordon Suzuki for comments on an earlier draft of this article.*



Men and Masculinities, Vol. 2 No. 4, April 2000 457-469
© 2000 Sage Publications, Inc.

and by extension, an opportunity to more directly confront and change (rather than manage or navigate) these dynamics.

Drawing from reflections on my own experience as a heterosexual white man teacher, and from some of the literature on race, gender, and pedagogy, I will begin this article from the premise that indeed, women and/or people of color professors tend to be more critically evaluated than are white male professors. For instance, students tend to judge women professors first by their "gender performance" and second by their teaching performance (Baker and Copp 1997). The contradictory expectations that students often hold for women professors and/or people of color professors make it very difficult for these professors to get consistently outstanding course evaluations (Bennett 1982; Feldman 1993; Johnsrud 1993; Statham, Richardson, and Cook 1991). However, I want to suggest that it is not simply that women, and women and men of color, are being "graded down" because of gender and/or racial bias students hold; it is also that white males are actually being "graded up." This happens for two reasons: first, when most students enter a classroom, their preconception of what the professor looks like is likely to be close to what I look like (white, tall, 40-something, male, wearing a wedding ring); second, as the semester progresses, students' readings of white male professors' embodied habitus confirms their preconceptions about us. By contrast, students' experience of women and/or people of color faculty are different, because first, they do not immediately invoke the student's preconceived image of what the professor looks like, and second, as the semester progresses, the students' readings of women and/or people of color faculty's embodied habitus often tend to confirm students' negative preconceptions toward them.

Students' generally more negative views of women and/or people of color faculty have been confirmed by comparative analyses of student evaluations, which reveal that women and/or faculty of color often do get lower teaching evaluations than white males, even when teaching the same courses. Some of the underlying reasons for this disparity are hinted at in student evaluations for an introductory, general education, gender studies course that I have been team-teaching for the past eleven years, with five different women colleagues of varying personal styles, ages, ranks, and political affiliations.¹ Student comments in these classes were generally patterned² into dichotomous categories for me and for my women colleagues.

Man Professor	Woman Professor
He's objective.	She's biased.
He looks at all sides of issue.	She has an agenda.
He's relaxed and comfortable.	She has a chip on her shoulder.
He's flexible.	She's rigid and dogmatic.
He's open-minded.	She's politically correct.
He's good humored.	She's grumpy and angry.

In analyzing these patterns, I will employ two concepts introduced by R. W. Connell (1987, 1995). The first concept is what Connell calls the Patriarchal Dividend, which I will extend to call the White/Patriarchal dividend—the benefits that are automatically available to white men. This concept is illustrated in the above list in the way that I am automatically assumed to be very knowledgeable and fair-minded until I prove otherwise. It is the opposite for “others,” who are “guilty until proven innocent”; and their “guilt” is nearly impossible to entirely overcome, given that they are likely to be teaching topics with which they have direct “identity/connections” (e.g., women teaching gender, people of color teaching race, etc.). Indeed, Rakow (1991) observes that feminist course content adds to a female professor’s already existing liabilities, as students are more likely to see her as biased (especially against men). My course evaluations support this, as I appear to be able to get away with making more overtly antipatriarchal statements in the classroom without receiving a negative judgement from students as to my “bias” or “anti-male” attitudes.

The second concept is Connell’s (1995) notion of Complicit Masculinities, which are “masculinities constructed in ways that realize the patriarchal dividend, without the tensions or risks of being the frontline troops of patriarchy. . . . [Complicit masculinities] . . . often involve extensive compromises with women rather than naked domination or an uncontested display of authority” (pp. 79-80). I want to suggest that even “progressive” white male teachers sometimes enact a masculinity in the classroom that, while it may not be overtly misogynist or racist, does not challenge existing social arrangements, and is in fact complicit with the reproduction of hegemonic masculinity and with the concomitant marginalization and subordination of women, men of color, and sexual minorities. Complicit masculinity tends to reproduce social inequalities and positions white men to benefit from the White/ Patriarchal dividend. This is accomplished not due to bad faith or rational calculation on the part of the white male teacher but, rather, because the college classroom tends to construct and reinforce a certain kind of habitus in teachers.

