

CONFORMITY TO MASCULINE NORMS, GENDER ROLE CONFLICT AND
RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION IN INTER-MALE FRIENDSHIPS

By

Zachary Joseph Rankin

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Psychology: Counseling

Committee Membership

Dr. Emily Sommerman, Committee Chair

Dr. Gregg Gold, Committee Member

Dr. Elizabeth Watson, Committee Member

Dr. Emily Sommerman, Graduate Coordinator

May 2013

ABSTRACT

Conformity to Masculine Norms, Gender Role Conflict and Relationship Satisfaction in Inter-male Friendships

Zachary Rankin

From an early age and consistently throughout the lifespan, men are inundated with messages about what it means to be a man, and consistently discouraged from displaying any vulnerable emotions. Masculinity research has increasingly focused on understanding the effects of traditional norms of masculinity and gender-linked stressors, known as gender role conflict, on the lives and psychological well-being of men. However, little is known about how these factors may impact men's relationship satisfaction in their friendships with other men. In this study, participants' levels of conformity to traditional masculine norms and gender-linked stress were measured and analyzed in relation to their levels of relationship satisfaction in inter-male friendships. Respondents with more conformity to traditional masculine norms were found to have higher levels of gender role conflict, supporting existing research findings. Gender role conflict was found to significantly negatively correlate with friendship satisfaction, suggesting that men experiencing more gender-linked stress in their lives have less fulfilling friendships with other men.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Innumerable people have contributed to the creation and completion of this thesis.

Thanks to my committee: first and foremost to Emily Sommerman, my advisor, for drawing out my interests and somehow making them into a doable thesis, and for her patience, wisdom and guidance over the last two years. Thanks to Gregg Gold for his support, good humor and invaluable contributions to the design of my study. And thanks to Betsy Watson, who taught me to write like a professional, had faith in me when I didn't, and was the first person to ask me about graduate school.

Thanks to Ariel, my wife-to-be, whose love, persistence and faith in me have made this and so many other things possible. There are not words to convey the depths of my love for her and gratitude for her presence in my life.

Thanks to my dad, Len, for showing me how it's all done, and to my mom, Michelle, for somehow already knowing how to do it all despite not doing it for a living. And to the rest of my family, especially Jenny, Marvin, Cyrus, Eloise, Brad and Kathe, Elyssa, Rob, Jalen, Zophia, my grandparents Hal and Martha, Aunt Kristen, Uncle Mike, Brittany, Uncle Rick and Emily, for their unfaltering love and encouragement in the face of setbacks, wisecracks and progress (if not quite perfection).

Thanks to Deanna Beeler for teaching me the paramount importance of laughter.

Thanks to Sheri Whitt for the mirth, ideas and challenges, and thanks to Lou Ann Wieand for getting my feet wet.

Thanks to Amy Hundley for seeing more than a dishwasher.

Thanks to Isaac Dietz for the two decades of laughter that are still going strong and for reminding me to push myself. And thanks to Suzanne Dietz for being the world's best second mom.

Thanks to Serena Golden for somehow sticking with me through it all.

Finally, an enormous thank you to my wonderful cohorties, each and every one of whom has made me a better student, counselor, friend and human being. I could not have been blessed with a better group of people to enter this field with.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Socialization	3
Men's Gender Identity	5
Inter-male Friendships.....	7
Gender Role Conflict	8
Success, Power and Competition.....	9
Restrictive Emotionality	10
Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men.....	11
Conflict Between Work and Family.....	12
The GRCS	13
Conformity to Masculine Norms.....	14
METHODS	16
Participants and Procedure	16
Scales.....	17
The CMNI-46	17
The GRCS.....	18
The RAS	18
Hypotheses	19
Hypothesis one	19
Hypothesis two	19

Hypothesis three	20
Statistical Analyses	21
RESULTS	22
Descriptive Statistics	22
Hypotheses	22
Hypothesis one	22
Hypothesis two	23
Hypothesis three	23
DISCUSSION	30
WORKS CITED	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – <i>Descriptive statistics</i>	25
Table 2 – <i>Age in years</i>	26
Table 3 – <i>Correlation between GRCS total scores and CMNI-46 total scores</i>	27
Table 4 – <i>Correlation between RE and RABBM scores and HSP scores</i>	28
Table 5 - <i>Correlation between GRCS/CMNI-46 total scores and RAS total scores</i>	29

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Informed consent.....	46
APPENDIX B - Debriefing	49
APPENDIX C – Gender Role Conflict Scale.....	50
APPENDIX D – Relationship Assessment Scale.....	65
APPENDIX E – Friendship Assessment Scale.....	67

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

From early childhood, boys are discouraged from displaying vulnerable emotion. Parents and peers positively reinforce cognitive and aggressive behavior in boys as they grow, and send a clear message that vulnerable feelings are okay for girls but not for boys. Research shows that these pressures are present throughout the lifespan, and that even young boys receive a myriad of messages about how males are supposed to behave (Cassano & Zeman, 2010; Crick, 1997; Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2003). Pressures to conform to masculine norms have been associated with psychological maladjustment throughout men's lives and remain a relevant factor in shaping their psychological and emotional well-being (Shepard, 2002).

The awareness of these pressures that men face throughout their lives has directed the focus of contemporary masculinity research. Much research is focused on the role of traditional masculine norms in men's lives. Specifically, research is geared toward understanding the different types of norms and expectations for masculine behavior that are put on men, and how men's adherence or lack of adherence to these norms is related to their psychological well-being (Liu, Rochlen & Mohr, 2005; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Some research has found that even as children, males are aware of pressures to enact certain masculine behaviors, and that that awareness is associated with psychological maladjustment (Egan & Perry, 2001). A consistent finding of masculinity

research is that traditional norms are still salient in men's lives, and often in a negative way: higher degrees of conformity to traditional masculine norms have been found to correlate with psychological distress and decreased relationship satisfaction, as well as domestic violence (Mahalik & Cournoyer, 2004; Wong, Owen & Shea, 2012).

Research has examined friendship from a number of angles. It covers nearly the entire lifespan: there is research focused on friendship groups and characteristics in early childhood, middle childhood, adolescence, college, and later adulthood. Longitudinal studies have shed light on a host of different processes that influence friendships over time (Lansford & Parker, 1999). And much of the friendship research controls for gender, and, as a result, there is a significant body of research focused on differences between male and female friendship groups, particularly earlier in life (Fehr, 2004; Rose & Asher, 1999). What is lacking, however, is a dedicated body of research focused on the characteristics of inter-male friendships.

Such research may be lacking because a significant component of the pressure facing men is the idea that men need to be in charge and achieve status over other men. There is little room within ideals of traditional masculinity for men to bond with and support one another. The present study aims to contribute to the growing body of research on men's gender identities and the lack of research on men's friendships by examining whether relationships with other men could be a source of support and a respite from the socialized pressures men face.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Socialization

Gender socialization research demonstrates that men and women undergo different socialization processes throughout the course of their lives. These processes are present and powerful from early childhood through adolescence and into adulthood. Research has already demonstrated that a family of origin's emotional expressiveness influences the individual expressiveness of the children of that family (Halberstadt, 1986). Further research into specific socialization processes present in childhood supports and informs research findings that highlight potential explanations for the roots of restricted emotional expression in adult men. From a young age, men are discouraged from expression vulnerable emotion, particularly by their fathers (Cassano & Zeman, 2010; Chaplin, Cole & Zahn-Waxler, 2005; Lytton & Romney, 1991). Perhaps unsurprising, then, is the subsequent finding that grown men tend to avoid expression of non-aggressive forms of negative emotion (Green & Addis, 2012). Boys are challenged and encouraged to express themselves cognitively and to pursue science as an academic endeavor (Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2003). They are also encouraged, if indirectly, to express their negative emotions in the form of anger or frustration (Crick, 1997).

