3-22-2018

The Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Academic Progress Comparing Division II Male Student-Athletes to Male Non-Student-Athletes

Andrew Schroeder
aschroeder@bellarmine.edu

The Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Academic Progress Comparing Division II Male Student-Athletes to Male Non-Student-Athletes

A Dissertation Submitted to

The Faculty of

The Annsley Frazier Thornton School of Education

Bellarmine University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Leadership in Higher Education

by

Andrew Schroeder

March 2018

Bellarmine University

The Annsley Frazier Thornton School of Education of Bellarmine University certifies that Andrew Schroeder has successfully defended his dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Leadership in Higher Education as of March 22, 2018.

The Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Academic Progress Comparing Division II Male Student-Athletes to Male Non-Student-Athletes

Andrew Schroeder

Dissertation Research Committee:

Committee Chair—Grant Smith, Ph.D.

Chair of Doctoral Programs and Assistant Professor of Research Design and Statistics

Bellarmine University

Committee Member—Fred Rhodes, Ed.D.

Professor and Department Chair of Leadership in Higher Education (Retired, December 2017)

Bellarmine University

Committee Member—Gary Petiprin, Ph.D.

Director of the Counseling Center

Bellarmine University

Acknowledgements

I am incredibly fortunate and thankful to have the family and friends that I do who have supported me and maintained their incredible love for me throughout this process. To my wife Anne…. wow. Your incredible sacrifice over these past nearly five years of my doctoral work is the prominent reason I made it to this point. Your amazing unselfishness in compliment to so many of my selfish needs with all this work will always be remembered. You also have given me the joy of three wonderful children – Oliver, Lucy, & Emmett, who have brought a smile to my face so often when I desperately needed it after the early mornings and longs days. Oliver, Lucy, & Emmett, your love for me is an incredible gift that has carried me through some tough times. To my mom, Kris, and my dad, Jim, you have given me the passion for learning, the model for what hard work is, and most importantly, love throughout my life that has allowed me the ability to be as good as I choose to be. To my siblings Jim (my), Mike, & Laura, you three are an amazing blessing that I just lucked into. Each of you motivate me in so many ways.

Thank you to my dissertation committee members for all you have done for me during this process. To Dr. Grant Smith, thank you for your commitment to me in your role as my dissertation chair, my frequent statistics professor, and as a colleague. I have gained a tremendous amount from you. To Dr. Fred Rhodes, this doctoral work all started with you: a call on a November day in 2005 to see if I would be interested in working with at-risk males. I would say I have grabbed hold of that. Your support of me over these past nearly two decades has been a gift. To Dr. Gary Petiprin, I am fortunate to have you as a committee member and a colleague. Thank you for pushing me to strengthen my writing and the foundations of my dissertation work. All of you have helped make this dissertation something I can be proud of. Finally, thank you to the athletics department and all those at the institution of study who have supported me in seeing this work through. I truly believe that this work matters to males and

females alike. I hope that through gaining a continued understanding of how males develop, we can find better ways to intervene and support them for the benefit of their psychological health and health of our society.

Abstract of the Dissertation

Data shows that there is a lack of progress in male graduation rates in recent decades in higher education (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). This study examines the impact of gender role conflict and academic motivation on academic progress with first and second year Division II male student-athletes and male non-student-athletes at a Midwestern, Carnegie classified master's college and university (larger program institution). Gender role conflict creates a narrow definition for masculinity in which males are expected to behave (O'Neil, 1981). Using general linear regression and binary logistic regression models, the researcher analyzed data of participants' ($N = 116$; $n_{\text{student-athletes}} = 58$; $n_{\text{non-student-athletes}} = 58$) scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) factors and Academic Motivation Scale (AMS) factors, alongside the participants' athlete status (Yes or No), midterm GPA, and composite ACT (Vallerand, et al., 1992; O'Neil, et al., 1986). The study explained mixed findings about GRC and AMS predictors of midterm GPA. GRC factors of Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Conflict Between Work Family – Leisure (CBWFR) were significant predictors of midterm GPA as a dependent variable, but only CBWFR was a negative significant predictor. The model using athlete status as a dependent variable was not significant. The full models of RE as a dependent variable or Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) as a dependent variable both explained sizable variance ($R^2_{\text{RE}} = .427$; $R^2_{\text{RABBM}} = .476$). Throughout the research, GRC factors were significant predictors. Findings demonstrate the continued need for further analysis

of the GRC factors and how they impact varying subgroup populations of males' academic progress, including the potential within group variations between different sports and sports types (i.e. contact versus non-contact sports).

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

The Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Academic Progress Comparing Division II Male Student-Athletes to Male Non-Student-Athletes

Introduction

Overview

There is a deficiency in academic progress for males colleges and universities in recent decades (Diprete and Buchmann, 2013). Research showed that at the high school level women get better grades than men; fewer males then females are taking and passing college preparatory classes, and in elementary and secondary school, males have lower literacy scores than females (Weaver-Hightower, 2010). In a study of over 42,000 college students in Texas and Florida, males demonstrated a lack of academic progress from the very first semester. They took fewer credits, earned lower grades, and were less likely to persist than females (Conger & Long, 2010). Throughout the researcher's work at his institution, there has been documented gaps in academic performance between males and females, with females consistently outperforming males in multiple ways such as GPA, progress towards degree, and retention. This gap and its relationship with certain behavioral characteristics has been demonstrated in research outside the institution of study and may be explained in some ways by gender role socialization. One research study stated, "Part of performing masculinity was limiting or hiding behaviors that colleges would encourage such as taking academics seriously, putting time and energy into studying, worrying about grades, and engaging in self-discovery (Edwards & Jones, 2009, p. 222)."

The literature surrounding gender role in this context has directed the researcher to study first and second year males attending a private, liberal arts, faith-based institution to assess

potential behavioral differences between male subgroups. Gender role conflict theory describes that there exists multiple competing concepts of male gender role that are contradictory and inconsistent, and that men may be naturally uncomfortable with these concepts, while still feeling the need to maintain them (O'Neil, 1981). The particular focus of this study will involve a snapshot look at the possible influence of gender role conflict (GRC) on academic progress between first and second year National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division II male-student-athletes in comparison with first and second year male non-student-athletes.

As recent as 2008, no study had evaluated GRC within the situational context of sport (Steinfeldt, Steinfeldt, England, & Speight, 2009). Following that initial research, there has been a limited body of work specifically exploring the relationship between gender role conflict and athletics (Wong, Hagan, Hoag, & Steinfeldt, 2011; Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010; Steinfeldt). There is a lack of research when studying this potential relationship, confirmed by the developer of GRC and co-developer of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (J. O'Neil, personal communication, January 17, 2017). The focus area for this study was described as "unique and timely" (J. O'Neil, personal communication, January 17, 2017). This need has been voiced in past research, as there has been a call for more examination and further research to better understand the potential variations and struggles with gender role conflict experienced within male groups in the college setting (Marrs & Sigler, 2012; Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011; Wimer & Levant, 2011; Mahalik, et al., 2003). The intent of this study is to expand on that limited body of work and explore the possible relationships that exist between academic motivation and gender role conflict for first and second year college males, and how they relate to academic progress.

Connected with GRC theory and academics, there have been implications in other research that behavior demonstrating a strong focus on academics is not seen as masculine (Morris, 2008; Jackson, 2003). Further, past research has shown males negative perception of academic help-seeking and the demonstrated lack of help-seeking's negative impact on academic success (Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011; Morris, 2008). Academic help-seeking pushed against the concepts of traditional masculinity (Wimer & Levant, 2011). These restrictions in behaviors of college males linked to specific GRC factors of Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) in other research, where high levels of both RE and RABBM predicted low levels of help-seeking (Lane & Addis, 2005). This past research demonstrating males negative perception of academic help-seeking and the lack of help-seeking's detrimental effects on academic success warrants further research to evaluate academic performance of specific subgroups of males in college through the lens of the GRCS and through the specific factors of RE and RABBM. These two factors focus on restriction of behavior and their potential negative impact on the participants in this current study are important to explore further. Understanding the potential implications male GRC has on the academic motivation and academic progress of males is of critical importance and is of value to the individual students and the institutions they attend. This study will in part advance the need for research of male GRC and its impact on student grade point average and impact on persistence, among other things.

Statement of the Problem

There is a relative lack of academic progress and success for males in comparison to females in higher education in recent decades (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). Finding the relevant factors is imperative because current solutions to the issue are limited. According to US Census data as of 1980, college graduation rates for males aged 26-28 years old was 25 percent,

moving a single percentage to 26 percent as of 2000, and only to 28 percent by 2010. Female bachelor's degree attainment rose from 21 percent in 1980, to 30 percent in 2000, to 36 percent in 2010 (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). Nearly 57 percent of undergraduate and 60 percent of graduate students are female with gaps between the genders expected to continue growing, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (McDaniel, 2012; Weaver-Hightower, 2010). There a number of reasons that can potentially explain this significant shift of higher degree attainment for women. One was the rise of feminism and the feminist movement's role on changing expectation in the 1960's of women's' roles in the work force. Earning a college degree and the benefit of the degree in being able to pursue a reputable, good-paying job was a foundational piece to meeting the changing expectations of women's roles in the work force (Goldin, Katz, & Kuziemko, 2006). Diprete and Buchmann (2006) described what they assessed as the individual benefit of a college degree for a woman, a better standard of living, a means of stability, and greater likelihood of marriage.

The masculinity construct and its impact on retention among college males is important to look at more closely based on current trends shown. The U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2014) stated that the six-year graduation rate for those who started college was 56 percent for males compared with 61 percent for females. Not only has initial enrollment been lower, but also completion rates are lower for males as compared with their female counterparts through a review of higher education statistics from 1990 through 2012 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). These statistics are not intended to critique female progress. They are intended to highlight the relative lack of progress of males in higher education and establish the need to continue taking a closer look at understanding the potential challenges that exist.

There is importance in better understanding the potential male characteristics that possibly explain reasons for the gap in progression and graduation rates in higher education between males and females. Results in one survey showed that college men devote less time and effort to studying and course-related materials (Sax, 2008). This lack of motivation towards school demonstrated itself in another study. Through qualitative interviews, a sample of 99 high school seniors (n = 53 females; 46 males) was asked if they enjoyed school. 54 percent of women indicated they did, while only 21 percent males said the same (Kleinfeld, 2009). The spring 2010 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) completed by 362,000 students attending 564 U.S. baccalaureate-granting colleges/universities, showed that each week, men are spending less time than women in preparing for classes while spending more time relaxing and playing intramural sports (Sander, 2012). The current study seeks to examine how varying male motivations and stereotypical masculine characteristics are related to academic progress with first and second year college male athlete and non-athletes.

Morris' (2008) interviews with rural high school students provided insights into male's perception of academic effort and how it related to the concepts of masculinity. In Morris (2008) qualitative study, males consistently perceived academic engagement as feminine and less respected. This approach towards limited academic engagement has been seen in research elsewhere. In a study of 650 college undergraduate students using two assessments, the Shortened Study Process Questionnaire (SSPQ) and the Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) 2nd edition, males scored lower on both dimensions of deep learning and achievement approaches (Marrs & Sigler, 2012). Further significant differences were found between males and females on four of the ten LASSI subscales, three of those being motivation, self-testing, and utilization of study aids (Marrs & Sigler, 2012). These findings reinforce the previous research

referenced suggesting that there seems to be differences in academic engagement between females and males because such activity is viewed as non-masculine. In another study of high school and college aged males, academic success seems to be acceptable to traditional males when it is perceived to be due to natural skills. If a male had to work hard to achieve, it was considered unacceptable because it was a sign of weaker academic skills compared to others (Jackson & Dempster, 2009). This finding relates to Dweck's (2006) fixed mindset, which is the idea that abilities a person possesses are set in stone and that the individual's focus is to prove that he or she is capable of these abilities and not engage in learning outside of these areas. Additionally, a person who appears or feels lacking in these abilities is not seen as okay. If a male feels inadequate in certain academic areas, academic risk-taking and help-seeking behaviors are not behaviors that a male following traditional norms may feel comfortable engaging in. There is importance in understanding the potential negative effects the constructs of masculinity may have on the academic progress of males who hold a fixed mindset.

Purpose

The previously mentioned college enrollment and graduation rate statistics, along with recent research on academics and masculinity, emphasize a serious need for better understanding of the potential relationship between masculinity and academic progress (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). Utilizing the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS), Academic Motivation Scale College Version (AMS – C28), and academic progress characteristics, it is the intent of the researcher to identify gender role conflict characteristics that demonstrate potential relationships with academic motivation and academic progress. Measurements of academic progress characteristics include midterm GPA, credit hours registered for as of the withdrawal date, cumulative GPA (if applicable), and credit hours earned (if applicable). The research is not

being approached with the idea that all constructs of masculinity have a negative influence on a male's functionality, but instead with a focus on learning more about how characteristics of masculinity correlate with males' approaches to academic success. This research will contribute to the research gap that currently exists in understanding the potential relationships within first and second year college male student-athletes and non-athletes. Additionally, this research will provide contributions to the field of research for Division-II male student-athletes and academic progress.

Research Questions

1. Does gender role conflict and academic motivation predict a male student's GPA?
2. Are there differences in the Gender Role Conflict Scale and Academic Motivation Scale scores for male student-athletes?
3. Are there factors that predict Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men?

Significance of Study

This study is a step forward in addressing the need to research GRC within different college male subgroups. It is the intent to drive further research that continues to look critically at within group variations between males. Variations observed between the two groups of focus in this study would provide additional motive for further exploring different college male subgroups. The researcher identifying associations between GRC and academic progress that are positive or negative in relationship could provide important direction for future research and opportunities to consider creating intervention strategies in work with male students. These intervention strategies could be developed and implemented early in a male's college career, creating more opportunities to promote or mitigate the respective qualities of influence

discovered through this research. Additionally, the opportunity for this study to increase awareness of the factors of gender role conflict in college success, with a specific focus on the factors of Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and how they may affect different males in different ways and how we can work more effectively with males to improve retention and academic success, is of high importance.

Conceptual Framework

Gender Role Conflict Theory

According to Pleck (2017), in the early 1970's, as the new field of the psychology of women was developing, there was an interpration that a psychology of men did not exist. However, this understanding was unfounded, as Pleck described that the United States "understanding of gender and gender development was almost entirely a psychology of men. Research between the 1940's and the 1970's using trait male and female measures, driven by assessment rooted in binary characteristics, was focused almost entirely through the study of males (Pleck, 2017, p. xi)." However, the approach of studying male development was done through trait behavior. A shift away from the focus on innate traits, traits that cannot be changed defining how a male or female should behave, was driven by introduction of gender role socialization, the concept that individuals have characteristics culturally expected for their sex. The concept of social constructionism, the understanding that an individual's development is not predetermined but is shaped by biological, psychological and social experiences began to take shape in the 1960's (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). There became an increased understanding that both males and females are impacted by the culture they exist within (Money & Ehrhardt, 1972). The 1960's also brought the rise of the feminist movement and the rise of new concepts of gender role for females (Friedan, 1963). The rise of the women's movement drove a response

from the male community (Kellom, 2004). Men's studies and the men's movement emerged based on the new perspective of gender and masculinity grounded in social constructionism, focusing on how society and culture influence how males develop into the men they are (Brod, 1987). The study of masculinity created a new lens for male gender role concepts and evaluating the positive and negative impact of gender role socialization. David and Brannon's (1976) work provided what is considered the foundational definition of stereotypical characteristics of masculinity for the field of men's studies.

David and Brannon (1976), through their overarching work as a sociologist (David) and behavioral psychologist (Brannon), developed the four pillars of masculinity: "no sissy stuff, the big wheel, the sturdy oak, and give 'em hell." These four central themes gave an understanding of what it is to be stereotypically masculine: to reject the feminine, to be strong and powerful, to show no vulnerable emotion, and to maintain an element of risk-taking and aggression. Men's studies focuses heavily on masculinity as a construct and what it means to be a man through males' experiences, identity, and development throughout life (Kellom, 2004). Alongside the development of men's studies, scholarly work identifying the psychological issues related to masculinity began to take place (O'Neil, 2015). The recognized need for further development of this critical area of study has resulted in research in the decades following to help better understand men's experiences.

New constructs were developed through research of the psychological issues that came from traditional masculinity. Pleck (1981) introduced the concept of gender role strain and the consequences of gender role strain: strain experienced when a male is not able to fulfill male role expectations, strain experienced even if a male meets the role expectations due to the trauma experienced trying to meet the role expectation, and finally, the negative side effects that can be

experienced by the male or others around them when trying to meet these male roles. O'Neil (1981) built on the concept of gender role strain (GRS) in developing gender role conflict (GRC). Both GRS and GRC are founded in the understanding that there exists multiple competing concepts of male gender role that are contradictory and inconsistent, and that men are naturally uncomfortable with the socialization process, while still feeling the need to prove their manhood (Levant & Pollack, 1995). In Pleck's (1981) theory, he further describes the impact of self-esteem on males trying to meet these expectations and the incongruity it creates when they do not. Additionally, when males do meet the expectations, they create dysfunction, as these characteristics often have limiting or harmful effects on themselves or others. Examples of limiting or harmful effects could involve the male having low self-esteem or the male have poor relationships with others close to him because he is trying to meet these traditional male gender role expectations (Levant & Pollack, 1995). O'Neil (2015) described his intent through the development of GRC to demonstrate the outcomes of gender role strain.

> "Pleck's analysis did not specify what the specific socialization outcomes were for boys and men, and therefore the GRC became the theoretically defined result of sex role strain. There was desire for the author to create a model that explained why men were sexist, dysfunctional, unhappy, and conflicted because of their socialized gender roles (p. 33)."

This effort to expand on sex role strain resulted in the continued development of GRC theory and a scale to measure GRC.

Gender Role Conflict (GRC) theory is defined as societally influenced male gender roles having negative consequences on the male or others (O'Neil, 1981). As described by O'Neil (1981), it is rooted in the masculine mystique, developed through a multifaceted set of values and beliefs, based on rigid sex and gender role stereotypes. Males learn to modify their behavior

to adhere to this value system, in their efforts to avoid punishment and negative criticism from others, known as devaluation through GRC. These standards, if males adhere to them, restrict their being open to what they see as feminine traits and behaviors. The traits of masculinity are reflected in the roots of hegemonic masculinity, with the ideas of being tough, rejecting the feminine, being the breadwinner, unemotional, dominant, and aggressive (David & Brannon, 1976; Chafetz, 1974). GRC theory has been well documented and supported in the research since its inception (O'Neil, 2008). This is due in large part to the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) created to assess GRC (O'Neil, et al., 1986). The four factors that make up the scale are Success, Power, Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Three of the four GRCS factors, RE, RABBM, and CBFWR, have a direct relationship with the GRC definition related to restrictions on behavior related to gender role, while SPC more indirectly assesses GRC by measuring attitudes about success (O'Neil, 2015). While David and Brannon's (1976) concepts come from the lens of hegemonic masculinity regarding how to act, gender role conflict comes from the lens of masculinity related to internal and external conflicts that exist in everyday life for many males based on gender roles that they see need to be followed. This theory and assessment instrument have been used for different topics of research with college males over the years like coping, help-seeking through counseling, and engagement (Stanzione, 2005; Joyce, 2012; Arndt, 2014). There has been a significant volume of research done with gender role conflict in the past three decades, but a modest portion done relative to GRC, academic progress, and males in the higher education setting. As stated earlier, there have been implications through other research that the academic world has a feminine connotation (Morris, 2008; Jackson, 2003). GRC theory provides a

foundation to explore the variables of GRC, males, and academic motivation and progress in more depth. It was predicted that high SPC scores may have a positive relationship with academic motivation and academic progress. However, it was anticipated that in the current research scores high in the other three factors of GRC would have a neutral or negative impact on academic progress, even if academic motivation scores were high.

Summary of Methodology

The research used two assessment instruments. The first assessment instrument was a 37-question 6-point Likert scale instrument called the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (See Appendix A). Among the 37 questions, there are sets of questions assessing the four GRC factors that make up the scale: Success, Power, Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR) (O'Neil, et al., 1986). An approved, slightly adapted version of the original GRCS, with the six CBWFR questions being altered to incorporate "sport" and "athletic" terminology was used (J. O'Neil, personal communication, August 18, 2017 & September 18, 2017). The original six CBWFR questions are structured to identify how a person experiences conflict between different demands on their time, but does not include any specific language about athletics. Participation in college sports is a time demanding activity. The intent of adjusting the questions was to allow student-athletes to identify the role of sport within the contexts of these questions. This language classifying athletics provided the student-athlete the ability to give more well thought answers about how these questions do or do not apply to their personal context (See Appendix C). The other assessment instrument used in this study was the 28-question 7-point Likert scale instrument called the Academic Motivation Scale - College Version (AMS – C28) (See Appendix B), a version of the original Academic

Motivation Scale (Vallerand, et al., 1992). It is made of questions that assess three types of motivation: intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation. Both instruments provided an opportunity to gather self-reported data from the participants. Additionally, extant academic information was collected, inclusive of: midterm GPA, registered hours, hours registered for at the beginning of the term, high school standardized test scores, high school GPA, college credits earned prior to starting at the institution, and for returning students – cumulative GPA and credit hours earned while at the institution of study. The study assessed a group of first and second year male Division II student-athletes (n = 58) and first and second year males who were not Division II student-athletes (n = 58) at a small, private, liberal arts, faith-based institution. The participants of the study were engaged through athletic team meetings, residence hall floor meetings, a first-year first-generation program meeting, and through email outreach to ask for their participation on the surveys to be taken online. The types of data analysis used for this study included multiple linear regression models and a binary logistic regression model.

