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ABSTRACT

The academic struggle of college men is an increasingly serious problem (Taylor & Lorimer, 2002). Research on masculinity and help seeking behavior in psychology has shown that men who endorse traditional masculinity ideology or conform to male norms (e.g., self-reliance) are less likely to seek help for various problems (cf. Addis & Mahalik, 2003). However, researchers have not examined whether endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and adherence to male norms interferes with seeking help from a teacher for academic problems. I examined how endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology, conformity to male norms, and the sex of a college teacher are related to the avoidance of academic help seeking of college men in psychology courses. One hundred seventy eight undergraduate males filled out a demographic survey, encountered a vignette making either a male or female teacher salient to them, and then completed measures of academic help seeking, conformity to male norms, and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology. The results indicated that teacher sex was not associated with academic help seeking behavior by itself or as a moderator. However, a higher reported level of conformity to male norms was significantly associated with a reported avoidance of academic help seeking above and beyond other factors. Furthermore, aspects of traditional masculinity ideology were associated with an avoidance of help seeking. These results indicate that masculinity interferes with the help seeking of men in academic situations similar to how it interferes with help seeking in
other areas. Finally, there were three main aspects of masculinity captured by both measures that are likely culprits when men fail to seek help when struggling academically: independence, dominance, and emotional restraint.
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A major reason why the topic of male academic help seeking in college interests me stems from my experience as a college teacher. I have noticed how the least engaged and lowest performing students in my psychology classes are almost always male. In addition, male students who struggle academically rarely come to my office for help, ask questions, or talk to me after class. Research supports my experience by revealing how the academic performance and engagement of college men is indeed an increasing problem. According to Taylor and Lorimer (2002), men are more likely to drop out of school than women, men are enrolling in college at a declining rate, men populate special education classes and are more likely to be labeled as learning disabled, and men take fewer advanced courses than women. In the 1980s, males made up 50% of those enrolled in college in the United States. However, by the mid 1990s males made up only 35% of all college students (Draves, 2002). This trend also occurred in England, Australia, France, and New Zealand. Furthermore, college males receive significantly lower grades than females (Brooks, 1987; Mau & Lynn, 2001). Male college students are also three times as likely to consume a high amount of alcohol, which is associated with receiving lower grades (Gliksman, Newton-Taylor, Adlaf, & Giesbrecht, 1997). What is most relevant for my study is the finding that men do not tend to seek help from teachers when
struggling academically (Ryan, Gheen, & Midgley, 1998). Thus, males tend to get lower grades but they are unlikely to improve their situation. This combination of lower performance with an increased reluctance to seek help is a precarious one that needs to be examined further. My study is an attempt to illuminate factors related to this unwillingness to seek academic help among male college students. Masculinity may be one of those factors.

A great deal of literature exists on masculinity and help seeking behavior. Specifically, much of the literature focuses on how subscribing to socially constructed rules of masculinity (known as “the male code”) can be a potent barrier to help seeking for certain men. For example, men who subscribe to the male code tend to not seek help for psychological problems (Mahalik, Good, & Englar-Carlson, 2003), career concerns (Rochlen & O’Brien, 2002), or medical concerns (Wyke, Hunt, & Ford, 1998). Related to academics, Lasane, Howard, Czopp, Sweigard, Bennett, and Carvajal (1999) discussed how traditional masculine sex roles interfere with the academic success of boys, and Martino (2000) conveyed how a rejection of academic achievement is tied to acting out problematic forms of masculinity.

Unfortunately, despite a large amount of general research on men and help seeking, there is not a great deal of research on men’s help seeking behavior specifically related to academic problems. Identifying barriers related to men’s help seeking in academic situations may provide keys to increase help seeking behavior for men and, in turn, academic motivation and performance.
Academic Help Seeking

Before discussing the literature on academic help seeking it will be important to answer whether or not academic help seeking is a positive endeavor that improves student learning and success. Veenman, Denessen, van den Akker, and van der Rijt (2005) would argue that academic help seeking is indeed helpful. These researchers studied 24, 6th grade dyads of both sexes and found that dyads that had help seeking experience and ability achieved more than dyads without such experience and ability. Webb (1982) studied junior high and high school students in small learning groups and found that achievement was significantly related to seeking and subsequently receiving help. Tobias (2006) noted that students who have a readiness to seek help in web-based courses are more likely to experience positive outcomes. Finally, Flammer (1981) demonstrated that seeking help is a basic component of knowledge acquisition. In short, seeking help from a teacher is indeed an effective academic strategy in many cases.

Definition of terms. At this point it will be pertinent to distinguish between and offer definitions for the terms sex and gender as they will be used throughout this document. First, sex and gender are not synonyms and will not be discussed as such in this document. The term sex refers to the different objective, biological sexes that exist among human beings including female, male, and transsexual. On the other hand, the term gender refers to the subjective, psychological, internalized experience of the masculine-feminine continuum (Sue, Sue, & Sue, 2006). To put it another way, sex is a discrete variable whereas gender is a continuous variable. The position of the gender role strain paradigm (Pleck, 1995) is that gender is socially constructed (i.e. imposed upon us by society and culture and then internalized). Moreover, gender is malleable whereas sex
can only be changed through invasive surgery. Thus, a person may be of a particular sex biologically but can psychologically identify more with the end of the gender spectrum that differs from her or his sex. For example, it is possible for person who is biologically and objectively male to identify more with the feminine gender. Brannon (1985) theorized how individuals of the male sex are influenced by cultural rules delineating how those men should act to be in accordance with the masculine side of the gender continuum. In this document, the terms *masculinity* and *femininity* are used to refer to gender.

Regarding academic help seeking, researchers make a distinction between *instrumental* and *executive* help seeking (Nelson-Le Gall, Gummerman, & Scott-Jones, 1983). Students who utilize *instrumental* help seeking are more concerned with the process of learning and increasing their understanding and mastery of academic material; they are considered intrinsically motivated. Conversely, students who engage in *executive* help seeking want to have problems solved for them, tend to focus on an outcome (i.e., grade), and tend to care about acquiring the answer versus learning how to arrive at the answer; they are considered to be extrinsically motivated. There are studies showing a relationship between sex and propensity for utilizing either instrumental or executive help-seeking (Cheong, Pajares, & Oberman, 2004). One prime example is a study by Gernigon, d’Arripe-Longueville, Debove, and Puvis (2003). These researchers assigned adolescent students to perform a motor task and examined the help-seeking requests made by the students. They found that females made more instrumental help requests than males. This result suggests that males may be less likely to engage in instrumental help-seeking.
Kennedy (1997) provided a helpful, succinct overview of variables that are associated with academic help seeking behavior, and mentioned how the decision to seek help in academic settings is a function of two broad categories of variables: personal characteristics of the help-seeker (e.g., masculinity or femininity) and contextual characteristics of the social setting. I address both categories by examining masculinity and propensity for either executive or instrumental help seeking (personal characteristics) and the sex of the teacher one seeks help from (a characteristic of the classroom setting). The following section is a brief outline on work that researchers have done on personal characteristics of academic help seeking.

**Personal Characteristics of Academic Help-Seeking**

One personal characteristic of help seeking that researchers have addressed is age. Perrine, Lisle, and Tucker (1999) performed a study in which 104 male and female students read a syllabus and then rated the extent to which they would seek help from the instructor for six different problems. The results indicated that younger students (i.e. students 18 to 24 years of age) were significantly less willing to seek academic help than students 25 years of age or older. This finding was supported by Duncan (2003) and Gasquet, Chavance, Ledoux, and Choquet (1997), who also found that older students tended to seek help more willingly.

Several studies have examined socioeconomic status (SES) as a personal characteristic in relation to help seeking. Fischer and Cohen (1972) studied how several demographic variables including SES are associated with help seeking, and they found that SES was not significantly related to help seeking attitudes. Lorion (1974) and Gasquet et al. (1997) performed similar studies and also found no relationship between
SES and help seeking attitudes. Thus, it appears that SES is a personal characteristic that is not associated with help seeking behavior.

The Fischer and Cohen (1972) study discussed above also featured an examination of how scholastic major and educational level (freshman, sophomore, etc.) were related to help seeking. The researchers noted that social science majors had the most favorable attitudes toward help seeking, whereas students from “hard” sciences such as physics and chemistry reported the least favorable attitudes. Further, Fischer and Cohen (1972) compared more advanced students (i.e. juniors and seniors) with less advanced students (i.e. freshmen and sophomores) and found that the advanced students reported more favorable attitudes toward seeking help.

Sex is a personal characteristic of academic help seeking that is of interest in my study. Ryan, Gheen, and Midgley (1998) demonstrated the importance of considering sex when examining academic help seeking. These researchers had 25 teachers and 516 students of both sexes in 63 different sixth grade math classrooms complete measures assessing avoidance of help seeking, academic self-efficacy, classroom goal structure, and teachers’ roles in the social-emotional well-being of students. Results indicated that boys reported being more avoidant of seeking help than girls. The next section concerns the literature on masculinity as related to help seeking behavior in general.

*Masculinity and General Help Seeking*

In the general psychology literature, researchers have studied many aspects of men’s help seeking behavior. For example, even though men have similar if not higher rates of distress than women, two out of three people who seek psychological help are women (McCarthy & Hollliday, 2004; Robertson, 2001). Indeed, men are overrepresented
in many problem populations such as substance abusers, the homeless, and perpetrators of violence (Levant, 1996a). These findings indicate the need for further progress in this area.

The theoretical basis for my study is the Gender Role Strain paradigm put forth by Pleck (1981), which stresses how society and culture socially construct gender as opposed to gender coming from within. Socially constructed gender roles are partially influenced by cultural myths or scripts that influence men (Mahalik, Good, & Englar-Carlson, 2003). The cultural myths in turn lead to an avoidance of help seeking. One such set of cultural myths has been labeled as “the male code” (Brannon, 1985), a list of myths about male behavior that outlines how men are supposed to demonstrate masculinity. Brannon described four rules of the male code. The first is the avoidance of acting in a feminine way. The second is to strive to be recognized for successful achievement. The third rule dictates that men should never show physical or emotional weakness. Finally, the fourth rule refers to men's willingness to engage in risky or thrill seeking behavior, and even engage in violence if necessary. This code of behavior for men is pervasive in contemporary US culture, as in reverence for athletes who play with injuries and the derision of men who cry in public.

Over the years, researchers have conceptualized masculinity in several different ways. The two conceptualizations I will use in my study are traditional masculinity ideology, which is associated with the work of Levant, and conformity to male norms, which is associated with the work of Mahalik. Traditional masculinity ideology is “a common constellation of standards and expectations associated with the traditional male role in the Western world” (Levant, Smalley, Aupont, House, Richmond, & Noronha,
Mahalik and colleagues (Mahalik, Locke, Ludlow, Diemer, Gottfried, Scott, & Freitas, 2003, p. 3) defined conformity to male norms as “meeting societal expectations for what constitutes masculinity in one’s public or private life.”

Levant (1996b) theorized about four reasons why men are reluctant to seek help. First, men tend to be reluctant to admit that they have problems. Second, men tend to find asking for help a difficult thing to do. Third, men tend to have difficulty identifying and processing their internal emotional states. Finally, men tend to avoid help seeking due to a fear of intimacy or dependency. These reasons lend support to the existence and operation of a "male code of masculinity" in our culture. A major goal of my study is to examine whether a greater endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and a higher degree of conformity to male norms is related to an avoidance of academic help seeking by male students in psychology courses.

Research has examined reasons, such as the male code, why men are less likely to seek help for mental health concerns (e.g., Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Blazina & Watkins, 1996). However, research has not directly demonstrated whether the male code is a reason why men are struggling academically and failing to seek help from teachers when they are in need of it. A major goal of my study is to see if the male code is related to seeking academic help from a teacher the same way it is related to seeking help from a counselor for mental health concerns or from a physician for physical health concerns. There is some evidence indicating that masculinity may hinder various kinds of help seeking other than seeking help for psychological concerns, such as Ashton and Fuehrer’s (1993) finding that masculine males are less likely to seek help in general than androgynous males or Johnson’s (2001) finding that more masculine individuals are less
likely to recognize a personal need for help in general. Also, Lasane et al. (1999), Martino (2000), and Newman, Murray, and Lussier (2001) provide evidence that masculinity reduces the academic engagement of males. However, the finding that masculinity reduces the likelihood that males seek help for mental health concerns may not necessarily generalize to situations in which males need help for academic problems because seeking help from a teacher may not involve the same level of stigma associated with seeking help from a mental health professional. Sue, Sue, and Sue (2006) mentioned that stigma is by far the number one problem facing the entire mental health field, and the stigma of mental health is the major reason why individuals avoid becoming involved with the mental health system. Does masculinity hinder academic help seeking anyway despite how academic help seeking likely does not involve the same stigma as mental health? This question may only be answered through an actual study examining the interplay between masculinity and academic help seeking behavior.

Examining personal characteristics of help seekers is not enough to fully understand the factors contributing to academic help seeking; one must also examine the context of the academic situation in which the help seeking may occur (Kennedy, 1997). The following section involves a brief overview of work researchers have done on contextual factors in academic help seeking.

*Contextual Factors in Academic Help Seeking*

Researchers must consider both person and contextual variables when studying academic help seeking behavior (Cheong, Pajares, & Oberman, 2004; Kennedy, 1997). Class size is a contextual variable that has received a small degree of research attention. Perrine et al. (1995) conducted a study in which they manipulated class size by having
participants read a syllabus from a class that has 15, 45, or 150 students. The participants then rated the extent to which they would seek help from the instructor for six different problems. The results showed no relationship between class size and reported academic help seeking; the students’ responses were the same regardless of whether the hypothetical class had 15 or 150 students.

The following section concerns the sex of a college teacher as it is associated with the academic help seeking situation for men. Teacher sex is the classroom contextual factor of interest in my study.

Teacher Sex and Academic Help Seeking

To date, no study has directly examined how the sex of a teacher is associated with the academic help seeking behavior of men according to their subscription to the male code. I will briefly describe research on the relations between teacher sex and general student attitudes and reactions here. This area is related to how teacher sex may relate with masculinity and the academic help seeking behavior of college men in psychology courses.

Sadker, Sadker, and Klein (1986) discussed how, in elementary level education, boys have traditionally been central figures in the classroom, and how this situation has adversely affected students of both sexes. Teachers have been shown to expect stereotypic behavior from male students earlier than female students, and when boys conform to stereotypes (or not), they suffer consequences (Sadker et al., 1986). Related, in a qualitative study, Lemare and Sohbat (2002) found that elementary school children reported a preference for seeking help from female versus male teachers. Concerning more advanced students, Freeman (1992) found that students were less willing to take a
course from an instructor who seemed more “masculine” than from a “feminine” or “androgynous” instructor. Dee (2006) noted that girls are more likely to report feeling apprehensive about learning the subject matter when a man teaches their class. Dee suggested that male students may learn more from male professors and female students may learn more from female professors. Finally, Moore (1997) reported that male students are more likely to see female professors as “male bashing”, and that male students perceive male professors to be more scientific, objective, qualified, and less politically oriented. Taken together, these findings indicate that the sex of a teacher is an important variable to account for when assessing student perceptions.

Statement of the Problem

Academic help-seeking behavior and gender (masculinity in particular) are two areas that have not been examined simultaneously, although there are logical connections between the extant literatures. There is a robust body of research showing how possessing a higher degree of masculinity-related constructs (such as conformity to male norms or endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology) makes seeking professional psychological help seem more threatening and less desirable (Addis & Mahalik, 2003). One of the goals of the present research is to see if this finding generalizes to seeking help for academic concerns. Moreover, some educational psychology literature on academic help-seeking hints that gender-related constructs may be influential in this arena as well. For instance, Lasane, Howard, Czopp, Sweigard, Bennett, and Carvajal (1999) discussed how masculinity interferes with the academic success of boys, and Martino (2000) conveyed how a rejection of academic achievement is tied to acting out problematic forms of masculinity. Combining the masculinity and academic help-seeking
literatures may illuminate ways to solve the ever increasing problem of males struggling in higher education, a problem that looms larger because of the findings showing how the students who need help the most are the least likely to seek it (Ryan et al., 1998). Furthermore, no research to date ties the above variables to the sex of the teacher and the influence it might have on males' help seeking behavior in psychology courses.

In brief, the present study is an attempt to make a connection between areas of the counseling psychology and educational psychology literatures that have not been linked empirically, but can be related from a logical standpoint. There is a need for more open dialogue between the sub disciplines within psychology, including educational psychology and counseling psychology. Researchers in these areas tend to work in their own sub disciplines without drawing upon or citing from the other. Doing so may make the progression and evolution of the research more efficient and fruitful. Counseling psychology’s focus on gender can contribute to the educational psychology literature on academic help seeking because endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and conformity to male norms may play a significant role in men’s avoidance of academic help seeking.

Significance of the Study

Counseling psychology has a great deal to offer toward alleviating the struggles of male college students. However, thus far much of the research performed on academic help-seeking behavior has been in the educational psychology literature. Variables (such as conformity to masculine norms) and values (such as commitment to multicultural issues) that are representative of counseling psychology can make a significant contribution to the academic help-seeking problem. This may be the first study that
combines counseling psychology and educational psychology to work toward improving
the attitudes, strategies, and behaviors of men who need to seek help for academic
concerns. Thus, this study may serve as a bridge between the two areas and may
ultimately lead to a better understanding of the complexities involved in the academic
help-seeking process. Freeman (1988) stated that variables studied in counseling
psychology may be helpful in understanding the classroom experience, and the present
study is faithful to that sentiment.

A large majority of the research on academic help-seeking behavior has been
performed on younger adolescents or children rather than college students. Karabenick
(2002) stated that there is only limited evidence with college students, and highlighted the
need for more research in this area using college-aged samples. Another contribution of
my study is that it will address the need for more academic help-seeking research on
college students rather than elementary or secondary school students.
My study will examine how conformity to male norms, traditional masculinity ideology, and the sex of a teacher are associated with men’s reported likelihood of avoiding help for academic problems. The purpose of this chapter is to progressively illuminate trends in the research literature that inform the rationale and research hypotheses of my study. Specifically, the progression is as follows. Males are less likely to seek help in general (cf. Addis & Mahalik, 2003), and research (e.g. Blazina & Watkins, 1996) has demonstrated that this is strongly associated with masculinity. Males are also less likely to seek academic help than females, but it is unclear as to whether this trend is also associated with masculinity. However, there is evidence showing that the pressure males experience to conform to the “male code” is related to lower academic engagement (e.g. Martino, 2000; Newman, 2002). Furthermore, evidence suggests that students may be more likely to avoid seeking help from a male teacher and more likely to self disclose to and seek help from a female teacher (e.g. Lemare & Sohbat, 2002).

Finally, Kennedy (1997) argued that the act of seeking academic help is dependent upon aspects of the help seeker (such as masculinity) and aspects of the classroom environment (such as having a male or female teacher). Thus, with the previous findings in mind one would expect that a male student who has a male teacher and feels more pressure to
subscribe to the male code would be more likely to avoid seeking help than other students. This progression will be reiterated in the conclusion of this chapter.

This review of the literature is organized into the following sections:

1. A discussion of the masculinity theory that informs my study and the models derived from that theory.
2. A review of the masculinity literature.
3. A review of the academic help seeking literature.
4. A review of studies that suggest a link between masculinity and academic help seeking.
5. A review of literature on the stimulus value of sex and the sex of a teacher.
6. A brief conclusion that reiterates the themes and connections from the previously discussed literature.
7. Research questions of interest that are related to the literature reviewed in this chapter.
8. A list of ways in which my study contributes to existing literature.

I will begin this literature review with a discussion of the theoretical underpinnings informing my study.

Theory on Masculinity and Gender Role Strain

Why does masculinity interfere with help seeking? In my experience, threat and fear of not being perceived as masculine are major culprits. Men, and especially men who identify with the masculine gender role, feel threatened by the thought of conveying weakness or vulnerability, admitting defeat, or appearing stereotypically feminine. Vulnerability, sensitivity, humility, and so forth are normal human emotions, but many
men are reinforced by culture to suppress them. Males are told that it is unattractive or shameful to cry, when in reality crying is a normal, healthy human reaction to certain life events. Males who watch sports receive the message that male athletes who play through injuries are heroic or brave, when in reality those men are taking enormous risks to their health by doing so. For example, the famous football player Shawn Merriman of the San Diego Chargers decided to play with a serious knee injury during the 2008-2009 season despite being warned by several prominent doctors to not do so; cultural messages about masculinity likely factored into Merriman’s decision. Males receive messages that winning is crucial and that one must always be the best at any given sport or activity, when in reality hardly anybody can be “the best” at what they do and those who are the best only remain that way for a limited time until someone else comes along. Considering these factors, it is not surprising that men experience a sense of reluctance when they need to seek help for various problems, as seeking help involves conveying vulnerability and other states that many males find threatening. Scholars have been addressing the issue of masculinity and how it is related to issues such as help seeking for a long time.

From approximately 1930 to 1980, the leading paradigm for explaining masculinity was the Male Sex Role Identity (MSRI) paradigm (Pleck, 1981). The MSRI paradigm posits that masculinity and femininity develop from within, and each individual must overcome the challenge of developing a healthy identity or suffer various consequences. However, Pleck (1981) published a landmark book in the study of masculinity entitled The Myth of Masculinity, in which he methodically evaluated and criticized the tenets of the MSRI paradigm. Pleck outlined eleven propositions that characterize the MSRI paradigm: 1) sex role identity is operationally defined by measures
of psychological sex typing, conceptualized in terms of psychological masculinity and/or femininity dimensions; 2) sex role identity derives from identification modeling and, to a lesser extent, reinforcement and cognitive learning of sex-typed traits, especially among males; 3) the development of appropriate sex role identity is a risky, failure-prone process, especially for males; 4) homosexuality reflects a disturbance of sex role identity; 5) appropriate sex role identity is necessary for good psychological adjustment; 6) hypermasculinity in males indicates insecurity in their sex role identities; 7) problems of sex role identity account for men’s negative attitudes and behaviors toward women; 8) problems of sex role identity account for boys’ difficulties in school performance and adjustment; 9) Black males are particularly vulnerable to sex role identity problems; 10) male adolescent initiation rites are a response to problems of sex role identity; and, 11) historical changes in the character of work and the organization of the family have made it more difficult for men to maintain their sex role identities.

