

RYAN PATRICK JOSEPH SCOTT

The Relationship Between Family Structure And Male Gender Role Development
(Under the Direction of ARTHUR M. HORNE, PH.D.)

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between Family Structure in the family of origin with the development of later male gender roles. To date, no studies had assessed the relationship between family structure as first identified by Minuchin (1974) and the development of male gender roles. This is despite the wide agreement in the literature on the importance of further understanding the relationship between male gender role development and family dynamics.

The present study was an attempt to address this lack of empirical examination of current theories on male development in the family by studying the relationship between the family of origin with male gender role development. Specifically, the variables of family structure first highlighted by Minuchin's (1974) Structural Family Therapy were examined in relation to dimensions of Male Gender Role Conflict (O'Neil, 1981) and Conformity to Masculine Norms (Mahalik, 2000). This study assessed 1) the relationship between males' retrospective perceptions of their family structure (disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition) with Male Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms, and 2) the relationship between perceptions of the mother/ child cohesion and father/ child cohesion growing up with Male Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms. Participants (N=135) were male undergraduate students at a large public university in the southeast region of the United States.

The current study offered additional insight into how the family of origin may influence male gender role development. Overall, the results indicated that levels of

family disengagement and conflict avoidance patterns were among the best family structure predictors of male gender role conformity and male gender role conflict. The analyses also implicated the level of cohesion with mother in the development of conformity to masculine norms and cohesion with both parents in male gender role conflict development. Implications for future research and practice are offered.

INDEX WORDS: Family structure, Males, Disengagement, Conflict avoidance, Cohesion, Gender role development, Gender role conflict, Conformity to masculine norms, Gender roles

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY STRUCTURE AND
MALE GENDER ROLE DEVELOPMENT

by

RYAN PATRICK JOSEPH SCOTT

B.S., University of Wisconsin – Stevens Point, 1996

M.S., Indiana University, 1998

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

©2002

Ryan Patrick Joseph Scott

All Rights Reserved

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY STRUCTURE AND
MALE GENDER ROLE DEVELOPMENT

by

RYAN PATRICK JOSEPH SCOTT

Approved:

Major Professor: Arthur M. Horne

Committee:

Brian A. Glaser
Georgia B. Calhoun
Ruperto M. Perez
James F. Calhoun

Electronic Version Approved:

Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2002

DEDICATION

To my parents, for encouragement.

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood, And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;
Then took the other, as just as fair, And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,
And both that morning equally lay, In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.
I shall be telling this with a sigh, Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I--
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

The Road Not Taken, Robert Frost

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No one individual can reach the twilight of a doctoral program without an enormous cast of encouraging individuals. I would often visualize this group standing behind me in support during particular struggles. My family has always been there for me throughout this journey. To my father Patrick, my mother Sharon, grandmothers Ida and Marie, my late grandfathers Joseph and Edward, my sisters Sarah and Stacy Jo, and my brother Nate, thank you! My family gave me the gifts of seeing education as a lifelong journey, the importance of making a difference in this world, and finding a personally meaningful career as the highest of priorities.

I would also like to sincerely thank my partner Darcy Knight for her love and companionship during my time in Athens. Many times I have felt that Darcy was vicariously going through all the stress of being in a doctoral program without any of the benefits. She and the “kids” made sure I maintained some perspective and grounding. I look forward to our next adventure in Oregon!

There have been many additional individuals who have supported me throughout my program at UGA, as well as leading up to my doctoral program. Carla Teed has been a constant friend and sounding board throughout graduate school. Jessica Hussin believed in me from early on and has maintained her incredible support. I would also like to acknowledge my brothers of the Sigma Tau Gamma Fraternity, who saw in me that which at the time I did not see in myself. Without that experience I would not be writing this today. I would especially like to thank Ray Ackerlund, Edwin Frommung, Ahmet Altılar, Hinhpalom Phouybanhdyt, Scott West, and the late Tim Hibbard. Each of you has epitomized the spirit

of brotherhood. Lynne Oswald has also enriched my life with her guidance and friendship. My classmate and friend Tracy Talmadge has been a beacon of hope and companionship during my program; without him this path would have been much less fun!

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to the many individuals who have contributed not only to this dissertation, but also my professional and personal development throughout my graduate training. I would like to thank Dr. Arthur Horne for his support throughout this project and serving as a mentor from day one in my doctoral program at UGA. Dr. Horne has consistently challenged me to think in new ways, served as a model for integrity, and given me the freedom to grow in a unique and personal way. Thank you Andy!

I would additionally like to thank Dr. Rex Stockton and Dr. Marianne Mitchell at Indiana University. I have often appreciated our connection that has endured long after my departure from IU. They have continued to encourage and support me to the present day. My colleagues at Boston College, Dr. James Mahalik and Ben Locke, have also served as invaluable collaboration of my work in the area of men's psychology and this dissertation in particular.

Additional acknowledgement is due to other significant contributors to this dissertation. I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Brian Glaser, Dr. Georgia Calhoun, James Calhoun, and Dr. Ruperto Perez for their sponsorship and flexibility throughout this process. Dr Perez has given thoughtful feedback and reinforcement from the very initial formulations of this project. Dr. Steve Olejnik has also been an excellent resource for navigating the murky waters of statistical analysis. Finally, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Glaser, as well as Dr. John Dagley, for their candor and perspective through challenging times in the doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	v
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem.	9
Purpose of the Study.	9
Research Questions and Hypotheses.	10
Definition of Terms.	12
Assumptions.	14
2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND CONSTRUCTS.	15
Male Gender Role Development:	
Constructs and Related Literature.	15
Structural Family Theory: Constructs and Related Literature.	25
Relationship Between Family Dynamics and	
Male Gender Role Development.	31
3 METHOD.	35
Procedure.	35
Sample.	35
Instrumentation.	36
Research Design and Analysis.	44
Limitations.	46

4	RESULTS.....	47
	Findings.....	50
	Summary of Findings.....	61
5	SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	63
	Future Directions.....	74
	Summary.....	79
	REFERENCES.....	81
	APPENDICES.....	94
	A CONSENT FORM.....	95
	B DEMOGRAPHICS FORM.....	96
	C STRUCTURAL FAMILY INTERACTION SCALE-REVISED.....	98
	D GENDER ROLE CONFLICT SCALE.....	104
	E CONFORMITY TO MASCULINE NORMS INVENTORY.....	106

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There are numerous changes occurring regarding our thinking about gender roles for men and women. This change has been led by feminist theorists, originally challenging traditional assumptions of femininity (Levant & Pollack, 1995). This movement prompted both men and women to reassess the definitions of what it means to be feminine. As women's roles have been reevaluated, so too have we questioned whether men's gender roles would also benefit from increased flexibility. Today, the traditional roles for both men and women are increasingly being reevaluated within the culture of the United States (Levant & Kopecky, 1995) and the entire world (Kaslow, 2001). Through this reevaluation process, a growing consensus has suggested that socialization continues to push young men and women into inflexible gender roles (Brannon, 1999).

The reevaluation process of gender roles that was the focus of this study is on gender-typed behavior is learned and contextual. The trend in the literature on male gender role development, as well as this study, is the focus on gender variables that are socially and culturally embedded (Fassinger, 2000; Good & Mintz, 1993). Although biology certainly may contribute to gender role development, it will not be of focus in the current study. An implicit goal of reexamining gender roles from the perspective of Counseling Psychology was to learn more about possible ways and means of providing individuals with an enhanced range of options from which men and women are freer to

choose on an individual basis what is or is not a good fit for a particular person in the context of their lives (Betz, 1989).

The present study was developed to examine the relationship between reported family interaction patterns and various approaches to male gender roles, rather than to promote global indictments or assumptions on all men (Good & Mintz, 1993). In other words, this research follows a popular line of inquiry in the literature that “focus(es) on men’s conceptions of the masculine gender role and the relation of men’s gender-related beliefs to other aspects of their lives” (Good & Mintz, 1993, p. 406-407). The present study builds upon the literature base that studies the impact of men’s gender related beliefs by examining how men’s conceptions of their own masculine gender roles as men are related to their earlier familial experiences. Thus, the goal of this research was to increase our understanding of the relationship between particular early family dynamics with contemporary male gender role patterns of attitudes in the individuals studied.

A reevaluation of the potential proscriptions for men and the possible subsequent deleterious effects resulting from rigid male gender roles is not done to condemn all that is male; rather it is to examine and/or highlight the potential costs of restrictions that may be associated with extreme male gender role conformity or conflict. Fassinger (2000) points out that socially constructed gender roles are not inherently dangerous; rather, it is the socially constructed values that are put on a group, in this case men, that can have a harmful impact. For example, a possible gender role for men may be the importance of competition. Competition in and of itself is not bad, and can lead to career advancement, the ability to provide for one’s family and greater success. However, an extreme emphasis on competition may lead to a degradation of a man’s self-esteem if he loses a

particular competition at work for a promotion, or he may alienate his friends if an excessively competitive edge permeates his interactions with them. Further, it should be pointed out that for the purposes of this study constructs will be described as they relate to men. For example, “competition” is not a uniquely male experience. However, “competition” in the context of this study is considered to be representative of a uniquely male experience around gender role expectations for competition.

Socially-prescribed gender roles that are perceived as excessively rigid for the individual may hamper that person’s ability to develop a healthy sense of self-esteem and satisfaction. In turn, the field of counseling psychology is increasing its acknowledgement of the importance of attending to issues of gender in working with clients in counseling. Betz & Fitzgerald (1993) note that the study of gender issues in counseling may be the most rapid area of growth in the future. Further, the influence of gender roles on male development has been increasingly studied (Enns, 2000) and linked to a variety of psychological difficulties. For example, particular male gender role patterns have been linked to psychological distress (Good, et. al, 1995) and attitudes towards seeking psychological assistance (e.g., Good & Wood, 1995; Robertson & Fitzgerald, 1992).

The goal of this study was to examine how the family of origin impacts male development, and there are strong theoretical suggestions connecting the family to the development of male gender roles. Boys growing up are increasingly receiving mixed messages on masculinity (Kiselica & Horne, 1999). Although society has in some ways promoted a wider definition of acceptable behavior for women, there continues to be a strong message to boys and men that traditionally “feminine” characteristics are not to be

allowed (Spielberg, 1999). Theorists (e.g., Pleck, 1995; Levant & Pollack, 1995) are progressively calling for a broader definition of what it means to “be a man.” A central theme in this movement is to not make a sweeping denigration of traditional male roles; rather, to promote an acknowledgement that men may benefit from the ability to access a wider range of acceptable behaviors, thoughts, and feelings.

In order to promote a wider range of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive options for men, we must first identify and better understand potential male gender role limitations. Brannon (1985) suggests a number of societal standards for the question “what does it mean to be an appropriate male?” These standards include that men are not to show emotions or weakness, that one should not behave in a manner that could be considered feminine, individual achievement is to be perceived as the only appropriate way to achieve self-respect, and that risk-taking, even when it results in physical harm, is to be encouraged. Doyle (1995) developed a five-part model, with the first four parts mirroring Brannon’s (1985) model, while adding a fifth dimension that emphasized a controlling or initiator sexual role. It has been suggested that the net result of these social standards can be an excessively narrow range of acceptable behavior, thoughts, and feelings exist for many men. Does this mean that all men highly uphold these standards? Certainly not; these are considered social expectations. The trouble perhaps comes in when a particular man denigrates himself or others as a result of frustration over not being able to live up to these largely unrealistic and extreme expectations. For example, a man that strongly believes that “good men” do not show weakness may feel that he is a failure after an emotionally devastating layoff at work.

Further, striving towards these socially-suggested standards, often largely unobtainable (Pleck, 1995), can result in psychological distress and cognitive dissonance (Levant & Brooks, 1997). For example, striving to be emotionally restrictive can have the dual negative effect of limiting the ability to get assistance and a self-devaluation by being unable to adhere to an impossibly inhuman standard of not having adverse negative emotions.

The restrictive expectations for men described by Brannon (1985) and Doyle (1995) are not only limited adults. Pollack (1998) notes how the expectations for men are transformed into a “boy code” for boys that emphasizes toughness, emotional restriction, and a subjugation of pain or difficulty. He notes that this “boy code” can disrupt the relationship between parent and child, resulting in an abrupt and premature emotional separation between parents and sons, stimulated by concern on behalf of parents to not promote behavior in their sons that may violate the “boy code.” Although done with the best of intentions, parents efforts may in fact increase their sons’ vulnerability to excessively rigid male gender roles.

The “boy code” (Pollack, 1998) quickly becomes clear for young boys. Early in a boy’s life, he may be inundated with messages to minimize emotions or negative feelings, detach from his affective life, and separate himself from his parents (Jolliff & Horne, 1999). Theorists (Bergman, 1995; Levant, 1995; Pollack, 1995) and researchers (Fischer & Good, 1998) alike suggest that cultural expectations and child-rearing roles encourage young boys to disconnect from their mothers. The emotional and physical detachment from one’s father also has been theorized to have far-reaching negative impacts on the healthy development of boys and men (Levant, 1995). Jolliff and Horne

(1999) suggest that this foundation predisposes men to the potential of lifelong ambivalence and fear about being able to feel safe when connecting to others.

Parents may also experience an elevated level of stress as they attempt to separate themselves from their sons at a very early age (Pollack, 1998). Arguably, this drive towards disconnection may be fueled by a fear of raising an overly “feminine” boy, who may experience a great deal of ostracism from his peers if he too does not subscribe to the “boy code.” Pollack theorizes that this abrupt disconnection experienced by many boys may result in increased stress for a young boy as he loses the emotional support needed at such a young age. Critical to healthy development is a continual, consistent nurturing from both caregivers (Jolliff & Horne, 1999). Both parents serve as internal models for how their boy should behave as a man and relate to women. If stifled, boys and young men may struggle with the ability to relate to themselves and those around them.

Thus, we can see a significant theoretical base (e.g., Pollack, 1998) that suggests a familial influence of male gender roles through the family. Contemporary theorists continue to acknowledge the importance of early family experiences in the development of gender roles for men (Bergman, 1995; Brooks & Gilbert, 1995; Fassinger, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1997; Jolliff & Horne, 1999; Lazur, 1998; O’Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995; Pleck, 1995; Pollack, 1995). However, little empirical evidence exists to support the link between particular family dynamics and male gender role development; that which has been done is largely limited to integrating attachment theory and male gender development (e.g., Fischer & Good, 1998). Further, although attachment theory has been utilized, family systems theory has not been used to study male gender role development,

despite the paucity of studies significantly linking unhealthy family structure to other areas of development (e.g., Lopez, 1992).

Despite the lack of empirical study into the influence of the family on development of male gender roles, there is a great deal of evidence that particular behavioral familial patterns are related to later development in other areas. Family theorists and researchers continue to underscore that there is a strong relationship between early familial experiences and later development (e.g., Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1989a). However, it has been suggested that further research on the impact of the family on individual development be more integrated with established family systems theory (Minuchin, 1985; Perosa & Perosa, 1993; Perosa, Perosa, & Tam, 1996).

Family Systems Theory adds substantially to our understanding of human development within the family. One major contributor to the area of family systems was Salvador Minuchin, and his Structural Family Therapy model. Minuchin (1974) believed that successful movement towards adulthood requires the individual to strike a balance between connectedness and independence with one's family. Bowen also described this balance as a compromise between togetherness and individuality (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998).

Minuchin (1974) noted that the optimal family structure during late adolescence is characterized by clear interpersonal boundaries, with hierarchical structure between parent and child firmly in place, and cross-generational coalitions avoided. These healthy boundaries are symbolized by the open exchange of nurturance and opinion (Perosa & Perosa, 1993). An overly involved family structure, with enmeshed boundaries, can lead to inappropriate levels of cohesion. Enmeshed boundaries can also limit the family

members' autonomy necessary for healthy development. Alternatively, disengaged families suffer from overly rigid boundaries and create psychological isolation (Minuchin, 1974).

The ability to resolve the conflict between autonomy and total immersion in one's family has been linked to healthy psychosocial functioning (Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1986) and positive identity formation (Lopez, 1989; Lopez & Andrews, 1987). Further, researchers have found that young adults who achieved a clear identity and positive coping skills also reported family characteristics that included clear boundaries, minimal cross-generational alliances, and an openness to express and resolve conflict (Compas, 1987; Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Perosa & Perosa, 1993). Thus, although no studies have examined the relationship between male gender role development and family structure, numerous studies suggest that there is a link between healthy family structure characteristics and healthy development.

In summary, an increased awareness of the influence of gender roles on human development has led to a reassessment of how male gender roles can promote or hinder development for men. However, there are many areas suggested by O'Neil et. al (1995) that need further exploration. Among these areas is family of origin issues. O'Neil et. al (1995) notes that "(t)he role that parents and family values play in men's gender role conflict needs to be explored" (p. 198). Fischer and Good (1998) also suggest the relevance in examining how parent-child relationships relate to later perceptions of the male gender role. Despite a profusion of research suggesting that 1) excessively rigid gender roles for men may lead to harmful effects (O'Neil, et. al, 1995) and 2) that the particular structure of the family can have a significant influence on an individual's

development (Lopez, 1992), no study thus far has sought to examine the role of family structure in the development of male gender roles.

