Gender, Power, and Dominance

A New Conceptualization of Gender Hegemony and its Application in a Media Case Study

F.M.W.H. Hendriks
Supervisor: H. Bak
November 15, 2015
Bachelor Thesis

Table of Contents

Abstract

Women's roles have been subject to great change over the past decades and now include both a traditional and a nontraditional component. Increasingly, women are moving into roles that were traditionally ascribed to men and this trend is expected to continue in the future. The two major frameworks that conceptualize masculinity and femininity postulate that hegemonic masculinity is necessarily dominant over all forms of femininities. In these frameworks femininity can only be exalted when it complies with their subordination to masculinity and consists of traditional feminine qualities. In this thesis a new model of hegemonic masculinity, hegemonic femininity, and their non-hegemonic counterparts is introduced which builds upon the frameworks created by Connell and Messerschmidt, and Schippers. The new model adopts Connell and Messerschmidt's conceptualization of hegemonic masculinity and presents an alternative model of hegemonic femininity which is independent from its relationship to hegemonic masculinity. The combination of traditional feminine qualities coupled with nontraditional qualities constitutes hegemonic femininity in the new model and leads to status, power, and dominance for women who embody these qualities. This model is applied to the protagonist of the popular dystopian novel *The Hunger Games*, Katniss Everdeen. A literary analysis of the book will serve as a case study to determine which of the models offers a more suitable conceptualization for discerning femininity. It will be demonstrated that the new model is superior to its predecessors as it demonstrates that a woman's display of agency can be exalted and provide her with true hegemony.

1. Introduction

A recent poll asked people to "[l]ist 10 books that have stayed with you in some way. Don't take more than a few minutes, and don't think too hard. They do not have to be the 'right' books or great works of literature, just ones that have affected you in some way" (Ademic and Patel). Adamic and Patel analyzed data of 130.000 people who posted their list on Facebook. They converted the data into a list of one hundred of the most influential books. The majority of the books on the list were young adult novels, with *Harry Potter* crowning the list. *The Hunger Games* took eighth place, only two places below the Bible (Ademic and Patel). Suzanne Collin's dystopian novel *The Hunger Games* was published in 2008 and has quickly gained great popularity with young adult and adult readers alike. Young adulthood, or adolescence, is a time in life characterized by the search for values and identity. As Huntemann and Morgan explain, the more mass media a child encounters, the more it "contributes to the cultivation of a child's values, beliefs, dreams, and expectations, which shape the adult identity a child will carry and modify throughout his or her life" (311). Printed media, like *The Hunger Games,* greatly and accumulatively influences the molding of an adolescent's world view.

  The Hunger Games has spurred academic interest, mainly geared towards examining the gender performance of the book's protagonist, Katniss Everdeen. Many scholars have concluded that Katniss's gender identity adheres more to the norms of masculinity than it does to the norms of femininity (Miller 146, Connors 137, Mitchell 130). Masculinity and femininity are described in two influential frameworks on gender hegemony, one by Connell and Messerschmidt and the other by Schippers. Their frameworks describe hegemonic masculinity as the exalted practices that maintain the dominance of men and the subordination of women (Connell and Messerschmidt 832, Schippers 94). Within these frameworks femininity can only be socially lauded when it consist of qualities that are traditionally feminine and constitute a submission to men (Connell 183, Schippers 94).

  In the past few decades the roles women adopt in society have shifted; moving away from only traditional roles towards more non-traditional roles (Prentice and Carranza 275). In this thesis, a new model of hegemonic femininity and hegemonic masculinity is introduced which takes the contemporary gender requirements for women into account. In the proposed model, hegemonic femininity is defined by a position of dominance and power, rather than a submission to men. The new model adopts the groundwork created by Connell and Messerschmidt for hegemonic masculinity and builds upon their work and Schippers's

framework to provide an alternative model for hegemonic femininity. The new model posits that power, status, and dominance can be exerted by women through the use of traditional feminine qualities (such as kindness) coupled with nontraditional qualities (such as assertiveness).

The guiding research question throughout this thesis will be as follows: Does the new model provide a more suitable conceptualization of femininity than the previous models by Connell and Messerschmidt, and Schippers do?

This thesis will first outline current conceptualizations of gender and hegemony, and will then propose a new model. This model will be evaluated via a literary analysis of *The Hunger Games* to explore the protagonist's gender performance. The new model will simultaneously be compared to frameworks by Schippers and by Connell and Messerschmidt. Finally, based on the literary analysis, a conclusion will be drawn on the applicability of all three models.

2. Gender, Dominance, and Power - A New Conceptualization of Gender Hegemony

Gender is a complex construct. It serves as a large umbrella term encompassing physical, mental and sociological matters. In this thesis, gender will refer to the definition outlined by West and Zimmerman in their seminal article 'Doing Gender'. They refer to gender as a social construct, actively performed by individuals in daily interaction instead of gender being seen as an inborn set of characteristics. West and Zimmerman elaborate on this definition of "doing gender" by highlighting the difference between "sex, sex category and gender" (127). Sex refers to biological sex, and is based on genetics, genitalia, or both. However, as the chromosomes and genitalia that define a person's biological sex are usually invisible in everyday life, it is necessary to perform "socially required identificatory [*sic*] displays" to signal membership in either the male or female sex category (127). A woman, for example, who wants to align herself with the female sex category will display stereotypically feminine qualities. She might be virtuous, nurturing and wear feminine clothing. The authors explain that "sex category presumes one's sex and stands as proxy for it in many situations" (127). Sex and sex category often correspond, although "sex and sex category can vary independently" (127).

Gender is the "activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category" (127). In other words, it is the assemblage of actions and attitudes used to signal aforementioned membership of a sex category. It is actively performed and either legitimizes or undermines this membership, following norms set out by society (127). Social control reinforces the alignment of gender and sex category. An individual is praised when his or her characteristics and behavior coincide with his or her perceived sex category. If someone is perceived as a man, he ought to 'act like one', to put it roughly. Social control makes it difficult to deviate from the expected characteristics and behavior, thus teaching what is deemed appropriate behavior for one's sex category (Prentice and Carranza 270). As Simone de Beauvoir said; "one is not born, but, rather *becomes* a woman" (qtd. in Butler "Performative acts" 519).

Connell and Messerschmidt illustrate in their seminal article 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept' that gender branches off into subdivisions of masculinity and femininity. According to the authors, hegemonic masculinity stands at the top of this hierarchical division of masculinity and femininity (846). Hegemonic masculinity can be understood as the epitome of manhood, encompassing all the traits that are desired in men. Hegemonic masculinity is the bar which every man is expected to measure up to. Despite

being normative, the group exemplifying hegemonic masculinity is a minority among men (846). Connell and Messerschmidt's concept of masculinity has been summarized by Schippers as a "social position, a set of practices, and the effects of the collective embodiment of those practices on individuals, relationships, institutional structures, and global relations of domination" (87). Hegemonic masculinity exists when "its exaltation stabilizes a structure of dominance and oppression in the gender order as a whole. To be culturally exalted, the pattern of masculinity must have exemplars who are celebrated as heroes" (qtd. in Donaldson 647). Hegemonic masculinity consists of a "pattern of practice" that showcases certain traits considered masculine in society (Connell and Messerschmidt 832, Schippers 94). Adherence to these traits, however, does not constitute hegemony in itself because hegemonic masculinity cannot be derived solely from a single trait (Connell and Messerschmidt 836, 841). Instead, "[m]asculinities are configurations that are accomplished in social action and, therefore, can differ according to the gender relations in a particular social setting" (836). The qualities that encompass hegemony, then, may change when circumstances change (836). Different settings call for different enactments of hegemony: "[b]ecause of economic, political, and social variation across groups and societies, what specific features of masculinity and femininity ensure men's dominance over women as a group will vary depending on context" (Schippers 98). Ascendency to hegemony is dependent on context and can vary at the local, regional and global level (Messerschmidt 59).

In any context, the subordination of both femininity and non-hegemonic masculinities are essential to understanding how hegemony can be performed and achieved (Connell and Messerschmidt 832, 846). The foundation of the concept of hegemonic masculinity lies "in the combination of the plurality of masculinities and the hierarchy of masculinities" (846). This thesis will look at both hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinity and at femininity, which will be discussed later. Non-hegemonic masculinity does not possess culturally dominant masculine traits and has a subordinated position in society. Both in Connell and Messerschmidt's framework and in Schippers's framework non-hegemonic masculinity and femininity are defined by their subordinated relationship to hegemonic masculinity (Connell and Messerschmidt 846, Schippers 91). Femininity is indispensable when it comes to the conceptualization of hegemonic masculinity (Connell and Messerschmidt 848). Women are integral in the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity "as mothers; as schoolmates; as girlfriends, sexual partners, and wives" (848). When the theory of hegemonic masculinity was first drafted by Connell, a separate category of hegemonic femininity was also discerned (183). The name was later changed to emphasized femininity to "acknowledge the

asymmetrical position of masculinities and femininities in a patriarchal gender order"
(Connell and Messerschmidt 848). According to Connell and Messerschmidt women's roles
are based in their submission to men (832). Emphasized femininity is defined by its
"compliance with this subordination and [...] oriented to accommodating the interests and
desires of men" (Connell 183). Heterosexuality is a prerequisite to gender hegemony (88).
Features of emphasized femininity include "vulnerability, fragility, acceptance of marriage,
sexual receptivity, and motherhood" (Finley 361). This type of femininity is "culturally
extolled and […] highly commercialized and legitimized" (360-361).

