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Male enrollment and graduate rates in higher education have paled in comparison to female achievement since the early 1980’s, and explanations as to the reasons behind why males are falling behind have not been fruitful in addressing these issues. One area that has received very little attention in the literature is the role that gender role conflict may play in male student performance.

The purpose of this research is to explore male and female engagement levels, while attempting to understand if levels of male gender role conflict are a mediating factor of engagement for men. This study utilized the three subscales of Collaborative Learning, Quality of Interaction and Student/Faculty Interaction from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and all four factors of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2013a; O’Neil, 1986) in order to explore to what extent male gender role conflict is a mediating factor of engagement for males in higher education. The four factors of the GRCS are: Success, Power, and Competition, Restrictive Emotionality, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia, and Conflicts Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations.
Survey instruments were distributed in the Winter 2014 semester using convenience sampling of undergraduate students at a large Midwestern university. A correlational analyses yielded significant relationships between responses for the GRCS subscale of Restrictive Emotionality, and Student Faculty Interaction, in addition to NSSE total score. Relationships were also noted between Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men and Quality of Interactions, as well as GRCS total score and Student Faculty Interaction, Quality of Interactions, and NSSE total score. The student demographic category of year of birth was significantly correlated with Success Power and Competition, while college major was significantly correlated with Collaborative Learning. Lastly, the education level of the first parent/legal guardian was correlated with Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, while student education level at the institution was correlated with Quality of Interactions. Regression models utilizing these correlations yielded significant coefficients with varied predictability.

Overall, this study found that gender role conflict was a mediating factor of engagement for college males. This is the first known study to connect male gender role conflict to engagement levels on the National Survey of Student Engagement. Limitations and implications for future research are also addressed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In January of 2006, the population of Milton High School was anything but equitable in terms of gender distribution. This small Massachusetts school boasted an almost two-to-one ratio of girls-to-boys on the honor roll. Moreover, this distribution also extended to advanced placement coursework where nearly 60 percent of the enrollees were female. While administrators admitted that it seemed disproportionate and that it was going to be “looked at” this was not necessarily “news worthy” content. This abruptly changed, when the father of 17 year old Doug Anglin, a student at Milton High School filed a suit with the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights. The complaint made by Anglin cites a systematic disadvantage for males within the Milton education system. Specifically, “The system is designed to the disadvantage of males…from the elementary level, they establish a philosophy that if you sit down, follow orders and listen to what they say, you’ll do well and get good grades. Men naturally rebel against this” (Wetzstein, 2006, para. 4).

This lawsuit brought about a number of discussions on the status of males within education, yielding mixed results. As one letter writer to the Boston Globe put it, “Perhaps if Mr. Anglin spent more time teaching his son how to sit down and complete his academic tasks and listen to his teacher, and less time helping him file lawsuits, Doug would perform better in school” (Langton, 2006, para 6). Is it this simple? Over the past 15 years there has been a growing concern about the condition of boys’ lives (Frank, Kehler, & Lovell, 2013). Boys are 50% more likely to be required to repeat a grade in elementary school, one third more apt to drop out of high school, and six times more
likely to be clinically diagnosed with attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder or ADHD (Kimmel, 2006).

Capraro (2004) argues that the paradigms of power that have traditionally been used to understand the dilemma of the powerless do not allow us to understand the plight of those who traditionally sit in social positions of power. Mortenson, a senior scholar at the Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education, published a fact sheet purporting that over the past 30 years, the vast majority of progress made in the attainment of education has been carried out by females. Consider the following:

- The number of male undergraduates between 1969 and 2000 has increased by 1,570,000 or 39%. During this same time period, the number of female undergraduates has increased 4,501,000 or 157%.

- The percentage of women high school graduates enrolled in college increased from 25.1 to 45.6% between 1969 and 2000. Males during this same time period decreased from 44.7 to 40.9%.

- In all 50 states, the majority of bachelor degrees are awarded to women in every racial/ethnic group and between 1975 and 2001; 92% of the total increase in bachelor degrees were earned by women (Mortenson, 2003).

Concurrently, nestled within the discussion regarding the current state of males in education, is a growing advocacy for the role that hegemonic masculinity plays in the development and perpetuation of boys into adolescent and finally young men (Frank et al., 2013; Kehler & Martino, 2007; Kimmel, 2006; Laker, 2005; Mahalik, 2000).

Hegemonic masculinity can be viewed as a gendered practice that reinforces the social position of men as a dominant force, while simultaneously subjugating individuals who
do not meet the idealized version of a male (Bird, 1996). As anything deemed feminine does not fit into this hegemonic masculine paradigm (Bowman, 2008; Kimmel, 2006; Lobel, Kirspın, & Schiller, 2004; Paciej, 2010), certain forms of academic achievement are in direct opposition to the standard by which all males are held (Frank et al., 2013).

**Background**

Higher education has been the focus of a litany of studies attempting to understand and explain what factors contribute to the success and failure of students pursuing degrees (e.g., Svanum & Bigatti, 2009). While some studies focus on characteristics relative to institutions or certain programs, others stress outcomes such as graduation rates, accreditation and rankings (e.g., Carini, Kuh, & Klein, 2006). These efforts have generally reached similar conclusions in regard to a few specific areas: students who are engaged in higher education are more likely to be successful, student persistence is nearly synonymous with the success of a student, and student engagement is the way to success (Astin, 1999; Auster, & Ohm, 2000; Carini et al., 2006; Hu, 2011; Hu & Wolniak, 2010; Price, in press; Svanum & Bigatti, 2009).

Despite the available information on student success and engagement relative to both males and females, there is still a glaring issue in the eyes of many scholars and academic institutions alike. Male college students are falling behind, way behind (United States Department of Education, 2012; Paciej, 2010).

The United States Department of Education released its high school longitudinal study in September 2012. According to this study, since 1971, females have scored higher than males on every level of reading scores at the ages of nine, 13, and 17 (United States Department of Education, 2009). In addition, women have held the majority status
in institutions of higher learning since 1979 going from 51% of the population to 57% (United States Department of Education, 2009). Since 1981 women have earned the majority of bachelor’s degrees in the United States, and beginning in 1994, women in every single race/ethnicity category earned more bachelor’s degrees than their male counterparts. In 2005, women surpassed men in earning the majority of bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees (U.S. Department of Education, 2012b).

It should be noted that the comparisons being drawn in the latter and proceeding pages of this study are examining the inequities of male performance within the field of higher education and not generalizing the scarcity of male performance to all levels of society. Historically, males have enjoyed far greater privilege than females in nearly every aspect of society. Even today, for example, despite women earning the majority of all degrees since 2005, as of 2012, they still only earn 77 cents for every dollar earned by a man (United States Census Bureau, 2012).

From elementary all the way through high school and into college, male students have lower grades, lower class rankings and fewer academic honors than their female counterparts (Kimmel, 2006). While the disparity that exists between men and women is ever apparent, the study of masculinity as a mediating factor in this disparity is relatively new and quite scarce (Laker, 2005). While previous studies on the construction of masculinity have focused on adult men, few if any have explored the construction and pedagogical practice of teaching young men about their gendered selves within the college setting (Laker, 2005). As the principal purpose of an educational institution is to foster opportunities for the success and engagement of its students (Capraro, 2004), there is a need to study masculinity at every institutional level (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009).
Discussions on college campuses regarding the gendered lives that men lead are almost non-existent. This is largely due to student affairs professionals and classroom instructors thinking that the discussion of male gender issues through either the medium of a classroom (usually as a subset of women’s studies) or as a college wide subject, would somehow detract from more important discussions revolving around the experiences of marginalized groups (Laker, 2005). College men remain unconscious to the significance of their gender to their everyday interactions which in turn, reproduces inequality (Coston & Kimmel, 2012; Kimmel, 1993). These inequities affect not only women, but other men as well. Men that conform to the norms of masculinity are securing their positions through subordinating women, males with feminine traits, and gay men (Coston & Kimmel, 2012). Bird (1996) discusses the objectification of women, emotional detachment, and the suppression of nondominant masculine behaviors as mechanisms for contributing to unequal treatment. In order to understand what constitutes a nondominant masculine behavior, there must be an idealized form of masculinity that males look toward for ideas of normalcy.

Contemporary scholars have argued that in order to begin understanding the role that dominant masculinity plays in identity formation, we cannot discuss it in a singular form (Barron, 2009; Richardson, 2010; Wade, 1996). Through pluralizing masculinity into “masculinities” we can begin to understand that masculinity provides a different meaning to different groups of males at varying times (Kimmel, 1997). For example, the masculine ideals for college men vary based on their socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity or level of feminine gender expression. These varying types of masculinity stratify men based on these different dimensions of identity, yet the impact of this segregation is not
fully understood (Laker, 2005). Laker (2005) further argues that given the lack of attention paid to the experiences of men and masculinities in colleges and universities, it would seem as though professionals within the institution do not see the importance in learning about the male identity, despite recent attention being paid to male student success in higher education (O’Neil & Crasper, 2011). Previous efforts attempting to understand the paucity of male student success have pointed to generic conclusions that could be largely applicable to female students as well (i.e., living off campus vs. on campus, high school success as a predictor, sports). These studies have charged institutions with identifying disengaged students and getting them involved with meaningful educational activities, however they have not looked at socialization or more specifically, male gender role conflict as a result of socialization (Huh & Wolniak, 2010; Kuh, 2001a; Kuh 2013; Laker, 2005). Gender role conflict is typically viewed as a “psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences for the person or others” (O’Neil, 2008, p. 362).

Despite this perceived lack of immediacy in understanding what gendered identity means to college males, efforts are still taking place to try and understand why college men are falling behind. The bottom line is that college males have the same opportunities as their female counterparts, yet they are still choosing to not engage in purposeful campus activities which have been closely linked with student success (Hu, 2011; Kuh, 2003; Paciej, 2010).

**Statement of the Problem**

My study explores the conflict college men experience between how they are expected to behave and how they actually behave. The manifestation of gendered norms
occurs when individuals notice what most males and females do in a given scenario. Both males and females observe or are told what is acceptable or unacceptable behavior, resulting in men and women learning what is expected or not expected of them (Harris III & Harper, 2008; Lazur, & Majors, 1995; Wallace, 2007). On college campuses, males build on these already established norms of behavior (e.g., boys do not cry, wear pink, are tough and respond to problems with violence, to name a few), and become acutely aware of their expectations with regards to being masculine (Mahalik et al., 2003). In short, gender inherently contains the power to organize people’s lives (Mahalik, Talmadge, Locke, & Scott, 2005). Males are also incredibly aware of the consequences associated with deviating from prescribed gendered roles and as such, men avoid behavior that may arouse suspicion or give cause to their peers to question their masculinity (Frank et al., 2013). As a result, it is reasonable to anticipate that because of the pressure to conform to gendered norms of behavior, males may be reluctant in asking for help, support or engaging in behaviors or activities that run counter to their masculinity (Mahalik et al., 2005).

On average, college graduates earn almost 24,000 dollars more a year than their high school graduate counter parts (Julian & Kominski, 2011). In addition to these economic advantages, the importance of the college experience on male student development and maturation into productive members of society is critical. It is the once in a lifetime opportunity for people to be in an environment that is conducive for transformational change and personal growth (Bono, 2011; Kuh, 2003). Despite this, data suggests that males are not enrolling at the same rate as women and do not make the same level of progress toward successful degree attainment (El-Kawas, 2003). For
example, more women than men were able to complete their bachelor’s degrees within four years of beginning college at public institutions, regardless of race/ethnicity in 2005 (United States Department of Education, 2013). Indeed, male graduation rates, grade point averages and enrollment have fallen while female success in these areas has continued to rise (Kimmel, 2006; Laker, 2005; United States Department of Education, 2012a, 2012b, 2013).

While the topic of student success in higher education is incredibly broad and at times nuanced, previous efforts within the realm of student success in higher education have been largely compensatory, that is, researchers attempt to understand who has or has not benefited from their college experience (e.g., Kuh, 2003; Price, (in press); Svanum & Bigatti, 2009). These determinations are often portraits of what is currently occurring within higher education allowing institutions to understand in hindsight what they are doing well and what may need to be improved. These snapshots often provide a broad look at student success through looking at specific areas of student engagement and persistence (Carini et al., 2006); however they do not examine the role that male gender role conformity may play in college males choosing to engage or disengage.

In fact, to date no instrument could be found that might capture the dynamic role that gender role conflict plays in student success. For the purposes of this study, student success is defined as “academic achievement, engagement in educationally purposeful activities, satisfaction, acquisition of desired knowledge, skills and competencies, persistence, attainment of educational objectives and post college performance” (Kuh et al., 2006, p. 7).
The omission of how, and if, male gendered behavior impacts student success in higher education restricts the potential for understanding and dealing with the contemporary issues facing young men and their education (Consalvo, 2013; Frank et al., 2013). While scholars and administrators alike are aware of the current crisis of males in higher education, what is still not understood is if the conflict male college students experience regarding their masculine gender role plays a part in their willingness to engage and subsequently become successful. This is not to say that if a male student does or does not experience these gender role conflicts, a direct connection exists between student successes. Rather, this researchable problem suggests that this could be a piece of the broader puzzle of male student engagement, one that could aid in understanding an area of this complex issue.

As mentioned, previous studies have touted the benefits that academically engaged students earn specifically indicating that males, as a population, benefit less than their female counterparts (Hu & Wolniak, 2010; Kuh, 2001a, 2003). To this end, this study examines both male and female levels of engagement in order to further contribute to the existing literature. In addition, it is necessary to understand how males and females compare on levels of engagement in order to explore if male gender role conflict plays any part in the potential variance of engagement scores. The next section specifies how this is addressed through the explication of my research questions.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of my study is to understand female and male levels of engagement in a subset of student college activities, while explicating the dynamics of gender role
conflict as a mediating factor of engagement for men. The following research questions frame my study:

1. From a current population of undergraduate females and males: a) what are their self-reported levels of engagement on campus, and b) what differences occur between females and males?

2. For this populate of undergraduate students: a) what levels of gender role conflict do these college males report and b) what levels of gender role stress do college females report?

3. For this populate of undergraduate students: a) what connections, if any, exist between reported levels of male gender role conflict and their college engagement, b) what role does the intersectionality of student demographics play in the reported levels of gender role conflict and engagement, and c) if connections are present, to what extent does one predict another?

**Theoretical/Conceptual Framework**

The lens through which male gender role conflict is examined in my study was guided by Astin’s (1999) *theory of student involvement*, Pleck’s (1981, 1995) *gender role strain paradigm* and O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David, and Wrightsman’s (1986) *gender role conflict theory*. Combined, these theories assist in providing the foundation for understanding gender role conflict in student engagement for male students. In the next section, these theories and their respective instruments are identified and explained in further detail.

Student engagement has been typically understood to encompass two critical factors: (1) the extent to which students spend time and effort towards their studies, and
other purposeful educational endeavors, and (2) how the institution utilizes resources and cultivates opportunities for students to partake in activities (Auster & Ohm, 2000). Astin (1999) accepts that in order for a student to be involved, they must utilize varying levels of physical and psychological energy towards their educational experience. As such, a highly involved student spends a great deal of time and energy studying, being engaged in campus activities, remaining active in student organizations and contributing to discussion and interaction with their peers and faculty members.

Astin (1999) believes that the amount of time any given student has is finite. As such, the theory of involvement recognizes the finite nature of student time and the competition that exists between stewards of the college and other concerns in the student’s life. This theory suggests that the more a student is involved in college life, the greater the amount of personal growth, development and learning. Numerous studies have also found this line of thinking to be true; that is, the more a student is engaged during their tenure at an academic institution, the more likely they are to be successful in their individual pursuits (Astin, 1999; Carini et al., 2006; Klein, 2006; Kuh, 2001b, 2003; Svanum & Bigatti, 2009).

In reference to Pleck’s (1981, 1985) gender role strain paradigm (GRSP), the writings of human history position males as the focal point of the majority of research. This is, in part, due to the universality of viewing males as the embodiment of humanity. The norms of masculine behavior serve as a template by which both men and women have been judged (Levant, 2011). These norms or roles are not biological, but are constructed socially and provide inherent advantages and disadvantages to those who conform. For example, male depression may be connected to seclusion as a result of
conforming to masculine norms of self-reliance, and competition/winning, whereas alcoholism and lack of meaningful academic endeavors may be a result of conforming to masculine risk taking behaviors. Conversely, males who do not subscribe to these behaviors may benefit from healthier relationships and physical well-being, but may face psychological stress and turmoil from other men for not conforming (Mahalik et al., 2005).

Pleck’s (1981, 1995) GRSP suggests modern gender roles are opposing and inconsistent, and that the majority of people violate these gender roles. The result leads to condemnation on some level (either internal or through peer networks), which results in individuals overconforming to these norms in an effort to compensate for perceived nonconformity. The violation of these norms is inevitable and consequences can be severe and impact numerous facets of a man’s life. Lastly, the GRSP contends that many of the behavioral traits males are expected to exhibit are dysfunctional and at odds with one another. For example, to be a good father requires aspects of compassion, patience, and tenderness, which are at odds with traditional manhood (Kimmel, 2005; Levant, 2011).

The last theoretical underpinning for this study comes from O’Neil et al.’s (1986) work with gender role conflict theory (GRC). O’Neil builds upon Pleck’s (1981) previous work dealing with the gender role strain model. O’Neil defines GRC as a “psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences for the person or others” (O’Neil, 2008, p. 362). O’Neil (1981a) contends in GRC theory that men are inherently oppressed by the stringent processes of gender role socialization. The result of this socialization is men being limited from being fully functioning human
beings. The patterns that males experience in GRC are outcomes of gender role strain that can be understood and measured (O’Neil, 2008).

O’Neil (2008) published a 25-year review of literature dealing with GRC which spans from 1982 through 2007. In this review, O’Neil details the influences on GRC, the GRCS, findings from the research surrounding GRC and criticisms of GRC and GRCS. In this review, O’Neil (2008) hypothesizes that GRC has direct implications for everyone at all levels of life, while maintaining GRC produces negative consequences for males both personally and interpersonally. The tenants of GRC will be covered more in depth in the second chapter.

While the aforementioned three theories being utilized may seem unique by themselves, when combined, they provide a frame for my study. Presently, males as a population are experiencing a crisis in higher education (Kehler & Martino, 2007), which involves graduation rates, grades, preparation, and a litany of other issues. College involvement theory provides the foundation for understanding that engaged students are successful students. Students who are engaged have consistently been shown to exhibit behaviors opposite of what male students (as a whole) are exhibiting (Astin, 1999; Kimmel & Davis, 2011; Kuh, 2003; Paciej, 2010). For example, males have been shown to not engage in question asking behavior as much as women on college campuses (Addis & Mahalik, 2003). It is not because men do not have questions, but to ask these questions is an admission of being unsuccessful in understanding the topic at hand. Being successful is a paramount attribute for men, and asking questions goes against this prescribed way of behaving (Mahalik, 1999). In an effort to try and understand why male students are not as engaged as their female counterparts, an examination of male
behavior, one that has had little to no prominence within the literature, is necessary. The role that masculinity, specifically the internal conflict males experience regarding conformity to masculine norms, plays in their choices to engage or not provides insight into an area that has yet to be fully explored. This exploration is valuable in understanding a new area of influence in college males and the tendency for this influence to contribute to their levels of engagement. The complexity in how the aforementioned theories and concepts frame my research can be viewed pictorially in Figure 1.

