2015

Man Up or Man Down?: Male Perceptions of Gender Identity

Matthew N. Barr
Taylor University

MAN UP OR MAN DOWN?: MALE PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER IDENTITY

A thesis

Presented to

The School of Social Sciences, Education & Business

Department of Higher Education and Student Development

Taylor University

Upland, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Higher Education and Student Development

---

by

Matthew N. Barr

February 2015

Higher Education and Student Development
Taylor University
Upland, Indiana

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

MASTER'S THESIS

This is to certify that the Thesis of

Matthew N. Barr

entitled

Man Up or Man Down?: Male Perceptions of Gender Identity

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the

Master of Arts Degree
in Higher Education and Student Development

February 2015

Drew Moser, Ph.D. Date
Thesis Supervisor

Scott Gaier, Ph.D. Date
Member, Thesis Hearing Committee

Tim Herrmann, Ph.D. Date
Member, Thesis Hearing Committee

Tim Herrmann, Ph.D. Date
Director, M.A. in Higher Education and Student Development

Abstract

Beginning during childhood, males learn to act in certain ways that will define them as masculine. Society expects boys to play with certain toys, not show emotion, and show aggressiveness. These expectations only increase as men age. By the time males enter college, they can be expected to take part in binge drinking, dangerous behavior, and sexual promiscuity. Research has shown many variables could affect male perceptions of gender identity during college. The current study aimed to investigate male perceptions of gender identity on two college campuses. The researcher distributed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) at two different faith-based institutions and used the added variables of institution type, residence hall type, class status, and amount of time spent with the opposite sex. The results of the current study found male perceptions of gender seemed affected by institution type, residence hall type, and class status. The amount of time spent with the opposite sex did not affect male perceptions of gender identity.

Acknowledgements

"So if there is any encouragement in Christ, any comfort from love, any participation in the Spirit, any affection and sympathy, complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind. Do nothing from selfish ambition or conceit, but in humility count others *more significant than yourselves. Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of* others*."*
- Philippians 2:1-4

First and foremost, I want to thank my Lord and Savior for always sustaining and providing for me – even when I didn't want it. Without His provision, I would not be the man that I am today. Thank you to my parents, Mike & Cindy, my sister, Jennifer, my beautiful niece, Mikayla, and the rest of my family, for supporting and loving me unconditionally. Your support for me to pursue my education means the world to me. Thank you to the Student Life staff at LeTourneau University that poured so generously and fervently into my life during my time in undergrad. Your guidance and support is what has inspired my track into higher education and student development.

Thank you to Steve & Kate Austin, Greta Joy Johnson, Taylor Smythe, Erica Gleason, and Brittane Turner for teaching and loving me well during my time with TSO. It has been such a tremendous and unexpected blessing to share life with each of you during my time at Taylor. Working alongside of y'all has been such a pleasure. Thank you for your friendship and love.

Thank you Drew Moser for allowing me to be your guinea pig as your first thesis to supervise. Your guidance has been so helpful and crucial throughout this process. Thank you Scott Gaier for inspiring me to be a learner, teaching me how to look at the

world through *soft eyes*, and gathering around the *grace of great things* with me. Thank you Tim Herrmann for believing in the value and importance of a higher education and student development master's program at Taylor University.

Finally, thank you to MAHE cohort 7. Spending the last two years with y'all have been the best two years of my life. I have been a part of many communities, but never before have I felt more loved and cared for than I have with y'all. Your friendships and conversations have been so life-giving, and at times challenging – challenges that I needed. I will forever carry our memories together for the rest of my life. We truly were, and always will be, the most goofy, affirming, crazy, loving, caring, and best cohort there has ever been. I love you all, dearly.

This thesis is dedicated to the many students that I have worked with and the ones that I will have the privilege of working with for many years to come. You are the reason I do what I do. Thank you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

"For the dormitory held young men to a common experience. It took them from the bosom of a sheltering home and placed them under the same roof, where they might share the experiences which made men of boys" (Rudolph, 1990, p. 96).

Overview

Beginning at an early age, males learn to fit societal expectations of masculinity. As males grow, masculine expectations increase, as well as the pressures to fulfill those expectations (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Scott, Livingston, Havice, & Cawthon, 2012). Male college students feel bombarded with positive and negative representations from the media of what masculinity entails (Chen, 2012; Moss, 2011). Research has shown peer groups serve as the most powerful source of influence and ideals on a person (Astin, 1993; Baxter-Magolda, 2003; Gellin, 2003; Terenzini, Pascarella, & Blimling, 1996). As a result, peer groups can greatly affect the perceptions of masculinity in males living in residence halls due to the close, communal-type living males experience in these types of environment (Scott et al., 2012). When examining campus culture, student development professionals must understand masculinity in developing males so as to better work with them and provide support during this time of development (Harris & Struve, 2009).

Research exists regarding masculinity and residence halls, but little research has compared the perceptions of masculinity of males living in coeducational halls versus all-male halls. Studies exploring the relationship between residence hall living and

satisfaction with the college experience showed students who live in residence halls to have a better overall college experience (Astin, 1984; Chickering, 1975; Foubert, 1998). Living in residence halls allows for students to create close ties with peers, to experience and appreciate differences in values and beliefs, and to learn how an individual's behavior can influence other people (Chickering, 1975; Harrington, 2002).

Masculinity theory. While the researcher chose not to define masculinity due to a wide spectrum of the meaning of the word, a culturally defined standard known as *hegemonic masculinity* describes a more common understanding of masculinity (Willer, 2005). Connell (1987) described hegemonic masculinity as "the maintenance of practices that institutionalize men's dominance over women…and is constructed in relation to women and to subordinate masculinities" (p. 185-186). Bird (1996) explained that this form of masculinity becomes perpetuated by homosociality, which refers to the non-sexual attractions between a man or a woman and members of the same sex: "…homosociality promotes clear distinctions between hegemonic masculinities and non-hegemonic masculinities by the segregation of social groups" (p. 121). Characteristics such as emotional detachment, competitiveness, physical strength, aggression, risk-taking, courage, sexual objectification of women, and lack of feminine traits have become linked to hegemonic masculinity (Bird, 1996; Willer, 2005).

Researchers presented masculinity as a product of social pressures in order to maintain a masculine gender identity (Connell, 1987; Kimmel, 2008; Willer, 2005). Kimmel (2008) emphasized that males in homosocial relationships often act as "gender police," keeping each other's masculinity in check and perpetuating the fear that other men will detect their masculine insufficiencies. Kimmel further explained sometimes

men portray a false masculinity to cover the fear of others perceiving them as anything but masculine: "What we call masculinity is often a hedge against being revealed as a fraud, an exaggerated set of activities that keep others from seeing through us, and a frenzied effort to keep at bay those fears within ourselves…" (p. 103). Both Kimmel (2008) and Dowd (2010) asserted masculinity has become something males must continually pursue in order to prove themselves as the social standard of manliness.