Connell and Messerschmidt's framework does not include hierarchy of femininity as
is the case with masculinity (Finley 361). The concept of emphasized femininity "leaves little
conceptual room to analyze the hierarchies of femininities and the statuses of women who
practice them" (361). Schippers has attempted to build upon Connell and Messerschmidt's
framework to "recover the feminine other and place it in the center of a theory of gender
hegemony" (86). Schippers created a framework in which a hierarchy with multiple
femininities can be discerned (85). The relationship between men and women, Schippers
argues, is complementary. Masculine characteristics such as "strength, the ability to use
interpersonal violence in the face of conflict, and authority" can only be socially dominant
when they are complemented by the "inferior qualit[ies] attached to femininity" like "physical
vulnerability, an inability to use violence effectively, and compliance" (91). Complementary
interactions "provide the legitimating rationale for social relations ensuring the ascendancy
and dominance of men" (91). Schippers's concept of hegemonic femininity thus consists of
practices that advance the position of men. According to Schippers, hegemonic femininity can
be identified within this framework of complementarity (85).

Schippers refers to femininities that are threatening to men's social dominance as
"pariah femininities" (95). These femininities come into play when women possess socially
unacceptable masculine traits, and are consequently threatening the gender order. Such a
threat is consequently neutralized by restructuring the quality as undesirable and feminine.
For example a woman who is promiscuous is considered a "slut" and a woman who is overly
assertive is considered a "bitch" (95). The hierarchical, complementary relationship between
masculinities and femininities is important to the theoretical framework laid out by Schippers.
The author notes that "[l]imiting hegemonic femininity and masculinity to only those
characteristics and practices that articulate a complementary and hierarchical relationship
between women and men offers conceptual and empirical space to identify idealized gender
characteristics that do not perpetuate male dominance" (97). Women who display behavior

that is disruptive to the current gender order are not always stigmatized or condemned. These performances of gender are called "alternative femininities" (98). This form does not hinge on this complementary relationship "of dominance and subordination between women and men" (98). She emphasizes that alternative femininities can only occur "within a local context", like a "specific rock subculture", and never within an entire culture (Finley 362, Schippers 97).

Schippers gives depth to femininity by creating a hierarchy of femininities that was lacking from Connell and Messerschmidt's research, which only recognized emphasized femininity. Schippers aims to "offer an alternative conceptual framework for how gender hegemony operates through masculinities and femininities and that places men's dominance over women at the center, [and] allows for multiple configurations of femininity" (86). Her form of hegemonic femininity closely resembles Connell and Messerschmidt's concept of emphasized femininity. Schippers, however, places emphasis on the "complementary", though unequal, relationship between hegemonic femininity and masculinity (91). Although Schippers's concept of multiple femininities considerably contributes to the understanding of femininity, her conceptualization does not provide a complete picture of the positions women occupy in contemporary society.

In previous frameworks, hegemonic masculinity can stand on its own, but hegemonic femininity cannot because it is inextricably linked to hegemonic masculinity. In the Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary hegemony is defined as "the position of being the strongest and most powerful and therefore able to control others" ("Hegemony"). True hegemony, then, cannot be discerned within femininity either in Connell and Messerschmidt's framework or in Schippers's framework, given the subordinate status of all women to men in patriarchal Western societies (Connell and Messerschmidt 848, Schippers 87).

All previous concepts of femininity center on their relationship with masculinity. Contrary to the previously discussed frameworks, I propose that in contemporary society femininity is not necessarily defined by its relationship with masculinity. I argue that hegemonic femininity can exist in its own right – independent of its relationship to masculinity. Contemporary society asks more of women than just performing their traditional gender role and their submission to men. Submission to masculinity will no longer be a defining factor for hegemonic femininity. Hegemony will still refer to the position associated with power, status, and dominance. This new model will not by definition exclude women from this position, as was the case in previously discussed frameworks. This model will build upon the previously discussed models, accepting the concept of hegemonic masculinity as described in Connell and Messerschmidt's framework and implementing changes to the

hierarchy of femininity. Successfully achieving hegemony depends on how gender is performed within the setting's social norms.

In this thesis the research by Prentice and Carranza will be used as a reflection of the contemporary social norms prevalent in the United States. Prentice and Carranza examined what is expected and required of men and women; a concept they call gender-intensified prescriptions (269, 271). They also distinguish its "mirror image": the gender-intensified proscriptions (271). These proscriptions consist of characteristics and traits that are considered undesirable in general but even more so for a specific gender. What is innovative about their approach is that they also examined so-called gender-relaxed prescriptions and proscriptions. Gender-relaxed prescriptions are considered desirable traits for people in general but less important for a specific gender; their gender provides them leeway in displaying these qualities (271). It is behavior in which men or women are "allowed to fall short" (271). While it is not required to display this behavior, it is generally appreciated. For example, while kindness is a desirable trait, it is not as fundamental for men to be kind as it is for women (274). It is acceptable for men to "fall short" in this area (271). Again, the gender-relaxed proscriptions are the "mirror image" of the gender-relaxed prescriptions (271). These traits are "low in general social desirability but significantly higher in desirability" for the given gender (271). For instance, while it is generally considered undesirable to be promiscuous, it is significantly less condemned in men (273).

In this model hegemonic masculinity is constructed solely from adherence to the gender-intensified prescriptions, not the gender-relaxed prescriptions. The 'manly' gender-intensified prescriptions, such as leadership ability or forcefulness, are easily associated with dominance and power (Prentice and Carranza 274). These traits are indicative of social requirements analogous to what Schippers described as the "qualities defined as manly" which she notes to be essential to hegemonic masculinity (94). Schippers also accepted Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity. The aforementioned qualities are the cultural exemplars of masculinity. Men have a univocal and stable role in society with a "traditional emphases [*sic*] on strength, drive, assertiveness, and self-reliance" which is reflected in the gender-intensified prescriptions (Prentice and Carranza 275).

The gender-relaxed prescriptions, like being friendly, creative or helpful, are not associated with the position of power and dominance necessary to be called hegemonic. Displaying qualities from the gender-relaxed category barely exerts any influence on membership to hegemonic masculinity if enough gender-intensified prescriptions are displayed. The gender-relaxed prescriptions are not a prerequisite for achieving hegemonic

masculinity. Men are excluded from hegemonic masculinity when they do not exhibit enough gender-intensified prescriptions.

Exhibiting gender-intensified proscriptions are considered a particularly serious transgression because "it typically entails both a manifestation of undesirable traits especially proscribed for one's gender and a failure to manifest desirable traits especially prescribed for one's gender" (Prentice and Carranza 280). Claims to membership to hegemonic masculinity (and hegemonic-femininity) can become undone when an individual displays traits from the gender-intensified proscription category. Exhibiting "weak, emotional, melodramatic or shy" behavior can only be tolerated sparingly and exclusively in situations in which this behavior is deemed acceptable (274). Men can show weakness, for instance, at emotional moments in life, like the birth of a child. Displaying gender-relaxed proscriptions, on the other hand, may not have any negative consequences at all, as long as one also exhibits the traits required for his gender; the gender-intensified prescriptions (280). This is the case for both hegemonic masculinity and hegemonic femininity. However, if too many of the proscriptions or too few of the gender-intensified prescriptions are displayed, an individual will be placed in the non-hegemonic group because he will lose status, dominance, and power by not displaying behavior that is expected of him.

Women who comply with gender-intensified prescriptions gain societal status, but not dominance or power. A woman who exhibits all the gender-intensified prescriptions and avoids the proscriptions can be seen as the prototype of Connell and Messerschmidt's emphasized femininity or Schippers's hegemonic femininity. Gender-intensified prescription traits fit Schippers's concept of hegemonic femininity as consisting of "the characteristics defined as womanly" (94). A woman who fulfills the gender-intensified prescriptions is interested in children, looks after her appearance and is wholesome and loyal. These traits relate to women's traditional gender role; they are ideally suited for family life (Prentice and Carranza 273). Akin to emphasized femininity, these traits appear to be "oriented to accommodating the interests and desires of men" (Connell and Messerschmidt 848, Connell 183, Schippers 94). A woman who positions herself in this fashion may gain status because she acts in a socially desirable way. However, the gender-intensified prescriptions are not associated with a position of power or dominance, which are fundamental aspects of hegemony. Dominance, status, and power are notions that are closely linked but far from synonymous. Consequently I argue that women who exhibit only the gender-intensified prescriptions and none of the gender-relaxed prescriptions should not be categorized as exemplifying hegemonic femininity, since true dominance and power cannot be discerned

within this group. Instead this group will be referred to as emphasized femininity in accordance with the concept developed by Connell (183). Emphasized femininity will be referred to as a separate category, above the remaining non-hegemonic group and therefore below hegemonic femininity (see Appendix C and D).

