12-16-2022

Developing a Healthy Masculinities Program on a University Campus

David A. Scott
Clemson University, dscott2@clemson.edu

Freeman Woolnough
The University of British Columbia, rwoolnou@mail.ubc.ca

Tony W. Cawthon
Clemson University, cawthot@clemson.edu

Developing a Healthy Masculinities Program on a University Campus

David A. Scott, PhD, Clemson University

Freeman Woolnough, The University of British Columbia

Tony W. Cawthon, PhD, Clemson University

(First published online, December 16, 2022)

Abstract

Amid increased concerns about mental health, sexual violence, and substance use among college students, college campuses are looking toward developing targeted programming to help counteract these concerning trends. This practitioner paper highlights the development and impacts of a program at a Canadian institution, which focuses on healthy masculinity and identity development. Although still in the early stages, the feedback and observations are indicative of the powerful potential of this type of programming to improve healthy masculinity on college campuses.

Key words: Identity development, higher education, masculinity, mental health

Over the past few years, there have been several hot topics discussed by students, parents, and administrators on campuses across North America, in particular: alcohol and substance use, mental health issues, and sexual assault. McCabe et al. (2014) reported trends that revealed college students have the highest rates of nonmedical prescription drug use compared to other age groups. Substances used by college students include sleeping medications, sedative/anxiety medications, stimulants, and pain medications (Lipari & Jean-Francois, 2016). Significant alcohol use also was identified as a severe health risk to college students, as this population typically averages nine or more alcoholic drinks during any binge-drinking episode (Naimi et al., 2010; Naudé et al., 2020). Schulenberg et al. (2018) reported that 79% of college students in their study reported alcohol consumption, with 33% reporting binge drinking within the past two weeks. Apart from increasing substance use, the American College Health Association (2014) reported that 64.3% of college students felt overwhelming anxiety, 42.9% experienced symptoms of depression, and 13% experienced suicidal ideation. Research also suggests that most sexual assaults are against women (Breiding et al., 2015) and during their first year on campus (Carey et al., 2015). Regarding these statistics, there is a disproportionate representation of men in all the above categories (American College Health Association, 2014). This disproportionate representation speaks to the importance of further discussions about masculinity and identity. College students continue to learn about themselves and try to define who they are as individuals.

The idea of developing a program targeting healthy masculinities and identities on a university campus, began through a discussion involving male-identified professional staff

members working in the Residence Life department at Queen's University in Canada. Some had

participated in similar programs at other institutions, but not as specific as what we thought was

needed. This group of professional staff become the program developers. Queen's University is a

large research institution in a city setting. The student body is made up of around 59% female

identified and 41% male identified. Initially focused on providing basic training around

masculinity and privilege to student staff, the idea evolved over the subsequent years into what is

now known as the Connecting Healthy Attitudes about Masculinity & Privilege (CHAMP)

program. This review of the CHAMP program is timely because, with our greater understanding

of the importance of developing healthy identities, continued research and programming will be

needed to expand our knowledge base and create or maintain effective programs. This paper

aims to describe the development and use of one such program, the CHAMP program.

Literature Review

In our review of the relevant research on healthy masculinity and identity development, a

theme of identity continued to emerge within the literature. Beginning with the more general

vectors of identity development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993), we devoted a significant amount

of time researching identity theories and models derived from and related to masculine/men's

identities. These included the key model (Scott & Robinson, 2001; Scott et al., 2012), men's

gender identity development theory (Edwards & Jones, 2009), college men's identity

construction theory (Davis, 2002), and men and masculinities (Tillapaugh & McGowan, 2021).

These works were used to inform the underlying tenets of our initial program. These identity

development theories and models discuss many critical aspects such as gender socialization,

social justice, restrictive gender roles, and ways to move away from the traditional rigid

definition of masculinity.

A common manner of defining identity is to account for the features that define a person

or make them who they are (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Evans et al., 2010; Jones & Abes,

2013). When it comes to personal identity, there are many avenues that one can follow.

Chickering and Reisser (1993) defined identity as developing self-esteem and self-acceptance

and being comfortable with their gender, body image, and sexual orientation. However, research

suggests that when it comes to men (based upon biology, not gender identity), the root of one's

identity is in his masculinity (Berger et al., 2012; Duckworth & Trautner, 2019; Franklin, 2012).

