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Abstract

In Otterbein’s explicitly-named and often-touted diverse and inclusive liberal arts collegiate environment, students are frequently exposed to the institution’s various messages regarding inclusive gender norms via administrative communications, curricular priorities, and the ideological content of extracurricular events. Taken together, institutional histories and contemporary practices demonstrate that Otterbein University purports to offer an environment permeated with an ideology that emphasizes the value of diversity, equality, and inclusion as part of a holistic educational experience.

My study includes three components. First, I administered the Bem (1971) Sex Role inventory (a scale originally designed to measure individual gender performance) to answer the following interrelated questions: Does time spent at Otterbein influence the ways that male students conceptualize their personal gender identity, does it facilitate a departure from traditional masculinity, and/or does it encourage more androgy nous self-description for male students? Second, I administered the PAQ (Personal Attribute Questionnaire—an instrument originally designed to measure gender performance) (1978) to answer the following question: Does time spent at Otterbein influence male and female student views on the heterosexual desirability of traditionally masculine traits (aggression, rationality, etc.) in prospective male romantic partners? Lastly, I conducted five open-ended interviews with male and female students to see how different student sub-cultures within the university community may have an impact on the gender ideologies students subscribe to and associated social practices. I hypothesized that if Otterbein lives up to its self-described ideals, time spent at Otterbein should influence my data
in the following ways: Men should score more androgynously, traditional male gender stereotypes will be seen as less desirable in heterosexual couplings, and male and female students will describe desirable masculinity in terms that significantly depart from traditional gender norms. The hypotheses all hypotheses resulted in being null, and the questions relatively unanswered, due to the weak design of the study. However there is evidence of the “guyland” young men within the unique environment of Otterbein University.
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Introduction

What it means to be an adult has changed with the turn of the century. During much of the twentieth century, most Americans were able to graduate high school, start a career, get married, and start a family, before even turning 30. The United States is a society that advertises and idealizes marriage, natalism, and the traditional nuclear family model of the male breadwinner and female care giver (Smith 1993). However, U.S. culture lacks any formal ceremony or initiation to ‘true’ adult status. These ceremonies are instead supplemented with meeting societal expectations of adults: having a stable job, owning a home, getting married, having children, and paying taxes.

Over the years there have been significant changes in these benchmarking practices, for instance according to information obtained through the U.S. Census Bureau (2016), in 2010, the average age for people in the United States to get married was 28.7 for men, and 26.5 for women. Theses ages have been steadily climbing since the baby boomer years of the 1950s where the median age of marriage was 22.8 for men and 20.3 for women. A common trend, for those who are capable financially, is now to attend college and receive a secondary education before trying to find a career, mate, or initiating childbearing. The former standards (family support, a career, tax paying) indicate ‘true’ adulthood still holds a great deal of power, and are expected of the most current generations by prior generations, and continue to comprise the most central institutions of our contemporary society (Silva 2015). However, in the absence of the material means to achieve dominant standards, teenagers and young adults have begun to take steps in creating their own forms of adulthood. In particular, young males have greater adulthood
expectations placed upon them, since the male in the classical and advertised model of family life in the United States is supposed to be financially responsible and capable of supporting a family as the primary breadwinner.

Kimmel’s (2008) *Guyland* discusses this critical point in the male life course when teens become men (known as the “transition to adulthood” in the broader literature) and begin to struggle to find an attainable and appropriate standard for adult masculinity. Overall, the declining material capacities of young men to meet historic and more traditional standards for ‘manhood,’ coupled with the dictates of increasing gender egalitarianism, have together resulted in a lack of clear normative expectations for ‘manhood’. An additional significant demographic shift includes the tremendous increase in women in the labor force since the 1950s, and women are also attending college in greater numbers since the 1950s. Young men, unable to engage in the taught practice of family breadwinner and claim the status associated with this role, instead opt to drift along in this new extended stage of the transition to adulthood which Kimmel refers to as “guyland”. Perhaps most significantly, “guyland” is a phase of development which allows young men to essentially delay entering adulthood. While adrift in the “guyland” phase of life, young men begin to congregate into groups with like-minded individuals in order to avoid social pressures and expectations, such as paying taxes, beginning a career, and starting a family. These relational groupings allow young men to foster social connections that would otherwise be present in the formation of a traditional, nuclear family (Kimmel 2008).

By more traditional, historical, normative standards for adulthood, young males should attempt to fulfill the role of breadwinner in a heteronormative family model. However, via the
standards offered by the “guyland,” young men seek, find, and participate in constructing rites of passage to verify they are independent adults. However, through participation in such rites of passage young men may avoid concerning themselves with ‘true’ adult matters such as a stable job, homeownership, or even childrearing. As Kimmel (2008) describes this new stage of development, “Guyland lies between the dependency and lack of autonomy of boyhood and the sacrifice of responsibility of manhood” (pg.6). Again, however, the decision of many young men to opt to drift in “guyland” is heavily informed by shifts in the global economy that have led to a disappearance of livable-wage jobs, by a rise in gender egalitarianism that has shifted the balance of men and women, by the increasing inaccessibility of home ownership after the global financial crash of 2008—the list goes on. Therefore, such decisions should be read as ‘constrained’, informed by the forces of history, but nevertheless involving the agency of individuals.

Since there is no formal, clearly established role recognized for young men according to Kimmel, especially for the white and affluent men that his text focuses on, young adults adrift in the ‘guyland’ seek confirmation of their adult status through pseudo-adult, alternative forms, which are established through other institutional venues, associated rites of passage, and group associations. Kimmel’s research dictates that such alternative forums for identity confirmation, for privileged or affluent young men, are most likely to include fraternities or sports teams. Both are founded on rites of passage and initiation designed to allow access to what has been redefined as ‘true’ adulthood, which consists of a redefining of self by joining such a group and ‘proving’ themselves.
Commonly these rites of passage will include hazing rituals, which are defined by Ohio State Law as “doing any act or coercing another, including the victim, to do any act of initiation unto any student or other organization that causes or creates a substantial risk of causing mental or physical harm to any person.” In this way, hazing often serves as the ‘proving’ ground for males attempting to join the “guyland”. Hazing in this model is used by established group members with status as a way to attain respect and authority from new initiates, or those attempting to join the group. Further, hazing provides a template for the process of initiation into group membership, and thereby, entrance into ‘guyland’ s’ liminal adulthood, for those attempting to join.

This “guyland,” or grey space in between male adolescence and adulthood, establishes prevalent normative standards for contemporary masculinity predominantly for collegiate males. According to Kimmel, the standards of “guyland” are especially powerful in private institutions of higher education where alumni themselves were subject to similar fraternal experiences, and therefore become both emotionally and fiscally invested in such processes of meaning-making (or more accurately, ‘man-making’). As alumni are frequent and significant sources of university donations, and given the increasing fiscal challenges institutions of higher education face in light of factors such as declining state budget allocations, heightened competition for declining numbers of high school graduates (in some regions, seen by many as a consequence of deepening socioeconomic inequality), and rising administrative expenditures, the imperatives that alumni attach to their fiscal contributions, such as maintaining autonomy of Greek life, have been known to sway the opinions of university presidents, administration, and even the board of trustees.
Oftentimes, donating alumni imperatives dictate heavy fiscal and moral investment in seeing the ‘traditions’ of fraternal associations carried on, and many times, this can include toxic behaviors which are not solely restricted to hazing practices.

The trends of financial struggle and relationships in higher education are illuminated in Armstrong & Hamilton’s (2013) *Paying for the Party: How College Maintains Inequality*, and Kimmel (2008). Both authors argue such systems are perpetuated due to decline in state and federal support. In general, these associated phenomena, whereby alumni donors’ and tuition-dollar dependence imperatives are taken quite seriously, have also been reproduced to some degree at Otterbein University, as is like other private colleges serving those who are privileged enough to support the college financially. Since the alumni are a predominant source of income for Otterbein University, and since, like most colleges, Otterbein is constantly in need of what donors have to offer, the alumni are able to maintain a major influence as a result/due to the college’s fear of these funds waning, or altogether stopping. Overall, Armstrong & Hamilton’s (2013) findings suggest that student groups with alumni that offer financial support to the university will reserve a greater amount of privilege, through resources and university support, than those without reliable alumni donors. The most affluent student groups will receive the most privilege at these colleges and universities.

Like many private institutions, Otterbein University has a long-standing history of Greek life, beginning in the 1850s (Schwarz 2015) 25 percent of Otterbein’s students are involved in Greek life as members of one of the eight fraternities and six sororities. However, Otterbein also advertises and has a long standing history of valuation for diversity education and progressive
ideals. For instance, the University’s mission statement and core values advertise and describe equality, inclusion and diversity. The documents discuss how the University attempts to teach on an environmental level beyond the classroom and engage students in discussions on political topics and issues.

Otterbein’s Greek system still maintains a high level of visibility in campus culture and enjoys a great amount of privilege over other student groups. Unlike other groups, Greeks have their own form of government, which includes a judicial board that circumvents normal judicial procedure. The United Greek Governing Board, an Otterbein judicial board for Greeks, has Greek members review charges against a chapter or chapter member, and they are given the opportunity to punish/not punish groups and individuals as they see fit. Greek organizations also have more access to programming and fiscal resources than do other student groups, through both Otterbein Student Life Fee support, via earmarked grants and operational funds. Additionally, due to the longevity of most Greek organizations (at least 50 years, for most), they have a deep well of alumni to support them. Greek Organizations are also provided a very formal and well-advertised recruitment drive sponsored by the University in the fall. During this recruitment the University encourages students to attend Greek sponsored events, and puts them in the spotlight compared to other non-Greek organizations that don’t receive the same special treatment.

