



2020


## Angry White Men on Campus: Theoretical Perspectives and Recommended Responses

Kyle C. Ashlee  
*Independent Scholar*

Pietro A. Sasso  
*Southern Illinois University Edwardsville*

Christina Witkowicki  
*LaunchPoint Consulting*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.luc.edu/jcshesa>

 Part of the [Counseling Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Other Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Ashlee, Kyle C.; Sasso, Pietro A.; and Witkowicki, Christina (2020) "Angry White Men on Campus: Theoretical Perspectives and Recommended Responses," *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 2 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://ecommons.luc.edu/jcshesa/vol5/iss2/4>

This Conceptual Framework is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals and Magazines at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).



Volume 5, Issue 2

Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs

## Angry White Men on Campus Theoretical Perspectives and Recommended Responses

**Kyle C. Ashlee, Ph.D.**, *University of North Carolina Wilmington*  
**Pietro A. Sasso, Ph.D.**, *Southern Illinois University Edwardsville*  
**Christina Witkowicki, Ed.D.**

### — Abstract —

In this article, the authors explore the rise in violent protest among white college men theoretical interpretations of this trend, and offer recommendations for student affairs educators that can be implemented to address the harmful acts of white males on campus. By examining hegemonic masculinity, the theory of dispossession, anomic protest masculinity, and white men's disengagement in college, student affairs professionals can begin to understand the larger contemporary trend of student activism among white college men. Moreover, evaluating common behavior-only approaches, such as bad-dogging accountability practices, and white privilege pedagogy, educators can gain perspective on how current responses in the field of student affairs may be counterproductive to solving destructive protests on campus. Finally, through a critical analysis of patriarchy and white supremacy as systems of oppression in graduate preparation, professional development, and individual self-reflection, educators can begin to effectively engage angry white men in college.

Keywords: Whiteness, masculinity, college, male, men, protest masculinity, hegemonic masculinity

ISSN 2377-1306

© 2020

All rights reserved for the authors of this study. Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs is an open access journal and all pages are available for copying and distribution under a Creative Commons Attribution/Non-Commercial/No Derivative works license. Any authorized work must be properly attributed to the author(s). Work cannot be used for commercial means or changed in any way.

**A**cross U.S. college campuses, privileged White men dressed in Oxford shirts, Sperrys, and pastel shorts, engage in rageful activism, including hate-filled marches, the secret distribution of racist propaganda, and in many cases, violent outbursts targeting students from marginalized populations (DeVitis & Sasso, 2019). Dangerously awakened, white men across U.S. college campuses rebuke the liberal culture of higher education as stifling and unrepresentative of their beliefs (Sasso, 2019). Although their protesting often offends and harms other campus members, freedom of speech regulations and nebulous hate speech definitions stymie postsecondary institutions from addressing this disruptive behavior (DeVitis & Sasso, 2019). The challenge of addressing angry white college men reveals a failure within the field of student affairs to engage these students.

In this article, we explore a rise in violent protest among white college men, theoretical interpretations of this trend, and recommendations for student affairs educators which can be implemented to address the harmful acts of white males on college campus. By examining hegemonic masculinity, the theory of dispossession, anomic protest masculinity, and white men's disengagement in college, student affairs professionals can begin to understand the larger contemporary trend of student activism among white college men (Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 2017; Sasso, 2019). Moreover, by evaluating common strategies for engaging college men, including behavior-only approaches (Kilmartin & Berkowitz, 2005) such as bad-dogging accountability practices (Laker, 2005) and white privilege pedagogy (Ashlee, 2019), educators can gain perspective on how current responses in the field of student affairs may be counterproductive to solving the problem of protest masculinities on campus. Finally, through a critical analysis of how patriarchy and white supremacy operate within students' graduate school preparation and professional development, as well as through critical self-reflection of their academic and professional socialization, stu-

dent affairs educators can begin to effectively engage angry white college men.

### Positionality

Within critical scholarship, researchers should disclose their biases and perspectives (Patton, 2012). All three of us are active student affairs educators with professional experience working with white college men across different functional areas. We consider masculinities through intersecting identities of race, gender, and social class. We also acknowledge the privilege and power we hold due to our dominant identities and the responsibility that comes with those identities to advocate for social justice. All of us identify as cisgender and heterosexual. Kyle is male-identified and racially identifies as white. Pietro is male-identified and engages a bicultural orientation of Latino and Italian cultural heritage socialized from a working-class family. Christina is woman-identified and engages a Transnational identity from a working-class family. Given that systems of oppression constantly reinforce dehumanizing patterns of thought and behavior, we acknowledge our respective positionalities which limit our perspectives and require us to continually deconstruct internalized hegemonies and reconstruct new ways of being that promote justice, healing, and liberation.