Sex and gender. Since the current study addressed the topic of gender, the researcher chose to distinguish the difference between the terms *sex* and *gender*. *Sex* refers to the biological differences that classify one as male or female. *Gender* refers to the characteristics set forth by society that deems one as masculine or feminine.

Residence halls. Residence halls function as unique, primary environments for co-curricular learning, with such conditions not easily replicated. These spaces allow for learning, evaluation, and peer relationships, all of which serve as major factors in student identity development (Blimling, 2015; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; McMahon, 1993). Living among those with diverse backgrounds and different lifestyles not only allows space for students to create a foundation for their own values and beliefs but also prepares students for life after college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; McMahon, 1993).

Astin (1984) and Chickering (1975) found that residential students have higher rates of satisfaction with their undergraduate experience as opposed to commuter students. Similarly, Ullom and Hallenbeck (1981) found that students living in residence halls have greater emotional support than students who choose to live off campus. In the same study, emotional support emerged as one of the main factors in students' choice to continue to live on campus. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) found residential students as

more likely to persist and graduate than students who commute to campus. A study conducted by Foubert (1998) revealed that a sense of belonging to one's floor or wing community contributed significantly to overall residence hall satisfaction. The same study showed higher rates of satisfaction among students who could study quietly in their residence halls (Foubert, 1998). Blimling (2015) and Fay (1981) believe that the physical setting of a residence hall also has shown to have an effect on students: "…[residence halls] have an impact on student development… [and] the lack of adequate facilities precludes the possibility of interpersonal growth taking place" (Fay, 1981, p. 47). If students do not live in up-to-date or visually appealing facilities visually appealing, then the ability to foster relationships becomes hindered.

In the same way that colleges and universities differ from one another, so do residence halls on a single campus. Each hall has its own culture, traditions, and character. Physical layouts, residence life staff, and the nature of students residing in any particular hall can play a major role in defining these factors. In light of this, a male college student's development can differ based upon his living environment.

Coeducational residence halls—housing facilities in which unmarried male and female students live—typically range from males and females living on separate floors, on the same wing or floor, or, more common in recent years, within the same suite, apartment, or room (McMahon, 1993). All-male residence halls, as their name suggests, house only male students.

Outline of the Study

The research presented below consists of five chapters. Chapter two includes a comprehensive literature review, covering current research relevant to the study's topic.

Chapter three introduces the study's methodology, containing an explanation of participants, procedures, measures, and data analysis. Chapter four contains the results and findings of the study. Finally, chapter five offers discussion, conclusions, and recommendations for future practice.

Significance and Purpose of the Study

In order for college student development professionals to better support their male students, practitioners should know how their male students perceive their gender identity. The research conducted within the preset study can benefit public, private, and private Christian colleges and universities strongly focused on the residential model. The resulting data within the study has implications for residence life staffing patterns. The emerging data also gives a better focus to the types of residence hall programming for males upon which colleges and universities should expand. Finally, the current study should also benefit the evaluation of the student housing assignments process.

The present study sought to compare the gender identity perceptions of males at two different faith-based higher education institutions. The study also compared the male perceptions of gender identity of males living in coeducational residence halls with those of males living in all-male residence halls. Finally, the study attempted to fill the gap in research regarding gender identity and residence halls. Currently, very little research exists that compares gender identity in the different types of residence hall.

Research Questions

In the process of conducting this research, the researcher developed four questions to guide the present study:

1. How do male college students perceive their gender identity?

2. How do males in all-male residence halls perceive their gender identity versus those living in coeducational residence halls?
3. How does class status affect male perception of gender identity?
4. How does amount of time spent with the opposite sex affect male perceptions of gender identity?

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Masculinity on College Campuses

From the time of adolescence, society expects boys to live up to masculine standards that include aggressiveness, competitiveness, success, toughness, and controlling one's feelings (Edwards & Jones, 2009). These expectations tell boys not only what they should be, but also what they should not be, such as vulnerable, feminine, or gay. In their study of male college student identity development, Edwards and Jones (2009) stated that the participants in their study could not remember a time that they learned these societal expectations of masculinity, nor could they remember a time when these expectations did not exist for them. Evidently, masculinity development not only becomes learned through social interactions, but it also happens unconsciously.

By the time they enter junior high, boys feel expected to play sports, fit into the right peer groups, break the rules, use swear words, and fight for the attention of girls (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Once they enter high school, teenage boys feel expected to act competitively, go to parties, drink alcohol, have sex with girls, and not, as society has phrased it, "act gay." One male research participant in the 2009 study by Edwards and Jones described high school as "you want to be the kid who beats your rival team in lacrosse and drinks that night to celebrate and have sex with a girl" (p. 216). According to another male participant in the same study, the college years represent "four years of

freedom" meant for "partying" (p. 216). In another study conducted by Harris and Struve (2009), male college students expressed that the male culture on their campus felt quite patriarchal and competitive. Students stated that males who slept with multiple girls, drank excessive amounts of alcohol, or made poor decisions became deemed as "cool" or "masculine" (p. 5). Regarding the competitive nature of his campus, one male student stated, "…you constantly have to try to beat everyone else because that's what [success] is based on… It's just doing better than the guy sitting next to you" (p. 6). In light of this competitive hierarchy, Dowd (2010) stated:

> Masculinity is as much about men's relation to other men as it is about men's relation to women. Indeed, it seems that competition and hierarchy with other men may be a more intense component of masculinity. In addition, one's standing and place is never secure; masculinity is often described as something never attained but rather something that must be consistently achieved on a daily basis. (p. 257)

If males must always work toward masculinity, yet can never attain it, then no males could claim that they are masculine. They can only claim that they exhibit masculine traits. Their own peer groups appear as the people who can most spur this idea of unattainable masculinity among men.

Many researchers agree that peer groups stand out as a major source of influence on academic and personal development of students (Astin, 1993; Baxter-Magolda, 2003; Gellin, 2003; Terenzini et al., 1996). Student-student interaction includes encounters such as working on group projects; participation in intramural sports, a fraternity, or a sorority; and hours per week spent socializing with other students. In a study by Astin

(1993), these types of interactions showed positive effects on leadership development, overall academic development, problem-solving skills, critical thinking skills, and cultural awareness. This study also showed negative effects on feelings of depression and the belief that an individual cannot change society. The gender effects of these peer group findings show that women more likely associate with women during college and men more likely associate with men. As a result, men more likely become influenced by the values and behaviors of other men (1993). The problem with influence by the values and behaviors of others, Baxter-Magolda (2003) claimed, comes with the fact that this peer group culture often exerts pressures to conform to external approval, rather than support an inward, personal growth. Therefore, while all men are born males, an individual's surroundings shape the process of becoming masculine just as much as an individual's actions does. Kimmel (2008) made the observation that men do not have inherent masculinity; rather, they become masculine through social constructs:

> Men are not born, they are made. Men make themselves, actively constructing their masculinities within a social and historical context. We are born as biological males, but we develop an identity as a man through a process of complex interactions with culture and in turn, learn the gender scripts that are important in our culture. (p. xxii)

If correct, Kimmel's assertion indicates that males living within residence halls reside in a prime location to shape their masculinity. Residence halls provide a space for students to interact with individuals that they normally would not have the chance to share community with in another location. These complex interactions also have the potential to shape how a male views his own masculinity and how he exerts it on others.

