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ABSTRACT

SOCIALLY UNDESIRABLE GENDER-LINKED PERSONALITY TRAITS AND THEIR RELATION TO ALCOHOL ABUSE IN A COLLEGE POPULATION

Carolyn A. Yawn

The goal of this study was to determine if the possession of socially undesirable masculine or feminine personality traits would relate to problematic drinking behaviors in a college population. Gender-linked personality traits were measured using the Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ) and the Unmitigated Communion Scale (UCS). Problematic drinking behaviors were measured using the Short Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (SMAST). One-hundred and one Humboldt State University undergraduate students were surveyed.

The findings of this study did not support the hypotheses. It was proposed that scores from the Unmitigated Agency subscale in the EPAQ would predict scores on the SMAST in that the higher the Unmitigated Agency score, the higher the SMAST score. These scores were not significantly correlated in any direction and the regression analysis indicated that even though the Unmitigated Agency subscale scores were the best predictors for SMAST scores, this relationship was not of statistical significance. It was further proposed that the UCS would also be positively related to the SMAST scores. The results did not indicate any relationship between the two.
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INTRODUCTION

Literature on substance abuse has shown that in a college population both men and women are at risk for developing a wide range of alcohol-related problems (Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens, & Castillo, 1994; Wechsler, Dowdall, Maenner, Gledhill-Hoyt & Lee, 1998, Young, Morales, McCabe, Boyd, & D’Arcy, 2005). For many college campuses, binge drinking is a social norm (Carter & Kahnweiler, 2000; Wechsler et al, 1998), evident in the estimate that 40% to 45% of college students participate in binge drinking (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, Seibring, Nelson, & Lee, 2002). Of the past studies that examine the sex differences in drinking behaviors, most have concluded that men engage in problematic actions more frequently than do women, but explanations about why this variance exists are unclear (Wilsnack et al, 2000; Williams & Ricciardelli, 1999; Lemle & Mishkind, 1989). However, studies indicate that now more than ever college women are choosing to partake in heavy drinking (Wilsnack et al, 2002). There is evidence to suggest that women who drink heavily are more vulnerable than men who binge-drink to health risks, sexual assault and harassment, academic impairment, injuries, and impaired driving (Young et al, 2005).

Over the past half century, there has been an abundance of research on gender role identity and its variance. More recently, researchers have determined that the concepts of masculinity and femininity can be operationalized as Agency and
Communion (Spence et al, 1979; Helgeson & Fritz, 1998, 1999, 2000; Ghaed & Gallo, 2006). Agency is defined as a focus on the achievement of personal goals and the expansion of the self. It is manifested in personality traits such as assertiveness and confidence (Bakan, 1966; Spence et al, 1979; Helgeson, 1993; Helgeson & Fritz, 1998, 1999, 2000; Ghaed & Gallo, 2006). Communion is defined as a focus on interpersonal relations and expressiveness, and is manifested in traits such as compassion (Bakan, 1966; Spence et al, 1979; Helgeson, 1993; Helgeson & Fritz, 1998, 1999, 2000; Ghaed & Gallo, 2006). Furthermore, researchers have determined that the socially undesirable aspects of Agency and Communion can be operationalized as well (Spence et al, 1979; Helgeson & Fritz, 1998). These are known in the literature as Unmitigated Communion and Unmitigated Agency. Unmitigated Communion is defined as a concentration on the needs of others to the extent of ignoring one’s own needs and desires and Unmitigated Agency is defined as an extreme focus on the self with little or no consideration of others and relationships (Bakan, 1966; Spence et al, 1979; Helgeson, 1993; Helgeson & Fritz, 1998, 1999, 2000; Ghaed & Gallo, 2006). It has been further determined that Unmitigated Agency is associated with difficulties in interpersonal relationships and depleted health (Helgeson & Fritz, 1999). The current study examined the relationship between Unmitigated Agency and self-reports of problematic alcohol use in a college population. This study was approved by the Humboldt State University Institutional Review Board’s Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (Approval #06-66).
LITERATURE REVIEW

Typically, when researchers examine gender and sex differences, some tend to choose either a biological perspective or a social perspective to support their findings. It has been proposed that separating gender (the term used in the social-environmental perspective) and sex (the term used in the biological perspective) into separate constructs is inaccurate because they are interconnected (Hines, 2004). According to the American Heritage Dictionary (2000), terms gender and sex are not interchangeable, because “traditionally, gender has been used primarily to refer to the grammatical categories of ‘masculine,’ ‘feminine,’ and ‘neuter,’ but in recent years the word has become well established in its use to refer to sex-based categories, as in phrases such as gender gap and the politics of gender. This usage is supported by the practice of many anthropologists, who reserve sex for reference to biological categories, while using gender to refer to social or cultural categories. This distinction is useful in principle, but it is by no means widely observed, and considerable variation in usage occurs at all levels” (American Heritage Dictionary, 2000). Though the research on sex and gender is presented separately, it is important to note that the two concepts are integrated and cannot be fully explored as separate constructs (Lippa, 2002; Hines, 2004; Rhodes, 2004). Furthermore, much of the research for the current study was from a social (i.e. “nurture”) perspective, due to the fact that measuring sex differences in personality and psychological aspects relies on observing behavior and making assumptions from those
observations, a practice than can be accomplished without the use of expensive or unattainable devices necessary to observe and measure biological differences.

Gender From a Biological Perspective

Research on the sexes has determined that brain differences lead to behavioral and cognitive variance in males and females. For example, men have larger brains while women have more densely packed neurons in parts, yet some research shows that there are few significant differences in IQ scores (Lippa, 2002). Conversely, in a recent study that examined facets of intelligence measured by the Scholastic Aptitude Test, males scored an average of 3.63 IQ points higher than females across all ethnic and socioeconomic groups (Jackson & Rushton, 2006). Furthermore, physiological variations lead to differences on visual-spatial ability (men are better overall) and verbal fluency (women are better overall) (Lippa, 2002). While the corpus callosum is thicker in women, indicating that the hemispheres of the brain are strongly connected, leading to more fluent communication than in men (Lippa), males have a larger hypothalamus, which is responsible for motivating aggression, hunger, thirst, and sex (Lippa). This may help explain why men tend to have more problems with substance abuse, aggression, and sexual deviance than women (Rhodes, 2004).

