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Abstract

Student affairs and higher education scholars have recently identified several problematic trends regarding the engagement, retention, performance, and behavior of college men across campuses. Concerns for college men’s lack of engagement worsen regarding leadership development, as not only do college men participate in leadership programming at very low rates, but they also have alarmingly low capacities for socially responsible leadership. This indicates that the scarce leadership programming college men are participating in is ineffective and underwhelming as an educative tool. In this thesis, I urge student affairs practitioners to provide college men with opportunities for leadership development that both challenge and support them, rather than just cater to them as it has historically only done. The proposed programmatic intervention, VIGOR Leadership Retreat for College Men, engages college men in high-context activities that center the Social Change Model of Leadership and embrace liberatory, experiential learning, and reflective pedagogies. It is designed to establish an environment in which college men can critically consider how antiquated gender norms, hegemonic masculinity, and traditional perceptions of leadership exacerbate oppressive conditions on their campus and in their communities. The ultimate goal is to raise college men’s critical consciousness and prepare them to engage in transformative social practices beyond the retreat.
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Chapter One: Introduction & Positionality

My interest in student affairs primarily concerns and surrounds student transition in higher education. Although this transition manifests itself most visibly in a student’s time transitioning from high school to college, and from college to the working world, I believe that many other less visible transitions, including those transitions during a student’s leadership development, are often overlooked. This reality is exceptionally true for college men. Student affairs scholars have recently identified problematic trends in the engagement, retention, performance, and behavior of college men across campuses (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harris & Struve, 2009; Davis & Laker, 2004). These concerns, paired with a documented lack of participation of college men in academic and student support services, particularly in leadership development, indicate a need for student affairs practitioners to better understand and support the development of their male students (Davis & Laker, 2004). Furthermore, student affairs practitioners need to provide college men with more opportunities for leadership development that both challenges and supports them, rather than just caters to them as it has historically done.

The Critical Importance of Leadership Development

Leadership development and education are currently experiencing increased attention from higher education senior leadership (Gigliotti, 2015; Haber & Komives, 2009). This renewed emphasis on leadership education is both well-deserved and much needed; there is a growing leadership deficit in schools, communities, and societal institutions that higher education can help combat (Gigliotti, 2015; Astin & Astin, 2000). Higher education plays a critical role in ensuring the quality of society’s future leadership (Astin & Astin, 2000). Helen and Alexander Astin (2000), leaders in the fields of college student identity development and leadership development and education, remind us of the critical importance of adept leadership:
Leadership is an essential ingredient of positive social change. No society can continue to evolve without it, no family or neighborhood holds together in its absence, and no institution prospers where it is unavailable. (p. 5)

Too few college students are receiving effective leadership training, and as a result, college students are drastically underprepared to engage in efforts to create positive social change. Producing more effective leaders is essential to positively influencing society and building a better world for us all to live in. Leadership development, then, should be considered a vital part of the college experience. Research (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Pascarella & Terrenzini, 2005) indicates that students can and do increase their leadership capacities during college, and that increased leadership development in turn enhances students’ conflict resolution skills, civic engagement, social adjustment, multicultural awareness, academic performance, self-efficacy, and character development (Komives et al., 2005; Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 1994; Cress, et al. 2001; Benson & Saito, 2000; Fertman & Van Linden, 1999; Scales & Leffort, 1999; Sipe et al., 1998). Scholars have also long understood campus involvement and leadership development to improve mental, emotional, and physical wellbeing (Peck et al., 2018).

Too often, students assume that “leadership” in college is limited to those who hold formal leadership roles in student organizations (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Arminio et al., 2000); this, however, is far from the case. Student affairs practitioners must be sure to make leadership development an opportunity available to any and all students on their campuses. Instead of understanding leadership as entirely position dependent, students ought to understand leadership as something that occurs when, “people become concerned about something and work to engage others in bringing about positive change” (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 23). Student affairs
professionals must work to help students understand that leadership is something that can be learned and developed, rather than something you inherently possess (Dugan & Komives, 2007). 

**My Journey of Leadership Development**

I have been a staunch defender of high-quality leadership education since I began my own journey of leadership development during my undergraduate years. I have valued the principles of experiential learning, espoused the benefits of campus involvement, and promoted leadership education since I first stepped foot on a college campus; however, it was only in beginning my graduate coursework that I realized my opinion was widely shared. The disconnected thoughts and opinions I had on involvement and leadership had already been defined and supported by higher education scholars for decades.

My own leadership education began with my move from the suburbs of Philadelphia to a large, public university in Virginia. My first lesson took place far away from any classroom, though you may have guessed as such given the student affairs profession’s dedication to justifying experiential learning opportunities. Instead, my leadership transition began in my residence hall common room when I was exposed, for the first time in a long time, to a new group of people with varying viewpoints and diverse backgrounds. The Catholic school education I had garnered did not instill in me a particularly uncompromising dedication to organized religion, but it did inadvertently acquaint me with an overwhelmingly similar group of people with whom my interactions in an education setting were limited to for close to 13 years. My idea of diversity prior to my transition to university life idealized students from one town over, watching a foreign film in class, or earning myself an A in introductory Spanish. Never before had I been exposed to such differing opinions, experiences, histories, and backgrounds. This exposure to new people, ideas, beliefs, and opinions was my first lesson in leadership.
The orientation experience at the university I attended was very much crafted to force students outside of their comfort zones, but with support and guidance. Though the week was full of activities and collaborative reflection exercises, I’d argue that by far the most effective delivery tool was my orientation leader. He was the first upper-class student who I was able to make a genuine connection with, and as a junior, he offered my peers and I a much-needed hand in facing the many new challenges of college life. He provided us ease of mind when academic and social pressures rose, and a dose of energy when he sensed us starting to coast. He did not force us into fake acclimation or urge us to take on more socialization than we could feasibly handle; instead, he carefully gauged what each student in my group was struggling with at the time, and adjusted his leadership style accordingly. Rather than losing patience or avoiding contact with us after our orientation week was over, he checked-in with us frequently and often dropped in on us eating lunch in the dining hall or hosting movie nights in our common room. His persistence in connecting with us helped foster a lasting trust among us individually with him, and also between each other independent of his presence. At the time, I only thought he was a genuinely nice person with limitless patience. In reflection and armed with a greater understanding of leadership theory, I now recognize Tim’s leadership style as both highly relational and situational (Dugan, 2017). Engaging so consistently in highly blended leadership in the setting we were in should have been exhausting, however, this is a side of him we never saw. I’m forever grateful for his assistance in community building and for setting the very first, and very highest, standard for strong, humble leadership.

Following orientation, the majority of my most formative experiences revolved around my campus involvements and leadership opportunities. These memories were made with my very best of friends, many of whom epitomized, and continue to epitomize, steadfast leadership
and healthy masculinity. I adjusted quickly to university life, investing almost immediately in a few interesting organizations and activities. I joined a student organization associated with the Office of Admissions through which I gave tours of the university, volunteered at large university events and open houses, and participated in service and social events. I met my closest friends, made my favorite memories in this organization, and served in several leadership positions while involved. As a chair of two different sub-committees, I learned to navigate group dynamics and greatly developed my interpersonal skills. I also learned valuable lessons about the more tactical aspects of successful leadership, like how to manage effective meetings and execute plans and priorities. These lessons, among many others, were reinforced during my time serving on the organization’s membership board. This position, far more collaborative than the others, pushed me far out of my comfort zone and stretched my leadership capacities beyond what I thought was possible.

During my second year at the university, I was selected to serve as an orientation guide for the incoming first year class. Although notably my shortest-lived leadership opportunity, this leadership experience was perhaps my most transformative. I initially struggled to assume what I perceived to be the apotheosis of leadership, unable to act in the authoritative or commanding role. According to these standards I had unnecessarily set for myself, I was failing. A few of my peers, however, excelled. Although they were successfully serving as the authoritative force that I thought I needed to be, I didn’t observe them making the connections or building the relationships with our first-year students that I was striving for. Having given up on attempting to be the dominant leader, I let my guard down and started acting far more authentically around my first-years. Come the end of orientation, I had made connections with all of my orientees and set the precedent for comfort and trust that I sought all along. Although I wasn’t able to articulate so
at the time, the change in heart I experienced that week was my first solid step towards developing a relational and highly facilitatory leadership style.

Aside from learning from these few obvious examples of positional leadership, my growth in identity as an engaged student and citizen was fostered by my campus environment; because of the institutional culture I became ingrained in, I unconsciously associated my place in the university with service and could not separate it from the larger community it was situated in. I came to recognize higher education’s critical role in society and obligation to furthering positive social change. While learning from my co-curricular involvements, I also pursued formal leadership education. Although I developed the bulk of my leadership capacity through experiential learning outside of the classroom, my coursework gave me the tools to name my skills and attach meaning to my experiences. All three of my leadership courses were instructed by members of the university’s leadership team, my first two courses by the university’s President and Special Assistant to the President for Strategic Planning as a pair, and third by the Vice President of Student Affairs. All three courses were largely experience based and relied heavily on collaborative activities, two principles that have helped inform my philosophy of education and my proposed programmatic intervention. I was also exposed to an array of leadership literature and indexes, different leadership styles, and new ways of thinking. My final course, Psychology of Leadership, most significantly influenced my graduate study, the development of my personal philosophy, and my pursuit of higher education as a career path.

My Exposure to my Concern

The lack of engagement of college men with student services and leadership programming has only become a recent concern of mine. I was not even aware of such a void until I began researching a different concern regarding leadership education for a separate project
in the fall of 2019, and when I learned of this concern, I was both bewildered and generally disappointed. During all of the aforementioned formative experiences where my previously held notions of leadership were challenged, I was kept company by a surplus of incredible male peers who embodied both effective leadership and healthy masculinity. The resident advisor on the floor below me never hesitated to assist us in mediating conflicts or settling laundry room turf battles. Rather, he was grateful for our trust and quick to counsel us to compromise. The president of an organization I become highly involved with as a general body member provided yet another outstanding example of leadership and healthy masculinity, and though his leadership was inherently positional, he demonstrated vulnerability, loyalty, and honesty that transcended hierarchy and fostered a democratic approach to organizational management. Even my social connections, some holding no positional leadership roles at all, served as outward displays of leadership and masculinity. Having had all of these outstanding examples of male leaders to reflect upon, a lack of engagement of male students with student services and void in the leadership development of college men was not a concern even on my radar.

**Why Student Affairs Practitioners Should Care**

The greatest challenge of this thesis was starting it. Aware that the majority of student development theory has been constructed around samples of straight, cisgender, white, male students, I questioned whether student affairs practitioners needed to design more programs to serve this demographic. Further research revealed a drastically different reality. The student development theories of greatest historical prominence sourced samples exclusively of male students, and consequently incorrectly assume that using men as subjects awards us with an exhaustive understanding of the male student experience. Laker (2003) reminds us,
The early research did not study “men.” Rather, it studied “students” who were men. There was no gender lens in the research and thus the resulting theory cannot capture the gendered nature of identity development, for men or for women. (p.1)

Furthermore, several studies (Sax, 2009; Edwards & Jones, 2009; Rosch et al., 2015; Tillapaugh & Haber-Curran, 2016) concerning the influence of gender on leadership development reveal a greater need to consider how gender norms and stereotypes impact students’ learning. Though interest in studying leadership development through a gendered lens has increased over the past 20 years in response, there has historically been very little attention paid to the connections between leadership and masculinity (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017; Davis & Laker, 2004). Recent research specifically surrounding gender and leadership has been limited to studying the influence of gender on college women’s leadership development and has largely ignored the experiences of college men (Bannon & Correia, 2006).

It is incredibly important that practitioners not overlook the developmental journeys of our male students. Moreover, college men face a variety of personal and social barriers that dissuade them from engaging with the university, and as such, it is unethical to assume correlation between the reported lack of engagement and students’ own sense of responsibility or diligence. Practitioners cannot hope to better engage male students in support services, and particularly leadership development programming, without a better understanding of their experience. The onus is on us, then, to at the very least attempt to relate with our male students and design programs they are excited to participate in. Student affairs practitioners have an obligation, assumed by trade, to promote the healthy development of all students on our campuses; this obligation certainly does not stop before we connect with our male populations. Leadership educators and student affairs practitioners should also be seeking out ways to use
leadership education and programming not just to support college men as it has historically done, but also to challenge them. Leadership can serve as a very powerful tool we can use to better prepare college men to take on leadership roles in the “real world” beyond campus.

**Introduction to my Positionality**

As a cisgender female, my understanding of the developmental journey of the male college student is admittedly incredibly limited. This reality, however, does nothing to dissuade me from taking on the challenge of engaging college men in transformative leadership experiences. Rather, my own personal acknowledgement of my previously insufficient knowledge base has served only to bolster my argument; student affairs as a field has generally failed to understand the developmental journeys of our male students. In particular, the field has failed to make needed connections between leadership and masculinity. My own ignorance helps prove this realization. Socialization according to norms of hegemonic masculinity, unhealthy emotional standards, and pressure to conform to masculine stereotypes often cripples college men’s mental health, their ability to build relationships, and leadership potential. I’ve witnessed the impacts of hegemonic masculinity on campus culture first hand, both as an undergraduate student myself and as a graduate paraprofessional advising, supervising, and mentoring undergraduate leaders over the past two years. Throughout the remainder of this thesis, I will assert that leadership development programming has the potential to serve two purposes, both the development of leadership skills for college men and the health of higher education culture by offering a critical lens to combat hegemonic masculinity and centering transformative practices. If one intervention can answer to both challenges, then I argue confidently that implementation efforts and institutional support ought to be twice as strong.

**Looking Forward**
This thesis is not intended, in any way, to serve as a comprehensive guide to gender expression, gender identity development, or any other gender related topic. It does, however, strive to question gender norms and stereotypes, including the male gender role complex and traditional perceptions of masculinity, as they exist on the college campus and relate to leadership development. Additionally, educators and practitioners are cautioned not to allow increased efforts in understanding their male students divert attention and resources away from supporting women and trans* students. Women and trans* students are challenged by gender-specific issues that require ongoing support and intervention. Rather, practitioners and educators ought to remain sensitive to the specific issues that challenge all of their student groups and continue to offer unbiased, appropriate support to all students.

There are numerous other challenges that higher education faces related to the concern addressed in this thesis. Some are discussed very briefly as they relate to leadership development, and it may appear as though the experiences of certain student groups are being downplayed or altogether ignored. This is not my intention, but is the result of trying best to balance both time and content constraints. It is also incredibly important to recognize that not all boys and men have experienced privilege in equal measure, and that an individual’s place of privilege and power in society is a complex interconnection of many sociocultural factors including race, gender, class, religion, education, ability, language and age. As such, male privilege is far from the only privilege that exists. We all live our lives on a daily basis as a result of the intersection of our privileges; some of us, my white, English-speaking able-bodied self included, experience greater privilege than those around us. My ability to study and write on this topic is, in itself, a result of my privilege. We cannot embark on a discussion of power, privilege,
and oppression without first reflecting inward on our own identity. Though I cannot demand it, I recommend that readers do the same.
Chapter Two: Thematic Concern, Conceptual Framework, & Definitions

The following chapter serves primarily to introduce the theoretical framework that my thematic concern is grounded in and situate the concern in a larger historical and sociocultural context. In addition, this chapter begins to explore leadership development theory, college student identity development theory, and understandings of collegiate masculinity to preview the role they play in my programmatic intervention. This chapter concludes with several key terms and phrases that have been defined specifically in the context of this concern that will aid reader comprehension throughout the remainder of this thesis.

Thematic Concern Statement

Student affairs educators and scholars have recently identified problematic trends in the engagement, retention, performance, and behavior of college men across campuses (Davis & Laker, 2004). This lack of engagement extends even further into leadership development, as not only are college men participating in leadership programming at extremely low rates, but they also have alarmingly low capacities for socially responsible and emotional leadership (Tillapaugh & Haber-Curran, 2016; Dugan et al., 2008). This indicates that the scarce leadership programming college men are participating in is ineffective and underwhelming as an educative tool. Student affairs practitioners are not providing college men with leadership programming that both challenges and supports them, rather than just caters to them as it has historically only done.

Conceptual Framework

My thesis is informed by several distinct theories and philosophies of education and leadership. The following section is intended to preview the most influential theories and philosophies to my thematic concern, in addition to previewing the historical social context my
concern is grounded in. As my interest in my concern is deeply personal and my aspirations in
higher education primarily surround leadership education, the following theories and
philosophies also necessarily influence my personal practice and philosophy of education.

**Philosophies**

This thesis is informed greatly by the work of educational philosophers, student identity
development theorists, and student affairs scholar-practitioners. I will draw upon John
Dewey’s (1916, 1933) extensive defense of experiential education, Michael Oakeshott’s (1950)
call for an educational interval, and Freirean pedagogy (Freire, 1970). In addition to these
philosophies, several college student identity development theoretical works influence my
positionality and the development of my programmatic intervention. Alexander and Helen
Astin’s (1993, 2000) explorations into college student leadership development and involvement,
Tinto’s (1975) theory of retention and departure, and additional works concerning reflective
pedagogy and experiential learning by Eich (2008), Kolb and Fry (1975), Boud, Keough, and
Walker (1985), Daudelin (1996), Fenwick (2001), and LeCornu (2009) are of particular
importance. Finally, I will draw upon principles of the Higher Education Research Institute
(HERI)’s (1996) Social Change Model of Leadership to inform and enhance the curriculum of
my programmatic intervention.

**Historical Influences**

In forthcoming sections of this thesis, I will explore the history of college student
leadership development to better situate my concern in the current state of leadership education.
In efforts to understand and address concerns of power and privilege, I will examine the role that
men have played in shaping college student development theory and the historical impacts of the
privilege this population has experienced. This thesis also includes a brief exploration into
society’s understanding of the concept of masculinity and how this traditional view damages male students and their communities.

Current Research & Literature


Other Factors

There are many socioeconomic, sociocultural, political, and historical factors that influence both male student engagement with leadership programming and perceptions of gender norms on college campuses to be considered in forthcoming chapters. Among those that I will
explore in detail are prevailing notions of hegemonic masculinity, perceptions of gender, and traditional definitions of leadership.

**Definition of Terms**

Throughout the remainder of this thesis, several terms and phrases will be referenced quite frequently. Though readers will likely find many of them familiar and may hesitate to reexamine these definitions, it becomes necessary to clearly define them within the context of higher education and leadership development. Many of the following are used in a unique manner; therefore, understanding the nuances of how the term or phrase is used within the addressed concern is crucial.

**Gender/Sex:** “gender refers to psychological, social, and cultural experiences and characteristics associated with social statuses of girls and women or boys and men, whereas sex refers to biological aspects of being male or female” (APA, 2018, p.2).

**Gender Role Conflict:** “problems resulting from adherence to rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles” (APA, 2018, p. 2).

**Hegemonic Masculinity:** a concept developed by sociologist R.W. Connell, defined as “the practice that legitimizes men’s dominant position in society and justifies the subordination of women and other marginalized ways of being a man” (1995). The phrase “toxic masculinity” is often used interchangeably.

**Leadership:** “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2007)

**Leadership Capacity:** an individual’s ability to be an effective leader (Wanger & Ostick, 2003)

**Leadership Development:** encompasses almost every form of growth or stage of development that promotes, encourages, and assists in one’s leadership potential (Brungardy, 1996)
**Leadership Education**: leadership development delivered in an academic context, such as a leadership minor or course, as opposed to a non-academic leadership program (Huber, 2002)

**Leadership Position**: any position in a student organization or campus department held by a student that elevates their membership status in said organization or department above that of the general body

**Leadership Self-Efficacy**: the extent to which someone believes they can be an effective leader; perceptions of leadership capacity (Wagner & Ostick, 2003)

**Male/Men**: The qualifier “male” applies specifically to biological sex, whereas “man” is a social identity that encompasses the attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs that are culturally associated with men (Harris and Struve, 2009). For the purpose of this paper and to ease semantic burden, “male” and “man/men” will be used interchangeably in forthcoming chapters. When used in historical analysis and for statistical purposes, both terms reflect the understanding of gender as it exists in these contexts; that is, both represent the male sex. When used in reference specifically to my programmatic intervention, both terms indicate any college student who identifies as a man, regardless of biological sex.