Limitations

The male study body at the institution of study consisted of predominantly white males. Due to the limited sample size of minority males, race and ethnicity were not analyzed within this research. There were other within gender variables like first-generation students, defined by the institution as neither parent completing a bachelor's degree that this study did not analyze. These within gender variables are important to investigate in future research. The particular institution of study's five year averages for entering cohort students reflects the following demographics: 37 percent first-generation, 29 percent Pell eligible, and 83 percent Caucasian (Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness, Institution of Study, 2018).

Similarly, due to the limited number of transfer, non-traditional and part-time students at the institution of study, only students who began their college career at the institution as full-time students were allowed to be participants. It is important that researchers be aware of this gap when reviewing the results of this study. In assessing academic progress this study did not examine variation in courses of study and the academic rigor of those courses, which has been done in past (Robst & Keil, 2000). This limits the ability to assess how variation in GPA, credit hours registered, and credit hours earned may be influenced by the rigor of a participant's coursework, in relation to the GRCS and AMS-C28 results. This study is being done at a private, liberal arts institution. If applying this study's results to other institution types, it is important that the potential difference in student populations be taken into consideration.

The current study does not include qualitative or longitudinal research. This restricts the depth of understanding that can be gained in this research. The researcher had past and current relationships at varying levels with a number of the participants of the study. This could have created biased responses to the questions in a way the participants' thought that would have been desired by the researcher. This research did not gather data on participants having a job or multiple jobs, and the amount of hours working if so. This leaves out a potential factor of influence for the study related to the scores on the GRC factor of CBWFR.

Definitions of Terms

Gender Role Conflict - "Gender role conflict is a psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences or impact the person or others (O'Neil, 1981, p. 203)." In this research, gender role conflict was used in the context of participants' responses to the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) questionnaire (O'Neil et al., 1986).

Traditional-Aged Cohort Students – A first-time, full-time, degree-seeking student who began their college career at the current institution of study immediately following the semester after they graduated from high school.

Male Student-Athletes – Any cohort full-time first and second-year male student-athlete in a National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) sanctioned Division II sport at the Midwestern, Carnegie classified master's college and university (larger program institution) where the research is taking place. The institution of study is a liberal arts institution with approximately 2500 full-time undergraduate students.

Male Non Student-Athlete – Any cohort full-time first- and second-year male who is not a member of a NCAA sanctioned Division II sport at the Midwestern, Carnegie classified master's college and university (larger program institution) where the research is taking place. The institution of study is a liberal arts institution with approximately 2500 full-time undergraduate students. For this study, male non-student-athletes can be male students who compete in intramurals, club sports, non-NCAA sanctioned sports, or no sport at all. There is no other restriction to this defined group, separate from not participating in an NCAA sport. These individuals could have played organized sports all the way through their senior year in high school.

Chapter 2

The Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Academic Progress Comparing

Division II Male Student-Athletes to Male Non-Student-Athletes

Literature Review

Researchers have discussed that many boys conform to the expectations of their peers by engaging in behaviors and expressing attitudes that are contradictory to what they deem appropriate and desirable in order to avoid negative male characterizations (Pollack, 2000). In a study of 10 college men, through three in-depth interviews with each participant, prominent perspectives of college male's gender identity development arose (Edwards & Jones, 2009). "Part of performing masculinity was limiting or hiding behaviors that colleges would encourage such as taking academics seriously, putting time and energy into studying, worrying about grades, and engaging in self-discovery (Edwards & Jones, 2009, p. 222)." The complexities of these behaviors will be more fully defined through the theoretical framework of gender role conflict (GRC) theory (O'Neil, 1981). The literature contained in this current chapter will more fully describe some of the foundational terms associated with traditional masculinity. The review will describe the historical perspective of masculinity as innate and contrast this with more current perspectives which view masculinity and gender as a social construct. It will describe the shift from gender role behaviors being understood as innate in a male or female to gender role behaviors now being a combination of factors, inclusive of the factor of social constructionism. Enrollment, academic engagement, and graduation rates of males and females will be briefly discussed. The intent of providing these statistical comparisons between males and females is not to create a focus for this study on the academic progress in the college setting between males and females, but to highlight a gap and the need for further study of the specific college male student population. However, the concerning gaps are a core reason for the researcher's motivation to better understand and identify possible factors among males that are

having a negative impact on academic success. A review of the literature of males' academic performance and engagement in the higher education setting will be provided. Additionally, research will be presented on male-student-athletes to give context of the prominent within group population for this study.

The GRCS scale developed in 1986 has been an assessment instrument involved with a sizable amount of research (O'Neil, 2008). Past research incorporating GRC and how the construct has shown itself with males will be shared. There is also additional research using other scales assessing male norms and male roles that will be briefly discussed to help further frame the constructs of masculinity and their relationship with college males. Past examination of GRCS and its four factors pertaining to the population of interests for this study will be scrutinized. There is a modest amount of GRC research at the undergraduate level in connection with academics. This study will be an opportunity to contribute to this body of research. Finally, the current literature on academic motivation and males will be analyzed.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

According to Pleck (2017), in the early 1970's, as the new field of the psychology of women was developing, there was an interpration that a psychology of men did not exist. However, this understanding was unfounded, as Pleck described that in the United States "understanding of gender and gender development was almost entirely a psychology of men (Pleck, 2017, p. xi)." What changed was the awareness of gender role socialization, the concept that individuals have characteristics culturally expected for their sex (Money & Ehrhardt, 1972). A common understanding for males and females in the early years of the field of psychology was that for each sex there was a normative identity and to deviate from that identity was psychologically abnormal (Terman & Miles, 1936). It wasn't until the 1950's that identity

development was looked at from a broader lens. Erikson (1959) was the first psychologist to speak to identity development as a function beyond childhood, focusing on development from adolescence to adulthood (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). Erikson (1959) emphasized that development was based not just on the internal dynamics, but also the external environment. In particular, during the transition from childhood to adulthood, Erikson described the core developmental stages of identity as finding one's core sense of self, values, beliefs, and goals. This idea of identifying an individual's core characteristics provides an important framework for the influence of gender role in later research and for this current study. Marcia (1966), building off Erikson's theory, was the first to develop a model to use for research on identity development of young adults (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). Marcia (1966) addressed four identity stages: Foreclose - where individuals accept parents values without question; moratorium, a stage of crisis where individuals question parental values in an effort to develop their identity; identity achievement, coming after an extended period of crisis to identify who they are to establish clear personal goals and foundation; diffusion, individuals either refuse or are unable to make a commitment (Marcia, 1966). Following the theme of Marcia's focus on identity development in young adults, Chickering (1969) introduced the seven vectors that contribute to the formation of identity, with a focus on development of students in the college years. These seven vectors continue to provide important foundation to current research on college-aged students. The seven trajectories are developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy to interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, establishing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity. With the focus of these developmental tasks being rooted in the college years, all are of significant impact in the current research. Of note, Chickering & Reiser's (1993) revised theory of the vectors included

the added dimension of comfort with gender, reflecting the body of research developed on gender studies after the original vectors were created. Each of the original identity development theories discussed provide important foundations for the constructs developed in the men's studies literature.

These concepts of identity development are critical components to the area of men's studies. Kohlberg (1966) was one of the first theorists to speak to identity development from a specific sex-type perspective. He argued that the highly sex-typed person was driven to maintain his or her behavior as consistent with the internalized sex role. Therefore, for a male, being female was seen as inappropriate. Kohlberg (1966), beginning to move away from the gender identity theory, formulated a theory known as gender constancy theory, focused on research with males, where children actively self-construct their gender through schemas. Bem's (1975) research had a similar focus on better understanding how stereotypical gender roles associate with male and female behavior. The results of her research suggested that gender role socialization prevented both males and females from behaving in ways that did not conform to the "expectations" of their gender or actively avoided the stereotypical expectations of their gender. According to Bem's (1975) theory and research in the study, the androgynous person, the person who was comfortable accessing and demonstrating both feminine and masculine behaviors in varying situational contexts, was the person who possessed the greatest psychological health because of these capacities. This focus on the concept of the androgyny and its psychological benefit to individuals is one that continues to be researched. Similar findings on the psychological benefits has been demonstrated in recent research. In a study of 197 college students, males who demonstrated androgynous traits reported significantly lower levels of perceived stress than their non-androgynous male peers (Jones, Mendenhall, & Myers,

2016). Leading up to Kohlberg and Bem, having a specific gender identity was seen as a psychological need. It was understood that individuals had a core psychological need to have a gender role identity and that the individuals' personality development hinged on this formation. If this identity was not attained, developmental issues resulted (Levant & Pollack, 1995). Gender identity was understood to be rooted in gender-stereotyping, whether children involved themselves in masculine or feminine activities, validated masculine or feminine personality traits, and whether parents believed children conformed to the appropriate gender norms (Huston, 1983). These conflicting themes of how a male or female was supposed to behave relative to their gender expectations provided continued foundation for further gender-based study.

The foundation of gender studies began with women's studies. Fostered by the women's studies work of those like Friedan (1963), resulting in the rise of the women's movement, there was a response from the male community (Kellom, 2004). Gilligan's (1977) work within feminist theory discussed the oppressive patriarchal structure of society and its negative impact on the psychological well-being of women. The negative impact this rigid patriarchal structure has on both genders is important to point out. Gilligan's (1977) framing of feminist theory and re-envisioning the gender role framework for women was critical foundational work for re-conceptualizing gender role socialization. Men's studies emerged based on the new perspective of masculinity grounded in social constructionism, focusing on how society and culture influence how males develop into the men they are (Brod, 1987). Men's studies focuses heavily on men's experience, identity, and development throughout the males' life. Men's studies focused on the understanding of what it means to be a man and the study of masculinity itself (Kellom, 2004). David & Brannon's (1976) work provide what is considered a foundational conceptual definition

for hegemonic masculinity. These definitions of traditional masculinity were developed through David and Brannon's ongoing observations as a sociologist (David) and psychologist (Brannon).

> David and Brannon (1976) defined these four rules of masculinity as: 1) No sissy stuff. Masculinity is bound in rejecting the feminine. 2) Be a big wheel. Masculinity is marked by the amount of money you earn, your wealth, power and status. 3) Be a sturdy oak. What defines a man is his reliability in crisis. He is stoic, showing no emotion or reaction to the difficulty at hand. 4) Give 'em hell. A man demonstrates an aura of risk-taking and aggression.

These four rules provide the core themes of stereotypical male socialization and the understanding of what it means to be masculine (Kellom, 2004). Chafetz (1974) framed what is known as the seven areas of traditional masculinity. They were the need to be:

> 1) Physical -- virile, athletic, strong, brave; unconcerned about appearance and aging; 2) functional -- breadwinner, provider for family as much as mate; 3) sexual -- sexually aggressive, experienced; 4) emotional -- unemotional, stoic, don't cry; 5)intellectual -- logical, intellectual, rational, objective, practical; 6) interpersonal -- leader, dominating, disciplinarian, independent, free, individualistic, demanding; 7) other personal characteristics -- success-oriented, ambitious, aggressive, proud, egotistical, moral, trustworthy, decisive, competitive, uninhibited, adventurous (p. 35-36).

These definitions provided further understanding of society's view of traditional masculinity and further need for the field of men's studies. As with the origins of men's studies, scholarly models describing the psychological issues related to masculinity did not exist until the early 1980's (O'Neil, 2015). The rise of men's studies and stronger recognition of gender role conflicts taking place resulted in scholarly work to better to understand men's experiences.

Researchers have sought to understand how frameworks of masculinity are formed and shaped. Examples of work in this area include gender role strain and gender role conflict (Pleck, 1981; O'Neil, 1981).

Social constructionism, tying back to Berger and Luckman (1966), emphasizes the concept that people and society interact and influence one another. Social constructionism is the idea that a person's gender role is developed in a relational way with the society that surrounds each individual, and, is subject to change. Sex role strain was a concept developed from the original foundations of the social constructionism framework. Sex role strain was defined as a feeling of stress in the connection between sex role personality characteristics and how they possibly conflicted with the development of the person (Garnett & Pleck, 1979). The term gender role strain, one of the core concepts in men's studies and masculinity, replaced the term of sex role strain to be current with terminology beginning to be used in psychology in the 1980's. The understanding of what sex role strain and gender role strain mean is the same (Pleck, 1981). Gender role strain is a conceptual framework that describes gender role norms as contradictory and inconsistent, with the number of individuals who violate these norms as high. Violating gender role norms leads to social disapproval (Pleck, 1981). This idea of the male attempting to live up to these unrealistic standards of the traditional male role is the foundations of gender role strain. Male peers have profound influences on boys' gender identities (Harris & Harper, 2008). This critical piece of the male influence is especially important to consider within the context of the male trying to conform to his peers' behaviors in his early years of college. This may create additional stress and challenges for a male trying to meet new expectations in his initial years of college. Pleck (1981) describes gender role strain as formed by evolving gender role stereotypes where the concept of gender roles are inconsistent in nature.

These roles are placed on and developed by who and what males interact with growing up, their parents, peers, teachers, coaches, other male figures, and media. The individuals that surround males provide a framework, often in many ways conflicting and inconsistent, with the roles males are expected to follow. This creates a negatively impactful framework for males to develop through (Pleck, 1981).

Pleck (1981) intimated that gender role was a psychologically, biologically, and socially constructed process. Bem (1983) looked at this through her development of gender schema theory, where children learn which characteristics are to be connected with their own sex. However, distinct from the origins of gender identity, Bem's gender schema involves the concept that there are not simply binary options for male versus female (i.e. boys are to be strong and girls to be weak). It is a "theory of process not content," with one's gender schema showing itself in a variety of dimensions. The process is one of ever evolving stages, not of particular tasks (Bem, 1983, p.356). Thus, a gender binary is socially constructed. Theories like Bem's and Pleck's provide foundation for the constructs of this current research.

The construct of Gender Role Conflict (GRC) is derived from sex role strain analysis (Garnet & Pleck, 1979). GRC theory postulates that societally influenced male gender roles have negative consequences on the male or others (O'Neil, 1981). Stereotypical gender roles may influence males to make choices that may be detrimental to themselves or behave towards other males in a way which is detrimental to another male's healthy functionality. GRC is rooted in the masculine mystique, developed through a multifaceted set of values and beliefs, based on rigid sex and gender role stereotypes (O'Neil, 1982). Males learn to modify their behavior to adhere to this value system, in their efforts to be accepted, and avoid punishment and devaluation. These standards, if males adhere to them, restrict them being open to healthy traits

and behaviors that they may see as feminine in nature. The conflict between potential feminine traits they value and masculine traits that they feel pressure to follow can come in conflict with them owning their choices, feelings, and actions. Males, due to these limitations, may not feel able to choose and act on what they believe is right for them. For example, a male may desire to be expressive about academic challenges he is experiencing. However, if he perceives expressiveness as a feminine trait he may not allow himself to communicate about the academic challenges he is experiencing and effectively identify solutions. If a male does stick with choices that are core to their values, they still may not be able to outwardly express with confidence their choices made due to the societal limitations and restrictions they experience. The structures of gender role conflict provided the foundation for developing the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS), defined by the four empirically-derived factors that it encompasses: Success, Power, Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR) (O'Neil, et al., 1986). Further definition will be provided for each of these factors later in the review.

O'Neil (2015) breaks down gender role conflict into four "situational contexts" 1) GRC within the man, 2) GRC expressed towards others, 3) GRC experience from others, and 4) GRC during gender role transitions (p. 43)." These intrapersonal and interpersonal contexts are experienced by a male as negative emotions and thoughts through the lens of gender role devaluations, restrictions, and violations. The GRC restriction of behavior describes the limitation on how a male can behave outside of the defined norm, and how that prohibits the individual's progress, development, and healthy functionality (O'Neil, 2008). For instance, if a male feels restricted to fully engage in academic work based on the traditional gender role

norms, this can limit his capacity to be fully effective in his academic coursework. Restrictions of behaviors creates problems in many ways, one of which is founded in the intense pressure males feel to succeed, connected with achievement and success (1981, O'Neil). Good and Wood's (1995) research on college males revealed achievement-related GRC, described as the drive to achieve because that is what is expected of a "real man." This achievement-related GRC for the college male possesses the conflicting dimensions of desiring success while also needing to maintain the restrictive behaviors (i.e. not being expressive, not having close male support systems) involved in being a "real man."

Devaluations are the negative evaluations of the person or others, when conforming to, deviating away from, or violating typecast gender role norms of masculinity philosophy (O'Neil, 2015). The interpersonal concept of GRC devaluation of others is the concept that one male's communication towards another male about a behavior that the male perceives to come in conflict with a traditional gender role norm, potentially devalues, violates, or restricts the male receiving that criticism from behaving in a healthy, functional way (O'Neil, 2015). An example of this could be a male criticizing another male investing a lot of time in an academic endeavor. The criticism received could create conflicting emotions for the academically-engaged male and may result in the male limiting his positive engagement in academics due to how it conflicts with the gender role approach he perceives should be maintained to be successful. The researcher anticipates this potential devaluation existing at some level related to academics and males who identify with traditional male roles. There may be some insights that can be gained in this study regarding potential variations of RABBM within the two male populations. There is an expectation that males who associate themselves with masculine qualities will be more likely to

either deliver or be more aware of negative messages that create internal conflict for themselves or others to positively engage with academic work.

The fourth and final GRC situational category that O'Neil (2015) identifies are conflicts experienced from role transitions. These transitions are events in a man's gender role development that adjust or push against the individual's prior gender role interpretations. These transitions can produce GRC or positive life changes. For example, the gender role transition of a male going from high school to college could be an impactful one that has real positive or negative consequences. The research in this study will focus on males in a stage of prominent transition and one that has been the focus of significant past and ongoing research, the first-year transition to college (Fiorini, Liu, Shepard, & Ouimet, 2014; DeBerard, Spielmans, & Julka, 2004; Kahn & Nauta, 2001). This critical first-year and the resulting progress or lack thereof into the second year is one that has great impact on the student and the college they attend. A male who struggles in that first-year transition to college may decide not to return to college for a second year. The university is impacted by the loss of a student and the possible negative impact to the university community, parallel with the loss being an impact on retention rates, graduation rates, and a loss of institutional revenue. How gender role plays into this distinct personal transition is one that clearly should be of interest to colleges and universities. Related to these types of intrapersonal and interpersonal contexts is shame theory. Shame theory intersects strongly with gender role strain, gender role conflict, and traditional male socialization (Krugman, 1995). Shame theory refers to identifying with the feelings of inadequacy or inferiority. If these feelings are identified with, a person often may react to these feelings from a place of avoidance or compensating behaviors, versus confronting the behavior of concern. This is driven by a fear that if males talk about their struggles with other peers they will be disparaged

for expressing their vulnerabilities. Similarly, the shame theory construct was developed out of a similar framework as the shame resiliency theory (SRT) for women. Through the SRT construct, it is suggested that shame is a psycho-social-emotional construct (Brown, 2006). SRT describes the construction of shame comprising the psychological components tied to emotions, thoughts, and behaviors, the social components tied to relationship and connection, and cultural components, tied to the cultural expectations established. Brown (2007) describes shame as a common experience that everyone has, defining it as "the intensely painful feeling or experience of believing we are flawed and therefore unworthy of connection and belonging (p.29)." Both shame theory constructs speak to one component of shame as a person attempting to hide the struggles he or she experiences (Krugman, 1995, Brown, 2006).

The approach of hiding vulnerabilities or challenges is very much in congruence with the concept of Restrictive Emotionality (RE) in GRC, and the frameworks of limited expressiveness in David and Brannon's (1976) and Chafetz's (1974) definitions of masculinity. These types of constructs have concerning implications on the appropriate behaviors perceived by a college male who follows traditional gender role norms perceives. The male who struggles to express the challenges he is experiencing is potentially hesitant to seek academic support for fear of the shame from others he may experience due to expressing his struggles. Shame theory is construct explaining that boys and men need intimacy, but based on it being seen as feminine, they often reject it (Krugman, 1995). Shame theory demonstrates a potential association with GRC factors of RE and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). If a male is supposed to suppress his vulnerabilities, then this leads to possible restriction of demonstrating affectionate behavior or any form of needing, support, connection, or assistance to a fellow male, particularly

in times of need. The current study will provide an opportunity to allow further exploration into how the population of college males may relate or not to these potential struggles.

Males and Higher Education

There is importance in gaining a better understanding of males in the context of higher education. Nearly 57 percent of undergraduate and 60 percent of graduate students are female with gaps between male and female enrollment expected to grow according to the National Center for Education Statistics (McDaniel, 2012; Weaver-Hightower, 2010). As of 1980, the number of 26-28 year old men completing a bachelor's degree was 25 percent, reaching only 26 percent by 2000, and 28 percent by 2010. In comparison, the number of 26-28 year old women bachelor's degree attainment was at 21 percent in 1980, 30 percent in 2000, and 36 percent in 2010 (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). For many reasons, including these statistics, there has been a call for a better understanding of males' perspectives and better understanding of the many types of masculinities (Weaver-Hightower, 2010). Kellom (2004) states, "We're left at a loss to explain the plight of the relatively powerful when the plight isn't all that positive (p. 23)." This idea of the "powerful" male somehow being in a position of deficit is a difficult concept to comprehend. This patriarchal role that males live within and the lack of exploration of gender roles within the context of higher education seems to be of harm to both males and females. "The specifically gendered character of men's lives and relations has been ignored or taken for granted… There is a moral imperative that men give up their unjust share of power, and men themselves will benefit from advancing towards gender equality (Flood & Howson, 2015, p. 4-5)." The intent of this current study is not to negatively analyze the positive strides made by females in recent decades in higher education, but to push again the patriarchal constructs that negatively impact both males and females. What is learned in the current study regarding

varying types of masculinities and how they relate to the success of college males within different subpopulations is desired for the benefit of both males and females.