However, recently, limitations on Greek life at Otterbein have started to become more prevalent. For example, there are now new limits on the amount of time that Greek Organizations can use in pledging or what the university now calls “new member education.”
Greek organizations must now submit a fully detailed report of their program and schedule, give the university the right to inspect possible events at any time in case of suspicion of hazing practices, and sets a limitation on how many hours of activities can happen in a week.

Otterbein’s highly visible Greek system, which according to, Schwarz (2015) currently makes up at least 25 percent of the student body, indicates evidence for a strong presence of “guyland”-related norms and practices at the university, due to fraternity culture being one of the most prevalent facets of and vehicles for the “guyland.”

Greek life itself operates on the basis of a gendered binary between sororities and fraternities. However at Otterbein there is a recent instance of a sorority becoming gender inclusive. However, it is worthwhile to point out that the organization in question was indeed a sorority, and the fraternal organizations on Otterbein’s campus have yet to make a similar decision. Despite this one high-profile instance of progressivism, there remains a seemingly contradictory juxtaposition between the gender-progressive liberal arts environment at Otterbein University on the one hand, and the ongoing haven for problematic, traditional normative standards for masculine roles, given the high visibility and institutional power of Greek life (and in particular, Greek male life) on Otterbein’s campus. Ultimately, students get University-sanctioned encouragement to engage in a system that has been shown at other universities, of similar socioeconomic status, to facilitate negative elements associated with the “guyland.” Students therefore receive seemingly contradictory messages from the school, given institutional support for the Greek system, and the permission Otterbein allows for such groups to act with social and judicial autonomy. Simultaneously, the advertised diversity, equality and
inclusiveness education through Otterbein’s unique and progressive liberal arts educational environment attempts to educate and expose students to ideas of diversity, collectivism, and contemporary gender ideas and practices. This aforementioned institutional contradiction leads to the question of which one of these environmental influences has a more powerful voice and influence over student views and behavior, especially for the male students who are both exposed to gender-inclusive and progressive values as they simultaneously participate in and work to perpetuate ”guyland”-associated standards for masculinity.

My study examines this dissonance between these educational ideas (equality, diversity, and community engagement) and presence of Greek life at Otterbein, seemingly disparate, long-standing collegiate traditions on the social construction of masculinity at Otterbein. In particular, my research examines which of these competing standards for masculinity enjoy a stronger influence over the male student’s gender performance and perception, and in which settings—specifically, in the context of standards for heterosexual desirability. I also examine the ways in which messages associated with both institutional standards from the “guyland” and Otterbein University’s uniquely progressive environment for masculinity have been interwoven, as well as the consequences of this institutional blending.

I find that “guyland”-associated standards are pervasive. However, “guyland’s” standards for masculinity are conceptualized in a modified way, most likely due to Greek system participants’ exposure to the gender-progressive environment Otterbein provides.
Overview of Literature

Formation of Idea

Masculine gender ideology and performance is seemingly in a state of flux in contemporary society. Levant, Rosalie, Hail & Rankin (2013) attempt to illuminate changes in gender roles by modifying and testing new forms of gender inventories presumed to correspond to shifts in gender ideology and practice. Rummel and Levant (2014) examine this same idea of evolving concepts of masculinity by looking to see if there was a relationship between individual men’s self-esteem and an inability to meet traditional male standards, defined by traits such as dominance, athleticism, and breadwinning. Results from a sample of collegiate men demonstrated no relationship between negative self-esteem and failure to perform within traditional male gender roles. Levant and Rummel saw that the lack of evidence to support the relationship between traditional role performance and self-esteem could be a result of males shifting away from traditional performance given the rewriting of new normative standards for masculinity. There are, however, limitations to their analysis of modern masculinity: they investigated gender role discrepancy amongst college males without any analysis of the extent to which individuals included in the sample participate in groups such as fraternities or athletics teams, and the influence that these groups may have on masculine performance.

The lack of examination on possible group influence are made clear through examining the main theoretical frame behind this project, Kimmel’s (2008) “guyland.” Again, as articulated above, “guyland” is a stage of development for men, ranging from teens to mid-20s where young
men’s ‘success’ hinges on the extent to which they can achieve a pseudo-adult status. As opposed to the model investigated by Rummel and Levant (2014), Kimmel’s “guyland” relies less on explicit, individual performance, and instead on implicit performance that is facilitated through groups that young men take part in. These gatherings serve as a time where men attempt to congregate and prove their adulthood to one another, without dealing with decisions. Kimmel explored and mapped this stage of development that essentially forms, or is formed by masculine sub-cultures, by studying predominantly white, middle class to upper-middle class collegiate males.

However, the concept of “guyland” itself is limited due to the criteria I have gathered from my understanding and interpretation of Kimmel’s model. Kimmel (2008) set standards for the participants of “guyland” early in his text, “The guys who populate Guyland are mostly white, middle-class kids, they are college-bound, in college, or have recently graduated.” (p. 8). I feel, after internalizing this text and comparing it to other similar works such as Rios (2011), that the “guyland” can exist, and be performed by young men as long as these five criteria: 1) there must be some form of hierarchy in the group that gives a level of superiority to older group members 2) rites of initiation must be held in order for a group member to prove their place, and rise to the status of an older-member (in either age, or time in the group) 3) positions of authority in order to give validation and responsibility to group members in lieu of actual positions of responsibility in broader society 4) the group must have a form of rejection towards the standards of broader society, or feelings of marginalization, that causes them to separate and differentiate themselves 5) traditions and rules that offer validation for their behavior within a group.
Through this five criteria model it’s apparent that one of the main groups that matches the criteria I have developed from Kimmel’s “guyland” would be fraternities—an example Kimmel himself holds up in his text. Sports teams are also supposed to be facilitators, according to Kimmel, but through my investigation of Otterbein I have no evidence of them having long standing tradition, or formal initiation, unless one were to count the initial training of first year men. This lack of evidence about Athletics is why this study predominantly focused on the University’s Greek System. There are also several other campus groups, in addition to Greek life, that meet some of the criteria, but not in a holistic, direct, and clear way. Therefore, my analysis focuses predominantly on Otterbein’s Greek system, and especially the fraternities where the fit with Kimmel’s model of the “guyland” is most salient.

**Guyland and Its Various Forms**

To be clear, “guyland” isn’t synonymous with more permanent forms of toxic masculinity, sexism, or dangerous behavior that span the life course, and are normally attributed to masculinity like aggression or sexual violence. According to Kimmel (2008), most young men will go through the stage of “guyland,” and may remain in this developmental stage, either when they leave college or begin to meet the demands of society, such as obtaining a career or forming a family. Most men will essentially grow out of a peter pan state (not wanting to grow up) with time. The real danger comes while young men are still within the “guyland”. Though, Kimmel (2008) for the most part found that the real harm for the young men and the subcultures they create he examined happens during the stages of initiation into these groups (fraternities, sports teams). This is when the hierarchical nature of guyland-associated groups comes into play, as the
older members of the group that have supposedly already proven themselves through their own initiation have the potential to repeat the same berating behavior that manifests specifically in fraternities as “hazing”. Elder or higher-status group members may be malicious or require younger members to prove themselves by engaging in dangerous challenges or public humiliation that possibly results in physical and emotional harm. Through the tradition-based criteria for guyland-associated groups, those that made it through such harrowing experiences will now be in the seat of authority and will do the same to the next younger group.

The severity of hazing and associated practices seem to be dependent on the institution and can really only be observed when an organization is caught engaging in behavior that either violates institutional or greater legal standards for harm. A well-known practice that is a result of fraternities and the “guyland” is binge drinking, and elevated consumption of alcohol. Kimmel (2008) himself discusses this practice of men proving themselves by how much they can drink. Routon and Walker (2014) found similar results when they performed a national survey to investigate the effects on student’s grades, alcohol consumption and how they relate to Greek life. Their longitudinal study included data from over 400 institutions. Their results showed evidence that male members of Greek life are more likely to demonstrate greater rates of alcohol consumption over non-Greek collegiate males. Greek men are also more likely to suffer academically (Routon and Walker 2014).

Alcohol consumption and poor grades are merely one example of what may happen when men are exposed to the “guyland” in college. This “guyland” can appear in other forms, for young men of other demographic groups such as working class black youth, and may also cause
a great deal of harm to young men. Rios (2011) performed an ethnographic study on young men of color in urban areas using the concept of criminalization, in which young men are branded as criminals because of their race and socioeconomic status. In the instance of Rios’ work, the “guyland” appears not through college and fraternities but instead gangs (though Rios himself does not use Kimmel’s language). Rios describes the struggle of the young men in his study as they try to reach adulthood and seek validation from society. However, the young men in Rios’ study do not usually have the opportunity to attend a four year college, therefore, they go through the temporary “guyland” via their gang affiliation. The way Rios describes it, these young men see gang members and criminals supporting each other, in part, through their ability to pay for status symbols of wealth like clothing, jewelry and cars. These young men join these groups in order to attain the same status symbols. However, along with drinking and drug use, these young men are also likely to go to jail or even get killed from gang violence, demonstrating that although gang affiliation may offer young men pseudo-familial networks, a sub-culture of support and a ‘proving ground’” for their masculinity when more traditional avenues for status and emotional support are blocked through racial and socioeconomic marginalization, the negative consequences of ‘guyland’-associated standards for group membership and behavior may be either harmful or lethal.

