

- Edwards, K. M., Turchik, J. A., Dardis, C. M., Reynolds, N., & Gidycz, C. A. (2011). Rape myths: History, individual and institutional-level presence, and implications for change. *Sex Roles, 65*, 761–773.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf>
- Fox, J. A., & Zawitz, M. W. (2010). *Homicide trends in the United States*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/htius.pdf>
- Gerami, S., & Lehnner, M. (2001). Women's agency and household diplomacy: Negotiating fundamentalism. *Gender & Society, 15*(4), 556–573.
- Hand, J. Z., & Sanchez, L. (2000). Badgering or bantering? Gender differences in experience of, and reactions to, sexual harassment among U.S. high school students. *Gender & Society, 14*(6), 718–746.
- Kempadoo, K., & Doezema, J. (1998). *Global sex workers: Rights, resistance, and redefinition*. New York: Routledge.
- Mahoney, P., Williams, L. M., & West, C. M. (2001). Violence against women by intimate relationship partners. In C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson, & R. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (pp. 143–178). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. (2012). *Title IX at 40: Working to ensure gender equality in education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nesbitt, P., Baust, J., & Bailey, E. (2001). Women's status in the Christian church. In D. Vannoy (Ed.), *Gender mosaics: Societal perspectives* (pp. 386–396). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Rennison, C. M. (2002). *Rape and sexual assault: Reporting to police and medical attention, 1992–2000*. Retrieved from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsarp00.pdf>
- Ronen, S. (2010). Grinding on the dance floor: Gendered scripts and sexualized dancing at college parties. *Gender & Society, 24*(3), 355–377.
- Rose, D. R. (2001). Gender and Judaism. In D. Vannoy (Ed.), *Gender mosaics: Societal perspectives* (pp. 415–424). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Ryan, K. M. (2011). The relationship between rape myths and sexual scripts: The social construction of rape. *Sex Roles, 65*, 774–782.
- Schact, S. P. (1996). Misogyny on and off the “pitch”: The gendered world of male rugby players. *Gender & Society, 10*(5), 550–565.
- Truman, J. L. (2011, September). *National Crime Victimization Survey: Criminal victimization, 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv10.pdf>
- Weiss, K. G. (2010). Male sexual victimization: Examining men's experiences of rape and sexual assault. *Men and Masculinities, 12*(3), 275–298.
- Welsh, S. (1999). Gender and sexual harassment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25*, 169–190.

Introduction to Reading 42

Norms that define women as essentially sexually passive were challenged as *Sex and the City* hit television screens. However, did that television program actually change the way the expression of sexuality is used to enforce gender inequality? This article would suggest that although things have changed, sexuality is still gendered. In this reading, Laura Hamilton and Elizabeth A. Armstrong report their findings from a 4-year ethnographic and interview study of women at a midwestern university. The study began in 2004, when the authors, along with seven other researchers, “occupied” a room on a dormitory floor in what students identified as a “party dorm.” In addition to observing and hanging out with the women, they also conducted interviews with 41 of the 53 women who lived on this floor during the first year. This particular paper summarizes the women's reports about hooking up and relationships and how both changed over the course of their study. Their focus on social interaction is particularly valuable in understanding how gender is understood and enforced within the inner circles of Berger's concentric

rings of social co
this chapter. In a
tion and meanin
they studied. The
sion of sexuality
for young wome
not consistent, i
class in this piec

1. How do
their ori
2. How did
social cl
3. Do you
differenc

As traditio
lege can
encounte
fueled, dance-c
become a primar
interaction (Engl
Paul, McManus,
attracted attentio
journalists (Bogl
2001; Stepp 200
of both data and
cations for wom
studies examine
one point during
an individualist, g

From Hamilton, Lau
options.” *Gender &*

rings of social control, by ourselves and those closest to us, as described in the introduction to this chapter. In addition, the authors provide an intersectional analysis, examining how interaction and meaning of these college relationships varies across social class for the young women they studied. Their findings help us think about how gender continues to influence the expression of sexuality in a world where permanent relationships are delayed and "sex" is the theme for young women as well as men. They also help us understand that gender enforcement, while not consistent, is patterned within intersections of different prisms, such as gender and social class in this piece.

1. How do the women in this study describe "hooking up," and what factors influence their orientation to this expression of sexuality?
2. How did gender influence the expression of sexuality differently for women from different social classes in this study?
3. Do you think heterosexuality will be less important in the future in enforcing gender difference and inequality than it has been in the past? Why or why not?

GENDERED SEXUALITY IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD

Double Binds and Flawed Options

Laura Hamilton and Elizabeth A. Armstrong

As traditional dating has declined on college campuses, hookups—casual sexual encounters often initiated at alcohol-fueled, dance-oriented social events—have become a primary form of intimate heterosexual interaction (England, Shafer, and Fogarty 2007; Paul, McManus, and Hayes 2000). Hookups have attracted attention among social scientists and journalists (Bogle 2008; Glenn and Marquardt 2001; Stepp 2007). To date, however, limitations of both data and theory have obscured the implications for women and the gender system. Most studies examine only the quality of hookups at one point during college and rely, if implicitly, on an individualist, gender-only approach. In contrast,

we follow a group of women as they move through college—assessing all of their sexual experiences. We use an interactionist approach and attend to how both gender and class shape college sexuality. . . .

GENDER THEORY AND COLLEGE SEXUALITY

Research on Hooking Up

Paul, McManus, and Hayes (2000) and Glenn and Marquardt (2001) were the first to draw attention to the hookup as a distinct social form. As Glenn and Marquardt (2001, 13) explain, most

From Hamilton, Laura and Elizabeth A. Armstrong. 2009. "Gendered sexuality in young adulthood: Double binds and flawed options." *Gender & Society* 23(5): 259–616. Published by Sage Publications on behalf of Sociologists for Women in Society.

students agree that "a hook up is anything 'ranging from kissing to having sex,' and that it takes place outside the context of commitment." Others have similarly found that *hooking up* refers to a broad range of sexual activity and that this ambiguity is part of the appeal of the term (Bogle 2008). Hookups differ from dates in that individuals typically do not plan to do something together prior to sexual activity. Rather, two people hanging out at a party, bar, or place of residence will begin talking, flirting, and/or dancing. Typically, they have been drinking. At some point, they move to a more private location, where sexual activity occurs (England, Shafer, and Fogarty 2007). While strangers sometimes hook up, more often hookups occur among those who know each other at least slightly (Manning, Giordano, and Longmore 2006).

England has surveyed more than 14,000 students from 19 universities and colleges about their hookup, dating, and relationship experiences. Her Online College Social Life Survey (OCSLS) asks students to report on their recent hookups using "whatever definition of a hookup you and your friends use." Seventy-two percent of both men and women participating in the OCSLS reported at least one hookup by their senior year in college. Of these, roughly 40 percent engaged in three or fewer hookups, 40 percent between four and nine hookups, and 20 percent 10 or more hookups. Only about one-third engaged in intercourse in their most recent hookups, although—among the 80 percent of students who had intercourse by the end of college—67 percent had done so outside of a relationship.