WHITE GUY HABITUS

Pierre Bourdieu’s reproduction theory is a useful (but ultimately limited) starting place for an analysis of the process through which white male teachers construct a complicit masculinity that positions us to benefit from the White/Patriarchal Dividend. Bourdieu’s concepts of “field” and “habitus” exist in dynamic relation to each other. Fields may be thought of as

spaces of objective relations that are the site of a logic and a necessity that are *specific and irreducible* to those that regulate other fields. For instance, the

artistic field, or the religious field, or the economic field all follow specific logics. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 102).

Habitus “consists of a set of historical relations ‘deposited’ within individual bodies in the form of mental and corporeal schemata of perception, appreciation and action” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 16). The “rules” of the field tend to condition and structure the habitus of agents who pass through the field. Habitus thus becomes “the embodiment of the immanent necessity of a field [and thus] contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 127). Importantly, the resultant actions of agents within the field are not to be conceptualized as “rational action”; rather, habitus is a “socialized subjectivity,” an embodied set of dispositions, strategies, and actions that agents have adopted to help them survive, or perhaps even thrive, within the context of a given field.

Education—and in particular, the college classroom—can be thought of as a field, a space of objective relations that is the site of a specific logic. And that logic is grounded in assumptions about professionalism, knowledge, and meritocracy that tend largely to mask the ways that social hierarchy is one of the major structuring processes, and eventual outcomes, of the field. When women professors and/or professors of color enter the field, they do not immediately or obviously display all of the signs of authority that are “necessary” for a smooth and unquestioned reproduction of the unspoken assumptions underlying academic hierarchy. In fact, they may directly—by virtue of their presence and sometimes through style and content of their courses—challenge these unspoken assumptions. By contrast, white male professors are likely beginning from a position of assumed and automatically accepted authority and respect. This fact gives those of us who are white males a different experience of the field. To put this into Bourdieu’s terms, the academic field tends differently to condition and structure the habitus of agents who pass through it. I will put some flesh on these abstract generalizations by examining two empirical points of focus: naming and the professor’s clothing choices in the classroom.

Naming Habitus

When my junior colleagues met with our dean, she told our women and men of color that to survive, they should be highly organized and accentuate their authority by insisting that their students call them “Dr.” or “Professor.” Indeed, a look at the feminist research on language would suggest that this is good advice. The research has shown that it is common practice for “dominants” (employers, teachers, parents) to have license to refer to “subordinates” (employees, students, children) by their first names. Subordinates, on the other hand, refer to dominants more formally, often using a title (e.g., Mr., Ms., Doctor, Professor, etc.), unless and until they are overtly invited or given

permission by the dominant to use more informal forms of address. This convention of first-name use for subordinate groups communicates and reproduces an infantilized subordinate status, while more formal modes of address for dominants communicates and reinforces their superordinate status. This is one of the ways that language interactions are implicated in the making and remaking of social hierarchies (Henley 1977; McConnell-Ginet 1978; Rubin 1981).

College professors, like other dominants, may choose whether we want students to refer to us more or less formally.³ But for professors who are members of marginalized or subordinated gender and/or racial identity categories, this choice puts them in a bind. On one hand, if a professor chooses to ask students to refer to her or him with a familiar, first-name usage, she or he risks reinforcing students' assumptions that she or he is not a "real professor." On the other hand, having students refer to one as "Dr. or Professor so-and-so" will communicate and reinforce the professor's superordinate status of respected authority, but it also may reinforce hierarchical distance from students and thus add to an impression of rigidity and lack of interest in "breaking down the social distance" between professor and students. In short, the person of color and/or woman professor is faced with a choice that, either way, results in a tradeoff: insisting on a formal mode of address reinforces one's professor status but risks creating an image of hierarchical distance and rigidity; inviting students to address one informally, using first name, may close the distance between students and professor but may contribute to a dynamic that infantilizes and delegitimizes the professor's status in the classroom.