**Methods Overview**

The population studied consisted of 212 undergraduates from a large Midwestern institution; 127 females and 85 males. Access had been given to a large lecture hall section in order to obtain appropriate sample sizes. To address my research questions, two instruments comprised of three existing validated measurements were utilized: (1) three subscales of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) including: Collaborative Learning, Student/Faculty Interaction and Quality of Interactions, because these subscales specifically measure the social interaction and initiative students make towards others on the college campus (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2013a), (2) the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O’Neil et al., 1986) to measure inherent gender role conflict, and (3) the Feminine Gender Role Stress Scale (Gillespie & Eisler, 1992) in order to measure gender role stress exhibited by female participants. Approval to use these instruments was obtained from O’Neil, Gillespie, and NSSE director McCormick. My methodology is explained in greater detail in the third chapter, including specifics regarding the sample, procedure, and the methodology as a whole.
The “psychological state in which the socialized male gender role has negative consequences for the person and others (O’Neil 2008, p. 362). Gender role conflict is operationally defined by four psychological domains, numerous situational contexts and three types of personal experiences.

**Gender Role Strain Paradigm (Pleck, 1981, 1995):** Gender roles are defined by gender role stereotypes and norms imposed on children by parents, teachers and peers.

**Level of Student Engagement**

Theory of Student Involvement
(Astin, 1999): The more a student is involved in college life, the greater the amount of personal growth, development and learning. Increased engagement leads to greater college success.

---

**RQ1:** From a current population of undergraduate males and females: a) what are their self-reported levels of engagement on campus and b) what differences occur between males and females?

**RQ2:** For this population of undergraduate students: a) what levels of gender role conflict do these college males report? And b) what levels of gender role stress do college females report?

**RQ3:** For this population of undergraduate students: a) what connections, if any, exist between reported levels of male gender role conflict and their college engagement, b) what role does the intersectionality of student demographics play in the reported levels of gender role conflict and engagement, and c) if connections are present, to what extent does one predict another?

---

**Instruments Used to Measure Research Questions**


**NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement)**
Three subscales: Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Quality of Interaction.

---

*Figure 1.* Theoretical/Conceptual Framework (Arndt, 2014).
Significance

As the current college student population continues to become more diverse, a premium needs to be placed on understanding subgroups within the population in order to address potential needs revolving around support and encouragement (Noldon & Sedlacek, 1998). As male students enter a university setting, they bring their experiences and beliefs that are assumed to carry over into their workplace attitudes and principles. If colleges and universities endeavor to address and accommodate diversity on college campuses, males must be a part of that discussion. In order to study college males, an understanding of the social construction of masculinity and moreover, the inherent burdens men feel to obey these standards must be done (Davis & Laker, 2009).

Therefore, comprehending gendered behavior and educational experiences is absolutely critical (Alexander, Mundrake, & Brown, 2009; Bono, 2011). Within the academic setting, a disparity exists between understanding the social construction of male masculinities and the dynamic of student success (Frank et al., 2013).

Within the campus setting, gender studies programs examine women’s issues (including other marginalized groups), while matters concerning men are overlooked. When placed in context with the historical roots of education, especially access to education, it is understandable why this was and continues to be the case. Traditionally, males have often been the focal point of history and higher education (Wallace, 2007), yet their socialization and the impact this process has on their lives has been largely understudied as a teachable discourse (Osborne, 2010). What is less commonly thought about, is that by calling attention to the necessity of studying women’s identities, colleges are proclaiming that gender matters in the healthy development of their students (Laker,
Failure to examine the power and implications associated with masculinity and identity development only serves to reinforce the already preexisting structures with little to no hope for change (Laker, 2005). Schrock and Schwalbe (2009) point out the need to understand and study institutionalized masculinity, while others contend that schools need to explore masculinity and engagement respectively in order to boost student involvement, while challenging dominant ways of thinking that may be holding male students back (Bono, 2011; Bowman, 2008; Kehler & Martino, 2007).

**Limitations and Delimitations**

The population utilized for my study was obtained from a large Midwestern institution and thus, my results are delimited to that population and therefore not necessarily representative of the population as a whole. Moreover, the population itself can be considered a limitation because of their respective levels of disengagement. College males may not have wanted to participate because of perceived masculine norm violations or their disinterest as a whole (Paciej, 2010). This might have also resulted in participants not taking the survey seriously or completing the instrument as fast as possible without carefully considering each question. Another limitation is the utilization of a self-report surveys which, while a valid measure of assessment, does carry inherent restrictions. Often, these reports are subject to the halo effect, whereby students may look upon aspects of their performance such as grades, effort, and benefits gained from college positively resulting in inflated results (Kuh, 2001a).

My study is also delimited in its measure of all aspects of student engagement, because it focuses on only three subscales of the NSSE. This was a conscious and practical decision because of the existing length of the GRCS and the full NSSE survey.
While other areas of engagement are possible and probable, this study only focused on three. In addition, student success in college is often defined as a mixture of student persistence and student engagement. While questions exist on the NSSE that address persistence, it was not focused on specifically for this study.

**Chapter I Summary**

Male students continue to fall behind in higher education and while information has been collected regarding their disengagement, it is not yet fully understood why they are choosing to do so. Mortenson (as cited in Jashik, 2008), believes that this is not only a crisis, but an institutional failing at the highest levels, by noting:

> The fact is male lives are falling apart at the growing margins of male welfare, and the utter failure of the education system to address male needs on male terms is indeed a crisis. We have shown what the education system can do for women when we set our minds to it (para. 10).

What has been left out of this discussion is the struggle males experience as a result of their gender identity development. Prior to this study gender role conflict has yet to be studied within the confines of university engagement as it relates to previously established measures of student engagement and success. This study examines the connections between the struggles college males experience regarding their gendered selves, and how that struggle may or may not contribute to their levels of engagement. The next chapter summarizes the existing literature on this topic in order to pour a foundation upon which the connections between male GRC and student engagement can be built.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to study the phenomenon of student engagement and gender role conflict, a review of the literature is necessary. To begin, an examination of the dynamics relative to student engagement will lead to social construction of masculinity, gender, gender identity, and gender role conflict. Finally an analysis of the relationships that can be drawn between engagement and gender role conflict will help paint the picture of what is known and what has yet to be discovered.

Student Engagement

The literature base surrounding student engagement is diverse and can cover a wide variety of subject matter with considerable variation. This variation can range from studying the complexity of student groups, institutional mores, individual students, assessment measures, behavioral characteristics and a litany of other subjects (Trowler, 2010). The benefits and results of student engagement are far too important to simply be left to their own devices. As Harper and Quaye (2009) suggest, the realization of social justice simply cannot occur if some groups of students enjoy the benefits of engagement while others do not. More than 70% of high school graduates in the U.S. will go on to take coursework in postsecondary education. Ideally, institutions are geared towards fostering an atmosphere that is conducive towards educating and engaging the ever increasing pool of diverse students. For decades, studies have consistently shown that when students direct their efforts towards academically purposeful endeavors during their tenure at college, they become more successful (Astin, 1999; Carini, et al., 2006; Kuh, 2001a; Kuh, 2003; Svanum & Bigatti, 2009).
In order for this environment to foster the necessary growth and development college students are expected to receive, students need to be socially integrated into their respective institutions. The more a student is engaged during their tenure at an academic institution, the more likely they are to be successful in their individual pursuits (Auster & Ohm, 2000).

Student success is increasingly becoming a central issue in higher education. It is because of this, according to Hu (2011) that colleges and universities pay particular attention to the presence of two issues: (1) student persistence in college and (2) student engagement in activities deemed purposeful in education. Student persistence and student engagement have often been thought of as two primary functions of student success with multiple facets and potentially complicated influences (Astin, 1999; Auster, & Ohm, 2000). Institutions that are capable of providing higher levels of engagement that include different opportunities for students to become involved can claim to be of higher quality than similar colleges and universities who do not provide such engagement opportunities (Kuh, 2001). The ability of an institution to provide support and engagement for their students will ultimately affect the ability of the student to not only successfully adjust to college life, but provide the foundation for continued success (Kuh, 2003; Noldon & Sedlacek, 1998).

Tinto (2000) suggests that one of the biggest indicators of student persistence is how engaged they are. Specifically, he notes that students fail to complete college and ultimately drop out because of lack of membership, or integration into the communities on campus which is shown to lead to higher levels of academic commitment. Academic success is not bound by the ability of the institution alone. Students who have people to
interact with, especially in times of distress, perform better academically and socially. It is important however, to distinguish between interacting or being involved and being engaged. To be involved in something does not necessitate being engaged. For example, it is entirely possible for a college student to be involved in study groups through sheer attendance, yet during their time with the study group, they are engaged in playing games on their phone (Harper & Quaye, 2009).

Coates (2007) believes engagement to be a broad construct containing both academic and nonacademic experiences. These experiences contain important notions of active and collaborative learning, being involved in educational experiences that enrich the student, feeling supported by the university, open lines of communication with academic staff, and being able to participate in academic activities that are challenging. Studies have confirmed these attributes as being vital in the success of students as they progress through their collegiate career (Bono, 2011).

The results of student socialization and engagement do not simply end after four years; the consequences are long lasting (Bono, 2011). Students having meaningful interaction contributes to higher levels of success (Price, in press). Disengagement, on the other hand has been shown to negatively impact retention and moreover, is one of the most common reasons that men leave college (Astin, 1975; Paciej, 2010). The fact that engagement and success in college are synonymous has not gone unnoticed by colleges and universities. Ku (2001) has been quite vocal about the importance of institutions of higher learning taking student engagement seriously. He contends that student engagement is a reflection of institutional quality. That is, as the engagement level of students increases on any given campus, so does the quality. Svanum and Bigatti (2009)
found that students who were highly engaged academically were 1.5 times more likely to not only graduate, but did so a semester sooner. They also found that not only were academically engaged students more likely to succeed over their disengaged counterparts, they did so in a shorter time frame, and had higher grade point averages than they previously expected based on a mid-semester assessment.

One of the newest strategies in engaging students is that of cultivating learning communities. Most of these communities are aimed at the advocacy of students taking coursework together, living in the same residence halls, and interacting with faculty and staff on a regular basis. The goal of these communities is to create a climate where students are not alone and feel as though they are undertaking the hardships of college life together. These communities have garnered promising results indicating that students that participate in these communities are more likely to benefit from enhanced academic performance, increase their social skills and have a positive outlook on their college experience as a whole (Zhao & Kuh, 2004). Yet, men are one of the least likely members on a college campus to join a learning community along with transfer students and students attending college part time (Hu & Wolniak, 2010; Zhao & Kuh, 2004). This is troublesome, because if male engagement and academic success trends persist, it is estimated that there will 156 women per 100 men earning college degrees by the year 2020 (Conlin, 2003). As Harper and Quaye (2009) contend, secondary institutions have a responsibility to understand the climate of a campus, where gaps of engagement exist, and subsequently spend time understanding the obstacles disengaged students are facing. This necessity leads us to one of the most disengaged groups of college students: males (Auster & Ohm, 2000; Kuh, 2003; Paciej, 2010).
The Development of Men’s Studies

The study of masculinity as a social construct came about just a few decades ago (Bird, 1996). In the late 1960’s, eminent power struggles between men and women lead to discussions and protests surrounding equality and sexism (Osborne, 2010). Nestled within these arguments is the following supposition; if discussions need to be conducted about the nature of equality between men and women, than it can be said that gender as a social construct is of importance. This importance had a number of different effects. First, because of the women’s movement and the push for equality, female students in higher education have made substantial gains and surpassed men in nearly all aspects (Mortenson, 2003, United States Department of Education, 2012a, 2012b, 2013). Second, almost inadvertently, this movement solidified the dichotomous view of gendered behavior (Osborne, 2010). Women act feminine, and men act masculine. That is not to say this view was not already ingrained without our conscious; that could not be further from the truth. What the women’s movement, and subsequently the men’s movement, created was one of the first open dialogues about masculinity and the collective experiences being shared amongst men, by men (Capraro, 2004; Osborne, 2010).

The foundation of this dialogue is that men can also be discriminated against (Benatar, 2012). Many men, both historically and presently, have been socialized to behave in a sexist manner without realizing their values, attitudes and behaviors have yet to be challenged or analyzed (Bird, 1996). As a result, numerous men were left adrift without instructions on how to adapt to the changing gender landscape (O’Neil, 1981a). While this review of the gender consciousness movement is by no means an exhaustive
or representative account of the complexities and hardships that are readily apparent in the literature, it serves as a stepping stone for how masculinity and men became more prominent within the public discourse.

Since the 1960s, scholars have attempted to dissect and make sense of the implications inherent within masculinity. This is difficult, as one of the staples of being male is not examining what it means to be a man (Laker, 2005). During the 1970’s, a growing trend was emerging amongst men aimed at identifying the male role within our society. The formation of male discussion groups became popular as they provided those participating with a safe environment to discuss male experiences. Part of the motivation behind these groups was the changing landscape of gender in the United States. With women and men now pursuing roles typically associated with the opposite sex, these groups aided in providing men with the tools necessary to redefine their masculine roles (David & Brannon, 1976; Osborne, 2010; Pleck & Sawyer, 1974). These discussion groups also served foundationally to articulate what characteristics men should or should not possess. As masculinities are typically associated with what men “do” and masculine ideologies deal more with the cultural beliefs about “maleness” or how to be a man, there are differences between being a male, and being a man (Barron, 2009; Kimmel & Kaufman, 1993).

It is important to distinguish between the notions of being male and being a man. Being a man is separate from being a male in the biological sense. To be a man is something to be achieved or earned through dramaturgical portrayals of behaviors that are acutely aware, regulated, and validated by other men (Kimmel & Kaufman, 1993; Laker, 2005). Men must strive to prove their manhood either because they are socialized
to think that masculinity is something to be proven or that it can never be fully established (Pleck, 1995). This portrayal is incredibly situational and contingent upon who is present and the environment one is in (Frank et al., 2013). Bem (1995) postulated that individuals who are tuned into these cultural definitions of what is or is not appropriate for their gendered behavior, use these prescriptions to shape the perceptions they hold of themselves and those around them. Thus, masculinity is a driving force in the sociability of men’s lives, however there is no singular objective test that men can perform to prove to both themselves and others around them that they have finally “achieved” the status of manhood (Barron, 2009). These hegemonic masculine norms are constantly being recreated regardless of individual departures or conceptualizations. The result is not necessarily altering the schema of “maleness” in our society, but rather penalties for men that depart from the established way of behaving (Bird, 1996). As such, male lives are lives lived in conflict.

Masculinity serves as a guide to navigate through the innumerable gendered norms, roles, world views and social minutia that restrict the lives of men (Addis, Syzdek, & Mansfield, 2010). Within the United States, there is a standard of idealized characteristics that men should have. Some of the most common traits include emotional stability, bravery, dependability, rationality, accumulating wealth, power, being adverse to femininity, aggressiveness, being competitive, and many more (Coston & Kimmel, 2012; Laker, 2005, Levant, 2011; Lobel et al., 2004). It is through the socialization process that the knowledge of these traits becomes engrained within all of us, guiding and influencing our behaviors and interactions.
**Sex Role Socialization**

The manner in which human beings view each other and the world around them begins with their socialization, a process often heavily influenced by their surroundings and caregivers. Sex role socialization theory contends that children are rewarded for demonstrating behaviors believed to be gender appropriate, a process that renders gender as a naturally occurring function (Risman & Davis, 2013). The role that family plays in the interpersonal development of identity cannot be understated (Levant, 2011; Mahalik, 1999; Risman & Davis, 2013). Our caregivers are our first teachers and the environment in which we are raised serves as our classroom. It is in this classroom that children begin to experience the process of socialization. Children learn early on that duties deemed domestic are relegated more towards women and femininity while responsibilities that incorporate physical prowess, and strength fall along the masculine spectrum (Harris III & Harper, 2008).

The interactions parents have with their children are incredibly important during the socialization process. Father-son interactions are informed and reinforced by the father’s pre-established notions of sex behavior coupled with his own pressures to behave in a gendered manner fitting for his son to model after (Harris III & Harper, 2008). That is to say, fathers typically feel directly responsible for the masculinity aptitude of their sons as they grow up. As Harper (2004) writes, “no father wants his son to grow up being a ‘pussy’, ‘sissy’, ‘punk’, or ‘softy’ – terms commonly associated with boys who fail to live up to the traditional standards of masculinities in America” (p. 92). This socialization is a critical step in the process because boys do not have the same interactions with their mothers. Mothers and sons do not share the same male
socialization process because of lack of physical similarities, in addition to the influence of cultural mores. Mothers do not interact as closely with their sons as they would with their daughters, and during discussions, are more impersonal with their language (Risman & Davis, 2013).

O’Neil’s (1981a) seminal article on the dynamics of sex role socialization and conflict explicates these characteristics that develop from traditional male socialization. These characteristics can be viewed in their entirety in Table 1. Despite traditional beliefs that biological influences play a significant part in the psychological differences between men and women, most researchers agree that the effects of family, peers and the educational atmosphere children are raised in are more influential (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Auster & Ohm, 2000; Bowman, 2008).

Table 1

| Psychological Patterns and Conflicts Developed During Men’s Sex-Role Socialization* |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Fear of femininity              | Restrictive emotionality        |
| Fear of emasculation            | Treating women as sex objects and inferiors |
| Fear being vulnerable           | Socialized competitiveness that restricts self and others |
| Fear of failure                 | Socialized power needs that restrict self and others |
| Low self-esteem                 | Socialized dominance needs that restrict self and others |
| Obsession with success/achievement | Limited Body awareness/sensuality |
| Work stress and strain          | Restricted sexual and affectionate behavior |
| Homophobia                      | Restricted communication patterns |

* Adapted from O’Neil 1981a

The socialization process is ripe with opportunities to confirm or disconfirm gendered behavior. Within the United States, masculinity is often seen as problematic (Coston & Kimmel, 2012). In order to understand how these patterns and conflicts are cultivated, the next section(s) will build from the socialization of children into young
adults. The notions of how boys and girls should behave based on masculine and
feminine ideals begins with the dichotomous socialization each is subjected to (Barron,
2009).

Children

With each generation males and females challenge and define the social
conventions of gendered behavior. For little boys and girls, this process begins as soon
as their expecting parents become aware of their conception. Kids enter a world that
differentiates between what constitutes a male/boy/man and a female/girl/woman (Laker,
2008; Paciej, 2010; Risman & Davis, 2013; Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). Once the child
enters the world, proclamations about the sex of the child are made in order to avoid
mistakes surrounding the traits or future aspirations of the child. Birth announcements
saying “It’s a Boy!” or “It’s a Girl!” are designed to provide receivers with a foundation
to remark on the baby’s potential and characteristics. For example, Adams and Coltrane
(2005) remark “Mothers attach cute little pink bows to the bald heads of baby girls to set
them apart from the supposedly rough and tumble boy babies who, it turns out, are not
only visually indistinguishable from girl babies but also slightly more fragile medically”
(p. 234).

The difference in treatment of little boys and girls is due largely to the behavior of
their gendered parents and other adults (Kimmel, 2006). Part of this process is the
communicative behaviors that children go through in order to convey their understanding
of this system to others. As Capraro (2004) contends, in order for boys to become men,
they must leave women and the behaviors of women behind, even if they are intended to
return and reconnect (at the very least romantically) with these feminine traits at a later
David and Brannon (1976) identified four primary stereotyped ideals that boys are typically socialized to believe. The first is called the *Sturdy Oak* and indicates the necessity for boys to be stoic, or not share pain or openly grieve. The second, termed *Give’em Hell* provides the foundation for boys to idolize violence, bravery, and to be daring in their behavior. This can often times be seen in the games boys play or the types of shows they desire to watch. The *Big Wheel* is next which stresses the importance of acquiring status and power despite the risks associated for both boys and those around them. The final ideal, *No Sissy Stuff*, can be one of the most damaging relationally for little boys. The stance for this socialization is the condemnation of boys displaying feelings or emotions that could be interpreted as feminine.