Ongoing sexual relationships without commitment were common and were labeled "repeat," "regular," or "continuing" hookups and sometimes "friends with benefits" (Armstrong, England, and Fogarty 2009; Bogle 2008; Glenn and Marquardt 2001). Ongoing hookups sometimes became committed relationships and vice versa; generally, the distinction revolved around the level of exclusivity and a willingness to refer to each other as "girlfriend/boyfriend" (Armstrong, England, and Fogarty 2009). Thus, hooking up does not imply

interest in a relationship, but it does not preclude such interest. Relationships are also common among students. By their senior year, 69 percent of heterosexual students had been in a college relationship of at least six months.

To date, however, scholars have paid more attention to women's experiences with hooking up than relationships and focused primarily on ways that hookups may be less enjoyable for women than for men. Glenn and Marquardt (2001, 20) indicate that "hooking up is an activity that women sometimes find rewarding but more often find confusing, hurtful, and awkward." Others similarly suggest that more women than men find hooking up to be a negative experience (Bogle 2008, 173; Owen et al. 2008) and focus on ways that hookups may be harmful to women (Eshbaugh and Gute 2008; Grello, Welsh, and Harper 2006).

This work assumes distinct and durable gender differences at the individual level. Authors draw, if implicitly, from evolutionary psychology, socialization, and psychoanalytic approaches to gender—depicting women as more relationally oriented and men as more sexually adventurous (see Wharton 2005 for a review). For example, despite only asking about hookup experiences, Bogle (2008, 173) describes a "battle of the sexes" in which women want hookups to "evolve into some semblance of a relationship," while men prefer to "hook up with no strings attached" (also see Glenn and Marquardt 2001; Stepp 2007).

The battle of the sexes view implies that if women could simply extract commitment from men rather than participating in hookups, gender inequalities in college sexuality would be alleviated. Yet this research—which often fails to examine relationships—ignores the possibility that women might be the losers in both hookups and relationships. Research suggests that young heterosexual women often suffer the most damage from those with whom they are most intimate: Physical battery, emotional abuse, sexual assault, and stalking occur at high rates in youthful heterosexual relationships (Campbell et al. 2007; Dunn 1999). This suggests that gender

inequality in college existing across social

Current research is solely about gender and the significance of it. Some scholars of the college environment students' position in it. Glenn and Marquardt is treated primarily sexual behavior rather than class reproduction. class in sex and relationship the appeal of women and men.

Gender Beliefs and

Contemporary gender resources to think about college sexuality differently developed and refined social structure reproductivity: Gender is individual selves but a national arrangement 1999; Risman 2000 interactional level public gender beliefs and romantic relationships

Drawing on Sen's theory, Ridgeway argues gender beliefs as conditions for enacting difference and inequality in gender." By believing individuals "see" others accountable if individuals do not they must still conform

Ridgeway and Sen's theory of gender inequality in the workplace but suggest in private life may

inequality in college sexuality is systemic, existing across social forms.

Current research also tends to see hooking up as solely about gender, without fully considering the significance of other dimensions of inequality. Some scholars highlight the importance of the college environment and traditional college students' position in the life course (Bogle 2008; Glenn and Marquardt 2001). However, college is treated primarily as a context for individual sexual behavior rather than as a key location for class reproduction. Analyzing the role of social class in sex and relationships may help to illuminate the appeal of hookups for both college women and men.

Gender Beliefs and Social Interaction

Contemporary gender theory provides us with resources to think about gender inequality in college sexuality differently. Gender scholars have developed and refined the notion of gender as a social structure reproduced at multiple levels of society: Gender is embedded not only in individual selves but also in interaction and organizational arrangements (Connell 1987; Glenn 1999; Risman 2004). This paper focuses on the interactional level, attending to the power of public gender beliefs in organizing college sexual and romantic relations.

Drawing on Sewell's (1992) theory of structure, Ridgeway and Correll (2004, 511) define gender beliefs as the "cultural rules or instructions for enacting the social structure of difference and inequality that we understand to be gender." By believing in gender differences, individuals "see" them in interaction and hold others accountable to this perception. Thus, even if individuals do not internalize gender beliefs, they must still confront them (Ridgeway 2009).

Ridgeway and coauthors (Ridgeway 2000; Ridgeway and Correll 2004) assert that interaction is particularly important to the reproduction of gender inequality because of how frequently men and women interact. They focus on the workplace but suggest that gendered interaction in private life may be intensifying in importance

as beliefs about gender difference in workplace competency diminish (Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007; Ridgeway 2000; Ridgeway and Correll 2004). We extend their insights to sexual interaction, as it is in sexuality and reproduction that men and women are believed to be most different. The significance of gender beliefs in sexual interaction may be magnified earlier in the life course, given the amount of time spent in interaction with peers and the greater malleability of selves (Eder, Evans, and Parker 1995). Consequently, the university provides an ideal site for this investigation.

The notion that men and women have distinct sexual interests and needs generates a powerful set of public gender beliefs about women's sexuality. A belief about what women should not do underlies a *sexual double standard*: While men are expected to desire and pursue sexual opportunities regardless of context, women are expected to avoid casual sex—having sex only when in relationships and in love (Crawford and Popp 2003; Risman and Schwartz 2002). Much research on the sexuality of young men focuses on male endorsement of this belief and its consequences (e.g., Bogle 2008; Kimmel 2008; Martin and Hummer 1989). There is an accompanying and equally powerful belief that normal women should always want love, romance, relationships, and marriage—what we refer to as the *relational imperative* (also see Holland and Eisenhart 1990; Martin 1996; Simon, Eder, and Evans 1992). We argue that these twin beliefs are implicated in the (re)production of gender inequality in college sexuality and are at the heart of women's sexual dilemmas with both hookups and relationships.

An Intersectional Approach

Gender theory has also moved toward an intersectional approach (Collins 1990; Glenn 1999). Most of this work focuses on the lived experiences of marginalized individuals who are situated at the intersection of several systems of oppression (McCall 2005). More recently, scholars have begun to theorize the ways in which systems of inequality are themselves linked

(Beisel and Kay 2004; Glenn 1999; McCall 2005). Beisel and Kay (2004) apply Sewell's (1992) theory of structure to intersectionality, arguing that structures intersect when they share resources or guidelines for action (of which gender beliefs would be one example). Using a similar logic, we argue that gender and class intersect in the sexual arena, as these structures both rely on beliefs about how and with whom individuals should be intimate.

Like gender, class structures beliefs about appropriate sexual and romantic conduct. Privileged young Americans, both men and women, are now expected to defer family formation until the mid-twenties or even early-thirties to focus on education and career investment—what we call the *self-development imperative* (Arnett 2004; Rosenfeld 2007). This imperative makes committed relationships less feasible as the sole contexts for premarital sexuality. Like marriage, relationships can be “greedy,” siphoning time and energy away from self-development (Gerstel and Sarkisian 2006; Glenn and Marquardt 2001). In contrast, hookups offer sexual pleasure without derailing investment in human capital and are increasingly viewed as part of life-stage appropriate sexual experimentation. Self-protection—both physical and emotional—is central to this logic, suggesting the rise of a strategic approach to sex and relationships (Brooks 2002; Illouz 2005). This approach is reflected in the development of erotic marketplaces offering short-term sexual partners, particularly on college campuses (Collins 2004).