In contrast to this no-win situation for women and/or people of color professors, the white man professor is in a win-win situation with respect to naming in the classroom. Over my twenty-plus years of teaching, I have often asked students to "just call me Mike." As a member of superordinate race, gender, and sexual orientation groups, my asking them to call me by my first name likely communicates a sense of security and comfort with my status: I don't need to put on airs! I'm the professor! It also may lessen hierarchical distance from students (although clearly it does so less dramatically as I get older: I have noticed in recent years that more and more undergraduates ignore my invitation to use my first name and prefer instead to refer to me as "Doctor" or "Professor" Messner).

Clothing Habitus

In my first year at my current institution, I came in as an entry-level assistant professor and was told that in my first semester, I would team-teach an introductory gender studies course with a woman who held an endowed professorship and, at least in feminist academic circles, was a famous scholar.

Although I was already an experienced teacher, I was awed and more than a bit nervous that I might not measure up (both in her eyes and in the eyes of the students). The class went well, as it turned out. I did fine, and my coteacher was a wonderful partner who mentored me in ways that helped me learn more about teaching while making me feel like a fully equal colleague. When the student evaluations for the course came back several weeks after the semester had ended, a curious asymmetry emerged. Although both of us were "graded" as good teachers in the numerical evaluations, several students took it upon themselves to criticize my coteacher's attire in the classroom. Her clothing, she was told, lacked style. She could do better. Some of them recommended particular items to spiff up her look, like certain name-brand shoes, that she might consider wearing in future semesters. By contrast, not one student evaluation mentioned my clothing choices, which at the time consisted of corduroy pants, cheap button-down shirts from Sears, and K-mart shoes.

Indeed, women faculty⁴ often are faced with dilemmas that are similar to those faced by women in other professions, when it comes to making choices about proper professional attire. On one hand, a woman is expected to dress "professionally" in ways that enhance her status by communicating her seriousness. On the other hand, she is simultaneously expected to dress in ways that communicate that she is not rejecting codes of emphasized femininity. In short, a woman professional walks a perilously thin line between appearing to be dressed "too formally" (thus communicating that she has "lost her femininity," or that she "wants to be a man") and appearing to wear "too much makeup" and clothing that is "too revealing" or "too feminine" (thus communicating that she is not to be taken seriously as a professional, that she is trying to "flirt her way to the top," etc.).

Women college professors (especially younger women faculty) face this dilemma both with their male colleagues and with their students in the classroom. How do women faculty respond to the contradictory expectations in the field? One result is that most women faculty undoubtedly put far more time and thought into choosing their professional wardrobe than do most men faculty. The women faculty who dress more conservatively to maximize their professional authority and avoid unwanted sexual "readings" of their professional habitus may succeed in being taken seriously as professionals but are also likely to be judged negatively by students (and some colleagues) in terms of their status as women. The enhanced professional status that might result for formally dressed female professors in the classroom is likely to be offset by students' negative judgements of the professor's lack of style and/or femininity. The result of this more formal professional mode of dress might be to increase the professor's distance from students and thus to create more sense of rigidity.

Men professors, by contrast, are rarely judged by the ways we dress, nor does the field encourage us to develop a habitus that negotiates a contradic-

tion between professional and masculine statuses (although it may for men of color and, especially, for gay men who are out to their students). In fact, there is a long tradition of cultural images of white male college professors dressed in a wide range of costumes, from the natty, to the casually stylish, to the scandalously sloppy. No matter what style is chosen, it seems only to enhance our status: the male professor in the expensive and stylish business suit communicates his good taste, manly control, and power; the guy in the Dockers and button-down shirt with no tie exudes casual confidence with no need to put on airs; the slob with the dirty jeans, tennies, and wrinkled flannel shirt must be a brilliant scholar to be able to dress that way and get away with it!