Recent research has discovered that there are hormonal variations between the sexes as well as within the sexes. Individual differences in masculinity and femininity may be due to exposure to prenatal sex hormones and genetic variation throughout stages
of pre- and postnatal development (Lippa, 2002). Girls who are exposed prenatally to androgen tend to act more aggressive and prefer typically masculine activities, such as rough, active outdoor play, compared to girls who did not have the hormonal exposure (Hines, 2004). Additionally, females who were prenatally exposed to high levels of testosterone tend to adopt masculine characteristics along with their feminine ones, such as competitiveness and aggressiveness, regardless of socialization attempts to influence them to be more feminine (Rhoads, 2004). Conversely, females who were prenatally exposed to below-average levels of testosterone tend to behave in hyperfeminine manners, expressing a strong desire to care for babies and being very concerned with appearance (Rhoads). It was concluded that the ability of any environmental factor to create or influence a female’s level of femininity was directly related to the level of prenatal testosterone exposure (Rhoads).

When it comes to choosing a mate, there are significant differences between the sexes. Evolutionary theorists focus on this particular topic primarily, and maintain the belief that natural selection will honor those traits that enhance survival and reproduction (Rhoads, 2004). According to evolutionary theory, women are more selective than men are when choosing a sexual partner. This is due to the lengthy gestation period of a human being and the limitations of how many offspring a woman can produce in her lifetime. Men, who produce millions of sperm a day, do not have to consider this aspect of reproduction, so they are less selective. Therefore, men tend to value youth and beauty (physical signs of health and fecundity) in a mate whereas women tend to value status
and security (provisions for her offspring) (Lippa, 2002; Rhoads, 2004). Both females and males have adapted over time to behave in the ways that they do, because the traits that they inherit have a reproductive function (Lippa). The result is that, on a group level, men are more eager for sex than women, because those males with an insatiable sex drive were more likely to sire male offspring with a similar drive. Thus, a general sex difference exists in terms of men and women’s sexual desires and motivations though there is diversity of sexual drive on an individual level.

Though evolutionary concepts were important in the times of our genetic ancestors as our basic genetic constitution was being established, they may not apply to the survival and reproductive needs of modern society. Biological research has concluded that there are few clear-cut boundaries between males and females on an individual level. Stating that one has better or higher status than the other is often of questionable significance. Furthermore, “variation within each sex is great, with both males and females near the top and bottom of the distributions for every characteristic…In fact, although most of us appear to be either clearly male or female, we are each complex mosaics of male and female characteristics” (Hines, 2004, pp. 18-19). While this statement has validity when looking at the majority of individuals, males and females are differentially represented at the extremes. For example, in a study that compared SAT math scores, boys outscored girls. Thirteen times as many boys as girls scored above 700, but only twice as many boys scored up to a 500 (Lippa, 2002). Thus, when it comes to
biological differences between males and females there is evidence to suggest variance on both a group and an individual level.

Gender From a Socio-Cultural Perspective

A majority of the research for the current study has come from literature that focused on a social-environmental perspective; thus the tools used to measure an individual’s embodied gendered traits are embedded in this approach as well. Furthermore, there are many theorists who take on a social-environmental perspective, yet label their theory to be a ‘feminist’ perspective or a ‘social learning’ perspective. For brevity’s sake, these theories have been combined into what has been labeled the socio-cultural perspective.

The social-environmental perspective views gender and culture as being interconnected. That is to say, culture has an impact on the construct of gender and the construct of gender influences the practices of a culture. Gender is viewed as more than simply a demographic of an individual; it is a social construction that “is learned and achieved at the interactional level, reified at the cultural level, and institutionally enforced via the family, law, religion, politics, economy, medicine, and the media” (Gagne, Tewksbury, & McGaughey, 1997, p. 479). On the other hand, there is an argument from the biological school of thought that questions which came first, culture or gender roles. Is it that culture shaped gender roles and expectations or that the inherent attitudes and behaviors of men and women shaped gender roles and culture? If the latter were true, it would lend a great deal of support to the biological perspective. However, it may be that
culture and gender are combined in a system, that the inherent attitudes and behaviors of men and women created general expectations for each. These expectations were then placed on generation after generation of females and males, which became cultural expectations. Could it be that biology and environment are in fact intertwined in a system of reciprocal influence? Many in the social-environmental school of thought do not seem to think so, especially in the early research.

Since the social-environmental perspective assumes that gender is learned and reinforced through operant conditioning and imitation of parents, peers, family members, teachers, mass media, and even strangers in one’s culture (Hines, 2004; Lippa, 2002), it is further assumed that it can also be unlearned; that the maladaptive, restrictive, and even detrimental aspects of gender, such as restrictive stereotypes, can be altered on both an individual and societal level (Hansen, Gama, & Harkins, 2002). Stereotypes and gender roles, it is argued, are in place in a culture’s social belief system to substantiate a separation between the sexes and create a status difference in men and women (Hansen et al, 2002). Nevertheless, more and more research of this vein suggests that the gap between the sexes does not indicate that one is better than the other; instead people are making the choice to unlearn the gendered dispositions within themselves that are no longer relevant to their lives (Bem, 1974; Spence et al, 1979; Stake, 1997; Hines, 2004, p. 19), though some researchers argue that this comes at a great cost. For example, according to Rhodes (2004), “there is a certain unworldly quality to the suggestions that a just world would be one in which men and women do all things equally. This
understanding would require that parents who are trying to tease out their children’s natural abilities should instead do their part to achieve a society in which a higher percentage of people do things they are not interested in and not very good at” (p. 44). This attitude is reflective of current attitudes about gender equality, which have shifted over the past 35 years.