While men's roles have remained relatively unchanged, women's roles have been subject to great change over the past decades (Diekman and Eagly 1183). Women used to be confined to the private domain. These last few decades, they have entered the public domain more and more. Women's participation in the labor force has increased greatly; from 34 percent in 1950 to 60 percent in 1998 (Diekman and Eagly 1172). Women are increasingly expected to perform "additional, nontraditional roles" as well since they have joined the workforce (Prentice and Carranza 275). Prentice and Carranza explain that "[w]omen are seen as having the qualities prescribed […] by their traditional gender roles, and also as having the qualities needed for their nontraditional occupational roles" (275). Women should behave in a way consistent with their traditional gender role, namely in a kind, warm and wholesome manner. Nontraditionally, they should also be self-reliant, independent, "highly intelligent, efficient, rational, to have common sense, and so on" (Prentice and Carranza 273, 275). These modern and traditional characteristics can be difficult to reconcile. Just being warm and wholesome does not quite cut it if a woman aspires to reach a hegemonic position. In this new model hegemonic femininity will consist of traditional traits which are required from women by society, like warmth and kindness. These traditional traits, or gender-intensified prescriptions, will need to be supplemented by nontraditional traits, namely the gender-relaxed prescriptions. The gender-relaxed prescriptions largely parallel the gender-intensified prescriptions for men. It is noteworthy to mention that most of these gender-relaxed prescriptions can easily be associated with amassing dominance and power. Again, as is the case for hegemonic masculinity, not displaying enough gender-intensified prescriptions or displaying too much of the proscriptions leads to removal from the hegemonic category.

This model will take into account that women will experience more difficulty attaining a dominant position in society due to the fact that the hierarchy of femininity and masculinity is set in a patriarchal society. Hegemonic femininity, consequently, will be placed slightly below hegemonic masculinity as a whole but individual members of the hegemonic femininity group may rank above members of the hegemonic masculinity group. Ascendancy to hegemonic femininity will be largely unlinked from hegemonic masculinity, and vice versa. In this way, hegemonic femininity can exist in its own right.

In this thesis the new model will be applied to the protagonist of *The Hunger Games;* Katniss Everdeen. The new model will be used to place Katniss in hegemonic or non-hegemonic femininity (see appendix B). This will be done by assessing which behavior from the prescription and proscription categories is observed in which context. This should not be misunderstood as adherence to an unyielding model of trait psychology. The goal is not to reduce hegemonic femininity to a "fixed character type" (Connell and Messerschmidt 847). Instead, displaying prescription or proscription traits is interpreted as the performance of gender which can be used to gain dominance, power, and societal status. These traits and characteristics serve as strong guidelines, but are not set in stone because context is very important to determine which traits are appropriate in which situation. Intent will not be taken into consideration when evaluating behavior. This analysis excludes Schippers's concept of alternative femininities because these femininities can only occur "within a local context" (Finley 362). Katniss's behavior is televised across Panem and therefore evaluated on a regional level.

The analysis is focused on Katniss because the new model most diverges from Schippers's and Connell and Messerschmidt's framework in its conceptualization of hegemonic femininity. *The Hunger Games* is set in a Western patriarchal society. Patriarchy is established through the division of labor; the men labor in the mines while the women work inside the home (Henthorne 47). As *The Hunger Games* is a reflection of Western society, all three models should be applicable. Katniss is hailed as a heroine, making her a possible candidate for the highest social position available to women.

3. Games of Gender Performance

It is established early on in the novel that Katniss is a hunter; not for sport but for food (Collins 10). Although Gale became her hunting partner after a few years, she does not need him (11). She has been the "head of the family" since she was eleven years old and has learned to provide for her family through hunting and gathering in the forest near District Twelve (28). She has saved her family from starvation many times (28). She is completely self-reliant up to the point that others can rely on her as well. Self-reliance is a gender-relaxed prescription for women and a gender-intensified prescription for men (Prentice and Carranza 273-274). Traditionally, men are the breadwinners of the family. They are expected to be self-reliant (274). It is not expected of women to be self-reliant (273). A woman has the possibility to rely on the men in her life, like her father and possibly her husband, without defying any of the gender-intensified prescriptions (273). This type of arrangement is still prevalent and deemed acceptable today (Hatfield 528). However, Prentice and Carranza show that self-reliance, while not expected, is celebrated in women. It is one of the gender-relaxed prescriptions and therefore a possible component of hegemonic femininity (273).

The new model allows for this societal appreciation to be taken into account. In line with the predictions from Prentice and Carranza's framework, no social sanctions follow Katniss's hunting, even though many people in the District, including law enforcers, are aware of Katniss's methods of self-reliance (Prentice and Carranza 280, Collins 6). The law enforcers and District Twelve's mayor even buy her game, thereby not merely tolerating her behavior but rewarding it (Collins 6, 12). This should not happen, according to Schippers's framework. Instead of complementing men by displaying an "inferior quality", Katniss undermines what Schippers assumes has to be "a relationship of dominance and submission" between men and women by being self-reliant (Schippers 91). This in turn leads to an exclusion from hegemonic femininity (95). Schippers claims that displaying traditionally masculine traits, like self-reliance, should lead to a form of social punishment (95). This is not the case in this example; Katniss her behavior is even rewarded, in line with the expectations from the new model (Collins 6, 12).

Her ability to be self-reliant turns out to be essential to her survival in the Arena of the Games. The composition of the Arena changes every year. This year, the Arena mainly consists of a large forest, which is familiar terrain to Katniss (147). She separates herself from the rest of the tributes and sets out on her own path. She climbs trees to find safe sleeping spots and forages for food and water (150). Self-reliance is seen as something that can elicit

rewards; "I want sponsors to see I can hunt, that I'm a good bet because I won't be lured into traps as easily as the others will by hunger" (163). It seems a lot of sponsors have been paying attention to Katniss and a reward is delivered to her shortly after this moment. When flying fireballs badly damage her leg and drive her towards the Career tributes, she has to quickly climb a tree to avoid being killed (179). Even though she is now stuck in a tree, with the Career tributes circling her tree like wolves, she does not give up. She waits until the anthem plays at nightfall to cut down a branch with a nest of tracker jackers – huge, venomous wasp-like creatures (185–186). Her plan is to drop the nest directly onto her sleeping attackers in the morning and make her escape. When she climbs back down to her own branch, where she will spend the night, she finds her first gift in the form of burn medication (186). "The cost of this medicine must be astronomical. Probably not one but many sponsors have contributed to buy this one tiny pot" (187). Her sponsors have rewarded Katniss for what they have seen so far in the Games; self-reliance, cleverness in the face of danger, and an ability to use aggression. In agreement with Prentice and Carranza's framework, these three gender-relaxed prescriptions are celebrated in this example. Her leg is almost fully healed in the morning which enables her escape. She saws through the remainder of the branch that holds the nest, which then cracks open on the ground. The mutated wasps take out two of the Careers before they can get away. Katniss escapes from her predicament and, thus, has effectively used violence as a defense mechanism (190).

Schippers states that hegemonic "femininity includes […] an inability to use violence effectively" (91). A woman who uses violence effectively is labeled a "badass" girl" (95). They are banned from hegemonic femininity and their behavior will be stigmatized (95). Schippers does stress that the "importance of context cannot be overstated" (98). Katniss's behavior is not stigmatized or penalized after she kills two tributes to escape. The use of violence within the Arena is not "central to forming and legitimating a hierarchical relationship between men and women" because violence is expected from both men and women in this context (97). Her violent behavior outside the Arena, however, should not warrant an exemption from disciplinary actions because there is a clear patriarchy in place.

On her way to the Capitol, Katniss and Peeta, her fellow tribute from District Twelve, realize that they need Haymitch to mentor them if they want to stand a chance at winning the Games. He is not only supposed to offer guidance, but also recruit and negotiate with sponsors (Collins 56). Haymitch, however, is a drunk and seems more concerned with alcohol than with them (56). This angers Katniss and incites her to "drive [her] knife into the table between his hand and the bottle, barely missing his fingers" (57). She expects retaliation for

this aggressive act but no reprisal follows (57). Instead Haymitch asks: "Well, what's this? […] Did I actually get a pair of fighters this year?" (57). Katniss's use of violence is effective; Haymitch starts to mentor them from this point onwards (57). Violence was not her only option to gain Haymitch's attention; she could have cried or raised her voice. Violence was not needed in this situation and was therefore unwarranted.

Schippers explains that women who successfully engage in aggressive behavior display a trait that belongs to hegemonic masculinity; "the ability to use interpersonal violence in the face of conflict" (91). Women who perform in such a way are deemed "socially undesirable and contaminating to social life more generally" because their behavior "constitute[s] a refusal to complement hegemonic masculinity in a relation of subordination" (95). Schippers claims that having "any one of these characteristics is assumed to contaminate the individual, so by having the one characteristic, an individual becomes a kind of person – a lesbian, a "slut", a shrew or "cockteaser", [or] a bitch" (95). The women who embody these traits are reinvented into a devalued feminine status so that dominance remains "squarely in masculinity and [its] only legitimate enactment solely in the hands of men" (95-96). Schippers refers to this group of women as "pariah femininities" (95). Schippers predicts that "very real, material sanctions" will be "exacted on women who embody [pariah femininities]" (96). This is not observed here. Katniss's aggression is rewarded because Haymitch starts offering useful advice after this incident (Collins 57). Aggressiveness is one of the gender-relaxed prescriptions for women and one of the gender-intensified prescriptions for men in the new model (Appendix A, B). Displaying this trait could elicit a reward, as it is celebrated in women and a possible component of hegemonic femininity. Katniss is not stigmatized or punished but rewarded for her behavior. She gains knowledge and power needed to survive the Games.

Katniss does not seem naturally inclined towards rebellion against her oppressive government, which she considers "pointless" (Collins 15). She does, however, engage in behavior that is perceived by others as rebellious. Rebellion is a gender-intensified proscription for women. Enactments of this quality are specifically proscribed for women (280). Prentice and Carranza's framework states that portraying gender-intensified proscriptions will most likely lead to punishment (280). This prediction is not always observed in the book; in four displays of rebellion Katniss is rewarded, ignored, and punished.