As I demonstrate above, the “guyland” isn’t exclusive to collegiate men which is something Kimmel (2008) fails to fully explore. The specific texture of ‘guyland’ also seems to take different forms depending on group members access to resources, which Kimmel (2008) would have done well to explore more fully since he admits to his sample being predominantly
white and of higher socioeconomic means. The current study suffers through a similar limitations, with only an examination of Otterbein University, but includes more information on a specific and unique environment.

**Greek Life and other “guyland” facilitators**

Corprew and Mitchell’s (2014) attempted to look at measurements of hyper masculinity in college students. They defined hyper masculine behavior as associated with the likelihood of showing aggression towards women, and overall aggression like physical violence, including traditional ideas associated with male gender performance. Corprew and Mitchell performed a similar investigation to Kimmel. Corprew and Mitchell had a sample of 217 men from three southern universities, 81 of which were fraternity members. They sought to see if there was a presence of hyper masculine attitude amongst fraternity men. The used gender test that categorizes the extent to which their subjects displayed or subscribed to masculine attitudes associated with hyper masculinity through three collections of statements about which subjects were asked to score their agreement/disagreement. The statements were: 1) ‘violence is manly,’ 2) ‘danger is exciting,’ and 3) callous attitudes towards women. Corprew and Mitchell hypothesized that fraternity men would score higher on the hyper masculine inventory than non-Greek students, as demonstrated by their agreement with the above-listed three categories of statements. The study’s results actually showed that men outside of fraternities were more likely to exhibit certain elements of hyper masculinity such as hostility towards women... Kimmel (2008) discussed harmful group practices including: hazing and binge drinking as part of men trying to prove and validate their masculinity through use of the “guyland” and torturing
members of formed subcultures in order to demonstrate authority. While the application of the “guylanß” discussed with Rios’ (2011) studies of urban youth and what drives them to gangs, I believe there is a level of mitigation of the effects of hyper masculinity already occurring among more privileged collegiate men. The main reason for the mitigation of harmful masculine of harmful behavior that is the facilitation of a departure from direct violence via economic resources, as well as group norms that take a disapproving view of direct violence.

Despite the “guylanß” presence in both private institutions groups, Corprew and Mitchell’s (2014) suggest that a degree of harmful masculine behavior, such as sexual aggression towards women, is being prevented in private colleges. This sits in contrast to the work of Rios (2011), where “guylanß” seems to be practiced as an avenue for hyper masculine performance, which leads young males to be incarcerated or even killed. Once again the missing formula seems to be a presence of available resources, education, wealth and support for these working class youth groups. Gangs are targeted by society, since they are often involved in criminal behavior. However, fraternities were shown by Routon and Walker (2012) to actually get students more engaged in the community through volunteering, and participants in fraternities are more likely than non-Greek affiliates to find careers immediately following graduation. Socioeconomic resources seem to matter when it comes to performance of masculinity in this stage of development.

Though this mitigation of harmful masculine behavior may purely be cosmetic, especially when looking at the rates of hazing collected and reported by Allen and Madden (2008). While the urban youth Rios (2011) studied were likely to be arrested for their forms or violence and
labeled because of their socioeconomic status and race. Higher socioeconomic privileged “guyland” groups still create risk factors of physical and psychological harm. Allen and Madden (2008) showed the true dangers that come with “guyland” facilitating sub cultures, like fraternities and athletic teams. They point out such information that since the 1970’s there has been at least one hazing related death on a college campus every year, and that 82 percent of these hazing related deaths involve alcohol. Also incidents of sexual intimidation, nudity and even stimulation have been increasing in their frequency since 1995. Which means that higher presence of resources for these collegiate forms of “guyland” may be shielded by the fact they are predominantly white and involve higher-class individuals.

Schwalbe (2007) offers a theoretical framework for understanding the relationship between resources and masculine practice via the concept of “manhood acts.” Manhood acts are varied masculine practices intended to establish the claim to masculinity of the ‘performer.’ Such “acts” are dependent on the level of privilege and the particularities of the institutional environment of the ‘performer,’ such as the city they come from, groups or cultures they are a part of, and family environment. When given a greater amount of privilege and socioeconomic resources, men are able to engage in more socially acceptable practices to establish their masculine dominance (over women, and even, over other men). Such masculine practices of the privileged are less reliant on physical violence or competitive standards with the masculine role such practice of aggressive and harmful masculinity, and instead at Otterbein is more supporting the role of the breadwinner and family supporter. Or in the case of “middle-class “guyland” practice, under-reported hazing practices are the most prevalent. Not only is Otterbein a school
seemingly for more middle class students, which is evident from its high tuition and expenses, but Otterbein’s Greek system itself is given a great deal of privilege through the offering of more funding opportunities than any other set of student groups on campus, the opportunity for autonomous governing, and even an independent judicial board. Kimmel (2008) saw similar support of Greek life in private institutions. While it’s unclear how many similarities that Otterbein’s Greek system, and its relationship to the campus, shares with other universities (both large and small, public and private), data from Kimmel (2008) and Armstrong & Hamilton (2013) suggest that while the extent of autonomy and level of toxicity of “guyland-“ associated practices at small and large, public and private universities may vary, the existence of organized sports and autonomous fraternity culture introduce the problematic elements with which this current study is concerned to some degree.

The Importance of Otterbein, the Contrary Environmental Influence

Strategies of mitigation for men in the “guyland” for an at-times detrimental stage of development is the focus of this research. As demonstrated by Rios’ (2011), the “guyland” takes a much more criminal, physically aggressive and explicit form for young men in urban area and working class families. However, it seems that the levels of “guyland” detriment may vary depending on the social environment and how it acts toward young men.

Kimmel (2008) described private institutions as being potentially greater facilitators of the “guyland” due to the role of the alumni as a means of monetary support. Otterbein, with its Annual Giving campaign, is subject to many of the same pressures, and therefore many of the
same problems, Kimmel describes. Through the Annual Giving (Otterbein, 2016) campaign Otterbein contacts alumni via email and telephone to raise money for certain institutional developments and facility management, organization & activity funding, scholarships, recruitment of new students to Otterbein and support for academic departments. Kimmel expresses how in other institutions with similar practices, whenever the autonomy of Greek life is threatened, the alumni retaliate with their own threats of refusing to donate. In previous years when the Greek system started to wane at Otterbein, it was the alumni that came back to aid in the Greek system’s growth.

While Otterbein seems to meet the standards for alumni presence and power that Kimmel refers to, part of the strength of this study comes from the fairly unique environment of Otterbein University. Otterbein advertises and has a long standing history of valuation for diversity education and progressive ideals. For instance Otterbein University’s (2016) mission statement is articulated as follows:

Otterbein is an inclusive community dedicated to educating the whole person in the context of humane values. Our mission is to prepare graduates to think deeply and broadly, to engage locally and globally, and to advance their professions and communities. An Otterbein education is distinguished by the intentional blending of the liberal arts and professional studies, combined with a unique approach to integrating direct experience into all learning.

Core values such as diversity, equality, and inclusiveness are also advertised and meant to be taught to the students, through Otterbein’s identified core values. There are over a dozen student groups that contribute to these ideas such as FreeZone! (LGBTQIA rights group) or Sisters United (a group dedicated to the education and advancement of women of color). These groups
also hold programming and events to educate other students on related topics like race and
gender. Otterbein also utilizes a fee system that includes a student life fee, which facilitates
grants for student organizations to hold programming. Student organizations are also encouraged
to collaborate with one another for further grant support for larger events. There are even campus
wide community service events called “plunges” that happen in the fall and spring, where
students either sign up for, or are randomly assigned community service jobs with different
groups in Westerville. These services jobs range from cleaning up trash, to aiding at a foodbank.
All for the purpose of engaging the Otterbein students in the community. Then there is the INST
program through which students take a variety of subjects in order to gain a broad understanding
of many topics. Though topics of diversity are not a first priority in these courses. A part of these
classes is INST events, where professors give students credit for going out and attending
approved events. These various classes and activities are provided to facilitate a broad education,
but also prompt community engagement and awareness.

This push for community engagement works in the Greek system’s favor. During the first
few weeks of school a formal recruitment period is held where the Greek community hosts
various events, advertises themselves all over campus and encourage students to attend. While
Otterbein may be a unique environment, Kimmel’s (2008) concept of “guyland” being facilitated
by these groups cannot be ignored. The Greek system at Otterbein University is itself unique
with only two national chapters, both being fraternities, that have only been present at the
University for a little over a decade. The Greek system is instead dominated by a local system
that maintains self-governance through the Interfraternal Council (fraternity) and Panhellenic
Council (sorority) outside the normal student government. These groups even have their own form of judicial governance called the United Greek Governing Board that allows Greeks to avoid normal judicial process and instead be judged by their peers which is local to the university. The judgements must be approved by the Dean of Students, but it remains a right that all non-Greek organizations lack.
Research Questions and Hypotheses

The questions motivating my research are informed by three main theoretical and empirical concerns: the performative (aggression, leadership ability) element of masculinity, opinions and views of ‘desirable’ masculinity, and the role and fulfillment of Otterbein University’s educational ideals with regard to gender and inclusivity. Each tie together to ultimately provide an empirical window onto the extent to which Otterbein is effective in defusing emerging toxic masculinity and the negative elements of Kimmel’s (2008) idea of "guyland". My motivating research questions for the project at hand are as follows: 1) Does time spent at Otterbein influence the ways that male students conceptualize their personal gender identity, does it facilitate a departure from traditional masculinity (self-reliance, athleticism, dominance), and/or does it encourage more androgynous self-description for male students 2) Does time spent at Otterbein influence the way male and female students at Otterbein view traditionally masculine traits (aggression, rationality, etc.) as heterosexually desirable in prospective male romantic partners? 3) How do different sub-cultures at Otterbein University help contribute to people’s gender ideology and associated practices? These questions are designed to survey the ways in which male students perform their gender, the content of heterosexually desirable performances of masculinity (according to male and female students), and the influence of sub-cultures and groups on the student’s gender performance and education on gender and sexuality.

