UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

Graduate Studies

BECOMING MEN: HOW GAY AND BISEXUAL COLLEGE MALES NAVIGATE MASCULINITY ON CAMPUS

A Chapter Style Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Education

Richard B. Anderson

College of Liberal Studies
Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education

May, 2012

BECOMING MEN: HOW GAY AND BISEXUAL COLLEGE MALES NAVIGATE MASCULINITY ON CAMPUS

By Richard B. Anderson

We recommend acceptance of this thesis in partial fulfillment of the candidate's requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Education.

The candidate has completed the oral defense of the thesis.

Larry Ringgenberg, Ph.D. — 4/18/2012
Thesis Committee Chairperson — Date

Ryan McKelley, Ph.D. — 4/18/2012
Thesis Committee Member — Date

Christine Bakkum, Ph.D. — 4/18/2012
Thesis Committee Member — Date

Thesis accepted

Robert H. Hoar, Ph.D. — 5/25/2012
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs — Date

ABSTRACT

Anderson, R. B. Becoming men: How gay and bisexual college males navigate masculinity on campus. MS in Education, May 2012, 70pp. (L. Ringgenberg)

This study is a qualitative examination of the development of masculine gender identities in gay and bisexual male students enrolled at a state institution in the Midwest. Seven male students volunteered to participate in the study. Results showed participants' ability to adapt gender expressions based on environment, the positive effects of coming out, and the importance of a positive campus climate toward sexual minorities. Recommendations include a call for offices and services directed at LGBT students to encourage students' gender identity development, particularly in helping male students to understand how sexism and heterosexism work to oppress them as men as well as for greater collaboration among professionals to develop students' identities holistically.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to the seven young men who took the time to share their experiences with me and who provided the foundation for my research. Their eagerness to open up and disclose their struggles to each other and their ability to keep me laughing are greatly appreciated.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance and support of the members of my Thesis Committee: Larry Ringgenberg, Ph.D., my Committee Chair, for his hours spent reading my revisions and for his insight and guidance. I thank Ryan McKelley, Ph.D., for his many suggestions and thoughtful comments. His experience in researching male student populations was both helpful and appreciated. I additionally appreciate the guidance and support of Christine Bakkum, Ph.D. as a professor and committee member.

I would like to acknowledge the support provided by Jörg Vianden, Ed.D., for his support and input at a critical moment and for helping to shape my writing. Further appreciation is extended to my Maryke Taute, M.S., for keeping me on track and helping me to balance my time commitments in my assistantship. I thank my student staff team in Hutchison Hall for the constant encouragement and inspiration, and other student staff across campus for the tweets, texts, and emails of support.

Finally I would like to acknowledge my family for their support of me in this process, without whom I could never have pursued postsecondary education, and my partner, Ramon Martinez, who supports me with his love and encouragement every day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION 1

Problem Statement 1

Previous Studies and Deficiencies 1

Significance of Study 2

Purpose Statement 3

Research Questions 4

Definitions 4

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 8

Idealized Masculinity 8

Heterosexual Expectations 8

Alcohol as a Gender Construct and Enforcer 9

Language as a Means to Degrade Femininity 10

Gay and Bisexual Men as Gender Deviants 11

Gay and Bisexual Masculinity 12

Campus Climate 12

Gay and Bisexual Student Experiences 14

Experiences in Communities of Color 15

Theoretical Frameworks 16

Masculinity Theories 16

Queer Theories 18

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY 19

Research Design 19

Research Site 20

Participant Sampling 20

Procedures 21

Data Analysis 22

Participant Confidentiality 22

Trustworthiness Strategies 23

Participant Characteristics 23

CHAPTER IV RESULTS 25

Introduction 25

Participant Overview 25

Table 1. Demographic Data of Study Participants 26

Masculinity as Defined by Participants 28

Concealing Identity 29

“I Just Put on the Masculine Face.” 29

Family Relations 30

Benefits and Consequences 31

Sexual Identity Development 32
Disclosure of Sexuality 32
Reconciliation of Masculinity 33
Student Involvement 33
Campus Climate 34
On Campus 34
Classroom 36
Off Campus 37
Peer Relations 37
Straight Males 37
Straight Females 38
Other Gay and Bisexual Males 39
CHAPTER V DISCUSSION 40
Summary of Findings 40
Implications and Recommendations 42
Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research 43
REFERENCES 45
APPENDICES 50

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX PAGE

A. Electronic communications 50

B. Focus group questions 53

C. Informed consent form 57

D. Institutional review board approval 59

E. Demographic data form 61

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Over the last decade, the nation's views toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons have changed dramatically, but not without controversy. Certainly, the legislation of the time reflects this. With near-daily discussion of marriage equality, nondiscrimination laws, and the recent surge in anti-bullying laws, LGBT people have moved to the forefront of the American conscious. The young gay and bisexual men in college today grew up during this time, arguably the most LGBT-friendly era in history, and likely view their sexuality differently than older gay and bisexual men. However, no comprehensive study on this population has been completed since the early 1990s, and there remains no theoretical framework to guide the helping work of student affairs professionals.

These students face the same conflicts as their heterosexual peers, albeit sometimes in different ways. However, there is little extant literature exploring gender as it relates to both men *and* women. Harper and Harris III (2010) assert current research has resulted in discussion *of* men, but not *about* them.

Previous Studies and Deficiencies

While the literature has begun to discuss the experiences of these young men, it remains largely incomplete. Rhoads (1994) conducted a study exploring the experiences

of gay students nearly two decades ago, leaving it stale and, in some ways, irrelevant. Additionally, current research focuses on the experiences of all LGBT people, often failing to account for the differences in lived experiences of men and women (Abreu, 2008; Bilodeau & Renn, 2005; Campus Pride, 2010; Cooley, 2009; Evans, 2009; Poynter & Washington, 2005).

Studies of masculinity have often been too broad, studying all college men and failing to account for gay and bisexual men (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Edwards & Jones, 2009; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). Those studies that have included gay and bisexual college men use the men as pieces of a larger model of masculinity that holds heterosexuality as the norm (Adams, 2011; Giles, 1999; Harris III & Struve, 2009). Additionally, several studies include information about gay and bisexual men, but do not include them as participants (Abreu, 2008; Evans, 2009; Pascoe, 2005; Theodore & Basow, 2000). Existing student development theories are assumed to account for the experiences of men, but are not universally applicable (Harper and Harris III, 2010).

At the institution where the study is to be conducted, attention has begun to be paid to this population through collaboration between the Pride Center, an office for LGBT students, a faculty member, and the Office of Residence Life. A group of gay and bisexual students meets weekly to discuss various topics and share their experiences with their peers.

Significance of Study

Only a few studies have looked at the ways in which gay and bisexual college men navigate their campuses and develop unique masculine identities (Gresham, 2009; Holland & Holley, 2011; Rhoads, 1994, 1997). This study will add to the growing

collection of literature surrounding the experiences of gay and bisexual men, specifically those enrolled as students at colleges and universities. This study seeks to fill the existing deficits in the literature by addressing the ways in which gay and bisexual students experience the college setting, how gay and bisexual students perceive masculinity, and how gay and bisexual students create and exhibit their own masculine gender identities. Ignorance of this process inhibits student affairs professionals from properly helping students in need and from understanding students as whole persons, instead of beings made up of disparate, isolated identities. This study seeks to rectify this situation, providing a medium to share the experiences of these students and a means to contribute to the literature. This information could better inform administrators as to how gay and bisexual college men think and feel, which may be of asset when considering policies like gender-neutral housing, adding sexual orientation to a nondiscrimination statement, or when forming a campus resource center for men.

Purpose Statement

The objective of this study is to explore how gay and bisexual college men develop and interpret their varied masculine identities. Through discussion with participants, the researcher hopes to describe and understand the experiences of these young men. Data collection, analysis, and the process of research were constructed under a phenomenological research strategy of inquiry. The population included all students enrolled at the research site who identified as men and as a non-heterosexual person. The sample includes seven young men identified through key faculty and staff gatekeepers at the research site. More information about each individual is included in the "Results" section.

Research took place at a mid-sized, comprehensive, public university in the upper Midwest of the United States. Roughly one-third of students live in the campus' residence halls, primarily freshmen and sophomores. The campus is known for its academic rigor and the fitness and wellness of its student population. The city surrounding the institution is small and has been increasingly known for its excessive use of alcohol at an annual festival in the fall. The study is limited only to men who openly identify as a non-heterosexual person, either as gay, bisexual, or another queer identity. Additionally, it is limited only to men at a specific institution at a specific geographic location. Similarly to Rhoads (1997, p. 276), the "focus on men reflects the fact that lesbian and bisexual women constitute a separate student subculture at the university under study."

Research Questions

Central question: How do gay and bisexual male students at a medium comprehensive institution of higher education interpret the concept of masculinity as applied to their own gender identities?

Guiding secondary questions: (1) What is it like to be a gay or bisexual male student on the research site campus? (2) How do participants integrate sexual identities with gendered ones? (3) How do the masculinities of gay and bisexual male students differ from those of their straight peers, as described in the literature?

