



2018

The Reification of Hegemonic Masculinity via Heteronormativity, Sexual Objectification, and Masculine Performances in Tau Kappa Epsilon Recruitment Videos

Viki Tomanov

Butler University, vtomanov@butler.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/bjur>



Part of the [Broadcast and Video Studies Commons](#), [Communication Technology and New Media Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), [Film and Media Studies Commons](#), [Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Ethnicity in Communication Commons](#), [Organizational Communication Commons](#), [Social Media Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tomanov, Viki (2018) "The Reification of Hegemonic Masculinity via Heteronormativity, Sexual Objectification, and Masculine Performances in Tau Kappa Epsilon Recruitment Videos," *Butler Journal of Undergraduate Research*: Vol. 4 , Article 13.

Retrieved from: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/bjur/vol4/iss1/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Butler Journal of Undergraduate Research by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

REIFYING HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN TKE RECRUITMENT VIDEOS

VIKI TOMANOV, BUTLER UNIVERSITY
MENTOR: DACIA CHARLESWORTH

Abstract

Fraternity members constitute a large percentage of men who hold highly influential jobs in politics, large corporations, and the like. Since fraternities are limited to men-only, it is important to examine how masculinity is both rhetorically constructed and subsequently performed. Tau Kappa Epsilon (TKE), the fraternity with the largest amount of chapters nationwide, is the focus of my analysis. Its popularity among college campuses signifies that its recruitment is successful and that, regardless of initiation into the fraternity, many men (and women) view TKE as an example of masculinity. In my analysis, I examine TKE recruitment videos from various universities that span the Northeastern, Southern, Midwestern, and Western regions of the United States. My analysis identified five markers that indicate an abundance to hegemonic masculinity, or the varying construction of the “ideal” man that is impossible to fully achieve: dominance (ascendancy), sexual objectification of women, heteronormativity, alcohol use, and recreational movement of the body. These markers demonstrate how TKE’s reification of hegemonic masculine ideals is problematic to society as a whole given the influence of fraternities beyond campus borders.

Rushing TKE is a choice to belong, but a challenge to become.

—TKE member, 2008

There are over nine million Greek Life members nationwide (“Greek Life Statistics,” 2011). Fraternity men, in particular, hold impressive leadership positions. For example, according to Greek Life Statistics (2011), all but two U.S. Presidents and Vice Presidents born since the first social fraternity was founded in 1825 have been members of a fraternity; since 1910, 76% of all Congressmen and 40 of 47 U.S Supreme Court Justices have belonged to a fraternity; and currently,

43 of the nation's 50 largest corporations are led by fraternity men, while 85% of Fortune 500 executives belong to a fraternity.

Given the leadership successes of fraternity members, and following from the assumption that belonging to a fraternity played some part in these successes, it is important to examine how fraternities rhetorically construct and subsequently encourage the performance of masculinity, since fraternities will have an impact on how their members perceive and perform gender. Since recruitment videos are most likely to be one of the members' first introductions to the fraternity, these videos are ideal rhetorical artifacts to analyze. Given that Tau Kappa Epsilon has the most active chapters, 290 to be exact (Geno, 2016), TKE serves as the ideal fraternity to analyze. Its nationwide popularity makes TKE the ideal fraternity to analyze because the fraternity successfully recruits members who are, from recruitment onward, subjected to TKE's views of masculinity and femininity.

Recruitment videos are meant to showcase the chapter in the best light possible; therefore, they are significant rhetorical artifacts for analyzing the performance of masculinity. After conducting my analysis, it is clear that presenting traditional forms of masculinity offers the key to effective promotion and successful recruitment. Like all fraternities, TKE chapters try to gather the best quality men to become future members, as those members will successfully continue the legacy of their brotherhood. Therefore, TKEs are highly intentional in the selection of video clips, photos, sound bites, and caption for, as well as the editing of, their recruitment videos in order to promote a performance of masculinity that will compete with what other fraternities have to offer.

In this essay, I begin by explaining the significance of fraternity recruitment videos as artifacts for rhetorical analysis. Next, I analyze TKE recruitment videos using the concept of hegemonic masculinity. Finally, I present the overall significance of my findings and provide directions for future research.

