

Keeping Control: Relations Between Men's Gender Role Conflict,  
Spirituality and Psychological Well Being

---

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of Missouri

---

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Andrew Bryant Lammy

Dr. Glenn Good, Dissertation Supervisor

December 2010

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

KEEPING CONTROL: RELATIONS BETWEEN MEN'S GENDER ROLE  
CONFLICT, SPIRITUALITY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL BEING

Presented by Andrew B. Lammy

A candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Glenn Good, Ph.D., Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Keith Herman, Ph.D. \_\_\_\_\_

Joe Johnston, Ph.D. \_\_\_\_\_

Michael Porter, Ph.D. \_\_\_\_\_

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Successfully completing my dissertation would not have been possible if not for the help of my family, friends and the University of Missouri faculty. To all who helped in this endeavor, I owe you more thanks than I can communicate here.

First, to my wife, Devin, for her encouragement, patience, and understanding throughout my graduate career (and honestly, throughout the course of our marriage). This project would never have been completed if not for her tireless data entry, formatting work, and for keeping me calm during the moments of extreme frustration. And to my daughter, Caroline, for reminding me that there are things more important than regression analyses- like bubble baths, tummy time, and twirling around in circles in the living room. I love you both.

To my parents, for instilling in me the importance of education at an early age, for believing in me, and for their unwavering support. Thanks for always making sure I knew how much you loved me. And to my sister, Kelsey, for delivering the hard copies to my committee, and for constantly reminding me how dorky graduate students are. I am extremely fortunate to have a family I adore and whom I miss when I'm far away.

To our great friends, Nathan and Morgan See, for simply being great friends. For pretending to be interested as I prattled on about research design, for countless meals (and copious amounts of grilled meat) shared, for Chile Beer, Hand & Foot, and inappropriate humor at the best possible times.

To my advisor, Glenn Good. For your kindness, humility, and your patience with a chronically absent-minded advisee. I particularly appreciate your unique ability to impart wisdom to students while making them feel as though they are your equal. Your confidence in me as a young graduate student gave me the courage to move forward, and knowing you're behind me continues to reassure me when I find myself on unsure footing. Your mentorship has been the cornerstone of my professional education, and for that I am grateful.

Finally, I would like to thank the leaders and members of the following campus organizations. Thank you for being so giving with your time, and for making this project possible:

Alpha Kappa Lambda  
Brothers Under Christ  
Pi Kappa Alpha  
Baptist Student Union  
Phi Kappa Theta  
Newman Center  
Sigma Nu  
The Rock  
Kappa Alpha Order  
Campus Crusade for Christ  
Veritas

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ii
ABSTRACT .....	v
CHAPTER	
1. Introduction .....	1
Masculinity and Gender Roles	
Gender Role Conflict	
Spirituality	
Spirituality and Psychological Development of Men	
Rationale for the Current Study	
Purpose of the Study	
Research Questions and Hypotheses	
2. Literature Review .....	11
Socialized Masculine Norms and Gender Roles	
Importance of Spirituality	
Spirituality and Physical Health	
3. Method .....	21
Participants	
Instruments	
Procedure	
Analyses	
4. Results .....	32
Preliminary Analyses	
Question 1	

Question 2	
Question 3	
Question 4	
Question 5	
5. Discussion .....	41
Demographic and Denominational Variables	
Relations among Gender Role Conflict, Spirituality, and Psychological Well-Being	
Predictors of Psychological Well-Being	
Predictors of Spiritual Maturity	
Limitations	
Implications for Practice and Research	
REFERENCES .....	50
APPENDIX .....	60
A. Demographic Questionnaire	
B. Gender Role Conflict Scale	
C. Spiritual Assessment Inventory	
D. Scales of Psychological Well-Being	
E. Socially Desirable Response Set Measure	
F. Informed Consent	
G. Descriptive Statistics	
H. Tables	
VITA .....	

## Abstract

Recent decades have seen an increase in scrutiny of masculinity and what it means to be a man in society. Researchers as well as popular culture have increased their focus on gender roles and how those roles can create internal and interpersonal conflicts in men. In addition, spirituality has become an increasingly salient variable for clinicians and researchers assessing overall psychological well-being. The current study explored the ability of gender role conflict and spiritual attitudes to predict psychological well-being among men. Participants were 223 college-aged men whom were either members of Christian organizations or fraternities on the campus of a large public university in the Midwest. Several variables of gender role conflict and spiritual attitudes were significantly related to psychological well-being. Increased gender role conflict combined with maladaptive spiritual attitudes were predictive of lower overall psychological well-being. Limitations and implications for practice and research are discussed.

## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

The concept of masculinity has long exerted tremendous influence over the lives of boys and shaped how boys grow into men. From an early age, little boys have been given Tonka trucks and action figures with which to create battle scenes, while little girls have received dolls to dress in pretty clothes and playhouses in which to act out family scenes. Boys are taught that it is appropriate and perhaps mandatory to behave aggressively, “play rough” and get dirty. There is less emphasis placed on boys being good listeners, expressing emotions, or being able to ask for help when they need it. Yet the aforementioned skills are necessary in order to navigate life’s obstacles and interact with others in meaningful, healthy ways.

In this chapter, an introduction to the concepts of masculinity and gender roles will be provided, as well as information regarding how conformity to socially-constructed masculine norms can be psychologically and physically harmful to men. In addition, spirituality and its potential effects on psychological well-being will be explored. Finally, a justification for the study of the relations between aspect of masculinity and spirituality will be provided. This justification will include the pressure on men to ascribe to potentially harmful masculine norms, the importance of spirituality for healthy psychological development, and the possibility of traditional masculine norms inhibiting the spiritual engagement of men.

#### Masculinity and gender roles

Recent decades have seen an increase in scrutiny of masculinity and what it means to be a man in society. Researchers as well as popular culture have increased their

focus on gender roles and how those roles can create internal and interpersonal conflicts in men. Men are often socialized to fit into a certain mold, one that embraces toughness, rugged individualism and eschews any attempt to be vulnerable, communicative, or able to express a variety of emotions (Mahalik, 1999).

David and Brannon (1976) identified four major injunctions taught to men regarding masculinity. First, there is to be “No sissy stuff”-- men are taught to refrain from exploring or sharing feelings and are taught to avoid all things perceived as feminine, such as crying or admitting weakness. Second, men will strive to become “The big wheel”-- men are to compete with and defeat other men, thus rising to the top. Competitive arenas include but are not limited to sexual prowess, physical stature, and economic status. Third, a man is to be “The sturdy oak”-- he will endure any and all hardships quietly and without asking for help. Any request for assistance is a sign of weakness and demonstrates a lack of competence. Finally, men will “Give’em hell”-- men are to be rough, tough and aggressive. They are to project an assertive image and willingly resort to violence when their dominance or masculinity is challenged. Violating any of these rules puts a male in danger of being seen as less than “a real man” by his peers.

At the root of some of these injunctions are traits that can be useful to men (or women) throughout the lifespan. For example, being ambitious in school or work settings or being resilient when faced with challenges can be helpful and adaptive traits. However, the extreme nature of the pillars of masculinity mentioned above is problematic for men, their partners, their families, and ultimately the society in which they live. Good et al. (1995) reported that a traditional male gender role was positively correlated to



psychological distress in men. That is, unattainable expectations about that it means to be masculine can have an adverse impact on psychological well-being. Another recent study found that men in the U.S. are more likely to adopt beliefs and behaviors that adversely affect their health and therefore put them at increased risk for chronic health problems (Courtenay, 2000). Traditional masculine gender roles and their associated messages can have harmful implications for the psychological and physical health of men.

### Gender role conflict

The unrealistic socialized expectations created for men often cause dissonance in men. For example, a man may feel compelled to engage emotionally with his romantic partner by sharing his thoughts and feelings openly. However, traditional masculinity dictates that such behavior is “unmanly” and may therefore deter a man from this behavior, leaving him confused or unsatisfied. This masculine role socialization leads to a fear of being seen as feminine and may cause men to adjust or curb their behavior to display stereotypically masculine acts in order to avoid even the slight appearance of femininity (O’Neil, 1981a). In doing so, men perpetuate the cycle of dissonance and suffer its associated intrapsychic and interpersonal consequences, with the ultimate outcome being the restriction of their human potential or the potential of others around them (O’Neil, 2008).

O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David, and Wrightsman (1986) termed this dissonance *gender role conflict*, and defined it as a psychological state in which gender roles create negative consequences for an individual or individuals. O’Neil (1990) posited that gender role conflict occurs when sexist or restrictive gender roles result in the restriction,

devaluation or violation of self or others. Imbedded in the definition of gender role conflict is the assumption that gender roles do not occur in a vacuum. Instead, gender roles and gender role conflict affect individuals, family, and relationships, both personal and professional. Thus, understanding gender role is an important part of understanding the cultural aspect of interpersonal relationships.

### Spirituality

Carl Jung (1933) asserted that spiritual functioning is akin to physical, emotional and cognitive function in its utility for healthy personal development. Jung went on to say that spirituality plays a corresponding role in healing. Thoresen (1999) examined more than 300 empirical studies and observed that in most cases (but not all) a positive relation was reported between spiritual or religious factors and physical health.

Individuals who were more spiritually involved tended to have higher rates of overall well-being and life satisfaction, lower rates of depressive symptoms and suicide, and higher rates of marital satisfaction. Nonetheless, Thoresen cautioned against inferring a causal relation between greater spiritual involvement and better mental health.

It is important to distinguish between spirituality and religiosity. Religiosity is generally defined as participation in religious practices and activities, as well as endorsement of a set of beliefs generally associated with a certain faith (Matthews et al., 1998). Spirituality is typically harder to define due to its nebulous and often more internal nature. Spirituality refers to “personal views and behaviours that express a sense of relatedness to the transcendental dimension or to something greater than the self” (Reed, 1987). That is, it is possible to endorse spirituality alone, religiosity alone, or to endorse both simultaneously. For example, an individual may align himself religiously

with Christianity and therefore regularly attend worship services and given a portion his income to his church. His spirituality, however, might be defined by his sense of connectedness to God and his concept of who God is. This distinction is important because while religion can be passed down through cultural or family ties, spirituality is typically a result of internal beliefs or philosophies (Hassed, 2000).

Those who report higher levels of spirituality may assume a direct or causal relationship between their spiritual beliefs and their physical health. However, the current research does not support this view. Levin (1996) identified the following seven popular myths about the effects of spirituality on physical health and reported their corresponding current empirical realities:

1. Religious involvement promotes healing (no, but it may prevent morbidity).
2. Religious people don't get sick (no, but it is associated with lower risk or odds of morbidity).
3. Spirituality is a protective factor (no, not yet studied independent of religion).
4. Prayer heals (no, epidemiological evidence is lacking and better experimental designs are needed).
5. Religion is the most important factor in health (no, but may be one of many significant factors for preventing disease).
6. Supernatural powers influence health (no, scientific evidence is not available).
7. Other factors explain away all religion-health relationships (no, religious factors are possible indirect causes, not just confounding or proxy variables).

Witter, Stock, Okun and Haring (1985) conducted a quantitative meta-analysis and found religious involvement to be an epidemiologically protective factor against

disease. However, Witter and colleagues also reported that religion only accounted for between two and six percent of the variance in adult subjective well-being. It appears that there may be a relation between spirituality and physical health, although the extent of this relation is unclear. Thus, ignoring spiritual aspects of individuals' psyches can leave researchers and clinicians with incomplete understandings of their participants and clients, respectively.