I hypothesized that if these institutional values of inclusiveness, community engagement, and diversity are truly being taught to Otterbein students, then the longer a student attends Otterbein the more likely they will be positively impacted with regard to gender ideology, and
practice than if these values are not pervasive at Otterbein. However due to the cross-sectional nature of this study a causal relationship cannot be established, and the data derives purely from students during the fall of 2015 to early 2016. Evidence of the possible relationship between this environment and student’s gender ideology and performance will be reflected in the scores of the surveys, and rhetoric of the qualitative interviews.

My second hypothesis refers to the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). For the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), if male students receive a more feminine or androgynous rating on a test that uses traditional gender ideas (aggressiveness, masculine, athletic), this could be a result of the unique environment of Otterbein. I hypothesize that the more time respondents have been students at Otterbein the more likely they will be to rate a more feminine or androgynous heterosexual male as desirable by the opposite sex in regards to gender performance than respondents who have spent less time at Otterbein.

The modified Personal Attribute Questionnaire utilizes a similar survey, but instead of males self-reflecting on gender performance it instead examines what male, female and non-binary students would consider as a heterosexually desirable male. Like the BSRI, I hypothesize that the more time spent at Otterbein, will result in the desirable heterosexual perception of males being more feminine, or undifferentiated. I also hypothesize that students who are members of Greek organizations will be more likely to view traditionally masculine traits as attractive, than students who are not involved in Greek organizations. Secondly, males who are in Greek life will be more likely to score as masculine based on the measures of the BSRI, than males who are not in Greek life.
Finally the results of the interviews would yield information to both explain the scores of the tests, and provide more insight to the relative influence of social groups and the impact of the University’s inclusive messages. If positive education has occurred, participants will be more likely to report that they have experienced changes in awareness of social issues regarding gender and sexuality such as respect for the LGBTQIA community. Finally, I hypothesized that I will most likely encounter instances where non-Greek respondents are more inclined to view local Otterbein Greek life, and national Greek life as harmful and a facilitator of the sexism.

**Methodology**

**Bem Sex Role Inventory (1971)**

**Participants**

This study had a sample size of 56 Otterbein males that had access to Sona Systems, an online surveying tool used to recruit students taking psychology courses in exchange for class credit. The average age of participants was 20, and the average time spent at Otterbein was 2.4 years. In the sample there were 23 Greek affiliates, 32 non-Greeks, and one who declined to self-identify as either.

**Material**

This was an online survey conducted using Sona Systems. Participants needed internet access and login credentials for Sona Systems in order to participate. Possessing log in
credentials means they must have taken, or were at the time taking a psychology class that required them to participate in research for credit.

**Procedure**

Male subjects accessed the survey through the Otterbein hosted, online subject pool system, Sona systems. Participants then began the Bem Sex-Role Inventory that consists of asking for levels of self-identification (via Likert scales) with gendered traits generally associated with “traditional” masculinity, androgyny, and femininity and to see how people feel they fit to those traits. After the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the subjects were asked to provide demographic information such as age, sexual-preference, residency on campus, major, academic year, and relationship status.

**Modified Personal Attribute Questionnaire**

**Participants**

This study, like the BSRI, recruited participants using Sona Systems. It had 211 respondents, there were 159 females, 51 males and 1 non-binary. The average age of participants was 19.5. The average years at Otterbein was 1.9. In the sample there were 139 respondents that weren’t affiliated with the Greek system, 68 Greeks, and 4 respondents who declined to self-identify as either.

**Material**
Like the BSRI, this was also an online survey conducted using Sona Systems. Participants needed internet access and login credentials for Sona Systems in order to participate. Possessing log in credentials means they must have taken, or were at the time taking a psychology class that required them to participate in research for credit.

**Procedure**

The subjects accessed the survey using Sona systems which is hosted by Otterbein University. This experiment was open to both male and female participants. Participants took a modified form of the Personal Attribute Questionnaire which normally tests how subjects self-describe their gender performance by offering gender traits and having them respond using a five point scale of agreeability. The PAQ was modified from the original self-reflection form to instead present gender traits and have participants respond based on what they felt to be desirable of a male from a heterosexual attraction perspective. This was done in order to not just see self-reporting but to try and get an idea of what kind of gender role expectations exist for heterosexual males at Otterbein. The survey was split into two sections: the first was the modified PAQ. The second was demographic information consisting of age, sexual orientation, residency/type of residency, academic year, years spent at Otterbein, and relationship status.

**Qualitative Interviews**

**Participants**

For this study 5 Otterbein students were recruiting using Gmail, Facebook and other forms of personal communication. All of them were upper class students: four seniors and one
junior. Three of the participants were female, and the other two male. Two of the respondents were in sororities, one was in a fraternity, and two were unaffiliated with Greek life. The five participants were selected based on their involvement, or lack of involvement in certain groups, such as Greek life and gender equality groups like Otterbein’s Free-Zone, and their declared majors.

**Materials**

Printed consent form for participants to sign. Set of questions for interviewer to ask. A digital audio recorder, notebook and pen were used to record and take notes on what respondents said. Finally a debriefing form to give to participants after the interview.

**Procedure**

Respondents were invited to up to 90 minute interviews through electronic communication. A meal not exceeding $15 dollars in worth was offered to respondents if they chose to participate. Before recording began they were given a consent form to sign. Questions were then asked to try and grasp their experience and opinions about Otterbein, with a primary focus on their gender performance and ideas about gender and sexuality. Types of questions included making comparisons to their high school and Otterbein University, experiences with classes that delved into topics of gender and sexuality, gauging their knowledge and awareness about gender and sexuality topics, and most importantly hearing their views on the role of Greek life on gender and sexism, and Otterbein’s performance of educating people about gender and sexuality. All interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed and explicit names of individuals
and organizations were edited out in order to maintain confidentiality. Transcripts were then coded using ATLAS.ti. The coding scheme was drafted to pick out examples of “guyland” rhetoric and masculine behavior, the positives and negatives of Otterbein University’s environment, rhetoric involving Greek life and non-Greek organizations, and discussion of sex and gender education at Otterbein University.

Results

BSRI

There were only two incidents of men scoring pure male scores. Unfortunately one of these masculine scores only occurred since the respondent declined to answer some questions and their feminine and androgynous scores couldn’t be recorded, which meant they only had a masculine score that exceeded 4. This is the line for a high score on one of the three traits measured (feminine, masculine, androgynous).

A two-way between- groups analysis of variances was conducted to examine the possible relationship of Greek affiliation and the amount of years spent at Otterbein with masculinity as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). Respondents were divided into two groups depending on their self-reports of the amount of years they have spent at Otterbein (Group 1: less than 1 to 2 years; Group 2: 3 to 4+). The interaction effect between the amount of years spent at Otterbein and Greek Affiliation was not statistically significant, $F (1, 51) = .652, p = .423$. There was no statistically significant main effect for amount of years spent at Otterbein, $F (1, 51) = .005, p = .944$; the effect size was also small (partial eta squared = .000).
PAQ

The scores were overwhelmingly in favor of more ‘feminine’ men. As over half of the scores were feminine, there was not a single score that was pure masculine. There were 119 feminine scores, 81 undifferentiated, 2 androgynous and 7 that I was unable to score due to declined responses.

Another two-way between-group’s analysis of variances was conducted to explore the possible relationship of Greek Affiliation and the Amount of Years someone spent at Otterbein on perception of heterosexually desirable male’s masculine score based on the modified Personal Attribute Questionnaire (PAQ). Participants were again divided by two groups according to the Amount of Years spent at Otterbein (Group 1: less than 1 to 2 years; Group 2: 3 to 4+). The interaction effect between Greek affiliation and Amounts of Years at Otterbein was not statistically significant, $F (1, 202) = .894, p = .345$. There was also no significant main effect for amount of years spent at Otterbein, $F (1, 202) = .318, p = .574$; once again the effect size was small (partial eta squared = .002).

Qualitative Interviews

1. Why did you choose Otterbein? What do you enjoy most about Otterbein? How is it different from your high school? What are your dislikes about Otterbein? Any groups or community issues that bother you? What is a liberal arts education? What should be prioritized in a liberal arts education? [Probe to gender and sexuality if respondent doesn’t go there initially]
When asked about why respondents chose Otterbein all but two respondents mentioned they were looking for a “small” campus/campus environment, or school, and were primarily applying to liberal arts schools. One of the male respondents (senior psychology student, Greek affiliate, pseudonym: Thomas), didn’t say the exact same “small campus” response in the first question of the section but also mentioned the enjoyment of what he called the “small atmosphere”, and proceeded to describe how attached and involved he feels to the community and his academic department. Once again similar language is seen in the other respondents as they describe the good relationships of faculty, staff, and various people they have met. Other common language for what respondents enjoy about Otterbein was good relationship with professors. One of the female (Greek affiliate, senior, computer science major, pseudonym: Wendy) respondents stated,

I don’t feel uncomfortable living here um… there are things about Otterbein’s community that’s not the best but I really feel like most of the time I feel like everybody on campus is pretty welcoming and nice to me.