More than 30 years later, these mentalities have not improved and in many ways, are getting worse. In 2008 Michael Kimmel interviewed 400 young men between the ages of 17 and 26 as part of a book aimed at examining the socialization process that young men go through. Kimmel’s *Guy Code* was found to be made up of the following 10 values, attitudes, and traits aimed at describing what it means to be a man:

1. Boys Don’t Cry
2. It’s Better to be Mad than Sad
3. Don’t Get Mad – Get Even
4. Take It like a Man
5. He who has the Most Toys When he Dies, Wins
6. Just Do It or Ride or Die
7. Size Matters
8. I Don’t Stop to Ask for Directions
9. Nice Guys Finish Last
10. It’s All Good

What is perhaps most reifying about this list is the continued perpetuation of never admitting weakness or emotion while maintaining control and striving towards competitive victories (Kimmel & Davis, 2011). Part of the rebuff towards the feminine is
derived from the encouraged autonomy and lack of identification boys experiences with their mothers. Typically, the notions of men and being masculine involve the keystone quality of superiority over women while simultaneously rejecting or suppressing femininity (Norwalk et al., 2011). In as early as second grade, boys begin to relegate behavior deemed feminine as undesirable. They begin to utilize terms such as “sissy” or “fag” in order to express both displeasure with the offense and to communicate to the other boy(s) that whatever it is they have done, should not occur again (Frank et al., 2013). Homophobia is one of the quintessential mechanisms aiding in the construction of U.S. American male adolescent identity (Pascoe, 2005). Boys that are gender atypical are at significantly higher risks of being bullied, have less friends and higher levels of psychological distress (Young & Sweeting, 2004). Parents help this process by teaching their children these dysfunctional ways of thinking and behaving in order to prevent them from not fitting into a prescribed pattern of behavior (O’Neil et al., 1986).

Within the schools themselves, teachers polarize gendered behaviors for boys and girls and interact with their students in accordance. The questions they ask, the manner in which they respond, and methods of rewarding students for behavior are influenced by assumptions revolving around what the teachers believe boys and girls will instinctually respond to (Swain, 2005). As soon as children can comprehend the staticity of their gender, they move forward performing actions that reify their gendered identity (Paciej, 2010). Boys police the behaviors of their peers academically by denouncing things like spending time on one’s school work, which is viewed as being feminine and therefore unacceptable. These male peer groups can have a profound influence on the gendered identities of boys which in turn reinforce the socialization process they learned at home
(Harris III & Harper, 2008). There is significant evidence that suggests harassment from male peers is common practice against boys who willingly take part in schoolwork (Frank et al., 2013).

Other traits such as expressing emotions that are perceived as vulnerable or soft are met with ridicule and other forms of punishment in the face of other dominant males. Therefore, boys learn to admonish these types of expressions and restrict these displays (Addis et al., 2010). Peer groups are one of the most powerful ways that masculinity is constructed, reinforced and negotiated. Harris (2009) contends that peer groups actually trump a child’s parents in their ability to regulate and influence the identity development of children. The result for most boys is the dramaturgical portrayal of the average student, one who does not display they are working too hard, but is not perceived as unintelligent. Boys, therefore, cannot afford to be too different (Swain, 2005). As boys and girls mature into adulthood, the seeds that were planted relative to their gendered identities grow and manifest themselves into adult behaviors. Thus, independent non-feminine boys grow into independent men who may value intimacy and relationships quite differently than their less masculine counterparts (Kimmel, 2005).

**From Boys to Men**

As young males mature and proceed through adolescence, they have been socialized into enacting the prescribed essence of masculine ideals. At this stage, males begin to associate with various male dominated organizations that emphasize the boundaries between the masculine and feminine, the hetero and homosexual, while simultaneously separating the “men” from the “boys” (Adams & Coltrane, 2005). Males that display behaviors that correspond with assertiveness and competitiveness for
example are assumed to be greeted with approval and positive responses from their peers.

As a result, these behaviors become more prominent in personalities and portrayals young men convey (Addis et al., 2010). In college classrooms this is never truer. In one recent study, male college students felt there was less of a problem for male students to fall asleep during class, use bad language, and use another person’s work in place of their own (Alexander et al., 2009). While this type of behavior may seem less appropriate and more risky in terms of the social standing of the student in relation to the instructor and class as a whole, males are almost always associated with more risk taking behavior in an effort to regulate perceptions of masculinity (Kimmel & Kaufman, 1993). Boys learn rather early that they can impress those around them by talking back to their teachers and having a general dislike for academics while carrying a predilection towards violence and aggression (Schrock, & Schwalbe, 2009).

As young men progress into romantic relationships, they almost immediately encounter opposition to what they have been taught is appropriate behavior. In relationships, people are expected to be more open, and expressive with their partners which runs in direct opposition to the manner in which males have been socialized to behave (Wester, O’Neil, Vogel, & Danforth, 2012). Relationships that produce greater self-disclosure bring about greater levels of relational closeness and are often more satisfactory for those involved (Bowman, 2008). Many young men strive towards closeness with other men and especially women, yet they lack the inherent tools necessary to succeed in these relationships. This process, along with so many others already mentioned, leads to a conflict or strain between how males think they should act, and the behaviors required to be successful in relationships (Frank et al., 2013).
Male Gender Role Strain

Various socialization paradigms are built upon the premise that males and females learn the ideological tenets of what it means to be men and women. For men, there is a standard that has held the reigns of what it means to be a man since it was published in 1963 (Coston & Kimmel, 2012; Laker, 2005). Consider the following passage from Goffman (1963):

In an important sense there is only one complete unblushing male in America: a young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight, and height, and a recent record in sports. Every American male tends to look upon the world from this perspective, this constituting one sense in which one can speak of a common value system in America. Any male who fails to qualify in any one of these ways is likely to view himself—during moments at least—as unworthy, incomplete, and inferior. (p. 128)

Both the appeal and appall of this contention is that it explicates the struggle that so many men go through while simultaneously revealing that there is not a single male that can meet this standard at all times (Beasley, 2008; Bird, 1996; Consalvo, 2013; Frank et al., 2013; Kimmel, 1993). Masculinity can vary from person to person based on a myriad of characteristics (Addis & Mahalik, 2003). One’s race, ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, and physical ability all play a part in how a male perceives himself.

Intersectionality of Race

The generalizability of research utilized thus far can be viewed as both a limitation and an asset when striving to understand a phenomenon. In the case of men,
there is an underlying assumption that all males are socialized to achieve a standard of masculinity (Carter, Williams, Juby, & Buckley, 2005). While this assumption of uniform masculine ideals aids in addressing a larger cultural understanding of how men are socialized, there are inherent differences in the perceptions and standards of masculinity based on individual socialization (Wade, 1996). That is to say, the standard of masculinity in the United States, is that of white or European heterosexual American males. While the scope of this study is exploratory in nature, it is imperative to note that the ability to generalize the findings of past research, along with the present effort to all categories of men is short sighted. One of the reasons behind this limitation deals with the availability of a diverse pool of male participants. To assume that all males experience the same socialization process assumes that all males are exposed to the same messages, by the same people, and are expected to act and behave in the same manner regardless of their intersectionality.

The term intersectionality was coined by Crenshaw in 1989 to illustrate the manner in which multiple burdens intersect (one’s race and one’s sex for example) resulting in multiple disadvantages for a person, and yet they are only viewed on a single axis framework of marginalization. Crenshaw’s (1989) analogy dealing with the marginalization of black women still proves to be a lucid example of the power of intersectionality:

Imagine a basement which contains all people who are disadvantaged on the basis of race, sex, class, sexual preference, age and/or physical ability. These people are stacked – feet standing on shoulders – with those on the bottom being disadvantaged by the full array of factors, up to the very top,
where the heads of all those disadvantaged by a singular factor brush up against the ceiling. Their ceiling is actually the floor above which only those who are not disadvantaged in any way reside. In efforts to correct some aspects of domination, those above the ceiling admit from the basement only those who can say that “but for” the ceiling, they too would be in the upper room. A hatch is developed through which those placed immediately below can crawl. Yet this hatch is generally available only to those who – due to the singularity of their burden and their otherwise privileged position relative to those below – are in the position to crawl through. Those who are multiply-burdened are generally left below unless they can somehow pull themselves into the groups that are permitted to squeeze through the hatch. (p. 45)

Crenshaw’s analogy is indicative of not only the struggle that marginalized groups regularly experience, but the propensity to understand how intersectionality impacts numerous groups of people. While intersectionality was originally posited for black women and feminism as a whole, recent efforts have applied intersectionality to a number of different arenas such as masculinity (e.g., Carbado, 2013). To say, for example, “men are scoring lower than women on standardized tests” takes into consideration the sex of the individual while ignoring the male’s sexual orientation, race, age, socioeconomic status, and a myriad of other influential identity constructs that most certainly guide the way in which a person behaves. As Jordan-Zachery (2007) articulated, “intersectionality has allowed us to stop essentializing differences” (p. 257).
While there are some tenants of masculinity that are salient to all groups of men, other characteristics may be canonized depending on a myriad of personal, political and social factors. As Kimmel (1997) discusses, the reason masculinity has been pluralized into masculinities is to acknowledge both the individual and collective notions of identity pertaining to male socialization. For example, it is understandable that one’s socioeconomic status, race, athletic prowess, age and other variables can contribute towards the complexity of male socialization (Stillson, Owen, & O’Neil, 1991). As such, attention needs to be paid to how these identities are established in particular environments and how these identities impact the relationships of those inside and outside peer groups. This is problematic because peer groups amongst men are not homogenous (Richardson, 2010). That is to say, the masculinities of a group of 12 year old white males may not match up with the masculinities of a group of 12 year old black males. Regardless of their respective ages aligning, the experiences of these groups of boys will be quite different.

As previously noted, the majority of studies dealing with gender role conflict and males have largely been conducted without the inclusion of men of color (Stillson et al., 1991). This trend of research is not new by any stretch of the imagination. As Wallace (2007) put it, “white males have long been the face of all that is good and right about human civilization” (p.14). While being the focus of the majority of GRC research, white male gender role conflict is a conflict rooted in privilege. All men experience tensions on some level regarding the implicit or explicit messages concerning conformity to the dominant masculine ideals. The standard being utilized for comparison is that of the European American male (Wester, Vogel, Wei, & McLain, 2006). This means that
white men are immune to the inherent conflict that men of color experience surrounding expectations to not only conform to the hegemonic white standard, but the individual standards imposed by their respective racial communities.

Lazur and Majors (1995) wrote extensively about this issue utilizing a historical narrative to describe the space men of color occupy. Often hindered by the roadblocks of discrimination and economic disparity, men of color are frequently viewed as outsiders by the dominant culture. Lazur and Majors (1995) note that for a man of color, the articulation of one’s own gender role includes integrating the dominant culture’s masculine ideals and then measuring himself against these ideals; the same set of rules that prevents equal access to the social capital necessary to sustain this standard. This means if a man of color acts according to his racial/ethnic culture, members of the dominant culture will view these actions as different resulting in restricted access to resources and worse yet, perhaps violence against him. By subscribing to the notions of the dominant culture, a system that for most accounts negates him, a man of color can be viewed by his own people as a sell out; a result of abandoning his racial/ethnic identity (Lazur & Majors, 1995; Norwalk, Vandiver, Englar, & White, 2011; Wade, 1996).

Despite these variations, males as a whole, continue to hold themselves against a standard that is not conducive for healthy psychological and interpersonal development (Levant, 2011; Mahalik, 1999). The result of these iterations leads men to struggle with their gender roles. Pleck (1981, 1995) discusses these struggles or as he calls them “strains” in his work on the Gender Role Strain Paradigm. Pleck contends that there are three broad ideas that have negative effects for males. The first, called gender role discrepancy is the idea that a significant portion of males demonstrate long term failure to
fulfill the expectations placed on them. Levant (1996) believes this strain has contributed significantly to the masculinity crisis in the U. S. In other words, men are entering domestic arenas where conflicts exist between traditional masculinity and more nurturing or egalitarian behaviors. The result is experiencing stress around what is the perceived right way to be a man, and their inability to live up to it (Barron, 2009). The result of not being able to fulfill these obligations typically leads to lowered self-esteem and an inability to deal with one’s emotions amongst other things (Levant, 2011; Paciej, 2010). Second, even if these roles are completed, the process through which males fulfill these roles is often wrought with trauma or the act itself is traumatic. Pleck dubs this gender role trauma. This trauma is often associated with the socialization of males to traditional masculine norms (Levant, 2011). The last point, called gender role dysfunction, is when males fulfill these expectations, the end result can be negative because many of these behaviors that are viewed as desirable for men to have (e.g., lack of communication skills, solving altercations with violence) are inherently damaging for those involved or even the males themselves. For example, a college male begins to feel depressed as a result of being called a “fag” for not being aggressive enough while consistently losing to his friends in various matches of sport. Within male peer groups, being called a “fag” is deemed highly insulting (Harper III & Harris, 2008) and typically reflects “a device of social control to maintain traditional male behavior appropriate to social situations…to control all men, not just gay men” (O’Neil, 1981 p. 208). This college student may experience discrepancy strain as a result of men typically being socialized to be heterosexual, and winners. If this college male was socialized by an overbearing parent to be a man, win at all costs and that nobody likes a loser, the psychological result of
continually losing can produce *gender role trauma* for the student. Lastly, in order to counteract the effects of not measuring up to these standards, the college student may feel it necessary to begin behaving in a hyper-aggressive manner and perhaps becoming physically violent towards others in order to assuage the taunts of his peers while simultaneously reaffirming his masculine ideology. This *gender role dysfunction* contains deleterious effects for both other males and the college student. Pleck (1995) provides an example of this in the adult lives of males. He argues that another area of prescribed/hegemonic masculinity is the expectations of relatively low levels of paternal involvement in exchange for being career driven and being the primary bread winner. The result of this *gender role dysfunction* was the production of negative consequences for both fathers and their children. Fathers typically reported lower levels of both well-being and occupational mobility. The effects of low involvement from fathers, according to Pleck (1995) predicted lowered levels of educational and occupational mobility for their children. It is important to note that masculine ideologies are not only implicated but essential in all three of these forms of male gender role strain (Pleck, 1981, 1995).

**Gender Role Conflict**

The tenants of Pleck’s (1981) gender role strain paradigm were influential in the construction of gender role conflict theory (GRC). GRC was the product of several theoretical and research papers presented in the 1980’s and 1990’s (O’Neil, 2008, O’Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995). GRC is multidimensional and complex given the socialization that each child goes through which makes this theory individualized (O’Neil et al., 1995). It is invariably difficult to blanket every single person’s idiosyncratic socialization
process, however there are broad categories that attempt to explain the struggle men experience.

O’Neil (2008) contends that there are four psychological domains, numerous situational contexts, and three personal experiences that operationally define what GRC is. These attributes can be viewed in Table 2. The four psychological domains deal with the mental and behavioral problems associated with gender role conflict. The cognitive (thinking), affective (feeling), behavioral (doing) and unconscious (unknown or repressed) experiences of individuals are complex and can be experienced in multiple contexts (Beaglaoich, Sarma, & Morrison, 2013; O’Neil et al., 1995; O’Neil, 2008, O’Neil, Fishman, & Kinsella-Shaw, 1987).

Table 2

**Gender Role Conflict: Operational Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Domains</th>
<th>Situational Contexts</th>
<th>Personal Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive: how we think about gender roles</td>
<td>GRC cause by gender role transitions</td>
<td>Devaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective: how we feel about gender roles</td>
<td>GRC experienced intrapersonally</td>
<td>Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral: how we act, respond and interact with others and ourselves because of gender roles</td>
<td>GRC expressed toward others interpersonally</td>
<td>Violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconscious: gender role dynamics beyond awareness affect behavior, produce conflicts</td>
<td>GRC experienced from others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted and compiled from O’Neil (2008)

These situational contexts deal with the mannerisms, whether intrapersonally (within the person) or interpersonally that occur in a given situation. While there are
numerous situations in which males could experience these psychological conflicts, there are four categories that represent the majority of them (O’Neil, 1990). The first GRC situation, gender role transition, is a product of a male encountering events that alter or change the assumptions he holds of his gendered self. One prominent example of this is entering school where the previously established notion of a gendered self may be challenged and thus, need to transition (Consalvo, 2013; Davis, 2002).

The second situation is GRC being experienced intrapersonally. This situation is categorized by men going through negative emotions and thoughts resulting from the experience of not measuring up. This could be the self-examination that occurs after a male realizes that he is looked down upon because of a lack of athletic prowess, for example. The third situation, the interpersonal nature of GRC is where males manifest these conflicts in how they interact with other people. The final situation, GRC experienced from others, takes place when someone devalues, restricts or violates someone else for failing to acquiesce to masculine norms (O’Neil, 2008). Regardless of these categories, the gender role conflict males personally experience can be characterized by devaluation, restriction, and violation (Beaglaoich et al., 2013; O’Neil, 2008).

Devaluation is the negative critique of either one’s self, or other people resulting from the ability or inability to conform to stereotypic gendered norms of masculinity (O’Neil, 2008). The result of a male devaluing himself or another is typically a loss of stature, and at the very least a lowered opinion of one’s self or another. The second category of gender restriction takes place when someone constrains others or themselves to the norms of masculine behavior. These restrictions produce controlling behaviors in
people that can inherently limit one’s potential and freedom (O’Neil, 2008). Gender role 
violations are the product of harming oneself, others, or being harmed by others because 
of deviating from the prescribed gendered norms of behaving (O’Neil et al., 1995; O’Neil, 2008).

As a whole, when an individual male endorses an aspect of traditional masculine 
ideology this reinforces the expectations that he personally applies to himself. These 
masculine ideologies have the potential to both influence and regulate how traumas that 
occur are resolved. As Pleck (1995) discusses, the phrase “men can’t cry” is oftentimes 
looked at as a simple truth amongst men, yet embedded in this statement is the message 
that within contemporary culture men are not allowed the right to grieve or convey the 
intensity that any given situation or emotion deemed “feminine” may bring. Research 
has consistently found that gender role conflict is related to harmful beliefs surrounding 
deression, negative attitudes towards homosexuals or homosexual behaviors, lowered 
self-esteem, depression and negative perceptions of help seeking behavior (e.g., Davis, 
2002).

As Kimmel and Messner (1989) assert, the roles that are prescribed for males and 
females carry with them the requisite social dimensions for conformity. Meaning no 
matter how unsuited, males and females need to fit themselves inside of these social 
cutouts. This stereotyping of expectant behavior starts at a very young age and when 
males inevitably cannot fit into the expected norms of behavior, a conflict occurs.