Spirituality may be an integral part of individual personality. Allport (1950) stated that spirituality "is the portion of personality that arises at the core of life and is directed towards the infinite" (p.142). Maslow (1971) asserted that the innate psychic need for self-actualization is often channeled through spiritual pursuits in which individuals seek self-transcendence and recognize a desire to live for something larger than themselves. Of course, these assertions are theoretical, not empirical. However, Piedmont's (1999) factor analysis of 755 undergraduate students suggested that spiritual transcendence, as measured by the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (Piedmont, 1997), is statistically independent of the Five Factor model of personality. Piedmont went on to assert that spirituality should be considered the sixth major factor of personality. The American Psychological Association's (2002) *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* made explicit reference to religion as an important part of individual differences which supports the notion that understanding spiritual beliefs is vital to creating a comprehensive picture of individuals' worldview. Another view has proposed spirituality as a continuous variable, stating that all persons are spiritual beings to one degree or another. That is, people differ only in their awareness of and response to their need for self-transcendence, identity, integration and surrender (Benner, 1991). Keeping

this in mind, it may be more accurate to view spirituality on a continuum rather than viewing it as a dichotomous variable.

### Spirituality and psychological development of men

The relation between spirituality and psychological development has led to a growing body of research on the intersection of gender role attitudes and spiritual beliefs. Nelsen and Nelsen (1975) asserted that religiosity is often related to the division of labor along gender lines. That is, women are responsible for the socio-emotional child-rearing activities such as instilling morals in their children. In such instances it becomes evident that religion can be an important part of gender role expectation, as it often provides input into which functions men and women are to perform. Francis (1997) found that gender role socialization, not individual differences, influences attitudes surrounding religion and gender roles. According to the Francis, females are taught “conflict resolution, submission, gentleness, nurturance and other expressive values congruent with religious emphases” (p. 82). This is consistent with Francis and Wilcox’s (1996) findings that women scored higher than men on religious attitude measures, and men with more feminine outlooks reported being more religious than men with more traditionally masculine outlooks. According to Mol (1985), men are socialized to believe that drive and aggression are virtues and that victory takes precedence over conflict resolution. The author states that such goals are better served by cold neutrality, which is a less spiritual concept, rather than by emotional surrender, which is more compatible with spirituality. Thus, the majority of men socialized in the U.S. would be predisposed towards non-spiritual pragmatism and away from spirituality.

### Rationale for the current study

Men in the U.S. tend to be socialized in ways that discourage spiritual development and see spiritual virtues such as submission as indicative of femininity or weakness. Thompson and Remmes (2002) studied men ages 60 to 92 and found that a feminine gender orientation among men predicted stronger religiosity and that traditionally masculine gender orientation was negatively correlated with religiosity. Gender orientation was determined by scores on the short form of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1981), with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of socially-desirable personality traits more typically associated with women (e.g., expressiveness) or men (e.g., instrumentality) (Good, Wallace & Borst, 1994; Spence, 1991). Thompson and Remmes reported that masculinity directly thwarted men's religious development when men endorsed a traditional masculinity ideology. When traditional masculinity ideologies were eschewed, men may be more likely to attend church services and to engage in private devotions.

There is a growing body of literature exploring gender role conflict and its effect on men. Good and Brooks (2005) examined current research in order to increase awareness of masculinity issues and increase counselors' competency regarding men's issues. However, there appears to be a shortage of research in the area of how individual spiritual values influence mental health and how those values can be addressed during counseling in ways that are efficacious to clients. Multiple scholars have noted this dearth of studies of spirituality and observed that counselor training and willingness to engage in discourse about spiritual subjects appears to be lagging behind other areas of emphasis, such as multicultural counselor competency studies (e.g., Bergin, 1991; Kelly

& Strupp, 1992). Hence, spirituality appears to be an often important part of individuals' worldviews, and can simultaneously be a source of comfort and conflict.

### Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate gender role conflict and spirituality as potentially important individual variables that influence men's psychological well being. In this vein, the study also sought to augment existing literature by examining the relations between aspects of gender role conflict and spirituality. More specifically, this study sought to evaluate the association between gender role conflict and spirituality in men. By testing the correlations between the Gender Role Conflict Scale and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory, the author sought to measure the subtleties of masculinity and spirituality in order to more precisely define the nature of the relations between these two important constructs. In addition, the study examined the relations of both gender role conflict and spirituality to men's psychological well being.

### Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study sought to answer the following research questions, which concern the relations of men's gender role conflicts and spirituality with aspects of their psychological well-being.

Question 1: Are men who report higher levels of gender role conflict and less mature relationships with God more likely to report lower overall psychological well-being?

Hypothesis 1: Higher scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale and the Grandiosity and Instability scales of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory will uniquely predict lower Scales of Psychological Well-Being subscale scores.

Question 2: Are men who report higher levels of gender role conflict more likely to report less developed relationships with God?

Hypothesis 2: High scores on the four subscales of the Gender Role Conflict Scale will uniquely predict lower scores on the Awareness and Realistic Acceptance subscales of the SAI.

Question 3: Are men who report higher degree of gender role conflict more likely to report lower psychological well-being?

Hypothesis 3: Higher scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales will uniquely predict lower scores on each of the six subscales of the Scales of Psychological Well-Being.

Question 4: Are men's realistic acceptance of their relationship with God related to greater overall psychological well-being?

Hypothesis 4: Higher scores on the Realistic Acceptance subscale of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory will be associated with higher scores on all six subscales of the Scales of Psychological Well-Being.

Question 5: Are men with stronger desire to maintain emotional control more likely to report a less developed relationship with God?

Hypothesis 5: Men who score higher on the Restrictive Emotionality subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale are more likely to score lower on the Awareness and Realistic Acceptance subscales of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory.



## Chapter 2

### Literature Review

#### Socialized Masculine Norms and Gender Roles

There is an established body of research reporting that socialized masculine norms and gender role expectations influence men's beliefs and behaviors. O'Neil (1981b) defined gender roles as "behaviors, expectations, and role sets defined by society as masculine or feminine which are embodied in the behavior of the individual man or woman and culturally regarded as appropriate to males or females" (p. 203). Due to the wide scope of these roles, men and women are under tremendous pressure to conform to gender role norms. Societal penalties for non-compliance provide additional motivation to ascribe to traditional gendered norms (Pleck, 1981).

Pleck (1981) also reported that gender stereotypes provide dichotomous collective definitions of what gender is and inform commonly held beliefs about perceived innate differences between men and women. Making gender role a dichotomous construct eliminates any acceptable overlap in behavior between men and women. Men may be socialized to refrain from being as nurturing or as tender as they might otherwise be because those behaviors are the domain of women. Thus, any man engaging in such behaviors is at risk for being viewed as feminine. As mentioned above, this is a serious insult for many men and may imply that he is a homosexual.

While both men and women experience pressures associated with gender norms, researchers have identified a number of unhealthy norms that have adverse effects on psychological well-being in men. Levant, Hirsch, Celentano, and Cozza (1992) identified seven dimensions of traditional masculine ideology: Avoiding all things

feminine, restricting emotionality, acting tough and aggressive, being self-reliant, achieving status, being non-relational and objectifying in sexual behaviors and attitudes, and homophobia. These dimensions encompass a large number of daily activities, and therefore affect a wide range of thoughts, actions and interactions. Thus, traditional masculinity is in a position to exert enormous influence over a significant portion of men's lives.

Similarly, Mahalik (1999) found that men receive socialization messages surrounding the following themes: success (get ahead, excel in order to be happy), power (physical, financially, sexually, interpersonally, intellectually), emotional control (being stoic even with wife and children, not crying), fearlessness (aggressive, violent), self-reliance (never asking for help from others), primacy of work (work is the biggest part of self-identity and takes priority over family), playboy (sex should be recreational, with many partners and with little focus on intimacy), and homophobia (express hate and possibly violence towards homosexuals, never display behavior that could be construed as feminine or homosexual). Because these messages combine to create the male gender role, men are pressured to conform to these attitudes in order to be seen as "real men." However, this can create discrepancy between what men desire and how men believe they should behave. For example, a man may experience a significant loss, perhaps of a loved one, and feel significant sorrow. The pressure to be stoic and not show emotions might stifle his desire to cry, causing emotional distress.

The resulting dissonance is called gender role conflict, which "occurs when rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles, learned during socialization, result in personal restriction, devaluation or violation of others or self" (O'Neil, 1990, p. 25). O'Neil also

identified four major areas of gender role conflict: (1) success, power and competition, (2) restrictive emotionality, (3) restrictive affectionate behavior between men, and (4) conflict between work and family relations. These conflicts can be psychologically damaging as men attempt to take care of their own emotional needs while at the same time appearing masculine to those around them. Pleck (1981) found that gender role violations (i.e., not adhering to a socialized message regarding normative masculine behavior) have more severe consequences for men than for women. That is, men are more prone to receive social condemnation for violating normative gender roles than are women.

Mahalik (2000) stated that conformity to social norms exists on a continuum of four stages: extreme conformity, moderate conformity, moderate nonconformity, and extreme nonconformity. Dominant societal groups determine gender role expectations and norms and communicate these norms through descriptive, injunctive and cohesive norms. He also reported that conformity exists on affective, behavioral and cognitive components and that each man conforms to each norm to a different extent. By creating a continuous variable of conformity, the author allows for free movement of men across the conformity spectrum depending on past and current personal and environmental influences.

It is also important to recognize the diversity of masculine ideologies present in the US. Cultural and individual factors are certain to influence male attitudes and beliefs. Lazur and Majors (1995) identified variance among minority groups:

African-American males have adopted distinctive actions and attitudes known as the cool pose.... Emphasizing honor, virility, and physical strength, the Latino

male adheres to a code of Machismo.... The American-Indian male struggles to maintain contact with a way of life and the traditions of elders while faced with economic castration and political trauma.... Asian-American men resolve uncertainty privately in order to save face and surrender personal autonomy to family obligations and needs. (p. 338).

Thus, gender role expectations influence thoughts and behaviors of men in different ways when combined with unique individual and cultural differences men face. Pleck (1995) asserted that “there is a particular constellation of standards and expectations that individually and jointly have various kinds of negative concomitants” (p. 20) for noncompliance to masculine norms. It is important to keep in mind that non-conformity to masculine norms can have an array of negative consequences for men depending on their race, ethnicity or culture.

#### Importance of spirituality

“All persons are created as spiritual beings. To describe someone as spiritual and someone else as not is to describe their differing awareness of and response to the deep striving for self-transcendence, surrender, integration, and identity” (Benner, 1991, p. 9). Counseling psychologists have long been reluctant to fully integrate spiritual factors into therapy. The American Psychological Association’s (2002) Code of Conduct makes explicit reference to religion as an important part of individual differences. Jung (1933) stated that physical, emotional and cognitive functioning are akin to spiritual functioning, and spiritual functioning is necessary for healing. That is, physical, emotional and cognitive functioning all affect how we interpret and interact with our environment, therefore affecting our worldview.