Evaluating males' academic motivation and progress before college is important in gaining further context of where males are at before they enter the college setting. One study showed that at the high school level women get better grades then men, fewer males then females are taking and passing college preparatory classes, and in elementary and secondary school, males have lower scores then females (Weaver-Hightower, 2010). A qualitative study comparing male and female high school students demonstrated the differences in levels of academic motivation between males and females (Kleinfeld, 2009). 72 percent of females compared with 46 percent of males saw college as a critical educational investment. From a sample of 47 male high school seniors, males from college-educated families were rarely excited about pursuing a college education, commonly indicating that it is what their parents wanted them to do (Kleinfeld 2009). This lack of motivation towards school was highlighted elsewhere in the study. When asked if they enjoyed school, 54 percent of women indicated they did, while only 21 percent males said the same (Kleinfeld, 2009). Morris' (2008) research on high school students provided him the assessment that lack of academic effort was an important characteristic of a boy's masculine identity. Morris (2008) research demonstrated a significant correlation between those who identified as traditionally masculine and the participants decreased likelihood to demonstrate academic help-seeking behaviors. The findings of these studies link to the gaps in males' academic performance in higher education.

The gap in college male enrollment and graduation numbers are mirrored by the lower male engagement in other areas in the higher education setting. The 2017 Open Doors report reflected that from 2010 to 2015-16 only 34 to 36 percent of study abroad participants were

males (The Power of International Education, 2017). According to the Campus Compact Annual Survey Statistics, college males only represented 35 percent of the student population who participated in community-based, service-learning work (Salgado, 2003). Similar low levels of engagement were demonstrated in other studies as well. In assessing data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) survey and the College Student Survey, indicators showed that college men devote less time and effort to studying and course-related materials (Sax, 2008). National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results have shown that men are spending less time than women are each week in preparing for classes while spending more time relaxing and playing intramural sports (Sander, 2012). All of these statistics have telling implications on the overall academic progress of males in higher education.

The college-aged male population and the role of masculinity has been researched from a variety of perspectives. Male participants of one qualitative study expressed consistent interpretations from societal messages of needing to be "competitive, unemotional, aggressive, responsible, the breadwinner, in a position of authority, rational, strong, successful, tough, and breaking the rules" as interpreted through grounded theory data analysis methods (Edwards & Jones, 2009, p. 215). In another study, male subjects view of expression and communication was seen as positive, but the participants who indicated this noted their awareness of this type of behavior being considered outside the parameters of masculinity. The participants indicated they knew they were behaving in a way that was outside of the normal model of masculinity and the need to be inexpressive (Davis, 2002). Males' recognition of, or acting on, behaviors seen as masculine was demonstrated elsewhere. One study demonstrated that many boys conformed to the expectations of their peers by engaging in behaviors and expressing attitudes that were contradictory to what they deemed appropriate and desirable in order to avoid negative male

characterizations (Pollack, 2000). A qualitative study of 10 college men focused on better understanding college male's gender identity development (Edwards & Jones, 2009). In this study, male participants "so deeply internalized" the societal expectation placed on them, such as repressing emotions that they often acted by following this expectation in spite of it contradicting their value of sharing their emotions (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Analysis of male college students' interaction between resilience and gender role conflict demonstrated that as GRC scores increased, resiliency decreased (Galligan, Barnett, Brennan, & Israel, 2010). These repeated example of gender role conflict and the impact it has on male behaviors demands further scrutiny.

Male's behaviors towards academic work is an important one to explore. Jackson's (2003) interviews with high school students resulted in findings where some males who wanted to be seen as masculine and naturally skilled, felt the need to avoid distinct demonstrations of hard work. The study indicated that being "caught" demonstrating "feminine" behaviors of putting effort into academics resulted in the potential negative social costs of being picked on or bullied (Jackson, 2003). The study further demonstrated situations where males would cover up hard work if that hard work still resulted in academic failure. Another study involving college males cited how natural skill played into academics (Marrs, Sigler, & Brammer, 2012). In this study involving 184 men completing three different questionnaires, males overall agreed that academic success was acceptable, but only if someone was naturally good at it. If a male had to work hard to achieve, it was considered unacceptable because it was seen as a sign of weakness of skillset compared to others (Marrs, Sigler, & Brammer, 2012). A related concept to this is Dweck's (2006) "fixed mindset." Fixed mindset is a concept where the belief is the abilities a person possesses are set in stone and that the focus of the individual is to clearly prove that they

are capable of these certain abilities, but not for the individual to spend time developing these talents (Dweck, 2006). For many men with a fixed mindset, this means being able to prove they very easily know how to do certain things well versus having to work hard, and that it is not okay to extend themselves in a way that shows them as weak or vulnerable in trying to learn new things.

There are a variety of scales that have been developed to try better assess masculinity (Mahalik, et al., 2003; O'Neil, et al., 1986; Bem, 1974). The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) is an assessment instrument used to measure masculinity, femininity, and androgyny (Bem, 1974). Masculinity, as measured by the BSRI, was not a significant predictor of academic performance for a quantitative study of 560 (184 men, 376 women) college students (Marrs, Sigler, & Brammer, 2012). Relative to these results, it is important to appreciate the possible within group complexities that exist for this study. One study on boys described the relationship between achieving masculinity (such as being tough, athletic, funny and witty) and being engaged in schoolwork, connected with the perception of having to work hard to achieve, as incompatible (Swain, 2004). Another demonstrated that as conformity scores to certain masculine norms increased in college male participants, intrinsic motivation factors scores decreased. When conformity to male scores such as emotional control, self-reliance, and winning were low, intrinsic motivation scores increased (Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011). The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) assesses "the extent to which an individual male conforms or does not conform to the actions, thoughts, and feelings that reflect masculinity norms in the dominant culture in the U.S. (Mahalik, et al., 2003, p. 5)." In a study using the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI), a high degree of conformity to masculine norms was associated with men being even less likely to seek academic help. Within that group, younger

male college students had a higher conformity to masculine norms than the older male college students did (Wimer & Levant, 2011). Wimer and Levant (2011) postulated that men may be less likely to approve of stereotypical masculine norms as they get older.

Male college students who scored higher to conformity on masculine norms demonstrated less adaptive tendencies towards academic motivation, approaches to learning, and approaches to study strategies (Marrs, 2016). In spite of this bleak picture, Sander (2012) indicates that men have more substantive engagement with professors, are more likely to do undergraduate research, and tend to major in fields that steer them into better paying jobs. In a study of 2,322 college students investigating their degree of growth in their first two years of college, capacities for critical thinking and complex reasoning, the only difference found between genders was grades; women's were higher than men (Arum & Roksa, 2011). These are indicators to be aware of related to male's academic engagement in college. However, it cannot be ignored that there are mixed perceptions that exist between males and the world of academics.

There has been a call in the past two decades for more research on male gender socialization to better understand the potential variations and struggles with gender role conflict experienced within groups in the college setting (Marrs & Sigler, 2012; Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011; Wimer & Levant, 2011; Mahalik, et al., 2003). Given the current male enrollment and graduation landscape in higher education, the need for further scrutiny of male gender role and its influences on college progression is a critical one. It is understood that other demographic factors such as race, age, socioeconomic status, and disability can have a strong impact on academic success, but due to the limitations of this study those demographics will not be explored (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017; Diprete & Buchmann, 2013; Bembenutty, 2007). The current study's focus on first and second year male students will

provide opportunities for continued insights into the impact of gender role conflict at this stage of a male's college career. This study intends to learn more about how different gender role conflict and academic motivation factors demonstrate a relationship with academic progress with the Division II male athlete and male non-athlete male population.

Male Student-Athletes

There is sometimes a public view that student-athletes struggle academically in college. Some research in past decades has demonstrated this (Eitzen & Sage, 1997; Adler & Adler, 1985). In a four-year study of a division I college basketball program, findings demonstrated that the student-athletes athletic, social, and academic experiences lead them to become more disconnected from academics, leading to lesser interest and performance (Adler & Adler, 1985).

Research in recent decades has shown positive trends for student-athletes academically. In a study comparing non-athletes to athletes, findings indicated that student-athletes reported higher scores on academic adjustment then their non-athlete peers (Melendez, 2006). There are also results that demonstrate athletes having a better graduation rate and slightly higher GPA than non-athletes (Hildenbrand, Sanders, Leslie-Toogood, & Benton, 2009). It is understood that being a student-athlete presents a demanding schedule. Athletics demands a large time commitment through activities like practice, conditioning, travel, and more. This presents a role conflict, as is discussed in past research, where student-athletes are expected to do the academic work, while also managing the demands of sport (Lance, 2004). Potentially related with the factors of GRC, research shows student-athletes report negatively about seeking help from others (Martin, 2005). One of the questions that the current research study hopes to explore is how these dual demands portray themselves in Division II male student-athletes and how that interacts with factors of gender role conflict and academics.

There are expectations that exist about a how a male who plays sports should behave. Kimmel (2008) discussed sports as rooted in hegemonic masculinity. This type of masculinity is understood as a dominant socially constructed form of masculinity. This masculinity is portrayed as the image of a heterosexual man who is explicit in rejecting all traits and behaviors interpreted as feminine. This concept of masculinity has been seen in research and discussed in the masculinity frameworks of David and Brannon (1976) and Chafetz (1974) discussed earlier in the literature review. Young boys who participate in sports are encouraged by families, friends, and coaches to establish a particular type of masculinity (Messner, 1992). Sports seems to be an influential conduit for advancing this practice of hegemonic masculinity (Whannel 2007; Eisner, 2000). Traditional messages of masculinity defined in athletic culture can contribute to men experiencing conflict with society's gender role expectations (O'Neil, 2008). These societal expectations for a male to behave in a certain way if playing sports demands an understanding of what the cost may be for establishing these behavioral expectations. This connection with the athlete identity is a potentially powerful one. Are there factors of GRC that the individual may score higher on when athletic influence has an impact on how a male student-athlete behaves? It is important to emphasize that the researcher believes that sport, and masculinity developed through it, can be in many ways a positive contributor to male development. Research discusses these values associated with masculinity and sport such as toughness and competition that can be positive depending on how they are expressed (Wellard, 2002). More research is needed to understand how the GRC constructs function in relation to sport being a positive or negative contributor to academic success. As recent as 2008, no study had evaluated GRC within the situational context of sport (Steinfeldt, Steinfeldt, England, & Speight, 2009). There appears to be limited research that has taken place exploring these

constructs with academics. This particular research will focus on students at a Division II institution. Data from one study of 188 total Division I and Division III student-athletes measuring athletic identity and student identity suggests that student-athletes at Division I schools have similar athletic and student identity levels as student-athletes at Division III schools (Sturm, Feltz, & Gilson, 2011). More recently, GPA's of nearly 19,000 student-athlete GPA's were reviewed across Division I, II, & III (Beron & Piquero, 2016, p.142).

> "Results indicated that GPA is directly influenced by their athletic versus academic identity, the athletic context including the coach's influence, and the seriousness with which they view academics. Additionally, the data indicated that athletic identity on male student-athletes did not demonstrate having a greater impact than female student-athletes, nor did the level of division a student-athlete participated lead to a variation in academic performance (Beron & Piquero, 2016, p.142)."

These findings provide impetus for the importance of needing to research males, particularly student-athletes at the Division II level, who demonstrate having a make-up similar to their D-I peers. While this current study will not explore possible connections with a male's particular sport or assessing specifically athletic identity and academic performance, it is of interest through the CBWFR factor, to understand how varying demands may be of connection with academic progress.

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) Factors

The GRCS has been used in over 350 studies since its inception (O'Neil, 2015), focusing on four factors referenced earlier in the literature review: Success, Power, Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Each of these factors has

demonstrated a variety of results in relation to male gender role. Two of the factors, RE & RABBM, have appeared to stand out amongst the others, as impactful areas related to academic progression for college males (Lane & Addis, 2005; Galligan, Barnett, Brennan, & Israel, 2010).

Success, Power, Competition (SPC)

SPC is a factor described as a person's attitude about success pursued through competition and power (O'Neil, 1986). In a study involving 362 male respondents, running a multivariate regression model, a significant relationship was demonstrated between SPC and resilience. As scores increased for the SPC factor, so did the positive relationship between SPC and resilience (Galligan, Barnett, Brennan, & Israel, 2010). Factors of success with college males has been looked at in different realms of research. Males' self-perception was above average in academic ability, physical and emotional health through UCLA's higher education research institute 2011 Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) freshmen survey (Sander, 2012). This concept studied through the CIRP of how males perceive themselves as able and successful in a variety of realms is an important one to highlight relative to this research and the SPC factor. Are these perceptions of successful abilities that males believe they carry actually hindering their success? To provide a little context on CIRP, as of 2003 nearly eleven million college freshmen at seventeen hundred institutions had been surveyed through the CIRP. It is a significant initiative in the field of higher education that has provided broad knowledge of understanding college students and their high school experiences, attitudes, behaviors, and expectations for college (Astin, 2003). The research done in this study will further scrutinize how SPC, and in some ways the males' perception of their own abilities, interacts with documented academic success for each of the different male subpopulations, and whether there is a positive or negative connection demonstrated between academic progress, academic motivation

and gender role conflict. One study hypothesized of gifted adolescent males anticipated that as these males demonstrated greater connection between traditional masculine norms, stronger maladjustment would result. However, through the data analysis of the study, no aspects of traditional masculinity correlated with greater maladjustment elsewhere (Shepard, Nicpon, Haley, Lind, & Liu, 2011). A qualitative study, using variation sampling to explore gender identity development from different social group identities, had 10 college males each participate in a series of three in-depth open interviews. Participants in a qualitative study talked about "developing their gender identity through constant interaction with society's expectations of them as men. Major components include being competitive, in control of emotions or unemotional, amongst a number of others. None of the participants could remember a time when they weren't conscious of how men were supposed to be (Edwards & Jones, 2009, p. 214)." The potential association between restrictive emotionality and competition (SPC factor) is an important one that will be able to be explored further through this study.

Through the Gender Role Conflict Scale – Adolescent (GRCS-A) an adapted version of the GRCS, there are indicators that the Need for Success & Achievement (NSA), similar to SPC, may not inherently play a role in negative outcomes academically or psychologically (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010). As a whole through the GRC research reviewed, SPC had limited findings of distinction demonstrated.

Restrictive Emotionality (RE)

Restrictive emotionality is defined as having challenges and worries about expressing one's feeling and difficulties finding words to express basic emotions. This is a critical piece for the researcher in this study. The researcher is interested in knowing the potential relationship high or low scores on this factor have with academic motivation and academic progress. Higher

levels of RE and RABBM predicted lower levels of help-seeking (Lane & Addis, 2005). The factors of RE and RABBM resonated strongly with adolescent men (Watts & Borders, 2005). They felt societal pressure to avoid expressing emotions. During some of the discussions, there was even the theme of denial about experiencing any emotion at all (alexithymia) (Watts & Borders, 2005). College males are seen as having an inherent desire to fit in and conform to the accepted societal view of what being a "real man" is. Academic help seeking was seen as counter to the society's image of masculinity and being a real man. (Wimer & Levant, 2011). Further studies speak to other behavioral characteristics that present concern in relation to academic progress. RE was negatively associated with seven of the eight factors of resilience looked at in this particular study (Galligan, Barnett, Brennan, & Israel, 2010). These characteristics of resilience and limited help-seeking and their relationship with high RE and RABBM scores provides questions about what types of associations may be seen between these factors and academic motivation. As another research study interpreted, not all men aspire to embrace a masculinity that allows for relationships, emotional expression, and an intrinsic desire for knowledge and internal stimulation (Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011). In the critical space of the first and second year of college, with the significant implications that exist regarding progressing towards a degree, and what that means for the individual, this desire for knowledge seeking is an area that will be evaluated closely through the Academic Motivation Scale. In research done by Good and Wood (1995), a lower level of focus on an individual's achievement motivation correlated with a restriction of emotional expressiveness.

Other RE results have been mixed in comparison regarding the effect of RE and RABBM. In one study, results did not support the mediating role of the RE factor (Davis & Liang, 2015). The only significant predicators of lower levels of help-seeking behavior were

restrictive emotionality and the grade level a student-athlete was in school. The rest of the GRC factors did not demonstrate results predicting negative help-seeking behavior (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010). In research focused on first-year students, academically successful student-athletes, when presented with challenges, described being able to learn from their mistakes, develop new strategies, and were able to identify when and who to reach out to. Academically unsuccessful student-athletes demonstrated limited motivation towards academics, struggled with self-initiating work, and often did not recognize when to ask for help and had difficulty asking for help when they recognized the need for it (Monda, Etzel, Shannon, & Wooding, 2015). The characteristic of help seeking with college males has been looked at in other studies as well. Accounting for a small proportion of variance, gender and academic help seeking were predictors of academic performance in a study of college students. However, in the same study, masculinity, as measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, was not a predictor of academic performance (Marrs, Sigler, & Brammer, 2012). As referenced earlier by Wimer & Levant (2011), a high degree of conformity to masculine norms was associated with men being even less likely to seek academic help. Five of the seven CMNI subscales were significantly correlated with avoidance of help seeking. These themes of lack of help seeking, GRC, RE, and academic progress are of significant relevance to the current research. In a study focused on college males, depression, and help-seeking, restriction-related GRC accounted for almost 25 percent of the variance in help-seeking attitudes (Good & Wood, 1995). Males who had high levels of GRC were more likely to hold negative attitudes towards help seeking. This current research gives further opportunity to explore and build on past research in these important matters.

Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)

The third of the four factors of GRC, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), is defined by having limiting ways to express one's feelings and thoughts with other men and difficulty touching other men (O'Neil, 1986). This factor, of the four GRC factors, would seem to have the least association with academic progress. The study will look at whether there is a possible association between this factor, being a student-athlete, and academic progress. Results of one study indicated that at least half of football players surveyed did not report high levels of difficulty in expressing their emotions and displaying affection towards other men (Steinfeldt, Steinfeldt, England, & Speight, 2009). Further, in different research, participants discussed wanting more meaningful relationships with other men and joining fraternities or athletic teams as a way to develop those connections (Edwards & Jones, 2009). This is a positive indicator in contrast with the gender role conflict of males not being comfortable demonstrating affectionate behavior with other males. This positive association could demonstrate that being part of a group like student-athletes could foster support in other areas like academics. The type of bond experienced between males playing sports was looked into further in a study on hockey players. In the study, the culture of masculinity defined through the bonding of the teammates was seen as one that created allegiance and loyalty, but also produced negative characteristics of reinforced aggressive behavior (Pappas, McKenry, & Catlatt, 2004). In an earlier study there were unanswered question about this impact of male bonds related external to sport. RABBM results of male college football indicated that scores in this area might represent experiences within the setting of football that vary from everyday life. An example may be after a male scores in competition. Fellow males may hug or slap him on the butt. That type of affection is not consistent with traditional masculine interactions outside of sport (Steinfeldt, Steinfeldt, England, & Speight, 2009). These male-to-male relationships

presented in this study are positive indicators. However, the researcher wonders what type of associations may exist between affectionate behaviors between males in the academic setting. For those males who demonstrate affectionate behavior between one another through the context of sport, does that same type of affectionate behavior exist in the academic setting? In a more recent qualitative study, results did not provide consistent themes of how football players perceive that they express themselves towards their fellow teammates versus those outside of the football team (Steinfeldt, Wong, Hagan, Hoag, & Steinfeldt, 2011). In another study, older high school football players in the study reported significantly less RABBM than their younger teammates (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010). With the focus of this study being on first and second year male college students, it will be interesting to observe if age has an impact or, even though college students are older, that being in a setting as a first and second year college student in transition will create higher levels of RABBM.

There has been some research focused on RABBM and learning. High levels of RABBM were associated with less resilience in commitment to learning and social competencies (Galligan, Barnett, Brennan, & Israel, 2010). Similar research discusses the influence of how academics is perceived related to investment in academic work. If male college students view academic involvement as inconsistent with their own perception of how males behave, it would be understood why there may be reason that investing in academic behaviors would come in conflict with what they see as acceptable (Marrs & Sigler, 2012). This ability to be affectionate towards others is one that could have similar connection when it comes to a teammate seeking academic support, or sharing in their academic challenges, with another teammate. This link to restrictive expressiveness connects with Wimer and Levant's (2012) postulation that men who strongly conform to a self-reliance norm are not as likely to have deep relationships with males

in ways that emphasizes academic help seeking. This concept of help seeking and its impact on RE was discussed earlier as well. This research will continue to provide an opportunity to see what associations may exist between male relationships and academic progress.