### Theoretical Perspectives on Angry White Men in College

To better understand the recent destructive behavior of white college men, educators should critically examine hegemonic masculinity, dispossession, and anomic protest masculinity. Engaging these theoretical perspectives can provide educators helpful context for the sociohistorical and cultural underpinnings behind white men's destructive activism on college campuses and insight about how they can more effectively engage these men moving forward. Kimmel and Davis (2011) define hegemony as "the process of influence where we learn to earnestly embrace a system of beliefs and practices that essentially harm

us, while working to uphold the interests of others who have power over us” (p. 9). The male form of this concept is referred to as hegemonic masculinity. This form of masculinity is the most socially endorsed form of male behavior where men in specific competitive subcultures project and hold a favorable, culturally-based, idealized version of themselves or others and subscribe to a dominant construction of masculinity (Connell, 1995; Peralta, 2007).

### Hegemonic Masculinity

Hegemonic masculinity asserts that a man must limit his emotionality and present himself as virile, strong, and sturdy. Sasso (2015) explains that hegemonic masculinity assumes only a limited number of men can attain this revered status. Hegemonic masculinity should be conceptualized as a cultural prototype or ideal form of manhood. Both women and men in heteronormative cultures acknowledge and accept the notion of hegemonic masculinity, whether they can or do conform to this idealized form of manhood (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Lusher & Robins, 2009). Also, hegemonic masculinity marginalizes men who do not perfectly fit within its confines, including men of color, Queer men, and men with disabilities, to name a few (Laker & Davis, 2011). “Furthermore, hegemonic systems position marginalized masculinities, which include nonconforming gender performances, identities, and expressions, into gender locations termed subordinate masculinities (Connell, 1995).

### The Theory of Dispossession

Kimmel (2017) suggests that white college men now exist as consumers of their exacted privilege, purchasing a preconceived, contrived, and mass-produced conceptualization of collegiate masculinity. Sasso (2019) furthered this notion to suggest that whiteness occurs as a material culture which exists as Harris’ (1993) concept of “property of power.” White college men, as consumers, are privileged to develop a sentiment of entitlement. These college men are

oblivious to their own consumerism and feel challenged to identify their own positionality within this system. This may influence affective sentiments of disorientation which result in a sense of deprivation of their consumerist privileges. Kimmel (2017) terms this phenomenon as the *theory of dispossession* and describes it as:

aggrieved entitlement that fuels their rage: once they were in power, they believe, but now they’ve been emasculated, their birth-right transferred to others who don’t deserve it. And now they march, fight and bomb innocent civilians to reclaim their manhood... Entirely unaware of the privileges that they already accrued, just by virtue of being white and male, they focus instead, again, partly correctly in my view – at their dispossession... (p. 277)

White men do not know themselves, leading them to search for external fulfillment, which the patriarchal and white supremacist system promised them. Rather than acknowledging the power and privilege they hold, white college men primarily focus on what the media and corporations tell them they lack as men. The list of entitled deficiencies that men are being sold grows longer and more severe every day. There are endless profits to be made from college men’s fragility and insecurities. This dispossessed perspective held by many white college men leads them to feel resentment and anger, which they display in offensive and harmful campus activism (DeVitis & Sasso, 2019).

### The Anomic Protest Masculinity of White College Men

White college men engage in neo-conservative ideologies in more vocal formats such as student activism—a disciplined form of protest masculinity (DeVitis & Sasso, 2019). This phenomenon is particularly salient among white college men from high so-

cioeconomic statuses affiliated with more conservative religious institutions and political ideologies (Tillapaugh, 2012). However, most white college men engage in anomic protest masculinity through disengagement from student engagement opportunities and affiliating with white supremacist rhetoric in the wake of their affective sentiments of anomie. This anomie is the conceptualization of a society in which people are more often passive receivers (i.e., dispossessed) than active creators in the process of constructing a social structure (hegemony) (Durkheim, 1951, 1972).