Coeducational Residence Halls

Coeducational housing initially emerged to help facilitate relational development between men and women, as well as create a living space allowing for the fluctuation in enrollment numbers of male and female students. Coeducational halls also permit universities to hire either a male or female for the residence hall director position of that building.

Numerous studies have discussed the advantages and disadvantages of coeducational housing and their effects on college student development. Compared to males living in all-male halls, men living in coeducational halls appear to hold more progressive attitudes toward women due to the close proximity in which males and females live (Wymore, 2010). Two separate studies done by Foubert (1998) and Corbett (1972) found that students living in coeducational halls had greater overall satisfaction with their living situation. Students in coeducational halls reported friendlier atmospheres, greater ease of meeting new people, and fewer cliques as compared to single-sex residence halls. A study by Willoughby and Carroll (2009) found that disadvantages of living in coeducational halls included higher levels of binge drinking and more permissive sexual attitudes.

All-Male Residence Halls

Rudolph (1990) wrote about the experience of young men in residence halls in early America: “For the dormitory held young men to a common experience. It took them from the bosom of a sheltering home and placed then under the same roof, where they might share the experiences which made men of boys” (p. 96). American residence halls began as a way to supervise and care for

the well-being of young men enrolled at university during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In light of this need to care for and supervise male students, universities all across the early United States began to build residence halls on their campuses (Rudolph, 1990):

> The dormitory brought to bear the sense of common decency and the sense of self-respect which taught responsibility. . . A revival might be sparked in a dormitory, where under the influence of a wiser chum a young man might move from indifference to belief, from idleness to profound inspiration. (p. 96)

McMahon (1993) compared the development of interpersonal relationships among men living in coeducational halls with men in all-male halls; the study found that men within all-male halls scored higher in the development of interpersonal relationships than men in coeducational halls. Arboleda, Shelley, Wang, and Whalen (2003) found that men who live in single-sex residence halls perform academically better than females who live in single-sex residence halls. Unlike research regarding coeducational residence halls, current literature lacks significant research concerning all-male residence halls.

Masculinity within American Media

According to a recent digital consumer report by the Nielsen Company (2014), the average American owns four electronic devices and spends approximately sixty hours a week consuming content from these devices. Kimmel (2008) stated that males ages 16 to 26 represent the most avid consumers of electronic devices. Television channels such as ESPN and Spike make large profits from advertisers who market to this age group because advertisers know that young male viewers buy their products.

Television, film, and video games. Many of the representations of American masculinity come from major sources of media that males consume: television, film, and video games. Primetime television shows such as *Everybody Loves Raymond, According to Jim, Modern Family,* and *The Simpsons* all depict grown men (all fathers) as infantilized by their wives, unable to do simple tasks for themselves, completely clueless about the lives of their children, and desperate for sexual intimacy (Kimmel, 2008). The 1999 film *Fight Club* features actor Brad Pitt, whose character, unhappy with his white-collar job, forms a club for recreational fighting (Baker, 2008). As a major theme, the movie seems to assert that, in order to achieve definitive masculinity, a man must fight; if he does not, others cannot consider him masculine. The film portrays continuous struggles and pressures for men to become more masculine by proving one's masculinity through participating in the fight club (Moss, 2011).

In another popular film representation of masculinity, Russell Crowe's *Gladiator* (Baker, 2008) character appears stoic, secure, a leader of men, and devoted to his family. Although the main male characters in both of these films manifest different characteristics of masculinity, they both portray violent male characters with the inherent need to fight or even brutally kill others (Moss, 2011). This theme of violence also appears in video games popular among males. Producers of the widely popular *Grand Theft Auto: San Andreas* characterize the game as "cinematic." Kimmel (2008) described the use of the word "cinematic" as "a thin justification for the violence and mayhem that your character, or avatar, then creates… Your goals are to sell drugs, build your crime empire, and kill cops. You can kill anyone you want" (p. 158).

The bromance. Seth, a character from the popular college age film *Superbad,* regarding his love for his best friend, said, "I love you. I love you. I'm not even embarrassed to say it… I just want to go to the rooftops and scream, 'I love my best friend Evan!'" (Sargent, 2013, p. 23). As early as 2004, men began expressing their masculinity through a new relational status called the "bromance" (Chen, 2012). Merriam-Webster (n.d.) defines a bromance as "a close nonsexual friendship between men." This term gained popularity through media outlets such as film and television. In *I Love You, Man* (2009), two characters participate in a bromance. One man struggles to balance his relationship with his girlfriend and his bromance with his friend (Sargent, 2013). In the 2009 MTV television series, *Bromance,* Brody Jenner searches for a best friend or a "bromance." On this show, male contestants competed for the chance to become Brody's best friend, and thus, participate in a "bromance" (Chen, 2012).

These types of male relationships allow for males to express their emotions through a close friendship with another male. Such a relationship differs from how society has normally perceived male friendship in the past. Without sexual intimacy, bromances permit intimacy with narrow and well-defined boundaries of emotional connection (Chen, 2012). Although the ability for males to express their emotions with one another proves healthy, Chen (2012) claimed bromances as unhealthy relationships for men. Sargent argued that bromances encourage gender hierarchy, prioritize the bromance over all other relationships, and normalize homophobia (Sargent, 2013).

Masculinity within American Evangelical Culture

"Easter Morning," a 1959 painting by Norman Rockwell, depicts a father slouching in his arm chair, in his pajamas, and reading his newspaper, while his wife and

children leave the house, dressed in their Sunday best, with Bibles in hand. This painting brings attention to a recent trend among men and the Christian church: they do not attend. Schaller (2008) stated that adult women outnumber adult men in church attendance by a 60-40 ratio, and some researchers believe that gap is widening (Mathewes-Green, 1999). The Western Christian church seems to have lost its appeal to men.

Longwood, Muesse, and Schipper (2004) stated that, despite male dominance of leadership in the church, men seem to have replaced the importance in faith with an uneasy, uncomfortable approach to faith. Debate in the nineteenth and twentieth century compares the masculinity of Christianity and atheism. Proponents argued for atheism as more masculine because religious beliefs "make males sentimental, weak, and 'soft-minded,'" while advocates of Christianity countered the atheist argument by asserting that Christian men "could be both pious and masculine" (p. 87).