Conflict Between Work and Leisure --- Family Relations (CBWFR)

The final factor of GRC, CBWFR, is of particular interest to the researcher in the context of the male student-athlete compared to the male non-student-athlete. College sport, and a student participating in a sport and the time demands that entails, compares similarly to a college student who is working a job while in school. It is the hope of this researcher that through this study more will be learned about the association student-athletes may demonstrate connected with this conflict factor. Lance (2004) discussed how eighty-four percent of the student-athletes disagreed that athletic demands of my work make it difficult to keep up with my studies. In the current study, the GRCS instrument has been modified, with the approval of the author of the instrument to incorporate "sport" and "athletics" language into the CBFWR questions (J. O'Neil, personal communication, August 18, 2017).

There is limited research in the field on the possible associations between CBFWR and student-athletes. There has been some research utilizing athletic identity as an identifying characteristic that provide some insights into this area. Football players with higher levels of athletic identity also reported higher levels of gender role conflict (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010). This particular research with football players did not dig deeper into the connection between athletic identity and academic performance. Another study focused on identity status demands and its potential conflict was a study on a specific group of males in a fraternity. The males that were part of the study were high achieving academically. However, these students desired to be

known in high school as athletes and were more focused on gaining peer-group validation through their athletic skills than their academic strengths (Hebert, 2006).

It was found CBWFR negatively associated with 3 of 8 levels of resilience for college males (Galligan, Barnett, Brennan, & Israel, 2010). This study will have an opportunity to build on whether high or low scores of CBWFR show associations with positive or negative academic progress. The concept of leisure and how males want to be seen related to putting effort into something versus the sense that it all comes naturally is one that that has been looked at. In a study by Harris and Edwards (2010), it was not seen as masculine to put a lot of time and effort into academics. The image to be masculine is that you are strong at all things and you do not have to put effort in it to do so (Harris & Edwards, 2010). If that is the case, reviewing the research about natural achievement, the CBFWR factor may be able to provide continued insights into how males view their conflicting demands. Another study reinforced that perspective. Male students agreed overall that academic success was suitable, but only if someone was naturally good at it (Marrs, Sigler, & Brammer, 2012). This same study indicated there is little in terms of quantitative research in identifying how important masculinity is to predicting achievement in comparison to other variables (Marrs, Sigler, & Brammer, 2012). Related to academic progress and achievement, the co-author of the GRCS stated understanding the relationship of academic motivation and GRC as a continued gap in the GRC research and important for exploration (J. O'Neil, personal communication, January 17, 2017). While this current quantitative study will not be able to predict achievement, it will provide an opportunity to create more of an understanding between the potential associations of the GRC factors and academic progress.

Academic Motivation

The Academic Motivation Scale (AMS) was developed to assess intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivation (Vallerand et al., 1992). The particular scale used for this study was created by the authors of the original scale to assess college students' academic motivation. The concepts of deep learning (learning for itself) and surface learning (learning for what is required) give further definition to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation related to students' approaches to learning and studying (Biggs, 1987). The author of the GRCS indicates there is little knowledge in the area of GRC and academic motivation, and that there is importance in gaining a better understanding of the relationship with GRC (J. O'Neil, personal communication, January 2017). Similarly, other studies have called for more in assessing the potential connection between masculine norms, college males approach to learning and academic motivation, and how these factors might play a role in gender achievement gap (Leaper & Van, 2008; Marrs & Sigler, 2012). Previous research has provided observations of academic work as feminine (Jackson, 2003; Morris, 2008). For the male who sees himself as masculine, this conflicting space may be a difficult one to navigate and cause conflict with their academic motivation beliefs. Marrs & Sigler (2012) identified that some males who display less intrinsic motivation are driven by needs towards greater conformity to masculine norms, while those demonstrating deeper learning approaches indicate less drive towards conformity. However, the results demonstrating these factors were of modest correlation and effect size.

This research will provide an opportunity to see how gender role associates with the differing forms of academic motivation. Academic self-efficacy is strongly correlated with both intrinsic value and self-regulated learning (Matthews, 2014). This continued theme of how a male values education, and their comfort in outwardly demonstrating that to others through their academic

efforts, is an important one to consider in this current study. The impact of a clear understanding and ownership of academic self-efficacy is shown in other work related to student-athletes. Academically successful student-athletes reported high academic motivation, strong individual standards, and clear goals. In a qualitative study involving 12 first-year male student-athletes who played football, the unsuccessful student-athlete reported sport being a priority, having unclear career goals related to not knowing what major they were going to pursue, and feeling more comfortable in the athletic environment compared to the classroom (Monda, Etzel, Shannon, & Wooding, 2015). What has been demonstrated in the literature is this reoccurring theme of what may be valued internally but conflict with the external societal expectations. Research was done studying academic motivation between athletes and non-athletes. The results of that research suggest that the levels of academic motivation between the two groups was the same (Bonura, 2009). "Men were often masking their insecurities as men by hiding, minimizing, or dismissing the things they did to prepare for life after college (Edwards & Jones, 2009, p. 217)." Osborne and Jones (2011) discussed academic identity formation as an individual's attempt to construct self-understanding and meaning defining himself through academic values, school belonging, regard, and performance. "The constructivist notion that learning is both individual and social has not yet been fully explored. Past research has not been extensively done to better understand how students approach their learning based on the social identity of the student (Smyth, Mavor, Platow, Grace, & Reynolds, 2015, p. 53)." There are studies that have been done to understand how academic identity information is influenced by various factors. One study observed the role of parental influence in their 7th grade child's academic identity formation. One finding of the study discussed communication styles between parents and student around academic achievement. If the communication style between the parent and

student was interpreted as unforgiving, in spite of the good intentions of the parent, it may negatively impact academic achievement. Another scenario that may result in unintended negative consequences for the student is the parent involving themselves in helping their child with schoolwork. The "help" may be perceived by the student as an intrusion and have a negative result related to the parent-child interaction (Strambler, Link, & Ward, 2012). Further, the study found that girls identified more positively with academics than boys. It was suggested that boys may process academic messages from their parents differently than girls. There are indicators that girls internalize the academic messages of their parents more strongly than boys do. There also may be an indirect negative effect for Black boys regarding positively internalizing academic messages from their parents because of the oppositional peer culture towards academic engagement suggested to exist amongst Black boys (Strambler, Link, & Ward, 2012). In the current study, the researcher expects potentially negatively perceived messages from college peers to have an influence on the participants. It is predicted that lower extrinsic academic motivation and higher RE may be influenced by peer group communication. A study on academic identity formation and ethnic minority adolescents focused on how participants' perceived value and belonging associated with academic identity. Adolescents who highly valued academics were willing to implement intentional efforts reflecting their value of academics. However, for students who had lower self-efficacy, self-regulated learning had more of a mediating effect on value and belonging (Matthews, Lauermann, Banerjee, 2014). However, this additional influence of self-efficacy is one that will not be evaluated directly in the current study. "Separate research on identified learning approaches amongst college students indicated that deeper and surface level learning approaches were predicted by the perceived norms of the reference group. If an individual interpreted themselves to be part of a group that

valued deep or surface learning, they indicated a stronger tendency to follow that norm (Smyth, Mavor, Platow, Grace, & Reynolds, 2015, p. 67)." Related to this, the need to understand how males see their academic identity formation developing and how peer groups influences that development is an important one. Experiences of intrinsic motivation present potential sources of conflict towards dominant masculinity, particularly in a liberal arts educational setting, when there is a focus on introspection and challenging self (Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011). This current study, working with students from a liberal arts institution, will have an opportunity to expand on this area of the literature. As a whole, understanding how academic motivation interacts with gender role conflict is an important area to learn more about through this research.

Chapter 3

The Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Academic Progress Comparing Division II Male Student-Athletes to Male Non-Student-Athletes

Research Design and Methodology

The researcher will contribute to the literature about the relationship between gender role conflict on academic progress with males who participate in Division II athletics and males who do not participate in Division II athletics. The purpose is to gain a better understanding of the relationship between gender role conflict and academic progress between these two male subpopulations. The researcher will be using the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) and Academic Motivation Scale – College Version (AMS – C28) assessments, and extant academic information from the university (Vallerand, et al., 1992; O'Neil, 1986). The author of GRCS has indicated a need for this study, citing a gap in the research on gender role conflict and academic progress (J. O'Neil, personal communication, January 17, 2017).

Research Questions

- Does gender role conflict and academic motivation predict a male student's GPA?
- Are there differences in the Gender Role Conflict Scale and Academic Motivation Scale scores for male student-athletes?
- Are there factors that predict Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men?

Instruments

This study is a quantitative study using two survey instruments: the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (see Appendix A for Gender Role Conflict Scale) and the Academic Motivation Scale (AMS – C 28) College Version (see Appendix B for Academic Motivation Scale College Version) (Vallerand, et al., 1992; O'Neil, 1986). The researcher consulted with the author of the study about using the original GRCS or the GRCS Adolescent Version (Blazina, Pisecco, & O'Neil, 2005).The author of GRCS advised the researcher to use the adult version for this research study since it was normed for the age group of participants involved in this study (O'Neil, personal communication, January 17, 2017). However, the study will be using an adjusted version of the adult GRCS (see Appendix C for Gender Role Conflict Scale – Adjusted Version). The six questions that are adjusted are the CBFWR questions. The original six questions are structured to identify how a person experiences conflict between different demands on their time but does not include any specific language about athletics. Participation in college sports is a time demanding activity. The intent of adjusting the questions was to allow student-athletes to identify the role of sport within the contexts of these questions. This provides the student-athlete the ability to give more well thought answers on how these questions do or do not apply to their personal context. CBFWR questions were adjusted to incorporate "sport" and "athletics" language to provide clarity for this particular student population using the instrument. These alterations were approved by the author of the GRCS scale (J. O'Neil, personal communication, August 18, 2017 & September 18, 2017). There was an additional recommendation to replace the word "men" with "male" on the GRCS based on a past study indicating the participants expressed confusion when they read the word men, as a reference term to their peers (Watts & Borders, 2005). The researcher consulted with the author on this

adjustment and was advised to maintain the men verbiage on the scale (O'Neil, personal communication, August 19, 2017).

The GRCS has been put through a substantive volume of testing for reliability, validity, psychometric properties, internal consistency reliabilities, test-retest evidence and social desirability, and convergent and divergent validity (O'Neil, 2015). The research has demonstrated positive construct validity and reliability amongst diverse groups of men. "Reliability results indicated that for SPC factors, *alphas* ranged from .83 to .89, with an average of .86; for RE *alphas* ranged from .81 to .91, with an average of. 84; for RABBM, *alphas* ranged from .82 to .88, with an average of .84; and for CBFWR, *alphas* ranged from .73 to .87 with an average of .80 (O'Neil, 2015, p. 85)." I chose both instruments below because of their association with gender role and academic progress. The GRCS has been used in over 350 studies. From 2006 to 2014, 80 studies were done using the GRCS (O'Neil, 2015). The GRCS is a 37- question assessment with four categorical areas: Success, Power, and Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations (CBWFR). Gender Role Conflict Scale and Eisler's Gender Role Stress Scale are the two most frequently used measures in the new psychology of men (Mahalik et al, 2003). There are a variety of measures for assessing masculinity, but the focus of the GRCS was to better measure conflict and stress in relation to academic motivation and progress. Scoring on the scale is done for each of the four categorical areas and has a total overall score.

The original Academic Motivation Scale (AMS) is also an extensively used instrument, cited by over 1800 articles according to Google Scholar. Where the GRCS assesses gender role, it does not directly assess academic motivation. The AMS has a specific instrument for college

students the Academic Motivation Scale - College Version (AMS – C28) (Vallerand, et al., 1992). The AMS-C28 allows the researcher to identify connections with academic motivation and males, whether they demonstrate high scores in the gender role factors or not. The AMS – C28 assessment involves 28 questions subdivided into seven sub-scales assessing intrinsic motivation: 1) towards knowledge (IMTK), 2) toward accomplishment (IMTA), 3) to experience stimulation (IMTES); extrinsic motivation: that is 4) identified (EMID), 5) introjected (EMIN), 6) external regulation (EMER); and 7) amotivation (AM; state of lacking any motivation to engage in an activity). The higher the score, the more intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, and or amotivated the participant is thought to be. An overall score was created for the intrinsic and extrinsic categories (Hegarty, 2010). The scale is scored through each of the seven categorical areas. A confirmatory factor analysis was done to test the reliability of the AMS (Vallerand, et al. 1993). It was reported that the *Cronbach alpha coefficient* for the subscales ranged from .83 to .86, except for the extrinsic motivation subscale, whose *alpha* value was a .61. Test-retest reliability over a month period scored from .71 to .83. Overall the reliability and validity of the test demonstrated well (Vallerand, et al. 1993).

Participants

Eligible participants for this study were first and second year Division II male student-athletes and first and second year male non-student-athletes to provide focus on assessing potential within gender variations. The focus on student-athletes is to try to get a better understanding of what potential variations may be taking place between male student-athletes and their non-athlete counterparts. Male student-athletes for this study are defined as any cohort full-time first and second-year student-athlete in a NCAA sanctioned Division II sport at the Midwestern, Carnegie classified master's college and university (larger program institution).

Male non student-athletes for this study are defined as any cohort full-time first- and second-year male who is not a member of a NCAA sanctioned Division II sport at the Midwestern, Carnegie classified master's college and university (larger program institution). This category also excludes any student-athlete who is a member of an NCAA Division I sport.

Research emphasizes the biggest transitional challenges for college students' academic are experienced in the early stages of college (Fiorini, Liu, Shepard, & Ouimet, 2014; Scott, Spielmans & Julka, 2004, Kahn & Nauta, 2001). In researching students who are in their first two years at the institution, valuable data would be captured on students who experience significant transitional challenges. Additionally, capturing this data on students who are entering college potentially could provide much broader insights on student challenges than on collecting data on upperclassmen, reflecting only the students who persisted to that point.

Based on the size of the liberal arts institution (approximately 2500 full-time undergraduate students as pulled from the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness reports), in order to adequately position the study, G Power, a statistical software used to determine statistical power analysis, was run a priori to determine the sample size to be attained to provide adequate statistical power to the study at *alpha* = .05, *beta* = .20, and with a small effect size (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). See below for a breakdown of the number of eligible male participants for each group as of the start of data collection in fall 2017.

- $N_{\text{student-athletes}}$ **= 78 male student-athletes** – Full-time male Division II student-athletes at the institution from the 2016 & 2017 cohort as of fall 2017. This is the number of eligible male student-athletes able to participate in the study.

- $N_{\text{non student-athletes}}$ **= 299 male non-student-athletes** – Full-time non-athlete males currently at the institution from the 2016 & 2017 cohort as of fall 2017. This is the number of eligible male non-student-athletes able to participate in the study.

Cohort Full-Time Students

The institution of study has a small number of first and second year transfer, non-traditional, and part-time students. Focusing specifically on cohort students who started at the institution in a full-time capacity (registered for 12 hours or more as of the institution's census day) in the fall semester would allow the researcher to narrow the focus and keep the data set cleaner. In focusing on students who started full-time at the institution, it allows the researcher to more cleanly assess specific within group male subpopulations.

NCAA Division II Sanctioned Sports

This variable was used to distinguish between males who specifically compete in a NCAA Division II sport at the institution versus those that do not. At the institution of study, all NCAA male sports participate in Division II athletics, with the exception of one sport that competes at the Division I level. With the continued focus on creating clearly defined subpopulations to assess, student-athletes from the Division I sport will not be allowed to participate in this study. Additionally, in articulating the focus on NCAA sanctioned sports, it is by design of the researcher to distinguish those who compete in an NCAA sport from males that compete in a non-NCAA sanctioned sport at the institution (i.e. club sports, intramurals, cheerleading) or participate in formal athletic sports team. This allows the researcher to assess potential variations strictly between NCAA Division II student-athletes and males who are not NCAA student-athletes.

Data Collection

The researcher has had ongoing communication with the athletics department administration about the research study being built to garner their support in the potential data collection taking place with the student-athletes. The researcher also communicated with the head coaches of all the male Division II sports teams (baseball, basketball, cross country, golf, soccer, swimming, track and field, tennis, and wrestling) at the institution to inform them of the work being done. Their support was sought in connecting the researcher with the freshmen and sophomore cohort student-athletes on each of their teams during different types of team meetings to seek their voluntary participation in the study. This is consistent with procedures in data collection in another GRC study with student-athletes (Steinfeldt, Steinfeldt, England, & Speight, 2009). The researcher met with each team and during set times and set locations in late September and early October of fall 2017.

The researcher also worked with the administration from the Office of Housing and Residence Life to seek student participation. Through these discussions, the researcher and Residence Life staff established possible opportunities to meet with the students in the residence halls through approved floor meetings and lobby presentations of primarily first and second year student housing. Once in these settings during months of October and November 2017, the researcher met with students to discuss their potential voluntary participation in the study. The informed consent and surveys were emailed to the students to provide them the information needed if they chose to participate in the survey. The researcher met with the universities first-generation program in November 2017 to seek male participants. The informed consent and surveys were emailed to the students who volunteered to participate to complete during those floor meetings.

Separate from the residence hall meetings, athletics meetings, and first-generation meetings, the researcher providing the informed consent and survey to all 2016 and 2017 cohort students in the research study via email. These individuals were sent a recruitment email giving them the opportunity to participate by completing the study online in a setting of their own choosing. This provided all male students in the population of interest for this research study, an opportunity to be part of the study. The email recruitment initiative was also intentionally done to give opportunity for involvement to the male student population who lived off-campus. This was a specific strategy taken to avoid coverage error, and get a representative sample consistent with the institution's population. The overall response rate was for eligible participants was 30.77 % (116 of 377 eligible participants, $n_{\text{student-athletes}} = 58$, $n_{\text{non-student-athletes}} = 58$). The response rate of eligible male student-athletes for this study was 74.35 % (58 of 78). The response rate of eligible male non-student-athletes was 19.40 % (58 of 299).

The researcher setup both assessments, previously administered by paper, in an online format where participants would select an answer instead of having to write it in. This was done in an effort to establish more effective data collection and data analysis, but also with the hope that it would create less missing data and incorrect data entry. Additionally, if a participant missed answering a question on either of the assessments the online format prevented them from submitting the assessments as completed to avoid missing data. This format still allowed a participant who was choosing not to answer the question the ability to opt out of continuing on with the survey at any time. Students who took the online assessment could only access it by logging in to their institution's main site with their specific institutional username and password. This was a specific data entry procedure constructed to create stronger probability that the same participant that the assessment results were linked to entered the data. Data checks were done

after the results were gathered to identify any potential data to be considered for removal because of extreme response style, answering consistently to one end of the scale or the other (Lau & Howard, 2005). The missing data rate was $n = 2$ out of 121. Two participants provided identification information that was not able to be located in the institution's database.

Through the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IR & E) at the institution, academic records data as of fall 2017 was pulled in the months of September and October for possible participants and participants who volunteered to participate. The following data points were used:

1) Midterm grades GPA. Midterm grades GPA is the overall calculated GPA based on the grades reported for each course the student was currently enrolled in when midterm grades were pulled. Professor at the institution of study are required to submit midterm grades for all 100 & 200 level courses being administered. The midterm grade data was pulled on the Wednesday immediately following midterm grades required date of submission of Monday at noon. The intent of pulling the data at that time was two-fold. First, it was to ensure the majority of grades had been reported and, therefore, could be more accurately assessed. Second, the immediacy of pulling the data was also intended to reduce the number of cases where students who received a low midterm grade withdraw from a class (es), allowing midterm grade GPA to be more reflective of the participant's performance, providing more reliable data to analyze.

The additional data points collected through IR & E were:

2) Cumulative college GPA, if applicable;

3) Overall college credit hours earned of second-year participants;

4) Registered hours for all participants, pulled in late October 2017 after the last day to withdraw as designated by the university;

5) Hours a student was registered for as of census day in fall 2017;

6) Identification of participants who added a half semester course starting in October to their schedule after census day; for participants who added a half-semester course during the term, IR & E transformed their post-withdrawal registered hours data, deducting the credit hour(s) addition of the half semester course;

7) Athletic participation coding – Yes (Y) for a Division II student-athlete, No (N) for a eligible participant not coded a student-athlete, and

8) cumulative high school GPA of each participant relative to a 4.0 scale. The institution of study bases their admissions criteria off a 4.0 scale. If a student entering the university is from a high school that has a weighted scale that has GPA's above a 4.0, the institution recalculates the students high school letter or number grade for each course using the following model: A = 100 – 93 (4.0); B = 92 - 85 (3.0); C = 84 – 75 (2.0); D = 74 – 63 (1.0); F = 62 or below (0.0), to determine their converted cumulative GPA score. According to admissions staff, this conversion scale process has existed for over 20 years at the institution of study (R. House, personal communication, September 13, 2017).

Additionally, I R & E provided participant's:

9) cumulative standardized test scores, and

10) college credits earned, if any, prior to starting at the institution. The three academic data points collected on participants' academic performance prior to starting college: HS GPA, standardized test scores, and college credits earned prior to starting at the institution, are seen as potential confounding variables for the participants involved with the study.