Along these lines of thought, the early research examined exclusively White men but did not

account for issues related to gender (Laker, 2003; Laker, 2013), men of color, or marginalized

groups of men (McEwen, 2003). Kimmel and Mahler (2003) and Tillapaugh and McGowan

(2021) posited that masculinity can be viewed as a collection of meanings that may constantly be

changing and is an accumulation of our views of ourselves, others, and the world. Therefore,

masculinity is not permanent but a social construct. As such, masculinity is a performed identity,

meaning it is learned and not an innate characteristic (Butler, 1990). For this reason, masculinity

is fluid and not viewed as a static disposition (Christian, 1994).

This performed identity leads to some sex role threat conflict in male identified college

students (Bowman & Filar, 2018; Schwab & Dupuis, 2021; Wagner, 2015). Men (and women)

regulate and validate the meaning of masculinity, thus overseeing what is considered socio-

culturally acceptable gender performance of other male-identified bodies. The paradox of

masculinity represents the powerlessness that men feel, although they are disproportionately in

control compared to women (Capraro, 2000). This feeling of powerlessness derives from men striving to meet the traits of being tough, fearless, powerful, wealthy, sexually attractive, and successful always because that is what it takes to be a real man (Scott & Robinson, 2001; Schwab & Dupuis, 2021). Depression can result from negative emotions brought about by work and study pressures, financial concerns, and isolation from their family (Tremblay et al., 2007), and the notion that men are more reluctant to ask for medical or counseling services (Courtenay, 2004). However, dissonance comes into play when considering that men populate categories such as low-income, minoritized, physically disabled, or gender non-conforming. With these expectations being hard to meet, some men take a path of destructive behaviors to hide their insecurities of not fitting into the mold of what it means to be a man (Koenig, 2018). The identity of those who occupy multiple identities might be impacted and also those identities of the men who reject those who do not fit the traditional mold of what it means to be a man. Men can employ traits such as homophobia, sexism, and other oppressive acts to help them fit the traditional mold of masculinity to regain a sense of power (Scott & Robinson, 2001).

With masculinity being a learned trait constructed by one's family, sports, social activities, and more importantly, the school setting during the transitional period during college men's' lives, there are various expressions of masculinity, for multiple masculinities lies on a spectrum (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Jewkes et al., 2015). It does not take much to recognize how male-identified students see themselves and how they see what it means to *be a man* can substantially impact many areas of campus culture, from substance use to sexual violence. Though there are many programs and policies that address concerning behaviors among students, a growing need exists for the development of programs that aim to address

underlying attitudes and male identified student identity (Claussen, 2017). By developing and

using this program (CHAMP) in a university setting, the goal was to help men develop a healthy

sense of masculinity, provide avenues to foster this growth, and support men in various aspects

of identity development.

The CHAMP Program

Initially, when creating the CHAMP program, we looked to already-existing programs

focusing on healthy masculinities. We discovered that a few campuses in the United States had

developed programs to address healthy masculinity, including the Princeton University's (2018)

Men's Allied Voices for a Respectful and Inclusive Community (MAVRIC) Project and the

Deep M-Pact (n.d.) program at Gustavus Adolphus College. The offerings in Canada were

scarcer by comparison. The Stepping Up mentorship program at Mount Royal University (n.d.)

stood out as one of the only (at least publicly promoted) developed programs in Canada. While

researching programs at post-secondary institutions, we also encountered community-based

programming, such as the WiseGuyz initiative in Calgary (Calgary Sexual Health Centre, n.d.),

and other programs for which masculinity was a partial focus, such as the Veterans Transition

Network in British Columbia (Veterans Transition Network, n.d.).

A review of the literature indicated that most of these programs (as well as others) have

yet to publish their effectiveness on developing healthy masculinity (Gwyther et al., 2019). The

search process began with Internet and literature reviews focusing on male identified/men

identity development (including masculinity) in higher education. Once the assessment of what

was offered in the U.S. and Canada was completed and reviewed, we began (interviews) and

connected with individuals who helped create and develop these programs. The programs had

websites with contact information for the directors or managers. We initially reached out to each

program via email and then followed up with additional emails or phone calls to discuss their

programs. Each program was asked to share their thoughts and insights around what had worked,

what had not worked, and any lessons learned. Each program had various goals, but the main

objective was to create a program that would foster an exploration of healthy masculine identity

development. Additionally, these individuals were asked for contact information for any other

programs they were aware of, and any relevant or useful articles and works of literature.

Although the initial vision was that the scope of healthy masculinity contacts was quite small,

within a few email and phone conversations, the researchers gathered a sizeable amount of

advice and perspectives and a large list of professionals interested in designing programs

targeting healthy masculinity.