In this case, gender and class behavioral rules are in conflict. Gender beliefs suggest that young women should avoid nonromantic sex and, if possible, be in a committed relationship. Class beliefs suggest that women should delay relationships while pursuing educational goals. Hookups are often less threatening to self-development projects, offering sexual activity in a way that better meshes with the demands of college. We see this as a case wherein structures intersect, but in a contradictory way (Friedland and Alford 1991; Martin 2004; Sewell 1992). This structural contradiction has experiential consequences: Privileged women find themselves caught between contradictory expectations,

while less privileged women confront a foreign sexual culture when they enter college.

* * *

THE POWER OF GENDER BELIEFS

The “Slut” Stigma

Women did not find hookups to be unproblematic. They complained about a pervasive sexual double standard. As one explained, “Guys can have sex with all the girls and *it makes them more of a man*, but if a girl does then all of a sudden she’s a ho, and she’s not as quality of a person” (10-1, emphasis added). Another complained, “Guys, they can go around and have sex with a number of girls and they’re not called anything” (6-1). Women noted that it was “easy to get a reputation” (11-1) from “hooking up with a bunch of different guys” (8-1) or “being wild and drinking too much” (14-3). Their experiences of being judged were often painful; one woman told us about being called a “slut” two years after the incident because it was so humiliating (42-3).

Fear of stigma constrained women’s sexual behavior and perhaps even shaped their preferences. For example, several indicated that they probably would “make out with more guys” but did not because “I don’t want to be a slut” (27-2). Others wanted to have intercourse on hookups but instead waited until they had boyfriends. A couple hid their sexual activity until the liaison was “official.” One said, “I would not spend the night there [at the fraternity] because that does not look good, but now everyone knows we’re boyfriend/girlfriend, so it’s like my home now” (15-1). Another woman, who initially seemed to have a deep aversion to hooking up, explained, “I would rather be a virgin for as much as I can than go out and do God knows who.” She later revealed a fear of social stigma, noting that when women engage in nonromantic sex, they “get a bad reputation. I know that I wouldn’t want that reputation” (11-1). Her comments highlight the feedback between social judgment and internalized preference.

Gender beliefs and women’s other chief concern, the disrespect of women. The notion that hookups are not for women was a common theme of the Greek sororities occurred: Sorority parties or overnight male parties about proper femininity fraternities collected money and viewed hookups as a bad activity. This disparity almost complete control of parties on campus and underage crowd (B. Martin and Hummer).

Women reported that at party transportation, party themes such as the flow of alcohol, and within the party (A. Sweeney 2006). Women they engaged in strategies in hordes” (21-1) and I don’t know where it is safer at fraternity parties hooking up, women noted, so if they sensed that it might mine their control over pushing them to drink exit from private rooms (home). Women typically party venues they preferred, noted, “I wouldn’t go if I heard they do bad things those interested in party scenes tired of game was rigged.

The sexual double standard and negative treatment of women regardless of whether they are hooking up. Women explained that the lack of respect for them in treating them solely as objects of desire extended to the disregard extended to them. “The guy gets off and he cares about” (12-1).

en confront a foreign
ter college.

BELIEFS

kups to be unproblem-
out a pervasive sexual
explained, "Guys can
nd *it makes them more*
s then all of a sudden
s quality of a person"
Another complained,
l and have sex with a
e not called anything"
it was "easy to get a
ooking up with a bunch
"being wild and drink-
r experiences of being
l; one woman told us
t" two years after the
humiliating (42-3).
tined women's sexual
n shaped their prefer-
ral indicated that they
t with more guys" but
ant to be a slut" (27-2).
rcourse on hookups but
id boyfriends. A couple
il the liaison was "offi-
ot spend the night there
hat does not look good,
we're boyfriend/girl-
e now" (15-1). Another
ed to have a deep aver-
ned, "I would rather be
can than go out and do
ter revealed a fear of
when women engage in
get a bad reputation. I
that reputation" (11-1).
the feedback between
alized preference.

Gender beliefs were also at the root of women's other chief complaint about hookups—the disrespect of women in the hookup scene. The notion that hooking up is okay for men but not for women was embedded in the organization of the Greek system, where most parties occurred: Sorority rules prohibited hosting parties or overnight male visitors, reflecting notions about proper feminine behavior. In contrast, fraternities collected social fees to pay for alcohol and viewed hosting parties as a central activity. This disparity gave fraternity men almost complete control over the most desirable parties on campus—particularly for the underage crowd (Boswell and Spade 1996; Martin and Hummer 1989).

Women reported that fraternity men dictated party transportation, the admittance of guests, party themes such as "CEO and secretary ho," the flow of alcohol, and the movement of guests within the party (Armstrong, Hamilton, and Sweeney 2006). Women often indicated that they engaged in strategies such as "travell[ing] in hordes" (21-1) and not "tak[ing] a drink if I don't know where it came from" (15-1) to feel safer at fraternity parties. Even when open to hooking up, women were not comfortable doing so if they sensed that men were trying to undermine their control of sexual activity (e.g., by pushing them to drink too heavily, barring their exit from private rooms, or refusing them rides home). Women typically opted not to return to party venues they perceived as unsafe. As one noted, "I wouldn't go to [that house] because I heard they do bad things to girls" (14-1). Even those interested in the erotic competition of party scenes tired of it as they realized that the game was rigged.

The sexual double standard also justified the negative treatment of women in the party scene—regardless of whether they chose to hook up. Women explained that men at parties showed a lack of respect for their feelings or interests—treating them solely as "sex objects" (32-1). This disregard extended to hookups. One told us, "The guy gets off and then it's done and that's all he cares about" (12-4). Another complained of

her efforts to get a recent hookup to call: "That wasn't me implying I wanted a relationship—that was me implying I wanted respect" (42-2). In her view, casual sex did not mean forgoing all interactional niceties. A third explained, "If you're talking to a boy, you're either going to get into this huge relationship or you are nothing to them" (24-3). This either-or situation often frustrated women who wanted men to treat them well regardless of the level of commitment.

The Relationship Imperative

Women also encountered problematic gender beliefs about men's and women's different levels of interest in relationships. As one noted, women fight the "dumb girl idea"—the notion "that every girl wants a boy to sweep her off her feet and fall in love" (42-2). The expectation that women should want to be in relationships was so pervasive that many found it necessary to justify their single status to us. For example, when asked if she had a boyfriend, one woman with no shortage of admirers apologetically explained, "I know this sounds really pathetic and you probably think I am lying, but there are so many other things going on right now that it's really not something high up on my list. . . . I know that's such a lame-ass excuse, but it's true" (9-3). Another noted that already having a boyfriend was the only "actual, legitimate excuse" to reject men who expressed interest in a relationship (34-3).

Certainly, many women wanted relationships and sought them out. However, women's interest in relationships varied, and almost all experienced periods during which they wanted to be single. Nonetheless, women reported pressure to be in relationships all the time. We found that women, rather than struggling to get into relationships, had to work to avoid them.