Data Analysis

To increase the reliability of the data, the researcher limited measurement to the use of two well established surveys, the GRCS and the AMS. Both instruments have established reliability and validity, with results supporting the strength of the instruments (O'Neil, 2015; Vallerand et al., 1993). Through the efforts previously referenced in meeting with all Division II sports teams, going to residence hall floors and lobbies of primarily first and second year students, attending a first-generation program, and sending out emails to all eligible participants informing them of the research study and providing them the opportunity to participate, the researcher went through great lengths to avoid non-response error. Steinfeldt, Wong, Hagan, Hoag and Steinfeldt's (2011) used linear regression as part of their data analysis when utilizing the GRCS in a study of college student-athletes. A multiple linear regression model (MLR) was used to analyze the data set. Additionally, a binary logistic regression model was used to assess the group difference of the dichotomous variable of athlete (Y) and non-athlete (N).

Human Participants and Ethics Precautions

Every effort was taken to minimize the risk to the participants' and protect their confidentiality to the degree possible. When consent forms (See Appendix D for Informed Consent) and surveys were administered, only the subject's student ID number was collected to identify the subject. Demographic questions from the original GRCS survey about age, educational level, marital status, and race were also removed to protect the confidentiality of the subject to the degree possible. No name, email, or IP address was noted on the completed survey data or on the finalized study code data. The surveys were housed on Microsoft Office 365 Forms data. This form follows the Office 365 compliance framework and meet compliance category C as outlined in the framework ("Compliance Framework," 2010).

The online consent forms, including the completed online surveys, were secured in a locked location on a password-protected computer file in the possession of the researcher. Once all survey data was collected, the participant's college ID number was converted to a study code number (i.e. Student ID # 257111 = Subject #1), and the rest of the data was merged to create the finalized study code data. After that, all identifiable participant information collected through this form was destroyed. Once survey data was collected, a study code number was assigned to convert the individual's ID number (i.e. Student ID # 257111 = Subject #1) to create further levels of confidentiality for the participating subject. A comprehensive study code key was created.

The academic records information used for this study was housed in a separate location than the study code key on a password-protected computer. Once individuals associated with the academic records data were given a study code number and the data was merged with the survey data, the original academic records document was destroyed. The finalized electronic study code document included the coded and merged academic records and survey data. The study code document was kept on a separate computer from the study code key. After three years, direct or indirect subject identifiable information will be destroyed, including the study code and demographic information that could reasonably identify the subject.

The researcher, through his professional role at the institution of study, is in a position that involves interaction with some of the participants. Additionally, his role has certain responsibilities that are connected with working and supporting first and second year students. It is possible that based on the relationships that the researcher has developed with some of the participants, there could have been some response biases by the participants to answer the questions they interpreted were desired by the researcher. The researcher, through the informed

consent and his initial comments to the participants was very explicit in stressing the importance of providing unbiased responses to the questionnaires.

Separately, the researcher, through his teaching role of a first-year transition course at the institution, had a handful of males in his course that would have been eligible participants for the study. Based on his supervisory role as the instructor and primary advisor for these students, the researcher did not allow them to be participants in the study as a protective measure for these individuals. Additionally, the researcher had a small handful of second year students who were his primary advisees. Based on his supervisory role, the researcher did not allow them to be participants in the study as a protective measure for these individuals. To reduce survey fatigue demographic questions were removed, shortening the amount of time it took participants to complete the survey and providing more opportunity to focus effectively on the questions asked. The ability to remove demographic questions was based on the ability to collect the demographic data needed already accessible through the student's academic records.

Chapter 4

The Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Academic Progress Comparing Division II Male Student-Athletes to Male Non-Student-Athletes

Results

This study examined the relationship between gender role conflict on academic progress with males who participated in Division II athletics and males who did not participate in Division II athletics using a linear regression model. In this study, two completed surveys by the participants were analyzed, Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) and Academic Motivation Scale – College Version (AMS – C28), along with participant extant academic information from the university (Vallerand, et al., 1992; O'Neil, 1986). GRC has four defined factors and AMS has eight seven motivation types being assessed. The GRCS scale was 1 to 6 and the AMS scale was 1 to 7. For data analysis purposes, total scores were calculated for each set of questions associated with each factor defined in the GRCS and AMS surveys. For example, a participant answered 13 questions that were linked to the Success, Power, Competition (SPC) pattern for the GRCS. The scores for of the individual participant were summed after all participants completed the surveys to provide the participant's total scores for each GRCS and AMS factor.

The response rate of eligible male student-athletes for this study was 74.35 % (58 of 78). The response rate of eligible male non-student-athletes was 19.40 % (58 of 299). Based on the sample size, the Effect Size Index indicated that the sample was adequate in detecting a small effect size for the models run at *alpha* = 05, *beta* = .20 (Cohen, 1988, p. 287). There were three additional participants' that had to be removed from the data. The decision to remove these respondents was based off these participants' standardized test scores not having formalized conversion parameters to convert the scores to an ACT equivalent or because the extant

academic information was not available. The study focused on answering the following research questions:

- Does gender role conflict and academic motivation predict a male student's GPA?
- Are there differences in the Gender Role Conflict Scale and Academic Motivation Scale scores for male student-athletes?
- Are there factors that predict Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men?

There were 116 first and second year participants in this current study. Table 1 below reflects the breakdown between male first-year student (FYS) and male second-year student (SYS) participants.

Table 1

Gender Role Conflict Study Participants

Participant Type	Frequency
FYS	85
SYS	31
Total	116

Male First-Year Student (FYS). Male Second-Year Student (SYS).

Research Question 1: Does gender role conflict and academic motivation predict a male student's GPA?

A general linear model was used to investigate each question. Because some of the variables were not significant in the multiple linear regression, in order to simplify the model these non-significant variables were systematically removed. The reported model summaries are based on the full and final reduced models for each dependent variable assessed.

Table 2 below provides: 1) summary data for each of the four factors of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS): 1. Success, Power, Competition (SPC), 2. Restrictive Emotionality

(RE), 3. Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and 4. Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR), including minimum and maximum scores that could be recorded by a participant for each factor, along with the mean (*M*) and standard deviation (*SD*) scores for each factor. Additionally Table 2 provides 2) summary data for each of the seven factors of the Academic Motivation Scale (AMS): 1. Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK), 2. Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA), 3. Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES), 4. Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID), 5. Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN), 6. Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER), and 7. Amotivation (AM), including minimum and maximum scores that could be recorded by a participant, along with the mean (*M*), and standard deviation (*SD*) scores for each factor, and 3) Midterm GPA, including the minimum midterm GPA earned, maximum midterm GPA earned, mean (*M*) of the midterm GPA's, and standard deviation (*SD*) for midterm grades. The 37-question GRCS uses a 6-point Likert scale. The SPC factor has 13 questions. Therefore, the minimum SPC score a participant could record is a 13 and the maximum scored would be a 78. The RE factor has 10 questions. Therefore, the minimum RE score a participant could record is a 10 and the maximum scored would be a 60. The RABBM factor has 8 questions. Therefore, the minimum RABBM score a participant could record is an 8 and the maximum scored would be a 48. The CBWFR factor has 6 questions. Therefore, the minimum CBWFR score a participant could record is a 6 and the maximum scored would be a 36. The 28-question AMS uses a 7-point Likert scale. All seven AMS factors have four questions on the survey. Therefore, the minimum score a participant could record on an AMS factor is 4 and the maximum score would be a 28. Midterm GPA scores can range from a 0.00 to a 4.0.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	*M*	*SD*
SPC (GRCS)	116	23.00	78.00	54.13	11.28
RE (GRCS)	116	11.00	60.00	32.00	9.19
RABBM (GRCS)	116	8.00	44.00	24.29	7.39
CBWFR (GRCS)	116	6.00	36.00	21.86	6.84
IMTK (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	19.66	5.00
IMTA (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	17.36	5.46
IMTES (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	11.91	5.26
EMID (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	22.75	4.08
EMIN (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	19.25	6.10
EMER (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	22.71	4.82
AM (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	7.28	4.92
GPA (AMS)	116	1.47	4.00	2.99	0.57

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). Academic Motivation Scale (AMS). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). Midterm GPA (GPA).

The equation and factors included in the full general linear model with midterm GPA as the dependent variable are provided below.

$$Y_i = B_0 + B_1 (X_1) + B_2 (X_2) + + B_3 (X_3) + B_4 (X_4) + B_5 (X_5) + B_6 (X_6) + B_7 (X_7) + B_8 (X_8) + B_9 (X_9) + B_{10} (X_{10}) + B_{11} (X_{11}) + B_{12} (X_{12}) + e_i$$

Y_i = Estimated Midterm GPA

B_0 = Constant

X_1 = Athlete – Yes or No

X_2 = Success, Power, Competition (SPC)

X_3 = Restrictive Emotionality (RE)

X_4 = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)

X_5 = Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR)

X_6 = Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK)

X_7 = Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA)

X_8 = Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES)

X_9 = Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID)

X_{10} = Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN)

X_{11} = Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER)

X_{12} = Amotivation (AM)

Table 3, on the next page, is the correlation matrix for the full model with the dependent variable of midterm GPA. Based on there only being one significant predictor, there were no correlations to be noted in the full model. The final reduced model showed two correlations between the significant predictors of the model with midterm GPA as a dependent variable. In the final reduced model, there were weak negative linear correlations between CBWFR and RE (r = -.374, p = .0001) and IMTA and EMER (r = -.338), indicating that a rise in one of the factor's scores correlates with a decline in the other factor's scores.

Table 3

Full Model Correlation Matrix with Midterm GPA as Dependent Variable

Model			AM	CBWFR	IMTA	ATHL	RABBM	EMER	IMTES	RE	EMIN	SPC	EMID	IMTK
1	Correlatio	AM	1.000											
	ns	CBWFR	.053	1.000										
		IMTA	.006	.135	1.000									
		ATHL	.077	.047	.103	1.000								
		RABBM	-.118	.058	.096	.141	1.000							
		EMER	-.017	.075	.208	.088	.012	1.000						
		IMTES	-.138	.055	-.119	.045	-.133	.238	1.000					
		RE	.098	-.245	.060	.182	-.377	.050	-.017	1.000				
		EMIN	-.161	-.052	-.319	-.066	-.136	-.185	-.112	.051	1.000			
		SPC	-.126	-.247	-.337	-.201	-.315	-.351	.016	-.194	-.097	1.000		
		EMID	.286	-.018	-.267	-.129	.051	-.419	.058	-.101	-.215	.086	1.000	
		IMTK	.058	-.062	-.485	.128	.123	-.238	-.369	-.032	-.011	.204	-.028	1.000

Amotivation (AM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Athlete Yes or No (ATHL). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK).

The multiple linear regression model (Table 4) with midterm GPA as the dependent variable, initially consisted of 12 covariates, including athletic status – yes or no and all total scores for each of the GRCS and AMS factor questions. The full model represented in Table 4 was statistically significant - F (12, 103) = 2.974, p = .001) and explained 25.7 % of the variance in Midterm GPA.

Table 4

Full Model with Midterm GPA as Dependent Variable

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.623	12	.802	2.974	.001*
	Residual	27.770	103	.270		
	Total	37.393	115			

R^2 = .257

The full multiple linear regression model showed that only Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR) was a significant predictor (p = .001, p < .05) of midterm GPA (Table 5). In this model, for every one standard deviation increase in CBWFR, midterm GPA scores will decrease by .243 standard deviations (Table 5).

Table 5

Full Model with GRCS & AMS Factors as Predictors of Midterm GPA

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Sig.
1	(Constant)	3.253	.406		.000
	ATHL (1 -Yes; 0 - No)	-.019	.106	-.017	.857
	SPC	-.009	.007	-.171	.202
	RE	.010	.007	.158	.159
	RABBM	.013	.009	.168	.151
	CBWFR	-.020	.008	-.243	.013*
	IMTK	.002	.016	.017	.902
	IMTA	.030	.016	.284	.067
	IMTES	-.003	.012	-.025	.823
	EMID	.030	.018	.217	.099
	EMIN	-.020	.012	-.217	.097
	EMER	-.028	.015	-.240	.055
	AM	-.021	.011	-.177	.069

Athlete Yes or No (ATHL). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). *$p < .05$.

The general linear model with midterm GPA as the dependent variable was run four more times as a reduced model, removing additional factors for each reduced model. The equation and factors of the final reduced model, inclusive of five independent variable factors, is provided below.

$$\boldsymbol{Y_i = B_0 + B_1 (X_1) + B_2 (X_2) + + B_3 (X_3) + B_4 (X_4) + B_5 (X_5) + e_i}$$

Y_i = Estimated Midterm GPA

B_0 = Constant

X_1 = Restrictive Emotionality (RE)

X_2 = Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR)

X_3 = Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA)

X_4 = Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER)

X_5 = Amotivation (AM)

The reduced model for midterm GPA as the dependent variable was statistically significant F (5, 110) = 5.504, p = .0001), as presented in Table 6. This model explained 20 % of the variance in midterm GPA. All remaining factors, RE, CBWFR, IMTA, and EMER were significant predictors as presented in Table 7. The predictor of CBWFR was the predictor that had the most impact in this model, indicating that for every one standard deviation increase in CBWFR, midterm GPA scores will decrease by .282 standard deviations.

Table 6

Reduced Model with Midterm GPA as Dependent Variable

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
5	Regression	7.483	5	1.497	5.504	.000*
	Residual	29.911	110	.272		
	Total	37.393	115			

R^2 = .200. *p < .05.

Table 7

Reduced Model with GRC & AMS Factors as Predictors of Midterm GPA

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Sig.
5	(Constant)	3.606	.304		.000
	RE	.012	.006	.191	.044*
	CBWFR	-.023	.008	-.282	.003*
	IMTA	.022	.010	.213	.021*
	EMER	-.029	.011	-.245	.009*
	AM	-.029	.010	-.249	.004*

Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). *$p < .05$.

In summary, from the full model with midterm GPA as a predictor with 12 covariates, to the final reduced model with 5 covariates, all models were statistically significant. The full model explained 25.7% variance in midterm GPA as compared to the final reduced model that explained 20 % variance in midterm GPA. CBWFR was a significant predictor in all models run, while IMTA and EMER were significant predictors in the second through final reduced model run.

Research Question 2: Are There Differences in the Gender Role Conflict Scale and Academic Motivation Scale Scores for Student-Athletes?

There were 116 participants in this study. Table 8 below reflects the breakdown between Division II male student-athletes participants and male non-student-athlete participants.

Table 8

Gender Role Conflict Study Participants

Participant Type	Frequency
MSA	58
MNSA	58
Total	116

Male Student-Athlete (MSA). Male Non-Student-Athlete (MNSA)

Table 9 below breaks out the data comparing the male student-athlete participants to the male non-student-athlete participants providing: 1) summary data for each of the four factors of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS): 1. Success, Power, Competition (SPC), 2. Restrictive Emotionality (RE), 3. Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and 4. Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR), including the mean (*M*) and standard deviation (*SD*) scores for male student-athletes for each factor. Table 9 also provides 2) summary data for each of the seven factors of the Academic Motivation Scale (AMS): 1. Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK), 2. Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA), 3. Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES), 4. Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID), 5. Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN), 6. Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER), and 7. Amotivation (AM), including the mean (*M*), and standard deviation (*SD*) scores for male non-student-athletes each factor, and 3) Composite ACT scores, including the mean and standard deviation (*SD*) scores for both male student-athlete participants and male non-student-athlete participants. The 37-question GRCS uses a 6-point Likert scale. The SPC factor has 13 questions, RE has 10 questions, RABBM has 8 questions, and CBWFR has 6 questions. The 28-question AMS uses a 7-point Likert scale. All seven AMS factors have four questions on the survey.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Male Student-Athlete and Male Non-Student-Athlete

	M(SA)	*SD*(SA)	*M*(NSA)	*SD*(NSA)
SPC	54.36	10.14	53.90	12.39
RE	30.05	7.12	33.95	10.58
RABBM	22.98	7.05	25.60	7.55
CBWFR	21.47	6.49	22.26	7.22
IMTK	18.60	4.71	20.71	5.10
IMTA	16.62	4.63	18.10	6.13
IMTES	10.84	4.29	12.98	5.92
EMID	22.97	2.72	22.53	5.10
EMIN	19.00	5.11	19.50	6.98
EMER	22.67	4.13	22.74	5.45
AM	6.72	4.04	7.83	5.65
ACT	24.48	3.15	26.21	3.68

$N_{\text{student-athlete}} = 58$. $N_{\text{non-student-athlete}} = 58$. Mean – Student-Athlete: *M* (SA). Standard Deviation – Student-Athlete: *SD* (SA). Mean – Non-Student-Athlete: *M* (NSA). Standard Deviation – Non-Student-Athlete: *SD* (NSA). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). Composite ACT Score (ACT).

Assessing the factor of athletic status, a binary logistic regression model was run with athlete and non-athlete being the dichotomous dependent variable, consisting of 12 covariates, including all total scores for each of the AMS and GRCS factor questions, and composite ACT scores. The equation and factors included in the full binary logistic regression model are provided below.

$$\boldsymbol{LOG\,(Y_i) = B_0 + B_1\,(X_1) + B_2\,(X_2) + + B_3\,(X_3) + B_4\,(X_4) + B_5\,(X_5) + B_6\,(X_6) + B_7\,(X_7) + B_8\,(X_8) + B_9\,(X_9) + B_{10}\,(X_{10}) + B_{11}\,(X_{11}) + B_{12}\,(X_{12}) + e_i}$$

$LOG\,(Y_i)$ = Athlete – Yes or No

B_0 = Constant

X_1 = Success, Power, Competition (SPC)

X_2 = Restrictive Emotionality (RE)

X_3 = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)

X_4 = Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR)

X_5 = Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK)

X_6 = Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA)

X_7 = Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES)

X_8 = Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID)

X_9 = Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN)

X_{10} = Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER)

X_{11} = Amotivation (AM)

X_{12} = Estimated Midterm GPA

The full binary logistic regression model with athlete and non-athlete status as the binary dependent variable, initially consisted of 12 covariates, including all GRCS and AMS factors, and composite ACT scores. The full model (Table 10) was statistically significant ($p = .015$, $p < .05$) and explained 25.9 % of the variance in male athlete versus male non-athlete status. However, no individual factors (Table 11) were statistically significant.

Table 10

Full Model with GRCS, AMS Factors, Composite ACT as Predictors of Male Student-Athlete and Male Non-Student-Athlete

	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step	25.053	12	.015
Block	25.053	12	.015
Model	25.053	12	.015

Nagelkerke $R^2 = .259$

Table 11

Full Model with GRCS, AMS Factors, Composite ACT as Predictors of Male Student-Athlete and Male Non-Student-Athlete

	B	S.E.	Sig.	Exp(B)
ACT	-.109	.069	.114	.896
SPC	.054	.029	.057	1.056
RE	-.052	.030	.087	.949
RABBM	-.054	.040	.176	.948
CBWFR	-.014	.035	.692	.986
IMTK	-.078	.071	.269	.925
IMTA	-.054	.071	.443	.947
IMTES	-.025	.052	.625	.975
EMID	.112	.083	.177	1.119
EMIN	.014	.056	.806	1.014
EMER	-.078	.067	.244	.925
AM	-.046	.051	.368	.955
Constant	5.145	2.520	.041*	171.607

Beta (B). Standard Error (S.E). Odds ratio for predictors: Exp (B). Composite ACT (ACT). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). *$p < .05$.

The binary logistic regression model with athlete and non-athlete being the dichotomous dependent variable was run again two times. The first reduced model (Table 12) was statistically significant ($p = .015$, $p < .05$) and explained 25.5 % of the variance in male athlete versus male non-athlete status. As with the first model, no individual factors were statistically significant. (Table 13). A second reduced binary logistic regression model was run, and that model was not significant.

Table 12

Reduced Model with Dependent Variable of Male Student-Athlete and Male Non-Student-Athlete

	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step	24.641	9	.003
Block	24.641	9	.003
Model	24.641	9	.003

Nagelkerke $R^2 = .255$

Table 13

Reduced Model with Dependent Variable of Male Student-Athlete and Male Non-Student-Athlete

	B	S.E.	Sig.	Exp (B)
ACT	-.113	.066	.089	.893
SPC	.053	.028	.056	1.054
RE	-.055	.030	.063	.946
RABBM	-.054	.039	.167	.947
IMTK	-.092	.065	.159	.912
IMTA	-.050	.064	.430	.951
EMID	.118	.080	.144	1.125
EMER	-.068	.064	.289	.934
AM	-.046	.049	.342	.955
Constant	4.961	2.498	.047	142.725

Beta (B). Standard Error (S.E). Odds ratio for predictors: Exp (B). Composite ACT (ACT). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM).

Research Question 3A: Are There Factors that Predict Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)?

Table 14 below provides: 1) summary data for each of the four factors of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS): 1. Success, Power, Competition (SPC), 2. Restrictive Emotionality (RE), 3. Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and 4. Conflict Between

Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR), including minimum and maximum scores that could be recorded by a participant for each factor, along with the mean (*M*) and standard deviation (*SD*) for each factor. Table 14 includes 2) summary data for each of the seven factors of the Academic Motivation Scale (AMS): 1. Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK), 2. Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA), 3. Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES), 4. Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID), 5. Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN), 6. Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER), and 7. Amotivation (AM), including minimum and maximum scores that could be recorded by a participant, along with the mean (*M*), and standard deviation (*SD*) for each factor, and 3) Midterm GPA, including the minimum midterm GPA earned, maximum midterm GPA earned, mean (*M*) of the midterm GPA's, and standard deviation (*SD*) for midterm grades. The 37-question GRCS uses a 6-point Likert scale. The SPC factor has 13 questions, RE has 10 questions, RABBM has 8 questions, and CBWFR has 6 questions. The 28-question AMS uses a 7-point Likert scale. All seven AMS factors have four questions on the survey. Midterm GPA scores can range from a 0.00 to a 4.0.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
SPC (GRCS)	116	23.00	78.00	54.13	11.28
RE (GRCS)	116	11.00	60.00	32.00	9.19
RABBM (GRCS)	116	8.00	44.00	24.29	7.39
CBW (GRCS)	116	6.00	36.00	21.86	6.84
IMTK (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	19.66	5.00
IMTA (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	17.36	5.46
IMTES (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	11.91	5.26
EMID (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	22.75	4.08
EMIN (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	19.25	6.10
EMER (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	22.71	4.82
AM (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	7.28	4.92
GPA	116	1.47	4.00	2.99	0.57

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). Academic Motivation Scale (AMS). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). Midterm GPA (GPA).