**Male Privilege**: “unearned sources of social status, power, and institutionalized advantage experienced by individuals by virtue of their culturally valued and dominant and social identities”, in this instance, that earned from being male (APA, 2018). Also, “the logical outgrowth of patriarchy” (Thomas, 2017).

**Masculinity**: “a socially constructed identity that encompasses the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that are culturally associated with men” (Harris and Struve, 2009, p.3); Possessing “masculinity” does not equate to simply existing as a man, but concerns the position of men in a
gendered order. Masculinity is the practice of this position by any individual, regardless of gender (Connell, 2005).

**Socially Responsible Leadership**: a type of leadership characterized by the Social Change Model of Leadership Development; “a shared responsibility for creating a better world in which to live and work which manifests in our passion to engage others in bringing about purposeful change” (Huber, 2002), or, a developmental and collaborative process that leads ultimately toward civic engagement and social change (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996).

**Student Support Service**: any service dedicated to providing physical, mental, or emotional support to students on a college campus; For the purpose of this paper, this phrase is utilized broadly as essentially any service provided to students unrelated to academics (Davis and Laker, 2004).

**ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies**

The ACPA/NASPA professional competencies for student affairs professionals primarily influence my own leadership style by acting as a guide for applying my philosophy to my work in the field of student affairs. The competencies ought to also inform practitioners' implementation of this programmatic intervention by serving as a both a performance target and marker of success. By striving to achieve the intermediate outcomes in the Leadership (LEAD) competency, practitioners can ensure that they are always developing their abilities to refine their own capacities while adopting new and developing strategies for improving the leadership development experience for their students (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and American College Personnel Association [NASPA], 2004). Professional facilitators should also work to help peer facilitators incorporate the same competencies as guides for their leadership, focusing on the most applicable competencies such as “serve as a
mentor or role model for others,” (NASPA, 2004, p. 28) and “encourage colleagues and students to engage in team and community building exercises” (NASPA, 2004, p. 28).
Chapter Three: Narrative

The following chapter serves to ground my concern and inform the implementation of my programmatic intervention. It details the philosophical positionality that informs my practice and ultimately influences the design and implementation of my proposed intervention, the historical context of my concern, current understandings of my concern and the sociocultural factors that influence its development, and my professional experiences that have contributed to my own understanding and expanded my perspective.

Philosophical Positionality

American philosopher and literary theorist Kenneth Burke (1935) once theorized in his novel *Permanence and Change*, “any performance is discussible from the standpoint of what it attains or what it misses. Comprehensiveness can be discussed as superficiality, intensiveness as a stricture, tolerance as uncertainty...a way of seeing is also a way of not seeing” (p. 70). Human beings constantly view the world through a set of learnt lenses, explicit or implicit, that influence how we perceive and interact with the world. That is, the lenses we take up influence whether we see comprehensiveness or superficiality, intensiveness or stricture, tolerance or uncertainty; in the world of student affairs, we may come across more familiar dichotomies such as unintelligent or a lack of tools, and unmotivated or preoccupied. Owen (2012) is quick to note that the application of our personal lenses is of particular importance in student affairs and leadership development, where educators and practitioners adopt theoretical perspectives from a multitude of disciplines. The act of leadership is by definition personal (HERI, 1996), and the personal philosophies of leadership educators necessarily impact what content they include in the programs they design, how they communicate beliefs about the nature and purpose of leadership, and how they measure the efficacy of programs. Naming and illustrating how theoretical
perspectives and diverse cognitive, social, developmental, and organizational frames influence my own practice is crucial to understanding how I approach my concern and design my programmatic intervention.

**Philosophy of Education**

My philosophy of education is informed primarily by the writings and theoretical perspectives of John Dewey (1916, 1933), Jacques Derrida (2002), Paulo Freire (1970), and Michael Oakeshott (1950). The goal of education, as proclaimed by Dewey (1916), is to both continue and improve society; society exists through the transmission of knowledge, and in this sense, would cease to exist should the transmission of knowledge end. Accordingly, society is dependent on the university's ability to educate its students and the ability of its students to act as responsible, participating members of a community (Dewey, 1916). Oakeshott (1950) counters that though the university has a place in society, it does not answer to society. Rather, the university answers to the uninterrupted pursuit of student learning (Oakeshott, 1950). I answer to both Dewey and Oakeshott and call for education to serve both the individual and society, in that the university should educate students civically to contribute to society. Additional emphasis placed on the importance of both informal and formal learning experiences by Dewey (1916, Derrida (2002), and Freire (1970) illustrates that there is no single, indisputably correct path to an education, and that experiential opportunities complete the educational mission. The university answers to the students’ need for engaged learning, and in turn, to society’s need for engaged humans (Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1970; Derrida, 2002; Oakeshott, 1950). The purpose of education, then, is to prepare students to become fully functioning members of society in that they contribute positively to social change, act responsibly towards achieving social goals, and engage civically in their collective communities. Doing so is not possible without first teaching
students to do so within their own microcosms of society by engaging them in campus and community involvements, leadership development opportunities, and other forms of social investment. Interests and skills in these areas, and particularly in leadership development centering social change, can and should be cultivated during a student’s undergraduate years.

**Philosophy of Student Affairs**

My philosophy of student affairs as one realm within the broader world of higher education centers several other theoretical perspectives, frameworks, and practices that expand upon those that define my educational philosophy mentioned above. I approach the practice of student affairs through the critical cultural perspective, which embraces Freirean liberatory pedagogy by calling into question manifestations of power and privilege in the university (Poon et al., 2016; Rodricks & McCoy, 2015). Incorporating the principles of liberatory pedagogy in student affairs work in particular can help students develop a critical consciousness, an awareness of how we further systems of oppression and inequality in our lives, and begin to act on this awareness through the programs practitioners design. Additionally, practitioners ought to provide programs to students that adopt principles of experiential learning theory and reflective pedagogy, pioneered by Dewey (1933), Boud, Keough, and Walker (1985), Daudelin (1996), Fenwick (2001), Kolb and Fry (1975), and Le Cornu (2009). Principles of experiential learning place high value on student experiences, while reflective pedagogy requires students to attach meaning to these experiences. The intersection of these frameworks as they relate to student learning and development inform my philosophy.

**Liberatory Pedagogy & the Critical Cultural Perspective.** The critical cultural perspective positions student affairs practitioners as transformative educators and agents of systemic change (Poon et al., 2016). They are called to work in partnership, both alongside
students and in collaboration with other faculty and staff across campus. This perspective applies Freirean liberatory pedagogy to the practice of student affairs by recognizing and centering historically marginalized groups and critiquing existing university power structures (Rodricks & McCoy, 2015; Poon et al., 2016). Liberatory pedagogy prescribes approaches to teaching and learning that are “intended to raise learners’ critical consciousness concerning oppressive social conditions” (Sayles-Hammon, 2007, p. 34). It has become abundantly apparent in much of the professional student affairs discourse on social justice that educators and practitioners are finding it increasingly important to illuminate the various sources and manifestations of privilege and oppression in the university (Wagner, 2011; Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Liberatory pedagogy provides strategies and tools for the recognition of this power and privilege, and seeks ultimately to unearth strategies for redistribution (Wagner, 2011; Sayles-Hammon, 2007).

The current educational landscape is marred by fixation on information transfer (Sayles-Hammon, 2007). This reliance and dependence on quick and easy knowledge delivery fails to encourage students to actively participate, engage in reflection, or invest in meaningful dialogue with their peers (Sayles-Hammon, 2007). Liberatory pedagogy answers to this need for deeper critical thinking and opportunities for reflection (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). By drawing upon the principles of liberatory pedagogy when designing programs, student affairs educators can better provide meaningful, transformative learning experiences that raise students’ critical consciousness of oppressive conditions. Providing opportunities for students to call into question the normative scripts of oppressive conditions in the university can help upset the systems and ideologies that endorse and engrain this oppression (Wagner, 2011). Practices of liberatory pedagogy will be implemented in my programmatic intervention to raise college men’s sensitivity to and awareness of the oppression that hegemonic masculinity furthers.
**Experiential Learning.** My philosophy of student affairs, and even more so my practice of leadership education, is influenced greatly by professional research and writing on the principles of experiential learning. Dewey’s (1916) defense of educational experiences beyond the academic setting and Kathy Guthrie’s (2012; 2020) work exploring and promoting experiential learning strategies and techniques are of particular influence. Experiential learning was first introduced by Kolb and Fry (1975) as a set of techniques and strategies to construct encounters in which individuals can learn and develop. Experiential learning was defined initially as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience...knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience” (Kolb & Fry, 1975, p. 41). Faculty and educators must recognize differences among students and institute experiential learning opportunities alongside traditional classroom lessons. Dewey (1916) refers to these as the informal and the formal, and urges that both must be present and implemented into curriculum alongside each other. The principles of experiential learning hold that experiences are not meaningful unless meaning is intentionally made, and that thoughtful consideration of an experience is required to inspire future action (Guthrie & Jones, 2012; Glenn & Nelson, 1988). Reflective pedagogy provides guidance for creating opportunities for students to cultivate this meaning and asserts that intentional reflection is required to maximize the efficacy of leadership development programming.

**Reflective Pedagogy.** Student affairs scholars have long understood the importance of reflective pedagogy. Reflection, which is conceptualized by scholars and practitioners (Fenwick, 2001; Illeris, 2007) as a process through which human beings extract knowledge and meaning from their experiences, is the is the key to unlocking developmental experiences (Dewey, 1933; Hatcher and Brindle, 1997). Dewey (1933) reminds us that an experience alone is not always
educative, but requires reflection and thoughtful consideration to become meaningful. He urges learners to “reflect in order that we may get hold of the full adequate significance of what happens” (Dewey, 1933, p. 11).

The most recent research on reflective pedagogy has tackled not just the need for student affairs practitioners to attach intentional reflection opportunities to programs and services to best maximize student success, but also strategies and instructional approaches to do so. (Guthrie & Jones, 2012). To maximize student learning, reflection should be specifically structured (Boud, et al. 1985; Eyler et al., 1996). Reflection should also be continuous, connected, challenging, and contextualized; when reflection meets these qualities, it can facilitate a self-dialogue between students’ thoughts about their experiences and the conceptual aspects of their consciousness (Eyler, et al., 1996; Jordi, 2011). Eich (2008) found that creating opportunities for intentional and specific reflection has proved especially vital to planning high quality leadership programs. On the two student learning and leadership development outcomes that Eich (2008) identified as having resulted from reflection, he noted:

First students learn more about themselves, develop future visions and goals, and become more purposeful with being themselves and making congruent decisions. Second, students develop a meaningful leadership philosophy, model, or framework to analyze their own thoughts and actions to ultimately integrate improvements in their life and leadership. (p. 183)

Although there is an abundance of effective reflection activities, the most popular of which include written reflection in many forms, reflective discussion, and case studies, student affairs educators have historically had very little guidance creating structured reflective activities that meet student needs at different points in Kolb’s cycle of learning (Guthrie & Jones 2012;
Hatcher & Bringle, 1997). The challenge, then, is in intentionally pairing activities with learning objectives to support students at many different stages of development.

Critical reflective pedagogy enhances reflection even further by adding a critical lens to reflective activities (Owen, 2015; Mitchell, 2008). Owen (2015) classified critical reflection as, “challenging students to question assumptions that support social injustices in our communities and leadership programs” (p.88). By engaging students in critical reflection, we ask them to apply what they have learned through personal experiences to difficult questions regarding the nature of inequality, oppression, meaning, beliefs, and so on (Wilson, 2002). It not only connects experience and meaning, but also endows students with a greater understanding of the role of social norms, political power, privilege, and their own lives in furthering systems of oppression (Mitchell, 2008; Rhoads, 1997). Engaging in critical reflection forces students to question their own assumptions and examine their own subjective thoughts (Owen, 2015, p. 88); in this way, they deepen their self-awareness and awareness of other tools of inequality (Owen, 2015; Wilson, 2002). Student affairs practitioners should center intentional critical reflection in any area of program planning, but ought to place particular emphasis on critical reflection in leadership development programming and education. Critical reflection can help students increase their critical consciousness of the traditional vision of hegemonic masculinity they may subscribe to and frame their leadership philosophies through a more equitable and socially-conscious lens.

**Philosophy of Involvement, Campus Engagement, and Leadership Development**

Studies of student success have reported a number of positive outcomes associated with involvement in co-curricular opportunities and engagement with campus community (Soria et al., 2013; Dugan, 2006; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Tyree, 1998; Kezar et al., 2006; Astin & Astin,
The rapidly expanding literature base has revealed that participation in student organizations and leadership programming contributes to an increased sense of responsibility, a stronger sense of self, and greater ease in social transitions among other personal benefits. Deep levels of campus engagement can improve academic outcomes and serve students beyond campus, as students who experience a deep level of connection with their institution of higher education find themselves happier in their careers and professions (Peck, et al., 2018). College student development frameworks by Astin (1993) and Tinto (1987; 1993) found that substantial campus engagement and co-curricular involvement improved student retention and persistence rates, and that ultimately, being involved on campus and engaged in their communities drastically lowered students’ risk of withdrawal. On involvement, Tinto (1933) noted “involvement with one’s peers and faculty, both inside and outside of the classroom, is itself positively related to the quality of student effort and in turn to both learning and persistence” (p. 71).

Through involvement, students have the opportunity to learn through feeling, watching, thinking, and doing; these experiences are not always available within the traditional academic setting (Dewey, 1916; Tinto, 1933). This unfortunate reality lends even more importance to providing said opportunities in co-curricular experiences. Comprehensive leadership programs embrace the “feeling, watching, thinking, and doing” methods of learning and create value-added benefits for many students by helping expand their understanding of leadership as something that everyone is capable of (Osteen & Coburn, 2012; Komives, et al., 2005). Additionally, Cress and colleagues (2001) found that students who participated in leadership opportunities displayed significant growth in four areas: leadership understanding and commitment, civic responsibility, multicultural awareness, and community orientation. As the world evolves and society becomes
more complex, the need for engaged citizens is ever increasing. Engaging students in their campus community and providing opportunities for leadership education can help answer to society’s call for engaged citizens. Astin and Astin (2000) highlighted this need:

If the next generation of citizen leaders is to be engaged and committed to leading for the common good, then the institutions which nurture them must be engaged in the work of the society and the community, modeling effective leadership and problem-solving skills, demonstrating how to accomplish change for the common good. (p.2)

By creating conditions where students can meaningfully engage with their campus, communities, and peers, student affairs educators can assist in fulfilling the university’s mission and supporting higher educations’ purpose to create engaged citizens and effective future leaders. Leadership educators actively engage students in processes and practices designed to increase students’ capacities to create a better world in which to live. Student affairs educators should recognize the importance of engaging students in leadership education that increases their critical consciousness and brings into question systems of power and oppression that they have increasing capacities to change.

I believe that the ultimate goal of leadership is social change, and that leaders ought to arrive at that goal by engaging in relationship building, cultural awareness, and emotional intelligence. Though I thoroughly believe as a tenant of my leadership philosophy that a perfect and complete definition of leadership does not exist, as there is no one correct way to lead, I identify most with Huber’s (2002) personal definition. “Leadership,” she accounts, “is a shared responsibility for creating a better world in which to live and work which manifests in our passion to engage others in bringing about purposeful change” (p. 26). While Huber’s conceptualization primarily concerns the purpose of leadership, Northouse’s (2007) concerns
process. “Leadership,” he defines, “is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p.6).

**Historical Context**

In many senses, the university serves as a sort of petri dish for society. Societal developments are reflected in the university, and in turn what takes place on the campus influences the rest of society. It is no surprise, then, that to fully understand an aspect of the university requires a deeper dive into the historical events and social climate of the time period. The following portion serves as a brief synopsis of the evolution of higher education as it relates to both the place of the man in the university and the evolution of leadership development. It is of particular interest to center the male student’s experience in this brief history, as it can inform our understanding of how hegemonic masculinity came to be embedded in American campus culture.

*The Place of Men in Higher Education*

Men have historically benefitted from an elevated place of privilege and power in the university setting. Prior to the 1960’s, American colleges and universities were populated almost entirely by white men from middle and upper-income families (Brock, 2010). Both prevailing social norms and a limited Federal role in higher education served to retain the exclusivity of colleges and universities (Brock, 2010). White upper-class students, particularly white men, have always enjoyed disproportionate access to elite colleges in the United States. When elite institutions in the United States first opened their doors in the 17th century, admissions criteria were concerned almost entirely with a family’s rank in society and limited admission solely to white men (Neklason, 2019). In many parts of the country, minorities were kept from pursuing higher education by discriminatory laws and practices, while social attitudes about the role of
women limited their abilities to enroll (Brock, 2011). Fewer than six colleges enrolled women prior to the civil war (Harper & Harris, 2010). Financial limitations created an additional barrier for students, as financial aid was not yet generally accessible (Brock, 2010). Although the G.I. Bill did aid with college costs for tens of thousands of veterans after WWII, it “masculinized” campus life and drastically increased the number of white men enrolling in college (Brock, 2010).

Although the privilege of men, and particularly white men, is deeply rooted, access to higher education has expanded rapidly over the past 50 to 60 years (Brock, 2010). Federal policy changes and shifts in public attitude in the mid-1960’s began to offer the possibility of higher education to women, minorities, and nontraditional students (Brock, 2010). The passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965 extended need-based financial assistance to the general public for the first time, making the attainment of a college degree more feasible for many individuals of varying financial statuses (Brock, 2010). During the same period, the civil rights movement influenced higher education by challenging public laws and practices that excluded minority groups from attending some colleges and universities (Brock, 2010; Wheatle & Commodore, 2019). Civil rights activists also focused on equal opportunity of education for women, aided by social opposition to traditional ideas that has previously limited women’s roles (Brock, 2010). As greater populations of people experienced increased access to higher education, public opinion and social norms evolved. The social activism of the 1960’s extended to the student body populations on American campuses and brought to light questions of who should have access to higher education and what role colleges and universities should play in confronting societal inequities (Wheatle & Commodore, 2019; Brock, 2010).
Due to extremely homogenized populations prior to the 1960’s, the culture of colleges and universities necessarily adopted a nearly universal masculine air (Brock, 2011; Harper & Harris, 2010). Harper and Harris (2010) argued, “masculine norms and gendered ideologies that privileged men were woven into the structural characters of colleges and universities. These would not be easily changed” (p. 3). The population of male attendees continued to surpass female attendees into the 1970’s, averaging a ratio of about 58 men to 42 women and dominating campus culture (Marcus, 2017). Men were viewed as intellectually superior and worthy of education, a stark contrast to society’s views of women (Harper & Harris, 2010). Education available for women from the women’s colleges that grew out of female academies and seminaries in the 1850’s was long considered “second best.” Alongside restricted female enrollment came a historical absence of female faculty (Solomon, 1985). Even at co-educational institutions, curriculum was masculine-dominated until the very latter end of the 20th century (Solomon, 1985). Eisenmann (2007) discovered that despite their increased presence at American colleges and universities approaching the millennium, women were considered “incidental students,” and few policies and practices were developed to respond to their needs. Harper and Harris (2010) substantiate this truth:

Ever since their initial entry into a dual-gender version of higher education, women have been forced to contend with sexism, sexual harassment, and egregious acts of differential treatment that often cause them to question their intellectual competence and develop lower career aspirations that their male peers. (p. 4)

Fortunately, ideas defining masculinity and the elevating man’s status evolved alongside changing demographics. Second wave feminism brought with it a major shift in the scholarly understanding of masculinity between the 1960’s and the 1980’s (Edwards, 2019). During this
time, scholars and practitioners working with college men began to consider differing, more emotional and adaptable views on masculinity (Edwards, 2019). Qualities traditionally associated with womanhood were brought to light as valuable human characteristics, regardless of sex or gender (Harper & Harris, 2010).