Individual views about religion and spiritual matters may play important roles in our developing personalities and also affect worldviews. Piedmont (1999) reported evidence for Spiritual Transcendence to be included as the sixth major factor of personality. It has also been reported that spirituality may serve as a latent influence on the other Big Five personality factors (McCrae & Costa, 1985). Although spirituality often receives very little attention from counselors, it can affect personality. Emmons (1999) stated “Spirituality and religion are an integral part of human culture, and as such, have the potential to shape individual lives and personalities” (p. 877). In addition, there is empirical evidence that religion can promote socially responsible behaviors such as marital fidelity (Jessor, Turbin & Costa, 1998) and fathers’ involvement in their children’s lives (Dollahite, 1998). More recently, Stanard, Sandhu, and Painter (2000) proposed that psychospiritual interventions are a valid way of addressing clients’ presenting concerns. Clients’ spirituality has become recognized as a more salient component of individual personality and therefore has become important for client conceptualization.

Reviews of empirical research consistently indicate that religious involvement is often (but not always) associated with positive mental health outcomes (Bergin, 1983; Gartner, Larson, & Allen, 1991; Koenig, 1994; Stark, 1970). Larson et al. (1989) conducted an analysis of 200 psychiatric and psychological studies on the subject of spirituality conducted over a 12-year period. They found that religiousness was often associated with desirable psychological outcomes. In a prospective study of three generations of Mexican Americans, Levin and colleagues (1996) found that religious attendance reduced depressive symptoms. Ellison, Levin, Taylor, and Chatters (1997)

reported that African Americans who attend religious services more than once a week or use religion for daily guidance reported reduced psychological distress and reduced risk for major depressive disorder over a three-year period.

Research supports the notion that masculine norms may influence men's psychological growth and development. In addition, spirituality continues to be become more recognized as a prominent factor of personality (Piedmont, 1999). However, the picture is not complete in terms of investigating whether or not conformity to masculine norms is associated with men's spiritual worldview. Thompson and Remmes (2002) found that among older men, a more feminine outlook predicted greater spirituality, while a masculine outlook predicted lesser spirituality. This masculine outlook was measured by responses to the short form of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1981). However, it should be noted that there is evidence suggesting that the BSRI is not strictly a sex-typing instrument, but rather is a personality inventory measuring "gender-related constructs in addition to instrumental and expressive traits" (Spence, 1991, p. 161). Another interesting finding of Thompson and Remmes' study was that men who conformed strongly to masculine norms and endorsed spirituality conceptualized their spirituality as a quest. The authors posited that that such a conceptualization may make spirituality more acceptable to men by appealing to the socialized message that men should seek adventure and danger. These findings provide a deeper understanding of how masculine norms may affect spirituality and how the two domains may interact with one another.

There is also evidence to suggest that religious involvement is associated with subjective well-being. A systematic review of 15 years of studies stated that most

authors found that religion increased reports of personal well-being (Levin, 1994). More specifically, Levin, Chatters, and Taylor (1995) found that indicators of spiritual devotion such as frequency of prayer and feelings closeness to God were linked to personal well-being. Ellison (1991) found that religious variables accounted for five to seven percent of the variance in overall life satisfaction, and that greater religious faith was significantly, positively correlated with greater personal happiness and significantly, negatively correlated with negative psychosocial consequences of traumatic life events.

#### Spirituality and physical health

Powell, Shahabi and Thoresen (2003) conducted a review of studies meeting minimum methodological standards (see Miller & Thoresen, 2003). This approach was chosen over meta-analysis because it allowed for greater focus on studies controlling for biases and confounds. Authors found that in eleven independent, longitudinal studies on a sample representative of the US population, church attendance accounted for a 25% to 30% decrease in mortality after controlling for demographic variables and established risk factors. The authors also noted that because private spiritual practices were not taken into account, the relation between spirituality and decreased mortality may be stronger than had been observed. Researchers have not yet been able to adequately explain why spirituality is associated with improved physical health, but there is evidence that spiritual engagement can augment overall physical functioning.

Researchers have found that certain religious groups, such as Mormons and Seventh-Day Adventists, tend to suffer from less chronic disease and have longer life expectancies when compared to other religious or non-religious groups (Cochran, Beeghly & Block, 1988; Jarvis & Northcutt, 1987; Richards & Bergin, 1997). It has

been suggested that their emphasis on healthier behaviors (e.g., refraining from drug or alcohol abuse) probably explains some, but not all, of the increased health of members of such denominations. Thus, one challenge is to understand why spiritual factors (among others) affect overall health (Thoresen, 1999).

Scheidt (1996) suggested that spiritual factors such as meditation might reduce unwanted sympathetic nervous system arousal. In turn, this reduction then prevents excessive levels of cortisol and norepinephrine from being released, which aids in disease risk prevention. McEwen (1998) identified chronic stress as being associated with a number of physiological problems. Stressors include perceived loss of control and lack of social emotional support. However, the author noted, spiritual beliefs may augment beliefs regarding perceived situational control, and religious groups often provide social support for members in crisis. Thus, spirituality and religious affiliation may serve as buffers to physiological risks by providing protection against chronic stressors. It should be noted that this is an area for future research and has yet to be empirically supported.

Meta-analyses have suggested that higher levels of religiosity are related to better overall health, decreased morbidity and decreased mortality. Levin and Vanderpool (1989) reviewed 27 studies and found that in 22 of the studies frequency of religious attendance was significantly, positively related to overall health. The outcomes used to determine overall health included hypertension, trichomoniasis, cervical cancer incidence, tuberculosis case rate, atherosclerotic and degenerative heart disease, neonatal mortality, subjective health, and overall mortality among others. They also found that members of certain religious groups such as Benedictine Monks, Baptist clergy, and Zen Buddhist priests had lower rates of hypertension compared to other religious groups or



non-religious groups. Higher religiosity was also found to be related to lower blood pressure, regardless of how religiosity was operationalized (religious attendance, church membership, or subjective self-ratings of religiosity).

Courtenay (2000) reported that while the shorter male lifespan is often assumed to be natural and unavoidable, there is evidence to support the theory that risky social practices (e.g., promiscuity, aggressiveness, excessive alcohol use) are also often signifiers of masculinity. Meeting gender role expectations is not merely a matter of psychological distress; there may be real physical danger associated with engaging in such behaviors. Therefore, conforming to masculine norms may actually contribute to shortening the male life expectancy.

Levin (1994) reviewed the literature with the aim of answering the following questions: “Is there an association between religion and health?”, “Is it valid?”, and “Is it causal?” According to the author, evidence suggests answers of “yes,” “probably” and “maybe,” respectively. It should be noted that this is a relatively fledgling area of research and that conclusions should be made tentatively (Thoresen, 1999). From a research perspective, one reasonable next step is to widen the scope of the current literature and uncover trends in this area among men in different age groups. It is also important to understand how masculinity influences the deeper aspects of spirituality. Spirituality is in part a socially-defined variable and is thus subject to multiple meanings. For example, men who identify strongly with masculine norms may state that they are Catholic or Baptist or simply Christian, but these in-group statuses are not precise indicators of their spirituality. Religious affiliations can be inherited or may simply be

used as the default setting or standby answer in situations in which spirituality is discussed.

Thus, more nuanced research designs are desirable to go beyond religious affiliations. In the case of those who ascribe to Judeo-Christian beliefs, this consists of their awareness of God in their lives and the maturity of their relationship with God. The proposed study seeks to conduct this type of deeper investigation in order to examine the relations between gender role conflict and the depth and richness of men's relationship with God.

## Chapter 3

### Method

#### Participants

Participants were men espousing religious beliefs that claim a belief in the Judeo-Christian God, which is a stipulation of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire which included age, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, religious denomination, and were asked whether or not they believe in God. Participants were men who are members of one of 6 Christian campus ministries or one of 5 fraternities on the campus of a large public university in the Midwest. Previous research conducted by Thompson and Remmes (2002) and Mahalik and Lagan (2001) identified significant relations between similar variables with sample sizes of 214 and 151 participants, respectively. Thus, the target sample size for this study was 225 participants, which was deemed to provide sufficient statistical power to detect relations if present. Campus Institutional Review Board approval was obtained.

#### Instruments

Gender Role Conflict Scale. The GRCS is an instrument designed to measure four dimensions of gender role conflict (O'Neil et al., 1986). The first dimension is Success/Power/Competition (SPC), which refers to personal attitudes regarding success pursued through competition and power. The second dimension is Restricted Emotionality (RE), which is defined as having restrictions and fears about expressing one's feelings as well as restrictions in finding words to express basic emotions. The third dimension is Restrictive and Affectionate Behaviors Between Men (RABBM), which represents restrictions in men's ability to share thoughts and feelings with one

another. The fourth dimension is Conflict Between Work and Family Responsibilities (CBWFR) and addresses conflicts in balancing work, school and family relations resulting in health problems, overwork, stress and a lack of leisure and relaxation. Each dimension represents a conflict between thoughts and feelings men naturally have (e.g., I love my family and want to spend more time with them) and attitudes they are socialized to embrace (e.g., real men put career success before their families).

The GRCS is a 37-item measure designed to assess the level of internal conflict men experience on the aforementioned for constructs. Respondents use a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Moderately Disagree, 3 = Mildly Disagree, 4 = Mildly Agree, 5 = Moderately Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree) to communicate how strongly they identify with statements associated with gender role conflict. Thirteen items make up the SPC subscale (e.g., “I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man”), 10 items make up the RE subscale (e.g., “I have difficulty telling others I care about them”), eight items make up the RABBM subscale (e.g., “Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable”), and six items make up the CBWFR (e.g., “My needs to work or study keep me from family or leisure more than I would like”). Higher scores on each subscale indicate a higher level of conflict regarding each of the four constructs, while higher total scores (the sums of the subscale scores) reflect a stronger expression of gender-role conflict and fear about femininity (O’Neil, 1981b, 1982).

The GRCS has been extensively studied and has been the subject of more than 20 factor analyses (O’Neil, 2008). Overall internal reliability estimates range from .71 to .89 for college students, and reliabilities for the four factors range from .71 to .91 for men from Korea, Germany, Canada, Sweden and Taiwan in addition to African-American,

Hispanic, Asian-American and gay men. Faria (2000) and O'Neil et al. (1986) both found test-retest reliabilities from .72 to .86 over a one-month period. Subscale correlations are moderate, ranging from .35 to .68, suggesting that the subscales are intercorrelated yet measure separate constructs (Moradi et al., 2008). Evidence supports the convergent validity of the GRCS with a range of masculinity measures, such as the Brannon Masculinity Scale (BMS; Brannon & Juni, 1984) and the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al., 1986) with coefficients ranging from .32 to .49 (O'Neil, 2008). These correlations suggest that the GRCS is correlated with similar assessments yet still measures a separate construct. In summary, a number of analyses have provided evidence for the reliability and validity of the GRCS for measuring gender role conflict in men.

Spiritual Assessment Inventory. The SAI (Hall & Edwards, 1996; 2002) is a measure designed to assess two dimensions of spiritual maturity from a Judeo-Christian perspective: Awareness of God and Quality of relationship with God. The Awareness dimension is designed to assess the degree of an individual's awareness of God's communication or presence in his/her life ("I am frequently aware of God prompting me to do something"). The Awareness dimension consists of two subscales: Awareness ("I have a sense of God working in my life"), and Disappointment ("There are times when I feel disappointed in God"). The Disappointment subscale consists of items assessing normal conflicts individuals have with God. Lower scores on these items may indicate defensiveness in respondents.