Most of the development and planning of the CHAMP program was completed in the

summer months when staff had more freedom in scheduling. We quickly realized that taking a

prescriptive approach to a program targeting healthy masculinities would not be very conducive

to achieving the goals set due to the individualized nature of identity development. With this in

mind, we created the program using a developmental approach. Recognizing that all students are

not at the same developmental level/stage when they first come in, it was assumed that they

would, progress through some stages throughout the year. The team hoped that the program

would capitalize on and enhance this developmental trajectory. Identity development theories

developed by Davis (2002), Edwards and Jones (2009), Scott et al. (2012), and Tillapaugh and

McGowan (2021) were used as our guiding understanding of identity development.

Working with first-year, male-identified students, we designed the CHAMP program with the goal of simply engaging this population at the initial stages of their identity development. The learning objectives were:

1. Gain a better understanding of self-identity as it relates to masculinity.

2. Be able to explain the concepts of privilege and responsibility, particularly how they relate to what it means to 'be a man.'

3. Develop confidence in starting/having conversations about healthy masculinities.

4. Develop at least one quality relationship that will contribute to a healthy sense of masculinity.

The program ran for three consecutive years. After the third year, other groups on campus began to take an interest in developing additional programming that helps continue this developmental trajectory throughout the entire course of students' academic careers.

From discussions with contacts and reading through the available literature mentioned above, the team developed a list of key tenets that would be important when designing the program:

- Meet students where they are at in their understanding of masculinity. Pushing male-identified students (or any student, for that matter) toward a specific way of thinking before they are open or ready for it can often be detrimental to the overall goals (Shallcross, 2010).

- Avoid shaming, both in language and in action. Shaming has the potential to push participants away (Batcho, 2017).

- Be sure to include in-person (live) and or synchronous components. Programming that focuses only on social media and online content has its place; however, greater shifts and learning seems to occur with in-person and synchronous programming (Kiviniemi, 2014).

- Ensure that the program is safe for men to talk about men, which will typically mean providing a forum for students who identify as men only. Note that this does not mean all aspects of the program need to be men-only; however, having at least one opportunity for discussion with only men in the room is essential. Creating a safe space is critical for most groups in general (Nagayama, 2017).

- Consider the language that you are using. As an example, students who identify as men are more likely to participate in a seminar than in a counseling group.

- Provide an opportunity for men to help other men. While ultimately, the goal of these types of programs is to support men in various aspects of identity development, men are less likely to attend programming where the sole intent is to help men (Davis, 2010). Switching it up so that men can themselves be helpers and provide expertise shows better promise.

- Create dissonance between beliefs and reality and acknowledge that other sexes and genders have a role to play in men's identity development (Scott & Robinson, 2001).

- When possible, incorporate a physical activity/action component (Fehr, 2003). We found this to assist in keeping the participant's attention and engagement in the group.

- And finally, provide informal opportunities (ex. A social engagement with food) for students to connect before jumping into in-depth or intense discussions about

masculinities. This may help ease initial anxiety and provide a chance for the participants

to get to know each other (and the leaders) before the group (Fehr, 2003).

Program Design

Participants

The implementation of the program was conducted at Queen's University in Canada. The

target audience was first-year, male-identified students. The university has an enrollment of

around 23,000 students each year, with a significant majority of these students arriving from

outside of the city. This results in over 90% of the first-year population choosing to live within

the residence system. Roughly 40% of this first-year population identify as male; international

students make up less than 10% of the total undergraduate population. There were 119

participants involved in the program. The program was IRB approved as the university required

IRB approval for any program development/implementation on campus. Most of the promotion

for this program was via posters/flyers in residence halls as well as the university's athletics and

recreation center. Information emails were also sent to front-line staff (residence directors,

academic advisors, support services), to pass along to first-year students. A copy of this

information was also posted on the departmental Facebook page. Individual emails were sent to

each registrant, both after registering and two days before the event. The participants were

informed that the program would focus on healthy masculinity development.

Within the campus culture, there is a perception among students and faculty of the typical

student at this specific institution. Historically, been a view that most students on campus are

White, heterosexual, and have high socio-economic status (Kayssi, 2004). Although this belief is

shifting (Williams, 2015), this emphasizes the need for discussions about privilege on campus as

the student demographics are changing. Another perception about the students is that they consistently consume large amounts of alcohol. This perception is grounded, with the numbers showing the university students as having higher rates than the national average regarding alcohol consumption (Humphrys & Dods, 2016). This level of alcohol consumption by university students only increased with the recent university closings due to COVID-19 (Lechner et al., 2020).

Based on the university's mission, there is also the thought that the students may strive to help others. With several unique peer-based support service groups, the university has a high number of students involved with helping others. By the time they graduate, over 60% of students will have participated in community service or volunteer activities. These numbers support the idea of having programming that is at least in part peer-led and shows that the student population is interested in helping others, which eventually was integrated into the CHAMP program.