Socialization plays an important role during adolescence, as well. Peer groups are a significant influence in adolescent's lives, and can have a significant effect on the psychological well-being of the group's individual members, both male and female (Conway, et. al., 2011; Giletta, Scholte, Burk, Engels & Larsen, 2011). But there are unique characteristics of adolescent males. They are more willing than females to follow friends into committing deviant or antisocial behavior, regardless of perceived peer pressure (Brown, Clasen & Eicher, 1986). Disturbingly, this behavior may include aggression toward romantic partners (Capaldi, Dishion, Stoolmiller & Yoerger, 2001). A potential explanation can be found in Poulin and Boivin (2000), who found that proactively aggressive boys tend to attract and befriend other proactively aggressive boys. The suggestion is that aggressive friends positively reinforce one another's behavior, essentially creating a feedback loop that reinforces aggression. The encouragement of emotional suppression experienced by young boys can be seen in adolescent populations as well. Social pressures to be strong (or to *not* be weak) discourage and stigmatize help-seeking behaviors (Timlin-Scalera, Ponterotto, Blumberg & Jackson, 2003), a recurring theme in masculinity research.

External pressures continue to influence men's behaviors in adulthood. However, it is difficult to draw the line between contemporary pressures and patterns of behavior reinforced by growing up male. Childhood influences do not go away; adult men tend to follow the patterns of limited emotional expressivity established in childhood (King &

Emmons, 1990). Simpson and Stroh (2004) found that men in the workplace typically expressed aggression or anger in place of vulnerable emotion, following traditional male patterns of emotional expression. Men who followed these patterns also reported feeling the highest levels of personal inauthenticity, suggesting that traditionally socialized modes of emotional expression are insufficient in communicating men's actual feelings.

Men's Gender Identity

Socialization research that illustrates the pressures and processes facing modern-day men may help explain why men exhibit varying degrees on emotional expressiveness. And although it illuminates the processes that shape male identity, it does not explain the results of those processes. How men integrate and understand their identities as men is its own field of research. Wade (1998) attempted to explain male identity in terms of "male reference group identity dependence," theorizing that the strength of men's masculine identities is derived from a sense of belonging or togetherness with other men, and that men depend on other men (to varying degrees) to inform their understanding of themselves as men (that is, their gender self-concept).

Wade's theory is unique in that it addresses factors that influence the development of a man's understanding of his gender and the present degree of strength of that identity. And, although it does not directly address the issue of inter-male friendship, it at least acknowledges the significance of the influence men have on each other's lives.

Unfortunately, that influence is not always positive. Wade and Brittan-Powell (2001) found that men who relied more on a masculine group to inform their own masculine identity harbored more negative feelings toward racial and sexual equality. This particular article recalled the Poulin and Boivin (2000) finding that proactively aggressive boys tended to be friends with other proactively aggressive boys. Although Wade and Brittan-Powell measured different constructs (attitudes about gender and ethnic equality, rather than aggressiveness), both studies reinforce some of the negative implications about inter-male relationships highlighted by research comparing characteristics of boys' and girls' friendships.

The effect of socialization pressures on how men ultimately understand their gender identity is as complex as the individual processes themselves, and scales have been developed that measure a number of different facets of gender identity. Some of the scales quantify gender roles according to masculine, feminine or androgynous categories. An overriding finding of this research has been that people with masculine gender roles are far more likely to express anger and aggressiveness than people with feminine or androgynous roles (Kopper, 1993; Kopper & Epperson, 1996). Significant research has also been done assessing individuals' *perceptions* of their gender identity, and has highlighted the salience of gender identity throughout the lifespan (ie Wade, 1998). Some of this research reiterates the negative effect of gender pressures on childhood adjustment.

Early gender identity research found that less traditionally masculine men tended to be less secure in their gender identity, and tended to have higher levels of anxiety, depression and maladjustment (O’Heron & Orlofsky, 1990). Subsequent research has supported the finding that males who conform less to traditionally masculine roles tend to be less well-adjusted. Perceptions of gender identity and the associated pressures seem to result in an increased level of maladjustment in children (Egan & Perry, 2001). Although Corby, Hodges and Perry (2007) point out that this appears to be truer of white children than children of other ethnicities, gender identity has been identified as a salient factor in the well-being of Asian and African American men, as well (Liu, 2002; Wade, 2008).

Inter-male Friendships

There is a wealth of research exploring the characteristics of friendships in different developmental and social contexts. Much of that research controls for gender, and provides information about the differences between male and female friendship groups. The research is valuable but limited, in that it narrows the scope of analysis that can be used to better understand intra-gender friendships. Between-gender friendship comparisons often carry the same basic message about intra-male behavior that they do about individual male behavior: for example, that friendships between boys are more aggressive and less intimate than those between girls (Lansford & Parker, 1999; Fehr, 2004), and that boys as a whole are less prosocial (Rose & Asher, 1999).

Research that shifts its attention from inter-gender differences to the unique characteristics of inter-male friendships provides different and illuminating results. Stinson and Ickes (1992) found that male friends' levels of empathic accuracy were interdependent, indicating a shared understanding of one another and a deeper connection than a simple reinforcement of aggressive or antisocial behavior. Fehr (2004) suggests that men are more likely than women to develop closeness in a same-sex friendship through the process of sharing activities, rather than solely by self-disclosing.

Although men's friendships are influenced by the socialization processes that govern men's expression and suppression of emotion, they may also provide an opportunity for men to connect and enjoy some degree of emotional reciprocity. There is a need to conduct masculinity research in general, and research into male friendships in particular, that explores the positive aspects of male relationships while acknowledging the reality of socialized constrictions.

Gender Role Conflict

Gender role conflict arises when proscribed gender role behavior, which is learned and embedded through socialization, results in some violation or restriction of the self or another. This violation can be achieved by following or refusing to follow socially-prescribed gendered behaviors. There are four factors of gender role conflict: Success, Power and Competition; Restrictive Emotionality; Restrictive Affectionate

Behavior Between Men; and Conflict Between Work and Family (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David & Wrightsman, 1986).

Success, Power and Competition

The Success, Power and Competition factor of gender role conflict refers to the emphasis an individual places on achieving personal and career success, as well as exercising control over (and engaging in competition with) others, and is arguably the most complex of the four factors of gender role conflict. All three components of this factor are relevant in men's lives both individually and together. The literature on Success, Power and Competition in men serves as a reminder that not every aspect of gender role conflict is in and of itself negative for the person experiencing it. Men who have higher levels of Success, Power and Competition may be rewarded, directly or indirectly, for behaviors that may infringe upon the rights or psychological well-being of others (Jacobs & McClelland, 1994). The underlying emphasis of the factor is on socially-encouraged male behavior having a negative effect on others.

Much research focuses on positive correlates and predictors of success. Some has focused on the role of education in predicting career success (e.g. Elman & O'Rand, 2004). Other research has confirmed that positive self-evaluations are associated with more career success and higher levels of job and life satisfaction (Judge, Bono, Erez & Locke, 2005). While higher self-esteem or other self-evaluations may lead to career success, they may also have a downside. Although research remains conflicted, there

have been findings that higher levels of self-esteem or beliefs of personal superiority may correlate with or predict higher levels of aggression (Baumeister, 1996; Diamantopoulou, Rydell & Henricsson, 2008; Kirkpatrick, Waugh, Valencia & Webster, 2002). The notion that higher levels of self-esteem may contribute to both greater career success and the potential for aggression demonstrates one of the potentially disparate outcomes of male socialization: that the same behavior and ways of viewing the self that contribute to career success may also contribute to aggression against others.

Jacobs and McClelland (1994) found successful male managers to be more likely to assert aggressive acts of control over co-workers and subordinates than both successful female managers and male managers who had achieved a lower level of success. Research findings illuminate the interconnectedness of the three components of the factor, in that competition with others and the use of power over others often accompanies a higher level of success. The findings also illustrate the potential relationship between male socialization and gender role conflict, in that men whose behavior is in line with the factor of Success, Power and Competition may be rewarded with advancement in the workplace.