Context

Gender plays a large role in fraternities, as a fraternity is a unique single-gender community that has the potential to powerfully perpetuate a specific type of gender performance. West and Zimmerman (1987) establish a clear distinction between three concepts: *sex*, *sex category*, and *gender* (p. 127). They state, "*Sex* is a determination made through the application of socially agreed upon biological criteria for classifying persons as females or males" (p. 127). Depending on classification of one's sex, either through classification of genitalia or chromosomal

typing, one is placed in a binary sex category of either female or male. *Sex category* “presumes one’s sex and stands as proxy for it in many situations” (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 127). Society typically expects biological males to perform their gender in masculine ways, and biological females to perform their gender in feminine ways. According to West and Zimmerman (1987), “Gender activities emerge from and bolster claims to membership in a sex category” (p.127). Therefore, sex category establishes a binary view of gender. Butler (1988) describes *gender* as “an identity instituted through a stylized repetition of acts” (p. 519), and with a community of men living under the same roof, these desired stylized repetitions of acts, in most gender situations, become so heavily engrained in life that they seem natural and unquestionable.

As Foss (1989) discusses, *rhetoric* is the “the use of symbols to influence thought and action” (p. 4). Symbols assume a variety of forms which include both verbal and nonverbal elements (Foss, 1989, p. 4). Finely-tuning verbal and nonverbal elements in the performance of gender contributes to the feeling that gender is “natural” instead of a rhetorically-created performance. Foss (1989) states, “[R]eality or knowledge of what is in the world is the result of communicating about it” (p. 4). Therefore, performance of gender becomes an unquestionable reality for the individual who frequently communicates their gender using both verbal and nonverbal elements.

As each sorority or fraternity exists as a single-gender community of either women or men, respectively, Greek Life solidifies the binary view of gender. One way the binary view of gender is held in place is by *symbolic interactionism*, which “claims that through communication with others we learn who we are” (Wood, 2014, p. 50). The brotherhood bond a fraternity offers is directly connected to this concept given that brothers constantly communicate, verbally and nonverbally, when living under the same roof. Regarding verbal communication, Wood (as cited in Verderber, 1995) indicates that “[m]asculine speech communities define the goals of talk as exerting control, preserving independence, and enhancing status. Conversation is an arena for proving oneself and negotiating prestige” (p. 23). Through the construction of masculine communities in the fraternity setting, masculine traits are thus repeatedly reinforced through symbolic interaction.

The male and female gender binary led to Connell’s concept of hegemonic masculinity for males and emphasized femininity for females. *Hegemonic masculinity* is described as “a range of popular ideologies of what constitute ideal or actual characteristics of ‘being a man’” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 841). Unfortunately, the “ideal or hegemonic man in contemporary Western

societies has been described as EA [European American], young, heterosexually active, economically successful, athletically inclined, and self-assured” (Peralta, 2007, p. 742). This is unfortunate because "hegemonic masculinities can be constructed that do not correspond closely to the lives of any actual men. Yet these models do, in various ways, express widespread ideals, fantasies, and desires. (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 839). Therefore, these criteria pressure men to strive for unrealistic and/or unobtainable ideals of masculinity.

Complementary to hegemonic masculinity is *emphasized femininity*, which enables men to be dominant in their idealized masculine roles through the subordination of women. Often, women are subordinated through sexual objectification permitted by the concept of the *male gaze*. Mulvey (1999) states that "[i]n their traditional exhibitionist role women are simultaneously looked at and displayed with their appearance coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote *to-be-looked-at-ness*" (p. 19). The sexual objectification of women through the male gaze targets heterosexual men as the audience. Hegemonic masculinity favors heterosexuality; therefore, *heteronormativity* is established: the “taken-for-granted norm against which other forms of human sexuality are defined, measured, and judged” (Westerfelhaus & Lacroix, 2006, p. 428). When women are constantly presented as subordinate to (heterosexual) men, the belief that women are to assume a complementary role to hegemonic masculinity is communicated.