Immediately before the program was initiated, discussions around men's rights were prevalent on the campus. Sparked primarily by the formation of a student-led men's rights group a few months prior, many campus activities and events were taking a decidedly anti-feminist stance. This men's issues awareness group was considered controversial by many on campus and seemed to be taking away power from less-privileged groups. While concerning for several reasons (and in many ways prohibitive toward introducing conversations around healthy masculinities), this context emphasized the need for and importance of developing the CHAMP program.

Program Themes

Grounded in research and theory (programs, theories, and identity models mentioned above), discussions and collaborations with staff, faculty, and students from across the campus,

The first iteration of the CHAMP program consisted of four events throughout the academic year. Again, based on research and collaboration as mentioned earlier, each planned event consisted of the following three elements:

1. Activity (something to entice students)

2. Food (often as an informal way to begin dialogue)

3. Discussion (the main part of the program and where we hoped to meet objectives)

For each event, a theme was selected to help focus the activity and discussion. Within the developmental framework, it was hoped to have the first session be light, with the final session beginning to tap into conversations about men's privilege. We developed the following themes based on related literature on healthy masculinity and theory in men's identity development.

Strength and Courage

As with the themes for the other three events, the notions of both strength and courage continued to be a topic of interest as we worked with the students. Interestingly, strength and courage consistently appear in the literature about masculinity and male-identified students (Bowman & Filar, 2018; Schwab & Dupuis, 2021; Wagner, 2015). We opted to begin with this theme because discussions around strength seemed to be quite accessible (i.e., most students already have an idea about what strength means for them). This made it easy to fit into the developmental framework; the first session was intended to be simply a forum to begin getting male-identified students out to the program, and the discussion would not broach many heavier

topics. Several ideas were put forward for an activity that could draw out our target audience; however, the ultimate decision was to go with a literal strength training opportunity. Held at the campus athletics and recreation center, students were given the opportunity for individualized strength and conditioning training and an introduction to yoga/stretching, before heading to a common space for food and discussion.

The goals for this session were:

1. Create their own definition of strength/courage

2. Define/identify any personal strengths they have

3. Develop goals around using courage in their lives

4. Have a chance to open up and be vulnerable

Friendship and Camaraderie

How men see themselves within the context of others shapes the conceptions of how men, in general, view themselves in society (Edward & Jones, 2009; Scott & Robinson, 2001). After several brainstorming sessions, the activity chosen for this event was a cooking challenge. Students were able to register for the event as individuals or in teams, with a maximum of five students per team. The challenge took place in one of the residence dining hall kitchens on a Sunday evening (which conveniently is when that dining hall does not provide dinner service and therefore was not being used). All ingredients were provided by the on-campus Dining Services and were a mystery to participants until they arrived. We also added a community/service component to this event to emphasize that relationships can extend beyond one-on-one friendships. Students were asked to bring donations for the local food bank; the teams with the highest number of donations could choose from an exclusive list of provided ingredients. Four

professional chefs were available in the kitchen during the challenge to help mitigate safety and give pointers to the teams. After cooking, judging by staff and volunteers took place while the students helped to clean up the kitchen. Discussions were held while students had the chance to sample all the meals prepared.

The goals for this session were:

1. Begin or enhance at least one meaningful (male identified) relationship

2. Identify aspects of quality male identified relationships

3. Spend time with other male-identified students

4. Contribute to the greater community

Sex and Relationships.

As this was the third session, keeping in mind the developmental framework, we hoped to open the discussions to some more in-depth and challenging topics. Topics included the concept of being a bystander to interpersonal violence (not intervening in a situation even when help is needed) and consent (for this program, consent means an agreement to participate in sexual activity). Although the topic of sex and relationships is extremely important for discussion when addressing healthy masculinities, this was one of the most challenging sessions to plan an activity. Historically, despite students acknowledging an interest in both topics, programming focusing on sex and relationships had drawn out mostly female-identified attendees. After much brainstorming, our team finally decided to hold a TEDTalk-like event, naming it SEXTalks. The original idea was to enlist first-year, male-identified students to participate and deliver the content (five talks at 10 minutes each). Ideally, this would create a draw via friends and acquaintances, resulting in reaching the target audience. Due to timing, we were unable to find

any interested first-year students; however, all five speakers identified as men. Two of the

speakers were third year students already participating in the program and the other three were

staff. Because of the nature of the subject and the format (a drop-in event), our team decided not

to have small group discussions for this event. There was a panel discussion at the end, during

which the audience (around 50% men) was encouraged to (and did) participate. Women were

invited to participate in this event.