Expectations for both men and women have evolved greatly since the feminist movement of the 1960s and 70s, but there continue to be strong expectations for men and women to behave, feel, and think in certain manners in social, vocational, and intimate relationships. Evidence for this is seen in a study on stereotypes, which suggests that a majority of respondents believed, on average, that men would behave in a more aggressive manner than women and that women would be more kind than men (Lippa, 2002). Despite the suggestion that questionable “evidence has been found on the presumed differences between males and females in levels of competitiveness, dominance, nurturance, suggestibility, sociability, activity, self-esteem, compliance, analytic ability, anxiety, and achievement motivation, stereotypical beliefs about differences between men and women persist in the literature and across cultures” (Hansen et al, 2002, p. 166). Thus, in America, according to this theoretical perspective, men and women are consistently viewed as being different in terms of status, ability, and personality, and these rigid expectations affect how one acts, feels, and thinks in one’s social environment.
One of the most popular psychological theories of gendered social learning comes from Janet Spence, Robert Helmreich, and their colleagues. These researchers recognized that in the late 1970s many psychologists assumed that males and females behaved in stereotypical manners, possessing personality traits to reflect the differences between the two (Spence et al, 1975, 1979). Males held a more instrumental, extradomestic role in society and embodied personality characteristics, like assertiveness, to maintain that role. The role of females was to tend to domestic, child-rearing responsibilities, which called for personality characteristics such as compassion (Parsons & Bales, 1955). A further assumption was that sex-typed individuals portrayed a higher level of self-esteem and better psychological health than those who did not conform to the standards of their gender (Spence et al, 1979). That is, individuals who strayed away from their designated roles were believed to have been plagued with emotional discomfort and alienation (Bakan, 1966). In order to determine if these suppositions were relevant, Spence et al (1974) developed an assessment tool that challenged these generalizations and assumptions.

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) was developed to measure masculinity and femininity in terms of Agency and Communion, respectively (Spence et al, 1979). Bakan (1966) was the first to suggest that the conceptualization of gender is in terms of Agency (masculine) and Communion (feminine). According to his essay, Bakan (1966) “adopted the terms ‘Agency’ and ‘Communion’ to characterize two fundamental modalities in the existence of living forms, Agency for the existence of an organism as an
individual and Communion for the participation of the individual in some larger organism of which the individual is a part” (pp. 14-15). Agency, the focus on the achievement of personal goals and the expansion of the self, manifests itself in traits such as self-assertion and self-aggrandizement whereas Communion, the focus on interpersonal relations and expressiveness, manifests itself in traits such as nurturing and caring (Bakan 1966; Spence et al, 1979; Korabik & McCreary, 2000; Helgeson & Fritz, 1999).

In testing their new measure, Spence et al (1979) found that there were indeed sex differences that went along with the assumptions made by their predecessors. Men and women differed in the degree of embodied agentic and communal traits, with men exhibiting higher levels of Agency and women exhibiting higher levels of Communion (Spence et al, 1979). However, this group of researchers discerned that within each sex, there was no correlation between the masculine-agentic and feminine-communal scale. This would indicate that Agency and Communion exert their influence over one’s sense of being independently of each other. Thus, Agency and Communion are not opposites of each other, and may not be directly related because one’s level of Agency cannot predict her or his level of Communion. Moreover, there were a number of both men and women who scored relatively high or low on both scales (Spence et al, 1975, 1979) and that scores on both the masculine-agentic and feminine-communal scale were positively associated with adjustment and social competence, regardless of the individual’s sex (Spence et al, 1975, 1979). Finally, it was concluded that “androgynous individuals (those who score high on both Agency and Communion scales) tend to be more socially
effective than those who are sex typed” (Spence et al, 1979, p. 1674) and that the PAQ was an effective measure to assess one’s degree of Agency and Communion (Spence et al, 1979).

Over the past 30 years, research has examined gender-specific personality traits (Agency or instrumentality and Communion or expressiveness) using the PAQ and has found that both Agency and Communion have been linked with positive consequences in psychological well-being. Agency has a moderate relationship with high self-esteem, high self-confidence and emotional regulation (Ghaed & Gallo, 2006; Helgeson, 1993; 1994b; Helgeson & Fritz, 2000) and Communion is related to positive relational outcomes, such as social support and marital satisfaction (Helgeson & Fritz, 2000). However, only the socially desirable agentic and communal traits, such as assertiveness and caring, have produced these outcomes.

The socially undesirable agentic and communal traits are referred to in the literature as Unmitigated Agency (Agency that is not assuaged by Communion) and Unmitigated Communion (Communion that is not assuaged by Agency) (Bakan, 1966; Helgeson & Fritz, 1999, 2000; Korabik & McCreary 2000; Spence et al, 1979; Ghaed & Gallo, 2006). Unmitigated Agency is defined as an extreme focus on the self with little or no consideration of others and relationships (Helgeson & Fritz, 1998, 1999,2000). A person who possesses a high level of this will embody such traits as hostility, arrogance, greed, and cynicism. According to Helgeson & Fritz (1999), Unmitigated Agency is negatively related to Communion and either not related to or slightly positively related to
Agency, though these results go against Spence et al’s (1979) finding that Agency and Communion are not related. Furthermore, Helgeson & Fritz (2000) have specified that Unmitigated Agency is not simply a high level of Agency and a low level of Communion; Unmitigated Agency is a separate construct, containing the socially undesirable aspects of society’s masculine ideal (e.g. arrogance).