The next question of how it was different from high school yielded similar instances of shared language. Four respondents discussed how much more open they feel at Otterbein, how they were from a more conservative and restrictive high school environment. Female respondent (Greek affiliate, senior, WGSS major, pseudonym: Kate) shared:

I’m like wow that’s actually like a lot like we’ve been given a lot of access and rights here because in my high school it was so narrow um… and so just the freedom that I have intellectually and personally here is the biggest difference.
Some dislikes and community issues were also brought up by multiple respondents, though in different perspectives. Kate, despite being a Greek affiliate brought up a disapproval of the Greek system, and sentiments that she puts as,

How we talk a really big game about our values when it comes to equality justice sustainability, I don’t think we’re actually doing enough to make those things happen.

Other Greek respondent Wendy and Thomas however spoke as if the Greek system was being marginalized and not appropriately supported. To Thomas this lack of support took the form of the school allowing an imbalance of power in the Greek organizations. Wendy stated,

I definitely feel like they disrespect the Greek community a lot. I don’t feel like they understand how important we are to Otterbein’s culture.

There wasn’t similar counter language between Robert and the other non-Greek respondent (WGSS major, junior, pseudonym: Jessica). Robert made statements about feeling about an overly political atmosphere, and he doesn’t always meet the views of Otterbein. Jessica mentioned how certain athletic groups have been known to use slurs or apprehensive language.

As for the definition of the liberal arts environment there was common language about it being well rounded, covering multiple subjects. Making sure that students are able to grasp a subject to some degree.

2. Are you involved with any groups or organizations at Otterbein? Which ones? How did you get involved? Why do you stay involved? Did Otterbein itself or the faculty push you or help you find these groups?
As for group involvement three of the respondents are Greek affiliates. Two of them focus on Greek life, but Kate is involved with WGSS groups and Student Government. Robert is an RA. Jessica was involved with various WGSS organizations on the campus.

When it came to organizations involving major that Kate and Jessica became involved in, that derived from continuing the major and being advertised by the head of the WGSS department. Greek life had different motivation involved. Thomas described joining Greek life with friends and hoping to expand his circle of friends. Wendy was actually suggested to join by one of the school facilitated therapists, along with the people she lived with at the time. Kate went through the normal recruitment process, and had planned on using it as a way to develop a stronger resume. Robert became an RA in order to actually become more involved on campus, after being a commuter his first year.

It seems that friendship and work ethic are common motivators for staying involved with these groups. Thomas demonstrated some “guyland” rhetoric when he stated,

I feel older compared to everyone else there I don’t want them to lose what that place represents.

He feels the need to maintain tradition and assist in the group.

3. What are your opinions on Greek life? (Miami’s Greek life, Dominion University “welcome” signs, hazing incidents) Do you see legitimacy in the idea that Greek organization reproduce and support sexism? Is there a difference between Otterbein’s local culture and the national Greek culture? (Bring up more examples of apparent toxic masculinity in news, and existing research that shows negative aspects of fraternities, Kimmel’s “guyland”) What makes the local culture different/similar?
All respondents stated that they felt legitimacy that Greek life could serve to support sexism, and were aware of the events brought up by the question. And when the “guyland” was explained they saw validity of it coinciding with Greek life. Thomas however stated,

can be a really positive thing but it can also be seen in a negative light that it’s easy to see all the bad things they do but it’s not really easy to see all the little things that they help people out with like you always see headline of what terrible things this organization did or that one. It’s like they’re never going to make a piece about how it brought people together and how they have lasting bonds because of it.

Wendy has similar rhetoric again, about how Greek life isn’t properly recognized. Jessica felt it was a

Case by case but it’s definitely not universal.

Robert said he felt “biased” since he isn’t involved with Greek life, but saw validity to the support of sexism. During his time as an RA he has developed a negative opinion seeing New Greek members having cardinal concerns set up, or having issues with grades. Kate was torn, because of her positive experiences but attributes these to her sorority.

The next part of this looked to see if Otterbein was unique. Jessica,

I guess I mean then. I like Otterbein’s Greek life opposed to other Greek lives at different colleges because of that, we have some certain things.

Thomas felt the same way, that the environment of Otterbein causes a positive effect on Greek life. Jessica like Thomas felt the college by college basis idea. Kate also began to describe this but took it in the opposite way. She mentioned how national chapters have greater checks and balances compared to the local organizations. Kate brings up the influence of our alumni when it comes to our Greek system,
and our alumni have a lot of power umm… and it’s going to take a major
generational change and I think with the new member education rules that were
installed this year that’s a good start on the universities part but the push back on
those was ridiculous people should have not thrown the big fits that they threw
over those rules because they should not have been doing those things in the first
place.

Robert didn’t know much about the differences of nationals and locals so he didn’t really
form an opinion on the matter.

A sentiment was brought up by Katie about how the local organizations actually
disrespect the national organization. These nationals are treated as an out group, despite the
greater legitimacy they receive through a national chapter. Thomas actually felt that the national
chapters are more facilitating to “guyland” and harmful masculine traditions when he states,

It’s like one of those things where you can observe it in a large group setting I
would say it’s more present because there are people to take notice of the things
that you are or are not doing. But like I think it goes away the smaller the group
is.

4. Thinking of asking about gendered terms or issues to see how they respond and look at their
awareness of such things. Simple things like what is Caitlyn Jenner’s gender, gender neutrality in
clothing, restrooms and childcare, freethenipple movement, homogenous masculinity/femininity,
gender essentialism, gender complementarianism, gender and sex... Use these to gauge
awareness. Ask about toxic masculinity, and guyland.

Each respondent was asked if they were aware of each term, or knew about the topic.
Everyone gave an appropriate answer to Caitlyn Jenner’s gender, and were aware of the motives
behind the free the nipple movement. Each respondent was also capable of appropriately
describing the difference between sex and gender.
The lack of responses came with the exact terms such as gender essentialism and complementarianism. Kate, who along with her WGSS background, has a background in sociology knew each meaning. Jessica who is also a WGSS, was familiar with the material when they started being described, but didn’t know the exact terms. All other respondents were able to grasp the idea when it was fully explained, but had no real knowledge of these gendered terms.

5. Have you taken any classes [with content or discussions relating to gender, gender roles, masculinity, femininity, feminism, (defunding planned parenthood, human trafficking, sexual violence, rape culture in college campuses, “Welcome” signs at dominion)] that had gender discussion in them?

   Once again Kate and Jessica, who are WGSS majors, had taken plenty of classes on the topics of gender and sexuality. All other respondents had only taken about one to two classes, and participated in a seminar that discussed issues of gender and sexuality. Robert had no formal class on the topic but had learned through meeting and presentation for RAs.

6. Do you feel that Otterbein does a good job of allowing/facilitating/resourcing the growth of programs and classes that teach people about the issues of gender, and gender itself? Do you have any prior experience with Free-Zone, have you taken any classes on Gender, or Gender theory?

   Robert felt that yes, but at the same time he referred to the WGSS program, and students as “they’re very active on campus, they’re a very active group” in spreading their messages. Jessica felt that Otterbein does a good job. Kate, who has taken a multitude of Otterbein gender focused classes said,
They do an okay job, I’m not satisfied but I’m not desperate.

Wendy expressed similar sentiment to Kate, where it’s not perfect but still working. Thomas however felt that Otterbein wasn’t doing an adequate job and since they aren’t part of his major and he has never really been given a reason to take those courses outside of earning credit.

Only the female respondents had first-hand prior experience with free-zone. Robert had minimal interactions with it as a group. There was a repeat question asking if they have taking any classes again to see if they would name explicit classes, and delve more into prior responses. The results from the first time asked didn’t change.

7. Do you feel you can be open with your gender and sexuality at Otterbein? In the Greek community? Yes, give examples, if no explain why?

All respondents said yes to both questions, they view it as a safe and open environment. Though only Wendy self-identified as bisexual, Jessica and Kate self-identified in the LGBTQIA community but didn’t specify her sexual preference. However Kate stated that she felt comfortable most likely because she is white cis-passing and hetero-passing as well.

8. Do you find yourself to be a more socially aware and sensitive person due to Otterbein’s environment [probe on gender/sexuality if respondent doesn’t go there]? Essentially how much have you learned at this school about topics like gender and sexuality?

All respondents stated yes, but at the same time they self-reported a degree of interest in these topics or awareness of gender and sexuality topics at some level due to family. Wendy stated,
even just meeting people that are… have a different sexuality and gender, kind of making me understand it as a whole because it is not as straightforward as I used to think it was, Um… So Yeah I mean I definitely think that… that the Otterbein community has taught me a lot and I am curious about a lot of different things.

Thomas stated similar sentiments about the environment of Otterbein,

I feel that being here makes it a lot easier to bounce those types of discussion and ideas.

Robert found himself to be more aware of gender and sexuality issues, but still lacking knowledge. Jessica merely agreed with the idea that the University has made her more socially aware.

Respondents stated they learned different levels of information involving gender and sexuality, or in Roberts case more of a basic understanding. Jessica described that she learned more about what a Trans-identity is due to her time here. Kate described her level of knowledge she gained as “life changing amounts.”

9. Do you consider yourself to be an ally of the LGBTQIA community? Were you one before or after coming here? If yes what caused this growth?