**Gender Role Conflict and Engagement**

The case for masculinity and the perpetuation of gender roles has led up to the 
intersection of this study. It is unmistakable that there are prescribed roles for women
and men. These roles have dire consequences for both males and females, especially their development into adults. For males, numerous scholars contend the social construction of masculinity is undoubtedly playing an important role in violence, low literacy, harassment, and bullying in schools (see Frank et al., 2013). When males enroll in college and come face-to-face with the unique opportunities available to them, the conflict they experience can have detrimental effects on engagement and their collegiate success. The notions of masculinity and gender roles that males bring with them to the college environment is nothing short of insidious (Laker, 2005). As Blimling (2003) notes:

Men as defined by our culture are supposed to be self-reliant, exhibit independence, and confront new tasks with little difficulty. The freshman male often has difficulty admitting that he really does not understand everything about his new environment. To ask simple questions such as, ‘Where is the dining hall?’ Or ‘What do I do if I get locked out of my room?’ is an admission that he is not in control of his environment. When one’s ego is fragile and one’s self image is closely tied to the perceptions of other students, a person may be reluctant to ask simple and basic questions. (p. 106)

Something as simple as asking a question on campus can have repercussions for males. Men need to be sure that the reason they are asking the questions is substantial enough in order to warrant asking it in the first place. If, for example, a man is experiencing pain, the implication is to sort it out by yourself rather than express this concern to anyone else. The result is often waiting until the condition they are concerned
about is significantly worse. The fear in asking a question or admitting weakness is the barrage of insults and ridicule they may face from their friends for not knowing something or not being tough enough to endure pain (Conlon & Wojnowicz, 2013; Paciej, 2010; Willer, Rogalin, Conlon, & Wojnowicz, 2013). Young men have also demonstrated distancing behavior from intellectual work in college because it is perceived as feminine. The result can be embracing fields that endorse physical work which is viewed as more masculine, thus limiting their upward mobility through impaired success in school (Fine, Weis, Addelston, & Marusza, 1997). As you can see, the road to manhood is not an easy one, yet the alternative for failing to meet the standard can be quite detrimental (Kimmel & Kaufman, 1993).

In order for a male to adhere to his gender role, he must engage in a very cynical and cyclical process. When men feel as though their masculinity is threatened, they often attempt to recover their status in both their own mind, and the minds of others. The process of doing this often results in diminishing the status or standing of other men. One of the most common ways to reify masculinity is through insulting another man. The result is cyclical, in that these insecurities are contagious through creating seeds of insecurity inside of other men who in turn, do the same (Willer et al., 2013). Because of these social pressures, and insecurities, college men think they do not meet the masculinity expectations they believe their peers have for them (Paciej, 2010; Willer et al., 2013). In an effort to address these social pressures, St. John’s University conducted a unique study. The university formed the Center for Men’s Leadership and Service, which endeavored to create an environment that was safe and conducive for male students to explore their masculinity, share their stories, and be a part of service-oriented
projects (Osborne, 2010). As part of the Center for Men’s Leadership, all incoming freshmen are required to take the GRCS two times. During the first round of questions, students are instructed to relate the questionnaire to themselves and to answer honestly. They are instructed to take the questionnaire again, however this time they are instructed to answer how they think their male peers will answer the questions. The results indicated that the male students believed their peers were much more masculine than they actually are (Kellom & Raverty, 2006).

In a recent attempt to understand what actions men take when falling short of their masculine expectations, Willer et al. (2013) developed the masculinity overcompensation thesis. This thesis asserts that men react to their masculine deficiencies by enacting a more extreme version of masculinity. As a way of coping with these masculine paucities, college men may fake behaviors in order to portray their compliance with these norms of behavior. As Kimmel (2004) contends, men end up “performing” masculinity. This construction and portrayal of masculinity restricts men from revealing an authentic self, and inspires them to carry out a version of themselves often to the detriment of not only themselves, but everyone else they come in contact with (Laker, 2005).

**Engagement**

School settings have the propensity to be a conduit for the reification of gendered ideologies (Whitehead, 2002). The complexities of how masculinity and anti-academic performance are interwoven into the fabric of our culture is not fully understood (Frank et al., 2013). The lack of existing literature combined with the complexity of this issue provides a necessity for the present study. A traditional aged college student enters a campus with the same developmental needs/issues as their peers which includes seeking
achievement, autonomy and identity development regardless of each individual male’s academic prowess (Noldon & Sedlacek, 1998). As previously discussed, part of the identity development of males as a whole involves being withdrawn in a number of different ways. Any student who is at risk often exhibits patterns of withdrawal or disengagement from school. Often, these exact patterns result in the student leaving school without graduating (Finn & Voelkl, 1993). These patterns are built prior to students reaching college campuses.

Numerous studies suggest that the level of engagement that students have in high school will carry over to their habits and success in college (Auster & Ohm, 2000; Consalvo, 2013; Paciej, 2010). For high school men, one of their greatest concerns is being able to demonstrate that they are normative in their masculine displays, so as not to entice harassment (Frank et al., 2013). Based on this, the habits being formed prior to entrance into college are at odds with academic success. Thus, these habits are built upon in college and perpetuated through male engagement patterns. These debilitating habits present an incredible dilemma for males when they reach traditional college age: the lack of connection.

In a longitudinal, mixed methods study on male friendships that took place over two decades, Way (2013) found that boys, among other things, crave the ability to share their secrets with close friends, and yet over time they lose most of their close friends despite their desires to keep them. As Way states:

The conceptions of manhood and maturity in the United States and elsewhere rest on valuing emotional stoicism and autonomy exclusively. Those of us from the United States and in many other places typically tell
our children, particularly as they reach late adolescence, that they must not only separate from their parents but also from their peers and move toward independence. We tell our children to think for themselves and not worry about what others think or feel. In other words, we foster ways of being that are not natural and do not bring about psychological or physical health for boys or girls, men or women. When asked what it would be like to be a girl, Andy, at the age of 17 says: “It might be nice to be a girl because then you wouldn’t have to be emotionless.” American culture, in other words, appears to foster the crisis of connection that the boys in my studies face in late adolescence and the crisis of connection that Americans are facing in the early 21st century. (p. 211)

Intimacy and connection amongst males is often facilitated on college campuses through membership in a fraternity. Other males find connection within the confines of sports, drinking and other homosocial masculine activities (Osborne, 2010; Paciej, 2010). Yet, this sense of connection is often positioned around actions that advocate violence, degrading and objectifying women, homophobia and extreme levels of drinking (Nuwer, 1999). Males need intimacy on numerous levels, yet as long as the notion of intimacy is associated with femininity, men reject these needs unless there is an ability to interject a mediating factor (Bowman, 2008; Capraro, 2004). One such mediating factor includes the use of alcohol. The instances of alcohol abuse on campus by males has been well documented (Kimmel, 2004; Laker, 2008; Paciej, 2010). Many males feel as though they need to drink because that is what is expected of them. While drunk, a window of opportunity opens for men to actually engage interpersonally with others about their
feelings and desires. As being drunk is the only venue where this type of behavior is acceptable, engaging in sober discourse on campus that could allow men to engage with their peers tends to be highly inauthentic because genuine disclosure may be a source of conflict or shame (Kimmel, 2004; Mahalik, 2000). Men restrict most types of emotional expression because of the latent struggle between their internal opinions about suitable masculine behavior and their fear of appearing feminine and thus being devalued by other men (Rando, Rogers, & Brittan, 1998). In addition to alcohol consumption, many males typically attempt to bridge this gap by engaging in shaming or disingenuous behavior in order to feel close to others. Through joking or putting other men down, men negotiate the inherent tensions felt over the need for intimacy; tensions arising from an inability to form authentic and intimate relationships because of heteronormative behavior (Frank et al., 2013; Kimmel & Kaufman, 1993).

Through the review of masculine literature, the results have been consistently clear: male gender role conflict as a product of masculinity has been “positively correlated with negative intrapersonal consequences for men, most notably depression, anxiety, stress, measures of self-esteem, substance use and abuse, as well as alexthymia and shame” (Wester et al., 2012, p. 200). The psychological effects of the conflict and strain males experiences through socialization can be viewed in greater detail in Table 3.

It is clear that males who experience these consequences as a result of gender role conflict could have trouble engaging in college settings. When studied, behaviors associated with student development and achievement in college and those that constitute adherence to traditional masculinities, are at odds with each other (Harris III & Harper,
Table 3

*Psychological Patterns and Conflicts Developed During Men’s Sex-Role Socialization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Life</th>
<th>Home and Family Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited intimacy with other men, women and children</td>
<td>Role overload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital conflict</td>
<td>Sexual dysfunction/dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of aging</td>
<td>Family violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of retirement</td>
<td>Inabilities in active and positive parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>Inabilities in active and positive parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over/covert subordination of women and children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Development and Work Life</th>
<th>Physical Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of failure</td>
<td>Health problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork</td>
<td>Drug, alcohol and food abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success bind</td>
<td>Early death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career ladder bind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work stress and strain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadwinner bind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of unemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from O’Neil (1981a)

2008). Colleges and universities around the nation spend significant amounts of time and money in an attempt to support students on their collegiate journey. The programs and services designed to help students through this process, especially male students who are falling behind, simply are not being utilized by men (Capraro, 2004). Men have cited in previous efforts feeling a lack of support on campuses while simultaneously being worried about how their actions will be interpreted by their peers (Davis, 2002). While the data is clear that men are not as engaged as women, the contention being offered in this study is that the conflict males experience as a result of trying to negotiate their gendered identities plays a part in this. As Kahn et al. (2011) explains “academic settings require cooperation, sometimes with women in positions of authority, and that the hegemonic masculinity requisites to “reject the feminine” renders these relationships
difficult at best” (p. 76). Environments in higher education in addition to many of the programs that are being offered to men may very well be looked at as a source of shame by college males (Capraro, 2004). As previously mentioned, the performance of feminine behaviors is typically viewed as negatively impacting the gendered roles males are expected to play (Bowman, 2008; Coston & Kimmel, 2012; Davis, 2002). Being able to survive and flourish in college necessitates having a desire and ability to connect and get support from other people (Harris III & Harper, 2008). These willing individuals are more likely to be able to adapt to new environments and potentially more likely to be engaged (Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011). Capraro (2004) theorized the majority of college men look at enrolling in programs designed to help them as a return to domesticity, or are inherently nurturing and therefore viewed as feminine. As Capraro goes on to say, because men are the most vulnerable beginning their college career, their own masculinity serves to sabotage the very resources designed to help them through this transition.

**Chapter II Summary**

The crisis of males in higher education is not being assuaged by current efforts to address the paucity of male performance. One area that has a high impact for male student development is that of gender role conflict. This area has not previously been explored as a catalyst for male student engagement at the collegiate level. If institutions of higher learning want to create environments that are conducive for all students to excel in, it behooves them to understand the identity development of men. Through using the lens of gender role conflict, we may begin to understand one potential area of influence in the reasoning behind why college men are not engaging (Davis, 2002). Rather than
assume all male-identified people share similar engagement behaviors, my interest is to see whether masculine gender role conflict is related to male student engagement. With this in mind, let us turn to chapter III where I will detail the methods used for my study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The intent of this study is to ascertain male and female levels of engagement in a subset of student college activities, while examining the dynamics of gender role conflict as a mediating factor of engagement for men. In order to accomplish these goals, a quantitative methodology was chosen for a variety of reasons. First, as Bono (2011) describes, quantitative approaches tend to decrease levels of ambiguity associated with qualitative work while providing specific characteristics that can be validated, measured and assessed. Second, quantitative research is by design a means for being able to test theoretical assumptions by understanding the relationships amongst variables. In order to do so, numerical outcomes are produced typically through instruments designed to utilize statistical processes (Creswell, 2009).

Specifically, this study utilized a survey design which is typically employed when researchers are interested in describing trends about issues (Cresswell, 2008). Questions are normally designed so participants respond on a numerical scale indicating their level of agreement or disagreement with statements or questions. The questions themselves are often close ended and attempt to allow the researcher to compare responses (Creswell, 2008). As this study is asking how masculinity, specifically gender role conflict, plays a part in college male engagement, it may have been difficult for participants to delineate between how this process actually effects their everyday experiences. For example, a fish does not know that it swims in water because the process has become so ingrained in their existence (Mahalik et al., 2005). College males also have little opportunity within a university setting to distinguish the nature of their gendered lives and moreover to
construct strategies that enable them to understand or frame what their masculinity is (Brod, 1987). Structured inventory assessments such as a survey design, may therefore be viewed as a more comfortable manner of assessment for men as it would not require them to vocalize their feelings and/or emotions; qualities men are not “supposed” to be apt at (Kimmel, 1993; Mahalik et al., 2005).

Sample and Survey Implementation

The sample for this study was taken from undergraduate males and females at a large, public Midwestern university. Students varied from first through fifth year and were selected from a large lecture hall course during the Spring 2014 semester. Convenience sampling was utilized in this regard based on the population and location, meaning the participants in this study were those accessible in the lecture hall session, made available to the researcher, and were willing to complete the survey. This method results in limitations, because it is not possible to detail with accuracy whether these participants are representative of the population as a whole, however it did provide data to understand the research questions being asked (Creswell, 2008).

Prior to starting a study, the sample size, power and effect size should be determined (Hudson, 2009), and a power analysis is needed in order to understand how large a sample size should be. In the simplest terms, a power analysis indicates the likelihood that an experiment will be capable of detecting a given change (Shepard, 1999). In order to do a power analysis, an effect size, power, and alpha values are needed (Creswell, 2008).

An effect size is a standardized measure that is utilized to understand the magnitude of difference between groups (Portney & Watkins, 2009). This is measured
through units of standard deviation and makes up for any variability in the outcomes among the individuals within each group (Palisano, 2011). The traditional effect size when studying a population within educational research is .50 (Murphy & Myors, 1998), which means that the magnitude of the difference between the means of the groups being studied is 0.50 standard deviation units. Thus, alpha and power values calculated for my study are .05 and .70 respectively, which produced a minimum requirement of 100 participants (50 males, 50 females). Any number below the minimum requirement for the sample size would increase the likelihood that differences between the populations being studied are due to chance and not from the effect being studied.

**Survey Implementation**

Access was granted to a mass lecture hall course during the Spring 2013 semester. The course had a maximum capacity of 280 students, and at the time of writing this had a current enrollment of 250. The instructor is a member of my dissertation committee. The class did not know who I was, nor did I have any influence or previous relationship with anyone in the class. The instructor was not present when students began their survey work and did not inform the students they were a member of my committee. This is important in order to reduce the likelihood of coercion based on authority. With 20 minutes left in the class, the instructor turned the floor over to me. I then followed the script as outlined in Appendix A. As the protocol was being read to the class, two of my assistants began handing out manila envelopes with the HSIRB protocol and a blank index card, both stapled to the front of the envelope. The blank index card served as an incentive for participants to complete the survey. Participants put their name and email address on the index card, and turned it in separate from their survey. After I finished
reading the script, the instructor read their portion of the script indicating that they would not be remaining in the room, participation was both voluntary and anonymous and those choosing not to participate would remain seated and at the conclusion of class they could return their blank survey and leave. The manila envelope distributed contained two versions of the survey. The first version of the survey was printed on green paper and had the NSSE subscales in addition to the GRCS scale. The first page had the word “Male” printed in large font. The second survey was printed on yellow paper and contained the NSSE subscales along with the FGRS scale. The first page had the word “Female” printed in large font. Students were instructed to select the survey that most closely corresponds to their sex.

Instrument

Surveys instruments are popular within education research because of their inexpensive nature and ease of development and execution (Carini et al., 2006). An instrument to collect data for my specific research purpose could not be found after an extensive search, therefore it was created. The “Male” version of the survey was created by combining the three subscales of the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2008) and all of the questions from the GRCS (O’Neil et al., 1986). The “Female” version of the survey was created by combining the same three subscales of the NSSE but in place of the GRCS, the Feminine Gender Role Stress scale (FGRS) (Gillespie & Eisler, 1992) was used. Consent for usage of existing survey instruments, was provided by all parties, the correspondence of which can be viewed in Appendix D. Both sexes answered the NSSE subscale questions first. After each respective sex completed either the GRCS or the FGRS they answered the same demographic questions. While the focal point of
the study is on college males, the inclusion of FGRS questions was needed in order to keep the overall length, time, and continuity of the survey intact. The data from the female questions was not directly compared to the male responses of the GRCS, as the FGRS scale of the female survey was not written from the same philosophical standpoint as the GRCS. To date, after extensive inquiry, there was not a female gender role conflict scale that could be utilized, and while the construction of one is not infeasible, it was not within the scope of this study.

The purpose of this study is to understand the role that male gender role conflict plays in male students being engaged in higher education. It is important to understand how men and women differ in terms of their engagement (hence both sexes taking the NSSE subscales). Since males are the focal point of this study, female students did not need to take the GRCS. However, it would have been abundantly clear to the class that female students did not have the same workload when they completed the first 13 questions, answered the demographics and were finished, while the male students still had another 37 questions to complete. This could have resulted in males not completing the entire survey, or rushing through the survey in order to be done as quickly as the females.

As such, the inclusion of the FGRS scale (Gillespie & Eisler, 1992) was imperative not only for continuity in the length of each survey, but also for exploratory measures. While not a focal point of the present effort, female gender role stress could certainly play a role in whether or not females are engaged in higher education. Given the opportunity, it seemed appropriate to utilize a scale that may help foster future inquiry into this line of questioning. The findings from the FGRS scale were not the focal point...
of this study, but they are reported and listed in the limitations in addition to future implications for research sections respectively.

An easy way around the complications of having two versions of a survey, on paper, and being disseminated in class, would have been to use a web based survey administration software like SurveyMonkey. The reason that I chose not to do this is based on previous research into male student engagement (Paciej, 2010). In her dissertation, Paciej (2010) performed a web based version of the GRCS at a number of different academic institutions. She cited that one of the limitations of her study is that it is quite possible that only the more engaged students would take the time outside of class to go to a website and take a survey that was not required of them. As the population I studied may be already disengaged, expecting them to take time outside of the classroom to do something of this nature may have negatively impacted my study. As such, collecting the data in a classroom where students were already seated and available gave me a better chance of achieving my minimum sample size, while capturing the target population being studied.

The validity and credibility of self-reported survey data has been extensively documented (e.g., Kuh, 2001b). Self-reported survey data are generally valid if certain conditions are met (Carini et al., 2006; Pace, 1984; Pike, 1995): (1) the respondents know the information being asked of them; (2) the phrasing of the questions is specific and clear; (3) questions are aimed at activities that occurred recently; (4) respondents believe a thoughtful response is warranted; (5) the information being requested has the potential to be verifiable; and (6) the respondents do not feel embarrassed, threatened, that their privacy is being violated, and the question does not merit responding in a socially desired
manner. The NSSE, FGRS and the GRCS, were designed with these criteria in mind (Kuh, 2001b; Mahalik et al., 2003; Rando et al., 1998).

**National Survey of Student Engagement Subscales**

The NSSE was created in order to evaluate the degree students are engaged in activities on college campuses that are considered to be meaningful and educationally sound (Kuh, 2001a). The NSSE allows universities to understand their findings while simultaneously comparing them to other academic institutions around the nation (Carle, Jaffee, Vaughan, & Eder 2009). The majority of the instrument revolves around understanding student behaviors that have been shown to have high corollary relationships with learning and personal development outcomes (Kuh, 2001b). In 1998, a panel of experts was assembled to develop the original version of the survey which has been used in more than 1500 different four year colleges since 2000 (Carini et al., 2006; Carle et al., 2009). Previous versions of the NSSE have undergone extensive validation and critique by numerous scholars, all finding the instrument to be sound, valid, and to be measuring what it sets out to measure (Carini et al., 2006; Carle et al., 2004; Hu, 2011; Kuh, 2001a, 2001b). The instrument was revised in 2013 to incorporate new “Engagement Indicators” or five major themes of engagement which were adapted from the Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice. These themes are: Academic Challenge, Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty, Campus Environment and High-Impact Practices. According to the NSSE website, the new process has been “scholarly, rigorous, and collaborative” (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2013b, para. 11).
In order to tabulate engagement indicator scores on the NSSE survey, the first step involves converting respondent scores to a 60 point scale. For example if there are four possible choices for a question (e.g., never, sometimes, often, and very often) the responses would be given a value of 0, 20, 40, or 60 respectively. Once converted, the total subscale scores are calculated by adding up the questions associated with each respective subscale and calculating the average. This ensures that each subscale can be fairly compared.