Whereas Unmitigated Agency is paralleled to an undesirable masculine orientation, Unmitigated Communion is in alignment with an undesirable feminine orientation (Bakan, 1966; Spence et al, 1979; McCreary & Korabik, 1994). According to Helgeson & Fritz (1999, 2000) in its extreme, Unmitigated Communion is a concentration on other’s needs to the extent of ignoring one’s own needs and desires. They have found that it is positively related to Communion and inversely related to Agency, going against Spence et al’s (1979) assumption that Agency and Communion are uncorrelated. Helgeson and Fritz do suggest that, unlike Communion, Unmitigated Communion can predict both relationship outcomes and those having to do with one’s self (1999, 2000). It is for this reason (and perhaps others as well) that the measurement of Unmitigated Communion has been inconsistent (Ghaed & Gallo, 2006; Helgeson & Fritz, 1999, 2000).

The empirical associations of Unmitigated Communion and Unmitigated Agency have been demonstrated in the literature. In their study, Spence et al (1979) found that Unmitigated Agency was not correlated with self-esteem whereas both Agency and Communion were positively correlated with it. Furthermore, their results indicated that
neuroticism was negatively correlated with Agency, and “acting-out” behaviors were positively correlated with Unmitigated Agency. In her study, Helgeson (1993) confirmed her predictions that cardiac patients and their spouses who had high levels of Unmitigated Agency and Unmitigated Communion would have difficulties adjusting to the psychological impacts of the medical treatment. In a later study, Helgeson and Fritz (2000) concluded that Unmitigated Agency and Unmitigated Communion would be associated with a range of problem behaviors. Specifically, they found that Unmitigated Communion was related to a tendency to suppress one’s own needs in order to provide support for another’s needs, as well as depending on others to provide a sense of personal value. Unmitigated Agency has been linked with an inability to seek help for problem behaviors as well as an unwillingness to become involved in relationships with others, and this relationship may have implications in the treatment of alcohol abuse in individuals with this personality constellation. Thus, examining the socially undesirable traits that are ingrained into individuals can enable researchers to better explain problem behaviors, such as substance abuse, in order to perhaps provide effective methods for prevention and intervention. Furthermore, as society has evolved to allow women in to more dominant extradomestic roles, the variance in levels of Communion and Agency, and their Unmitigated counterparts, between men and women has virtually disappeared (Ghaed & Gallo, 2006), suggesting that men and women may have some similarities in their agentic and communal traits and that cultural expectations may influence the development and expression of these gender-typed personality constellations.
The previous literature on alcohol use and abuse suggests that men engage in the heavy drinking of alcohol more frequently than do women (McCabe, 2002; Wechsler et al, 1995; 2000; 2002) and college students participate in binge drinking episodes much more frequently than other populations (Wechsler et al, 1995; 2002; Reifman & Watson, 2003; McCabe 2002). Binge drinking is defined as “the consumption of a sufficiently large amount of alcohol to place the drinker at increased risk of experiencing alcohol-related problems” (Wechsler & Nelson, 2001, p. 287) that takes place in an episode of extreme, uninhibited, reckless abandon (Wechsler & Nelson, 2001). It is measured as the consumption of four or more alcoholic drinks in one sitting for a woman, or five or more for a man (Wechsler & Nelson, 2001; Young et al, 2005; McCabe, 2002; Wechsler et al, 2002; Reifman & Watson, 2003) and the term “binge drinking” is now widely used to describe the heavy drinking behaviors that is typical of college students (Wechsler & Nelson, 2001). Studies indicate that about 44% of college students are binge drinkers (Wechsler et al, 2002) and many researchers agree that binge drinking is a key hazard for the early-adult development of undergraduate students (McCabe, 2001; Wechsler 1994, 2000; Wechsler & Nelson, 2001; Wechsler et al, 2002 Young et al, 2005; Reifman & Watson, 2003) with men being at the highest risk of incorporating problematic habits in to their everyday lives (McCreary, 2005; McCabe, 2002; Reifman & Watson, 2003). Despite this finding, Wechsler et al (2002) postulate that an increasing amount of women
are adopting attitudes that lead them to engage in problematic episodes of alcohol consumption. According to their data from the College Alcohol Study, which includes statistics from 1993 to 2001, in 2001, 20.9% of college women have reported frequently partaking in binge drinking while 25.2% of men reported binge drinking. Furthermore, 16.8% of the female participants reported drinking on 10 or more occasions in the past 30 days while 29.2% of the male participants reported the same. In 1993, these numbers were 17.1% and 12.3%, respectively, for the females, and 22.4% and 23.9% for the men. Thus, binge drinking for both men and women has increased over the past 15 years.

This increase in the rate of college women’s drinking is problematic because women are generally more vulnerable than men to the negative effects of alcohol (Wechsler et al, 1995). Some alcohol-related risks that have been associated with alcohol abuse include missing class, getting behind in schoolwork, engaging in unprotected sexual activity, getting hurt or injured, getting in trouble with campus or local police, committing a regretful act, and driving while intoxicated (Wechsler et al, 2002). The knowledge that more college students than ever are putting themselves at risk by engaging in heavy drinking leads to further questions, such as: 1) Why is it considered normal to continually put oneself at risk by heavily drinking in college? 2) Are moderate drinkers at risk of becoming binge drinkers? 3) Why do some individuals choose not to drink?

Looking at motivations for drinking over the past few decades will enable researchers to better understand college student’s drinking behaviors. In a study from
1976, Moos et al concluded that females who drank heavily were more likely to report negative affect, such as loneliness, depression, frustration, and anger than light drinkers were. In 1981, Wechsler and Rohman examined the motivations of heavy drinkers in a sample of 244 males and 68 females. They determined that 19.7% of the females drank “to cheer up” where only 7.9% of the males gave this reason, 38.8% of females drank “to relax” where 26.9% of the males did, and 13.6% of females drank “to forget problems” whereas 9.9% of males felt this way. Finally, 32% of the males and 25.8% of the females stated that they drank “to get drunk.” Twenty years later, 42.4% of women and 55.2% of men reported that drinking “to get drunk” was an important reason for imbibing unhealthy amounts of alcohol (Wechsler et al, 2002). A majority of the binge drinking occurs at sorority/fraternity parties (32.4%) and at off-campus bars (32.5%) (Wechsler et al, 2002), possibly indicating that the choice of drinking setting may have an effect on the amount one chooses to drink in one episode.