The apparent need of Christian American men to prove the masculinity of their religion evidences an uneasiness regarding faith and masculinity. This uneasiness shows in the twenty-first century in male-Christian conferences such as Act Like Men and Promise Keepers. One Promise Keepers slogan states, "Real men love Jesus" (Longwood et al., 2004). However, Longwood et al., 2004 agreed that "if men were truly comfortable with loving Jesus, asserting that this is something that real men do would not be necessary" (p. 87). However, conferences such as these two attempt to promote a more positive depiction of masculinity among evangelicals. The home page of the Act Like Men (2014) website states that, "[men should be] loud and ruthless about their own sin, but patient and full of grace in leading others" (para. 2). Similarly, in recent trends among Christian movies such as *Facing the Giants*, *Fireproof*, and *Courageous*, the

leading men serve as a football coach, a fireman, and a cop – occupations considered the pinnacle of masculinity (Moring, 2012).

Some Christians link the problem of male absence in the church to a need to "re-masculate" Jesus (O'Brien, 2008). In one extreme, Driscoll stated, "Real men avoid the church because it projects a Richard Simmons, hippie, queer Christ" (p. 49). Driscoll elaborated, "Jesus was not a long-haired… effeminate-looking dude, rather He had callused hands and big biceps" (p. 49). Driscoll and others suggest a solution to the problem: inject the church with a heavy dose of testosterone. Besides offering a narrow view of Christian masculinity, this type of theology excludes women. If this "masculine Christ" offers a true model of Jesus, women cannot imitate Him. Quoting 1 Corinthians 1:15, O'Brien argued against Jesus as the model of masculinity; rather,

> Jesus 'is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.' As such, He is not simply the perfect male; He is the perfect human being. Through His obedience to the Father, Christ exhibited the qualities that should characterize all believers, both male and female. (p. 51)

As explored above, the ideals of masculinity encourage males in competitiveness, independence, self-sufficiency, and emotional restriction. These qualities become frequently used to judge the masculinity of American males. However, the ideals of Christianity encourage cooperation, connectedness, community, and emotionality. The standards of masculinity in America challenge Christian males as they strive to live up to expectations quite opposite of their beliefs. Feeling unable to meet these masculine expectations produces problems for Christian males as they try to acknowledge their faith to their male peers (Longwood et al., 2004).

Chapter 3

Methodology

The present study aimed to compare the gender identity perceptions of males at two different faith-based higher education institutions. Currently, a gap exists in the research regarding male perceptions of gender identity in the two different types of residence halls. The current study used a quantitative methodology. According to Creswell (2008), "Quantitative research tends to address research problems requiring a description of trends or an explanation of the relationship among variables" (p. 51).

Participants

The researcher administered the present quantitative comparative study to males living in either coeducational residence halls or all-male residence halls at two small, private, faith-based institutions: one school located in the Southern region of the United States and the other located in the Midwest region of the United States. To protect confidentiality and reduce confusion, the researcher assigned pseudonyms to both institutions, referring to the Southern university as *Institution A* and the Midwestern university as *Institution B.* The student population of both schools appears primarily Caucasian, conservative Protestant. Of the 1,346 students who attend Institution A, 74% live on campus. The current sex breakdown entails 71% male and 29% female. The university seems predominantly male because of an emphasis on engineering and aeronautical science programs—historically male dominated careers. The student

population of Institution B stands at 1,913, with approximately 84% of the student body living on campus, with a current sex breakdown of 44% male and 56% female.

Procedure

The researcher asked all residential male students at both campuses to participate in a voluntary, confidential, incentivized online survey administered through an email from the Student Development department at Institution A and an email from the researcher at Institution B. The researcher sent out one reminder email to take the survey two days before the survey closed. Both schools received identical surveys. The survey for Institution A went to all 627 residential males. The researcher offered an incentive of entrance into a drawing for one of eight Amazon gift cards: five $10 gift cards, two $25 gift cards, and one $50 gift card. The survey for the Institution B went to all 761 residential males, with the same incentive as Institution A. The researcher selected the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) as the measure administered (see Appendix A). The confidential survey contained 60 items that took an estimated 5-10 minutes to complete, administered through SurveyMonkey.com.

Measure

Bem sex-role inventory. In 1974, Dr. Sandra Bem developed the Measurement of Psychological Androgyny, more commonly known as the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The BSRI measures masculinity-femininity and gender roles, assessing how participants perceive themselves. Bem (1974) developed the measure to examine psychological androgyny and to show the advantages of exhibiting both masculine and feminine traits as opposed to gender-typed categorization. The researcher did not develop the measure to determine an individual as more masculine or more feminine, “but rather a tendency to

describe one's self in accordance with sex-typed standards of desirable behavior for men and women" (p. 155). The survey contains 60 personality traits that participants on which participants self-rate according to a Likert scale ranging from 1 (never or almost never true) to 7 (always or almost always true). Twenty of the personality characteristics typically receive consideration as more masculine, twenty as more feminine, and twenty as fillers not affecting the outcome of individual results.

Added Variables

As part of its purpose, the present study compared male perceptions of gender identity within coeducational residence halls and all-male residence halls. In this pursuit, the researcher asked participants to designate the type of residence hall in which they resided: all-male (on-campus male apartments included) or coeducational residence hall (males and female living in the same building, on different floors). According to Yoder (2009), males who advance in their undergraduate career can change their perception of masculinity. In light of this finding, the researcher also asked students to provide their current (freshman, sophomore, junior or senior) class status in order to determine possible trends connecting gender identity and class status. Finally, the researcher asked participants to state the amount of time per week spent with the opposite sex outside of class. Students chose from 0-5 hours, 5-10 hours, 10-15 hours, or 15 or more hours per week to determine if the amount of time spent with females serves as a variable affecting male perceptions of gender identity.

Omitted variables. Initially, the researcher included a variable to distinguish amount of time spent with the opposite sex through friendships and amount of time spent with the opposite sex through dating relationships. After collecting the data, the

researcher realized the survey should have listed the dating relationship question as optional because not all males surveyed would currently have in a relationship with a significant other. In light of this possibility, the researcher omitted the added variable from the study. The researcher also removed the second variable from the final research that asked participants to distinguish the academic school to which they belonged. The researcher decided on this omission because the academic schools at both institutions do not align with one another, making comparison difficult.

Data Analysis

The researcher analyzed the collected data to address the four research questions: 1) How do male college students perceive their gender identity? 2) How do males in all-male residence halls perceive their gender identity versus those living in coeducational residence halls? 3) How does class status affect male perception of gender identity? 4) How does amount of time spent with the opposite sex affect male perceptions of gender identity? The researcher collected the BSRI data from SurveyMonkey.com and analyzed it using SPSS analysis. The researcher also used independent sample t-tests to analyze the results of the first two research questions through average scores on the masculinity and femininity scales, then used ANOVAs and post-hoc tests to analyze the last two research questions. The researcher scored significance at *p* level of .05.