Student development theory work prior to 2000 reflects the exclusive nature of higher education at the time. Foundational student development theories (Lewin, 1936; Piaget, 1952; Erikson, 1959; Marcia, 1966; Perry, 1968; Chickering, 1969; Kohlberg, 1981; Kegan, 1982) published during what is coined the “first wave” of student development theory by feminist scholars reflect the context of the time and are based almost entirely on the study of white male subjects from privileged socioeconomic backgrounds (Jones & Stewart, 2016). A growing recognition of the need to include lived experiences from students not previously represented in these foundational theories, among other limitations, gave rise to the “second wave” theories and perspectives (Jones & Stewart, 2016). As the 1970’s and 1980’s saw increasingly diversified student populations, student development researchers answered the need to center voices neglected in earlier theories (Jones & Stewart, 2016). Researchers began to recognize identity as socially constructed and integrate experiences of privilege and oppression into their theories (Jones & Abes, 2013). Both academic faculty teaching courses and researchers began to draw upon perspectives from a wide array of disciplines, including women’s studies, ethnic studies, and Black studies (Jones & Stewart, 2016).

Between 1965 and 2005, total fall enrollment increased by nearly 300%, while the gender balance of college attendees reversed from mostly male to mostly female (Brock, 2010). All minority groups experienced growth in college enrollment while white enrollment declined and as of the fall of 2017, more than 56% of students on campuses nationwide identified as female
(Brock, 2010; Marcus, 2017). This trend shows no signs of abating; the Department of Education estimates that by 2026, 57% of college students will be women (Marcus, 2017). However, the privilege of white men in both higher education and society has yet to entirely dissipate. White males were always meant, and at many elite institutions, still are meant to enjoy disproportionate access (Neklason, 2019). Regardless of their historic place of privilege and power in the university as will be detailed in forthcoming sections, we know that college men are struggling personally, socially, and academically. In recognition that college men’s experiences in higher education will undoubtedly shape their perceptions and actions, and in their lives beyond campus, it becomes crucial to both better understand their experiences and create opportunities for male students to develop lasting leadership skills to rely on once they are elevated to positions of power in society.

**A Brief History of Leadership Education**

Concrete theories of student leadership development were first established in the 1800’s, commencing what leadership education scholars refer to as the industrial paradigm (Komives & Dugan, 2011). The industrial paradigm is the first of two paradigms that comprise the dual paradigm model, the most highly popularized tool used by leadership education scholars to classify the evolution of leadership theories (Komives & Dugan 2011; Dugan, 2017). The two paradigms represent drastic differences in core principles and perspectives, particularly over what leadership really is, what makes a good leader, and how individuals ought to lead (Komives & Dugan, 2011). Evolution in theory reveals a general shift from valuing individual achievement, management, and positional authority to shared responsibility, process orientation, and a concern for the greater good. Views of students have shifted alongside these principles
from those that demand management of the status quo out of student leaders towards those that celebrate students as social actors, civic participants, and change makers.

The leadership theories of the industrial paradigm preceding the 1970’s were leader centric and emphasized productivity and efficiency. They were favored by educators and the general public at the time because they were highly prescriptive, offering simple, seemingly definitive solutions to complex problems (Komives & Dugan, 2011). Oftentimes, leadership programs at universities were designed around individual skill development and positional attainment. Students were viewed as future managers who would need leadership skills to maintain their industries, control employees, and lead with authority (Komives & Dugan, 2011).

The first significant theories to emerge were the “great man” theory, spanning from the mid 17th century to the early 1990’s, and trait theories, evolving out of the great mean theory and prevailing until the 1950’s (Komives & Dugan, 2011). During this time, universities were much smaller in campus size, student body, and both academic and social offerings (Altbach & Paterson, 1971). In 1912, there were only approximately 400,000 students attending American universities (Altbach & Paterson, 1971). Leadership education, and the audiences for such programs, were limited (Komives & Dugan, 2011; Murphy & Riggio, 2003). Both theories held that great leaders were born, not made, and were endowed with certain unlearnable traits. These theories pointed to intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability as being the most desirable; however, given society’s views on race and gender at the time, these inherited traits also necessarily included white, male, upper class, heterosexual, and able bodied (Komives & Dugan, 2011). As society deemed what could be studied and who could study it, the audience for leadership development excluded a large portion of the population (Komives & Dugan, 2011).
Higher education expanded rapidly in the 1920’s. The percentage of American youth enrolled in higher education increased from 4 to 12 percent by the end of the decade, accompanying rapid social change and a shift in college students’ attitudes towards greater tolerance surrounding concerns of sex and religion (Altbach & Peterson, 1971). In the 1930’s, students’ attention turned towards issues that stretched far beyond campus to society at large and were notably more political in nature, such as ROTC, anti-war efforts, and labor organizing (Altbach & Peterson, 1971; Brock, 2010). Leadership theory slowly evolved alongside changing ideologies, beginning to champion university students as social actors and contributors to a larger society outside of their campus circles and social groups (Altbach & Paterson, 1971; Komives & Dugan, 2011). Influence theories began to emerge in leadership development, understanding leadership as a process of social exchange. These theories played a less visible role in leadership programming; rather than significantly influencing leadership programming of the day, the ideas behind influence theories lay mostly dormant in the background and silently helped usher in the postindustrial paradigm when educators became more open to considering the potential social impact of student leaders (Murphy & Riggio, 2003; Komives & Dugan, 2011).

As trait theories dissipated in the 1940’s and early 1950’s, behavioral theories emerged in part from the field of psychology and government-funded efforts in leadership development to increase wartime efficiency (Komives & Dugan, 2011; Murphy & Riggio, 2003). These theories suggested that leadership was less resultant from intrinsic characteristics and more reliant on a specific set of human behaviors (Dugan, 2017; Komives & Dugan, 2011). Because leadership was concerned less with who a leader was, and more with what a leader did, the demand for the ideal white male leader of the early 1900’s slowly began to dissipate (Komives & Dugan, 2011). The study of leadership began to take on more obvious political tendencies and the introduction
of leadership styles brought to light differences among autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire approaches and tendencies (Dugan, 2017; Komives & Dugan, 2011). Situational and contingency theories arose alongside behavioral theories and helped remedy some of the preceding theories’ shortfalls (Komives & Dugan, 2011). Most notably, preceding leadership theories failed to acknowledge the role of environment and social context in shaping the success of leaders; as a result, the theories were all guilty of oversimplifying a complex problem (Komives & Dugan, 2011).

Situational leadership theories began to take societal influences into account in the 1960’s, a hallmark decade in the history of student activism (Komives & Dugan, 2011). Students’ voices in society and on campus were centered more than any era before, and a large number of developments outside of the campus, including the end of the Korean War, a period of greater tolerance in America, and a growing consciousness about nuclear war, influenced students and brought about a wave of student activism and concern (Wheatle & Commodore, 2019). Situational theories were grounded in the leader’s ability to assess the needs of the group or situation based on both support and task orientation; as a result, even though university administrators may not have viewed it as such, the idea of situational leadership favored student activism and civic engagement (Komives & Dugan, 2011; Wheatle & Commodore, 2019). At the same time, another significant expansion of higher education increased access for many students (Wheatle & Commodore, 2019). Changing demographics required institutions to shed some of the university’s elitist disposition; fortunately, leadership development theory followed suit (Komives & Dugan, 2011). This shift in values helped usher into the second paradigm of leadership development theory.
The second paradigm of leadership development theory, beginning in the late 1970’s and extending into the present day, flourished following the publication of James MacGregor Burns’ seminal work *Leadership* (Komives & Dugan, 2011; Burns, 1978). Burns (1978) argued the central concern of postindustrial theorists that leadership was much more complex than previously thought. Postindustrial theories shared themes of transformational influence, reciprocal relationships, complexity, and authenticity (Komives & Dugan, 2011; Burns, 1978.) They also focused on group and follower dynamics, rather than exclusively on positional leadership (Komives & Dugan, 2011; Dugan, 2017).

Interest in leadership development was fueled during the 1970’s and 1980’s in part due to the publication of *Leadership Programs in Higher Education*, one of the first surveys of the field of leadership by an American College Personnel Association (ACPA) taskforce on leadership. Leadership development theory also evolved alongside America’s strong and powerful business culture, which supplied a heavy stream of funding for leadership studies (Dugan & Komives, 2011; Murphy & Riggio, 2003). Large corporations and foundations, such as the W.K.Kellog, Ford, and Carnegie foundations, provided funding for large studies and produced reports of their own in attempts to groom student leaders for the workforce (Murphy & Riggio, 2003). The individualistic nature of the American experience, the relative stability of the American economy, and the heavy dependence on neoliberalism at this time made leadership education a feasible feat (Murphy & Riggio, 2003).

The private sector’s interest in college student leadership development continued into the 1990’s (Murphy & Riggio, 2003). The systems approach to leadership development arose in the early 1990’s and gained traction due in part to the realization that leadership is highly dependent on individual, organizational, and social systems (Komives & Dugan, 2011). Systems theories
explored the need for responsive systems in order to best address complex leadership issues (Dugan, 2017). They recognized that control was not possible and attempted to describe leadership within the context of a complex, rapidly changing world (Komives & Dugan, 2011). It was also around this time that leadership educators intentionally began to separate the ideas of leadership and management; the mid to late 1990’s were crucial to transitioning view of college leaders from managers to active citizens and change makers (Astin & Astin, 2000; Soria, et al., 2013). Emerging leadership frameworks from the late 20th century (HERI, 1996; Komives, et al., 1998; Rost, 1993) began to highlight leadership as non-hierarchical, while scholars began to recognize that contemporary challenges called for collaborative approaches. Coursework on leadership education proliferated on college campuses in the early 1990’s. Colleges and universities began offering academic credit for leadership education in the mid 1990’s, and the trend towards assimilating leadership education in academia continues today (Murphy & Riggio, 2003; Astin & Astin, 2000).

Since the 1800’s, society has helped expand the concept of leadership to cater to and include a larger demographic of students, transition the purpose of leadership from management to social change, and usher in highly relational theories of leadership. The number of curricular and co-curricular leadership programs has more than doubled since 1980 (Scott, 2004). This increased interest, and a more than substantial body of scholarly research, indicates a need to educate all undergraduate students in preparation for leadership both on their campuses and in the future.

**Current State of Concern**

*Modern Understandings of Leadership*
Some of the earliest colleges and universities were created to educate citizens for civic and religious leadership (Soria et al., 2013). Though higher education has evolved greatly since the establishment of these early institutions, these public service objectives remain a central tenet of many colleges’ and universities’ strategic plans and mission (Soria et al., 2013). Scholars (Komives et al., 2005; Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 1994; Cress, et al. 2001; Benson & Saito, 200; Fertman & Van Linden, 1999; Scales & Leffort, 1999; Sipe et al., 1998) have recently postulated that there is a direct connection between leadership qualities and civic engagement, and that universities can use leadership development programming to produce more actively engaged graduates (Soria et al., 2013). Several publications have also emerged to call for change; most notably, the National Task Force of Civic Learning and Democratic Education published *A Crucible Moment: Civic Learning and Democracy’s Future* in 2012 with this goal in mind (Soria, et al. 2013). Student leadership development is not immune to the social, political, and economic ebbs and flows of society at large. The shift from the view of students as managers to students as social change makers has influenced theory as much as any historical event or political concern. Both this relatively new view of students and the thought that promoting leadership development can foster civic engagement among university students situates leadership development as a powerful tool to aid students in cultivating a critical consciousness of social issues, such as the impacts of hegemonic masculinity and the systems of oppression it solidifies.

Recent proof that students can, and do, improve their leadership skills during their college years has encouraged the development of many leadership models specifically targeting college students, including the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996). As is reflected in the mission statements of many institutions of higher education, greater
importance is being lent to outcomes related to student leadership development and reaching higher levels of developmental maturity in leadership skills, knowledge, and competence (Astin & Astin 200; Haber & Komives, 2009). Leadership education has gained a great deal of prominence both nationally and globally, and the leadership development of students has increasingly become a central tenet of student affairs work (Huber, 2002; Komives et al., 2006).

**Common Trends and Principles.** There are many different understandings of leadership, and a multitude of definitions, theories, and models that grapple with and seek to conceptualize these various perspectives (Haber & Komives, 2009; Northouse, 2007). Even when considering the differences in design, empirical grounding, and practical implications among the many theories and models, leadership development has generally evolved and progressed over the past thirty years to take on a more relational, process-oriented, service-directed, and systems-focused approach (Haber & Komives, 2009; Haber, 2006; Dugan, 2006). This new emergent understanding of leadership involves

- a process, rather than a position (Komives & Wagner, 2009; Komives et al. 2007; Shankman & Allen, 2008);
- relationships and collaboration between group members (Komives, et al. 2007; Komives & Wagner, 2009; Shankman & Allen, 2008; Heifetz et al., 2009; Kelly, 1995);
- working towards and serving a greater good beyond the self (Komives, et al. 2007; Komives & Wagner, 2009);
- morals and ethics (Burns, 1978; Komives, et al. 2007);
- awareness of and the ability to manage oneself (Shankman & Allen, 1995; Komives & Wagner, 2009; Kelley, 1995);
Additional trends have emerged in recent years concerning different delivery modes and program formats of leadership development (Haber & Komives, 2009). Literature tends to focus on the effectiveness of three prevalent types of programming or involvement strategies in helping students develop their leadership capacities; these formats are co-curricular involvement, formal leadership roles, and leadership training and education programs (Astin, 1993; Cooper, et al. 2005; Dugan, 2006b; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Pascarella & Terezini, 2005). Co-curricular involvement entails involvements occurring outside of the classroom that contributes to learning and development outcomes (Haber & Komives, 2009). Formal leadership roles are positions that students may hold in a campus or community organization that elevate their membership status above that of the remaining general body (Haber & Komives, 2009). Finally, defined by Haber (2006), leadership training and education programs include “any program or activity intentionally designed with the purpose of developing or enhancing the leadership skills, knowledge, or abilities of college students” (p. 29). There are a variety of creative formats and modes of delivery of these leadership programs, including such options as seminars, workshops, mentoring, service and volunteer placements, guest speakers, leadership courses, outdoor education, conferences, peer leadership councils, retreats, and consulting services (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999; Haber, 2006).

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The Social Change Model of Leadership Development remains the most commonly utilized leadership framework for program design and implementation at a collegiate level (Dugan, 2006; Haber & Komives, 2009). The
The model was published in 1996 by Helen and Alexander Astin, alongside several prominent leadership specialists through the Higher Education Research Institute, in efforts to create a leadership development model catered specifically to undergraduate college students (Wagner, 2006; HERI, 1996). In highlighting the degree of the model’s significance in the functions of leadership development and student affairs, Alexander Astin himself reminded us that, “the Social Change Model of Leadership Development in many respects modeled the model” (Komives & Wagner, 2017, p. ix). Furthermore, Kezar, Carducci, and McGavin (2006) noted that, “the Social Change Model of Leadership Development and the seven C’s of social change have played a prominent role in shaping the curricula and formats of undergraduate leadership education initiatives in colleges and universities throughout the country” (p. 142).

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development views leadership as a developmental and collaborative process that leads ultimately toward civic engagement and social change (Komives & Wagner, 2017). The core principles behind the SCM differ from normative and more traditional conceptions of leadership (Soria et al., 2013). Rather than a hierarchical or individual process, leadership is highly collaborative; additionally, leadership itself is highly value-based, as opposed to the value-neutral process that definitively delineates between “leaders” and “followers” frequently found in antiquated views on leadership (Astin & Astin, 1996; HERI 1996).

In addition to the aforementioned guiding principles, the Social Change Model is built upon the following key assumptions of leadership (Komives & Wagner, 2017):

- Leadership is concerned with effecting change on behalf of others and society.
- Leadership is collaborative.
- Leadership is a process rather than a position.
• Leadership should be value-based.
• All students, not just those that hold formal leadership positions, are potential leaders.
• Service is a powerful vehicle for developing students’ leadership skills.

These key assumptions necessarily make the process of leadership available for everyone to cultivate (Komives & Wagner, 2017). The Social Change Model includes seven “critical values” referred to as the “seven C’s” of leadership (HERI, 1996, p. 21); the values are consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship (HERI, 1996). Some scholars and practitioners consider change to serve as an eighth “C” of leadership, as change is widely considered the central tenet of the model (Wagner, 2006; Astin & Astin, 1996; HERI 1996). In current practice, the model serves as the foundation of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2007), and has been used to frame a wide variety of co-curricular student leadership programs and leadership education curricula (Haber, 2006; Seemiller 2006). The term “socially responsible leadership” is often utilized to describe the same philosophy (Tyree, 1998).

The Connections Among Leadership and Gender. Interest in studying leadership from a gendered lens has steadily increased over the last twenty years (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Prominent scholars (Dugan et al., 2008; Shankman et al., 2010; Rosch et al., 2015; Sax, 2009) have made many connections between gender and the leadership development of college students, and understand gender to greatly influence students’ leadership traits, styles, and overall approaches and perspectives (Dugan et al., 2008; Northouse, 2004; Haber & Komives, 2009). Although literature has generally recognized the influence of gender on leadership development, recent work on gender has generally been conflated to looking at the experiences
of women, in many cases, using “gender” and “women” synonymously (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). It tends to focus widely on college women and their leadership practices, with very little attention paid to the leadership development of college men (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Existing studies that do focus specifically on college men and leaders frequently limit their sample populations to fraternity men or athletes, failing to consider the developmental needs of many college men who do not fit these categories (Byer, 1998; DiPaolo, 2002; Sutten & Terrel, 1997).

**What We Know About Men in College**

Exploring the gender related experience and leadership development of college men is well warranted. Despite a history of privilege and success, student development scholars have recently identified a surplus of problematic trends regarding college men’s recruitment, retention, and success (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harris & Struve, 2009; Davis & Laker, 2004). The male share of total college enrollment has fallen steadily from 71 percent in 1947 to 43 percent in 2005, settling at a female to male enrollment ratio of 1.4 to 1 (Conger & Long, 2010; DiPrete, 2013). This gap in campus enrollment continues, presenting additional challenges for university administration seeking gender-balanced enrollment and participation (Marcus, 2017). Scholars have also identified disparities in academic performance. College men earn lower grade point averages and credits in their first semesters of college, and ultimately earn 42% of bachelor's degrees awarded by colleges and universities (Conger & Long, 2010). Boys and young men also face greater odds of being diagnosed with a developmental or learning ability that may impair their academic performance later in life (American Psychological Association [APA], 2018).
Concerns extend to college men’s emotional, mental, and physical wellbeing; men are experiencing an increased likelihood to be the victims and perpetrators of most forms of violence, including suicide (Pollack, 1999), and nearly all acts of sexual assaults and sexual harassment that occur on college campuses are committed by men (Harris & Struve, 2009). Attempts to keep pace with traditional expectations of men have been linked to alcohol and drug abuse (Caprano, 2004), depression (Wood & Good, 1995), perpetration of sexual assault (Kilmartin, 2001), homophobia (Rhoads, 1995) and frequent judicial offense (Harper et al., 2005). Additionally, college men participate in campus activities and civic engagement at far lower rates than their female peers (Harris & Struve, 2009). Despite the known benefits and lasting effects of campus involvement, men show significantly less interest in and engagement with nearly all areas of campus life and student support services (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Davis & Laker, 2004). These trends indicate the need for student affairs practitioners to better understand and support college men (Harris & Struve, 2009).