Restrictive Emotionality

As addressed in socialization research, men are discouraged from displaying vulnerable emotion from a young age, encouraged to pursue cognitive tasks, and addressed using more cognitive language. The Restrictive Emotionality factor of gender

role conflict, which measures the discomfort men feel with the expression of their own emotions and the emotions of others, may be the manifestation of these socialization processes. The repression of feelings that might be classified as feminine, and underlying feelings of homophobia, also underscore this factor. Two important correlates of Restrictive Emotionality are a negative perception of the *expression* of emotion (not just the emotion itself) and a difficulty identifying emotion in the first place (Wong, Pituch & Rochlen, 2006). This suggests that men may be socialized against expressing emotion to such a degree that they lack the vocabulary for, and have an active aversion to, doing so. Meta-analysis also reveals that men simply smile less than women (LaFrance, Hecht & Paluck, 2003). Underscoring the severity of men's restriction of emotion is the consistent finding that it correlates with physical abuse (Cohn, Jakupcak, Seibert, Hildebrandt & Zeichner, 2010; Tager, Good & Brammer, 2010). That is not to say that the negative effects of Restrictive Emotionality are only external. Men with higher levels of Restrictive Emotionality have been found to have higher levels of self-dislike, feelings of failure, guilt, and other generally negative self-perceptions (Shepard, 2002).

Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men

Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men is the factor of gender role conflict that addresses a man's avoidance of and displeasure at expressing or receiving caring emotions to or from another man. Its existence is to be expected, given the body of literature demonstrating the general repression of men's emotional expression, and

supported even in early friendship research (e.g. Hays, 1985). This factor is especially relevant to therapy, as it can damage the therapeutic relationship in two ways. The presence of Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men is associated with less willingness to seek counseling (Good, Dell & Mintz, 1989), but the presence of this restriction is not solely confined to the client. A male therapist may have his own level of resistance to the expression of affectionate behavior between men, and such resistance might lead him to misinterpret the client's expression of vulnerable emotion as some pathological symptom, especially in the case of a homosexual client (Ipsaro, 1986).

Conflict Between Work and Family

The Conflict Between Work and Family factor of gender role conflict addresses the degree to which men's attempts to succeed professionally interfere with their family lives. There is evidence that there is still a significant gendered split between work and family roles (McElwain, Korabik & Rosin, 2005), which had been observed in previous research (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991). There are a number of contributors to the conflict between work and family. They include interrole conflict, in which successfully fulfilling either a work role makes it difficult to achieve a family role, or vice versa, and time-based conflict, in which insufficient time exists to fully meet the requirements of both roles (Netemeyer, Boles & McMurrian, 1996). Some research suggests that men experience higher levels of work-family conflict, and that the way most men with traditional perceptions of gender deal with the conflict is to spend as much time as

possible meeting their work demands, rather than working to find a balance between work and family life (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2007). This coping strategy, focusing on accommodating work stresses instead of addressing family needs, is in keeping with the socialization processes that encourage finding success over displaying emotion.

The GRCS

Gender role conflict is measured using Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil, et. al., 1986), which quantifies the four factors of gender role conflict. The GRCS is one of the most widely-used assessment tools in masculinity research, and it often highlights the negative traits that correlate with higher levels of gender role conflict. Higher levels of gender role conflict have been found to positively correlate with measures of distress, such as anxiety (Liu, Rochlen & Mohr, 2005), and negatively correlate with measures of well-being, including self-esteem (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Mahalik and Cournoyer (2004) found that depressed men reported higher levels of all four factors of gender role conflict than non-depressed men. Although there have been encouraging findings that social support may moderate some aspects of gender role conflict (Wester, Christianson, Fowell, Vogel & Wei, 2007), those findings are tempered by indications that men who report higher levels of gender role conflict may be less likely to seek social support or psychological counseling (Mahalik, Cournoyer, DeFranc, Cherry & Napolitano, 1998; Pederson & Vogel, 2007). Specifically, higher levels of

Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men tend to correlate with a lower likelihood of seeking counseling (Good, Dell & Mintz, 1989).

Conformity to Masculine Norms

The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik, et. al., 2003), and its short-form, the CMNI-46 (Parent & Moradi, 2011), measure the degree of an individual's identification with traditional characteristics of American masculinity. The CMNI was developed after factor analysis and review of the literature surrounding masculine norms in the United States, and consists of eleven distinct factors: Winning, Emotional Control, Risk-Taking, Violence, Dominance, Playboy, Self-Reliance, Primacy of Work, Power Over Women, Disdain for Homosexuals, and Pursuit of Status.

The general tone of research using the CMNI is similar to that of research using the GRCS, in that many of the findings highlight the negative or maladaptive traits that correlate with higher levels of conformity to masculine norms. As is the case with higher levels of gender role conflict, more conformity to traditional masculine norms has been found to correlate with negative attitudes about help-seeking (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2012). Higher GRCS scores have been found to correlate with anxiety (Liu, Rochlen & Mohr, 2005); similarly, higher CMNI scores have sometimes been found to correlate with depression (Iwamoto, Liao & Liu, 2010) and other measures of psychological distress (Wong, Owen & Shea, 2012). While some research has attempted to explore the

beneficial aspects of adherence to traditional masculine norms, the findings have been mixed (Hammer & Good, 2010).

Relatively little research has been conducted using both the GRCS and the CMNI (or its short-form, the CMNI-46). The research that does use both generally reinforces the established knowledge about gender role conflict and traditional masculinity: for example, that both constructs contribute to and correlate with higher levels of aggression (Cohn & Zeichner, 2006). The lack of research using both scales is puzzling given the widespread use of each scale individually. The two measure distinct, important and related concepts, and seem like a logical pairing in masculinity research.

METHODS

Participants and Procedure

Participants were recruited from Hanover College's online psychological research volunteer pool, as well as through convenience sampling on Facebook and via email. Hanover College students received extra credit for participating in the study. However, the Hanover College online psychological research volunteer pool is open to public access, so not every participant who completed the study through the Hanover College website necessarily received extra credit. It was anticipated that participants would be recruited through Humboldt State University's undergraduate psychology volunteer research pool, but that volunteer pool is not accessible to gender-based studies. In this case, the only demographic criterion was gender: participation in the study was limited to people who identified as male.

Scales assessing friendship satisfaction, conformity to male norms and levels of gender role conflict were digitally administered through <http://www.surveymonkey.com>. Participants were directed to the appropriate website via a hyperlink, where they were presented with an informed consent form (Appendix A), provided some basic demographic information, and filled out the three scales. Upon finishing the survey, participants were given a brief explanation of the purpose of the scales they had

completed, and the potential benefit of the research they had participated in. Participants were also given the number of the United Way Crisis Helpline (Appendix B).

Scales

The CMNI-46

Respondents' conformity to masculine norms was measured using the CMNI-46 (Parent & Moradi, 2009), a 46-item short-form of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (Mahalik, et. al., 2003). The CMNI-46 measures conformity to masculine norms across nine subscales: Winning; Emotional Control; Risk-Taking; Violence; Power Over Women; Playboy; Self-Reliance; Primacy of Work; and Heterosexual Self-Presentation.

Psychometric analysis supports the use of the CMNI-46 in measuring masculinity and adherence to masculine norms. Its construction of the concept of conformity to masculine norms has been determined to be distinct from other potentially overlapping dimensions of personality and self-esteem (Parent, Moradi, Rummell & Tokar, 2011). The CMNI-46 has also demonstrated good validity, reliability and factor structure. CMNI-46 subscales were found to correlate with both convergent and discriminant validity indicators, and Cronbach's alphas for each of the subscales ranged from .78 to .89 (median .82). Each alpha score fell within the good to excellent range, indicating high levels of internal consistency reliability. (Parent & Moradi, 2011).