Anomic protest masculinity is a subordinate form of hegemonic masculinity associated with with working-class culture, which draws from traditional, active heterosexual practices (Connell, 1995; Walker, 2006). This construction of anomic protest masculinity causes “a tense [...] facade, making a claim to power where there are no real resources for power” (Connell, 1995, p. 111). These individual tensions exist as narratives between social classes of white men in which they assume a marginalized identity congruent with working-class ideologies which is described as a *hegemonic bargain* (Chen, 1999; Walker, 2006). In the performance of protest masculinity, men can become self-destructive as well as destructive toward others, particularly when they feel like they will never realize the masculine ideal. Therefore, privileged white men tend identify with the dispossessed working-class (Broude, 1990; Tomsen, 1997).

White undergraduate college men engage in anomic protest masculinity attempting to achieve hegemonic masculinity because they feel dispossessed like those of the working-class. Anomic protest masculinity is thus dysfunctional and may include disengagement from student co-curricular opportunities or individual protest efforts to reassert their dominance. White college men also engage through male affirming institutions such as fraternities or neo-conservative student organizations because they feel dispossessed according to Kimmel’s aforementioned definition. These same men increasingly engage toward the hegemonic masculine ideal as they seek to subjugate oth-

ers which is typical in the performativity of protest masculinity. DeVitis and Sasso (2019) further characterized these activities as the resurrection of white supremacy on college campuses.

In the contemporary context, many white college men disengage and withdraw, while others simmer in anger and rage (Kimmel, 2008, 2017). On college campuses, Reed (2011) notes, “men overall are participating in fewer educationally purposeful activities associated with persistence-to-graduation and increasing their time spent on activities that actually impede their chances of success” (p. 116). Similarly, Kellom (2004) found that white college men serve less in traditional student leadership positions, such as student government roles, resident assistantships, orientation leadership, and teaching assistantships. This lack of student involvement in leadership positions or participation in other educationally purposeful activities leaves white college men listless and in a state of wanderlust. Kimmel (2008) further explained this lethargy among white men in the college environment as:

[...]the arena in which young men so relentlessly seem to act out, seem to take the greatest risks, and do some of the stupidest things. Directionless and often clueless, they rely increasingly on their peers to usher them into adulthood and validate their masculinity. And their peers often have some interesting plans for what they will have to endure to prove that they are real men. (p. 43)

As the demography of the United States shifts, so do the demographics of college campuses (Flashman, 2013). Although diverse college campuses contribute to richer collegiate experiences, white college men have struggled to adjust to these changing demographics (Flashman, 2013; Sax, 2008). Amid today’s push for greater equality, many white men feel as though historically marginalized groups take opportunities away from them—opportunities which were

once historically afforded to only them. (Davis, 2002; Kimmel, 2008; O’Neil, 1990; O’Neil & Crapser, 2011). However, white college men might be aware of the power, privilege, and status they continue to hold within the university, specifically, and within the general larger society and other white college men may be opaque to these privileges. However, they all do not want to forgo any of their positionality and privileges (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). Many white men inaccurately feel as though they are losing opportunities they are entitled to, contributing to a sense of lost control or status (Kimmel, 2008; Sax, 2008). White men see an increasing gender gap and changing demographics on their campuses.

For example, there is a gender gap in college enrollment, with female-identified students outnumbering their male-identified peers (Sax, 2008). Although more women enroll in college than men overall, this statistic is somewhat misleading, as this gender gap varies by race and ethnicity. Specifically, the gender gap is widest among Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx communities and almost nonexistent among white students (Sax, 2008). These types of gendered misunderstanding contribute to the anger that white men feel towards marginalized communities who they believe “stole” their educational and career opportunities (Kimmel, 2008, 2017). Although this anger is misguided and based on misleading information, opportunities to correct these misperceptions and redirect this anger are few and far between, and existing opportunities are not capitalized due to a lack of preparation and effective strategies within student affairs.

### **White College Men’s Disengagement on Campus**

White men feel like college today is especially challenging for them. Many white college men, in particular, feel like they are under a microscope due to the global spotlight on gender inequality and sexual violence (Freitas, 2018). In a qualitative study on

the experiences of white undergraduate college men in leadership positions, Witkowicki (2019) found they believe people immediately assume they are racist, sexist, misogynistic predators. The participants recognized that white men were responsible for most of society’s issues but felt undue pressure to solve all these problems (Witkowicki, 2019). Furthermore, although some men considered themselves inclusive and supportive of historically marginalized groups and even allies—as opposed to oppressors—once they arrived at college, they quickly realized others saw them as the enemy or as perpetrators (Witkowicki, 2019).