Definitions

The definitions listed below serve as a reference for various chapters in this thesis. While some are included to provide context, others are informative. It is worth noting

this thesis was written with a strong social constructionist perspective, relying on the postmodern paradigm in regards to identities.

Bisexual – The potential to be attracted, romantically and/or sexually, to people of more than one sex, not necessarily at the same time, not necessarily in the same way, and not necessarily to the same degree (Ochs & Rowley, 2005, p. 8). Though the term implies there are but two sexes, the bisexual community today includes pansexual and other fluid sexual orientations as well.

Camp – Reflects an attitude about one's sexual orientation and how that gets enacted in public. More specifically, camp involves acting in a flamboyant and effeminate manner (Rhoads, 1994, p. 125).

Campus Climate – Simply, the current attitudes, behavior and standards, and practices of employees and students of an institution (Rankin and Reason, 2008, as cited in Campus Pride, 2010). Additionally, Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Perderson, and Allen (1998, as cited in Campus Pride, 2010) defined four interrelated dimensions of the campus climate: an institution's historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion of various racial or ethnic groups; structural diversity in terms of the number of racial or ethnic groups presented on campus; psychological climate consisting of perceptions and attitudes between and among groups; and behavioral climate characterized from intergroup relations on campus. Though this framework refers primarily to racial and ethnic diversity, it has been extended to include sexual orientation and gender identity within the context of this thesis.

Coming out – Short for the phrase "coming out of the closet"; the process of openly acknowledging one's same-sex attractions (Rhoads, 1994, p. 7); can be internal or shared externally.

Gay – Finding a definition for this term proved difficult. Potential sources were so dated they could not accurately describe the modern young gay man, and yet, contemporary sources assumed the reader knew just exactly what gay meant. Relying on the voices of the research participants became the only adequate approach. As participant Charles stated, "Gay is defined as a male who is emotionally, spiritually, and physically attracted to other males. It's not defined by how you dress or how you act, only your preference for whom you are attracted." Mark went on to add, "Gay, to me, also means minority. I'm automatically on the fringe of most of my social groups. In today's society I identify being gay with trouble/difficulty ahead."

Gender – Refers to the societally-determined characteristics of a particular sex; these Characteristics are commonly referred to as "feminine" and "masculine." Different societies have different ideas about what it means to be feminine or masculine and how people are expected to act (Tanis, 2009).

Gender identity – An individual's internal sense of being male, female, or something else. Since gender identity is internal, one's gender identity is not necessarily visible to others ("Transgender Terminology," 2009).

Gender expression – How a person represents or expresses one's gender identity to others, often through behavior, clothing, hairstyles, voice or body characteristics ("Transgender Terminology," 2009).

Hegemony – A sociological term used to describe the dominance of one group over another. In the case of hegemonic masculinity, traditional masculine qualities are given a place of honour [sic] while traditional feminine qualities are devalued (Connell, 1995, as cited in Brown & Alderson, 2010).

Heterosexual/straight- A person who is emotionally, spiritually, and physically attracted to a person of a gender different than their own. This definition is borrowed from participant Charles' definition of "gay" (see above).

Masculinity – The act of displaying characteristics generally associated with males. The research participants listed being employed, consuming alcohol, interest in sports, hunting, and hiding emotions as traditional male roles.

Queer – "Identifying as queer connotes a sense of pride and openness about one's same-sex desires as well as a degree of hostility toward heterosexism" (Rhoads, 1994, p. 3). Individuals who identify as queer do so to resist the restrictions placed on them by others. It is subtly political, but also fluid.

Sex – Refers to the designation of the biological differences between females and males (Tanis, 2009).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Idealized Masculinity

Heterosexual Expectations

An understanding of the development of masculine identities in males is necessary prior to beginning to evaluate similar processes in gay and bisexual men. Men, specifically those who are heterosexual, face stricter gender confines than do women. They are expected to be competitive, in control of their emotions or unemotional all together, aggressive, responsible, in a position of authority, rational, strong, successful, tough, prone to breaking rules, and the primary breadwinner in their relationships with women (Edwards & Jones, 2009). A heterosexual male identity is assumed to develop naturally, yet men are still expected to prove that this development has occurred. This is done by drinking excessively, having lots of sex with women to prove they are heterosexual, refraining from physically expressing emotion, using anti-homosexual epithets, and challenging established laws, among other things (Pascoe, 2005; Peralta, 2007. Men's sexual identities interact with cultural pressures to produce stress over their gendered selves (Brown & Alderson, 2010). If at any time a man views himself as less masculine than what he perceives to be the societal norm, he has to work hard to overcome that either by altering the gender role to fit his needs or by exaggerating those aspects of his personality that more easily conform to that norm (Brown & Alderson, 2010). It should

be noted that gender norms are constantly changing for both men and women, and emerging liberal and inclusive forms of masculinity are leading to great acceptance of gay and bisexual men. Much of this is due to changes in organized sports, a backbone of the masculine ideal (Adams, 2011; Harris III & Struve, 2009; Stewart, 2008).

Alcohol as a Gender Construct and Enforcer

Throughout the history of higher education, alcohol has consistently played a role in the social lives of college students. The general public holds an image of university campuses as havens for wild, party-crazed students, especially those who live near these institutions. For many students, alcohol helps to spur conversations with potential friends and intimate partners, but has different meanings for men and women. When viewed as a social phenomenon, alcohol reinforces the gender constructs of both masculinity and femininity. According to Landrine, Bardwell, and Dean (1988), drunkenness may be an aspect of the concept of masculinity. College men use alcohol as a means of maintaining their masculine identity and sense of power. This identity can be characterized as wild, tough, popular, youthful, aggressive, competitive, confident, and anti-feminine (Schacht, as cited in Peralta, 2007). This perception is important if the presentation of masculinity is to be accepted as valid by the male's peer group. Because masculinity needs to be reproduced through social settings, men can prove their toughness through telling stories of drunken experiences and behaviors (Giles, 1999).

Peralta (2007) found both men and women, regardless of sexual orientation, believe that heavy drinking is indicative of masculinity accomplishment. For gay and bisexual college men, attempting to maintain this level of masculinity can be difficult because they are already perceived to be more feminine and of less social status by their

peers. In an interview with an openly gay, European American student, Peralta (2007) shares that the student was labeled a "fruit" among those in his residence hall because he did not engage in heavy drinking. Conversely, David, also gay and European American, drank to excess when interacting with heterosexual peers in order to compensate for his lack of athletic ability. He achieved social status by proving he could "party with the boys" (Peralta, 2007). For one student, the expectation to drink was simply too much, causing him to avoid social interactions with other male students and form connections with females, thus altering his personal definition of masculinity. This raises interesting concerns about the student's ability to create his own masculine gender identity within dominantly male spaces. Despite the awareness of the harmful consequences of viewing frequent intoxication as a symbol of their maleness, the homosexual students, including lesbians, interviewed in Peralta's study were no less likely to agree with gendered statements about alcohol than their heterosexual peers.

Language as a Means to Degrade Femininity

Another way in which heterosexual men can prove their heterosexuality to their peers is by using language that demeans and degrades femininity. This includes not only women, but gay and bisexual men as well. Femininity is widely regarded as a passive gender, and in terms of sexual roles, women traditionally have adopted a passive, penetrated role. Since some gay and bisexual men may choose to engage in receptive anal intercourse, it becomes easy to categorize them as feminine and treat them with the same degrading behaviors usually reserved for women. Gay men, and to some extent bisexual men as well, represent a masculinity that is devoid of power, which posits them in contradiction to traditional heterosexual masculinity (Pascoe, 2005). In order to

alleviate the stress that performing the gendered tasks expected by society, heterosexual men can use epithets against gay and bisexual men as a way to show their personal commitment to the patriarchal system that supports their own hegemonic masculinity (Brown & Alderson, 2010). Indeed, the word "faggot" is one of the worst things a man can be called (Pascoe, 2005). Whereas heterosexual men are expected to frequently engage in sexual intercourse with other women in order to affirm their own sexual identities (Peralta, 2007), and those that do adopt traditional constructions of masculinity are more likely to engage in risky sexual behavior (Hamilton & Mahalik, 2009), some insults against gay and bisexual men may be a response by heterosexual men to demonstrate their knowledge of hegemonic masculinity with the intent of appearing sexually attractive to heterosexual women (Brown & Alderson, 2010). Additionally, heterosexual men may use anti-queer insults to gain and secure access to the power and privileges associated with hegemonic masculinity and to avoid being labeled feminine themselves (Brown & Alderson). It is important to note that, while the use of anti-queer insults is certainly homophobic, they are specifically of a gendered homophobia. Females rarely use insults that refer to another women's sexuality, but men use such words amongst each other at rates up to eight times as often (Pascoe, 2005). When labeled a "faggot" themselves, men can pass that identity on to other men by labeling them as such, and showing their commitment to the system. They are often unknowingly perpetuating the use of such language under the guise of fun or jest (Pascoe, 2005).