According to a report in *Time* in April 2002, heterosexual college women of the 21st century believe in equality of gender roles and that they have the same opportunities as men (cited in Young et al, 2005). Because of these non-traditional values, women find themselves engaging in what were formerly male-exclusive behaviors, such as binge drinking, in order to demonstrate this equality (Young et al, 2005), but much of the literature asserts that women are drinking for different reasons. According to the results of a focus group, Young et al concluded that some women choose to engage in heavy drinking in order to “drink like a guy” and present themselves as appealing to their male
counter parts. The authors also found that some of the women who participated in the focus group believed that a man is attracted to a woman with whom he can share a friendship as well as a romantic and sexual relationship. Drinking in social situations can therefore enable a heterosexual woman to demonstrate her potential as a friend to a heterosexual man, as social drinking is a traditional way in which men exhibit their friendships with each other. Thus, despite the non-traditional values of the current generation of college women, the predilections of their male peers influence heterosexual college women’s drinking behaviors.

Conversely, when considering the potential for males to have an effect on the amount that women drink in a college setting, Wechsler et al (2002) gathered data from all-women’s colleges. In 1993 24.5% of women reported binge drinking and in 2001 that statistic had risen to 32.1%. Though the difference is not a large one, it still suggests that it is becoming more common for women to participate in binge drinking; however, it was unclear in this study with whom the women were drinking. Since it is a possibility that attending college may act as a risk factor for engaging in problematic alcohol use, a preventative measure, such as screening college students early in their college experience, may indicate which students are going to develop problematic drinking habits. This may assist college health providers in detecting alcohol issues and building support systems for those students who may be most at-risk.
Purpose and Hypotheses

With these past findings, one can assume that a prominent problem in society, such as binge drinking in a college population, could benefit from the knowledge that, although men and women physiologically respond differently to alcohol due to biological differences, both are at risk for developing problematic drinking habits. Applying the concept that research can classify men and women in a more specific manner (e.g. having varying levels of Communion, Agency, and the Unmitigated versions of each) may yield results that are more useful because the practice may aid in grouping people for prevention and intervention programs. Since Unmitigated Agency has been linked with many individual problems, such as low self-esteem, acting-out behaviors, and neuroticism (Spence et al, 1979) and an inability to seek help (Helgeson & Fritz, 2000) it could be assumed that those who possess more socially undesirable masculine traits could struggle with unhealthy lifestyle habits, such as binge drinking. An individual with high levels of Unmitigated Agency would experience a lack of interpersonal relationships (Helgeson & Fritz, 1999), which may lead to loneliness, which in turn may lead to drinking to escape the negative emotions caused by the lack of connection with other individuals. Examining and understanding how Unmitigated Agency and Unmitigated Communion may motivate behaviors increases the potential to gain a better understanding of the varying reasons why individuals abuse substances, such as alcohol.
These findings have the potential to aid in creating prevention strategies and more productive intervention programs on college campuses.

Based on the foregoing, the hypotheses for this study are:

1. Regardless of biological sex, individuals who score high on the Unmitigated Agency scale will have scores of 2 or more on the SMAST scale, thus consuming alcohol in higher quantities and more frequently than those who have moderate to high levels of Agency and Communion.

2. Regardless of biological sex, individuals with higher scores on the Unmitigated Communion scale will score 2 or higher on the SMAST scale, thus consuming alcohol in higher quantities and more frequently than those who have moderate to high levels of Agency and Communion.
METHODS

Instruments

Three subscales from the Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ; Spence et al, 1979) were utilized to assess each participant’s inherent level of socially desirable (M+) and undesirable agentic (M-) and socially desirable communal (F+) personality traits. Psychometric data suggests that the scale that measures undesirable communal traits (F-) is inadequate (Helgeson, 1993) with an internal consistency coefficient of 0.60 and lower (Helgeson & Fritz, 1999; McCreary, 1994; Helmreich et al, 1981) and thus was not used as a part of this study. In addition, the M-F subscale, conceptualized with the assumption that gender is on a continuum, anchored by male and female, was not included because it is not relevant to the current study. Past researchers have reported adequate internal consistency coefficients for the M+ subscale ranging from 0.70 to 0.77, the M- subscale ranging from 0.71 to 0.85, and the F+ subscale ranging from 0.72 to 0.81 (Helgeson, 1993; Helgeson & Fritz, 1999). Empirical support for subscale validity has not been established and is questionable.

The M+ and F+ scales were developed as part of the PAQ (Spence et al, 1974). The authors pooled a bipolar list of adjectives and asked two samples of undergraduate men and women to rate what they believed to be the typical man and woman in order to determine what descriptive stereotypes exist. A third sample was instructed to rate an
ideal man and woman in order to determine what common stereotypes existed at the time. Items chosen to be included in the measure were those that were rated as more significant than others in the first two samples. In the prescriptive stereotypes sample, “items for which the mean ratings of both the ideal man and woman fell toward the same pole of the rating scale, and the typical woman fell closer to that pole than the typical man, were assigned to the F scale” (Spence, 1991, p. 148). A similar process was used to build the M scale. Items on both scales were therefore described as “tapping traits that are socially desirable to some degree for both sexes but that differentiated the typical member of each sex” (Spence, 1991, p.148).

After recognizing the need to examine socially undesirable traits, Spence et al (1979) used a similar procedure to develop the M- scale. Items included were judged by members of both sexes to be undesirable, were attributed to males more frequently than females, and were agentic in content (Spence et al, 1979).