Some college men describe conversations about privilege as a “white privilege roast” (Witkowicki, 2019, p. 159), and many men believe that no matter what they say, people will think they are wrong and potentially call them out. Witkowicki paradoxically found that many college men believe that people on liberal campuses are so open-minded that they are, in fact, closed-minded to any perceived conservative thought or group, and the current progressive targets are cis, straight, white college men. In response to the roasts, call outs, and perceived closed-mindedness of the campus community, the men in her study disengage entirely. This behavior by college men further supports the findings by Edwards and Jones (2009). Edwards and Jones (2009) found that divergence between internal feelings, societal expectations, and assumptions from fellow campus community members exacerbated gender role conflict within college men. This dissonance, in turn, leads to male students’ disengagement, emotional or physical isolation, and reduced involvement.

When men feel they cannot share their thoughts and opinions, those thoughts fester within their minds (Witkowicki, 2019). To find some community and support, they may commiserate with other men, who fan their anger. In college, men may feel they are actively graded on their opinions rather than the assignments and, thus, hide their true thoughts for fear of being penalized or ostracized for their thoughts.



These experiences for college white men reinforce their held divisive perspectives about others and stereotypes they experience about themselves. This white silence behavior also prevents higher education professionals from truly understanding the thoughts and perspectives by their white male students, making developmental conversations around these topics with these students nearly impossible (Witkowicki, 2019).

Men do not believe the stereotypes assigned to them and feel they cannot change people's minds or negate the stereotypes, so they disengage from the campus experience (Witkowicki, 2019). College white men feel like they are a product of the society around which sends conflicting messages (Witkowicki, 2019). They retreat out of self-preservation, which is an example of how hegemonic masculinity, disillusionment, and anomic protest masculinity converge to result in the disengagement of white men in college. Although many student affairs professionals attempt to engage white undergraduate men on campus, their attempts frequently are met with defensiveness, resistance, and fragility (DiAngelo, 2011). Not only are such reactions frustrating for educators, but they might also signal that their current tactics are counterproductive.

### Counterproductive Campus Responses to White Men's Engagement

Despite efforts to positively engage white college men, educators may unwittingly contribute to the proliferation of protest masculinities and white supremacy on college campuses. Using *behavior-only* approaches (Kilmartin & Berkowitz, 2005), including bad-dogging accountability practices (Laker, 2005) and white privilege pedagogy in professional socialization (Ashlee, 2019), college educators risk reinforcing the problematic behavior they aim to correct. Moreover, these behavioral, punitive, and individualized interventions might drive collegiate white men away from developmental opportunities they need to become productively engaged members of their campus communities.

### Behavior-Only Approaches

Many educators employ what Kilmartin and Berkowitz (2005) refer to as *behavior-only* approaches to correct problematic student behaviors like sexual assault and racism. Given that white college men are the typical perpetrators of such behaviors, educators generally use these approaches with these students (Harper, Harris, & Mmeje, 2005). Rather than evaluating the root cause of these behaviors, including hegemonic masculinity, disillusionment, and anomic protest masculinity, behavior-only approaches simply address the specific actions and behaviors of individual students at any given moment in time.

Behavior-only approaches do not account for the pervasive hegemonic socialization white men undergo throughout their lives, underpinning the problematic conduct in question (DiAngelo, 2018; Edwards & Jones, 2009; Kimmel, 2008). Much like a band-aid temporarily covering a wound, behavior-only approaches only address the immediate concerns presented by angry white men on college campuses, rather than eliminating these problematic behaviors by tackling their root causes. Behavior-only approaches are common among educational initiatives, including bystander intervention training programs and judicial sanction efforts focused on specific policy violations like binge-drinking and hazing. Although such interventions are both important and necessary, behavior-only approaches alone will not eradicate these problems. Even more, these approaches may worsen problems. For instance, Kilmartin and Berkowitz (2005) noted that behavior-only approaches for sexual assault prevention likely have unintended consequences.