Gay and Bisexual Men as Gender Deviants

Gay and bisexual men are often assumed to be feminine and this perceived deviancy from gender expectations can cause stress on them as men (Eisler & Skidmore,

1987; Theodore & Bassow, 2000). Heterosexual masculinity requires men to have sex with women in order to maintain their male identity (Johnson, 2005) and failure to do so by gay and bisexual men compromises their attempts at developing a masculine identity of their own. Additional expectations of men include acting wild, tough, popular, youthful, aggressive, competitive, confident, and anti-feminine (Peralta, 2007). Hegemony is a sociological term used to describe the dominance of one group over another (Brown & Alderson, 2010). Hegemonic masculinity is the configuration of male gender practices that serves to legitimize patriarchy and heterosexuality, guaranteeing the dominant position of men and heterosexuals and the subordination of women and non-heterosexuals (Johnson, 2005; Brown & Alderson, 2010). Since hegemonic masculinity excludes gay and bisexual men from accessing power in society, and all men, regardless of sexual orientation, are expected to support this setup, gay and bisexual men find themselves in a position directly opposed to it. On this subject, "Robert," a white, gay and transgender student stated "being gay just completely disqualifies you . . . you just have to kind of make it [gay masculinity] up on your own. And so it is kind of inter-self defined" (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Although gay and bisexual men challenge the power structure of hegemonic masculinity, their existence is required to sustain it through their own social subordination (Johnson, 2005).

Gay and Bisexual Masculinity

Campus Climate

Rhoads' (1997) explorative account of GB college men exposed an unfriendly climate toward nonheterosexual people. One student stated he would be embarrassed to walk with another student who was wearing clothing indicating his sexuality because it

represented weakness. College campuses have traditionally not been very welcoming to nonheterosexual students, who are more likely than their heterosexual peers to notice this (Brown, Clarke, Gortmaker, & Robinson-Keilig, 2004; Stevens, 2004; Rankin, 2006). For much of the 20th century, administrators used various strategies to restrict the activities and identities of its gay students. Dilley (2002) traced the change in approach of university officials from student surveillance and expulsions, to psychological counseling, ending with the legal and legislative battles of the 1990s. This evolution is best summarized as one from "exclusion to integration" but calls for universities to commit more fully to the success of their nonheterosexual students (Dilley, 2002). Less than eight percent of the more than four thousand accredited institutions of higher education in the United States offer protection against discrimination for LGBTQ students (Messinger, 2009). Additionally, most schools with inclusive policies are secular, predominantly white, and located on the West Coast or in the Northeast. At schools where students were able to effectively advocate for change, approaches differed depending on the size and structure of the institution. Messinger (2009) stated that at the few historically black colleges and universities that had instituted inclusive policies, decisions were made informally and adopted quietly. This resulted in little to no change in the overall perception of the campus's climate toward LGBTQ persons. A change in administration, adoption of inclusive policies by neighboring or competing institutions, grantors or local government regulations, and faculty leaving the institution with large research grants for more friendly workplaces can all spur a university to change current policies (Messinger, 2009). While students may feel it is the role of professors to

confront homophobic behavior and to create an inclusive classroom setting, this often fails to occur (Lopez & Chism, 1993, as cited in Stevens, 2004).

Gay and Bisexual Student Experiences

If gay and bisexual college men find themselves in supportive and welcoming college environments, their sexual and gender identities may flourish. Existing research show that involvement in leadership roles pertaining to students' identities helps them to further develop that identity (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005). As such, Rhoads' (1997) ethnographic study of gay and bisexual college men involved in an LGBTQ activism organization at a research University in the Midwest provides insight into this population. Some students were in the process of disclosing their sexuality to close friends and family, while others had been "out" for years and were dealing with mixed reactions. The men studied frequently hung out in bars if they were old enough or at a local diner. Only those places where the men felt comfortable were used as spaces for social interactions. Most of the gay and bisexual men avoided potentially hostile environments or people. One participant stated "the subjects of conversation [were] definitely different" when he hung out with his straight friends compared to the conversations he had with fellow gay and bisexual friends. For several of the men in Rhoads' study, the use of "camp" helped give them their own unique style, set apart from their heterosexual peers. For the students, "camp is a source of identity to which straights do not have access" (Rhoads, 1997). Camp involves acting in a flamboyant and often effeminate behavior, often used in a satirical manner to poke fun at stereotypes about gay and bisexual men. For the students interviewed, camp gave them something that they could claim as their own. Ironically, this hyper-feminine portrayal was an important

aspect of their constructions of masculinity. It should also be noted that several other men indicated their disdain for camp culture, as they felt it only served to perpetuate stereotypes and stigmas (Rhoads, 1997). Stevens (2004) conducted a grounded theory study involving 11 gay male students at a mid-sized University on the East Coast. Students in the study stated coming out was difficult, as they struggled with letting go of heterosexual privilege, acknowledging their sexual identities as more than a phase, and figuring out how the rest of their identity would then change. Disclosure of a sexual identity encouraged empowerment and solidified these students' identities as gay men. Similar to other studies, the participants of color felt excluded from the activities of their White peers and felt isolated from the gay subculture on campus. Several participants indicated experience with mental health issues including depression and suicide.

Experiences in Communities of Color

While there is existing literature on gay and bisexual college men, it focuses primarily on white or European American men. Where the experiences of students of color are discussed, only the voices of black men are heard. Because gay and bisexual students of color have both a sexual and racial identity, they face the challenges of both heterosexism and racism. Homophobia is pervasive within the black community as homosexuality – and bisexuality – is seen as a threat to the existence of the black family structure. Gresham (2009) points out that the gay community reflects the same attitudes concerning race as the dominant heterosexual community. Indeed, racial differences in gay and bisexual organizations can serve to challenge the solidarity of the group (Rhoads, 1997). Levels of homophobia toward gay men in the black community vary depending on certain demographic data, but only for women. Lemelle and Battle's (2004) analysis

of nationally collected data found that an increase in age, income, and education among black women resulted in more favorable attitudes toward gay men. This was not true, however, for black men, whose attitudes toward gay men were affected only by their frequency of attendance at a place of worship. Abreu (2008) found similar results.

Theoretical Frameworks

Masculinity Theories

The second half of the twentieth century saw a boom in gender studies in America, fueled by the entry of women into the workforce, the subsequent second wave of the feminist movement, and increasing atmosphere of tolerance following the Civil Rights Movement. Because this interest was encouraged by women, the great majority of the existing research focuses on the experiences of women. Harper and Harris III (2010) assert "gender" has now become synonymous with "women." This is due, in part, to the assumption that earlier research used predominantly male samples and therefore was reflective of male experiences. This view is problematic in that it overlooks the fact that these samples were composed primarily of White, heterosexual, young, and middle-class men, rendering the scope of these studies and theories limited to those populations. Additionally, to assume contemporary student affairs practitioners have learned all they can about college men is foolish. The men enrolled in institutions of higher education in the 1960s and 70s are quite different than those currently finding their way to campus. Harper and Harris III (2010) continue to posit "classic studies" were not concerned with men as gendered beings, and thus cannot speak to the participants' experiences *as men*. They present the "Model Gender Majority Myth" and five assumptions commonly held about men:

> (1) Every male student benefits similarly from gender privilege; (2) gender initiatives need not include men unless they are focused on reducing violence and sexual assault against women; (3) undergraduate men do not encounter harmful stereotypes, social and academic challenges, and differential treatment in college environments because of their gender; (4) male students do not require gender-specific resources and support; and (5) historical dominance and structural determinism ensure success for the overwhelming majority of contemporary college men. (p. 8).

These assumptions can prove troubling for college men, particularly those with other "minority" identities, such as disabled, gay or bisexual, or working class men. Their male privilege obscures their other identities, although they often have lesser access to it.

Although the field of men's studies is certainly not new, it became popular in the 1980s and is currently emerging as a credible area of study, particularly among student affairs practitioners. NASPA currently has a Men and Masculinities Knowledge Community and ACPA hosts the Standing Committee for Men, working collaboratively to host the National Conference on College Men since 2007. While gender has long been viewed through the social constructivist lens, along with race and sexual orientation, higher education scholars have only recently begun to view men in this way. In his pioneering article, Kimmel (1994) links masculinity to homophobia, demonstrating how masculine gender identities are developed through men's performance of masculinity to other men. Asserting masculinity is a homosocial action, one confined specifically to men, Kimmel states homophobia is necessary to men's identities. They hold gay and bisexual men as the "other," in order to cast themselves as strong, fearless, and cool. In order to subjugate gay and bisexual men – as well as men of color and other disenfranchised men, and certainly women – these "gender police" have built up systems to maintain their images of masculinity. Indeed, this is how hegemonic masculinity is institutionalized.