The relational imperative was supported by the belief that women's relational opportunities were scarce and should not be wasted. Women described themselves as "lucky" to find a man willing to commit, as "there's not many guys like that in college" (15-1). This belief persisted

despite the fact that most women were in relationships most of the time. As one woman noted, "I don't think anyone really wants to be in a serious relationship, but most, well actually all of us, have boyfriends" (13-1). Belief in the myth of scarcity also led women to stay in relationships when they were no longer happy. A woman who was "sick of" her conflict-ridden relationship explained why she could not end it: "I feel like I have to meet somebody else. . . . I go out and they're all these asshole frat guys. . . . That's what stops me. . . . Boys are not datable right now because . . . all they're looking for is freshman girls to hook up with. . . . [So] I'm just stuck. I need to do something about it, but I don't know what" (30-3). It took her another year to extract herself from this relationship. Despite her fears, when she decided she was ready for another relationship, she quickly found a boyfriend.

Women also confronted the belief that all women are relationally insatiable. They often told stories of men who acted entitled to relationships, expected their relational overtures to be accepted, and became angry when rebuffed—sometimes stalking the rejecting woman. As one explained about a friend, "Abby was having issues with this guy who likes her. He was like, 'You have to like me. . . . I'm not gonna take no for an answer. I'm gonna do whatever it takes to date you'" (24-3). Another noted that "last semester, this guy really wanted to date me, and I did not want to date him at all. He flipped out and was like, 'This is ridiculous, I don't deserve this'" (12-3). A third eventually gave in when a man continually rejected her refusals: "I was like, if I go [out with him] . . . maybe he'll stop. Because he wouldn't stop." She planned to act "extremely conservative" as a way to convince him that he did not want to be with her (39-4).

Gender beliefs may also limit women's control over the terms of interaction within relationships. If women are made to feel lucky to have boyfriends, men are placed in a position of power, as presumably women should be grateful when they commit. Women's reports suggest that men attempted to use this power to regulate their participation in college life. One noted, "When I got here my first semester

freshman year, I wanted to go out to the parties . . . and he got pissed off about it. . . . He's like, 'Why do you need to do that? Why can't you just stay with me?'" (4-2). Boyfriends sometimes tried to limit the time women spent with their friends and the activities in which they participated. As a woman explained, "There are times when I feel like Steve can get . . . possessive. He'll be like . . . 'I feel like you're always with your friends over me.' He wanted to go out to lunch after our class, and I was like, 'No, I have to come have this interview.' And he got so upset about it" (42-3). Men's control even extended to women's attire. Another told us about her boyfriend, "He is a very controlling person. . . . He's like, 'What are you wearing tonight?' . . . It's like a joke but serious at the same time" (32-4).

Women also became jealous; however, rather than trying to control their boyfriends, they often tried to change themselves. One noted that she would "do anything to make this relationship work." She elaborated, "I was so nervous being with Dan because I knew he had cheated on his [prior] girlfriend . . . [but] I'm getting over it. When I go [to visit him] now . . . I let him go to the bar, whatever. I stayed in his apartment because there was nothing else to do" (39-3). Other women changed the way they dressed, their friends, and where they went in the attempt to keep boyfriends.

When women attempted to end relationships, they often reported that men's efforts to control them escalated. We heard 10 accounts of men using abuse to keep women in relationships. One woman spent months dealing with a boyfriend who accused her of cheating on him. When she tried to break up, he cut his wrist in her apartment (9-2). Another tried to end a relationship but was forced to flee the state when her car windows were broken and her safety was threatened (6-4). Men often drew on romantic repertoires to coerce interaction after relationships had ended. One woman told us that her ex-boyfriend stalked her for months—even showing up at her workplace, showering her with flowers and gifts, and blocking her entry into work until the police arrived (25-2).

INTERSECTIONAL BETWEEN CLASS

Existing research almost exclusively contend that sexual behavior by multiple intersections of class and race. Young people show different sexual behaviors at college. Although sexual behavior varied by class and race, women struggled with a difficult set of double standards reflected in their own sexual behavior.

More Privileged Experience of Doubt

The Self-Developmental Relational Doubt

The four-year college is a natural location. On campus, students attend college in a more homogeneous economic position. This is characterized by a more homogeneous experience, or the notion of a more homogeneous and personal growth. Students are also accompanying their parents in marriage and parenthood. Education and employment are also important.

For more privileged students and those who are less privileged. Even those who have experienced phase changes in their lives, women (94 percent) did not want a boyfriend here . . . the experience with [a boyfriend]

INTERSECTIONALITY: CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN CLASS AND GENDER

Existing research about college sexuality focuses almost exclusively on its gendered nature. We contend that sexuality is shaped simultaneously by multiple intersecting structures. In this section, we examine the sexual and romantic implications of class beliefs about how ambitious young people should conduct themselves during college. Although all of our participants contended with class beliefs that contradicted those of gender, experiences of this structural intersection varied by class location. More privileged women struggled to meet gender and class guidelines for sexual behavior, introducing a difficult set of double binds. Because these class beliefs reflected a privileged path to adulthood, less privileged women found them foreign to their own sexual and romantic logics.

More Privileged Women and the Experience of Double Binds

The Self-Development Imperative and the Relational Double Bind

The four-year university is a classed structural location. One of the primary reasons to attend college is to preserve or enhance economic position. The university culture is thus characterized by the self-development imperative, or the notion that individual achievement and personal growth are paramount. There are also accompanying rules for sex and relationships: Students are expected to postpone marriage and parenthood until after completing an education and establishing a career.

For more privileged women, personal expectations and those of the university culture meshed. Even those who enjoyed relationships experienced phases in college where they preferred to remain single. Almost all privileged women (94 percent) told us at one point that they did not want a boyfriend. One noted, "All my friends here . . . they're like, 'I don't want to deal with [a boyfriend] right now. I want to be on my

own'" (37-1). Another eloquently remarked, "I've always looked at college as the only time in your life when you should be a hundred percent selfish. . . . I have the rest of my life to devote to a husband or kids or my job . . . but right now, it's my time" (21-2).

The notion that independence is critical during college reflected class beliefs about the appropriate role for romance that opposed those of gender. During college, relational commitments were supposed to take a backseat to self-development. As an upper-middle-class woman noted, "College is the only time that you don't have obligations to anyone but yourself. . . . I want to get settled down and figure out what I'm doing with my life before [I] dedicate myself to something or someone else" (14-4). Another emphasized the value of investment in human capital: "I've always been someone who wants to have my own money, have my own career so that, you know, 50 percent of marriages fail. . . . If I want to maintain the lifestyle that I've grown up with . . . I have to work. I just don't see myself being someone who marries young and lives off of some boy's money" (42-4). To become self-supporting, many privileged women indicated they needed to postpone marriage. One told us, "I don't want to think about that [marriage]. I want to get secure in a city and in a job. . . . I'm not in any hurry at all. As long as I'm married by 30, I'm good" (13-4). Even those who wanted to be supported by husbands did not expect to find them in college, instead setting their sights on the more accomplished men they expected to meet in urban centers after college.