The second step involves averaging the values of each subscale together. For each of the subscales, participants need to answer at least 4 out of the 5 questions in order to be calculated (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2013b). Participants receive an overall score in addition to category scores. The 2013 NSSE engagement indicators demonstrated reliable internal consistency measures when comparing freshman to senior students. These scores can be viewed in more detail in Table 4. Cronbach’s alpha scores were also conducted in my analysis chapter and are compared to these scores in Table 4. While all of the NSSE categories are of importance, the subscales being utilized in my study are found within the Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty, and Campus Environment themes. Specifically, the questions revolving around Collaborative Learning (4 items), Student/Faculty Interaction (4 items) and Quality of Interactions (5 items) were chosen respectively out of the aforementioned themes.

These subscales were chosen as they deal specifically with the social interaction portion of student engagement, an area that has been shown to be counterintuitive with dominant masculine paradigms (Harris III & Harper, 2008; Kahn et al., 2011; Kimmel, 1997). According to the NSSE website, the NSSE survey instrument utilizes a weighting
system in order to be able to generalize the findings to the entire population of an institution. As my study is exploratory and not meant to be representative of an entire population, the weighting portion of the demographics section of the survey was not necessary.

Table 4

*Internal Consistency Statistics for Three Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>First Year Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Senior Year Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning (4 items)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction (4 items)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions (5 items)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS)

Male gender role conflict, for the purposes of this study, refers to the negative consequences males experience as a result of adhering to traditional masculine scripts of behavior (O’Neil, 2008; Paciej, 2010). O’Neil (1981a, 1981b) believes that the traditional manner in which males are socialized is fraught with messages that are contradictory, unrealistic, and ultimately guide men towards a fear of femininity. The result of this is a conflicted male, one who demonstrates patterns of gender role conflict that restrict certain behaviors while simultaneously devaluing displays of feminine conduct (Mahalik, 1999).

The items on the GRCS categorically break these areas of conflict down into four separate parts. The first is “Success, Power, and Competition,” which has a total of 13 items that examine the extent that men are socialized towards focusing on their personal
achievements through competition. The second category is “Restrictive Emotionality,” and has 10 items which measure the extent that men are taught to avoid expressing their feelings verbally in an effort to escape being seen as weak. The third category examines “Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia,” and has a total of eight items aimed at exploring inherent difficulties men may have in expressing their care for and/or concern toward other men. The last category of “Conflicts Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations” contains six items, which are geared towards the level of difficulty men have balancing their personal and professional obligations such as school, family and work (O’Neil et al., 1986; Wester et al., 2012).

The GRCS provides participants with four subscale scores in addition to an overall score. More than 300 studies have utilized the GRCS in 19 different countries within numerous fields and disciplines (University of Connecticut, n.d.). Table 5 shows the overall mean factor loading, internal consistency and test-retest reliability for each of the four subscales on the GRCS.

Table 5

*Gender Role Conflict Scale Reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean Factor Loading</th>
<th>Internal Consistency Reliabilities</th>
<th>Test-Retest Reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success, Power, Competition</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Emotionality</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts Between Work and Leisure-Family Relations</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from University of Connecticut (n.d.)
The Feminine Gender Role Stress Scale (FGRS)

The feminine gender role stress scale contains five overall factors aimed at understanding the perceived stress associated with violating feminine gender role norms. The first factor is “Fear of Unemotional Relationships” (10 items) and deals with the fear of failing to develop emotionally close, trusting and intimate relationships. The second factor, “Fear of Physical Unattractiveness” (8 items) deals with unfeminine physical attributes such as obesity. “Fear of Victimization” (6 items) is the third factor and represents situations where women are exposed to potential harm or violence. Fourth, “Fear of Behaving Assertively” (7 items) looks at the interpersonal confrontations and transactions requiring assertive behaviors. Lastly, “Fear of Not Being Nurturant” (8 items) is the fifth factor and involves questions revolving around losing custody of a child, losing a friend, and other dimensions of stress that are absent of being nurturing. The scale as a whole asks participants to respond based on hypothetical scenarios that may or may not occur in the future. The individual and collapsed variables can be viewed in greater detail in Appendix F.

Data Entry

The distribution and completion of my survey instrument was conducted using a paper format, whereby the participants circled or bubbled in answers directly on the instrument. Given the diversity of the questions being combined from three different instruments, using different scales, a scantron sheet was not feasible, nor was it physically possible to provide an electronic medium for every student in the lecture hall to take the instrument in person. As such, the data entry from the completed paper surveys was done manually.
Because all data was entered manually, there was an inherent risk of entry errors. The results of quantitative work are wholly dependent on the level of accuracy in constructing the data set. When transferring information manually from paper into a computer, there is little doubt that errors can and quite probably will occur. The result of errors, often unknowingly entered, can have catastrophic effects on the findings of a study (Atkinson, 2012).

Because the designation of questionnaires, at times, does not lend itself easily for the automatic capture of data, there are a number of methods that can be used to enter data manually, some of the most common being single, and double entry. The single entry of data into statistical software or other comparable spreadsheets involves careful training and monitoring of those entering the data because it is only done once. The double entry method involves the same rigorous training, however the data is entered twice in separate spreadsheets and then checked for accuracy. A number of studies have concluded that double entry is the most accurate method of manually entering data into a computer; therefore this method was used in my study. It is considered by many to be the gold standard of data entry (Barchard & Verenikina, 2013). The benefit in using the double entry method is that errors are caught almost immediately and can be addressed by looking at the specific discrepancy on the instrument. The downfall of this method is that it is far more time consuming and costly if employing individuals to enter the data (Buchele, Och, Bolte, & Weiland, 2005).

Another benefit of using double entry is that it increases the level of confidence between the information on the paper instrument and the data entered into the data set. The process involves two separate data entry workers entering the data independently of
each other in two identical databases. Errors are assumed to be made by both and will likely be randomly distributed throughout the data set. For my study, after the information was entered, an electronic comparison was made between the two data sets to locate pairs of cells that are not the same. Once identified, the original forms were located and examined, followed by making the appropriate corrections (Atkinson, 2012).

**Data Analysis by Research Question**

The sample for this study was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics to address the research questions. As a preliminary measure, descriptive statistics were run to gauge measures of central tendency referent to all research questions. Frequency tables were utilized initially to examine demographic characteristics dealing with year of birth, parental level of education, first generation college student status, Greek membership, education level, estimated GPA, race/ethnicity, and program of study (major). The dependent variable for the first research question is NSSE subscale scores, while the independent variable is gender. For the first part of the second research question, the dependent variable was GRCS scores and the independent variable was gender. For the second part of this question, the dependent variable is the FGRC scale and the independent variable is gender. For the third and final research question, the dependent variable was NSSE scores and the independent variable was GRCS scores. All significance levels were set at .05. Table 6 shows a cross-walk table providing a visual representation of the research questions, instrument questions, and the anticipated types of tests/analyses utilized.
Table 6

*Research Question and Data Analysis Crosswalk Table*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a From a current population of undergraduate males and females: what are their self-reported levels of engagement on campus?</td>
<td>Questions 1-13</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>Frequencies, Means, SD, Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b From a current population of undergraduate males and females: what differences occur between males and females?</td>
<td>Questions 1-13</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>Frequencies, Means, SD, Cronbach’s Alpha, Independent t-tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a For this populate of undergraduate students: what levels of gender role conflict do these college males report?</td>
<td>Questions 14-50</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>GRCS</td>
<td>Mean, SD, Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b For this populate of undergraduate students: what levels of gender role stress do college females report</td>
<td>Questions 14-52</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>FGRS</td>
<td>Mean, SD, Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a For this populate of undergraduate students: what connections, if any, exist between reported levels of male gender role conflict and their college engagement?</td>
<td>Questions 1-50</td>
<td>GRCS</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha, Correlation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b For this populate of undergraduate students: what role does the intersectionality of student demographics play in the reported levels of gender role conflict and engagement?</td>
<td>Questions 1-59</td>
<td>GRCS, Demographic Questions</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>Correlation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c If connections are present, to what extent does one predict another?</td>
<td>Questions 1-59</td>
<td>GRCS, Demographic Questions</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>Linear Regression Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first research question contains two sub questions aimed at understanding basic levels of engagement. Question 1a examines the self-reported levels of engagement on college campus for both males and females. Question 1b looks at the engagement
differences between males and females. The two aspects of research question one were addressed using data from the extracted three subscales of the NSSE. The first two subscales addressing this question (Q1-8) utilize four possible choices (very often, often, sometimes, never) and are categorized as a continuous scale of measurement (Creswell, 2009).

The third set of questions (Q9-13) can be classified as an interval scale, providing respondents with a numerical choice on a scale of one through seven. These types of scales are useful in social sciences and while they may not necessarily constitute equal measurements of attitude between each number, experts indicate “we proceed as if they did” (Shavelson, 1996, p. 18).

Prior to measuring question one, a Cronbach’s alpha test was run on each of the subscale categories and their respective questions. For example, in order to make sure the four questions being asked under the Collaborative Learning subscale actually measure instances of collaborative learning, a Cronbach’s alpha test is one method of ensuring reliability of these subscale questions (Grau, 2007). Next, the subscale questions were collapsed into their respective subscale categories thus creating three new variables. The three new variables and their number of questions are; Collaborative Learning (CL); four questions, Student/Faculty Interaction (SFI); four questions and Quality of Interactions (QI); five questions. In order to measure part A of question one, descriptive statistics were run in order to measure issues of central tendency. For part B of question one, independent sample t-tests were utilized to compare the average scores for the collapsed subscales of the NSSE (CL, SFI, QI) using gender as an independent variable.
Research question two inquires about levels of gender role conflict amongst college males and uses an interval scale (Q14-50). These questions provide respondents with six choices ranging from strongly agree through strongly disagree. Mean scores in addition to descriptive statistics provide a picture of where college males are for not only the overall GRCS, but for each of the four factors. The four factors of the GRCS are comprised of several questions that like the NSSE, will be collapsed for comparison. Each factor and corresponding items can be viewed in Appendix F. The measures taken for the first part of question two were utilized for the second portion of the question dealing with female gender role stress levels.

Part A of research question three examines the potential for relationships to exist between scores on the GRCS and the NSSE. A correlation analysis was utilized to explicate the relationships between the overall and subscale scores of the NSSE and the overall and the four individual factor scores of the GRCS. Utilizing correlation for the present study seems fitting, as the goal of correlation is to examine how closely two or more variables are related. In addition, the use of a correlational analysis provided the magnitude and significance of the relationships (if they exist) allowing a directional proportion (negative or positive) to be noticed (Prematunga, 2012). For part B of research question three, student demographics were entered into the correlation matrix in an effort to understand if the intersectionality of these characteristics can play a part in understanding the potential for relationships to exist.

For part C of research question three, if connections exist between the NSSE and GRCS scores, a regression analysis was utilized to understand if predictions can be made about the influence one variable may have on another. In general, this statistical
technique is used when attempting to predict the values of one variable by using the values of one or more other variables (Allen, 1997). For example, as GRCS scores increase, could student engagement scores (NSSE) decrease? If a relationship exists, a regression analysis can help understand the nature of the relationship and to what extent one variable influences another.

**Exploratory**

The challenge with the present study is there is very little known about this subject matter. As previously mentioned in chapter II, there is a substantial body of research surrounding male gender roles. There is also significant work regarding student success through engagement. However the same cannot be stated for the role that gender role conflict plays in male college student engagement on campus. A review of the literature on this topic produced one study, a dissertation, completed by Paciej (2010). In her study, Paciej utilized the GRCS in tandem with a customized instrument called the Student Life Engagement Survey (SLES). The SLES scales were based on the NSSE scales, however the SLES examined engagement indicators that dealt with individual participation in activities, not sub-scales found within the NSSE. The questions on the SLES were designed based on questions found within the engagement literature.

In her analysis chapter, Paciej (2010) found that the response categories for the SLES contained scales that were too broad and resulted in a lack of variability. In addition, Paciej inadvertently left out seven questions from the GRCS on the final instrument. While a factor analysis indicated that the altered version of the GRCS was still as reliable as the original, the author suggested that future research may need to
examine if the altered factors provide a high enough score for the participant to be significant.

While Paciej’s (2010) study provided one of the first glimpses into this arena, it was conducted in a different manner and using different instruments than this effort. As this topic is largely exploratory in nature, multiple types of data extraction were utilized in order to best understand what relationships exist between college male gender role conflict and engagement. Any and all extraction methods utilized are explained in further detail in chapter IV.

**Chapter III Summary**

This chapter provided the foundation for examining the research questions framing my study. Based on the proposed testing and extraction methods, the next chapter presents my analysis of the collected data.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS

The purpose of my study is to understand the levels of engagement males and females have in a subset of student college activities, while simultaneously examining the dynamics of gender role conflict as an interceding factor of engagement for men. The following research questions were posited:

1. From a current population of undergraduate females and males: a) what are their self-reported levels of engagement on campus, and b) what differences occur between females and males?

2. For this populate of undergraduate students: a) what levels of gender role conflict do these college males report and b) what levels of gender role stress do college females report?

3. For this populate of undergraduate students: a) what connections, if any, exist between reported levels of male gender role conflict and their college engagement, b) what role does the intersectionality of student demographics play in the reported levels of gender role conflict and engagement, and c) if connections are present, to what extent does one predict another?

In an attempt to understand these questions, a structured survey instrument was administered to a single course during the Spring 2014 semester of a large Midwestern university. At the time of administering the survey, there were approximately 246 total students enrolled in the class, however 218 were present on the day of administration. Of those 218 students present, 212 surveys were completed and returned constituting a 97% response rate. As detailed in chapter III, the surveys were manually entered following the
double entry data protocol. Once both databases were completed, they were compared using SPSS in order to identify inconsistencies. In order to calculate the error rate, I took the total number of errors and divided it by the total number of fields in the database (Buchele et al., 2005). The result was an error rate of .009%. This suggests that the database is an accurate representation of the information recorded on the survey instruments.

Description of the Population

Of those responding to the survey, 85 (40.1%) identified as male and 127 (59.9%) respondents identified as female. This exceeds the minimum required sample size of 50 males and 50 females based on the power analysis previously conducted. Almost 24% of the population were first generation college students, and the largest percentage of respondents were in their second year of college. The majority of students were not members of a social fraternity/sorority (n = 173) and the average reported grade point average (GPA) was 3.2. These specific demographics can be viewed in greater detail in Table 7.

The next section of population description deals with the level of education attained by the parents/legal guardians of participants. As a whole, nearly 8% of the population had at least one parent/legal guardian that did not graduate high school, while another 39% had at least one parent/legal guardian attend college for some length of time.
Table 7

*Population Description: Breakdown of Gender, FGCS, Greek Affiliation, and Educational Status.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation College Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a Social Fraternity/Sorority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another 47% of respondents indicated that at least one parent/legal guardian earned a bachelor’s degree and 40% of students reported at least one parent/legal guardian pursued education at the graduate level. Students also reported that their parent/guardian two had higher percentages of masters and doctoral degrees completed compared to parent one. Specifically, 16% of students indicated that parent/guardian two had completed a master’s degree compared to 12.7% of parent/guardian one. More than double the amount of doctoral degrees were earned by parent/guardian two (n = 12) when compared to parent/guardian one (n = 5). Individual category numbers can be viewed in greater detail in Table 8.
Table 8  

*Description of Population: Breakdown of Parent One and Two’s Education Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent 1 Education Level</th>
<th>Parent 2 Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or tech. school</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some grad school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final table describing the population studied deals with college major and year of birth. On the survey, participants were given an open ended question and asked to record their major. Because of the multitude of majors available at the university being studied, the majors were coded and then separated based on the college that houses each major. This was done in order to be able to draw inferences based on comparable groups of populations. After separating each major into their respective colleges a total of eight categories emerged. The vast majority of respondents are majoring in fields housed under the College of Arts and Sciences ($n = 151$) with the next closest being the College of Business with 24 responses. Participant year of birth (YOB) ranged from
1982 to 1995, with a mean YOB of 1993 (SD = 2.92), after removing one outlier with a YOB of 1968. Out of the 212 surveys received, 20 chose not to enter their YOB, while nearly 63% of respondents were born between 1993 and 1995. The details of College and YOB can be viewed in Table 9.

**Table 9**

*Description of Population: College and Year of Birth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Human Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to addressing the research questions for my study, the reliability of all GRCS, and NSSE factors was measured using Cronbach’s alpha. Table 10 compares the results of O’Neil’s original study with my study.
Table 10

*Gender Role Conflict Scale Reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O’Neil*</th>
<th>Arndt (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success, Power, Competition</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Emotionality</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts Between Work and Leisure-Family Relations</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCS Overall</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University of Connecticut (n.d.)*

The reliability measures in my study meet or exceed the original reliability scores reported by O’Neil (University of Connecticut, n.d.). As the range of Chronbach’s alpha scores are comparable in their respective and overall strength to those reported by O’Neil, the factors utilized in this study can be viewed as a reliable measure of O’Neil’s original construction of the GRCS (O’Neil et al., 1986). Table 11 shows the reliability for the most recent version of the NSSE compared to my study. Again, the range of Chronbach’s alpha scores in the current study are comparable to those reported by the NSSE indicating the subscales being used are reliable and consistent with previous work in this field.

Table 12 shows the reliability for each respective survey instrument, the GRCS and NSSE combined, and finally all questions on the survey combined. Chronbach’s alpha results indicated high values suggesting the items in question are closely related, enough so to adequately measure the constructs or questions being asked.
Table 11

Chronbach’s Alpha of National Survey of Student Engagement Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>NSSE First Year</th>
<th>NSSE Senior Year</th>
<th>Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning (4 items)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Interaction (4 items)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interaction (5 items)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Subscale Combined Overall</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from National Survey of Student Engagement (2013c)

Table 12

Reliability for Survey Instruments by Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRCS Overall</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSSE Overall</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRCS + NSSE</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Questions</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1

Research question one asked male and female participants to identify what their self-reported levels of engagement were. In order to measure this, both male and female versions of the survey began by asking 13 questions from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The first eight questions utilized an interval scale with degrees of measurement ranging from “never,” “sometimes,” “often,” and “very often.” The final five questions were on a seven point Likert type scale with “1” being labeled as “poor”
and “7” being labeled as “excellent.” The first four questions belonged to the NSSE subscale Collaborative Learning (CL) and asked participants to report the frequency with which they interacted with other students. The results can be viewed in Table 13.

Table 13

*Frequencies for NSSE Collaborative Learning Subscale (n = 212)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?</th>
<th>Very n(%)</th>
<th>Often n(%)</th>
<th>Sometimes n(%)</th>
<th>Never n(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asked another student to help you understand course material</td>
<td>28 (13.2)</td>
<td>63 (29.7)</td>
<td>101 (47.6)</td>
<td>20 (9.4)</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained course material to one or more students</td>
<td>30 (14.2)</td>
<td>90 (42.5)</td>
<td>86 (40.6)</td>
<td>6 (2.8)</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students</td>
<td>36 (17.0)</td>
<td>65 (30.7)</td>
<td>77 (36.3)</td>
<td>34 (16.0)</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on course projects or assignments</td>
<td>34 (16.0)</td>
<td>65 (30.7)</td>
<td>92 (43.4)</td>
<td>21 (9.9)</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequencies in Table 14 show how participants responded to the second subscale of the NSSE, labeled Student/Faculty Interaction. This subscale contained four questions aimed at understanding the level of interaction students had with faculty members.