Pleck (1981) saw a need to challenge this paradigm. Pleck argued that the MSRI paradigm did not adequately consider the importance of social or cultural context, and certain propositions are clearly offensive to certain marginalized groups. For example, proposition four indicates that homosexuality is the undesired result of a failed attempt to adequately develop one’s sex role identity. Pleck offered a new paradigm that he named the Sex Role Strain (SRS) paradigm, which eventually became known as the Gender Role Strain (GRS) paradigm. Pleck offered the following ten propositions of the GRS paradigm:

1. Sex roles are operationally defined by sex role stereotypes and norms;
2. Sex roles are contradictory and inconsistent;
3. The proportion of individuals who violate sex roles is high;
4. Violating sex roles leads to social condemnation;
5. Violating sex roles leads to negative psychological consequences;
6. Actual/imagined violation of sex roles leads individuals to overconform to them;
7. Violating sex roles has more severe consequences for males than females;
8. Certain characteristics prescribed by sex roles are psychologically dysfunctional;
9. Each sex experiences sex role strain in its paid work and family roles; and,
10. Historical change causes sex role strain.

Pleck (1981) reconceptualized masculinity and femininity as phenomena that are socially constructed. This reconceptualization had an enormous impact on masculinity research and altered what investigators considered as normative in masculinity ideology (Levant et al., 2007). Levant (1996a) offered a concise summary of the GRS paradigm, and stressed the importance of how the GRS paradigm views gender roles as malleable. In addition, due to the socially constructed nature of masculinity, the GRS paradigm posits that there is no single, unvarying masculinity ideology. Instead, ideals of manhood likely differ for men of different social classes, races, ethnic groups, sexual orientations, life stages, and historical eras.

Pleck (1995) updated his original postulation of the GRS paradigm by delineating three different types of male gender role strain: discrepancy strain, dysfunction strain, and trauma strain. Discrepancy strain is the social psychological concept of the self-ideal discrepancy applied to masculine gender roles (a perceived gap between one’s actual self and how one would ideally like to be). Men who experience discrepancy strain experience distress from failing to live up to their own internalized ideal of manhood,
which is usually similar to the traditional, historical ideal of manhood prescribed by society or culture. \textit{Dysfunction strain} is a label for the distress that occurs when a man fulfills the socially constructed requirements of masculinity and then this fulfillment creates negative consequences for himself or for those close to him. For example, a man who fulfills the ideal that he should be competitive who ends up working too many hours at his job, which results in an eventual divorce with his partner. Finally, \textit{trauma strain} is trauma experienced from the unhealthy ordeal of the male role socialization process. The male role socialization process can create trauma in many ways, such as male athletes being “hazed” upon joining a team or men developing physical or psychological disorders from the over-suppression of emotions.

The research literature on masculinity may be confusing to someone unfamiliar with it because of how different researchers use different terminology. There is controversy and disagreement among masculinity researchers over how to conceptualize and how to empirically study Pleck’s (1981) paradigm. An analogy would be a body of psychoanalytic psychologists who all use Freud’s theory as the basis for their work but they all conceptualize and apply the theory in their own way. This section is designed to alleviate confusion and to address the controversy and disagreement in the literature by describing each conceptualization and conveying how the various terms and models are considered in this document. The following masculinity models are theoretical and then empirical conceptualizations of Pleck’s original gender role strain paradigm. Thus, they are essentially different ways of conceptualizing the same overarching theory.
Masculinity Models

Socially constructed requirements of masculinity are sometimes known in the current literature on masculinity as the “male code” (Brannon, 1985). Brannon (1985) offered the male code as a taxonomy of maladaptive masculinity ideology.

The male code is a set of socially constructed and socially reinforced rules delineating how “real” men should conduct themselves. Levant (1996b) theorized that the male code requires men to be independent, strong, self-reliant, competitive, achievement-oriented, powerful, adventurous, and emotionally restrained. These qualities can have a positive side, but can be harmful if taken to an extreme. For example, Mahalik, Good, & Englar-Carlson (2003) reviewed literature and discussed various male code generated “scripts” that increase men’s problems but also reduce the likelihood that men will seek help for those problems. Women are 50% more likely than men to seek help for physical problems and approximately 75% more likely to seek help for emotional problems and depressive symptoms (Moller-Leimkuhler, 2002). Moller-Leimkuhler (2002) theorized a discrepancy between men’s perceptions of need for help and their propensity to seek help such that males who are aware that they need help still do not seek it, and she argued that the male code is likely a major contributor to this discrepancy. The male code taxonomy consists of the following four rules:

- **No Sissy Stuff**: The idea that men should avoid demonstrating stereotypically feminine behavior. The unspoken social rule that men should not wear "feminine" colors or styles of clothing is an example of this rule.
• **The Big Wheel**: The idea that men should be respected for displaying competitiveness and achievement. The stereotype of the workaholic is an example of this rule.

• **The Sturdy Oak**: The idea that men should never reveal weakness. The characters Clint Eastwood portrayed in Western films such as *Unforgiven* and *The Outlaw Josey Wales* are archetypes for this component. Those characters never displayed emotion or weakness while enduring tragedy or committing brutalities.

• **Give ‘em Hell**: The idea that men should seek adventure and take risks, even if they have to perpetuate violence. The stunt man Evil Knievel, who defied (and sometimes suffered) great personal injury for the thrill and adventure of risk-taking, is a cultural archetype for this rule.

The male code is likely a potent reason why men seek help for mental and physical problems less often than women (Addis & Mahalik, 2003).

Levant (1996b) theorized about four reasons why men are reluctant to seek preventative health services: 1) Difficulty admitting the existence of a problem in the first place, stemming from the Sturdy Oak rule of the male code; 2) difficulty in asking for help, which is related to all four components of the male code; 3) difficulty identifying and processing emotional states or the inability to describe one’s emotions in words, which is related to the No Sissy Stuff and Study Oak rules of the male code; and, 4) a fear of intimacy, which is related to the No Sissy Stuff and Sturdy Oak rules of the male code. Levant argued further that help seeking for psychological distress is less appealing to men who subscribe to the male code because a therapeutic relationship is intimate, and typically involves a great deal of self-disclosure on the client’s part.
Brannon’s (1985) male code and Levant’s (1996b) four reasons mentioned above are theoretical pieces that supplement Pleck’s (1981) original gender role strain theory. The following are various ways that researchers have interpreted and conceptualized gender role strain theory with the goal of generating research based on the theory.

*Traditional Masculinity Ideology*

A conceptualization of masculinity that stems from Pleck’s (1995) Gender Role Strain paradigm is known as “traditional masculinity ideology.” Levant (1996a) is the researcher primarily associated with this conceptualization. Traditional masculinity ideology is “a common constellation of standards and expectations associated with the traditional male role in the Western world” (Levant et al., 2007, p. 84). Studies have found that a greater endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology is associated with being male, being younger, being single, being less educated, reporting greater church participation, reporting greater sexual activity, being African-American, living in the southern United States rather than the northern United States, and being Chinese or Russian (Levant, Cuthbert, et al., 2003; Levant & Majors, 1997; Levant, Majors, & Kelly, 1998; Levant & Richmond, 2006; Levant, Richmond, et al., 2003; Levant, Wu, & Fischer, 1996; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994; Thompson & Pleck, 1986; Wu, Levant, & Sellers, 2001). See Chapter 3 for information about how this conceptualization of masculinity is measured in my study.

*Conformity to Male Norms*

Another conceptualization of masculinity derived from Pleck (1981) is known as “conformity to male norms”, and Mahalik is the researcher most closely associated with the area. Mahalik et al. (2003, p. 3) defined gender role norms as “those rules and
standards that guide and constrain masculine and feminine behavior, and are believed to have the same properties as social norms.” More specifically, Mahalik et al. (2003) discussed how males feel pressure to conform to social expectations, or, in other words, to conform to masculine norms. The researchers defined conformity to masculine norms as “meeting societal expectations for what constitutes masculinity in one’s public or private life” (Mahalik et al., 2003, p. 3). See Chapter 3 for information about how this conceptualization of masculinity is measured in my study.

**Gender Role Conflict**

Finally, O’Neal is the researcher mainly associated with gender role conflict. O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David, and Wrightsman (1986; pp. 336) said that, “gender role conflict is a psychological state where gender roles have negative consequences or impact on a person or others.” Further, O’Neil et al. conceptualized gender role conflict as occurring across four overlapping, complex dimensions: cognitive, affective, behavioral, and unconscious experience. The cognitive dimension involves how we think about our gender roles and the concepts of masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. The affective dimension involves our emotions regarding our own gender-role issues. The behavioral dimension involves how we interact with ourselves and others regarding gender-role issues. Finally, the unconscious dimension involves intrapsychic, repressed aspects of our gender roles outside our conscious awareness.

O’Neil et al. (1986) created the Gender Role Conflict Scale I and II to measure gender role conflict. The GRCS-I measures men’s thoughts and feelings about their gender-role behaviors whereas the GRCS-II assesses how much conflict men report feeling in various situations. Many of the studies in the masculinity literature review
below use this gender role conflict conceptualization and use the GRCS-I as a measurement tool. This is most likely the case because the GRCS was arguably the leading gender role strain measure at the time many of those studies were conducted. However, the gender role conflict conceptualization has more recently been criticized by Mahalik et al. (2003) and Berger, Levant, McMillan, Kelleher, and Sellers (2005). Mahalik et al. (2003) argued that gender role conflict is limited in that it only examines the pathological side of masculinity, whereas “normative” conceptualizations of gender role strain such as conformity to male norms focus on both maladaptive and adaptive aspects of masculinity. Berger et al. (2005) showed how gender role conflict does not capture elements that relate to male avoidance of help-seeking as much as more recent conceptualizations, such as traditional masculinity ideology. For example, all subscales and the total score of a measure of traditional masculinity ideology were significantly, negatively related to reported attitudes toward seeking psychological help (Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised Total, r = -.34; Restrictive Emotionality, r = -.25; Self-Reliance, r = -.17; Rejection of Homosexuals, r = -.44; Avoidance of Femininity, r = -.36). These scales accounted for 11.6%, 6.3%, 2.9%, 19.4%, and 13% of variance respectively. In comparison, only one out of four gender role conflict subscales was significantly, negatively related to participant’s reported attitudes toward seeking psychological help (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, r = -.22), and that subscale only accounted for 4.8% of variance. Thus, I do not use the GRCS in my study because of these criticisms and because I do not want the study to be too long for participants.
The following is a review of several key studies on masculinity and help seeking behavior that inform my study. The results of studies featuring only male participants may only be generalized to males, but studies featuring participants of both sexes may be generalized to both sexes. The articles will be presented chronologically.

**Masculinity Literature**

Blazina and Watkins (1996) conducted a study on the relation between masculine gender role conflict and help seeking behavior. One hundred and forty-eight male undergraduates complete the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS-I; O’Neil et al., 1986) as well as measures of depression, anger, anxiety, substance use, and attitudes toward psychological help seeking. The GRCS-I is comprised of four factors (Success, Power, & Competition; Restricted Emotionality; Restricted Affection Between Men; and, Conflict Between Work and Family). Blazina and Watkins found significant, negative correlations between attitudes toward seeking help and three of the four GRCS-I subscales (Success, Power, & Competition, r = -.25; Restricted Emotionality, r = -.32; Restricted Affection Between Men, r = -.24). These three subscales accounted for 6.3%, 10.2%, and 5.8% of variance in attitudes toward seeking psychological help, respectively. In other words, a high degree of masculine gender role conflict is associated with an avoidance of help seeking behavior. The results of this study should be considered with caution, however, because, although the negative relationships between three of the four GRCS-I subscales were statistically significant, the relationships may not be clinically significant. Effect sizes of .063 and .058 are considered “small” according to Murphy and Myors (2004). In addition, causation may not be inferred due to the correlational nature of the study, and the study’s self-report measures were not administered in random order so order effects...
may have occurred. Despite these limitations, this study is relevant for my study because it showed how factors related to Brannon’s (1985) male code are associated with less favorable attitudes toward seeking help. Specifically, the Success, Power, and Competition subscale of the GRCS-I is reminiscent of the Big Wheel rule of the male code, whereas the Restrictive Emotionality subscale is reminiscent of the Sturdy Oak rule, and finally the Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men subscale is reminiscent of both the Sturdy Oak and the No Sissy Stuff rules of the male code.

Rochlen and O’Brien (2002) asked 77 college men to list three reasons why they would and three reasons why they would not seek career counseling. The researchers analyzed the data by using a coding strategy previously utilized by Jobes and Mann (1999) and narrowed the 462 responses to 13 categories for reasons why the participants would seek career counseling and 12 categories for reasons why participants would not seek career counseling. Interrater agreement for the coding was 84%. The most commonly reported reasons why the male participants would not seek career counseling were inconvenience (37.7%), a preference to solve problems on their own (36.4%), and a perceived lack of need for counseling on the matter (36.4%). Rochlen and O’Brien suggested that these reasons were linked to how men are socialized to solve problems without the help of others and to avoid looking weak or indecisive. The results of this study are another example of how men are socialized to be overly independent, and this independence likely interferes with help seeking. As for a critique, the researchers asked participants about hypothetical reasons why they would or would not seek career counseling but did not ask them whether they would actually seek career-related help or not. I improve upon this limitation in my study by including a manipulation check item at
the end in which participants report whether they would seek help from a teacher or not. A positive aspect of Rochlen and O’Brien’s study, however, is how they used qualitative methodology that differs from the questionnaire methodology used by a majority of the studies in the masculinity literature.

Bruch (2002) performed a study relevant to the Sturdy Oak rule of the male code (Brannon, 1985) by examining aspects of shyness and toughness associated with the emotional inexpression of men. One hundred and sixty-nine male college students completed measures of shyness (Social Reticence Scale; Jones & Briggs, 1986), toughness (Toughness Norm Scale; Thompson & Pleck, 1986), and the Restrictive Emotionality subscale of the GRCS-I (O’Neil et al., 1986). Results indicated that shyness and toughness explained a unique amount of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .06, p < .01$) in restrictive emotionality. In addition, an interaction effect was found in which shyness related to restrictive emotionality only with men who adhered to a norm of toughness ($\Delta R^2 = .022, p < .03$). Essentially, shy men who endorse the toughness aspect of the Sturdy Oak rule of the male code tend to have more difficulty expressing emotion than shy men who do not endorse toughness. A critique of this study is that, while the moderation effect was statistically significant, 2.2% of unique variance is not a large amount and may not be clinically significant. Furthermore, this study was published in 2002 yet the three self-report measures mentioned above are all from 1986. My study improves upon this situation by using more recent measures. One positive aspect of Bruch’s study is that he randomized the order in which participants filled out the measures to control for order effects. Bruch’s study is another example of a finding that
rules of the male code interfere with men communicating emotions to others, and communicating emotion is necessary for seeking help when in need of it.

Vogel and Wester (2003) conducted a study on self-disclosure and male help seeking. Specifically, they examined “avoidance factors” that decrease men’s willingness to seek help. Vogel and Wester gave measures of self-disclosure and intentions to seek counseling to 477 college student males. Discomfort with self-disclosure of personal problems was a chief factor associated with students' reported intention to avoid counseling (r = .39, p < .001). This relationship has a moderate effect size of .15 (Murphy & Myors, 2004). Discomfort with self-disclosure is another factor consistent with The Sturdy Oak.

Relational factors are associated with a man’s decision to seek help or not. For example, Cusack, Deane, Wilson, & Ciarrochi (2004) examined questionnaires (the Help-Seeking Influences subscale of the General Help Seeking Questionnaire, GHSQ; Deane, Wilson, & Ciarrochi, 2001) from 73 men who recently sought counseling and were no longer active clients or were current clients. Questions centered on help seeking behavior and the sources of influence that triggered the help seeking behavior of the men. Cusack et al. (2004) reported that 96% of the men in the study indicated that other people (and usually more than one person) were an influence on their decision to seek help; in fact, 37% of these men reported that they would not have sought help at all if family or friends did not encourage them. In addition, the participants cited intimate relationship partners as the number one source of influence on their decision to seek help or not. Seventy-two percent of participants who sought help reported that an intimate relationship partner influenced their behavior. There are some problematic aspects of this study, however.
The participants’ therapists invited them to participate in the study, and considering how therapists have an inherent power advantage over clients some participants may have felt pressured into participating. In addition, the researchers did not report any data about participant response rate. Further, while Cusack et al. reported three week test-retest reliability estimates for the GHSQ ranging from .86 to .92, they did not report any internal consistency data. This study has some major strengths as well. The researchers used a population of actual clients who were either currently in therapy or recently in therapy, rather than a population of college students like many studies in the masculinity literature and psychology in general. This likely increases the study’s external validity. Also, this study was a needed examination of the contextual factors related to male help seeking, rather than simply an examination of the potential help seeker himself. Cusack et al.’s study demonstrates how men do not make help seeking decisions in isolation. The supportiveness of a man’s social network likely makes a difference as to whether he seeks help or not for various problems, including academic problems.

Ang, Lim, Tan, and Yau (2004) studied how sex and gender role orientation (masculine, feminine, or androgynous) influence the help-seeking attitudes of both males and females. The researchers gave a self-report measure of gender role orientation known as the Singapore Androgyny Inventory (SAI; Ward, 2000) and the Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Psychological Help scale (ATSSPH; Fischer & Turner, 1970) to 52 male and 111 female student teachers in Singapore and subsequently conducted ANOVAs to compare the mean scores of males and females on the measures. The results indicated that females ($M = 77.48, SD = 10.37$) reported more positive overall attitudes toward help seeking than males ($M = 74.35, SD = 8.33$; $F (1, 131) = 4.93, p = .02, \eta^2 =$
.04). In examining the subscales of the ATSPPH, Ang et al. also found a statistically significant main effect of sex such that females ($M = 20.79, SD = 4$) reported being more willing to recognize the need for professional help than males ($M = 19.36, SD = 3.17$). However, this study has a few substantial limitations. First, the researchers misuse the term “gender” in their study by using it to refer to “sex”, which may create confusion for readers. In addition, the internal consistency values for the ATSPPH subscales in this study were mediocre at best as they ranged from .58 to .67. Moreover, the researchers compared males and females but the sample sizes were vastly different (52 males vs. 111 females). Finally, the researchers should be lauded for reporting $\eta^2$ values as the importance of reporting effect size is being increasingly recognized (Wilkinson & APA Task Force on Statistical Inference, 1999), but the effect sizes for the significant differences in this study were only .04. Thus, the mean differences may not be clinically significant. A strong point of this study, though, is that it replicated the finding that males hold less favorable attitudes toward help seeking using an Asian sample. This study is yet another demonstration that males from various backgrounds have a more difficult time seeking help when needing it.

Researchers have studied male help seeking behavior in many cultures. Ang et al. (2004) showed how males in Singapore may hold less favorable attitudes toward seeking professional help. Turkum (2005) studied the effects of sex and gender roles (masculine, feminine, or androgynous) on the help seeking attitudes and experiences of 398 male and female university students in Turkey. Turkum administered the Bem Sex Roles Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) and the shortened Scale of Attitudes toward Seeking Professional Help scale (ASPH-S; Turkum, 2004) to 279 female and 119 male university students.
Once again, males ($M = 70.7$, $SD = 11.78$) reported less favorable attitudes toward help seeking than females ($M = 76.14$, $SD = 10.02$; $F(1, 380) = 4.71, p < .03$). The results also indicated that individuals who reported having a “masculine” gender role ($M = 71.93$, $SD = 12.78$) had less favorable attitudes toward seeking psychological help than individuals who reported having an “androgynous” gender role ($M = 77.09$, $SD = 10.93$; $t(174) = 5.16, p < .05$). Individuals who reported being androgynous had the most favorable attitudes toward help seeking. Limitations of this study were as follows. Like Ang et al., Turkum used the term “gender” when he should have used the term “sex”. Also, the BSRI is a thirty-four year old measure and it would have been preferable for Turkum to have used a more recent measure of gender role orientation. Finally, unlike Ang et al., Turkum did not report any effect sizes. The importance of this study is that it indicated, using a Turkish sample, that males and females who report being more masculine have less favorable attitudes toward seeking professional help. The finding of most relevance to my study is that masculine males ($M = 68.3$, $SD = 13.24$) had less favorable attitudes toward help seeking than feminine ($M = 74.88$, $SD = 8.27$) or androgynous ($M = 76.83$, $SD = 10.85$) males.

I alluded to this study earlier but I will convey a more in depth discussion of it here. Berger et al. (2005) gave the Male Role Norms Inventory – Revised (MRNI-R; a measure of traditional masculinity ideology), the Gender Role Conflict Scale-I (GRCS-I), the Berman-Vorst Alexithymia Questionnaire, and the Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Psychological Help Scale (ASPPH) to 155 adult males. The results indicated that higher reported scores on the MRNI-R Total scale ($r = -.34$), the Restricted Emotionality subscale ($r = -.25$), the Self-Reliance subscale ($r = -.17$), the Rejection of
Homosexuals subscale (r = -.44), and the Avoidance of Femininity subscale (r = -.36) of the MRNI-R as well as the Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Toward Men subscale (r = -.22) of the GRCS-I were associated with less favorable attitudes toward seeking psychological help. In other words, males who follow rules of the male code (Brannon, 1985) to a greater degree are less likely to seek professional psychological help. Moreover, older participants reported more favorable attitudes toward seeking psychological help than younger participants (r = .29). In terms of the two different conceptualizations of masculinity utilized in the study, traditional masculinity ideology was more strongly associated with negative attitudes about seeking psychological help than gender role conflict, as five of the MRNI-R subscales significantly correlated with the ASPPH compared to only one of the GRCS scales. This indicates that endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology is stronger at capturing the factors involved in men’s avoidance of help seeking. Finally, regression analyses indicated that rejection of homosexuals uniquely accounted for 10.63% of the variance whereas age uniquely accounted for an additional 6.5% of the variance in attitudes toward seeking psychological help. Thus, being homophobic and being younger are associated with less favorable help seeking attitudes. A critique of this study is that it featured uncontrolled variables of social and psychological contexts in that Berger et al. did not control for socioeconomic status and education level. A positive quality of this study is that Berger et al. used a community sample with a diverse age range, which is different from many studies in the masculinity literature that use college student samples. Participants in the study ranged from 18 to 88 years of age with a mean age of 55.74. The importance of Berger et al. (2005) for my study is that the study indicated that two of the variables that
my study examines, traditional masculinity ideology and age, are associated with help seeking avoidance.

Chang (2007) investigated how sex, student status (traditional vs. non-traditional), and psychological distress influence attitudes toward seeking professional psychological help. Chang gave measures of depression (Beck Depression Inventory-II, BDI-II; Beck et al., 1996) and anxiety (Beck Anxiety Inventory, BAI; Beck & Steer, 1990) in addition to the short form of the ATSPPH (Fischer & Farina, 1995) to 961 male and female first-year university students in Taiwan. Chang noted that female students ($M = 18.53, SD = 4.73$) had more positive attitudes toward seeking help than their male counterparts ($M = 17.31, SD = 5.21$). Chang conducted a regression analysis and found that higher BDI-II scores were significantly, negatively related to help seeking attitudes ($\beta = -.13, p = .001$). That is, participants who reported more depression also reported less favorable attitudes toward help seeking. This serves as an interesting parallel to the academic help seeking literature, as Karabenick (2003) found that students with poorer grades are significantly less likely to seek academic help. Traditional or non-traditional student status was not associated with reported help seeking attitudes. It was laudable how Chang attempted to study the help seeking attitudes of nontraditional college students. However, his categorization of “nontraditional” students was somewhat lacking as any student who did not enter college immediately after high school was considered “nontraditional”. Thus, many of the students in the study who were labeled “nontraditional” were likely 18 or 19 years old. The mean age of participants in this study was 19.29 years ($SD = 2.94$) so there likely was not much of a difference between what he considered “traditional” and “nontraditional” students. However, this study serves as another example of the
robustness of how most males across cultures tend to hold more negative attitudes toward seeking psychological help than females.