Personal Barriers to Success for College Men. Scholars of men and masculinities have reported many barriers to success that college men face. These same barriers prevent or dissuade college men from engaging with student support services, leadership programming, and other campus involvements (Davis, 2004; Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017; Harris & Struve, 2009). Davis (2002) and Pollack (1999) found that college men felt pushed or challenged in their college experiences without accompanying support. It is important, then, for student affairs practitioners to offer direct services and programs on their campuses for their male students (Davis, 2002).

One significant personal barrier to success for college men is a tendency away from help-seeking behavior. Good and Wood (1995) found that it is generally outside of the traditional male role to express a need for help or support. The common phrase “take it like a man” furthers
college men’s perceptions that seeking help is an inherently “un-manly” thing to do (Davis, 2002; Good & Wood, 1995). An additional barrier to success for college men is the expectation of emotional disconnect. Contrary to the popular image of the inexpressive male, college men often feel that self-expression and communication are very important to them (Davis, 2002). However, comfortability with self-expression and displays of emotion are rarely practiced early in life. Rather, college men struggle with becoming comfortable with self-expression during their later formative years (Davis, 2002). Several studies (Blazina, 2001; Brody, 1996) have proven that gender-related limits on men’s self-expression have been linked to negative emotional outcomes (Davis, 2002).

Fear of femininity is also a proven substantial barrier. College men report having feelings of fear or frustration around the narrowness of expectations of their self-expression (Davis, 2002). The root of this frustration lies in fear of being seen as “feminine” or “unmanly.” (Davis, 2002). Additionally, college men sometimes felt that engaging in activities traditionally viewed as un-masculine raised questions about their sexual orientations (Davis, 2002). Furthermore, college men face additional social and personal barriers to success, including underdeveloped decision-making skills, peer pressure, and a common inability to trust (Ashlee & Loeffelman, 2020).

Leading Literature. Modern scholars of men and masculinities still rely heavily on several field-defining works that attempt to conceptualize men’s experiences in college (Davis & Laker, 2004; Catalano et al., 2018; Davis, 2002; Harris & Edwards, 2010; Harris & Struve, 2009; Jones & Edwards, 2009; Ashlee & Wagner, 2019; Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Michael Kimmel’s findings about college men in his 2008 book, Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men have proved particularly influential (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). In Guyland,
Kimmel makes observations about men’s reliance on and interaction with the “Guy Code”, “a set of rules understood by men regarding interactions and relationships with other men” (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017, p. 47). Kimmel characterizes the “Guy Code” as defiant, sexist, and anti-intellectual; it pressures men to conform to the same standards that ultimately inhibit them from creating and maintaining lasting relationships (Kimmel, 2008). David and Brannon (1976) and Connell (1987) also contributed foundational works to our understanding of men and masculinities, the former offering an exploration into the male sex role and the latter an understanding of hegemonic masculinity. Harper and Harris III’s 2010 book College Men and Masculinities: Theory, Research, and Implications for Practice, Laker and Davis’s 2011 book Masculinities in Higher Education: Theoretical and Practical Considerations, Connell’s 2005 book Masculinities, and Kimmel’s (2008) Guyland all but serve as unofficial textbooks in the field. Most recently, Daniel Tillapaugh and Daniel McGowan’s (2019) Men and Masculinities: Theoretical Foundations and Promising Practices for Supporting College Men’s Development offers the most contemporary version of our understandings of men and masculinities as they relate to the experience of college men.

**Gaps in Understanding.** Although most traditional scholarship regarding leadership, and student development in general, were constructed primarily by and for men, the theories that traditional literature has produced have failed to grasp an understanding what it means to be a man (Davis, 2002). Unfortunately, student affairs practitioners have not generally been trained to view issues affecting men or may mistakenly already believe that they understand men due to the expansive base of insufficient, incomplete literature (Edward & Jones, 2009; Davis & Laker, 2004). Gilligan (1982) has accurately argued that developmental research has too often treated the male sex as representative of humanity, however, Meth and Pasick (1990) countered:
Although writing has been androcentric, it has also been gender blind. It has assumed a male perspective but has not really explored what it means to be a man any more than what it means to be a woman. (p. vii)

Because student affairs educators have recognized that the majority of student development theories were developed by looking exclusively at men, they can, and oftentimes do, wrongly assume that they understand college men (Davis & Laker, 2004; Laker, 2002; Harris & Struve, 2009). Even Kimmel himself noted the prevalent gap in understanding of the male experience, writing, “guyland is a terra-incognita; it has never been adequately mapped” (Kimmel, 2008, p. 5). Researchers need to examine the development of men through a gendered lens far more closely in order to fill this gap (Davis, 2002).

Literature about men and masculinities has generally maintained a very myopic view of masculinity, though Davis (2018) noted that emerging literature is complicating what we understand about gender identity, men, and the concepts of masculinity. Most notably, scholars are combating the binary-reinforcing understanding of masculinity as something that only men possess, and beginning to treat masculinity as a fluid characteristic (Davis, 2018). Men and masculinities scholars (Ashlee & Wagner, 2019; Catalano et al., 2018; Davis, 2008) are also increasingly considering the role of intersectionality in the developmental journeys of college men and recognizing that masculinity is only one aspect of identity that compounds with many others when considering individual’s experiences with privilege, power, and oppression (Ashlee & Loeffelman, 2020).

The alarming statistics that suggest college men are far from succeeding ought to bring to light the need for student affairs practitioners to “better understand college men within the contours of socially constructed identities” (Davis & Laker, 2004, p. 55). Too often, educators
and practitioners rely on hegemonic tendencies in our interactions with college men (Davis & Laker, 2004). Pollack (1998) demonstrates this clearly, arguing, “teachers, rather than exploring the emotional reasons behind a boy’s misconduct, may instead apply behavioral control techniques that are intended to somehow better ‘civilize’ boys” (p.17). This ineffective strategy, coined the “bad dog” strategy (Laker, 2003), often unintentionally reinforces what Pollack (1998) calls the “gender role straitjacket”. Rather, Kegan (1982) offers an alternative strategy that has been widely exalted. Student affairs educators should meet defensive positions with confirmation, taking the form of identifying commonalities with students, establishing and modeling ground rules for respectful listening, affirming that it is okay to be uninformed and confused, and identifying misinformation, stereotypes, or assumptions (Kegan, 1982).

**College Men and Leadership.** What is known about college men and leadership serves to reinforce the notion that college men need more effective leadership training. Scholars have found that college men have higher perceptions of leadership capacity than their female counterparts (Dugan & Komives, 2007), yet display lower competencies for democratic and transformational leadership (Dugan et al., 2008; Shankman et al., 2010; Haber & Komives, 2009). This may indicate that although college men frequently believe themselves capable of leading, their skills are, in reality, underdeveloped. Tillapaugh and Haber-Curran (2016) found that college men tend to exhibit both relationship-oriented and task-oriented behaviors, or at the very least, seek to adopt a leadership style that encompasses a focus on both relationships and tasks. Eagly and Carli (2007) and Kimmel (2008) have postulated that this ability to engage in a range of leadership practices is due, in part, to men’s privilege; men often face less resistance to switching between more masculine and more feminine styles of leadership than women do (Tillapaugh & Haber-Curran, 2016). The same study found that college men craved power in
leadership on a spectrum, and that some college men placed a greater deal of importance on feeling respected as an authority figure than others (Tillapaugh & Haber-Curran, 2016).

**Relevant Sociocultural Factors and Influences**

Sociocultural factors are large scale forces and influences within society that affect behavior, thoughts, and feelings (Clauss-Ehlers, 2008). There are many socioeconomic, political, and historical factors that influence both male student engagement with leadership programming and perceptions of gender norms on college campuses. Astin (1993) postulated that behavior is the outcome of what individuals learn from the environments they interact with, so it is imperative that student affairs practitioners seek to understand the context in which their students exist (Harris & Struve, 2009). The following examination is not intended to serve as a comprehensive list of sociocultural factors, but as an overview of those most influential considering both magnitude of effect and breadth of presence across campuses. It is also crucial to note that while the presence of these factors in the broader university context is indisputable, the extent to which they may be felt and observed can vary drastically from campus to campus.

**Traditional Views of Leadership**

Despite the recent trend of perceptions away from the toxic qualities that have historically defined understandings of leadership, some traditional stereotypical leadership behavior is still prominent in higher education. Literature has traditionally distinguished between masculine and feminine approaches to leadership, viewing the generalized characteristics of masculine leadership as far superior (Tillapaugh & Haber-Curran, 2016; Eagly & Carli, 2007). Reverting to this approach supports an antiquated dichotomy, rather than a continuum of leadership (Eagly & Carli, 2007). It pressures college men to strive for the assertiveness, hierarchy, task, and power domination that have been traditionally viewed as “masculine” and
discourages them from embracing the relationship-building, shared decision-making, and collaboration that have traditionally characterized “feminine” leadership (Tillapaugh & Haber-Curran, 2016). Recent studies (Tillapaugh & Haber-Curran, 2016; Dugan et al., 2008) suggest that young men today may not find this traditional conception of the male leader as personally relevant in their lives; however, the same young men still feel pressure from those outsiders of their close circles to conform to this standard (Edwards & Jones, 2009).

Some holdovers remain from the industrial paradigm of leadership theories, partly in response to the calls for efficiency made during the closing of the 20th century (Komives & Dugan, 2011). American society currently remains consumer driven, and consumers demand simple, prescriptive solutions to complex problems (Murphy & Riggio, 2003). This principle is a direct contrast to the remaining concepts of postindustrial leadership theories, and in a sense, serves to weaken current ideas of leadership (Komives & Dugan, 2011). While leadership programs designed under such principles certainly can prove effective for teaching specific tactical skills, such as budgeting or meeting management for student organizations, universities must be careful not to rely on the same strategies to teach power skills or foster leadership development. Such topics require far more impactful and adaptable programs (Komives & Dugan, 2011).

**Prevailing Norms of Hegemonic Masculinity**

The concept of hegemonic masculinity introduced by Connell (1987) is widely understood as the behavior and practices that promote the dominant social and political position of men over women (Connell, 1987; Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Edward and Jones (2009), remind us that:
A traditional hegemonic conception of masculinity fosters a patriarchal social system, including how individual men’s identity perpetuates, contributes to, and reinforces patriarchy. In these ways, the hegemonic traditional definition of masculinity serves to oppress women, marginalize some men, and limit all men. (p. 211)

Hegemonic masculinity is rooted in sexism, patriarchy, and misogyny; it continually perpetuates these oppressive forces, which often privilege white men (Connell & Messerchmidt, 2005; Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). When applied to leadership development, the dominant forms of masculinity are honored while the forms of leadership traditionally viewed as “feminine,” such as collaboration and empowerment of others, are eschewed (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017).

The rules of hegemonic masculinity stunt the development of men, as Bell Hooks (2004) reminds us:

Learning to wear a mask (that world already embedded in the term “masculinity”) is the first lesson in patriarchal masculinity that a boy learns. He learns that his core feelings cannot be expressed if they do not conform to the acceptable behaviors sexism defines as male. Asked to give up the true self in order to realize the patriarchal ideal, boys learn self-betrayal early and are rewarded for these acts of soul murder. (p. 153)

What men and masculinity scholars refer to as “the old boy network” is a strong social force that is stubbornly maintained (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017; Edward & Jones, 2009). Historically, many organizations have supported and rewarded stereotypical masculine behaviors that conformed to gender-based values (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Though thought surrounding what ought to embody masculinity is slowly evolving, many of these organizations are still structured to protect dominant male power sources and reward stereotypical masculine values and behaviors such as analytical rationality and assertiveness (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). This
continued protection of dominant power structures results in the overrepresentation of men in leadership positions characterized by power and authority (Eagly & Carli, 2003).

Socialization to conform to traditional norms of masculinity has negative effects on the healthy emotional, psychological, and physical development of men (Davis, 2002; Davis & Laker, 2004; APA, 2018). According to Thomas (2017), “in many ways boys and men face challenges due to the existence and reinforcement of the same patriarchal structures that harm girls and women.” Feelings related to gender role conflict correlate with high levels of anxiety and lower capacity for intimacy (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Additionally, gender role conflict is related to negative attitudes about help seeking behavior (Good & Wood, 1995), low self-esteem (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995), negative attitudes and intolerance of homosexuality (Rounds, 1994), depression (Good & Mintz, 1990), and the endorsement of traditional masculine ideology (Good et al., 1991).

Effects of this socialization impact men beginning early in childhood; boys disproportionately experience learning difficulties and are the source of more behavioral disruptions in primary school than their female counterparts (APA, 2018). Within schools and learning environments, constricting norms of masculinity force boys to channel aggression and confusion into disruptive behaviors, such as bullying, homosexual taunting, and sexual harassment (Steinfeldt, et al., 2012). Research also indicates that masculine gender norms are associated with adolescent smoking, drinking and driving, and alcohol abuse (APA, 2018). Socialization as young boys to be self-reliant, to be strong, and to manage their own problems (Pollack, 1995) decreases the likelihood of men to seek mental health treatment (APA, 2018). When men do seek mental health treatment, they are far less likely to be diagnosed with internal disorders, even when accurate, as the effects of these disorders do not conform to gender role
stereotypes. As a result, many are misdiagnosed and do not receive proper treatment (APA, 2018). Men also both commit the vast majority of violent crimes in the United States and make up the greatest population of victims, despite having greater socioeconomic wealth than women in every ethnic group (APA, 2018). Finally, men are overrepresented in Federal prisons, accounting for 93% of the adult incarcerated population. (Federal Bureau of Prisons [FBP], 2014).

Effects of gender socialization remain with men for the entirety of their lives. A 2018 report by the American Psychological Association found that men die sooner than women in part due to engaging in more risky behaviors (APA, 2018), while several studies have found that men are four times more likely to die by suicide than women (DeLeo at al., 2013). Social scientists have also found that men die at far higher rates than women by preventable disease, suggesting that men do not engage in nearly enough preventative care (APA, 2018). The APA (2018) has recognized that though men’s health concerns are related to a complex interplay between biology and environment, gender role socialization often dissuades men from health-promoting behaviors including consulting medical and mental health care providers, engaging in sufficient physical activity, and healthy eating.

The negative impacts of hegemonic masculinity extend beyond the individual and into society. Kimmel (2008) found that men socialized according to these norms engaged in dangerous sexual activity that in turn, negatively impacted their communities. The APA (2018) found that, “traditional masculinity encourages men to adopt an approach to sexuality that emphasizes promiscuity and other aspects of risky sexual behavior, such as not learning a partner’s sexual history or engaging in sex without protection from pregnancy” (p. 11). The APA (2018) has also surmised that socialization according to traditional masculine norms influences
fatherhood. Nationally representative samples (Jones & Mosher, 2013) suggest that about 80% of fathers are involved in their children’s lives, and that only half of them believe they are doing a very good job as a parent.

**Issues of Power and Privilege**

It is of critical importance to recognize that men remain privileged in a patriarchal culture; however, student affairs practitioners should not refrain from treating college men with developmental care (Davis & Laker, 2004). Despite this privilege, college educators and student affairs practitioners have not historically prioritized the establishment of healthy gender identities for college men, or even considered the developmental needs of male students (Harris & Struve, 2009; Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Pollack (1990) reminds practitioners to “be sensitively aware of the particular forms of affiliative needs and capacities shown by men” (p. 318). In other words, practitioners should be careful not to fall back into assumptions of sex and gender role expectations in addressing the needs of college men (Davis & Laker, 2004). Harper and Harris (2010) advocate for the gendered treatment of men primarily for two concerns; first, they argue, “it needs to be more understood that men have gender too” (p. 5), and second, that “because gender in relational, the status of women cannot be improved without a corresponding emphasis on tending to the social forces that misshape men’s attitudes and behaviors and helping them develop productive masculinities” (p. 5).

Practitioners must also recognize that not all men experience privilege to same extent; Thomas (2017) reminds us that “many boys grow up being bullied in school or abused at home, and these boys understandably do not connect with the idea that boys and men receive privilege simply from the fact that they are male” (Chapter One, para. 4). Men who are queer or transgender experience extraordinarily difficult challenges that heterosexual, cis-men rarely face.
These versions of masculinities do not benefit from the same dominant, hegemonic status; hierarchies of privilege exist regarding race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, gender identity, and other factors (Thomas, 2017).

Tillapaugh and Haber-Curran (2016) remind us that, “men have greater access to social or interpersonal power than women, which is often connected to systems of authority and access within leadership settings” (p. 132). Given the historical place of power and privilege that men have benefited from in the university, they do, and will continue to be elevated to positions of power and leadership in the university and society. The traditional definition of masculinity reinforces misogyny and homophobia (Edwards & Jones, 2009). In effect, men who do not fit the traditional model of masculinity because of their race, sexual orientation, gender expression, religion, age, class, or ability are marginalized, ridiculed, and pushed out of positions of authority and power (Edward & Jones, 2009). As a result, ideas of what defines masculinity become increasingly homogenized. The male leader we get, then, is emotionally illiterate (Kindlon & Thompson, 2000) and lacks developed leadership skills (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). We should want, and need, to educate these men for leadership and help them develop a critical consciousness now so that when they do come into these positions they lead through an emotional, feminist lens for social change and against systems of oppression and inequality. We need to be able to rely on and trust that the men we are elevating to positions of power lead with empathy, compassion, and equality.

**Applying Theory to Practice**

Having worked closely in an advisory or supervisory role with student leaders and paraprofessionals in a variety of settings has increased my awareness of this concern. Not only have I advised far fewer male undergraduate leaders in several functional areas, but I have also
viewed first hand a significant deficit in practitioners' care for college men. Most notably, the assumption of practitioners that men are not as emotionally complex as female students prevents us from making authentic attempts to connect with our male students. I am fortunate to report that this is not behavior I have observed in my direct circles of co-workers and supervisors over the past two years, but within other campus departments and functional areas and on other college campuses. Overcoming our mistakes on an institutional level will prove challenging, however, I’m optimistic it can be done having already witnessed shifts in understanding on a departmental level.
Chapter Four: Program Design & Implementation

Research from leadership educators and college student identity development theorists has proven that greater opportunity to engage in impactful leadership development directly influences students’ willingness and ability to promote positive social change (Soria, et al., 2013). College men’s lower efficacies for socially responsible leadership (Haber & Komives, 2009) indicate a general failure of student affairs practitioners to engage college men in impactful leadership development, which in turn, neglects the development of men’s capacities for social change. Due to socialization to conform to norms of masculinity and unhealthy standards of masculinity imposed upon them in their college environments, college men face many gender related challenges and fall into problematic behavioral trends (Harris & Struve, 2009). Not only do college men suffer individually, but without being challenged to build the leadership skills and critical consciousness to make positive social change, they also continually perpetuate the toxic gender norms and stereotypes that are detrimental to the rest of campus and society as a whole (Harris and Struve, 2009; Soria et al., 2013).

Armed with the awareness that masculinity inevitably influences college men’s daily lives and perceptions, their leadership practice included, student affairs practitioners and leadership educators must work to find ways in which we can engage our male students in impactful leadership programs that expand their capacities for meaningful leadership and challenge them to question unhealthy norms of masculinity on their campuses and in society. Targeted leadership programming that engages college men in liberatory pedagogy and centers social change as the main purpose of leadership has immense potential to positively impact college men’s leadership capacities, yet far too little of these intensive programs are being implemented that respond to the challenges they face on a daily basis. Leadership programming
can, and should, serve to increase college men’s critical consciousness of the systems of oppression both on campus and in society that hegemonic masculinity helps to engrain. This programmatic intervention is designed to engage college men in high-context activities in an environment where students can engage in transformative practices that raise critical consciousness of the oppressive conditions that unhealthy masculinity ingrains, all while building leadership skills and capacities for social change.