The GRCS

Gender role conflict was assessed by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (Appendix C; GRCS; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David & Wrightsman, 1986). The GRCS, widely-used in masculinity research, measures an individual's level of gender role conflict across four subscales: Success, Power and Competition; Restrictive Emotionality; Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; and Conflict Between Work and Family. Like the CMNI-46, the GRCS has been supported by psychometric analysis. Factor analysis confirms the scale's structural validity (Moradi, Tokar, Schaub, Jome & Serna, 2000). A review of the scale's internal consistency across a number of studies indicated good internal consistency, and indicated good construct validity (Good, et. al., 1995).

The RAS

Friendship satisfaction was measured by modifying the Relationship Assessment Scale (Appendix D; RAS; Hendrick, Dicke & Hendrick, 1998) to address friendship rather than a romantic relationship (Appendix E). The RAS has been modified to measure friendship satisfaction in other studies (e.g., Morry, 2003; 2005). The RAS consists of seven questions using a five-point Likert scale to measure various aspects of relationship satisfaction. Responses range from 1, indicating the lowest level of satisfaction, to 5, indicating the highest level of satisfaction, with some items reverse-scored. Questions include, "In general, how satisfied are you with your friendship?" and "How many problems are there in your friendship?" Respondents were asked how many

male friends they have, and were instructed to complete the scale in regards to their closest current or most recent inter-male friendship. They were instructed not to fill out the scale if they had never had an inter-male friendship. Respondents were asked if they were still in the friendship they referred to in filling out the scale, and asked to provide the length of the friendship in years and months.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis one

GRCS and CMNI-46 total scores will have a significant positive correlation.

Rationale

Correlation between the total scores would indicate that men who adhere more strongly to traditional norms of masculinity also experience greater levels of gender role conflict. A significant positive correlation between GRCS and CMNI scores was found in Mahalik, et. al.'s (2003) initial development of the CMNI, and has been demonstrated in subsequent research using both scales (e.g. Cohn & Zeichner, 2006).

Hypothesis two

There will be a significant positive correlation between two GRCS subscales, Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Restriction of Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and one CMNI-46 subscale, Heterosexual Self-Presentation (HSP).

Rationale

This hypothesis is based on the body of socialization research that illustrates the numerous processes that discourage men from expressing emotion (e.g. Cassano & Zeman, 2010). It is also informed by the similarity between the RE and RABBM subscales: the former measures a participant's overall level of emotional restriction while the latter measures one area of emotional restriction more specifically. The RABBM is constructed, in part, to measure homophobia, and the presence of homophobia in the subscale suggests a potential link between it and the Heterosexual Self-Presentation measured by the CMNI-46.

Hypothesis three

There will be a significant negative correlation between the GRCS/CMNI-46 total scores and RAS total scores.

Rationale

Existing research demonstrates the negative relationship between gender role conflict and relationship satisfaction (Campbell & Snow, 1992), as well as between conformity to traditional masculinity and relationship satisfaction (Burn & Ward, 2005). It is expected that the present study will support those findings, with the small but significant shift of assessing friendship satisfaction instead of satisfaction in romantic relationships.

Statistical Analyses

Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the strength and significance of the anticipated correlations.

RESULTS

The goal of the present study was to examine the potential relationship between levels of gender role conflict, conformity to masculine norms, and levels of friendship satisfaction in 18+ year old men. These constructs were measured using the self-report Gender Role Conflict Scale, Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46, and a Relationship Assessment Scale that was modified to assess for satisfaction in friendships as opposed to romantic relationships.

Descriptive Statistics

A total of 77 participants started the survey, all of whom identified as male. Of those 77, 64 (83.1%) completed the first scale, the CMNI-46. Of those 64, 52 (67.5% of the original 77) completed the second scale, the GRCS. Of the remaining 52 participants, 50 (64.9% of the original 77) completed the third and final scale, the FAS (see Table 1). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 52, with a mean age of 25.98 years and a mode age of 26 (see Table 2).

Hypotheses

Hypothesis one

GRCS and CMNI-46 total scores will have a significant positive correlation.

Using a one-tailed Pearson product moment correlation, participants' GRCS total scores ($M = 118.56$, $SD = 26.19$) significantly positively correlated with CMNI-46 total scores ($M = 53.78$, $SD = 16.36$), $r = .707$, $p = <.001$ (see Table 3).

Hypothesis two

There will be a significant positive correlation between two GRCS subscales, Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Restriction of Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and one CMNI-46 subscale, Heterosexual Self-Presentation (HSP).

Using a one-tailed Pearson product moment correlation, participants' RE subscale scores ($M = 31.02$, $SD = 9.99$) significantly positively correlated with RABBM subscale scores ($M = 18.77$, $SD = 7.32$), $r = .674$, $p = <.001$ (see Table 4).

Using a one-tailed Pearson product moment correlation, participants' RE subscale scores ($M = 31.02$, $SD = 9.99$) significantly positively correlated with HSP subscale scores ($M = 5.97$, $SD = 4.68$), $r = .377$, $p = .003$ (see Table 4).

Using a one-tailed Pearson product moment correlation, participants' RABBM subscale scores ($M = 18.77$, $SD = 7.32$) significantly positively correlated with HSP subscale scores ($M = 5.97$, $SD = 4.68$), $r = .683$, $p = <.001$ (see Table 4).

Hypothesis three

There will be a significant negative correlation between the GRCS/CMNI-46 total scores and RAS total scores.

Using a one-tailed Pearson product moment correlation, participants' GRCS total scores ($M = 118.56$, $SD = 26.19$) significantly negatively correlated with participants' RAS scores ($M = 4.12$, $SD = .65$), $r = -.337$, $p = <.01$ (see Table 5).

Using a one-tailed Pearson product moment correlation, participants' CMNI-46 total scores ($M = 53.78$, $SD = 16.36$) showed no significant negative correlation with participants' RAS scores ($M = 4.12$, $SD = .65$), $r = -.020$, $p = <.05$ (see Table 5).

Table 1

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CMNI-46 total score	64	0	83	53.78	16.356
GRCS total score	52	52	197	118.5 6	26.187
RAS score	50	3	5	4.12	.645
Valid N (listwise)	50				

Table 2

Age in years

What is your age in years?				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18	5	7.8	7.8	7.8
19	6	9.4	9.4	17.2
20	3	4.7	4.7	21.9
22	3	4.7	4.7	26.6
23	3	4.7	4.7	31.3
24	6	9.4	9.4	40.6
25	6	9.4	9.4	50.0
26	7	10.9	10.9	60.9
27	4	6.3	6.3	67.2
28	5	7.8	7.8	75.0
29	2	3.1	3.1	78.1
31	4	6.3	6.3	84.4
33	2	3.1	3.1	87.5
34	2	3.1	3.1	90.6
36	1	1.6	1.6	92.2
39	1	1.6	1.6	93.8
48	1	1.6	1.6	95.3
49	1	1.6	1.6	96.9
52	1	1.6	1.6	98.4
Open-Ended Response	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
Total	64	100.0	100.0	

Table 3

Correlation between GRCS total scores and CMNI-46 total scores

		GRCS total score	CMNI-46 total score
GRCS total score	Pearson Correlation	1	.707**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000
	N	52	52
CMNI-46 total score	Pearson Correlation	.707**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	
	N	52	64

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Table 4

Correlation between RE and RABBM scores and HSP scores

		Heterosexual Self- Presentation	RE	RABBM
Heterosexual Self- Presentation	Pearson Correlation	1	.377**	.683**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.003	.000
	N	63	52	52
RE	Pearson Correlation	.377**	1	.674**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.003		.000
	N	52	52	52
RABBM	Pearson Correlation	.683**	.674**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	52	52	52

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Table 5

Correlation between GRCS/CMNI-46 total scores and RAS total scores

		Correlations		
		GRCS total score	CMNI total score	RAS score
GRCS total score	Pearson Correlation	1	.707**	-.337**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000	.008
	N	52	52	50
CMNI total score	Pearson Correlation	.707**	1	-.020
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000		.445
	N	52	64	50
RAS score	Pearson Correlation	-.337**	-.020	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.008	.445	
	N	50	50	50

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

DISCUSSION

Nearly all of the study's hypotheses were supported by statistical analysis. Although further research is necessary to confirm some of the preliminary findings of the current study, especially those related to friendship satisfaction (an understudied area of masculinity research), the study's results have interesting implications for the field of masculinity and inter-male friendships.