**Bad-dogging Accountability Practices.** An example of a behavior-only approach is what Laker (2005) refers to as *bad-dogging accountability practices*. In reaction to racist, sexist, or homophobic comments, for example, an educator may rebuke the offending student, intending to elicit guilt and shame on the part of the student. This interaction generally leaves the chided student feeling resentful and discon-

nected from the educator and, perhaps, only deters them from engaging in similar behavior while in the presence of said educator. Although the educator's goal is to hold the student accountable, bad-dogging accountability practices may, in fact, feed problematic student behavior.

Punitive bad-dogging accountability practices effectively ignore the students' socialization of hegemonic masculinity and white supremacy, which inform and encourage their problematic behaviors (Laker, 2005). Rather than viewing the harmful action as connected to the larger system of oppression, bad-dogging practices treat each behavior as an isolated incident. Moreover, this reactionary approach only concerns the reprimanded student, rather than all those who benefit from and participate in a system of oppression that allows such troubling behaviors. Consequently, students may believe there are objectively good men and bad men—those who refrain from bad behavior such as sexual violence and those who perpetrate such behavior. Under the auspices of bad-dogging accountability practices, a student must either cease engaging in the problematic behavior or, at least, maintain their innocence about their participation in such activities

Bad-dogging accountability practices result in detrimental rifts between offending students and educators (Laker, 2005). When educators snap at students, they emphasize the group's distinctive power and authority. Moreover, the student will likely walk away from the interaction feeling subordinate and fragile, while the educator may feel vindicated and self-righteous (DiAngelo, 2011). Even though the educator may have good intentions, guilt and shame are ineffective pedagogical tools. In fact, guilt and shame are often the impetus for depression, anxiety, and isolation, which often undergirds white college men's risky and destructive behavior (Brown, 2012; Laker & Davis, 2012; Kimmel, 2008).

Despite the negative implications of bad-dogging accountability practices, college educators needn't be overly cautious in protecting white men from feelings

of fragility, which may arise when they hold these students accountable for problematic behavior (DiAngelo, 2011). Accustomed to privilege and comfort, white men tend to express strong, resistant emotions when challenged, like anger, denial, guilt, and shame, to reestablish their sense of dominance (Cabrera, 2018; Matias, 2016). Aware of white men's fragility and the broader systemic influences of hegemony, disillusionment, and anomie, educators can hold these privileged students accountable for their harmful actions, while at the same time, engaging them in solving these problems. In this way, educators can help advance social justice on campus.

**White Privilege Pedagogy.** Another example of a behavior-only approach to working with white college men is the use of *white privilege pedagogy* (Lensmire et al., 2013). White privilege pedagogy intends for students to become aware of their individual privileges in a larger system of whiteness which allows students to believe they are experiencing a transformation through renunciations of privilege as the potential panacea to systematic oppression (Margolin, 2014). Ashlee (2019) discovered that white student affairs graduate students began exploring the concept of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988) as undergraduate students, typically through training associated with student leadership roles. These graduate students often regarded their undergraduate leadership experiences as early professional socialization into the field of student affairs (Ashlee, 2019). Although an important concept for white student affairs professionals to understand, the reliance on white privilege pedagogy alone is insufficient for student affairs professional socialization and may contribute to the proliferation of angry white men in higher education.

Although many college educators learn about white privilege as undergraduate students, this initial training does not enable them to fully grasp the depth or complexity of how white supremacy operates as a socially constructed system of oppression, including laws, policies, and cultural practices. Such an individualistic approach to examining whiteness



suggests white people's role in racial justice work is simply a public acknowledgement of their privilege, rather than their acceptance of responsibility in dismantling systemic racial oppression (Lensmire et al., 2013; Levine-Rasky, 2000). Additionally, white privilege pedagogy reinforces the notion that there are good white people and bad white people, namely those who acknowledge their privilege and those who do not, all-the-while the system of white supremacy goes unchallenged (DiAngelo, 2011).

Similar to the use of bad-dog accountability practices with male students, the reliance on white privilege pedagogy in educators' professional socialization may reinforce white supremacy in higher education (Ashlee, 2019). White privilege pedagogy does not equip future educators with the skills to engage students in a critical examination of whiteness, meaning these professionals generally have a limited set of tools to engage white students in conversations about race and racism. Moreover, the reliance on white privilege pedagogy in professional socialization results in many white educators believing that they do not have a significant role to play in advocating for racial justice within higher education. In other words, white privilege pedagogy informs white educators that they have the privilege to choose whether they engage in social justice efforts on their campuses.