Katniss's first act of rebellion is observed when she is called to be evaluated by the Gamemakers. Their evaluation will result in a score between one and twelve which demonstrates a tribute's potential (104). A higher score increases the likelihood of attracting

sponsors and unwanted attention from fellow tributes. The Gamemakers do not pay any attention to Katniss when she is called in for her evaluation. They are enjoying an extravagant feast. Katniss becomes enraged that "with [her] life on the line, they don't even have the decency to pay attention" (101). She shoots an apple straight out of the mouth of a roast pig that the Gamemakers were about to enjoy (101). This could be seen as an act of rebellion by the Gamemakers. Katniss fears that she has ruined her chances of winning the Games and believes that she may even be mutilated as retaliation for her hotheaded act (103). Against Katniss's expectation, she is rewarded by the Gamemakers with the highest score of all the tributes (108).

Katniss and Peeta also rebel against the nature of the Games in a small but significant way at the opening ceremony when they are instructed to hold hands. This is highly unusual; the norm is to stand "stiffly apart, never touching or acknowledging each other, as if their fellow tribute did not exist, as if the Games had already begun" (79). The Games dehumanize its contestants, pitting districts and its citizens against each other. Their humanity is reaffirmed when Katniss and Peeta hold hands and are portrayed as allies. Haymitch calls this "the perfect act of rebellion" (79). This act distinguishes them from the rest of the tributes, making them more noticeable and appealing to the audience. Katniss and Peeta enjoy the benefits of their insurgence immediately; "Every head is turned our way, pulling the focus from the three chariots ahead of us. […] The people of the Capitol are going nuts, showering us with flowers, shouting our names" (69-70). Katniss believes that her small act of rebellion has been helpful; "Surely, there must be one sponsor willing to take me on!" (70). No retribution follows Katniss and Peeta's deviation from the norm in the opening ceremony. They are adored by the public and, in this case, tolerated by the Gamemakers and the government.

Katniss only intentionally challenges the Capitol once; when her ally Rue is killed. Katniss immediately kills Rue's attacker but is too late to save Rue (230). Rue was the youngest of the tributes, small in stature, and child-like. She reminds Katniss of her sister, Prim (99). Rue's murder has a tremendous impact on Katniss. She turns her anger towards the Capitol, vowing to "show the Capitol that whatever they do or force us to do there is a part of every tribute they can't own" (233). Katniss then covers Rue's body in flowers and salutes her with a gesture of thankfulness, respect and farewell to a loved one (234). Fallen tributes are usually taken away by hovercraft and unceremoniously shipped back home in a wooden box (152). The image of innocent Rue's violent demise is countervailed by Katniss's dignified goodbye. Katniss wants to show that Rue was "more than just a piece in [the Capitol's]

games" (234). Her act serves as an antithesis to the dehumanization of the tributes by the Capitol. Katniss revels that "everyone will see her […] and know I did it" (234). The dignified goodbye Katniss has created for Rue is rewarded by the members of Rue's district; they send her a loaf of bread which shows their gratitude for Katniss's magnanimousness (235).

Katniss's most severe transgression towards the Capitol is the very reason that she and Peeta both emerge from the Arena as victors. Halfway through the Games a rule change is announced stating that two "tributes from the same district will be declared winners if they are the last two alive" (241). This rule is rescinded when Katniss and Peeta are the only ones left standing. The Gamemakers have forced them into a scenario where one must kill the other. Peeta urges Katniss to kill him and threatens to commit suicide if she does not. He wants her to live, if only one can survive (337). ""Listen," he says pulling me to my feet. "We both know they have to have a victor. It can only be one of us. Please, take it. For me." And he goes on about how he loves me, what life would be without me but I've stopped listening because his previous words are trapped in my head, thrashing desperately around" (338). In this moment Katniss's rationality outweighs any feelings she may have for Peeta. She does not engage in Peeta's ramblings about love but instead realizes that she can manipulate the situation in a way that benefits them both. She forces the Gamemakers to choose between two victors or none at all by threatening a double suicide. She realizes that "[w]ithout a victor, the whole thing would blow up in the Gamemakers' faces" (338). According to Henthorne, "a double suicide would subvert the ideological purpose of the Games, which is to dramatize the government's absolute power over its citizens" (102). Katniss and Peeta have already placed poisonous berries in their mouth when the announcer shouts out: "Stop! Stop! Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to present the victors of the Seventy-fourth Hunger Games, Katniss Everdeen and Peeta Mellark! I give you — the tributes of District Twelve!" (Collins 339).

Katniss's act of rebellion has led to the desired result; both Katniss and Peeta have survived the Games. However, the defiance of this gender-intensified proscription does not go unpunished. Haymitch warns Katniss: "You're in trouble. Word is the Capitol's furious about you showing them up in the arena. The one thing they can't stand is being laughed at and they're the joke of Panem" (350). Katniss reclaimed her agency through rebellion by threatening to take away the Capitol's victors. The Capitol retaliates by taking away this agency and forcing her into a traditionally feminine role. She is supposed to act like a love-crazed teenager and wear pretty dresses to convince people of her innocence. If she does not comply, Katniss expects that her family will suffer the consequences for her actions (351).

This last example demonstrates that Katniss's violation of a gender-intensified proscription, namely rebellion, leads to punishment when the transgression is severe enough. In line with the predictions from Prentice and Carranza's framework, Peeta gets off unscathed because rebellion is a gender-relaxed proscription for men (274). His actions will be criticized, but not condemned.

Displaying rebellious behavior can relegate Katniss to non-hegemonic femininity in the new model. Within this context, however, rebelliousness does not lead to an exclusion from hegemonic femininity despite the proscribed nature of the trait. Her act of rebellion must be evaluated within the context of her country's oppressive political system. By manipulating the Gamemakers, Katniss "claims control of herself and embraces her power to direct the outcome of her own life" (Montz et al. 42). She has three choices; kill herself, kill Peeta, or save both. Killing herself will leave Prim at the hands of mercy. By killing Peeta, she would be just another pawn in their Games. Of the three choices, the last one benefits her best because she would regain her agency without losing Prim or Peeta. Rebelling is the only way for her to gain dominance and power in this situation. Exhibiting the gender-intensified proscription should consistently lead to a form of punishment. As it does enable Katniss to regain her dominance and power, both essential to hegemonic femininity, this display does not lead to an exclusion from hegemonic femininity as the consequences negate each other.

Compliance is the central feature of Connell and Messerschmidt's concept of emphasized femininity (848). Rebellion is an antonym for this compliance and, therefore, women who engage in rebellious behavior are excluded from achieving emphasized femininity. The enactment of rebellion corresponds to different, unnamed, forms of femininity "defined centrally by strategies of resistance or forms of non-compliance" (Connell 183).

Her stylist Cinna, her prep team, and her mentor transform Katniss's look to offset the rebellion and neutralize the threat she exudes; "I look, very simply, like a girl. A young one. Fourteen at the most. Innocent. Harmless. Yes, it is shocking that Cinna has pulled this off when you remember I've just won the Games. This is a very calculated look" (Collins 348). Katniss's appearance is used to perform a non-threatening form of femininity. Katniss's look has been tightly controlled and used as a tactic since the outset of the Games. A public persona was created for Katniss before the Games started so that she would appeal more to the audience. These public appearances are strongly reminiscent of a pageant (Frankel 51). Katniss notes that all the tributes employ a similar strategy, with behavior ranging from sexy to angelic for girls (Collins 125, 126). Katniss needs to be identifiable and is therefore presented as a blueprint of fierce femininity to which the audience can readily relate. She will

need to display qualities tied to the traditional performance of femininity, the gender-intensified prescriptions (Appendix B). Crafting a likeable 'feminine' persona is crucial to her success in the Games because tributes that appeal to the audience are able to gain their favor. She will have little to no chance of surviving the Games if she falls out of favor. A necessary aspect of gaining favor is conforming to the Capitol's beauty standards. Katniss notes that while the "Hunger Games aren't a beauty contest, […] the best-looking tributes always seem to pull more sponsors" (58). Katniss struggles with the construction of a likeable feminine persona. She relies on her beauty to compensate for her lack of stage presence, hoping her stylist "can make [her] look so wonderful, no one will care what comes out of [her] mouth" (120). After all her body hair is removed, the prep team exclaims: "Excellent! You almost look like a human being now!" (62).

The beautification characterizes her as decidedly feminine and distinguishes her from masculinity. Butler notes that "[d]iscrete genders are part of what "humanizes" individuals within contemporary culture; indeed we regularly punish those who fail to do their gender right" (*Gender Trouble* 178). The punitive consequences are exacted by the sponsors in *The Hunger Games.* Failing to perform gender 'right' can have consequences as severe as death. Punishment is doled out to those who do not conform to normative gender conceptions, like women with body hair. These normative gender conceptions include more than just traditional femininity, as Katniss demonstrates in her pre-Games interview. Katniss performs quite well during the interview, in which she twirls and giggles, which she has "done maybe never in [her] lifetime" (Collins 128). She successfully performs the traditional femininity required of her and the audience acknowledges this with their cheers, laughter, and applause (127, 128). She also displays the trait determination, a gender-relaxed prescription, when she recounts that Prim asked her to win: "[I]nstead of warmth, I feel an icy rigidity take over my body. My muscles tense as they do before a kill. When I speak, my voice seems to have dropped an octave. "I swore I would" (129). The audience responds well to this display and rewards it with applause that "continues long after [she is] seated" (129). This example demonstrates that what Butler described as doing gender "right" does not necessarily entail an adherence to only the gender-intensified prescriptions (*Gender Trouble* 178). The well-timed use of a gender-relaxed prescription, in this case determination, has made Katniss memorable while displaying gender-intensified prescriptions such as being cheerful, cooperative, and friendly, has made Katniss only likeable.