Statement of the Problem

Very little has been done to examine the relationship between male gender role development and family structure. This is despite the critique of gender role development research in general that it fails to incorporate environmental factors (Enns, 2000). Consistently, the empirical study of male gender roles and male gender role conflict has neglected studying the relationship between early family experiences in boys and later gender role conflict (Good, Borst, & Wallace, 1994; O'Neil, et. al, 1995). This is curious considering that early theorists in this area noted that the child learns "what the sexes should be like" (Pleck, 1981, p. 135) in the family of origin. It has been suggested that the principle time for development and internalization of gender roles is early childhood to late adolescence (O'Neil, et. al, 1995). O'Neil (1981), in his first theoretical paper on his conceptualizations of Male Gender Role Conflict (MGRC), noted that a boy's experience with his parents is related to later masculine role conflicts and stresses. The family becomes the "incubator of gender roles" (Lazur, 1998). Thus, this study sought to address the lack of understanding of the influence on family interaction patterns on male gender role development by integrating what is known generally about the influence of family structure with the existing literature base on male gender role conflict and conformity.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between family structure in the family of origin of men with the development of later male gender roles.

To date, little research has been directed towards the relationship between family structure as first identified by Minuchin (1974) and the development of male gender roles. This is despite the wide agreement in the literature on the importance of further understanding of the relationship between male gender role development and family variables (e.g., Bergman, 1995; Enns, 2000; Fassinger, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998; Good, Borst, & Wallace, 1994; Jolliff & Horne, 1999; Lazur, 1998; Levant, 1995; O'Neil, 1981; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986; O'Neil, et. al, 1995; Pleck, 1981; Pollack, 1995, 1998).

The present study was an attempt to bridge this gap between the existing theories on male development and the lack of empirical evidence by studying the relationship between the family of origin with male gender role development. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between variables of family structure first highlighted by Minuchin's (1974) Structural Family Therapy with dimensions of Male Gender Role Conflict (O'Neil, 1981; O'Neil, et. al, 1986) and Conformity to Masculine Norms (Mahalik, 2000). This study assessed the relationship between males' retrospective perceptions of their family structure (enmeshment, fusion, differentiation, and flexibility) with 1) Male Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms, and 2) the relationship between perceptions of the mother/ child cohesion and father/ child cohesion growing up with Male Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question #1. Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of family structure (disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition) with Male Gender Role Conflict?

H₁: There is a significant positive relationship between disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition with increased Male Gender Role Conflict.

Research Question #2. Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of family structure (disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition) with Conformity to Masculine Norms?

H₁: There is a significant positive relationship between disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition with increased levels of Conformity to Masculine Norms.

Research Question #3. Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with Male Gender Role Conflict?

H₁: There is a significant positive relationship between increased mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with elevated reported levels of Male Gender Role Conflict.

Research Question #4. Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with Conformity to Masculine Norms?

H₁: There is a significant positive relationship between increased mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with elevated levels of Conformity to Masculine Norms.

Definition of Terms

1. Male Gender Roles For the purposes of this study, gender was defined as “a socially constructed set of ideas, beliefs, and values based on historical, economic, sociopolitical, and cultural factors” (Fassinger, 2000, p. 347). The focus of this study was not “sex,” defined as “a biological entity based on physiological, hormonal, reproductive, and genetic factors” (Fassinger, 2000, p. 347). The concept of gender roles was measured through the measures related to the dual constructs of Male Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms.

2. Male Gender Role Conflict (MGRC) MGRC represents the influence of prescribed and proscribed roles for men, as well as how extreme adherence to these roles can be related to negative interpersonal and intrapersonal consequences (O’Neil, et. al, 1995). MGRC was quantified by scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O’Neil, et. al, 1986).

3. Conformity to Masculine Norms (CMN) Conformity to Masculine Norms assesses the level of internalization of social norms for men, integrating the existing male gender role literature with the group influence literature in social psychology (Mahalik, 2000). For the purposes of this study, CMN is quantified by scores on the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik, et. al, 2000).

4. Family Structure Family Structure represents a theoretical orientation within the family systems literature. First developed by Salvador Minuchin (1974), family structure is symbolized by frequent structural patterns that vary across families, and serve to provide consistent interactions and interpersonal transactions within a particular family. For the purpose of this study, particularly relevant components of this theory have been

included, specifically: disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, triangulation/coalition, and estrangement.

5. Disengagement Disengagement is one end of the enmeshment/ disengagement continuum described by Minuchin (1974). Disengaged subsystems are represented by overly rigid boundaries that result in psychological isolation and detachment. For the purposes of this study, differentiation was quantified by scores on the subscale of the Enmeshment/ Disengagement subscale of the Structural Family Interaction Scale-Revised (SFIS-R; Perosa & Perosa, 1990a).

6. Rigidity Rigidity describes the ability of a family to cope and adapt to increasing autonomy in developing youth or to transient stress experienced by members of the family (Perosa, Hansen, & Perosa, 1981). For the purposes of this study, rigidity was quantified by scores on the subscale of Flexibility/ Rigidity subscale on the Structural Family Interaction Scale- Revised (SFIS-R; Perosa & Perosa, 1990a).

7. Conflict Avoidance Conflict avoidance represents a lack of openness in dealing with challenges or differences that may lead to arguments (Perosa & Perosa, 1993). For the purposes of this study, conflict avoidance was quantified by scores of the Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression subscale of the Structural Family Interaction Scale- Revised (SFIS-R; Perosa & Perosa, 1990a).

8. Triangulation/ Coalition Triangulation and coalitions evaluate the amount of boundary violations between parents and children, the amount that boundaries are crossed to avoid conflict or differences between parents (Perosa & Perosa, 1993). These violations are embedded in the theoretical concepts of boundaries, triangulation, and cross-generational coalitions (Minuchin, 1974). Cross-generational coalitions and

triangulation are closely related in that they both represent a pairing of two people within the family, aligning against a third person (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). For the purposes of this study, triangulation and coalitions were quantified by scores on the subscale of Cross-Generational Triads/ Parent Coalition of the Structural Family Interaction Scale-Revised (SFIS-R; Perosa & Perosa, 1990a).

9. Estrangement The concept of estrangement is also related to boundaries, and represents a lack of nurturance given to a child by his parents (Perosa & Perosa, 1993). For the purposes of this study, estrangement with both parents is quantified by scores on the subscale of Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement of the Structural Family Interaction Scale- Revised (SFIS-R; Perosa & Perosa, 1990a).

Assumptions

1. It was assumed that participants would share their thoughts and perceptions honestly and accurately.
2. It was assumed that the focus of this study may be affected by a particular set of opinions and biases embraced by the researcher.
3. It was assumed that family dynamics were only one portion of the variance of individual male gender role differences.
4. It was assumed that the instruments used in this study were reasonably effective in capturing reliable measures for the variables of interest.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND CONSTRUCTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between family structure and later male development in late adolescence and early adulthood. The current chapter elaborates on the study's purpose by reviewing theoretical contributions and empirical studies in the areas of Structural Family Theory and male gender role development. Male gender role development is described through theoretical grounding and quantitative studies related to Male Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms. The area of Family Structure Theory is described by reviewing the theoretical constructs salient to this study with the most relevant and recent studies to date. Further, this review highlights significant contributions to our understanding of 1) how the family structure influences late adolescent and early adult development, 2) ways in which family interaction patterns has been linked to difficulties with male gender role conflict, and 3) the limited empirical inquiries involving conformity to masculine norms.

Male Gender Role Development: Constructs and Related Literature

Male Gender Role Socialization

Gender roles have been defined by O'Neil (1981) as "behaviors, expectations, and role sets defined by society as masculine or feminine which are embodied in the behavior of the individual man or woman and culturally regarded as appropriate to males or females" (p. 203). Male gender role socialization describes the cultural and societal influences and messages that males in our society receive as "rules" for what it means to

be a “good man.” These rules strongly influence men and women’s perceptions of what is appropriate and inappropriate behavior for men. As noted earlier, these proscriptions (what one shouldn’t do) and prescriptions (what men should do) are increasingly being challenged. The changing nature of gender roles for both men and women have forced men to renegotiate what it means to be a man (Levant & Kopecky, 1995).

Brannon (1985) describes four components of this male socialization that are embedded in our society. These themes include that 1) men should not behave in ways that could be labeled feminine, 2) achievement is the primary path for seeing oneself as a successful person, 3) showing weakness is unacceptable, and 4) risk taking is encouraged, even when it includes physical violence. Doyle (1995) added to Brannon’s list of male socialization messages with the expectation that men play an aggressive instigator role in sexual relations. The preceding narrow definitions of acceptable behaviors leave men with little room for flexibility, intimacy, and self-acceptance. Rigid gender roles, and personal adherence to these roles, can result in disconnection from one’s emotional self and a lack of connection with others. There is also evidence that these types of rigid socialization messages inherently bar men from seeking psychological services (Wisch, Mahalik, Hayes, & Nutt, 1995).

Theorists have suggested that striving to achieve often unachievable prescriptions of what it means to be a man can have severe ramifications for men’s subsequent mental health (e.g., O’Neil, 1981; O’Neil, et. al, 1995). Good and Mintz (1990) note that cardinal traits of traditional male gender roles, such as striving towards external achievements, restriction of affective expression, and stoic isolation may inherently bar

men from achieving quality interpersonal relationships and the ability to have positive satisfactory emotional relationships.

Conformity to Masculine Norms

The Theory of Male Conformity

A powerful vehicle for the transmission of gender role socialization is through pressure to conform to the larger society. For men, the gender role socialization process has been described through the theory of Conformity to Masculine Norms (CMN; Mahalik, 2000). The burgeoning area of CMN integrates social psychology with the psychology of male gender roles to build an understanding of how social and cultural forces shape men's behavior, their views of themselves, and the costs and benefits for men who conform or do not conform to gender role prescriptions and proscriptions. The theoretical approach of CMN seeks to further our understanding of the social and cultural processes that promote conformity, the costs involved with conforming or not conforming, and the factors that interact to produce an approach towards male gender roles.

The theoretical foundation of CMN is still in the development stage. However, there are several premises that highlight issues around male conformity (Mahalik, 2000). Central ideas are that male norms are social norms, that there are social expectations for males that can become internalized, and that there are affective, behavioral, and cognitive aspects of conformity.

Conformity is seen as existing along a continuum. Conformity to masculine norms has been broken into twelve different dimensions: Winning, Emotional Control, Risk-taking, Violence, Dominance, Playboy, Self-Reliance, Primacy of Work, Power

Over Women, Disdain For Homosexuals, Physical Toughness, and Pursuit of Status (Mahalik, 2000). This theory also indicates that individuals conform to some dimensions of CMN but not others, and conformity in one area may be exacerbated to compensate for a lack of conformity in a different area (Mahalik, 2000).

Certainly all men do not subscribe to the extreme end of each individual dimension of conformity. For example, not all men have an extreme disdain for homosexuality or enjoy having women in a subservient role. Rather, the dimension titles used represent the extreme end of the continuum towards a “hypermasculine” approach to life. Therefore, in reviewing the studies related to Conformity to Masculine Norms (Mahalik, 2000) (as well as Male Gender Role Conflict (O’Neil, 1981)), it is important to keep in mind that the results may suggest a particular index of psychological difficulty is linked to tending towards an extreme “hypermasculine” position, rather than an indictment of all men who participated in the study.

Existing Studies of Conformity to Masculine Norms

Although the research studying CMN is limited, there is great potential for increasing our understanding of the internal and socio-cultural processes of gender norming for men (Mahalik, 2000). Preliminary data from empirical studies of this construct are encouraging. The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik, et. al, 2000) has been developed to study the construct of Conformity to Masculine Norms. The CMNI Total Scores were found to relate significantly, and in a positive direction, to The Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRSS), The Brannon Masculinity Scale (BMS), and the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (Mahalik et. al, 2000). Further, the CMNI was found to significantly correlate with the Attitudes

Towards Seeking Professional Help Scale (ATPHSS) and social desirability (per the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale; ATPHSS), but not the total score on the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). Finally, the CMNI Total Score was found to significantly relate to the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO) total score, the Aggression Scale (AS) total score, and the Drive for Muscularity Scale (MD) total score (Mahalik, et. al, 2000). These studies suggest that the CMNI resists tendencies to answer in a socially desirable way and that increased conformity scores inhibit men's abilities to seek professional help. Further, men studied who endorsed more extreme masculine conformity beliefs also reported elevated scores on other instruments of masculinity, increased aggression, a need for social dominance, and an enhanced need for muscle mass.

Male Gender Role Conflict

The construct of Conformity to Masculine Norms helps us conceptualize the different ways in which men are socialized to conform to society's expectations for acceptable and unacceptable male behavior, thoughts, and feelings. However, these societal expectations are often idealized, unobtainable and unrealistic. Unfortunately, this does not keep men from aspiring for this idealized image of what it means to be a "good man." The schism between expectations and reality for what it means to "be a man" has been operationalized as Male Gender Role Conflict (MGRC; O'Neil, et. al, 1995). MGRC occurs through the socialization process, in which prescribed and proscribed roles may have harmful interpersonal and intrapersonal consequences. Conflict can occur "when rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles result in personal restriction, devaluation, or violation of self or others" (p. 167) MGRC is measured by the

Gender Role Conflict Scale, which consist of four scales: Success, Power, and Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWF) (O'Neil, et. al, 1995; O'Neil, et. al, 1986).

Copious studies have examined the relationship between MGRC and a variety of aspects, including personality dynamics, demographic variables, positive and negative relationships of psychological functioning, relational and interpersonal factors, and attitudes towards seeking psychological assistance (O'Neil, et. al, 1995). Elevated male gender role conflict has been linked to general psychological distress (Good, et. al, 1995), anxiety, (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Good & Mintz, 1990; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), psychological defenses (Mahalik, Cournoyer, DeFranc, Cherry, & Napolitano, 1998), shyness (Bruch, Berko, & Haase, 1998), decreased self esteem (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), anger (Blazina & Watkins, 1996), elevated depression (Mahalik & Cournoyer, 2000; Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Good & Mintz, 1990; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), and alexithymia (Fischer & Good, 1997).

The relationship between MGRC and additional variables has also been examined. These studies have suggested a relationship between high levels of MGRC and increased reported personality dysfunction (Good, et. al, 1996), decreased satisfaction with relationships (Sharpe, Heppner, & Dixon, 1995), difficulty related to intimacy (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Fischer & Good, 1997; Good et al., 1995, Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Sharpe et. al, 1995), alcohol use behavior (Blazina & Watkins, 1996), decreased willingness to seek psychological assistance (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good, Dell, & Mintz, 1989), career development difficulty (Jome & Tokar, 1998; Tokar &

Jome, 1998), and sexual aggression towards women (Rando, Rogers, & Brittan-Powell, 1998).

This is not to suggest that all traditional male gender roles are inherently harmful to oneself or others, sexist, or restrictive. Rather, MGRC refers to excessively restrictive gender roles that serve to limit a man's options for how he views himself and interacts with those around him. For example, one particular "traditional" male gender role may be independence and autonomy. Autonomy or independence in and of itself is not inherently bad, but actually may help promote individual success and can be an attractive quality to other people. However, an extreme need for autonomy can cause conflict if a particular man takes the need for independence to an extreme point where he cannot function successfully in a group or get assistance when he needs it.

MGRC and Psychological Difficulty

Studies have found a link between elevated male gender role conflict (as measured by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (O'Neil, et. al, 1986) and decreased psychological health (Cournoyer & Mahalik; 1995), increased psychological distress (Good, et. al, 1995; 1996), and troublesome interpersonal factors, such as difficulty with interpersonal intimacy (Good et. al, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Sharpe and Heppner (1991) found that participants in their study who reported high levels of of MGRC on all subscales on the GRCS, with the exception of the Success, Power, and Competition scale, also had results which were positively correlated with decreased self-esteem, increased anxiety and depression, and difficulties with intimacy. Further, Good and Mintz (1990) found a significant link in college men who participated in their study between self-reported levels of depression and all four subscales of the GRCS. Increased

depression, elevated anxiety, difficulty with intimacy, and lowered self-esteem has also been related to elevated reported levels of male gender role conflict (Courneyer & Mahalik, 1995).

Courneyer and Mahalik (1995) examined the relationship between MGRC and psychological well being from a developmental perspective, comparing college aged men and middle-aged men. They hypothesized that MGRC would differ for men across developmental levels. Their results indicated that middle-aged men, when compared to college-aged men, experienced elevated conflict between work and family, but reported less conflict with success, power, and competition. Additionally, college-aged and middle-aged men in the Courneyer and Mahalik (1995) study did not differ on the emotional restriction and restrictive affectionate behavior between men. In general, restrictive emotionality for both groups of men was related to decreased psychological well-being.

The relationship between MGRC and psychological distress has also been studied with a clinical population. Good et. al (1995) examined the relationship between the GRCS and the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R; Derogatis, 1983). Extremely high levels of male gender role conflict was found to be a significant predictor of paranoia, psychoticism, and obsessive-compulsivity. However, Good et. al (1995) did not find a strong relationship between the GRCS and anxiety in this clinical sample.

MGRC and Psychological Help Seeking

Greater understanding of the development of male gender roles also can help shed light on the nature of males' underutilization of psychological services. Studies suggest that gender role conflict in males can have important implications for seeking

psychological help (eg., Blazina & Watkins, 1996). Good and Wood (1995) suggest that traditional male gender roles may prohibit men from being able to display behaviors that are typically considered important for a client's success in therapy. These characteristics include emotional expressiveness, an ability and willingness to self-disclose, a deep understanding of one's affective experience, and ability to admit one's problems. Good and Wood (1995) also suggest that these restrictive-related elements of MGRC, what men "shouldn't do", limit using counseling or therapy services. Good and Mintz (1990) suggest that elevated MGRC can create a "compound risk" for increased depression paired with a limited utilization of psychological services. In other words, a man who experiences elevated levels of male gender role conflict 1) may be predisposed to psychological difficulty and 2) may find a counseling profession that is ill-suited to serve his needs.