A significant positive correlation was found between CMNI-46 and GRCS total scores, supporting the findings of previous research (Cohn & Zeichner, 2006). A more thorough analysis of the two scales shows a number of significant positive correlations between the total scores and subscales of each. Some of these correlations may be the result of construct overlap (for example, between the Winning subscale on the CMNI-46 and the Success, Power and Competition subscale of the GRCS). However, due to the distinctly different nature of the scales (the CMNI-46 is a measure of conformity to masculine norms; the GRCS is a measure of distress), it seems unlikely that the entirety of the apparent relationship between them is due to construct overlap. Developing a greater understanding of the relationship between the two scales, including where they overlap and where they measure distinct but related constructs, would allow for a more in-depth understanding of the potential link between traditional masculine norms and gender-related stress in contemporary men.

It was hypothesized that a significant positive correlation would exist between participants' scores on two GRCS subscales, Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Restriction of Affection Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and that scores on those subscales would also significantly positively correlate with scores on the Heterosexual Self-Presentation (HSP) subscale of the CMNI-46. That multi-layered hypothesis was supported: scores on the two GRCS subscales were found to significantly positively correlate with one another and with scores on the CMNI-46 subscale.

These findings help provide empirical support for the idea that men who struggle to express their emotions and/or have a negative view of emotional expression will be unlikely to express their emotions to another man. The finding that those men will also be more concerned with presenting themselves as heterosexual is more interesting, and may suggest that a persistent association between emotional expression and homosexuality exists in the minds of some modern men. This study's findings do not provide information as to the details of any potential relationship between these subscales. However, it does provide at least preliminary evidence that a relationship may exist.

The final hypothesis was that participants' GRCS and CMNI-46 total scores would significantly negatively correlate with their FAS total scores, indicating that men with higher levels of gender role conflict and a more rigid adherence to traditional male norms would have lower levels of satisfaction in their friendships with other men. This

hypothesis was only partially supported. There was a significant negative correlation between GRCS total scores and FAS total scores, indicating that participants with higher levels of gender role conflict have lower levels of relationship satisfaction in their inter-male friendships. However, there was no significant negative correlation between CMNI-46 total scores and FAS total scores, offering no evidence for a relationship between higher levels of conformity to masculine norms and lower levels of satisfaction in inter-male friendships.

A closer look at the correlations between GRCS subscales and FAS total scores reveals interesting information about the potential relationship between gender role conflict and satisfaction in inter-male friendships. The two GRCS subscales that significantly positively correlated with Heterosexual Self-Presentation, Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, both significantly negatively correlated with FAS total scores. Neither of the two other GRCS subscales, Success, Power and Competition (SPC) and Conflict Between Work and Leisure (CBWL), significantly negatively correlated with FAS total scores. Further research is needed to confirm and clarify the relationship between specific elements of gender role conflict and satisfaction in inter-male friendships. However, this preliminary data lends itself to the face-valid suggestion that the potential relationship between gender role conflict and lower levels of satisfaction in inter-male friendships may be rooted in a man's underlying aversion to expressing emotions, especially to other men.

A more thorough analysis of the CMNI-46 subscales reveals a significant negative correlation between the Self-Reliance subscale scores and FAS total scores. The correlation found in this study does not provide detailed information about the nature of the potential relationship between the concept of Self-Reliance (as measured on the CMNI-46) and relationship satisfaction in inter-male friendships; exploring that potential relationship is a task for future research. However, this preliminary finding may speak to participants feeling that being self-reliant is somehow incompatible with maintaining an emotionally fulfilling friendship with another man.

LIMITATIONS

Taking the scales in a certain order may have influenced participants' responses, and subsequent studies should randomize the order in which scales are presented to participants. Additionally, the present study had a relatively small sample size: only 50 participants completed all three measures. While the n was big enough that statistical analyses were significant at a meaningful level, a larger sample would help confirm the potential relationships demonstrated in this research. Although the CMNI-46 is a short-form scale, completing it does take a time commitment, especially in conjunction with other scales. Incentivizing future participants might result in a higher rate of survey completion.

Controlling the sample more strictly would help clarify findings, as well. The present study collected some basic demographic information but did not subject it to statistical analysis. Establishing a more significant level of control over the demographics of the participants, including controlling for basic information such as age, ethnicity, relationship status, educational level, etc., would allow for a more thorough analysis and better understanding of how masculine norms and gender role conflict relate to inter-male friendships for different groups of men.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should examine potential generational differences in men's levels of gender role conflict and conformity to masculine norms, and seek to identify similarities and differences between older and younger men, as the present study did not have a sample that was sufficiently age-diverse to make inter-generational comparisons. Future research should further investigate the potential relationships between men's friendship satisfaction and their emotional expression, heterosexual self-presentation, self-reliance, and other facets of traditional masculinity and gender role conflict.

WORKS CITED

- Baumeister, R. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to aggression and violence: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review*, *103*, 5-33. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.103.1.5
- Blazina, C. (2001). Analytic psychology and gender role conflict: The development of the fragile masculine self. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice Training*, *38*, 50-59. doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.38.1.50
- Breiding, M. (2004). Observed hostility and dominance as mediators of the relationship between husbands' gender role conflict and wives' outcomes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *51*(4), 429-436. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.51.4.429
- Brown, B., Clasen, D., & Eicher, S. (1986). Perceptions of peer pressure, peer conformity dispositions, and self-reported behavior among adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*(4), 521-530. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.22.4.521
- Burn, S. & Ward, A. (2005). Men's conformity to traditional masculinity and relationship satisfaction. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *6*, 254-263. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.4.254
- Campbell, J. & Snow, B. (1992). Gender role conflict and family environment as predictors of men's marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *6*, 84-87. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.6.1.84
- Cassano, M. & Zeman, J. (2010). Parental socialization of sadness regulation in middle childhood: The role of expectations and gender. *Developmental Psychology*, *46*(5), 1214-1226. Abstract retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com>
- Capaldi, D., Dishion, T., Stoolmiller, M., & Yoerger, K. (2001). Aggression toward female partners by at-risk young men: The contribution of male adolescent friendships. *Developmental Psychology*, *37*, 61-73. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.37.1.61

- Chaplin, T., Cole, P., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (2005). Parental socialization of emotion expression: Gender differences and relation to child adjustment. *Emotion, 5*, 80-88. Abstract retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com>
- Cohn, A., Jakupcak, M., Seibert, L., Hildebrandt, T., & Zeichner, A. (2010). The role of emotion dysregulation in the association between men's restrictive emotionality and use of physical aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*, 53-64. doi: 10.1037/a0018090
- Cohn, A. & Zeichner, A. (2006). Effects of masculine identity and gender role stress on aggression in men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*, 179-190. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.7.4.179
- Conway, C., Rancourt, D., Adelman, C., Burk, W. & Prinstein, M. (2011). Depression socialization within friendship groups at the transition to adolescence: The roles of gender and group centrality as moderators of peer influence. *The Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 120(4)*, 857-867. doi: 10.1037/a0024779
- Corby, B., Hodges, E. & Perry, D. (2007). Gender identity and adjustment in black, Hispanic, and white preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 261-266. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.43.1.261
- Crick, N. (1997). Engagement in gender normative versus nonnormative forms of aggression: Links to social-psychological adjustment. *Developmental Psychology, 33(3)*, 610-617. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.33.4.610
- Dedovic, K., Wadiwalla, M., Engert, V., & Pruessner, J. (2009). The role of sex and gender socialization in stress reactivity. *Developmental Psychology, 45*, 45-55. doi: 10.1037/a0014433
- DeFranc, W. & Mahalik, J.R. (2002). Masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to parental attachment and separation. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3*, 51-60. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.3.1.51
- Diamantopoulou, S., Rydell, A., & Henricsson, L. (2008). Can both low and high self-esteem be related to aggression in children? *Social Development, 17(3)*, 682-698. Abstract retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com>