Queer Theories

Because gay and bisexual men exist and live their lives within the framework of the majority heterosexual culture, their own masculinities can often come into conflict with those of the men around them. The past two decades have seen an enormous surge in the number of scholars working with nonheterosexual identity development models. There are two main types, with stage models being the more traditional style. These models focus primarily on the "coming out" process, the period in which a queer person begins to identify as such. They hold clear divisions among the steps, but assert that individuals progress erratically through them, moving both forward and backward. The most famous model in this category is Vivienne Cass's 1979 Homosexual Identity Model. Newer developmental models have strayed from the linear path and have instead focused on development over the course of the individual's entire life. These "lifespan" models acknowledge the social and cultural environment in which a person lives and the impact they may have on his or her development (Bilodeau & Renn, 2005). While the majority of theories have focused on development in lesbians and gay men, attention has begun to be paid to bisexual individuals. These people develop differently in that their identities may or may not develop in clear, orderly ways and often develop later in life (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005). Recent research has centered on the intersection of sexual orientation with race and ethnicity and comparable theories have been identified for African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans, while other studies have begun to explore how socioeconomic status, spirituality, and physical ability affect the formation of a queer identity (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to further the understanding of gay and bisexual male students' experiences. Specifically, the study examined how these students develop and perceive their individual masculine gender identities. This was a qualitative study relying on the phenomenological research strategy of inquiry. Primary data was collected through focus groups.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was not to formulate a new theory grounded in participants' views. Nor was it intended to continue over a long period of time or to explore a particular issue in depth. However, the purpose of this study was to "identify the essence of human experiences about a phenomenon as described by [the] participants" (Creswell, 2009, p. 13). This study was carried out using a phenomenological research strategy of inquiry. In particular, the phenomenon of masculine gender identity among gay and bisexual college males was explored. Phenomenological research is appropriate when studying a small number of subjects through extensive and prolonged engagement to develop patterns and relationships of meaning (Moustakas, 1994, as cited in Creswell, 2009).

Research Site

All research was conducted at a mid-sized, comprehensive, public university in the upper Midwest of the United States. Creswell (2009) states:

> Qualitative researchers tend to collect data in the field at the site where participants experience the issue or problem under study. They do not bring participants into a lab (a contrived situation), nor do they typically send out instruments for individuals to complete. This up close information gathered by actually talking directly to people and seeing them behave and act within their context is a major characteristic of qualitative research. In the natural setting, the researchers have face-to-face interaction over time. (p. 175)

It was important to interview the participants on the campus where they were enrolled as students. This familiarity with the environment encouraged an informal tone to the focus groups and elicited greater feedback. Highlighting the participant as an individual is a hallmark of qualitative research.

Participant Sampling

Participants were limited to those students attending the research site institution at the time of data collection, with the exception of one recent alumnus. A support and conversation group for gay and bisexual men exists on the campus of the research site. An advisor to this group agreed to send an email out to these students. Additionally, the researcher solicited participants through the social networking website Facebook by way of posts in groups for the campus LGBT resource center and student organization. When initial participation numbers were low, the researcher individually contacted students of

whom he knew were openly gay or bisexual and had previous contact with. This resulted in a total of seven student participants.

Procedures

In qualitative research, the process is emergent. This means that a research plan is often drafted, but it must remain flexible in order to accommodate the needs of the participants. In fact, all phases of the process may change or shift after the researcher enters the field and begins to collect data (Creswell, 2009). Research began with an initial set of questions and participants' responses guided the creation of the second set of questions, used to further explore themes that arose during the first focus group. Both sets of questions can be found in the Appendices section, titled Question Set 1 and Question Set 2, respectively.

Focus groups were used to provide an introductory understanding of the gay and bisexual male collegiate experience. This setting allowed participants to share in each other's' experiences and to effectively build upon each other's words. In accordance with the qualitative approach, participants were asked open-ended questions initially guided by the existing literature, but additional questions were asked as prompted by the discussion. When scheduling conflicts arose for two participants during the second focus group, they were emailed the questions, including the unscripted questions, and asked for their feedback.

Each focus group took place on campus. The same room was used both times, despite the presence of both a window and vents in the door. Because of this, confidentiality could not be guaranteed. Participants were informed as such, and all were still willing to continue their involvement. Each focus group lasted between 45 minutes

to an hour, both ending with a period for participants to ask questions of the researcher and each other.

Data Analysis

Both focus groups were recorded digitally with a handheld device. Following the first focus group, the researcher transcribed the recording and read through it, looking for key themes. This transcription was used to refine questions for the second focus group, which was then also transcribed. Later, each transcript was carefully read and analyzed. Each participant's sentences were broken down into codes, which were then sorted into overall themes and helped to inform the researcher of the central phenomenon.

Participant Confidentiality

Initial solicitation of participation encouraged individuals to contact the researcher directly, so as not to disclose their identity prior to being properly informed of the purpose and risks of the study. Once the participants were identified, the researcher sent a blind carbon copy email to each of them. Prior to meeting for the first focus group, participants were notified their consent was assumed unless otherwise stated. Each participant later signed an Informed Consent Form. After each focus group, the recording device was stored in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher's office, along with the consent forms and Demographic Data Forms. All electronic files were stored on the researcher's personal, password-protected laptop computer. No additional safeguards were taken to protect email correspondence potentially identifying the participants other than those provided by the institution's email provider.

Trustworthiness Strategies

According to Lincoln & Guba (1985), congruence and consistency are impacted by how researchers establish confidence in the research findings (as cited in Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006). Several strategies were employed to gain and build trust with the participants. Initially, the researcher had interacted with several of the participants prior to the study through on-campus social and professional activities. Participants were emailed copies of the focus group transcripts to verify the accuracy and intended meanings of their words. Jones, et al. (2006) asserts member checks are the most critical aspect of congruence, as they provide participants with "the opportunity to react to the findings and interpretations that emerged as a result of his or her participation" (p. 99). Allowing this review to occur deepens the trust between the researcher and the participants and helps to enrich the data.

In an effort to provide Jones et al.'s (2006) Elements of Goodness regarding trustworthiness, it is important to disclose here I am an openly gay man, interested in this topic for professional and societal reasons, as well as personal ones. Similarly, I carry personal biases and assumptions about what it means to be a gay or bisexual male student. I have done my best to be objective; however, it is imperative to qualitative research to acknowledge one's subjectivity.

Participant Characteristics

For the purpose of this research, all participants were (a) self-identified as gay, bisexual, or queer; (b) male; (c) between the ages of 18 and 25; and (d) identified as a man or as a masculine person. There has been significant attention paid to LGBT students as a population in the last decade, but little of this research has focused on men

within this group. This study was conducted through a social constructivist lens; only those individuals who self-identified as gay, bisexual, or queer were allowed to participate. It was important to explore a population of students with a particular sociopolitical identity with a particular meaning. To allow individuals outside of this category to participate would have broadened the scope of the study and potentially weakened the other participants' trust. Traditionally aged students were chosen to provide consistency and to help narrow the focus of the study. Finally, as the study focused on masculine identity, it was important to select only those individuals with this particular gender identity.

The goal of this study was to describe the ways in which gay and bisexual male students interpret masculinity; it is the experiences of the participants that are most important, and not how many of them there are. Data collection resulted in a total of seven participants.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The seven participants in this study represent a wide spectrum of ages and socioeconomic statuses (SES), as seen in Table 1, below. All participants were upperclassmen, with no freshmen present. One participant was a recent graduate who was able to provide a perspective the other students could not. In regards to SES, one participant was of a lower class background; two were of a lower-middle class; and four were from upper-middle class backgrounds. Despite an effort to include young men of color, all of the participants identified as racially White and none identified as ethnically Hispanic. Demographic data are more fully detailed in Table 1. More information about each participant is included below in the "Participant Overview" section.

Participant Overview

Mark is a gay junior majoring in sociology. He has only recently come out to his peers, finding no strong opposition from his friends. Mark arrived to the first focus group with his nails painted, fresh from an evening recently spent with females in his residence hall. Despite his outwardly flamboyant personality, Mark has a reserved, stoic side he keeps to himself. He comes from a family with a strong hunting and angling background, and he participates in such activities, but in his own way. During the focus groups, Mark stated, "I'm more or less out there to enjoy the scenery."

Scott is a gay senior, out to his immediate family and friends since the age of 14. A junior majoring in community health education, Scott has learned to conceal his sexual orientation as he traverses multiple environments on campus, saying, "I am very careful

Table 1. Demographic Data of Study Participants

Name*	Age	Academic Class	Socioeconomic Status**	Race***
Jamal	22	Alumnus	Upper-Middle	Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian
Mark	21	Junior	Lower-Middle	Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian
Scott	21	Junior	Upper-Middle	Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian
Jay	25	Graduate	Lower	Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian
Charles	20	Junior	Upper-Middle	Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian
Nick	19	Sophomore	Upper-Middle	Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian
Ryan	22	5th Year Senior	Lower-Middle	Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian

*Participant names were changed for reasons of confidentiality
**SES categories are defined as such: Lower Class: <$15,000; Working Class: $15,000-$29,999; Lower-Middle Class: $30,000-$49,999; Upper-Middle Class: $50,000-$99,999; Upper Class: $100,000+
***Category options included American Indian or Alaska Native; Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; Asian or Asian American; Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino; Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian; and Other

with how I look, act, and am portrayed." Somewhere between reflective and charismatic, Scott was not able to participate in the first focus group, opting to contribute to the second via email.