Fraternities sustain hegemonic masculinity through their prescriptions of gender performances. Anderson (2007) states, “Men must maintain and sustain a host of achieved and ascribed variables to obtain hegemonic power. Accordingly, previous investigations of the masculine construction among men in the American fraternity system consistently show that these men revere hegemonic masculinity” (p. 1). Thus, fraternity men are not expected to merely embody hegemonic masculinity; Anderson goes a step further to describe them as being expected to *revere* it. This is significant in that it reinforces the argument that hegemonic masculinity forms the backbone of TKE recruitment videos. Taking this into account, it becomes clear that the community setting in fraternities fosters hegemonic masculinity as the “ideal” man. Wood (2014) writes, “Within institutional settings, men are also stereotyped in ways that reflect cultural views of masculinity” (p. 213). Given the institutional setting of a university/college and a fraternity house, TKEs will therefore aim to present themselves in their most idealized version of man within their institution with hopes of attracting like-minded potential new members. The idealized version is also a social stereotype,

which Anokhina (2016) defines as “simplified, schematized, emotionally colored, and extremely stable images of a particular social group or community” (p. 1). Even though masculinities are fluid, as “‘masculinity’ represents not a certain type of man, rather, a way that men position themselves through discursive practices” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 841), social stereotypes perpetuate a rigid concept of what it means to be a man. Social stereotypes are also a “simplified” version of a group; therefore, they do not always represent individual members. In the fraternity setting, a symbiotic relationship thus exists between social stereotypes and group identity that becomes the lifeblood of sustaining hegemonic masculinity.

Fraternities oftentimes perceive women as sexual objects to be obtained. Anderson (2007) notes that “the fraternity system fosters stereotypical views of male dominance and female submissiveness, so that women solely represent objects to be sexually conquered” (p. 604-605). Fortunately, Anderson (2007) studies a different type of masculinity in the fraternal setting where chapter members challenge traditional forms of masculinity performance by being “overtly required” (Anderson, 2007, p. 616) to respect women. Such chapter members consider themselves as being the “new age man” (Anderson, 2007, p. 608) when they challenge stereotypical male dominant behavior. Moreover, this view is not limited to fraternities. Ciasullo and Magill (2015) note women as sexual objects is a deeply rooted concept within traditional masculinities, and they analyze the renewed masculinity type created within the films *21 Jump Street* and *22 Jump Street*, stating that the films “offer us a possible new form of twenty-first century masculinity in their celebration of male emotional intimacy and acceptance of multiple forms of masculinity” (Ciasullo & Magill, 2015, p. 317). Thus, exerting control over women through sexual objectification appears to be progressively diminishing through men’s consideration of non-traditional forms of masculinity. However, Anderson (2007) also writes that “[m]any of the men [in the fraternity] do sexually objectify women in constructing their heterosexual identities” (p. 613), and Ciasullo and Magill (2015) confess that “they [the *Jump Street* films] offer up moments of misogyny and sexual objectification” (p. 305). Therefore, despite efforts to challenge traditional forms of masculinity in the fraternal and non-fraternal setting, the sexual objectification of women persists.

In addition to exerting dominance over women, fraternity men exert dominance over alcohol through heavy consumption; in turn, alcohol becomes an instrument for constructing hegemonic masculinity. Alcohol usage is labelled as being “only one vehicle” for communicating hegemonic masculinity and sustaining it through society’s gender classification of men overall (Peralta, 2007, p. 754).

Cho, Wilkum, King, Bernat, and Ruvarac (2010) note that fraternity members drink more than both nonmembers (and their sorority counterparts) and “efforts to improve the health of a community (e.g., fraternities) can be most effective when they are grounded in the beliefs, values, and lifestyles of the community” (p. 212). Capone (2007) provides reasoning as to why fraternity members drink more than nonmembers, as “students who enter the Greek system will be exposed to a social environment that encourages heavy drinking” (p. 7). Peralta (2007) reveals that “empty bottles of liquor are displayed [by fraternity men] much like athletic trophies might be displayed as a measure of athletic accomplishment” (p. 747). Representative of heavy consumption, empty bottles become tokens of successful domination of alcohol. The more successful fraternity men are at accumulating “trophies,” the more successful they are at reifying hegemonic masculinity.