**Introduction to Program**

The following programmatic intervention is a multi-day leadership retreat entitled VIGOR that engages college men in high context activities centered around the Social Change Model of Leadership, and that embrace liberatory, experiential, and reflective pedagogies. It aims to create an environment where college men can critically consider how gender norms, hegemonic masculinity, and traditional perceptions of leadership further oppressive conditions on their campus and in their communities. The ultimate goal is to raise college men’s critical consciousness and prepare them to engage in transformative practices beyond the retreat.

The name VIGOR was selected for symbolic meaning. The word vigor represents many qualities, but generally equates to strength, good health, energy, effort, and enthusiasm. Participants will be prompted to contemplate the meaning of the word vigor and discuss ways to reframe other traits commonly characterized as traditionally masculine in an early retreat session.

**Current Best Practices**

**Standards of High-Quality Leadership Programming.** Leadership development scholars (Brungardt, 1996; Dugan & Komives, 2001; Eich, 2008; Gigliotti, 2015; Guthrie & Jones; 2012; Haber, 2006/2011; Murphy & Riggio, 2003; Northouse, 2007; Owen, 2011) have
identified several characteristics and qualities that most often make for successful leadership development programming. Although the qualities identified below do not represent the extent of all successful elements of leadership programming, they are a few of the most significant and most common features.

**Shared Experience.** Many leadership development experiences, particularly those that center kinetic strategies, are collaborative in nature (Haber, 2006; Haber & Komives, 2009). Allowing time and space for students to get to know each other and setting expectations for inclusivity are crucial to utilizing shared experiences in leadership development (Wagner & Ostick, 2003). Research suggests that shared experiences prove particularly effective for programs centering masculinity, as one-on-one discussions with other men are very influential as a means of teaching men how to grow into their authentic selves (Congdon, et al., 2015).

**Varied Structure.** Leadership development opportunities relying on a combination of different types of activities are the most inclusive avenues to leadership development (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). In a grounded study of varying modes of leadership programming, Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt (1999) found that the majority of leadership programs hosted prior to 2000 utilized multiple methods of instruction, with seminars, workshops, guest speakers, mentorships, and community service opportunities representing a few common examples. In modern day programming, the variety of activity format has greatly expanded to include more kinetic and experiential practices, for example those that include physical activity or adopt a game-like structure (Guthrie & Jones, 2012).

**Peer Education.** Research indicates that although college students develop their leadership through a number of different forms of instructions, experiences, and activities, the most significant experiences are those that involve some form of peer interaction (Astin, 1993;
The commonly held and widely espoused conceptualization of leadership as a shared, collaborative process reflects interaction between group members or peers (Haber, 2011). Haber (2011) identified the following benefits of incorporating peer education into leadership programming:

- Peer leadership provides the peer educators or leaders with a valuable experiential learning and development experience.
- Peer educators or leaders can serve as a support system for younger or less experienced participants.
- The potential of having a future peer leadership opportunity can help increase students’ commitment to the program.
- Involving students in critical roles within a program can increase the program’s sustainability.
- Involving students in critical roles within a program can increase the ability of the program to connect to the student population and serve their needs.
- Peer leaders provide valuable human resources.

**Civic Leadership.** Many leadership development programs incorporate some form of civic engagement, civic literacy, or community outreach (Owen, 2015). When implemented well, these programs have been connected to increased leadership capacity (Dugan et al., 2013) and increased motivation to learn (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Research from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) found in 2013 that community engagement is one of the four strongest predictors of leadership growth (Dugan et al., 2013). Other studies have correlated engagement in a service activity with increased self-efficacy, clarification of values, collaborative skills, interdependence, self-awareness, identity development, and commitment to ethics and moral
behavior (Astin 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Mitchell, 2008). It should be of no surprise, then, that leadership programs are increasingly including these principles long employed in service-learning and civic engagement.

**Assessment.** Assessment is becoming increasingly important in student affairs and leadership development (Gigliotti, 2015). Leadership educators recognize that using mixed assessment methods allows practitioners to identify specific needs to their institutions, develop programs around these needs, and measure the effectiveness of programs in meeting predetermined learning outcomes (Owen, 2011; Gigliotti, 2015). Potential assessment strategies and tools that have proven particularly effective in assessing leadership education include focus groups with established and emerging leaders, informal conversations with alumni of leadership programs, program evaluations, direct observation, and questionnaires (Gigliotti, 2015; Owen, 2011).

**Existing Programmatic Strategies for College Men.**

**Men’s Groups.** Men’s groups, which are growing in numbers on college campuses across the country, rely on community building to tackle topical concerns (Grinspan, 2016). Collegiate men's groups are typically housed in a university identity center, like the Men and Masculinities Center at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (n.d.), and though they vary in structure and format, most center the concern of what it truly means to be a man (Grinspan, 2016). The Masculinity Group at Trinity College in Hartford (Trinity College, n.d.), Stony Brook’s Center for the Studies of Men and Masculinities (Stony Brook, n.d.), and Lafayette College’s Masculinities on Mondays (Lafayette College, n.d.) present a few effective examples.

**Shared Experiences.** Shared experience programming incorporates a wide variety of program formats that engage participants in experiences together that often feature a highly
Mentoring. Mentorship programs help create a culture where men can support each other through positive relationship-building (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Examples of mentoring programs include those between faculty and students, alumni and students, and peers among each other (Beatty & Tillapaugh, 2017). Dugan and associates (2013) found a direct correlation between college men’s capacities for leadership and the amount of time they spent with a campus mentor. Student affairs professionals can design programs, workshops, and retreats that allow college men to interact authentically with one another to help build community in the same way (Beatty & Tillapaugh; Congdon, et al., 2015).

Exemplary Men’s Leadership Programs.

Men’s Leadership Project, The University of Virginia. The UVA Men’s Leadership Project is a mentoring program hosted by the Maxine Platzer Lynn Women’s Center at the University of Virginia. The project pairs undergraduate men with local middle school students and combines mentoring with group activities designed to improve the boys’ confidence, relationship-building, and healthy decision-making. The program places a large emphasis on how playing the role of mentor and facilitator serves as a meaningful leadership development opportunity and learning experience for college men (University of Virginia, n.d.).

Male Initiative Program, York College. The Male Initiative Program at York College seeks to provide a system of support to the college’s male students through numerous resources and programs. Most notably, the Barbershop is a monthly forum sponsored by the College’s Men’s Center that welcomes students’ expression of opinion about various topics. The program
maintains an informal setting inspired by the cultural dynamic often found in venues students are familiar with and comfortable in, like barbershops (York College, n.d.).

The Men’s Story Project. The Men’s Story Project is a storytelling and dialogue project that seeks to begin critical dialogue about masculinity in public forums around the world. Project leaders collect personal stories from boys, men, and folks who identify in any way as masculine and share them in efforts to support health and equality. The project centers the role of testimony and personal connection in supporting men’s development. Additionally, the project’s effectiveness hinges on its recognition of masculinity as a fluid concept that exists outside of traditionally masculine males and its inclusion of folks that do not fit the traditional view of masculinity (The Men’s Story Project, 2020).

Application of Theoretical Frameworks

Critical Action Research

Critical action research (CAR) unites the social critique central to liberatory pedagogy with the democratic research methods of action research (AR). CAR centers people, their experiences, and the knowledge they contribute to the development of more effective strategies for promoting social justice and challenging societal norms (Poon et al., 2016; Brydon-Miller et al., 2003). Critical action research by definition is critical, which when applied to higher education, questions “power, domination, and exploitation, the political demand and struggle for a just society” (Fuchs, 2015, p. 2). The curriculum of VIGOR is designed in the style of a CAR project, adopting the research tradition’s central principles. Many sessions included in the VIGOR curriculum center men’s experiences as value added to the relatively new knowledge community on men and masculinity. Additionally, adopting both CAR guiding principles and qualities of democratic leadership, VIGOR participants are urged to create their own experience
through a combination of authentic representation of self, genuine participation, and some self-paced instruction. Furthermore, the experiences of previous VIGOR participants play a role in shaping future versions of the retreat by providing students with opportunities to select future topics and design future sessions or activities. In this sense, the participants are influencing the experiences of their future peers.

**Liberatory Pedagogy**

The curriculum of VIGOR is designed to engage college men in liberatory pedagogy to increase their sensitivity to hegemonic masculinity, men’s history of power and privilege, and other social factors that have impacted themselves, their campuses, and their communities. The principles of liberatory pedagogy will primarily inform reflective activities by applying a critical lens to participant discussion. In the words of Beatty and Tillapaugh (2017), “once college men understand their privilege and can identify toxic hegemonic masculinity, we must then challenge young men who are interested in being leaders to take action against this toxicity” (p. 53). Beatty & Tillapaugh (2017) pose “calling in” college men to challenge and change prevailing notions of masculinity and power, rather than “calling out” college men for historically formed societal notions. It is recommended that project leadership adopt this mindset in marketing and promotion efforts, as will be examined further. VIGOR also provides participants with extensive opportunity through several sessions to develop their own personal strategies to address oppression and form healthy views of leadership once this “calling in” has occurred. The ultimate ideal, then, is for the curriculum of VIGOR to engage college men in new ways of thinking, doing, and being as they involve leadership and social change through the principles of liberatory pedagogy.

**Experiential Learning**
Education scholars (Dewey, 1916; Kolb & Frye, 1975; Glenn & Nelson, 1988; Guthrie, 2012/2020) and student affairs professionals have long postulated that learning experiences outside of the classroom have immense educational potential. The VIGOR curriculum includes many experiential learning opportunities, all paired with meaning-making exercises or space for group and individual reflection. VIGOR resists the hegemonic myth that men are simply inexpressive by exploring physical activity as means to promote men’s expression and accelerate mental and emotional processing (Pollack, 2001). The curriculum provides alternative action-oriented pathways for expression and learning, what Davis and Laker (2004) classify as “doing activities.” Examples of “doing activities,” some of which are implemented in VIGOR but can be interchanged as desired, are hiking, walking, playing video games, completing a ropes course, and organizing a low-stakes sports game. Student affairs professionals, however, must be careful not to assume that all college men want to participate in these activities, limit the stakes and competitiveness of “doing activities,” and be willing to work with these participants to find alternatives. Failing to do so will in itself reinforce the traditional norms of hegemonic masculinity that VIGOR seeks to challenge.

Reflective Pedagogy

VIGOR employs the central tenet of reflective pedagogy, that reflection is the key to unlocking developmental experiences, by engaging participants in two primary forms of reflection. First, VIGOR curriculum calls for intentional reflection following all activities or presentations, regardless of session format. Suggested processing and reflection questions for all VIGOR sessions, in addition to general reflection questions that peer facilitators may insert into the retreat as they see fit, can be found in Appendix A. Additionally, VIGOR centers critical discussions, both in small and large groups, that tackle topics including the development of a
leadership philosophy that is socially-conscious, how hegemonic masculinity impacts that campus culture, and how participants can play a role in changing campus culture. It is important to note that while these two modes of reflection are planned, it should be expected by facilitators that other informal reflection is likely to crop up naturally outside of scheduled reflection. Both the democratic leadership model and Kolb’s Cycle of Learning suggest that inserting more reflection activities into the program will help students connect personally to the subject material and invest in their own development within the program. In addition, increasing reflection will help student participants better retain information and teach it to their friends and peer groups beyond the retreat.

**Program Purpose and Objectives**

Specific program goals and objectives, along with student learning and performance outcomes for both retreat participants and peer facilitators are detailed below.

**Program Goals**

Program goals concern why planners create programs, what planners hope to change in the future, and why planners feel the program is worth doing (Caffarella & Dafron, 2013). They are the ideal results that project leaders should desire to see following several years of implementation. Vigor men’s leadership retreat strives to

- increase college men’s capacities for leadership and social change;
- raise college men’s critical consciousness of the role of hegemonic masculinity in furthering systems of oppression present on their campuses and in their communities;
- encourage college men to challenge impacts of hegemonic masculinity on their campuses and in their communities;
• increase the involvement of college men in leadership development opportunities, civic engagement, and other campus activities.

Program Objectives

Program objectives are clear statements of more specific, practical results to be achieved by a program (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). They are concrete foundations for achieving program goals. VIGOR men’s leadership retreat will

• engage participants in critical discourse with peers;
• create a supportive setting conducive to personal growth and development for both participants and peer-facilitator;
• guide participants through a variety of activities aimed at developing leadership skills and qualities;
• assist participants in the creation of personal action plans to challenge hegemonic masculinity and engage in transformative action following the retreat;
• provide peer-facilitators with an advanced leadership development opportunity.

Student Learning Objectives

Student learning objectives, or outcomes, describe what participants will learn or gain as a result of participating in a program (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). Learning objectives differ from program objectives in that they focus on desired results for individual participants, rather than for the program as a whole (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). After participating in VIGOR Men’s Leadership Retreat, participants and peer-facilitators will be able to

• practice intercultural fluency when interacting with peers from different backgrounds;
• articulate their personal leadership philosophies and styles;
• identify evidence of hegemonic masculinity on campus;
• identify three strategies to implement positive social change on their campus or in their communities.

**Student Performance Outcomes**

Performance outcomes describe tangible actions that program planners want participants to take. After participating in VIGOR Men’s Leadership Retreat, participants will

• interact with at least one additional student support service in the academic semester following their attendance;

• recommend at least one resource to their peers when discussing leadership development.

**Program Content Selection**

The curriculum of VIGOR is modeled to achieve co-curricular learning goals and elements of strategic plans commonly found among university divisions of student affairs. By modeling curriculum topics around co-curricular learning goals, the retreat is necessarily aligned with the university’s strategic plan. Such alignment should serve to help validate the program’s funding requirements and need for other university support. Additionally, target areas and specific content pieces were selected to best connect to the missions and goals of other student affairs departments and offices who may have a stake in raising critical consciousness about oppressive conditions across campuses. Program leadership should seek to partner with offices and departments with related mission and goals; examples may include gender and culture identity centers, career development centers, and service-learning and volunteer programs. Finally, session topics were diversified to address all seven “C’s” of the Social Change Model of Leadership (HERI 1996). A detailed visual of these seven “C’s” can be found in Appendix B, and a chart outlining the co-curricular goals and “C’s” that each VIGOR session addresses can be found in Appendix C.
Co-curricular Learning Goals

The following co-curricular learning domains represent intended target areas of VIGOR curriculum. The domains and definitions are those of the division of student affairs at West Chester University of Pennsylvania, however, very similar target areas are likely to be incorporated in many institutions of higher education. The exact curriculum and specific topics addressed should be modified according to the minutia of different institutional strategic plans and mission statements.

Civic Engagement. Civic engagement “encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal, political, and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community” (West Chester University [WCU], n.d.a).

Communication. Communication concerns “the exchange of information orally, non-verbally and in writing, with individuals, groups and external audiences using multiple modes, including technology and related applications” (WCU, n.d.a).

Integrative Learning. Integrative learning is “an understanding and disposition that a student builds across their personal, curricular, and co-curricular lives, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new and complex situations” (WCU, n.d.a).

Intercultural Fluency. Intercultural fluency involves “valuing, respecting, and learning from people with diverse backgrounds. The individual demonstrates openness, inclusiveness, sensitivity, and the ability to interact respectfully with all people and understand individuals’ differences” (WCU, n.d.a).
Critical Thinking. Critical thinking entails “a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion” (WCU, n.d.a).

Problem Solving. Problem solving is “the process of designing, evaluating and implementing a strategy to answer a question or achieve a desired goal” (WCU, n.d.a).

Personal Development. Personal development “includes both intra- and inter-personal elements. Intrapersonal development refers to an individual’s self-understanding and the extent to which they engage in selecting and living by their personal values and beliefs. Interpersonal development refers to an individual’s ability to build and maintain meaningful and healthy relationships, work collaboratively, and lead others” (WCU, n.d.a).

Program Design

Audience

All self-identified male undergraduate students regardless of class year and leadership experience are eligible and encouraged to attend VIGOR. Additional promotional emphasis should be placed on targeting emerging leaders, who may not realize that this program is available to them. An application process may be utilized if interest for VIGOR exhausts attendance capacity, though the process should be brief in order to not exclude any student from participation due to excess additional labor.

It is important to note that retreat participants are not the only students intended to benefit from VIGOR. The VIGOR curriculum employs peer education strategies, which, as indicated in previously cited scholarly research (Haber, 2011; Dugan & Komives, 2007), provide valuable learning experiences for the peer facilitators and leaders themselves. As such, separate learning
outcomes for peer facilitators, alongside a suggested training plan and recommended facilitation materials, can be found in Appendix D.

**VIGOR Sessions**

Although all retreat activities should connect back to creating positive social change and increasing one’s critical consciousness, the curriculum is designed to be relatively flexible. Potential activities are interchangeable and modifiable to allow for needed adaptations. Additionally, professional leadership should honor the democratic style of leadership and strive to adapt session topics and activities according to student needs and desires at the time and on their campus.

Many potential retreat sessions intentionally center shared experiences. Though at first glance some of these sessions may appear to have no purposeful objectives that relate back to retreat goals, the power of shared experiences should not be overlooked. Commensality, the act of eating together, serves as a provisional bridging mechanism between people and groups (Marovelli, 2019). Eating together at the same table, or in close quarters of groups of tables, fosters the creation of social relationships (Marovelli, 2019). In fact, commensality has long been considered by scholars as a form of communication between participants, an act further enhanced by preparing the meal to be eaten together (Marovelli, 2019). The kitchen is considered by many anthropologists (Meah & Jackson, 2016; Longhurst et al., 2009) as an emotional space and site of memory making, one which cultivates conviviality and connection in “culinary production” (Marovelli, 2019, p. 193). Research suggests that memory-making is increased for individuals in kitchens as a location and during the act of food preparation (Meah & Jackson, 2016).

The following sections detail sample retreat sessions according to the general timeframe they should be scheduled in. Within timeframes, the sessions themselves are interchangeable;
however, program leadership should pay careful attention to how sessions are organized in the retreat schedule to ensure a variety of format and ease of transition between sessions. Additionally, program leadership should be wary of overloading participants with several high context or highly emotional sessions back-to-back and intentional about allowing ample space for unorganized free time. A sample retreat schedule can be found in Appendix E.

**Initial VIGOR Sessions.** The following VIGOR sessions should occur first, as they provide critical information that future retreat activities and discussions expand upon.

*Opening Discussion: Welcome and Setting Expectations.* Professional and peer facilitators should include a welcome message, their expectations regarding open and authentic behavior, and whatever else facilitators decide they would like to share with the large group. This should be followed by an icebreaker and a teambuilding activity.

*Lecture and Discussion: Leadership Styles.* Peer facilitators will create a presentation for participants detailing different leadership styles and techniques. A leadership or strengths inventory of the facilitators’ choice may be used. Reflection questions should center the efficacy of different styles and techniques.

*Journaling Activity: Testimony and “I Am” Stories.* Peer facilitators will be assigned to the same small groups throughout the weekend, but only to complete this specific activity. Facilitators will begin by distributing a pad of paper or small notebook to every participant in their group and introducing the concept of an “I Am” story. Peer facilitators will then share their own prepared “I Am” stories with the group and have participants begin to take notes and write their own. Small groups will then meet periodically throughout the remainder of the retreat to check in and share updates on their writing. Small groups will then meet on the last day of the retreat to share their “I Am” stories with each other. A few participants will then have the option
to share their story with the large group, if they choose. Details and prompts for writing can be found in Appendix F.

*Lecture and Discussion: What is Hegemonic Masculinity?* Peer facilitators will create a visual presentation and discussion exploring the topic of hegemonic masculinity. Although peer facilitators should be given proper autonomy to create the presentation and materials, professional facilitators should recommend resources and monitor progress to ensure enough information is covered. See Appendix A for sample reflection questions and Appendix G for recommended resources for peer facilitators.

*Intermediate VIGOR Sessions.* The following VIGOR activities and discussions should follow the initial sessions and proceed the closing sessions for the sake of content clarity.