Good, et. al (1989) investigated the relationship between men's abilities to seek professional psychological help and gender role conflict. They found that men in their sample who reported strong gender role conflict scores for the GRCS subscales of Restrictive Emotional Expression and Restricted Affectionate Behavior Amongst Men to be more apprehensive about utilizing traditional psychological services. Robertson and Fitzgerald (1992) also found a relationship between unwillingness to seek psychological services and gender role conflict scales of restrictive emotionality and the success/ power competition.

Wisch, et. al (1995) studied men's perceptions of taped counseling vignettes, either emotion or cognition focused, and their levels of gender role conflict. Their aim was to study how the level of male gender role conflict and counseling approach (either

cognitive or affect focused) would interact to impact attitudes towards seeking professional help. The results indicated that the men who scored high on gender role conflict and viewed a affect-focused vignette were least likely out of the four conditions to express willingness to seek psychological services. It should be noted that this study did not find men lower on gender role conflict to be more likely to seek psychological services. Thus, while these studies may suggest that increased MGRC may prohibit one from entering counseling, there is no evidence thus far indicating that lower levels of reported MGRC increases the likelihood that a particular male will enter counseling.

MGRC and Relationships

Male gender role development can also have implications for the quality of one's current relationships. Few studies have evaluated the relationship between MGRC and a variety of variables related to the current family situation, including family environment (Campbell & Snow, 1992), as well as marital and relationship satisfaction (Campbell & Snow, 1992; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). These studies suggest that marital satisfaction is increased as male gender role conflicts subscales of work and family relations as well as restrictive emotionality are reduced. Decreased satisfaction in one's marriage or relationship has also been related to the GRCS subscales of conflict between work and family relations in college students (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), emotional restrictiveness in married men (Sharpe, 1993), and restrictive emotionality and conflict between work and family relations (Campbell & Snow, 1992). Elevated MGRC was also linked to a decreased capacity for intimacy (Sharpe, 1993; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991).

What this cluster of studies suggest is that elevated levels of male gender role conflict may serve to inhibit men's abilities to have successful and/or satisfying

relationships. Not surprisingly, the inability or difficulty in expressing emotions and balancing the responsibilities with work and family repeatedly has been shown to reduce the capacity of men to enjoy satisfying relationships with their partners and families. However, these studies do not uncover how these difficulties are developed in the family of origin.

Structural Family Theory: Constructs and Related Literature

Structural Family Theory

The concept of the family system is used to describe the dynamic nature of families, in which the behavior and actions of one member of the family influences and effects the other members of the family. The family system is motivated towards growth and adaptation (Levant, 1984). Healthy family structures have the flexibility required to adapt as members of the system grow and change throughout the course of life. These systems must be stable enough to provide support and nurturance while having sufficient plasticity to allow for changes in the family members. Dysfunction from within the family system occurs when stressors are combined with a family's inability to adapt or cope. Also, family therapists believe that disruptive behavior by a member of a family can serve to stabilize the system, protecting the status quo and increasing the likelihood of that behavior to continue (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). Some family therapists believe that the patterns of family interactions represent an underlying family structure. This structure reflects the way in which healthy or unhealthy behaviors are continued through the family (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). Structures of family systems influence repeated patterns through the entire family system or subsystems (Minuchin, 1974).

The construct of Family Structure describes the dynamics between two or more people in a family. Minuchin (1974) defined Family Structure as “the invisible set of functional demands that organizes the ways in which family members interact” (p. 51). These covert structures are reinforced and established through repeated patterns that dictate how members of the family system interact. These structures often involve typical patterns of interaction amongst the members of a family system, governed by implicit rules of behavior. In this way the family system maintains itself. For example, rigid boundaries may limit discussion and emotional sharing between members of a particular family that was experiencing a divorce between parents.

Boundaries

Boundaries are critical to understanding the concept of family structure. Boundaries are the latent barriers that surround a particular individual, subsystem, or group, governing rules of behavior and interaction. These boundaries dictate with whom and how one participates with other members of a family. Boundaries also regulate the autonomy of the members of the family system through hierarchy and proximity, as well as moderate the amount of contact between members (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). Boundaries may be defined by demographic factors (age, sex, interests, mutual goals) or by latent coalitions that have been established within the family structure (Minuchin, 1974).

Minuchin (1974) notes that clear boundaries are the hallmark of a healthy family structure. Boundaries must be established that allow sufficient latitude for family members to achieve their tasks without excessive interference, while providing for sufficient contact among the members. The “normal” range of clear boundaries can be

placed on a continuum between disengaged and enmeshed boundary poles. What is important to healthy development is finding a balance between enmeshment and disengagement.

Boundaries can serve to protect individuals and subsystems from excessive involvement by other subsystems. Most families have a combination of both enmeshed and disengaged boundaries, and this isn't necessarily unusual or unhealthy. The problem comes when these patterns limit the behavioral repertoire of a family system (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). However, both types of transaction patterns can serve to mute healthy functioning in supporting established boundaries. For example, enmeshment can serve to prevent functional boundaries in the family system from working, and by doing so inhibit family functioning. An enmeshed family may actively avoid interactions outside the family to ensure the maintenance of an enmeshed behavioral pattern (Minuchin, 1974).

Differentiation of The Self

Differentiation involves striving towards a balance between over-involvement and disconnection in the family system. This differentiation is seen as critical to healthy individual development within the family. This balance is characterized in structural family therapy as the establishment of clear boundaries (Minuchin, 1974). Bowen describes differentiation as autonomy from others (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998) as well as separating thoughts from feelings (Levant, 1984). Bowen argued that emotions can overwhelm cognitions to the point of making reactions and behaviors reflexive (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). Healthy differentiation also involves separating oneself from the dynamics of the family and minimizing participation in dysfunctional patterns that are firmly established in the family structure (Guerin, Fay, Burden, & Kautto, 1987).

Enmeshment and Disengagement

A critical component of differentiation is finding a balance between enmeshment and disengagement. A strong tendency towards either enmeshment or disengagement can result in unhealthy consequences. Enmeshed families manifest in weak psychological boundaries and a loss of personal autonomy (Becvar & Becvar, 1996). Overly enmeshed families value an inappropriate level of cohesion, limiting flexible movement by family members in dealing with challenges. Alternatively, disengaged families show strain from overly rigid boundaries that result in psychological isolation (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). This disconnection has also been operationalized as estrangement (Perosa & Perosa, 1993). Neither enmeshed nor disengaged boundaries are themselves representative of family dysfunction, but are indicative of typical interaction types between members of a family (Minuchin, 1974).

Triangulation

Triangulation is the concept of deflecting discord between two family members by involving a third person, resulting in stabilization between the original pair (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). Minuchin (1974) described triangles as “chronic boundary problems” (p. 101), typically occurring when one parent insisted that the child side with him or her, thus turning this child against the other parent. Haley conceptualized “perverse triangles” as signified by hidden coalitions that disrupt the functioning of the family system (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). Bowen felt that the formation of triangles was a normal process for individuals when a family system was faced with stress, but that resistance to being pulled into triangles helped individuals differentiate from the family (Nichols &

Schwartz, 1998). Healthy coping with triangles involves managing anxiety and discomfort in the family without relying on triangles (Levant, 1984).

Cross-Generational Coalitions

Similar to triangulation, coalitions represent the joining of two people or social units within a family against a third person (Haley, 1987). This is distinguished from healthy alliances, when members of the family system cooperate to achieve mutual goals. A particular type of inappropriate coalition is a cross-generational coalition, when an alliance between a parent and child is formed across generational hierarchy boundaries, and align against a third member of a family. Structural family therapists believe that a key characteristic of healthy families is appropriate boundaries that do not cross generational lines (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998).

Empirical Examination of the Influence of the Family System and Family Structure on Development

The theoretical constructs of family systems and the Structural Family Theory (Minuchin, 1974) have stimulated a strong line of research examining the influence of the family of origin on later development. An unhealthy family environment is thought to promote maladaptive adjustment by 1) providing a fertile environment for the development of psychopathology, or 2) supporting a structure which maintains or propagates a maladaptive environment (Levant, 1984).

Increasingly, a family systems approach, and specifically Structural Family Therapy, is assisting in the conceptualization of how family dynamics impact later development. Lopez (1992), in his summary of the familial influences on development, lists the structural family model as a major contribution to the understanding of late

adolescent development. Lopez also notes that several researchers have studied the relationship between family variables and the development and functioning of late adolescents. Also, numerous researchers have used a structural family therapy model, or some deviation of it, as a framework for understanding late adolescent development.

Some of the major areas investigated thus far have been between family structure and depression (Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1986; 1989a), psychological attachments (Lopez, Campbell, and Watkins, 1989a), adjustment (Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984), stress (Bray, Harvey, & Williamson, 1987), difficulty with self-expression (Perosa & Perosa, 1997), identity development (Perosa, et. al, 1996), coping style (Perosa & Perosa, 1993), marital conflict (Lopez, Campbell, and Watkins, 1989b), psychological separation (Lopez, Campbell, and Watkins, 1988), separation (Lopez, et. al, 1989a), health distress (Bray, Harvey, & Williamson, 1987), college adjustment, (Lopez, et. al, 1989b), and career indecision (Lopez & Andrews, 1987).

There is a consistent support in the literature of the relationship between clear boundaries with positive development. For example, Perosa and Perosa (1993) found that firm boundaries and the ability to mediate conflict in one's family of origin were related to healthy coping and improved ability to achieve a firm sense of one's identity. Lopez, et. al (1989a) also found that college students who reported less cohesion and more anxiety with their parents experienced increased levels of depression. Additionally, strong cross-generational alliances have been found to relate to difficulty in self-expression (Perosa & Perosa, 1997).

Gender has also been found as an important variable to consider when studying the relationship between family structure and late adolescent development. Lopez, et. al

(1988) note that a maladaptive family structure impacts men and women differently. Perosa and Perosa (1993) found that close ties to both mother and father were important for women in identity achievement, whereas their data suggested that this may not necessarily be true for males. Further, additional studies found that a structural family approach was useful in adding to our understanding of female individuation (Perosa, et. al, 1996).

The Relationship between Family Dynamics and Male Gender Role Development

Although the literature on the relationship between family structure and later adjustment strongly suggests a significant interaction, thus far there has been little integration of this knowledge to help us better understand male gender role development. Theoreticians have promoted the view that male gender role socialization has a unique impact on males, limiting boys' connectedness to their families (e.g., Jolliff & Horne, 1999; Lazur, 1998; O'Neil, 1981; Pleck, 1981; 1995). These writers suggest that the striving to raise "good boys" (boys who fit the narrow range of what is acceptable behavior for boys) can sometimes come at the cost of their emotional and psychological well being. Yet, the majority of the literature on male gender role development is limited to "snapshots," correlational studies between MGRC and current reported symptomology and other indices, rather than an examination of potential antecedents of MGRC. A handful of studies are the exception, rather than the rule. There is a small body of literature examining the interplay between gender role conflict for males and experiences in the family of origin, including family environment (Campbell & Snow, 1992), separation-individuation (Blazina & Watkins, 2000), and attachment styles (Fischer & Good, 1998).

Campbell and Snow (1992) examined the relationship between male gender role conflict in currently married men with 1) family environment and 2) men's marital satisfaction. Their results indicated that men who reported lower levels of male gender role conflict between work and family and feeling emotionally restricted also reported an increased level of marital satisfaction and cohesion within their current families. However, this study was limited to perceptions of male's current families, not their families of origin.

While Campbell and Snow (1992) examined current family dynamics, the present literature review revealed only two published studies that examined the relationship between MGRC and retrospective perceptions of family dynamics (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998). These studies indicate a relationship between parenting style (in this instance evaluated through attachment theory) and reported levels of gender role conflict and strain.

Fischer and Good (1998) specifically examined relationships between parent-child attachment styles with MGRC and gender role stress in college men. However, these perceptions were limited to the perspective of attachment theory. Their results indicated that those men who endorsed less gender role stress and conflict also perceived their relationships with their parents as more positive, secure, and conflict-free.

Further, Fischer and Good (1998) found that boys who have positive relationships with both parents and felt secure in their relationship to their fathers exhibit an increased ability to be emotionally expressive. This is noteworthy due to previous studies that have found a relationship between restricted emotional expression and overall psychological distress (Good, et. al, 1995), a fear of intimacy (Fischer & Good, 1997), and serious

indices of psychopathology (Good, et. al, 1996). Also noteworthy was that secure attachment to father was related with decreased concerns about intellectual inferiority and performance (Fischer & Good, 1998).

Likewise, Blazina & Watkins (2000) found a relationship between MGRC and attachment style. Specifically, their results indicated 1) a negative correlation between the Restrictive Emotionality subscale of the GRCS and positive attachment to mother and father, 2) and that maladaptive attachment styles were linked to an elevated concern over success, power, and competition on the GRCS. Further, Blazina and Watkins found a negative correlation between the GRCS and separation/ individuation, that as MGRC increased across every scale of the GRCS, so too did reported indications of difficulties with separation/ individuation and a fragile sense of self-identity.

Thus, what these studies (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998) suggest is a pervasive pattern of strained relationships with one's parents being linked to extreme male gender role conflict later in life. Across these studies, elevated dimensions of Male Gender Role Conflict reduced the quality of healthy attachment to parents and the ability to successfully resolve the ability to differentiate from one's parents. Despite this repeated pattern, these studies are largely limited to an attachment paradigm and fail to take into account the overall family structure.

The present study builds upon this literature base (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Campbell & Snow, 1992; Fischer & Good, 1998), which implicates family structure as having a potentially large impact on later male gender role development. A family structure approach has been useful in adding to our understanding of identity development (e.g., Perosa & Perosa, 1993), adjustment difficulties (e.g., Lopez,

Campbell, & Watkins, 1989a), and how this structure impacts men and women differently (e.g., Perosa & Persoa, 1993). However, we have little understanding of how this family structure influences male gender role development for men. This is despite the numerous theoretical contributions to the men's literature (e.g., Brooks & Gilbert, 1995; Jolliff & Horne, 1999; O'Neil, et. al, 1995) that suggest the family is a major influence and contributor to male gender role development. Also, Lazur (1998) suggests using a family systems approach when working with men in therapy. The logical next step is to bring the areas of male gender role development and family structure together, to integrate what is known in both areas to help us understand how the family structure influences gender roles for boys and men.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Procedure

Data was collected at a large public university through the research pool in the psychology department. Students volunteered through signing up for specific times, and received class credit. After distributing the questionnaires and the research self-report measures to the research participants, the principal investigator gave general instructions for filling out the research packet.

The instruments were administered in the following order:

Structural Family Interaction Scale-Revised (SFIS-R; Perosa & Perosa, 1990a).

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil, et. al, 1986).

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik, et. al, 2000).

Sample

Participants ($N=135$) were male undergraduate students at a large public university in the southeast region of the United States. Using Green's (1991) formula it was determined that the minimum N required for this study was 81. Each participant was recruited from the available students in undergraduate psychology classes through an on-line registration system sponsored by the psychology department. Each participant received one hour of research credit towards completing the requisite requirement by the psychology department of 6.5 hours of participation per three-credit class. Each participant was given a five part packet, including a consent form, demographic form,

and three research surveys. Answers for the research surveys were entered by the participants on NCS scan forms. Informed consent was obtained (Appendix A) from each participant prior to completing the research surveys. Demographic information for each participant was also collected through a questionnaire created for this research and completed by each participant (Appendix B). Demographic data is summarized in Table 1.

Instrumentation

A thorough review of the literature was done to insure correspondence between 1) the research questions and 2) an underlying goal to provide data that relates well to an established, clinically utilized, theory, such as Structural Family Theory. The instruments selected were the Structural Family Interaction Scale-Revised (SFIS-R; Perosa & Perosa, 1990a), the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil, et. al, 1986), and the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik, 2000).

Structural Family Interaction Scale-Revised (SFIS-R)

The SFIS-R (Perosa & Perosa, 1990a) was developed to assess family interactions as suggested by Minuchin's (1974) structural family therapy approach. The responses on the SFIS-R are on a four-point Likert Scale, from very false (1) to very true (4). The SFIS-R consists of eight scales, derived from 68 statements designed to indicate family interactions (Perosa & Perosa, 1990b), and is grounded within the framework of a structural model of family functioning (Minuchin, 1974). Structural family therapy emphasizes that each family has an underlying structure that guides interaction patterns amongst its members, is relatively consistent within a family, and can promote as well as sustain both adaptive and maladaptive functioning. These patterns of interaction within a

Table 1: Demographic Variables For Participants (N=135).

Variable			
Age	Mean= 19.5 SD= 1.54	Min= 18	Max= 29
Race/ Ethnicity	Asian / Asian American	3%	
	African American	3%	
	Caucasian	88%	
	Latino/ Hispanic	3%	
	Bi-racial	3%	
	Other	0%	
Marital Status	Single	99%	
	Married	1%	
	Divorced	0%	
	Widowed	0%	
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	99%	
	Homosexual	1%	
	Bi-Sexual	0%	
College Class	Freshman	35%	
	Sophomore	27%	
	Junior	14%	
	Senior	24%	
Family reported on SFIS	Living with both parents	70%	
	Living with stepparent stepmother	2%	stepfather 9%
	Living in single- parent home With mother	4%	With father 7%
	No contact with parents	<1 %	
	Other	7%	

family represent an underlying family structure (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998). These patterns can develop into rigid patterns of behavior that limit the range of expression and behavior for individuals as well as the family as a whole (Colapinto, 2000).