Jamal is a recent graduate of the university, having completed a degree in broadcast management the previous spring. Identifying as a young, queer man, Jamal is stereotypically masculine, with strong interests in sports and competition, helping him to

connect with his male peers. In his words, he's "totally one of the guys." He is out to his immediate family and friends, as well as some of his new coworkers.

Jay is a gay graduate student, new to the campus. He was active in promoting LGBT causes at his undergraduate institution, but feels isolated as the only queer person in his academic program. Jay has been out to his entire extended family for the last six years. Growing up in a small town, he learned to act more masculine because he did not "want to draw any type of attention" to himself.

Charles is a gay male student in his junior year of college. Studying in the field of biology, he rarely discusses LGBT issues in the classroom, because he is "a science person so we don't talk about them, 'cause we don't need to." A current member of the student LGBT organization's executive board, Charles has seen his involvement in campus activism increase during the last three years.

Sophomore Nick is the youngest of the participants. He comes across as shy at times, and is open about his sexual orientation to only a few people. His sister is the only family member he has come out to, and he has only been out to anyone for about one year. He is a member of a fraternity on campus and previously was involved with a campus Evangelical Christian organization.

Ryan is the only bisexual participant, having come out the summer after his junior year. Finishing his fifth year at the institution, Ryan has quickly become involved in the LGBT student culture following his coming out and serves as a Peer Educator to other students. A future teacher, Ryan considers himself to be very masculine, and relates to other men better than to women.

Masculinity as Defined by Participants

When initially asked to describe what being masculine meant to them, the participants struggled to express themselves at first, with Charles simply saying, "I wear typical male clothing." They eventually gave several varied answers, but included common themes. Jamal's definition of the "typical man role where you work your job 9-5 and you come home and sit down in front of the tv, drink a beer or whatever and watch sports and all that other manly stuff" describes two main themes – consumption of alcohol and participation in or interest in sports. These were supported by the other men, adding things like hunting and not crying. For Jay, masculinity is "how you carry yourself. Not crying, but I think there's just kind of an air that you have about yourself that portrays masculinity." For Ryan, masculinity is carried out through what he sees as chivalry – "Just doing stuff for other people, whether it's for other ladies, or for, uh, other guys. Just being the bigger, stronger, you know, type of person that's willing to do stuff for other people." Jamal followed this statement with "[Masculinity is] standing up for what you're sure of and always being able to show it and demand to be respected." In addition to those already mentioned, common themes shared by the men were hiding emotion, personal confidence, physical strength, and control.

The participants expressed their masculinity in ways similar to heterosexual men, with Jay sharing, "I feel the most masculine when I'm eating chicken wings and drinking beer," a statement the other men affirmed with laughter. Mark stated that someone is masculine "when you have all the attention and power." Working out helped Scott feel more masculine, and several of the men expressed playing violent video games made them feel manly, particularly when the games were loud, aggressive, and competitive.

Sports was a dividing topic for the group, with some men indicating sports helped them feel more masculine and others stating it excluded them from social situations. For example, Nick stated, "All the guys are out there yelling at the tv about sports and I'm just sitting there, kind of watching, but not really caring, and they're asking me stuff and I'm like 'No idea. Sports is not my thing.'"

Concealing Identity

Several of the men discussed having to conceal their sexual orientations at time, either from peers, professors, or family members. They shared both benefits and consequences of doing so, as well as the pressure in trying to conform to the societal masculine ideal.

"I Just Put on the Masculine Face."

At various times, the men discussed changing their actions or personalities to appear more masculine. For Mark, in "one on one masculine communication," he uses "a lot fewer hand gestures and it's more or less like body language." For Charles, travel to and from places on campus involves having "this blank face and kind of just like [being] sheltered. But when I'm with my friends, I'm just open and flail my hands." Several of the men discussed "putting on" a masculine personality. When downtown at bars, Jamal puts "on more of a masculine identity. Just trying not to give myself away for the sake of not being picked on by anything." Ryan shared that in class, he "put[s] on more of a masculine personality just because I don't know if they know [about his sexual identity] and I don't necessarily want them making judgments before they get to know me." Nick similarly stated, "I guess it depends, like, on who you're out to. For me, if I'm out to somebody at work or in a classroom or something like that, it's like you know, I just put

on the masculine face I guess." He continued, "When I'm with my friends,…I'm just who I am. I don't really try to impress anybody and have a masculine role. I'm just myself then." These young men have all learned to adapt their gender expression to fit their social environment, mainly as a safety defense. Depending on when they came out, they each had many years to practice this role.

Family Relations

Each of the men participating at some point described their family and its role in shaping their masculinity. Charles shared, "Well, for me, a lot of it is hunting…and football. And that's basically it and none of it I do" but also that his family was fine with this and allowed him to do things he enjoyed. In response to a comment from another participant, he exclaimed "I'd rather talk about dog sweaters than basketball! I don't like sports. I don't care." For Jamal, "it was anything competitive in [his] family…You always try to be the one to win" and "just any way that you could really show off physical talent." Even though he shared that he was terrible at sports and trailed behind the other boys growing up, Jamal participated anyway. He said, "I've always just gone along with it, with my family…'cause it gave my family something to talk about, something to do together." Like Jamal, Mark and Nick played sports to please their families, but neither enjoyed themselves. Mark shared "I'm not sporty. I'll go for the social aspect and when I did participate, like, it was subpar. I mean, I could be a lineman – I knew how to hit people, but I didn't enjoy it." When Nick decided to stop playing sports and pursue opportunities in theater, his family was upset. "Like, when I told my dad I didn't wanna go out for football next year, I saw him shed a tear actually, so we're pretty diehard about sports in my family." Later, he followed with "Both my sister and I

didn't get the athletic gene…We both did it throughout high school. I was trying to, like, do the sports but afterwards I didn't really care." In strong and obvious ways, these men's lives were shaped by their family structures and the emphasis placed on traditional masculinity.

Benefits and Consequences

For conforming to society's expectations of what these men should look and act like, they were rewarded with certain benefits. Charles supposed he would probably gain "more acceptance from other males – mostly straight males" and Jamal stated conforming "gives you an opportunity to socialize more if you're into a lot of masculine norms, 'cause you have a lot of things to talk about, similar things you can do together." Scott shared that by having a traditionally masculine gender expression, he is able to "gain a unique view on heterosexual men, because [he doesn't] fit the 'mold' of stereotypes of gay men that [heterosexual men] have heard about, and therefore break down a few walls and open peoples' minds up a bit more." For Jay, the benefits are simple: "I think you would gain not being asked about your sexuality," a topic that can often lead to uncomfortable situations.

Failing to keep up a masculine front at times left the participants facing unexpected, and sometimes isolating, consequences. While Charles and Jamal felt that they would not lose anything, Ryan was concerned professors would grade him poorly if he was not masculine, or that he could be confronted on his identity in public places like the cafeteria lunch line. Nick and Mark were concerned they would lose their closest friends, with Mark conceding some of his relationships with other guys are based entirely around playing sports or video games. Scott reacted to the question more ardently:

> I loose [sic] somewhat a sense of who I am as an individual. By feeling like I have to change my level of masculinity between groups of straight male friends, or any other straight males I am around that are more masculine, I am forced to "put on a show" to feel and be accepted, and therefore loose a small part of my sense of self. After doing this long enough, it almost becomes second nature to "switch" my level or masculine presence to adapt to those around me.

Jay shared a similar story of how his friends expected him to be "extremely flamboyant all the time." He said, "It got to a point where I didn't know who I was and I had to figure out who I wanted to be outside of that group of friends." These young men go through their daily lives, continuously evaluating their actions in regards to others, and judging what meaning they are giving to the people they have formed relationships with.

Sexual Identity Development

Disclosure of Sexuality

The participants shared a variety of stories surrounding their eventual disclosure of their sexual orientations to another person. Some are out to just a few people, while others are out to everyone they encounter. Nick has only come out within the last year, telling "probably, like, five or six people or, like, friends back home." His sister is the only family member he has told, along with a few close friends at college. Conversely, Charles has been out for only two years, but is highly comfortable with his sexual identity. When asked to whom he is out to, he replied, "Everyone, as far as I'm aware. Family and friends and if they don't know, it's their problem." He was also quick to add "If they don't ask, it's their fault for not asking. I got past the 'I'm going to tell everyone

stage.'" The men in this study are at various stages of the coming out process and in their own sexual identity development.

Reconciliation of Masculinity

As the young men in the study develop their sexual and gender identities more fully, some have had more time and opportunities to do so, because of either age or the length of time they have been out. For example, Jamal has been out for the last five years, giving him the chance to mature. When explaining how his masculinity in college compares to his masculinity after graduation, he shared "I've been able to do whatever I wanted to. I have a tendency of being very masculine, other than the occasional episode of [television series] *Glee* on Tuesday nights." This awareness of his masculine identity and the ability to observe how watching a show generally deemed feminine plays into that identity demonstrates Jamal's ability to be himself in a full and real way. For Ryan, his identity was shaped by his early years at college, and as he prepares to graduate, he states, "I am who I am right now and that's how I am going to be after college too." Having been out for only one year, Mark is still in the process of bringing his sometimes flamboyant outward personality in line with his inner, reflective, masculine self. He expressed concerns with entering a career after college and having to adapt to that or concealing his identity again.