Finally, Pederson and Vogel (2007) performed a study on male gender role conflict (O’Neil et al., 1986) and willingness to seek psychological help. The researchers administered the Gender Role Conflict Scale-I (GRCS-I), the ATSPPH, and measures of self-stigma, comfort with self-disclosure, and willingness to seek counseling for psychological and relational issues to 575 male undergraduates. Pederson and Vogel used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to examine three potential mediators (feelings of stigma associated with seeking psychological help, comfort with self-disclosure, and attitudes toward seeking counseling) of the relationship between gender role conflict and willingness to seek psychological help. The results indicated that the mediation model accounted for 29% of the variance in willingness to seek help. Thus, the link between gender role conflict and a willingness to seek psychological help is partially mediated by likelihood of self-stigmatizing for seeking help, willingness to self-disclose, and attitudes toward help seeking. Specifically, men who reported more gender role conflict were more likely to self-stigmatize (.37) and less likely to self-disclose (-.42). Self-stigmatizing (-.65) and discomfort with self-disclosure (.21) were in turn related to less favorable attitudes toward help seeking and, subsequently, attitudes toward help seeking was positively related to willingness to seek professional psychological help (.56). As a critique, this article was published in 2007 but it still used the gender role conflict conceptualization rather than conformity to male norms or traditional masculinity ideology. This article contributed to the literature by examining how stigma and comfort
with self-disclosure are associated with help seeking and by demonstrating that attitudes about help-seeking translate into a willingness to seek help or not.

Summary. Taken together, a robust finding from the literature discussed above is that being male and/or being more masculine is adversely associated with help seeking. Blazina and Watkins (1996), Bruch (2002), Rochlen and O’Brien (2002), Berger et al. (2005), and Pederson and Vogel (2007) all showed how either gender role conflict or traditional masculinity ideology was associated with less favorable attitudes toward help seeking or a reduced willingness to seek psychological help. In a study validating the Conformity to Male Norms measure, Mahalik et al. (2003) also showed that a higher reported degree of conformity to male norms is negatively associated with psychological help seeking. Thus, subscribing to the rules of Brannon’s (1985) male code reduces the likelihood of seeking help among men. Additionally, studies from Turkey (Turkum, 2005), Singapore (Ang et al., 2004), and Taiwan (Chang, 2005) indicate that subscription to the male code occurs across cultures. My study is concerned with attempting to determine if this finding that the male code reduces the likelihood of psychological help seeking among men generalizes to academic help seeking.

One observation about the masculinity literature is that a majority of the studies on masculinity and help-seeking behavior utilize an older conceptualization of masculinity, gender role conflict (O’Neil et al., 1986). Berger et al. (2005) and Mahalik et al. (2003) criticized gender role conflict for reasons discussed above. Thus, my study addresses this issue by using the newer conceptualizations of endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and conformity to male norms. In addition, my study features a comparison between traditional masculinity ideology and conformity to male norms,
which will suggest which aspects of the two conceptualizations best capture certain aspects of help seeking avoidance.

A limitation of the masculinity literature is that many studies involve statistically significant relationships or statistically significant differences, but in studies such as Ang et al. (2004) the effect sizes are small and may not be of clinical importance. Effect size is not even reported or mentioned in many studies, such as Turkum (2005). Researchers need to place a greater emphasis on effect size and on clinical significance rather than statistical significance. Another limitation of the masculinity literature is that it almost exclusively relies on self-report measures. The use of self-report measures such as the GRCS-I seems to be the accepted norm in the literature. Masculinity is a construct that you cannot replicate in a lab and survey research is a way to study personal characteristics that you cannot study in a lab (Newman, 2002), but, as Turkum (2005) suggested, the literature may benefit from more qualitative studies on masculinity such as Martino’s (2000) study of Australian high school males. Related, much of the research in the masculinity literature is correlational and thus causality cannot be inferred. In addition, the masculinity literature appears to over-rely on college student samples. Only two of the studies in this review used a non-college sample. In my study, however, male college students are the population of interest because the study is an investigation of the academic help seeking behavior of college men.

This section of this chapter was designed to provide an overview of the literature on masculinity and the repeated finding that subscribing to socially constructed gender norms such as the male code (Brannon, 1985) can reduce one’s attitudes toward or willingness to seek psychological help. In my study I am interested in empirically
showing that Gender Role Strain (Pleck, 1981) and subscribing to the male code (Brannon, 1985) may be associated with the reluctance of males to seek academic help when struggling in a college class (Karabenick, 2003). Before discussing potential links between the masculinity and academic help seeking literatures, however, it is important to provide an overview of the literature on academic help seeking. Thus, the following section is a discussion of the academic help seeking literature.

Academic Help Seeking

This section regards the body of literature on academic help seeking. Again, the results of studies featuring only male participants may only be generalized to males, but studies featuring participants of both sexes may be generalized to both sexes (depending on many methodological considerations). This section is divided into three subsections:

1. A brief discussion of research that has been done on the difference between instrumental and executive help seeking.

2. A discussion of academic help seeking research conducted with samples of elementary and secondary school students, which is a large majority of the research.

3. A discussion of the relatively small amount of academic help seeking research conducted with samples of college students.

*Instrumental vs. executive help seeking.* Nelson-Le Gall, Gummerman, and Scott-Jones (1983) made a distinction between seeking academic help for intrinsic or extrinsic reasons. *Instrumental* help seeking involves an intrinsic motivation to learn and gain mastery over the subject matter. Instrumental help seekers enjoy the process of learning and are interested in gaining help to improve their knowledge and achieve a sense of
challenge and accomplishment. *Executive* help seeking involves a motivation to achieve an extrinsic outcome (e.g. getting a good grade). Executive help seekers tend to be less interested in the process of learning and more interested in the outcome of getting a satisfactory grade or a well paying job. They are also interested in being given answers rather than working toward them. There is evidence that males are more likely than females to be extrinsically motivated and, in turn, be more likely to utilize executive help seeking. Research in higher education and educational psychology has shown that men are more likely to cite extrinsic motivations (such as having a higher income) for getting an education (von Prummer, 1990). In addition, Mansfield and Vallance (2003) reviewed a series of studies and concluded that males are more likely to focus on the outcome of learning (i.e. executive) rather than mastery of the material (i.e. instrumental). The following is a discussion of two empirical studies that examine sex differences in seeking executive or instrumental help.

Gernigon et al. (2003) asked 20 ninth grade boys and 20 ninth grade girls to execute a gymnastics move on a set of uneven bars and measured the subsequent help seeking requests made by the students (instrumental or executive requests). In this study, an instrumental help request was when students asked a teacher to either help them to start the move or to show them how to do it, whereas an executive help request was when a student asked a teacher to hold and push them until the end of the move (essentially doing the work for the student). Two judges coded videotapes to measure help seeking requests, and the inter-rater agreement was 92.5%. Results showed that girls ($M = 5.2, SD = 2.09$) made a significantly greater number of instrumental help requests than boys ($M = 3.15, SD = 2.03$). An advantage of this study is that Gernigon et al. utilized a behavioral
manipulation in which they measured actual, physical help requests instead of asking about help seeking attitudes via a questionnaire.

In another examination of instrumental and executive help seeking, Cheong, Pajares, and Oberman (2004) administered the Computer Science Help Seeking Scales (CSHSS; Pajares et al., 2004) to 314 computer science students. Sex was significantly correlated with reported instrumental help seeking ($r = -.12$) and perceived benefits of help seeking ($r = -.14$) such that females reported higher scores on both scales. While these relationships were statistically significant, the effect sizes of .014 and .02 are considered “small” (Murphy & Myors, 2004). Another limitation of this study is that the study examined sex differences but the group sizes were highly discrepant, as there were 250 male and only 64 female participants. However, the Cheong et al. study featured an ethnically diverse sample as 54.8% of the participants were from diverse groups. Finally, I am using the CSHSS to measure reported help seeking in my study but Cheong et al. did not report any psychometric data for the measure. Like Gernigon et al. (2004), this study suggests that females may be more likely to utilize instrumental help seeking at least to some degree. In my study I am examining within group variance in academic help seeking behavior among males who subscribe to the male code to varying degrees.

In sum, males, and especially males who subscribe to the male code, may be more likely to seek executive help over instrumental help. Executive help is considered to be a less beneficial help seeking strategy (Nelson-Le Gall et al., 1983), and so sex differences in help seeking style may partially explain the academic struggles of males. The next two subsections feature a general discussion, in chronological order, of findings in the academic help seeking literature that are relevant to my study.
The Academic Help Seeking Literature

Regarding early academics, Newman and Goldin (1990) examined factors underlying children’s reluctance to seek academic help. These researchers developed a questionnaire specifically containing items measuring attitudes and beliefs about help seeking. Newman and Goldin administered this questionnaire to 65 children of both sexes in second, fourth, and sixth grade math classes. For sixth graders, reluctance to ask questions was negatively correlated with achievement (r = -.47) and positively correlated with a perceived need for help (r = .47). Thus, children who reported lower levels of academic achievement were more reluctant to ask questions even though they also reported a greater perceived need for help. A fear of negative perceptions and a desire to work independently were commonly reported reasons for students' reluctance. This article had a relatively small sample size, but the sample was ethnically diverse as approximately 40% of the participants were from minority groups. A limitation of this study is its correlational nature and the fact that the findings do not address causality.

Ryan and Pintrich (1997) examined the factors that motivate students to seek help for difficulties in math classes. They administered questionnaires measuring preference for intrinsic or extrinsic goals, perceptions of social and cognitive competence, perceived threat, achievement, attitudes toward help seeking, and avoidance of help seeking to 203 seventh and eight grade math students of both sexes. Ryan and Pintrich constructed a makeshift help seeking measure by adapting items from the measure used by Arbreton (1993). Perceived cognitive competence was negatively correlated with avoidance of help seeking (r = -.45), whereas preference for extrinsic goals (r = .47) and perceived threat (r = .36) were positively correlated with avoidance of help seeking. These relationships
accounted for 20.3%, 22.1%, and 13% of variance respectively. In addition, Ryan and Pintrich conducted path analyses and found that perceived threat from peers was positively associated with avoidance of help seeking ($\beta = .19$, $p < .01$). Thus, students who reported being extrinsically motivated and more unsure of themselves were more likely to report feeling threatened by seeking help and reported a greater likelihood of avoiding help when needing it, suggesting an inverse relationship between self-esteem and academic help seeking behavior. As for a critique, Ryan and Pintrich used a hybrid measure of academic help-seeking criticized by Pajares et al. (2004), and the Cronbach alpha coefficients reported for their study were all below .8. Academic help seeking research may benefit from the use of a preferable academic help seeking measure such as the CSHSS used in my study. Furthermore, this was another self-report study that was correlational in nature so causation cannot be inferred from the data. Finally, in the limitations section of their article Ryan and Pintrich (1997) mentioned that their study did not examine classroom context and recommended that future studies include this in examinations of academic help seeking, supporting Kennedy (1997) who stressed the importance of studying both personal characteristics of help seekers as well as contextual factors. My study addresses this by examining the classroom context factor of teacher sex.

Salomon and Strobel (1997) assessed how student sex, school performance, and socioeconomic status were related to the perceptions of social support, interpersonal concerns and academic help seeking behavior of 330 fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students of both sexes. They gave a questionnaire with questions the social network of the participants, a questionnaire with questions about the interpersonal concerns of the
participants, and the help seeking questions used by Newman and Goldin (1990). Students were labeled as good or poor academic performers based on their most recent annual report card, and the local school board already classified the socioeconomic status of the students (lower or middle class). Salomon and Strobel analyzed the data by conducting a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial ANOVA with sex, academic performance, and socioeconomic status as the factors. The results indicated that females ($M = 2.51, SD = 1.06$) reported a significantly stronger desire for closeness with others than males ($M = 2.34, SD = .97$), reported possessing a more varied social network ($M = 5.05, SD = 3.76$) than males ($M = 3.91, SD = 3.83$), and reported a greater likelihood of seeking academic help ($M = .57, SD = .22$) than males ($M = .46, SD = .24$). Conversely, students who performed poorly in school reported less supportive social networks ($M = .61, SD = .99$) and more social alienation ($M = 3.38, SD = 3.7$) than those who performed well ($M = 1.27, SD = 1.48; M = 2.08, SD = 3.04$). Although the specific means were not reported, Salomon and Strobel found that students of lower class socioeconomic status reported less favorable attitudes toward academic help seeking than middle class students ($F(1, 322) = 13.57, p < .01$). In short, this is another study indicating that males are more reluctant to seek academic help than females. The study also further suggests how factors such as the quality of one’s social network and self-perceptions of academic ability are related to reported academic help seeking attitudes. This study was another instance of using self-report measures, and the internal consistency value for the help seeking items adapted from Newman and Goldin was .72. However, a positive characteristic of this study is that it examined socioeconomic status, which is a variable that other studies in
this review did not address. Finally, the study was also a slight digression from the usual correlational methods in this literature because it featured a factorial design.

Ryan, Gheen, and Midgley (1998) examined the concept of academic self-efficacy, a term signifying students’ perceptions of their ability to complete their schoolwork successfully. The study also involved the concept of classroom goal structure. A task-focused goal structure exists when the classroom culture communicates to students that understanding, improvement, and the intrinsic value of learning are valued, whereas a relative-ability goal structure exists when the demonstration of ability relative to others is valued. A task-focused goal structure is consistent with instrumental help seeking while a relative-ability goal structure is consistent with executive help seeking. Ryan et al. (1998) had 25 teachers and 516 students of both sexes in 63 different sixth grade math classrooms complete measures assessing avoidance of help seeking (Arbreton, 1993), academic self-efficacy, classroom goal structure, and teachers’ roles in the social-emotional well-being of students. The data were analyzed using hierarchical linear modeling. Results indicated that both the individual characteristics of students and characteristics of the classroom culture are related to an avoidance of help seeking. Approximately 20% of the variance in student-reported help seeking was due to classroom context effects. As for individual student characteristics, boys reported being more reluctant to seek academic help than girls ($\gamma = -.227, p < .01$), and students with lower academic self-efficacy were also more likely to avoid seeking academic help ($\gamma = -.283, p < .01$). Students experiencing a relative-ability classroom goal structure reported more avoidance of help seeking than students in a task-focused goal structure environment ($\gamma = .245, p < .05$). Finally, students reported less avoidance of help seeking
in classrooms with teachers who were rated as having more supportive relationships with students ($\gamma = .331, p < .01$). In other words, classrooms featuring warm, supportive teacher-student relationships may empower lower-efficacy students to risk asking for help. Two advantages of this study were that it featured an ethnically diverse sample in which 52% of the participants were from minority groups and the study examined a combination of personal characteristics of help seekers (sex, academic self-efficacy) and classroom contextual variables (classroom goal structure, supportiveness of teacher) rather than simply one or the other like many other studies. My study features this same advantage as it is an examination of traditional masculinity ideology and conformity to male norms (characteristics of the help seeker) and teacher sex (classroom context).

Taplin and Jegede (2001) investigated sex differences in help seeking that lead to successful achievement. They used an extreme groups method and sent out a series of questionnaires about help seeking to 3171 teenage students in Hong Kong. They received responses from 712 high and low achieving distance-learning students of both sexes. High achieving students were those having grades in the top 5% of their class, whereas low achieving students were those with grades in the bottom 5%. The results revealed no differences between low achieving females and males. However, among high achievers men ($M = 58.95$) were more likely to report less favorable attitudes toward help seeking than women ($M = 46.2$). Men were much more likely to figure out problems and resolve academic difficulties on their own, and this independent stance is consistent with rules of the male code. Taplin and Jegede did not report standard deviations for the means above, and they did not report much information about the help seeking questionnaire that they used. Another disadvantage of this study is that it featured a low response rate of 22%,
and the authors admit that the extreme groups approach does have some flaws such as not taking individual differences and individual reasons for struggling or succeeding into account. However, advantages were that the study used a Chinese sample and the consistent finding that males are less likely to seek academic help than females was at least partially replicated in another culture.

Themes from the literature discussed above are as follows. Male students report being less likely to seek academic help than female students and this finding seems fairly robust. Moreover, students who either perform more poorly than other students or perceive that they have lower ability are significantly less likely to seek academic help than other students. This adds to the importance of finding factors that both promote and hinder academic help seeking so that ways to improve the situation for these struggling students may be discovered.

Two limitations of the academic help seeking literature are limitations also relevant to the masculinity literature discussed earlier. Most academic help seeking studies appear to be correlational studies that rely on self-report measures, and thus causation cannot be inferred and the data are susceptible to the well documented pitfalls of self-report research (Schwartz, 1999) which will be discussed in the limitations section of this document. Another aspect of the academic help seeking literature is that many studies including Ryan et al. (1998), Ryan and Pintrich (1997), and Newman and Goldin (1997) examined academic help seeking specifically in math classes. Not much is known about academic help seeking in other subject areas, and my study addresses this by examining academic help seeking in psychology courses. Ryan et al.’s (1998) study showed the importance of taking both personal characteristics of the help seeker and
classroom context into account, and they suggested that future researchers study different help seeker characteristics and different classroom contexts (such as examining help seeking for a subject other than math).

The research described above can shed light on issues surrounding academic help seeking behavior but can only indirectly inform my study as the studies were performed using elementary and secondary student samples. Karabenick (2003) said that there is a need for more academic help seeking research using college student samples as most of the academic help seeking literature has involved elementary and secondary student samples. College men are struggling academically at an increasing rate (Taylor & Lorimer, 2002), but the male students who need help the most are the least likely to seek it (Ryan et al., 1998). This additive problem highlights the need for a greater understanding of the academic help seeking of college men. The following section involves a discussion of academic help seeking research conducted with college student samples rather than elementary or secondary student samples. The articles will once again be discussed in chronological order.

Collegiate academics. Karabenick and Knapp (1988) asked 612 Introductory Psychology students of both sexes at the end of a semester about their self-perceived need for academic assistance and amount of actual academic help seeking behavior they engaged in. Karabenick and Knapp hypothesized a curvilinear (inverted U-shaped) relationship between need for academic assistance and help seeking such that students with moderate grades would be the most likely to seek help. They analyzed the data using polynomial regression and found that the quadratic component of the polynomial was significant for the frequency of help seeking behavior when regressed on expected
grades, \( t(608) = -5.62, p < .001 \). This supported the hypothesized curvilinear relationship such that students with the highest and the lowest grades did not report seeking help as much whereas students with moderate grades (i.e. the “C+” range) reported the most help seeking behavior. Students with a grade of D+ or lower reported the least amount of academic help seeking behavior. The researchers speculated that help seeking might be threatening to such students because continued failure after seeking help may add more weight to disheartening self-perceptions of low ability. A disadvantage of this study is that the entire procedure involved asking the participants only two questions about perceived need for help and one question about help seeking behavior. The data were completely reliant on student memory and student self-report, and at the end of a long semester some students may not have reported their help seeking behavior accurately. Also, the measure would have been easy to fake. However, this was one of the earliest studies of academic help seeking behavior among college students and the demonstration of a curvilinear relationship between need and help seeking was innovative and helpful for future researchers in showing the difficult situation faced by low performing students.

Karabenick and Knapp (1991) conducted a two-part research project examining the correlates of help seeking among college students. The researchers posed a scenario in which they told students to consider themselves in a situation where they faced poor academic performance. Then, the investigators administered a survey measuring students’ reported tendencies to engage in achievement-related and help seeking behaviors. Results obtained on a sample of 612 Introductory Psychology students of both sexes indicated that increased engagement in instrumental achievement activities (e.g., taking better notes and going to class more often) was significantly associated with help
seeking ($r = .44$). This relationship accounted for 19.4% of variance. Furthermore, students who reported having higher self-esteem also reported being less threatened by help seeking ($r = -.28$), and this relationship accounted for 7.8% of variance.

In the second study, Karabenick and Knapp (1991) measured learning strategies and help seeking behavior by administering the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ; McKeachie et al., 1985) to 396 male and female college students before and after a semester of course work. The researchers mentioned that the results of the first study could be attributed to help seeking threat’s simultaneous influence on both strategy use and help seeking, so they controlled for help seeking threat. The adoption of cognitive learning strategies (e.g., elaborative rehearsal) and resource management strategies (e.g., time management, creating a facilitative study environment) were significantly related to higher levels of help seeking ($r = .31; r = .28$), and these relationships accounted for 9.6% and 7.8% of variance. Karabenick and Knapp concluded that proactive learners who are more invested in their education (also known as “instrumental” learners) are more likely to seek help when needing it. This may partially explain the result from Karabenick and Knapp (1988) that students who struggle the most are the least likely to be proactive about it. Like Karabenick and Knapp (1988), the data for this project relied on the accuracy of the participants’ memories. However, this project improved upon the methodology of the 1988 study by using a greater variety of measures and by controlling for potential confounding variables.

Karabenick (2003) studied the help seeking categories, perceived levels of help seeking threat, intentions to seek help, goals of help seeking (intrinsic vs. executive), preferred sources of help (“formal”/teachers vs. “informal”/peers), academic motivation,
and learning strategies of 883 college students of both sexes in large chemistry classes. The students in the sample were mostly high academic achievers, as they had mean college GPAs of 3.34 and mean high school GPAs of 3.87. During the sixth week of a semester, which was right before the second of three exams, Karabenick administered the multifaceted Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ; McKeachie et al., 1985) and a brief academic help seeking questionnaire with several makeshift items that he wrote specifically for this study. In terms of correlations, Karabenick supported previous findings when he found that students who were more threatened by help seeking were more likely to avoid seeking academic help (r = .69) and were more likely to report a preference for executive (r = .52) rather than instrumental help seeking (r = -.26) if they did seek academic help. These three relationships accounted for 47.6%, 27%, and 6.8% of variance, respectively. The first two effect sizes are considered “large” (Murphy & Myors, 2004). Karabenick also found that students who reported a preference for instrumental help seeking tended to prefer seeking help from a formal source (i.e. a teacher) rather than informal sources (i.e. peers; r = .17). However, although this relationship was statistically significant the variance accounted for was only 2.9% so this relationship may not be clinically significant and must be considered with caution.