*Gender Influences on Leadership.* Peer facilitators will lead participants in this activity detailed in Haber-Curran’s (2003) module “Gender Influences on Leadership” in the *Exploring Leadership for College Students who Want to Make a Difference* facilitation guide. Two peer facilitators will act out a silent cultural demonstration using the instructions provided in Haber-Curran’s module. In an initial reflection activity, participants will offer up adjectives that come to mind when thinking about the culture depicted in the demonstration. A facilitator will then read aloud a description of the culture portrayed that reveals that the culture was in fact not sexist as participants will likely surmise, but only very different than the one we are accustomed to. Module instructions alongside this explanation can be found in Appendix H. Peer facilitators will lead the group in a first round of reflective dialogue. Facilitators will then distribute four to five sticky notes to each participant and instruct them to write a word or short phrase that depicts a gender stereotype for women in society on half of the notes, and a word or short phrase that depicts a gender stereotype for men on the other half. Participants will place each sticky note on
two flip charts or sections on a whiteboard, one titled “men are…” and one titled “women are…” Once participants are done, facilitators will have two volunteers report out common themes on each and then lead the group in reflective dialogue. Finally, peer facilitators will create two more lists on either the flip charts or whiteboard titled “female leaders should…” and “male leaders should…,” and ask participants to shout out some attitudes, behaviors, or skills that they feel are expected for male and female leaders based on the norms and stereotypes identified earlier. Peer facilitators will record responses on the charts and break participants into small groups for a final reflection. All processing and reflection questions for this activity can be found in Appendix A. Facilitators should collect all charts as built-in qualitative data for assessment and evaluation purposes.

*Lecture and Critical Thinking Scenarios: Communication & Inclusion.* Peer facilitators will create a visual presentation for participants on the topics of communication and inclusion as they relate to leadership and intercultural fluency. Recommended resources for peer facilitators can be found in Appendix G. Facilitators will then split participants into four small groups and distribute the critical thinking scenarios found in Appendix I from Kathryn A. Sturtevant’s (2003) module “Leadership and Communication” in the *Exploring leadership for college students who want to make a difference* facilitation guide. Facilitators should instruct small groups to work collaboratively to devise a plan of action and formulate rationale to back up their plans. Peer facilitators will then bring the large group back together and ask a volunteer from each group to read their scenarios and report out their group’s plan of action. Finally, facilitators will lead the large group in reflective dialogue. Processing and reflection questions can be found in Appendix A.
**Discussion: What is VIGOR?** Peer facilitators will lead the large group in a discussion of what they believe the word “vigor” means, and why it was selected as the title of this retreat. Facilitators should create a small visual presentation to accompany the discussion, including the definition of the word “vigor,” and what they feel are characteristics that have traditionally described men. Facilitators should then break participants into smaller groups and discuss societal expectations of them as men. Participants should share their opinions, thoughts, and feelings before reflecting as a large group. Then, the large group will brainstorm specific strategies to reframe societal expectations into views that participants agree with and positive characteristics they feel define, or should define, men. Volunteers should record these strategies and positive characteristics on large sticky pads for use later in other activities and as built-in qualitative data for assessment purposes. See Appendix A for sample reflection questions.

**Comedy Skit Construction.** Peer facilitators will split participants into small groups of four to five participants and task them with creating a skit that problematizes hegemonic masculinity. Participants should have access to a large bin of random items that they can use in their skit. Peer facilitators should make it clear to participants that each skit should embed a lesson or possible solution to their identified problem. After having time to develop their skit, groups will reconvene and perform their skits for each other. After each performance, peer facilitators will challenge other participants to identify the problematic elements and brainstorm ways to correct these problematic elements, or identify how the skit could have gone correctly.

**Leadership Shark Tank.** Peer facilitators will split participants into small groups of four to five participants and task them with creating “pitches” for a leadership shark tank. Facilitators should provide all groups with a copy of the “pitch” instructions found in Appendix J. Participants should have access to a large bin of random items that they can use in their pitch, in
addition to a few pieces of poster board and several markers to brainstorm product branding. Facilitators may play an example clip of a pitch from the tv show Shark Tank if they wish. One can be found in Appendix J. Once all groups are done formulating their “pitches,” groups will reconvene and deliver their “pitches” to each other. After each “pitch,” peer facilitators should act as “sharks” and respond to each group’s “pitch” using the suggested prompts in Appendix J.

**Trash Your Values.** Peer facilitators will begin this value clarification exercise by passing out a sheet of blank paper and marker to each participant. Facilitators should request that three or four participants share their definition of a “value” with the large group. Facilitators will then split participants into groups of about 10, have small groups sit in a circle, and begin to instruct participants according to the prompts found in Appendix K. Once each small group is finished, facilitators will lead the group in reflective dialogue. Suggested processing and reflection questions can be found in Appendix A.

**Flexible VIGOR Activities.** The following activities can occur at any point during the VIGOR retreat.

**Cooking Meals.** Participants will be split into cooking groups to rotate preparation of meals to be shared as a group. If participants do not have access to a kitchen or cooking is otherwise impossible, peer facilitators should work creatively to plan snacks that require some sort of preparation. Peer facilitators will create a food plan that accounts for dietary needs of the group, shop for groceries, and assign cooking groups beforehand.

**Group Hike or Walk.** Peer facilitators will lead participants in a group hike or walk, allowing participants to naturally do whatever they would like and move at their own pace. Facilitators should also provide a less physically demanding alternative depending on venue capabilities.
**Group Service Project.** Peer facilitators will lead participants in completing a service project at the retreat location. This may be either a task or project that the location owners may need assistance with, such as painting or gardening, or a project identified beforehand that participants can engage in while on retreat. In this case, professional leaders should task peer facilitators with identifying a project that participants can feasibly do while on retreat, such as assembling care packages for a shelter.

**Closing VIGOR Sessions.** The following VIGOR sessions should occur last in the retreat schedule.

**Roundtable Discussion: Leadership for Social Change.** Peer facilitators will split participants into two groups and facilitate a group discussion centering the connection between leadership, activism, and social change. Facilitators have the autonomy to lead the discussions how they see fit, but should be careful to keep the groups generally on topic. Suggested prompts that peer facilitators to use can be found in Appendix L.

**Make Your Demands.** Peer facilitators will split participants into two or three small groups to create demand statements for their communities moving forwards. This activity is based on an activity created by Dr. Jason Wozniak for the graduate class EDF 591 at West Chester University. Peer facilitators may choose whether participants will make demands for their peers, campuses, their local communities, themselves, or society as a whole; however, all small groups must choose the same audience. Facilitators will then bring the small groups back together to share their demands with each other. A suggested format for demand statements can be found in Appendix M. The demand statements should be collected as built-in qualitative data for assessment purposes.
Step In, Step Out. Peer facilitators will lead participants in this silent activity adapted from the Cultural Orientation Resource Center (Cultural Orientation Resource Center, 2010), Peggy McIntosh’s 1988 essay “White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women’s Studies,” and my own personal experience. Facilitators should gather participants in a large location where they are able to comfortably stand in a circle facing the center. Facilitators will then begin reading prompts that may or may not apply to participants and instruct participants to take a step into the circle if the statement does apply. Participants will then step back, and facilitators will continue to read prompts that become progressively higher risk. It is critical that peer facilitators, even when reading prompts, join in on the activity to build a sense of trust and connection. A suggested list of prompts and facilitator instructions can be found in Appendix N. Peer facilitators will then lead small groups in processing and reflection questions, found in Appendix A.

Action Plans. Peer facilitators will instruct participants to work individually on developing an action plan following their return to campus VIGOR. Participants can take notes in their “I Am” notepads. Peer facilitators will guide participants through the activity one question at a time using the reflection questions found in Appendix A. Facilitators will lead the large group through the same reflection questions, asking participants to share out their individual ideas. Facilitators should record these ideas as built-in data for assessment purposes and to share electronically with participants at a later date as an accountability reminder.

Retreat Schedule

See Appendix E for an example VIGOR schedule.

Timing & Location
Initially, VIGOR will be hosted twice an academic year, once during each academic semester. If interest abounds and facilitation needs can be met, program leadership should consider hosting an additional VIGOR retreat during the summer term. The retreat is to begin with a pre-retreat meeting in the early evening on the Friday of departure. This meeting is to review conduct expectations while on the retreat venue grounds, announce carpool and rooming assignments, and introduce participants and facilitators. Dinner will be provided during this meeting prior to departure. The retreat will conclude with a final group activity, closing discussion, merchandise distribution if desired, and a group photo on early Sunday evening, after which participants and facilitators will return to campus.

VIGOR will require an off-campus venue suited for hosting retreats. Ideally, project leadership will identify a retreat location that

- is located within a reasonable driving distance of campus, or further if bus service can be provided;
- can accommodate the appropriate number of guests, accounting for both student participants and facilitators;
- provides meals or an accessible kitchen for participant meal preparation;
- includes an outdoor activity feature, such as hiking trail, woods, or small ropes course;
- contains indoor space that can allow for presentation-style sessions with AV capacities;
- contains a large gathering space and common room;
- provides bedding and toiletry basics, including sheets, blankets, toilet paper, and hand soap;
- And is open to creating a sustained partnership.

*Program Facilitation*
VIGOR requires significant investment from both professional and paraprofessional student staff. In anticipation of the burden that significant planning and organization might have on one or a few staff members, project leadership should seek out and include interested professionals from other student affairs campus departments and offices early in the planning process to assist with student leader recruitment and training, expand the reach of marketing, and serve as professional retreat facilitators. Though not all may be vital to the planning process, three to four professional facilitators should physically be in attendance at the retreat to assist with logistics and provide professional guidance and direction should emergency situations arise.

In modeling the successful peer-to-peer method of content delivery, VIGOR also requires dedicated and sustained commitment from exemplary male student leaders across campus. Initially, peer facilitators will be selected from experienced student leaders via a shoulder tapping and recruitment process. Campus partners can support the efforts behind VIGOR by encouraging male student leaders in their respective offices, departments, and programs to serve as VIGOR retreat coordinators. In addition, if student peer educators or mentors from other departments are selected to be VIGOR facilitators, campus partners can allow these students to substitute a portion of their retreat facilitation hours for their mandatory office hours with respective departments. VIGOR curriculum is designed to create the most impact for students with a participant to peer facilitator ratio of five and seven to one. Maintaining a comfortable ratio will be crucial when asking participants to engage in difficult discussions and act with authenticity and vulnerability in small group settings.

Program Implementation

Program Planning Timeline
The initial implementation of a VIGOR retreat is likely to require a minimum of one academic year to plan. This timeline may be extended depending upon the availability of retreat venues, availability of funds, and notice needed for campus partners. Professional facilitators should be careful not to schedule retreat weekends too close to major holidays or campus events, such as spring break or homecoming weekend. Additionally, professionals will need to recruit and train peer facilitators, gather physical materials, and arrange for transportation if needed. Professionals should begin by requesting or allocating funding, establishing a retreat date for the two upcoming semesters, and securing a venue. In order to fairly expect a solid commitment from student leaders and peer educators, professionals should not begin recruiting for the peer facilitator role until the retreat dates and time requirements are confirmed. Following the establishment of major retreat details and the selection of peer and professional facilitators, project leadership should begin training peer facilitators, marketing to participants, designing the retreat schedule, and gathering physical materials. Although the initial program planning timeline is quite long, it is estimated that this timeline can be reduced by about half following the first few retreats. In order to achieve this goal, project leadership should work to establish a positive relationship with the retreat venue to begin tentatively scheduling retreats several sessions in advance. Project leadership can also reduce the burden of securing a new source of funding for each retreat by working diligently to prove program success following each iteration. Lastly, project leadership can select peer facilitators on an annual basis rather than with each retreat. A suggested program planning timeline can be found in Appendix O.

**Program Funding & Budgetary Concerns**

VIGOR requires a great deal of funding. Fortunately, professional facilitators need only concern themselves with operating costs as professional and peer facilitators should be paid in
kind. Though the exact source of funding will depend on institutional budgeting strategies, project leaders may consider

- writing a grant;
- requesting institutional funding for a pilot modification;
- asking divisional departments offices to “sponsor” a few students for the initial retreat;
- funding VIGOR through the hosting office’s student fees budget, if applicable;
- asking for partial funding from campus partners;
- a combination of the options above.

If possible, project leadership should avoid charging student participants a large fee for attendance. It is suggested that students are charged upwards of 30 dollars to be aggregated into a contingency fund and used if needed for emergencies while on retreat. Should project leadership ask for funding support from campus partners, components of VIGOR that may be funded include attendee and facilitator apparel items, peer facilitator training needs, transportation, food and beverages for pre-retreat meeting, and program materials. The following chapter details strategies for securing campus partners.

**Marketing & Promotion**

Project leadership should vary marketing strategies in order to reach a wide variety of potential participants. Professional facilitators should promote VIGOR to academic faculty and request their assistance in “shoulder tapping” students who may be interested in attending VIGOR or might benefit personally from what the retreat can offer. It is also highly recommended that professional facilitators capitalize on peer facilitators’ perspectives and social connections once they are recruited. Additionally, student facilitators should be tasked with “shoulder tapping” the same target audience, in addition to first year students who may not see
VIGOR as a program designed for them and uninvolved students who may not hear about VIGOR otherwise. Rather than framing the VIGOR mission as something that students need, promotional materials should highlight VIGOR as a challenge and seek students who are willing to take on the responsibility of influencing campus culture. Project leadership should pay close attention to the direction that their promotional efforts are heading towards, being careful not to guilt students into participating or placing blame on them as individuals for the negative results of hegemonic masculinity. Creating a positive program reputation will prove very important, and project leadership should recognize that doing so may take a few years. Peer facilitators and project leadership should work to mold this reputation into one that is both fun and transformative to draw students who may be hesitant to dedicate an entire weekend to the retreat.

**Potential Challenges & Limitations**

The majority of VIGOR’s challenges and limitations are dependent upon specific institutional characteristics. First and foremost, project leadership must consider legal risks and liability concerns. Though private institutions may benefit from more leeway in addressing these concerns, project leadership of both private and public institutions should consider requiring participants to sign a waiver. An additional challenge may be finding a suitable retreat venue. As many retreat venues are religiously affiliated, and although VIGOR in no way concerns or centers religion, project leadership should reference their institutional policies or speak with superiors to minimize risk. Content limitations abound as well, the most significant of which is the ability to cover only a few topics in the program curriculum. Suggestions for a future expansion of VIGOR, including additional topics for potential coverage, will be posed in the following chapter.
Chapter Five: Program Leadership & Evaluation

The following chapter details the crucial importance of effective leadership in student affairs and in the implementation of my programmatic intervention. An assessment and evaluation plan is included, alongside an explanation of how the characteristics of effective leadership in higher education might be directly applied to the implementation, evaluation and assessment, and future modifications of VIGOR.

My own leadership style is highly facilitatory; I believe that a leader’s primary responsibility is to provide their team with tools and an environment in which they feel comfortable, capable, and empowered to act. The best leaders, I believe, will eventually work themselves out of their own jobs; the ultimate testament of our leadership skill is the capability of our team to operate successfully without us. Like Astin (1985), I believe that we are products of the environment that we engage with, and to this claim, I add that we are the sum of the people we interact with. Therefore, as leaders in higher education, we ought to strive always to surround ourselves with outstanding examples of leadership and true dedication to the field.

Leadership in Higher Education

Colleges and universities across the country are faced with seemingly insurmountable challenges, both internal and external, and pressure to perform from a multitude of stakeholders (Kezar, 2011). Changing demographics, globalization, technological advances, accountability, new pedagogical approaches, wicked problems like sexual assault and substance abuse, and evolving policy and regulation are only a few of the complex concerns that higher education leadership is faced with on a continual basis (Kezar, 2011; Roper & Whitt, 2016). Many of these challenges are exacerbated by leaders’ own inner struggles to clarify and affirm their own identities, their capacities for leadership, and how their identity aligns as a cog in their
institutional machine (Roper & Whitt, 2016). Astin and Astin (2000) surmised that this inner struggle afflicts leadership at all levels, and that at least a partial answer to this concern is the pursuit of effective and transformative leadership. While an exhaustive answer to these questions is nearly impossible given the ever-evolving climate of higher education and the individuals who sustain it, the following sections detail the characteristics that I pose must be understood and present for effective student affairs leadership.

**Effective Leadership Occurs at all Levels**

Student affairs and higher education professionals can fall prone to the assumption that leadership is limited to those serving in formal, high-level positions of authority (Astin & Astin, 2000). This commonly held perception, however, is far from accurate. Student affairs professionals are frequently positioned to impact policy and initiate transformational change, regardless of whether this capability is realized (Allen & Cherrey, 2003; Astin & Astin, 2000). Additionally, leadership can occur in any area of institutional functioning, regardless of the level of perceived positional authority (Astin & Astin 2000). Astin and Astin (2000) further assert that any and all members of the academic and professional communities have immense leadership potential. Opposing beliefs, they argue,

> Severely constrain the role that student affairs professionals are likely to play, not only in positively shaping the learning environment of students, but - more importantly - in transforming education and organizational culture of their institution. (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 50)

By gaining a fuller appreciation of their own leadership capacities and the capacities of their colleagues, student affairs professionals can have a more direct influence on creating learning
environments that are characterized by “commitment, empathy, authenticity, and shared purpose.” (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 51)

**Effective Leadership Centers Organizational Vision**

I also believe that all higher education and student affairs leaders should, if they wish to lead effectively, be able to easily articulate their organizational vision. Strong institutional visions, and the ability to clearly articulate them, serve to assure staff and faculty and motivate them to contribute to that vision themselves. Providing support for this need, Cheryl Norton (2019) wrote, “the failure of leadership to identify, communicate, or strategically define a vision can result in organization stagnation and institution infusions” (p.1). In contrast, working with a clearly defined vision in mind can improve educational opportunities and increase the potential for institutional leadership within the greater community of higher education.

**Effective Leadership Requires Institutional Partnership**

As Arminio (2011) indicated, institutional partnerships play an important role, especially in the context of limited resources. For Arminio, “making the passion for leadership education a reality requires adopting a change process; taking institution type, culture, leadership practices, and demographics into consideration; and removing barriers that inhibit program advancement” (p. 153). Campus partners can assist in removing said barriers. The same sentiment applies to all plans for higher education. Student affairs professionals must first seek to understand the individual and group dynamics at play in their own professional communities and administrative functions (Astin & Astin, 2000). Leading with integrity requires professionals to acknowledge the ways that power works in organizations and use this power and influence responsibly (Harrison, 2011). Professionals may consider utilizing principles of systems thinking (Birnbaum, 1988) and circular framing (Sriram & Farley, 2004) to better understand power dynamics and
institutional politics, while adopting principles of synergistic supervision (Shupp & Arminiö, 2012) can improve relationships with constituents and employees who might support a cause or back a program.

**Effective Leadership Pursues Change**

Effective and transformational leadership is pervasive across the university, but higher education and student affairs leaders must focus their attention on making change to maximize its impact. It is not enough to simply operate in stagnancy on a daily basis; the visions practitioners articulate should be connected closely to creating social change. Allen and Cherrey (2003) entitled student affairs professionals the university’s “change agents,” as the work they do has the greatest potential for influencing significant change. Harrison (2011) recommends infusing more political and business literature into student affairs graduate curriculum, cultivating strategic mentor relationships, and reframing student affairs through positive public relations to boost the field’s transformational potential. Additional strategies include involving early supporters of change that share similar values, passions, principles, and visions (Allen & Cherrey, 2003), taking advantage of the autonomy of faculty member supporters to influence change (Astin & Astin, 2000), and developing structures that facilitate ways for people to connect and share information (Allen & Cherrey, 2003).