In sum, forms of address (or naming) between professors and students, and the professor's clothing styles are two parts of the dynamic of the classroom as a "field." White male professors, women professors, and professors of color, all negotiate their way into this field by "reading" the ways we suppose the students "read" us. Since our experiences of this dynamic are differently contextualized by race and gender, our decisions as to modes of address to be used and clothing to be worn in the classroom tend to vary. Women and/or faculty of color are faced with a set of paradoxical options: either solidify your professional status at the expense of appearing rigid and distant or break down the social distance and risk undercutting your legitimacy as the professor. By contrast, white male professors are faced with a range of choices, all of which reinforce our display of status and authority. Students' constructions of the meanings of our modes of address and attire are then read through their own racial and gender assumptions. As these various modes of address and attire become embodied as part of the habitus of students and professors, they serve largely to reproduce unspoken assumptions about race, gender, and authority, and thus help to reproduce the hierarchical structure of the field.

REVEALING AND DISRUPTING WHITE GUY HABITUS

The concepts of habitus and field are useful as a theory of social reproduction; that is, they help illustrate the ways that agents variously embody the dictates of the field and then act unconsciously to reproduce the field. But to think about conscious intervention into a field, with the intent to change it, it is useful to return to a concept that Bourdieu is hoping to leave behind: agency. I see habitus, as Bourdieu describes it, as reproductive agency; it is what social actors think and do in response to the field that ultimately reproduces the field. But Bourdieu's radical functionalism does not as clearly illuminate the dynamics of conscious attempts to disrupt and fundamentally change a field: resistant agency (Dworkin and Messner 1999).

In other words, Bourdieu's theory is useful in showing how the embodied habitus of women professors, people of color professors, and white male professors operate in a largely reproductive manner. But this leaves open the question of how to develop a conscious praxis of a pedagogical agency that is oppositional and resistant. One element of this is to explore how white, male, nongay teachers can use the automatic authority and respect that most of our students give us to disrupt the assumptions underlying our direct access to the patriarchal dividend. This means adopting practices in the classroom that directly challenge the commonplace liberal, white male habitus that is, perhaps unwittingly, complicit with the continued devaluation of women, and of women and men of color. In short, we need to become aware of the ways that our embodied habitus serves largely conservative reproductive functions and then become conscious and active agents of change whose goal, to borrow bell hooks's (1994) term, is "teaching to transgress."

Women faculty and/or faculty of color are often highly aware of the contradictory dynamics that they face concerning choices of naming, clothing, and other matters of professorial habitus. By contrast, white male faculty usually seem unaware. This should not surprise us. Members of privileged groups rarely recognize the institutional processes and interactional dynamics through which we "do difference" in ways that reproduce our privileges and others' subordination (Kimmel and Messner 1998; MacIntosh 1989; West and Fenstermaker 1995). And even those of us who consider ourselves progressives rarely recognize the ways that our own actions put us in a position of complicity with the continued reconstruction of gender, race, and class hierarchies that benefit us. Here, I want to offer some examples of some strategies that I have used in the classroom to reveal dynamics of privilege, to mutually explore them (and hopefully disrupt them) with my students. I offer these examples with some humility, as I do not want to suggest that I believe I have transcended or overcome my own complicity in a hierarchical educational field that benefits me. In fact, some readers may conclude from the following examples that my strategies might just take matters to another level of more strategic and rationally calculated complicity: the more antisexist, antiracist, and "personally vulnerable" I make myself in the classroom, the more, perhaps, my status rises with many students! But this is precisely the sort of paradox with which progressive white male teachers should consciously wrestle.