Karabenick (2003) noted that the relations among help seeking variables in this study were consistent with previous studies using younger students in K-12 settings, suggesting that results found with samples of young students may generalize to older, college-aged students. As well, Karabenick speculated that propensities toward help seeking may be formed early in the academic and educational process. However, the main analysis of this study was a cluster analysis that was performed to determine whether participants fell
into distinct help seeking categories. The analysis resulted in four clusters, which are described below along with the percentage of participants that fell into each cluster and the mean scores for the various academic help seeking questionnaire items (standard deviations were not reported):

1. **Strategic/adaptive formal** (17%)
   
a. High in instrumental help seeking from formal sources (4.1) and low in threat (1.3), avoidance (1.2), and executive help seeking (1.3).

2. **Strategic/adaptive informal** (25%)
   
a. High in instrumental help seeking from informal sources (4.3) and low in threat (1.2), avoidance (1.2), and executive help seeking (1.5).

3. **Non-strategic** (36%)
   
a. Lower in instrumental help seeking (2.9), slightly more feelings of help seeking threat (1.6), slightly higher in help seeking avoidance (1.8), and moderate in executive help seeking (1.6).

4. **Help seeking avoidant** (23%)
   
a. Although this group reported slightly more positive attitudes than clusters three and four about seeking help from a formal source (2.9 vs. 2.4 and 2.5), this group features significantly higher levels of help seeking threat (3), help seeking avoidance (2.7), and executive help seeking (2.8).

It is interesting how the help seeking avoidant individuals had more positive attitudes toward seeking help from a teacher than those in clusters two and three yet their levels of help seeking avoidance and threat were significantly higher. Perhaps the feelings of threat were so salient for the help seeking avoidant individuals that they overwhelm any thoughts about pursuing academic help from a teacher and improving one’s grade.

Finally, Karabenick suggested that future studies examine the influence of classroom context on academic help seeking, such as the characteristics of an instructor. My study
addresses this by examining the stimulus value teacher sex. I must once again criticize the way in which academic help seeking was measured, as the items Karabenick used had no validity evidence and had an internal consistency value of only .66 in this study. Also, I do not understand why Karabenick chose to study a high achieving sample that predominantly did not need to seek academic help. As such, the results from these data may not be representative of typical college students. As for positive qualities of this study, the study examined academic help seeking among chemistry students, which was different from the focus on math students used in much of the earlier academic help seeking literature. The cluster analysis contributed to the literature by suggesting four help seeking categories that students may fall into. Specifically, the knowledge about the help seeking avoidant category may be useful when thinking about interventions for promoting academic help seeking among those who need it most. Lastly, Karabenick took a more complex view of academic help seeking in this study by realizing that students may seek help from various sources and not just a teacher.

Finally, Karabenick (2004) conducted two studies that looked at links between college students’ academic help seeking and perceptions of classroom achievement goal structure. Regarding study one, Karabenick administered the MSLQ (McKeachie et al., 1985) to 883 male and female college chemistry students. He used exploratory factor analysis and found two distinct help seeking patterns. Karabenick referred to these patterns as approach and avoidance. For the approach factor, the eigenvalue was 1.1 and the variance accounted for was 21.8%. The factor loadings were .6 for instrumental help seeking and .87 for seeking help from a formal source (i.e. a teacher). Help seeking approach students were more likely to seek instrumental help from both teachers and
peers, and were more mastery oriented and academically successful. For the avoidance factor, the eigenvalue was 2.4 and the variance accounted for was 47.2%. The factor loadings were .87 for help seeking threat, .88 for help seeking avoidance, and .76 for executive help seeking. Help seeking avoidance students were more threatened by help seeking, were more likely to avoid seeking help, and were more concerned about their ability relative to peers. When they did seek help, they did so to avoid learning the work (executive help seeking). One problem I have with this first study is that Karabenick (2004) used the same data from the same exact sample that he used in the study described above (Karabenick, 2003). The help seeking approach factor is similar to clusters one and two from Karabenick (2003), whereas the help seeking avoid factor in Karabenick (2004) is similar to clusters three and four from Karabenick (2003).

In study two, Karabenick (2004) gathered MSLQ data from 852 male and female Introductory Psychology students at a point late in a semester when classroom goal structure was likely to be stabilized. The purpose of this study was to determine whether college students’ help seeking patterns were related to students’ perceptions of their classes’ achievement goal structure (mastery vs. relative ability), which is essentially a study of how classroom context is related to academic help seeking. Recall the definitions of mastery goals and relative ability goals provided earlier in this chapter. Karabenick used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) for the approach and avoidance help seeking patterns found in study one. For the approach pattern, a perceived classroom mastery goal orientation predicted help seeking approach pattern scores, $X^2(3, N = 852) = 89.93, p < .001$. In other words, students may be more likely to seek help in classrooms in which teachers promote a mastery goal orientation among students. For the avoidance pattern, a
perceived classroom emphasis on relative ability goals predicted help seeking avoidance pattern scores, $\chi^2(3, \, N = 852) = 210.53, \, p < .001$. Thus, students may be more likely to be help seeking avoidant if their teachers promote a classroom atmosphere in which students’ grades and performances are overtly compared with those of other students. For example, teachers who display the distribution of exam scores to the entire class to tell students where they fell on the grade distribution may be increasing the likelihood that students will avoid academic help seeking. Overall, the criticisms I mentioned for Karabenick (2003) hold true for this project. However, Karabenick (2004) contributed to the literature by showing a relationship between classroom context and the help seeking attitudes and intentions of students. Karabenick (2004) applied Kennedy’s (1997) assertion that researchers must take both the help seeker and the context of academic help seeking into account.

My critique of this body of literature is as follows. There is only a small amount of research thus far on the academic help seeking of college students, and the existing research has been dominated by a single researcher, Karabenick. Thus, there is a need for more research on the academic help seeking behavior of college students, and especially college men (Taylor & Lorimer, 2002). In addition, much of the research involves the use of self-report data and correlational designs, disallowing for the inference of causality. However, Karabenick (2003) defended the use of self-report methods in this literature by arguing that college help seeking differs from help seeking at earlier levels because it occurs in a variety of settings outside the classroom. Thus, direct observation of help seeking is impractical when studying college students and so questionnaire methods, despite their flaws, are the best available way to study college student academic help
seeking. Finally, the measurement of academic help seeking needs to be improved. Most of the studies described above used measures with little to no validity evidence supporting them, and the measures sometimes had less than adequate internal consistency values. The Computer Science Help Seeking Scales (CSHSS; Pajares et al., 2004) used in my study does not have a large amount of supporting validity evidence but it has more than the makeshift measures used by Karabenick and others. In addition, the CSHSS has generated strong reliability data. Thus, my study will improve upon the measurement of academic help seeking previously utilized in the literature.

Themes from the college student academic help seeking literature are as follows. First, and not surprisingly, proactive students who engage in more efficient study and learning strategies are more likely to seek academic help when needing it. Second, there is a discrepancy such that students who need academic help the most report being the least likely to seek it. This theme shows how bad the situation is for low performing students and increases the importance of examining the factors involved in academic help seeking. Third, students generally tend to fall into one of two broad academic help seeking categories: help seeking approachers or help seeking avoiders. According to Karabenick’s (2003) cluster analysis, a majority of students may (59%) be considered help seeking avoiders rather than approachers (although the sample used in that study consisted of high achieving students who may not have needed help). Fourth, the perceived threat of academic help seeking, which is likely tied to self esteem (Karabenick & Knapp, 1991), is a major factor in the avoidance of academic help seeking among college students. Recall the large effect size found by Karabenick (2003) for the relationship between perceived threat and avoidance of academic help seeking. For
college males, it is possible that masculinity is involved with this threat in some way, and the next section of this literature review is concerned with this potential link between masculinity and an avoidance of academic help seeking.

The following section is a brief review of articles providing hints that subscribing to the male code can indeed interfere with academic help seeking similar to how it interferes with psychological help seeking. The results of the studies described below insinuate that the robust finding that masculinity is related to less favorable attitudes toward seeking help for psychological and physical problems among men may generalize to academic help seeking situations.

Masculinity and Academic Help Seeking

Studies such as the following have suggested a link between subscribing to the male code and negative attitudes toward engaging in academic activities. In a qualitative study, Martino (2000) showed how the pressure to act in a traditionally masculine way in an Australian high school was associated with some of the boys choosing to be in certain groups and performing certain traditionally masculine behaviors to avoid being bullied. This socially pressured masculine demeanor also created a highly negative attitude toward academic work. One male student remarked, “It looks geekish to try hard” at school, indicating that masculinity is in opposition to the demeanor of a hard-working student. Football players reported being motivated to not work hard at academics and to defy authority. In short, Martino’s (2000) qualitative examination provided evidence that the rejection of academic achievement is tied to acting out problematic masculinity beliefs. This is also similar to Kennedy’s (1997) observation that students were more likely to express fear of seeking help from a teacher if they perceived their peers to be
hostile to academics (e.g., one student said that peers “pick at you” if you do well academically), which indicates that a peer environment hostile toward academic achievement may be associated with a reduced likelihood of seeking help. Martino’s (2000) qualitative study provides a refreshing change from the questionnaire methods that have been predominantly used in studies throughout this review.

Lasane, Howard, Czopp, Sweigard, Bennett, and Carvajal (1999) examined the relationship between masculinity and positive academic goal setting. Lasane et al (1999) defined positive academic goal setting as a combination of helpful educational strategies and activities such as self-regulated learning, completion of academic assignments, and effective time management. Lasane et al. administered the Index of Masculinity, the Hypermasculinity Index (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984), and the Behavioral Preferences Checklist (Lasane & Jones, 1999) to 281 college students of both sexes. The Index of Masculinity is a 19 item questionnaire developed by the investigators for this study. It features two subscales measuring types of competitiveness that likely either facilitate or inhibit positive academic goal setting, mastery competitiveness and antisocial competitiveness. Cronbach alphas for the two subscales were .64 and .75 for this study, respectively. Test-retest reliability estimates were .76 and .81. The Hypermasculinity Index measures how much participants agree with 20 exaggerated, stereotypically masculine statements. In this study, Lasane et al. (1999) reported a Cronbach alpha of .78. Finally, the Behavioral Preferences Checklist is a 17 item measure of positive academic goal setting. Lasane and Jones (1999) reported a test-retest reliability value of .86 for the measure, and Lasane et al. (1999) reported a Cronbach alpha of .84 in this study. The investigators regressed mastery competitiveness, antisocial competitiveness,
and hypermasculinity on academic goal setting. The three masculinity factors together significantly predicted academic goal setting ($R^2 = .136, p < .01$). Specifically, mastery competitiveness was positively associated with academic goal setting ($\beta = .25, p < .01$) whereas antisocial competitiveness ($\beta = -.18, p < .01$) and hypermasculinity ($\beta = -.2, p < .01$) were negatively associated with academic goal setting. These results indicate that problematic aspects of masculinity are associated with reduced academic engagement. In other words, individuals who subscribe to Brannon’s (1985) male code may be less likely to academically succeed. This finding that masculinity can hinder academic achievement supports past research such as the finding that men who were unconcerned with academic performance were judged to be more masculine and more socially attractive than other males (Czopp, Lasane, Sweigard, Bradshaw, and Hammer, 1998). In addition, Lasane et al. (1999) conducted t tests to examine sex differences, and males reported a greater degree of antisocial competitiveness than females ($t = 5.46, p < .01$). This is another study in which measurement was a limitation. The Index of Masculinity featured only moderate internal consistency data, and the Hypermasculinity Index does not have subscales to provide more specific details. Lasane et al. (1999) recommended that future studies examine the specific aspects of masculinity that may hinder academic engagement. Subscales from more recent and more psychometrically supported masculinity measures such as the Conformity to Male Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al., 2003) and the Male Role Norms Inventory, Revised (MRNI-R; Levant et al., 2007) would likely provide more detailed and more accurate information about the relationship between masculinity and academic engagement. A positive characteristic of this study is that it featured an ethnically diverse sample, in which 44.5% of the participants were
from minority groups. The importance of Lasane et al.’s findings for my study is how the findings indicated that masculinity can indeed hinder academic achievement; however, it is unclear as to whether masculinity hinders academic help seeking, and a major goal of my study is to answer that question.

Ashton and Fuehrer (1993) gave the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) and a measure of general help seeking known as the Support Seeking Questionnaire (SSQ; Nadler, Maler, & Friedman, 1984) to 178 male and 182 female college student participants to determine if individuals of varying reported gender roles differ in their reported willingness to seek help. The design of the study was a sex (male or female) by gender role (masculine or androgynous) factorial with attitudes toward help seeking as the dependent variable. Like many other studies discussed in this chapter, Ashton and Fuehrer (1993) found that males ($M = 10.61, SD = 3.52$) reported being less willing to seek help than females ($M = 12.04, SD = 2.79$). More importantly was the finding that masculine males reported being significantly less willing to seek help than androgynous males. This study did have a few limitations, however. The authors misused language in that they used the term “gender” when they actually meant “sex”. The study also used the BSRI to delineate participants into gender roles via a median split. It is commonly known in psychology that the median split procedure is inadvisable because of the resulting loss in variance. Also, the BSRI is a 34 year old measure that stems from the older Sex Role Identity paradigm that was criticized by Pleck (1981) when he offered the Gender Role Strain paradigm that serves as the theoretical basis for my study. The BSRI views gender like a personality trait whereas measures derived from the Gender Role Strain paradigm, such as the CMNI (Mahalik et al., 2003) and the MRNI-R (Levant et al., 2007), view
gender as socially constructed and malleable. In short, Ashton and Fuehrer used an outdated conceptualization of gender that my study updates and improves upon. Despite these cautions, the findings from Ashton and Fuehrer are important for my study because they insinuate that masculine males may be more likely to avoid help seeking than androgynous males. Ashton and Fuehrer’s study involved help seeking in general rather than help seeking for mental or physical health concerns, so their study’s results may generalize to academic help seeking. This may indicate that males who subscribe more to the male code may be less likely to seek academic help.

Taken together, the three preceding studies suggest that masculinity likely does interfere with men’s willingness to engage in academic activities and willingness to seek help for academic concerns when in need of it. My study demonstrates whether masculinity’s involvement in reduced academic engagement or reduced help seeking generalizes to seeking academic help when in need of it.

Summary. There are a few themes from the above literatures that stand out. First, masculinity seems associated with less favorable attitudes toward academic success (Lasane et al., 1999; Martino, 2000). Second, males seem less willing and less able to utilize their social support networks, including teachers, and this difficulty may be exacerbated by subscribing to the male code (Cusack et al., 2004). In addition, males are less likely than females to seek help from teachers (Nadler, 1997; Taplin & Jegede, 2001), and they tend to have extrinsic rather than intrinsic reasons when they do seek help (Cheong, Pajares, & Oberman, 2004; Karabenick, 2003). Finally, components of the male code have been associated with an avoidance of academic help seeking (Newman, 1990). Seeking help from a teacher is an act that violates the components of the male code.
code. In short, men who subscribe to the male code may be less likely to seek help from a college teacher and may therefore suffer even poorer academic performance. My study will contribute to the literature by examining the degree to which male students’ endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and adherence to male norms interfere with seeking help for academic problems in psychology courses.

The literature reviewed above indicates that gender is potentially a powerful determinant of help seeking behavior. Research findings in the above sections have underscored the importance of considering both personal and contextual variables in the examination of help seeking (e.g., Karabenick, 2004; Kennedy, 1997). Since gender is the main person variable of interest in the present study, it would make sense to examine a contextual variable that is gender-related. The sex of a teacher and the influence that classroom contextual variable has on both classroom culture and the help seeking propensity of students is that next variable of interest in my study that I will discuss. The first subsection below involves a brief examination of the stimulus value that sex has on self-disclosure, which is a powerful determinant of help seeking (Snell, Belk, Flowers, and Warren, 1988). The second subsection is a discussion of how teacher sex serves as a stimulus to students. Finally, the third and most relevant subsection involves a discussion of the small amount of existing research on teacher sex and student help seeking behavior. The articles in each subsection will be presented such that any literature reviews will be discussed first and then empirical studies will be presented chronologically.
Teacher Sex

Regarding the stimulus value of sex on self-disclosure, Brooks (1974) assigned either male or female interviewers to interview 40 male and 40 female undergraduates and rate their degree of self-disclosure in the interviews. Interviewers rated self-disclosure using the Revealingness Scale (Suchman, 1965). Brooks (1974) found that male participants disclosed more to female interviewers ($M = 4.3, SD = 1.47$) than male interviewers ($M = 3.65, SD = 1.11$). In fact, the male interviewer-male participant pairs resulted in the least amount of disclosure among all participant-interviewer pairs. Although not directly related to seeking help from a teacher, it is possible that these results may generalize to the classroom setting such that males may be more likely to avoid self-disclosing to a male teacher than a female teacher. Freeman (1988) mentioned that results from counseling research likely do generalize to teaching situations. A point of criticism for this study is the study’s age, as results from 34 years ago may not be applicable today. Another point of criticism is that the Revealingness Scale is a highly subjective way to measure self-disclosure, and its interrater reliability for this study was only .72. The importance of these findings for my study is that males may be more likely to self-disclose to females, including female teachers.

*The Stimulus Value of Teacher Sex*

The contextual variable of teacher sex is a topic that has received considerable empirical attention. Feldman (1992, 1993) published two literature reviews in the area. Feldman (1992) reviewed the body of research on college students’ perceptions of male and female college teachers. A theme from Feldman’s literature review was that perceptions of female teachers are more malleable given factors such as expressiveness,
physical attractiveness, and teaching method. Feldman also highlighted the fact that female teachers were generally perceived by students to be more warm and friendly than their male counterparts. Feldman (1993) also reviewed the body of research on college students’ classroom evaluations of their female and male teachers. Several of the studies found no differences between male and female teachers in terms of how students evaluated them. However, students favored female teachers in many studies that did feature statistically significant results. There are no data to report as these are literature reviews.

Elmore and Lapointe (1975) examined 838 student evaluations (in which a lower number indicates a more positive response) that included additional questions asking the students to rate their teachers’ level of warmth (on a one to five scale in which one was “very warm” and five was “not warm at all”) and to rate whether the teachers were primarily interested in course content or in the students. The students’ responses about teacher warmth were dichotomized into above average warmth (scores of one or two) or below average warmth (scores of three to five). Overall, female teachers received better student evaluation ratings ($M = 1.97$) than male teachers ($M = 2.45$, $p < .01$). Recall that a lower number indicated a more favorable rating for these evaluations; standard deviations were not reported. Female teachers ($M = 1.82$) were also rated as showing more interest in students than male teachers ($M = 2.26$, $p < .01$), and female teachers ($M = 1.87$) were rated as being more available outside of class than male teachers ($M = 2.18$, $p < .01$). Finally, across both sexes teachers perceived as above average in warmth ($M = 1.85$) were rated more favorably than teachers perceived as below average in warmth ($M = 2.48$, $p < .01$), and teachers who were perceived as being more interested in students ($M =
1.87) were rated more favorably than teachers perceived as being more interested in course content ($M = 2.23, p < .01$). Thus, female teachers were rated more favorably in terms of characteristics that students seem to value and characteristics that may create an atmosphere more amenable to academic help seeking. This study did have some limitations that I should mention here. First, the study dichotomized teacher warmth ratings, which is essentially a median split. This is widely considered to be an inadvisable research practice because it results in a loss of variance. Second, the rating scales used in this study were confusing because a rating of one indicated more warmth whereas a rating of five indicated less warmth and so on. Finally, the study relied on subjective student reports so the problems inherent to subjective report research are relevant here. The importance to my study, however, is how these findings suggest that students may perceive female teachers as more approachable.

Basow (1990) examined how teacher sex and teacher expressiveness influence student ratings of teachers. Basow randomly assigned forty male and forty female undergraduate participants to watch one of four different seven minute video clips depicting a teacher giving a history lecture. Basow controlled for potential confounds by using teachers similar in attractiveness and age and by having the teachers lecture on the same content. For this study, an “expressive” teacher was a teacher who used open body language, gesticulation, and varied nonverbal cues. The four video clips were as follows: a female expressive teacher, a female nonexpressive teacher, a male expressive teacher, and a male nonexpressive teacher. After participants viewed one of the four video clips they filled out a 26-item teacher rating form and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI: Bem, 1974). For the teacher rating form, a lower number indicated a more favorable
rating. The students filled out the BSRI in order to rate the masculinity or femininity of the teacher on the clip rather than themselves; a higher number indicated a higher degree of masculinity or femininity. Basow performed correlations and a teacher expressiveness by teacher sex by student sex multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) along with post hoc tests to analyze the data. Teacher masculinity was negatively correlated with the teacher’s overall rating (r = .28, p < .01) such that teachers perceived as more masculine received less favorable ratings. This relationship accounted for 7.8% of variance. Regarding the MANOVA, expressive female teachers (M = 3.2, SD = 1) received significantly more favorable ratings than expressive male teachers (M = 3.6, SD = .7), F(1, 72) = 4.9, MS_e = 7.99, p < .05. There was no overall sex difference between the nonexpressive teachers. In addition, expressive female teachers (M = 13.6, SD = 4.6) received more favorable ratings for “instructor-student interaction” than expressive male teachers (M = 15.4, SD = 2.8). This indicates that students reported feeling more comfortable interacting with expressive female teachers. In other words, expressive female teachers were rated as more approachable. As a limitation, the students were only exposed to the stimulus teacher for approximately seven minutes so this artificial scenario may not generalize to an actual classroom situation. However, what this study may have lacked in external validity it made up for with positive internal validity because participants were randomly assigned to conditions and potential confounds were controlled for. Thus, this study differs from much of the questionnaire research reviewed in this chapter as causality may be inferred. Basow’s (1990) study is important for my study because the results suggest that students may feel more comfortable with female teachers and thus may be more likely to seek help from them when needing it.
Basow (2000) evaluated how teacher sex was associated with student’s perceptions of their “best” and “worst” professors. She gave a questionnaire with two open-ended questions (“Think of the best professor you’ve had in college and describe what made him or her the ‘best’ in your opinion”; “Think of the worst professor you’ve had in college and describe what made him or her the ‘worst’ in your opinion”) to 61 female and 47 male undergraduates at a small, liberal arts college. The order of the questions was counterbalanced to control for order effects. Basow also asked the students to list the teacher’s sex. A research assistant coded the qualitative comments and grouped them according to theme. The data were analyzed by examining the frequencies of the descriptors by teacher sex. The most frequently occurring descriptors for “best” female teachers were “caring” (53%) and “helpful” (32%), whereas the most frequent descriptors for “best” male teachers were “caring” (43%) and “interesting” (28%). Thus, “caring” seemed to be the teacher quality most valued by students. Conversely, the most frequently occurring descriptors for “worst” teachers were disorganized (32% of female teachers and 36% of male teachers), unclear (32% of female teachers and 30% of male teachers), and indifferent (26% of both female and male teachers). Basow conducted a series of chi square analyses to determine if differences in frequency were significant. “Best” female teachers were significantly more likely than their male counterparts to be described as “helpful”, $X^2(1) = 4.602$, $p = .032$. In addition, male students only were more likely to describe a “best” female teacher as more approachable than a “best” male teacher, $X^2(1) = 4.827$, $p = .028$. This finding that male students are more likely to consider a female teacher to be approachable suggests that male students may be more likely to seek help from a female teacher. The only sex difference for “worst” teachers
was that male teachers (23.4%) were more likely to be described as “rude” or “mean” than female teachers (12.9%). One weakness of this study is that all of the data were gathered from only two questions and the data consisted only of frequencies. Also, the data were collected at a small, liberal arts college and thus the student’s perceptions may not generalize to students at larger institutions with larger class sizes and potentially more impersonal classroom situations. However, past studies such as Basow (1990) used closed ended questionnaires that may have limited the information that students could convey about their teachers. A positive quality of Basow’s (2000) study is how it used open ended questions to more directly examine the teacher qualities that students either value or dislike. Overall, this is another study suggesting that the stimulus value of female teachers may be more positive and may be more likely to facilitate help seeking than the stimulus value of male teachers.