The full multiple linear regression model with the Total RE score as the dependent variable, initially consisted of 12 covariates, including all total scores for each of the AMS and GRCS factor questions, along with athletic status – yes or no, and midterm GPA. The equation and factors included in the full multiple linear regression model are provided below.

$$\boldsymbol{Y_i = B_0 + B_1 (X_1) + B_2 (X_2) + + B_3 (X_3) + B_4 (X_4) + B_5 (X_5) + B_6 (X_6) + B_7 (X_7) + B_8 (X_8) + B_9 (X_9) + B_{10} (X_{10}) + B_{11} (X_{11}) + B_{12} (X_{12}) + e_i}$$

Y_i = Restrictive Emotionality (RE)

B_0 = Constant

X_1 = Athlete – Yes or No

X_2 = Success, Power, Competition (SPC)

X_3 = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)

X_4 = Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR)

X_5 = Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK)

X_6 = Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA)

X_7 = Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES)

X_8 = Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID)

X_9 = Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN)

X_{10} = Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER)

X_{11} = Amotivation (AM)

X_{12} = Estimated Midterm GPA

The correlation matrix table for Restrictive Emotionality as the dependent variable (Table 15) shows one weak negative linear correlation between the significant predictors of the model. There is a weak negative linear correlation between Success, Power, Competition (SPC) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) (r = -.437, p = .0001), indicating that a rise in SPC scores correlate with a decline in RABBM scores. There was only one moderate linear correlation between the significant predictors of the final reduced model with Restrictive Emotionality as the dependent variable. In the final reduced model, there was a moderate negative linear correlation between Success, Power, Competition (SPC) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) (r = -.501, p = .0001), indicating that a rise in SPC scores correlate with a decline in RABBM scores.

Table 15: Full Model Correlation Matrix with Restrictive Emotionality as Dependent Variable

Model		GPA	**RABBM**	EMID	IMTES	ATHL	CBW	AM	SPC	IMTK	EMIN	EMER	IMTA
1 Correlations	GPA	1.000											
	RABBM	-.204	1.000										
	EMID	-.175	.049	1.000									
	IMTES	.020	-.151	.052	1.000								
	ATHL	.044	.216	-.119	.050	1.000							
	CBWFR	.216	-.081	-.080	.055	.103	1.000						
	AM	.190	-.123	.256	-.130	.068	.117	1.000					
	SPC	.100	**-.437***	.050	.015	-.166	-.279	-.088	1.000				
	IMTK	-.017	.121	-.028	-.370	.135	-.074	.057	.199	1.000			
	EMIN	.168	-.156	-.235	-.106	-.069	-.003	-.130	-.070	-.012	1.000		
	EMER	.193	-.008	-.436	.239	.087	.128	.015	-.321	-.235	-.149	1.000	
	IMTA	-.170	.158	-.225	-.120	.085	.112	-.032	-.343	-.474	-.342	.166	1.000

Midterm GPA (GPA). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Athlete Yes or No (ATHL). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Amotivation (AM). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA). *$p <$ .05.

The full model, represented in Table 16, was statistically significant F (12, 103) = 6.399, p = .0001) and explained 42.7 % of the variance in Total RE.

Table 16

Full Model with Restrictive Emotionality (RE) as Dependent Variable

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4144.606	12	345.384	6.399	.000*
	Residual	5559.394	103	53.975		
	Total	9704.000	115			

R^2 = .427. *p < .05.

The full multiple linear regression model (Table 17) demonstrated that SPC, RABBM, and CBWFR were significant predictors of the total RE score. The predictor of RABBM had the most impact in this model, indicating that for every one standard deviation increase in RABBM, Total RE scores will increase by .366 standard deviations.

Table 17

Full Model with Predictors of Restrictive Emotionality as Dependent Variable

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-1.480	7.315		.840
	ATHL	-2.717	1.478	-.149	.069
	SPC	.202	.094	.248	.034*
	RABBM	.455	.120	.366	.000*
	CBWFR	.317	.112	.236	.005*
	IMTK	.068	.222	.037	.760
	IMTA	-.194	.229	-.115	.400
	IMTES	.033	.170	.019	.844
	EMID	.202	.261	.090	.439
	EMIN	-.048	.174	-.032	.782
	EMER	-.049	.210	-.026	.815
	AM	-.116	.160	-.062	.471
	GPA	1.958	1.381	.122	.159

Athlete Yes or No (ATHL). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). Midterm GPA (GPA). *$p < .05$.

The general linear model with Restrictive Emotionality as the dependent variable was run two more times as a reduced model, removing additional factors for each reduced model. The equation and factors of the final reduced model, inclusive of five independent variable factors, is provided below.

$$\boldsymbol{Y_i = B_0 + B_1 (X_1) + B_2 (X_2) + + B_3 (X_3) + B_4 (X_4) + B_5 (X_5) + e_i}$$

Y_i = Restrictive Emotionality (RE)

B_0 = Constant

X_1 = Athlete – Yes or No

X_2 = Success, Power, Competition (SPC)

X_3 = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)

X_4 = Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR)

X_5 = Estimated Midterm GPA

The reduced model (Table 18) for Total RE as the dependent variable was statistically significant F (5, 110) = 15.569, p = .000). The model explained 41.4% of the variance in Total RE, only a 1.3% reduction in variance from the full model.

Table 18

Reduced Model with Restrictive Emotionality as Dependent Variable

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
3	Regression	4021.455	5	804.291	15.569	.000*
	Residual	5682.545	110	51.659		
	Total	9704.000	115			

R^2 = .414. *p < .05.

SPC, RABBM, and CBWFR remained significant predictors, as presented in Table 19. Of the significant predictors in this model, RABBM continued to have the greatest effect, signifying that for every one standard deviation increase in RABBM, Total RE scores will increase by .355.

Table 19

Reduced Model with Predictors of Restrictive Emotionality as Dependent Variable

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Sig.
3	(Constant)	-.671	5.713		.907
	ATHL	-2.373	1.373	-.130	.087
	SPC	.162	.073	.199	.029*
	RABBM	.441	.109	.355	.000*
	CBWFR	.349	.107	.260	.001*
	GPA	2.255	1.226	.140	.068

Athlete Yes or No (ATHL). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Midterm GPA (GPA). *$p < .05$.

Research Question 3B: Are There Factors that Predict Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)?

Table 20 below provides: 1) summary data for each of the four factors of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS): 1. Success, Power, Competition (SPC), 2. Restrictive Emotionality (RE), 3. Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and 4. Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR), including minimum and maximum scores that could be recorded by a participant for each factor, along with the mean (*M*) and standard deviation (*SD*) for each factor. Additionally, table 20 includes 2) summary data for each of the seven factors of the Academic Motivation Scale (AMS): 1. Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK), 2. Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA), 3. Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES), 4. Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID), 5. Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN), 6. Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER), and 7. Amotivation (AM), including minimum and maximum scores that could be recorded by a participant, along with the mean (*M*), and standard deviation (*SD*) for each factor, and 3)

Midterm GPA, including the minimum midterm GPA earned, maximum midterm GPA earned, mean (M) of the midterm GPA's, and standard deviation (*SD*) for midterm grades. The 37-question GRCS uses a 6-point Likert scale. The SPC factor has 13 questions, RE has 10 questions, RABBM has 8 questions, and CBWFR has 6 questions. The 28-question AMS uses a 7-point Likert scale. All seven AMS factors have four questions on the survey. Midterm GPA scores can range from a 0.00 to a 4.0.

Table 20

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
SPC (GRCS)	116	23.00	78.00	54.13	11.28
RE (GRCS)	116	11.00	60.00	32.00	9.19
RABBM (GRCS)	116	8.00	44.00	24.29	7.39
CBW (GRCS)	116	6.00	36.00	21.86	6.84
IMTK (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	19.66	5.00
IMTA (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	17.36	5.46
IMTES (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	11.91	5.26
EMID (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	22.75	4.08
EMIN (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	19.25	6.10
EMER (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	22.71	4.82
AM (AMS)	116	4.00	28.00	7.28	4.92
GPA	116	1.47	4.00	2.99	0.57

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). Academic Motivation Scale (AMS). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). Midterm GPA (GPA).

The multiple linear regression model, with the Total RABBM score as the dependent variable, initially consisted of 12 covariates, including all total scores for each of the AMS and

GRCS factor questions, along with athletic status – yes or no, and midterm GPA. The equation and factors included in the full multiple linear regression model are provided below.

$$Y_i = B_0 + B_1 (X_1) + B_2 (X_2) + + B_3 (X_3) + B_4 (X_4) + B_5 (X_5) + B_6 (X_6) + B_7 (X_7) + B_8 (X_8) + B_9 (X_9) + B_{10} (X_{10}) + B_{11} (X_{11}) + B_{12} (X_{12}) + e_i$$

Y_i = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)

B_0 = Constant

X_1 = Athlete – Yes or No

X_2 = Success, Power, Competition (SPC)

X_3 = Restrictive Emotionality (RE)

X_4 = Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR)

X_5 = Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK)

X_6 = Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA)

X_7 = Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES)

X_8 = Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID)

X_9 = Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN)

X_{10} = Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER)

X_{11} = Amotivation (AM)

X_{12} = Estimated Midterm GPA

The correlation matrix table (Table 21) shows one weak linear correlation between the significant predictors of the full model with Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men as the dependent variable. There is a weak negative linear correlation between Success, Power, Competition (SPC) and Restrictive Emotionality (RE) (r = -.364, p = .0001), indicating that a rise in SPC scores correlate with a decline in RE scores. There was only one weak linear correlation between the significant predictors of the final reduced model with Restrictive

Affectionate Behavior Between Men as the dependent variable. There was a weak negative linear correlation between Success, Power, Competition (SPC) and Restrictive Emotionality (RE) (r = -.464, p = .0001), indicating that a rise in SPC scores correlate with a decline in RE scores.

Table 21

Full Model Correlation Matrix with Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men as Dependent Variable

Model		GPA	**RE**	IMTES	EMID	ATHL	AM	CBWFR	SPC	IMTK	EMIN	EMER	IMTA
1 Correlations	GPA	1.000											
	RE	-.203	1.000										
	IMTES	.003	-.072	1.000									
	EMID	-.154	-.054	.064	1.000								
	ATHL	.038	.244	.065	-.142	1.000							
	AM	.161	.024	-.153	.262	.100	1.000						
	CBWFR	.248	-.279	.062	-.058	.047	.097	1.000					
	SPC	.085	**-.364***	-.027	.093	-.162	-.156	-.212	1.000				
	IMTK	.005	.014	-.358	-.035	.113	.073	-.066	.257	1.000			
	EMIN	.144	-.029	-.130	-.228	-.042	-.153	-.007	-.134	.007	1.000		
	EMER	.188	.019	.238	-.437	.093	.015	.117	-.343	-.236	-.153	1.000	
	IMTA	-.166	.134	-.107	-.241	.083	-.010	.083	-.333	-.496	-.327	.170	1.000

Midterm GPA (GPA). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Athlete Yes or No (ATHL). Amotivation (AM). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA). *$p < .05$.

The full model (Table 22) was statistically significant F (12, 103) = 7.793, p = .000). The model explained 47.6 % of the variance in Total RABBM.

Table 22

Full Model with Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men as Dependent Variable

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2987.447	12	248.954	7.793	.000*
	Residual	3290.588	103	31.947		
	Total	6278.034	115			

R^2 = .476

The full multiple linear regression model (Table 23) showed that SPC and RE were significant predictors of the total RABBM score. The predictor of SPC was the predictor that reflected the most impact in this model, demonstrating that for every one standard deviation increase in SPC, Total RABBM scores will increase by .374 standard deviations.

Table 23

Full Model with Predictors of Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men as Dependent Variable

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.274	5.625		.404	.687
	ATHL	-1.606	1.145	-.109	-1.402	.164
	SPC	.245	.070	.374	3.516	.001*
	RE	.270	.071	.335	3.796	.000*
	CBWFR	-.020	.089	-.018	-.218	.828
	IMTK	-.214	.169	-.145	-1.263	.209
	IMTA	-.213	.176	-.157	-1.211	.229
	IMTES	.178	.129	.127	1.378	.171
	EMID	-.148	.201	-.082	-.737	.463
	EMIN	.212	.132	.175	1.602	.112
	EMER	.025	.162	.016	.155	.877
	AM	.176	.122	.117	1.437	.154
	GPA	1.535	1.062	.118	1.445	.151

Athlete Yes or No (ATHL). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR). Intrinsic Motivation to Know (IMTK). Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA). Intrinsic Motivation to Experience Stimulation (IMTES). Extrinsic Motivation Identified (EMID). Extrinsic Motivation Introjected (EMIN). Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER). Amotivation (AM). Midterm GPA (GPA). *$p < .05$.

The general linear model with Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men as the dependent variable was run three more times as a reduced model. The equation and factors of the final reduced model, inclusive of four independent variable factors, is provided below.

$$\boldsymbol{Y_i = B_0 + B_1 (X_1) + B_2 (X_2) + + B_3 (X_3) + B_4 (X_4) + e_i}$$

Y_i = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM)

B_0 = Constant

X_1 = Athlete – Yes or No

X_2 = Success, Power, Competition (SPC)

X_3 = Restrictive Emotionality (RE)

X_4 = Amotivation (AM)

The reduced model for Total RABBM as the dependent variable was statistically significant F (4, 111) = 20.483, p = .0001), as presented in Table 24. The reduced model explained 42.5% of the variance in Total RABBM, a 5 % decrease in variance from the full model.

Table 24

Reduced Model with Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men as Dependent Variable

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
4	Regression	2666.100	4	666.525	20.483	.000*
	Residual	3611.935	111	32.540		
	Total	6278.034	115			

R^2 = .425

SPC, RE, and AM remained significant predictors as presented in Table 25. Of the significant predictors in this model, RE had the greatest effect, demonstrating that for every one standard deviation increase in RE, Total RABBM scores will increase by .372 standard deviations.

Table 25

Reduced Model with Predictors of Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men as Dependent Variable

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Sig.
4	(Constant)	2.055	2.857		.473
	ATHL	-1.275	1.104	-.087	.251
	SPC	.212	.054	.323	.000*
	RE	.299	.067	.372	.000*
	AM	.253	.111	.168	.025*

Athlete – Yes or No (ATHL). Success, Power, Competition (SPC). Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Amotivation (AM). *$p < .05$.

Residual analysis was used to confirm model adequacy for each of the models. Analysis was done by plotting residuals for each model on a probability-probality (pp) plot and by plotting the residuals on a scatter plot of residuals versus predicted values to determine model adequacy. Assumptions of regression for each model were tested. The analysis confirmed that there was minimal multicollinearity, and that the homogoneity (using Levene's test of homogeneity), independence, and normality reaffirmed confidence in the models.

Chapter 5

The Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Academic Progress Comparing Division II Male Student-Athletes to Male Non-Student-Athletes

Findings, Conclusions, and Implications

Introduction

In this chapter the summary of the study will be discussed. The problem identified by the researcher, research questions, and the method of data collection will be briefly revisited. A review of the findings will be provided along with the implications of the research. The limitations of the study will be addressed and recommendations for future research will be provided.

There is a problem with academic progression and graduation rates of males in higher education. Enrollment rates and completion rates are lower for males as compared with their female counterparts through a review of higher education statistics from 1990 to 2012 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). According to US Census data, in 1980 the proportion of college graduation rates for males aged 26-28 years old was 25 percent, 26 percent as of 2000, and only 28 percent by 2010. Female bachelor's degree attainment was 21 percent in 1980, 30 percent in 2000, and 36 percent in 2010 (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). This near stagnant change in the proportion of male graduates in this recent 30 year span is cause for concern and drives the critical need to seek better understanding for what potential challenges exist within males. This study targeted first and second year college male Division II athletes and male non-athletes who began their college career at the institution of study. 118 total males ($n_{\text{student athletes}} = 58$; $n_{\text{non-student-athletes}} = 58$) participated in the study, completing the Gender Role Conflict Scale and the Academic Motivation Scale (Vallerand, et al., 1992; O'Neil, 1986). Additionally, academic

information of the participants was accessed, most prominently midterm GPA, to identify the potential relationships between the participants' feedback on the surveys and their academic performance. The following three research questions were assessed:

- Does gender role conflict and academic motivation predict a male student's GPA?
- Are there differences in the Gender Role Conflict Scale and Academic Motivation Scale scores for male student-athletes?
- Are there factors that predict Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men?

Gender role conflict was the core theoretical framework for this study (O'Neil, 1981). The premise for gender role conflict is that it creates a narrow definition for how males are to behave and that there are multiple competing concepts of male gender role that are contradictory and inconsistent. Males may be socialized to be uncomfortable with these concepts, while still feeling the need to prove themselves to meet these expectations (O'Neil, 1981). The literature review discussed other founding theories that lead up to and were foundational structures for gender role. The research associated with the four defining factors of the gender role conflict scale was discussed (O'Neil, et al., 1986). Past studies on academic performance and gender role conflict related to males in higher education and the within group population of male student-athletes were discussed in the literature review.

This study took place at a Midwestern, Carnegie classified master's college and university (larger program institution). The institution is a private, liberal arts, faith-based institution with approximately 2,500 full-time undergraduate students. The overall response rate for eligible participants was 30.77 % (116 of 377 eligible participants). The response rate of

eligible male student-athletes for this study was 74.35 % (58 of 78). The response rate of eligible male non-student-athletes was 19.40 % (58 of 299).

Synthesis of Findings

This study explained mixed associations between GRC factors, AMS factors and midterm GPA through the models ran with midterm GPA as both a dependent variable and as a predictor for other dependent variables. In the five models (all significant) ran with midterm GPA as the dependent variable, only two of the four GRC factors, Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR)and Restrictive Emotionality (RE), were significant predictors of midterm GPA. CBWFR was the only factor that held as a significant predictor of midterm GPA in all the models run. Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA), Extrinsic Motivation External Regulation (EMER), and Amotivation (AM) were the three AMS factors that were significant predictors in multiple models. For the factors of CBWFR, EMER, and AM, when they were significant predictors in the respective models, scores indicated that when these predictor scores decreased, midterm GPA scores will increase. For the factors of IMTA and RE, when they were significant predictors in their respective models, results indicated that when these predictor scores increased, midterm GPA will increase. Of the significant predictors in each of the five models, three different ones amongst the models, CBWFR, IMTA, and EMER, demonstrated having the greatest effect on midterm GPA. The predictor with the highest effect amongst the five models was IMTA in model two, indicating that for every one standard deviation increase in IMTA, midterm GPA scores would increase by .289.

The full model with midterm GPA as the dependent variable explained 25.7% (R^2 = .257) of the variance of midterm GPA compared with the final reduced model, which explained 20 % (R^2 = .200) of the variance. The fourth of the five models was the first one that a linear

correlation between one or more of the significant predictors was present. In the final two reduced models, RE and CBWFR demonstrated a weak negative linear correlation ($r_{\text{model 4}} = -.367$; $r_{\text{model 5}} = -.374$), meaning that as one factor's scores increased, the other decreased. In the final model, EMER and IMTA demonstrated a weak negative linear correlation ($r = -.338$). Throughout all five models with midterm GPA as the dependent variable, there was no correlation score between any of the GRC factors and AMS factors that demonstrated at least a minimum of a weak negative or positive linear relationship ($r \geq \pm .3$).

Assessing the factor of athletic status, a binary logistic regression model was run with athlete and non-athlete being the dichotomous dependent variable, consisting of 12 covariates, including all total scores for each of the AMS and GRCS factor questions, and midterm GPA. The full model was statistically significant, but no individual factors were significant. The binary logistic regression model was run two more times, removing additional factors each time. The first reduced model was statistically significant but no individual factors were significant. The final reduced model ran was not statistically significant.

All three models run with the gender role conflict pattern of Restrictive Emotionality (RE) as a dependent variable were statistically significant. In the full model involving 12 covariates, Success, Power, Competition (SPC) was a significant predictor of RE. In all three models Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) and Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR) were significant factors predicting RE. Increased scores in these three factors, predicted increased scores in RE. Of the significant predictors in each of the models, RABBM held for all for them as having the greatest effect, indicating that for every one standard deviation increase in RABBM, RE scores would increase by a range of .355 to .377. No factors of AMS were significant predictors of RE.

The full model with RE as the dependent variable, including 12 covariates, explained 42.7 % (R^2 = .427) of the variance in Total RE. Comparatively, the final reduced model with only five covariates explained 41.4% of the variance in Total RE, only a 1.3% reduction in variance from the full model. In the full model, SPC and RABBM demonstrated a weak negative linear correlation (r = - .437). In the final model, SPC and RABBM indicated a moderate negative linear relationship (r = -. 501), suggesting that as SPC scores increased RABBM scores decreased.