**The Role of Leadership in VIGOR Planning & Implementation**

Project leadership will need to rely on the principles and characteristics of effective and transformational leadership to successfully implement this intervention. First, it is crucial to recall that leadership occurs at all levels of authority and to recognize that the student facilitators are perhaps exhibiting the most important form of leadership in this intervention by fulfilling the role of a peer educator during the duration of the retreat. Although the student paraprofessionals
are typically very far removed from the institutional power structure, they can help implement positive social change, the ultimate goal of leadership, by starting on the level of the individual. Second, professional facilitators ought to take note of how the project has potential to influence perceptions of gender across their campus. Though it may take a while and quite a bit of work, student participants have the ability to share their knowledge and critical consciousness with their peer groups. Eventually, this sharing of knowledge can impact campus culture and create significant, transformative change. In this sense, professional facilitators must always remember that they are acting as change agents and prepare to do so accordingly.

Project leaders may find themselves facing a massive challenge in convincing institutional leadership and campus partners to invest in programming exclusively targeting male students given the demographic’s historical place of power and privilege. Just as there is a direct relationship between our individual beliefs and actions, there is a similar correlation among shared beliefs and institutional practices (Astin & Astin, 2000). As such, project leaders must be able to concisely and persuasively articulate their vision that the purpose of VIGOR is not to cater to college men, but to challenge them and assist their growth. Project leadership should brainstorm creative ways to inspire the shared visions behind VIGOR and communicate these beliefs with paraprofessionals, colleagues, institutional leadership, and potential campus partners.

Finally, ample support from other student affairs departments and offices will be required to maximize the success of VIGOR. When seeking partnerships, project leadership should intentionally connect the vision of VIGOR to the missions of offices and departments, while noting the program’s potential positive implications for the campus community and for society. When extending this “ask,” leaders should draw attention to the specific features of VIGOR that
potential partners may be most compelled to support. For example, in seeking partnership from a center for women and gender services or campus equivalent, leaders should highlight VIGOR sessions intended to raise critical consciousness of gender oppression. If seeking assistance from a campus career center, one might draw attention to sessions structured around building leadership skills that increase students’ employability.

Facilitators and project leaders should adopt a democratic approach to leading this program in the context of course instruction and curriculum; there should be many opportunities for student participants and peer facilitators to provide candid and meaningful feedback on the topics addressed and modes of delivery. Given that societal perceptions of masculinity adapt and evolve frequently, and that the campus serves as a microcosm of society, staff and faculty should use this feedback to appropriately adjust curriculum. Among university leadership, co-facilitators, and department staff, facilitators may consider adopting either the situational or the connective leadership model. Given certain challenges, such as finding funding, facilitators will need to adapt their strategies according to the problem and population they target. Additionally, project leaders may want to act more collaboratively in securing funding by involving campus partners in brainstorming sessions. In advertising the program and recruiting participants, project leaders should adjust their approach to rely heavily on input from peer facilitators.

**Program Assessment & Evaluation**

Program assessment and evaluation are crucial components to effective program planning in student affairs. Higher education assessment efforts are typically focused on student learning, satisfaction, retention, and success (WCU, n.d.b). Evaluation concerns whether or not programs were successful in achieving identified goals and objectives (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). In other words, practitioners would utilize assessment to answer, “what do students know, or how
are students doing,” whereas evaluation might answer to, “was this program successful, or how did students enjoy this event.” When utilized to its full extent, evaluation is just as important as assessment. Many decisions regarding program planning are made using assessment evaluation data (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013), including

- making changes to program design, delivery, management, and evaluation processes;
- deciding whether programs should continue;
- cancelling programs either before they start or mid-process;
- investigating reasons for program failure;
- responding to needs identified for future programs.

Assessment and evaluation are both naturally supportive of critical action research; an intrinsic component to both is the use of human input to inform decision making.

**VIGOR Assessment & Evaluation Plan**

Detailed below is a suggested four stage mixed-methods assessment and evaluation strategy. Reference Appendix O for a suggested timeline of when each stage of assessment or evaluation should be completed and how these pieces overlap with program planning efforts. The task of assessment can prove particularly challenging for leadership education, as most assessment processes rely on clearly definable and measurable constructs, as opposed to more abstract concepts like “leadership” (Owen, 2011). The following assessment plan relies heavily on indirect measures of student learning, those that measure perceptions, attitudes, and feelings rather than direct measures of what we observe students doing and metrics they achieve. I thoroughly believe that students’ perceptions of leadership, however, are equally as important as more direct measures in context of leadership learning. We should want our male students to be able to articulate what they have learned, acknowledge their responsibility to create positive
social change, and feel confident in their leadership ability. Increased leadership self-efficacy is an equally crucial indicator of success, as perceptions of one’s capabilities now influence the actions they take later.

Stage One: Pre-Retreat

Project leadership will begin assessment and evaluation efforts by conducting an unstructured hybrid student needs campus climate assessment. Needs assessments are used to determine what students need in order to be successful, while campus climate surveys focus on the quality of a person’s experience in their environment (WCU, n.d.b). This assessment should be administered twice prior to the finalization of the retreat schedule, once to peer facilitators immediately after their selection to gain a general understanding of campus climate and culture, and again to retreat participants once selected to prioritize specific content according to current awareness and needs. This informal needs assessment will be distributed in the form of a brief survey that gauges both facilitators’ and participants’ perceptions of their leadership capacities, basic knowledge of what hegemonic masculinity is, sensitivity to systems of oppression that hegemonic masculinity engrain, and awareness of campus impacts. Additionally, the survey should collect basic information about their experience with leadership, campus involvement, and history seeking student support services. The survey will also serve as a pre-test for participants, as a nearly identical survey should be provided to participants immediately following the retreat.

Pre-retreat assessment measures for paraprofessional peer facilitators involve semi-structured interviews to gauge leadership experience and knowledge of topics covered. The initial interview should occur before facilitator training, and a second interview should occur post-retreat to assess learning and leadership development. The assessment should also assist
professional facilitators develop a training plan for peer facilitators. Suggested resources for this training can be found in Appendix D.

**Stage Two: During Retreat**

The VIGOR assessment strategy relies on built-in data collected while the retreat is taking place. Project leaders should modify their assessment strategies during the retreat to measure the indicators of success most crucial to their specific goals as they relate to institutional vision and the results of their pre-retreat informal needs and campus assessment efforts. However, the following strategies are highly recommended:

- Systematic observation of participants during their free time and group activities. Facilitators should look for participants to increasingly include others in their games or activities, improve their group communication skills, and display greater comfort with opening up to other participants. This should indicate the successful creation of a supportive setting and the ability of participants to engage in increasingly critical discourse with peers.

- The completion of a learning style assessment and leadership style index. Peer facilitators should use the leadership style index to identify areas of potential growth for participants, and then look to see what areas of growth have been developed during the final retreat activities. The learning style assessment, though primarily for participants’ own self-awareness, can be used for future modifications to content delivery.

- Systematic observation and storytelling recording from Comedy Skit Construction or Leadership Shark Tank. Facilitators should collect the product posters and may record the “pitches” or skits, with participant permission. Peer facilitators should
look for participants to clearly identify a leadership need or accurately problematize a gender stereotype. This should indicate that participants either have a clear leadership vision or are able to identify evidence of hegemonic masculinity.

- Data collection from select reflective exercises. See Appendix A for a list of reflection questions. Peer facilitators should take anonymous notes to record significant comments, opinions, or other contributions. Fruitful reflective dialogue should indicate that participants are able to engage in critical discourse, grow independently in their leadership, improve their self-awareness, and expand their capabilities to make change.

- Data collection from round table discussion Leadership for Social Change. Facilitators should collect table notes and look for evidence indicating that participants understand that leadership equates to social change.

- Data collection from all VIGOR sessions that require participants to share their ideas on flip charts. Peer facilitators should collect the notes made on flip charts and use these ideas to gauge current perceptions about topics addressed and compare them to what participants share out during the creation of their action plans.

- The collection of participants’ action plans. Peer facilitators should take notes on the ideas that participants share out and look for participants to devise plans that are feasible, transformative, and applicable to themselves, their peer groups, their campus, and their community. This should indicate that participants understand
that leadership equates to social change and recognize their role in creating this change.

**Stage Three: Post-retreat**

Upon immediate return to campus, project leaders should distribute a survey that closely matches the survey administered to students prior to the retreat. Additionally, project leadership should host a second set of semi-structured interviews with peer facilitators. Professional facilitators should remove all pieces of the survey and interview that gauged participants’ and peer facilitators’ experience prior to the retreat, but keep all pieces that can help them determine growth by comparing their perceptions and beliefs. Project leadership should look for the following improvements as evidence to indicate program success:

- Participants display an increased awareness of the impacts of hegemonic masculinity on themselves, in their peer groups, on their campus, and in society.
- Participants display a greater understanding of leadership skills.
- Participants are better able to describe their leadership styles and beliefs.
- Participants are more confident in their leadership abilities.

**Stage Four: Long Run**

Project leadership should begin planning to implement an annual campus-wide survey beginning the following academic year. The survey should gauge general feelings about hegemonic masculinity and gender norms across campus. If possible given institutional constraints, project leadership should begin to record retention and performance measures for male students across the university prior to the implementation of the leadership retreat, collecting data every year the retreat is implemented. Increased retention rates, improved academic performance, and declining incidents of violence and other judicial offenses by male
students are a few examples of measures that might suggest project success. Project leadership should also use this data to adjust curriculum.

**Program Limitations & Future Implementation Plans**

Hegemonic masculinity is a deeply-ingrained problem that a single weekend retreat for a few select college men cannot possibly hope to solve. Project leadership should consider finding creative ways to answer questions of limitations, including:

- How can VIGOR participants stay connected once the retreat ends?
- How can we extend the investment of VIGOR beyond a weekend?
- How can we expand the number of students who are able to participate?
- How can we address additional topics and campus concerns?

Additional limitations of VIGOR include concerns specific to individual colleges and universities, for example, a lack of availability of student peer-facilitators or funding constraints.

**Co-Curricular-Academic Partnership**

The impacts of VIGOR can be extended by incorporating an academic component. Project leadership can explore the potential of forming a student affairs academic partnership and creating an academic course offering that features a curriculum corresponding with the curriculum of VIGOR. This course might be offered to students as a peer-facilitation training course for which they can receive academic credit. It could also serve as an extension or pre-requisite to VIGOR, or as an elective credit for a leadership minor or gender studies major. Doing so would require the formation of a strong faculty partnership and a detailed plan to have the course recognized by the institution's curriculum approval council or campus equivalent.

**Selection of Peer Facilitators**
Although peer facilitators for the initial implementation should be recruited from existing student leaders across campus, future facilitators can be selected via a number of various strategies. Should project leadership create an academic component, peer facilitators may be required to complete the course as part of their training and preparation program. Future peer facilitators may also be selected by project leadership from previous retreat attendees, via nomination from previous peer or professional facilitators, or recommendation from faculty and staff. Should student interest in VIGOR expand greatly and the program become a campus staple, the recommended method of peer facilitator recruitment is the establishment of a regular yearly student paraprofessional position housed in the host department and the expansion of VIGOR efforts to additional related academic year programming that peer facilitators can develop and lead.

Content Expansion

As previously mentioned throughout this thesis, a wide array of social factors and identities impact leadership and masculinity. However, only so many of these can be addressed during a single weekend retreat. If VIGOR is successful on their campus, project leadership ought to begin developing plans to expand VIGOR into a multiple retreat graduated format. Project leadership may create an advanced version of VIGOR that examines the connections among leadership, masculinity, and other sociocultural factors, and stagger the retreat schedules. Topics that I would have liked to include in my research and that can potentially be addressed in an advanced version include race as a significant factor on leadership and the expansion of the concept of multiple masculinities.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Processing and Reflection Questions

**Lecture and Discussion: Leadership Styles**
Setting: Large group reflection following large group lecture
Reflection Questions: *reflection questions should be customized to reflect the facilitators’ preferred leadership styles inventory. They should center the efficacy of different styles and techniques.*

**Lecture and Discussion: “What is Hegemonic Masculinity?”**
Setting: Peer facilitator choice of reflection structure following large group lecture
Reflection Questions:
1. How does hegemonic masculinity harm us? Our friends? Our communities?
2. What is evidence of hegemonic masculinity you see on campus?
3. How does hegemonic masculinity privilege men? Does it privilege some men differently from others?

**Gender Influences on Leadership**
Setting: Large group and small group reflections following large group activity
Reflection Questions (after cultural demonstration):
1. “Why did we initially view this culture as (key adjectives that participants identified in discussion)?” (Haber-Curran, 2003, p. 104)
2. “In what ways were we socialized throughout our lives to have certain expectations based on gender?” (Haber-Curran, 2003, p. 105)

Reflection Questions (after first sticky note activity):
1. What were your initial reactions to the themes that emerged?
2. What themes, words, or phrases surprised you?
3. Did any themes seem out of place to you? Are there any words or phrases found on the “women are…” list do you think apply to you?
4. “Where have you heard or seen some of these gender roles and stereotypes depicted or reinforced in society?” (Haber-Curran, 2003, p. 106)
5. “What is problematic about these gender norms and stereotypes?” (Haber-Curran, 2003).

Reflection Questions (after second sticky note activity):
1. “What examples do you have of men or women who confirm or disconfirm the attitudes, behaviors, and skills we generated?” (Haber-Curran, 2003, p. 107)
2. “Are any of the attitudes, behaviors, and skills strictly gendered, meaning only men or only women are capable of possessing them?” (Haber-Curran, 2003, p. 107)
3. “Which of these attitudes, behaviors, and skills do you believe contribute to effective leadership?” (Haber-Curran, 2003, p. 107)

**Lecture and Critical Thinking Scenarios: Communication & Inclusion**
Setting: Large group reflection following large group lecture and small group activity

Reflection Questions:
1. What kind of action plan did you provide? Was it more assertive, more unassertive, more emotional?
2. “What potential ways can the other people in your scenario take your response?” (Sturtevant, 2003, p. 121)
3. What assumptions did you and your group make about the characters in your scenario? Did those assumptions help or hinder your conversation?
4. “How did you employ empathy in your response?” (Sturtevant, 2003, p. 121)
5. What communication strategies did you employ in your response?
6. What do you think could be some consequences and/or benefits of your response?
7. “How did you own identities have a role in shaping your response?” (Sturtevant, 2003, p. 121)

Discussion: “What is Vigor?”

Setting: Large group reflection following large and small group discussions

Reflection Questions (small group discussion):
1. How does society define being a man differently from how you define it?
2. How do you friends define being a man differently from how you define it? Family? Teachers? Classmates?
3. Is having “vigor” important?
4. What characteristics come to mind when you think about who men are? Are these different from what the peer-facilitators presented on?
5. What evidence do you see on a daily basis that praises these characteristics?
6. What evidence do you see on a daily basis that praises other characteristics? Demeans other characteristics?

Reflection Questions (large group reflection):
1. Is having “vigor” important? Share out from your conclusions in your small groups.
2. What were some of the traditional characteristics of men that your small groups reflected on? Which do you see as positive, and which do you see as negative? Allow participants to make their cases for either or. Decide as a group which are positive and which are negative, indicating this on two separate sticky pads.
3. What can we do to address the negative characteristics? To promote the positive characteristics? Record these ideas on the appropriate sticky pads.

Trash Your Values

Setting: Small group reflection following small group activity

Reflection Questions:
1. Tell us a little about your final value. What does it mean to you?
2. Why is it important?
3. Did you make any observations about commonalities in our values?
   a. Any differences?
4. What was this activity like for you to do?
   a. If it was difficult, why?
5. What did it feel like to have someone else “trash” one of your values?
6. What was it like to have to “trash” someone else’s value?
7. How can we ensure that we make choices in life that are in line with our values?
8. How does, or can, your final value inform your leadership practice?
9. What role does your value have in influencing or creating social change?

**Step In Step Out**
Setting: Small group reflection following large group activity
Reflection Questions:

1. What realizations did you have while doing this exercise?
2. Were you surprised by any of the prompts?
3. Were you surprised by any of your peers’ responses? Were you surprised by any of your responses?
4. Did you learn anything new about yourself?
5. What topics were you prompted to think about for the first time?
6. How will what you learned impact you now?

**Action Plans**
Setting: Large group reflection following individual activity
Reflection Questions:

1. What is one thing you can do to make positive change tomorrow in…
   a. Your friend group?
   b. Your college community?
   c. Your neighborhood?
2. What is one thing you can do to make positive change in the next few months to make positive change in…
   a. Your friend group?
   b. Your college community?
   c. Your neighborhood?
3. What is one thing you can do to make positive change in the next few years to in…
   a. Your friend group?
   b. Your college community?
   c. Your neighborhood?
4. What is one leadership skill that you can implement….
   a. Immediately?
   b. After a little bit more development?
   c. In the far future after practice?
5. Share out your action plan.

**Additional Reflection Questions**

1. Why is it important to have healthy male leaders?
2. What were some things that you were surprised by during this retreat?
3. How does society define you as a man differently from how you define being a man?
4. What is the most difficult leadership skill to develop?
Appendix B

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development
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# The Seven C's: The Critical Values of the Social Change Model

## INDIVIDUAL VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>Being self-aware of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate you to take action. Being mindful, or aware of your current emotional state, behavior, and perceptual lenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>Acting in ways that are consistent with your values and beliefs. Thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty toward others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Having significant investment in an idea or person, both in terms of intensity and duration. Having the energy to serve the group and its goals. Commitment originates from within, but others can create an environment that supports an individual’s passions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GROUP VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Working with others in a common effort, sharing responsibility, authority, and accountability. Multiplying group effectiveness by capitalizing on various perspectives and talents, and on the power of diversity to generate creative solutions and actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>Having shared aims and values. Involving others in building a group’s vision and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>Recognizing two fundamental realities of any creative effort: 1) that differences in viewpoint are inevitable, and 2) that such differences must be aired openly but with civility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COMMUNITY VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Believing in a process whereby an individual and/or a group become responsibly connected to the community and to society through some activity. Recognizing that members of communities are not independent, but interdependent. Recognizing individuals and groups have responsibility for the welfare of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since it is a key assumption of the SCM that the ultimate goal of leadership is positive social change, “change” is considered to be at the “hub” of the SCM.*

| Change                 | Believing in the importance of making a better world and a better society for oneself and others. Believing that individuals, groups and communities have the ability to work together to make that change. |

(Adapted from Higher Education Research Institute, 1996, p. 21; Tyrer, 1998, p. 176; and Avton, 1996, p. 6-7)

---
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## Appendix C

### Corresponding Co-Curricular Learning Goal(s) and SCM “C(s)” of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Title</th>
<th>Co-Curricular Learning Goal(s)</th>
<th>“C(s)” of the Social Change Model of Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture and Discussion: Leadership Styles</td>
<td>Communication, Integrative Learning</td>
<td>Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Others dependent on content selection by peer facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journaling Activity: Testimony and “I Am” Stories</td>
<td>Intercultural Fluency, Personal Development</td>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture and Discussion: What is Hegemonic Masculinity?</td>
<td>Civic Engagement, Critical Thinking, Intercultural Fluency</td>
<td>Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Common Purpose, Controversy with Civility, Others dependent on content selection by peer facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Influences on Leadership</td>
<td>Civic Engagement, Critical Thinking, Intercultural Fluency</td>
<td>Consciousness of Self, Controversy with Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture and Critical Thinking Scenarios: Communication &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>Communication, Critical Thinking, Integrative Learning, Problem Solving</td>
<td>Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Controversy with Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: What is VIGOR?</td>
<td>Critical Thinking, Personal Development</td>
<td>Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Common Purpose, Controversy with Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy Skit Construction</td>
<td>Personal Development, Problem Solving</td>
<td>Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Common Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Shark Tank</td>
<td>Personal Development, Problem Solving</td>
<td>Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Common Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Your Values</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Intercultural Fluency</td>
<td>Personal Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Service Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable Discussion: Leadership for Social Change</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Your Demands</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step In, Step Out</td>
<td>Intercultural Fluency</td>
<td>Personal Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plans</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

VIGOR Peer Facilitator Learning Outcomes and Suggested Training Plan

Learning Outcomes

The following are additional student learning objectives for peer-facilitators. After participating in VIGOR Men’s Leadership Retreat, peer-facilitators will be able to:

- identify three ways in which their leadership and facilitation skills have grown following their leadership role in VIGOR;
- formulate a mentorship plan for at least two VIGOR participants following the conclusion of VIGOR;
- design a discussion session or group activity concerning either leadership, traditional gender norms, or another topic of their choosing.