The final set of frequencies for the NSSE were analyzed from the Quality of Interactions subscale. Table 15 provides the means and standard deviations for each item.
Table 14

*Frequencies for NSSE Student/Faculty Interactions Subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: During the current school year how often have you done the following?</th>
<th>Very n(%)</th>
<th>Often n(%)</th>
<th>Sometimes n(%)</th>
<th>Never n(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talked about career plans with a faculty member</td>
<td>21 (9.9)</td>
<td>47 (22.2)</td>
<td>106 (50.0)</td>
<td>38 (18.0)</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework</td>
<td>7 (3.3)</td>
<td>22 (10.4)</td>
<td>66 (31.1)</td>
<td>117 (55.2)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class</td>
<td>11 (5.2)</td>
<td>35 (16.6)</td>
<td>84 (39.8)</td>
<td>81 (38.4)</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member</td>
<td>15 (7.1)</td>
<td>52 (24.5)</td>
<td>103 (48.8)</td>
<td>41 (19.4)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

*Frequencies for NSSE Quality of Interactions Subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution (n = 212)</th>
<th>1 n(%)</th>
<th>2 n(%)</th>
<th>3 n(%)</th>
<th>4 n(%)</th>
<th>5 n(%)</th>
<th>6 n(%)</th>
<th>7 n(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1 (.05)</td>
<td>3 (1.4)</td>
<td>12 (5.7)</td>
<td>38 (17.9)</td>
<td>50 (23.6)</td>
<td>31 (28.8)</td>
<td>47 (22.2)</td>
<td>53.77</td>
<td>12.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td>6 (2.8)</td>
<td>20 (9.4)</td>
<td>22 (10.4)</td>
<td>48 (22.6)</td>
<td>48 (22.6)</td>
<td>39 (18.4)</td>
<td>28 (13.2)</td>
<td>46.16</td>
<td>15.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>10 (4.7)</td>
<td>9 (4.2)</td>
<td>31 (14.6)</td>
<td>44 (20.8)</td>
<td>51 (24.1)</td>
<td>41 (19.3)</td>
<td>23 (10.8)</td>
<td>45.89</td>
<td>15.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Staff</td>
<td>21 (9.9)</td>
<td>15 (7.1)</td>
<td>34 (16.0)</td>
<td>45 (21.2)</td>
<td>38 (17.9)</td>
<td>31 (14.6)</td>
<td>24 (11.3)</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>17.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Admin Staff and Offices</td>
<td>11 (5.2)</td>
<td>28 (13.2)</td>
<td>40 (18.9)</td>
<td>51 (24.1)</td>
<td>40 (18.9)</td>
<td>23 (10.8)</td>
<td>19 (9.0)</td>
<td>40.66</td>
<td>16.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 13 through 15 represent the results of the NSSE questions geared towards activities surrounding interaction and participation with other members of campus life. As the NSSE takes into consideration various other subscales and factors it is difficult to utilize these numbers in order to paint an accurate picture of student engagement as a whole. However, when these numbers are separated based on gender it does provide a slightly more informative look at where males and females are engaging.

In order to understand part (b) of research question one, independent t-tests were run in addition to the aforementioned frequencies and descriptives for each subscale of the NSSE. The individual questions were collapsed into their respective subscales in order to compare the subscales based on gender. Table 16 provides an overview of the means and standard deviations for each of the subscales and the overall NSSE total score for both men and women combined. The next step in this process was separating the subscales scores based on gender.

Table 16

*Reported Levels of Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>13.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>23.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE Total Score</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After separating the scores based on gender (Table 17), independent sample t-tests were run on each dependent variable in order to measure differences between males and females. The results indicate there is a significant difference present in the Collaborative Learning subscale between males and females \( t(210) = -2.49, p = .014 \). Based on these results females scored, on average, nearly five points higher than their male counterparts \((M = 32.68, SD = 12.52 \text{ vs. } M = 28, SD = 14.62)\) within the subscale of Collaborative Learning. There were no other significant differences between males and females on any other subscale or overall scores of the NSSE \((p < .05)\)

Table 17

**Reported Levels of Engagement: Differences Between Males and Females***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>SFI</th>
<th>QI</th>
<th>NSSE Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>32.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>32.68</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>46.39</td>
<td>33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Collaborative Learning (CL), Student/Faculty Interaction (SFI), Quality of Interactions (QI), National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)*

As previously discussed in the second chapter of this study, females traditionally report having higher engagement scores than males do (Auster & Ohm, 2000; Kuh, 2003). This study found similar results for one of the three subscales of the NSSE, Collaborative Learning. While no previous studies indicate specifically utilizing these
three subscales as a standalone representation of student engagement, it would appear as though only one of the three subscales supports previous work on male/female student engagement.

**Research Question 2**

The second research question looked at the levels of gender role conflict that males report in addition to the levels of gender role stress that college females experience. Part (a) of this question asked what levels of gender role conflict are reported by college males. In order to measure this, male participants completed the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). The survey contains 37 questions that are categorically broken down into four subscales/factors (Appendix F). The scale utilized contains a six item response beginning with “6 strongly agree” down to “1 strongly disagree.” As this study is not examining the scores of each individual survey question, Table 18 shows the means and standard deviations for each of the four factors scores of the GRCS.

Table 18

**GRCS Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Power and Competition</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56.46</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Emotionality</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts Between Work and Leisure</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCS Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139.60</td>
<td>28.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At a cursory glance it becomes apparent that male respondents had the highest average score for the Success, Power and Competition factor ($M = 56.46, SD = 10.42$) and by contrast reported the least amount of conflict surrounding Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations ($M = 23.83, SD = 6.30$).

The second part (b) of research question two inquired about the levels of female gender role stress that college women reported. In order to measure this, the female version of the survey instrument contained the Female Gender Role Stress scale (FGRS). The scale contains 39 items, representative of five factors or collapsed variables that measure varying types of gender role stress (Appendix F). These findings can be found in greater detail in Table 19.

Table 19

**FGRS Scale Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Unemotional Relationships</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Physical Unattractiveness</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Victimization</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Behaving Assertively</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Not Being Nurturant</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGRS Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>124.00</td>
<td>35.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a whole, it would appear females in this sample population experienced the highest amount of gender role stress surrounding Fear of Unemotional Relationships ($M = 32.93, SD = 9.98$) while reporting the lowest levels of gender role stress, on average, in the Fear of Behaving Assertively factor ($M = 19.43, SD = 7.82$). It is important to note that the use of the FGRC scale was not the focal point of this study, however it is my hope that this data can be used in future explorations into the potential role that gender role behavior and student engagement play in the lives of college students.

**Research Question 3**

The final research question explores the connections between male responses on the GRCS and the NSSE. First, the scores for each of overall subscale categories were averaged. As the GRCS and the NSSE use different types of scale ratings, this was necessary in order to ensure continuity across the instrument as a whole. Next, a 2-tailed correlation analysis was conducted on the subscale scores for both instruments. The results of this analysis can be viewed in Table 20.

Table 20

*Correlations for GRCS and NSSE Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRCS Variable</th>
<th>NSSE Variable</th>
<th>p-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Emotionality</td>
<td>Student/Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>-.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSSE Total Score</td>
<td>-.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Affectionate Behavior</td>
<td>Quality of Interaction</td>
<td>-.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCS Total Score</td>
<td>Student/Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>-.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Interaction</td>
<td>-.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSSE Total Score</td>
<td>-.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
The GRCS subscale of Restrictive Emotionality was found to be inversely correlated with two scales of the NSSE. The first, Student/Faculty Interaction $r(77) = -.323$, $p = .003$, and the second being the total NSSE score $r(74) = -.247$, $p = .031$. The second GRCS subscale of Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men showed an inverse correlation with the NSSE scale of Quality of Interaction $r(72) = -.258$, $p = .027$. Finally, the overall GRCS score was inversely correlated with two NSSE subscales and the total NSSE score. An inverse correlation between GRCS total score and Student/Faculty Interaction was found to be significant at $r(72) = -.260$, $p = .025$. The total score for GRCS was also inversely significant with Quality of Interaction $r(69) = -.277$, $p = .019$, and NSSE total score $r(69) = -.239$, $p = .045$. These results suggest that as scores on the GRCS go up, scores on the NSSE go down. That is, as the levels of male gender role conflict increase in the areas of Restrictive Emotionality, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men and as a whole on the GRCS, their engagement scores in Student Faculty Interaction, Quality of Interactions, and on the NSSE as a whole decrease. The results for the first part (a) of question three indicate that further investigation needs to be conducted in an effort to see to what extent one score may predict another.

The second part (b) of question three examines the intersectionality of student demographics with student engagement and gender role conflict. In order to measure this, the same measures employed in part (a) of question three were utilized while adding in student demographics as part of the correlation matrix. Table 21 details the results of the correlational analysis between student demographics and GRCS/NSSE items. The results as a whole indicate inverse correlations between male participant scores on the
GRCS/NSSE and certain demographics with the exception of year of birth and college major. Within the year of birth category, results suggest that as a participant’s year of birth increases, their reported levels of Success Power and Competition (SPC) increase $r(69) = -.274, p = .023$. In other words, the younger a respondent is, the more Success Power and Competition they reported.

Table 21

*Correlations for Student Demographics and GRCS/NSSE Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>GRCS/NSSE Item</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>p-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>Success Power and Competition</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Quality of Interaction</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent 1 Ed. Level</td>
<td>Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Major</td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

The college major students were pursuing had significant correlations with the NSSE subscale of Collaborative Learning $r(74) = .322, p = .005$. As the college major students chose was coded numerically, the specificity of their major relative to individual levels of collaborative learning will need to be further explored in part (c) of question three. The intersectionality results suggest that further exploration is warranted in order to see to what extent one or multiple items can predict scores on the GRCS and/or the NSSE.

For the third part (c) of question three, a regression analysis was run for the variables involved in the first (a) and second (b) parts of question three. Regression models were constructed based on the significant results of the correlational analysis.
Results indicated several models with significant predictors, yet low overall percentages of explained variance. In other words, the models were statistically significant but not practically meaningful.

Individually, Gender Role Conflict Scale Total scores ($t = -2.05, p = .045$) and Restrictive Emotionality scores ($t = -2.19, p = .031$) are statistically significant in predicting the total scores on the NSSE, however each variable is individually only responsible for explaining 6% of the variability in the NSSE scores. Restrictive Emotionality scores were also found to be statistically significant in predicting 11% of the variance in Student Faculty interaction scores ($t = -3.02, p = .003$).

Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men was a statistically significant predictor of Quality of Interaction scores ($t = -2.26, p = .027$), and was accountable for 7% of the variability of QI scores. GRCS total scores were also predictors of Quality of Interaction ($t = -2.40, p = .019$), while being able to predict 8% of the Quality of Interaction score variance. Lastly, GRCS total scores were statistically significant in predicting Student Faculty Interaction scores ($t = -2.29, p = .025$) with a variance of 7%.

These results can be viewed in their entirety in Table 22.

These results suggest that two subscales of the GRCS and GRCS total scores are able to predict student engagement subscales and overall scores on a statistically significant level. The level of explanation or variance that can be derived from these models ranges from 6-11%. Possible explanations for this will be accounted for in Chapter V.
Table 22

Summary of Coefficients for GRCS and NSSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRCS Variable</th>
<th>NSSE Variable</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value*</th>
<th>r-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role Conflict Total Score</td>
<td>NSSE Total Score</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>.045*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Interaction</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>.019*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student/Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Emotionality</td>
<td>NSSE Total Score</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>.031*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student/Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men</td>
<td>Quality of Interaction</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>.027*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

When incorporating the intersectionality of student demographics into the regression models, statistically significant relationships were observed. While certain demographics were found to be correlated with either GRCS or NSSE items, only the category of parent 1 education level yielded a significant relationship between student demographics and a GRCS item that correlated with NSSE scores.

When regressed, the model no longer became significant, suggesting that while the education level of parent 1 is significantly correlated with Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men, it is not a statistically significant predictor of Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men scores.

Next, college major was found to be significantly correlated with the NSSE subscale Collaborative Learning. As outlined in chapter III, the category of college major was an open ended question, allowing students to write in their response. In order to translate the information quantitatively, those responses were then given a number
based on the alphabetical list of majors offered. This yielded a total of 45 different majors that needed to be analyzed. In order to further group the information, the majors were then broken down and placed into the colleges that offered them. This reduced the groups from 45 to 7. Two majors were removed from the model because of inadequate sample size. No males were majoring in health and human services and there was only one individual majoring in aviation sciences.

Utilizing the variables of college major and collaborative learning to construct a regression model based on statistically significant correlations yielded the highest predictors of score variance thus far. The model as a whole was able to predict 19% of the variance in scores for the Collaborative Learning subscale \((p = .005)\). Further exploration into the model indicated that the Colleges of Business and Fine Arts were the strongest positive predictors of Collaborative Learning scores. A new model was constructed examining only majors in Business and Fine Arts which was able to predict 13% of the variance of scores in CL \((p = .003)\). Table 23 details the individual colleges and their respective coefficients.

Table 23

| Summary of Coefficients for College Major and Collaborative Learning \((N=84)\) |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| College          | B       | SE (B)  | t       | p-value* |
| (Constant)       | 25.00   | 3.92    | 6.38    | .000*    |
| Arts and Sciences| -.385   | 4.35    | -.088   | .930     |
| Business         | 12.73   | 5.67    | 2.25    | .028*    |
| Education        | 15.00   | 10.37   | 1.45    | .152     |
| Engineering      | 10.00   | 6.46    | 1.55    | .125     |
| Fine Arts        | 35.00   | 14.130  | 2.48    | .015*    |

*\(p < .05\)
Year of birth (YOB) was also found to be a predictor of the GRCS variable Success Power and Competition. Further analysis indicated that YOB was able to predict 8% of the variance in scores for Success Power and Competition ($t = -2.27, p = .026$).

Beyond college major and year of birth being used as predictors of their respective subscale scores, when combining the intersectionality of the remaining demographic variables (parent 1 education level and student college status) with their correlated subscales, no statistically significant models could be obtained.

**Chapter IV Summary**

Chapter IV provided a detailed analysis of the results surrounding the exploration of gender role conflict and its relationship with student engagement. Chapter V will provide descriptions and discussions of the key findings from this study, along with relating these findings to the extant literature with recommendations for future practice.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter is devoted to summarizing and essentializing the findings from my study. A brief summary of the intent of this research leads into the conclusions reached through this effort. Implications for practice are discussed along with the limitations that this study contains. Lastly, recommendations for future research in this field are made.

Summary of Study

Within the realm of higher education, history has long been the purveyor of inequity between men and women. In the past, research has been focused on why or how women were not receiving equal representation in higher education. More recently, research has turned its focus on trying to understand why men are now disproportionately less motivated and represented on college campuses (Kahn et al., 2011). The graduation rates, levels of enrollment, grade point averages, levels of engagement and many more areas are falling or in repose for college males (Auster & Ohm, 2000; Kimmel, 2006; Laker, 2005; United States Department of Education, 2012a, 2012b, 2013).

Concurrently, emerging research has demonstrated connections between male adherence to dominant masculine paradigms and behaviors that run counter to successful academic strategies; strategies that if not utilized can play a role in the paucity of male performance (Davis & Laker, 2004; Kimmel & Mahalik, 2004; Laker, 2004).

The purpose of this study was to understand female and male levels of engagement in a subset of student college activities, while simultaneously explicating the dynamics of gender role conflict as a mediating factor of engagement for men. In an attempt to understand this phenomenon, the following research questions were posited:
1. From a current population of undergraduate males and females: a) what are their self-reported levels of engagement on campus, and b) what differences occur between males and females?

2. For this populate of undergraduate students: a) what levels of gender role conflict do these college males report and b) what levels of gender role stress do college females report?

3. For this populate of undergraduate students: a) what connections, if any, exist between reported levels of male gender role conflict and their college engagement, b) what role does the intersectionality of student demographics play in the reported levels of gender role conflict and engagement, and c) if connections are present, to what extent does one predict another?

In order to address these questions, convenience sampling was utilized on a population of 212 students at a large Midwestern university. A combination of three previously established and validated survey instruments were used in order to accomplish this. Male students completed surveys that combined portions of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2013a) and the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (O’Neil et al., 1981). Female participants completed the same set of NSSE questions, however since the GRCS was designed for male respondents, female students next completed the Feminine Gender Role Stress scale (FGRS) (Gillespie & Eisler, 1992). Both sexes finished with the same set of demographic questions after the first two respective scales were completed.
Key Findings

The findings presented in my study are based on the self-reported surveys of 212 undergraduate respondents at a large Midwestern university. Nearly 60% of the population was female and the average respondent age was approximately 21 (YOB = 1993). More detailed descriptions of the population demographics can be viewed in tables 8-10 within chapter IV.

Findings Related to Self-Reported Levels of Engagement

The first research question asked participants to report their perceived levels of engagement in numerous areas of campus life. In order to do so, both male and female respondents completed three subscales of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The three subscales were Collaborative Learning (CL), Student/Faculty Interaction (SFI) and Quality of Interactions (QI). Mean scores and individual question indices can be viewed in chapter IV, Tables 13-15. As a whole, participants indicated lower engagement scores with faculty members while engaging more frequently with other students around course work or projects. Within the Quality of Interactions (QI) subscale, the highest quality score was interacting with other students on campus ($M = 53.77/70$) while the lowest score was with administrative staff and other offices ($M = 40.66/70$). Comparatively, it is difficult to compare these results to previous efforts because the NSSE typically weights their results in order to ensure the efficacy of their outcomes.

The second part of research question one inquired about the differences between males and females on levels of engagement. Independent t-tests were run using NSSE subscale scores as the dependent variable and gender as the independent variable. The
results of these tests indicated a significant difference between males and females on the Collaborative Learning (CL) subscale. On average females scored nearly five points higher on this subscale than their male counterparts, however this was the only significant difference noted. If we situate this finding within the masculinity literature we are left with little surprises. Males as a whole are socialized to be competitive and positioned ideally with power over other people (Bird, 1996; Coston & Kimmel, 2012). Having experiences working with groups of people that resulted in positive outcomes would necessitate a number of traits that run counter to idealized masculine behavior (O’Neil, 2008). While previous efforts have indicated that women are more engaged than men when taking the NSSE (Auster & Ohm, 2000; Kuh, 2003), only one subscale in my study was found to support this. A possible explanation for this disparity resides in this study only using three of the ten subscales of the NSSE. Previous efforts compared all ten subscales which might provide different results compared to my study, which only used one-third of the questions.

Findings Related to Gender Role Conflict and Feminine Gender Role Stress

The first part of the second research question inquires about the levels of GRC that college males are experiencing. The individual questions were collapsed into their respective subscales and then analyzed as a whole. For the population of males being studied, the highest mean levels were associated with Success Power and Competition (SPC) while the lowest levels were Conflicts Between Work and Leisure (CBWL). As previous research has suggested that Success Power and Competition is often higher for younger males, it is understandable why this conflict was situated towards the top in the population being studied. O’Neil (2008) summarized six studies that demonstrated
college men have significantly higher levels of Success Power and Competition than older men. Additional support has been documented on college men having significantly lower levels of Conflicts Between Work and Leisure than their middle aged counterparts (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Theodore & Lloyd, 2000). As discussed later on in this chapter, the process of identity development may help to explain the elevated levels of Success Power and Competition for college males.

For female participants, the FGRS was administered in order to maintain test length and time congruity for all participants, although the scale was not the focal point of this study. As a whole, females had the highest average score for Fear of Unemotional Relationships (FUR), and the lowest average subscale score was for Fear of Behaving Assertively (FBA). As the purpose of this study was not to analyze individual scales of the GRCS and NSSE in terms of their individual reported levels, but to understand if one can predict another, the information provided for the first two research questions can be viewed in greater detail in chapter IV.