Student Involvement

Renn & Bilodeau (2005) found students involved in LGBT campus leadership derive benefits related to both their sexual identity and as leaders. Among the study participants, Charles, Ryan, Jamal, Jay, and Mark have all been members of the campus's LGBT student group or employed by the campus LGBT resource office. While Nick and

Scott had no affiliations to these organizations, they were each also involved on campus. It is worth noting here that the five students closely involved in LGBT student leadership opportunities were the most open about discussing their sexual identities, suggesting perhaps their increased comfort with their identities. Similarly, Charles, Scott, Ryan, Jamal, Jay, and Mark had all participated in some form of LGBT activism on campus or in the community. Nick's hesitancy to do so can likely be attributed to not being fully out at the time of the study. However, this study was not designed to test these claims, and they are only speculation.

Campus Climate

Throughout the study, the students spoke extensively about their experiences on campus. All of them, except Jay, have lived in the residence halls on campus during their time at the institution, and three of them currently do. Campus climate is comprised of "current attitudes, behavior and standards, and practices of employees and students of an institution" (Rankin and Reason, 2008, as cited in Campus Pride, 2010). The study participants discussed various aspects of campus climate, including safety, public affection, in the residence halls, and in the classroom setting.

On Campus

The students expressed feeling safe and having positive experiences on campus. Charles shared, "On campus, I feel really safe. I don't expect bad things to happen on campus, so I'm pretty open." Scott agreed, but added "I might feel a little more intimidated in the weight room or over in [the physical education building], which is to be expected." Mark and Jamal both described the campus as a "bubble" of acceptance, set apart from the city the university is located in. Students expressed gratitude for

having supportive faculty and staff available to them. All of them, however, expressed fear for their physical safety if they were to publicly express physical intimacy with another man on the campus. Commonly referred to as a "public display of affection," some of the men thought it was inappropriate, while others said even holding hands would be unusual for them. Ryan shared how his parents warned him to be safe when he came out to them, and that his parents' message continued to resonate with him.

In the residence halls, the men had mixed experiences. For Charles, living in an all-male community was very difficult, since he did not interact well with other males. He never bonded with the other residents in his community, instead opting to visit female friends in other parts of his building. When asked how he felt in that setting, Charles responded with "I felt like I shouldn't have been there. I didn't hide myself, but when I was on my floor, it was kind of like get to my room as fast as possible." For Nick, connecting with the male students was difficult, so he also spent a lot of time with female friends, becoming the "honorary member" of an all-female wing. Because of that, he did not feel particularly masculine, or welcome, in that setting. He currently has moved to a coed environment, so he is able to interact with both male and female residents, helping to boost his confidence in himself as a masculine person. Other participants had more positive experiences, particularly Ryan and Jamal, who each were employed as Resident Assistants for one year. Ryan stated that he "relate[s] a lot better with males than females, so [he] fit in." While Jamal had generally positive experiences, he had an experience his freshman year in which he openly discussed his sexual behaviors with a group of men he was close to. After that experience, the men in his hall community began to shy away from him or ignore him. The other residents never actively confronted

him on his identity. Instead, according to Jamal, "it was more of an indirect behind-my-back sort of ordeal." For Mark, the experience was both positive and negative. While the residents of the building accepted him as an openly gay man, they assumed his positivity and caring attitude mean he had a feminine gender expression, referring to him as "Mama Bear," and causing him to struggle to retain his masculinity in that setting.

Classroom

In the classroom, the men expressed appreciation for their professors attempting to include topics relating to LGBT people. However, these topics were discussed more frequently in the social sciences. As a biology major, Charles rarely encountered the topic in his courses, but as a sociology major, Mark's professors often discussed them. When introduced in the classroom, the participants shared that they did not feel the discussions went far enough in exploring the subject matter. As an education major, discussion of LGBT people in Ryan's classes focuses on bullying and how to stop it, but not necessarily why it happens. Similarly, for Scott, LGBT people are only discussed in the context of health issues or mental health concerns, failing to discuss them either as whole persons or in a healthy manner. Several of the students reported being tokenized, or asked to speak on behalf of all persons of the same identity as them, in the classroom, although they insisted they were okay with it, as it gave them the opportunity to educate their peers. When asked for suggestions on topics to include in courses, topics ranging from general stereotypes and myths to the inclusion of LGBT persons in history courses were mentioned. Overall, the students wanted to see a greater exploration of topics in the classroom and identify the root causes of the issues presented.

Off Campus

While experiences on campus were generally positive, the men in the study expressed concern for their safety off campus. Ryan said, "On campus, you have a lot of faculty and administration that are behind you that would defend you, where off campus, you don't have those safety nets." Not knowing the identity of those around them, remembering to whom they had disclosed their sexuality, and monitoring their mannerisms were all concerns the men had. They handled this by going out in groups, usually with straight peers.

Peer Relations

Interacting with other students is both expected and essential to the college experience. The participants of this study, as young gay and bisexual men, do so in markedly different ways than their heterosexual counterparts. The following sections describe these differences in peer relations.

Straight Males

For some of the men, Charles in particular, bonding with their straight, male peers is not desirable. They do not relate well and do not make a strong effort to form those relationships. For the other men, hanging out with their straight counterparts involves things like playing and watching sports, video games, drinking alcohol, or studying for a class. Those participants who viewed themselves as most masculine were more likely to identify and socialize with straight males. They highly value these relationships as a means of affirming their masculinities, although such relationships can sometimes be challenging. Mark shared, "Sometimes I have to check myself, like 'Wait, he's straight. Just because he's texting you a lot and wants to hang out doesn't mean anything.'"

Potential strains on relationships with straight males shared by participants included not being able to discuss an intimate relationship with another male, filtering conversations, and confronting awkward questions about being gay or bisexual.

Straight Females

Similar to relationships with straight males, the participants of this study had varied reactions toward friendships with females. For Mark, his female friends often want to paint his fingernails or give him a mud mask facial, but as he states, "Sometimes it sucks with the female relationships because I don't want to be one of the girls. Like, it's not something I strive for." In this case, Mark's female friends assume he wants to be "one of the girls" without asking him if that is what he wants out of their relationship. For Charles, relationships with females are easier to foster and maintain, since he has more in common with them. For him, the women in his life have been more accepting of his sexuality and he has trouble relating to his male peers. Jay felt similarly, adding that "there's a non-threatening aspect of it where I'm not threatening to them [women] and they're not threatening to me." For these men, relationships with women are safer and less risky. For Jamal, hanging out with females is boring and difficult to do. He has trouble finding things to discuss with them, and would rather be watching a sporting event. Describing himself as "kind of in the middle," Scott has several female friends, but says he can easily get "testy" with them, indicating he can only deal with females for a certain amount of time, a statement other participants agreed with. Finally, for Ryan, the answer is quite simple: "I'd say I relate more to guys. Um, I *am* a guy so it's easier for me to relate to them." Additionally, interacting with females is different for Ryan

than the other male participants in that his bisexual identity allows for the potential to be attracted to his female friends.

Other Gay and Bisexual Males

Forming relationships with other gay and bisexual men on campus was difficult for several of the participants due to a lack of openly GB men. The participants did not feel their relationships with other GB men were drastically different than those with other friends. However, there were some unique benefits of having another GB man to relate to, including the freedom to be their whole selves, discuss topics more fully, and having someone to confide in. The men had difficulty naming a GB male role model they looked up to on campus, with only a residence hall director and the director of the campus' LGBT center being named. When questioned on where they find partners for sexual or dating purposes, the men listed bars, online web sites, campus organizations, and through friends as the main venues.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The young men interviewed for this study have developed complicated and individual masculine gender identities. While they all label themselves as men, they represent a broad spectrum of gender expressions. They shared common ideas of what a man should be, but differed greatly in how they interpreted that for themselves. While this study could not fully explore all dimensions of these men's lives, it provided an introduction to the lived experiences of gay and bisexual college males. By learning to effectively interpret social cues, these men are able to adapt their gender expressions to maintain close peer relationships and avoid uncomfortable situations.

The men interviewed described several means of navigating masculine culture on and off campus, including:

- adapting physical appearances and actions to conform;
- resisting others' attempts to define their gender identity for them;
- activism to increase confidence;
- using gender norms to defend themselves from social and physical harm;
- forming a network for safety and support; and
- being conscious of when to disclose their sexuality.

Some of the participants used all of these strategies, while others used only a few, depending on how close their gender identity conformed to traditional masculine norms. Several of them masculinity in a fluid manner, indicating they could increase or decrease their masculinity to fit a given social environment. This aligns with Kimmel's (1994) assertion that manhood is demonstrated for other men. Indeed, the men interviewed struggled to define what masculinity meant to them, instead explaining it in terms of the other, or in terms of what was expected of them by their peers.

The act of disclosing one's sexual identity to another person presents a fundamental moment in the development of that identity. It became clear those participants who were most open about their sexuality were most confident in their identities both as gay, bisexual, or queer persons, and as men. This conforms to many sexual identity development models, particularly those of Cass (1979, 1984), Savin-Williams (1988), Troiden (1988), and Fassinger (1991).