In the opening ceremony of the Games, Katniss and Peeta are dressed up and paraded around in a chariot for the Capitol crowd (Collins 69). Katniss seems to get wrapped up in the

moment: "[the] music, the cheers, the admiration work their way into my blood, and I can't suppress my excitement" (70). She plays her part well, flirting with the audience, blowing them a kiss which a "hundred hands reach up to catch" (70). Her excitability and flirtatious behavior is rewarded. The crowd chants her name; ""Katniss! Katniss!" [She] can hear [her] name being called from all sides. Everyone wants [her] kisses" (71). During the public appearances Katniss is flirtatious, cooperative, excitable, friendly, and cheerful. These are all gender-intensified prescriptions. This is unusual behavior for her, illustrated by Haymitch when he says; "I don't know where you pulled that cheery, wavy girl on the chariot from, but I haven't seen her before or since" (Collins 117). This marks her behavior as performative; she imitates the ideal enactment for her gender as described by the gender-intensified prescriptions (Butler "Performative Acts" 526, Prentice and Carranza 273). The reader is aware that behavior like flirtatiousness does not come naturally to Katniss. The crowd, however, is not clued in on this fact. They judge her on the perceived behavior. At the hand of her prep team Katniss is made to look "breathtaking" (Collins 70). While Katniss did not actually contribute to her beautification, she is *perceived* to be "well-groomed" and attentive to appearances (Prentice and Carranza 280, 273). In the new model the actions that are discernible to others are evaluated; meaning that Katniss appears well-groomed and the fact that she does not have a hand in this does not prevent her behavior from being noted.

Katniss's portrayal of a feminine persona closely resembles Schippers's "idealized quality content of the categories "man" and "woman"" in which hegemonic masculinity and femininity is established (90). The traits Katniss exhibits can thus be seen as those "defined as womanly that establish and legitimate a hierarchical and complementary relationship to hegemonic masculinity" (94). Katniss's display of gender-intensified prescriptions for women would contribute to her placement in hegemonic femininity in Schippers's framework. When Peeta confesses he has a crush on Katniss, she is drawn into a 'feminine' role without her consent; she becomes his "object of love" (Collins 134). Peeta's confession strengthens Katniss's constructed persona of traditional femininity and her claim to hegemonic femininity in Schippers's framework. The audience sees Katniss "blushing and confused, made beautiful by Cinna's hands, desirable by Peeta's confession, tragic by circumstance, and by all accounts, unforgettable" (136). The audience adores the star-crossed lovers story as demonstrated by the "roar of the crowd" following his confession (132). The audience responds with enthusiasm, appreciating the displays of traditional femininity.

Katniss immediately interprets Peeta's confession of love as a stratagem (133). She does not even consider that his feelings may be genuine until the very end, when he

demonstrates he is willing to die for her (338). She never voices her cynicism by openly questioning Peeta's motives and her cynicism is only visible to the reader.

Cynicism is a gender-intensified proscription, meaning that this type of behavior is especially condemned in women and could be used to place Katniss in the non-hegemonic category. Prentice and Carranza note that they "would expect the harshest treatment to go to those who are perceived to defy gender-intensified proscriptions" (280). Characteristics need to be perceived by others to elicit punishment in the new model. No punishment follows Katniss's cynicism, precisely because she never expresses it. There is no behavior to be observed and as a result Katniss's cynicism does not lead to an exclusion from hegemonic femininity (Appendix B).

Katniss does voice her dissent with the situation by using violence. After the interview Katniss confronts Peeta because she fears that Peeta has made her look weak. She retaliates by shoving him to the ground and screaming that they are not star-crossed lovers (133). This angers Haymitch, who says "Who cares? It's all a big show. It's all [about] how you're perceived" (134). Haymitch ensures her of her success in performing her role: "You're golden, sweetheart. You're going to have sponsors lined up around the block" (136).

The star-crossed lovers is a story that can be sold to the viewers. Katniss realizes the benefits of participating in this farce and agrees to participate. In this scene, Katniss expresses her dissent, and thus her emotions, and makes a rational decision. Her behavior is a mix of gender-intensified and gender-relaxed prescriptions for women.

While it is clear to the reader that Katniss is uninterested in Peeta's advances, she does come across to the uniformed viewer as though she does like Peeta. This is confirmed by Peeta's stylist; ""[D]id you think I could be in love with him, too?" [Katniss asks]. "I did," says Portia. "The way you avoided looking at the cameras, the blush" (Collins 135-136). Connell notes that emphasized femininity "is performed and performed especially to men" (187). Katniss's public appearances have been very performative in nature as it is conveyed to the readers that she is playing a role; she does not really have feelings for Peeta, she does not normally wear dresses, or make-up, and she has never giggled before in her life. She is perceived by the audience as someone who does. Katniss portrays traditional feminine behavior. In Connell's framework traditional feminine behavior should be targeting men's "interests and desires" which is a necessary component of emphasized femininity (183).

According to Schippers, "being the object of masculine desire is feminine" (90). The attraction between men and women "does the hegemonic work of fusing masculinity and femininity together as complementary opposites" (90). Heterosexuality is the foundation of

complementarity between men and women and their relationship of dominance and submission within Schippers's framework (90, 91). As such, heterosexuality is a prerequisite for achieving gender hegemony in Schippers's framework. Katniss is perceived as feminine because she is the object of Peeta's love. Being regarded as highly feminine contributes to reaching a position of hegemonic femininity in Schippers's framework because it makes gender more legible (90). In Schippers's model, "those who embody intelligible gender" are dominant over those whose gender is less legible (100).

Katniss does not appear to reciprocate Peeta's feelings in the preamble to the Games. Her behavior takes on a form of non-compliance. In both Connell and Messerschmidt's and Schippers's framework compliance towards men is essential for achieving emphasized femininity or hegemonic femininity. Rejecting a man's romantic interest signals non-compliance. Katniss overturns her newly constructed public image of emphasized femininity by displaying aggression toward Peeta and not reciprocating his advances. Non-compliance is regarded as "a refusal to complement hegemonic masculinity in a relation of subordination" in Schippers's model (95). Schippers notes that women who are "sexually inaccessible" are considered deviant and would be stigmatized (95). They are relegated to pariah femininity and assigned the label "cock-teaser" (95). "[B]eing the object of masculine desire" and accepting this role is conducive to placement in Schippers's form of hegemonic femininity (90). It can provide women with status but not with dominance or power. Women only have two choices; 'get with the program, or suffer the consequences'. This takes away their agency and dominance and power remain in the hands of men. True hegemony, then, cannot be discerned.

Because femininity and masculinity are largely unlinked in the new model, being the object of desire does not influence the placement in either category. The choice to participate in the role of star-crossed lover in itself is consequential in the new model; Katniss has made a rational choice to appear reciprocative of Peeta's affections because it increases her chances of survival. Canavan and Petrovic assert that the role of "the star-crossed-lover, while powerful tools that help Katniss survive the Hunger Games, also severely limit her agency in terms of her ability to end her participation" (47). This is in agreement with Schippers's framework because the agency of women is limited to uphold the dominance of men.

Katniss has to keep up appearances as Peeta's lover after winning the Games because her family's survival depends on her ability to convince the audience of her love for Peeta. It serves as a public defense for her rebellious act with the berries. Within the confines of the situation, Katniss's choice is the most prudent. Her choice is based on rationality and also demonstrates intelligence. Katniss employs these gender-relaxed traits successfully. She also

displays gender-intensified prescriptions; she appears sensitive and excitable by blushing and averting her eyes while always aware the cameras are fixed on her. Overall, Katniss's adoption of the role of star-crossed lover neither contributes nor opposes a placement in hegemonic femininity in the new model.

Before Peeta becomes Katniss's ally later on in the Games, she joins forces with Rue first. Katniss could have chosen to team up with more powerful allies, like the Careers, given her high training score. She chooses to form alliances with Rue and Peeta instead. When Rue helps Katniss escape from her predicament in the tree by pointing out the tracker jacker nest, Katniss decides to become her ally (Collins 184). Katniss's choice of ally is peculiar because both Peeta and Rue are weaker than she is. Rue is twelve years old and, and like her sister Prim, would not be able to "tip the scale at seventy pounds soaking wet" (99). Rue is physically weaker than Katniss but proves her worth in the form of information and company. Katniss takes Rue under her wing and becomes her protector and provider (201). Katniss shares her food with Rue and is warm, friendly, and affectionate towards her: "I poke Rue in the belly, just like I would Prim" (209). This dovetails with Connell and Messerschmidt's concept of emphasized femininity as "an adaptation to men's power emphasizing compliance, nurturance, and empathy as womanly virtues" (Connell 188).