The SFIS-R is based on a factor analysis of the original Structural Family Interaction Scale (Perosa, et. al, 1981). The original SFIS was found to differentiate between the families of well-functioning adolescents from adolescents with suicidal ideation (Mitchell & Rosenthal, 1992), emotional problems (Walrath, 1984), and learning disabilities (Perosa & Perosa, 1982). Additional studies have found that adaptive family functioning per the SFIS-R were found to be related to coping strategies (Perosa & Perosa, 1993), successful identity achievement (Perosa & Perosa, 1993), and identity development in females (Perosa, et. al, 1996).

The eight scales on the SFIS-R can be divided into two sections (Perosa, et. al, 1996). The first section is overall family dynamics, and includes the scales of Enmeshment/ Disengagement (EN/D), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLX/RG), and Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAV/EX). The next section evaluates the quality of intergenerational interactions, and includes the two scales of Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCC/E) and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (FCC/E), Spouse Conflict Resolved/ Unresolved (SPCR/U), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PC/CGT), and Overprotection/ Autonomy (O/A) (Perosa & Perosa, 1990a; Perosa, et. al, 1996).

Five of the original eight scales on the SFIS-R were used for the current study. These five scales were hypothesized to best evaluate the particulars of interaction that influence male gender development. These are Enmeshment/ Disengagement,

Flexibility/ Rigidity, Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression, Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement. The Enmeshment/ Disengagement scale seeks to measure the amount of support, involvement, responsiveness, involvement, and differentiation that is experienced amongst members. Higher scores indicate enmeshment. Flexibility/ Rigidity reflects a family's ability to adapt and change with the development of individuals and external changes, with elevated scores indicating flexibility (Perosa & Perosa, 1990).

The Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression Scale provides information about how a family approaches conflict, whether they express or avoid conflicts that may lead to arguments. High scores represent conflict avoidance. Cross-Generational Triads/ Parent Coalition indicates the degree to which boundaries between parent and child are crossed to form rigid communication patterns to avoid direct communication in marriage difficulties. The triadic aspect refers to the structural family components of triangulation, coalitions, and detouring. Higher scores indicate that a cross-generational triad is occurring within the family (Perosa & Perosa, 1990).

Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement represents the ability between a child and each respective parent to successfully resolve conflicts and the level of nurturance provided to a child. This is seen as evaluating the level of closeness between parent and child, with high scores indicating increased cohesion (Perosa & Perosa, 1990).

The SFIS-R has been found to have adequate reliability. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the individual scales range from .71 to .93. Correlations between the scales has ranged from .32 to .61. Test-retest correlations across a range of four weeks

ranged from .81 to .92 (Perosa & Perosa, 1993). Correlations for individual scales of the SFIS-R are provided below.

Convergent and discriminate validity has been established between the SFIS-R and the Family Environment Scale (FES; Moos & Moos, 1981), the Family Assessment Device (FAD; Epstein, Baldwin, & Bishop, 1983), and the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale (FACES III; Olson, Portner, & Lavee, 1985). The results indicated that there was very good convergent validity between all the instruments for cohesion, and for all the instruments studied except the FAD for adaptability. Results also suggested that the Flexibility/ Rigidity scores on the SFIS-R may be indicative of the process of individuation (Perosa & Perosa, 1996b).

It has also been suggested that the SFIS-R has great utility in identifying the multiple dimensions of structural family therapy. Perosa and Perosa (1993) note a popular structural family instrument, the Family Structure Survey (Lopez, 1986), fails to identify the degree of enmeshment, the nature of disagreements in the home, or how these conflicts are subsequently managed. Further, the selection and use of the SFIS-R was promoted by its ability to discriminate the relationships the child has with father and mother.

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS)

The GRCS (O'Neil, et. al, 1986) is a 37 item questionnaire that is designed to assess gender role conflict in men (O'Neil, et. al, 1995). Men report the degree to which they agree or disagree with a particular statement by answering on a six-point scale, from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree). The GRCS have been found to have good internal consistency (Good, et. al, 1995), ranging from .75 to .85. Test-retest reliabilities

have ranged from .72 to .86 (O'Neil, et. al, 1995). Structural validity (Good, et. al, 1995; Moradi, et. al, 2000) and construct validity (Good, et. al, 1995) of the GRCS has also been empirically supported. Further, Sharpe and Heppner (1991) suggest that the GRCS provides a more complete picture of some of the negative results from subscribing to traditional expectations of males in our society than other instruments designed to look at gender role (e.g., the PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

The structural validity of O'Neil et. al's (1986) four factor model of MGRC has been challenged and evaluated (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993). In response to this challenge, additional studies of the GRCS sought to determine whether the four factors of the GRCS were appropriate. Good et. al (1995) completed a series of confirmatory factor analyses to determine the appropriate number of factors that emerge. Their results indicated that a four-factor model was the moderately appropriate for their data. The CBWF scale received the least support, but was still statistically significant. Moradi et. al (2000) also conducted a confirmatory factor analysis of the GRCS. Their results also indicated that the original four-factor model suggested by O'Neil et. al (1986) was structurally valid and appropriate for further research on masculinity. The GRCS was also found to have test-retest reliabilities ranging from .72 to .86 (O'Neil, et. al, 1986).

A meta-analysis of 11 studies was done by O'Neil and Owen (1994, as cited by O'Neil, et. al, 1995), who examined the internal consistency of all four factors of the GRCS. Their results were: SPC, alpha ranged from .83 to .89, average of .86; RE, alphas from .81 to .91 and an average of .84; RABBM, an average alpha of .84, from a range of .82 to .88; CBWF, alpha ranges from .73 to .87, with an average of .80.

In further assessing the psychometric properties of the GRCS for construct validity, internal consistency and factor analysis, Good et. al (1995) found that the GRCS was consistent with the theoretical framework offered by O'Neil et. al (1986), finding support for internal consistency and the four intercorrelated factors. The factor of Conflict between Work and Family Relations (CBWF) was found to correlate with factors of psychological distress, but poorly with other measures of male gender roles. This is consistent with Good and Mintz' (1990) finding that this scale correlated poorly with other measures of traditional attitudes regarding gender roles for men.

Good et. al (1995) also found the GRCS not to be significantly affected by issues of social desirability. Construct Validity has also been supported by positive correlations with depression (Good & Mintz, 1990), traditional male norms, and psychological distress (Good, et. al, 1995). The GRCS was also found to discriminate gender role conflict for men from other theoretical concepts around male gender roles (Walker, Tokar, & Fischer, 2000).

Additional studies have found relationships between the GRCS and personality characteristics, demographic factors, positive and negative indices of psychological well-being, and interpersonal/ relational variables. Particular to this study, the GRCS has been found to be positively correlated to parental attachment (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998), conflict between parents (Fischer & Good, 1998), marital satisfaction (Campbell & Snow, 1992), relational difficulties (Blazina & Watkins, 2000), and difficulty with separation/ individuation (Blazina & Watkins, 2000).

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI)

The CMNI (Mahalik, et. al, 2000) was developed to assess the level of conformity to socially-enforced gender norms for men. This 144-item instrument provides a grand total score, and 12 subscales. Each scale supplies a score along a continuum of conformity to masculine norms across four positions: Extreme Conformity, Moderate Conformity, Moderate Nonconformity, and Extreme Nonconformity.

The current study incorporated all twelve scales on the CMNI. The twelve scales are Winning, Emotional Control, Risk-taking, Violence, Dominance, Playboy, Self-Reliance, Primacy of Work, Power Over Women, Disdain For Homosexuals, Physical Toughness, and Pursuit of Status. Each scale can be defined from a position of conformity to non-conformity.

There have been four linked studies designed to evaluate the psychometric properties of CMNI (Mahalik, et. al, 2000). The CMNI was found to have satisfactory internal consistency ($\alpha=.95$), with a coefficient alpha scores ranging from .76 (Dominance & Primacy of Work) to .92 (Emotional Control). All subscales were found to related positively at a statistically significant level to the total CMNI score. Test-retest correlations were .98 for the CMNI total score, and sub-scale correlations ranged from .76 (Physical Toughness) to .96 (Disdain for Homosexuals/ Playboy) (Mahalik, et. al, 2000). Comparisons between men and women indicated that men scored higher on the CMNI on the Total Score and 10 of the 12 Masculine Norms scores (Physical Toughness, Disdain for Homosexuals, Self-Reliance, Winning, Emotional Control, Power Over Women, Risk-Taking, Dominance, Playboy, Physical Toughness).

Research Design and Analysis

This exploratory study sought to provide insight into the nature of the relationship between family structure and male gender role development. Measures of the predictor (independent) variables in this study were disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition, mother/child estrangement, father/child estrangement; the criterion (dependent) variables were male gender role conflict and conformity to masculine norms. Participants who completed measures of these constructs were recruited through an available research pool in the psychology department at a large southeastern university.

Items marked on the questionnaires were converted into raw scores for each instrument and each subscale. Answers were put on NCS “scanable bubble” forms by the participants, and data was entered into a SPSS-compatible database through cooperation of an academic computing center in a college of education located at the large public institution. The data was then entered into a computer and analyzed. Significance levels were set at the 0.05 to minimize the probability of making a Type I error (Keppel, 1991). The statistical software package SPSS (Statistical Package and Service Solutions) was used to analyze the data. Means and standard deviations were provided for the individual variables.

The relationship between the predictor variables and the total scores on the GRCS and the CMNI were examined by selecting variables that contributed meaningfully to the variance in CMNI and GRCS scores by using an All Possible Regression (APR; Olejnik, Mills, & Keselman, 2000) multiple regression analysis. Pedazur (1997) notes that use of a multiple regression analysis model “is eminently suited for analyzing collective and

separate effect of two or more independent variables on a dependent variable” (p. 3).

Again, the predictor variables for this study were the factors of family structure, with the criterion variables either being conformity to masculine norms or male gender role conflict.

“All Possible Regression” techniques eliminates those predictor variables that do not contribute a significant or meaningful amount to the variance on the CMNI or the GRCS by running “all possible regression” equations (N of APR= k^n-1). Each regression equation is then evaluated for Adjusted R-squared ($Adj. R^2$) and Mallows’ Prediction Criterion (C_p) ($Adjusted R^2$ is conventionally used as it is believed to best reflect “actual” variance in the population that a study participant sample is assumed to model). The better regression models are then chosen from the total regression equations by examining each equation to see which explain the most variance ($Adj. R^2$) and least unexplained variance (C_p). This procedure was run for each of the four individual research hypothesis. Thus, a separate analysis was run to determine 1) how adequately disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, triangulation/ coalition and 2) mother/child estrangement/ and father/child estrangement contributed to the variance for both Male Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms.

Results reported included standardized regression coefficients (beta-weights) semipartial correlations (\underline{sr}^2_i), Mallows’ Prediction Criterion (C_p), Adjusted R-squared ($Adj. R^2$), and adjusted R-squared change ($Adj. R^{2\text{ change}}$). Pearson correlations were also used to construct a correlation matrix. This matrix displays the correlations between each subscale on the SFIS-R with of each individual subscale of the GRCS and CMNI to add additional insight to the relationships between the criterion and predictor variables.

Limitations

1. The instruments used in the current study are based on self-report measures, and limited to a single family member's retrospective on family dynamics.
2. Perceptions of gender roles, and the male gender role instruments of focus in this study, are grounded in the culture of the United States, and perhaps further limited to white males. Thus, generalizability of the future results of this study to other countries should be done with caution.
3. The correlational nature of the research design for this study yields no evidence of causality.
4. The results of this study are bound by the limitations of the reliability and validity of the respective instruments, as reviewed in the Instrument section.
5. As with all studies using regression analysis techniques, the data of this study is assumed to lack multicollinearity, have singularity of variables, an acceptable level of homoscedasticity, a linear relationship between predictor (independent) and criterion (dependent) variables, and a normal multivariate distribution. Statistical techniques and an inspection of residuals were done to ensure the data in this study did not violate these regression assumptions.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The current study was designed to add to our understanding of the relationship between Family Structure (Minuchin, 1974) and male gender role development through the dual lenses of Conformity to Masculine Norms (Mahalik, 2000) and Male Gender Role Conflict (O'Neil, 1981; O'Neil, et. al, 1986). Although numerous theoreticians have suggested a relationship between the family of origin and male gender role development (e.g., Jolliff & Horne, 1999; O'Neil, 1981; O'Neil, et. al, 1995; Pleck, 1995; Pollack, 1995; 1998), very few empirical studies have been done to examine this potential relationship (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Campbell & Snow, 1992; Fischer & Good, 1998).

Further, none of the existing studies on the relationship between male gender role development and family dynamics have specifically 1) incorporated measures that focused on family structure theory (Minuchin, 1974), 2) separately studied the structural interaction patterns between a man and his father and mother, or 3) integrated the theory of Conformity to Masculine Norms (Mahalik, 2000) with family structure. Previous studies were limited by their focus to only the relationship with either parent (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998), attachment theory (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998), the current families for the men studied rather than the family of origin (Campbell & Snow, 1992), or failed to use a measure that was solidly grounded in structural family theory (Campbell & Snow, 1992). The current study was initiated to

help remedy these previous shortcomings while offering to potentially increase our understanding of the relationship between selected family variables and later male gender role conflict and conformity.

Male gender role development was assessed through two different theoretical models: 1) Male Gender Role Conflict (O'Neil, 1981) and 2) Conformity to Masculine Norms (Mahalik, 2000). These two models suggest that there is a socialization process that influences men in their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors towards themselves and in interaction with those around them. For the purposes of this study, our understanding of family interaction was operationalized through Minuchin's (1974) Structural Family Theory. The current study assumed that the family of origin was only one component of the larger socialization process for men.

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses of the data as they pertain to the four research questions first described in Chapter Three. The research questions are as follows:

1. Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of family structure (disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition) with Male Gender Role Conflict?
2. Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of family structure (disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition) with Conformity to Masculine Norms?
3. Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with Male Gender Role Conflict?

4. Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with Conformity to Masculine Norms?

The relationships among the variables of this study were examined using an "All Possible Regressions" (APR; Olejnik, et. al, 2000) multiple regression technique and Pearson correlation analysis. Separate multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to determine whether structural family interaction patterns significantly predicted male gender role conflict and conformity to masculine norms. Bivariate correlations were performed between the subscales of predictor variables (Male Gender Role Conflict (MGRC; O'Neil, 1981) and Conformity to Masculine Norms (CMNI; Mahalik, 2000)) and the criterion subscales of the structural family interaction patterns (Structural Family Interaction Scale- Revised (SFIS; Perosa & Perosa, 1990a). Means and standard deviations for each of the variables were also included within the correlation matrix.

Results are presented by restating the particular research question of interest, followed by the related findings for each question. Measures of the predictor variables (disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, triangulation/ coalition, father/child estrangement, and mother/child estrangement) and the criterion variables (male gender role conflict and conformity to masculine norms) were obtained during a five month period from volunteers in undergraduate psychology courses. A total of 137 undergraduate males participated in the study, of which the scores for 135 were included in the current study (See Table 1). Two participants were dropped from the study due to insufficient data points. These two omissions were random to the best of the researcher's knowledge.

Findings

Data Screening

Abundant techniques were applied to the data set to ensure quality. Data screening procedures were modeled after suggestions by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). A frequency analysis was run on SPSS to investigate the data set for missing data, skewness, and kurtosis. Examination of the mean, minimum and maximum scores suggested that all scores were within expected parameters. Criteria for acceptable levels of skewness (deviation of symmetry) and kurtosis (deviation from normality of distribution) were set at +/-1 (excellent) to +/- 2 (acceptable), as recommended by George and Mallery (2001). Examination of the SPSS Frequency output indicated the data quality to be excellent and fall well within acceptable limits. Skewness levels ranged from -.606 to .956 and kurtosis values ranged from -.770 to 1.364.

Further, expected normal probability plots and detrended expected normal probability plots (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) were generated to visually assess issues of distribution normality. Each individual scale for the variables of interest conformed to normal distributions. These plots also indicated little concern for outliers. Outliers were statistically assessed by using Cook's D(istance), for which values >1 typically indicate a problem with outliers in a given data set. Cook's D assesses if any one score is putting excessive influence (a product of leverage and discrepancy; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) on the distribution statistics. Examination of Cook's D levels suggested that no outliers were notably affecting the data set, with values ranging from .001 to .266.

Examination of the SPSS Frequency output did indicate missing values within the data set. Upon closer examination, two participants were removed from the data set due

to substantial missing responses. Additional missing variables appeared to be random omissions. It was decided that the Mean Substitution data transformation technique would be used to compensate for the missing values. This procedure was chosen because 1) the percentage of missing values on individual scales was well below the five-percent cutoff suggested in the literature (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001; George & Mallery, 2001) and 2) the mean substitution procedure is considered a conservative technique as it moves scores towards the mean of the distribution.

Comparative stepwise regression analyses were run to compare results between the data set with and without mean substitutions. This comparative analysis demonstrated that the mean substitution technique actually reduced the reported F and Adjusted R² values. The comparison indicated that the utilization of Mean Substitution data transformations did not change or unduly influence the results of this study.

Between-group differences were also examined to assess whether there was a significant difference in variance between individuals who participated in the study during the end of the Fall semester ($N=115$) versus participation at the beginning of the Spring semester ($N=20$). Analysis was done through a Levene's Independent Samples Test. Comparisons were done between composite and subscales of the GRCS, CMNI, and the SFIS (a total of 22 individual scores). The Levene's analysis indicated that only three scales were found to have unequal variances: END ($F=9.860$, $p=.002$), WINNING ($F=6.997$, $p=.009$), and STATUS ($F=4.031$, $p=.047$). Olejnik (personal communication, April 24, 2001) indicated that so few differences in variance did not suggest a problem, particularly in light of the positive nature of the data screening results described above.