First-Name and Last-Name Usage

I do not stop with simply telling my students that they can "call me Mike." In addition, at some point early in my introductory gender studies courses, I discuss Nancy Henley's and others' research on body politics and naming. I give students an option to do a paper on "occupational segregation under our

noses” that asks them to examine the gender/race/class dynamics at play in who does what on our campus. Drawing from assigned readings (Reskin and Padavic 1994), the students are asked to observe who does what on their campus, and among other things, they find that the vast majority of women employed on campus are in office staff positions; the vast majority of people of color are in office, food services, or janitorial occupations; the vast majority of white males are faculty and administrators; and so on. Some of my students have creatively explored pay gaps within and between academic units. But beyond simply counting who does what, I also invite my students to explore some of the daily interactional dynamics that support, legitimize, and quietly reproduce gender, race, and class inequalities, such as the routine practices of naming. Go into a department office, I tell them, and look at the labels on mailboxes. In some departments, you will see that professors have last names on their boxes, while office staff (nearly always female, and disproportionately women of color) have their first names only on their boxes. Then, I ask them to go knock on faculty doors and ask each faculty member if he or she knows the full name of the office staff workers, some of whom they may have been working with for years, even decades. What does it mean when certain workers appear to have no last names? This sort of assignment accomplishes two and possibly three things: first, it personally engages the student’s learning within the very field that she or he is in; second, it pushes the student to recognize connections between structured hierarchies and the social practices that legitimate and reproduce them; and third, if the student does the interviews with faculty, he or she is perhaps subtly disrupting a largely invisible process of social reproduction.

Professorial Attire

I confess that I am a casual-to-sloppy dresser, prone to white tennies, jeans, and button-down shirts. As I suggested above, there is nothing terribly noble or disruptive about this attire. It is just comfortable, and I do not seem to get any flack from colleagues or students for dressing this way. I really had not thought much about it until a number of years ago when my senior team-teaching partner, as I discussed above, was criticized by students for her attire. Since that time, I have made it a point in each of my classes to present this story to them as an empirical example that they need to analyze. Why, I ask them, had several students felt it appropriate or necessary to comment negatively (or at all!) on the clothing choices of a senior woman professor while apparently feeling no inclination or obligation to similarly comment on the male coteacher?

Essentially, I present this example and other patterns from student evaluations (such as the “he’s open minded; she’s politically correct” patterns from students’ comments) back to students as “data” on the prejudices and precon-

ceptions of students at their own university. When I do this, I find that some students are very adept at analyzing why and how these sorts of patterns exist, what they mean, and what effect they might have. When students themselves take these examples as data to collectively analyze, the students who are less conscious about these sorts of dynamics (and are perhaps likely to be the ones to make such comments on course evaluations) are educated by their own peers about their prejudices. To be sure, this sort of exercise might be viewed as self-aggrandizing grandstanding by me; after all, I am giving the students "data" that show that previous students have found me to be "open-minded." So when presenting these patterns to students, I have to take care to emphasize that compared with my coteachers, I am not less opinionated and less expressive of my opinions in the classroom. Moreover, this sort of classroom strategy can come back to haunt a professor in unexpected ways. A few years ago, when I went to read the course evaluations for my upper-division Men and Masculinity course, it became apparent that the students had collectively decided to humorously jam me on the issue of my attire: On every single evaluation, the students in this class had written something to the effect that "Professor Messner is a fabulous dresser!" My favorite was, "Mike Messner sets a fashion standard for male professors throughout the world!" I took this to mean that they got the point.