The Quality dimension is designed to assess different levels of relationship with God from an object relations perspective. The corresponding subscales for the four levels

are: Instability (“I am very afraid that God will give up on me”), Grandiosity (“God recognizes that I am more spiritual than most people”), Realistic Acceptance (“There are times when I feel angry at God, but when this happens, I still have the sense that God will always be with me”), and Impression Management (“I am always as kind at home as I am in church”), which was added after the initial scale development (Hall & Edwards, 2002). The Impression Management scale consists of items that exaggerate spiritually mature behavior and positive scores may indicate respondent social desirability that should be accounted for in analyses. Higher scores on the Awareness Disappointment, and Realistic Acceptance subscales are indicative of spiritual maturity, while higher scores on the Instability and Grandiosity subscales are indicative of spiritual immaturity.

The SAI consists of 52 items, with seven of those items requiring two-part responses (e.g., Item 18.1: “There are times when I feel angry at God”; Item 18.2: “When this happens, I still have the sense that God will always be with me”). Items are scored on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all true, 2 = Slightly true, 3 = Moderately true, 4 = Substantially true, 5 = Very True), with each subscale being calculated by averaging its answered items. Higher scores indicate greater presence of the trait named. None of the items are reverse-scored and there is no overall SAI score calculated. If the respondent omits more than half the items for a given scale, the scale cannot be scored. In each two-part response item, the second response assesses the Realistic Acceptance (RA) subscale. If the respondent answers “Not at all true” for the first response of the two-part item, the second response cannot be scored and that item is omitted from the RA scale score average. The authors reported that IM scale displayed poor construct reliability for assessing desirability and is highly correlated with substantive scales such

as Awareness of God (T. Hall, personal communication, October 2, 2008). Thus, the five Impression Management subscale items were omitted, leaving 47 total items.

The internal consistency estimates of each subscale using coefficient alpha were: Awareness (.95), Disappointment (.90), Realistic Acceptance (.83), Grandiosity, (.73), Impression Management (.77), and Instability (.84). Evidence for construct validity was provided by comparing scores on the SAI to the Bell Object Relations Inventory (BORI), Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS), Intrinsic/Extrinsic- Revised, Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), and Defense Style Questionnaire-40 (DSQ-40). (See Table 1 for a list of correlations).

The Instability subscale of the SAI had a stronger overall relation with the BORI subscales than did the Awareness subscale, which was consistent with author expectations given the utility of the BORI in identifying pathological object relations styles. The Grandiosity subscale correlated higher with the Egocentricity subscale ( $r = .47, p < 0.01$ ) than with any other BORI subscale, while Egocentricity had lower correlations with other SAI subscales. This pattern provides evidence for the convergent and discriminant validity of the Grandiosity subscale. As expected, high positive correlations were found between the SAI Awareness subscale and the Religious Well-Being (RWB) ( $r = .68, p < .01$ ) and Existential Well-Being (EWB) ( $r = .56, p < .01$ ). The quality scales of the SAI appear to measure aspects of spirituality that the SWBS does not.

The Intrinsic scale of the I/E-R correlated more highly with the Awareness subscale of the SAI than with the quality scales. The Extrinsic social (Es) scale has low correlations with all five SAI subscales (all  $r$ 's below .20). The Extrinsic personal (Ep)

scale had three correlations below 0.20 with the SAI subscales, while the Ep scale correlated  $r = .26$  and  $r = .32$  with the Instability and Grandiosity subscales, respectively. Evidence suggests that quality of relationship with God has minimal relationship with the I/E-R measure of religious motivation.

Authors of the SAI correlated its subscales with the NPI in order to test the Grandiosity subscales' discriminant validity. Grandiosity was the only subscale to correlate significantly with all three NPI subscales. The correlation of the Authority subscale of the NPI and the Awareness subscale of the SAI ( $r = .22$ ) was the only correlation of the 15 conducted that was inconsistent with convergent-discriminant validity hypotheses for the Grandiosity subscale. The data is presented in Table 1.

#### Scales of Psychological Well-Being

The SPWB (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Keyes, 1995) consists of six 14-item scales (84 total items) designed to assess the core dimensions of psychological well-being. Respondents use a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Moderately Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Slightly Agree, 5 = Moderately Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree) to indicate the degree to which they agree with each item on a given scale. Responses to negatively-scored items are reversed in final scoring so that high scores indicate high self-rating on a given dimension. No overall score is reported. The six scales are: Self-acceptance, Positive relations with others, Autonomy, Environmental mastery, Purpose in life, and Personal growth.

Self-acceptance is defined as having a positive attitude toward oneself, acknowledging and accepting good and bad aspects of self, and feeling positive about past life. Positive relations with others is defined as having empathy and affection for all



human beings and being capable of love, deep friendship, intimacy and understands the give and take of human relationships. Autonomy is defined as being self-determining and independent, able to resist social pressures to think and act in certain ways, regulating behavior from within, and evaluating oneself by personal standards. Environmental mastery is defined by having a sense of mastery and competence in managing the environment, controlling a complex array of activities, making effective use of surrounding opportunities, and being able to create or choose contexts suitable to personal needs and values. Purpose in life is defined as having goals in life, having a sense of directedness, feeling there is meaning to past and present life, holding beliefs that give life purpose, and having aims and objectives for living. Personal growth is defined as having a feeling of continued development, seeing oneself as growing and expanding, being open to new experiences, having a sense of realizing one's potential, seeing improvement in self and behavior over time, and changing in ways that reflect more self-knowledge and effectiveness.

Each subscale was derived from a 20-item parent scale. The coefficient alpha measure of internal consistency and correlation with its parent scale, respectively, for each subscale were: Self-acceptance, .91, .99; Positive relations with others, .88, .98; Autonomy, .83, .97; Environmental mastery, .86, .98; Purpose in life, .88, .98; and Personal Growth, .85, .93. Test-retest reliability coefficients for each parent scale ( $N = 117$ ) over a two-week period were: Self-acceptance, .85; Positive relations with others, .83; Autonomy, .88; Environmental mastery, .81; Purpose in life, .82; and Personal Growth, .81.

Correlational analyses were conducted to compare the Scales of Psychological Well-Being to the following well-being measures: Life Satisfaction Index, Affect Balance Scale, Self-Esteem Scale, Levinson's Locus of Control subscales (Powerful Others, Internal, Chance), Zung Depression Scale, and Philadelphia Geriatric Morale Scale. Correlations of the new scales with prior measures of positive functioning (life satisfaction, affect balance, self-esteem, internal control and morale) were all significant and positive, ranging from .25 to .73. All correlations with previous measures of negative functioning (powerful others, chance control, depression) are significant and negative, ranging from -.30 to -.60. The scales are also positively correlated with each other, with coefficients ranging from .32 to .76. However, self-acceptance and environmental mastery correlated .76, and self-acceptance and purpose in life correlated .72, suggesting a common underlying construct. See Table 2 for the specific intercorrelations.

Significant effects were found for overall sex,  $F(6, 310) = 8.65, p < .001$ . This was accounted for by women scoring higher than men on positive relations with others,  $F(1, 315) = 17.64, p < .001$ . Outcomes for personal growth approached significance,  $F(1, 315) = 3.61, p < .058$ . No other significant sex differences were obtained. The author contends that conflict and competition between values is inevitable in this area of research and should be seen as a target for future studies rather than as an obstacle.

#### Socially Desirable Response Set Five-Item Survey.

The SDRS-5 (Hays, Hayashi & Stewart, 1989) is a self-report measures designed to assess respondents' tendencies to give socially desirable responses. The measure consists of five items, with respondents using a five-point Likert-type scale (1 =

Definitely True, 2 = Mostly True, 3 = Don't Know, 4 = Mostly False, 5 = Definitely False) to indicate how true or false each statement is for them. Items one and five are reverse scored (i.e., 1 = 5, 2 = 4, 3 = 3, 4 = 2, 5 = 1). The sum of the five scores represents the overall score, with higher scores indicating more socially desirable responding tendencies.

Internal consistency and reliability were examined with two samples: a sample of 614 outpatients of medical providers and 3,053 outpatients of medical and mental health providers. Coefficient alpha reliability estimates were .66 and .68, respectively. A one-month test-retest reliability estimate with a sample of 75 adults was .75. Overall, the SDRS-5 is ideally suited for researchers needing a brief measure of respondent social desirability response set. The proposed study will use this assessment to measure social desirability bias due to the aforementioned removal of the Impression Management subscale from the Spiritual Assessment Inventory.

### Procedure

Participants consisted of male members of Christian campus ministries and fraternity members at a public university in the Midwest. Organizations included Campus Crusade for Christ, Mizzou Baptist Student Union Ministries, Newman Center, The Rock, Veritas, and six campus fraternities.

Researchers attended meetings for each organization in order to recruit participants, provide informed consent and administer survey instruments. Participants completed an informed consent document, demographic questionnaire, the Gender Role Conflict Scale, the Spiritual Assessment Inventory, the Scales of Psychological Well-

Being, and the Socially Desirable Response Set Five-Item Survey. Participants were entered in a drawing to win one of eight iPod Shuffles.

### Analyses

7.0 (2009) will be used to analyze the collected data. Descriptive analyses were conducted. For the first research question and its corresponding hypothesis, the four subscales of the Gender Role Conflict Scale and the Grandiosity and Instability subscales of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory were entered on one side and the six subscales of the Scales of Psychological Well-Being will be entered on the other side of a simultaneous regression analysis. The results will provide an estimate of the extent of variance that gender role conflict and spirituality combine to explain in Christian men's psychological well being. For the second research question and its corresponding hypothesis, the four subscales of the Gender Role Conflict Scale were entered on one side and the Grandiosity and Instability subscales of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory were entered on the other side of a simultaneous regression analysis. The results provided an estimate of the extent of variance that gender role conflict explains grandiose and unstable relationships with God. For the third research question and the corresponding hypothesis, the four subscales of the GRCS were entered on one side and the six subscales of the Scales of Psychological Well-Being were entered on the other side of a simultaneous regression analysis. The results provided an estimate of the extent of variance that gender role conflict explains psychological well-being.

For the fourth research question and corresponding hypothesis, a correlational analysis were conducted between the Realistic Acceptance subscale of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory and all six of the Scales of Psychological Well-Being subscales.

For the fifth research question and associated hypothesis, a correlational analysis was conducted between the Restrictive Emotionality subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale and the Awareness and Realistic Acceptance subscales of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory.

## Chapter 4

### Results

#### Preliminary Analyses

The following chapter describes and summarizes the statistical analyses used to answer the research questions previously set forth. The sample consisted of 223 male college students at a large, public Midwestern university. Fourteen participant surveys were excluded from the analysis due to either incomplete responses or questionable responses styles. More specifically, in eight cases, at least one page of the survey was left completely blank. In the remaining cases, participants' responses either did not vary (e.g., answering each item as a "5") or varied in a systematic way (e.g., participant response pattern was "5, 4, 3, 2, 1" repeated throughout the survey) that suggested a lack of attention to the content of the items. Missing or unreadable responses for individual items on the remaining surveys were replaced with the population mean for that item.

Participants ranged in age from 18 to 26, with a mean age of approximately 20 years old (19.94). The sample consisted of 205 White males (93%), two African-American males, five Asian males, five Latino males, and six Multiracial males. The sample consisted of 79 freshmen (36%), 66 sophomores (30%), 35 juniors (16%), 27 seniors (12%), eight fifth-year undergraduate students (3%), and eight graduate students (3%). Participants also self-reported their religious denominations. The sample consisted of 83 Catholics (37%), 22 Baptists (10%), 24 Presbyterians (11%), 18 Methodists (8%), 14 Lutherans (6%), 2 Pentecostals (1%), 38 Evangelicals (17%), and 22 "Other" (10%). Descriptive statistics for each denomination are available in Appendix G.

The Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) consists of four subscales and an overall total score. For the Success, Power and Control (SPC) scale, respondents' scores ranged from 23 to 78 (out of a possible 78), with mean = 50.08 and  $SD = 11.12$ . For the Restricted Emotionality (RE) scale, respondents' scores ranged from 10 to 55 (out of a possible 60), with a mean of 28.77 and  $SD = 8.56$ . For the Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) scale, respondents' scores ranged from 8 to 48 (out of a possible 48), with a mean of 24.62 and  $SD = 7.83$ . For the Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) scale, respondents' scores ranged from 6 to 36 (out of a possible 36), with a mean of 21.20 and  $SD = 6.10$ . For the GRCS total score, respondents scores ranged from 60 to 217 (out of a possible 222), with a mean of 124.68 and  $SD = 24.97$ .

The Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) consists of five subscale scores. For the Disappointment scale, respondents' scores ranged from 7 to 35 (out of a possible 35), with a mean of 17.12 and  $SD = 6.41$ . For the Awareness scale, respondents' scores ranged from 18 to 90 (out of a possible 90), with a mean of 55.94 and  $SD = 16.14$ . For the Instability scale, respondents' scores ranged from 9 to 38 (out of a possible 45), with a mean of 19.28 and  $SD = 6.37$ . For the Grandiosity scale, respondents' scores ranged from 7 to 27 (out of a possible 35), with a mean of 12.91 and  $SD = 5.10$ . For the Realistic Acceptance scale, respondents' scores ranged from 7 to 35 (out of a possible 35), with a mean of 24.05 and  $SD = 7.62$ .

The Scales of Psychological Well-Being (SPWB) scale consists of six subscale scores, each scale with a maximum score of 84. For the Self-Acceptance scale, respondents' scores ranged from 41 to 68, with a mean of 54.08 and  $SD = 6.03$ . For the

Positive Relations with Others scale, respondents' scores ranged from 39 to 84, with a mean of 62.69 and  $SD = 10.67$ . For the Autonomy scale, respondents' scores ranged from 37 to 79, with a mean of 56.05 and  $SD = 7.75$ . For the Environmental Mastery scale, respondents' scores ranged from 29 to 83, with a mean of 56.90 and  $SD = 8.96$ . For the Purpose in Life scale, respondents' scores ranged from 34 to 84, with a mean of 60.60 and  $SD = 9.30$ . For the Personal Growth scale, respondents' scores ranged from 42 to 84, with a mean of 64.13 and  $SD = 10.41$ .

The Socially Desirable Response Set Five-Item Survey (SDRS-5) consists of 5 items and a maximum overall score of 25, with total score indicating level of socially desirable responding. Respondents' scores ranged from 5 to 19, with a mean of 13.37 and  $SD = 2.73$ .

Descriptive statistics were also taken for the various racial and ethnic groups from the sample. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the included variables and are displayed in Table 2.

Extensive research has been conducted using the GRCS, and as a result a large amount of normative data has been compiled on various demographic populations. A summary of the data can be found in Table 3. Mean scores for White College Students from the current study ( $n = 205$ ) fell within one standard deviation on each subscale score and for the overall total score when compared to mean scores for the national normative data. Mean scores for African-American ( $n = 2$ ) students were significantly different from the national normative data for African-American men on Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, and in both cases men from the current study scored lower on those subscales. However, the current study's small



number of cases of African-American participants prevents the author from drawing broader conclusions from that data.

Mean scores were also obtained for Hispanic/Latino College Students ( $n = 5$ ) and compared to the national normative data for Hispanic/Latino Men. Mean scores for each subscale and the total scale score were all within one standard deviation of the mean score for the national normative data. The same was true for the sample of Asian College Students ( $n = 5$ ). No normative data has been compiled for Multiracial men. Currently, normative data is not available for the SAI or the SDRS-5. Ryff, Lee, Essex, and Schmutte (1994) reported data for 101 men. (The data is reported in Table 4). In general, participants in the study reported scores approximately one standard deviation lower than the normative data provided by Ryff (1994).

Participants also reported their religious denomination in the demographic questionnaire. Denominations were broken into 8 categories: Catholic, Baptist, Presbyterian, Pentecostal, Methodist, Lutheran, Evangelical, and Other. Across denominations, seven of the eight groups showed no significant differences in scores for Psychological Well-Being, Gender Role Conflict, or Spiritual Maturity. This reflects the relative homogeneity of the sample, which was dominated by White, Christian men from the Midwest, and may indicate that there is little practical difference between various iterations of Christianity on the construct examined by this study.

Prior to addressing the research hypotheses, a correlation matrix was constructed for all respondent variables. The data are presented in Table 5. Correlation analyses revealed several noteworthy relations between variables. The SDRS-5 scale was negatively, significantly correlated with the Disappointment with God subscale with the

SAI, indicating as participants increase their socially desirable response style, their tendency to report disappointment with God decreases. The Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) subscale of the GRCS positively correlated with the Grandiosity subscale of the SAI,  $r = .31, p < .01$ . While the relationship between the two scales is not immediately evident, a common factor shared by the two scales is a sense of isolation. Four of the five SAI items loading on the Grandiosity scale address a strong differentiation between the participant and others with regard to relationship to God. This is somewhat consistent with the RABBM subscale, which represents difficulty expressing one's thoughts and feelings with other men.

The RABBM subscale was also significantly negatively correlated with the Positive Relations with Others ( $r = -.39, p < .01$ ), Personal Growth ( $r = -.34, p < .01$ ), and Autonomy ( $r = -.26, p < .01$ ) scales of the Scales of Psychological Well-Being. It should be noted that these three scales share some of the common variance. The Positive Relations with Others scale is defined by the capability of expressing deeper friendship and greater love with others, which logically would conflict with the RABBM subscale, which is characterized by an inability to articulate one's feelings for others.

The Restricted Emotionality (RE) subscale of the GRCS was significantly negatively correlated with all six Scales of Psychological Well-Being, with Positive Relations with Others ( $r = -.44, p < .01$ ), Autonomy ( $r = -.33, p < .01$ ), and Personal Growth ( $r = -.32, p < .01$ ) having the strongest correlations. RE is defined as having restrictions and fears about expressing feelings as well as difficulty finding words to express emotions. The significant correlations on all six scales can be explained by the role of emotional expression and communication in healthy psychological well-being

(Ryff, 1989). In particular, the relationship between the RE subscale and the Positive Relations with Others make sense in that a lack of emotional expression would inhibit one's ability to create and nurture strong interpersonal relationships with others.

The GRCS Total scale was statistically significantly positively correlated with the SAI subscales of Instability ( $r = .24, p < .01$ ) and Grandiosity ( $r = .24, p < .01$ ). The total GRCS score is defined as an overall assessment of the GRC across the four subscales. While the correlations are relatively small, it is noteworthy that the two SAI subscales scales representing negative personality attributes were positively related to the GRCS Total scale. The Instability subscale is described as the inability to integrate positive and negative attributes in the self and others, resulting in concrete, all-or-none thinking. The Grandiosity subscale reflects narcissism, a tendency to manipulate others for personal gain, and an inflated sense of importance. All three scales share negative internal processes, which in turn may impact how individuals interact with their environments.

In addition, the GRCS Total score was negatively correlated with four of the Scales of Psychological Well-Being; Positive Relations With Others ( $r = -.34, p < .01$ ), Autonomy ( $r = -.31, p < .01$ ), Personal Growth ( $r = -.26, p < .01$ ) and Environmental Mastery ( $r = -.25, p < .01$ ). That is, those who endorse greater total GRC are less likely to report high levels of Psychological Well-Being. The Positive Relations with Others scale, however, was related to GRCS Total over and above the other subscales. The four constructs of the GRCS each address interpersonal relationships and how men interact with their environment due to socialized gender roles. Thus, it logically follows that high levels of GRC would coincide with poor relationships with others.

The Instability subscale of the SAI was significantly negatively correlated to all six Scales of Psychological Well-Being, and had the strongest relations with the Self-Acceptance ( $r = -.40, p < .01$ ) and Personal Growth ( $r = -.39, p < .01$ ) scales. According to Hall and Edwards (1996), those with unstable relationships with God tend to have difficulty reconciling ambiguity in their behavior as well as in the behavior of others. This lack of flexibility may coincide with the inability to hold oneself in positive regard despite making mistakes or performing poorly in some areas. Thus, the negative relations between Self-Acceptance and spiritual Instability falls in line with the theoretical underpinnings of each measure. The Personal Growth construct of Psychological Well-Being is characterized by constant change and development, with room for errors and new learning by the individual. This is at odds with the unstable spiritual construct, which sees errors as signs of weakness and therefore aims to avoid situations in which those errors would be exposed or magnified.

Finally, the Grandiosity subscale of the SAI was significantly negatively correlated with the Personal Growth ( $r = -.48, p < .01$ ), Positive Relations with Others ( $r = -.39, p < .01$ ) and Purpose in Life ( $r = -.30, p < .01$ ) scales of Psychological Well-Being. The Grandiose relationship with God is characterized by alternating one's perception of God (e.g., benevolent and kind vs. spiteful and cruel) in order to maintain one's own ego and inflated sense of self. The Personal Growth subscale, on the other hand, is characterized by an internal equilibrium that depends little on outside agencies for validation. Those scoring highly on the Personal Growth subscale may have a higher internal locus of control compared to those who tend to score highly on the Grandiosity scale and tend to use external objects to measure their personal progress and worth.

### Question 1

To determine whether or not higher levels of gender role conflict and less mature relationships with God predict lower psychological well-being, six simultaneous regressions were conducted using the following variables as predictors of the six Scales of Psychological Well-Being: Gender Role Conflict Total, Spiritual Instability and Spiritual Grandiosity. Results of each regression analysis are shown in Tables 17-22. Each model was significant ( $p < .01$ ). The  $R^2$  value for each outcome variable ranged from .14 to .27. However, there is still a substantial amount of variance not accounted for by the model. The regression model was most predictive for Positive Relationships with Others ( $R^2 = .23$ ) and Personal Growth ( $R^2 = .27$ ).

### Question 2

To determine whether or not higher levels of gender role conflict predicted spiritual awareness and realistic acceptance of God, two simultaneous regressions were conducted using the following variables as predictors of Awareness and Realistic Acceptance: Success, Power & Control, Restrictive Emotionality, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations. Results of each regression analysis are shown in Table 23 and 24. Neither model was significant  $p=.05$  level. The  $R^2$  values for the Awareness and Realistic Acceptance models were .02 and .04, respectively.

### Question 3

To determine whether or not the dimensions of Gender Role Conflict predicted overall psychological well-being, a series of six simultaneous regressions were conducted using the following variables as predictors of Psychological Well-Being: Success, Power

& Control, Restrictive Emotionality, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations. Results of each regression analysis are shown in Tables 25-30. Each model was significant ( $p < .01$ ). The  $R^2$  value for each outcome variable ranged from .08 to .24. However, there is still a substantial amount of variance not accounted for by the model. The regression model was most predictive for Positive Relationships with Others ( $R^2 = .24$ ).

#### Question 4

To determine whether or not the Realistic Acceptance subscale of the SAI is correlated with the Scales of Psychological Well-Being, Pearson's  $r$  was calculated for each pair of variables. See Table 3 for a complete list of correlations. While all correlation coefficients are positive, only the Autonomy scale and Purpose in Life scale were significant at the  $p = .05$  level ( $r = .17$  and  $r = .14$ , respectively).