Chapter 4

Results

Demographics

The response rate for Institution A reached 49% (*N*=307). The residence hall breakdown divided into 75.6% all-male and 24.4% coeducational. Freshmen contributed 28.3% of responses, sophomores 30.6%, juniors 18.9%, and seniors 22.2%. Males who reported spending 0-5 hours per week with the opposite sex outside of class represented 35.5% of participants, 25.1% 5-10 hours, 19.2% 10-15 hours, and 20.2% 15 or more hours. The response rate for Institution B reached 37% (*N*=280). The residence hall breakdown divided into 68.6% all-male \ and 31.4% coeducational. Freshmen contributed 25.4% of responses, sophomores 19.3%, juniors 27.5%, and seniors 27.8%. Males who reported spending 0-5 hours per week with the opposite sex outside of class represented 27.9%, 29.3% 5-10 hours, 21.1% 10-15, and 21.7% 15 or more hours.

Institutions

The first research question read, "How do male college students perceive their gender identity?" An independent samples t-test compared the means of the masculinity and femininity scales at both institutions. The test concluded males at Institution B (M = 4.50, SD = .561) scored significantly higher on the femininity scale (p = .013) than males at Institution A (M = 4.38, SD = .630). Th test also showed neither institution scored significantly higher than the other on the masculinity scale (p > .05) (see Table 1).

Table 1

Independent Samples T-Test of Masculinity and Femininity Scales at Both Institutions

Scale	*t*	*df*	*p*
Masculinity Scale	-1.58	585	.114
Femininity Scale	2.50	585	.013*

Note. *$p < .05$.

Residence Hall

The second research question read, "How do males in all-male residence halls perceive their gender identity versus those living in coeducational residence halls?" An independent samples t-test compared the masculinity and femininity scales means in both residence hall options (Table 2). Institution A's results showed no statistical significance between the masculinity scale and all-male or coeducational residence halls ($p > .05$) or between the femininity scale and all-male or coeducational residence halls for Institution A ($p > .05$). Institution B's results found males living in all-male residence halls scored significantly higher on the masculinity scale than those in coeducational residence halls ($p = .016$). Finally, no statistical significance existed between the femininity scale and all-male or coeducational residence halls for Institution B ($p > .05$) (Table 3).

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Masculinity and Femininity Scales in Different Types of Residence Halls

Institution	Scale	Type of Res Hall	*N*	*M*	*SD*
A	Masculinity	Coed	75	4.72	.692
		All-Male	232	4.82	.664
	Femininity	Coed	75	4.32	.585
		All-Male	232	4.40	.643
B	Masculinity	Coed	88	4.56	.787
		All-Male	192	4.78	.684
	Femininity	Coed	88	4.49	.608
		All-Male	192	4.51	.539

Table 3

Independent Samples T-Test of Masculinity and Femininity Scales in Different Types of Residence Halls

Institution	Scale	*t*	*df*	*p*
A	Masculinity	-1.13	305	.260
	Femininity	-.985	305	.326
B	Masculinity	-2.41	278	.016*
	Femininity	-.231	278	.818

Note. *$p < .05$.

Class Status

The third research question asked, "How does class status affect male perception of gender identity?" A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) determined if a difference between means existed for the masculinity scale and the femininity scale on class status at both institutions. Table 4 lists the descriptive statistics for the ANOVA. Neither the masculinity scale nor femininity scale showed a significant difference ($p > .05$) of means when comparing to class status for either institution (see Table 5).

The researcher ran a post hoc test to determine if individual classes differed significantly from one another on the masculinity or femininity scale at each institution. The post hoc did not find any statistically significant ($p > .05$) data in the test run for Institution A for either scale. However, the test for Institution B found a significant difference ($p = .037$) between freshman males ($M = 4.59$, $SD = .717$) and senior males ($M = 4.83$, $SD = .737$) in the masculinity scale. The femininity scale showed no significance between classes at Institution B.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Class Status and Effects on Masculinity and Femininity Scales

Institution	Scale	Class	*N*	*M*	*SD*
A	Masculinity	Freshman	87	4.76	.610
		Sophomore	94	4.83	.659
		Junior	58	4.80	.709
		Senior	68	4.81	.740
		Total	307	4.80	.671
	Femininity	Freshman	87	4.43	.623
		Sophomore	94	4.35	.625
		Junior	58	4.35	.622
		Senior	68	4.36	.657
		Total	307	4.39	.629
B	Masculinity	Freshman	71	4.58	.718
		Sophomore	54	4.63	.685
		Junior	77	4.76	.731
		Senior	78	4.83	.737
		Total	280	4.71	.729
	Femininity	Freshman	71	4.56	.558
		Sophomore	54	4.49	.551
		Junior	77	4.56	.556
		Senior	78	4.40	.568
		Total	280	4.50	.561

Table 5

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Effects of Class Status on Masculinity and Femininity Scale

Institution	Scale		*df*	*F*	*p*
A	Masculinity	Between Groups	3	.183	.908
	Femininity	Between Groups	3	.307	.820
B	Masculinity	Between Groups	3	1.81	.146
	Femininity	Between Groups	3	1.46	.226

Time Spent with Opposite Sex

The final research question read, "How does amount of time spent with the opposite sex affect male perceptions of gender identity?" The researcher ran another ANOVA to determine if a difference between means existed for the two scales on time

spent with opposite sex at both institutions. Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics for this ANOVA. Neither scale showed a significant difference ($p > .05$) of means when comparing amount of time spent with the opposite sex for either institution (Table 7).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Time Spent with Opposite Sex and Effects on Masculinity and Femininity Scales

Institution	Scale	Time	*N*	*M*	*SD*
A	Masculinity	0-5 hours	109	4.70	.715
		5-10 hours	77	4.78	.520
		10-15 hours	59	4.93	.623
		15 or more hours	62	4.88	.779
		Total	307	4.80	.671
	Femininity	0-5 hours	109	4.30	.662
		5-10 hours	77	4.39	.628
		10-15 hours	59	4.44	.646
		15 or more hours	62	4.44	.549
		Total	307	4.38	.629
B	Masculinity	0-5 hours	78	4.54	.746
		5-10 hours	82	4.74	.725
		10-15 hours	59	4.79	.636
		15 or more hours	61	4.81	.754
		Total	280	4.71	.724
	Femininity	0-5 hours	78	4.51	.566
		5-10 hours	82	4.44	.550
		10-15 hours	59	4.65	.558
		15 or more hours	61	4.43	.556
		Total	280	4.50	.561

Table 7

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Effects of Class Status on Masculinity and Femininity Scale

Institution	Scale		*df*	*F*	*p*
A	Masculinity	Between Groups	3	1.94	.123
	Femininity	Between Groups	3	.940	.422
B	Masculinity	Between Groups	3	2.06	.106
	Femininity	Between Groups	3	2.01	.113

Chapter 5

Discussion

Results

The present study compared the gender identity perceptions of males at two different faith-based higher education institutions. The following four research questions guided the study: 1) How do male college students perceive their gender identity? 2) How do males in all-male residence halls perceive their gender identity versus those living in coeducational residence halls? 3) How does class status affect male perception of gender identity? 4) How does amount of time spent with the opposite sex affect male perceptions of gender identity? As shown in the literature, peer groups serve as a guiding force for gender identity perceptions (Astin, 1993; Baxter-Magolda, 2003; Gellin, 2003; Terenzini et al., 1996). The discussion below uses results from Chapter 4 and supporting literature from Chapter 2 to answer these questions regarding male perceptions of gender identity.