The goals for this session were:

1. Reflect on aspects of healthy relationships.

2. Consider how consent plays a role in healthy sexual relationships.

3. Increase sexual assault prevention behaviors in their own life.

4. Consider what guys' experiences of sex/relationships can be influenced by society and

    groupthink.

Power and Responsibility.

The final event of the year was where, developmentally, the authors and program

developers were hoping that students would be open to discussions about privilege. Interestingly,

it was easy for the planning committee to develop discussion topics and questions that could help

facilitate this; however, developing an activity that would serve as a draw for the target audience

proved quite difficult. The final event ultimately resulted in two separate sessions:

- Informal discussion and lunch. Rather than focus solely on first-year students, especially

  so close to the end of the academic year, we opted to send an invite to all the incoming

  student leaders: lead first-year student organizers and student society presidents. These

  students were invited to a free lunch, with an opportunity for informal conversation with

a university alum who worked for Buzzfeed Canada at that time. The lunch conversation was promoted as being leadership-focused, with a particular emphasis on privilege and masculinity on campus.

- Evening workshop. Open to all first-year students, the same alum then offered an interactive workshop around leadership and privilege. The student leaders who had attended the lunch were encouraged to promote this workshop to their own student groups, which was our main means of promotion.

The goals for this session were:

1. Create their own definition of power and privilege.

2. Consider what power and respect look like on the Queen's University campus.

3. Develop an awareness of negative and positive consequences of privilege.

4. Consider the socially constructed norms around being a man.

Program Evaluation

There was a small program evaluation component integrated into each event of the CHAMP program. As this was the first iteration of the program, the evaluation was basic and included a pre and post assessment and a questionnaire. However, we were interested to see that the intended outcome of increasing confidence in having conversations about masculinity was met for all four of the program events (see Table 1). There is the intention to follow up with participants over the coming years to increase the generalizability of this data. The initial pre (before the event) and post (after the event) question (how comfortable do you feel about each topic) indicated that all participants exhibited an increase in all four categories.

Table 1

Pre and Post Questionnaire

How comfortable do you feel talking about privilege or what it means to be a man? (1 = not at all, 5 = very comfortable)

	Before event	After event
Strength and Courage	3.3	3.7
Friendship and Camaraderie	3.3	4.3
Sex and Relationships	3.0	4.23
Power and Responsibility	3.8	4.6

While not a qualitative study, we wanted to point out some of the comments expressed by many of the participants from the open-ended questionnaire. The questionnaire focused on the participant's thoughts and feelings about the overall program, the program themes and anything that could be added or removed. Statements included:

"I really enjoyed how informal the event was, but also that there was a balance and it centred around a discussion."

"Not as scary as I expected!"

"It was awesome!"

"I loved every part of it!"

"I learned how the perception men have on relationships is a little different than the stereotypes."

The participants' responses were overwhelmingly supportive of the program. The responses allowed us to think about how other institutions could use this program and possibly contribute to the growing list of options for higher education settings.

Lessons Learned

Beyond challenges of event planning and scheduling logistics, we have learned several lessons that can inform future practice for our CHAMP program and that we hope will guide other practitioners:

Promotion and Marketing

- Promote appropriately. Location, time, and nature of the activity certainly all came into play, but at the end of the day both attendance and buy-in depended on the promotion and how tailored it was to the event itself.

- Stay alert for new promotional opportunities. The SEXTalks event was promoted on Yik Yak, a social media platform relatively new to the university at that time. Many students who attended the event noted that this promotion had been quite effective.

- Switch up advertising. By the end of the first year of programming, we realized that different events require different forms of promotion and advertising. Not only does this speak to the uniqueness of each event, but it also ensures that the population (who are already bombarded with advertisements across the whole campus) does not get weary of our program.

Recruitment and Involvement

- Have male-identified students as volunteers for events. As previously noted, research does support that male-identified students are more likely to want to help others than

want to be helped. While the volunteers served a different capacity than the

participants, they contributed substantially to the discussions and brought some

wonderful perspectives to the table.

- Involve students. There were several key student leaders who were integral to the

  success of the program and connected with a different student group for each event.

- Divide and conquer. Two staff members were involved throughout the entire program

  and planning process to ensure consistency; however, each specific event was

  planned by a different small group of 4-5 (staff and students) to lessen the workload.

- Recruit early. Speakers for SEXTalks were recruited a few weeks before the event

  itself, which led to a scramble for speakers at the last moment.

- Connect with student leaders. This should be a given for any staff-led campus

  program, but the benefits were particularly evident throughout the CHAMP program.