Lastly, demonstration of athleticism is used as a way of depicting hegemonic masculinity. Researchers indicate that males demonstrate healthy behaviors and glorify body usage as a means of emphasizing an abidance to hegemonic masculinity (Peralta, 2007, p. 743; Courtenay, 2000, p. 1388). Thus, demonstrations of athletic activity are essential to performing the “ideal” man, but only when success is expressed—the scoring of points, effective teamwork, and no acquiring of injury, as it “undercuts the power of the body” (Peralta, 2007, p. 743). Thus, demonstrations of athletic achievement serve the function of highlighting men’s strength, success, and superiority.

In sum, fraternity men sustain performance of hegemonic masculinity through revering traditional displays of masculinity, in which they become the “ideal man”—one who exerts dominance, sexually objectifies women, abides by heteronormativity, “conquers” alcohol, and demonstrates successful usage of the body.

Analysis

My findings indicate that TKE does not meet their goal of creating “Better Men for a Better World” (“TKE Official Recruitment Guide,” 2016, pg. 1), given that hegemonic masculinity is constantly reified among the almost non-differentiating recruitment videos. These videos emphasize five markers of hegemonic masculinity: exertion of dominance (ascendency); sexual objectification of women expressed through concepts of emphasized femininity and the male gaze; heteronormativity; alcohol use; and recreational movement of the body.

I examined five recruitment videos from four regions of the United States. Each TKE chapter is hosted by a public or private university/college, and considered large (with over 10,000 undergraduates) or small (with under 10,000 undergraduates). The institutions and their characteristics are as follows:

Region	Institution	Public/Private	Small/Large
Northeast	St. Francis College	Private	Small
Northeast	Long Island University (LIU)	Private	Large
South	Nicholls State University (NSU)	Public	Small
Midwest	University of South Dakota (USD)	Public	Small
West	Sonoma State University (SSU)	Public	Small

Table 1. Institution Profile

Selecting various geographic regions also allowed me to discover if there was diversity in the performance of gender based on region. All of the videos analyzed were posted on YouTube, making the videos available to a wide audience, not just the recruits. YouTube also immortalizes videos, in a sense. The videos date back to 2007, with the most recent being 2016. Therefore, alongside the diversity in region, diversity is also enacted through time. Regardless of the university and its regional location, however, I expected that each chapter would remain uniform in its values, such as upholding the “honest convictions of the Fraternity: Love, Charity and Esteem” (“TKE Official Recruitment Guide,” 2016, pg. 10), as this is an expectation of TKE chapters nation-wide.

To conduct my performative analysis, I transcribed each video, aiming to determine how these videos encourage the performance of gender. Transcriptions were divided into time segments and analyzed for markers of hegemonic masculinity/emphasized femininity. For example, a recruitment video featuring a scene of TKEs playing a sport for five seconds constitutes one marker of hegemonic masculinity, which, in this case is recreational movement of the body.

A common theme within the recruitment videos is the element of domination, or ascendancy in life, which perpetuates hegemonic masculinity. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) state, “Hegemony did not mean violence, although it could be supported by force; it meant ascendancy achieved through

culture, institutions, and persuasion” (p. 832). Thus, through highlighting leadership roles within recruitment videos, ascendancy is promoted. In the St. Francis 2014 TKE recruitment video, 17% of the video features individual members and their achievements in a slideshow form. The University of South Dakota (USD) 2007 recruitment video similarly features individual TKE members, mentioning the previous year’s “Strollers” President (who directs campus competition events between Greek houses), their current Student Association President, and former president Ronald Reagan, a once-active TKE member. The USD 2007 video concludes the leadership segment with a member stating: “Leadership is definitely something TKE excels in.”

The Nicholls State University (NSU) 2008 video also emphasizes leadership. The TKE president declares, “TKE’s involvement on campus is—everywhere.” Another member says: “Much of the older members are involved in different organizations like SGA [Student Government Association], SPA [Student Progress and Achievement], IFC [Interfraternity Council]—and these older members push you to get involved; start small and then eventually work your way up to the e-board [executive board] positions most current TKEs hold.” Undoubtedly, active leadership within the TKE house and on campus is highly encouraged and well-received, thus reifying hegemonic masculinity. TKEs are men who enjoy power and influence on campus—and they want people to know about it.