All respondents stated yes, and that this began in high school predominantly because of friends or family. Kate reported her ally ship growing and becoming more active. The same happened with Wendy, she was never opposed to LGBTQIA groups, but only recognized herself as an ally when she learned more, and gained more experience with them,

10. Do you have any issues with the environment of Otterbein [probe to gender and sexuality if respondent doesn’t go there]? How could it be made better?
For the changes the respondents requested of Otterbein, Wendy Felt that more INST classes on the topic of gender would be a benefit. Kate had a plethora suggestions: more gender inclusive housing; removal of the active police force; more information on the Title IX policy distributed; finally the abolishment of the Greek system. Jessica has witnessed cisgender males still using derogatory language, and feels an FYS on gender and sexuality to inform people about language usage. Thomas felt that all groups need to be more open minded and patient of language, and professors need to be more capable of defusing student arguments. He describes that people trying to be politically correct need to be more understanding than attacking others. Robert has similar feelings to Thomas about language and idea policing, he states how the environment has become fairly small for him, and even “too political”. He described a situation where during a conversation on gender inclusive housing, the RAs that didn’t approve of it felt attacked by the WGSS students.

Discussion

There are quite a few limitations associated with the methodology used in this study. At the forefront of these limitations was that this was a cross-sectional study, meaning I cannot make any causal claims about mitigation of the “guyland” due to Otterbein University’s unique environment. The gender analysis I used were also quite dated the BSRI being from 1971, and the PAQ 1978, though modified, the test still has a dated understanding of masculinity and femininity. The whole drive behind this study is that there is a shift in the behavior of men due to lack of opportunity to assert oneself as an adult using by meeting the role of a breadwinner.
Since neither test was able to yield significant results. There is no main effect of time spent at Otterbein, with on the masculinity scores on either survey. And no significant interaction between times spent at Otterbein and Greek Affiliation. Which means my hypotheses for the BSRI and PAQ are null. This could be due to a great amount of outside influence, I didn’t predict, or test for. Such as doing a longitudinal study to track if a subjects’ gender performance actually changes each year or semester.

The PAQ for example while it was beneficial that there was a sample of 211 respondents, the most common rating of a desirable male was coded “feminine.” This form of the PAQ was adapted by a study from Miller, Bilimoria, & Pattni (2000) where they examined desirability in relation to cultural traditionalism in the United Kingdom. They focused on Asian Britons for their study, and their results ultimately demonstrated a great deal of responses coded “masculine,” which the authors linked to the patriarchal nature of their respondents’ culture. Women at Otterbein could be more open and unrestricted by patriarchal gender rhetoric, and patriarchal influence could be less prevalent on the campus if there is such a preference for “feminine” traits that the PAQ measures (emotional, kind, devotion, and understanding), can’t be supported as being in relation to their time spent at Otterbein. This study also doesn’t use some traditional traits like aggression for final scoring, so it is oddly binary but still not like classic and general understandings of binary gender difference. According to Spence and Helmreich (1978), it is a self-assessment on traits either perceived as masculine or feminine. It also draws on limited aspects of sex roles, being more self-assertive traits for men, and more interpersonal expressive traits for women.
Using tests that assess gender performance as outside of one’s gender for this project is a mistake that should be rectified if attempted again here, or at another school. I was looking to see if there was evidence of a harmful stage of masculinity that can create gender exclusive attitudes. So supplementing both the BSRI and PAQ with Corprew and Mitchell’s (2014) examination of hyper masculinity would have given me pure masculine role results, and also eluded to dangerous behaviors associated with masculinity (sexual aggression), as opposed to seeing information on other gender roles. I made a mistake in trying to associate older gender tests as a sign of possible harmful understanding of gender performance. The very explicit examination of hyper masculinity would be much more suitable for self-assessment, and change it to measure what other genders would view as a socially acceptable, cisgendered, heteronormative man based on the ratings. Not to mention I could instead make claims about the kind of harm the “guyland” at Otterbein is creating due to reaffirmation of hyper masculine ideology. Higher scores means it would be a negative form of the “guyland”.

The qualitative interviews provide perhaps the most insightful data for explaining possible relationships not seen in the quantitative results, as well as an understanding of the “guyland” presence at Otterbein. Though it needs to be sad that the responses of the interviews are a result of convenience sampling, to very explicit examples of Otterbein students, and purely upper class student. Though there were only five respondents they were representatives of the many different sub-cultures (fraternities, sororities, sports teams) of Otterbein. This started becoming clear with the first set of questions when asked, why they chose Otterbein. Respondents were looking for a smaller school and were interested in the unique environment of
Otterbein. When other questions were asked about what they like about the Otterbein, and how it has shaped their social awareness of gender and sexuality topics, they gave similar responses to one another. They felt comfortable here expressing themselves, it’s a nurturing environment for gender and sexuality issues. And most importantly each stated that they had become more socially aware of gender and sexuality issues due to their time spent at Otterbein,

While there were very progressive sentiments in each of the respondent’s reactions to "guyland", which was described to them as a stage of masculinity, between ages 16 to 25, where men will congregate and escape the pressures of society to practice more traditional ideas of masculinity. There was an error using this terminology with them, because it operates under the assumption that they have a concept of traditional masculinity as wrong in the eyes of society. Respondents recognized that it could exist within Greek life, however sports teams weren’t asked about during the interviews. Most respondents thought it would be dependent on the organization though, as opposed to a model which encompasses them all. And questions involving Greek life really demonstrated how much they are aware of fraternity life and self-reflect on actions involving Greek life. The most critical person on Greek life was Kate (the respondent most familiar with gender theory terms, and already familiar with the “guyland” idea), who despite being Greek, and respecting what it has done for her, still stated that it needs abolished at Otterbein.

Along with the respondents claiming it’s a case by case basis for “guyland” and fraternity interaction, there was a continuing sentiment from everyone but Kate, that there is good in fraternities that is overshadowed by the negative attention that the poor behavior of a few bring.
Thomas and Wendy were fairly adamant on this notion. Robert, who was neither a Greek affiliate nor supporter of the Greek system felt this way as well. This idea that not all fraternities are bad at Otterbein is not in any way being denied by this project. This good that these chapters do is possibly a facet of "guyland" that helps with the continuation of it as a practice. The practices of community service, civil duty, or brotherhood building helps young men feel that they are behaving independently and like adults. It creates a validity to these fraternities, by giving them jobs (a criteria for meeting adulthood). The fraternity, according to Kimmel (2008) replaces their parents and family that was keeping them in a state of youth, and by abandoning the standards of the family for the standards of fraternal life, Greek-affiliated young men may now feel that they are adults dealing with adult problems, though it is just a fundraiser as opposed to supporting a family.

However, in the case of my respondents, even if the work their fraternal organizations do is beneficial for the community it is still confining and disillusioning the members of these fraternal organizations to a degree. These kinds of charitable and community service-oriented behaviors are also used as a veiling excuse for violent behavior, and to deflect attention from acts such as hazing, which are the biggest possible harm to the “guyland” sub-culture of fraternities. Unfortunately none of my respondents made much mention of hazing. This is again an oversight of myself for not explicitly asking about it as a facet of the “guyland”. There are mentions of hazing/initiation based on how Kimmel (2008) describes it as part of his model. Kate describes one of the local fraternities known participants in hazing,
the pledging process is so, it’s more (local fraternity) the pledging process is so severe and so horrific that these people come out of it with the inability to really kind of relate and cope and understand, and really form bonds if they’re not formed in that way.

This is language is in perfect sync with Kimmel’s ideology. This initiation is used to perpetuate the "guyland", young men are put into positions where they must respect and treat someone who is at most 2 years older than them with the utmost respect and admiration. Then after they go through this process it all just repeats, imitates hand out the tests and become the authoritarians. They’re then educated and told that this action will cause them to become a better man, they will learn something worthwhile. This works because these young men are grasping at straws to grow up and prove themselves to the world, in a world where it is almost impossible to not go to college and achieve a healthy material standard of living.

I should have also tried to look at more than just fraternities. I had no questions that explicitly asked about sports teams, and didn’t really look at them at all. I also only talked to students, I should have reached out to faculty/staff and maybe even administrators to see what they thought about this stage of development. I was far too oriented on the students, which in many ways can be a mistake if I’m looking for young males to self report on a stage of development that I’m unintentionally priming as negative.

There were quite a few mistake in the design of this overall study. One of the main reasons is my personal bias through the process of this study. I began it as a member of a fraternity at Otterbein University, and a participant in the “guyland”. It was originally meant to try and off some data that fraternities aren’t a bad thing and because of that I did a fairly poor job
in initially preparing my tools, writing questions and doing initial research. I started seeing this bias after I left my sub-culture and immersing myself more in this work.

Conclusion

Unfortunately the majority of my hypotheses were null. There was no evidence from the quantitative studies to support claims that Otterbein is influencing performance and preference of cis-gendered heteronormative masculinity. However this is based on a classical and binary ideology of gender which fortunately wasn’t discovered to be present at this University, even in the younger students in either the BSRI or the PAQ. The qualitative interviews enlighten a possible reasoning to the lack of preference for traditional masculinity, though this was from a sample of 5 that were specifically picked to represent, various sub-culture and majors across campus.