  Connecting one-on-one/in-person with the student leaders also worked well as

  promotion, even for events to which they were not the target audience.

- Stay positive. Interestingly, we did not encounter much pushback from other staff or

  departments regarding targeting male-identified students (as opposed to being

  inclusive of all students on campus). This was likely due to a combination of being

  explicit in the emphasis on healthy masculinity and continued collaboration and

  communication with staff and students across the campus.

- Look for collaboration and funding resources. The program was designed to be open

  to collaboration between programs on campus and even the local community.

General Considerations

- Adapt. While the initial program focused on healthy masculinities and development, the nature of the program quickly shifted focus to figuring out how to engage the target audience (first-year, male-identified students). Continual feedback from the participants and implementation of this feedback will allow for increasing the chances of a successful event.

- Consider societal influences. While the venue and activity of the first CHAMP event seemed to be male-oriented (i.e., strength training at the athletics center), this event was not actually suited toward attracting male-identified students (and this was reflected in the numbers). There is an assumption that students who sign up for this type of event 'need help' in the gym, a location traditionally/stereotypically thought to be a place where men should already be comfortable.

- Leave them wanting more. The discussions at the end of the events were very productive. Part of this was likely due to skilled facilitators working with each team, with many opportunities to interact and know each other informally beforehand.

After the successes and feedback from the first iteration of the CHAMP program, the program ran for a second time during the following academic year. Each event remained relatively the same, with some minor changes, except for the Strength and Courage event, where strength training was replaced by an opportunity to learn about/play wheelchair basketball. The attendance was similar (119 participants in total), and feedback continued to be positive.

For the upcoming academic year planning for a CHAMP program that is modified from previous years has begun. The program's core now consists of a group of first-year, male-

identified students, with at least one representative from each residence building on campus. This group of students take a leadership role within their communities in promoting discussions about healthy masculinities and have regular meetups, with the outcomes and curriculum for these meetups currently being developed by several on-campus staff. Additionally, the group can plan two events throughout the year, with support and guidance from the supervising staff. Outside of the core group, staff continues to plan two additional events, the most popular events from previous years, the cooking challenge, and SEXTalks.

With relative success in attracting the desired target audience of first-year, male-identified students, future programming may consider other populations within this audience. International, aboriginal, and first-generation students are all possible audiences that we would like to ensure feel included in future iterations of CHAMP. Regarding longer-term planning, a significant amount of research points toward mentorship programs being very effective for college students (Coles, 2011). While a top-down mentorship program would likely take some intensive planning and resources at an institution as the size of the university discussed in this program, there is the possibility of creating a mentorship component into the program, where first-year students mentor male-identified high school students in the community. Currently a lofty goal, but one that will continue to develop in the future.

Conclusion

In the current North American campus environment, there has been a small but growing shift toward developing programs that target and build healthy masculine identities (Beh, 2019; NASPA, n.d.). While these programs can be difficult to plan and initiate, the CHAMP program is an example of how dedicated collaboration between university student development offices and

students can result in success and ongoing momentum, as reported by the participants and leaders. The program was not intended to immediately result in students talking about the concepts of power and privilege related to ideas of masculinity, nor was it envisioned as a direct means to sexual assault (or any other problem behavior) prevention. Working with first-year, male-identified students the hope was that the program would simply engage this population at the initial stages of healthy identity development. By offering these types of programs, the ideal result would be that by the end of their academic career, these students will be developmentally at a place where they can have frank and open discussions about privilege, bystanderism and challenge traditional, hegemonic norms. There are challenges to overcome with healthy masculinity programming, including continued student engagement and broader campus support. However, other campuses are encouraged to develop their own unique programs based on lessons learned from the CHAMP program. A continued examination into shifting men's identity through programming will benefit students, the broader campus, and social community.

References

American College Health Association. (2014). *Spring 2014 reference group executive summary*.

American College Health Association National College Health Assessment II.

https://www.acha.org/documents/ncha/ACHA-NCHA-

II_ReferenceGroup_ExecutiveSummary_Spring2014.pdf

Beh, J. (2019). *Fostering healthy masculinity at the University of San Diego* [M.A. in Higher

Education Leadership: Action Research Projects].

https://digital.sandiego.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1044&context=soles-mahel-

action

Batcho, K. I. (2017, May 31). Why shaming doesn't work. *Psychology Today*.

https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/longing-nostalgia/201705/why-shaming-

doesnt-work

Berger, M., Wallis, B., & Watson, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Constructing masculinity*. Routledge.