How do male college students perceive their gender identity? The results of the first independent samples t-test for the first research question showed no male students at either institution scored significantly higher than the other on the masculinity scale. However, male students at Institution B did score significantly higher on the femininity scale than male students at Institution A. The results of this portion of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) show that males at Institution B feel more comfortable identifying themselves with more feminine descriptors than males from Institution A.

This finding appears to contradict what literature tells us about males more comfortably attributing masculine characteristics to themselves as opposed to feminine characteristics (Bird, 1996; Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harris & Struve, 2009; Willer, 2005).

Taking into account the student populations at the different institutions (Institution A: m = 71%, f = 29%; Institution B: m = 44%, f = 56%), one could conclude male students at Institution B scored higher on the femininity scale due to the higher percentage of female students at their institution. Male students at Institution A seem less exposed to the presence of females, which could possibly affect their perceptions of gender identity. The discussion of the fourth research question addresses this assumption of time spent with the opposite sex affecting perceptions of gender identity.

How do males in all-male residence halls perceive their gender identity versus those living in coeducational residence halls? The second independent samples t-test determined whether or not different living situations in residence halls affects male perceptions of gender identity. The results showed no significance for the masculinity or femininity scale for Institution A. It also showed no significance for the femininity scale at Institution B. However, the test did show significance for students in all-male residence halls at Institution B who scored significantly higher on the masculinity scale than male students living in coeducational residence halls at Institution B.

In light of these results, students who live in all-male residence halls at Institution B would more likely identify with more masculine descriptors than male students living in coeducational residence halls. This identification could result from the fact that all-male residence hall students experience more exposureto male peer interactions than that of males living in coeducational residence halls. The higher score on the masculinity

scale for all-male residence hall students correlates with literature stating males tend to exert more masculine descriptors such as competitiveness, aggressiveness, and toughness when around other males (Bird, 1996; Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harris & Struve, 2009; Willer, 2005). This finding further reinforces that peer groups majorly influence identity development (Astin, 1993; Baxter-Magolda, 2003; Gellin, 2003; Terenzini et al., 1996).

How does class status affect male perception of gender identity? A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) determined whether one's class status affected perceptions of gender identity. Although the ANOVA found no significance for either scale at either institution regarding class status, the researcher ran a post-hoc test in order to find any significance between individual class statuses. The post-hoc test found a significant difference between senior males who scored higher on the masculinity scale than freshman males at Institution B.

Although class status does not appear to significantly affect overall male perceptions of gender identity, discovering that male students at Institution B average higher scores on the masculinity scale the higher their class status proves interesting. The results of the descriptive analysis of class status showed freshman scored the lowest mean on the masculinity scale, followed in order by sophomores, juniors, and seniors. This result suggests that as male students progress through their time at Institution B, they become more comfortable identifying with masculine descriptors. This finding aligns with previous research at the same institution that found a male's ability to change his perceptions of masculinity could happen during his time at college (Yoder, 2009).

How does amount of time spent with the opposite sex affect male perceptions of gender identity? Another ANOVA determined whether amount of time spent with the

opposite sex affected male perceptions of gender identity. This ANOVA found no statistical significance in amount of time spent with the opposite sex for either scale at either institution. The ANOVA results surprised the researcher, who expected the amount of time spent with the opposite sex would significantly affect one's perception of gender identity. The assumption came from previous research that found men who spent more time with the opposite sex have more progressive attitudes toward women (Wymore, 2010). The researcher expected more hours men spent with women would correlate to higher scores on the femininity scale.

Individual Adjective Responses

There emerged ways in which male students from both institutions answered similarly to one another; however, on a few individual questions, male students at both institutions differed in their likelihood to describe themselves with a certain adjective. Males at Institution A proved significantly more likely to describe themselves with masculine adjectives such as *aggressive* ($p = .045$), *analytical* ($p = .031$), *masculine* ($p < .001$), and *solemn* ($p = .004$). Males at Institution B seemed significantly more likely to describe themselves with feminine adjectives such as *affectionate* ($p = .043$), *conscientious* ($p = .004$), *sympathetic* ($p = .026$), *sensitive to the needs of others* ($p = .001$), *compassionate* ($p = .048$), *warm* ($p = .024$), *tactful* ($p < .001$), *gentle* ($p = .021$), *flatterable* ($p < .001$), and *likable* ($p = .01$). Male at this institution are more comfortable characterizing themselves with more feminine characteristics.

Identifying with these adjectives need not appear negative. However, male college student should learn how to best portray both masculine and feminine characteristics. In light of this finding, both universities should find space for more

conversations or programming surrounding how to portray both masculine and feminine characteristics and what such portrayal means.

Implications

The findings of the present research added weight to the evidence that college student development professionals must remain aware of the needs of their male students. The current study indicated areas within groups of male college students that need support in gender identity development. Residence hall type and class status appear to affect the way male students perceive gender identity. Thus, student development professionals should stay mindful of providing support for gender identity development. This support can come in various ways through different types of programming, conversations with students, and continual professional development within this field.

The findings of the current research also aligned with literature regarding peer groups strongly influencing identity development (Astin, 1993; Baxter-Magolda, 2003; Gellin, 2003; Terenzini et al., 1996). The results of the survey showed that different types of residence halls and class status affect male perceptions of gender identity. Residence halls are a place for co-curricular learning through teaching, evaluation, and peer relationships (McMahon, 1993). Since many residence halls have multiple classes living within them, residence halls are a place for male students to spend time to think critically and develop their own perceptions of gender identity.

Student development professionals at both institutions should also note the adjective categories in which their institution scored significantly higher. These results could indicate potential programming opportunities or conversation starters with male

students. For example, Institution A scored high in aggressiveness and low in sensitivity to others' needs. Conversations or programming on these topics could prove fruitful.

Based on the findings of the current research, as well as preexisting literature, college student development professionals should start conversations surrounding gender identity—both the masculine and feminine sides of gender identity. College students must work through these conversations with other students, faculty, and staff in healthy ways because of the collegiate experience's very influential space (Astin, 1993; Baxter-Magolda, 2003; Gellin, 2003; Terenzini et al., 1996). Housing professionals such as resident directors and assistants hold a unique position to provide direct support to students who might struggle or limit themselves in regards to gender identity. Speaking to these topics could help address common issues among male students such as overexertion of masculinity, substance abuse, and violence (Scott et al., 2012).