Research Question 1

The first research question investigated by this study was: Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of family structure (disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition) with Male Gender Role Conflict? APR multiple regression analyses were used to ascertain the relationship between the family structure variables particular to this research question on male gender role conflict (MGRC). Fifteen separate regression equations were run (N of APR= k^n-1). The predictor variables were entered in the following order: Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END), Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PCCGT), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLR).

Examination of APR results suggest that a multiple regression equation that included the predictor variables of Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END) and Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE) to be the most parsimonious and explained sixteen percent of the variance of reported male gender role conflict in the participant pool ($F(2,132) = 14.00, p = .001$). Table 2 displays the standardized regression coefficients (beta-weights), semipartial correlations ($\underline{sr}^2_{i,}$), Mallows' Prediction Criterion (C_p), Adjusted R-squared ($Adj. R^2$) and adjusted R-squared change ($Adj. R^{2 \text{ change}}$) for the regression equation $END \times FCAE = MGRC$. Examination of Beta-weights in Table 2 suggest that MGRC composite levels would increase as enmeshment (beta-weight=.10) decreases and conflict avoidance increases (beta-weight=-.35). The results of the first research question would suggest that elevated disengagement and increased avoidance of conflict in the family significantly predicted increased male gender role conflict.

Table 2: Multiple Regressions of Structural Family Interaction Scale Subscales on 1) Male Gender Role Conflict and 2) Conformity to Masculine Norms.

Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	dfs	Adj. R ²	Adj. R ² change	C _p	F	β	sr ² _i
Research Question 1 CV: MGRC	END x	1, 134	.16	.10	1.578	14.00**	.10	.006
	FCAE			.07			-.35	.070
Research Question 2 CV: CMN	END x	1, 134	.06	.041	1.993	5.371**	.054	.002
	FCAE			.034			-.237	.030
Research Question 3 CV: GRCS	MCCE x	1, 134	.09	.062	3.00	7.451**	.181	.029
	FCCE			.039			.210	.040
Research Question 4 CV: CMN	MCCE	1, 134	.05		1.352	7.545*	.232	.050

*p<.05

*p<.01

N=135

Notes: sr²_i= Squared semi-partial correlation. C_p = Mallows' Prediction Criterion. β = Standard Regression Coefficient Beta-Weights. The Criterion Variables are Male Gender Role Conflict Scale Composite (GRCS) and Conformity to Masculine Norms Composite (CMN). Subscales for the Structural Family Interaction Scale- Revised include Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLR), Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PCCGT), Overprotection/ Autonomy (OA) Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (FCCE).

Research Question 2

The second research question of this study was as follows: Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of family structure (disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition) with Conformity to Masculine Norms? APR multiple regression analyses were used to ascertain the relationship between the family structure variables particular to this research question on conformity to masculine norms. Fifteen separate regression equations were run (N of APR= k^n-1). The predictor variables were entered in the following order: Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END), Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PCCGT), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLR).

Examination of APR results for the second research question suggests that a multiple regression equation that includes both predictor variables of Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END) and Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE) would best predict conformity to masculine norms. This regression model accounted for 6% of the variance of reported male gender role conflict in the participant pool ($F(2,132) = 5.371$, $p = .001$). Table 2 displays the standardized regression coefficients (beta-weights), semipartial correlations ($\underline{sr}^2_{i.}$), Mallows' Prediction Criterion (C_p), Adjusted R-squared ($\text{Adj. } R^2$) and adjusted R-squared change ($\text{Adj. } R^{2 \text{ change}}$) for the regression equation $\text{END} \times \text{FCAE} = \text{CMN}$. The results for Question 2 indicate that general conformity to masculine norms would increase as enmeshment (beta-weight=.054) decreased and conflict avoidance rose (beta-weight=-.237). In other words, and similar to the first research question, the results for the second research question suggest that elevated levels of

disengagement and increased levels of conflict avoidance per the SFIS significantly predicted an overall increase in conformity to masculine norms.

Research Question 3

The third question examined the following: Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with Male Gender Role Conflict? APR multiple regression analyses were used to ascertain the relationship between the family structure variables particular to this research question on male gender role conflict. Three separate regression equations were run (N of $APR=k^n-1$). The predictor variables were entered in the following order: Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE), Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (FCCE). Examination of APR results suggest that a multiple regression equation that includes both predictor variables of Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (FCCE) would best predict male gender role conflict (MGRC). This regression model accounted for nine percent of the variance of reported male gender role conflict in the participant pool ($F(2,132)=7.451, p=.001$). Table 2 displays the standardized regression coefficients (beta-weights), semipartial correlations (sr^2_i), Mallows' Prediction Criterion (C_p), Adjusted R-squared ($Adj. R^2$) and adjusted R-squared change ($Adj. R^{2\text{ change}}$). The data in Table 2 suggests that increased cohesion with mother (beta-weight=.181) and father (beta-weight=.210) predicted increased levels of male gender role conflict. The findings related to the third research question suggest that the quality of relationship with mother and father, as measured by cohesion, are both significantly involved in later male gender role conflict. Decreased cohesion in the

relationship with mother and father may predict increased levels of male gender role conflict.

Research Question 4

The final research question of this study was: Is there a significant relationship between males' perceptions of mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with Conformity to Masculine Norms? APR multiple regression analyses were used to ascertain the relationship between the family structure variables particular to this research question on conformity to masculine norms. Three separate regression equations were run ($N \text{ of APR} = k^n - 1$). The predictor variables were entered in the following order: Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE), Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (FCCE). Examination of APR results suggest that a multiple regression equation that includes only the predictor variable Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) accounts for 9% of the variance of conformity to masculine norms. The addition of the additional variable of Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) did not further account for additional variance. The predictor variable of MCCE significantly accounted for the overall variance of conformity to masculine norms ($F(2, 132) = 7.545, p = .007$); as conformity increased so did levels of estrangement from mother (beta-weight = .232).. Table 2 displays the standardized regression coefficients (beta-weights), semipartial correlations ($sr^2_{i.}$), Mallows' Prediction Criterion (C_p), Adjusted R-squared ($Adj. R^2$) and adjusted R-squared change ($Adj. R^{2 \text{ change}}$). The findings around the last research question indicate that lower reported levels of cohesion between a mother and her son significantly predicts male gender role conformity. Also, the relationship between father and son

(FCCE) did not meaningfully contribute to the variance in male gender role conformity outside of the variance explained by MCCE.

Additional Analyses

In addition to the APR multiple regression analyses described above that are specific to individual research questions, Pearson correlations were conducted to further explore the relationships amongst the different variables in this study. Table three presents intercorrelational data amongst the composite and subscale scores of the Gender Role Conflict Scale and the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory with the Structural Family Interaction Scale- Revised. Although the results of this correlation matrix are complex, several patterns emerge from the data. It should be noted that correlation does not necessarily imply meaningful correlations. For example, a correlation of .10 may be significant, but does not represent a significant amount of variance (only 1 percent of the variance). In contrast, a correlation of .50 accounts for a substantial portion of the variance (25 percent).

The MGRC composite score was significantly related to all seven scales of the SFIS, with Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE) ($r=-.411$) and Overprotection/ Autonomy (OA) ($r=-.197$; $p<.01$) negatively correlated and Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END) ($r=.319$; $p<.01$), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PCCGT) ($r=.273$; $p<.01$), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLR) ($r=.273$; $p<.01$), Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) ($r=.249$; $p<.01$), and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) ($r=.268$; $p<.01$) positively correlated. Thus, results from this study indicated that increased levels of gender role conflict corresponded for the participants in this study with increased conflict avoidance and autonomy, as well as

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson's Correlations for Scales and Subscales of the Structural Family Interaction Scale, Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory, and the Gender Role Conflict Scale.

Variable	M	SD	END	PCCGT	FCAE	FLR	OA	MCCE	FCCE
			34.60 6.75	20.46 5.86	23.93 4.65	17.52 3.62	24.07 2.90	14.80 5.06	16.30 5.46
WINNING	32.23	5.78	.06	.06	-.10	.06	-.01	.03	.02
EMOTION	29.14	6.50	.26**	.19*	-.39*	.18*	.05	.22*	.11
RISK	32.01	3.57	-.16	.13	.04	-.05	-.17	.11	-.01
VIOLENCE	29.46	5.54	.16	.28**	-.11	.26**	-.13	.22*	.13
POWER	27.52	5.83	.06	.19*	-.17*	.09	-.08	.21*	.11
DOMINANCE	31.16	4.09	.04	.19*	.02	.12	-.01	.10	.07
PLAYBOY	25.22	6.98	.13	.19*	-.21*	.12	.01	.25**	.24**
RELIANCE	29.57	4.57	.22*	.14	-.23	.19*	.13	.17*	.12
WORK	27	3.96	.06	.11	-.08	.08	-.10	.16	.01
DISDAIN	34.56	7.12	-.01	.01	-.12	-.04	-.15	-.05	-.07
TOUGH	33.32	3.94	-.01	-.06	-.10	-.03	.04	.05	-.06
STATUS	33.32	3.94	.08	.03	.04	-.03	.01	.03	-.07
CONTOTAL	364.56	32.09	.20*	.18*	-.27*	.22*	-.05	.23**	.12
SPC	50.68	12.07	.06	.04	-.11	.01	-.14	.01	.04
RE	29.30	10.53	.43**	.39**	-.51**	.38**	-.17*	.42**	.30**
RABBM	26.28	8.79	.36**	.25**	-.40**	.23**	-.06	.25**	.25**
CBWF	20.47	6.77	.03	.10	-.17*	.05	-.20*	.04	.18*
GRC	127.12	26.77	.32**	.27**	-.41**	.24**	-.20*	.25**	.27**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

$N = 135$

Notes: The Criterion Variables are Male Gender Role Conflict Composite (GRCS) and Conformity to Masculine Norms Composite (CONTOTAL). Subscales for the Structural Family Interaction Scale- Revised include Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLR), Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PCCGT), Overprotection/ Autonomy (OA), Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE), and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (FCCE). Subscales for the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) are as follows: SPC=Success, Power, and Competition; RE=Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM=Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men; CBWF= Conflict Between Work and Family Relations.

decreased enmeshment, parent-child coalitions and triangulation, and rigidity in the family of origin. Also, increased gender role conflict was significantly related to increased estrangement within the relationships with a man's father and mother.

Further, the composite score for conformity to masculine norms (CMN) was positively correlated to Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END) ($r=.203$; $p<.05$), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PCCGT) ($r=.182$; $p<.05$), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLR) ($r=.219$; $p<.05$) and Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) ($r=.232$; $p<.01$), while being negatively correlated to Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE) ($r=-.271$; $p<.05$). Therefore, the results would indicate that elevated overall conformity to masculine norms was significantly related to elevated levels of disengagement, mother-child estrangement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and reduced cross-generational triads and coalitions.

Closer examination of the Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE) subscale correlations in Table 2 reveals that this subscale of the SFIS was negatively correlated (although not all were significantly related) to virtually every other scale on the two male gender role development instruments. Several subscales were significantly negatively correlated with FCAE, including significant negative correlations with Emotion ($r=.391$; $p<.05$), Power ($r=-.172$; $p<.05$), Playboy ($r=-.210$; $p<.05$), Restrictive Emotionality (RE) ($r=-.525$; $p<.01$), Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) ($r=-.407$; $p<.01$), and Conflict between Work and Family (CBWF) ($r=-.172$; $p<.01$). Thus, increased conflict expression was related to conformity to the masculine norms around emotional control, power over women, "playboy" type attitudes,

conformity overall, conflict over restrictive emotionality, emotional expression between men, conflicts between work and one's family, and overall gender role conflict.

Examination of the "parent" subscales of the SFIS reveal numerous significant relationships between various facets of male gender roles examined by the CMNI and the GRCS and the MCCE and FCCE subscales. The Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) scale was significantly correlated with Emotion ($r=.218$; $p<.05$), Violence ($r=.218$; $p<.05$), Power ($r=.213$; $p<.05$), Playboy ($r=.247$; $p<.01$), Reliance ($r=.173$; $p<.05$), CMN ($r=.232$; $p<.01$), Restrictive Emotionality (RE ($r=.422$; $p<.01$), Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) ($r=.251$; $p<.01$), and the MGRC composite score ($r=.249$; $p<.01$). Likewise, Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE) was significantly related to the Playboy ($r=.241$; $p<.01$), Restrictive Emotionality (RE) ($r=.303$; $p<.01$), Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) ($r=.255$; $p<.01$), Conflict between Work and Family (CBWF) ($r=.184$; $p<.05$), and the MGRC composite score ($r=.268$; $p<.01$).

The results around the "father scale" of the SFIS indicate that an estranged relationship between a participant in this study was significantly related to restrictions in emotional expression, affectionate behavior with other men, feelings of conflict between one's family commitments and work responsibilities, and overall gender role conflict. Also, an estranged relationship with a participant's mother was related to conformity to masculine norms around emotional control, violence, power over women, "playboy" beliefs, restricted between-men emotional expression, and work/ family conflicts.

Closer examination for the Emotional Control and Emotional Restrictiveness scales strongly implicates family structure particulars in the development of emotional

expressivity. The Restrictive Emotionality subscale of the GRCS was significantly correlated with the following subscales of the SFIS: Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END; $r=.433$; $p<.01$), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLR; $r=.378$; $p<.01$), Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE; $r=-.506$; $p<.01$), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PCCGT; $r=.393$; $p<.01$), Overprotection/ Autonomy (OA; $r=-.168$; $p<.01$), Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE; $r=.419$; $p<.01$), and Father-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (FCCE; $r=.294$; $p<.01$).

The Emotional Control subscale of the CMNI was also significantly related to Enmeshment/ Disengagement (END; $r=.264$; $p<.01$), Flexibility/ Rigidity (FLR; $r=.178$; $p<.05$), Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE; $r=-.391$; $p<.05$), Parent Coalition/ Cross-Generational Triads (PCCGT; $r=.190$; $p<.05$), and Mother-Child Cohesion/ Estrangement (MCCE; $r=.218$; $p<.05$) subscales of the SFIS. This cluster of correlations around emotional expression suggest that increased disengagement, conflict avoidance, rigidity, autonomy, estrangement from mother, and reduced cross-generational triads are implicated in the development of increased male conformity to the need for emotional control, coupled with conflicted feelings and attitudes about emotional expression.

Summary of Findings

Overall, the results of the current study into the nature of male gender role development largely supported the hypothesized results. The results of APR multiple regression analyses indicated that levels of family enmeshment and conflict avoidance patterns were among the best family structure predictors of male gender role conformity and male gender role conflict. The analyses also implicated the level of cohesion with

mother in the development of conformity to masculine norms and cohesion with both parents in male gender role conflict development.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This study examined the relationship between patterns of structural family interactions and male gender role development. Today finds a society in the United States in which the typical ways men and women interact and behave are changing (Levant & Kopecky, 1995) as both genders experiment with ways of doing things that were at one time considered taboo or off limits. However, despite a shifting of typical gender roles, a socialization process persists that arguably limits men and women to largely inflexible gender roles (Brannon, 1999).

Although not all "traditional" male gender roles are inherently bad (Fassinger, 2000), there is a growing challenge to reevaluate how beneficial or harmful some traditional male gender roles may be to individual men (Levant & Pollack, 1995). Theorists continue to call for an expanded range of behaviors that are considered permissible for males (Pleck, 1995; Levant & Pollack, 1995). As an example, a traditional male gender role of being a provider for a family is not inherently harmful, and may have many positive characteristics, such as supplying a family with stability, resources, and an ability to promote healthy development for children. However, a man may have a problem if his adherence to this role as provider pushes him to the point of forbidding his wife from having a meaningful career.

While roles for men traditionally offer enhanced opportunities, this is often tempered with restrictions of what is considered appropriate behavior. These restrictions

for behavior often include that men should limit emotional expression, should not act in a way that could be construed as feminine, that individual achievement is the only way to achieve self-respect, physical risk-taking is a sign of "being a man" (Brannon, 1985), and that men must be the controllers and initiators of sexual behavior (Doyle, 1995). These guidelines for men can provide few options for acceptable behaviors, thoughts, or feelings. Often the guidelines for men are strict to the point of being unobtainable (Pleck, 1995) and can serve to promote psychological distress and cognitive dissonance (Levant & Brooks, 1997).

The restrictions suggested by Brannon (1985) and Doyle (1995) can be found in the ways we interact and socialize boys. Pollack (1998) notes that our expectations for men are often translated to a "boy code" for how boys should and should not behave. Characteristics of the "boy code" include an emphasis on toughness, a lack of emotional expression, and minimization of the expression of pain or difficulty. The pressure for parents to push their male children to adhere to the "boy code" can be intense, and sadly the result may be a premature disconnection of the emotional bond between son and parent. Although parents often have the best intentions with their sons, they may feel pressure to raise a child who conforms to society's expectations of men. It should be noted that helping socialize boys to become gender-appropriate is not inherently wrong, but taken to the extreme can promote an excessively rigid gender role boundary.

The idea that male gender roles are at least partially imposed through the family is nothing new. Many theorists (Bergman, 1995; Brooks & Gilbert, 1995; Fassinger, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1997; Joliff & Horne, 1999; Lazur, 1998; O'Neil, et. al, 1995; Pleck, 1995; Pollack, 1995) have suggested that early developmental experiences in the family

of origin can have both positive and negative impacts on a man's approach to gender roles. Unfortunately, a darker side of male socialization can include messages to minimize the acknowledgement of "negative" emotions and to have males abruptly separate emotionally from their parents (Jolliff & Horne, 1999). The net result can be a painful emotional and physical detachment from both mother (Fischer & Good, 1998) and father (Levant, 1995).