Each subscale contains eight items that are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 “not at all” possessing the attribute to 5 “very” much possessing the attribute. An example item is “not at all arrogant” versus “very arrogant.” Participants in the current study rated themselves. Scores for each of the three subscales ranged from 8 to 40, with a higher score indicating more traits that are reflective of the measured constellation. For example, a score of 35 on the Unmitigated Agency scale means that the individual possesses a majority of the socially undesirable traits associated with Agency.
A tool that was developed by Fritz and Helgeson (1998) upon realizing the empirical limitations of the reliability of Spence et al’s (1979) Unmitigated Communion scale (UCS) in the EPAQ was utilized to assess each participant’s level of Unmitigated Communion. Research has demonstrated that this new UCS contains internal consistency coefficients ranging from 0.66 to 0.80, as well as adequate test-retest reliability (Ghaed & Gallo, 2006; Fritz & Helgeson, 1998; Helgeson & Fritz, 1996). However, there remains a lack of empirical support for the validity of the use of this scale.

The UCS contains nine statements that are self-rated on a 5-point Likert scale. A sample item is “For me to be happy, I need others to be happy.” The participant circles one of five numbers to indicate his or her opinion about the item. Number one indicates that the participant disagrees strongly with the item and number five indicates that the participant agrees strongly with the item. This scale was originally created for use with cardiac patients (Helgeson, 1993) and later revised to make its use more general (Fritz & Helgeson, 1998).

The short form of the Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (SMAST; Selzer, 1975) was implemented in order to assess an individual’s degree of problem drinking. This measure possesses solid predictive value in determining not only those who currently engage in problematic drinking behaviors, but also those who have the potential to develop poor drinking habits (Creek et al, 1982). It has performed well in empirical studies, with reported reliability coefficients ranging from 0.76 (Selzer et al, 1975; Zung 1979) to 0.87 (Fleming & Barry, 1989) to 0.93 (Hays & Revetto, 1992). Furthermore, it
has repeatedly demonstrated proficient sensitivity and specificity (Hays & Revetto, 1992; Fleming & Barry, 1989; Creek et al, 1982) and good test-retest reliability (Fleming & Barry, 1989).

The SMAST is a 13-item self-report measure. The form that was used in the current study contained wording that had been altered from Selzer’s original measure in order to maintain the specificity, per Creek et al (1982) and Fleming & Barry’s (1989) suggestions. For example, rather than asking, “Do you feel you are a normal drinker?” the item was “Do you believe that you drink more than most people?” (Creek et al, 1982). Four items were reworded to make them more specific (#s 1, 4, 5, and 8. See Appendix A). This practice has been justified by several authors and does not decrease the empirical value of the measure (Fleming & Barry, 1989; Creek et al, 1982). Respondents answered “yes” or “no” to the statements. Scores from the sample ranged from zero to four, with a two indicating that an individual has the potential to develop problematic drinking habits, and a three or higher, indicates that an individual presently engages in drinking habits that are problematic. A score of zero or one indicates that the individual does not presently engage in drinking habits that are problematic, and that there is little risk of the individual developing problematic drinking habits.

Participants and Procedure

One hundred and one participants were surveyed in the current study. There were sixty-two women and thirty-nine men in the sample. The participants were recruited from
a small, rural state university in public places on campus, such as the quad or in front of the library. They were approached by the principle investigator and asked if they were interested in participating in the study. Those who agreed were given a consent form which contained basic information about the study. They also had the option to have their name put into a raffle drawing to win a $50 gift certificate to a local grocery store to be compensated for their time, which they signed and provided an email address in order to be contacted in the event that they won the raffle. Consent forms were destroyed once data collection had been completed. Participants then completed a survey packet of three measures, which took between 5 to 10 minutes to fill out. After completing the survey, all participants were provided with a written debriefing form which contained information on where to seek help in the event that their participation had caused them any discomfort or distress, possible implications for the results of the study, and how to contact the principle investigator to access the results of the study or to inquire about anything regarding the study (See Appendix A). A name and email address was drawn and the principal investigator contacted the raffle winner via email before the completion of the current study. Consent forms and surveys were destroyed once data analysis had been completed.

Risks and Benefits

Risks for this investigation included possible minor psychological discomfort from having to consider the extent to which one potentially abuses alcohol. Benefits of
this investigation included the possibility of recognizing that certain personality constellations (e.g. a moderate level of Unmitigated Agency) may predict alcohol abuse, and this could lead to preventative measures in a college population. Furthermore, interventions for alcohol abuse may be tailored to meet the needs of individuals with different personality constellations, making the interventions more efficacious.
RESULTS

Multiple analyses were completed once the data were collected. First, the mean scores for the Unmitigated Agency subscale were 22.40 (SD= 4.59) for females and 22.46 (SD= 4.78) for males and means for the Unmitigated Communion subscale (which has a range from 9 to 45 unlike the other three subscales which have a range from 8 to 40) were 27.23 (SD= 4.25) for females and 23.51 (SD= 5.9) for males. The means for the Agency subscale were 23.96 (SD= 4.58) for females and 24.9 (SD= 6.07) for males. Finally, the means for the Communion scale were 30.95 (SD= 3.45) for females and 29.44 (SD= 4.6) for males. It is evident in the means that this population generally possesses more socially desirable feminine personality characteristics than any others. However, this result may be inaccurate due to the disproportionate number of men and women sampled.

A two-tailed $t$-test analysis to compare the means of the female and male participant’s scores on the Mitigated and Unmitigated subscales was completed. The results of this analysis indicated that for the Unmitigated Communion subscale the two sexes differed significantly in levels of the associated traits ($t= 3.67; p< .05$), with women exhibiting more socially undesirable feminine traits. A significant difference between the means for males and females was also found with the Agency subscale ($t= -1.13; p< .05$).
Correlations among the EPAQ and UCS subscales were also examined. There was a statistically significant positive relationship between Unmitigated Communion and Communion \( r = .36, p < .05 \). This matches the results of Helgeson & Fritz (1999; 2000) and is in opposition with the results of Korabik & McCreary (2000). No other statistically significant relationships were found among the subscales (see Table 1).