All four models run with the gender role conflict pattern of Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) as a dependent variable were statistically significant. The full model initially consisted of 12 covariates as potential predictors. Two factors, SPC and RE, were significant predictors through all four models. Amotivation (AM), the only other significant predictor amongst the four models, was a significant predictor in the final two reduced models. For each standard deviation increase in SPC, RE, and AM, RABBM scores will increase as well. Of the significant predictors in each of the models, SPC had the greatest effect for the full model, indicating that for every one standard deviation increase in SPC scores, RABBM scores would increase by .374. RE had the greatest effect in the final reduced model, indicating that for every one standard deviation increase in RE scores, RABBM scores would increase by .372.

The full model with 12 covariates explained 47.6 % (R^2 = .476) of the variance in total RABBM. Comparatively, the final model with only four covariates, explained 42.5% (R^2 = .425) of the variance in total RABBM, only a 5 % decrease in variance from the full model. In the full model, SPC and RE demonstrated a weak negative linear correlation (r = - .437), indicating that as SPC scores go up, RE scores go down. The weak negative linear correlation

between SPC and RE held in the second (r = -.465), third (r = - .440), and final model (r = -.464) as well. This combination was the only correlation of significant predictors within all four models of RABBM as the dependent variable.

Implications

The implications in prior literature are very clear that there is a lack of improvement in college graduation rates of males (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). One study discusses a mindset amongst prospective college males as viewing college as something their parents wanted them to do, but not necessarily something they were motivated towards (Kleinfeld, 2009). The researcher used the lens of gender role conflict (GRC) as the primary theoretical framework to further analyze potential characteristics that may be negatively impacting the academic engagement and progression of college males (O'Neil 1981). Higher education institutions better understanding why their students experience difficulties and the resulting consequences of the challenges experienced should be of critical importance. The researcher anticipated that multiple GRC factors would have a relationship with midterm GPA for both groups of college males being studied. However, only two (RE and CBWFR) of the four GRC factors were significant predictors of midterm GPA, with only one, CBWFR, being a negative predictor. The negative predictor of CBWFR possibly links to past research of college males view of hard work related to academics in the college setting. In one study academic success was acceptable but only if someone was naturally good at it (Marrs, Sigler, & Brammer, 2012). For the male who identifies with the CBWFR pattern, this creates a negative impact on the need for hard work to academically achieve in college.

Related to the other GRC pattern of significance, RE, with midterm GPA as the dependent variable, the researcher anticipated inaccurately that it would be a negative predictor of midterm

GPA. This expectation is based off the researcher's interpreted connection with RE and past research highlighting males negative perception of academic help-seeking and the lack of help-seeking's detrimental effects on academic success (Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011; Morris, 2008). Pushing against this research, RE was a significant positive predictor for midterm GPA. Another study, where RE was negatively associated with seven of eight factors of resiliency evaluated, also seems to demonstrate need for further research to more fully understand these unexpected results (Galligan, Barnett, Brennan, & Israel, 2010). The researcher still holds strongly to the expectation that long-term, in spite of the high RE scores and their positive association with midterm GPA for the current study's participants, high RE scores will be detrimental to academic progress.

Among the two GRC factors of significance in the model with midterm GPA as the dependent variable, there was a weak negative linear correlation between RE and CBWFR. The researcher interprets this correlation as reflective of an individual who may even have difficulty being able to express the conflicts on demands they may be experiencing in their life, a detriment on multiple levels. Neither GRC pattern of significance demonstrated even a weak correlation with any of the academic motivation factors. The researcher anticipated some restriction related to GRC factors and varying types of motivation. This is surprising considering the ways in which males can experience gender role conflict both intrinsically and through GRC experiences from others (O'Neil, 2015).

Amotivation was a significant predictor with a negative effect on midterm GPA. The researcher expected that factor to have that type of association. An intrinsic motivation factor, Intrinsic Motivation Toward Accomplishment (IMTA), was a significant predictor with a positive effect on midterm GPA. What was not fully expected was how any of the three extrinsic

motivation characteristics would interact with midterm GPA and the other covariates in the respective models. Extrinsic motivation external regulation (EMER), engaging in a behavior to meet external demands or attain externally enforced rewards, was a significant predictor of midterm GPA with a negative effect on midterm GPA (Vallerand, et al., 1992). Building on this, there was a weak negative correlation between EMER and IMTA. This correlation implies that participants' who identify with IMTA do not identify with EMER and vice versa. Of greater importance, the current study's findings indicate that EMER is a characteristic negatively associated with male participants' academic performance. Past research has not been extensive in understanding how students approach their learning based on their social identity (Smyth, Mavor, Platow, Grace, 2015). These findings provide further foundation for exploring how social identity and college males drive towards learning is connected.

A previous study demonstrated that academically successful student-athletes reported high academic motivation among other characteristics (Monda, Etzel, Shannon, & Wooding, 2015). In prior research, it was shown that student-athletes report negatively about seeking help from others (Martin, 2005). Related to GRC factors, one study showed only one pattern, RE, that was a significant predictor of lower levels of help-seeking behavior (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010). The role conflict of meeting the demands of sport and school has been a conflict identified in past research (Lance, 2004). Kimmel (2008) discussed sport as founded in hegemonic masculinity. Messner (1992) spoke to how young boys who participate in sport are encouraged by those that surround them to develop a particular type of masculinity. These were important foundations for the approach to analyze potential within group variations of male student-athletes and male non-student-athletes. The binary logistic regression models run assessing the factor of athletic status, with athlete and non-athlete being the dichotomous dependent variable, showed as

significant in the first two models, but not significant in the final reduced model. However, in spite of the researcher's expectations that there are GRC factors and AMS factors that are predictors of male student-athletes and non-student-athletes academic success, the results did not tell that story. There were no individual GRC factors and AMS factors that were predictors for either male population. For male student-athletes, the researcher interprets potential confounding variables such as academic eligibility requirements and the potential expectations of the coach that may mask the negative impact of GRC factors detrimental to the success of the male student-athlete. The student-athletes who select to attend the university and the culture of athletics at the institution of study also may push positively against the detrimental factors of GRC. Additionally, GRC factors and AMS factors may have some variation within sport that create mixed results and cannot be analyzed based on the parameters of this study. Similarly, there may be characteristics within the non-athlete male group, such as students who are in learning communities, or students who play club sports, that interfered with clearly assessing the "non-athlete male" in this study. The response rate of the non-athlete group is also important to reference. There was just under a 20% response rate for non-athlete males. It is possible that the non-athlete males who were part of the study are potentially the same males who are the most engaged, and may not fully reflect the overall non-athlete population in relation to GRC and AMS factors.

The results of the models with RE as a dependent variable and RABBM as a dependent variable demonstrated a consistent trend. In the model with RE as a dependent variable, RABBM was a significant predictor, demonstrating a positive effect in all models. The same was the case for the models with RABBM as the dependent variable, where RE was a significant predictor in all models, demonstrating positive effect. This study reinforced these expected

factors relevance for the college males being studied, and reaffirmed one of the foundation pieces of GRC, restriction of behavior (O'Neil, 1981). These two connecting factors also affirmed similar findings through past research of adolescent men and a study whose results indicated a strong relationship between the two factors, higher levels in RE and RABBM predicted lower levels of help-seeking (Watts & Borders; Lane & Addis, 2005). It is powerful to reflect on how these gender role factors developed more than three decades ago still demonstrate such a current connection for the college male participants in this study. This presence of these two factors has real implications on seeking further understanding on the short and long-term impact these behaviors have on the academic success of college males. The importance of better understanding how college males relate to the factors of RE and RABBM will provide better opportunities for practitioners to establish intervention strategies to support college males.

In the model with RE as the dependent variable, all three GRC factors were significant predictors, speaking again to the interconnectedness these GRC factors maintain with the study's current male participants and possibly other males at varying institution types. Again, similar to the model with midterm GPA as the dependent variable, no AMS factors predicted RE, and therefore demonstrated no correlation with RE or any other GRC factors in the model. This recurring theme continues to imply the limited level of interconnectedness between types of academic motivation and GRC factors. SPC scores demonstrated a moderate negative linear relationship with RABBM. This could be interpreted that for the male who has a higher drive toward success, engaging in affectionate behavior with other males is seen as a positive characteristic benefitting that goal, or that males who are less constricted emotionally are also more willing to strive and not be bound by societal expectations. This potential relationship showed itself in similar ways for the model where RE was a dependent variable. As SPC scores

went up there was a correlation with RE scores going down. These results, in good ways, push against the GRC framework of restriction of behavior, which can limit an individual's progress and healthy functionality (O'Neil, 2008). These results also push against past themes found in qualitative research identifying the characteristics of competition and being unemotional as being strongly connected (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Dating back to Bem (1975), through her research on 33 males and 33 females, she postulated that the androgynous person, a person who was comfortable accessing and demonstrating both feminine and masculine behaviors in varying situational contexts, was an individual who would best define what the appropriate standard of psychological health should look like. It is the hope of the researcher that the model of success, competition, and power, for a college male will continue to look differently, and be framed in a model that is inclusive of expression, seeking support from others, and develop healthy relationships.

Overall, GRC factors were frequently significant predictors throughout this research for this population of study. The continued question to be explored is, at what cost? Overall, grades did not show as being negatively impacted, but further and extended analysis of this population, through hours earned over a period of semesters and progression at the institution of study may serve to better reflect the overall impact these factors may have for males who identify with them. The gaps in enrollment and graduation rates between males and females continue to grow, both overall and within race (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). It is critical to continue to understand why males are not making the strides needed to be successful in college.

Study Limitations

There are limitations to address regarding this study. Based on the limited sample at the institution of research, this study was not able to assess by race/ethnicity. U.S. Census data

shows that even though white males are graduating at lower rates than white females, there are even more distinct disparities among minority populations (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). In 2010, African-American males had the largest graduation disparity, 66% degrees earned by African American females compared with 34% or degrees earned by African American males, followed by the Hispanic population (61% for females, 39% for males), and Native American population (60% versus 40%) (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). Gender role conflict and academic progress comparing different ethnicities would be of great value for future study.

Gender role conflict factors, with the exception of Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR), did not demonstrate being significant predictors with a negative effect on grades in this study. However, this study did not compare variation in rigor of courses for participants as past studies have done (Robst & Keil, 2000). Incorporating analysis of rigor of coursework in relation to the structure and results of a future replicated study would be of real benefit in most effectively analyzing the academic performance of the participants. Because rigor of courses was not part of the analysis, this restricts the ability to assess if variation in GPA was due to motivation or GRCS scores, but may be influenced by the rigor of one participant's major versus another's. Determining course load ease, the average grade for all students in all courses given, provides a baseline to better analyze grade results (Robst & Keil, 2000). Researching the broader lens of academic rigor related to major, Beron and Piquero (2016) showed consistent findings regarding lower GPA's arising amongst male DII student-athletes who selected an easy major, associated with these student-athletes seeing themselves more as an athlete than a student. Further, speaking to the component of academic progress, this study only assessed one semester's GPA standing. It did not address hours earned and GPA trends over multiple semesters for participants.

The participants of this study were accessed through convenience sample data collection. The researcher had most direct access to seek participants who were either on a male sports team, lived in the residence halls, or were part of the first-year, first-generation program at the institution. The researcher had no in-person contact with any first or second year student who lived off campus that was not part of a sports team or in the first-generation program. Therefore, in spite of this study being sent out to all eligible participant's, there is a strong possibility that the sample of participants involved reflects a minimal group of off campus male students. While on-campus versus off campus status was not a demographic assessed, this limitation is important to keep in mind related to future potential replications of the study. In considering replication of the study and generalizability of this study's results to males at other institutions, the reader needs to consider that the study was done at a private, liberal arts, faith-based institution. The student type who attends this institution may have more adaptive characteristics to the liberal arts, faith-based institution model and may vary from the male student who attends the public 4-year institution (Kahn, Brett, & Holmes, 2011).

In further scrutinizing the binary within group dependent variable of athlete versus non-athlete, this study did not attempt to identify the potential student-athlete background of the male "non-athlete." For example, a first-year male who doesn't participate in a Division II sport at the institution of study could have competed in organized sports through his entire academic career leading up to his first-year of college. However, this participant is still labeled non-athlete for the purposes of this study. There is an unknown impact of the non-athlete males past athletic experiences for this study that possibly could be a distinct confounding variable.

Related to the demands of the current participants in this study, this research did not collect work and service data (weekly hours working or involved in service). Dundes and Marx

(2006) research addressed both the positive experiences of being a working student, the increased "forced" efficiency experienced by many of the students in the study who worked, but also the negative impact, the increased level of stress reported by many students. The impact of work on the GRC pattern of Conflict Between Work and Leisure -- Family Relations (CBWFR) is an unknown influence for this current study.

Future Research

There are a number of additional student demographic characteristics that were not analyzed as part of this study. As spoken to earlier, race and ethnicity demonstrate significant variations related to male graduation rates in college (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013). Replicating this study with a more diverse population could provide better understanding of how gender role conflict may exist differently within varying racial and ethnic backgrounds of males, and how it may associate with academic motivation and academic progress in relation to what was found in the current study. Replicating this study and assessing first-generation status as a within group factor for college males would be of significant importance. "First-generation students more frequently encounter specific obstacles that compromise their academic success as compared to non-first generation students (Stebleton & Soria, 2012, p. 13)." DeAngelo et al. (2011) cited a 14 % and 11 % decline in graduation rates for first-generation students compared with continuing generation students at 4-year public universities and 4-year private institutions, respectively. There are student-athlete factors that the researcher would like to see pursued in future work. From the broadest sense of the college athletic setting, it would be to replicate this study at the Division I & Division III level to see if any individual factors of significance presented themselves in either or both divisions. Is there a make-up of the student-athlete that is different at either level?

Further studying the relationship between sports (i.e. baseball compared with tennis) and sports types (contact sports comparted with non-contact sports) connected with gender role conflict (GRC) and academic progress is of great interest to the researcher. This could not be done in the current study due to the limited student-athlete sample size by team. Further understanding how GRC characteristics may present themselves in different sports and relate to academic motivation, and academic progress would be of real interest. Research has demonstrated higher negative attitudes towards help-seeking behaviors for contact vs. non-contact sports (Martin, 2005). Prior studies have indicated limited research done specifically on GRC and contact sports (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010). This potential association of help-seeking connected with two GRC factors, Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), would be importance in seeing how these factors within varying sports connect with academic progress. Past research has been done on a particular sport, football, to understand athletic identity and its interaction with gender role conflict. In that study those who reported higher levels of athletic identity reported higher levels of gender role conflict (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010). This is an important foundation for future work. Assessment models specifically geared towards athletic identity such as the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS) could be added on to the study to further analyze how both male student-athletes and male student-athletes identify with athletic identity and how that connects with academic motivation and academic progress (Brewer & Cornelius, 2002). It also may address the potential confounding variable of identifying the non-athlete male who very much connects with athletic identity similar to a sanctioned college student-athlete.

The researcher would like to see the research questions be developed into a mixed methods or purely qualitative study to gain a deeper understanding of gender role conflict related

to its relationship with academic motivation and academic progress in college males (Steinfeldt, Wong, Hagan, Hoag, & Steinfeldt, 2011). Utilizing the GRCS and AMS to develop a qualitative framework both for the general male population and for male student-athletes would provide a much richer understanding of how college males see themselves within these frameworks over the life span of their college career. Researchers gaining a better understanding of the potential connections between age, masculinity, and academic engagement would be of benefit to practitioners' future work with males (Wimer & Levant, 2011). This could also more effectively allow future studies to understand RE and RABBM within the context of college males. It is powerful to reflect on how these gender role factors, developed more than three decades ago, still demonstrate such a current connection for the male participants in the current study. This emphasizes a real need for seeking further understanding on the short and long-term impact these behaviors have on the academic success of college males. In the context of this quantitative study, GRC devaluation towards others was not assessed. Gaining a better understanding of how criticism of males, towards themselves or others, when conforming to, deviating away from, or violating typecast gender role norms associates with views towards academics would be of great benefit (O'Neil, 2015). It is important for researchers to continue to gain a better understanding of the possible influence of characteristics that influence behaviors within the various subculture male groups (i.e. male student-athletes).

Finally, it would be of great value to do a longitudinal study using the current makeup of this study as a framework. If the data tells us that males enroll, progress, and graduate at a lesser rate than females, there needs to be continued understanding gained of what characteristics may be identified within males that demonstrate a negative effect on academic progress (Diprete & Buchmann, 2013; Conger & Long, 2010). Evaluating survey results in relation to potential

variations in academic progress over the participants' college careers using academic data such as progress of credit hours earned over time, comparison of attempted versus earned hours over time, and GPA earned over time, would provide important insight into further understanding college males at the institution of study.

References

Adler, P., & Adler, P. A. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: the academic performance of college athletes. *Sociology of Education*, 241-250.

Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). *Academically adrift: limited learning on college campuses.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Astin, A. W. (2003). Studying how college affects students: a personal history of the CIRP. *About Campus*, *8(3)*, 21-28.

Blazina, C., Pisecco, S., & O'Neil, J. M. (2005). An adaptation of the gender role conflict scale for adolescents: psychometric issues and correlates with psychological distress. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6(1),* 39.

Bonura, C. F. (2009). A study of academic motivation of intercollegiate athletes and collegiate non-athletes (Doctoral dissertation, Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 1473499).

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

Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society, 8(4)*, 598-616.

Bem, S. L., & Lewis, S. A. (1975). Sex role adaptability: one consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *31(4*), 634.

Bembenutty, H. (2007). Self-regulation of learning and academic delay of gratification: gender and ethnic differences among college students. *Journal of advanced academics, 18(4)*, 586-616.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality.* Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Beron, K. J., & Piquero, A. R. (2016). Studying the determinants of student-athlete grade point average: the roles of identity, context, and academic interests. *Social Science Quarterly, 97(2)*, 142-160.

Biggs, J. B. (1987). Student approaches to learning and studying. Research Monograph. Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd. Hawthorn, Australia.

Brewer, B.W. & Cornelius, A.E. (2002). Norms and factorial invariance of the athletic identity measurement scale (AIMS). *The Academic Athletic Journal*, 103-113.

Brod, H. (Ed.). (1987). *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Brown, B. (2006). Shame resilience theory: A grounded theory study on women and shame. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, *87*(1), 43-52.

Brown, B. (2007). *I thought it was just me (but it isn't): making the journey from 'what will people think' to 'I am enough.'* New York, NY: Penguin.

Chafetz, J. S. (1974). *Masculinity/femininity or human? An overview of the sociology of sex-roles*. Itasca, Illinois. F.E. Peacock Publishers**.**

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity. the jossey-bass higher and adult education series*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clayton, O., Lucas Hewitt, C., & Gaffney, E. D. (2004). Reflecting on reconnecting males to higher education. *New directions for student services, 2004(107),* 9-22.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.).* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Conger, D., & Long, M. C. (2010). Why are men falling behind? Gender gaps in college performance and persistence. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 627(1)*, 184-214.

Connell, R. W., & Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., & Connell, R. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Oakland: University of California Press.

David, D. S., & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role.* New York, NY: Random House.

Davis, T. L. (2002). Voices of gender role conflict: The social construction of college men's identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, *43(4*), 508-517.

Davis, J. M., & Liang, C. T. (2015). A test of the mediating role of gender role conflict: Latino masculinities and help-seeking attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16(1),* 23.

DeAngelo, L., Franke, R., Hurtado, S., Pryor, J. H., & Tran, S. (2011). Completing college: assessing graduation rates at four-year institutions. *Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA*. 1-55.

DeBerard, M. S., Spielmans, G., & Julka, D. (2004). Predictors of academic achievement and retention among college freshmen: A longitudinal study. *College student journal, 38(1)*, 66-80.

DiPrete, T. A., & Buchmann, C. (2013). *The rise of women: the growing gender gap in education and what it means for American schools.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dundes, L. and Marx, J. (2006). Balancing work and academics in college: why do students working 10-19 hours per week excel? *Journal of College Student Retention, 8(1),* 107-120.

Dweck, C.S. (2006). *Mindset: the new psychology of success.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 50(2),* 210-228.

Eitzen, D. S., & George, H. Sage. 1997. *Sociology of north american sport.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Erikson, E. H. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle: selected papers.* Oxford, England: International University Presses.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. P., & Patton, L. L. & Renn, K. (2010). *Student development in college: theory, research and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G. & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175-191.

Fiorini, S., Liu, T., Shepard, L., & Ouimet, J. (2014, November). Using NSSE to understand student success: a multi-year analysis. In annual conference of the Indiana Association for Institutional Research, Indianapolis, IN (Vol. 5).

Flood, M. & Howson, R. (2015). *Engaging men in building gender equality.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Friedan, Betty (1963). The problem that has no name. In: Friedan, B., *The feminine mystique*. London: Victor Gollancz.

Galligan, S. B., Barnett, R. V., Brennan, M. A., & Israel, G. D. (2010). The effects of gender role conflict on adolescent and emerging adult male resiliency. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 18(1)*, 3-21.

Garnets, L., & Pleck, J. H. (1979). Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex role transcendence: A sex role strain analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3(3)*, 270-283.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: women's conceptions of self and of morality. *Harvard educational review*, *47*(4), 481-517.

Goldin, C., Katz, L. F., & Kuziemko, I. (2006). The homecoming of American college women: the reversal of the college gender gap. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *20*(4), 133-156.