- Duxbury, L. & Higgins, C. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 60-73. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.1.60
- Egan, S. & Perry, D. (2001). Gender identity: A multidimensional analysis with implications for psychosocial adjustment. *Developmental Psychology, 37*(4), 451-463. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.37.4.451
- Elman, C. & O’Rand, A. (2005). The race is to the swift: Socioeconomic origins, adult education, and wage attainment. *The American Journal of Sociology, 110*, 123-160. Abstract retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com>
- Fehr, B. (2004). Intimacy expectations in same-sex friendships: A prototype interaction-pattern model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 265-284. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.2.265
- Giletta, M., Scholte, R., Burk, W., Engels, R., & Larsen, J. (2011). Similarity in depressive symptoms in adolescents’ friendship dyads: Selection or socialization? *Developmental Psychology, 47*(6), 1804-1814. doi: 10.1037/a0023872
- Good, G., Dell, D., & Mintz, L. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 295-300. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.36.3.295
- Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., O’Neil, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., DeBord, K.A., Bartels, K.M., Braverman, D.G. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 3-10. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.42.1.3
- Green, J. & Addis, M. (2012). Individual differences in masculine gender socialization as predictive of men’s psychophysiological responses to negative affect. *International Journal of Men’s Health, 11*, 63-82. Abstract retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com>
- Halberstadt, A. (1986). Family socialization of emotional expression and nonverbal communication styles and skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(4), 827-836. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.51.4.827

- Hammer, J. & Good, G. (2010). Positive psychology: An empirical examination of beneficial aspects of endorsement of masculine norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*, 303-318. doi: 10.1037/a0019056
- Hays, R. (1985). A longitudinal study of friendship development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*(4), 909-924. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.48.4.909
- Hendrick, S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The Relationship Assessment Scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*(1), 137-142. Abstract retrieved from <http://spr.sagepub.com>
- Hill, C. & Stull, D. (1981). Sex differences in effects of social and value similarity in same-sex friendships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*(3), 488-502. Abstract retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com>
- Ipsaro, A. (1986). Male client-male therapist: Issues in a therapeutic alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 23*(2), 257-266. doi: 10.1037/h0085607
- Iwamoto, D.K., Liao, L. & Liu, W.M. (2010). Masculine norms, avoidant coping, Asian values, and depression among Asian American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*, 15-24. doi: 10.1037/a0017874
- Jacobs, R. & McClelland, C. (1994). Moving up the corporate ladder: A longitudinal study of the leadership motive pattern and managerial success in men and women. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 46*, 32-41. doi: 10.1037/1061-4087.46.1.32
- Judge, T., Bono, J., Erez, A., & Locke, E. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: The role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 257-268. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.257
- Kimmel, S. & Mahalik, J.R. (2005). Body image concerns of gay men: The roles of minority stress and conformity to masculine norms. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*(6), 1185-1190. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1185

- King, L. & Emmons, R. (1990). Conflict over emotional expression: Psychological and physical correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(5), 864-877. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.5.864
- Kirkpatrick, L., Waugh, C., Valencia, A., & Webster, G. (2002). The functional domain specificity of self-esteem and the differential prediction of aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(5), 756-767. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.756
- Kopper, B. (1993). Role of gender, sex role identity, and Type A behavior in anger expression and mental health functioning. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40*, 232-237. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.40.2.232
- Kopper, B. & Epperson, D. (1996). The experience and expression of anger: Relationships with gender, gender role socialization, depression and mental health functioning. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*, 158-165. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.43.2.158
- LaFrance, M., Hecht, M., & Paluck, E. (2003). The contingent smile: A meta-analysis of sex differences in smiling. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(2), 305-334. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.2.305
- Lansford, J. & Parker, J. (1999). Children's interactions in triads: Behavioral profiles and effects of gender and patterns of friendship among members. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 80-93. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.35.1.80
- Liu, W.M. & Iwamoto, D.K. (2007). Conformity to masculine norms, Asian values, coping strategies, peer group influence and substance use among Asian American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 8*, 25-39. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.8.1.25
- Liu, W.M., Rochlen, A., & Mohr, J. (2005). Real and Ideal Gender-Role Conflict: Exploring Psychological Distress Among Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*, 137-148. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.2.137
- Liu, W.M. (2002). Exploring the lives of Asian American men: Racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*, 107-118. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.107

- Lytton, H. & Romney, D. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *109*, 267-296. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.109.2.267
- McElwain, A., Korabik, K., & Rosen, H. (2005). An examination of gender differences in work-family conflict. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *37*, 283-298. doi: 10.1037/h0087263
- Magovcevic, M. & Addis, M. (2008). The Masculine Depression Scale: Development and psychometric evaluation. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *9*, 117-132. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.9.3.117
- Mahalik, J.R., Locke, B., Ludlow, L., Diemer, M., Scott, R.P.J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *4*, 3-25. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3
- 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. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.45.3.247
- Mahalik, J.R. & Cournoyer, R.J. (2000). Identifying gender role conflict messages that distinguish mildly depressed men from nondepressed men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *1*, 109-115. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.1.2.109
- Moradi, B., Tokar, D., Schaub, M., Jome, L., & Serna, G. (2000). Revisiting the structural validity of the Gender Role Conflict Scale. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *1*, 62-69. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.1.1.62
- Morry, M. (2003). Relationship satisfaction as a predictor of similarity ratings: A test of the attraction-similarity hypothesis. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships*, *22*(4), 561-584. Abstract retrieved from <http://spr.sagepub.com>
- Morry, M. (2005). Allocentrism and friendship satisfaction: The mediating roles of disclosure and closeness. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *37*, 211-222. doi: 10.1037/h0087258
- Netemeyer, R., Boles, J., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(4), 400-410. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400

- O'Heron, C. & Orlofsky, J. (1990). Stereotypic and nonstereotypic sex role trait and behavior orientations, gender identity, and psychological adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 134-143. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.134
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender role conflict scale (GRCS): College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles*, *14*, 335-350. doi:10.1007/BF00287583
- Parent, M.C. & Moradi, B. (2009). Confirmatory factory analysis of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory and the development of the CMNI-46. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *10*, 175-189. doi: 10.1037/a0015481
- Parent, M.C. & Moradi, B. (2011). An abbreviated tool for assessing conformity to masculine norms: Psychometric properties of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *12*, 339-353. doi: 10.1037/a0021904
- Parent, M.C., Moradi, B., Rummell, C., & Tokar, D. (2011). Evidence of construct distinctiveness for conformity to masculine norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *12*, 354-367. doi: 10.1037/a0023837
- Peterson, E.L. & Vogel, D.L. (2007). Male gender role conflict and willingness to seek counseling: Testing a mediation model on college-aged men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*, 373-384. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.4.373
- Poulin, F. & Boivin, M. (2000). The role of proactive and reactive aggression in the formation and development of boys' friendships. *Developmental Psychology*, *36*(2), 233-240. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.36.2.233
- Robertson, M. & Fitzgerald, L. (1992). Overcoming the masculine mystique: Preferences for alternative forms of assistance among men who avoid counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *39*, 240-246. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.39.2.240
- Rochlen, A. & Mahalik J. (2004). Women's perception of male partners' gender role conflict as predictors of psychological well-being and relationship satisfaction. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *5*, 147-157. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.147