Suggested Training Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Training Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediately After Selection</td>
<td>Pre-retreat semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months Out</td>
<td>Hegemonic masculinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Months Out</td>
<td>Lecture and presentation creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having difficult conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective facilitation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Month Out</td>
<td>Effective facilitation skills (Cont’d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Training Resources

Books:


**Journal Articles:**


**Other:**


Seed of Change “Facilitating Meetings” Guide

“The MSW@USC Diversity Toolkit: A Guide to Discussing Identity, Power, and Privilege”

“The Mask You Live In” Documentary
Trailer found at: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hc45-ptHMxo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hc45-ptHMxo)

“The End of Violent, Simplistic, Macho, Masculinity”

“Guys, We Have A Problem: How American Masculinity Creates Lonely Men”
## Appendix E

### Sample VIGOR Retreat Schedule

#### FRIDAY EVENING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity Title</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>Pre-retreat Pizza Dinner</td>
<td>Participants, student facilitators, and professional facilitators arrive at assigned campus meeting point and engage in pre-retreat activities (pizza dinner, carpool assignments, and housing assignments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-7:30 pm</td>
<td>Arrival and Free Time</td>
<td>All arrive at the retreat location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 pm</td>
<td>Opening Discussion: Welcome and Setting Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 pm</td>
<td>Lecture and Discussion: Leadership Styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 pm</td>
<td>Journaling Activity: Testimony &amp; “I Am” Stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 pm</td>
<td>Conclusion of Day One</td>
<td>Wrap up and review Day 2 schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SATURDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity Title</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast Preparation</td>
<td>First cooking group begins to prepare breakfast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Lecture and Discussion: What is Hegemonic Masculinity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Team Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 am</td>
<td>Group Hike/Walk and Free Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 am</td>
<td>Gender Influences on Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>Journaling Activity: Testimony &amp; “I Am” Stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity Title</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch Preparation or Free Time</td>
<td>Second cooking group begins to prepare lunch. Other participants have free time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 pm</td>
<td>Lecture and Critical Thinking Scenarios: Communication &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 pm</td>
<td>Group Service Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>Icebreaker and Team Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Lecture and Discussion: What is VIGOR?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Journaling Activity: Testimony &amp; “I Am” Stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45</td>
<td>Dinner Preparation or Free Time</td>
<td>Third cooking group begins to prepare dinner. Other participants have free time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Comedy Skit Construction or Leadership Shark Tank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>Trash Your Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Conclusion of Day 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUNDAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity Title</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast Preparation</td>
<td>Fourth cooking group begins to prepare breakfast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Roundtable Discussion: Leadership for Social Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am</td>
<td>Make Your Demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>Final Journaling Activity: Testimony &amp; “I Am” Stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 am</td>
<td>Step In, Step Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>Lunch Preparation or Free Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitators begin to prepare lunch, the last meal together. Other participants have free time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Team Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>Closing Discussion: Weekend Reflection, Apparel Distribution, and Group Photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:00</td>
<td>VIGOR concludes and participants return to campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

“I Am” Story Supplemental Materials

Peer Facilitator Instructions

Peer facilitators should explain that an “I Am” story should express what participants feel, hope, think, believe, know, don’t know, and so on. Some participants may have written an “I Am” poem before, however, their modified “I Am” stories do not have to be in the form of a poem and can be as short or as long as the writer would like. Facilitators should also explain that this activity is self-paced, meaning that they can work on their stories whenever they find the time when not in another session. They will be shared among the same small group on the final day of the retreat.

Peer facilitators can share the following prompts with small group members as inspiration for their “I Am” stories.

- Where were you born?
- What is your hometown like?
- What is your family like? Your friends?
- What do you like to do? What do you not like to do?
- What three words best describe you?
- What do you wonder? What do you know? What do you believe?
- What makes you different or unique?
- What really bothers you?
- What makes you sad? What makes you happy?
- What do you worry about? What are you confident in?
- What do you dream of doing one day?
- What is your favorite thing about yourself?
- What do you hope for?
Appendix G

Recommended Resources for VIGOR Sessions by Peer Facilitators

What is Hegemonic Masculinity?

- McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondents through work in women’s studies*. Wellesley Centers for Women.

Communication & Inclusion

- Davenport, D. (n.d.). Five traits of effective leadership: A guide for communication professionals. Purdue University. [https://cla.purdue.edu/academic/communication/graduate/online/five-traits-of-effective-leadership-for-communication-professionals.html](https://cla.purdue.edu/academic/communication/graduate/online/five-traits-of-effective-leadership-for-communication-professionals.html)
- The RSA. (2013, December 10). Brene Brown on empathy. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Evwgu369Jw&t=7s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Evwgu369Jw&t=7s)
Appendix H

Gender Influences on Leadership Supplemental Material

Demonstration Instructions for Volunteers

“This is a silent demonstration. The two volunteers enter the room. The man enters first, and the woman follows approximately 10 feet behind. The man sits down on one of the chairs and puts his feet up on the other chair in front of him. After the man is seated the woman kneels down on the floor near the chairs.

After five seconds the woman silently stands up and walks over to the water. She pours water into the two cups and takes the two cups back to where the man is sitting. She hands one cup to the man, who takes a sip. After taking a sip the man turns to the woman and nods to her, signaling that it is OK for her to also drink the water. The woman then kneels down near the man and takes a few sips of water.

After another five seconds the woman silently stands up and walks over to the crackers (or cookies). She brings the crackers back to where the man is sitting and hands the man a cracker. The man takes a small bite of the cracker and then nods to the woman, signaling that it is OK for her to also eat the cracker. The woman then kneels down near the man and takes a few bites of cracker” (Haber-Curran, 2003, pp. 103-104).

Demonstration Explanation

“The culture you just observed worships the earth. Women are the leaders in this society and have complete control. Men’s sole purpose is to serve the women. Because of men’s inferior role to women, men are not allowed to directly touch the earth. If they walk on the ground, they must immediately raise their feet up off the ground when they get to their destination. Women, on the other hand, are allowed to sit on the ground and touch the earth. The culture you observed is also violent and dangerous. Thus, men must always walk in front of women so they are the first to face harm and so they can protect the women from danger. Additionally, there is a risk that food and drinks may be poisoned. Thus, the men must taste all food and drink before women and must sacrifice themselves to prevent women from being poisoned” (Haber-Curran, 2003, 104).
Scenario One: “You are involved in a student organization that wants to organize a Christmas party before winter break. You notice that not everyone identifies as Christian, and you recommend having a general holiday party instead of focusing specifically on a Christmas-themed party. Another student leader says, “It doesn’t really matter too much, because we always have a Christmas party, and if someone doesn’t want to attend, they don’t have to.” The group processes to discuss buying a Christmas tree, food options, gift exchange plans, popular Christmas music to play, and so on. How would you handle this situation?” (Sturtevant, 2003, p.122)

Scenario Two: “You are part of a group that plans a large-scale service event in the community. This event typically involved physical labor. You are in charge of recruiting and coordinating all volunteers. One volunteer sends you an email sharing that he is a new student on campus and is really excited to participate in the event this year. He also shares that he requires* a wheelchair and will need special accommodations in order to participate. While your email is open, another student reads the email and says, “Oh, don’t worry about that. Just tell him that this event involves physical activity, so won’t be able to participate. He should understand.” How would you handle this situation?” (Sturtevant, 2003, p.122)

Scenario Three: “You are the treasurer for a student organization. After making an announcement at a meeting about paying dues, $40.00, several students come up to you asking for an extension, or the option of a payment plan. They share that they are not in a financial state to pay up front, but would really like to continue their involvement with this organization. You decide on a payment plan and all is well. The next day, another student leaders informs you that for the committee retreat, everyone needs to pay $100.00 within three days to pay for all of the up front costs. If students are unable to do so, they will not be allowed to attend. You share with that individual the situation regarding the students who were unable to pay dues, and the student says, “That’s not my problem. Ask them just to borrow money from their parents, or they can’t go.” How would you handle this situation?” (Sturtevant, 2003, pp.122-123)

Scenario Four: “During one of your organization’s retreats, you play an icebreaker game that involves female members “quizzing” male members about the things they find attractive about the opposite gender*, and vice versa. For example, a male will get in the middle of the circle and the female members will shout questions about dating, relationships, and so forth. This game is somewhat of a tradition for this organization and every year the questions get more and more personal. You know a few of the new members identify as queer*. When you approach another student leader about your discomfort putting students who identify as queer* in a potentially oppressive environment, their response is “It’s just a game. It isn’t really that big of a deal and this one game shouldn’t really matter.” How would you handle this situation?” (Sturtevant, 2003, p.123)

*some language has been updated to reflect developments in using inclusive language.
Appendix J

Leadership Shark Tank Supplemental Material

Sample “Pitch” Clip

- [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=itqrdO4kdKA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=itqrdO4kdKA) (end at 2:04)

Written Instructions for Small Groups

You and a small group of your colleagues have recently won a competition and your group has been selected to pitch an invention to a group of investors on the tv show Shark Tank. Your task is to create some sort of leadership “product” using your creativity, knowledge of leadership skills and styles, and the items provided to you. Your product must be related to leadership in some way, but the specifics are up to you. For example, you might invent something that helps individuals become better leaders, or a specific product that leaders can use during their jobs or day-to-day lives.

You are permitted to use as many or as few items as you would like during your pitch, including poster board/paper and markers. You have 20 minutes to prepare and plan before everyone will present their pitches to the “sharks.”

Address the following in your “pitch”:

- What is the name of your product?
- What does your product do?
- Why did you decide to make your product?
- Why is your product important?
- How is your product intended to help leaders?
- What leadership skills does your product “represent”?
- Why should the “sharks” invest in your invention?

Everyone must participate in the presentation of your pitch. In addition, be prepared to respond to a few questions or comments about your product following your pitch.

Suggested “Shark” Prompts

- Challenge the product’s accessibility.
- Question how the product might help other populations not targeted by the product.
- Challenge participants to think “bigger.”
Appendix K

Trash Your Values Supplemental Material

Activity Prompts for Participants

1. Rip your piece of paper up into 10 smaller pieces. While doing so, listen to this definition of a value: (peer facilitators should agree on once to use beforehand)

2. Take 5 minutes to think about your 10 most important values. Write down each value on a ripped piece of paper.

3. It’s time to take out the trash. “Throw out” two of your values, so that you have eight values left. (Participants should “throw out” their values by putting them into the “trash pile” in the center of the circle.)

4. It’s spring cleaning season. Choose your top five values and “throw out” the rest.

5. Help your neighbor take out their trash. Choose a value from the person to your left that you think they could live without and “throw it out” for them. (Do not allow discussion here)

6. Garbage day is here, and you forgot to take yours out. Hurry; you only have 10 seconds to “throw out” another value.

7. One person’s trash is another one’s treasure. Swap one of your values with a value of the person to the right of you. (Facilitators will pick someone to go first. Then continue in a circle until everyone has a new value. At this point, everyone should have three values left.)

8. It’s time to lighten the load a little bit. “Throw out” another value. This one is hard; feel free to say a few words about this value. (Each participant can say one sentence defending the value they threw out.)

9. Who’s been dumpster diving? You can choose to swap one of your values with a value from the trash pile. It can be someone else’s thrown out value, or one that you previously “threw out.” (At this point, everyone should have two values left.)

10. Time to take out the trash again. “Throw out” one more value.
Appendix L

Roundtable Discussion: Leadership for Social Change Supplemental Material

Suggested Prompts and Questions for Peer Facilitators

- Is activism leadership?
- Is all change social change?
- Is leadership dependent on a position?
- Who can be a leader?
- What leadership skills are most important for making social change?
  1. How do you define these skills?
  2. Where/how can we develop these skills?
- Share a relevant story from personal experience
- Have participants all share a piece of social change they would like to see happen in the world
Appendix M

Make Your Demands Supplemental Material

Demand Statement Format

Title of Demand Statement (i.e. “Group A’s Demand Statement”)

Our Positionality: This section contains information about the individuals writing the demand. It should preview their beliefs and values, what they want to achieve, and what they are dedicated to. It should also indicate what the writers have in common. Who are the writers? What do they know? What do they have in common?

Our Main Claims: This section essentially explains why doing what the writers demand is important. What impact will the demands have? Why is caring about what the writers care about important?

Our Principles: This section is where writers should list their principles as they relate to what they demand. What do the writers believe is important? How do the writers support their cause? What do the writers hope for long term?

- “We believe…”
- “We support…”
- “We welcome…”
- “We hold…”

Call-to-Action: This section is where writers should list and explain their demands. Writers should include who they are making demands to, for example their peers.

- “We demand…”
- “We demand…”
- “We demand…”
Appendix N

Step In, Step Out Supplemental Material

Facilitation Instructions
1. Instruct participants that Step In, Step Out is a silent activity, and that this is a challenge by choice exercise. Participants should be fully present and participate at their own comfort level.
2. Do not skip any of the rounds. A new peer facilitator should read each round of prompts.
3. Begin every prompt with “Step in if...”
4. Allow time for participants to make their decisions and step in if applicable.
5. Ask participants to “step out,” if they stepped inside the circle. Then continue with the next prompt.
6. Immediately follow the activity with small group processing and reflection.

Activity Prompts for Participants

Round one
1. You go to (institution).
2. You are a first-year student.
3. You are a second-year student.
4. You are a third-year student.
5. You are a fourth, fifth year, or sixth year student.
6. You are from (institution state).
7. You are from somewhere other than (institution state).
8. You are a transfer student.
9. Your major is declared.
10. Your major is undeclared.
11. You’ve ever changed your major.
12. You’ve ever failed a class.
13. You felt academically underprepared when you got to (institution).
14. (Institution) was not your first choice.
15. You’ve ever been overwhelmed with your course load.
16. You’re completely satisfied with your major.
17. Money is the reason you picked your major.
18. You have ever considered transferring.
19. You are hoping to improve your situation by finishing college.

Round Two
1. You are a night owl.
2. You are a morning person.
3. You like to play or watch sports.
4. You like to cook.
5. You like to eat.
6. You like the fine arts.
7. You speak more than one language.
8. You like how you sing, even if other people don’t.
9. You like to spend time with your friends outside of class.
10. You enjoyed your high school experience.
11. You did not enjoy your high school experience.
12. You were the valedictorian of your high school class.
13. You play a varsity sport in high school.
14. You felt like an outsider in high school.

Round Three
1. You are an only child.
2. You have siblings.
3. You helped raise a sibling.
4. You are living in the shadow of a sibling
5. You are very close with one of both of your parents.
6. You do not have a close relationship with one or both of your parents.
7. You are still learning to accept and love your family.
8. Your family is one of your greatest support systems.
9. Your family adds extra stress in your life.
10. You are the first person in your family to attend college.
11. You're in a relationship.
12. You’ve ever been in love.
13. You’ve even been in love and been hurt.
14. You’ve ever been in love and you’ve hurt someone.
15. You have feelings for someone from a past relationship.
16. You’ve created a family at (institution).
17. You’ve yet to find your family at (institution).
18. You consider (institution) more of a home than your hometown.

Round Four
1. You have never had to worry about money.
2. You have had to worry about money.
3. You pay your own tuition.
4. You are religiously affiliated.
5. You are not religiously affiliated.
6. You consider yourself spiritual, but not religions.
7. You have ever doubted your faith.
8. You live a drug and alcohol-free lifestyle.
9. You have ever felt pressure to drink in order to be accepted by your peers.
10. You have ever felt pressure to act “manlier”, even though you felt that it wasn’t an
accurate description of yourself.
11. You feel entirely comfortable expressing your emotions all of the time.
12. You have ever felt pressure to suppress your emotions.
13. Someone has ever made you feel bad for expressing your emotions or told you not to do
it again.
14. You always feel comfortable asking for help when you need it.
15. You have felt uncomfortable asking for help when you need it sometimes.
16. Someone has made you feel as if you should not have asked for help at time when you needed it.
17. You can talk about the social events of the weekend without fearing most listener’s reactions.
18. You have even feared someone’s reactions when telling them about social events you have partaken in.
19. You feel “welcomed” and “normal” at (institution).
20. You feel “welcomed” and “normal” in everyday social situations, like going to the bank or seeing a movie.
21. You could, if you wanted, be in the company of people of the same race as you most of the time.
22. You never have to answer questions about the people you are romantically connected to.
23. You have never felt afraid to introduce someone you’re attracted to or in a relationship with to your friends or family.
24. You are ever called to speak for people of your race.
25. You have ever felt like you had to fight to be heard in a group.
26. You have felt like your opinions didn’t matter, or that nobody wanted to hear them.
27. You have never had to fight to get time to speak in class.
28. You have ever not been able to do something you wanted to because you were physically unable.
29. You have ever suffered from mental health concerns.
30. You can ignore social developments as they relate to race, because they don’t really apply to you.
31. You can ignore social developments as they relate to gender, because they don’t really apply to you.
32. You know someone who you think is a role model for healthy masculinity.
33. You don’t feel like you have many role models for healthy masculinity.
34. You wish you had more role models for healthy masculinity.

Round Five
1. You feel like while being at college, you have changed.
2. You feel like you are still trying to find yourself.
3. You failed to step in for something that applied to you.
4. You stepped in for something that didn’t apply to you.
5. You wish you would have been able to step in for something, but in reality, it didn’t apply to you.
6. You wish you hadn’t had to step in for something, because you wish it didn’t apply to you.
7. You learned something new about someone during this retreat.
8. You learned something new about yourself during this retreat.
9. You can identify something in your life you would like to change for the better after this retreat.
Appendix O

Program Planning and Assessment and Evaluation (A/E) Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Planning Efforts</th>
<th>A/E Efforts</th>
<th>A/E Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-12 Months Prior</td>
<td>Secure location&lt;br&gt;Set date&lt;br&gt;Secure funding</td>
<td>(Beginning with the planning of the second retreat, stage four from the previous retreat will occur here)</td>
<td>Stage One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 Months Prior</td>
<td>Secure campus partnership(s)</td>
<td>Semi-structured peer facilitator interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 Months Prior</td>
<td>Begin planning for peer facilitator recruitment</td>
<td>Needs-assessment/campus climate survey to peer facilitators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Months Prior</td>
<td>Select peer facilitators&lt;br&gt;Begin participant marketing&lt;br&gt;Develop peer facilitator training plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months Prior</td>
<td>Begin peer facilitator training</td>
<td>Needs-assessment/campus climate survey to participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Months Prior</td>
<td>Continue peer facilitator training&lt;br&gt;Continue participant marketing&lt;br&gt;Develop content and schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Month Prior</td>
<td>Select participants&lt;br&gt;Continue peer facilitator training&lt;br&gt;Gather materials&lt;br&gt;Finalize schedule and content</td>
<td>Collection of all built-in data</td>
<td>Stage Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreat</td>
<td>Facilitate Retreat</td>
<td>Post-test survey to participants&lt;br&gt;Semi-structured peer facilitator interviews</td>
<td>Stage Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Month After first retreat</td>
<td>12 Months Prior to second retreat</td>
<td>Begin campus-wide campus climate survey&lt;br&gt;Begin recording retention and performance data.</td>
<td>Stage Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11 Months Prior to second retreat</td>
<td>Continue planning for next retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It is estimated that following the second or third implementation of VIGOR, professional facilitators can reduce this timeline by over half, only needing an estimated 4-5 months to plan each retreat.