More privileged women often found committed relationships to be greedy—demanding of time and energy. As one stated, "When it comes to a serious relationship, it's a lot for me to give into that. [What do you feel like you are giving up?] Like my everything. . . . There's just a lot involved in it" (35-3). These women feared that they would be devoured by relationships and sometimes struggled to keep their self-development projects going when they did get involved. As an upper-class woman told us, "It's hard to have a boyfriend and be really excited about it and still

not let it consume you" (42-2). This situation was exacerbated by the gender beliefs discussed earlier, as women experienced pressure to fully devote themselves to relationships.

Privileged women reported that committed relationships detracted from what they saw as the main tasks of college. They complained, for example, that relationships made it difficult to meet people. As an upper-middle-class woman who had just ended a relationship described, "I'm happy that I'm able to go out and meet new people. . . . I feel like I'm doing what a college student should be doing. I don't need to be tied down to my high school boyfriend for two years when this is the time to be meeting people" (14-3). A middle-class woman similarly noted that her relationship with her boyfriend made it impossible to make friends on the floor her first year. She explained, "We were together every day. . . . It was the critical time of making friends and meeting people, [and] I wasn't there" (21-2).

Many also complained that committed relationships competed with schoolwork (also see Holland and Eisenhart 1990). An upper-middle-class woman remarked, "[My boyfriend] doesn't understand why I can't pick up and go see him all the time. But I have school. . . . I just want to be a college kid" (18-3). Another told us that her major was not compatible with the demands of a boyfriend. She said, "I wouldn't mind having a boyfriend again, but it's a lot of work. Right now with [my major] and everything . . . I wouldn't have time even to see him" (30-4). She did not plan to consider a relationship until her workload lessened.

With marriage far in the future, more privileged women often worried about college relationships getting too serious too fast. All planned to marry—ideally to men with greater earnings—but were clear about the importance of temporary independence. Consequently, some worked to slow the progression of relationships. One told us, "I won't let myself think that [I love him]. I definitely don't say that. . . . The person he loves is the person he is going to marry. . . . At the age we are at now, I feel like I don't want anything to be

more serious than it has to be until it is" (34-3). Eight privileged women even dated men they deemed unsuitable for marriage to ensure autonomy. One noted, "He fits my needs now because I don't want to get married now. I don't want anyone else to influence what I do after I graduate" (33-3). Others planned to end relationships when boyfriends were not on the same page. An upper-middle-class woman explained, "[He] wants to have two kids by the time he's thirty. I'm like, I guess we're not getting married. . . . I'd rather make money and travel first" (43-3).

For more privileged women, contradictory cultural rules created what we call the *relational double bind*. The relational imperative pushed them to participate in committed relationships; however, relationships did not mesh well with the demands of college, as they inhibited classed self-development strategies. Privileged women struggled to be both "good girls" who limited their sexual activity to relationships and "good students" who did not allow relational commitments to derail their educational and career development.

The Appeal of Hookups and the Sexual Double Bind

In contrast, hookups fit well with the self-development imperative of college. They allowed women to be sexual without the demands of relationships. For example, one upper-class woman described hooking up as "fun and non-threatening." She noted, "So many of us girls, we complain that these guys just want to hook up all the time. I'm going, these guys that I'm attracted to . . . get kind of serious." She saw her last hookup as ideal because "we were physical, and that was it. I never wanted it to go anywhere" (34-2). Many privileged women understood, if implicitly, that hooking up was a delay tactic, allowing sex without participation in serious relationships.

As a sexual solution for the demands of college, hooking up became incorporated into notions of what the college experience should be.

When asked which most, one woman who came to college party" (14-1). With and spring break institutionalized the One upper-middle happens. It's natural learning about sex were supposed to described, "I'm glad stands and my sex. . . . Now I know like when I'm with. I feel bad. They're still virgin

High rates of interest in the accommodation to men's college, privileged ups. One noted, "You like, 'I just want tonight.' . . . It's all the guys" (41-1). suggest that college almost as much searching for some women as men (respectively) reported of their last hookup and less than half relationship with t

In private, several used the classed challenge stereotypical ences in sexuality. that want things are girls that want 'Oh it's been a while are no more innocent think girls are just they're like, 'What When asked about and girls want relationships "I think that is the I know so many girls Friday night and t

to be until it is" (34-1). Women even dated men for marriage to ensure it fits my needs now. I get married now. I influence what I do. Others planned to end. Friends were not on the middle-class woman have two kids by the guess we're not getting make money and

women, contradictory we call the *relational* imperative pushed committed relationships; not mesh well with they inhibited classed. Privileged women and girls" who limited relationships and "good w relational commitment and career

and the Sexual

it well with the self-college. They allowed out the demands of life, one upper-class up as "fun and non-So many of us girls, s just want to hook up these guys that I'm serious." She saw her se "we were physical, wanted it to go any-ileged women under-oking up was a delay t participation in seri-

r the demands of col-ie incorporated into experience should be.

When asked which kinds of people hook up the most, one woman noted, "All. . . The people who came to college to have a good time and party" (14-1). With the help of media, alcohol, and spring break industries, hooking up was so institutionalized that many took it for granted. One upper-middle-class woman said, "It just happens. It's natural" (15-1). They told us that learning about sexuality was something they were supposed to be doing in college. Another described, "I'm glad that I've had my one-night stands and my being in love and having sex. . . . Now I know what it's supposed to feel like when I'm with someone that I want to be with. I feel bad for some of my friends. . . . They're still virgins" (29-1).

High rates of hooking up suggest genuine interest in the activity rather than simply accommodation to men's interests. Particularly early in college, privileged women actively sought hookups. One noted, "You see a lot of people who are like, 'I just want to hook up with someone tonight.' . . . It's always the girls that try to get the guys" (41-1). Data from the OCSLS also suggest that college women like hooking up almost as much as men and are not always searching for something more. Nearly as many women as men (85 percent and 89 percent, respectively) report enjoying the sexual activity of their last hookup "very much" or "somewhat," and less than half of women report interest in a relationship with their most recent hookup.

In private, several privileged women even used the classed logic of hooking up to challenge stereotyped portrayals of gender differences in sexuality. As one noted, "There are girls that want things as much as guys do. There are girls that want things more, and they're like, 'Oh it's been a while [since I had sex].' The girls are no more innocent than the guys. . . . People think girls are jealous of relationships, but they're like, 'What? I want to be single'" (34-1). When asked about the notion that guys want sex and girls want relationships another responded, "I think that is the absolute epitome of bullshit. I know so many girls who honestly go out on a Friday night and they're like, 'I hope I get some

ass tonight.' They don't wanna have a boyfriend! They just wanna hook up with someone. And I know boys who want relationships. I think it goes both ways" (42-2). These women drew on gender-neutral understandings of sexuality characteristic of university culture to contradict the notion of women's sexuality as inevitably and naturally relational.