The importance of institutional campus climate cannot be understated. The participants discussed their appreciation for supportive and encouraging professionals at the research site, but identified two areas of concern. While students felt generally safe, they were hesitant to show physical intimacy with another man on campus. For several of them, even holding hands was out of the question. Regardless of their comfort with their own sexual identity, all of the men feared for their physical safety if they were to do so. Additionally, while the participants indicated the inclusion of LGBT issues and themes in their coursework, they were introduced in potentially negative ways, focusing on deviant health issues or solely on oppression. LGBT people were rarely discussed in a positive or holistic manner. When pressed to identify a male role model on campus, none

of the participants mentioned a faculty member, although answers to this question highlighted a campus-wide deficit in male leaders.

Finally, responses from the participants indicated their interactions with not only other gay, bisexual, and queer males, but with all queer people were confined to the University campus. This suggests an unsafe off campus environment as well as concern for the cohesiveness of the queer student population at the institution. While visibly present in small numbers, the students were able to interact mainly through activities sponsored by the campus LGBT office. This has the potential to effectively segregate LGBT students to one area of campus and prevents them from expressing their full selves across campus.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study hold significance for both theoretical and practical frameworks. First, the study examined the intersection of two commonly researched fields – LGBT identity development and masculine identity development. Because the literature on this topic is sparse, this study provides a meaningful introduction to the content topic, potentially contributing to the future creation of a developmental theory specific to gay and bisexual college males.

Additionally, the findings are significant to the field of college and university student affairs. Many campuses now provide resources and services to LGBT students, many of which are predictably male. This study can provide greater insight to professionals working with gay and bisexual males as to what these students are experiencing and how they cope with them. Similarly, attention paid to male students as gendered beings has begun to increase recently, in regards to both research and campus

initiatives. The creation of a Men's Center at the University of Oregon, the Men and Masculinity Research Center at the University of Missouri, and men-focused initiatives sponsored by the American College Personnel Association and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators all point to a greater need to foster development in college men, including those who identify as gay or bisexual.

It is recommended offices and services directed at LGBT students actively seek to encourage students' gender identity development, particularly in helping male students to understand how sexism and heterosexism work to oppress them as men. Additionally, both Women's and Men's Centers should work together to address issues of gender development and inequality. Finally, all student affairs professionals should work collaboratively with other colleagues on campus to serve students with respect to all of their identities.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

This study explored the experiences of six gay men and one bisexual man. Despite attempts to diversity the participant population, all seven men were White or Caucasian, and most came from economically privileged homes. Transgender or gender nonconforming men were not included, in an attempt to focus specifically on sexual orientation. Therefore, these men cannot properly represent the experiences of students of color, students from poor and working class backgrounds, or transgender students. The findings of this study are not meant to be comprehensive or speak for the experiences of all white, privileged men at this specific campus either. Rather, they are an extrapolation of themes presented through conversations with the seven participants. Generalizability is not a necessary goal in qualitative research and was not an objective in

this study. Additionally, interests in personal safety and unwillingness to disclose a sexual identity may have presented students in less visible roles on campus from participating in this study. The use of focus groups to gather data may have attributed to the low response rate from the campus population.

Within the realm of higher education, further research into the ways in which gay and bisexual college males develop and express their masculine identities should focus on the following three areas: the ways in which students situationally conceal their identities and possible consequences of such actions; the ways in which heterosexual expectations of masculinity are imposed on gay and bisexual males; and the creation of a grounded developmental theory describing the various ways gay and bisexual males create masculine identities for themselves.

REFERENCES

(2009, May). Transgender terminology. Retrieved from http://transequality.org/Resources/NCTE_TransTerminology.pdf

Abreu, V. (2008). Attitudes of undergraduate and graduate students toward homosexuality. (Master's thesis, Kean University). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Adams, A. (2011). "Josh wears pink cleats": Inclusive masculinity on the soccer field. *Journal of Homosexuality, 58*(5), 579-596. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2011.563654

Bilodeau, B., & Renn, K. (2005). Analysis of LGBT identity development models and implications for practice. *New Directions for Student Services, 111,* 25-39.

Brown, T., & Alderson, K. (2010). Sexual identity and heterosexual male students' usage of homosexual insults: An exploratory study. *Candian Journal of Human Sexuality, 19*(1/2), 27-42. Retrieved from LGBT Life with Full Text database.

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review, 106*(4), 676-713. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

Campus Pride. (2010). *2010 state of higher education for lesbian, gay, bisexual, & transgender people.* Charlotte, NC: Rankin, S., Weber, G., Blumenfeld, W., & Frazer, S.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality, 4*, 219-235.

Cass, V. C. (1984). Homosexual identity formation: Testing a theoretical model. *The Journal of Sex Research, 20*(2), 143-167.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Cooley, J. J. (2009). The use of contact theory to explain attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Edwards, K., & Jones, S. (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. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Eisler, R., & Skidmore, J. (1987). Masculine Gender Role Stress: Scale Development and Component Factors in the Appraisal of Stressful Situations. *Behavior Modification, 11*(2), 123-136. doi:10.1177/01454455870112001

Evans, J. (2009). Investigating sexual prejudice: The relationship between heterosexual's sexual attitudes and their attitudes towards sexual minorities. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Hartford). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Fassinger, R. E. (1991). The hidden minority: Issues and challenges in working with lesbian women and gay men. *The Counseling Psychologist, 19*(2), 157-176.

Fisher, L. E., & Banik, S. (2007). College major, gender and heterosexism reconsidered under more controlled conditions. *Journal of LGBT Health Research, 3*(1), 49-53. doi:10.1300/J463v03n01_06

Giles, D. (1999). Retrospective accounts of drunken behaviour: Implications for theory of self, memory, and the discursive construction of identity. *Discourse Studies, 1*(4), 387-403. doi: 10.1177/1461445699001004001

Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumpner, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles, 5*(1/2), 55-59. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9195-3

Gresham, S. (2009). Negotiating cultural contexts: An exploratory investigation of black gay male strategy employment. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 5*(3), 247-267. doi: 10.1080/15504280903035738

Hamilton, C., & Mahalik, J. (2009). Minority stress, masculinity, and social norms predicting gay men's health risk behaviors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(1), 132-141. doi: 10.1037/a0014440

Harper, S. R., & Harris III, F. (2010). Beyond the model gender majority myth: Responding equitably to the developmental needs and challenges of college men. In S. Harper & F. Harris III (Eds.), *College men and masculinities: Theory, research and implications for practice* (pp. 1-15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harris III, F., & Struve, L. (2009). Gents, jerks, and jocks: What male students learn about masculinity in college. *About Campus, 14*(3), 2-9. doi: 10.1002/abc.289

Hooberman, R. (1979). Psychological androgyny, feminine gender identity and self-esteem in homosexual and heterosexual males. *The Journal of Sex Research, 15*(4), 306-315. Retrieved from LGBT Life with Full Text database.

Johnson, C. (2005). "The first step is the two-step": Hegemonic masculinity and dancing in a country-western gay bar. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 18*(4), 445-464. doi: 10.1080/09518390500137626

Jones, S. R., Torres, V. & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kimmel, M. S. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 119-141). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kimmel, S., & Mahalik, J. (2005). Body image concerns of gay men: The roles of minority stress and conformity to masculine norms. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*(6), 1185-1190. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1185

Landrine, H., Bardwell, S., & Dean, T. (1988). Gender expectations for alcohol use: A study of the significance of the male role. *Sex Roles, 19*(11/12), 703-712. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

Lemmelle Jr., A., & Battle, J. (2004). Black masculinity matters in attitudes toward gay males. *Journal of Homosexuality, 47*(1), 39-51. doi: 10.1300/J082v47n01_03

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lippa, R. (2008). The relation between childhood gender nonconformity and adult masculinity-femininity and anxiety in heterosexual and homosexual men and women. *Sex Roles, 59*(9/10), 684-693. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9476-5

Lopez, G., & Chism, N. (1993). Classroom concerns of gay and lesbian students. *College Teaching, 41*(3), 97-103.

McCarthy, J., & Holliday, E. (2004). Help-seeking and counseling within a traditional male gender role: An examination from a multicultural perspective. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82*(1), 25-30. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ochs, R., & Rowley, S. E. (Eds.). (2005). *Getting bi: Voices of bisexuals around the world*. Boston, MA: Bisexual Resource Center.

Peralta, R. (2007). College alcohol use and the embodiment of hegemonic masculinity among European American men. *Sex Roles, 56*(11/12), 741-756. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9233-1

Poynter, K. J., & Washington, J. (2005). Multiple identities: Creating community on campus for LGBT students. *New Directions for Student Services, 111,* 41-47.

Rankin, S. R. (2005). Campus climates for sexual minorities. *New Directions for Student Services, 111,* 17-23.

Rankin, S., & Reason, R. D. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1,* 262-274. doi: 10.1037/a0014018

Renn, K. A., & Bilodeau, B. L. (2005). Leadership identity development among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender student leaders. *NASPA Journal, 42*(3), 342-367. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Rhoads, R. (1994). *Coming out in college: The struggle for a queer identity*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rhoads, R. (1997). A subcultural stud of gay and bisexual college males. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*(4), 460-482. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.