What kind of support has been given to answer the research question of: 1) Does time spent at Otterbein influence the ways that male students conceptualize their personal gender identity, does it facilitate a departure from traditional masculinity (self-reliance, athleticism, dominance), and/or does it encourage more androgynous self-description for male students 2) Does time spent at Otterbein influence the way male and female students at Otterbein view traditionally masculine traits (aggression, rationality, etc.) as heterosexually desirable in prospective male romantic partners? 3) How do different sub-cultures at Otterbein University help contribute to people’s gender ideology and associated practices? Unfortunately for questions one and 2 there is not much that can said, the design of the quantitative side of this
research was very weak, and the survey’s didn’t target what should have been measured which is hyper masculine behavior tied to “guyland”. However the qualitative data did provide some evidence of two possibilities, the “guyland” is prevalent in Otterbein’s Greek system, and there is possibly some form of mitigation that allows for the fraternities to maintain a seemingly peaceful coexistence with the University.

For the, how can we rate the effectiveness of Otterbein’s unique liberal arts education? Qualitative respondents stated that they were pushed to join certain groups and enroll in specific classes due to the influence of Otterbein professors, administration, faculty, and staff. They also felt that while the integrative studies program may have some weaknesses, it still ultimately aides in granting students a better-rounded, and multi-faceted education. This is done through engaging students in various INSTs, allowing groups to hold events and providing funding, and encouraging community engagement.

However, the “guyland” still seems very present at Otterbein. Otterbein’s fraternities seem meet the 5 criteria for Greek life. Qualitative respondents and the information of Greek life available on Otterbein’s website (Schwarz, 2015). Thomas describes the how old he felt around younger members, and Kate mentions the cycle of abuse. The cycle of abuse which unfortunately only Kate mentioned is the initiation. There are positions of authority within these groups, which again is described by Kate. Language of marginalization was seen to be expressed by Wendy and Thomas. Wendy especially who called for the University to give a more fair assessment and treatment of the Greek system. Thomas claims that there is unfair treatment of the fraternity, though unfortunately didn’t delve much more into this language. Finally the validation through
service. This is apparent when language is used about the “good” that Greek life does for the university by Wendy. The criteria are in some way met, though this data would be more compelling if the interviews had a focus of proving the presence of the “guyland”, instead of general assessment of Otterbein’s Unique environment. Also a larger, and more diverse sample would possibly give more of the various sub-cultures at Otterbein University.

Based on the criteria I developed the “guyland” shouldn’t be thought of as a state of development that takes the form of a static sub-culture. This performance has to adapt and change with its environment, or else “guyland” can’t appeal to new members. It has to present itself in a way that seemingly supports its environment to give it validation of adulthood.

The greater depth of the “guyland”, as representative of its environment means it need to be examined in multiple ways. For instance, Rios (2011) describes the development of youth in urban areas and how because of their skin color, family structure, and social class they are criminalized and labeled as criminals their entire lives. This discourse can lead them to join gangs, local groups where young men may start to earn money, acquire social status, and earn respect from their peers and those elder to them. For them this is their "guyland"—they feel that even if it is illegal, being able to earn money in any way, when other opportunities are blocked due to labor market discrimination, is what defines them as a man and an adult. This is a form of the “guyland” adapting to its environment in order to recruit young men.

With the self-made man is still promoted as a capitalist goal and idea, and the breadwinning man is promoted to every male in the United States regardless of class or race.
Young men of privilege are instead in home environments where instead of being told to go out and get a job they must attend college and become educated. They are handed a great deal of opportunity and no clear time where they truly prove themselves as men according to Kimmel (2008). The “guyland” and fraternal associations function almost as privileged avoidance of criminalization, where resources are denied. Privileged males are essentially being kept in a state where they can maintain a persona of we support this environment, while essentially torturing one another with hazing, and binge drinking. For affluent young men, they are trying to prove that they’re able to survive on their own, which is why they seek to find a place in these fraternal groups, and work on college campuses to essentially prove themselves.

Schwalbe (2007) spoke of how men with greater resources are able to engage in less apparent physical aggression and more subtle criminal practices, while those with less are more likely to engage in crime. The "guyland" is a very subtle manhood act for these young men to convince themselves that they are self-aware as they have an organizational pseudo government and group responsibilities, and engage in community service. All so that they can feel autonomous, or grown up, but at the same time they are avoiding the pressures of real adult life. Though again, just because the young men engaged in these forms aren’t in gangs doesn’t mean the “guyland” isn’t harming them.

Otterbein University gives a great deal of privilege to student groups, especially Greek life. In a private institution that requires donations to survive, the alumni of these groups hold a great deal of power in institutional decision-making. Kate describes an instance where the Otterbein tried to place rules more regulation to prevent hazing, but the alumni disagreed and
were able to make some changes. The "guyland" is present and Otterbein University is advertising, the Greek system to students in order to get them involved in the community. But they are seemingly failing to truly regulate the Greek system. What’s worse is the unique and progressive liberal arts environment of Otterbein University acts as a sort of camouflage for public display of these groups as they are held on a pedestal for the services they perform. As soon as the public turns their eyes, there is possible abuse, and backwards tradition to ensure that the next generation continues to act the same way. In many ways this is defeating the message that Otterbein tries to display to the public about its progressive ideas.

It wouldn’t be surprising if this act of camouflage of the Greek same relationship is occurring at other schools. The "guyland" works when there are males that need to prove that they are men to one another but aren’t in an actual point in life where they can begin true adulthood. As long as an environment is a host of this criteria of men the “guyland” can make an appearance. The unique environment of Otterbein University could possibly be an example of mitigation, or a less, hyper masculine “guyland”, though this needs to be further empirically tested. However, gender is changing and developing. It seems that for privileged males masculinity is more about trying to attain respect and influence than the dominance and strength masculinity has traditionally been associated with—consistent with Schwalbe’s arguments. More regulations on fraternal groups in order to prevent such negative behavior is the most necessary and critical policy recommendation that follows from the findings of my research. One of the main reasons such behavior is perpetuated is because of the practices of hazing and other problematic fraternal traditions, which education about gendered topics, and issues could also
help phase out the “guyland” and allow for development to adulthood. Men are seeking a way to grow up without having to deal with the real world. Making collegiate fraternal groups more socially accountable, not allowing them to govern themselves and have their own judicial board, and giving them real life consequences seem to be the only pragmatic solution to the contemporary problems associated with collegiate fraternal life.
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Appendix A: Consent Form BSRI

This study consists of an online survey, which you may now participate in. The survey consists of 68 multiple-choice and/or free-answer questions, in two sections. Section 1 is the Bem Sex-Role that will characterize your personality as masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. Section 2 asks basic demographic information like age, major, etc... You may decline to answer any question for any reason, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. While you are participating, your responses will be stored in a temporary holding area as you move through the sections, but they will not be permanently saved until you complete all sections and you are given a chance to review your responses. If you consent to be in this study, please click on the Start Survey button below/Sign your name below.
Appendix B: BSRI

Intro. Text: Bem Sex-Role Inventory, rate yourself on each item based on how often you feel that you practice each trait on the scale from 1(never or almost never true) to 7(always or almost always true).

1. Self-reliant (self-reliant)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

2. Yielding (Yielding)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

3. Helpful (Helpful)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

4. defend own beliefs (beliefs)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

5. Cheerful (cheerful)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

6. moody (moody)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

7. independent (independent)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

8. shy (shy)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

9. conscientious (conscientious)
1. athletic (athletic)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

10. affectionate (affectionate)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

11. theatrical (theatrical)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

12. Assertive (assertive)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

13. Flatterable (flatterable)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

14. Happy (happy)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

15. strong personality (personality)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

16. Loyal (loyal)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

17. unpredictable (unpredictable)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

18. forceful (forceful)
1. feminine (feminine)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

20. reliable (reliable)
    1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

21. analytical (analytical)
    1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

22. sympathetic (sympathetic)
    1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

23. jealous (jealous)
    1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

24. leadership ability (leadership abi)
    1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

25. sensitive to other's needs (sensitive to ot)
    1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

26. truthful (truthful)
    1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

27. willing to take risks (truthful)
    1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)
29. understanding (understanding)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

30. secretive (secretive)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

31. make decisions easily (make decisions )
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

32. compassionate (compassionate)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

33. sincere (sincere)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

34. self-sufficient (self-sufficient)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

35. eager to soothe hurt feelings (eager to soothe)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

36. conceited (conceited)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

37. dominant (dominant)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

38. soft spoken (soft spoken)
1. likable (likable)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

2. masculine (masculine)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

3. warm (warm)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

4. solemn (solemn)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

5. willing to take a stand (willing to take)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

6. tender (tender)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

7. friendly (friendly)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

8. aggressive (aggressive)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

9. gullible (gullible)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)
48. inefficient (inefficient)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

49. acts as a leader (acts as a leader)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

50. childlike (childlike)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

51. adaptable (adaptable)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

52. individualistic (individualistic)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

53. does not use harsh language (does not use ha)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

54. unsystematic (unsystematic)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

55. competitive (competitive)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

56. loves children (loves children)
   1(never) 2(very rarely) 3(rarely) 4(neutral) 5(sometimes) 6(often) 7(always)

57. tactful (tactful)
1 (never) 2 (very rarely) 3 (rarely) 4 (neutral) 5 (sometimes) 6 (often) 7 (always)

58. ambitious (ambitious)
1 (never) 2 (very rarely) 3 (rarely) 4 (neutral) 5 (sometimes) 6 (often) 7 (always)

59. gentle (gentle)
1 (never) 2 (very rarely) 3 (rarely) 4 (neutral) 5 (sometimes) 6 (often) 7 (always)

60. conventional (conventional)
1 (never) 2 (very rarely) 3 (rarely) 4 (neutral) 5 (sometimes) 6 (often) 7 (always)
Appendix C: Demographic Questions BSRI

Intro. Text: Listed below are questions for this section of the survey regarding demographic information. If you are given the option to decline to answer a question, then declining to answer is considered a response.