White student affairs educators who engage in racial justice efforts are prone to a punitive, self-righteous orientation toward white students and colleagues (Ashlee, 2019). White educators are socialized according to white privilege pedagogy and their understanding of an individual student behavior is disconnected from the systemic influence of white supremacy. Moreover, white educators feel pressure to prove they are anti-racist allies. One of the most effective ways for these professionals to demonstrate their commitment to racial justice is to publicly engage other white people about white privilege pedagogy.

White privilege pedagogy has long been a useful and beneficial method to engage white educators and students in a critical examination of their racial iden-

tities (Lensmire et al., 2013; Levine-Rasky, 2000). Although this pedagogical method may be an important practice for addressing individual racism, the root cause of racism in higher education stems from both individual and systemic forces working to maintain white supremacy (Cabrera, Franklin, & Watson, 2017). When working with white college men socialized by both white supremacist and patriarchal logics, college educators must go beyond the behavior-only approaches, like bad-dogging accountability practices and white privilege pedagogy, to more effectively engage these students.

### **Recommended Responses to Angry White Men on Campus**

To address the problematic and destructive behavior of angry white men on college campuses, educators must begin by evaluating their own attitudes and pedagogical strategies. Professional preparation for future student affairs professionals should incorporate critical analyses of the patriarchy and white supremacy. For instance, faculty teaching in student affairs graduate programs should integrate these types of conversations into their curricula to help students understand the larger systems of oppression that inform individual student behavior. Divisions of student affairs, functional area units, and other organizations responsible for professional development should provide training for educators to critically examine hegemonic masculinity and whiteness, as well as facilitate opportunities to solve problems related to their campus contexts. Finally, individual student affairs professionals should conduct critical self-reflection about their understandings of the patriarchy and white supremacy as systems of oppression.

### **Graduate Preparation**

Higher education and student affairs graduate preparation programs do not generally provide sufficient training to prepare future educators to engage white college men about hegemonic masculinity or whiteness as systems of oppression (Ashlee, 2019;

Laker, 2005). Without the necessary preparation, educators rely on socialized assumptions and individual stereotypes when working with these students, which leads to tenuous relationships between them and the students they serve (Davis & Laker, 2004). As a result, white college men often feel like they have to navigate college without institutional support, leading them to turn to other like-minded students who validate their feelings of aggrieved entitlement (Kimmel, 2017). In other words, insufficient graduate training may contribute to the troubling behavior of angry white college men because educators are prepared with behavior-only approaches, such as bad-dogging accountability practices and white privilege pedagogy.

To counter this problem, student affairs faculty should actively include critical analyses of the patriarchy and white supremacy into their graduate program curriculum (Ashlee, 2019; Laker, 2005). Adding this content to student affairs graduate preparation could equip future educators with a broader understanding of the patriarchy and white supremacy, thereby allowing them to situate individual students' problematic behavior within larger systems of oppression. Some graduate programs have developed stand-alone courses focused on training future educators to understand how these systems of oppression impact college students, while other programs have incorporated this material into existing coursework (Ashlee, 2019). Whether through standalone courses or integrated curriculums, graduate preparation programs should leverage individual student identity development models to analyze the patriarchy and white supremacy as systems of oppression in higher education.

### Professional Development

Divisions of student affairs, functional area units, and other organizations responsible for professional development, should provide educators with training opportunities to critically examine the patriarchy and white supremacy as systems of oppression. Again, gaining a critical perspective about the patriarchy and white supremacy could enable educators to take a step

back and see how students' individual actions fit within the larger context. From here, educators can hold individual white men accountable by helping them see how systems of oppression, like the patriarchy and white supremacy, impact the ways they think and act. When students can situate themselves within larger systems of oppression, they may be more likely to change their behavior and take action for social justice (Jones & Abes, 2013; Ashlee & Wagner, 2019).

In addition, divisions of student affairs, functional area units, and professional development organizations should facilitate opportunities for educators to brainstorm solutions for problems that arise from the harmful protests led by white men on their campuses. Without one-size-fits-all solutions, colleges and universities must provide educators opportunities to consider the most appropriate responses (e.g., one-on-one development conversations, peer mentoring, or dialogue based praxis) to the destructive behavior of white men on their campuses (Tillapaugh & McGowan, 2019). Theoretical perspectives are important, but to address concerns related to hegemony, dissolution, and anomie among white male students, educators need to apply a critical analysis of the patriarchy and white supremacy to cases of white men's disengagement in their specific campus environment.