Bowman, J. M., & Filar, D. C. (2018). *Masculinity and student success in higher education* (1st

ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315542867

Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Basile, K. C., Walters, M., Chen, J., & Merrick, M. T. (2015).

Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence

victimization - National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States,

2011. *American Journal of Public Health*, *105*(4), e11-e12.

https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2015.302634

Butler J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

Calgary Sexual Health Centre. (n.d.). *WiseGuyz*. https://www.centreforsexuality.ca/programs-

      services/wiseguyz/

Capraro, R. L. (2000). Why college men drink: Alcohol, adventure, and the paradox of

      masculinity. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(6), 307-

      315. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480009596272

Carey, K. B., Durney, S. E., Shepardson, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2015). Precollege predictors of

      incapacitated rape among female students in their first year of college. *Journal of Studies*

      on Alcohol and Drugs, *76*(6), 829-837. https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2015.76.829

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. Jossey-Bass.

Christian, H. (1994). *The making of anti-sexist men*. Routledge.

Claussen, C. (2017). The WiseGuyz program: Sexual health education as a pathway to

      supporting changes in endorsement of traditional masculinity ideologies. *The Journal of*

      Men's Studies, 25(2), 150-167. http://doi.org/10.1177/1060826516661319

Coles, A. (2011). *The role of mentoring in college access and success*. *Research to practice*

      brief. Retrieved from https://www.wsac.wa.gov/sites/default/files/2014.ptw.(31).pdf

Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept.

      Gender and Society, 19(6), 829-859. http://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639

Courtenay, W. H. (2004). Best practices for improving college men's health. In G. E. Kellom

      (Ed.), Developing effective programs and services for college men (New Directions for

      Student Services, no. 107, pp. 59-74). Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.133

Davis, T. L. (2002). Voices of gender role conflict: The social construction of college men's

      identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(4), 508-521.

Davis, T. L. (2010). *Voices of gender role conflict: The social construction of college men's identity.* In S. R. Harper & F. Harris, III (Eds.), *College men and masculinities: Theory, research, and implications for practice* (p. 49-65). Jossey-Bass.

Duckworth, K. D., & Trautner, M. N. (2019). Gender goals: Defining masculinity and navigating peer pressure to engage in sexual activity. *Gender & Society*, *33*(5), 795-817. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243219863031

Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(2), 210-228. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0063

Evans, N. J., Forney, D., Guido, F., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. (2010*). Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass

Fehr, S. S. (2003). *Introduction to group therapy: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Haworth.

Franklin, II, C. W. (2012). *The changing definition of masculinity*. Springer.

Gwyther, K., Swann, R., Casey, K., Purcell, R., & Rice, S. M. (2019). Developing young men's wellbeing through community and school-based programs: A systematic review. *PloS one*, *14*(5), e0216955. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216955

Humphrys, K., & Dods, J. (2016). *2016 student health survey report: National College Health Assessment* (NCHA) [PDF document]. https://www.queensu.ca/studentaffairs/sites/vpsawww/files/uploaded_files/Committees%20and%20Reports/NCHA%202016%20FINAL%20.pdf

Jewkes, R., Morrell, R., Hearn, J., Lundqvist, E., Blackbeard, D., Lindegger, G., Quayle, M., Sikweyiya, Y., & Gottzén, L. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity: Combining theory and

practice in gender interventions. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *17*(sup2), 96-111.

https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2015.1085094

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2013). *Identity development of college students: Advancing*

frameworks for multiple dimensions of identity. Jossey-Bass.

Kayssi, A. (2004, July 27). Making sure Queen's is for everyone. *The Queen's University*

Journal. http://www.queensjournal.ca/story/2004-07-27/diversity-queens/

Kimmel, M. S., & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent masculinity, homophobia, and violence:

Random school shootings, 1982-2001. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *46*(10), 1439-

1458. https://doi-org.libproxy.clemson.edu/10.1177/0002764203046010010

Kiviniemi, M. T. (2014). Effects of a blended learning approach on student outcomes in a

graduate-level public health course. *BMC Medical Education, 14,* 47.

https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-14-47

Koenig A. M. (2018). Comparing prescriptive and descriptive gender stereotypes about children,

adults, and the elderly. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 1086.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01086

Laker, J. A. (2003). Bad dogs: Rethinking our engagement of male students. *ACPA's Standing*

Committee for Men Newsletter. http://works.bepress.com/jason_laker/54/

Laker, J. A. (2013). Men and masculinities in higher education: Introduction to a special

issue. *Culture, Society & Masculinities*, *5*(2), 106-108.

https://doi.org/10.3149/CSM.0502.106

Lechner, W. V., Laurene, K. R., Patel, S., Anderson, M., Grega, C., & Kenne, D. R. (2020).