1. Academic year? (Academic year?)
   Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior

2. How many years have you been at Otterbein?
   This is my first semester, 1, 2, 3, 4, More than 4

3. Type of residency
   Residence Hall, Commons Apartment, Greek Housing, Theme Housing, Commuter

4. Sexual orientation
   Heterosexual, Bisexual, Homosexual, Other

5. Major(s) (Major(s))
   (Fill in the blank)

6. Relationship Status
   Married, In a relationship, Single, Other

7. What is your age?
   17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, greater than 23

8. Are you a member of a fraternity?
   Yes, No
Appendix D: BSRI Debriefing Form

Thank you for completing this survey. We are interested in the relationship between time in a Liberal Arts University and conformity to masculinity. We expect that the more time spent at Otterbein will mean a more androgynous and less masculine score. Your responses to our survey will help us to test this hypothesis. The results will be presented as part of a final project at Psychology Reporting Day 2016. If you have any questions please feel free to contact myself Samuel Oakley, samuel.oakley@otterbein.edu, or my project advisor Dr. Docka-Filipek, ddockafilipek@otterbein.edu
Appendix E: PAQ Consent Form

This study consists of an online survey, which you may now participate in. The survey consists of 33 multiple-choice and/or free-answer questions, in two sections. Section 1 is demographic information such as gender, age, relationship status, and time spent at Otterbein University. Section 2 is the modified Personal Attribute Questionnaire that lists gendered personality traits. You will respond to these questions based on what you believe to be the behavior of a desirable college aged modern male in a romantic relationship. You may decline to answer any question for any reason, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. While you are participating, your responses will be stored in a temporary holding area as you move through the sections, but they will not be permanently saved until you complete all sections and you are given a chance to review your responses. If you consent to be in this study, please click on the Start Survey button below/sign below.
Appendix F: PAQ demographic Questions

Intro. Text: Listed below are questions for this section of the survey regarding demographic information. If you are given the option to decline to answer a question, then declining to answer is considered a response.

1. Academic year? (Academic year?)
   Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior

2. How many years have you been at Otterbein? (Years at Otterbein)
   This is my first semester, 1, 2, 3, 4, More than 4

3. Type of residency (Type of residency)
   Residence Hall, Commons Apartment, Greek Housing, Theme Housing, Commuter

4. Sexual orientation
   Heterosexual, Bisexual, Homosexual, Not Listed/Other

5. Major(s) (Major(s))
   (Fill in the blank)

6. Relationship Status (Relationship St)
   Married, In a relationship, Single, Other

7. What is your age?
   17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, greater than 23

8. Are you a member of a fraternity or sorority?
   Yes, No

9. Gender
   Male, Female, Non-binary
Appendix G: PAQ

Intro Text: Each of the items below represents a gendered personality trait. You will respond to these questions based on what you believe to be the behavior of a desirable college aged modern male in a romantic relationship. If you are given the option to decline to answer a question, then declining to answer is considered a response.

1. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all aggressive
A.......B.......C.......D......E Very aggressive

2. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all independent
A.......B.......C.......D......E Very independent

3. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all emotional
A.......B.......C.......D......E Very emotional

4. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Very submissive
A.......B.......C.......D......E Very dominant

5. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all excitable in a major crisis*
A.......B.......C.......D......E Very excitable in a major crisis

6. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: It is desirable when my partner is: Very passive
A.......B.......C.......D......E Very active
7. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: It is desirable when my partner is: Not at all able to devote self completely to others A.......B.......C.......D.......E Able to devote self completely to others

8. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: It is desirable when my partner is: Very rough A.......B.......C.......D.......E Very gentle*

9. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: It is desirable when my partner is: Not at all helpful to others A.......B.......C.......D.......E Very helpful to others

10. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all competitive A.......B.......C.......D.......E Very competitive

11. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Very home oriented A.......B.......C.......D.......E Very worldly

12. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all kind A.......B.......C.......D.......E Very kind*

13. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Indifferent to others= approval* A.......B.......C.......D.......E Highly needful of others’ approval

14. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Feelings not easily hurt* A.......B.......C.......D.......E Feelings easily hurt

15. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all aware of feelings of others A.......B.......C.......D.......E Very aware of feelings of others*
16. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Can make decisions easily*
A......B......C......D......E Has difficulty making decisions

17. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Gives up very easily
A......B......C......D......E Never gives up easily

18. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Never cries* A......B......C......D......E Cries very easily

19. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all self-confident
A......B......C......D......E Very self-confident*

20. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Feels very inferior A......B......C......D......E Feels very superior*

21. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Not at all understanding of others
A......B......C......D......E Very understanding of others*

22. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Very cold in relations with others
A......B......C......D......E Very warm in relations with others*

23. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Very little need for security*
A......B......C......D......E Very strong need for security

24. It is desirable when a male romantic partner is: Goes to pieces under pressure
A......B......C......D......E Stands up well under pressure*
Appendix H: PAQ Debriefing

Thank you for completing this survey. We are interested in the relationship between time in a Liberal Arts University and opinions on traditional masculinity. We expect that the more time spent at Otterbein should mean that more feminine scores and behaviors will be viewed as more desirable than traditional masculine ones. Your responses to our survey will help us to test this hypothesis. The results will be presented as part of a final project at Psychology Reporting Day 2016. If you have any questions please feel free to contact myself Samuel Oakley, samuel.oakley@otterbein.edu, or my project advisor Dr. Docka Filipek, ddockafilipek@otterbein.edu
Appendix I: Interview Consent Form

This study is a one on one interview that was crafted with the hopes to examine people from multiple facets of the Otterbein culture, and their views, practices, knowledge, and understanding of gender. You were selected due to the experimenter viewing you as an example of a participant in a facet of the Otterbein Culture. This interview will be recorded by a digital audio recorder, and the experimenter will be taking notes during the entirety, when it is finished the interviews will be transcribed to word document for data analysis purposes. In order to protect your confidentiality you will be given a pseudonym and any explicit organization you mention will not be named and instead be reported as campus organization, or Greek organization, etc... If at any time you feel uncomfortable with a question or the interview as a whole you may decline to answer a question or stop the interview entirely. If you are at least 18 years old, and consent to be in this study, please sign your name below.

Signature

Date

X
Appendix J: Interview Questions

“I’m essentially trying to see how the culture of Otterbein has shaped your views and opinions when it comes to your gender performance, and your views on gender issues as a whole. When I say gender performance I mean how you personally act in a gendered way, like your everyday actions that can be associated with gender traits. Do you have any questions before we begin?”

1. Why did you choose Otterbein? What do you enjoy most about Otterbein? How is it different from your high school? What are your dislikes about Otterbein? Any groups or community issues that bother you? What is a liberal arts education? What should be prioritized in a liberal arts education? [Probe to gender and sexuality if respondent doesn’t go there initially]

2. Are you involved with any groups or organizations at Otterbein? Which ones? How did you get involved? Why do you stay involved? Did Otterbein itself or the faculty push you or help you find these groups?

3. What are your opinions on Greek life? (Bring up recent Greek life incidents, which will depend on the interview date, Miami’s Greek life, Dominion University “welcome” signs) Do you see legitimacy in the idea that Greek organization reproduce and support sexism? Is there a difference between Otterbein’s local culture and the national Greek culture? (Bring up more examples of apparent toxic masculinity in news, and existing research that shows negative aspects of fraternities, Kimmel’s guyland, Fleming & Lee “Real Men Don’t”) What makes the local culture different/similar?
4. Thinking of asking about gendered terms or issues to see how they respond and look at their awareness of such things. Simple things like what is Caitlyn Jenner’s, gender neutrality in clothing, restrooms and childcare, freethenipple movement, homogenous masculinity/femininity, gender essentialism, gender complementarianism, gender and sex. Use these to gauge awareness. Ask about toxic masculinity, and guyland

5. Have you taken any classes [with content or discussions relating to gender, gender roles, masculinity, femininity, feminism, (defunding planned parenthood, human trafficking, sexual violence, rape culture in college campuses, “Welcome” signs at dominion? that had gender discussion in them?

6. Do you feel that Otterbein does a good job of allowing/facilitating/resourcing the growth of programs and classes that teach people about the issues of gender, and gender itself? Do you have any prior experience with Free-Zone, have you taken any classes on Gender, or Gender theory?

7. Do you feel you can be open with your gender and sexuality at Otterbein? In the Greek community? Yes, give examples, if no explain why?

8. Do you find yourself to be a more socially aware and sensitive person due to Otterbein’s environment [probe on gender/sexuality if respondent doesn’t go there]? Essentially how much have you learned at this school about topics like gender and sexuality?

9. Do you consider yourself to be an ally of the LGBTQIA community? Were you one before or after coming here? If yes what caused this growth?
10. Do you have any issues with the environment of Otterbein [probe to gender and sexuality if respondent doesn’t go there]? How could it be made better?

Anymore Questions for me?
Appendix K: Interview Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in this interview. I am interested in the relationship between time in a Liberal Arts University such as Otterbein and the performance and understanding of Gender. Your responses will help look at how participants in the different organizations and classes that Otterbein provides, currently view and perform, or have grown to view and perform gendered behavior. The results will be presented as part of a final project at Psychology Reporting Day 2016. If you have any questions please feel free to contact myself Samuel Oakley, samuel.oakley@otterbein.edu, or my project advisor Dr. Docka-Filipek, ddockafilipek@otterbein.edu