### Individual Self-Reflection

Both student affairs faculty and higher education professionals intent on engaging students in critical analyses of the patriarchy and white supremacy should spend significant time reflecting on their identities, socialization, attitudes, and behaviors that might perpetuate systems of oppression. Although there is never a point of arrival, some level of personal commitment to self-reflection is necessary to successfully engage students in learning about dominant identities and systems of oppression (Ashlee, 2019). For white male-identified educators, in particular, this personal self-exploration can help them facilitate students' cognitive and affective development (Ashlee, 2019). Role-modeling critical self-reflection is one

of the most effective ways that educators can engage students and build trust with them. Educators who identify as white men have a responsibility to engage in effective role-modeling and challenge white men in critical self-reflection about the patriarchy and white supremacy.

Margolin (2015) purported that women and people of color face the burden of responsibility to educate white men about systems of oppression. However, Ashlee (2019) suggested that educators with dominant identities can role model in critical self-reflection and effectively engage students to do this work. Content knowledge about college masculinities and racial identity development is insufficient; students will be much less likely to engage in critical self-reflection if the educator has not also done personal reflection.

### Conclusion

In recent years, college campuses across the United States have seen a swell of angry white men protesting what they believe to be an overly liberal college environment. They feel others in this environment unfairly label them as predators, perpetrators, and problems. Fueled by the alt-right media, consumer capitalism, and neoconservative politics, these students often lash out against marginalized college populations, causing further harm and challenges for students already working hard to succeed amid an oppressive system of higher education.

Due to complex free speech laws and nuanced campus policies, educators struggle to find effective response strategies to mitigate the harm caused by the disruptive and often violent activism led by white men on their campuses. Furthermore, student affairs educators are not sufficiently trained to understand the larger systemic context behind white men's disengagement in college, including the theoretical concepts of hegemony, dissolution, and anomie. As a result, student affairs professionals typically employ counterproductive behavior-only responses to address these problems.

Through a critical analysis of the patriarchy and

white supremacy as systems of oppression in graduate preparation, additional professional development opportunities, and individual self-reflection, student affairs professionals can begin to effectively respond to the destructive protests and behaviors spearheaded by white male students. Moving beyond individualized behavior-only approaches, educators can hold individual white men accountable for their behavior and invite them to consider how larger systems of oppression inform their actions. Unlike behavior only approaches which led to conflict between educators and students, system-level responses allow both parties to see how systems of oppression cause harm to everyone. In other words, engaging in a critical examination of the patriarchy and white supremacy enables college educators and students to work together instead of against each other. In this way, system-level approaches can help channel white men's anger into the dismantlement of systems of oppression.