While the alliance between Katniss and Rue mostly displays behavior that would fit with emphasized femininity, they also display behavior that defies the compliant and subordinated nature of emphasized femininity. Katniss devises a plan "that isn't motivated by the need for flight and evasion", namely "an offensive plan", to improve their chances of winning (Collins 205). The plan is for Rue to ignite previously constructed campfires, luring the Careers miles away into the forest, while Katniss simultaneously blows up their food supply (205). This plan demonstrates Katniss's intelligence as it plays to both their strengths. It is a clever method for speeding up the Careers' demise through indirect violence (210). Rue is adept at blending in with nature and will have enough time to flee. Katniss has good aim and can detonate the landmines surrounding the pile of supplies. However, during the execution of the plan, something goes awry and Rue is attacked by a Career tribute (229). Katniss immediately tries to defend Rue and kills the attacker by shooting him in the neck (230). The quickness of her actions demonstrates natural decisiveness, forcefulness, and an ability to use aggression when necessary. The last interaction between the two allies, however, is a sensitive moment in which Katniss holds Rue and sings her a lullaby until she passes away (231-232).

Katniss's second alliance is created both by choice and by necessity after a rule change is announced, informing the remaining tributes that two victors may be crowned if they originate from the same district (243). Katniss notes that they would be outcasts back home if she and Peeta would not form an alliance forthwith. Furthermore, "being one of the star-crossed lovers from District 12 — it's an absolute requirement if [they] want any more help from sympathetic sponsors" (243). When the rule change is announced, she immediately blurts out Peeta's name, calling the attention of possible enemies towards her. This involuntary exclamation suggests that there is an emotional component to her alliance as well (241). She eventually finds the severely wounded Peeta and spends the following days tending to his injuries (248). Katniss reflects that "by teaming up with him, I've made myself far more vulnerable than when I was alone. Tethered to the ground, on guard, with a very sick person to take care of. But I knew he was injured. And still I came after him" (259). In the alliance between Katniss and Peeta, she takes on the role of caretaker while she fully understands the risks involved.

Peeta has not received a single gift during his time in the Arena even though he is in dire need, while Katniss has already received two gifts (255). This implies that sponsors are not responding well to his behavior and are instead betting on Katniss to win. This observation can be explained via the new model; Katniss has demonstrated to be deserving of sponsor's attention because of her performance in the Arena. She has shown to be self-reliant, clever, and aggressive, which marks her as a potential winner. She has also shown a softer, warmer side in her alliance with Rue and in the interview which makes her more likeable. Within Schippers's model only the affectionate interaction with Rue and her 'feminine' display before the Games would be praised. The displays of the gender-relaxed prescriptions are considered to disrupt the dominance of men and are devalued in Schippers's model. From the perspective of Schippers's model, then, it is illogical for Katniss to receive the favor of the sponsors.

In her efforts to save Peeta, Katniss must also keep up their manufactured romance (260). Katniss has deduced that their feigned romance must have captured the hearts of the viewers and driven the Gamemakers to change the rules (243). She is aware that their romance may keep the audiences entertained, which in turn keeps them safe. A bored audience is a dangerous one because the Gamemakers will find more violent ways to keep the viewers entertained (258). To uphold the façade, Katniss kisses Peeta for the first time, stating: "[t]his is probably overdue anyway since […] we are supposed to be madly in love. It's the first time I've ever kissed a boy, which should make some sort of impression I guess,

but all I can register is how unnaturally hot his lips are from the fever" (256-257). Katniss clearly cares for Peeta's well-being and is concerned about his health even though the romantic content ascribed to the behavior is feigned on her part. The audience perceives her as caring and flirtatious and sends them both a gift (257).

Peeta is too weak to move and is dependent on Katniss's hunting skills, which undermines the position of male dominance as outlined in Connell and Messerschmidt's and Schippers's framework. Despite Katniss's best efforts to heal Peeta, his health deteriorates further. Katniss realizes that he will not survive much longer without medical treatment. Around this time a "feast" is announced where the medicine needed to save Peeta's life can be found (269). This is a clear attempt on behalf of the Gamemakers to lure the remaining tributes together to provoke a fight. Peeta pleads with Katniss not to risk her life for him and threatens to endanger himself if she does go. In his current state, this would lead to his death (270). Katniss is still set on going to the feast, creating an impasse between the two. Their gridlock is resolved when Haymitch sends Katniss sleep medication which will keep Peeta sedated long enough for her to obtain the medicine (272). She does not take his feelings into consideration because she cannot let him die. She deeply cares for Peeta and is willing to risk her life to save his. While her caring nature is traditionally feminine, her actions take on a more nontraditional form and speak to her strong personality, her willingness to take risks, and her assertiveness. Katniss is able to procure the medicine but almost died in the process (280).

Katniss shows great loyalty to both her allies. She demonstrates many qualities considered traditionally feminine in her interaction with Peeta and Rue: warmth, kindness, and friendliness. She cares for them and provides them with food. She takes care of Peeta while he is sick. Katniss also cooperates in the fake romance, engaging in affectionate behavior such as kissing or caressing his cheek. Katniss also demonstrates a sensitive side when she holds and sings to dying Rue. These qualities should be celebrated according to all three models. Her displays of kindness and cooperation could elicit a placement in hegemonic femininity in Schippers's framework and emphasized femininity in Connell and Messerschmidt's framework. Katniss, however, also displays behavior that would be castigated in both frameworks. In her alliance with Rue, for example, Katniss takes the initiative to craft an offensive plan. She goes against Peeta's wishes and retrieves medicine for him. These actions demonstrate Katniss's assertiveness and denote her strong personality. Assertiveness is not a desirable quality in a woman according to Schippers's framework (95). Schippers describes that "taking charge and not being compliant" would place Katniss in one

of the pariah femininities (95). Schippers maintains that women who exhibit this kind of take-charge attitude are contaminating to the relationship between men and women and are therefore stigmatized; in this case as "bitch" (95). The kindness, loyalty, and sensitivity Katniss also displays during her alliances with Rue and Peeta are irrelevant within Schippers's model, because the enactment of "one characteristic", in this case assertiveness, places her in a pariah femininity and simultaneously excludes her from hegemonic femininity (95).

It is exactly the combination the gender-intensified prescriptions like loyalty and kindness coupled with the gender-relaxed prescriptions such as assertiveness and high intelligence that correlates to hegemonic femininity in the new model. Katniss's enactment of these dual sets of prescriptions is very successful as it allows her to gain favor from the sponsors and to win the Games.

4. Conclusion

This thesis set out to examine the applicability of a new model of hegemonic masculinity, hegemonic femininity, and their non-hegemonic counterparts. The thesis focuses on femininity because women's social positions have considerably changed over the last few decades. Connell and Messerschmidt's conceptualization of emphasized femininity and Schippers's framework of multiple femininities do not sufficiently take the changing position of women into account. As women have increasingly joined the workforce over the past few decades, new, nontraditional gender roles were taken on. These roles are performed alongside their traditional feminine gender role. This warrants an updated conceptualization of femininity.

The main difference between the new model and both Connell and Messerschmidt's and Schipper's framework is that hegemonic femininity is no longer dependent on its relationship with masculinity. Women can achieve true hegemony in this new theorization because they are no longer restricted in a role of submission. This new way of looking at femininity was applied to Katniss Everdeen, the female protagonist of *The Hunger Games*.

Katniss Everdeen is assertive, intelligent, self-reliant, and can successfully use violence. These traits are all gender-relaxed prescriptions according to the new model. Most of the gender-relaxed prescriptions for women are also deemed typical and expected from hegemonic masculinity. Many scholars have concluded that Katniss's gender identity is masculine based on these typically masculine traits. This behavior is also appreciated in women and necessary for performing their nontraditional role in contemporary society. These gender-relaxed prescriptions are a necessary component of hegemonic femininity in the new model. They will need to be supplemented by the traditionally feminine gender-intensified prescriptions as women are still expected to adhere to their traditional gender role as well.

Exhibiting gender-relaxed prescriptions is celebrated in the new model, and strongly condemned within both Connell's and Schippers's framework. In agreement with Connell and Messerschmidt's framework, Katniss displays nurturing and empathetic behavior that fits emphasized femininity. She cooperates with Haymitch and Cinna's plan and agrees to be glamorized for the audience's benefit. Katniss does not protest her beautification because she understands that beauty is desired for women in the Capitol. To be the object of desire is a passive role and does not contradict the subordination of women. This is an essential component of Connell's concept of emphasized femininity. The concept of emphasized femininity is very narrow. While Katniss is often defiant of subordination, no clear

consequences are outlined in Connell's framework. Overall, Katniss would not be a suitable candidate for emphasized femininity because her behavior does not consistently code as traditionally feminine. She does not appear oriented toward pleasing men as she prefers to serve her own interests first.

In Schippers's framework, this type of behavior fails to complement masculinity in a way that supports the dominance of men and the submission of women. Contrary to the expectations from both Connell and Messerschmidt's and Schippers's framework, Katniss's nontraditionally feminine behavior is mostly rewarded. Katniss's self-reliance is inherently rewarding because it allows her to take care of herself and her family. She is not punished for hunting, for instance, even though it is illegal in District Twelve. The law enforcers buy her game, rewarding her for her transgression. Her engagement in violent behavior has consistently benefitted her. She drives a knife between Haymitch's fingers when he would rather nurse his alcoholism than help her. He does not hit or scold her, but offers his guidance instead. In Schippers's framework, both self-reliance and the ability to successfully employ violence defy the social hierarchy that establishes a subordinated role for women. Katniss's behavior is not compliant and does not necessarily complement hegemonic masculinity. Katniss would be placed in pariah femininity in Schippers's framework because embodying any of these characteristics would relegate her to this rank. Katniss in fact shows many of these types of traditionally masculine characteristics throughout the novel. Even though Katniss does display many gender-intensified prescriptions, like warmth, kindness, and sensitivity, these displays are deemed irrelevant; embodying one traditionally masculine characteristic is enough to contaminate her entire gender identity. Katniss should consequently be stigmatized and punished but throughout the novel no punishment follows said behavior. Rather, her behavior elicits rewards. Schippers's framework does not offer any explanation for the steady stream of rewards Katniss receives.