Ascendancy is also exerted through direct control of individuals who are figuratively, and literally, below TKE members. In the Sonoma State University (SSU) 2016 recruitment video, members are featured dragging a swordfish by its bill through the water while on a boat during a fishing trip. There is no clear purpose for this besides exerting control (through animal cruelty). The TKEs figuratively and literally place themselves above the swordfish, as they only value it as a commodity for exerting their own control. Furthermore, in the Long Island University (LIU) 2016 recruitment video, a Snapchat picture of a TKE wearing a blazer and khakis is featured. The member wears flip-flops and holds his leg out to have his pant legs folded up by another man. The caption on the picture reads, “When you have a guy to fold your pants.” It is unclear whether the man folding his pants is a TKE, but either way, the TKE is literally standing above him, while exerting control to have a task completed—one that most people do themselves. The song playing in background throughout the entirety of this recruitment video (including the presentation of the photo at 0:59) repeats the lyric, “I am the God”

(The Game & Skrillex, 2015), which aims to compare the ascendancy of TKE members to that of a god's—a figure with the ultimate level of ascendancy.

Given this self-proclaimed comparison to god, it is no surprise that another TKE video, the St. Francis 2014 video, features a T-Shirt with the words, "Rise Above the Rest" (at 3:48). This statement can be interpreted as making a comparison to god, as god is typically portrayed as "rising above the rest." This intense level of control, demonstrated through ridiculous and unique ways, correlates to TKE's desire to achieve in the symbolic hierarchy of men built by hegemonic masculinity.

TKEs also sexually objectify women in order to sustain hegemonic masculinity. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) explain that "women are central in many of the processes constructing masculinities," in particular those which use femininity to encourage compliance with the patriarchy. Under the patriarchal umbrella is the concept of the male gaze, which assumes a target audience of heterosexual men; in other words, women adhere to the male gaze by looking attractive and being sexually objectified. This phenomenon is most accurately depicted in the 2008 NSU recruitment video. The video poses the question (at 5:07): "Are there any other reasons to join TKE?" Afterwards, at 5:15, the picture of a TKE member appears grasping the buttocks of two bent-over girls. The caption reads: "We can think of a couple," insinuating that the two girls (and others like them) are a reason for joining. Following this photo is video footage of girls, aware and unaware that they are being filmed, dancing provocatively at parties. This footage constitutes over a fourth of the video (between 5:27- 7:49, which equates to roughly 25.8%).

The featuring of girls dancing alone, with other girls, or grinding on TKEs connects back to the male gaze and women's sexual objectification as this segment becomes a showcase of women. A similar scene in the SSU 2016 recruitment video occurs when the video pans to five couples (of TKEs and girls) kissing and grinding (between 2:05-2:33). In addition to this, attractive girls clad in swimsuits make up the TKE sign with their hands. One girl wears a bright orange bikini, another a Hawaiian shirt. The "beach" theme itself encourages little clothing, which has the ability to invite sexual objectification of women as they wear bikinis and shorts and often display bare midriffs, cleavage, and legs.

The USD 2007 video also caters to the male gaze when at 5:31, a picture of five girls appears, in which one girl holds the breast of another. The line in the other woman's arm leads the viewer's eye directly to the girl's breast. When this occurs, the primary focus becomes the woman's breast held by the other woman, who

appears to be comfortable with the woman to the point of intimacy, sexual or otherwise. Ultimately, this focus enables sexual objectification as her body becomes the primary focus, catering to the male gaze and insinuating an eroticism between the two women.