Taken together, the studies from this subsection suggest that female teachers may be perceived more positively than male teachers. For instance, female teachers have been perceived as warmer (Feldman, 1992) and more approachable (Basow, 2000). Furthermore, female teachers tend to receive more positive overall evaluations than male teachers (Feldman, 1993). Basow (2000) argued that researchers should pay more attention to sex/gender dynamics in the classroom and the stimulus value created by teacher sex. I am heeding Basow’s message through my study because I am examining whether the more positive stimulus value of female teachers translates into male college students being more likely to seek help from female teachers.
**Teacher Sex and Student Preference When Seeking Help.**

Help seeking involves two individuals; the student who needs help and the person from whom he or she seeks help (LeMare & Sohbat, 2002). Examining characteristics of a teacher, such as the teacher’s sex, may provide clues about why certain students feel safe to seek help whereas others do not. The following studies hint more directly at an association between teacher sex and academic help seeking.

Freeman (1992) studied the effects of teacher gender role on student willingness to take a psychology course from the instructor. Freeman had 62 female and 65 male undergraduate psychology students read three instructor descriptions (of a feminine, an androgynous, and a masculine teacher) and then rate their willingness to take a clinical course and an experimental course from a feminine, an androgynous, and a masculine teacher. The teacher descriptions were counterbalanced to guard against order effects. Freeman (1992) performed an analysis of variance (ANOVA) and found an overall effect for teacher gender role, F(2, 122) = 32.1, p < .001. A post hoc test revealed that students reported a greater preference for taking a course from either a feminine (M = 5.8) or an androgynous teacher (M = 5.63) rather than a masculine teacher (M = 4.94). Standard deviations were not reported. In addition, students were significantly more willing to take a clinical course from a feminine teacher (M = 5.95) than an androgynous (M = 5.62) or masculine teacher (M = 4.86). There were two problems with this study, however. Freeman performed a manipulation check to make sure that students agreed that the teacher descriptions were indeed feminine, androgynous, and masculine. There seemed to be confusion and ambiguity regarding the androgynous teacher descriptions as several students considered it to actually describe a feminine teacher. Thus, the androgynous
description may not have accurately triggered perceptions about an androgynous teacher. In addition, this study involved psychology students and the results may not generalize to other disciplines. It should also be noted that this study was about teacher gender rather than sex. The importance to my study is that Freeman’s (1992) data further support other findings showing how students seem to prefer feminine qualities among teachers. Also, other studies reviewed previously in this section tested for student perceptions about teachers, whereas this study went a step further by asking about willingness to engage in contact with different kinds of teachers.

The study in this section that most directly showed how students may prefer seeking help from female teachers was conducted by LeMare and Sohbat (2002). These researchers conducted semistructured, open-ended interviews with 115 male and female students in grades two through seven. The students were asked to talk about any academic help seeking experiences that were salient to them. Lemare and Sohbat examined the resulting data and grouped them into categories of teacher characteristics. Regarding teacher sex, although the specific proportion wasn’t reported the students seemed to overwhelmingly prefer seeking help from female teachers. A seventh grade girl said that male teachers are more difficult to get help from because, “they are stricter, and they don’t smile a lot.” A boy in grade seven said, “I have an easier time with women teachers. I don’t know why.” Finally, a grade seven girl said, “I find it easier to talk to female teachers because I sometimes feel they understand you more.” Lemare and Sohbat said that other students mentioned a preference for seeking help from female teachers but these were the only examples they reported. It should also be noted that teacher sex seemed to be more salient to students in grades six and seven than younger students,
although this may have been due to a larger number of male teachers in higher grades. LeMare and Sohbat argued that the stereotype of men valuing independence might lead students to view female teachers as creating classroom environments in which students feel safer about seeking help. As a critique, the results of this study rely on the memories and perceptions of second through seventh grade students, which may not be highly reliable. However, Lemare and Sohbat’s data are important for my study because they directly suggest that the stimulus value of female teachers is more amenable to the promotion of academic help seeking than the stimulus value of male teachers. This study used an elementary and middle school sample, and my study is an attempt to determine if the preference for seeking help from female teachers mentioned by this sample generalizes to college students.

My critique of this body of literature is as follows. Similar to other literatures reviewed in this chapter, several of the studies reviewed in this section relied on subjective student reports. Also, several of the studies reviewed in this section are old and potentially outdated (Brooks, 1974; Elmore & Lapointe, 1975) and thus there is a need for fresh research in this area. Furthermore, studies in this section measured or manipulated gender in a flawed way. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) is a potentially outdated measure that has been criticized by gender role strain researchers for stemming from the older and potentially offensive Sex Role Identity paradigm (Levant et al., 2007; Mahalik et al., 2003). The vignettes used by Freeman (1992) could be construed as considering teacher gender as an inherent, inborn quality and such a consideration is consistent with the Sex Role Identity paradigm rather than the Gender Role Strain paradigm. Thus, there is a need for research related to teacher sex that stems
from Pleck’s (1981) Gender Role Strain paradigm. On a positive note, several of the studies in this section used features of more empirical designs such as random assignment to conditions (Basow, 1990), which is a refreshing change from studies based entirely on questionnaires that constitutes a majority of the research in this chapter. In addition, studies reviewed in this section used open ended questionnaires and qualitative methods (Basow, 2000; Lemare & Sohbat, 2002). Finally, many of the studies suggesting that students may feel more comfortable approaching a female teacher when in need of help involved samples of elementary or secondary school students (e.g. Lemare & Sohbat, 2002). It is unclear whether this trend holds true for college students. My study will contribute to the literature by providing a more direct examination of how the sex of a college teacher is related to academic help seeking among college students.

Summary. The literature on teacher sex and academic help seeking suggests that students of both sexes may feel more comfortable disclosing to and seeking help from a female teacher. Males tend to feel more comfortable engaging in self-disclosure with females (Brooks, 1974; Snell et al., 1998). Moreover, female teachers tend to be rated as more warm and friendly (Basow, 2000; Elmore & Lapointe, 1975; Feldman, 1992) and more approachable (Basow, 1990; Freeman, 1992). Female teachers also tend to receive more favorable overall student ratings and evaluations (Basow, 2000; Elmore & Lapointe, 1975; Feldman, 1993), whereas both male and female teachers rated as more masculine tend to receive less favorable ratings (Basow, 1990; Freeman, 1992). Finally, students of both sexes have directly expressed a greater willingness to seek academic help from female teachers (Lemare & Sohbat, 2002).
Conclusion

To synthesize the literature reviewed in this chapter, it is a robust finding that males are less likely than females to seek help in general, and this has been shown to be associated with masculinity (cf. Addis & Mahalik, 2003). Males are less likely than females to seek academic help (Taplin & Jegede, 2001), but whether or not masculinity is associated with this trend has not been empirically demonstrated. There is evidence suggesting that masculinity may be involved because there are studies indicating that the pressure males experience to conform to the male code (Brannon, 1985) is related to lower academic engagement (Martino, 2000). Furthermore, evidence in teacher sex research suggests that students of both sexes may be more likely to avoid seeking help from a male teacher and more likely to self-disclose to and seek help from a female teacher (e.g. Lemare & Sohbat, 2002). Finally, Kennedy (1997) argued that the act of seeking academic help is dependent upon aspects of the help seeker (such as masculinity) and aspects of the classroom environment (such as having a male or female teacher). Thus, with the previous findings in mind one would expect that a male student who feels more pressure to conform to the male code and has a male teacher and would be more likely to avoid seeking help than other students. These issues are associated with the formulation of the following research questions.

Research Questions

From the teacher sex literature, an exploratory question:

1. Are male college students more likely to avoid seeking academic help from a male teacher?

From the intersection of the masculinity and academic help seeking literatures:
2. Is masculinity associated with an avoidance of academic help seeking above and beyond other factors?

From the intersection of all three literatures, another exploratory question:

3. Does masculinity and teacher sex have an additive effect such that male students who subscribe to the male code and have a male teacher are more likely to avoid seeking academic help than other students?

Contributions

My study contributes to existing literature in the following ways:

1. My study generalizes the findings on masculinity and help seeking to academic situations. Freeman (1988) argued that variables from counseling psychology can make important contributions to educational situations.

2. My study provides insight into the reasons why men are struggling in college (cf. Taylor & Lorimer, 2002).

3. Academic help seeking has mostly been studied among elementary and secondary school students, and there is a strong need for more research on academic help seeking behavior among college students (Karabenick, 2002). My study examines the academic help seeking behavior of college men rather than male students in elementary or secondary school.

4. Basow (2000) argued that the stimulus value of teacher sex needs to be studied further, and it is unclear whether teacher sex is related to academic help seeking at the college level. My study illuminates how teacher sex is related to academic help seeking behavior for college males.
5. Levant, Wimer, Williams, Smalley, and Noronha (in press) examined how various masculinity measures capture the relationship between masculinity and engagement in risky health-related behaviors. My study is accomplishing a similar goal by examining how the Conformity to Male Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al., 2003) and the Male Role Norms Inventory, Revised (MRNI-R; Levant et al., 2007) differentially capture the relationship between masculinity and academic help seeking behavior. This may illuminate how the measures could be optimally used in future examinations of masculinity and academic help seeking.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of my study was to combine the theoretical underpinnings offered by Pleck (1981) and Brannon (1985) in the counseling psychology literature on masculinity with the academic help seeking literature from educational psychology to achieve a better understanding of the academic help seeking behavior of college men in psychology courses. In addition to the personal variables of masculinity and help seeking style, I examined teacher sex to explore a contextual variable that may be related to sex and academic help seeking. Furthermore, I compared two leading, contemporary conceptualizations of masculinity (endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and conformity to male norms) to determine how each one is related to academic help seeking.

Power Analysis

According to Cohen, $f$ effect sizes are small if they are 0.10, medium if they are 0.25, and large if they are 0.40 (Cohen, 1992). I was unable to find estimated effect size information from previous studies that are similar to mine, and when such information is unavailable the default is to use an average or medium effect size (Aczel & Sounderpendian, 2005; Lipsey, 1990). Thus, a medium effect size was be used in the
determination of the sample size. This is considered an average effect and is appropriate for the analysis.

Considering this medium effect size of 0.25, a generally accepted power of 0.80, and a 0.05 level of significance, the necessary sample size that would allow my study to be credibly compared to other studies is 128 participants, or 64 participants in each group. I stopped collecting data at the end of the spring, 2008 semester at Kutztown University and the number of participants was above this number.

Participants

One hundred ninety three male participants were recruited from an undergraduate subject pool at a medium-sized public university in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Students received course credit for their participation. The participants were directed to an on-line survey on SurveyMonkey.com from the psychology department’s subject pool web site. Of the 193 surveys, 14 could not be used because the participants stopped taking the survey shortly after filling out the initial demographics page. In addition, one survey was not used because the participant gave the incorrect response for the teacher sex manipulation check question, indicating that he was not aware of the condition he encountered. Thus, the final sample consisted of 178 undergraduate males between the ages of 18 and 38 ($M = 20.01; SD = 2.89$). Regarding reported race/ethnicity, participants consisted of 156 European-Americans (87.6%), 12 African-Americans (6.7%), 5 Latinos (2.8%), 3 Asian-Americans (1.7%), 1 American-Indian (0.6%), and 1 Bi or Multi-racial individual (0.6%). Participants also reported their estimated number of credits completed (mean number of credits = 26).
Instruments

Participants completed a brief demographic survey and report their age, sex, race/ethnicity, and number of class credits completed (see Appendix A).

*Male Role Norms Inventory, Revised (MRNI-R; Levant et al., 2007).* The original MRNI was created in the late 1980s to measure traditional and non-traditional masculinity ideology (Levant et al., 1992). The measure was revised because the wording of certain items was out of date and the reliability for certain subscales proved to be less than adequate (Levant et al., 2007). The MRNI-R measures endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology, and consists of 53 items across seven subscales (sample items from each scale are in parentheses): Avoidance of Femininity (“Men should not be interested in talk shows such as Oprah.”), Fear & Hatred of Homosexuals (“Homosexuals should never marry.”), Extreme Self-reliance (“A man should be able to perform his job even if he is physically ill or hurt.”), Aggression (“Men should excel at contact sports.”), Dominance (“Men should be the leader in any group.”), Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality (“Men should always like to have sex.”), and Restrictive Emotionality (“Men should be detached in emotionally charged situations.”).

The revised version of the original measure was initially analyzed by Levant and colleagues (2007) and was found to have strong Cronbach alphas, which were as follows: .85 for Avoidance of Femininity, .91 for Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals, .78 for Extreme Self-Reliance, .80 for Aggression, .84 for Dominance, .79 for Non-relational Sexuality, .86 for Restrictive Emotionality, and .96 for the MRNI-R Total Score.
Levant and colleagues (2007) also examined the construct validity of the MRNI-R by examining differences in how males and females endorse traditional masculinity ideology. The researchers conducted an analysis of covariance (with age and years of education as covariates) using the MRNI-R total scale, race/ethnicity, and sex. The results indicated that Asian American \( (M = 3.58, SD = .13) \), African American \( (M = 4.31, SD = .27) \), and European American \( (M = 3.14, SD = .21) \) males reported higher MRNI-R total scores than Asian American \( (M = 3.04, SD = .36) \), African American \( (M = 2.94, SD = .14) \), and European American \( (M = 2.17, SD = .08) \) females. These data support the construct validity of the MRNI-R by demonstrating that males across various racial/ethnic groups endorse traditional masculinity ideology to a greater degree than females. Further reliability and validity evidence was garnered by Levant, Williams, Rankin, Hasan, and Smalley (2008). First, in this study the Cronbach alpha value for the total scale of the MRNI-R was .94, which further supports the reliability of the measure. Levant et al. (2008) examined the concurrent validity of the MRNI-R by giving the measure to 603 undergraduate participants along with other masculinity measures derived from the Gender Role Strain paradigm, namely the Male Role Attitudes Scale (MRAS; Pleck et al., 1994), the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI: Mahalik et al., 2003), the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS: O’Neil et al., 1986), and the Normative Male Alexithymia Scale (NMAS; Levant et al., 2006). Concurrent validity was supported via strong positive correlations with these measures \((r = .6 \text{ for the MRAS, } r = .62 \text{ for the CMNI, } r = .56 \text{ for the GRCS, } & r = .52 \text{ for the NMAS})\). Finally, Levant et al. examined the factor structure of the MRNI-R by performing a principal components analysis. Principal components analysis indicated the presence of seven components with
eigenvalues exceeding 1.0. These components accounted for 44.03, 5.99, 4.78, 2.98, 2.6, 2.25, and 2.02 percent of variance, respectively. The seven factors accounted for 64.65% of total variance. Levant et al. (2008) also conducted a scree test that revealed a break after the seventh component, so seven components were retained for further investigation. Moreover, each MRNI-R factor correlated more strongly with the MRNI-R total scale (these correlations ranged from .68 to .87 for male participants) than with the other factors (these correlations ranged from .37 to .71). Levant et al. argued that these results suggest that each of the MRNI-R subscales measure different aspects of the same broad construct. In short, these data indicate a factor structure that corresponds with the hypothesized subscales of the MRNI-R.

The data alluded to above is the only available validity evidence thus far for the revised version of the Male Role Norms Inventory. However, Levant and Fischer (1998) examined the validity evidence of the original MRNI. Levant and Fischer examined discriminant validity by administering the MRNI along with the short form of the Personal Attributes Scale (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), which is a measure that the MRNI is theoretically different from and thus should not correlate with. The MRNI was indeed not significantly correlated to the PAQ (r = .06 for men and r = .08 for women), which provided evidence for the discriminant validity of the MRNI.

Levant and Fischer (1998) also examined the convergent validity of the MRNI by administering the measure along with two theoretically congruent measures that are also derived from Pleck’s (1981) Gender Role Strain Paradigm, the Gender Role Conflict Scale-I (GRCS-I; O’Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995) and the Masculine Gender Role Stress scale (MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). The MRNI was significantly and positively
correlated with both the GRCS-I \((r = .52)\) and the MGRS \((r = .52)\), which provided evidence for the convergent validity of the MRNI.

As for a critique of the MRNI-R, overall it seems like a strong way to capture traditional masculinity ideology. The measure has strong reliability evidence, and although more validity evidence is needed the existing validity evidence is strong. In addition, the factor analysis performed by Levant et al. (2008) supports the use of the measure’s seven subscales. Finally, the MRNI-R uses items that measure attitudes reflecting socially constructed ideology, and thus it is consistent with Pleck’s (1981) Gender Role Strain paradigm (R.F. Levant, personal communication, August 27, 2008). In brief, the MRNI-R seems to be one of the best contemporary measures of masculinity. See Table 1 for the internal consistency values for the present study, and see Appendix H for a copy of the MRNI-R.

*Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al., 2003).* The CMNI assesses the degree to which men adhere to masculinity norms. The scale features 94 items on a 4-response Likert-type scale, with the anchored responses of strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

Mahalik et al. (2003) conducted five studies on 752 college males \((M = 20; SD = 3.42)\) to assess the factor structure, reliability, and validity of the CMNI. Factor analysis yielded 11 factors, which became the following subscales (sample items are in parentheses): Winning (“In general, I will do anything to win”), Emotional Control (“It is best to keep your emotions hidden”), Risk-Taking (“Taking dangerous risks helps me to prove myself.”), Violence (“I like fighting.”), Power over Women (“In general, I control the women in my life.”), Dominance (“In general, I must get my way.”), Playboy (“If I
could, I would frequently change sexual partners.”), Self-Reliance (“I hate asking for help.”), Primacy of Work (“I am often absorbed in my work.”), Disdain for Homosexuality (“It is important for people to think I am heterosexual.”), and Pursuit of Status (“It feels good to be important.”).

Results also demonstrated a relatively high test-retest reliability estimate of .95 for the CMNI Total Score (over a two to three week period). Test-retest reliability estimates for the subscales were as follows: .87 for Winning, .90 for Emotional Control, .88 for Risk-Taking, .76 for Violence, .74 for Power over Women, .75 for Dominance, .91 for Playboy, .80 for Self-Reliance, .67 for Primacy of Work, .96 for Disdain for Homosexuals, and .51 for Pursuit of Status.

Cronbach alphas for the subscales were as follows: .88 for Winning, .91 for Emotional Control, .82 for Risk-Taking, .84 for Violence, .87 for Power over Women, .73 for Dominance, .88 for Playboy, .85 for Self-Reliance, .76 for Primacy of Work, .90 for Disdain for Homosexuals, and .72 for Pursuit of Status. The Cronbach alpha for the CMNI Total Score was .94.

Mahalik et al. (2003) examined the convergent validity of the CMNI by comparing it with the Brannon Masculinity Scale (BMS; Brannon & Juni, 1984), the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O’Neil et al., 1986), and the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). The CMNI scores statistically significantly correlated with the total scores of all three measures: the BMS (r = .79), the GRCS (r = .56), and the MGRS (r = .40), which showed that the CMNI measures the masculinity constructs that it intended to measure. According to Mahalik and colleagues, the CMNI was so highly correlated with the BMS because the CMNI and the BMS are
both “normative” measures of masculinity whereas the GRCS and the MGRS focus on the pathology associated with masculinity (conflict and stress, respectively). To clarify, “normative” measures of masculinity are designed to tap into socially constructed norms that men may or may not conform to. They examine both the costs and benefits of conforming to masculine norms rather than simply assessing the costs. Thus, the CMNI was intentionally modeled after the BMS but was intended to be at least somewhat different from the GRCS and the MGRS so the authors were not surprised by the correlations reported above.

Mahalik et al. (2003) attempted to determine whether the CMNI differentiates between men and women and between men who respond differently to questions reflecting aspects of health. The authors made the assumption that men would be more likely to report conforming to masculine norms than women and that men who report higher CMNI scores would report engaging in more behaviors that would negatively affect their health. Using a one-tailed t-test, the authors found that men ($M = 134.45, SD = 24.64$) did indeed score significantly higher than women ($M = 112.43, SD = 20.09$) on the CMNI, which demonstrated that the CMNI does discriminate between males and females ($t = 12.68$). Furthermore, Mahalik et al. administered the CMNI along with a series of six health-related questions such as, “I use tobacco products.” The participants responded “yes” or “no” to each health-related question, in which “yes” indicated engagement in an unhealthy behavior, and Mahalik et al. conducted a series of one-tailed t-tests to detect a difference between the CMNI scores of those responding either “yes” or “no” to each question. Men who answered “yes” to the health questions reported significantly higher mean CMNI total scores than men who answered “no” for four of the
six items. In brief, the results discussed here indicate that the CMNI does differentiate between men and women.