## References

- Ashlee, K. (2019). *Constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing whiteness: A critical participatory action research study of how participating in a critical whiteness studies course informs the professional socialization of white student affairs graduate students* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 13893951).
- Ashlee, K. C., & Wagner, R. L. (2019). Toward an intersectional model of college men and masculinities programming. In D. Tillapaugh & B. L. McGowan (Eds.), *Men and masculinities: Theoretical foundations and promising practices for supporting college men's development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Brown, B. (2008). *Daring greatly: How the courage to be vulnerable transforms the way we live, love, parent, and lead*. New York, NY: Gotham Books.
- Broude, G. J. (1990). Protest masculinity: A further look at the causes and the concept. *Ethos*, 18(1), 103-22.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2018). *White guys on campus: Racism, White immunity, and the myth of "post-racial" higher education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2017). Whiteness in higher education: The invisible missing link in diversity and racial analyses. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 42(6).
- Chen, A. (1999). Lives at the center of the periphery, lives at the periphery of the center. *Gender and Society*, 5, 584-607.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Davis, T. L. (2002). Voices of gender role conflict: The social construction of college men's identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(4), 508-521.
- Davis, T. L., & Laker, J. (2004). Connecting men to academic and student affairs programs and services. In G. E. Kellom (Ed.), *Developing effective programs and services for college men* (pp. 47-57). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Freitas, D. (2018). *Consent on campus: A manifesto*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- DeVitis, J. L., & Sasso, P. A. (Eds.) (2019). *Student activism in the academy: Its struggles and promise* (Eds.). Sterling, VA: Myers Educational Press/Stylus Publishing.
- DiAngelo, R. (2011). White fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), 54-70.
- DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide: A study in sociology*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1972). *Selected writings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(2), 210-228. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0063>
- Flashman, J. (2013). A cohort perspective on gender gaps in college attendance and completion. *Research in Higher Education*, 54(5), 545-570. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-013-9285-8>
- Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106(8), 1707-1791.
- Harper, S. R., Harris III, F., & Mmeje, K. (2005). A theoretical model to explain the overrepresentation of college men among campus judicial offenders: Implications for campus administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 42(4), 565-588. <https://doi.org/10.2202/0027-6014.1541>
- Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2013). *Identity development of college students: Advancing frameworks for multiple dimensions of identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kellom, G. E. (Ed.). (2004). Developing effective programs and services for college men. *New Directions for Student Services* (No. 107). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kilmartin, C., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2005). *Sexual assault in context: Teaching college men about gender*. Mahwah, NJ: Taylor & Francis.
- Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Kimmel, M. (2017). *Angry white men: American masculinity at the end of an era*. New York, NY: Nation Books.
- Kimmel, M., & Davis, T. (2011). Mapping guyland in college. In J. A. Laker & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 3-15). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 593-611.
- Laker, J. A. (2005). Beyond bad dogs: A pedagogy of engagement of male students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Arizona.
- Laker, J. A., & Davis T. (Eds.) (2011). *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis.
- Lensmire, T. J., McManimon, S. K., Dockter Tierney, J., Lee-Nichols, M. E., Casey, Z. A., Lensmire, A., & Davis, B. M. (2013). McIntosh as synecdoche: How teacher education's focus on white privilege undermines antiracism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(3), 410-432. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.83.3.35054h1418230574>



- Levine-Rasky, C. (2000). Framing whiteness: Working through the tensions in introducing whiteness to educators. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 3(3), 271–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713693039>
- Lusher, D., & Robins, G. (2009). Hegemonic and other masculinities in local social contexts. *Men & Masculinities*, 11(4), 387–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X06298776>
- Margolin, L. (2015) Unpacking the invisible knapsack: The invention of white privilege pedagogy, *Cogent Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1053183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2015.1053183>
- Matias, C. E. (2016). *Feeling White: Whiteness, Emotionality, and Education*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies* (Working Paper 189). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley Center for Research on Women.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1990). Assessing men's gender role conflict. In D. Moore & F. Leafgrem (Eds.), *Problem-solving strategies and interventions for men in conflict* (pp. 23–38). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- O'Neil, J. M., & Crapser, B. (2011). Using the psychology of men and gender role conflict theory to promote comprehensive service delivery to college men. In Laker, J. A. & Davis, T. (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 16–49). Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis.
- Patton, M. Q. (2012). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peralta, R. L. (2007). College alcohol use and the embodiment of hegemonic masculinity among European American men. *Sex Roles*, 56, 741–756. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9233-1>
- Reed, B. D. (2011). Socio-economic and work identity intersections with masculinity and college success. In J. A. Laker & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 111–129). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sasso, P. A. (2015). White boy wasted: Compensatory masculinities in fraternity men. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 10(1), 14–30.
- Sasso, P. A. (2019). Peter pan is white boy wasted: The wanderlust of college men in protest. In J. L DeVitis, & P. A. Sasso (Eds.), *Student activism in the academy: Its struggles and promise* (pp. 135–154). Sterling, VA: Myers Educational Press/Stylus Publishing.
- Sax, L. J. (2008). *The gender gap in college: Maximizing the developmental potential of women and men*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Tillapaugh, D. W. (2012). *Toward an integrated self: Making meaning of the multiple identities of gay men in college* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Tillapaugh, D., & McGowan, B. L. (2019). *Men and masculinities: Theoretical foundations and promising practices for supporting college men's development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Tomsen, S. (1997). A top night: Social protest, masculinity and the culture of drinking violence. *British Journal of Criminology*, 37(1), 90–102.
- Walker, G. W. (2006). Disciplining protest masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, 9(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X05284217>
- Witkowicki, C. (2019). *The influence of gender role norms and perceptions of masculinity on leadership style development in college men* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/2194824075/>

### Recommended Citation:

Ashlee, K. C., Sasso, P. A., & Witkowicki, C. (2020). Angry White men on campus: Theoretical perspectives and recommended responses. *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*, 5(2), 40-51.