The present study built upon the dual literature bases of male gender role development and family structure, which implicated family interaction patterns as having a potentially large impact on later development. A family structure approach has benefited our understanding of identity development (e.g., Perosa & Perosa, 1993), maladaptive adjustment (e.g., Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1989a), and how family interactions can impact men and women differently (e.g., Perosa & Perosa, 1993). However, there has been little understanding of how family structure may influence male gender role development for men. This lack of empirical understanding is despite the numerous theoretical contributions to the men's literature (e.g., Brooks & Gilbert, 1998; Jolliff & Horne, 1999; O'Neil, et. al, 1995) that implicate the family as a major influence and contributor to male gender role development. Also, Lazur (1998) suggested using a family systems approach when working with men in therapy. The logical next step was to bring the areas of male gender role development and family structure together, to integrate what is known in both areas to help us understand how the family structure influences gender roles for boys and men.

It can be generally concluded that the results of the current study tentatively agreed with the hypothesized results, although perhaps not to the magnitude expected. The results of APR multiple regression analyses suggested that levels of family enmeshment and conflict avoidance patterns were among the best predictors of male gender role Conformity and male gender role conflict. The analyses also implicated the level of cohesion with mother in the development of conformity to masculine norms and cohesion with both parents in male gender role conflict development.

General Family Structure and Male Gender Role Conflict

The alternative hypothesis for the first research question (H_1 : There is a significant positive relationship between disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition with increased Male Gender Role Conflict) turned out to be largely supported, although it was determined that triangulation/ coalition and rigidity did not significantly contribute to the variance of gender role conflict. The results of the first research question would suggest that elevated disengagement and increased avoidance of conflict in the family significantly predicted increased male gender role conflict.

Further examination of the relationships between the general family variables measured by the SFIS (excluding the parent scales) also revealed interesting relationships. The results of this study suggest that elevated levels of gender role conflict were related to increased conflict avoidance and autonomy, disengagement, reduced parent-child coalitions and triangulation, and enhanced rigidity in the family of origin. Also, increased conflict expression in the family of origin was related to conflict over restrictive emotionality, emotional expression between men, conflicts between work and one's family, and overall gender role conflict. Closer examination for the Restrictive

Emotionality scale also strongly implicated family structure particulars in the development of emotional expressivity.

The results from this study that suggest that family of origin dynamics, such as elevated disengagement and conflict avoidance significantly relate to male gender role conflict are important due to previous studies reviewed in chapter three, which have linked increased feelings of MGRC to numerous psychological difficulties. Elevated male gender role conflict has been linked to general psychological distress (Good, et. al, 1995), anxiety, (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Good & Mintz, 1990; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), psychological defenses (Mahalik, et. al, 1998), shyness (Bruch, et. al, 1998), decreased self esteem (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), anger (Blazina & Watkins, 1996), elevated depression (Mahalik & Cournoyer, 2000; Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995, Good & Mintz, 1990; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), and alexithymia (Fischer & Good, 1997). The results from this study, combined with these earlier studies, offer a tentative suggestion that structural family interaction patterns may contribute to male gender role conflict, which in turn may influence later psychological difficulty.

The results of this study expand on an earlier study (Campbell and Snow, 1992) that examined the relationship between male gender role conflict in currently married men with 1) family environment and 2) men's marital satisfaction. Their results indicated that men who reported lower levels of male gender role conflict between work and family and feeling emotionally restricted also reported an increased level of marital satisfaction and cohesion within their current families. However, the Campbell and Snow (1992) study was limited to perceptions of male's current families, not their families of origin. The current study expands upon the connection between the family and MGRC by

demonstrating that gender role conflict not only affects current relationships, but also may indicate the nature of relationships with one's family of origin. This study indicated that men who reported lower levels of male gender role conflict also experienced less conflict avoidance and less disengaged relationships in the family. Thus, we see that extreme male gender role conflict (the conflict created by rigidly adhering to overly concrete societal expectations for men) can have seriously harmful impact on one's psychological well being, relationships with other, and the ability to seek helpful psychological services. In turn, the results of this study suggest that the socialization process that arguably may put men at risk for psychological difficulties later in life may start at an early age in the family of origin.

General Family Structure and Conformity to Masculine Norms

The results of the analysis related to the second research question also relatively supported the alternative hypothesis (H_1 : There is a significant positive relationship between disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and triangulation/ coalition with increased levels of Conformity to Masculine Norms). Like the first research question, the results for the second research question suggest that elevated levels of disengagement and increased levels of conflict avoidance per the SFIS significantly predicted an overall increase in conformity to masculine norms. Also, APR analysis techniques suggested that triangulation/ coalition and rigidity did not significantly contribute uniquely to the variance within conformity to masculine norms. The results also proposed that increased reported conformity to masculine norms composite scores were significantly predicted by elevated levels of disengagement, rigidity, conflict avoidance, and reduced cross-generational triads and coalitions.

Also similar to the results around research question one, the Family Conflict Avoidance/ Expression (FCAE) subscale was significantly correlated with numerous subscales of male conformity. Augmented conflict expression was related to conformity to the masculine norms around emotional control, power over others, "playboy" type attitudes, and overall conformity. The results also suggested that emotional control was significantly related to increased disengagement, conflict avoidance, rigidity, autonomy, and reduced cross-generational triads.

Although little research has been conducted on the new construct of Conformity to Masculine Norms, the current study results do suggest that the family of origin significantly influences one's conformity to masculine norms. But what does this exactly mean? It is incumbent upon us to note that although both the construct of gender role conflict and conformity highlights aspects of male gender role development, they describe very different constructs. Whereas male gender role conflict describes a conflictual experience between social expectations and one's own performance, conformity to masculine norms simply describes adherence or rejection of the social conventions for men. Despite the "negative" names assigned to the individual scales on the CMNI, closer examination of the supporting theory suggest that there are costs and benefits to both conformity and non-conformity. Therefore, these results around the construct of conformity to masculine norms do not necessarily equate conformity to "typical" social expectations for men as pathological. Indeed, the original study on the CMNI (Mahalik, et. al, 2000) found no relationship between the conformity instrument and pathology as measured by the BSI. Therefore, this cluster of results only suggests

patterns of relationships between male gender role conformity and family interaction patterns, not implications for dysfunction.

This study generally supported a relationship between family structure and later male gender role conflict and conformity to masculine norms. These results add to our understanding of how male gender roles may develop, and also how family structure influences later development. Family theorists and researchers have repeatedly suggested that there is a strong relationship between early familial experiences and later development (e.g., Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1989). Some of the major areas previously investigated have been between family structure and depression (Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1986; 1989a), psychological attachments (Lopez, et. al, 1989a), adjustment (Bray, et. al, 1984), stress (Bray, et. al, 1987), difficulty with self expression (Perosa & Perosa, 1997), identity development (Perosa, et. al, 1996), coping style (Perosa & Perosa, 1993), marital conflict (Lopez, et. al, 1989b), psychological separation (Lopez, et. al, 1988), separation (Lopez, et. al, 1989a), health distress (Bray, Harvey, & Williamson, 1987), college adjustment, (Lopez, et. al, 1989b), and career indecision (Lopez & Andrews, 1987). This study supplemented this literature base by advancing our understanding of how various family structure patterns can promote less extreme and/or conflictual male gender role development.

Relationships with Parents and Male Gender Role Development

There were also some interesting results from this study around a man's relationship with his mother and father with later male gender role development. The two alternative hypotheses related to parent relationships were as follows: 1) H₁: There is a significant positive relationship between increased mother/ child estrangement and

father/ child estrangement with elevated reported levels of Male Gender Role Conflict and 2) H₁: There is a significant positive relationship between increased mother/ child estrangement and father/ child estrangement with elevated levels of Conformity to Masculine Norms.

The level of reported estrangement in the relationship with a man's mother was implicated in the development of both male gender role conflict and conformity to masculine norms. However, the estrangement with father was found to contribute a significant portion of the variance only in the area of male gender role conflict. The results of a series of APR analyses suggest that the quality of relationship with mother and father, as measured by cohesion, are both significantly involved in later male gender role conflict. Reduced levels of cohesion in the relationship with mother and father may predict increased levels of male gender role conflict. The findings also suggest that lower reported levels of cohesion between a mother and her son significantly predicts male gender role conformity, while the relationship between father and son did not meaningfully contribute to the variance in male gender role conformity outside of the variance explained by the mother-child relationship.

Additional data culled from the correlation matrix adds to our understanding between various facets of male gender role development and the separate relationships with mother and father. The results suggest that a more disengaged relationship with father was significantly related to restrictions in emotional expression, affectionate behavior with other men, feelings of conflict between one's family commitments and work responsibilities, and overall gender role conflict. Additionally, an estranged relationship with a participant's mother was related to conformity to masculine norms

around emotional control, violence, power over women, "playboy" beliefs, restricted between-men emotional expression, and work/ family conflicts.

This study further informs our understanding of how the relationship with parents relates to male gender role development. Two previous studies have examined the relationship between MGRC and relationships with parents (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998). These studies (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998) suggest a pervasive pattern of strained relationships with one's parents being linked to extreme male gender role conflict later in life. Across these studies, elevated dimensions of Male Gender Role Conflict reduced the quality of healthy attachment to parents and the ability to successfully resolve the ability to differentiate from one's parents. The current study largely supported these previous studies while using the different theoretical grounding of Family Structure. Whereas previous studies (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Fischer & Good, 1998) found positive attachment styles to predict lowered MGRC, so too did this study suggest that lowered male gender role conflict was related to parental cohesion.

The results of this study should be viewed with caution. Any generalization from this study to other groups of men should be tempered with knowledge of the limited range of the current sample. The current participant sample parameters limit generalizability to college students, mainly Caucasian, in the southeast United States. Also, it should be remembered that the results are also restricted to the quality of the theories they represent. For example, Good et. al (1995) found limited empirical support for the conflict between work and family subscale of the GRCS.

Another caveat of the current study is that the use of retrospective reports of family dynamics can be fraught with difficulty due to potential biases and distortions of memory. It is far from clear whether an individual asked to describe their family of origin reports an accurate reflection of the interaction amongst members (Gavin & Wamboldt, 1994; Schouten, 1994; 1995). We have seen that other areas, such as witness testimony (Kassin, Tubb, Hosch, & Memon, 2001), is fraught with errors in reporting. Studies focused specifically on the recollections of the family of origin have also found that age had a strong moderating effect on those memories of the family (Hampson, Hyman, & Beavers, 1994). Past studies of the family of origin through the lens of attachment theory has also suggested an inconsistency in adult recollections of attachment styles in childhood (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994; Lopez, 1995; Rice, FitzGerald, Whaley, & Gibbs, 1995). Thus, future research would benefit from cross-validating reports of family dynamics amongst various members of the same family.

Also, it cannot be emphasized enough that the constructs around male gender role development do not represent all men, but rather describe 1) men who are at the extreme end of gender role beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors, or 2) social expectations for men rather than the men in the society themselves. A major impetus of this general line of research is to highlight ways in which society may push men into narrow ranges of options. Certainly all men do not subscribe to the extreme end of each individual dimension of conformity. For example, not all men have an extreme disdain for homosexuality or enjoy having women in a subservient role. Rather, the dimension titles used represent the extreme end of the continuum towards a "hypermasculine" approach to life. Therefore, in reviewing the studies related to Conformity to Masculine Norms

(Mahalik, 2000) (as well as Male Gender Role Conflict (O'Neil, 1981)), it is important to keep in mind that the results may suggest a particular index of psychological difficulty is linked to tending towards an extreme "hypermasculine" position, rather than an indictment of all men who participated in the study.

Future Directions

There are several ways in which this study can serve as a catalyst for further empirical inquiry. Subsequent studies would benefit from examining other family member's perspectives, employment of a longitudinal design to see how gender role attitudes vary over time and culture, and utilization of direct observations of the family. Further, additional research would benefit from examining family dynamics and male gender role development across diverse cultures. Due to the correlational nature of this research design, additional studies will be needed to unravel the direction of the relationships in this study. Also, "correlation does not equal causation." Although some may suggest that regression is better suited for prediction than other models, true causation cannot be completely established without manipulation of variables (which, for obvious reasons, would be ethically prohibited from this area of research).

While this study establishes a relationship between overly disconnected family interaction patterns and later rigid male gender role development, the results are less clear as to whether lowered rigidity in the family would lead to positive mental health. If disconnection with one's parent leads to elevated male gender role conflict, it does not necessarily mean that more connection would lead to increased self-esteem. Actually, too much connection can be harmful, such as in the case of enmeshment. The study of individual differences in male gender role development in the literature has also largely

focused on the negative consequences of elevated "hypermasculine" identities. However, very few of these studies offer suggestions of what promotes healthy male gender role development, or what "healthy" even describes. Now, arguably, many of the correlational articles reviewed and this study may inherently suggest what is positive development by pointing out what negative consequences can be associated with strong conflictual male gender role feelings or experiences. For example, when a study by Good and Mintz (1990) suggests that elevated emotional restriction is significantly related to increased depression and a reduced use of psychological services, do the results not also suggest that individuals with decreased emotional restriction also tend to be less depressed and more likely to use psychological services. In turn, wouldn't decreased depression be experienced as a positive improvement in one's mental health?

Indeed, having an understanding of negative consequences of individual differences can also inform our understanding of the implications for "positive" characteristics (Salovey, Rothman, Detweiler, & Steward, 2000) or conflict levels. However, the reality is that the line of research on male gender role conflict in particular seems to have a preoccupation with how increased male gender role conflict can lead to "psychological disaster." What is needed is a shift from this pathology focus to one that suggests optimal development. As Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) point out, the field of psychology in general has had a strong focus on a disease model. What they suggest is needed is a renewed interest on such constructs as hope, optimism, flow and happiness.

There are many human strengths that can reduce one's susceptibility to mental illness, including improved interpersonal skill, courage, faith (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), and optimism (Peterson, 2000). The propagation of human

strengths can also lead to important health benefits, such as improved immune system functioning (Salovey, et al., 2000). Therefore, a future line of research building upon this study with fertile potential may be an examination of how positive attributes (e.g., hope, optimism, enhanced self-esteem) may be linked to a less restrictive male gender role, or how the family of origin can promote positive development for boys. For example, how does male gender role development work to promote social interest (Adler, 1928; 1929, as translated in Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956), self actualization (Goldstein, 1959) or meaning in one's life (Frankl, 1963)? There are an infinite number of possibilities to promote our understanding of how to emphasize healthy male development beyond "less depression" or "less personality pathology."

This study established an increased understanding of male gender role development through the lens of family structure. Although the results found a trend between male development and family dynamics, the implications for practice are less clear. Future research would benefit from examining the impact of family counseling on the gender development of children, or the effect of reassessing gender boundaries in families. The fact that this study is grounded in family systems theory also opens up an number of clinical options. For example, a central goal for structural family therapy is to promote a restructuring of the way family members typically interact with one another so that the structure becomes more open and flexible to change (Colapinto, 2000). The approach of reorganization of the family system towards increased openness and flexibility may be tailor-fit to increasing the range of options for boys within a family.

Several additional researchers and theorists have offered suggestions for incorporating the exploration of gender roles with men in the course of counseling (e.g., Cournoyer and Mahalik, 1995) in general and family therapy specifically (Campbell & Snow, 1992). Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995) suggest that "counselors may explore the contribution that rigid adherence to the traditional male role has to overall well being for male clients" across age differences (p. 17). The use of gender roles in counseling may also take on a developmental perspective. As an illustration, the results from Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995) suggest that a counselor may find benefit in attending more to issues of success and comparisons to others when working with younger men, and considering the conflict between work and family in older men. Further, Campbell and Snow (1992) suggest that the level of gender role conflict in males be assessed when working with couples, as well as increase an understanding of the level of cooperation and closeness within a family.

The use of assessment instruments focusing on male gender roles would also be helpful in identifying particularly problematic facets for men in therapy as part of a larger diagnostic battery (Stillson, O'Neil, & Owen, 1991). Initial inquiries suggest that the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (Mahalik, et al., 2000) can be very useful as a stimulus to clinically explore how one's gender role conformity around different dimensions has helped and hindered a particular male client (Scott & Talmadge, 2000).

Good and Mintz (1990) offer numerous suggestions in building upon an understanding of one's level of MGRC to direct psychological services. Among the suggestions are psychoeducational approaches to help educate individuals on some of the liabilities of male gender roles and the potential benefits of counseling, promotion of an

appreciation in male clients on the mental health benefits inherent in emotional self-disclosure, and promoting male client's efforts to balance the pressures of work and family. Cognitive restructuring for men may also be beneficial to assist them in obtaining reasonable expectations for success (Good, et. al, 1996) and aspirations for what they "should and should not" do. Finally, this study offers an understanding of male gender role development from a family structure perspective, which offers an extensive practice foundation.

We as a profession must exercise caution in the promotion of a more balanced and healthy development for men. Therapists must be sensitive to ethical concerns in promoting expressiveness in men. Balswick (1979) emphasizes that expressiveness may be more than some men are willing or able to offer. Pushing for this may increase the threatening nature of therapy for men. It becomes an ethical problem when therapists begin to expect all men to want to enter counseling or openly express their feelings. If men do not want to develop their abilities in expressiveness, for example, then therapists have no right to thrust it upon them.

It is also important to work to move society past the perception that counseling is only for the "sick" and that men who seek professional therapeutic services are "weak" or "failures" in some way. Good and Wood (1995) suggest reframing counseling as an activity with positive attributes. This can be achieved by moving services targeting men towards a model more compatible to the variety of men who all vary in their particular approach to what it means to be masculine. Through these steps we can create a therapeutic culture that is more conducive to safe exploration of the issues that face men today.