To examine the concurrent validity of the CMNI, Mahalik et al. (2003) administered the CMNI along with measures of psychological distress (Brief Symptom Inventory, BSI; Derogatis, 1993), attitudes toward seeking psychological help (Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Psychological Help Scale, ATSPPH; Fischer & Farina, 1995), social dominance (Social Dominance Orientation Scale, SDO; Pratto et al., 1994), aggression (The Aggression Questionnaire, TAQ; Buss & Perry, 1992) and the desire to be more muscular (Drive for Muscularity Scale, DMS; McCreary & Sasse, 2000). Theoretically, higher reported scores on the CMNI should be negatively related to self-reported attitudes toward seeking psychological help and positively related to the four other constructs. The CMNI was indeed negatively and significantly correlated with self-reported attitudes toward seeking psychological help (r = -.49). The CMNI was positively and significantly correlated with self-reported psychological distress (r = .20), but this significant relationship only accounted for a small proportion of variance, according to the effect size criteria conveyed by Murphy and Myors (2004). There was also a positive, significant correlation between the CMNI and the desire to be more muscular (r = .29), but again the relationship accounted for only a small proportion of variance. Thus, the CMNI should be used with caution when using the measure to predict psychological distress or a desire to be more muscular. Finally, the CMNI was significantly and positively correlated with social dominance (r = .48) and aggression (r = .55). In short, despite some mixed results Mahalik et al.’s (2003) findings indicate that the CMNI has acceptable concurrent validity.
Overall, the CMNI seems to be a strong measure of Mahalik’s conceptualization of masculinity. Mahalik and colleagues (2003) performed a thorough investigation of the measure’s reliability and validity across five studies and, despite a few mixed results such as the relationship between CMNI scores and self-reported psychological distress, the measure appears overall to have strong reliability and validity evidence. In addition, the CMNI is one of the most recent measures of masculinity and thus its wording is likely more contemporary than older measures such as the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O’Neil et al., 1986). Finally, the CMNI contributed to the masculinity literature by measuring masculinity from a normative standpoint rather than pathological standpoint. In other words, many older masculinity measures such as the MGRS (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) conceptualize masculinity in a solely negative way whereas the CMNI measures socially constructed norms of masculinity and conforming or nonconforming to those norms may be either adaptive or maladaptive. Thus, the CMNI is a more diverse measure that utilizes a more complex view of masculinity. Despite these strengths, however, some aspects of the CMNI have been criticized (R.F. Levant, personal communication, August 27, 2008). First, the CMNI features a four point scale whereas many other measures feature a five or seven point scale. A four point scale has no neutral point, and may not capture enough variance. Second, the CMNI has 11 factors, which is far more than any other masculinity measure. Thus, the CMNI may be spread too thin in its ability to capture the key elements of masculinity. Finally, a major criticism of the CMNI is that the measure mixes self-descriptive items that capture personality traits with items that capture general attitudes. In other words, like the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) that is derived from older Sex Role Identity paradigm, many CMNI items (such as, “In
general, I will do anything to win”) capture inherent traits rather than attitudes about socially constructed norms and pressures. This means that the CMNI may only be partially consistent with Pleck’s (1981) Gender Role Strain paradigm from which it was derived (according to Mahalik et al., 2003). Regardless of these criticisms, the CMNI still seems to be one of the best contemporary masculinity measures. See Appendix B for a copy of the CMNI, and see Table 1 for the internal consistency values for the present study.

Computer Science Help Seeking Scales (Pajares, Cheong, & Oberman, 2004).

Pajares, Cheong, and Oberman (2004) created a measure of the self-reported academic help seeking behavior utilized by computer science students. In my study, I slightly altered the wording of the questions to make the measure relevant for psychology students rather than computer science students. Thus, for this study the instrument was renamed the “Psychology Help Seeking Scales” or PHSS; Pajares et al. mentioned that the CSHSS may be easily adapted for use in other academic areas. There are four subscales: Instrumental Help Seeking, Executive Help Seeking, Avoidance of Help Seeking, and Perceived Benefits of Help Seeking. Pajares et al. (2004) found strong Cronbach alpha coefficients of .89, .92, .86, and .91, respectively, for the aforementioned subscales. See Table 1 for the Cronbach alpha coefficients for the present study. The Perceived Benefits of Help Seeking subscale was not used in the present study because the focus was on examining help seeking avoidance. In addition, participants in the female teacher condition encountered a version of the PHSS that refers to a female teacher whereas participants in the male teacher condition encountered a slightly different version that refers to a male teacher. The Instrumental and Executive help seeking
subscales each have ten items whereas the Avoidance of Help Seeking subscale has nine items. For each item participants respond via an eight point Likert-type response scale ranging from “most definitely false” to “most definitely true”. An example of an item from the Instrumental Help Seeking subscale is, “When I ask the teacher for help, I prefer to be given hints or clues rather than the answer.” A sample item from the Executive Help Seeking subscale is, “When I ask my teacher for help on something I don’t understand, I prefer that she (he) does it for me.” Finally, a sample item from the Avoidance of Help Seeking subscale is, “I would put down any answer rather than ask for help in this class.”

Pajares et al. (2004) created the CSHSS by combining two completely new subscales, Instrumental and Executive help seeking, with two subscales consisting of items that were altered and improved from previous academic help seeking measures created by Arbreton (1993) and Karabenick (2001). Pajares et al. criticized the previous measures for having low to modest alpha coefficients ranging from .53 to .78. Pajares et al. also criticized the clarity and consistency of how items were worded on the previous measures. Pajares et al. argued that the CSHSS has improved construct validity when compared with the earlier measures because it has corrected these flaws by adjusting the items to be more faithful to the constructs they set out to measure. Pajares et al. also improved the consistency of the wording by including the stem, “When I ask…” in all items.

Pajares et al. (2004) performed an exploratory factor analysis to identify the latent structure underlying the scale items for the two new subscales they created. The analysis involved the 20 items used to assess executive and instrumental help seeking. The results
suggested a three factor solution in which Factor I comprised the ten executive help seeking items and Factor II comprised nine of the ten instrumental help seeking items. Factor III comprised only three executive help seeking items so Pajares et al. decided that a two factor solution was adequate.

Pajares et al. (2004) examined the relationships among the CSHSS subscales to examine the accuracy of the measure. A positive relation existed between instrumental help seeking and perceived benefits of help seeking (r = .34), whereas there was a positive relation between executive help seeking and avoidance of help seeking (r = .35). In addition, instrumental and executive help seeking were negatively correlated (r = -.73), and perceived benefits of help seeking and avoidance of help seeking were also negatively correlated (r = -.44). Finally, instrumental help seeking was negatively correlated with help seeking avoidance (r = -.28) and executive help seeking was negatively correlated with perceived benefits of help seeking (r = -.22). This supported the accuracy of the subscales because the subscales that were theoretically meant to correlate with each other were indeed related and the subscales that were theoretically not meant to correlate did not, although the authors failed to mention whether the correlations mentioned above were statistically significant or not so the results should be interpreted with some caution. Furthermore, Pajares et al. (2004) examined relationships between the CSHSS and various achievement and motivation indices to examine the measure’s concurrent validity. Instrumental Help Seeking was positively correlated with positive academic motivational variables such as task goals (r = .59), self-efficacy (r = .16), self-concept (r = .34), self-regulation (r = .37), and perceived value of learning (r = .46). Executive Help Seeking was negatively correlated with the same academic motivational
variables: task goals ($r = -.49$), self-efficacy ($r = -.15$), self-concept ($r = -.36$), self-regulation ($-.38$), and perceived value of learning ($r = -.4$). This supports the concurrent validity of the measure, although once again the authors did not report the statistical significance of the correlations.

The study described above is the only study to date on the psychometric properties of the CSHSS. Thus, a limitation of the CSHSS is that only minimal validity evidence exists at this time. Pajares et al. (2004) evaluated the concurrent validity of the CSHSS, but there is a need to examine the convergent and discriminant validity as well. Another limitation is that the measure is self-report (Schwartz, 1999) and the social desirability of the items may seem fairly obvious to participants, so the measure may be easy to fake or students may exaggerate how much instrumental or executive help seeking the engage in. Finally, many of the items on the CSHSS seem so similar to other items that they may be construed as redundant, which may partially explain the very high Cronbach alphas that Pajares et al. (2004) found for the measure.

Despite these limitations, Pajares et al. (2004) argued that the CSHSS (or PHSS as it is known in my study) is an improvement upon the previous academic help seeking measures of Arbreton (1993) and Karabenick (2001), and I would have to agree. The Cronbach alphas for the CSHSS are considerably higher than those obtained by previous researchers for earlier measures, even accounting for the redundancy described above. Also, the CSHSS appears to have stronger construct validity than the previous measures. For example, Karabenick (2001) used the following item to capture executive help seeking: “I often ask the teacher for help before I try the work on my own”. This older item could be construed as executive or instrumental help seeking depending on the
situation, and thus it is not an accurate gauge of executive help seeking. The new Executive Help Seeking Scale of the CSHSS features a similar item, which captures the construct of executive help seeking more accurately: “When I ask my teacher for help, I want the teacher to do the work for me rather than help me be able to complete the work myself.” Finally, a positive characteristic of the CSHSS is that it measures academic help-seeking as a multi-dimensional construct, which is more accurate than a measure that does not take the diversity of academic help seeking styles into account. In brief, the CSHSS seems to be the best available measure of academic help seeking and thus was the best way to capture avoidance of help seeking in my study. See Appendices D and E for copies of the measure.

Manipulation Check Items

Two manipulation check questions were featured at the end of the on-line survey. The purpose of the first item was to determine if the participants accurately perceived and remembered the teacher sex condition that they randomly encountered. Participants were asked to click on either “male” or “female” after reading the question, “What was the sex (male or female) of the teacher from the description you read earlier?” The purpose of the second manipulation check item was to determine if the responses on the Psychology Help Seeking Scales (PHSS) were consistent with the participants’ actual likelihood of seeking academic help or not. Participants were asked to click on either “yes” or “no” after reading the question, “If you were struggling in this teacher’s class, would you seek help from that teacher by going to posted office hours?”
Procedures

I acquired University of Akron Institutional Review Board approval followed by Kutztown University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board approval before conducting my study. See Appendix I for copies of both letters. After receiving this approval, I made the link to the on-line survey active on the psychology department’s subject pool web site. The informed consent statement was the initial page of the survey (see Appendix F for the informed consent for participation), and the participants’ consent was assumed if they continued. Participants were notified that they were free to discontinue the study at any time without penalty. The informed consent page was followed by demographic questions. If a participant reported being female on the demographics page, then they were closed out of the survey immediately since the measures were only appropriate for male participants. Upon finishing the demographics page, the survey in Survey Monkey was designed such that participants were randomly sent to one of two different pages on the survey after they clicked to continue. Thus, the survey randomly placed the participant into either the male teacher or female teacher condition and they encountered either the male or female teacher vignette (see Appendix C for a copy of the vignettes). This was followed by either the male or female teacher version of the help-seeking measures, and then the CMNI, the MRNI-R, and finally the two manipulation check items. The materials took approximately 30 minutes to complete. SurveyMonkey.com is an interactive web-based data collection system that allows for participants to complete research materials in an anonymous manner from any location over the Internet. SurveyMonkey.com employs 128-bit encryption, secure socket layer technology that offers state-of-the-art confidentiality and anonymity for survey
responders. Data collected and stored by SurveyMonkey.com is available only to the account owner and is not shared with any third parties. Data have been reported in aggregate form so that individual participants cannot be identified. The following are the three research hypotheses for my study, which were based on the research questions mentioned in chapter two, followed by a brief discussion of how the data will be analyzed.

**Research Hypotheses:**

1). Participants completing research materials in the female teacher condition (versus the male teacher condition) will have statistically significantly lower mean scores on the modified Avoidance of Help Seeking subscale of the PHSS.

2). For participants in both the female and male teacher conditions, scores on the CMNI and MRNI-R will explain a statistically significant amount of variance in the modified Avoidance of Help Seeking subscale of the PHSS more so than what is accounted for by demographics, amount of course work taken, and propensity for engaging in executive help-seeking.

3). Teacher sex will moderate the relationship between masculinity and help seeking avoidance such that encountering the male teacher vignette will lead to a greater self-reported avoidance of help seeking and this degree of avoidance will be exacerbated for participants who score high on the MRNI-R and the CMNI.

**Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics (e.g., frequencies) were be reported for each measure and on the demographic variables collected from the data set. A zero-order correlation matrix of all measures and relevant demographics was calculated and presented. I also examined
the manipulation check items to determine if the teacher sex vignette manipulation was
effective and whether participants who reported a low level of academic help seeking
avoidance would be more likely to answer “yes” when asked if they would seek academic
help if in need of it.

A preliminary MANOVA analysis was conducted first to ascertain if key
variables differed in a statistically significant manner by instructor sex. In this analysis,
instructor sex (female and male) served as the independent variable, and the modified
CSHSS subscales served as the dependent variables. Differences by instructor sex were
not found, so the primary analysis of interest did not involve two separate regression
analyses for each condition. Considering that my study was exploratory in nature, I
performed a standard multiple regression analysis to determine which independent
variables were the best predictors of the dependent variable, avoidance of help seeking.
The major independent variables of interest were traditional masculinity ideology (as
measured by the MRNI-R), conformity to masculinity norms (as measured by the CMNI
subscales), age, ethnicity, and college credit hours completed. I examined significant R^2
for change to assess the impact of these variables.

*Testing Hypotheses.* To test hypothesis one I performed a one-way analysis of
variance (ANOVA) with teacher sex as the independent variable and help seeking
avoidance as the dependent variable. To test hypothesis two I performed a hierarchical
regression analysis in which age, ethnicity, number of college credit hours completed,
and executive help seeking were entered in the first block and then total scores for the
CMNI and MRNI-R were entered in the second block. Finally, I tested hypothesis three
by using Frazier, Tix, and Barron’s (2004) recommendations for performing moderation
analyses. I centered the independent variable and then created a product term for the moderation analysis. Hypothesis two determined which masculinity measure better captures avoidance of help seeking, so the independent variable when testing hypothesis three consisted of the total score for the measure that accounted for more variance in help seeking avoidance. I then conducted a hierarchical regression analysis in which teacher sex and the total masculinity score were be entered in the first block and then the product term was entered in the second block.
I included two manipulation check items at the end of the on-line survey. The purpose of the first item was to determine if the participants accurately perceived and remembered the teacher sex condition that they randomly encountered. I examined the data visually and only 1 out of 179 participants gave the wrong answer when responding to the question, “What was the sex (male or female) of the teacher from the description you read earlier?” This indicates that the teacher sex vignette manipulation was indeed effective.

The purpose of the second manipulation check item was to determine if the responses on the modified Computer Science Help Seeking Scales or CSHSS (renamed the Psychology Help Seeking Scales or PHSS) were consistent with the participants’ actual likelihood of seeking academic help or not. Participants responded “yes” or “no” to the question, “If you were struggling in this teacher’s class, would you seek help from that teacher by going to posted office hours?” 139 participants responded “yes” whereas 39 participants responded “no”. I performed a chi square test to determine if the number of participants responding “yes” or “no” significantly differed from what would be expected by chance (.5 or 50%). The chi square test was significant ($\chi^2 = 56.18$, p < .001), indicating that a significantly greater number of participants responded “yes” when
asked if they would seek academic help when struggling in the teacher’s class. Furthermore, I performed a one-way ANOVA with the help-seeking manipulation as the independent variable and help seeking avoidance as the dependent variable to determine if the participants who responded “no” to the second manipulation check item would have significantly higher scores on the Avoidance of Help Seeking subscale of the PHSS. Participants who responded “no” did indeed have significantly higher mean scores on the Avoidance of Help Seeking scale \( (M = 4.27, SD = 2.7) \) than participants who responded “yes” \( (M = 2.69, SD = 1.3) \), \( [F(1, 176) = 34.39, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .163] \). This indicates that participants responded consistently to both the manipulation check item and the Avoidance of Help Seeking scale.

Data Screening

The data were screened to make sure no observations were outside their possible numerical ranges (for example, CMNI scores could only be from zero to three), and all observations were in their expected ranges. I analyzed for outliers by using the procedure recommended by Fox (1991). I created a residuals plot, and decided to not delete any cases because no standardized residuals on the plot were below -3 or above 3. Finally, I used cutoffs recommended by Fox (1991) and performed collinearity diagnostics in the regression analyses I performed. The tolerance values were all over .1 and the VIF values were all below 10, and thus there did not seem to be a problem with multicollinearity.

Preliminary Analyses

First, I generated the descriptive statistics for the measures used in the study. These are presented in Table 1 below. The male participants reported a mean score for the instrumental help seeking scale \( (M = 5.34, SD = 1.5) \) that is more than twice as high
as the mean score for the executive help seeking scale \([M = 2.38, SD = 1.4], t (1, 177) = 15.57, p < .001\). Thus, the participants endorsed instrumental help seeking significantly more than executive help seeking. Next, I performed zero-order correlations to examine the relationships between the variables of interest in the study (demographics, PHSS, CMNI, and MRNI-R). See Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4 for these correlations.

On the demographic questionnaire used in my study participants responded to questions asking about their race/ethnicity, age, and number of class credits completed. I will discuss results related to these three demographic variables in turn. Race/Ethnicity was not correlated with any other variable. Age was negatively correlated with the total scores for the CMNI \((r = -.24, p < .01)\) and the MRNI-R \((r = -.18, p < .05)\). These relationships account for 5.8% and 3.2% of variance respectively, which are both “small” effect sizes (Murphy & Myers, 2004). Finally, the number of class credits participants have taken was also negatively correlated with the total score for the CMNI \((r = -.27, p < .01)\) and the MRNI-R \((r = -.22, p < .01)\). These relationships account for 7.3% and 4.8% of variance, respectively.
Table 1

*Alphas, Means and Standard Deviations for the Subscales of the Psychology Help Seeking Scales (PHSS), Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI), and the Male Role Norms Inventory Revised (MRNI-R)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>PHSS</th>
<th>CMNI</th>
<th>MRNI-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help Seeking Avoidance (α = .94)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Help Seeking (α = .94)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Help Seeking (α = .90)</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMNI Total (α = .92)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning (α = .91)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Control (α = .89)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking (α = .83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence (α = .87)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power over Women (α = .84)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance (α = .73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy (α = .88)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance (α = .86)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primacy of Work (α = .76)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disdain for Homosexuals (α = .93)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit of Status (α = .75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNI-R Total (α = .97)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of Femininity (α = .91)</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophobia (α = .93)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Self-Reliance (α = .85)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression (α = .89)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance (α = .91)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-relational Sex (α = .84)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Emotionality (α = .89)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Correlations between demographic variables, subscales of the Psychology Help Seeking Scales, and total scores for the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory and the Male Role Norms Inventory, Revised (N = 178)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instrumental HS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive HS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HS Avoidance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Credits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CMNI Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MRNI-R Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05, two-tailed, ** = p < .01, two-tailed
Table 3

*Correlations between subscales of the Psychology Help Seeking Scales and subscales of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (N = 178)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instrumental HS</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive HS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HS Avoidance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Winning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional Control</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Risk Taking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Violence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Power over Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Playboy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Self-Reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Primacy of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Disdain for Homosexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Pursuit of Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05, two-tailed, ** = p < .01, two-tailed
Table 4

Correlations between subscales of the Psychology Help Seeking Scales and subscales of the Male Role Norms Inventory, Revised (N = 178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instrumental HS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive HS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HS Avoidance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Avoidance of Femininity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Homophobia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extreme Self-Reliance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aggression</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dominance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-relational Sex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Restrictive Emotionality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05, two-tailed, ** = p < .01, two-tailed
Regarding the PHSS, instrumental help seeking and executive help seeking are contrasting help seeking strategies. Thus, one would expect the two variables to be negatively correlated and they were (r = -.52, p < .001). The main dependent variable of interest in the study, help seeking avoidance, was negatively correlated with instrumental help seeking (r = -.33, p < .001) and positively correlated with executive help seeking (r = .36, p < .001). The effect sizes of these relationships were both “moderate” (Murphy & Myors, 2004) as they accounted for 10.9% and 13% of variance, respectively. Both of these correlations supported the findings of Pajares et al. (2004). An instrumental help seeker would be less likely to avoid seeking help altogether whereas an executive help seeker may be reluctant to seek help in the first place. Although the effect sizes were small, the CMNI total score was negatively correlated with instrumental help seeking (r = -.19, p < .01) and positively correlated with executive help seeking (r = .18, p < .05). However, the MRNI-R was not correlated with either of those variables. Finally, avoidance of help seeking was positively correlated with the total scores of both the CMNI (r = .30, p < .001) and the MRNI-R (r = .24, p = .001); these correlations accounted for 9% and 5.8% of variance, respectively. This indicates that a higher degree of both conformity to male norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology is related to an avoidance of academic help seeking.

Not surprisingly, the CMNI and the MRNI-R were positively correlated (r = .65, p < .001). Regarding the CMNI subscales, the following subscales were negatively correlated with instrumental help seeking: Power over Women (r = -.30, p < .001), Playboy (r = -.22, p < .01), and Self-Reliance (r = -.28, p < .001). In addition, the following CMNI subscales were positively correlated with executive help seeking: Power
over Women (r = .26, p < .001), Playboy (r = .15, p < .05), and Self-Reliance (r = .221, p < .01). Finally, the following CMNI subscales were positively correlated with an avoidance of academic help seeking: Emotional Control (r = .15, p < .05), Power over Women (r = .30, p < .001), Dominance (r = .33, p < .001), and Self-Reliance (r = .66, p < .001). The correlation between the Self-Reliance subscale and avoidance of help seeking can be considered “large” (Murphy & Myers, 2004) as it accounted for 43.6% of variance. Regarding the MRNI-R, the Dominance subscale was negatively correlated with instrumental help seeking (r = -.16, p < .05). Furthermore, the following MRNI-R subscales were positively correlated with executive help seeking: Dominance (r = .17, p < .05) and Non-Relational Sexuality (r = .19, p < .05). Finally, the following MRNI-R subscales were positively correlated with an avoidance of academic help seeking: Avoidance of Femininity (r = .17, p < .05), Extreme Self-Reliance (r = .24, p < .01), Dominance (r = .35, p < .001), Non-Relational Sexuality (r = .21, p < .01), and Restrictive Emotionality (r = .21, p < .01).

Lastly, I generated a preliminary MANOVA to ascertain if the dependent variables (help seeking avoidance, instrumental help seeking, and executive help seeking) differ in a statistically significant manner by teacher sex, which would determine how I conduct subsequent analyses. The overall omnibus MANOVA was significant (Wilks’ Lambda = .027, p < .001). However, the results of subsequent univariate ANOVAs indicated that teacher sex was not significantly associated with degree of instrumental help seeking (F [1, 176] = 2.39, p > .05, NS), executive help seeking (F [1, 176] = 1.04, p = .31, NS), or help seeking avoidance (F [1, 176] = 3.28, p > .05, NS). Teacher sex accounted for only 1.3% (η² = .013) of the variance in instrumental help seeking, .6% (η²
= .006) of the variance in executive help seeking, and 1.8% ($\eta^2 = .018$) of the variance in avoidance of help seeking. Thus, I did not perform separate regression analyses for the male and female teacher conditions.

Hypothesis One

I hypothesized that participants would be more likely to seek help from a female teacher rather than a male teacher. I performed a one-way ANOVA with teacher sex as the independent variable and help seeking avoidance as the dependent variable to test this hypothesis. Hypothesis one was not supported because the mean avoidance of help seeking score was not significantly higher for the male teacher condition ($M = 3.26; SD = 1.78$) than the female teacher ($M = 2.82; SD = 1.4$) condition, indicating that teacher sex was not significantly associated with help seeking behavior, $F (1, 176) = 3.28, p = .072, \text{NS}.$

Two more one way ANOVAs with teacher sex as the independent variable and the two help seeking strategies as the dependent variables indicated that teacher sex also was not significantly associated with participants’ propensity for either instrumental ($F [1, 176] = 2.39, p = .124, \text{NS}$) or executive help seeking ($F [1, 176] = 1.04, p = .31, \text{NS}$).