- Rose, A. & Asher, S. (1999). Children's goals and strategies in response to conflicts within a friendship. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 69-79. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.35.1.69
- Schwartz, J.P., Waldo, M., & Daniel, D. (2005). Gender-Role Conflict and Self-Esteem: Factors Associated With Partner Abuse in Court-Referred Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*, 109-113. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.2.109
- Sharpe, M. & Heppner, P. (1991). Gender role, gender role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 323-330. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.38.3.323
- Shepard, D. (2002). A negative state of mind: Patterns of depressive symptoms among men with high gender role conflict. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*, 3-8. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.3.1.3
- Simonsen, G., Blazina, C., & Watkins, C.E. (2000). Gender-role conflict and psychological well-being among gay men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 85-89. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.85
- Simpson, P. & Stroh, L. (2004). Gender differences: Emotional expression and feelings of personal inauthenticity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 715-721. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.715
- Somech, A. & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2007). Strategies for coping with work-family conflict: The distinctive relationships of gender role ideology. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*, 1-19. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.1
- Steinfeldt, J. & Steinfeldt, M.C. (2012). Profile of masculine norms and help-seeking stigma in college football. *Sports, Exercise and Performance Psychology, 1*, 58-71. doi: 10.1037/a0024919
- Steinfeldt, J., Zakrajsek, R., Carter, H., & Steinfeldt, M.C. (2011). Conformity to gender norms among female student-athletes: Implications for body image. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*, 401-416. doi: 10.1037/a0023634
- Stillson, R.W., O'Neil, J.M., & Owens, 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. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.38.4.458
- Stinson, L. & Ickes, W. (1992). Empathic accuracy in the interactions of male friends versus male strangers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(5), 787-797. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.5.787
- Tager, D., Good, G., & Brammer, S. (2010). "Walking oven 'em": An exploration of relations between emotion dysregulation, masculine norms, and intimate partner abuse in a clinical sample of men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11, 233-239. doi: 10.1037/a0017636
- Timlin-Scalera, R., Ponterotto, J., Blumberg, F., & Jackson, M. (2003). A grounded theory study of help-seeking behaviors among White male high school students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 339-350. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.50.3.339
- Wade, J. (1998). Male reference group identity dependence: A theory of male identity. *Counseling Psychologist*, 26(3), 349-383. Abstract retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>
- Wade, J. (2008). Masculine ideology, male reference group identity dependence, and African American men's health-related attitudes and behaviors. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9, 5-16. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.9.1.5
- Wade, J. & Brittan-Powell, C. (2001). Men's attitudes toward race and gender equity: The importance of masculine ideology, gender-related traits, and reference group identity dependence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2, 42-50. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.2.1.42
- Wester, S.R., Christianson, H.F., Vogel, D.L., & Wei, M. (2007). Gender role conflict and psychological distress: The role of social support. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 8, 215-224. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.8.4.215
- Wester, S.R., Kuo, B.C., & Vogel, D.L. (2006). Multicultural coping: Chinese Canadian adolescents, male gender role conflict, and psychological distress. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 7, 83-100. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.7.2.83

- Wong, Y.J., Owen, J., & Shea, M. (2012). A latent class regression analysis of men's conformity to masculine norms and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*, 176-183. doi: 10.1037/a0026206
- Wong, Y.J., Steinfeldt, J., Speight, Q., & Hickman, S. (2011). Content analysis of Psychology of Men & Masculinity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*, 170-181. doi: 10.1037/a0019133
- Wong, Y.J., Pituch, K., & Rochlen, A. (2006). Men's restrictive emotionality: An investigation of associations with other emotion-related constructs, anxiety, and underlying dimensions. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*, 113-126. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.7.2.113

APPENDIX A

CONSENT TO ACT AS RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

To be eligible for this study, I understand I must be at least 18 years of age and currently identify as a man. I hereby agree to participate in the following surveys conducted by Zachary Rankin, a MA candidate in Counseling Psychology, for research purposes.

These surveys will take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete, and will be conducted anonymously online. The purpose of these surveys is to collect relevant information regarding stressors related to masculine identity and relationship satisfaction in inter-male friendships.

I understand that participating in this study may involve the possible risk of emotional discomfort or anxiety as a result of exploring such personal topics as gender role identity and masculinity. Participating in this study has the potential benefit of collecting valuable information that may be relevant to more effective counseling of men.

I understand that Zachary will answer any questions I may have concerning this investigation or the procedures at any time. I also understand that my participation is entirely voluntary and that I may decline to enter this study or may withdraw from

participation at any time without consequence. I understand that the investigator may terminate my participation in the study at any time. I understand that Zachary will provide me with a list of counseling resources, should I choose to seek therapy during or after participating in this research.

I understand that the results from surveys submitted online will be stored electronically in a password-protected filing system, and identifying information (such as name, phone number, e-mail address, etc.) will NOT be requested of me. I understand that I may be asked for non-identifiable demographic information and that this information will also be stored electronically in a password-protected filing system. My responses, therefore, will be anonymous to the researcher.

If I have any questions regarding the survey and/or my participation, or if I would like further references to counseling as a result of the nature of this research, I can contact Zachary Rankin, graduate student in Psychology, at zjr2@humboldt.edu or Emily Sommerman, Psy. D and HSU Psychology Professor, at es47@humboldt.edu. If I have any concerns regarding this project, or any dissatisfaction with any part of this study, I may contact the IRB Chair, Dr. Ethan Gahtan, at eg51@humboldt.edu or (707) 826-4545.

If I have questions regarding my rights as a participant, any concerns regarding this project, or any dissatisfaction with any part of this study, I may report them to the IRB

Institutional Official at HSU, Dr. Rhea Williamson at Rhea.Williamson@humboldt.edu
or (707) 826-5169.

I hereby acknowledge that I have read and understand the implications of this research.

By continuing on to the following surveys, I give my consent to participate, and therefore also declare that I am at least 18 years of age and currently identify as male and thus eligible for participation in this study.

Please print this informed consent form now and retain it for your future reference. If you agree to voluntarily participate in this research as described, please click on the link below to begin the online survey. Thank you for your participation in this research.

APPENDIX B

Thank you for participating!

The scales you completed are measures of different components of masculine gender identity, gender-linked stressors, and friendship satisfaction. Your participation in this research will contribute to a better scientific understanding of the complexity of men's identities and the ways in which men's lives are impacted by stress. It may help therapists and other clinicians help men to understand and deal with stress in their lives. The research will also contribute important preliminary information about the nature of men's friendships with other men, and how those friendships may be impacted by the stressors described above.

If you feel anxious or otherwise disturbed as a result of participating in this research, you may call the United Way Crisis Helpline at 1-800-233-4357.

APPENDIX C

GENDER ROLE CONFLICT SCALE -I (GRCS-I)

Dr. James M. O'Neil

Department of Educational Psychology

Neag School of Education

249 Glenbrook Road, Road, U-2064

University of Connecticut

Storrs, CT. 06269-2058

Jimoneil1@aol.com

1. Age: _____

2. Educational Level: (Check the highest level that fits you.)

_____ High School Diploma _____ Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior

_____ Master's Degree _____ Ph.D. _____ Other

3. Present Marital Status: _____ Married _____ Single _____ Divorced _____ Remarried

4. Race: _____ White _____ Black _____ Hispanic _____ Asian American

Instructions: In the space to the left of each sentence below, write the number that most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for.

Strongly

Strongly

Agree

Disagree

6

5

4

3

2

1

1. _____ Moving up the career ladder is important to me.

2. ____ I have difficulty telling others I care about them.
3. ____ Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.
4. ____ I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.
5. ____ Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.
6. ____ Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.
7. ____ Affection with other men makes me tense.
8. ____ I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.
9. ____ Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.
10. ____ Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.
11. ____ My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.
12. ____ I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.