**Findings Related to Demographics; Predictors of GRCS and NSSE Scores**

For part (a) and (c) of the final research question, a correlational analysis was run comparing student self-reported levels of gender role conflict with the three subscales of the NSSE. Results indicated Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) and the GRCS total score had significant correlations with NSSE subscales of Quality of Interaction (QI), Student/Faculty Interaction (SFI) and finally the NSSE total score. All correlations were found to be inverse and suggested that as scores on the GRCS increased, NSSE subscale scores decreased. The GRCS category of Restrictive Emotionality has historically been associated with a number of
psychological and interpersonal behaviors (Davis, 2002; O’Neil, 2008). Out of all the GRCS factors, Restrictive Emotionality is the most consistent predictor of depression, feelings of shame, alexithymia, and men experiencing feelings of hopelessness and self-destructive behaviors (e.g., O’Neil, 2008). This could be a governing factor in the amount of interaction students have with other students and faculty members, in addition to their overall willingness to engage. Thus, inverse relationships existing between Restrictive Emotionality and Student Faculty Interaction/NSSE total score could be influenced by psychological and interpersonal behaviors associated with higher Restrictive Emotionality scores.

The relationship between Restrictive Affectionate Behaviors Between Men (RABBM) and Quality of Interactions (QI) could be explained by a number of factors. First, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men scores are typically higher for younger males as opposed to older men (O’Neil, 2008). Second, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men has been linked to interpersonal behaviors that are not conducive to quality interactions between people such as hostility or rigid social exchanges (Mahalik, 2000). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men has also been significantly correlated with shyness and an inability to convey emotions towards others (Berko, 1994; Bruch, Berko, & Haas, 1998). For instance, in a study by Sileo (1996), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men was associated with the absence of intimacy and as a barrier to male friendships. Based on these previous findings, one could arguably see how Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men could impact the quality of male student interactions.
Lastly, GRCS total score was significantly correlated with Student Faculty Interaction, Quality of Interactions and NSSE total scores. As Restricted Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men are a part of the total GRCS total score, it is understandable (based on previously mentioned research) how the total score on the GRCS would impact engagement in these subscales. GRC has been linked as a whole to the restricted development of male friendships and levels of self-disclosure (Berko, 1994; O’Neil, 2008), as well as negative attitudes towards minorities (Robinson, 2011; Robinson & Schwartz, 2004) stereotypic views on women (e.g., O’Neil & Crasper, 2011); as well as a litany of other outcomes as previously mentioned. When considering these effects both individually and collectively, it paints a vivid picture of the potential for GRC to influence the self-reported levels of male engagement.

Given these findings, further exploration was needed in order to explicate the levels and degree to which one score actually impacted another. This would mean that students reported lower levels of engagement on the three subscales of the NSSE if their Restrictive Emotionality, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men and GRCS total scores went up. While there were significant correlations noted, when attempting to examine what extent GRCS scores can predict NSSE scores, the predictability was varied. GRCS total and Restrictive Emotionality were successful in predicting 7% and 11% respectively of Student Faculty Interactions score variance. Part (b) of question three also asked if corollary relationships existed between student demographics and areas of the GRCS/NSSE.

Figure 2 shows how both the GRCS total score and the subscales of Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men impact the total NSSE
score and QI subscales. In addition to these, GRCS total score and Restrictive Emotionality were also found to be significant in predicting Student/Faculty Interaction subscale scores (SFI). Several demographics were found to have significant relationships with either GRCS or NSSE scores. Success Power and Competition was found to be significantly correlated with age which is congruent with previous findings surrounding younger men and their struggles with Success Power and Competition (O’Neil, 2008).

![Diagram](Figure 2. Specific GRCS items as predictors of NSSE subscale scores.)

The correlational trend found in my research suggests that as male students get older they struggle less with the Success Power and Competition component of GRC, potentially meaning it is a less salient issue in their lives. Mahalik (2000) found that Success Power and Competition scores significantly predicted behaviors that were rigid and more dominant, trends that could be associated with younger males with the potential to dissipate with age. This trend could be explained by the prevalence for adolescent males and females to enact the prescribed notions of their idealized gender behavior in
order to “fit in.” Males able to display behaviors that are competitive and dominant in nature are often met with approval and positive regard from their peer groups. This often results in young males adopting these competitive and assertive traits in their personalities (Addis et al., 2010). As males age, the tensions surrounding Success Power and Competition and identity development may be assuaged by other actuating social factors such as developing a family and career aspirations.

Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) was found to be inversely correlated with the education level of parent 1. Dummy variables were created in order to understand if there was a difference between the reference group (parents who did not finish high school) and each of the following groups: high school graduate, some college, Associates, Bachelors, some graduate school, Masters and Ph.D., respectively. The results of this linear regression suggest there is no difference between the reference group and each of the other educational levels ($p > .05$). However, it should be noted that when comparing respondents that indicated parent 1 had less than a high school degree with those with a Masters degree ($p = .056$), or a Ph.D. ($p = .054$) the results were nearly significant. This demonstrates that as the education level of parent 1 increases, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men scores decrease. While numerous aspects of family life/socialization have been correlated with Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (Mahalik, 2000; O’Neil, 2008), this finding does not seem to have previous support within the literature base.

The next significant finding was between what year of college the participant was in, and the NSSE subscale Quality of Interaction (QI). In order to understand the existing relationship between the education level of respondents and the quality of their
interactions, dummy variables were created utilizing first year students as the reference
group and second through fifth year students as the comparison groups. After conducting
a linear regression, no significant differences were observed between the reference group
and each of the remaining comparison groups. This would indicate that as a whole, the
more time a student spent at their institution, the more their Quality of Interaction scores
decreased. This is odd, as previous efforts dealing with engagement scores have shown
that quality of interactions typically increases with one’s tenure at college (National
Survey of Student Engagement, 2013d.) This finding was not supported within the
engagement literature. However, it should be noted this study was unable to predict this
relationship with any significance.

Student college major was also shown to be significantly associated with
Collaborative Learning (CL). The original majors students provided were incredibly
broad and nuanced based on open ended nature of the question being asked. In order to
be able to draw conclusions on the population, the individual majors were grouped based
on the college that housed them. This resulted in seven individual colleges that housed a
possible 45 majors. After grouping the majors by college, dummy variables were created
using Arts and Sciences as the reference group and Business, Education, Engineering,
Health and Human Services, and Fine Arts as the comparison groups. When compared,
this model was effective in predicting 19% of the variance in scores in Collaborative
Learning. The regression model indicated that students in the comparison groups of the
Colleges of Business ($t = 2.94, p = .004$) and Fine Arts ($t = 2.58, p = .012$) had the
strongest positive predictor for Collaborative Learning scores when compared to the
reference group (see Table 23). Hu and Wolniak (2010) found that one’s choice of major
may impact the relationship between student engagement and eventually early career earnings. While speculative, it could be that students with a major in the College of Business or the College of Fine Arts are assigned more group projects and cooperative work than in other colleges, thus increasing the frequency and quality of their collaborative efforts.

While encouraging, it is difficult to compare the present findings to those reported in previous studies, because gender role conflict is not an area that is often studied within the realm of higher education. Very little literature exists on how male issues of gender role conflict and socialization relate to college student development (O’Neil & Crasper, 2011) and by extension college student engagement. What is known is that male GRC has been extensively studied (over 203 separate efforts) and has been significantly correlated with a number of psychological and behavioral issues such as: self-esteem, depression, shame, stress, help seeking attitudes, substance abuse, interpersonal problems and competence, coping strategies, problems with anger, and conduct issues (O’Neil, 2008; O’Neil & Crasper, 2011). While these are only a few on the list of problems men face as a result of GRC, it stands to reason that these issues would have an impact on how engaged males are on college campus.

As Ku (2001) indicates, good engagement indicators involve cooperating with other students, using institutional resources, and spending time with faculty. Auster and Ohm (2000) also discuss the importance of interpersonal relations, and student faculty interaction, behaviors negatively associated with males and GRC. Table 24 provides a summary of the results of this study broken down by research question. The results of
this study have significant implications for practitioners and academics alike concerned about the well-being and success of males in higher education.

Table 24

**Summary of Arndt (2014) Overall Findings**

| Research Question 1: From a current population of undergraduate males and females: a) what are their self-reported levels of engagement on campus, and b) what differences occur between males and females? | • Participants scored the highest on the Quality of Interactions subscale ($M = 45.80$, $SD = 23.37$) and the lowest on Collaborative Learning ($M = 30.80$, $SD = 13.56$).  
• Significant differences were noted between males and females on the NSSE subscale of Collaborative Learning. On average, females scored nearly five points higher than their male counterparts ($M = 32.68$, $SD = 12.52$). |
| --- | --- |
| Research Question 2: For the population of undergraduate students: a) what levels of gender role conflict do these college males report and b) what levels of gender role stress do college females report? | • Male participants scored the highest on the Success Power and Competition scale of the GRCS ($M = 56.46$, $SD = 10.42$), and the lowest on Conflicts Between Work and Leisure ($M = 23.83$, $SD = 6.30$).  
• Females had the highest score on the Fear of Unemotional Relationships subscale of the FGRCS ($M = 32.93$, $SD = 9.98$) and the lowest on Fear of Behaving Assertively ($M = 19.43$, $SD = 7.82$). |
| Research Question 3: For the population of undergraduate students: a) what connections, if any, exist between reported levels of male gender role conflict and their college engagement, b) what role does the intersectionality of student demographics play in the reported levels of gender role conflict and engagement, and c) if connections are present, to what extent does one predict another? | Significant correlations were found between the GRCS and NSSE in the following areas:  
• Restrictive Emotionality: Student/Faculty Interaction ($p = .003$), NSSE Total Score ($p = .031$)  
• Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men: Quality of Interaction ($p = .027$)  
• GRCS Total Score: Student/Faculty Interaction ($t = 2.29$, $p = .025$, $r^2 = .07$)  
• Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men: Quality of Interaction ($t = 2.40$, $p = .019$, $r^2 = .08$)  
• GRCS Total Score: NSSE Total Score ($t = 2.05$, $p = .045$, $r^2 = .06$)  
• Restrictive Emotionality: NSSE Total Score ($t = 2.19$, $p = .031$, $r^2 = .06$)  
• Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men: NSSE Total Score ($t = 3.02$, $p = .003$, $r^2 = .11$)  
• GRCS Total Score: Collaborative Learning ($r^2 = .19$, $F(6,84) = 3.04$, $p = .01$)  
• College Major: Collaborative Learning ($r^2 = .26$, $p = .027$, $r^2 = .07$)  
• Year of Birth: Collaborative Learning ($r^2 = .19$, $F(6,84) = 3.04$, $p = .01$)  
• Year of Birth: Collaborative Learning ($r^2 = .19$, $F(6,84) = 3.04$, $p = .01$) |

Intersectionality of Student Demographics  
• Year of Birth: Success Power and Competition ($p = .023$)  
• Education Level: Quality of Interactions ($p = .052$)  
• Parent 1 Education Level: Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men ($p = .036$)  
• College Major: Collaborative Learning ($p = .005$)

Summary of Regression Model Results for GRCS, Intersectionality, and NSSE  
• GRCS: NSSE Total Score ($t = 2.05$, $p = .045$, $r^2 = .06$), Quality of Interaction ($t = 2.40$, $p = .019$, $r^2 = .08$), Student/Faculty ($t = 2.29$, $p = .025$, $r^2 = .07$)  
• Restrictive Emotionality: NSSE Total Score ($t = 2.19$, $p = .031$, $r^2 = .06$), Student/Faculty Interaction ($t = 3.02$, $p = .003$, $r^2 = .11$)  
• Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men: Quality of Interaction ($t = 2.40$, $p = .019$, $r^2 = .08$)  
• GRCS Total Score: NSSE Total Score ($t = 2.05$, $p = .045$, $r^2 = .06$)  
• Restrictive Emotionality: NSSE Total Score ($t = 2.19$, $p = .031$, $r^2 = .06$), Student/Faculty Interaction ($t = 3.02$, $p = .003$, $r^2 = .11$)  
• Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men: Quality of Interaction ($t = 2.40$, $p = .019$, $r^2 = .08$)  
• GRCS Total Score: Collaborative Learning ($r^2 = .19$, $F(6,84) = 3.04$, $p = .01$)  
• College Major: Collaborative Learning ($r^2 = .26$, $p = .027$, $r^2 = .07$)  
• Year of Birth: Collaborative Learning ($r^2 = .19$, $F(6,84) = 3.04$, $p = .01$)  
• Year of Birth: Success Power and Competition ($t = 2.26$, $p = .027$, $r^2 = .07$)
Implications

The relationship between academic institutions and their students is of paramount importance in order to foster continued growth for students. Males as a student population are falling behind their female counterparts at alarming and sustained rates, yet little is known about the reasons behind this continued decline in performance.

Studying males as a disparaged population on college campuses has not been a paramount concern in higher education (Laker, 2005). As such, there is a need for masculinity to be studied at the institutional level (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009).

It is important for academic institutions to provide support for all of their students; male or female. The ideals of masculinity that men hold themselves against are clearly related to identity development and lend support for increasing the programs available on campuses for men (O’Neil & Crapser, 2011). Institutional programming designed to help males develop and understand masculinity is nearly non-existent (Kellom, 2004; Osborne, 2010). Professionals in higher education need to provide non-competitive environments that enable males to engage in open dialogues about their experiences. Osborne (2010) found that elements needed for institutional programming geared towards males to be effective, are communication, confidentiality, faculty participation, and membership commitment amongst others. If these elements are present, males are more likely to engage in behaviors that run counter to their masculine socialization.

The results from my study indicate masculine gender role conflict plays a role in student engagement. This information adds to the literature base on male/female engagement levels, male gender role conflict, and moreover, indicates that GRCS total
scores, Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men
scores impact levels of engagement on college campus. The results suggest that further
inquiry is required and moreover, it is apparent that relationships exist between male
gender role conflict and levels of male engagement in higher education. Student affairs
practitioners as well as administrators should begin examining the role that gender role
conflict plays in male student engagement. As Davis and Laker (2004) contend, it may
be tempting to hold men accountable for their own inability to engage or follow
prescribed programs and services; however, it is the professional obligation of those
within higher education to provide and foster opportunities for diversity and the inclusion
of men’s development.

Universities that can address these concerns and nurture the prosocial view of
masculine identity development could reap substantial benefits. First and foremost, this
can be done by creating a more aware and educated male populous that focuses less on
the dichotomy of male/female attributes and more on the realization that these traits are
human in nature, and do not have to be polarizing. One tool might be the addition of a
gender studies center that focuses on the deleterious effects of gender role conflict for
both men and women. While the inclusion of a gender studies center is a step in the right
direction, students need to utilize the services. Mandatory freshman enrollment in gender
based programs would alleviate this while simultaneously recreating the perceptions of
acceptable gendered behavior. Second, if fewer males are dropping out of college, that
means an increase in revenue and an increase in males graduating, which perpetuates the
image of male student success. One could argue that while the inclusion of male
programs could offer risk and the potential for failure, the benefit for institutions choosing to do so can be great, both socially and financially.

**Limitations**

This study is limited in a number of ways that should be taken into consideration. First, the study was conducted at a large Midwestern university and is therefore not representative of the entire college male population. Also, this study only utilized three subscales of the NSSE out of the ten possible. While this was a conscious choice based on survey length and previous knowledge on male gender role conflict, it is a limitation because my findings cannot be generalized for the NSSE survey as a whole.

Another limitation of my research deals with population sample. The sample was taken within a large lecture hall course and while there were responses from students in six out of the seven colleges at this University, the distribution of these numbers was weighted heavily towards those pursuing majors that required the course for their program. In addition to the composition of the student body, the population being studied is disengaged, which could have resulted in surveys being haphazardly answered or not taken seriously. Since this study utilized convenience sampling, the generalizability of these findings is limited. Being able to randomly sample male students from around the United States at various institutions (both public and private) would substantially increase the external validity of this work.

Another limitation can be found with the reference categories chosen for dummy coding the variables of college major, parent 1 education level, and student year of college. Utilizing different reference categories would have yielded different coefficients and different relationships amongst the comparison groups. Other limitations should be
noted based on the environment and composition of those participating. Levels of engagement and involvement for this study may have been greater due to both the format of the course and the climate set by the instructor. Participants completed the survey at the end of the class session allowing the instructor to “prime” their behaviors depending on what they were doing prior to survey administration. If the class was engaged in a lively and interactive session vs. sitting quietly with no interaction, the results could be skewed because of this. With a larger sample size, perhaps across a variety of institutions, this potential effect would be reduced and more than likely randomly distributed. Also, having participants take the survey instrument via computer would also increase sample sizes while removing the potential for these concerns to impact the population being studied.

Lastly, the use of self-reporting instruments, while valid, carry inherent limitations. Often, when using these types of reports participants experience the halo effect, whereby individuals may reflect upon areas of their performance such as grades, levels of effort, and rewards from college positively, consequently inflating results (Kuh, 2001a). In order to compensate for these limitations, the next section will discuss how future research could be conducted in order to mitigate these restrictions.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

While the results of my study indicate that gender role conflict is connected to student engagement scores on the NSSE, it can only be specifically stated for the three subscales of the NSSE. In total, the NSSE contains ten subscales that measure a variety of engagement indicators. Since a relationship exists, future research should include the entire NSSE with the GRCS in order to understand how many and in what capacity the
remaining NSSE subscales could be impacted. Future research could also expand the sample size to include more colleges/universities and perhaps examine any potential differences between GRC at private vs. public institutions if financial responsibility is a factor. For example, how does male GRC impact levels of engagement at private vs public institutions if students are personally paying for school vs. receiving financial assistance?

In addition to studying different institutions and their impact on male engagement, future studies may also want to explicate the sex of each parent/legal guardian prior to administering surveys. As previously noted, the education level of parent 1 was significantly correlated with Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men. Understanding if parent 1 was of the same or opposite sex when indicating their highest level of education could provide more information about the socialization process. Males use their fathers and/or other men as informers of appropriate or inappropriate behavior (Addis et al., 2010). It would be useful to know if relationships exist between how much formal education their father/male guardian has received and levels of gender role conflict experienced as young adults.

The dataset utilized in the present study was weighed rather heavily toward younger college students. Future studies could also explore the role that GRCS plays in male graduate students, and/or nontraditional students as well. This would help substantiate previous findings linking age to Success Power and Competition. Previous research has suggested a paucity in male gender role education and the impact that male gender role conflict has in the behaviors of college males (Kimmel & Davis, 2011; O’Neil & Crapser, 2011). As the socialization process that males go through does not
begin and end in college, future research should also focus on GRC in elementary, middle and high school students of varying races, ethnicities, and nationalities. In order to understand the magnitude that GRC has on males, the population being studied should be as diverse as possible.

My research also indicated significant relationships existing between the college or college major students pursued and gender role conflict. Additional research should focus on varying levels of both gender role conflict and student engagement as impacted by student major. How are levels of GRC impacted at trade schools or in programs typically viewed as more masculine than feminine? Larger sample sizes could also contribute to the external validity of these findings.

In addition, future studies surrounding student engagement and gender role conflict should study only students who have dropped or perhaps failed courses. In my study, the male population was in class, available and willing to take the survey instrument. In my findings, minimal differences were noted between males and females on the NSSE subscales with the exception of Collaborative Learning. By default, the males in my sample could have been more engaged than those who chose not to attend class that day, or who dropped out altogether. By creating a study that only studied GRC experienced by males who have dropped out of courses or college all together, a greater understanding of the broader assumptions of student engagement and connections to gender role conflict could be gained.