The male gaze promotes heteronormativity by following the assumption that heterosexual men are the default target audience. This phenomenon is illustrated in subtle ways throughout the TKE recruitment videos. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) state that the subordination of homosexual men has been a central issue in discourse of hegemonic masculinity that has sparked "the policing of heterosexuality" (p. 837). In the St. Francis 2014 video, between 3:38-3:55, the TKE narrator reveals that the fraternity is situated among four sororities: Alpha Zeta, Kappa Alpha Theta, Alpha Phi, and Pi Beta Phi. At the credits portion of the video (at 8:42) appears the caption: "Top 10 Reasons to Rush TKE," in which "Location" is an answer twice mentioned in the listing, with the second time written in all capital letters. Ultimately, this insinuates that TKEs benefit from close relations with sorority women—in other words, the message becomes: *join TKE and girls will surround you*. This falls under heteronormativity as it glorifies closeness between (fraternity) men and (sorority) women and uses this closeness as a selling point to attract potential new members; it must assume that heterosexuality is the default sexual identity of TKE members.

The LIU 2016 recruitment video also expresses heteronormativity with the emphasis of a particular picture at 0:40. The Snapchat photo becomes the main feature as various other pictures move out of the frame behind it in an animated picture montage. The picture features an attractive blonde woman with her tongue sticking out, standing next to a TKE who is making a silly face, revealing that they are comfortable with each other. Above the picture is the username display: "Dat Fine Hoe." The name itself is enough to sexually objectify the woman in the photo, as the contemporary word for "hoe" is synonymous with the word "slut"—with both terms usually used to insult a woman who partakes in sexual intercourse. Therefore not only does this photo sexualize the woman, it also promotes heteronormativity in that the main feature of the animated video montage is that of an assumed heterosexual couple.

TKE also displays alcohol frequently to express hegemonic masculinity. Cho et al. (2010) straightforwardly declare, "Results suggest that the meaning of public drinking is to express a form of masculinity" (p. 741). Therefore, paying attention to alcoholic drinks in the videos is crucial when examining masculinity in the fraternal setting. The NSU 2008 recruitment video features alcohol in 31

different pictures/scenes: in the background in a bar-type setting, or through members holding bottles, cans, or cups of alcohol, constituting 36.18% of the video (199 seconds out of 550 total). Furthermore, even the background music for the video glorifies alcohol: “Sippin’ whiskey out the bottle, not thinkin’ bout tomorrow” (Kid Rock, 2008), with a picture of TKEs posing in a group photo holding their beverage of choice (at 3:09). In addition, not even a minute passes before alcohol is introduced, as the first frame showing alcohol is at 0:54.

The LIU 2016 recruitment video does not differ much: Although it features alcohol less – only six times throughout the video – alcohol is first shown 0:43 seconds into the video, and there are moments when alcohol is emphasized more than in the NSU 2008 video. For instance, at 2:55 a very demonstrative picture of bottles of alcohol in the hands of TKE members in formalwear appears. Alcohol seems to be an accessory to their outfits, as three members each hold a bottle of alcohol in front of them. This photo lasts for four seconds (until 2:59), which may not seem like a long time, but comparatively—it is. The picture is among an animated picture montage, where pictures move behind the frame in various directions. This montage reveals 10 pictures, overlapping from the animation, in the time span of 15 seconds. On average, each of the 10 pictures appears on the screen for 1.5 seconds, making the alcohol photo prominent as it is featured $2\frac{2}{3}$ times longer than the other photos (for four seconds). Such findings reveal that alcohol plays a prominent role in TKE promotion. Photos and videos of alcohol are not rare to witness, even though many members or guests may be underage, not paying much attention to the fact that the video will be displayed openly on YouTube, a public-viewing platform. It appears alcohol is a taken-for-granted, naturally accepted part of the fraternity experience. Given the connection between alcohol and hegemonic masculinity, TKEs clearly communicate that they desire to reify hegemonic masculinity through their displays and glorification of alcohol consumption.

Finally, TKE recruitment videos feature hegemonic masculinity through recreational movement of the body: athletics, dancing, and risky backflips. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) describe bodies as “both objects of social practice and agents in social practice” (p. 851), especially in youth as “skilled bodily activity becomes a prime indicator of masculinity, as we have already seen with sport” (p. 851). Therefore, when TKEs feature their athleticism, they promote their masculinity.