#### Question 5

To determine whether the Restricted Emotionality subscale of the GRCS was correlated to the Awareness and Realistic Acceptance subscales of the SAI, Pearson's  $r$  was calculated for each pair of variables. The correlation coefficients for Awareness and Realistic Acceptance were negative, but neither was statistically significant ( $r = -.07$  and  $r = -.05$  respectively).

## Chapter 5

### Discussion

In this chapter, the results of the study will be discussed, as well as the contribution of the study to the research literature on gender role conflict, spirituality, and psychological well-being. First, the demographic and denominational variables will be summarized as they relate to men's responses. Then, the relations between the three constructs will be discussed. Limitations of the study will be acknowledged, along with implications for research and practice.

#### Demographic and Denominational Variables

Overall, men from the current study responded similarly to the normative data available for the Gender Role Conflict Scale and Scales of Psychological Well-Being. This suggests these men endorse similar levels of gender role conflict but reported lower psychological well-being. No normative data is currently available for the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. While there was some significant variation in scores between minority students from the sample and national normative data from the Gender Role Conflict Scale, the sample sizes for these groups were too small to be meaningful. Participants across races responded in similar fashions to one another across instruments. Differences that were found were difficult to interpret due to the homogeneity of the sample and the small number of racial minority participants. It is noteworthy, however, that African-American respondents ( $n = 2$ ) scored significantly lower on the Restricted Emotionality subscale and significantly higher on the Positive Relationships with Others subscale when compared to White participants ( $n = 205$ ). If the data can be replicated in a larger sample group and subsequently generalized to the population, findings may

suggest African-Americans possess superior interpersonal skills as well as a positive relationship between the ability to express one's emotions and the ability to develop and maintain close relationships with others.

Scores calculated for respondents across religious denominations yielded similar results. However, the one notable exception was the Pentecostal group ( $n = 2$ ). Due to the small size of this group, Pentecostal responses may reflect individual differences, and should be interpreted with great caution. When compared to the largest denominational group (Catholics,  $n = 82$ ), Pentecostal students scored significantly higher on Awareness of God, Realistic Acceptance of God, Positive Relationships with Others, Autonomy, and Personal Growth, and scored significantly lower on the Grandiosity scale in terms of their relationship with God. That is, they scored higher on five "positive" measures and lower on one "negative" measure. Although the reason for these scores (aside from individual differences as mentioned above) is unclear, it may suggest that differences in theology between denominations could have a practical impact on how members see themselves in relation to God, and could in turn impact their psychological well-being.

#### Relations among Gender Role Conflict, Spirituality, and Psychological Well-Being

Correlations between subscales demonstrated noteworthy relations between several constructs. Restrictive Emotionality was significantly, negatively related to all indicators of psychological well-being. This suggests that the ability and willingness to express emotions to others, particularly through verbal expression, may contribute to healthy psychological well-being. Ironically, the urge to restrict one's emotions is a response to socialized gender roles imposed by sexist or patriarchal societies (O'Neil 2008). Thus, engaging in such restriction should, according to socialized gender roles,



enhance psychological well-being and social relationships by putting men in their proper socially-defined masculine role. However, the results of the current study suggest that restricting emotions is related to poor psychological well-being, particularly having an inverse association with the Positive Relations with Others scale.

The Instability subscale of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory was also significantly, negatively associated with all six indicators of psychological well-being. The Instability with God scale of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory is indicative of a rigid, black-and-white pattern of thinking as related to one's concept of God, and does not allow for contextualization when evaluating the thoughts, words and actions of oneself or of others. It follows that this style of thinking would be problematic across the domains of psychological well-being. For example, individuals would likely find it difficult to accept oneself if every mistake or failure was seen as an indictment of their character, effectively sending them "back to square one" each time. These results suggest that increased cognitive flexibility may be a component of overall well-being.

It should be noted that the Instability with God and Grandiosity with God subscales of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory were the two subscales that showed the strongest relations with psychological well-being and the gender role conflict. (The Disappointment with God subscale was also significantly, negatively associated with psychological well-being, although the associations were relatively small.) More specifically, the scales measuring negative or maladaptive relationships with God were most strongly related to decreased psychological well-being as measured by the Scales of Psychological Well-Being or the Gender Role Conflict Scale. However, the positive, adaptive subscales of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (Awareness and Realistic

Acceptance) did not show the same relationship strength with increased psychological well-being as measured by the same scales. Perhaps an antagonistic, maladaptive view of God influences one's psyche and interpersonal relationships to the point that it could inhibit overall psychological well-being. On the other hand, a healthier, more stable relationship with God (as measured by the Awareness and Realistic Acceptance scales) may not be sufficient or necessary to improve overall psychological health.

### Predictors of Psychological Well-Being

Overall gender role conflict, along with Instability with God and Grandiosity with God, were used to predict psychological well-being among men. From that model, two noteworthy predictive relations were identified. First, the model predicted roughly 23% of the variance in Positive Relations with Others. Positive relations are characterized by the ability to identify and connect with others as well as a tendency to develop close interpersonal relationships. Greater Instability with God indicates a tendency to have a chaotic relationship with God due to a rigid, black-and-white cognitive style that does not cope well with ambiguity. Grandiosity with God describes a manipulative interpersonal style that tends to value others (including God) to the extent that others are able to satisfy one's needs. Thus, scores on these two measures appear to be indicative of individuals' skill in developing and maintaining close relationships. In addition, overall gender role conflict reflects the combined effects on all four gender role conflict dimensions. At the heart of gender role conflict is a fear of femininity, often resulting in maladaptive behaviors designed to preserve and enhance a man's image as masculine (O'Neil, 2008). This manipulation of external behavior can negatively impact men's relationships with others.

Greater endorsement of Instability with God, Grandiosity with God, and overall gender role conflict suggest negative interpersonal patterns, which logically decrease one's ability to maintain positive relations with others. Of note in this sample of predominately White, Christian male college students that relationship with God contributed to predicting their relationships with others, reinforcing the importance of spirituality as a dimension of psychological health. While spirituality may not necessarily be a target of psychological intervention, it may be a useful aspect in helping identify individuals' interpersonal style.

The model also predicted almost 27% of the variance for Personal Growth. Those who highly endorse this construct continue to grow and develop throughout their lives, consistently seek out new opportunities and challenges, and resist stagnating personally or professionally. Overall gender role conflict is characterized in large part by restrictive emotions and behavior, which may be antithetical to continued development throughout the lifespan. In addition, greater endorsement of Instability with God tend to indicate a desire to reach a fixed state in which one's environment can be easily partitioned into parts labeled "right" or "wrong," which would be predictive of individuals who are less likely to seek continued personal growth. Similarly, those with highly grandiose relationships with God do not seek to deepen relationships but rather use them as tools to obtain specific goals, which is a more shallow approach and one that does not typically lend itself to ongoing maturation. Again, an unhealthy relationship with God may be predictive of one's inability to grow and mature consistently over time.

The second model employed the four dimensions of gender role conflict to predict six aspects of psychological well-being (as measured by the Scales of Psychological

Well-Being). Gender role conflict explained little of the variance in psychological well-being. Gender role conflict was most strongly predictive of the positive relations with others aspect of the Scales of Psychological Well-Being. This is likely due to the fact that 78% of items on the GRCS have an interpersonal context (O'Neil, 2008). That is, the Gender Role Conflict Scale is in large part a measure of how gender role conflict impacts men's relationships with those around them. It follows that high levels of gender role conflict would be predictive of impaired relationships with others. Generally, gender role conflict may not have a tremendous impact on global functioning, but is likely to adversely affect the interpersonal domain.

#### Predictors of Spiritual Maturity

The four dimensions of gender role conflict were used to predict Awareness of God and Realistic Acceptance of God (as measured by the Spiritual Assessment Inventory). The model was not significant for predicting either construct. In other words, the current study did not demonstrate GRC as predictive of the quality of one's relationship with God. One hypothesis of this study was that GRC and its associated restrictive behaviors and emotions would inhibit spiritual maturity in men. However, the data do not support this hypothesis. Instead, aspects of GRC and Spiritual Maturity appear to be mostly independent of each other.

#### Limitations

Several limitations are present in the current study. First, the respondent population is extremely homogeneous, making the results less generalizable across demographic groups. The vast majority of participants were White, all expressed belief in a Judeo-Christian God, more than one-third were Catholic, and all were college

students at the same university. Thus, these findings may not be applied to Non-White, non-Christian populations, and may not be applied to populations outside the Midwest or who are not attending college. Even within the Christian population in the U.S., spiritual attitudes vary tremendously, thus the results of the current study should not be considered representative of Christians across the country.

In addition, the sampling of college-aged males limits generalizability of the study to males outside the 18 to 26 age range and of differing academic abilities. A wider age range among the population would be helpful particularly regarding the GRCS, where career and family responsibilities might alter responses from participants. The validity of participant responses may have also suffered due to the use of self-report measures. Limitations associated with data collected via self-report are also present. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, Bonferroni corrections were not performed as part of the regression analyses. Therefore, predictive power of the regression models should be interpreted with caution.

Finally, the measures themselves provided some obstacles regarding analysis and interpretation. While the GRCS consists of subscales as well as an overall score, the SAI and the SPWB consist only of subscales and offer no overall score indicating spiritual maturity or psychological well-being. While these scales were helpful in untangling which specific aspects spirituality and well-being, the lack of an overall score limits the ability to easily comprehend the overall relations between the three constructs.

#### Implications for Practice and Research

The results of the current study support previous studies that indicate spirituality is an important aspect of psychological well-being. Specifically, the data suggest that

maladaptive relations with God is associated with one's interpersonal style and may inhibit personal growth. If this research can be generalized across demographic groups and replicated consistently, it may demonstrate that while a healthy spiritual life may not be necessary for overall psychological health, a problematic or antagonistic spiritual schema can negatively impact other areas of one's life. That is, spirituality is not a discrete psychological domain, but rather may be a dynamic part of one's personality that interacts with other facets of self. From a mental healthcare perspective, the data suggest that clients' relationship with God can be a useful dimension to help understand their way of relating to others and how they see the world. Thus, spirituality appears to be an important part of client conceptualization and treatment.

The current study also demonstrates gender role conflict as interpersonally inhibitory. RE has been found to be correlated to poor social skills (Sharpe et al., 1995) and to poor interpersonal competence (Berko, 1994). The current study supports these findings as well as previous research that has shown associations between men's Restrictive Emotionality, Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men and poor psychological well-being (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). A consistent theme throughout the research on gender role conflict is the antagonistic impact of Restrictive Emotionality with interpersonal relationships and, in some cases, with anxiety and depression. Practitioners working with men would benefit from exploring their clients' emotional expressiveness and interpersonal relationships as part of conceptualizing and planning for client treatment. Encouraging emotional expressiveness may serve as an attainable, concrete way of improving client interaction with others.

Future research should seek to further explore how gender role conflict and spirituality affect overall psychological well-being. Specifically, future research should examine how restricted emotionality and an unstable relationship with God may impact interpersonal relationships for men. Generalizability of the current study is also an issue for future exploration. It is important to explore relations of the constructs within a more heterogeneous sample in terms of age, race, and denomination. In addition, alternate measures of spirituality should be developed and/or utilized in order to assess spiritual maturity for those who do not profess a belief in the Judeo-Christian God.