In the new model, Katniss would be placed squarely in hegemonic femininity. The new model is best suited to assess women's gender performance and most accurately predicts social response to displayed behavior. Hegemonic femininity would correlate to the highest social position attainable for women. Gender-intensified prescriptions and gender-relaxed prescriptions are necessary components of hegemonic femininity. The new model allows for the best conceptualization of the current roles and requirements for women in contemporary society. The model also restores the agency of women that is demonstrated in the book, but missing from both Connell and Messerschmidt's and Schippers's framework. By combining traditional and nontraditional traits, women can gain status, dominance, power, and thus

hegemony. Katniss complies with the conditions of hegemonic femininity. She displays a combination of gender-intensified prescriptions and gender-relaxed prescriptions. She exhibits none of the gender-relaxed proscriptions and one gender-intensified proscription, namely rebelliousness. This could lead to an exclusion of hegemonic femininity and place her into its non-hegemonic counterpart. Her rebellious acts do not always elicit disciplinary actions. Because her rebelliousness is rewarded on several occasions and not consistently punished, it is not viewed as threatening to her gender performance. The new model proves to be more useful for discerning a socially exalted form of hegemonic femininity in this case study. Throughout the analysis exhibiting a combination of gender-intensified and gender-relaxed prescriptions does not lead to a form of punishment but rather to social praise which supports the assumption that the new model is more relevant than its predecessors.

Further research can be conducted to see if the predictions made from this model can also be empirically established. The current framework consists of a total of almost sixty traits that are heavily dependent on context. Future research could be directed towards finding other traits that are celebrated and condemned in men or women and towards examining which features of the context would change the evaluation of these traits.

Works Cited

Adamic, Lada and Pinkesh Patel. "Books that have stayed with us." Facebook. 09-08-2014.

07-13-2014.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. 1990. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Butler, Judith. "Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and

feminist theory." *Theatre journal* (1988): 519-531.

Canavan, Anne M., and Sarah N. Petrovic. "Tipping the Odds Ever in Her Favor." *Space and

Place in The Hunger Games: New Readings of the Novels* (2014): 45.

Connell, Raewyn. *Gender and power*. Polity Press, 1987.

Connell, Raewyn W., and James W. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic masculinity rethinking the

concept." *Gender & society* 19.6 (2005): 829-859.

Connors, Sean P. "I Try to Remember Who I am and Who I am Not." *The Politics of Panem*.

SensePublishers, 2014. 137-156.

Collins, Suzanne. *The Hunger Games*. New York: Scholastic, 2008. Ebook.

Diekman, Amanda B., and Alice H. Eagly. "Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and

men of the past, present, and future." *Personality and social psychology bulletin* 26.10

(2000): 1171-1188.

Donaldson, Mike. "What is hegemonic masculinity?." *Theory and society* 22.5 (1993): 643-

657.

Finley, Nancy J. "Skating femininity: Gender maneuvering in women's roller derby." *Journal

of contemporary ethnography* 39.4 (2010): 359-387.

Frankel, Valerie Estelle. "Reflection in a Plastic Mirror." *Of Bread, Blood and The Hunger

Games: Critical Essays on the Suzanne Collins Trilogy* 35 (2012).

"Hegemony." *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 3rd ed. 2008. Print

Henthorne, Tom. *Approaching The Hunger Games trilogy: A literary and cultural analysis*.

McFarland, 2012.

Huntemann, Nina, and Michael Morgan. "Mass media and identity development." *Handbook*

of children and the media (2001): 309-322.

Messerschmidt, James W. "Engendering gendered knowledge: Assessing the academic

appropriation of hegemonic masculinity." *Men and Masculinities*

(2012):1097184X11428384.

Miller, J. "She has no idea. The effect she can have". Katniss and the politics of gender. In

GA Dunn & N. Michaud (Eds.), The Hunger Games and philosophy: A critique of

pure treason (pp. 145–161)." (2012).

Mitchell, Jennifer. "Of queer necessity: Panem's hunger games as gender games." *Of Bread,*

Blood, and the Hunger Games: Critical Essays on the Suzanne Collins Trilogy (2012):

128-137.

Prentice, Deborah A., and Erica Carranza. "What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are

allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes."

Psychology of Women Quarterly 26.4 (2002): 269-281.

Schippers, Mimi. "Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender

hegemony." *Theory and society* 36.1 (2007): 85-102.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. "Doing gender." *Gender & society* 1.2 (1987): 125-

151.

Features of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinity adapted from Prentice and Carranza (274).

Hegemonic masculinity	Non-hegemonic masculinity
Gender-intensified prescriptions (prerequisite)	*Gender-intensified proscriptions (condemned)*
Business sense	Emotional
Athletic	Approval seeking
Leadership ability	Impressionable
Self-reliant	Yielding
Dependable	Superstitious
Ambitious	Child-like
High self-esteem	Shy
Assertive	Moody
Decisive	Melodramatic
Strong personality	Naïve
Disciplined	Gullible
Rational	Weak
Competitive	
Willing to take risks	
Consistent	
Aggressive	
Intense	
Forceful	
Non-essential to hegemonic masculinity	
Gender-relaxed prescriptions (desirable)	*Gender-relaxed proscriptions (criticized)*
Happy	Rebellious
Friendly	Solemn
Helpful	Controlling
Clean	Stubborn
Warm & kind	Promiscuous
Enthusiastic	Self-righteous
Optimistic	Jealous
Cheerful	Arrogant
Cooperative	
Interest in children	
Creative	
Sensitive	
Attn. to appearances	
Wholesome	
Spiritual	
Devoted to religion	
Expresses emotion	
Excitable	

Appendix B
Features of hegemonic and non-hegemonic femininity adapted from Prentice and Carranza (273).

Hegemonic femininity	Non-hegemonic femininity
Gender-relaxed prescriptions (nontraditional, prerequisite)	*Gender-relaxed proscriptions (criticized)*
Intelligent	Yielding
Mature	Emotional
High self-esteem	Impressionable
Common sense	Child-like
Sense of humor	Shy
Concern for future	Naïve
Principled	Superstitious
Efficient	Weak
Rational	Melodramatic
Strong personality	Gullible
Athletic	
Disciplined	
Clever	
Self-reliant	
Defends own beliefs	
Decisive	
Ambitious	
Business sense	
Leadership ability	
Worldly	
Willing to take risks	
Persuasive	
Assertive	
Intense	
Competitive	
Aggressive	
Forceful	
Gender-intensified prescriptions (traditional, prerequisite)	*Gender-intensified proscriptions (condemned)*
Warm & kind	Rebellious
Interest in children	Stubborn
Loyal	Controlling
Sensitive	Cynical
Clean	Promiscuous
Attn. to appearances	Arrogant
Patient	
Polite	
Cheerful	
Cooperative	
Wholesome	
Expresses emotion	
Spiritual	
Flirtatious	
Excitable	
Caring	

Visual interpretation of Schippers's and Connell and Messerschmidt's model of gender hegemony

Hegemonic Masculinity

Non-hegemonic masculinity

Hegemonic femininity/ emphasized femininity

Non-hegemonic femininty

Hegemonic
Masculinity

Non-
hegemonic
masculinity

Hegemonic
femininty

Non-
hegemonic
femininty

Intensified and relaxed prescriptions and proscriptions for Women and men in American society as described by Prentice and Carranza's article 'What Women and Men Should Be, Shouldn't be, are Allowed to be, and don't Have to Be: The Contents of Prescriptive Gender Stereotypes' (273-274).

Table 3
Intensified and Relaxed Prescriptions and Proscriptions for Men in American Society

Intensified prescriptions	DM	DP	DW	*Relaxed prescriptions*	DM	DP	DW
Business sense	8.32$_a$	7.86$_b$	6.07$_c$	*Happy	7.49$_a$	7.94$_b$	7.94$_b$
Athletic	8.27$_a$	7.71$_b$	6.79$_c$	Friendly	7.32$_a$	7.77$_b$	8.01$_c$
Leadership ability	8.24$_a$	7.88$_b$	6.04$_c$	Helpful	7.12$_a$	7.64$_b$	7.75$_b$
Self-reliant	8.18$_a$	7.75$_b$	6.40$_c$	Clean	7.05$_a$	7.37$_b$	7.98$_c$
*Dependable	8.09$_a$	7.69$_b$	7.67$_b$	Warm & kind	7.00$_a$	7.51$_b$	8.30$_c$
Ambitious	8.09$_a$	7.81$_b$	6.09$_c$	Enthusiastic	6.98$_a$	7.51$_b$	7.37$_b$
High self-esteem	8.05$_a$	7.87$_b$	7.35$_c$	Optimistic	6.90$_a$	7.37$_b$	7.49$_b$
Assertive	7.96$_a$	7.40$_b$	5.67$_c$	Cheerful	6.78$_a$	7.35$_b$	7.80$_c$
Decisive	7.92$_a$	7.32$_b$	6.19$_c$	Cooperative	6.75$_a$	7.27$_b$	7.63$_c$
Strong personality	7.82$_a$	7.49$_b$	6.82$_c$	Interest in children	6.68$_a$	7.00$_b$	8.16$_c$
*Disciplined	7.76$_a$	7.49$_b$	6.78$_c$	Creative	6.65$_a$	7.32$_b$	7.20$_b$
Rational	7.73$_a$	7.42$_b$	6.84$_c$	Sensitive	6.61$_a$	7.13$_b$	8.05$_c$
Competitive	7.47$_a$	7.23$_b$	5.18$_c$	Attn. to appearances	6.48$_a$	7.15$_b$	7.89$_c$
Willing to take risks	7.44$_a$	7.09$_b$	5.87$_c$	Wholesome	6.22$_a$	6.82$_b$	7.24$_c$
*Consistent	7.24$_a$	7.02$_b$	6.84$_b$	Spiritual	5.73$_a$	6.08$_b$	6.36$_c$
Aggressive	6.98$_a$	6.16$_b$	4.41$_c$	Devoted to religion	5.59$_a$	5.87$_b$	5.88$_b$
Intense	6.81$_a$	6.45$_b$	5.44$_c$	Expresses emotion	5.48$_a$	6.06$_b$	7.22$_c$
Forceful	6.58$_a$	5.89$_b$	4.39$_c$	Excitable	4.69$_a$	5.38$_b$	5.79$_c$