For more privileged women, enjoyment of hookups was tightly linked to the atmosphere in which they occurred. Most were initiated at college parties where alcohol, music, attractive people, sexy outfits, and flirting combined to generate a collective erotic energy. As one woman enthusiastically noted, "Everyone was so excited. It was a big fun party" (15-1). Privileged women often "loved" it when they had an "excuse to just let loose" and "grind" on the dance floor. They reported turning on their "make-out radar" (18-1), explaining that "it's fun to know that a guy's attracted to you and is willing to kiss you" (16-1). The party scene gave them a chance to play with adult sexualities and interact for purely sexual purposes—an experience that one middle-class woman claimed "empowered" her (17-1).

Hookups enabled more privileged women to conduct themselves in accordance with class expectations, but as we demonstrated earlier, the enforcement of gender beliefs placed them at risk of sanction. This conflict gets to the heart of a *sexual double bind*: While hookups protected privileged women from relationships that could derail their ambitions, the double standard gave men greater control over the terms of hooking up, justified the disrespectful treatment of women, supported sexual stigma, and produced feelings of shame.

Less Privileged Women and the Experience of Foreign Sexual Culture

Women's comfort with delaying commitment and participating in the hookup culture was shaped by class location. College culture reflects the beliefs of the more privileged classes. Less privileged women arrived at college with their

own orientation to sex and romance, characterized by a faster transition into adulthood. They often attempted to build both relationships and career at the same time. As a result, the third of the participants from less privileged backgrounds often experienced the hookup culture as foreign in ways that made it difficult to persist at the university.

Less privileged women had less exposure to the notion that the college years should be set aside solely for educational and career development. Many did not see serious relationships as incompatible with college life. Four were married or engaged before graduating—a step that others would not take until later. One reminisced, “I thought I’d get married in college. . . . When I was still in high school, I figured by my senior year, I’d be engaged or married or something. . . . I wanted to have kids before I was 25” (25-4). Another spoke of her plans to marry her high school sweetheart: “I’ll be 21 and I know he’s the one I want to spend the rest of my life with. . . . Really, I don’t want to date anybody else” (6-1).

Plans to move into adult roles relatively quickly made less privileged women outsiders among their more privileged peers. One working-class woman saw her friendships dissolve as she revealed her desire to marry and have children in the near future. As one of her former friends described,

She would always talk about how she couldn’t wait to get married and have babies. . . . It was just like, Whoa. I’m 18. . . . Slow down, you know? Then she just crazy dropped out of school and wouldn’t contact any of us. . . . The way I see it is that she’s from a really small town, and that’s what everyone in her town does . . . get married and have babies. That’s all she ever wanted to do maybe? . . . I don’t know if she was homesick or didn’t fit in. (24-4)

This account glosses over the extent to which the working-class woman was pushed out of the university—ostracized by her peers for not acclimating to the self-development imperative and, as noted below, to the campus sexual climate. In fact, 40 percent of less privileged women left the

university, compared to 5 percent of more privileged women. In all cases, mismatch between the sexual culture of women’s hometowns and that of college was a factor in the decision to leave.

Most of the less privileged women found the hookup culture to be not only foreign but hostile. As the working-class woman described above told us,

I tried so hard to fit in with what everybody else was doing here. . . . I think one morning I just woke up and realized that this isn’t me at all; I don’t like the way I am right now. . . . I didn’t feel like I was growing up. I felt like I was actually getting younger the way I was trying to act. Growing up to me isn’t going out and getting smashed and sleeping around. . . . That to me is immature. (28-1)

She emphasized the value of “growing up” in college. Without the desire to postpone adulthood, less privileged women often could not understand the appeal of hooking up. As a lower-middle-class woman noted, “Who would be interested in just meeting somebody and then doing something that night? And then never talking to them again? . . . I’m supposed to do this; I’m supposed to get drunk every weekend. I’m supposed to go to parties every weekend . . . and I’m supposed to enjoy it like everyone else. But it just doesn’t appeal to me” (5-1). She reveals the extent to which hooking up was a normalized part of college life: For those who were not interested in this, college life could be experienced as mystifying, uncomfortable, and alienating.

The self-development imperative was a resource women could use in resisting the gendered pull of relationships. Less privileged women did not have as much access to this resource and were invested in settling down. Thus, they found it hard to resist the pull back home of local boyfriends, who—unlike the college men they had met—seemed interested in marrying and having children soon. One woman noted after transferring to a branch campus, “I think if I hadn’t been connected with [my fiancé], I think I would have been more strongly

connected to [the] probably would described her like, ‘I want to stress he was p here my first year following year, explained about home. . . . He w and . . . to feel l relationship. . . . school and he l that I’m capable . . . it scares hi ended this relati semester of scho

Women were slut stigma, as p tration or jealous any association instance, one w virulent sexual r her hometown, parents. Going l rumors to rest strained by leav

Thus, less caught between the university m and adopting a human capital adulthood. As c led her to revis like, I don’t eve [or] have kids. 17- to 20-year- and I’m like, O to do something settle down . . . These changes relationships wi from theirs. For with hometown whose friends noted, “I’m just for me anymo there” (22-4).

DISCUSSION

The Strengths of an Interactional Approach

Public gender beliefs are a key source of gender inequality in college heterosexual interaction. They undergird a sexual double standard and a relational imperative that justify the disrespect of women who hook up and the disempowerment of women in relationships—reinforcing male dominance across social forms. Most of the women we studied cycled back and forth between hookups and relationships, in part because they found both to be problematic. These findings indicate that an individualist, battle of the sexes explanation not only is inadequate but may contribute to gender inequality by naturalizing problematic notions of gender difference.

We are not, however, claiming that gender differences in stated preferences do not exist. Analysis of the OCSLS finds a small but significant difference between men and women in preferences for relationships as compared to hookups: After the most recent hookup, 47 percent of women compared to 37 percent of men expressed some interest in a relationship. These differences in preferences are consistent with a multilevel perspective that views the internalization of gender as an aspect of gender structure (Risman 2004). As we have shown, the pressure to internalize gender-appropriate preferences is considerable, and the line between personal preferences and the desire to avoid social stigma is fuzzy. However, we believe that widely shared beliefs about gender difference contribute more to gender inequality in college heterosexuality than the substantively small differences in actual preferences.

The Strengths of an Intersectional Approach

An intersectional approach sheds light on the ambivalent and contradictory nature of many college women's sexual desires. Class beliefs associated with the appropriate timing of marriage clash with resilient gender beliefs—creating difficult double binds for the more privileged women who

connected to [the college town], and I think I probably would have stayed" (2-4). Another described her hometown boyfriend: "He'll be like, 'I want to see you. Come home.' . . . The stress he was putting me under and me being here my first year. I could not take it" (7-2). The following year, she moved back home. A third explained about her husband, "He wants me at home. . . . He wants to have control over me and . . . to feel like he's the dominant one in the relationship. . . . The fact that I'm going to school and he knows I'm smart and he knows that I'm capable of doing anything that I want . . . it scares him" (6-4). While she eventually ended this relationship, it cost her an additional semester of school.