Limitations

Throughout the study's process, the researcher noted certain limitations. First, the researcher encountered difficulty in assigning a single definition to masculinity or femininity due to a wide range of different definitions for gender identity. While the BSRI used descriptors of both masculinity and femininity, any of the descriptors could prove useful in describing both males and females, regardless of sex. Secondly, danger exists in the possible confusion of the purpose of the BSRI. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the BSRI does not define someone as more masculine or feminine; rather, the BSRI reveals "a tendency to describe one's self in accordance with sex-typed standards of desirable behavior for men and women" (Bem, 1974, p. 155). That is, does one feel more comfortable describing one's self with either masculine or feminine characteristics?

Another limitation to the study came with the samples used for conducting the research. While the researcher purposefully chose both institutions because of their faith-based missions, the results of the surveys could have differed with male students at institutions without a faith focus. Both colleges claimed Protestantism with predominantly White faculty, staff, and student bodies, so surveying institutions with more culturally diverse student bodies could prove beneficial. At both institutions, all-male residence halls accounted for over half of the responses (Institution A = 76%, Institution B = 69%). The lack of coeducational residence hall responses potentially could give a less than desired representation of males living in such residence halls.

Further Research

Conducting similar research at other faith-based institutions could provide a better understanding of gender identity perceptions at these types of colleges and universities. Exploring more questions regarding faith and its effects on perceptions of gender identity could offer a better understanding of faith and gender. Based on the present research, a similar study could survey a large non-faith-based institution. Faith could prove a component of one's perception of gender identity. Having a larger sample size and response rate from a larger institution could also benefit higher education literature.

There still exists a large gap in the literature regarding different types of residence halls. A study researching the benefits, disadvantages, or even effects on different types of development in coeducational or single-sex residence halls could add more depth to the major gap in the literature. There also exist various types of coeducational residence halls such as males and females living on different floors, males and females living on the same floor, and even males and females living in the same living space.

Finally, researchers could conduct another study to determine the effects of media on perceptions of gender identity. Current literature showed both good and poor representations of masculinity and femininity portrayed through a variety of media such as film, television, and video games. Providing more discussion surrounding the effects of media on gender identity perceptions and gender identity development could benefit this area of research.

Conclusion

The BSRI results concluded male perceptions of gender identity differ between the two institutions studied. Significant differences emerged between coeducational residence halls and all-male residence halls at Institution B. The researcher also determined that, as male students progress through their time at Institution B, they begin to score higher on the masculinity scale. The BSRI did not detect amount of time spent with the opposite sex as significantly affecting male perceptions of gender identity. The instrument proved useful in understanding perceptions of gender identity in male college students.

In light of the present research, male students' living environment influences their perception of their own gender. Higher education professionals should carefully consider the relationship between residence life context and gender development. The current study should help in providing more conversations and programs in regards to gender identity. Residence halls do not just function as spaces for living—they offer spaces for personal, emotional, and intellectual growth. Conversations on gender identity become much more than "male" and "female" issues—they become conversations that can help create greater understanding and mutuality.

References

Act Like Men. (2014). Home. Retrieved from actlikemen.com.

Arboleda, A., Shelley M. C., Wang, Y., & Whalen, D. F. (2003). The influence of residence hall community on academic success of male and female undergraduate students. *Journal of College & University Student Housing*, *32*(2), 16-22.

Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *25*, 297-308.

Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college. *Liberal Education*, *79*(4), 4-15.

Baker, B. (2008). *Masculinity in fiction and film: Representing men in popular genres, 1945-2000*. London, UK: Continuum.

Baxter-Magolda, M. B. (2003). Identity and learning: Student affairs' role in transforming higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 231-247.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 42*, 155-162.

Bird, S. R. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Society, 10*, 120-132.

Blimling, G. S. (2015). *Student learning in college residence halls: What works, what doesn't, and why*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chen, E. J. (2012). Caught in a bad bromance. *Texas Journal of Women and the Law, 21*,

241-266.

Chickering, A. (1975). *Commuting versus resident students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Standford, CA: Standford University Press.

Corbett, J., & Sommer, R. (1972). Anatomy of a coed residence hall. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 13,* 215-217.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dowd, N. E. (2010). *The man question: Male subordination and privilege*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 50,* 210–228.

Fay, G (1981). A model for reviewing growth environments. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 11*(1), 46-47.

Foubert, J.D. (1998). Predictors of student satisfaction in university residence halls. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 27*(1), 41-46.

Gellin, A. (2003). The effect of undergraduate student involvement on critical thinking: A meta-analysis of the literature from 1991-2000. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 746-760.

Harrington, M. M. (2002). *Student perceptions of community on co-educational and single-sex floors in the residence halls at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse*

(Master's thesis). Retrieved from MINDS@UW. (http://minds.wisconsin.edu/handle/1793/28906)

Harris, F., & Struve, L. E. (2009). Gents, jerks, and jocks: What male students learn about masculinity in college. *About Campus, 14*(3), 2-9.

Kimmel, M. S. (1994). *Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kimmel, M. S. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York, NY: Harper.

Longwood, W. M., Muesse, M. W., & Schipper, W. (2004). Men, spirituality, and the collegiate experience. *New Directions for Student Services, 2004*(107), 87–95.

Mathewes-Green, F. (1999). Men need church, too. *Christianity Today, 43*(6), 70.

McMahon, J. P. (1993). *A comparison of the development of mature interpersonal relationships among freshmen who live in coeducational residence halls and those who live in single sex residence halls at the University of South Carolina* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. (n.d.). Bromance. *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/bromance

Moring, M. (2012). The masculinity quotient. *Christianity Today, 56*(2), 34-36.

Moss, M. H. (2011). *The media and the models of masculinity*. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.

The Nielsen Company. (2014). The U.S. digital consumer report. Retrieved from http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/reports/2014/the-us-digital-consumer-report.html

O'Brien, B. (2008). A Jesus for real men. *Christianity Today*, *52*(4), 48-52.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rockwell, N. (1959). *Easter morning* [Painting]. Retrieved from http://www.saturdayeveningpost.com/wp-content/uploads/satevepost/9590516.jpg

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Sargent, D. (2013). *American masculinity and homosocial behavior in the bromance era* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ScholarWorks@Georgia State University. (http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses/99)

Schaller, L.E. (2008). Where are the men? *Religious Product: News.* Retrieved from http://www.religiousproductnews.com/articles/2008-January/In-Every-Issue/Where-Are-the-Men-.htm

Scott, D. A., Livingston, W. G., Havice, P. A., & Cawthon, T. W. (2012). Men's identity development: Issues and implications for residence life. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 3*(1), 200-213.

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 37*, 149-162.

Ullom, M., & Hallenbeck, D.A. (1981). Factors affecting the return rate of students to the residence halls. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 11*(2), 27-29.

Willer, R. (2005). *Overdoing gender: A test of the masculine overcompensation thesis.* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of California-Burkeley, Burkeley, CA.