Summary

The "boy code" (Pollack, 1998) quickly becomes clear for many young boys. All too often in a boy's life, he may be inundated with messages to minimize emotions or negative feelings, detach from his affective life, and separate himself from his parents (Jolliff & Horne, 1999). Theorists (Bergman, 1995; Levant, 1995; Pollack, 1995) and researchers (Fischer & Good, 1998) alike have suggested that cultural expectations and child-rearing roles force young boys to disconnect from their mothers. The emotional and physical detachment from one's father also has been theorized to have far-reaching negative impacts on the healthy development of boys and men (Levant, 1995). Jolliff and Horne (1999) have suggested that this foundation predisposes men to the potential of lifelong ambivalence and fear about being able to feel safe when connecting to others.

Parents may also experience an elevated level of stress as they attempt to separate themselves from their sons at a very early age (Pollack, 1998). Arguably, this drive towards disconnection may be fueled by a fear of raising an overly "feminine" boy, who may experience a great deal of ostracism from his peers if he too does not subscribe to the "boy code." Pollack theorizes that the abrupt disconnection from a boy's parents may result in increased stress for a young boy as he loses the emotional support needed at such a young age. Critical to healthy development is continual, consistent nurturing from both caregivers (Jolliff & Horne, 1999). Both parents serve as internal models for how their boy should behave as a man and relate to women. If stifled, boys and young men may struggle with the ability to relate to themselves and those around them.

The principle time for development, internalization, and experience of gender roles is early childhood to late adolescence (O'Neil, et. al, 1995). O'Neil (1981), in his first

theoretical paper on his conceptualizations of Male Gender Role Conflict (MGRC), noted that a boy's experience with his parents is related to later masculine role conflicts and stresses. The family becomes the "incubator of gender roles" (Lazur, 1998). Thus, this study sought to address the lack of understanding of the influence on family interaction patterns on male gender role development by integrating what is known generally about the influence of family structure with the existing literature base on male gender role conflict and conformity.

The current study offered additional insight into how the family of origin may influence male gender role development. Overall, the results indicated that levels of family enmeshment and conflict avoidance patterns were among the best family structure predictors of male gender role conformity and male gender role conflict. The analyses also implicated the level of cohesion with mother in the development of conformity to masculine norms and cohesion with both parents in male gender role conflict development. Future research in the psychology of masculinity can have a meaningful positive impact on men as our understanding of the impact of the family of origin on male development moves from the antidotal to the empirically supported. In this way we can build upon the previous literature and embrace ways to interact with men and boys that promotes healthy development and quality relationships with others.

REFERENCES

- Ansbacher, H.L., & Ansbacher, R.R. (1956). The individual psychology of Alfred Adler: A systematic presentation in selections from his writings. New York: Harper Collins.
- Balswick, J. (1979). The inexpressive male: Functional-conflict and role theories as contrasting explanations. Family Relations, 28, 331-336.
- Becvar, D.S., & Becvar, R.J. (1996). Family Therapy: A systematic integration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bergman, S.J. (1995). Men's psychological development: A relational perspective. In R.F. Levant and W.S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men. (p. 68-90). New York: Basic Books.
- Betz, N.E. (1989). Implications of the null environment hypothesis for women's career development and for counseling psychology. The Counseling Psychologist, 17, 136-144.
- Betz, N.E., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1993). Individuality and diversity: Theory and research in counseling psychology. Annual Review of Psychology, 44, 343-381.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, C.E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance abuse usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43, 461-465.

Blazina, C., & Watkins, C.E. (2000). Separation/ Individuation, parental attachment, and male gender role conflict: Attitudes toward the feminine and the fragile masculine self. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1, 126-132.

Brannon, L. (1999). Gender: Psychological perspectives (2nd ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Brannon, R. (1985). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. In A. Sargent (Ed.), Beyond sex roles, (pp. 110-116). St. Paul, MN: West.

Bray, J.H., Harvey, D.M., & Williamson, D.S. (1987). Intergenerational family relationships: An evaluation of theory and measurements. Psychotherapy, 24, 516-528.

Bray, J.H., Williamson, D.S., & Malone, P.E. (1984). Personal Authority in the Family System: Development of a questionnaire to measure personal authority in intergenerational family processes. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 10, 167-178.

Brooks, G.R., & Gilbert, L.A. (1995). Men in families: Old constraints, new possibilities. In R.F. Levant and W.S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men (p. 252-279). New York: Basic Books.

Bruch, M.A., Berko, E.H., & Haase, R.F. (1998). Shyness, masculine ideology, physical attractiveness, and emotional expressiveness: Testing a mediational model of men's interpersonal competence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45, 84-97.

Campbell, J.L., & Snow, B.M. (1992). Gender role conflict and family environment as predictors of men's marital satisfaction. Journal of Family Psychology, 6, 84-87.

Colapinto, J. (2000). Structural family therapy. In A.M. Horne (Ed.), Family counseling and therapy: Third edition (3rd ed.) (140-167). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

- Compas, B. (1987). Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence. Psychological Bulletin, 101, 393-403.
- Cournoyer, R.J., & Mahalik, J.R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42, 11-19.
- Derogatis, L.R. (1983). SCL-90-R: Administration, scoring and procedures manual-II. Towson, MD: Clinical Psychometric Research.
- Doyle, J. (1995). The male experience (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.
- Enns, C.Z. (2000). Gender issues in counseling. In R.W. Brown & Lent (Eds.), Handbook of Counseling Psychology (3rd ed.) (pp. 601-638). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Epstein, N., Baldwin, L., & Bishop, D. (1983). The McMaster Family Assessment Device. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 9, 171-180.
- Fassinger, R.E. (2000). Gender and sexuality in human development: Implications for prevention and advocacy in counseling psychology. In R.W. Brown & Lent (Eds.), Handbook of Counseling Psychology (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Fischer, A.R., & Good, G.E. (1997). Men and psychotherapy: An investigation of alexithymia, intimacy, and masculine gender roles. Psychotherapy, 34, 160-170.
- Fischer, A.R., & Good, G.E. (1998). Perceptions of parent-child relationships and masculine role conflicts of college men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45(3), 346-352.
- Frankl, V.E. (1963). Man's search for meaning. New York: Washington Square Press.

Gavin, L., & Wamboldt, F.S. (1994). Schouten in the dark: Missing the forest and the trees. Journal of Marital & Family Therapy, 20, 301-310.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2001). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference: 10.0 Update. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Goldstein, K. (1959). The organism: A holistic approach to biology derived from psychological data in man. New York: American Book.

Good, G.E., & Mintz, L.B. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence for compound risk. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 7-21.

Good, G.E., & Mintz, L.B. (1993). Towards healthy conceptions of masculinity: Clarifying the issues. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 15, 403-413.

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

Good, G.E., Borst, T.F., & Wallace, D.L. (1994). Masculine research: A review and critique. Applied & Preventive Psychology, 3, 3-14.

Good, G.E., Dell, D.M., & Mintz, L.B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36, 295-300.

Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., & Bartels, K.M., & Braverman, D.G. (1996). The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. Journal of Counseling & Development, 75, 44-49.

Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., O'Neil, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., DeBord, K.A., & Bartels, K.M. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological distress. Journal of Counseling Psychology, *42*, 3-10.

Green, S. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? Multivariate Behavioral Research, *26*, 499-510.

Grotevant, H., & Cooper, C. (1985). Patterns of interaction in family relationships and the development of identity exploration in adolescents. Child Development, *56*, 425-428.

Guerin, P.J., Fay, L., Burden, S., & Kautto, J.G. (1987). The evaluation and treatment of marital conflict: A four-stage approach. New York: Basic Books.

Haley, J. (1987). Problem-solving therapy (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hampson, R.B., Hyman, T.L., & Beavers, W.R. (1994). Age-of-recall effects on family-of-origin ratings. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, *20*, 61-67.

Jolliff, D., & Horne, A.M. (1999). Growing up male: The development of mature masculinity. In A.M. Horne & M.S. Kiselica's (Eds.), Handbook of counseling boys and adolescent males. (p. 3-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jome, L.M., & Tokar, D.M. (1998). Dimensions of masculinity and major choice traditionality. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *52*, 120-134.

Kaslow, F. W. (2001). Families and Family Psychology at the Millennium: Intersecting Crossroads. American Psychologist, *56*, 37-46.

Kassin, S.M., Tubb, V.A., Hisch, H.M., & Memon, A. (2001). On the "general acceptance" of eyewitness testimony research: A new survey of the experts. American Psychologist, *2001*, 405-416.

- Keppel, G. (1991). Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Kirkpatrick, L.A., & Davis, K.E. (1994). Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 66, 502-512.
- Kiselica, M.S., & Horne, A.M. (1999). Preface: For the sake of our nation's sons. In A.M. Horne & M.S. Kiselica (Eds.), Handbook of counseling boys and adolescent males. (p. xv-xx). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lazur, R.F. (1998). Men in the family: A family system's approach to treating men. In W.S. Pollack & R.F. Levant (Eds.), New psychotherapy for men (127-146). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Levant, R. F. (1984). Family therapy: A comprehensive overview. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Levant, R. F. (1995). Toward the reconstruction of masculinity. In R.F. Levant and W.S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men. (p. 229-251). New York: Basic Books.
- Levant, R.,F., & Brooks, G.R. (Eds.). (1997). Men and sex: New psychological perspectives. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Levant, R.F., & Kopecky, G. (1995). Masculinity reconstructed: Changing the rules of manhood, at work, in relationships, and in family life. New York: Penguin.
- Levant, R.F., & Pollack, W.S. (1995). A new psychology of men. New York: Basic Books.

Lopez, F.G. (1986). Family structure and depression: Implications for the counseling of depressed college students. Journal of Counseling and Development, *64*, 508-511.

Lopez, F.G. (1989). Current family dynamics, trait anxiety, and academic adjustment: Test of a family-based model of vocational identity. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *35*, 76-87.

Lopez, F.G. (1992). In R.W. Brown & Lent (Eds.), Handbook of Counseling Psychology (2nd ed.) (pp. 251-284). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Lopez, F.G. (1995). Contemporary attachment theory: An introduction with implications for counseling psychology. Counseling Psychologist, *23*, 395-415.

Lopez, F.G., & Andrews, S. (1987). Career indecision: A family systems perspective. Journal of Counseling and Development, *65*, 304-307.

Lopez, F.G., Campbell, V.L., & Watkins, C.E. (1986). Depression, psychological separation, and college adjustment: An investigation of sex differences. Journal of Counseling Psychology, *33*, 52-56.

Lopez, F.G., Campbell, V.L., & Watkins, C.E. (1988). Family structure, psychological separation, and college adjustment: A canonical analysis and cross-validation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, *35*, 402-409.

Lopez, F.G., Campbell, V.L., & Watkins, C.E. (1989a). Effects of marital conflict and family coalition patterns on college student adjustment. Journal of College Student Development, *30*, 46-52.

Lopez, F.G., Campbell, V.L., & Watkins, C.E. (1989b). Construction of current family functioning among depressed and nondepressed college students. Journal of College Student Development 30, 221-228.

Mahalik, J.R. (2000, August). A theory of conformity to masculine norms. Presented at the 108th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Mahalik, J.R., & Cournoyer, R.J. (2000). Identifying gender role messages that distinguish mildly depressed from nondepressed men. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1, 109-115.

Mahalik, J.R., Cournoyer, R.J., DeFranc, W., Cherry, M., & Napolitano, J.M., (1998). Men's gender role conflict and use of psychological defenses. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45, 247-255.

Mahalik, J.R., Locke, B.D., Ludlow, L.H., Diemer, M., Scott, R.P.J., Gottfried, M., Freitas, G. (2000). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. Presented at the 108th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Minuchin, P. (1985). Families and family development: Provocations from the field of family therapy. Child Development, 56, 289-302.

Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and family therapy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mitchell, M., & Rosenthal, D. (1992). Suicidal adolescents: Family dynamics and the effects of lethality and hopelessness. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 21, 23-33.

Moos, R.H., & Moos, B.W. (1981). Family environment scale and preliminary manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Moradi, B., Tokar, D.M., Schaub, M., Jome, L.M., & Serna, G.S., (2000). Revisiting the structural validity of the Gender Role Conflict Scale. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1, 62-69.

Nichols, M.P., & Schwartz, R.C. (1998). Family Therapy: Concepts and Methods (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

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

O'Neil, J.M., & Owen, S.V. (1994). The manual for the Gender Role Conflict Scale. Storrs: School of Family Studies, University of Connecticut.

O'Neil, J.M., Good, G.E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New Paradigms for empirical research. In R.F. Levant and W.S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men. (p. 164-206). New York: Basic Books.

O'Neil, J.M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. Sex Roles, 4, 335-350.

Olejnik, S., Mills, J., & Keselman, H. (2000). Using Wherry's Adjusted R^2 and Mallows's Cp for model selection from all possible regressions. The Journal of Experimental Education, 68(4), 365-380.

Olson, D.H., Portner, J., & Lavee, Y. (1985). FACES III. St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Family Social Sciences.

Pedhazur, E.J. (1997). Multiple regression in behavioral research: explanation and prediction (3rd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Perosa, L.M., & Perosa, S.L. (1990b). Convergent and discriminant validity for family self-report measures. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 50, 855-868.

Perosa, L.M., & Perosa, S.L. (1982). Structural interaction patterns in families with a learning disabled child. Family Therapy, 9, 175-187.

Perosa, L.M., & Perosa, S.L. (1990a, August). The revision and validation of the Structural Family Interaction Scale. Paper presented at the 98th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Perosa, L.M., Hansen, J., & Perosa, S.L. (1981). Development of the Structural Family Interaction Scale. Family Therapy, 8, 77-90.

Perosa, L.M., Perosa, S.L., & Tam, H.P. (1996). The contribution of family structure and differentiation to identity development in females. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 25, 817-837.

Perosa, S.L., & Perosa, L.M. (1997). Intergenerational family theory and Kohut's self-psychology constructs supplied to college females. Journal of College Student Development, 38, 143-157.

Perosa, S.L., & Perosa, L.M. (1993). Relationships among Minuchin's structural family model, identity achievement, and coping style. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40, 479-489.

Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. American Psychologist, 55, 44-55.

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

Pleck, J.H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), The new psychology of men (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.

Pollack, W.S. (1995). No man is an island: Toward a new psychoanalytic psychology of men. In R.F. Levant and W.S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men. (p. 33-67). New York: Basic Books.

Pollack, W.S. (1998). Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of manhood. New York: Random House.

Pollack, W.S., & Levant, R.F. (1998). New psychology for men. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rando, R.A., Rogers, J.R., & Brittan-Powell, C.S. (1998). Gender role conflict and college men's sexually aggressive attitudes and behavior. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 20, 359-369.

Rice, K.G., FitzGerald, D.P., Whaley, T.J., & Gibbs, Cynthia, L. (1995). Cross-sectional and longitudinal examination of attachment, separation-individuation, and college student adjustment. Journal of Counseling & Development, 73, 463-474.

Robertson, J.M., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1992). Overcoming the masculine mystique: Preferences for alternative forms of assistance among men who avoid counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39, 240-246.

Salovey, P., Rothman, A.J., Detweiler, J.B., & Steward, W.T. (2000). Emotional states and physical health. American Psychologist, 55, 110-121.

Schouten, P.G.W. (1994). A scale in search of a construct: Comments on Gavin and Wamboldt. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 20, 53-60.

Schouten, P.G.W. (1995). Making magic with the Family-of-Origin Scale: A rejoinder to Gavin and Wamboldt. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 21, 321-323.

Scott, R.P.J., & Talmadge, W.T. (2000, August). Client responses to interpretation of the Masculine Gender Role Conformity Scale. Paper presented as part of symposium "Masculine Gender Role Conformity: Examining Theory, Research, and Practice," 108th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Seligman, M.E.P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. American Psychologist, 55, 5-14.

Sharpe, M.J. (1993). Gender role and psychological well-being in adult men (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54/10, 5373.

Sharpe, M.J., & Heppner, P.P. (1991). Gender role, gender-role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 323-330.

Sharpe, M.J., Heppner, P.P., & Dixon, W.A. (1995). Gender role conflict, instrumentality, expressiveness, and well-being in adult men. Sex Roles, 33, 1-18.

Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Spielberg, W. (1999). A cultural critique of current practices of male adolescent identity formation. In A.M. Horne & M.S. Kiselica's (Eds.), Handbook of counseling boys and adolescent males. (p. 25-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stillson, R., O'Neil, J.M., & Owen, S.V. (1991). Predictors of adult men's gender role conflict: Race, class, unemployment, age, instrumentality-expressiveness, and personal strain. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 458-464.

Tabachnick, B.F., & Fidell, L.S. (2001). Using multivariate statistics (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tokar, D.M., & Jome, L.M. (1998). Masculinity, vocational interests, and career choice traditionality: Evidence for a fully mediated model. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45, 424-435.

Walker, D.F., Tokar, D.M., & Fischer, A.R. (2000). What are eight popular masculinity-related instruments measuring? Underlying dimensions and their relations to sociosexuality. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1, 98-108.

Walrath, R. (1984). Measures of enmeshment and disengagement in normal and disturbed families. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.

Wisch, A.F., Mahalik, J.R., Hayes, J.A., & Nutt, E.A. (1995). The impact of gender role conflict and counseling technique on psychological help seeking in men. Sex Roles, 33, 77-89.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHICS FORM
Please complete the followingGender (check one): 1) Male _____ 2) Female _____Age: _____Race/Ethnicity (check one):1) Asian or Asian American _____ 2) African-American _____
3) Caucasian _____ 4) Latino/Hispanic _____ 5) Bi-Racial _____ 6) Other _____Marital Status (check one):

1) Single _____ 2) Married _____ 3) Divorced _____ 4) Widowed _____

Sexual Orientation (check one):

1) Heterosexual _____ 2) Homosexual _____ 3) Bi-Sexual _____

Graduated (check highest completed):1) High School _____ 2) Associate's Degree _____ 3) College Degree _____
4) Some graduate school _____ 5) Post-graduate degree _____If in college now, please check current year:

1) Freshman _____ 2) Sophomore _____ 3) Junior _____ 4) Senior _____

Occupation: _____ (If student, write "student")

If you are a college student, please complete the following:

What is your major? _____

Please evaluate the following statement by
circling "Yes" or "No": I am very satisfied
with the major I listed above.