Women were also pulled back home by the slut stigma, as people there—perhaps out of frustration or jealousy—judged college women for any association with campus sexual culture. For instance, one woman became distraught when a virulent sexual rumor about her circulated around her hometown, especially when it reached her parents. Going home was a way of putting sexual rumors to rest and reaffirming ties that were strained by leaving.

Thus, less privileged women were often caught between two sexual cultures. Staying at the university meant abandoning a familiar logic and adopting a privileged one—investing in human capital while delaying the transition to adulthood. As one explained, attending college led her to revise her "whole plan": "Now I'm like, I don't even need to be getting married yet [or] have kids. . . . All of [my brother's] friends, 17- to 20-year-old girls, have their . . . babies, and I'm like, Oh my God. . . . Now I'll be able to do something else for a couple years before I settle down . . . before I worry about kids" (25-3). These changes in agendas required them to end relationships with men whose life plans diverged from theirs. For some, this also meant cutting ties with hometown friends. One resolute woman, whose friends back home had turned on her, noted, "I'm just sick of it. There's nothing there for me anymore. There's absolutely nothing there" (22-4).

ent of more privi-
match between the
metowns and that
decision to leave.

women found the
foreign but hostile.
I described above

what everybody else
one morning I just
his isn't me at all; I
now. . . . I didn't feel
t like I was actually
was trying to act.
ing out and getting
id. . . . That to me is

e of "growing up"
lesire to postpone
women often could
f hooking up. As a
noted, "Who would
ing somebody and
t night? And then
? . . . I'm supposed
to get drunk every
go to parties every
osed to enjoy it like
esn't appeal to me"
at to which hooking
of college life: For
sted in this, college
: mystifying, uncom-

imperative was a
in resisting the gen-
ps. Less privileged
much access to this
ed in settling down.
o resist the pull back
who—unlike the col-
seemed interested in
ren soon. One woman
a branch campus, "I
connected with [my
ve been more strongly

strive to meet both. In the case of the relational double bind, relationships fit with gender beliefs but pose problems for the classed self-development imperative. As for the sexual double bind, hookups provide sexual activity with little cost to career development, but a double standard penalizes women for participating. Less privileged women face an even more complex situation: Much of the appeal of hookups derives from their utility as a delay strategy. Women who do not believe that it is desirable to delay marriage may experience the hookup culture as puzzling and immature.

An intersectional approach also suggests that the way young heterosexuals make decisions about sexuality and relationships underlies the reproduction of social class. These choices are part of women's efforts to, as one privileged participant so eloquently put it, "maintain the lifestyle that I've grown up with." Our participants were not well versed in research demonstrating that college-educated women benefit from their own human capital investments, are more likely to marry than less educated women, and are more likely to have a similarly well-credentialed spouse (DiPrete and Buchmann 2006). Nonetheless, most were aware that completing college and delaying marriage until the mid-to-late twenties made economic sense. Nearly all took access to marriage for granted, instead focusing their attention on when and whom they would marry.

The two-pronged strategy of career investment and delay of family formation has so quickly become naturalized that its historical novelty is now invisible. It is based on the consolidation of class, along with heterosexual, privilege: Heterosexual men and women attempt to maximize their own earning power and that of their spouse—a pattern that is reflected in increased levels of educational homogamy (Schwartz and Mare 2005; Sweeney 2002). Consolidation of privilege is made possible by women's greater parity with men in education and the workforce. In this new marital marketplace, a woman's educational credentials and earning potential are more relevant than her premarital sexual activity, assuming she avoids having a child before marriage.

Relationship commitments that block educational and career investments, particularly if they foreclose future opportunities to meet men with elite credentials, are a threat to a woman's upward mobility.

The gender implications of the consolidation of privilege are most visible when contrasted with gender specialization—a marital strategy once assumed to be universal. Marriage was thought to be a system of complementary interdependence in which the man specialized in the market and the woman in domesticity (Becker 1991). Men maximized earning power while women accessed these benefits by marrying those with greater educational or career credentials. Gender specialization does not logically demand chastity of women; however, historically it has often been offered for trade in the marital marketplace. When this occurs, women's sexual reputation and economic welfare are linked. Although this connection has long been attenuated in the United States, it still exists. For example, the term "classy" refers simultaneously to wealth and sexual modesty.

As marriage in the United States has become less guided by gender specialization and more by the consolidation of privilege, gender inequality—at least within the marriages of the privileged—may have decreased. At the same time, class inequality may have intensified. The consolidation of privilege increases economic gaps between the affluent who are married to each other, the less affluent who are also married to each other and the poor, who are excluded from marriage altogether (also see Edin and Kefalas 2005; England 2004; Schwartz and Mare 2005; Sweeney 2002). The hookup culture may contribute in a small way to the intensification of class inequality by facilitating the delay necessary for the consolidation of privilege. . . .

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, Elizabeth A., Paula England, and Alison C. K. Fogarty. 2009. Orgasm in college hookups and relationships. In *Families as they really are*, edited by B. Risman. New York: Norton.

- Armstrong, Elizabeth A. 2000. Sweeney. 2000. Multilevel, intersectional analysis of the Social Problem. Arnett, Jeffrey J. 2000. The winding road to adulthood in the twenties. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Becker, Gary S. 1991. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Beisel, Nicola, and Jennifer Armstrong. 2000. *American Sociological Review* 65(4): 1000-1015.
- Bogle, Kathleen A. 2000. *Relationships and the Gender Revolution*. University Press of California.
- Boswell, A. Ayre. 2000. *Fraternities and the Gender Revolution*. Some fraternities and some women? *Gender and Society* 14(4): 600-615.
- Brooks, David. 2000. *America's Fraternity Standard*. December 2000. *Standard*, December 2000.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn. 2007. *Intimate Violence & Abuse*. Collins, Patricia H. 2000. *Knowledge, Power, and Empowerment*. Collins, Randall. 2000. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Connell, R. W. 1998. *person, and sex*. University Press of California.
- Correll, Shelley J. 2000. *Getting a job*. *American Journal of Sociology* 106(1): 1-40.
- Crawford, Mary. 2000. *double standard critique of two Sex Research*. DiPrete, Thomas A. 2000. *Gender-specific and the emergence of the Demographic*. Dunn, Jennifer L. 2000. *The cultural context of women's reproductive Problems* 46:4.
- Eder, Donna, Cath Parker. 1995. *culture*. New York: Press.