Hypothesis Two

I hypothesized that total scores of the two masculinity measures (the CMNI and the MRNI-R) would be associated with an avoidance of help seeking above and beyond the variance accounted for by demographics, amount of course work taken, and executive help seeking. To test this hypothesis I performed a hierarchical regression analysis in which age, race/ethnicity, number of college credits taken, and executive help seeking
score were entered in the first block and then total scores for the CMNI and MRNI-R were entered in the second block.

Results indicated that a combination of conformity to masculine norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology was significantly associated with help seeking avoidance, accounting for 7% of the variance explained above and beyond the other variables ($R^2 = .196$, $p < .001$; $\Delta R^2 = .07$). Thus, hypothesis two was supported. It should be noted, however, that Murphy and Myers (2004) consider .07 to be a “small” effect. I then examined beta weights to determine which measure explained more of the variance. The total score for the CMNI significantly predicted help seeking avoidance in the positive direction ($\beta = .209$, $p = .025$), whereas the contribution of the MRNI-R was non-significant ($\beta = .082$, $p = .363$, NS). See Table 5 for an outline of these results.
Table 5

*Summary of hierarchical regression analysis for variables predicting help seeking avoidance (N = 178)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Help Seeking</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.131**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Help Seeking</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMNI Total</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNI-R Total</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.196**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = p < .05, two tailed; ** = p < .001, two tailed.
Hypothesis Three

I hypothesized that teacher sex would moderate the relationship between masculinity and help seeking avoidance such that encountering the male teacher vignette would lead to a greater avoidance of help seeking and this degree of avoidance would be exacerbated for participants who score high on the MRNI-R and the CMNI. To test this hypothesis, I followed the suggestions offered by Frazier, Tix, and Barron (2004). The first step in the process was to decide on and create a code variable for my categorical independent variable, teacher sex. Since teacher sex has only two levels I only needed one code variable. I chose to use effects coding because I wanted to examine the effects of teacher sex and conformity to male norms as average effects, similar to an ANOVA. I coded the male teacher condition as “1” and the female teacher condition as “-1”. The second step toward testing this hypothesis was to center the continuous independent variable to reduce unwanted multicollinearity (diagnostics indicated that there was not a problem with multicollinearity among the data). In this analysis I decided to only use the CMNI total score as an independent variable and leave out the MRNI-R total score because the MRNI-R total score was not significantly related to help seeking avoidance. Thus, I centered the data for the CMNI total score. The third step was to create a product term by multiplying the coded categorical variable (teacher sex) and the centered continuous variable (CMNI total score).

I then conducted a hierarchical regression analysis in which I entered teacher sex and the CMNI total score in the first block followed by the product term in the second block. The results indicated that teacher sex does not moderate the relationship between conformity to male norms and avoidance of help seeking as the product term did not
explain any additional variance above and beyond teacher sex and the CMNI total score by themselves (B = .108, NS; ΔR² = .0001). See Table 6 for an outline of these results.

Table 6

*Test to determine whether teacher sex moderates conformity to male norms and avoidance of academic help seeking (N = 178)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equation 1, Avoidance of Help Seeking =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Sex</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMNI Total</td>
<td>1.924</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.103**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 2, Avoidance of Help Seeking =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Sex</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMNI Total</td>
<td>1.945</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Sex x CMNI Total</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.104**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** = p < .001, two tailed.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Past research has indicated that a higher level of conformity to masculine norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology are associated with self-reported avoidance of help seeking for mental (Addis & Mahalik, 2003) and physical health problems (Wyke et al., 1998) among men. The present study expands on these findings by showing that conformity to masculine norms and aspects of traditional masculinity ideology may be associated with a self-reported avoidance of help seeking for academic problems as well.

Preliminary Analyses

The finding that the males in the present study reported a higher preference for instrumental help seeking rather than executive help seeking is a puzzling one, as it contradicts past research (Karabenick, 2004). However, this result may be due to demand characteristics. The participants likely realized that instrumental help seeking is considered to be the more desirable help seeking strategy. In addition, a significantly higher number of participants reported that they would seek help from a teacher if struggling in that teacher’s class. It may be the case that males are less likely to seek academic help than women but this indicates that a majority of males would still seek academic help when needing it. However, this result may also be due to demand
characteristics. The findings that a majority of male participants reported a preference for instrumental help seeking and a majority of male participants reported that they would seek help from a teacher if academically struggling may simply be due to the large amount of within group variance among males. Mahalik et al. (2003) suggested that researchers focus more on differences within men rather than focusing on how men as a whole differ from women and the present findings would support that notion. Finally, these results may be due to salience as academic help seeking is promoted at freshman orientation at the university where the data were collected.

Younger participants had higher degrees of conformity to male norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology than older participants. Thus, men may be less likely to subscribe to Brannon’s (1985) male code as they get older. This supports the work of Levant and Fischer (1998), who also found a negative relationship between age and the endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology. A possible explanation for this is that boys and young men spend much of their time at school around other boys and young men, and so the pressure to subscribe to the male code and the consequences for not doing so may be more salient. For example, a high school boy would likely be made fun of for wearing a pink t-shirt to school, as that would violate the No Sissy Stuff rule of the male code. However, as males get older the cultural messages that make violating the male code threatening are not heard as often or as loudly, or older males simply do not care as much about those cultural messages. Also, as they get older men may simply not care as much about how they are perceived. As many men develop families and careers they may be focused on those areas of their lives and they may not have as much energy to work on appearing stereotypically masculine. Regarding academic help seeking, past
research has indicated that younger students are less likely to seek academic help (Choquet, 1997; Duncan, 2003; Gasquet et al., 1997; Perrine et al., 1999), and it’s possible that conformity to male norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology played a role in that relationship for the male participants in those studies. Future research could further examine the link between age, masculinity, and academic help seeking.

As expected, a higher degree of conformity to male norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology was associated with a greater self-reported degree of help seeking avoidance. In addition, conformity to male norms was related to a greater endorsement of executive help seeking and a lower endorsement of instrumental help seeking. Thus, masculinity is associated with using a more surface-level help seeking strategy (i.e. executive) when men do seek academic help.

A common theme to emerge from the data for the subscales of the two masculinity measures was that independence, dominance, and emotional restraint may be the three main characteristics hindering men from seeking academic help. It is interesting to note that these three factors are related to rules of Brannon’s (1985) Male Code. Independence is related to “The Big Wheel” and “The Sturdy Oak”. It makes sense that males who adhere to the cultural myth that men should be independent and self-reliant would be reluctant to seek any form of help, including academic help. Dominance is related to “The Big Wheel” and “Give ‘em Hell”. Perhaps men who feel pressure to be dominant over others to conform to the Male Code are reluctant to seek academic help because it could be perceived as a sign of weakness or a loss of power. Finally, emotional restraint is related to “The Sturdy Oak”. It also makes sense that a man who experiences
difficulty experiencing or communicating emotions (i.e. *normative male alexithymia*; Levant et al., 2006) would avoid seeking help because getting help would involve admitting and conveying emotions such as frustration.

The data from the CMNI indicated that Self-Reliance, Dominance, Power over Women, and Emotional Control were the subscales that were positively related to an avoidance of help seeking, with Self-Reliance being the most strongly related by far as the relationship between Self-Reliance and avoidance of help seeking accounted for 44% of variance. Self-reliance is potentially the key ingredient in understanding why males avoid help seeking in many areas. Self-reliance may be why men don’t seek help for mental or physical health concerns, and my study shows that it is associated with avoiding help for academic concerns as well. Self-reliance may be a major reason or the major reason why men are reluctant to seek help in general, regardless of what kind of help it is. The Big Wheel and Sturdy Oak rules of the male code may motivate men to incorporate the archetype of the lone, tough provider who doesn’t need help from others into their self-image. While this independent self-image can certainly have benefits, it can also have consequences because people need other people to survive. It is unrealistic to expect to make it through life without needing help from others, but males are culturally reinforced to internalize that unrealistic expectation. Furrer and Skinner (2003) showed how feeling a sense of relatedness is vital for seeking academic help, so perhaps males who most strongly conform to the self-reliance norm of masculinity are less likely to feel this sense of relatedness to others because their desire to be stereotypically masculine isolates them.
The data from the MRNI-R indicated that Dominance, Extreme Self-Reliance, Non-relational Sexuality, Restrictive Emotionality, and Avoidance of Femininity were the subscales significantly associated with an avoidance of academic help seeking, with Dominance being the most strongly related as the relationship between Dominance and avoidance of help seeking accounted for 12.3% of variance (a moderate effect size; Murphy & Myers, 2004). Like I mentioned before, males who report a higher degree of dominance likely subscribe more to the “Big Wheel” and “Give ‘em Hell” rules of the male code because they report being more competitive and aggressive. While it is likely not as strongly associated with an avoidance of general help seeking as self-reliance, the concept of dominance is likely also an important ingredient in males avoiding various kinds of help seeking, including academic help seeking. In the help seeking situation, the one who seeks help is inherently giving away power to the one who helps them. Thus, it makes sense that males who endorse the dominance aspect of traditional masculinity ideology would avoid seeking help in general because having less power in a relationship is threatening to one’s internalized sense of masculinity. This issue of relational power may be another important key to understanding the underlying reasons why males avoid general help seeking. Across both masculinity measures, there appears to be an interesting and potentially meaningful level of interplay between dominance, power over women, and non-relational sexuality. For example, the Power over Women subscale of the CMNI was positively correlated with the Dominance (r = .58; 34% of variance) and Non-relational Sexuality (r = .49; 24.3% of variance) subscales of the MRNI-R, whereas the Dominance subscale of the CMNI was positively correlated with the Non-relational Sexuality subscale of the MRNI-R (r = .33; 11% of variance). In fact, the .58 correlation
between the Power over Women subscale of the CMNI and the Dominance subscale of the MRNI-R was the largest relationship between any two subscales across the two measures. Perhaps the males who reported higher scores for these subscales have a desire to feel superior to women (and perhaps other men, too) in order to alleviate any potential threat to their manhood. As for non-relational sexuality, it makes sense that a man who is motivated to assert power over others would report having casual sex with many partners because that may make him feel more powerful and it may enhance his desired self-image.

Hypothesis One

Reported levels of academic help seeking avoidance did not significantly differ between participants in the male teacher and female teacher conditions, so teacher sex was not associated with how strongly participants’ endorsed an avoidance of academic help seeking. Thus, hypothesis one was not supported. In addition, teacher sex was not associated with the reported likelihood of engaging in instrumental or executive help seeking. These results were only mildly surprising because hypothesis one was exploratory due to the somewhat mixed nature of the literature. Although a majority of findings indicated that students prefer seeking help from a female teacher (Feldman, 1992; LeMare & Sohbat, 2002), there are several studies that revealed no differences between male and female teachers in their likelihood of eliciting academic help seeking behavior (Feldman, 1993). Moreover, most of the past research on teacher sex and help seeking was conducted with elementary or secondary school students and not college students. Thus, it is possible that teacher sex matters for younger students but does not matter for college students. Finally, the hypothesis may not have been supported simply
because of low observed power (the observed power for the ANOVA was only .44, which is less than the accepted amount of .8 mentioned by Murphy & Myors, 2004). In other words, this result may have been a Type II error. A future study with more statistical power may find that having a male teacher is associated with a greater avoidance of academic help seeking.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two was supported. A combination of conformity to male norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology was significantly associated with a self-reported avoidance of academic help seeking after controlling for race/ethnicity, age, number of college credits taken, and endorsement of executive help seeking. Being an executive help seeker may make one less likely to seek help in the first place, but a high degree of conformity to male norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology are associated with men being even less likely to seek academic help than simply having a propensity for executive help seeking alone. According to these results, a male college student who prefers executive help seeking, conforms to male norms, and endorses traditional masculinity ideology is highly unlikely to seek academic help when struggling in the classroom. These college men are the ones who most need to be targeted in interventions designed to enhance the likelihood of seeking academic help.

Conformity to male norms and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology explained approximately 7% of the variance in help seeking avoidance above and beyond other factors. These results demonstrate that masculinity does indeed interfere with academic help seeking similar to how it interferes with help seeking in other areas, such as seeking help for physical or mental health concerns. This is important because
possessing insight into the underlying reasons why males are reluctant to seek help in
general may lead to interventions that can improve the situation for males. These results
also serve as a bridge between the counseling psychology and educational psychology
literatures as the findings on masculinity and help seeking behavior seem to generalize to
academic settings. A main implication of this is that gender and gender role strain must
be taken into account when studying and confronting academic help seeking.

Another interesting finding based on this hypothesis is the interplay of the two
masculinity measures, the CMNI and the MRNI-R. The CMNI total score emerged as a
strong predictor of academic help seeking, whereas the MRNI-R total score did not.
Thus, using the complete version of the CMNI with all subscales appears to be a positive
way to capture aspects of masculinity that interfere with academic help seeking. A
possible reason for this result is that conformity to male norms may be a
conceptualization of masculinity that better captures the underlying reasons why males
avoid seeking academic help when needing it. Perhaps pressure to conform to socially
constructed and socially reinforced male norms is more salient when males decide to
avoid seeking academic help than socially reinforced pressure to endorse traditional
masculinity ideology. Most students experience pressure to “fit in” as they suffer various
consequences for not fitting in with other students, and this concept can be applied to
males and their inherent desire to conform to the accepted societal image of a “real man”.
Seeking academic help, like seeking help for physical or mental health problems, is
counter to that societal image. Another possible explanation for this result is that the
CMNI measures masculinity from a normative standpoint (i.e. it focuses on both positive
and negative aspects of masculinity) whereas the MRNI-R only measures the
pathological aspects of masculinity. Thus, the CMNI may simply be a more diverse measure that can capture more of the factors associated with help seeking avoidance. Finally, the Self-Reliance subscale of the CMNI accounted for 43.6% of the variance in the relationship between conformity to male norms and avoidance of academic help seeking, which was a large effect (Murphy & Myors, 2004). The success of this one subscale in terms of how strongly it was related to help seeking avoidance may have been a major reason why the CMNI as a whole emerged as being more strongly related to academic help seeking avoidance.

The CMNI would be a good measure to use in future examinations of this relationship between masculinity and academic help seeking behavior. However, this does not necessarily mean that the MRNI-R should be avoided as a measure to be used in further studies of masculinity and academic help seeking. Although the MRNI-R total score was unrelated, five of the seven subscales were significantly related to help seeking avoidance (only four of the CMNI’s eleven subscales were significantly related to help seeking avoidance, although those four subscales did account for more variance than the significant MRNI-R subscales). Thus, aspects of the MRNI-R can provide valuable clues as to which specific aspects of traditional masculinity ideology interfere with academic help seeking and thus need to be addressed in interventions.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis one was not supported, indicating that teacher sex by itself is not associated with an avoidance of academic help seeking. Teacher sex also does not appear to moderate the relationship between conformity to male norms and an avoidance of academic help seeking, which means that hypothesis three was also not supported. Thus,
with the one small exception mentioned below teacher sex does not seem to be associated with academic help seeking behavior among college men either by itself or in combination with other variables. Again, this result was only mildly surprising due to the exploratory nature of the hypothesis. Future studies could examine the effect of class size (Perrine et al., 1995), another classroom context variable discussed in this document.

Implications, Applications, and Future Directions

A major implication of my study is that one must take gender into account when studying and working with academic help seeking behavior. Gender is an important variable when considering other forms of help seeking (Addis & Mahalik, 2003), and it appears to be a predictor in the academic help seeking arena as well. The results of my study indicate that a male college student who prefers executive help seeking, conforms to male norms, and endorses traditional masculinity ideology is highly unlikely to seek academic help when struggling in the classroom. Thus, interventions designed to promote academic help seeking should ideally be targeted at these at risk college males. As for specific interventions themselves, some of the strategies that have been used to promote men seeking help from a counselor may be applied to academic help seeking. For example, Robertson and Fitzgerald (1992) suggested reducing the stigma of help seeking and the threat associated with help seeking by using interventions that are congruent with male gender role socialization. This can be achieved by using terms that are more amenable to the Male Code (Brannon, 1985), such as “consultation”, and by emphasizing skill building and achievement over personal development. There are no suggested interventions to increase male academic help seeking from the masculinity literature as my study is one of the first to directly demonstrate a link between masculinity and
academic help seeking, however there are findings and theory from the educational psychology and education literatures that suggest ways to increase the academic engagement of males and possibly the academic help seeking behavior as well. Martino (2000) suggested that avoidance of academic help seeking among males may be due to a larger scale problem, which is that many males are intentionally disengaged from school because academic success violates the male code. The following is an overview of studies and theoretical pieces that suggest ways to increase the academic engagement and, possibly in turn, the academic help seeking behavior of male students. A common theme across these studies is a focus on social and relational factors.

Wilson and Deane (2001) explored ways to reduce barriers to help seeking. Using focus groups of high school students from both sexes, these investigators solicited information regarding their engagement in help seeking, their ideas on ways to reduce barriers to help seeking, and ways to increase the employment of help-providing resources. Transcripts from the focus groups showed positive attitudes toward help seeking, even though those attitudes did not translate into actual help seeking behavior. One major theme to emerge from the data was the importance of relational factors such as trust. Students reported placing value on feeling listened to, accepted, and treated with dignity. Another theme concerned positive prior experiences with help seeking promoting future help seeking behavior. Finally, students suggested that barriers to help seeking may be reduced by educators providing to them information that overtly promotes the importance and benefit of appropriate help seeking, matches appropriate help sources to different types of problems, and involves an experiential component allowing students to
practice approaching teachers for help. Teachers may apply this information to enhance the likelihood that students, and especially male students, will seek academic help.

Furrer and Skinner (2003) conducted a study that suggested how possessing a sense of relatedness is associated with greater academic motivation and engagement. These researchers discussed the distinction between academic engagement and academic disaffection. *Academic engagement* was defined as engaging in, “active, goal-directed, flexible, constructive, persistent, focused interactions with the social and physical environments” (pp. 149). Conversely, Furrer and Skinner defined *academic disaffection* as being, “alienated, apathetic, rebellious, frightened, or burned out” (pp. 149). Furrer and Skinner gave questionnaires about relatedness and academic engagement or academic disaffection to 641 third through sixth grade students. They found that female students reported having a greater sense of relatedness overall, but for male students a high self reported sense of relatedness with teachers was a more salient predictor of academic engagement. Thus, relatedness seems to have a greater impact for male students. Also, the association between relatedness and engagement was stronger for older students. The importance of these findings for my study is that they suggest how crucial it is for teachers to form supportive relationships with male students. The struggles of male students reported by Taylor and Lorimer (2002) may be reduced if teachers convey a sense of caring and form supportive, engaging relationships with struggling male students.

Some of the studies discussed in chapter two provide clues about how to enhance the academic engagement or academic help seeking behavior of male students. For example, Ryan, Gheen, and Midgley (1998) noted that classrooms featuring warm,
supportive teacher-student relationships may empower lower-efficacy students to overcome stigma and risk asking for help. In addition, Cusack et al. (2004) noted how peers are crucial in motivating individuals to seek help. Thus, a combination of a supportive teacher and supportive peers can enhance the likelihood of academic help seeking. I would recommend that teachers create classroom environments that focus on mastery goals rather than relative ability goals, as this has been shown to facilitate a more supportive classroom environment (Karabenick, 2004; Mansfield & Vallance, 2003; Newman, 2002).

Newman (2002) discussed the developmental influences (including attachment) on the adaptive help seeking of students, and provided ways in which teachers can enhance the likelihood that students will seek academic help. He defined *adaptive help seeking* as follows: “When children monitor their academic performance, show awareness of difficulty they cannot overcome on their own, and exhibit the wherewithal and self-determination to remedy that difficulty by requesting assistance from a more knowledgeable individual” (pp. 286). In order for children to engage in adaptive help seeking, students need to possess:

- Cognitive competencies, such as knowing that you have a problem.
- Social competencies, such as knowing how to make a request for help
- Motivational resources, such as attitudes and beliefs that influence willingness to admit difficulty and seek help

These three factors need to be taken into account when considering the help-seeking behavior of students. Newman (2002) suggested that teachers can do three things to
promote the three factors mentioned above and to ultimately facilitate academic help seeking: involvement, support for autonomy, and support for competence. **Involvement** means being emotionally engaged with students and devoting one’s time and energy. **Support for autonomy** involves encouraging and rewarding initiative, autonomy, and intrinsic motivation among students and avoiding extrinsic pressures such as a classroom focus on relative ability goals. Finally, **support for competence** involves conveying rules and expectations that instill a sense of competence in students and an understanding of the link between actions and consequences. Newman also argued that socialization experiences help children to develop these competencies and resources. He also discussed the importance of social context in that negatively perceiving a teacher may hinder seeking help from that teacher. He stated that it’s important for teachers to have open lines of communication with students and to help students in a non-threatening way. This becomes more important as students age because thoughts and fears about help-seeking take on a more prominent role in the decision to seek help or not. The contextual factors of peer pressure and culture (such as the male code) also need to be taken into account. In short, teachers may apply Newman’s (2002) suggestions to enhance the academic situation for male students. The following two studies involve actual, concrete programs designed to enhance the academic engagement and improve the academic situation of college males.

Stefanou and Salisbury-Glennon (2002) examined the relationship between participation in a learning community and academic motivation and self-efficacy among college students. The authors defined **learning community** as, “a non-traditional, university-level learning context that emphasizes (1) integrated courses, (2) active student
learning, and (3) collaborative learning” (pp. 81). Stefanou and Salisbury-Glennon also mentioned that the use of technology and library resources as primary learning resources was also a feature of the learning community under investigation, and that the community also featured a great deal of interpersonal collaboration. Stefanou and Salisbury-Glennon measured academic motivation by administering the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ: McKeachie et al., 1985) to 172 first-year undergraduates of both sexes. The pre-post mean increase was .15 for intrinsic motivation, .17 for extrinsic motivation, and .24 for self-efficacy. All of these increases were statistically significant at the .05 level. These results indicate that participating in a learning community may be associated with an increase in academic motivation and confidence. Edwards and McKelfrish (2002) also examined the effectiveness of a learning community, except they used the term living learning center (LLC). They examined whether participating in the LLC was associated with increased academic success and persistence for 81 first year undergraduates of both sexes. Academic success was measured via change in grade point average (GPA) and persistence was measured by examining whether students returned the following semester or the following year and by examining the number of college credits students completed. Students who participated in the LLC had greater GPA increases than students outside of the LLC: the mean GPA of female students increased by .44 whereas the mean GPA of male students increased by .40. As for persistence, participating in the LLC was significantly associated with a greater persistence rate for male students only, as males who participated in the LLC were 50.4% more likely to persist than male students outside the LLC. In other words, male students seem to react particularly well to LLCs. Finally, another positive aspect of learning communities or
LLCs is that resources and academic assistance are so readily available to students, as proximity and convenience are major factors that promote and facilitate academic help seeking (Burk & Bender, 2005). In sum, learning communities or LLCs may improve the academic struggles of college men outlined by Taylor and Lorimer (2002).