Yes

No

What is your ideal job/career after college? _____

US State in which you reside: _____Please indicate in what geographic location you have lived most of your life. If in the U.S.,
please indicate what state you have lived in most of your
life _____

Please evaluate the following statement by circling “Yes” or “No”.

- Yes No 1. I have visited a physician for a check-up in the last 12 months.
- Yes No 2. I enjoy spending time with my father.
- Yes No 3. I have been involved in a violent situation in the past 12 months.
- Yes No 4. I have been in trouble with the law
- Yes No 5. I volunteer my time to community work.
- Yes No 6. I use tobacco products.
- Yes No 7. I have witnessed violence in my family.
- Yes No 8. I attend church.
- Yes No 9. I feel supported by my father.
- Yes No 10. At least one time in my life I drank so much that I couldn’t remember things I had done while drinking.
- Yes No 11. I am confident about my career plans.
- Yes No 12. I am an only child

If you answered “no” to question 12 above, please complete the following questions.

- What is your birth order in your family of origin (e.g., first-born, second-born, etc). When reporting please use step-siblings and half-siblings if appropriate _____
- How many older brothers do you have? _____
- How many older sisters do you have? _____
- How many younger brothers do you have? _____
- How many younger sisters do you have? _____

APPENDIX C

STRUCTURAL FAMILY INTERACTION SCALE- REVISED

Form A

Copyright, 1980
Linda M. Perosa, Ph.D.
All rights reserved.

Directions:

Below are statements describing family interaction patterns. Please think of your family during the last two years as you respond to them. Mark your answers on the IBM sheet provided using a #2 pencil.

Place a check by the statement which shows how you are answering the items on the questionnaire referring to parents or mother or father.

1. You are living with both your natural parents, so you are answering questions about mother and father by referring to your natural parents.
2. You are living with a step parent (or foster parents) so you are answering questions about mother or father by referring to a step-parent (or foster parents). The step-parent is your mother? your father?
3. You are living in a single-parent home, but the parent who is missing has some contact with your family, such as once a week, or once a month. You are answering the questions referring to both parents. The parent who is out of the home is your mother? your father?
4. You are living in a home in which the natural parent has died or has no contact with the family members, so you are leaving the questions about that parent blank.
5. other situation. Please explain _____

Read each statement carefully. For each statement below choose the response (A, B, C, or D) which is most characteristic of your family in the last two years and fill in the corresponding box on the answer sheet.

A = Very true
B = More true than false
C = More false than true
D = Very false

1. We are a very "close family".
2. When my parents disagree over something they try to get me to take sides.
3. In my family my father and I don't seem to be able to settle our differences satisfactorily.
4. We seldom talk about the things that are really bothering us.
5. In my family my parents can talk over their differences and settle them fairly.
6. We think and act alike.
7. We easily change our way of doing things when we need to at home.
8. My mother and I work out disagreements without hurting each other's feelings.
9. Members of my family are encouraged to do things "their own way."
10. We take an interest in each other's activities and problems.
11. I feel it is necessary to choose a side when my parents have a disagreement.
12. We feel responsible for each other.
13. My father is not there when I need him.
14. We don't talk over disagreements with each other.
15. Disagreements between my parents are discussed with both of them feeling their view was considered.
16. I found it easy to gain more privileges and responsibilities as I grew older.
17. In my family my mother and I can talk over differences and settle them fairly.

(Remember) A = Very true
B = More true than false
C = More false than true
D = Very false

18. Family members feel guilty if they go their own way.
19. One or both of my parents are extremely careful about protecting me.
20. In our family we lack a feeling of togetherness.
21. I feel trapped in between when my parents argue.
22. My father is too busy with his own life to give attention to me.
23. When someone in our family tries to talk about a problem the other members avoid really talking about it.
24. When we try to help each other we sometimes get too involved.
25. In our family my parents compromise to settle their differences.
26. We are flexible enough to do things spontaneously.
27. In my family my mother and I just end up yelling at each other when we try to discuss issues.
28. I am extremely anxious about making a mistake when doing a task or solving a problem.
29. We feel free to express our real feelings at home.
30. Family members feel guilty if we want to spend time alone.
31. I am able to get more attention or support from one parent rather than the other.
32. My father and I seem to be fighting about the same thing again and again.
33. We avoid discussing a problem with each other if it may lead to an argument.
34. When my parents disagree one of them ends up walking away angry.
35. We encourage each other to develop in his or her own individual way.

Remember: A = Very true
 B = more true than false
 C = More false than true
 D = Very false

36. Some family members interfere with each other even though they mean well.
37. My mother puts a lot of energy into doing things with and for me.
38. One or both parents is (are) totally involved in my life.
39. We know each other well in our family.
40. Family problems tend to focus on one person at home.
41. In my family my father and I can talk over differences and settle them fairly.
42. We cannot be frank with each other.
43. My parents support each other in making family decisions.
44. Family members are flexible in whom they agree with or side with in family discussions and arguments.
45. My mother seldom responds when I need help or support.
46. In my family members think for themselves.
47. We feel close to each other even though family members hold different values or beliefs.
48. Parents never seem to argue about their own problems; instead they argue with or about a child.
49. My father and I just end up yelling at each other when we try to discuss issues.
50. We are careful about bringing up touchy subjects with each other.
51. My parents work together to see rules are carried out around the house.
52. It's hard to break family routines at home.
53. When my mother and I disagree one of us ends up walking away angry.

Remember: A = Very true
 B = more true than false
 C = More false than true
 D = Very false

54. One or both of my parents show me exactly how to do my work.
55. There is a strong sense of loyalty in our family.
56. In my family I feel it is possible to get a rule changed by getting the help of one parent against the other.
57. In my family my father and I compromise to settle our differences.
58. When someone in my family tries to bring up an issue the other one puts off discussing it by saying, "I can't talk about it now."
59. My parents seem to fighting about the same thing again and again.
60. Rules are pretty flexible in our house.
61. My mother is too busy with her own life to give attention to me.
62. one or both of my parents let me do things for myself.
63. We feel accepted for who we are in my family.
64. The same person gets blamed for most of the problems in our family.
65. My father seldom responds when I need help or support.
66. We don't deal with situations that may bring about an argument between us.
67. Arguments between my parents end up with one of them feeling resentful and hurt.
68. As I grow older I find it easy to get more freedom from my parents.
69. My mother and I seem to be f fighting about the same thing again and again.
70. When I am having difficulties I am encouraged to think of and carry through my own solution.
71. We spend very little time together in our family.
72. One parent often protects or defends me at home.
73. My father puts a lot of energy into doing things with and forme.

Remember: A = Very true
 B = more true than false
 C = More false than true
 D = Very false

74. My parents back each other up in disciplining the children.
75. Family members seem to "pair off" in the same way around issues in discussions or fights.
76. When someone in my family gets hurt or upset we all get involved.
77. In our family my mother and I compromise to settle our differences.
78. So much attention is needed by me that my parents never seem to discuss issues just about themselves.
79. Arguments between my father and I end up with one of us feeling hurt or angry.
80. In my family my parents just end up yelling at each other when they try to discuss issues.
81. In my family people feel "cut off" from each other.
82. When my parents disagree about an issue they sometimes make me feel "caught in the middle".
83. I have difficulty making decisions on my own and accepting responsibility for my choices.

APPENDIX D

GENDER ROLE CONFLICT SCALE

Instructions: In the space to the left of each sentence below, write the number which most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is not right or wrong answer to each statement: your own reaction is what is asked for.

Strongly Disagree					Strongly	
Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6
84. ___						
Moving up the career ladder is important to me.						
85. ___						
I have difficulty telling others that I care about them.						
86. ___						
Verbally expressing my love for another man is difficult for me.						
87. ___						
I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.						
88. ___						
Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.						
89. ___						
Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.						
90. ___						
Affection with other men makes me tense.						
91. ___						
I sometimes define my personal value with my career success.						
92. ___						
Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.						
93. ___						
Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.						
94. ___						
My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.						
95. ___						
I evaluate other people's values by their level of achievement and success.						
96. ___						
Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.						
97. ___						
I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.						
98. ___						
I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.						
99. ___						
Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.						
100. ___						
Finding time to relax is difficult for me.						
101. ___						
Doing well all the time is important to me.						
102. ___						
I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.						
103. ___						
Hugging other men is difficult for me.						
104. ___						
I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.						
105. ___						
Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.						
106. ___						
Competing with others is the best way to succeed.						

NEXT PAGE PLEASE

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

107. ___ Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.
108. ___ I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.
109. ___ I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others
110. ___ might perceive me.
111. ___ My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.
112. ___ I strive to be more successful than others.
113. ___ I do not like to show my emotions to other people.
114. ___ Telling my partner my feelings about her/him during sex is difficult for me.
115. ___ My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).
116. ___ I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.
117. ___ Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.
118. ___ Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.
119. ___ Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference.
120. ___ Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.
121. ___ I like to feel superior to other people.

APPENDIX E

CONFORMITY TO MASCULINE NORMS INVENTORY

This inventory is designed to measure attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling SD for "Strongly Disagree", D for "Disagree", A for "Agree", or SA for "Strongly agree" to the left of the statement. There are no right or wrong responses to the statements.

It is important that you respond to all the statements in the inventory and best if you respond with your first impression when answering. Also, please note what time it is now and record how long it takes you to complete this measure (not all the measures your packet) in the space below.

Minutes it took to complete this measure _____.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---|---|----|---|
| 1. | SD | D | A | SA | It is best to keep your emotions hidden |
| 2. | SD | D | A | SA | In general, I will do anything to win |
| 3. | SD | D | A | SA | It is shameful for me to give in to pain |
| 4. | SD | D | A | SA | I usually try to remain anonymous |
| 5. | SD | D | A | SA | I don't mind losing |
| 6. | SD | D | A | SA | If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners |
| 7. | SD | D | A | SA | Its never worth the effort to insist that you are right |
| 8. | SD | D | A | SA | I avoid anything that might be physically painful |
| 9. | SD | D | A | SA | I always make sure that I'm in control of women |
| 10. | SD | D | A | SA | I would only be satisfied with sex if there was an emotional bond |
| 11. | SD | D | A | SA | I try to avoid being perceived as gay |
| 12. | SD | D | A | SA | If there is going to be violence, I find a way to avoid it |
| 13. | SD | D | A | SA | It would not bother me at all if someone thought I was gay |
| 14. | SD | D | A | SA | Dealing with pain is usually mind over matter |
| 15. | SD | D | A | SA | Being admired by others is important to me |

16. SD D A SA I would feel good if I had many sexual partners
17. SD D A SA In general, I must get my way
18. SD D A SA Violence is almost never justified
19. SD D A SA I should take every opportunity to show my feelings
20. SD D A SA In general, I should take care of my own problems
21. SD D A SA Trying to be important is the greatest waste of time
22. SD D A SA It is important for me to keep my emotions under control
23. SD D A SA When I am hurt, I try to “walk it off”
24. SD D A SA I am comfortable trying to get my way
25. SD D A SA I respect homosexuals
26. SD D A SA I am always the first to start a fight
27. SD D A SA I always rely on others
28. SD D A SA I prefer to stay unemotional
29. SD D A SA I like to avoid things that might be physically painful
30. SD D A SA I make sure people do as I say
31. SD D A SA The first thing a person should do is ask for help
32. SD D A SA I believe that violence is never justified
33. SD D A SA Taking dangerous risks helps me to prove myself
34. SD D A SA I feel proud of myself when I tough it out
35. SD D A SA In general, I do not expend a lot of energy trying to win at things
36. SD D A SA An emotional bond with a partner is the best part of sex
37. SD D A SA I am often absorbed in my work
38. SD D A SA Winning isn’t everything, it’s the only thing

39. SD D A SA If you walk away from a fight, you are a coward
40. SD D A SA I believe one has to risk something to gain something
41. SD D A SA Ignoring pain is foolish
42. SD D A SA I do not spend any energy trying to beat other people
43. SD D A SA Everyone can use a helping hand
44. SD D A SA In general, I do not like risky situations
45. SD D A SA I am uncomfortable seeing violence
46. SD D A SA Being thought of as gay is not a bad thing
47. SD D A SA I never take chances
48. SD D A SA More often than not, losing does not bother me
49. SD D A SA I am very uncomfortable insisting that things be done my way
50. SD D A SA Feelings are important to show
51. SD D A SA I feel miserable when work occupies all my attention
52. SD D A SA Having status is the most important thing in my life
53. SD D A SA Winning is not my first priority
54. SD D A SA I tend to let others be in charge
55. SD D A SA I will only be satisfied when women are equal to men
56. SD D A SA I make sure that people think I am heterosexual
57. SD D A SA Any kind of physical hardship makes me very unhappy
58. SD D A SA I am disgusted by any kind of violence
59. SD D A SA I would hate to be important
60. SD D A SA I love to explore my feelings with others
61. SD D A SA If I could, I would date a lot of different people

62. SD D A SA I ask for help when I need it
63. SD D A SA I enjoy taking risks
64. SD D A SA My work is the most important part of my life
65. SD D A SA I would only have sex if I was in a committed relationship
66. SD D A SA I make sure people see my point of view
67. SD D A SA I like fighting
68. SD D A SA I should be in charge
69. SD D A SA I would be friends with a gay man
70. SD D A SA I bring up my feelings when talking to others
71. SD D A SA I should be physically tough as nails
72. SD D A SA I don't like giving all my attention to work
73. SD D A SA I only get romantically involved with one person
74. SD D A SA I take risks
75. SD D A SA I never do things to be an important person
76. SD D A SA I never avoid physical hardship
77. SD D A SA I hate asking for help
78. SD D A SA It is important to me that people think I am heterosexual
79. SD D A SA I never let work get in the way of other things
80. SD D A SA I feel best about my relationships with women when we are equals
81. SD D A SA It feels good to be important
82. SD D A SA Asking for help is a sign of failure
83. SD D A SA In general, I control the women in my life
84. SD D A SA Sometimes I will do things so others will admire me
85. SD D A SA It is important for me to win

86. SD D A SA I would be furious if someone thought I was gay
87. SD D A SA I believe in “better safe than sorry”
88. SD D A SA I feel uncomfortable when others see me as important
89. SD D A SA It would be awful if people thought I was gay
90. SD D A SA I tend to be comfortable when women are serving men
91. SD D A SA I like to talk about my feelings
92. SD D A SA I would sacrifice just about anything to achieve status in life
93. SD D A SA I never ask for help
94. SD D A SA I never take time off from work
95. SD D A SA I treat women as equals
96. SD D A SA It is foolish to take risks
97. SD D A SA I like watching violent games
98. SD D A SA Work is not the most important thing in my life
99. SD D A SA Men and women should respect each other as equals
100. SD D A SA I feel a little down when I lose
101. SD D A SA I am most satisfied when I can tell people what to do
102. SD D A SA Long term relationships are better than casual sexual encounters
103. SD D A SA Having status is not very important to me
104. SD D A SA I frequently put myself in risky situations
105. SD D A SA Women should be subservient to men
106. SD D A SA When there is a conflict, I will almost always back down
107. SD D A SA I feel good when work is my first priority
108. SD D A SA I tend to keep my feelings to myself

109. SD D A SA For me working is only about getting a paycheck
110. SD D A SA Emotional involvement should be avoided when having sex
111. SD D A SA Winning is not important to me
112. SD D A SA I take active steps to help women gain equality
113. SD D A SA I hate any kind of risk
114. SD D A SA I never share my feelings
115. SD D A SA Oftentimes, letting others have their way is the best course of action
116. SD D A SA I am happiest when I'm risking danger
117. SD D A SA Men should not have power over women
118. SD D A SA I admit to others when I am in physical pain
119. SD D A SA I would feel uncomfortable if someone thought I was gay
120. SD D A SA I am not ashamed to ask for help
121. SD D A SA The best feeling in the world comes from winning
122. SD D A SA I'm comfortable letting others take the lead
123. SD D A SA Work comes first
124. SD D A SA I tend to share my feelings
125. SD D A SA I feel satisfied when I can focus on my work
126. SD D A SA I like emotional involvement in a romantic relationship
127. SD D A SA No matter what the situation I would never act violently
128. SD D A SA I am only happy when I feel really important
129. SD D A SA If someone thought I was gay, I would not argue with them about it
130. SD D A SA Things tend to be better when men are in charge
131. SD D A SA I prefer to be safe and careful

132. SD D A SA A person shouldn't get tied down to dating just one person
133. SD D A SA I tend to invest my energy in things other than work
134. SD D A SA It bothers me when I have to ask for help
135. SD D A SA I love it when men are in charge of women
136. SD D A SA I am willing to get into a physical fight if necessary
137. SD D A SA I like having gay friends
138. SD D A SA It would be enjoyable to date more than one person at a time
139. SD D A SA Physical hardship should be avoided at all costs
140. SD D A SA I rely on myself
141. SD D A SA Sometimes violent action is necessary
142. SD D A SA I hate it when people ask me to talk about my feelings
143. SD D A SA I work hard to win
144. SD D A SA I am happiest when others are helping me

THANKS AGAIN!

DON'T FORGET TO ENTER YOUR TIME AT THE TOP!