Strongly

Strongly

Agree

Disagree

6

5

4

3

2

1

13. ____ Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me.
14. ____ I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.
15. ____ I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.
16. ____ Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.

17. ____ Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
18. ____ Doing well all the time is important to me.
19. ____ I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.
20. ____ Hugging other men is difficult for me.
21. ____ I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.
22. ____ Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.
23. ____ Competing with others is the best way to succeed.
24. ____ Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.
25. ____ I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.
26. ____ I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others
might perceive me.
27. ____ My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than
would like.
28. ____ I strive to be more successful than others.
29. ____ I do not like to show my emotions to other people.
30. ____ Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.

Strongly

Agree

6

5

4

3

2

Strongly

Disagree

1

31. ____ My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health leisure).
32. ____ I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.
33. ____ Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.
34. ____ Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.
35. ____ Men who are overly friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).
36. ____ Overwork and stress caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.
37. ____ I like to feel superior to other people.

FACTOR STRUCTURE

Factor 1 - Success, Power, Competition (13 items)

Items – 1, 5, 8, 12, 14, 18, 21, 23, 24, 28, 32, 34, 37

Factor 2 – Restrictive Emotionality (10 items)

Items – 2, 6, 9, 13, 15, 19, 22, 25, 29, 30

Factor 3 – Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (8 items)

Items – 3, 7, 10, 16, 20, 26, 33, 35

Factor 4 – Conflicts Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations (6 items)

Items – 4, 11, 17, 27, 31, 36

Total Number of Items = 37

FACTOR LOADINGS AND RELIABILITIES FOR ITEMS OF GRC5-I

FACTOR 1 – SUCCESS, POWER, COMPETITION (13 items)

Items	Factor Loadings
1. Moving up the career ladder is important to me.	.64
5. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.	.52
8. I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.	.54
12. I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.	.54
14. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.	.45
18. Doing well all the time is important to me.	.43
21. I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.	.49
23. Competing with others is the best way to succeed.	.58
24. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.	.57
28. I strive to be more successful than others.	.72
32. I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.	.41
34. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important	.61

to me.

37. I like to feel superior to other people. .53

Mean Factor Loading .54

Internal Consistency Reliabilities .85

Test – Retest Reliabilities .84

Variance Explained 17.2%

FACTOR 2 – RESTRICTIVE EMOTIONALITY (10 items)

Items	Factor Loadings
2. I have difficulty telling others I care about them.	.70
6. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.	.35
9. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people	.37
13. Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.	.52
15. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.	.78
19. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.	.76
22. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior	.44
25. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling	.41
29. I do not like to show my emotions to other people	.43
30. Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.	.75
Mean Factor Loading	.55

Internal Consistency Reliabilities	.82
Test – Retest Reliabilities	.76
Variance Explained	7.6%

FACTOR 3 – RESTRICTIVE AFFECTIONATE BEHAVIOR BETWEEN MEN –
HOMOPHOBIA (8 items)

Items	Factor Loadings
3. Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.	.50
7. Affection with other men make me tense.	.69
10. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky	.58
16. Men who touch other men is difficult for me.	.67
20. Hugging other men is difficult for me.	.71
26. I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.	.52
33. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.	.66
35. Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).	.48
Mean Factor Loading	.60
Internal Consistency Reliabilities	.83
Test – Retest Reliabilities	.86
Variance Explained	6.1%

FACTOR 4 – CONFLICTS BETWEEN WORK AND LEISURE – FAMILY RELATIONS

(6 items)

Items	Factor Loadings
4. I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health	.45
11. My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.	.65
17. Finding time to relax is difficult for me.	.57
27. My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.	.70
31. My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, health, leisure).	.58
36. Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.	.46
Mean Factor Loading	.57
Internal Consistency Reliabilities	.75
Test – Retest Reliabilities	.72
Variance Explained	4.6%

DATA ON ALL ITEMS

Mean Factor Loadings	.57
Overall Internal Consistency Reliabilities	
Test-Retest Reliabilities	.88
Variance Explained	35.2%

Table 1: Internal Consistency, Reliabilities of GRCS Across Various Diverse Samples

STUDY AND SAMPLE	SPC	RE	RABBM	CBWFR	Total Score
O'Neil et al (1986) American College Students N=527	0.85	0.82	0.83	0.75	N/A
Good et al. (1995) American College Student N=1043 (3 samples) #1	0.83	0.81	0.86	0.75	0.88
Sample 2	0.84	0.84	0.83	0.74	0.90
Sample 3	0.86	0.84	0.88	0.78	0.89
Rogers, Abbey-Hines Rando (1997) College Men N=198	0.87	0.88	0.86	0.79	N/A
Borthick Knox, Taylor, Dietrich Women College Students (1997) N=427	0.84	0.86	0.83	0.81	N/A
Pylluk + Casas (1998) Ethnic Men (N=153)	0.71	0.84	0.85	0.79	0.87
Non Ethnic Men (N=128)	0.87	0.88	0.87	0.84	0.91
Laurent 1997 African American Adult Men N=193	0.88	0.83	0.90	0.76	N/A
Simonsen (1998) Gay Men N=117	0.88	0.85	0.75	0.81	N/A
Chamberlin (1993) Adult Airline Pilots N=188	0.84	0.91	0.86	0.80	0.89
JO (2000) Korean Students N=303	0.85	0.77	0.71	0.67	N/A
Kang (2001) Korean Students N=303	0.78	0.76	0.72	0.67	N/A
Gulder (1999) German Adult Men N=115	0.81	0.87	0.87	0.87	N/A
Gough (1999) Australian Students N=189	0.85	0.71	0.81	0.81	N/A
Kim (1990) Asian American Men N=125	0.87	0.85	0.84	0.78	N/A
Theodore (1997) Australian Men 18-24yrs N=350	0.84	0.84	0.88	0.78	N/A

STUDY AND SAMPLE	SPC	RE	RABBM	CBWFR	Total Score
36-45yrs	0.85	0.89	0.91	0.90	N/A
55+yrs	0.86	0.88	0.85	0.80	N/A
Torres Rivera (1995) Low Class Puerto Rican Men N=84	0.71	0.67	0.80	0.76	N/A
Charter, Graff, + Arnold (1986) Canadian Men N=555	0.81	0.90	0.84	0.75	0.89
Hayashi (1999) Japanese Men N=270	0.70	0.60	0.59	0.73	0.73
Tsai (2000) Taiwanese Men N=737	0.85	0.82	0.83	0.72	0.86

APPENDIX D

RELATIONSHIP ASSESSMENT SCALE

Please mark on the answer sheet the letter for each item which best answers that item for you.

How well does your partner meet your needs?

A	B	C	D	E
Poorly		Average		Extremely well

In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?

A	B	C	D	E
Unsatisfied		Average		Extremely satisfied

How good is your relationship compared to most?

A	B	C	D	E
Poor		Average		Excellent

How often do you wish you hadn't gotten in this relationship?

A	B	C	D	E
Never		Average		Very often

To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations:

A	B	C	D	E
Hardly at all		Average		Completely

How much do you love your partner?

A	B	C	D	E
Not much		Average		Very much

How many problems are there in your relationship?

A	B	C	D	E
Very few		Average		Very many

NOTE: Items 4 and 7 are reverse scored. A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4, E=5. You add up the items and divide by 7 to get a mean score.

APPENDIX E

FRIENDSHIP ASSESSMENT SCALE

Please complete the following scale in regards to your closest current or most recent friendship with another man. If you have never been involved in a friendship with another man, please skip this scale.

Please mark on the answer sheet the letter for each item which best answers that item for you.

How well does your friend meet your needs?

A	B	C	D	E
Poorly		Average		Extremely well

In general, how satisfied are you with your friendship?

A	B	C	D	E
Unsatisfied		Average		Extremely satisfied

How good is your friendship compared to most?

A	B	C	D	E
Poor		Average		Excellent

How often do you wish you hadn't gotten in this friendship?

A	B	C	D	E
---	---	---	---	---