Taken together, the scholarship presented above indicates that there are many ways for educators to enhance the academic motivation of male students, but the common theme seems to be a high level of interpersonal engagement. It is crucial for teachers to form supportive, engaging relationships with male college students and to convey a sense of caring to those students. Also, a lesson from the masculinity literature and studies such as Robertson and Fitzgerald (1992) is that teachers must realize the impact that the male code may have on college men and accordingly do what they can to make academic help seeking seem less threatening.

As for future directions, the finding that men endorsed instrumental help seeking more than executive help seeking is a positive sign because it indicates that most males may use the more efficient help seeking strategy (instrumental) when they do seek academic help. Past research (Karabenick, 2003) has shown that females are more likely to utilize instrumental help seeking than males, but the present finding shows that most men do not necessarily utilize executive help seeking simply because women are more likely to be instrumental help seekers. Future research should examine within group variability among men (Mahalik et al., 2003), including a further examination of within group differences in help seeking style. Since teacher sex did not moderate the relationship between masculinity and academic help seeking avoidance, future studies may examine other potential moderators such as class size or internal working model of
attachment (cf. Larose, Bernier, Soucy, & Duchesne, 1999). According to Salomon and Strobel (1997), future studies should also further examine the relationship between socioeconomic status and academic help seeking.

Limitations

Two limitations indicate that these results must be interpreted with caution. First, the participants were recruited from a convenience sample of undergraduates participating in research for a class requirement. Furthermore, with the exception of the vignettes designed to manipulate teacher sex, all other tools in the study were self-report. Schwartz (1999) outlined the pitfalls of self-report research. He argued that minor changes in question wording, question format, or question context can precipitate major changes in obtained results. Schwartz (1999) cited data in which the same exact question was asked to two groups of participants, however in response one group was asked to give a rating on a scale from zero to ten whereas the other group was asked to give a rating on a scale from negative five to positive five. This difference in how the scale was structured resulted in a 21% discrepancy in how the groups responded to the question. Schwartz said that such a change in scale structure may be associated with participants cognitively interpreting a question differently. Considering this, in my study it is possible that differences in how participants responded to the CMNI and the MRNI-R, for instance, may have been due to how the two measures use rating scales with different structures (the CMNI features a four point scale with no midpoint and the MRNI-R features a seven point scale with a midpoint). Much of the research in the masculinity and academic help seeking literatures uses self report data, and there is certainly a need for greater methodological diversity in these areas. Newman (2002) said that more
longitudinal research on academic help seeking is needed, whereas Turkum (2005) argued that more qualitative research needs to be conducted on masculinity. However, Newman (2002) also argued that self report research may be necessary to study certain topics, as it is very difficult or impossible to naturally observe most kinds of academic help seeking, and it would be practically impossible to study academic help seeking in a lab setting. Consider Gelso’s (1979) bubble hypothesis as well, which stated that no research design is perfect such that increasing external validity almost always leads to a decrease in internal validity and vice versa. Thus, despite its flaws self-report research may be one of the best existing ways to study concepts like masculinity and academic help seeking. The key is to choose measures with the best possible validity and reliability evidence (Newman, 2002), and for my study I chose the best available measures for the subject matter at hand.

Summary

Through this study I attempted to determine how the sex of a teacher, the degree of conformity to male norms, endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology, and help seeking style of college men are related to whether or not men avoid seeking academic help. One hundred seventy eight undergraduate males filled out a demographic survey, encountered a vignette making either a male or female teacher salient to them, and then completed measures of academic help seeking, conformity to male norms, and endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology. The results indicated that teacher sex was not associated with academic help seeking behavior by itself or as a moderator. However, a higher reported degree of conformity to male norms was significantly associated with a reported avoidance of academic help seeking. Furthermore, aspects of
traditional masculinity ideology were associated with a reported avoidance of academic help seeking. These results indicate that masculinity may hinder the help seeking of men in academic situations similar to how it hinders help seeking in other areas. Finally, there were three main aspects of masculinity captured by both measures that are likely culprits when men fail to seek help when struggling academically. The first was independence, as measured by the Self-Reliance subscale of the CMNI and the Extreme Self-Reliance subscale of the MRNI-R. The second was dominance, as measured by the Dominance subscales of both the CMNI and the MRNI-R. Finally, the third aspect of masculinity the emerged as a consistent predictor of help seeking avoidance was emotional restraint, as measured by the Emotional Control subscale of the CMNI and the Restrictive Emotionality subscale of the MRNI-R. An increased awareness of the far reaching impact that the male code may have and interventions such as those discussed by scholars such as Robertson and Fitzgerald (1992) and Edwards and McKelfrish (2002) may provide steps toward increasing alleviating the academic struggles of many college men.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following items in as accurate of a fashion as you can. Please do not provide your name or any other identifying information anywhere on these materials.

1. Age (in years): ________

2. Sex: (1) Male (2) Female

3. Race/Ethnicity:
   (1) Black/African American    (2) Asian American
   (3) White/European American   (4) Latino(a)/Hispanic
   (5) American Indian           (6) Pacific Islander/Inuit
   (7) Bi/Multi-Racial

   Other: ______________________

4. Please estimate the number of credit hours you have completed (not counting courses in which you are currently enrolled) ________

5. Major: ____________________
APPENDIX B

THE CONFORMITY TO MASCULINE NORMS INVENTORY

The following pages contain a series of statements about how men might think, feel, or behave. The statements are designed to measure attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors associated with both traditional and non-traditional masculine gender roles.

Thinking about your own actions, feelings, and beliefs, please indicate how much you personally agree or disagree with each statement by circling SD for “Strongly Disagree”, D for “Disagree”, A for “Agree”, and SA for “Strongly Agree” to the right of the statement. There are no right or wrong responses to the statements. You should give the responses that most accurately describe your personal actions, feelings, and beliefs. It is best if you respond with your first impression when answering.

1. It is best to keep your emotions hidden SD  D  A  SA
2. In general, I will do anything to win SD  D  A  SA
3. If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners SD  D  A  SA
4. If there is going to be violence, I find a way to avoid it SD  D  A  SA
5. It is important to me that people think I am heterosexual SD  D  A  SA
6. In general, I must get my way SD  D  A  SA
7. Trying to be important is the greatest waste of time SD  D  A  SA
8. I am often absorbed in my work SD  D  A  SA
9. I will only be satisfied when women are equal to men SD  D  A  SA
10. I hate asking for help SD  D  A  SA
11. Taking dangerous risks helps me to prove myself SD  D  A  SA
12. In general, I do not expend a lot of energy trying to win at things
13. An emotional bond with a partner is the best part of sex
14. I should take every opportunity to show my feelings
15. I believe that violence is never justified
16. Being thought of as gay is not a bad thing
17. In general, I do not like risky situations
18. I should be in charge
19. Feelings are important to show
20. I feel miserable when work occupies all my attention
21. I feel best about my relationships with women when we are equals
22. Winning is not my first priority
23. I make sure that people think I am heterosexual
24. I enjoy taking risks
25. I am disgusted by any kind of violence
26. I would hate to be important
27. I love to explore my feelings with others
28. If I could, I would date a lot of different people
29. I ask for help when I need it
30. My work is the most important part of my life
31. Winning isn’t everything, it’s the only thing
32. I never take chances
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. I would only have sex if I were in a committed relationship</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I like fighting</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I treat women as equals</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I bring up feelings when talking to others</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I would be furious if someone thought I was gay</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I only get romantically involved with one person</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I don’t mind losing</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I take risks</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I never do things to be an important person</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It would not bother me at all if someone thought I was gay</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I never share my feelings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Sometimes violent action is necessary</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Asking for help is a sign of failure</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. In general, I control the women in my life</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I would feel good if I had many sexual partners</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. It is important for me to win</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I don’t like giving all my attention to work</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I feel uncomfortable when others see me as important</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. It would be awful if people thought I was gay</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I like to talk about my feelings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I never ask for help</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. More often than not, losing does not bother me</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. It is foolish to take risks
56. Work is not the most important thing in my life
57. Men and women should respect each other as equals
58. Long term relationships are better than casual sexual encounters
59. Having status is not very important to me
60. I frequently put myself in risky situations
61. Women should be subservient to men
62. I am willing to get into a physical fight if necessary
63. I like having gay friends
64. I feel good when work is my first priority
65. I tend to keep my feelings to myself
66. Emotional involvement should be avoided when having sex
67. Winning is not important to me
68. Violence is almost never justified
69. I am comfortable trying to get my way
70. I am happiest when I’m risking danger
71. Men should not have power over women
72. It would be enjoyable to date more than one person at a time
73. I would feel uncomfortable if someone thought I was gay
74. I am not ashamed to ask for help
75. The best feeling in the world comes from winning
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76. Work comes first</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. I tend to share my feelings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. I like emotional involvement in a romantic relationship</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. No matter what the situation I would never act violently</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. If someone thought I was gay, I would not argue with them about it</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Things tend to be better when men are in charge</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. I prefer to be safe and careful</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. A person shouldn’t get tied down to dating just one person</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. I tend to invest my energy in things other than work</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. It bothers me when I have to ask for help</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. I love it when men are in charge of women</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. It feels good to be important</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. I hate it when people ask me to talk about my feelings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. I work hard to win</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. I would only be satisfied with sex if there was an emotional bond</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. I try to avoid being perceived as gay</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. I hate any kind of risk</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. I prefer to stay unemotional</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. I make sure people do as I say</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Vignette

Please read the following statement about a college teacher. Have this information in mind when filling out the following surveys.

You are a student in a college course. The course is taught by a woman, Dr. Mindy Smith, who is a tenured associate professor in the psychology department. There are no teaching assistants for the class; Dr. Smith handles all aspects of the course and holds all office hours. As the semester progresses, you realize that you are having a very difficult time understanding some of the concepts from the book and lecture that are covered in the course. You are feeling very confused and lost in the class. Answer the following questions as if you are actually in the middle of this situation in this course.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Teacher Vignette

Please read the following statement about a college teacher. Have this information in mind when filling out the following surveys.

You are a student in a college course. The course is taught by a man, Dr. Mike Smith, who is a tenured associate professor in the psychology department. There are no teaching assistants for the class; Dr. Smith handles all aspects of the course and holds all office hours. As the semester progresses, you realize that you are having a very difficult time understanding some of the concepts from the book and lecture that are covered in the course. You are feeling very confused and lost in the class. Answer the following questions as if you are actually in the middle of this situation in this course.
APPENDIX D

MODIFIED COMPUTER SCIENCE HELP SEEKING SCALES: PSYCHOLOGY

HELP SEEKING SCALES (FEMALE TEACHER VERSION)

Please use the following scale to answer the statements below. Imagine that the statements refer to a college course taught by a female teacher. Circle the number that best describes how true or false each statement is for you.

Definitely false  
Definitely true

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

Instrumental Help-Seeking

1. When I ask the teacher for help, I prefer to be given hints or clues rather than the answer.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

2. When I ask my teacher for help with my work, I don’t want her to give away the whole answer.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

3. When I ask the teacher for help with something I don’t understand, I ask her to explain it to me rather than just give me the answer.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

4. When I ask my teacher for help in class, I only want as much help as necessary to complete the work by myself.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

5. When I ask my teacher for help understanding the material in this class, I prefer that she help me to understand the general ideas rather than simply tell me the answers.
6. When I ask a student for help with my work, I don’t want the student to give away the whole answer.

7. When I ask a student for help understanding the material in this class, I prefer that the student help me understand the general ideas rather than simply tell me the answer.

8. When I ask a student for help in class, I want to be helped to complete the work myself rather than have the work done for me.

9. When I ask a student for help in class, I prefer to be given hints or clues rather than the answer.

10. When I ask a student for help with something I don’t understand, I ask the student to explain it to me rather than just give me the answer.

Executive Help-Seeking

1. When I ask the teacher for help in a class, I prefer that she do the work for me rather than explain to me how to do it.

2. When I ask my teacher for help on something I don’t understand, I prefer that she does it for me.

3. When I ask my teacher for help on something I don’t understand, I prefer that she just gives me the answer rather than explain it.
4. When I ask the teacher for help with my work, I prefer to be given the answer rather than an explanation of how to do the work myself.

5. When I ask my teacher for help, I want her to do the work for me rather than help me be able to complete the work myself.

6. When I ask a student for help on something I don’t understand, I prefer that student to just give me the answer rather than explain to me how to do it.

7. When I ask a student for help with my work, I prefer that the student do the work for me rather than explain to me how to do it.

8. When I ask another student for help on something I don’t understand, I ask that student to do it for me.

9. When I ask a student for help in this class, I want the work done for me rather than be shown how to complete the work myself.

10. When I ask a student for help with my work, I prefer to be given the answer rather than an explanation of how to do the work myself.

Avoidance of Help Seeking

1. I don’t ask for help in psychology class even when the work is too hard to solve on my own.
2. If I need to answer a statistics or research methods question, I prefer to skip it rather than ask for help.

3. I don’t ask for help in psychology class even if I don’t understand the lesson.

4. If I didn’t understand something in psychology class, I would guess rather than ask someone for help.

5. I would rather do worse on an assignment I couldn’t finish than ask for help in psychology class.

6. Even if the work was too hard to do on my own, I wouldn’t ask for help in psychology class.

7. I would put down any answer rather than ask for help in this class.

8. I don’t ask questions in psychology class even if I don’t understand the lesson.

9. If work in psychology class is too hard, I don’t do it rather than ask for help.
APPENDIX E

MODIFIED COMPUTER SCIENCE HELP SEEKING SCALES: PSYCHOLOGY

HELP SEEKING SCALES (MALE TEACHER VERSION)

Please use the following scale to answer the statements below. Imagine that the statements refer to a college course taught by a male teacher. Circle the number that best describes how true or false each statement is for you.

Definitely false

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Definitely true

Instrumental Help-Seeking

1. When I ask the teacher for help, I prefer to be given hints or clues rather than the answer.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

2. When I ask my teacher for help with my work, I don’t want him to give away the whole answer.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

3. When I ask the teacher for help with something I don’t understand, I ask him to explain it to me rather than just give me the answer.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

4. When I ask my teacher for help in class, I only want as much help as necessary to complete the work by myself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

5. When I ask my teacher for help understanding the material in this class, I prefer that he help me to understand the general ideas rather than simply tell me the answers.
6. When I ask a student for help with my work, I don’t want the student to give away the whole answer.

7. When I ask a student for help understanding the material in this class, I prefer that the student help me understand the general ideas rather than simply tell me the answer.

8. When I ask a student for help in class, I want to be helped to complete the work myself rather than have the work done for me.

9. When I ask a student for help in class, I prefer to be given hints or clues rather than the answer.

10. When I ask a student for help with something I don’t understand, I ask the student to explain it to me rather than just give me the answer.

Executive Help-Seeking

1. When I ask the teacher for help in a class, I prefer that he do the work for me rather than explain to me how to do it.

2. When I ask my teacher for help on something I don’t understand, I prefer that he does it for me.

3. When I ask my teacher for help on something I don’t understand, I prefer it when he just gives me the answer rather than explain it.
4. When I ask the teacher for help with my work, I prefer to be given the answer rather than an explanation of how to do the work myself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

5. When I ask my teacher for help, I want him to do the work for me rather than help me be able to complete the work myself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

6. When I ask a student for help on something I don’t understand, I prefer that student to just give me the answer rather than explain to me how to do it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

7. When I ask a student for help with my work, I prefer that the student do the work for me rather than explain to me how to do it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

8. When I ask another student for help on something I don’t understand, I ask that student to do it for me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

9. When I ask a student for help in this class, I want the work done for me rather than be shown how to complete the work myself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

10. When I ask a student for help with my work, I prefer to be given the answer rather than an explanation of how to do the work myself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Avoidance of Help Seeking

1. I don’t ask for help in psychology class even when the work is too hard to solve on my own.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
2. If I need to answer a statistics or research methods question, I prefer to skip it rather than ask for help.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

3. I don’t ask for help in psychology class even if I don’t understand the lesson.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

4. If I didn’t understand something in psychology class, I would guess rather than ask someone for help.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

5. I would rather do worse on an assignment I couldn’t finish than ask for help in psychology class.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

6. Even if the work was too hard to do on my own, I wouldn’t ask for help in psychology class.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

7. I would put down any answer rather than ask for help in this class.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

8. I don’t ask questions in psychology class even if I don’t understand the lesson.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

9. If work in psychology class is too hard, I don’t do it rather than ask for help.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8
APPENDIX F

BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS ITEM AND MANIPULATION CHECK

Final Questions:

• Please write down the sex (male or female) of the teacher from the vignette you read: __________

• If you were struggling in this teacher’s class, would you seek help from that teacher by going to posted office hours?

  1). Yes
  2). No
APPENDIX G

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION

Dear Student,

My name is David Wimer, and I am a doctoral student in the Collaborative Program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Akron. I know that you are extremely busy with your own work; therefore, I will make this as brief as possible. For my dissertation, I am conducting research on seeking help for academic struggles, and I would greatly appreciate your input on this topic.

This survey web page link (list link) will take you to a site where you can complete a demographic questionnaire and two self-report instruments. The materials should take no more than 30 minutes or so to complete. All information you provide will be confidential. All research materials are coded in such a way that makes identification of individual respondents virtually impossible. Findings will be reported only in aggregate form; no institution, program, or individual will be specifically identified in any presentation of the research findings. Your completion of materials will constitute your informed consent to participate. We would greatly appreciate your completing this survey, preferably by May 2nd, 2008. Of course, participation is voluntary, you may decline participation in this study with no penalty whatsoever, and you may discontinue participation, even after submitting materials.
If you have any questions or comments concerning this study, please contact either me or my research advisor at the numbers listed below. This study was approved by The Institutional Review Board for The Protection of Human Subjects at The University of Akron and at Kutztown University of Pennsylvania. Questions on human subjects’ rights can also be directed to Ms. Sharon McWhorter, Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs, (330) 972-7666 or 1-888-232-8790. We very much hope that you will elect to assist us by completing this survey, as we believe this study could contribute to the understanding of an important topic!

Sincerely,

David J. Wimer, M.A.  Ronald F. Levant, Ed.D., MBA, ABPP
Collaborative Program in  Dean, Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences
Counseling Psychology  The University of Akron
The University of Akron  Akron, OH 44325-1901
Akron, OH 44325-5007  Phone: (330) 972-7882
Phone: (330) 714-2538  Fax: (330) 972-7222
E-mail: djw31@uakron.edu  E-mail: levant@uakron.edu
APPENDIX H

MALE ROLE NORMS INVENTORY – REVISED

MRNI-R

Please complete the questionnaire by circling the number which indicates your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. Give only one answer for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Homosexuals should never marry.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. The President of the US should always be a man.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Men should be the leader in any group.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. A man should be able to perform his job even if he is physically ill or hurt.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Men should not talk with a lisp because this is a sign of being gay.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Men should not wear make-up, cover-up or bronzer.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Men should watch football games instead of soap operas.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. All homosexual bars should be closed down.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Men should not be interested in talk shows such as Oprah.
10. Men should excel at contact sports.

11. Boys should play with action figures not dolls.

12. Men should not borrow money from friends or family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Men should have home improvement skills.

14. Men should be able to fix most things around the house.

15. A man should prefer watching action movies to reading romantic novels.

16. Men should always like to have sex.

17. Homosexuals should not be allowed to serve in the military.

18. Men should never compliment or flirt with another male.

19. Boys should prefer to play with trucks rather than dolls.

20. A man should not turn down sex.

21. A man should always be the boss.

22. A man should provide the discipline in the family.

161
23. Men should never hold hands or show affection toward another.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

24. It is ok for a man to use any and all means to “convince” a woman to have sex.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

25. Homosexuals should never kiss in public.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. A man should avoid holding his wife’s purse at all times.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

27. A man must be able to make his own way in the world.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

28. Men should always take the initiative when it comes to sex.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

29. A man should never count on someone else to get the job done.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

30. Boys should not throw baseballs like girls.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

31. A man should not react when other people cry.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

32. A man should not continue a friendship with another man if he finds out that the other man is homosexual.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

33. Being a little down in the dumps is not a good reason for a man to act depressed.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

34. If another man flirts with the women accompanying a man, this is a serious provocation and the man should respond with aggression.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

35. Boys should be encouraged to find a means of demonstrating physical prowess.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. A man should know how to repair his car if it should break down.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. Homosexuals should be barred from the teaching profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. A man should never admit when others hurt his feelings.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Men should get up to investigate if there is a strange noise in the house at night.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40. A man shouldn't bother with sex unless he can achieve an orgasm.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41. Men should be detached in emotionally charged situations.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42. It is important for a man to take risks, even if he might get hurt.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43. A man should always be ready for sex.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44. A man should always be the major provider in his family.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45. When the going gets tough, men should get tough.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46. I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love story.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

47. Fathers should teach their sons to mask fear.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

48. I think a young man should try to be physically tough, even if he’s not big.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
49. In a group, it is up to the men to get things organized and moving ahead.

50. One should not be able to tell how a man is feeling by looking at his face.

51. Men should make the final decision involving money.

52. It is disappointing to learn that a famous athlete is gay.

53. Men should not be too quick to tell others that they care about them.
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTERS FROM KUTZTOWN UNIVERSITY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
November 16, 2007

Dr. David Wimer  
Department of Psychology  
Kutztown University  
Kutztown, Pennsylvania

Dear Dr. Wimer:

The Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your project, 
"The Relation of Masculinity, Teacher Sex, and Help Seeking Style With Academic 
Help Seeking Avoidance of College Men in Psychology Courses", and approved it as an 
Exempt project.

If you decide to change any of your methodology, you must notify the 
Institutional Review Board prior to implementing any changes.

The approval is valid for one year from the date of this letter. If you need an 
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We wish you success in your research.
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Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board  
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December 10, 2007

David Wimer
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Mr. Wimer:

Your protocol entitled "The Relation of Masculinity, Teacher Sex and Help Seeking Style with the Academic Help Seeking Avoidance of College Men" was determined to be exempt from IRB review on December 10, 2007. The IRB application number assigned to this project is 20071201. The protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for exemption:
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☐ Exemption 3 - Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior not exempt under category 2, but subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.
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Sincerely,
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Sharon McWhorter
Associate Director

Cc: Ronald Levant, Advisor
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