Finally, a linear regression analysis was completed to determine if the EPAQ and UCS subscale scores were able to predict the SMAST scores. The analysis indicated that while the Unmitigated Agency subscale was the best predictor for SMAST scores, this result was not statistically significant \( \beta = .159; t = 1.55; R \text{ square change} = .041; p = .124 \). It should be noted that of the 101 individuals sampled for this study, only 12 scored a 2 on the SMAST, indicating that they have the potential to develop problems with their drinking habits. Furthermore, only 3 individuals scored a 3 or higher on the SMAST, indicating that they have a problem with their drinking habits. The lack of participants who experience and report problems with their alcohol use may have contributed to the insignificant results.
Table 1

Correlations between SMAST scores and the mitigated and Unmitigated subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SMAST total</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unmit Ag</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unmit Com</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mit Ag</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mit Com</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to determine if the possession of socially undesirable masculine and/or feminine personality traits would relate to problematic drinking behaviors in a college population. The findings of this study did not support the hypotheses. It was proposed that scores from the Unmitigated Agency subscale would predict scores on the SMAST in that the higher the Unmitigated Agency score, the higher the SMAST score. These scores were not significantly correlated in any direction and the regression analysis indicated that even though the Unmitigated Agency subscale scores were the best predictors for SMAST scores, this relationship was not of statistical significance. It was further proposed that the Unmitigated Communion subscale would also be positively related to the SMAST scores. The results did not indicate any relationship between the two. There are some possible explanations for these findings.

One explanation is that the alcohol-related issues that were present in the sampled population were not the same as those presented in the SMAST. Previous studies have concluded that up to 44% of all college students are binge drinkers (Wechsler et al, 2002; McCabe, 2001) and that the act of binge drinking is a significant hazard for undergraduate college students (McCabe, 2001; Wechsler 1994, 2000; Wechsler & Nelson, 2001; Wechsler et al, 2002; Young et al, 2005; Reifman & Watson, 2003). The results indicated that only 15% of the sampled population reported having serious problems with their drinking versus the 44% that has been found in other studies. The
SMAST was developed for use in a clinical setting with patients who had already been diagnosed with an alcohol-related disorder (Fleming & Barry, 1989). The way in which it was utilized for this study was to predict future alcohol-related problems for the sampled population, as it had been used in Hays & Revetto’s (1992) study, not necessarily to evaluate to what extent an individual binge drinks. It may have been that the alcohol-related problems represented on the SMAST were not the same as the sampled population, hence the comparatively small percentage of problem drinkers in the current study. The use of a more sensitive alcohol questionnaire would have probably yielded more significant results.

A further problem with the data collection was that the population that was sampled was too general. The principal investigator found that most of the surveys were filled out when participants were recruited outside in front of the campus library. This put a bias on the sample because going to the library itself could be a confounding variable. This study would have been more accurate if the principal investigator had collected the data from a known binge-drinking population, such as at the campus counseling center, where group therapy sessions are offered for those with drinking problems.

Another explanation for the lack of significant results in this study could be the dearth of psychometric support for the EPAQ and the UCS, which is evident in the absence of validity scores in previous studies which have utilized these tools (Spence et al, 1979; Helgeson, 1993; Helgeson & Fritz, 1999). Researchers typically list only internal validity to support the use of the measure in their studies (Helgeson, 1993; Fritz & Helgeson, 1998, 1999, 2000). It is possible that the EPAQ and the UCS do not measure
what researchers assume that they do. Despite this possibility, researchers continue to use both the EPAQ and the UCS to examine relationships between the constructs they measure and many other facets of interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships and well-being (Fritz & Helgeson, 1999; Korabik & McCreary, 2000; Woodhill & Samuels, 2004). Ghaed & Gallo (2006) did successfully attempt to validate the EPAQ and the UCS, but this single study is not enough to draw conclusions about the validity of these measures. Researchers should continue to use caution when making generalizations about findings that are the product of the EPAQ and the UCS due to their lack of validity.

The many limitations of this study could have contributed to the lack of significant results as well. The sample size was small (N= 101) and disproportionate, including 62 females and 39 males. Perhaps with a larger sample of more equal numbers of males and females the predictive power of Unmitigated Agency over SMAST scores would be stronger and statistically significant. Furthermore, the sample for this population was from a small, rural state university and, while it is a homogenous sample, it may not represent a sample like those used in previous studies. The findings suggest that the sample reported to possess more socially desirable feminine traits than socially desirable masculine traits and both socially undesirable masculine and feminine traits. This is consistent with only one other study (Ghaed & Gallo, 2006). Thus, it could be concluded that the results of this study could not be generalized to any other population.

Future gender role research could see the use of the EPAQ and the UCS if they were examined more thoroughly and validated. By focusing on both the social-environmental facets and the biological facets of gender, researchers may be able to use
tools that more accurately represent an individual’s gender identity. Perhaps determining
if a relationship exists between sex hormone levels and scores on the EPAQ subscales
would determine if it accurately measures Agency and Communion and their
Unmitigated counterparts.

Furthermore, the EPAQ was developed in 1979 using the attitudes and
perceptions of undergraduate college students. It may be worth it for researchers to
determine if attitudes and perceptions about gender stereotypes have shifted over the past
30 years and then to redesign the measure using this information. Currently the EPAQ
and the UCS are widely used to measure gender identity despite their limitations (Ghaed
& Gallo, 2006; Woodhill & Samuels, 2004), but they are not accurate enough to make
conclusions about gender identity and its impact on various areas of research.
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APPENDIX A:
SURVEY PACKET
Consent to act as a research participant

I hereby agree to have Carolyn Yawn, under the sponsorship of Dr. T. Mark Harwood, administer a survey to me for the expressed purpose of gathering information about my personality and current alcohol use. The results of this investigation could prove potentially useful to students and therapists in developing prevention and intervention methods for college students who struggle with alcohol abuse. The survey will take 10-15 minutes to complete.

I understand that the procedures may involve possible emotional or psychological risks and/or discomfort associated with my alcohol use and/or personality. I also understand that my participation is entirely voluntary and that I may decline to participate in this investigation or withdraw from it at any time. I understand that the researcher will answer any questions I may have concerning the investigation or the procedures.