Relaxed proscriptions	DW	DP	DM	*Intensified proscriptions*	DW	DP	DM
Rebellious	5.31$_a$	4.79$_b$	3.96$_c$	Emotional	4.24$_a$	4.97$_b$	5.73$_c$
*Solemn	5.12$_a$	4.78$_b$	4.45$_b$	Approval seeking	4.22$_a$	4.93$_b$	5.19$_b$
Controlling	4.87$_a$	4.14$_b$	3.19$_c$	Impressionable	4.22$_a$	4.93$_b$	5.19$_c$
Stubborn	4.57$_a$	4.08$_b$	3.46$_c$	Yielding	3.91$_a$	4.31$_b$	6.05$_c$
Promiscuous	4.39$_a$	3.63$_b$	3.02$_c$	Superstitious	3.48$_a$	3.78$_b$	4.12$_c$
Self-righteous	4.35$_a$	4.01$_b$	3.72$_b$	*Child-like	3.33$_a$	3.94$_b$	4.96$_c$
*Jealous	4.07$_a$	3.67$_b$	3.72$_b$	Shy	3.05$_a$	3.51$_b$	4.76$_c$
Arrogant	3.82$_a$	3.33$_b$	2.55$_c$	Moody	2.79$_a$	3.15$_b$	3.29$_b$
				Melodramatic	2.70$_a$	3.64$_b$	4.10$_c$
				Naïve	2.41$_a$	3.04$_b$	4.53$_c$
				Gullible	2.13$_a$	2.63$_b$	3.99$_c$
				Weak	1.69$_a$	2.12$_b$	4.11$_c$

Note: DM = mean rating of desirability for a man in American society; DP = mean rating of desirability for a person in American society; DW = mean rating of desirability for a woman in American society. Means are based on *ns* of 177–204. Within each row, means not sharing a common subscript differ significantly at the .01 level. Traits marked with an asterisk did not show corresponding differences in perceived typicality for women and men.

Table 2

Intensified and Relaxed Prescriptions and Proscriptions for Women in American Society

Intensified prescriptions				Relaxed prescriptions			
	DW	DP	DM		DW	DP	DM
Warm & kind	8.30$_a$	7.51$_b$	7.00$_c$	*Intelligent	7.51$_a$	8.14$_b$	8.27$_b$
Interest in children	8.16$_a$	7.00$_b$	6.68$_c$	*Mature	7.38$_a$	7.61$_b$	7.81$_b$
*Loyal	8.06$_a$	7.77$_b$	7.83$_b$	High self-esteem	7.35$_a$	7.87$_b$	8.05$_c$
Sensitive	8.05$_a$	7.13$_b$	6.61$_c$	*Common sense	7.32$_a$	8.04$_b$	8.12$_b$
Friendly	8.01$_a$	7.77$_b$	7.32$_c$	Sense of humor	7.28$_a$	7.82$_b$	7.78$_b$
Clean	7.98$_a$	7.37$_b$	7.05$_c$	*Concern for future	6.97$_a$	7.43$_b$	7.39$_b$
Attn. to appearances	7.89$_a$	7.15$_b$	6.47$_c$	*Principled	6.92$_a$	7.33$_b$	7.45$_b$
Patient	7.84$_a$	7.08$_b$	6.96$_b$	*Efficient	6.86$_a$	7.74$_b$	7.69$_b$
Polite	7.81$_a$	7.40$_b$	7.32$_b$	*Rational	6.84$_a$	7.42$_b$	7.73$_c$
Cheerful	7.80$_a$	7.35$_b$	6.78$_c$	Strong personality	6.82$_a$	7.49$_b$	7.82$_c$
Cooperative	7.63$_a$	7.27$_b$	6.75$_c$	Athletic	6.79$_a$	7.71$_b$	8.27$_c$
Wholesome	7.24$_a$	6.82$_b$	6.22$_c$	*Disciplined	6.78$_a$	7.49$_b$	7.76$_c$
Expresses emotion	7.22$_a$	6.06$_b$	5.48$_c$	*Clever	6.73$_a$	7.47$_b$	7.61$_b$
Spiritual	6.36$_a$	6.08$_b$	5.73$_c$	Self-reliant	6.40$_a$	7.75$_b$	8.18$_c$
*Flirtatious	6.23$_a$	5.70$_b$	5.66$_b$	Defends own beliefs	6.39$_a$	7.41$_b$	7.46$_b$
Excitable	5.79$_a$	5.38$_b$	4.69$_c$	Decisive	6.19$_a$	7.32$_b$	7.92$_c$
				Ambitious	6.09$_a$	7.81$_b$	8.09$_c$
				Business sense	6.07$_a$	7.86$_b$	8.32$_c$
				Leadership ability	6.04$_a$	7.88$_b$	8.24$_c$
				*Worldly	5.87$_a$	6.67$_b$	6.82$_b$
				Willing to take risks	5.87$_a$	7.09$_b$	7.44$_c$
				Persuasive	5.80$_a$	6.79$_b$	7.01$_b$
				Assertive	5.67$_a$	7.40$_b$	7.96$_c$
				Intense	5.44$_a$	6.45$_b$	6.81$_c$
				Competitive	5.18$_a$	7.23$_b$	7.47$_c$
				Aggressive	4.41$_a$	6.16$_b$	6.98$_c$
				Forceful	4.39$_a$	5.89$_b$	6.58$_c$

Relaxed proscriptions				Intensified proscriptions			
	DW	DP	DM		DW	DP	DM
Yielding	6.05$_a$	4.31$_b$	3.91$_c$	Rebellious	3.96$_a$	4.79$_b$	5.31$_c$
Emotional	5.73$_a$	4.97$_b$	4.24$_c$	Stubborn	3.46$_a$	4.08$_b$	4.57$_c$
Impressionable	5.43$_a$	4.66$_b$	4.22$_c$	Controlling	3.19$_a$	4.14$_b$	4.87$_c$
*Child-like	4.96$_a$	3.94$_b$	3.33$_c$	Cynical	3.19$_a$	3.84$_b$	4.06$_b$
Shy	4.76$_a$	3.51$_b$	3.05$_c$	Promiscuous	3.02$_a$	3.63$_b$	4.39$_c$
Naïve	4.53$_a$	3.04$_b$	2.41$_c$	Arrogant	2.55$_a$	3.33$_b$	3.82$_c$
Superstitious	4.12$_a$	3.78$_b$	3.48$_c$				
Weak	4.11$_a$	2.12$_b$	1.69$_c$				
Melodramatic	4.10$_a$	3.64$_b$	2.70$_c$				
Gullible	3.99$_a$	2.63$_b$	2.13$_c$				

Note: DW = mean rating of desirability for a woman in American society; DP = mean rating of desirability for a person in American society; DM = mean rating of desirability for a man in American society. Means are based on ns of 177–204. Within each row, means not sharing a common subscript differ significantly at the .01 level. Traits marked with an asterisk did not show corresponding differences in perceived typicality for women and men.

Hegemonic masculinity – Socially celebrated form of masculinity; dominant form of masculinity within society

Emphasized femininity – Socially celebrated form of femininity that is defined by its orientation towards accommodating the desires and interests of men and its compliance to the subordination of women

Pariah femininity – Socially depreciated and stigmatized form of femininity defined by its enactment of traits associated with hegemonic masculinity and its refusal to embody the hierarchical relationship of dominant men and subordinated women

Hegemonic femininity (Schippers) - Socially celebrated form of femininity that legitimates a complementary and hierarchical relationship to masculinity that ensures the dominance of men and submission of women

Hegemonic femininity (in the new model) – Socially celebrated form of femininity that consist of a combination of traditional feminine qualities coupled with nontraditional qualities that leads to status, power and dominance for women who embody these qualities

Gender-intensified prescriptions – The traits expected and required of men and women

Gender-relaxed prescriptions – Generally desirable traits that are less important for a specific gender

Gender-relaxed proscriptions – Traits low in general social desirability but significantly higher in desirability for a particular gender

Gender-intensified proscriptions - Traits that are considered undesirable in general but even more so for a specific gender

Panem – Dystopian nation, formerly known as North-America, in which *The Hunger Games* are set

Capitol – The capitol city of Panem, interchangeably used to refer to Panem's government

The Hunger Games – annual televised games in which twenty-four children between the ages of twelve and eighteen have to fight to the death until only one survives