Changes in alcohol use as a function of psychological distress and social support

following COVID-19 related University closings. *Addictive Behaviors*, *110*, 106527.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106527

Lipari, R. N., & Jean-Francois, B. (2016). *A day in the life of college students aged 18 to 22: Substance use facts.* The CBHSQ Report. Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK396154/

McCabe, S. E., West, B. T., Teter, C. J., & Boyd, C. J. (2014). Trends in medical use, diversion, and nonmedical use of prescription medications among college students from 2003 to 2013: Connecting the dots. *Addictive Behaviors*, *39*(7), 1176-1182. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.03.008

McEwen, M. (2003). New perspectives on identity development. In S. R. Komives, & D. Woodard, Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 188-217). Jossey-Bass.

M-Pact. (n.d.). *M-Pact*. https://sites.google.com/a/gustavus.edu/m-pact/

Mount Royal University. (n.d.). *Stepping up*. Mount Royal University. Retrieved from https://www.mtroyal.ca/ProgramsCourses/FacultiesSchoolsCentres/HealthCommunityEducation/Departments/ChildStudiesandSocialWork/RelationshipViolencePrevention/GetInvolved/SteppingUp/index.htm

Nagayama, G. C. (2017, July 13). Creating safe spaces. *Psychology Today*. https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/life-in-the-intersection/201707/creating-safe-spaces

Naimi, T. S., Nelson, D. E., & Brewer, R. D. (2010). The intensity of binge alcohol consumption

among U.S. adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *38*(2), 201-207.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.09.039

NASPA. (n.d.). Men and masculinities. https://www.naspa.org/division/men-and-masculinities

Naudé, G. P., Foster, R. N. S., Bartley, M., Martinetti, M. P., Ayers, L. O., & Reed, D. D.

(2020). Predicting adverse consequences of alcohol consumption in underage college

students using a novel fake ID purchase task. *Experimental and Clinical

Psychopharmacology*, *28*(6), 669-676. doi: 10.1037/pha0000345

Princeton University. (2018). *Men's Allied Voices for a Respectful and Inclusive Community

(MAVRIC) project.* The Trustees of Princeton University.

https://umatter.princeton.edu/respect-matters/healthy-masculinity

Queen's University. (n.d.a). *Queen's University: Quick facts*.

http://www.queensu.ca/about/quickfacts

Queen's University (n.d.b). *Queen's University: Queen's & Kingston.*

http://www.queensu.ca/about/queenskingston

Schulenberg, J., Maslowsky, J., Maggs, J. L., & Zucker, R. A. (2018). Development matters:

Taking the long view on substance use during adolescence and the transition to

adulthood. In P. M. Monti, S. M. Colby, & T. O. Tevyaw (Eds.), *Brief interventions for

adolescent alcohol and substance abuse* (pp. 13-49). Guilford.

Schwab, J. R., & Dupuis, D. L. (2021). Masculinity and silence in the academic struggles of

American male college students. *Emerging Adulthood, 10*(1), 249-263.

https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696820983052

Scott, D. A., Livingston, W. G., Havice, P. A., & Cawthon, T. W. (2012). Men's identity

    development: Issues and implications for residence life. *The Journal of College and*

    University Student Housing, 39(1), 200-213.

Scott, D. A., & Robinson, T. L. (2001). White male identity development: The Key model.

    Journal of Counseling & Development, 79(4), 415-421. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-

    6676.2001.tb01988.x

Shallcross, L. (2010, February 14). Managing resistant clients. *Counseling Today*.

    https://ct.counseling.org/2010/02/managing-resistant-clients/

Tillapaugh, D., & McGowan, B. L. (Eds.) (2021). *Men and masculinities: Theoretical*

    foundations and promising practices for supporting college men's development. Stylus.

Tremblay, G., Morin, M. A., Desbiens, V., & Bouchard, P. (2007). Conflicting role of gender

    and depression in men. *Studies Collection and Analysis*, 36.

    https://www.raiv.ulaval.ca/sites/raiv.ulaval.ca/files/publications/fichiers/pub_113.pdf

Veterans Transition Network. (n.d.). *Veterans Transition Network*. https://vtncanada.org/

Wagner, R. (2015). College men and masculinity: Implications for diversity education. *Equity &*

    Excellence in Education, 48(3), 473-488.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2015.1056919

Williams, A. (2015, September 21). The typical Queen's student. *The Queen's University*

    Journal. http://www.queensjournal.ca/story/2015-09-21/features/the- typical-queens-

    student/