I understand that my responses to this survey will be kept completely anonymous and once my participation is completed, there will be no way to associate me with my survey. I further understand that my completed survey will be kept in a locked file cabinet accessible only by Carolyn Yawn and Dr. Harwood, and will be destroyed after a period of one year.

I understand that, while I will receive no monetary compensation for my participation, my name and email address will be, by my discretion, entered in to a raffle drawing for a $50 gift certificate to Wildberries Supermarket. Though my name and contact information will be provided for participation in the raffle, this information will not be in any way linked to my survey.

I understand that Carolyn Yawn will answer my questions concerning this investigation or procedures. I understand that I have rights as a participant of this investigation, and if I wish to obtain more information on said rights, I may contact the committee for the protection of human participants at Humboldt State University at 707-826-3949.

Finally, I am at least 18 years of age. I have read and understood the previous information, and I do speak and read English.

Participant’s Signature: __________________________________ Date___________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!
Principle Investigator: Carolyn Anne Yawn Email: cay4@humboldt.edu

Faculty Advisor: Dr. T. Mark Harwood Email: tmh29@humboldt.edu

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Fill out this information ONLY IF you wish to have your name entered in to the raffle drawing for a $50 gift certificate to Wildberries Supermarket. The drawing will take place after all data has been collected and you will be contacted, via email, by Carolyn Yawn ONLY IF you have won the raffle.

Name (please print):____________________________________________________

Email address: ______________________________________________________
Fill out the survey as it pertains to you. The items consist of a pair of contradictory characteristics—that is, you cannot be both at the same time. The numbers form a scale between the two extremes. Circle the number that describes where you fall on the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all arrogant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very arrogant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks out for self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks out for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all egotistical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very egotistical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to devote self completely to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to devote self completely to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all helpful to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very helpful to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all boastful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very boastful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all aware of others’ feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very aware of others’ feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can make decisions easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has difficulty making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all greedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very greedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives up easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never gives up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all self-confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very self-confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels very inferior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feels very superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all dictatorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very dictatorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all understanding of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very understanding of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all cynical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very cynical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very cold in relations with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very warm in relations with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes to pieces under pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stands up well under pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: Fill out this survey as it pertains to you. For the following items, circle the number on the scale that represents how much or little you agree with the statement. Think of the people close to you—friends and family—in responding to each statement.

1. I always place the needs of others above my own.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

2. I never find myself getting overly involved in others’ problems.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

3. For me to be happy, I need others to be happy.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

4. I worry about how others get along without me when I am not there.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

5. I have no trouble getting to sleep at night when other people are upset.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

6. It is impossible for me to satisfy my own needs when they interfere with the needs of others.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

7. I cannot say no when someone asks me for help.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

8. Even when exhausted, I will always help other people.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

9. I often worry about other people’s problems.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

10. My biological sex is:   Male   Female
Instructions: Fill out this survey as it pertains to you. Circle yes or no for each item. Remember, this information will be kept confidential, so answer honestly.

1. Do you think that you drink more than most people?
   Yes   No

2. Do others who are important to you ever worry or complain about your drinking?
   Yes   No

3. Do you ever feel bad about your drinking?
   Yes   No

4. Do your friends or relatives think that you drink more than most people?
   Yes   No

5. Are you unable to stop drinking even when you want to?
   Yes   No

6. Have you ever attended a meeting of Alcoholics Anonymous (A.A.) for yourself?
   Yes   No

7. Has drinking ever created problems between you and others who are important to you?
   Yes   No

8. Have you ever gotten in trouble at work or school because of your drinking?
   Yes   No

9. Have you ever neglected your obligations, your family or your work for two or more days because you were drinking?
   Yes   No

10. Have you ever gone to anyone for help because of your drinking?
    Yes   No

11. Have you ever been in a hospital because of your drinking?
    Yes   No

12. Have you ever been arrested for drunken driving, driving while intoxicated, or driving under the influence of alcoholic beverages?
    Yes   No

13. Have you ever been arrested, even for a few hours, because of other (not pertaining to driving) behavior?
    Yes   No
Debriefing information

The survey you have just completed is to gather information about the personality and alcohol use of undergraduate students at Humboldt State University, with the hypothesis that certain personality traits will be related to a higher potential for alcohol abuse. The first two surveys assessed your personality, while the third survey assessed your potential for alcohol abuse.

I understand that answering questions about your alcohol use and personality might be difficult for you. If you have experienced any psychological discomfort or distress as a result of your participation in this investigation, I encourage you to make an appointment at one of the following counseling centers.

**HSU Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPs)**
Phone: 707-826-3236
Fax: 707-826-5735
Located in the Health Center, 2nd floor
This is a free service to HSU students, but please note that being a client at CAPs will preclude you from working there as a therapist or practicum student in the future.

**Davis House**
Phone: 707-826-3921
Located on Harpst St, House 81
Fees at this center range from $5-$25, sliding scale, based on your income.

**Humboldt Family Service Center**
Phone: 707-443-7358
Located in Arcata at 282 South G St
Located in Eureka at 1892 California St
Fees range from $10-$90, sliding scale. Medi-Cal is accepted.

**Catholic Charities**
Phone: 707-441-9611
Located in Eureka at 2936 J St (the corner of Wood and J)
Fees range from $10-$125, sliding scale. Medicare, Medi-Cal, and some private insurance is accepted. Scholarships are available to those who are qualified.

Once again, I would like to thank you for your participation in this investigation. Your contribution to this research has not only provided me with data for my Master’s thesis, but may also help provide useful information to counseling centers in providing better services to the students at this university and the community.

**Carolyn Anne Yawn**
Email: cay4@humboldt.edu
Principle Investigator

**Dr. T. Mark Harwood**
Email: tmh29@humboldt.edu
Faculty Advisor