PEDAGOGICAL PARADOXES FOR PROGRESSIVE WHITE GUYS

I have suggested, using two (naming and attire) of many possible examples, how white male professors might reject our unconscious complicity in reaping the benefits of the white/patriarchal dividend and instead might use the automatic respect that we enjoy to unveil and explore with our students the reproductive dynamics of the classroom. The goal of this strategy is the development of a mutual understanding of the classroom and the university as a field in which our collective habitus is largely reproductive, in the hopes that we might move toward the conscious development of resistant agencies. This is promising, but it is not enough. After all, this strategy leaves me, the white male teacher, largely separate from the critical scrutiny. Obviously, other multiply layered strategies are also needed. Again, I do not want to pretend that I have all of this figured out; in some ways, in fact, my classrooms are structured around a fairly conventional lecture-discussion format. But I do want to suggest that white male professors might explore more directly (but carefully and strategically) bringing critical autobiography into lectures and discussions. Students tend to appreciate professors who tell some personal stories; it "humanizes" us in their eyes. Indeed, bell hooks (1994) has argued, "It is often productive for professors to take the first risk, linking confessional narratives to academic discussions so as to show how experience

can illuminate and enhance our understanding of academic material” (p. 21). But the professor’s “confessional narratives” in the classroom may have value beyond helping students learn academic material; they also may help to create an empowering space wherein students are encouraged to explore the ways that their own “personal” experiences are linked with structural and interactional contexts. Jacobs (1998, 224) sees value in a confessional technique that he calls “teacher as text,” wherein he explores “my own vulnerabilities and complications within oppressive systems.” For Jacobs, a key of moving beyond mere therapeutic confession toward empowering sociological analysis is contextualizing his personal stories within the conceptual framework of a “matrix of domination: We must illustrate the operation of both privileged and dominated identities and resulting experiences and be willing to explore their complex intersections” (p. 226).

But are these strategies tenable for a heterosexually identified white male professor? I think that, if contextualized in the way that Jacobs suggests, the personal stories of professors from superordinate groups might help to puncture the raced and gendered expectations and images that our students project on us, and that we respond to and largely reproduce. One way I try to do this in my classroom is by recounting and analyzing what Plummer (1995) calls “sexual stories.” I discuss the insecurity of embarrassing early sexual experiences, such as my “first kiss”; I recount the male peer group dynamics when my college basketball teammates discovered that I and another member of the team were “virgins” and pressured us to “get laid” (and to pressure our girlfriends to “put out”), and I discuss—and ask my classes to help me analyze—my early teen attraction to another boy, the shift from attraction to rejection and aggression toward him, and my eventual definition of myself as “100% heterosexual” (Messner 1996, 1999). Although these stories might be seen by some as merely confessional and therapeutic “new man” whining, it is the pedagogical contextualization that can make them useful in revealing the constructedness of, and the internal fissures and paradoxes within, hegemonic conceptions of heterosexual masculinity. Although heterosexual white male professors have a responsibility to create a space—through readings, films, lectures, and discussions—for the voices of women and marginalized groups of men to be heard, perhaps the most radical thing we can do in the classroom is to contribute to a “strategic deconstruction” of the master categories of social hierarchies: whiteness, masculinity, heterosexuality, professional class, and so on. The strategic use of our own personal stories can be a powerful way to accomplish what MacIntosh (1989) calls “the unpacking of white [and male and heterosexual] privilege.”

Of course, just as with my choices of naming and classroom attire, my use of critical autobiography in the classroom might leave me looking better than ever to my students because I seem “so secure to be able to talk about these things.” Indeed, as Sherryl Kleinman (1996) has shown, in politically “progressive” contexts, white heterosexual professional class men’s status is

enhanced when we reveal “human vulnerabilities.” But tackling such issues, and using reflexive self-stories to do so, has another important goal: in illuminating the cracks, fissures, and constructedness of whiteness, heterosexuality, or masculinity, we deconstruct the “naturalness” of the very categories that give us the privilege to speak and be heard and, in so doing, contribute to making the classroom a force in the move toward social justice.