In the SSU 2016 recruitment video, athletic scenes are shown 10 times throughout—including scenes of baseball, basketball, football, fishing, and corn-

hole. The NSU 2008 video poses the question: “What made you rush TKE?” The first answer glorifies TKE’s athleticism: “Athletics is what brought me in to TKE. I was an athlete my whole life and TKE’s full of athletes.” The LIU 2016 recruitment video also features sports (basketball, soccer ball tricks, and football) for 38 seconds; 17 seconds of dancing; and 9 seconds of back-flipping (4 seconds off a cliff, 5 seconds off the roof of a house). In total, that is 64 seconds of a three-minute-and-fourteen second video, meaning that nearly 33% of the video features movement of the body.

It is clear that recreational movement is common in TKE recruitment videos. However, unlike watching a sporting event, these videos display movement for the sole purpose of displaying achievement; they do not take the audience through the ups and downs of a sports game. Thus, these brief glimpses of athleticism perpetuate the idea of athleticism as masculine performance. It appears as if each video adds these scenes as merely a way to demonstrate and emphasize members’ masculinity, as there is no other purpose to the clips. The strategy could be compared to an actor highlighting certain traits of a character in a performance to get the message across of what type of character being played. Thus, the various fragmented displays of bodily movement directly contribute to TKEs’ reification of hegemonic masculinity.

Conclusion

TKE recruitment videos reify hegemonic masculinity through the prominent portrayals of dominance (ascendancy), sexual objectification of women expressed through emphasized femininity and the male gaze, heteronormativity, alcohol use, and recreational movement of the body. Each of the five recruitment videos emphasize one or more of these markers of hegemonic masculinity. It is as though the creators of the recruitment videos have gone through the motions of performing their masculine gender—making sure to display each marker as a way of stressing their masculinity. The uniformity of the videos is the ultimate indicator that region did not make a significant difference in the way gender was performed, only the intensity with which it was performed; that is, by region videos varied in their degree of emphasis on certain hegemonic masculinity markers.

Moreover, the foils of hegemonic masculinity, the “new age man” (Anderson, 2007, p. 5) and the “new form of twenty-first century masculinity” (Ciasullo & Magill, 2015, p. 317), have yet to be upheld as the standard in TKE recruitment videos. The consequences of reifying hegemonic masculinity are also likely to reach beyond TKE, as other fraternities, hoping to be as successful at

recruiting members and expanding chapters as TKE, are likely to look to TKE's example when creating their own recruitment videos. As mentioned previously, the recruitment videos reveal a similar abidance to hegemonic masculinity constructs in the span of various regions across the United States and a relatively wide span of time (between 2007 and 2016). Efforts to combat traditional forms of hegemonic masculinity therefore appear to be decelerated; progress is slow, and change is small. Given the impact of fraternities on society as a whole (e.g. through leadership positions in jobs), TKEs (and other fraternity members) transcend the borders of university/college, as members graduate with hegemonic masculinity concepts firmly engrained into their gender performance. Time will only tell when the "new age man" will be considered the "common man."

Future research in this area could focus on the impact of "new" forms of masculinity on traditional, hegemonic values if individual members who reject the hegemonic model – and consequently uphold stated fraternity expectations – could be found. In addition, future research focusing on emphasized femininity in sorority recruitment videos could potentially provide a unique perspective on hegemonic masculinity; basically, this would be an analysis of masculinity through feminine gender expression. Questions to delve into would include, but not be limited to: Do sororities abide by the concept of emphasized femininity? Do sororities encourage traditional performance of femininity? Analysis of these questions could act as a stepping stone to research on why fraternities have significantly less content posted on YouTube than sororities when it comes to recruitment videos—does that speak to gender expression, or is it negated by the secretiveness preferred by the Greek chapter/house? Lastly, research on multiple TKEs from the recruitment videos, those individual members who have graduated and now make a living through professional, leadership positions, would be a great follow-up to the currently presented information, as it could ask whether the TKE alumni follow mostly traditional masculine concepts emphasized in the videos, or whether their masculinity has developed into the acclaimed new form of the twenty-first century.