## References

- Allport, G.W. (1950). *The individual and his religion: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Macmillan.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-IV-TR*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 57, 1060-1073.
- Bem, S.L. (1981). *Bem sex-role inventory: Professional manual*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Benner, D.G. (1991). *Counseling as a spiritual process*. Grand Rapids, MI: Lingdale Papers.
- Bergin, A.E. (1983). Religiosity and mental health: A critical reevaluation and meta-analysis. *Professional psychology: Research and Practice*, 14, 170-184.
- Bergin, A. E. (1991). Values and religious issues in psychotherapy and mental health. *American Psychologist*, 46, 394-403.
- Berko, E.H. (1994). Shyness, gender-role orientation, physical self-esteem and male gender role conflict (Doctoral dissertation, University of Albany, State University of New York, 1994.) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55, 4100.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, Jr., C.E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: effect of college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance use, and attitudes towards help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43, (4), 461-465.



- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint of manhood, and what it's done for us lately. In *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role*, edited by D. David and R. Brannon, pp. 1-45. Reading, MA. Addison-Wesley.
- Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes toward masculinity. *JSAS Psychological Documents*, 14, 6-7 (ms2612).
- Cochran, J.K., Beeghley, L., & Bock, E.W. (1988). Religiosity and alcohol behavior: An exploration of reference group theory. *Sociological Forum*, 3, 256-276.
- Connors, N.A., Whiteside-Mansell, Leanne & Sherman, A.C. (2006). Dimensions of religious involvement and mental health outcomes among alcohol- and drug-dependent women. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 24, 89-108.
- Cournoyer, R.J., & Mahalik, J.R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42, 1, 11-19.
- Courtenay, W.H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on mens well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science and Medicine*, 50, 1385-1401.
- David, D.S., & Brannon, R. (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dollahite, D.C. (1998). Fathering, faith, and spirituality. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 7, 3-15.
- Ellison, C.G. (1991). Religious involvement and subjective well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 32, 80-99.

- Ellison, C.G., Levin, J.S., Taylor, R.J., & Chatters, L.M. (1997, November). *Religious involvement and psychological distress in a national panel study of African-Americans*. Paper presented at the joint meetings of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion and Religious Research Association, San Diego.
- Emmons, R.A. (1999). Religion and psychology personality: An introduction. *Journal of Personality, 67*, 873-888.
- Engbretson, K. (2006). Identity, masculinity and spirituality: A study of Australian teenage boys. *Journal of Youth Studies, 9* (1), 91-110.
- Faria, M. (2000). *Analysis of the components of gender role conflict*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Lusofona of Humanities and Technology, Lisboa, Mestrado de Sexologia, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Francis, L.J. (1997). The psychology of gender differences in religion: A review of empirical research. *Religion, 27*, 81-96.
- Francis, L.J. & Wilcox, C. (1996). Religion and gender orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 20*, 119-121.
- Gartner, J.D., Larson, D.B., & Allen, G.D. (1991). Religious commitment and health: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Psychology & Theology, 19*, 6-25.
- Good, G.E., & Brooks, G.R. (Eds.). (2005). *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling in men: A comprehensive guide to settings, problems, and treatment approaches*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Good, G.E., Dell, D.M. & Mintz, L.B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 295-300.

- Good, G.E., & Mintz, L.M. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence for compounded risk. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 17-21.
- Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., O'Neil, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., Debord, K.A., et al. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 3-10.
- Good, G.E., Wallace, D.L., & Borst, T.S. (1994). Masculinity research: A review and critique. *Applied and Preventative Psychology, 3*, 3-14.
- Hall, T.W. & Edwards, K.J. (1996). The initial development and factor analysis of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 24*, 233-246.
- Hall, T.W. & Edwards, K.J. (2002). The Spiritual Assessment Inventory: A theistic model and measure for assessing spiritual development. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41*, 341-357.
- Hassed, C.S. (2000). Depression: dispirited or spiritually deprived? *Medical Journal of Australia, 173*, 545-547.
- Hays, R.D., Hayashi, T., & Stewart, A.L. (1989). A five-item measure of socially desirable response set. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 49*, 629-636.
- Jarvis, G.K., & Northcutt, H.C. (1987). Religion and differences in morbidity and mortality. *Social Science and Medicine, 25*, 813-824.
- Jessor, R., Turbin, M.S., & Costa, F.M. (1998). Protective factors in adolescent health behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 788-800.

- Jung, C.G. (1933). *Modern man in search of a soul*. (W.S. Dell & C.F. Baynes, Trans.). New York: Harcourt.
- Kelly, T.A., & Strupp, H.S. (1992). Patient and therapist values in psychotherapy: Perceived changes, assimilation, similarity and outcome. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60*, 34-40.
- Koenig, H.G. (1994). *Aging and God: spiritual pathways to mental health in midlife and later years*. New York: Haworth.
- Larson, D.B., Sherill, K.A., Lyons, J.S., Craigie, F.C., Thielman, S.B., Greenwold, M.A., et al. (1992). Associations between dimensions of religious commitment and mental health reported in the American Journal of Psychiatry and the Archives of General Psychiatry: 1978-1989. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 149*, 557-559.
- Lazur, R.F., & Majors, R. (1995). Men of color: Ethnocultural variations of male role gender strain. In Levant, R.F., & Pollack, W.S. (Eds.), *The new psychology of men*. New York: Basic Books.
- Levant, R.F., Hirsch, L.S., Celentano, E., Cozza, T.M., et al. (1992). The male role: An investigation of temporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 325-337.
- Levant, R.F., & Pollack, W.S. (Eds.), (1995). *The new psychology of men*. New York: Basic Books.
- Levin, J.S. (1994). Religion and health: Is there an association, is it valid, is it causal? *Social Science and Medicine, 38*, 1475-1482.

- Levin, J.S., Chatters, L.M., & Taylor, R.J. (1995). Religious effects on health status and life satisfaction among black Americans. *Journals of Gerontology: Social Science, 50B*, S154-S163.
- Levin, J.S., Markides, K.S., & Ray, L.A. (1996). Religious attendance and psychological well-being in Mexican-Americans: A panel analysis of three generations. *The Gerontologist, 36*, 454-463.
- Levin, J.S., & Vanderpool, H.Y. (1989). Is religion therapeutically significant for hypertension? *Social Science and Medicine, 29*, 69-78.
- Mahalik, J.R. (1999). Incorporating a gender role strain perspective in assessing and treating men's cognitive distortions. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 30*, 333-340.
- Mahalik, J.R. (2000, August). *A model of masculine gender role conformity. Symposium- Masculine gender role conformity: Examining theory, research and practice, 30*, 5-13.
- Mahalik, J.R. & Lagan, H.D. (2001). Examining masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to religious orientation and spiritual well-being. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 2*, 24-33.
- Mahalik, J.R., Locke, B.D., Ludlow, L.H., Diemer, M.A., Gottfried, M., Scott, R.P.J. & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 3-25.
- Maslow, A.H. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature*. New York: Viking Press.
- Matthews, D.A., McCullough, M.E., Larson, D.B., Koenig, H.G., Swyers, J.P., & Milano, M.G. (1998). Religious commitment and health status: A review of the

- research and implications for family medicine. *Archives of Family Medicine*, 7, 118-124.
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T., Jr. (1985). Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 710-721.
- McCrae, R.R., & John, O.P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175-215.
- McEwen, B.S. (1998). Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 338, 171-179.
- Miller, W.R., & Thoresen, C.E. (2003). Spirituality, religion and health: An emerging research field. *American Psychologist*, 58, 24-35.
- Mol, H. (1985). *The Faith of Australians*. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.
- Moradi, B., Tokar, D. M., Schaub, M., Jome, L. M., & Serna, G. S. (2000). Revisiting the structural validity of the gender role conflict scale. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 1, 62-69.
- Nelsen, H.M., & Nelsen, A.K. (1975). *Black church in the sixties*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- O'Neil, J.M. (1981a). Male sex role conflicts, sexism and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women and the counseling psychologists. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 9, 61-81.
- O'Neil, J.M., (1981b). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 60, 203-210.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1982). Gender role conflict and strain in men's lives: Implications for

- psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human service providers. In K. Solomon & N. Levy (Eds.), *Men in transition: Changing male roles, theory, and therapy* (pp. 5-44). New York: Plenum.
- O'Neil, J.M. (1990). Assessing men's gender role conflict. In D. Moore and F. Leafgren (Eds.), *Problem solving strategies and interventions for men in conflict* (pp. 23-38). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.
- O'Neil, J.M., (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the gender role conflict scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 358-445.
- O'Neil, J.M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335-350.
- Piedmont, R.L. (1997, August). Development and validation of the transcendence scale: A measure of spiritual experience. In J.E.G. Williams (Chair), *Spiritual experience and the Five-Factor Model of personality*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Piedmont, R.L. (1999). Does spirituality represent the sixth factor of personality? Spiritual transcendence and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality, 67*, 985-1013.
- Pleck, J.H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pleck, J.H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), *The New Psychology of Men* (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.

- Powell, L.H., Shahabi, L., & Thoresen, C.E. (2003). Religion and spirituality: Linkages to physical health. *American Psychologist, 36*, 36-52.
- Reed, P. (1987). Spirituality and wellbeing in terminally ill hospitalized patients. *Research in Nursing and Health, 9*, 35-41.
- Richards, P.S., & Bergin, A.E. (1997). *A spiritual strategy for counseling and psychotherapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ryff, C.D., & Keyes, L.M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 719-727.
- Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1069-1081.
- Scheidt, S. (1996). A whirlwind tour of cardiology for the mental health professional. In R. Allan & S. Scheidt (Eds.), *Heart and Mind: Practice of Cardiac Psychology* (pp.15-24). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Sharpe, M.J., & Heppner, P.P. (1991). Gender role, gender-role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 323-330.
- Sharpe, M.J., Heppner, P.P., & Dixon, W.A. (1995). Gender role conflict, instrumentality, expressiveness, and well-being in adult men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 323-330.
- Spence, J.T. (1991). Do the BSRI and the PAQ measure the same or different concepts? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 141-165.
- SPSS (2009). *SPSS for Windows, Rel. 17.0.1*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.



- Stanard, P.S., Sandhu, D.S., & Painter, L.C. (2000). Assessment of spirituality in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 78*, 204-210.
- Stark, R. (1970). Psychopathology and religious commitment. *Review of Religious Research, 12*, 165-176.
- Thompson, E.H. (1991). Beyond the status characteristic: Gender variations in religiousness. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 30*, 381-394.
- Thompson, E.H. & Remmes, K.R. (2002). Does masculinity thwart being religious? An examination of older men's religiousness. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41*, 521-532.
- Thoresen, C.E. (1999). Spirituality and health: Is there a relationship? *Journal of Health Psychology, 4*, 291-300.
- Witter, R.A., Stock, W.A., Okun, M.A., & Haring, M.J. (1985). Religion and subjective well-being in adulthood: A quantitative synthesis. *Review of Religious Research, 26*, 332-342.

Appendix A  
Demographic Questionnaire

**DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

Please do not write your name on this form. Completing this form will allow researchers to provide an accurate description of the sample.

For the following items, please select the **one** response that is most descriptive of you or fill in the blank as appropriate.

Gender:  Male  Female

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Race:  Asian or Pacific Islander  Asian Indian  
 Black/African American  Caucasian/White  
 Native American  Latino/Hispanic

Multiracial (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Year in college (please circle one):    1        2        3        4        5+        Graduate student

Do you consider yourself a Christian?       Yes       No

Which denomination best describes you?