Savin-Williams, R. C. (1988). Theoretical perspectives accounting for adolescent homosexuality. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 9*(6), 95-104. Retrieved from ScienceDirect.com.

Stevens, R. A. (2004). Understanding gay identity development within the college environment. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(2), 185-206. doi: 10.1353/csd.2004.0028

Stewart, M. C. (2008). Constructing masculine and athletic identities: The case of college football players. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Tanis, J. (2009). *Teaching transgender*. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality.

Theodore, P., & Basow, S. (2000). Heterosexual masculinity and homophobia: A reaction to the self. *Journal of Homosexuality, 40*(2), 31-48. doi: 10.1300/J082v40n02_03

Troiden, R. R. (1988). Homosexual identity development. *Journal of Adolescent Health Care, 9*(2), 105-113.

Whitley Jr., B. E., Childs, C. E., & Collins, J. B. (2010). Differences in black and white American college students' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Sex Roles, 64,* 299-310.

APPENDIX A

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS

Message posted on Facebook

Hello! My name is Richard Anderson and I'm currently engaged in research for my Master's Thesis here at UW-L titled "Becoming Men: How Gay and Bisexual College Males Navigate Masculinity on Campus."

I'm looking for 10-15 cisgender, male-identified gay and bisexual students to participate in 2 separate 1-hour focus groups in the next few weeks. Participants will receive no monetary compensation for involvement in this study. Risks are minimal and participation includes disclosure of your identity to other participants present for the focus group.

If you are interested, I would greatly appreciate your participation. Please email me at Anderson.Rich@uwlax.edu or shoot me a message here on Facebook.

Thanks!

Message emailed to members of focus group at research site

Hello! My name is Richard Anderson and I'm currently engaged in research for my Master's Thesis here at UW-L titled "Becoming Men: How Gay and Bisexual College Males Navigate Masculinity on Campus."

I'm looking for 10-15 cisgender, male-identified gay and bisexual students to participate in 2 separate 1-hour focus groups in the next few weeks. Participants will receive no monetary compensation for involvement in this study. Risks are minimal and participation includes disclosure of your identity to other participants present for the focus group.

If you are interested, I would greatly appreciate your participation. Please email me at Anderson.Rich@uwlax.edu.

Thanks!

Email coordinating focus groups

Good evening and thank you for your interest in my thesis research project.

First, until we meet, any participation is assumed to be of your own consent. Additionally, you will all be anonymous to each other until Informed Consent Forms have been filled out. I realize this is a little odd, but it's out of respect for your own privacy.

Second, I would like for us to meet for two, separate one-hour sessions during the week of December 4th if at all possible. I would like to avoid interfering with time commitments during Finals Week. In order to identify times that work for us, I've created a Doodle poll. Please fill this out within the next 2 days. If you have not used Doodle before or have questions, please feel free to email me. The link to the poll is http://www.doodle.com/nxha2txci55rpmhp.

Thanks again for your time!

APPENDIX B

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Focus Group Questions – Session 1

1. Please describe your sexual orientation. You do not have to use any specific label; use only those you wish to.
2. Please describe what being masculine means to you.
3. In what ways do you feel masculine? When do you not feel masculine?
4. What cocurricular activities are you involved in here at UW-L?
5. To whom are you out to about your sexual orientation?
6. Please describe how safe you feel on campus.
7. How often do LGBTQ issues come up in the classroom?
8. Do you drink alcohol? If so, how often, and with whom do you go drinking?
9. What role have you played in campus activism surrounding LGBTQ issues?
10. What do you do when you hang out with your straight friends?
11. What do you do when you hang out with other gay or bisexual men?

Focus Group Questions – Session 2

1. Could you please tell me about masculinity in your family of origin – aka your biological family?

2. How do you see your masculinity changing in your life after college?

3. What do you gain by adhering to traditional masculine norms while in college?

4. What do you, or would you, lose by not adhering to traditional masculine norms while on campus?

5. How does your masculine presentation change based on where you are or what you're doing? Examples include class, sports, residence halls, in relationships, etc.

6. In what ways do you think your sexual orientation affects your gendered identity as a man?

7. As young men, what male role models do you have on campus that you look up to for guidance on being men?

8. On Sunday, several of you indicated you would never be involved in PDA (public displays of affection) on campus. What factors make you hesitant to express

physical intimacy in front of others?

9. If you currently live in a residence hall on campus, or have, how did you feel as a masculine person in that setting?

10. How do you find potential partners, whether for sexual or dating purposes?

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Protocol Title: Becoming Men: How Gay and Bisexual College Males Navigate Masculinity on Campus

Principal Investigator: Richard Anderson
1425 Pine Street
La Crosse, WI 54601
Cell: (262)705-5285

Purpose and Procedure

- The purpose of this study is to explore the ways in which gay and bisexual college males develop individual identities as men.
- My participation will involve two one-hour interviews to take place in a focus group setting. This will involve discussion prompted by questions from the principal investigator.
- Focus group discussions will be digitally recorded.
- The total time requirement is approximately three hours over the course of the fall semester.
- Focus groups will take place at UW-La Crosse.

Potential Risks

- I must self-disclose my sexual orientation to the principal investigator and other participants involved in the focus group.
- The risk of serious physical or emotional harm to myself is near zero.

Possible Benefits

- I and other gay/bisexual college males may benefit from understanding the ways in which masculine identities are developed.
- Other university staff may also benefit from an understanding of this phenomenon, especially in its application to work with students.

Confidentiality

- The identities of all participants will be concealed through use of pseudonyms. My data will not be linked with personally identifiable information.
- Recordings of focus group sessions will be kept confidential and stored in the possession of the principal investigator.
- My identity will be known to the other participants of the focus group.

Participant Rights

- My participation is voluntary. I can withdraw or refuse to answer any question without consequences at any time.
- I can withdraw from the study at any time for any reason without penalty.
- The results of this study may be published in scientific literature or presented at professional meetings using grouped data only.
- I understand that I may seek assistance from the Counseling & Testing Center staff or Dr. Ryan McKelley if I feel uncomfortable.

Participant Costs

- There will be no costs for participating in this study.

Questions regarding study procedures may be directed to Richard Anderson, principal investigator at (262-705-5285) or the study Chairperson, Dr. Larry Ringgenberg, Director of University Centers, UW-La Crosse, at (608-785-8888). Questions regarding the protection of human subjects may be addressed to the UW-La Crosse Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, (608-785-4321 or irb@uwlax.edu).

Participant _____ Date _____
Researcher _____ Date _____

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
LA CROSSE

To: Richard Anderson

From: Bart Van Voorhis, Coordinator
Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the
Protection of Human Subjects
bvanvoorhis@uwlax.edu
5-6892

Date: October 24, 2011

Re: **RESEARCH PROTOCOL SUBMITTED TO IRB**

The IRB Committee has reviewed your proposed research project: ***"Becoming Men: How Gay and Bisexual College Males Navigate Masculinity on Campus."***

Because your research protocol will place human subjects at minimal risk, it **has been approved under the expedited review category in accordance with 45CFR46, 46.110(a)(b).**

Since you are not seeking federal funding for this research, the review process is complete and you may proceed with your project. Remember to provide participants a copy of the consent form and to keep a copy for your records. Consent documentation and IRB records should be retained for at least 3 years after completion of the project.

Please note that this approval is for a one year period only, from the date of this letter. **If the project continues for more than 12 months, an IRB renewal must be requested using Attachment C on the IRB website. Please submit Attachment C one month prior to the date on this letter. Continued data collection beyond this date will place your project in non-compliance. The IRB is required to report instances of noncompliance to the Federal Office of Human Research Protections.**

Good luck with your project!

Bart A. VanVoorhis

cc: IRB File
Larry Ringgenberg, Faculty Advisor

Graduate Studies and Research & Sponsored Program
220 Morris Hall, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
1725 State Street, La Crosse, WI 54601
Phone (608)785-8124 and (608) 785-8007
An affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM

"Becoming Men" – Demographic data form

Legal Name [First] _____ [Last] _____

Literature Pseudonym _____ **Age** _____

Academic Class
- ☐ Freshman
- ☐ Sophomore
- ☐ Junior
- ☐ Senior
- ☐ 5th Year Senior
- ☐ Graduate

Socioeconomic Status
- ☐ Upper class ($100,000 or more)
- ☐ Upper-middle class ($50,000-$99,999)
- ☐ Lower-middle class ($30,000-$49,999)
- ☐ Working class ($15,000-$29,999)
- ☐ Lower class (Less than $15,000)

Racial/Ethnic Identity (Check all that apply)
- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- ☐ Asian or Asian American
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ Non-Hispanic White or Caucasian
- ☐ Other _____

Major _____

_____

Minor _____

Career Plans _____

_____

_____

Racial/ethnic categories adapted from University of Wisconsin – Cooperative Extension
http://www.uwex.edu/ces/tobaccoeval/resources/surveydemographics.html