Willoughby, B. J. & Carroll, J. S. (2009). The impact of co-ed housing on risk-taking among college students. *Journal of American College Health, 58*(3), 241-246

Wymore, J. (2010). *The impact of coeducational residence halls on men's relationship halls on men's relationships with women* (Unpublished master's thesis). Taylor University, Upland, IN.

Yoder, T. (2009). *Traditional masculinity and male student engagement in college* (Unpublished master's thesis). Taylor University, Upland, IN.

Appendix A

BEM Sex Role Inventory

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Age Restriction

Only individuals above the age of 18 are allowed to participate in this survey. If you are above the age of 18, click the "next" button. If you are not, please exit this survey.

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT

MALE PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER IDENTITY
You are invited to participate in a research study of a comparison of male perceptions of their own gender identity. You were selected as a possible subject because you are a male at LeTourneau University or Taylor University and you reside on campus either in a coeducational residence hall, all-male residence hall, or in an on-campus apartment. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you many have before agreeing to be in the study. The study is being conducted by Matthew N. Barr in association with Master of Arts in Higher Education department at Taylor University in Upland, Indiana. It is funded by LeTourneau University in Longview, Texas.

STUDY PURPOSE
The purpose of this study is to compare male perceptions of gender identity at two different faith-based institutions.

NUMBER OF PEOPLE TAKING PART IN THE STUDY:
If you agree to participate, you will be one of approximately 630 male subjects who will be participating in this research.

PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY:
If you agree to be in the study, you will do the following things:
Take part in an online version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). The BSRI is a 60 question survey that takes an estimated 5-10 minutes to complete. The BSRI is a measure of masculinity-femininity and gender roles that measures an individual's assessment of their own gender identity. The survey will be completed in full confidentiality. There will be five demographic questions. The results of individual surveys will not be released to participants. However, an overall anonymous summary of results will be provided to LeTourneau University upon the completion of the study. The survey will be open for a total of two weeks beginning on Friday, April 4, 2014 until April 18, 2014.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Efforts will be made to keep your personal information confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Your identity will be held in confidence in reports in which the study may be published and databases in which results may be stored. Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis include groups such as the study investigator and his/her research associates, the Taylor University Institutional Review Board or its designees, the study sponsor, LeTourneau University, and (as allowed by law) state or federal agencies, specifically the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) etc., who may need to access your research records.

CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS
For questions about the study or a research-related injury, contact the researcher Matthew N. Barr at 254-722-8589 or email him at matt_barr@taylor.edu. If you cannot reach the researcher during regular business hours e.g. 8:00AM-5:00PM, please leave a voicemail and Matthew will call you back as soon as possible.

LETOURNEAU UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Inquiries regarding the nature of the research at LeTourneau University, your rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to your participation as a subject can be directed to LeTourneau University's Institutional Review Board with the Secretary of the IRB, Paul Boggs at 903-233-3981 or PaulBoggs@letu.edu

TAYLOR UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Inquiries regarding the nature of the research, your rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to your participation as a subject can be directed to Taylor University's Institutional Review Board at IRB@taylor.edu or the Chair of the IRB, R. Edwin Welch at 756-998-4315 or edwelch@taylor.edu

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF STUDY
Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part or may leave the study at any time. Leaving the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. You decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with LeTourneau University or Taylor University. You will not be compensated with pay for taking part in this survey.

Bem Sex Role Inventory

1. Do you agree to take part in this study?

Yes

Page 3

Survey Give Away

If you would like to be entered in for a chance to win one of eight Amazon gift cards (one $50 card, two $25 cards, and five $10 cards), please enter your email address below. You do not have to include your email address in order to take part in the survey.

Your email address will only be used to send a notification email in case of winning one of the give aways. Once the winners have been randomly drawn and notified, then all email addresses will be deleted.

2. Email Address:

Page 4

Bem Sex Role Inventory

On this page, you will find listed a number of personality characteristics. Please use those characteristics to describe yourself, that is, please indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true each of these characteristics is to you. Please do not leave any characteristic unanswered.

Example: Sly
Choose a 1 if it is never or almost never true that you are sly.
Choose a 2 if it is usually not true that you are sly.
Choose a 3 if it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are sly.
Choose a 4 if it is occasionally true that you are sly.
Choose a 5 if it is often true that you are sly.
Choose a 6 if it is usually true that you are sly.
Choose a 7 if it is always or almost always true that you are sly.

3. Defend my own beliefs

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

4. Affectionate

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

5. Conscientious

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

6. Independent

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

7. Sympathetic

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

8. Moody

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

9. Assertive

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

10. Sensitive to needs of others

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

11. Reliable

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

12. Strong personality

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

13. Understanding

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

14. Jealous

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

15. Forceful

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

16. Compassionate

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

17. Truthful

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

18. Have leadership abilities

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

19. Eager to soothe hurt feelings

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

20. Secretive

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

21. Willing to take risks

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

22. Warm

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

23. Adaptable

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

24. Dominant

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

25. Tender

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

26. Conceited

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

27. Willing to take a stand

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

28. Love children

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

29. Tactful

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

30. Aggressive

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

31. Gentle

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

32. Conventional

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

33. Self-reliant

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

34. Yielding

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

35. Helpful

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

36. Athletic

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

37. Cheerful

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

38. Unsystematic

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

39. Analytical

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

40. Shy

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

41. Inefficient

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

42. Make decisions early

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

43. Flatterable

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

44. Theatrical

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

45. Self-sufficient

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

46. Loyal

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

47. Happy

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

48. Individualistic

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

49. Soft-spoken

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

50. Unpredictable

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

51. Masculine

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

52. Gullible

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

53. Solemn

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

54. Competitive

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

55. Childlike

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

56. Likable

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

57. Ambitious

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

58. Do not use harsh language

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

59. Sincere

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

60. Act as a leader

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

61. Feminine

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

62. Friendly

1 Never or almost never true	2 Usually not true	3 Sometimes but infrequently true	4 Occasionally true	5 Often true	6 Usually true	7 Always or almost always true
1						

Added Measures

63. What type of residence hall do you live in?

- Coeducational residence hall (males and females live in the same building on different floors)
- All-Male residence hall (this includes on-campus apartments and society houses)

64. What is your class status?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

65. On average, how much time per week do you spend with the opposite gender (outside of class)?

- 0-5 hours
- 5-10 hours
- 10-15 hours
- 15-20 hours
- 20 or more hours

66. On average, how much time per week do you spend with a significant other (someone with whom you are in a dating relationship with)?

- 0-5 hours
- 5-10 hours
- 10-15 hours
- 15-20 hours
- 20 or more hours

67. Which academic school does your major fall under?

- School of Aeronautical Science
- School of Arts & Sciences (Biology, Chemistry & Physics, Computer Science, History, Political Science, & Criminal Justice, Literature & Language Arts, Mathematics, and Theology)
- School of Business
- School of Education (Teacher Education, Psychology, Kinesiology, and Interdisciplinary Studies)
- School of Engineering & Engineering Technology
- Undecided