Catholic       Baptist       Presbyterian       Methodist

Lutheran       Unitarian       Jehovah's Witness

Pentecostal       Evangelical (non-denominational)       LDS

Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix B  
Gender Role Conflict Scale

## GRCS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please fill in the number that most closely represents the extent that you Agree or Disagree with that statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement. Your own reaction is what is asked for.

---

strongly disagree	moderately disagree	mildly disagree	mildly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

---

- \_\_\_ 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 time or family life.
- \_\_\_ 12. I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.
- \_\_\_ 13. Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.
- \_\_\_ 14. I worry about failing and how it will affect me 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 others around me.
- \_\_\_ 22. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.

---

strongly disagree 1	moderately disagree 2	mildly disagree 3	mildly agree 4	moderately agree 5	strongly agree 6
---------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

---

\_\_\_ 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 other men.

\_\_\_ 27. My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I 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.

\_\_\_ 31. My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, 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 or hurts my life.

\_\_\_ 37. I like to feel superior to other people.

Appendix C  
Spiritual Assessment Inventory

## SAI

**Instructions**

- Please respond to each statement below by writing the number that best represents your experience in the box to the right of the statement.
- It is best to answer according to what *really reflects* your experience rather than what you think your experience should be.
- Give the answer that comes to mind first. Don't spend too much time thinking about an item.
- Give the best possible response to each statement even if it does not provide all the information you would like.
- Try your best to respond to all statements. Your answers will be completely confidential.
- Some of the statements consist of two parts as shown here:  
     [2.1] There are times when I feel disappointed with God.  
     [2.2] When this happens, I still want our relationship to continue.
- Your response to 2.2 tells how true statement 2.2 is for you when you have the experience of feeling disappointed with God described in statement 2.1.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Not At All</b>	<b>True Slightly</b>	<b>True Moderately</b>	<b>True Substantially</b>	<b>True Very True</b>

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1 I have a sense of how God is working in my life
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2.1 There are times when I feel disappointed with God
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2.2 When this happens, I still want our relationship to continue
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3 God's presence feels very real to me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4 I am afraid that God will give up on me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5 I seem to have a unique ability to influence God through my prayers
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6 Listening to God is an essential part of my life
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7 I am always in a worshipful mood when I go to church
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8.1 There are times when I feel frustrated with God
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8.2 When I feel this way, I still desire to put effort into our relationship
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9 I am aware of God prompting me to do things
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 My emotional connection with God is unstable
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11 My experiences of God's responses to me impact me greatly
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12.1 There are times when I feel irritated at God
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12.2 When I feel this way, I am able to come to some sense of resolution in our relationship
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13 God recognizes that I am more spiritual than most people
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14 I always seek God's guidance for every decision I make
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15 I am aware of God's presence in my interactions with other people
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16 There are times when I feel that God is punishing me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17 I am aware of God responding to me in a variety of ways
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18.1 There are times when I feel angry at God



- \_\_\_\_\_ 18.2 When this happens, I still have the sense that God will always be with me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19 I am aware of God attending to me in times of need
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20 God understands that my needs are more important than most people's
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21 I am aware of God telling me to do something
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22 I worry that I will be left out of God's plans
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23 My experiences of God's presence impacts me greatly
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24 I am always as kind at home as I am at church.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25 I have a sense of the direction in which God is guiding me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26 My relationship with God is an extraordinary one that most people would not understand
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27.1 There are times when I feel betrayed by God
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27.2 When I feel this way, I put effort into restoring our relationship
- \_\_\_\_\_ 28 I am aware of God communicating to me in a variety of ways
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29 Manipulating God seems to be the best way to get what I want
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30 I am aware of God's presence in times of need
- \_\_\_\_\_ 31 From day to day, I sense God being with me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 32 I pray for all my friends and relatives every day
- \_\_\_\_\_ 33.1 There are times when I feel frustrated by God for not responding to my prayers
- \_\_\_\_\_ 33.2 When I feel this way, I am able to talk it through with God
- \_\_\_\_\_ 34 I have a sense of God communicating guidance to me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 35 When I sin, I tend to withdraw from God
- \_\_\_\_\_ 36 I experience an awareness of God speaking to me personally
- \_\_\_\_\_ 37 I find my prayers to God are more effective than other people's
- \_\_\_\_\_ 38 I am always in the mood to pray.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 39 I feel I have to please God or he might reject me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 40 I have a strong impression of God's presence
- \_\_\_\_\_ 41 There are times when I feel that God is angry at me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 42 I am aware of God being very near to me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 43 When I sin, I am afraid of what God will do to me
- \_\_\_\_\_ 44 When I consult God about decisions in my life, I am aware to my prayers of his direction and help
- \_\_\_\_\_ 45 I seem to be more gifted than most people in discerning God's will
- \_\_\_\_\_ 46 When I feel God is not protecting me, I tend to feel worthless
- \_\_\_\_\_ 47.1 There are times when I feel like God has let me down
- \_\_\_\_\_ 47.2 When this happens, my trust in God is not completely broken

Appendix D

Scales of Psychological Well-Being

The following set of questions deals with how you feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers.

<b>Circle the number that best describes your present agreement or disagreement with each statement.</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Slightly</b>	<b>Agree Slightly</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
1. Most people see me as loving and affectionate.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Sometimes I change the way I act or think to be more like those around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I feel good when I think of what I've done in the past and what I hope to do in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The demands of everyday life often get me down.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. In general, I feel that I continue to learn more about myself as time goes by.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. I am the kind of person who likes to give new things a try.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I tend to focus on the present, because the future nearly always brings me problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I feel like many of the people I know have gotten more out of life than I have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. I tend to worry about what other people think of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

21. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. I don't want to try new ways of doing things - my life is fine the way it is.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Given the opportunity, there are many things about myself that I would change.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. It is important to me to be a good listener when close friends talk to me about their problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Being happy with myself is more important to me than having others approve of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. I like most aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. I don't have many people who want to listen when I need to talk.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. If I were unhappy with my living situation, I would take effective steps to change it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. I don't have a good sense of what it is I'm trying to accomplish in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. I made some mistakes in the past, but I feel that all in all everything has worked out for the best.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. I feel like I get a lot out of my friendships.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. People rarely talk to me into doing things I don't want to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I generally do a good job of taking care of my personal finances and affairs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. In my view, people of every age are able to continue growing and developing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. I used to set goals for myself, but that now seems like a waste of time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6

43. It seems to me that most other people have more friends than I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. It is more important to me to “fit in” with others than to stand alone on my principles.	1	2	3	4	5	6
45. I find it stressful that I can’t keep up with all of the things I have to do each day.	1	2	3	4	5	6
46. With time, I have gained a lot of insight about life that has made me a stronger, more capable person.	1	2	3	4	5	6
47. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.	1	2	3	4	5	6
48. For the most part, I am proud of who I am and the life I lead.	1	2	3	4	5	6
49. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.	1	2	3	4	5	6
51. I am good at juggling my time so that I can fit everything in that needs to be done.	1	2	3	4	5	6
52. I have a sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
53. I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6
54. I envy many people for the lives they lead.	1	2	3	4	5	6
55. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
56. It’s difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters.	1	2	3	4	5	6
57. My daily life is busy, but I derive a sense of satisfaction from keeping up with everything.	1	2	3	4	5	6
58. I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things.	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. My attitude about myself is probably not as positive as most people feel about themselves.	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. I often feel as if I’m on the outside looking in when it comes to friendships.	1	2	3	4	5	6
62. I often change my mind about decisions if my friends or family disagree.	1	2	3	4	5	6
63. I get frustrated when trying to plan my daily activities because I never accomplish the things I set out to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6

64. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
65. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
66. Many days I wake up feeling discouraged about how I have lived my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
67. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
68. I am not the kind of person who gives in to social pressures to think or act in certain ways.	1	2	3	4	5	6
69. My efforts to find the kinds of activities and relationships that I need have been quite successful.	1	2	3	4	5	6
70. I enjoy seeing how my views have changed and matured over the years.	1	2	3	4	5	6
71. My aims in life have been more a source of satisfaction than frustration to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
72. The past had its ups and downs, but in general, I wouldn't want to change it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
73. I find it difficult to really open up when I talk with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
74. I am concerned about how other people evaluate the choices I have made in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
75. I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
76. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.	1	2	3	4	5	6
77. I find it satisfying to think about what I have accomplished in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
78. When I compare myself to friends and acquaintances, it makes me feel good about who I am.	1	2	3	4	5	6
79. My friends and I sympathize with each other's problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
80. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.	1	2	3	4	5	6
81. I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking.	1	2	3	4	5	6
82. There is truth to the saying that you can't teach an old dog new tricks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
83. In the final analysis, I'm not so sure that my life adds up to much.	1	2	3	4	5	6
84. Everyone has their weaknesses, but I seem to have more than my share.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix E

Socially Desirable Response Set Measure

## SDRS-5

Listed below are a few statements about your relationships with others. How much is each statement TRUE or FALSE for you?

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Definitely True</b>	<b>Mostly True</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Mostly False</b>	<b>Definitely False</b>

\_\_\_ 1. I am always courteous even to people who are disagreeable.

\_\_\_ 2. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

\_\_\_ 3. I sometimes try to get even rather than to forgive and forget.

\_\_\_ 4. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

\_\_\_ 5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.



Appendix F  
Informed Consent

## Informed Consent

**Project Title:** Keeping Control: Relations Between Men's Gender Role Conflict, Spirituality, and Psychological Well-being

**Purpose of the Study:** The purpose of the proposed study is to evaluate the association between gender role conflict and spirituality in men. In addition, the study will examine the relations of both gender role and spirituality to men's psychological well-being.

**What you will be asked to do in the study:**

**Time required:** Participants will be asked to fill out a paper survey that will take no more than 15 minutes.

**Risks and Benefits:** There are no risks to participants beyond those encountered in daily life.

**Compensation:** Participants will be entered in a raffle to win one of several free iPods.

**Confidentiality:** Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number, in lieu of any personally identifying information. The list connecting your name to this number will be kept in a locked file in the researcher's office. When the study is completed and the data have been analyzed, the list will be destroyed. Your name will not be used in any report.

**Voluntary participation:** Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating. You may also refuse to answer any of the questions asked.

**Right to withdraw from the study:** You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

**Whom to contact about the study or your rights as a research participant in the study:**

**Drew Lammy**  
Phone: 573.424.0530  
16 Hill Hall  
Columbia, MO 65211  
ablammy@mizzou.edu

**Campus IRB**  
Phone: 572.882.9585  
Fax: 573.884.0663  
843 McReynolds  
Columbia, MO 65211  
umcresearchirb@missouri.edu

**Agreement:** I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study, understanding that I can refuse to take part or continue at any time without penalty.

Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## VITA

Drew Lammy was born and raised in Columbia, MO. He attended David H. Hickman High School in Columbia, graduating in 2000. He then attended Truman State University in Kirksville, MO, earning a B.A. in psychology in 2004. He then returned to Columbia, earning an M.Ed. in Counseling Psychology in 2006 and a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology in 2010, both at the University of Missouri.

Under the mentorship of Glenn Good, Ph.D., Drew developed an interest in the impact of masculinity and gender role on psychological well-being and help-seeking behaviors. Moving forward, Drew looks forward to a career that integrates research and practice in exploring correlates of psychological health and predictive models of well-being.