Future studies could also focus on what engaged male students are doing outside of the classroom. For example, what types of activities do college males who have low levels of gender role conflict participate in? Are college males with low gender role
conflict graduating at higher rates than their more conflicted counterparts? Longitudinal studies would also aid in this process. We know from this study that gender role conflict in college males impacts their levels of engagement on certain subscales of the NSSE. Could the environment that a student lives in play a role in male student engagement? Previous research has demonstrated that living on campus tends to increase student engagement levels, however would male students living on campus have lower levels of GRC? Are there associations with living outside of a college campus and increased levels of GRC? The implication from the literature is that college males who utilize campus housing have higher engagement levels, but are their GRC levels lower than college males who live off campus?

Future efforts may also want to explore more qualitative avenues of male GRC and engagement. As previously noted, peer groups are incredibly influential in shaping and reinforcing identity development (Harris III & Harper, 2008). Understanding the content being used within male peer groups to emphasize and reinforce cooperation with masculine paradigms would be incredibly useful. What words, phrases or actions are being communicated to male students with low levels of GRC vs. male students with high levels of GRC? This could provide valuable insight into the minutia of male masculinity discourse for men of all ages.

Lastly, future research could also focus on the impact that GRC plays for female college students. Gender role conflict as a concept is ubiquitous and effects both men and women. While women are outperforming men in nearly all areas of higher education, this does not mean they are exempt from the gender socialization process or that they do not experience gender role conflict. It also may shed light on the differences
in this socialization process. The literature would suggest that if women are more engaged than their male counterparts, their levels of GRC should be much lower. As this is an area that has received little to attention, efforts directed at understanding if this is the case would be of value. Understanding how this conflict affects both males and females could be incredibly useful in designing programs aimed at reducing gender role conflict and aiding in the healthy development and socialization of all students.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to understand to what extent gender role conflict impacted male student engagement in higher education. Three research questions with several sub questions were posited in an effort to begin understanding a phenomenon that has received very little attention in the literature. Males in higher education have continued to fall short of their academic potential and yet little has been done to address the complexities and damages that result from males being conflicted about their gender role. This study found statistically significant relationships between male gender role conflict and male levels of engagement. Connections were also noted between the intersectionality of student demographics and both gender role conflict and student engagement. This study is the first known effort to find significant relationships between male gender role conflict and the National Survey of Student Engagement, opening the door for future work aimed at understanding this complex relationship.

What is being advocated in this work is the necessity to think differently about males and their socialization process. A critical examination into the deleterious effects of masculinity and gender role conflict on male student success is imperative if we are to begin to dissect the factors effecting males in higher education. What is at stake for both
institutions and male students alike is the ability to change how we view masculine behavior and how we treat males in higher education. Repurposing the dichotomous views surrounding male vs. female behavior, can lead to the belief that these traits are human in nature and are not reserved or assigned to one sex instead of another. Only after we understand how we have built and reinforced the male socialization process can we begin to deconstruct it, leaving academic institutions and individuals alike to rebuild and support a different way of framing masculinity.
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Appendix A

Opening Instructions to Survey
Instructions printed on survey folder:

“Attention! Please write your name and email address on the blank index card and remove it from the envelope. Please do not open this envelope until the facilitator instructs you to. Thank you for your cooperation.”

Instructions to be read to class:

Good afternoon everyone,

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Male and female levels of engagement in a subset of college activities" designed to analyze levels of engagement and personal traits of college students. The study is being conducted by Louann Bierlein Palmer and myself, Jacob G. Arndt from Western Michigan University, Department of Educational Leadership. This research is being conducted as part of my dissertation requirements. This survey is comprised of up to 61 multiple choice, true/false and fill in the blank questions and will take approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the survey form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may return the blank survey in the box provided at the end of class. Returning the survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. Taped to the front of your folders you should all have a blank index card. Please take a moment to write your name and email address on the blank index card. Once you have done so, please remove the index card from the front of your folder. As an incentive for completing the survey this morning 5 of these index cards will be drawn at random and the winners will receive 25 dollar Visa gift cards.
When you open your folders there will be two surveys inside, one labeled “Male” and one labeled “Female”. Please select and complete the survey that most closely corresponds to your sex. You may leave the remaining survey inside of the envelope.

**When you are finished with the survey, please put it back inside of the folder and remain seated until the end of class (1:45 pm).** At that time, I’ll invite all of you to come up and place the folder containing your survey in the large bin to the right of the table labeled “Survey”. Then, please place your index card inside the small box to the left of the table labeled “Index Card”. Once you have returned the survey and index cards you are finished for the day.

**Instructor:** I will be leaving the room at this point and as such, will not be present when you take this instrument. If you choose to not participate in this survey, **please remain seated and at the end of class you may return the blank survey and exit.**

**Me:** You may open your folders and begin.
Appendix B

Female Survey Instrument
FEMALE
Student Engagement & Trait Survey

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Male and female levels of engagement in a subset of college activities" designed to analyze levels of engagement and personal traits of college students. The study is being conducted by Louann Berlein Palmer and Jacob G. Arndt from Western Michigan University, Department of Educational Leadership. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Jacob G. Arndt.

This survey is comprised of 61 multiple choice, true/false and fill in the blank questions and will take approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the blank survey or you may discard it in the box provided. Returning the survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions, you may contact Louann Berlein Palmer at (269) 387-3596, Jacob G. Arndt at (269) 488-4766, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the vice president for research (269-387-8298).

This consent has been approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) on February 25, 2014. Do not participate after February 25, 2015.

Questions 1-13 are used with permission from The College Student Report, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-14 The Trustees of Indiana University
# Student Engagement & Trait Survey

**During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Asked another student to help you understand course material</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explained course material to one or more students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Talked about career plans with a faculty member</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Academic Advisors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Faculty</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Student Services Staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other Administrative Staff and Offices (Registrar, financial aid, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DIRECTIONS: Please read the descriptions of the following hypothetical scenarios that may or may not occur in the future. Then rate how stressful the situation would be for you. Give each item a rating on the scale from 0 to 5, ranging from not stressful to extremely stressful.

Note: The term "mate" refers to either a spouse or partner in an intimate relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Being perceived by others as overweight</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Not being able to meet family members' emotional needs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Feeling less attractive than you once were</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Trying to be a good parent and excel at work</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Having others believe that you are emotionally cold</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Being in a sexual relationship without any commitment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Being pressured for sex when seeking affection from your mate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Your child is disliked by her/his peers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Wearing a bathing suit in public</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Having a weak or incompetent mate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Making sure you are not taken advantage of when buying house or car</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Having an intimate relationship without any romance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Continued: Please read the descriptions of the following hypothetical scenarios that may or may not occur in the future. Then rate how stressful the situation would be for you. Give each item a rating on the scale from 0 to 5, ranging from not stressful to extremely stressful.

Note: The term "mate" refers to either a spouse or partner in an intimate relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>0 Not at All Stressful</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Extremely Stressful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Being unable to change your appearance to please someone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Having to move to a new city or town alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Bargaining with a salesperson when buying a car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Negotiating the price of car repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Being heavier than your mate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Being unusually tall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Supervising older and more experienced employees at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Feeling that you are being followed by someone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Being considered promiscuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Hearing a strange noise while you are home alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Having to deal with unwanted sexual advances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Losing custody of your children after divorce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Your mate is unemployed and cannot find a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Continued: Please read the descriptions of the following hypothetical scenarios that may or may not occur in the future. Then rate how stressful the situation would be for you. Give each item a rating on the scale from 0 to 5, ranging from not stressful to extremely stressful.

Note: The term "mate" refers to either a spouse or partner in an intimate relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>0 Not at All Stressful</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Extremely Stressful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Feeling pressured to engage in sexual activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Talking with someone who is angry with you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Turning middle-aged and being single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Having your car breakdown on the road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Having multiple sex partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Having to &quot;sell&quot; yourself at a job interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Hearing that a dangerous criminal has escaped nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Receiving an obscene phone call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Having someone else raise your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Trying to get your mate to take responsibility for childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Returning to work soon after your child is born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. A very close friend stops speaking to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Your mate will not discuss your relationship problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Finding that you have gained 10 pounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Demographic Information

53. Please enter your year of birth:  

54. What is your mother's/legal guardian's/parent 1's highest level of education?  
   - Did not finish high school
   - High school graduate
   - Some college or technical school
   - Associates degree
   - Bachelors degree
   - Masters degree
   - Doctorate or law degree
   - Not applicable

55. What is your father's/legal guardian's/parent 2's highest level of education?  
   - Did not finish high school
   - High school graduate
   - Some college or technical school
   - Associates degree
   - Bachelors degree
   - Masters degree
   - Doctorate or law degree
   - Not applicable

56. In your immediate family (parents and siblings), are you the first person to attend a university/college?  
   - Yes
   - No
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57. Are you a member of a social fraternity or sorority?
   - Yes
   - No

58. Education Level (Check the highest level that fits you):
   - First Year
   - Second Year
   - Third Year
   - Fourth Year
   - Fifth Year or Above

59. Present Estimated GPA:

60. Race/Ethnicity (Please select the one you most closely identify with):
   - White/Caucasian
   - Black/African American
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - Middle Eastern
   - Native American
   - Multiracial
   - Other

61. What is your major?
Appendix C

Male Survey Instrument
MALE
Student Engagement & Trait Survey

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Male and female levels of engagement in a subset of college activities" designed to analyze levels of engagement and personal traits of college students. The study is being conducted by Louann Berlein Palmer and Jacob G. Arndt from Western Michigan University, Department of Educational Leadership. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Jacob G. Arndt.

This survey is comprised of 59 multiple choice, yes/no and fill in the blank questions and will take approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the blank survey or you may discard it in the box provided. Returning the survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions, you may contact Louann Berlein Palmer at (269) 387-3596, Jacob G. Arndt at (269) 488-4736, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the vice president for research (269-387-8298).

This consent has been approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) on February 25, 2014. Do not participate after February 25, 2015.

Questions 1 - 13 used with permission from The College Student Report, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-14 The Trustees of Indiana University.
### Student Engagement & Trait Survey

#### During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Asked another student to help you understand course material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explained course material to one or more students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Talked about career plans with a faculty member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Poor</th>
<th>3 Poor</th>
<th>4 Poor</th>
<th>5 Poor</th>
<th>6 Poor</th>
<th>7 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Academic Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Student Services Staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other Administrative Staff and Offices (Registrar, financial aid, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Instructions:** Please fill in the circle that most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Moving up the career ladder is important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have difficulty telling others I care about them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Affection with other men makes me tense.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I evaluate other people’s value by their level of achievement and success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Engagement & Trait Survey

Continued: Please fill in the circle that most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Finding time to relax is difficult for me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Doing well all the time is important to me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Hugging other men is difficult for me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Competing with others is the best way to succeed.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Engagement & Trait Survey

Continued: Please fill in the circle that most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I strive to be more successful than others.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I do not like to show my emotions to other people.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Men who are overly friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Overwork and stress caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school affects my life.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I like to feel superior to other people.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Engagement & Trait Survey

#### Demographic Information

**51. Please enter your year of birth:**

[Insert year]

---

**52. What is your mother's/legal guardian's/parent 1's highest level of education?**

- [ ] Did not finish high school
- [ ] High school graduate
- [ ] Some college or technical school
- [ ] Associates degree
- [ ] Bachelors degree
- [ ] Some graduate school
- [ ] Masters degree
- [ ] Doctorate or law degree
- [ ] Not applicable

**53. What is your father's/legal guardian's/parent 2's highest level of education?**

- [ ] Did not finish high school
- [ ] High school graduate
- [ ] Some college or technical school
- [ ] Associates degree
- [ ] Bachelors degree
- [ ] Some graduate school
- [ ] Masters degree
- [ ] Doctorate or law degree
- [ ] Not applicable

**54. In your immediate family (parents and siblings), are you the first person to attend a university/college?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Engagement &amp; Trait Survey</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>55. Are you a member of a social fraternity or sorority?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>56. Education Level (Check the highest level that fits you):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ First Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Second Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Third Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fourth Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fifth Year or Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>57. Present Estimated GPA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>58. Race/Ethnicity (Please select the one you most closely identify with):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ White/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Black/African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Middle Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>59. What is your major?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Permission to use the GRCS
Dear Jacob:

Thanks for your email about using the GRCS with your research on students success. This study has not been completed before, so it could be unique and timely. I have attached the GRCS to this email. If you use it, please send back the release form. You may also want to go to the GRC Research web page where the previous 230 GRC studies are summarized in 24 informational file. The address is: http//web.uconn.edu/joneil.

Also the recently published paper may be useful to you (See below). The best to you with your research.

Jim O'Neil, Ph.D.
Professor of Educational Psychology & Family Studies
University of Connecticut
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© 2008 Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association

Summarizing 25 Years of Research on Men's Gender Role Conflict Using the Gender Role Conflict Scale

New Research Paradigms and Clinical Implications
James M. O'Neil
University of Connecticut, James.O'Neil@uconn.edu

This article reviews 232 empirical studies that used the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) over the past 25 years (1982-2007). The article introduces the gender role conflict (GRC) construct using past definitions and theoretical models. The research findings for diverse men are summarized and studies related to men's intrapersonal, interpersonal, and therapeutic lives are analyzed. The empirical support, criticism, and challenges to the gender role conflict research program are reviewed. A contextual research paradigm with seven domains is presented and 18 research questions and two research models are discussed to foster more moderation and mediation studies on men's GRC. A new diagnostic schema to assess men's GRC in therapy and during psychoeducational interventions is discussed. The research review concludes that GRC is significantly related to men's psychological and interpersonal problems and therefore an important construct for psychologists and other helping professionals.
Appendix E

Permission to use the NSSE
The College Student Report
Item Usage Agreement

The National Survey of Student Engagement’s (NSSE) survey instrument, The College Student Report, is copyrighted and the copyright is owned by The Trustees of Indiana University. Any use of survey items contained within The College Student Report is prohibited without prior written permission from Indiana University. When fully executed, this Agreement constitutes written permission from the University, on behalf of NSSE, for the party named below to use an item or items from The College Student Report in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

In consideration of the mutual promises below, the parties hereby agree as follows:

1) The University hereby grants Jacob Arndt ("Licensee") a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable license to use, reproduce, distribute, publicly display and perform, and create derivatives from, in all media now known or hereafter developed, the item(s) listed in the proposal attached as Exhibit A, solely for the purpose of including such item(s) in the survey activity described in Exhibit A, which is incorporated by reference into this Agreement. This license does not include any right to sublicense others. This license only covers the survey instrument, time frame, population, and other terms described in Exhibit A. Any different or repeated use of the item(s) shall require an additional license.

2) "National Survey of Student Engagement", "NSSE", and the NSSE logo are registered with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Except as provided in part 3c below, these elements may not be incorporated without permission in materials developed under this agreement, including but not limited to surveys, Web sites, reports, and promotional materials.

3) In exchange for the license granted in section 1, Licensee agrees:

a) there will be no licensing fee to use NSSE items for the purposes described in Exhibit A;

b) to provide to NSSE frequency distributions and means on the licensed item(s);

c) on the survey form itself, and in all publications or presentations of data obtained through the licensed item(s), to include the following citation: "Items xx and xx used with permission from The College Student Report, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-14 The Trustees of Indiana University";

d) to provide to NSSE a copy of any derivatives of, or alterations to, the item(s) that Licensee makes for the purpose of Licensee’s survey ("modified items"), for NSSE’s own nonprofit, educational purposes, which shall include the use of the modified items in The College Student Report or any other survey instruments, reports, or other educational or professional materials that NSSE may develop or use in the future. Licensee hereby grants the University a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable, royalty-free license to use,
reproduce, distribute, create derivatives from, and publicly display and perform the modified items, in any media now known or hereafter developed; and

e) to provide to NSSE, for its own nonprofit, educational purposes, a copy of all reports, presentations, analyses, or other materials in which the item(s) licensed under this Agreement, or modified items, and any responses to licensed or modified items, are presented, discussed, or analyzed. NSSE shall not make public any data it obtains under this subsection in a manner that identifies specific institutions or individuals, except with the consent of the Licensee.

4) This Agreement expires on December 31, 2014.

The undersigned hereby consent to the terms of this Agreement and confirm that they have all necessary authority to enter into this Agreement.

For The Trustees of Indiana University:

Alexander C. McCormick
Director
National Survey of Student Engagement

For Licensee:

Jacob Arndt
Doctoral Student
Western Michigan University

Dr. Louann Bierlein Palmer
Dissertation Chair
Western Michigan University
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Thanks! I got this one. That sounds like an interesting project.
Please feel free to use the FGRS scale. Let me know how things turn out!

Best,
Betty Gillespie
Appendix G

Factor Loadings for GRCS (O’Neil et al., 1986)
FACTOR LOADINGS AND RELIABILITIES FOR ITEMS OF GRC5-I

FACTOR 1 – SUCCESS, POWER, COMPETITION (13 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Moving up the career ladder is important to me.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I evaluate other people’s value by their level of achievement and success.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Doing well all the time is important to me.</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Competing with others is the best way to succeed.</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I strive to be more successful than others.</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I like to feel superior to other people.</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Factor Loading: .54
Internal Consistency Reliabilities: .85
Test – Retest Reliabilities: .84
Variance Explained: 17.2%
### FACTOR 2 – RESTRICTIVE EMOTIONALITY (10 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I have difficulty telling others I care about them.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I do not like to show my emotions to other people</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mean Factor Loading: .55
- Internal Consistency Reliabilities: .82
- Test – Retest Reliabilities: .76
- Variance Explained: 7.6%
### FACTOR 3 – RESTRICTIVE AFFECTIONATE BEHAVIOR BETWEEN MEN – HOMOPHOBIA (8 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affection with other men make me tense.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Men who touch other men is difficult for me.</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Hugging other men is difficult for me.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mean Factor Loading**: .60
- **Internal Consistency Reliabilities**: .83
- **Test – Retest Reliabilities**: .86
- **Variance Explained**: 6.1%
## FACTOR 4 – CONFLICTS BETWEEN WORK AND LEISURE – FAMILY RELATIONS (6 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Finding time to relax is difficult for me.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, health, leisure).</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Factor Loading .57

Internal Consistency Reliabilities .75

Test – Retest Reliabilities .72

Variance Explained 4.6%

### DATA ON ALL ITEMS

Mean Factor Loadings .57

Overall Internal Consistency Reliabilities

Test-Retest Reliabilities .88

Variance Explained 35.2%
Appendix H

Individual and Collapsed Variables for Survey Instruments
### National Survey of Student Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSSE Collapsed Variable</th>
<th>NSSE Individual Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>Questions 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>Questions 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>Questions 9-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Role Conflict Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRCS Collapsed Variable</th>
<th>GRCS Individual Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success, Power, Competition</td>
<td>Questions: 14,18,21,25,27,31,34,36,37,41,45,47,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Emotionality</td>
<td>Questions: 15,19,22,26,28,32,35,38,42,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men</td>
<td>Questions: 16,20,23,29,33,39,46,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts Between Work and Leisure</td>
<td>Questions: 17,24,30,40,44,49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Feminine Gender Role Stress Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGRS Collapsed Variable</th>
<th>FGRS Individual Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Unemotional Relationships</td>
<td>Questions: 39,36,19,20,43,25,15,51,34,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Physical Unattractiveness</td>
<td>Questions: 14,52,16,30,31,26,41,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Victimization</td>
<td>Questions: 35,45,42,33,27,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Behaving Assertively</td>
<td>Questions: 28,29,24,32,17,44,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Not Being Nurturant</td>
<td>Questions: 38,21,23,47,49,48,37,50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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