that block educational
ticularly if they fore-
to meet men with elite
a woman's upward

s of the consolidation
when contrasted with
marital strategy once
marriage was thought to
itary interdependence
ed in the market and
(Becker 1991). Men
while women accessed
g those with greater
ntials. Gender special-
demand chastity of
ally it has often been
marital marketplace.
sexual reputation and
ed. Although this con-
enuated in the United
r example, the term
ously to wealth and

ted States has become
ialization and more by
ge, gender inequality—
es of the privileged—
the same time, class
isified. The consolida-
conomic gaps between
d to each other, the less
ried to each other and
ed from marriage alto-
Kefalas 2005; England
2005; Sweeney 2002).
ontribute in a small way
ass inequality by facili-
y for the consolidation

aula England, and Alison
rgasm in college hookups
imilies as they really are,

- Armstrong, Elizabeth A., Laura Hamilton, and Brian Sweeney. 2006. Sexual assault on campus: A multilevel, integrative approach to party rape. *Social Problems* 53:483–99.
- Arnett, Jeffrey Jensen. 2004. Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties. New York: Oxford.
- Becker, Gary S. 1991. *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Beisel, Nicola, and Tamara Kay. 2004. Abortion, race, and gender in nineteenth century America. *American Sociological Review* 69:498–518.
- Bogle, Kathleen A. 2008. *Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus*. New York: New York University Press.
- Boswell, A. Ayres, and Joan Z. Spade. 1996. Fraternities and collegiate rape culture: Why are some fraternities more dangerous places for women? *Gender & Society* 10:133–47.
- Brooks, David. 2002. Making it: Love and success at America's finest universities. *The Weekly Standard*, December 23.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn C., Nancy Glass, Phyllis W. Sharps, Kathryn Laughon, and Tina Bloom. 2007. Intimate partner homicide. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* 8:246–69.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Collins, Randall. 2004. *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Connell, R. W. 1987. *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Correll, Shelley J., Stephen Benard, and In Paik. 2007. Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology* 112:1297–1338.
- Crawford, Mary, and Danielle Popp. 2003. Sexual double standards: A review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *Journal of Sex Research* 40:13–26.
- DiPrete, Thomas A., and Claudia Buchmann. 2006. Gender-specific trends in the value of education and the emerging gender gap in college completion. *Demography* 43:1–24.
- Dunn, Jennifer L. 1999. What love has to do with it: The cultural construction of emotion and sorority women's responses to forcible interaction. *Social Problems* 46:440–59.
- Eder, Donna, Catherine Colleen Evans, and Stephen Parker. 1995. *School talk: Gender and adolescent culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Edin, Kathryn, and Maria Kefalas. 2005. *Promises I can keep: Why poor women put motherhood before marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- England, Paula. 2004. More mercenary mate selection? Comment on Sweeney and Cancian (2004) and Press (2004). *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 66:1034–37.
- England, Paula, Emily Fitzgibbons Shafer, and Alison C. K. Fogarty. 2007. Hooking up and forming romantic relationships on today's college campuses. In *The gendered society reader*, edited by M. Kimmel. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eshbaugh, Elaine M., and Gary Gute. 2008. Hookups and sexual regret among college women. *Journal of Social Psychology* 148:77–89.
- Friedland, Roger, and Robert R. Alford. 1991. Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, edited by W. W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio, 232–63. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gerstel, Naomi, and Natalia Sarkisian. 2006. Marriage: The good, the bad, and the greedy. *Contexts* 5:16–21.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1999. The social construction and institutionalization of gender and race: An integrative framework. In *Revisioning gender*, edited by M. M. Ferree, J. Lorber, and B. B. Hess, 3–43. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Glenn, Norval, and Elizabeth Marquardt. 2001. *Hooking up, hanging out, and hoping for Mr. Right: College women on mating and dating today*. New York: Institute for American Values.
- Grello, Catherine M., Deborah P. Welsh, and Melinda M. Harper. 2006. No strings attached: The nature of casual sex in college students. *Journal of Sex Research* 43:255–67.
- Holland, Dorothy C., and Margaret A. Eisenhart. 1990. *Educated in romance: Women, achievement, and college culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Illouz, Eva. 2005. *Cold intimacies: The making of emotional capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Kimmel, Michael. 2008. *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Manning, Wendy D., Peggy C. Giordano, and Monica A. Longmore. 2006. Hooking up: The relationship contexts of “nonrelationship” sex. *Journal of Adolescent Research* 21:459–83.
- Martin, Karin. 1996. *Puberty, sexuality, and the self: Boys and girls at adolescence*. New York:

- Martin, Patricia Yancey. 2004. Gender as a social institution. *Social Forces* 82:1249-73.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey, and Robert A. Hummer. 1989. Fraternities and rape on campus. *Gender & Society* 3:457-73.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30:1771-1800.
- Owen, Jesse J., Galena K. Rhoades, Scott M. Stanley, and Frank D. Fincham. 2008. "Hooking up" among college students: Demographic and psychosocial correlates. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/44j645v7v38013u4/fulltext.html>.
- Paul, Elizabeth L., Brian McManus and, Allison Hayes. 2000. "Hookups": Characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research* 37:76-88.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2000. Limiting inequality through interaction: The end(s) of gender. *Contemporary Sociology* 29:110-20.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2009. Framed before we know it: How gender shapes social relations. *Gender & Society* 23:145-60.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L., and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender & Society* 18:510-31.
- Risman, Barbara, and Pepper Schwartz. 2002. After the sexual revolution: Gender politics in teen dating. *Contexts* 1:16-24.
- Risman, Barbara J. 2004. Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender & Society* 18:429-50.
- Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2007. *The age of independence: Interracial unions, same sex unions and the changing American family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schwartz, Christine R., and Robert D. Mare. 2005. Trends in educational assortative marriage from 1940 to 2003. *Demography* 42:621-46.
- Sewell, William H. 1992. A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1-29.
- Simon, Robin W., Donna Eder, and Cathy Evans. 1992. The development of feeling norms underlying romantic love among adolescent females. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 55:29-46.
- Stepp, Laura Sessions. 2007. *Unhooked: How young women pursue sex, delay love, and lose at both*. New York: Riverhead.
- Sweeney, Megan M. 2002. Two decades of family change: The shifting economic foundations of marriage. *American Sociological Review* 67:132-47.
- Wharton, Amy S. 2005. *The sociology of gender: An introduction to theory and research*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Introduction to Reading 43

Enforcing gender happens everywhere in all sorts of institutions. This reading about the division of volunteer labor of parents on youth baseball and soccer teams illustrates how all institutions in our daily lives operate to enforce and maintain traditional and unequal gender categories. The first author spent many years participating in and observing these youth sports in his community. Both authors conducted field observations at practices and games and also participated in clinics for coaches and referees, and did 50 in-depth interviews with both women and men volunteers from the baseball and soccer teams in this community. They present a picture of how gender is seen as natural or essential, despite very clear interactions and expectations that place men and women in roles similar to those in "traditional" families. Unfortunately, this enforcement of gender does not always recognize talents of individual men and women.

1. What do the authors mean by "soft essentialism," and how is it used to enforce a traditional gender division of labor? Find examples of soft essentialism in the reading.

2. What are these teams?
3. Compare the arenas. However, how is gender?

In volunteer work and workplace, men's labor is valued and persistent to do the work of daily needs. Women's labor is devalued in housework and child care and women's work is devalued (2004). Similarly, the work of public leaders, family and the work is valued according to gender.

This article examines the division of adult gender division of labor in youth volunteer activities. Researchers have examined youth sports (Boyle & Little League Baseball, 2004). Little League Baseball estimates that the head coaches, and contribute a total labor in a season—per person. Much of the labor is done by men.

From Messner, Michael. Segregation in Youth Sports. In *Handbook of Sociology of Sport and Exercise*, ed. J. L. Coakley and W. J. Douglas. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000.