References

- Alcazar, L. (Producer). (2008, July 30). TKE Rush Video 2008 [Video file]. In Youtube.com. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TS3J9lv8dVI&index=5&list=WL>
- Anderson, E. (2008). Inclusive Masculinity in a Fraternal Setting. *Men & Masculinities, 10*(5), 604-620.
- Anokhina, S. P. (2016). Gender Portrayals in Aphorisms. *Global Media Journal: American Edition, 1-7*.
- Bovin, M. (Producer). (2016, September 26). *Tau Kappa Epsilon Recruitment Fall 2016 Long Island University Post* [Video file]. In Youtube.com. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ODW-dOdTYz4&t=56s&list=WL&index=10>
- Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal, 40*(4), 519. doi:10.2307/3207893
- Capone, C., Wood, M. D., Borsari, B., & Laird, R. D. (2007). Fraternity and sorority involvement, social influences, and alcohol use among college students: A prospective examination. *Psychology Of Addictive Behaviors, 21*(3), 316-327. doi:10.1037/0893-164X.21.3.316
- Cho, H., Wilkum, K., King, A. J., Bernat, J. K., Ruvarac, A., & Xu, H. (2010). Fraternity drinking as edgework: an analysis of perspectives on risk and control. *Health Communication, 25*(3), 212-220. doi:10.1080/10410231003698887
- Ciasullo, A. M., & Magill, D. (2015). 'This is what I've always wanted': Bromance and the evolution of male intimacy in the Jump Street films. *Interactions: Studies In Communication & Culture, 6*(3), 303-321. doi:10.1386/iscc.6.3.303_1
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829-859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639

- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 50(10), 1385-1401. doi:10.1016/s0277-9536(99)00390-1
- Cuccurullo, R. (Producer). (2014, August 26). Rush TKE (Upsilon-Chi) St. Francis College [Video file]. In Youtube.com. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aTr5KpvWluA&index=2&list=WL>
- Foss, S. K. (1989). Rhetorical criticism: Exploration & practice. *Communication Education*, 38(3), 191-196. doi:10.1080/03634528909378755.
- Game, T. Skrillex (2015). Documentary 2.5 [CD]. Record Room Studios, Chalice Recording Studios: EOne Music, Blood Money.
- Geno, C. (2016). 10 Largest Fraternities. Retrieved November 30, 2016, from <http://www.campusexplorer.com/college-advice-tips/0BCBEEAE/10-Largest-Fraternities/>
- Greek Life Statistics. (2011). Retrieved from <http://thefraternityadvisor.com/greek-life-statistics/>
- Kid Rock. (2008). All Summer Long [CD]. Allen Roadhouse: Atlantic, Top Dog. (2007)
- Michaud, B. (Producer). (2016, February 10). Tau Kappa Epsilon Sonoma State Spring Rush 2016 [Video file]. In Youtube.com. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4dF7lCd9EyE&index=9&list=WL>
- Mulvey, L. (1989). Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. *Visual and Other Pleasures*, 14-26. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-19798-9_3
- Peralta, R. (2007). College Alcohol Use and the Embodiment of Hegemonic Masculinity among European American Men. *Sex Roles*, 56(11-12), 741-756. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-92331
- Tkekittles (Producer). (2007, August 13). Rush TKE at USD- Fall 2007 [Video file]. In Youtube.com. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jkLKMzIWTNo&index=8&list=WL>
- “The Official TKE Recruitment Guide.” (2016, February 09) [PDF File]. Retrieved from <http://files.tke.org/tkeorg/other/Tau%20Kappa%20Epsilon%20Recruitment%20Guide.pdf>

- Verderber, K. (1995). *Voices : A selection of multicultural readings*. Belmont Calif.: Wadsworth Pub.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151. doi:10.1177/0891243287001002002
- Westerfelhaus, R., & Lacroix, C. (2006). Seeing “Straight” through Queer Eye: Exposing the Strategic Rhetoric of Heteronormativity in a Mediated Ritual of Gay Rebellion. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 23(5), 426-444. doi:10.1080/07393180601046196
- Wood, J. T. (2014). *Gendered Lives: Communication, gender, and culture* (11th ed., Cengage Learning).