NOTES

1. I have taught “Sex and Gender in Society” (previously called “Introduction to the Study of Women and Men”) fourteen times in my eleven years at the University of Southern California. Four of those times, I taught it myself; ten times, I team-taught the class with a woman. My teaching partners included two historians, a sociologist, a novelist, and a classicist. Four of my teaching partners were older than I, and one was younger. Two were full professors, and three were adjunct professors. Politically, three were very similar to my socialist-feminist/multiracial-feminist perspective, one leaned more toward radical feminism, and another more toward moderate-to-liberal feminism.

2. This pattern, although generally accurate, did not pertain equally to all of my teaching partners. The one whom I have defined as the “moderate-to-liberal feminist” professor tended to be judged by students to be less biased and more open-minded than the more radical or socialist-oriented women teachers. This raised questions about the extent to which values-based approaches to course content intersects with gendered habitus in students’ assessments of professors’ “objectivity” or bias.

3. I have noticed that some professors prefer to have undergraduates refer to them as “Dr.” or “Professor” but invite graduate students to interact with them on a first-name basis. The moment that this invitation is made, it appears as a sort of gift exchange, with the professor humbly and congenially saying “please call me Mike” and the graduate student somewhat awkwardly saying “Okay, thanks.”

4. My discussion of clothing habitus here focuses exclusively on gender. I expect race plays in to this dynamic in ways that are similar, but I lack the data or even concrete examples to confidently reflect on this here.

REFERENCES

- Baker, P., and M. Copp. 1997. Gender matters most: The interaction of gendered expectations, feminist course content, and pregnancy in student course evaluations. *Teaching sociology* 25:29-43.
- Bennett, S. K. 1982. Student perceptions and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. *Journal of educational psychology* 74:170-79.
- Bourdieu, P., and L.J.D. Wacquant. 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Connell, R. W. 1987. *Gender and Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Dworkin, S. L., and M. A. Messner. 1999. Just do . . . what? Sport, bodies, gender. In *Revisioning gender*, edited by J. Lorber, M. Marx Ferree, and B. Hess, 341-61. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Feldman, K. A. 1993. College students’ views of male and female college teachers: Part II—Evidence from students’ evaluations of their classroom teachers. *Research in Higher Education* 34:151-211.

- Henley, N. 1977. *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- hooks, b. 1994. *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Jacobs, W. R. 1998. The teacher as text: Using personal experience to stimulate the sociological imagination. *Teaching Sociology* 26:222-28.
- Johnsrud, L. 1993. Women and minority faculty experiences: Defining and responding to diverse realities. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning* 53:3-16.
- Kimmel, M. S., and M. A. Messner. 1998. Introduction. In *Men's lives*, 4th ed., xiii-xxii. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kleinman, S. 1996. *Opposing ambitions: Gender and identity in an alternative organization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MacIntosh, P. 1989. White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and freedom* (July/August): 10-12.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. 1978. Address forms in sexual politics. In *Women's language and style*, edited by D. Butterff and E. L. Epstein, 23-35. Akron, OH: L & S.
- Messner, M. A. 1996. Studying up on sex. *Sociology of sport journal* 13:221-37.
- . 1999. Becoming 100% straight. In *Inside Sports*, edited by J. Coakley and P. Donnelly, 104-10. London and New York: Routledge.
- Plummer, K. 1995. *Telling sexual stories: Power, change and social worlds*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rakow, L. 1991. Gender and race in the classroom: Teaching way out of line. *Feminist Teacher* 6:10-13.
- Reskin, B. F., and I. Padavic. 1994. *Women and men at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rubin, R. 1981. Ideal traits and terms of address for male and female college professors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 41:966-74.
- Statham, A., L. Richardson, and J. Cook. 1991. *Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- West, C., and S. Fenstermaker. 1995. Doing difference. *Gender & society* 9:8-37.

Michael A. Messner is associate professor of Sociology and Gender Studies at the University of Southern California, where he teaches courses on sex and gender, men and masculinities, and gender and sport. He is coeditor of Men's Lives and Gender through the Prism of Difference. His most recent book is Politics of Masculinities: Men in Movements (Sage, 1997).