Good, G. E., & Wood, P. K. (1995). Male gender role conflict, depression, and help seeking: do college men face double jeopardy? *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74(1*), 70-75.

Harris, J. R. (1998). *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Harris, F. & Harper, S.R. (2008). Masculinities go to community college: understanding male identity socialization and gender role conflict. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 142,* 25-35.

Hegarty, N. (2010). Application of the academic motivation scale to graduate school students. *The Journal of Human Resource and adult learning, 6(2)*, 48-55.

Huston, A. C. (1983). Sex-typing. *Handbook of child psychology*, *4*, 387-467. New York, NY: Wiley.

Jackson, C. (2003). Motives for 'laddishness' at school: fear of failure and fear of the 'feminine.' *British Educational Research Journal, 29(4)*, 583-598.

Jackson, D. (2003). Beyond one-dimensional models of masculinity: a life-course perspective on the processes of becoming masculine. *Auto/Biography, 11(1)*, 71-87.

Jackson, T., Weiss, K. E., Lundquist, J. J., & Hooper, D. (2003). The impact of hope, procrastination, and social activity on academic performance of midwestern college students. *Education, 124(2)*, 310-321.

Jackson, C., & Dempster, S. (2009). 'I sat back on my computer… with a bottle of whisky next to me': Constructing 'cool' masculinity through 'effortless' achievement in secondary and higher education. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *18*(4), 341-356.

Jones, K., Mendenhall, S., & Myers, C. A. (2016). The effects of sex and gender role identity on perceived stress and coping among traditional and nontraditional students. *Journal of American College Health*, *64(3),* 205-213.

Joyce, N. (2012). An empirical examination of the influence of personality, gender role conflict, and self-stigma on attitudes and intentions to seek online counseling in college students (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Akron.

Kahn, J. S., Brett, B. L., & Holmes, J. R. (2011). Concerns with men's academic motivation in higher education: An exploratory investigation of the role of masculinity. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 19(1)*, 65-82.

Kahn, J. H., & Nauta, M. M. (2001). Social-cognitive predictors of first-year college persistence: the importance of proximal assessment. *Research in higher education, 42(6)*, 633-652.

Kellom, G. E. (2004). *Developing effective programs and services for college men* (No. 105-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kelly, S. (2017). *The effects of gender role orientation, self esteem and self efficacy on help*

seeking behaviours and wellbeing (Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from https://esource.dbs.ie/bitstream/handle/10788/3307/hdip_kelly_s_2017.pdf?sequence=1

Kleinfeld, J. (2009). No map to manhood: Male and female mindsets behind the college gender gap. *Gender Issues*, *26(3-4*), 171.

Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland.* New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers.

Krugman, S. (1995). Male development and the transformation of shame. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *The new psychology of men* (pp. 91-126). New York: Basic Books.

Lance, L. M. (2004). Gender differences in perceived role conflict among university student-athletes. *College Student Journal, 38(2*), 179-191.

Lane, J. M., & Addis, M. E. (2005). Male gender role conflict and patterns of help seeking in Costa Rica and the United States. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6(3)*, 155.

Lau, M. Y., & Howard, G. S. (2005). Extreme response style: A review of the evidence, assessment and potential solutions to the problem. Poster presented at the Division, 17.

Leaper, C., & Van, S. R. (2008). Masculinity ideology, covert sexism, and perceived gender typicality in relation to young men's academic motivation and choices in college. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 9(3)*, 139.

Levant, R. F., & Pollack, W. S. (1995). *A new psychology of men*. New York: Basic Books.

Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the conformity to masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4(1)*, 3-25.

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *3*(5), 551.

Marrs, H. (2016). Conformity to masculine norms and academic engagement in college men.

Psychology of Men & Masculinity, *17*(2), 197-205.

Marrs, H., & Sigler, E. A. (2012). Male academic performance in college: The possible role of study strategies. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13(2)*, 227.

Marrs, H., Sigler, E. A., & Brammer, R. D. (2012). Gender, masculinity, femininity, and help seeking in college. *Masculinities & Social Change, 1(3*), 267-292.

Martin, S. B. (2005). High school and college athletes' attitudes toward sport psychology consulting. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 17(2)*, 127-139.

Matthews, J. S., Banerjee, M., & Lauermann, F. (2014). Academic identity formation and motivation among ethnic minority adolescents: The role of the "self" between internal and external perceptions of identity. *Child development*, *85*(6), 2355-2373.

McDaniel, A. (2012). Women's advantage in higher education: towards understanding a global phenomenon. *Sociology Compass, 6(7*), 581-595.

Melendez, M.C. (2006). The influence of athletic participation on the college adjustment of freshmen and sophomore student athletes. *College Student Retention, 8(1)*, 39-55.

Messner, M. A. (1992). *Power at play: sports and the problem of masculinity.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Microsoft Office 365 (2017 March). Compliance framework for industry standards and regulations. Retrieved from https://go.microsoft.com/fwlink/p/?LinkId=615657

Monda, S. J., Etzel, E. F., Shannon, V. R., & Wooding, C. B (2015). Understanding the academic experiences of freshman football athletes: insight for sport psychology professionals. *Athletics Insights, 7(2)*, 115-128.

Money, J. & Ehrhardt, A. (1972). *Man and woman, boy and girl*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Morris, E. W. (2008). "Rednecks, rutters," and rithmetic: social class, masculinity, and schooling in a rural context. *Gender & Society, 22(6*), 728-751.

National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (2017). Signature 12 supplement: completing college: a national view of student attainment rates by race and ethnicity – fall 2010 cohort. Retrieved from https://nscresearchcenter.org/signaturereport12-supplement-2/

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). 2010. Major differences: examining student engagement by field of study; annual results 2010.

O'Neil, J.M. (2015). *Men's gender role conflict: psychological cost, consequences, and an agenda for change.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

O'Neil, J. M. (2013). Gender role conflict research 30 years later: An evidence-based diagnostic schema to assess boys and men in counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 91(4)*, 490-498.

O'Neil, J. M. (1982). Gender-role conflict and strain in men's lives. In *Men in transition* (pp. 5-44). Boston, MA: Springer.

O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel & Guidance Journal. 60*, 203-210.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex roles, 14(5)*, 335-350.

O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the Gender Role Conflict Scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36(3)*, 358-445.

Osborne, J. W., & Jones, B. D. (2011). Identification with academics and motivation to achieve

in school: How the structure of the self influences academic outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review, 23(1)*, 131-158.

Pleck, J. H. (2017). Foreword: A brief history of the psychology of men and masculinities. In R. L. Levant & Y. J. Wong (Eds.), *The psychology of men and masculinities* (pp. xi-xxi). Washington: APA Books.

Pleck, J.H. (1983). The theory of male sex role identity: Its rise and fall, 1936 to the present. In H. Brod (Ed.), *The making of masculinities: the new men's studies* (pp. 21-38). Boston, MA: Allen and Unwin Hyman, 1987.

Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pollack (1995) (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 91–126). New York, NY: Basic.

Pollack, W.S. (2000). *Real boys' voices.* New York, NY: Random House.

Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58(3)*, 307-321.

Robidoux, M. (2001). *Men at play: a working understanding of professional hockey*. Montreal, Quebec: McGill-Queen's Press.

Robst, J., & Keil, J. (2000). The relationship between athletic participation and academic performance: evidence from NCAA Division III. *Applied Economics, 32(5),* 547-558.

Salgado, D.M. (2003). "2003 Campus Compact Annual Membership Survey." Retrieved from https://compact.org/resource-posts/2003-annual-membership-survey/

Sander, L. (2012). Colleges confront a gender gap in student engagement. Chronicle of Higher Education.

Sax, L. J. (2008). *The gender gap in college: maximizing the developmental potential of women and men*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shepard, S. J., Nicpon, M. F., Haley, J. T., Lind, M., & Liu, W. M. (2011). Masculine norms, school attitudes, and psychosocial adjustment among gifted boys. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12(2)*, 181-187.

Smyth, L., Mavor, K. I., Platow, M. J., Grace, D. M., & Reynolds, K. J. (2015). Discipline social identification, study norms and learning approach in university students. *Educational Psychology*, *35(1*), 53-72.

Snyder, T. D., Dillow, S. A., & Hoffman, C. M. (2008). Digest of Education Statistics, 2007. NCES 2008-022. *National Center for Education Statistics*.

Stanzione, D. (2005). Male gender role strain, coping, and college adjustment. ProQuest dissertations digital database (Publication No. AAT 3171005).

Stebleton, M.J. & Soria, K.M. (2012). Breaking down barriers: academic obstacles of first-generation students at research universities. *Learning Assistance Review, 17*, 7-20.

Steinfeldt, J. A., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2010). Gender role conflict, athletic identity, and help-seeking among high school football players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 22(3),* 262-273.

Steinfeldt, J. A., Steinfeldt, M. C., England, B., & Speight, Q. L. (2009). Gender role conflict and stigma toward help seeking among college football players. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10(4)*, 261-272.

Steinfeldt, J. A., Wong, Y. J., Hagan, A. R., Hoag, J. M., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2011). A contextual examination of gender role conflict among college football players. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12(4)*, 311-323.

Strambler, M. J., Linke, L. H., & Ward, N. L. (2013). Academic identification as a mediator of

the relationship between parental socialization and academic achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *38*(1), 99-106.

Swain, J. (2004). The resources and strategies that 10–11-year-old boys use to construct masculinities in the school setting. *British Educational Research Journal*, *30(1),* 167-185.

Swain, J. (2005). Masculinities in education. In M. Kimmel, J. Hearn, & R.W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 213-229). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Terman, L. & Miles, C. (1936). *Sex and personality*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

The Power of International Education (2017). 2017 open doors report on international educational exchange data. Retrieved from https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Data/US-Study-Abroad/Student-Profile

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2014). The condition of education 2014 (NCES 2014-083). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.

Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senecal, C., & Vallieres, E.F. (1993). On the assessment of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education: evidence on the concurrent and construct validity of the academic motivation scale. *Educational and psychological measurement, 53(1)*, 159-172.

Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Briere, N. M., Senecal, C., & Vallieres, E. F. (1992). The Academic Motivation Scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education. *Educational and psychological measurement, 52(4*), 1003-1017.

Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C. B., & Vallières, E. F.

(1992). Academic motivation scale (AMS C 28): College version. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*, 1003-1017.

Watts Jr, R. H., & Borders, L. D. (2005). Boys' perceptions of the male role: Understanding gender role conflict in adolescent males. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 13(2)*, 267-280.

Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2010). Where the guys are: Males in higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 42(3)*, 29-35.

Whannel, G. (2007). Mediating masculinities: the production of media representations in sport. In C. C. Aitchison (Ed.), *Sport and gender identities: Masculinities, femininities and sexualities* (pp. 7-21). New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Wimer, D. J., & Levant, R. F. (2011). The relation of masculinity and help-seeking style with the academic help-seeking behavior of college men. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 19(3)*, 256-274.

Appendix A

Gender Role Conflict Scale

GENDER ROLE CONFLICT SCALE -I (GRCS-I)

Dr. James M. O'Neil
Department of Educational Psychology
Neag School of Education
249 Glenbrook Road, Road, U-2064
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT. 06269-2058
Jimoneil1@aol.com

RELEASE FORM FOR THE GENDER ROLE CONFLICT SCALE (GRCS)

NAME _____

ADDRESS_____
_____
_____ ZIP CODE_____

E-MAIL ADDRESS_____

PHONE_____ (WORK)
_____ (HOME)

1._____ Yes, I plan to use the Gender Role Conflict Scale in my research.

2. Please briefly describe your research project, if possible, including the nature of your sample and any other scales to be used. (Use reverse side if necessary)

3. How many subjects do you expect will complete the GRCS? _____

4. If this research is a supervised undergraduate thesis, master's thesis or doctoral dissertation, who is supervising your research? Please give faculty member's name, address, and phone number.
Name_____
Address_____
_____
_____Zip Code _____
Phone (If known) _____

I agree to send the results to the study to Dr. Jim O'Neil upon completion of research to be included on the Gender Role Conflict Research Program Web Page and in any future reviews of the literature on men's gender role conflict. This means sending me copies of the thesis, dissertation, convention presentation, and submitted or published journal article that describes the research's rationale, methods, results, and discussion.

Signature _____ Date _____

Retain one copy of this release for your records and before the research is implemented return one to:

Dr. James M. O'Neil
Department of Educational Psychology
249 Glenbrook Road, Road, U-2064
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269-2064
FAX: 860-486-3452
E-MAIL: oneil@uconnvm.uconn.edu
Jimoneil1@aol.com

1. Age: _____

2. Educational Level: (Check the highest level that fits you.)

____High School Diploma ____Freshman ____Sophomore ____Junior ____Senior

____Master's Degree ____Ph.D. ____Other

3. Present Marital Status: ____Married ____Single ____Divorced ____Remarried

4. Race: ____White ____Black ____Hispanic ____Asian American

Instructions: In the space to the left of each sentence below, write the number that most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for.

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

1. ____ Moving up the career ladder is important to me.

2. ____ I have difficulty telling others I care about them.

3. ____ Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.
4. ____ I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.
5. ____ Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.
6. ____ Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.
7. ____ Affection with other men makes me tense.
8. ____ I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.
9. ____ Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.
10. ____ Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.
11. ____ My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.
12. ____ I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

---

13. ____Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me.
14. ____ I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.
15. ____ I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.
16. ____ Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.
17. ____ Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
18. ____ Doing well all the time is important to me.
19. ____ I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.
20. ____ Hugging other men is difficult for me.
21. ____ I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.

22. ____ Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.

23. ____ Competing with others is the best way to succeed.

24. ____ Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.

25. ____ I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.

26. ____ I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.

27. ____ My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than would like.

28. ____ I strive to be more successful than others.

29. ____ I do not like to show my emotions to other people.

30. ____ Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

31. ____ My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).

32. ____I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.

33. ____Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.

34. ____Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.

35. ____ Men who are overly friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).

36. ____ Overwork and stress caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school,

affects/hurts my life.

37. ____ I like to feel superior to other people.

FACTOR STRUCTURE

Factor 1 - Success, Power, Competition (13 items)

Items – 1, 5, 8, 12, 14, 18, 21, 23, 24, 28, 32, 34, 37

Factor 2 – Restrictive Emotionality (10 items)

Items – 2, 6, 9, 13, 15, 19, 22, 25, 29, 30

Factor 3 – Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (8 items)

Items – 3, 7, 10, 16, 20, 26, 33, 35

Factor 4 – Conflicts Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations (6 items)

Items – 4, 11, 17, 27, 31, 36

Total Number of Items = 37

Appendix B

Academic Motivation Scale – College Version

Scale Description

This scale assesses 7 types of constructs: intrinsic motivation towards knowledge, accomplishments, and stimulation, as well as external, introjected and identified regulations, and finally amotivation. It contains 28 items (4 items per subscale) assessed on a 7-point scale.

References

Vallerand, R.J., Blais, M.R., Brière, N.M., & Pelletier, L.G. (1989). Construction et validation de l'Échelle de Motivation en Éducation (EME). Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 21, 323-349.

ACADEMIC MOTIVATION SCALE (AMS-C 28)

COLLEGE VERSION

Robert J. Vallerand, Luc G. Pelletier, Marc R. Blais, Nathalie M. Brière,
Caroline B. Senécal, Évelyne F. Vallières, 1992-1993

Educational and Psychological Measurement, vols. 52 and 53

WHY DO YOU GO TO COLLEGE?

Using the scale below, indicate to what extent each of the following items presently corresponds to one of the reasons why you go to college.

Does not correspond at all		Corresponds a little		Corresponds moderately		Corresponds a lot	Corresponds exactly
1	2	3		4	5	6	7

WHY DO YOU GO TO COLLEGE?

---

1. Because with only a high-school degree I would not

find a high-paying job later on. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Because I experience pleasure and satisfaction while learning new things. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Because I think that a college education will help me better prepare for the career I have chosen. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. For the intense feelings I experience when I am communicating my own ideas to others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Honestly, I don't know; I really feel that I am wasting my time in school. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. For the pleasure I experience while surpassing myself in my studies. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. To prove to myself that I am capable of completing my college degree. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. In order to obtain a more prestigious job later on. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. For the pleasure I experience when I discover new things never seen before. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. Because eventually it will enable me to enter the job market in a field that I like. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. For the pleasure that I experience when I read interesting authors. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I once had good reasons for going to college; however, now I wonder whether I should continue. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. For the pleasure that I experience while I am surpassing myself in one of my personal accomplishments. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Because of the fact that when I succeed in college I feel important. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Because I want to have "the good life" later on. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. For the pleasure that I experience in broadening my knowledge about subjects which appeal to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. Because this will help me make a better choice regarding my career orientation. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. For the pleasure that I experience when I feel completely absorbed by what certain authors have written. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I can't see why I go to college and frankly, I couldn't care less. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. For the satisfaction I feel when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult academic activities. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. To show myself that I am an intelligent person. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. In order to have a better salary later on. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Because my studies allow me to continue to learn about many things that interest me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. Because I believe that a few additional years of education will improve my competence as a worker. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. For the "high" feeling that I experience while reading about various interesting subjects. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I don't know; I can't understand what I am doing in school. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. Because college allows me to experience a personal satisfaction in my quest for excellence in my studies. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. Because I want to show myself that I can succeed in my studies. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

KEY FOR AMS-28

2, 9, 16, 23 Intrinsic motivation - to know

6, 13, 20, 27 Intrinsic motivation - toward accomplishment

4, 11, 18, 25 Intrinsic motivation - to experience stimulation

3, 10, 17, 24 Extrinsic motivation - identified

7, 14, 21, 28 Extrinsic motivation - introjected

1, 8, 15, 22 Extrinsic motivation - external regulation

5, 12, 19, 26 Amotivation

Appendix C

Gender Role Conflict Scale – Adjusted Version

GENDER ROLE CONFLICT SCALE -I (GRCS-I)

Institution Student ID # _____

Instructions: In the space to the left of each sentence below, write the number that most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for.

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

1. ___ _ Moving up the career ladder is important to me.

2. ____ I have difficulty telling others I care about them.

3. ____Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.

4. ____ I feel torn between my hectic work schedule or athletic schedule, and caring for my health.

5. ____ Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.

6. ____ Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.

7. ____ Affection with other men makes me tense.

8. ____ I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.

9. ____ Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.

10. ____ Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.

11. ____ My career, job, athletic commitment, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.

12. ____ I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

---

13. ____Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me.

14. ____ I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.

15. ____ I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.

16. ____ Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.

17. ____ Finding time to relax is difficult for me.

18. ____ Doing well all the time is important to me.

19. ____ I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.

20. ____ Hugging other men is difficult for me.

21. ____ I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.

22. ____ Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.

23. ____ Competing with others is the best way to succeed.

24. ____ Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.

25. ____ I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.

26. ____ I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.

27. ____ My needs to work, play sport, or study keep me from my family or leisure more than would like.

28. ____ I strive to be more successful than others.

29. ____ I do not like to show my emotions to other people.

30. ____ Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

31. ____ My work, athletic commitment, or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).

32. ____ I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work, athletics, or school.

33. ____Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.

34. ____Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.

35. ____ Men who are overly friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).

36. ____ Overwork and stress caused by a need to achieve on the job, in my athletics commitment, or in school, affects/hurts my life.

37. ___ I like to feel superior to other people.

Appendix D

Informed Consent

Gender Role Conflict, Academic Motivation & Its Impact on Academic Progress for Male Student-Athletes and Male Non-Student Athletes

Dear Bellarmine University Student:

You are being invited to answer the attached questionnaires to help better understand the impact of male gender role conflict (where societally influenced male gender roles have negative consequences on the male or others) and motivation have on academic progress with males who participate in Division II athletics and males who do not participate in Division II athletics. There are no risks or penalties for your participation in this research study but your participation may or may not benefit you directly. There will be approximately 100 subjects participating in this study. The information learned in this study may be helpful to others. The data you provide will *aid in* continuing to better grasp if these factors have a relationship with one another. If there are gender role conflict characteristics that demonstrate a negative connection with academic motivation and academic progress, the hope would be that in the future these factors could be assessed early on. Intervention strategies could be created and introduced early on for those who identify as having gender role conflict characteristics that negatively connect with academic progress**.** The questionnaires will take less than 10 minutes to complete. Your online consent form and completed questionnaire will be stored in the possession of Andrew Schroeder in a password protected computer file at his home residence or a password protected computer file in his office, B05B in the W.L. Lyons Brown Library on Bellarmine's campus**.** Individuals from the Annsley Frazier Thornton School of Education and the Bellarmine University Institutional Review Board may inspect these records. In all other respects, however, the data will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Should the data be published, your identity will not be disclosed.

Please remember that your participation in this study is voluntary. By completing and returning the attached questionnaire, you are voluntarily agreeing to participate. You are free to decline to answer any particular question that may make you feel uncomfortable or which may render you prosecutable under law. **Your participation in the study provides permission for the researcher to access your educational records.**

You acknowledge that all your present questions have been answered in language you can understand. If you have any questions about the study, please contact Andrew Schroeder at 502-645-8958. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Institutional Review Board (IRB) office at 502-272-8032. You will be given the opportunity to discuss any questions about your rights as a research subject, in confidence, with a member of the committee. This is an independent committee composed of members of the University community and lay members of the community not connected with this institution. The IRB has reviewed this study.

Sincerely,

Andrew Schroeder

Click the following link to proceed with the research study: