UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIMENSIONS OF INTIMACY AND MALE GENDER ROLE CONFLICT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

SCOTT M. RAINWATER
Norman, Oklahoma
2010

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/319086

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIMENSIONS OF INTIMACY AND MALE GENDER ROLE CONFLICT

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

_____
Dr. Cal Stoltenberg, Chair

_____
Dr. Rockey Robbins

_____
Dr. Terry Pace

_____
Dr. Mike Crowson

_____
Dr. Joseph Rodgers

© Copyright by SCOTT M. RAINWATER 2010
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgements

In my life, there have been many family and friends who have given me encouragement and have invested in my personal growth. First, God has blessed me with every one of these relationships and the gifts to become who I am today. I am deeply grateful to all four of my parents who have believed in me throughout my life and have always been there for me, especially in times of difficulty and uncertainty. My professors and other academic colleagues have also been instrumental in helping me to become more aware and skillful at working on my growth edges. I am also indebted to my younger sister, Allynn, who has always been there to offer her insight, acceptance, and intuition when I needed it most. She helped me clarify my vision and remember what the important goals were. I want to thank all my grandparents, especially my grandmother Leona who has always supported my academic pursuits and shown tremendous pride in those accomplishments. She has been there every step of the way and has been one of my best cheerleaders throughout my life. This has been an amazing journey so far and I know I will continue to walk with God, full of gratitude and openness.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research Hypotheses

III. METHODOLOGY

IV. RESULTS

V. DISCUSSION

REFERENCES

APPENDIX A – Oral Description of Study

APPENDIX B – Survey Consent Form

APPENDIX C – Gender Role Conflict Scale

APPENDIX D – Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Scale

APPENDIX E – Demographics Questionnaire

APPENDIX F –Correlational Matrices

List of Tables

Table 1	Descriptive Statistics	Page 65
Table 2	Correlational Coefficients	Page 66

Abstract

This study was predicated by Pleck's (1981) male gender role strain paradigm that assumes the existence of inherent maladaptive elements in the rigid adherence of traditional male ideology. This construct has been widely researched across multiple domains in the field of psychology. In addition, intimacy has been considered an indice of overall well being, but has not been researched as extensively. Examining the relationship between these two constructs is considered significant in understanding vital influencing elements of romantic relationships. Previous research has not examined gender role conflict as a potential influencing factor in a heterosexual couple's experience of romantic intimacy.

This study used a descriptive correlational design. Participants completed the Gender Role Conflict Scale, First Edition, the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships scale, and a demographics questionnaire. Participants were recruited from home construction related arenas. The sample consisted of 101 males in the Tulsa, Oklahoma area and was primarily Caucasian.

Most hypotheses were retained and statistical significance was found in theoretically congruent directions. The overall gender role conflict score and the subscale score of restrictive emotionality were found to be significantly correlated with most scores of intimacy, including the overall and many subscale

intimacy scores. Gender role conflict and restrictive emotionality were also found to be significant predictors for many intimacy scores via multivariate regression equations.

This study affirmed the relationship between gender role conflict and its deleterious effects on one's corresponding experience of intimacy in committed romantic relationships. Future research should focus on exploring more factors that influence a male's experience of romantic relationship in the hopes to aid clinical interventions and the general examination of traditional male gender ideology.

Chapter I: Introduction

"The personal meanings a person constructs from experience are unavoidably constrained by the sources of information to which that person attends."

(Greenberg, 2002, p.165).

For decades, psychological theory has stressed the importance the role of emotion and interpersonal relationships serve in overall mental health and therapy (Fischer, 1997; Greenberg, 2002). "Intimate emotional encounter is the human experience most desired, it is at the same time, arguably, the most feared and avoided" (Goldberg, 2000, p.61). Goldberg also noted that "difficulties with intimate relating are responsible for much of the pervasive sense of alienation and existential exhaustion that characterizes Postmodern society" (p.62). Though not always considered as such in research historically, emotions are now understood as an important and adaptive function (Greenberg, 2002). Greenberg stated that emotions "involve a meaning system that informs people of the significance of events to their well-being, and they organize people for rapid adaptive action" (p.156). Emotions help us deal with danger, accentuate pleasurable activities, and make decisions with more efficiency and accuracy. "Healthy adaptation thus necessitates learning to be aware of, to tolerate, and to regulate negative emotionality" (Greenberg, 2002, p.156). The male socialization process in America is a road that tends to encourage men to deny their emotions. This causes

impairment in a man's ability to navigate his world, internally and socially (Macklin, 1983). In this study, we hope to better understand this process and relate what is now termed gender role conflict to its impact on social realms; specifically, with heterosexual romantic intimacy.

Emotions have been studied in many ways. Emotion can be considered as a constructive process, involving multiple levels of meaning involving "stimulus appraisal, physiological arousal, expressive behaviors, impulses to instrumental behaviors, and some sort of subjective feeling" (Greenberg, 2002, p.158). Emotions have been shown to improve decision making. Patients who have had neuropsychological damage to areas of the brain thought to be related to emotional states, such as the limbic system, have shown to have impairment in decision making, such as scenarios requiring a global assessment of gains and losses overall, and then converting this assessment to decisions on individual trials, cumulatively accounting for one's overall status (e.g. a poker game; Damasio, 1994). These emotional processes even occur unconsciously as shown by magnetic resonance imaging (Whalen, Rausch, Etcoff, McInerny, Lee, & Jenike, 1998).

According to many theorists of male psychology, the male socialization experience in many ways reinforces and punishes males to try and depress this large facet of one's existence; our emotional experience (Brannon, 1976; Thompson and Pleck, 1995). When we disconnect from our emotional state, we separate from ourselves and others, contributing to feelings of isolation, loneliness, and illness (psychological and physiological). If indeed the socialization of Western man inherently limits males, then it is imperative to comprehend these limitations so that

we do not confuse “immature forms of masculine behavior to be wrongly typified as the essence of masculinity and to have masculine traits and behaviors dismissed or derogated as a result” (Heesacker, 1994, p.247). Emphasizing emotional empathy and emotional self-awareness throughout the development of the lifespan for both sexes would prove beneficial (Levant, 1992). Difficulty with the expression of emotion (alexithymia) and emotional restrictivity have been found to relate with negative indices of health (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Campbell & Snow, 1992; Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Good, Robertson, O”Neil, Fitzgerald, Stevens, Debord, & Bartels, 1995; O’Neil, 1981; Sharpe, Heppner, & Dixon, 1995; Theodore & Lloyd, 1995). It is the goal of this study to better understand this process and, through this scientific elucidation, deconstruct that which might be inherently dysfunctional and establish healthy and actualizing environments that allow us to pay attention to and celebrate the full experience of being a male in our post-modern society. “Making sense of emotion in new ways helps to break cycles of maladaptive automatic emotion processes” (Greenberg, 2002, p.169). This study examines the relationship between male gender role conflict, and its effects on intimacy.

Therapists often perceive their clients as more psychopathalogical when they deviate from their respective gender norms. Men who are more emotionally expressive and women who display more typically masculine behaviors are seen and treated as more severe in mental illness (Fischer, 1993). For a large portion of the twentieth century, scientists considered gender to be a stable trait-like facet of identity. Currently, gender is considered more contextual, and subject to the pervasive impact of socialization (Levant, 1992).

I. Problem statement

The problem this study will address is to describe various dimensions of gender role conflict and how they relate to various dimensions of intimacy in a current sample of adult males in the Southwest. This will provide greater understanding of how gender role conflict affects various dimensions of intimacy.

II. Rationale for the study

Gender role conflict (GRC) is a highly influential phenomenon as demonstrated by the myriad correlates to which it is related. Male gender role conflict occurs when a man experiences negative emotions and thoughts related to gender role devaluations, restrictions, and violations. These can be expressed toward another, from others, or within the man (O'Neil, 2008). GRC has been found to significantly correlate with interpersonal functioning, an alternative indication of well-being (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Mahalik, Locke, Theodore, & Cournoyer, 2001). While direct causal relationships have not been determined, the relationship between gender role conflict and intimacy is likely reciprocal.

Fortunately, research on gender role conflict has largely found consensus among researchers of male psychology. Consequently, the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) has been used in over 230 studies and has demonstrated good validity and reliability across these studies.

Although consensus on the construct and subsequent operationalizations of intimacy has not been met with such accordance, there currently exists a measure

that incorporates multiple dimensions of intimacy that may prove to be less biased toward the more stereotypically viewed avenues of establishing closeness (via emotionally verbal expressions) more associated with feminine styles of intimacy. Some researchers have indeed argued that previous measures of intimacy are inappropriately biased toward feminine styles of establishing intimacy, verbal self-disclosure of emotions (Jansz, 2000). Inman and Wood (1993) stated, "When closeness is defined exclusively or primarily by typically feminine behaviors such as self-disclosure, it is pregiven that women will be found more skilled than men" (p.285). Due to masculinity scripts and normative pressures for a man to be stoic or emotionally inexpressive, researchers have suggested that men often establish closeness through shared activities (Camarena, Sarigiani, & Petersen, 1990; Wood & Inman, 1993). Schaefer and Olson (1981) included the subdimension of "recreational intimacy" into their operationalization. This broader definition may better integrate more stereotypical male behaviors (e.g. such as shared activities) to establish and experience intimacy. The Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR) has been shown to have good reliability and validity, including concurrent validity (Schaefer & Olsen, 1981).

III. Research question

How do men's experiences of gender role conflict affect their experience of intimacy? Do certain aspects of gender role conflict (i.e. restrictive emotionality) affect intimacy more than others (i.e. success, power, and competition)?

IV. Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are offered concerning how gender role conflicts relate with various dimensions of intimacy. First, overall GRC will negatively correlate with scores of intimacy (emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy) as theory and previous research predict (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995). Second, Restrictive Emotionality (RE) will also negatively correlate with all subscales of intimacy. Third, combining theories of gender role conflict and intimacy, we would expect for recreational intimacy to account for a greater amount of variance than emotional intimacy (defined commonly as verbal intimacy) based on masculinity scripts prohibiting the expression of emotion and relationship theorists' view on male pathways to closeness (Twohey & Ewing, 1995). Finally, overall Gender Role Conflict will significantly predict levels of all measures of intimacy. As the GRC subscale Restrictive Emotionality (RE) has consistently shown strong correlative value to measures of relationship quality, RE will significantly predict measures of intimacy. To date, no published study has conducted these predictive analyses using GRC and romantic intimacy.

Chapter II. Literature Review

Now, more than ever, research is showing significant problems in mental and physical health in men. Men die seven years younger on average than women (Englar-Carlson, 2006) and are afflicted more by the 15 leading causes of death (Courtenay, 2000). Men represent a greater percentage in substance abusers (Kessler, 1994), perpetrators of severe physical violence, sex offenders, victims of fatal suicide attempts and automobile crashes, absent parenting, stress-related physical illnesses such as heart problems, and many psychological disorders (Levant, 1996a). Compounding this problem, men are less likely to seek help for these problems, including physiological maladies (Boehm et al, 1993; Courtenay, 2000; Good & Mintz, 1990; Pedersen & Vogel, 2007). The psychology of men is an important field of study, and empirical investigations may provide valuable insights into remedying these disproportionate representations of men in these problem populations. Furthermore, these problems affect not only men, but women, children, families, and society as a whole both directly and indirectly (Henley, 1985).

Levant (1996b) stated that we are currently in a "crisis of connection" between men and women. He posits that at no time in recent history have men experienced more pressure and dissonance between expectations of behavior and traditional masculinity ideology. These pressures include "pressures to commit to relationships, to communicate one's innermost feelings, to nurture children, to share in housework, to integrate sexuality with love, and to curb aggression and violence" (Levant, 1996a, p.259). A reconsideration of masculinity is called for and may

provide tools to successfully navigate these new expectations (Levant, 1992). In addition, given the tragic divorce rates, efforts to improve quality of relationships have been largely unsuccessful. It has become increasingly important to understand what contributes to long and healthy romantic relationships.

Overview

The "new" psychology of men perceives masculinity not as an inherent, but a psychologically and socially constructed phenomenon (Levant, 1996a). Masculinity has changed throughout history and is, therefore, malleable and merits a close examination given its ramifications on hierarchical structures in society and within intrapersonal arenas (Enns, 2008; Levant et al., 2003; Macklin, 1983; O'Neil, 1981). This relatively new perspective recognizes biological differences but does not attribute these differences solely to the construction of masculinity and femininity. Instead, concomitants of biological, political, psychological, and sociological influences combine to build tenets of masculinity and femininity. Traditional structures of gender establish inequities of power between the sexes (Enns, 2008; Levant, 2003). As the anthropological pioneer Margaret Mead (1935) has shown, not all cultures have such inequities in power structures providing evidence that biological differences do not equate to patriarchy.

In 1981, Joseph Pleck originated the gender role strain paradigm which has spawned hundreds of studies in the field of masculinity. This new paradigm elucidated the process and pitfalls of men trying to live up to the image of what it means to be a "real" man. Current perspectives on masculinity can now be traced

back to Pleck and other early theorists. Pleck (1981) contrasted the gender role strain paradigm to the previous paradigm on masculinity, the gender role identity paradigm, which governed the research on masculinity for fifty years. Pleck challenged that this previous research inadequately explained the data and subsequently propagated the division of sex on the foundation of over-stereotyped gender roles. This view was considered to contribute to the maintenance of the status quo of women and men by implying that society's structure was a biological imperative.

The gender role *identity* paradigm posits that men and women alike have inherent propulsion toward establishing a gender role identity and that healthy personality development pivots on its successful construction. The level to which this psychological need is satiated is determined by how integrally the man or woman accepts his or her traditional gender role. From this viewpoint, the establishment of an appropriate gender role identity is considered a failure-prone process. Consequently, incomplete development of a gender role identity in a man was considered to result in homosexuality, hostile or aversive attitudes towards women, and/or defensive hypermasculinity (Levant, 1996a). This paradigm stems from the same theoretical constructs of essentialism or biological views of sex roles. That is, in men, there is an invariant male essence that is independent of cultural, historical, or societal influences (Bem, 1981).

The gender role *strain* paradigm, however, has these following guiding principles: modern gender roles are inconsistent and contradictory; the majority of men and women in today's society violate gender roles, the violation of gender roles

leads to negative psychological consequences (interpersonal and intrapersonal), including condemnation; actual or imagined violation of gender roles leads people to overconform to them; violation of gender roles affect men more severely than women who violate gender lines, and certain prescribed gender behaviors are inherently dysfunctional (i.e. physical male aggression) (Thompson & Pleck, 1995; Brody, 1997). In the gender role strain paradigm, appropriate gender roles are determined by gender ideology (mostly defined by norms and gender stereotypes; Thompson & Pleck, 1995). "The negative outcome of adhering to or deviating from culturally defined and restrictive masculinity ideologies is the experience of gender role conflict (GRC)" (O'Neil, 2008, p.364-365). This ideology is imprinted early and often on a burgeoning child by parents, teachers, family, media, and friends (all who have internalized the adopted ideology; Fagot, Rodgers, & Leinbach, 2000). This paradigm runs parallel with the underlying roots of social constructionism (Smiler, 2004). That is, that femininity and masculinity are interpersonally and culturally constructed, malleable, and changing (Levant, 1996b).

Ideology

Over the past few decades, researchers have examined the ways contemporary culture has dictated what a man "should" be and how individual men adopt and internalize these norms. Although men's roles in modern society are quite diverse, studies have shown that there are common underlying messages across subcultures in Western society. Masculinity ideology can be explained as an overarching conceptualization of socially sanctioned unacceptable and acceptable

behaviors for men and what it is to be a man (Addis & Cohane, 2005; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993; Thompson & Pleck, 1995).

These dominant attributes afforded to men throughout their lifespan can be labeled in various ways. Traditional masculinity is viewed as the dominant form of masculinity that existed in Western societies until the deconstruction of gender in the 1970's. This masculinity is considered to take a prominent role in the dominance of white heterosexual men over women and racial, ethnic, and sexual minorities, in the past as well as the present (Levant, 2005; Connell, 1995). According to Englar-Carlson, it is considered the most powerful in dictating what members adopt as normative (2006). It is also important to note that traditional masculinity ideology is considered to be entrenched in a structural relationship between the two sexes (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993). Some have even proposed the idea that, because of women's historical powerlessness in society, they have had to adopt different strategies to increase their control over their environment, such as affiliative motives versus competitive. That is, women have had to utilize recruiting behaviors that propagate 'power with' versus 'power over' (Miller, 1984). Levant (1996b) discussed the possibility that the wife demand/husband withdraw cycle can be explained as a negotiation of power. Husbands often have more power in the relationship. Rehman and Holtzworth-Munroe (2006) looked at American and Pakistani couples. American couples were characterized by more egalitarian relationships between the husband and wife, and Pakistani wives were characterized as having much less power than the husband. Their prediction was that because the Pakistani husband had more established power, he would be less likely to withdraw,

because the husbands would be less likely to be threatened. Also, the Pakistani wives would implement less aggressive methods because of their lack of power. These predictions held true. American men were more likely to withdraw, and Pakistani women exhibited less aggressive demands than American women. Through the lens of this theoretical framework, the wife's goal is empowerment and, thus, she attempts to elicit accommodations to increase the likelihood to meet her needs. The husband, who already has power, withdraws in an attempt to avoid the loss of power. For American couples, wives were more aggressively demanding than husbands, which indicated more power, and the more withdrawal by husbands indicated less power. Theoretically, if power and control are vital to a man's self-perception of worth, and competition is the main vehicle to achieve both, then strategies that share power would threaten a male's sense of worth. Unfortunately, in order to maintain power, a man must implement less interpersonal or emotional flexibility, harming a potentially nurturing and beneficial loving relationship (O'Neil, 1981).

Leading researchers in the psychology of men have delineated these "masculinity scripts" into four main tenets: autonomy, achievement, aggression, and stoicism (Brannon, 1976; Pleck, 1981; Levant, 1992; O'Neil, 1982; Mahalik, Good, & Englar-Carlson, 2003). Autonomy describes the behaviors of independence and denying dependence on anyone and in dealing with problems alone. This calls to the extent that self-reliance is maintained to the exclusion of collaboration (Wester & Vogel, 2002). Achievement refers to excellence in work and play, providing for family and being better than other men in economic, leisure, and sexual arenas.

Aggression refers to being tough and acting aggressively if one's power or status is threatened. Even in samples assessed less than 30 years ago, Brannon and Juni (1984) and Thompson, Grisanti, and Pleck (1985) found their participants still endorsed male aggression as appropriate. Stoicism dictates that a man hides his feelings, does not show his pain or grief and avoids warm or dependent feelings (Lytton & Romney, 1991). These masculinity scripts together form a masculine ideology common to the vast majority in Western culture. It is interesting to note that many of these "masculine" qualities were once labels equivocated with healthy traits (i.e. assertive, competitive, reasonable; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972)

O'Neil (1981) discusses the "masculine mystique," congruent with traditional masculinity ideology. Some of the assumptions he transcribed include the following: "men are biologically superior to women, and therefore men have greater human potential to women; masculinity is the superior form of gender identity; rational-logical thought rather than intuitive and emotional expressions is the superior form of communication" (p.205). Overall, O'Neil reduces the masculine mystique to one major premise: "Men are superior to women and therefore have the right to devalue and restrict women's values, roles, and lifestyles. Feminine values are inferior, inappropriate and immature" (p.205). According to O'Neil, this premise may have historically permeated most facets of society. Though probably rarely made explicit, this is thought to be reinforced at many levels: the media, work environments, family dynamics, politics, schools, etc.

Jansz (2000) supported the theoretical framework that a masculine identity does not originate via genetics but is created interpersonally. Personifying these conceptions of masculinity through individual levels perpetuates public and cultural norms. The bidirectional reinforcements of these ideologies maintain their strength in modern society. Stewart and McDermott (2004) stated that a person's sense of self is "composed of many disparate elements, including one's identification of one's own past experience, with particular characteristics and traits, with ideas and ideologies, and with a defined place (often an occupation, but also with other roles, e.g., family and gender) in the social structure" (p.524). Jansz (2000) reported that "surveys and self-reports show that men generally construct their identities within the confines of the cultural model of masculinity" (p.169). Strictly adhering to these norms is not, however, devoid of contradictions. Researchers have shown that striving to live up to these standards are difficult and stressful for men resulting in distress in all domains of men's lives (Campbell & Snow, 1992; Good et al, 1996; Hayes & Mahalik, 2000; O'Neil, 2008; O'Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995; Pleck, 1981; Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992).

Masculinity ideology was a term also used by Thompson and Pleck (1995) to encapsulate the theoretical framework in the body of work researching general attitudes towards males and male roles. Masculinity ideology differs from the construct of gender orientation, a notion that was furthered along with the gender identity paradigm body of research. Gender orientation makes the assumption that masculinity arises out of actual differences between the sexes. Operationally, researchers looked at personality traits that were more common in men than in

women. Instruments such as the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) attached personality traits such as instrumentality to men and expressivity to women. In contrast, theorists of masculinity ideology hold the view that masculinity is perceived as a socially constructed ideal for men to optimally emulate. In contrast, where the orientation approach views man as having specific personality traits, the ideological normative approach views man as endorsing the ideology that man *should* have certain qualities that are male-specific and, in addition, women should not have these same qualities (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). They further argued that orientation and ideology are different constructs, statistically and practically having different correlational variables.

Moreover, because masculinity ideology is considered to be socially constructed, the gender role strain paradigm asserts that there are multiple masculinities due to the diversity across and within groups of men, such as differences in social class, race, ethnicity, subcultures, geographic locations, nationality, sexual orientations, life-span developmental stages, and cohorts (e.g. generational anomalies) (Addis & Cohane, 2005, Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Some examples of diversity include common experiences among WWII veterans, Latino machismo, inner-city gang street code, and fantasy role playing gamers.

Although a multitude of masculinities are believed to exist, there is also a common set of expectations and standards that occur in traditional masculinity ideology. Brannon (1976), who later constructed the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon & Juni, 1984), arranged this multidimensional construct into four core

components: “no sissy stuff,” to avoid looking or being feminine; “the big wheel,” the emphasis on achievement; “the sturdy oak,” the avoidance of any sign of weakness or vulnerability; and “give ‘em hell,” the embracing of risk, adventure, and violence. Subsequently, several other instruments have been designed to measure masculinity ideology as well.

The Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI; Levant et al., 1992) delineates traditional masculinity ideology into seven tenets: the avoidance of all things feminine, achievement as the highest criteria for proving one’s manhood, the mandate to be self-sufficient, non-intimate sexuality, fear and hostility toward homosexuality, the importance to be strong and aggressive, and to restrict one’s emotions (e.g. stoicism) in experience and expressiveness (Levant et al, 1992). Research using the MRNI have now spanned 15 years and continue to influence the field of male psychology. The MRNI has shown to continue to exhibit good confirmatory factor analysis. Fischer, Tokar, Good, and Snell (1998) conducted an exploratory and confirmatory analysis on the MRNI and found a four factor model (versus the original three factor) to be the best fit, stressing the importance of an impression management factor loading on its own impact, further emphasizing the strength of the social salience of this construct.

Pleck (1995) expounded on the gender role strain paradigm by demarcating three types of gender role strain: discrepancy-strain, dysfunction-strain, and trauma-strain. Masculinity ideology is implicated in all three domains of gender role strain (Pleck, 1995). Discrepancy-strain is experienced when a man perceives himself falling short of an internalized image of the ideal man, which is a close facsimile of

traditional masculinity. Even when a man lives up to the traditional male code, he experiences dysfunction-strain, because characteristics of the male code are inherently dysfunctional and result in negative consequences in himself or others in relationships with him. Trauma-strain results from the normative course of male socialization which is considered inherently traumatic in this paradigm.

Pleck (1995) further elucidated masculine ideology's impact on the three domains of gender role strain. In regards to the discrepancy form of male strain, the extent to which a man endorses masculine ideology is proportional to the gender expectations he places on himself, and consequently, how subjectively he perceives himself to fit with who he is in reality and with whom he feel he should be. Masculinity ideology directly contributes to trauma through the ordeal of socialization (to be discussed later in more detail) and "influences, if not regulates, how other trauma from other sources is psychologically resolved" (p.20). Lastly, masculinity ideology affects how behaviors are maintained despite negative consequences that persist in lieu of the inherent dysfunctional nature of some traditional gender roles.

Types of Gender Role Strain

Masculine gender role stress, one major avenue of research examining constructs congruent with the discrepancy-strain construct of the gender role strain paradigm, has been utilized (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). "Discrepancy strain and GRC occur simultaneously when men try to conform or fail to conform to expected gender role norms" (O'Neil, 2008, p.365). The Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale

is one major instrument that has been developed to tap into this constructs (MGRSS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987).

The MGRSS is a 40 item six-point likert scale asking participants to rate how stressful a hypothetical situation would be if they experienced it themselves. The conception of this scale is largely based on Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) cognitive stress model. This instrument contains five subscales assessing men's health in the following categories: physical inadequacy, emotional expression, threats to intellectual control, failures with work or sex, and subordination to women. Eisler (1995) later continued the work conducted on the MGRSS and found a significant trend in the relationship between masculine gender role stress and cardiovascular health. This research may prove useful in adding to our understanding why men have more heart problems and higher mortality rates than women.

Another type of gender role strain is *dysfunction*-strain. This sub-construct states that adherence to the traditional male code can be itself harmful to men as well as others involved in close relationships with them. Evidence has been found that links dysfunction-strain to negative outcomes, including marital and family roles (Barnett, Davidson, & Marshall, 1991; Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck, 1991; Pleck, 1995). Dysfunction strain is theorized to contribute to sexual assault, harassment, and addiction, self-abusive behaviors, chemical dependence, risky behaviors, absent parenting, relationship dysfunction, and inadequate emotional partnering (Brooks & Silverstein, 1995).

The Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) has been widely used to assess the construct of dysfunction-strain. Men who do not conform to gender stereotypic

behavior run the risk of social punishment through rejection or some other form of condemnation, whereas men who conform to traditional gender roles may be rewarded via the form of social approval (Brody, 1997; Fiske & Stevens, 1993). O'Neil (2008) defined Gender Role Conflict (GRC) as "a psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences for the person or others" (p.362). The ultimate result is the limiting of a person's unique potential. Brody (1997) reported the major risks of violating gender roles include: rejection by entire social groups (e.g. peer popularity), decreased sexual attractiveness and the quality of interpersonal interactions, and lowered self-esteem. Brody further stated that "stereotypes are self-fulfilling prophecies, pressuring males and females to express emotions in ways that are constraining, and ultimately limiting for both psychological and physical adaptation" (p.388).

The GRCS is an empirically devised 37 item measure assessing actual experiences of dysfunction-strain and asks participants to rate on a six-point likert scale to what extent they experience gender role conflict in four domains: Success, Power, and Competition; Restrictive Emotionality; Conflict Between Work and Family Relations; and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men. O'Neil (2008) conducted a review of all studies using the GRCS including 22 factor analyses and 232 empirical studies across 25 years. They concluded that gender role conflict (GRC) has repeatedly shown associations with anxiety, depression, and physical health risks. Furthermore, they have adduced that gender role conflict varies with personality, demographics, interpersonal, and psychological functioning.

References to psychological functioning include how one thinks about gender roles (cognitive), how one feels about gender roles (affective), how one relates to others (behavioral), and how problems are experienced and created beyond our conscious awareness (unconscious) (O'Neil, 2008). The situational contexts where GRC is identified have been categorized into four domains: Gender role transitions (e.g. going to college), GRC experiences from others, intrapersonally, and GRC toward others (O'Neil, 2008).

Overall, gender role conflict has shown to be associated with many negative outcomes. "Gender role conflict patterns are defined as concrete outcomes of gender role strain that can be understood and measured" (O'Neil, 2008, p.364). Directly relevant to this study, GRC has specifically been related to lower intimacy scores (O'Neil et al, 1995).

The third and last component within the gender role strain paradigm is what Pleck (1995) termed trauma-strain. This concept originally was more directed toward certain populations that have shown particularly harmful effects of trauma-strain including war veterans, victims of child abuse (sexual and otherwise), athletes, and bisexual or gay men (Brooks, 1990; Lisak, 1995; Messner, 1992; Harrison, 1995; respectively). More recently, the normative process of male socialization of traditional masculinity ideology is now considered to be traumatic across any particular group of men (Levant, 1996a). Research looking at parenting and peer interactions has contributed to the validity of this paradigm.

Using a social learning lens, research has shown that early on in development, a child will experience gender-specific consequences and interaction patterns from

adults and peers (Fagot, Rodgers, & Leinbach, 2000). Haviland and Malatesta (1981) conducted a meta-analysis and found that 12 studies showed male infants to be more emotionally expressive and reactive than female infants. They were found to more easily startle, be more excitable, cry more often and with a quicker onset, and their emotions fluctuated more rapidly between affective states. Weinberg (1992) also found that male babies around six months of age expressed more vocalizations (positive and negative) and non-verbal signals to the mother than their female counterparts. Male infants showed to maintain this pattern until at least six months of age. Weinberg (1992) conducted an empirical study and found that six-month-old male infants expressed more positive and negative non-verbal communication than female infants. Levant and Kopecky (1995) provide an explanation for the discrepancy between boys' emotional expressiveness and men's lessened expressivity (compared to women) later in life. They divide their theoretical elucidation into four influences that result in the attenuation of male emotionality. The first influence centers on the proposition that mothers expend more efforts to manage their more easily arousable sons than their female counterparts (Haviland & Malatesta, 1981; Malatesta, Culver, Tesman, & Shephard, 1989).

Second, fathers interact with their children in stereotypic gender-specific ways (Levant, 1996a; Tognoli, 1980). Field (1978) observed 36 white, middle-class fathers playing with their four-month old children and found that fathers played more games and expressed less high pitched vocal sounds with their sons than with their daughters. Future studies are recommended to ascertain if this trend still holds true in present day family dynamics.

Third, depending on whether they are dealing with their son or daughter, both parents use different language usage when dealing with the content of emotions. Fathers have been observed using less emotion words when reading wordless storybooks to their sons than with their daughters (Brody & Hall, 1993), and mothers have also shown to use less feeling words to their eighteen-month-old sons than to their daughters (Dunn, Bretherton, & Munn, 1987). Studies have indicated that parents thwart their son's expression of vulnerable emotions versus the encouragement of their daughter's expression of caring and soft emotions. Levant (1992) looked at a multitude of empirical studies and concluded that both mothers and fathers spoke more about emotions to their daughters than their sons. When emotions were talked about with boys, anger was the specified emotion addressed. With daughters, sadness was the predominant emotional state addressed. Fuchs and Thelen (1988) found that by the time children reach the age of school attendance, boys expect an aversive reaction from parents when expressing sadness. Girls expected less positive reactions when expressing anger than with sadness. In addition, parents have been found to dampen the expression of aggression in girls (Brody & Hall, 1993; Fivush, 1989; Fuchs & Thelen, 1988). Brody (1997) cited evidence that had participants observe sex-ambiguous babies and found that they perceived the baby to be more sad and fearful if they thought it was a girl and more angry if they thought it was a boy. People are likely to interpret emotional expressivity along stereotypical gender lines and utilize the cognitive strategy of confirmatory bias. Furthermore, Golombok and Fivush (1994) found that if they perceived a baby to be a boy, they saw the baby as stronger, firmer, and less fragile

than if they believed it to be a girl. Courtenay (2000) conducted a review of studies examining interaction patterns between adults and children. In summary, they found that boys were (in comparison to girls) given more games that promoted gender stereotypes, encouraged to be more independent, distanced from parents more, expressed less concern about danger, and were actually discouraged to seek help (even punished at times).

Furthermore, Courtenay discussed some empirical studies that found girls and boys themselves reacted more negatively toward boys that crossed gender lines, became subject to these consequences at an earlier age, and these negative reactions became increasingly negative as they grew older. The conveyance of cultural imperatives can be internalized through salient experiences such as getting injured or crying (Good, Thomson, & Brathwaite, 2005). During these experiences, a boy may receive interpersonal punishments or ridicule for crying and similarly, be praised for inhibiting the expression of emotion as a sign of strength associated with masculinity. Boys are called derogatory names referring to girls or gays if they express signs of weakness or softer emotions.

The influence of peers helps to crystallize these gender-specific lines. Grade school girls have been observed to commonly play in dyads or groups of three with their play consisting of relationship enhancing interactions and sharing emotionally laden material. Boys, however, spend most of their play time in large groups focusing on structured games that emphasize rules, competition, and toughness (Maccoby, 1990). Maccoby (1990) further states that these same-sex interactional patterns have ramifications on subsequent cross-sex relationships that boys and girls

have throughout adolescence and later into adulthood. Way (2004) and Tolman, Spencer, Harmon, Rosen-Reynoso, and Striepe (2004) both found in their qualitative studies that boys desired emotionally intimate relationships with their peers but chose to exude behaviorally the more hegemonic masculine behaviors due to fear of negative social consequences. Way found that as boys progressed through adolescence, they become more distrustful of opening up emotionally and trusting in relationships due to their experience in emotional risk taking. Wester, Vogel, Pressly, and Heesacker (2002) summarized empirical research to date, stating that girls are socialized to be "emotional, non-aggressive, nurturing, and obedient," and boys are socialized to be "unemotional, aggressive, achievement oriented and self-reliant" (p.640). Throughout childhood and adolescence, peers contribute to the learning that there are certain social rules determining how, where, why, and to whom feelings should be expressed (Shields, 2000; Wester & Vogel, 2002). Birbaum and Croll (1984) showed that even preschool children connect anger as a male characteristic and fear, sadness, and happiness are connected to the feminine. These influences continue throughout childhood, and, in their longitudinal study, Galambos, Almeida, and Peterson (1990) discovered an intensification of masculine gender roles in boys during the developmental stage of adolescence.

Recent research has contributed important findings that distinguish between the more socially sanctioned emotional expression of anger in masculine socialization and actual manifestation of aggressive behaviors (Richardson, 2005). Aggression by men and women has also been found to be influenced by the presence or absence of observation. That is, this behavior is affected by perceptions of social

roles. Although, as stated briefly above, men are more associated with anger than women, Archer (2000), in a meta-analytic review, reported that "women were slightly more likely to use one or more act of physical aggression and to use such acts more frequently" in heterosexual partners (p.651). Richardson (2005) reviewed thirty years of research on male and female aggression and reported that "differences between men and women are small to nonexistent" (p.238). The research reviewed by Richardson encompassed studies on preadolescents, adolescents, college-aged samples, and older adults.

In the case of sex differences in aggressive behaviors, masculine scripts seem to have little effect on actual behaviors, suggesting that not all elements of traditional masculinity have equal impact on actual behavior. To further this point, Richardson discussed research that looked at differences in aggressive behaviors between nontraditional and traditional women. Nontraditional women were described as having more liberal attitudes about women's roles, and traditional women endorsed more attitudes that are considered conservative (e.g. wives and homemakers). Although counterintuitive, the more traditional women were found to be more aggressive than the less traditional women. Furthermore, the experimental conditions showed that the baseline for responding to provocation was reciprocity, not passivity, as female socialization scripts might suggest.

It appears that the stereotype of males being more aggressive is distorted by the research that shows that males will indeed implement more extreme violent responses. Also, in romantic relationships, direct aggression was found to be more frequent than indirect aggression than when reported in friendships. This pattern was

equally found for men and women. Romantic relationships showed to have the highest incidences of aggression, both indirect and direct. Although there is little debate whether socialization heavily impacts our behaviors, there is still much research needed to understand under which contexts and types of relationships certain stereotypical schemata are triggered and behaviors are expressed.

Levant (1996a) posits that these socialization influences result in four major consequences in male emotionality. The first delineation involves what Levant terms "action empathy" (p.262), which is defined as the ability to predict what others will do (Levant & Kopecky, 1995), versus the emotional empathy that girls develop as a result of taking the other's perspective increases their ability to know what others will feel (Brody & Hall, 1993; Eisenberg & Lennon, 1983).

In addition to differences in empathy types, it is theorized that men often become estranged from the emotional component of themselves and experience normative male alexithymia, which literally means "without words for emotions" (Levant & Kopecky, 1995; Brody & Hall, 1993; Levant et al. 2003). Researchers have shown that those who endorse more traditional masculine ideology are more likely to report alexithymia than men who do not endorse such ideology. Fischer and Good (1997) and Levant et al (2003) each found unique variance accounted for by gender role conflict in all alexithymia scales. This result held true even after controlling for social desirability. These results argue that traditional male socialization may be associated with normative male alexithymia.

The final impact on the emotional life of males as a result of these socialization practices involves the channeling of caring emotions into sexuality and

objectification (Levant, 1996a; Levant & Kopecky, 1995). Masculinity scripts dictate that one main vehicle to establish validation as a man is through sexual prowess. This refers to the objectification of women as sexual conquests and trophies, implicitly sending a message of power, dominance, and superiority.

Gender Roles

Socialization history is posited as being one contributing proxy for gender (Brody, 1997). Gender roles appear to affect the level of emotional experiencing and expressiveness. Men who transcend gender lines and become primary caregivers for their children have shown to express more feelings, affection, and nurturance than men who do not (Hanson, 1988; Radin, 1994). In accordance with this argument, Gutmann (1987) found that women's aptness to express aggression also varied with whether they were in the process of rearing children or not. In boys, those who helped care for their siblings showed to have less gender differences in nurturance than boys who did not (Whiting & Edwards, 1988). These studies suggest that the roles we perform lend us to express emotions in different ways. That is, as socialization experiences shift, so do gender differences in emotion (Brody, 1997). Both sexes' personal history of engaging in social roles is an influencing agent due to the effect these experiences have on attitudes and skills (Wood, Rhodes, & Whelan, 1989).

The last component of the gender role strain paradigm involves normative traumas that are believed to occur above and beyond various classes of men. Two normative experiences that are proposed to occur readily are the early separation

from the mother and the unavailability of the father. Chodorow (1978) discussed the emotional trauma associated with boys' early separation from the mother in the separation-individuation phase of early development. This has been labeled the "traumatic abrogation of the holding environment" (Pollack, 1995, p.41). Boys are thought to experience a sense of self and develop a fear of losing oneself or becoming enmeshed. Subsequently, adult men often feel safer being alone that feeling too close to someone else, a term Pollack (1995) termed "defensive autonomy". Conversely, girls are thought to be allowed to stay intimately engaged with the mother and are spared the anxiety associated with this separation (Levant, 1996a; Levant 1996b).

The other normative trauma involves the common absence of the father. Robert Bly (1990), a mytho-poetic author, has termed this the "father wound." The absence may come in the form of the father staying uninvolved in a boy's life. The absence can also refer to psychological distance or emotional absence. Due to the father's socialization history and internalization of masculinity ideology, refraining and avoidance from emotional expression propagates these messages through direct verbal rejection of the boy or via modeling when emotional contexts occur.

This study focuses on restrictive emotional aspects of gender role conflict and its effects on interpersonal functioning, specifically romantic intimacy. Myriad researchers have emphasized the distinction between emotional experiencing and emotional expression. The following sections will also discuss this major facet of gender role conflict and its relation to the internalization of traditional male ideology.

Emotional Experiencing

As briefly noted above, emotions are considered a multilayered constructive process involving many sources of information, not all of which we are consciously aware (Greenberg, 2002; Whalen et al, 1998). Object relations theory views "affective processes at the core of attachment and interpersonal needs" and is considered the "connective glue in people's internal models of self-other relationships" (Greenberg, 2002, p.160). Greenberg furthered the idea that emotions are affected by mechanisms beyond those involving rational-logic lines of thought. Increased emotional awareness and acceptance has played a vital role in Gestalt therapy (Greenberg, 2002) and forms of humanistic-existential therapies (Rogers, 1959).

Many researchers have emphasized the methodological and theoretical differences in studying emotional experience versus emotional expression (Heesacker & Prichard, 1992; LaFrance & Banaji, 1992). Little evidence has shown consistent differences between men and women in emotional experiencing when accessing immediate reports of emotional experience even when accounting for differentially salient contexts by gender (Barrett, Robin, Pietromonaco, & Eyssell, 1998). Methodologically, differences are found more consistently when participants are asked to report global ratings of emotional experiencing. Barrett et al. (1998) found that when asked about happiness, sadness, nervousness, surprise, and anger, men and women reported equal amounts. But, when asked about overall emotional

experiencing, gender differences were found. This can be explained by empirical results noting that when accessing global retrospective evaluations of self in experiences of emotion, women and men describe themselves more consistently with stereotypes. Jacupcak, Salters, Gratz, and Roemer (2003) noted that initial experiencing of emotion should not be confused with how they are dealt with or the manner in which they are understood. Perhaps when global evaluations are assessed, different comparisons are drawn. In immediate experiencing, one might compare their emotional state with how they were feeling before the stimulus. This is in contrast to global emotional evaluations in which they might be comparing how they experience emotions in comparison to other men or women.

Studies have shown significant differences between wives' and husbands' physiological arousal when in conflict situations considered to be emotionally provocative (Gottman & Levenson, 1988; Levenson, Cartensen, & Gottman, 1994). Men were found to show significantly higher levels of physiological arousal than women when discussing conflictual content in their relationship. Levant (1992) explained this finding by stating that men's increased physiological arousal resulted from "skill deficits (in empathy and emotional self-awareness) and the emotional problems that result from gender role socializations" (p.247). That is, the difficulty in awareness and processing of emotional states would make it difficult to make sense of the feelings the men are experiencing, compounded by the intense emotions being experienced and expressed by their romantic counterparts.

Notarius and Johnson (1982) also looked at physiological reactivity and the benefits of the cathartic effect of expressing emotion. They concluded that evidence

of “physiological reactivity in the relatively unexpressive husband lends support to the discharge or suppression model of emotion” (p.488). Notarius and Johnson demonstrated that the inexpression of emotion results in decreased health consequences. They attributed the differences in physiological reactivity to be concomitant to the social history of negative consequences of emotional displays and the subsequent inhibition of emotional expressions. In addition, Consedine, Magi, and Bonnano (2002) found that the inhibition of emotion triggers a stress response, leading to aversive consequences affecting the immune system, and was even found to be associated with cancer.

Brody (1997) explained that the physiological effects are due to attempts at suppressing emotion, not due to the results of negative affect per se. The expression of feeling following emotionally salient experiences has been related to increased mental and physical health (e.g. immune functioning) (Pennebaker, Kiecolt-Glaser & Glaser, 1988; Pennebaker, 1989). Manstead (1992) looked at gender differences across multiple lines of research including psychophysiological data. He concluded that social psychological factors, rather than biological processes, were better able to explain gender differences. Grossman and Wood (1993), looking at electromyography (EMG), showed women to be better at heightening muscular activity when instructed to enhance emotional responses, and men showed a better ability to inhibit muscle activity than women when instructed to do so. From almost birth through our entire life span development, females are taught to express, males to suppress.

Emotional Expressivity

Displays of emotion are highly affected by socially sanctioned display rules via direct consequences and internalized expectations of gender-appropriate behaviors (Shields, 1987). Restrictive emotionality can be understood as involving intrapsychic, socialization, and contextual factors (Englar-Carlson, 2006). Emotional expression has been found to have more differences between the sexes than emotional experiencing (Allen & Haccoun, 1976; LaFrance & Banji, 1992; Timmers, Fischer, & Manstead, 1998). Except for anger, boys and men are discouraged from expressing emotions, including those that are positive (Brody & Hall, 1993, Levant 2001, Levant & Pollack, 1995). Differences in emotionality occur the most frequently and consistently via self-reports of expressivity, rather than self-reports of subjective experience (LaFrance & Banji, 1992). Outward expression of emotion can function somewhat independent of internal experience. That is, there can be subjective experiencing without expression and expression without internal experiencing. The research that shows females to be more emotionally expressive may be a product of gender-specific display rules and attitudes toward emotional expression than actual experience (Fischer & Good, 1997; Wong, Pituch, & Rochlen, 2006). LaFrance and Banaji (1992) conducted a meta-review of data examining expressivity and internal experience of emotion. They found that females will report being more emotional when the reported emotion is perceived by others rather than privately experienced, when the context is interpersonal versus impersonal, and when global emotionality is assessed versus specific emotion experienced. They concluded that these findings, “coupled with

results showing no consistent differences in the ability to be expressive, suggests strongly that the differences may be due to self-presentational conformity with prescribed sex roles" (p.189). That is, men may be reporting their beliefs in gender-specific roles more than their inner experience.

Other contextual variables that have contributed toward the paradigm that gender differences are learned (vs. biological) include differences found in emotional expressivity as result of the target's sex. Blier and Blier-Wilson (1989) found that males showed an increased proclivity to express anger with male friends than with female friends. In addition, females showed greater confidence in expressing liking to females than toward male targets.

Notarius and Johnson (1982) discussed the different social consequences one receives depending on which gender is expressing the affect. Women are encouraged to express emotions, and men learn to inhibit overt emotional reactions. Researchers have suggested that males and females are more similar than different with respect to immediate emotion experiencing (Heesacker, Wester, Vogel, Wentzel, Mejia-Millan, Goodhom, 1999; Wester, Vogel, Pressly, & Heesacker, 2002). LaFrance and Banaji (1992) stress the position that differences in expressivity may not reflect differences in internal state. In accordance with the gender role strain paradigm, Grossman and Wood (1993) showed that when normative pressure to suppress emotion was manipulated in a laboratory setting to attenuate these effects, gender differences were not found in the intensity of emotion reported.

Bryant and colleagues (1996) found no differences between the sexes on the variable of affect intensity, but they did find differences in reactivity between men

and women. Furthermore, they found that these differences in emotional reactivity were mediated by adherence to masculine ideology; the more one endorsed masculine ideology, the lower they displayed negative reactivity. This lends itself to the argument that measures of emotional expressivity are more susceptible to the influence of stereotypes than are variables of subjective emotional experience (Levant, Richmond, Majors, Inclan, Rossello, Heesacker, Rowan, & Sellars, 2003). Over the past several decades, the question has not been "can men process, be aware of, and express emotions effectively?" but "why aren't they?" Men are taught to suppress and ignore emotion (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). One important study to compliment this point was performed by Pennebaker and Roberts (1992). It showed men to be superior to women in the ability to identify internal physiology when situational cues are held constant. Fischer and Good (1997) wrote, "The degree to which men have internalized traditional masculine gender roles may tell us more about what they *will* do than about what they *can* do" (p.6).

One final important point to make about the importance of emotional expression is backed by a study conducted by Keltner, Ellsworth, and Edwards (1993). They found that when participants were asked to make certain facial expression conveying a particular emotion, they actually interpreted the hypothetical situation differently. The difference attributed to this was the expression itself and not the cognitive constituent due to the fact that participants were asked to pose the expression, not to feel it. This study argues for the importance of the behavior or emotional expression in interpersonal connections beyond that of internal experiencing and congruent expression therewith. This bidirectional process has

been well rehearsed in the field of social psychology (Bem, 1972; Briscoe, 1982). In social psychology as well as in clinical and counseling psychology, therapists and other mental health providers have shown that an individual can learn about their internal status by paying attention to external cues and expressions (Wood et al, 1989).

Restrictive Emotionality

Restrictive Emotionality (RE) is defined by Mahalik, Cournoyer, DeFranc, Cherry, Nopolitano (1998) as a "measure of rigidity in avoiding emotional expression" (p.248). Restriction of emotion is associated with psychological dysfunction (O'Neil, 1981). In O'Neil's (2008) review, he reported that several studies found RE to be related to "problematic coping strategies…, lower self esteem, anxiety, depression, stress, shame, marital dissatisfaction, negative attitudes toward women and gay men, and many other interpersonal restrictions" (p.419). Greenberg (2002) discussed restrictive emotionality as an "overregulation of affect" (p.177). Cognitive processes and beliefs are considered influential factors of overregulation. These beliefs could come from personal experiences (being made fun of for crying) or cultural messages (a movie where a man doesn't flinch while being shot by a gun). Blazina and Watkins (1996) examined college men and found Restrictive Emotionality to be related to a decrease in well-being, negative attitudes toward help seeking, and similarity to personality style to that of chemical abusers. Cusack, Dean, Wilson, and Ciarrochi (2006) found restrictive emotionality to be inversely related to treatment effectiveness in male clients. In addition, the

restrictive emotion subscale of the GRCS statistically predicted four variables measuring psychological well-being (Sharpe, Heppner, & Dixon, 1995). They considered this to be congruent with the personality theory of Jung (1969, 1971), who considered mature and healthy development as utilizing historically defined masculine and feminine aspects of personality in a complementary integration. Multiple studies have shown that restrictive emotionality can result in a detriment to well-being across cultures and age groups in men (e.g. Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Theodore & Lloyd, 2000).

In relationships, expressing feelings increases the likelihood that other people will respond in ways that help us fulfill basic human needs that are critical to our survival and adaptive existence (Brody, 1997). Campbell and Snow (1992) found that restrictive emotionality was negatively correlated with marital satisfaction in a group of predominately college educated men living in the south central part of the United States. Wong, Pituch, and Rochlen (2006) found restrictive emotionality to be related to difficulty with emotional communication in interpersonal contexts in 227 undergraduate males in the Southwest.

Mahalik et al (1998) discussed the conflicting messages about inhibiting the expression of emotion and current demands on a male's significant relationships in current society. Dealing with gender role conflict is thought to instigate the implementation of ego defense mechanisms to resolve these dissonances. Mahalik and colleagues noted that these defense mechanisms are utilized for four functions: the falsification of the weight of perceived threats, protecting one's perception of well-being, creating a self-deception of control over the interpreted danger, and the

reduction of conscious anxiety to manageable levels. Furthermore, these researchers found Restrictive Emotionality (as operationalized via the GRCS) to be positively correlated with immature defense mechanisms and negatively related to mature defenses. Moreover, constructing rigid limits on what is self-disclosed promotes interpersonal distance and prevents one from being manipulated as easily, further contributing to a sense of independence and safety from perceived social threats (Jansz, 2000).

Like other dimensions of masculinity, Restrictive Emotionality is considered a multi-dimensional subconstruct to the gender role strain paradigm. Men can restrict their emotionality at different times for different reasons. Wong and Rochlen (2005) elucidated this point by delineating this paradigm onto a five-step cognitive-evaluative process. They posit that restrictive emotionality can occur during any step of the process. A man can repress his feelings (disruption at awareness stage), have difficulty identifying what he is feeling (labeling and interpretation stage), be uncomfortable at his negative emotions (evaluation stage), or may have a narrow range of opportunities to express them interpersonally (social context stage).

Masculine ideology dictates that men ignore or at least derogate their emotional experiencing. Fischer and Good (1997) stated that one consequence to this socialization is that men "become less able to recognize and process many emotions as they occur" (p.2). Male gender role norms dictate that experiencing emotion is associated with femininity, and, therefore, is associated with weakness. Men may be actually afraid of their emotions, a notion that makes sense given the evidence of negative social consequences from infancy well into adulthood

(Heesacker, Wester, Vogel, Wentzel, Mejia-Millan, & Goodholm, 1999; Jakupcak, 2003; Levant & Pollack, 1995; Pleck, 1981). This construct was developed under the paradigm that there are multiple levels of processing emotions. Primary emotional responding corresponds to an emotional reaction to a stimulus (e.g. loss of a romantic relationship), whereas secondary responding refers to a person's learned reaction to the experiencing of primary emotions, such as the experience of anxiety for feeling sadness (Jakupcak, 2003). Jakupcak (2003) examined men's responding to their own emotions and found that men reported significantly more overall fear of emotion than women and also found significance with more fear of the experiencing of anger, positive emotions, and sadness. Jakupcak (2003) also found that masculine ideology was positively correlated with men's global fear of emotions. This researcher posited that gender role socialization may have a greater effect on men's reactions to their emotional states than trait-like measures of emotional responding. Greenberg (2002) stated "people with restricted affect, who fear their own anger or automatically control against any weakness first, have to overcome their fear of, or resistance to, feeling. This work takes time and will only later lead to the ability to experience and express emotion" (p.181).

Jansz (2000) stated that if males are to hide their vulnerabilities and prohibit themselves from expressing emotion, it will prove difficult to share feelings and function optimally in intimate relationships. Fischer and Good (1997) discussed the severity of behavioral restrictions, stating that boys avoid anything remotely feminine, including the perceived feminine behavior of experiencing emotion.

Furthermore, Wong and Rochlen (2005) address studies of physiological data and emotions by stating that the translation of emotional experiencing into language is an essential piece to experiencing health benefits. Multiple studies by Pennebaker and associates have validated these notions of the importance of putting feelings to words and its effects on overall health and improved functioning in romantic relationships (Petrie, Fontanilla, & Thomas, 2004 ; Slatcher & Pennebaker, 2006).

Levant (2001) has conducted extensive research on alexithymia, a condition of being unaware of one's own emotions, difficulty in expressing those feelings into words, and being uncomfortable in dealing with others' emotions. Levant proposes that many men in Western society suffer a milder form of alexithymia that he has coined "normative male alexithymia" (Levant, 2001). In addition to this, participants also reported the fear of becoming emotional and the social punishments that would ensue (Wilcox & Forrest, 1992). The experience and expression of feelings would result in an image of oneself that was not considered masculine, and, therefore a threat to one's positive identity as a man (Eisler, 1995; O'Neil, Good & Holmes, 1995; Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrara, 1992). Dindia and Allen (1992) conducted a meta-analysis and found that women disclose their emotions more than men. One interesting point to this analysis was that women disclosed the same amount to men as men did to men. Jansz (2000) stated that the recalcitrance of men to disclose intimate feelings was due to the threat that sharing would shake their identity, because sharing feelings would make them vulnerable, often interpreted as an indicator of weakness. Perhaps this also speaks to the reactions men give when a man or a woman express emotionally salient material.

Levant, Good, Cook, O'Neil, Smalley, Owen, and Richmond (2006) proposed that men do not learn emotional proficiencies that could be applied to "self-understanding, self-care, emotional empathy, and richer interactions with others because of their lack of awareness of emotions" (p.213). Greenberg (2002) stated that "problems of overregulation of emotion, however, require the learning of a different set of skills for quick change and symptom alleviation. These require increased awareness of emotion, approaching and accepting emotion, expressing the emotion, sorting through emotions, understanding the primary message of an emotion, attending to the adaptive action tendency in the emotion, and being guided by the adaptive motivation" (p.179).

Though restrictive emotionality is considered to be encouraged via masculine socialization, its effects are not solely prohibitive in men. Zamarripa, Wampold, and Gregory (2003) found that "the detrimental effects of restricted emotion operate similarly in men *and* women" (p.336). The effects of restrictive emotionality does not affect men disproportionately more than it does women when controlling for frequency of restrictive emotionality, but they found that men do restrict their emotions more than women, resulting in more men experiencing this detrimental effect.

Relationship Measures and Emotion

Though gender differences in all contexts are beyond the scope of this study, we will examine how restrictive emotionality as a result of male socialization (and internalized beliefs) affects a man's ability to relate to his own emotional expression and subsequently the quality of the relationship in which it is expressed. Macklin

(1983) posited that "the emotional socialization of women has taught them to be more sensitive to the quality of the relationship and to deal more effectively with their emotion" (p.99). In a study examining the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationship Scale (PAIR), men displayed less accuracy in predicting their partner's level of intimacy experience in the relationship (Heller & Wood, 1998). Also found in this study was a trend that showed participants who were less accurate in predicting their partner's intimacy score also diverged in their intimacy score and experienced less intimacy. This further posits the emphasis and adaptive value of being aware of one's own and a partner's experience of intimacy.

Most current theories agree that emotion is considered a multi-faceted system with cognitive, neurological, experiential, subjective, and expressive components. Appraisal theorists postulate that before we experience an emotion, we appraise the environment and accumulate relevant information relating, but not limited to, novelty, level of threat, controllability, aversiveness, and predictability of outcome (Brody & Hall, 1997). Due to differences in socialization histories and roles, males and females may interpret contexts and situations differently, which affects styles, modalities, and levels of emotional expression (Shields, 1987). Functionalist theories postulate that every emotional expression has subsequent behavioral results which can be adaptive for ourselves as well as others (Brody & Hall, 1997). Emotion that deviates too much on any multitude of levels may be met with social disapproval, stimulating efforts to modulate future expressions even to the level of altering the subjective quality of felt emotion in order to more effectively conform to perceived societal standards (Shields, 1987).

Antill (1983) found that marital satisfaction decreased for husbands and wives when levels of restricted emotionality increased. Good, Robertson, O'Neil, Fitzgerald, Stevens, Debord, Bartels, and Braverman (1995) showed the Restrictive Emotionality subscale of the GRCS correlated with a fear of intimacy measure. Other studies have shown directly that men scoring high on restrictive emotionality also report low on measures of intimacy in significant relationships (O'Neil et al, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Tognoli (1980) described the potential barriers to close relationships in male-female dyads including "the taboos against intimacy and making oneself vulnerable, homophobia, competition, and the dislike of women" (p.278).

In a study conducted by Barrett and colleagues (1998), they found that intensity and expressions of emotion increased with increased intimacy. After controlling for the level of intimacy, women and men did not differ in the intensity of emotion experienced. Men who appear to deeply experience emotions and feel the freedom to express these experiences, may experience improvement in all types of relationships, intrapersonally and interpersonally.

Pathways to Intimacy

"Women's specialization is so inculcated into modern culture (including the practice of mental health), that little cultural validation is provided for men's evolutionary specialization and emotional style" (Heesacker & Prichard, 1992, p.282). Heesacker and Prichard further discuss the importance of "being comfortable with silence" and "brooding" as being a dismissed aspect of men's

affective style. There are many ways to deal with emotional problems and many ways to express those emotions. It is the restriction of these emotional facets based on cultural artifacts that seems to limit our understanding and validation of human relationships and meaning. Men may more commonly express love by doing things versus direct verbal expressions of emotion or other intimate conveyances (Levant, 1996b). In adolescence, the playground of precursors to adult interactions, boys' avenues to experiencing closeness included sharing secrets, sharing money, and protection from harm (physical and psychological) (Way, 2004). O'Neil (1981) reported that the fear of femininity restricts men in affectionate exchanges due to socialization's message that emotions (and expressions therewith) are feminine, and a man should not express any passive sexual behaviors such as touch, sensuality, and other "softer" behaviors of sexuality.

Heesacker and Prichard (1992) discussed an expressive tendency of a man sharing himself through the telling of stories. They further posited that although the telling of stories has been considered a form of emotional escapism in the past, the salience of affect encoded in these stories may be a viable form of sharing one's internal experiences of self. These researchers further discuss changes regarding their approach with men in the counseling session. They recommend the approach of encouraging male clients to increase their awareness of how their actions reveal meanings and emotions. Men are pressured to conform to traditional male scripts and, therefore, more subtle behaviors to elicit close relationships and intimacy are dictated. Caldwell and Peplau (1982) conducted a study examining potential gender differences in intimacy. Their study showed that women and men both valued

intimacy in their relationships, yet self-disclosure of feelings were less reported by men than by women. The point is made that due to men's socialization that encourages stoicism and the inhibition of expression, small degrees of expression may be taken as a sign of significant intimacy. Conversely, greater levels of emotional self-disclosure by women may be needed to warrant an exchange as intimate (Caldwell & Peplau, 1982).

Due to socialization experiences and interactions of same sex groups in childhood, men and women acquire different forms of interaction and thus could experience feelings of intimacy through different vehicles. Richey and Richey (1980) found that grade school girls selected friends because they could talk freely with them. Grade school boys selected friends equally on the basis of being able to have fun with them and to be able to confide in them. For boys, the relationship between feelings of closeness and shared experiences was significant even when controlling for self-disclosure. Crandall, Shiffhauer, and Harvey (1997) found college women associated friends along lines of physical characteristics more than men, while men more associated friends by activities.

Wood and Inman (1993) stress the point that men express *and* recognize feelings of closeness by doing things for love ones "as indicated by consistent reports that men want to do things for people about whom they care" (p.291). Wood and Inman also challenge the long-standing dichotomy in the field of personality theory of instrumentality and expressiveness. Through a masculine lens, material assistance is a validated expression of care. "To persist in dismissing ways of interacting that men seem to prefer and to excel in impoverishes understanding of human

connections" (p.291). A feminine lens may obscure meaning underscoring communication and lead to a misjudging of one's inner experience, intentions, and expression of affect.

Hook and colleagues (2003) support the contention that most researchers and counselors listen to dialogues for indices of intimacy and are much more sensitized to more typically feminine avenues of relating (e.g. verbal intimacy, empathic responding) and subsequently discount or are unaware of a more male (learned or inherent) voice of intimacy. Schaefer and Olson (1981) constructed an instrument (Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Scale; PAIR) that incorporated "recreational intimacy" into their multi-dimensional operationalization of intimacy. Recreational intimacy refers to the experience of closeness and connection one feels while performing activities together and the communication of support and validation that can accompany this form of sharing. This can be viewed as understanding the multiple modes to achieve closeness and intimacy. Furthermore, Hook et al (2003) conducted a factor analysis on their data to look at various dimensions of intimacy using multiple instruments purporting to measure intimacy, including the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (SIS; Miller & Lefcourt, 1982) and the PAIR. One of the four factor loadings included a dimension that they described as consisting of ways of sharing interests, being together, and a strong sense of acceptance in multiple contexts. The narrow scope of how close relationships are thought to be developed and maintained may prove to be widened with increased research looking at a man's experience of intimacy. These aforementioned avenues to closeness should be acknowledged, especially given the restrictive climate placed

on men to nurture relationships without violating masculine ideology. It is important to summarize that men appear to have the same capacity for intimacy and exhibit different ways to achieve intimacy. In addition, the understanding of what contributes to fulfilling, meaningful, and intimate relationships should be broadened to incorporate feminine *and* masculine ways of achieving intimacy.

Gender Role Conflict and Relationship Measures

Campbell and Snow (1992) examined gender role conflict, family environment, and marital satisfaction in 70 married men. Restrictive Emotionality and Conflict Between Work and Family both proved to be significant predictors for marital satisfaction, the criterion variable. Sharpe and Heppner (1991) completed a study using the GRCS and measures of psychological well-being, including the SIS on 190 male college students. Their usage of the SIS was geared toward friendship intimacy. Out of the four subscales of the GRCS, Sharpe and Heppner showed (a) Restrictive Emotionality, (b) Success, Power and Competition, and (c) Restrictive Behavior Between Men to be significantly correlated with friendship intimacy. Further, using a canonical analysis, they concluded that well-being may prove to be often defined too narrowly, as they found two roots which they later labeled Traditional Masculine Well-Being and Affiliative Well-Being. The former referred to more traditional measures of well-being such as depression, anxiety, and self-esteem. The latter referred to variables such as intimacy and stressed the impact of interpersonal relationships. This study focused more on the affiliative aspects of

well-being and emphasized the importance of this factor on overall health in men and women.

Theodore and Lloyd (2000) also studied gender role conflict and measures of psychological well-being, including intimacy (as measured by the SIS), in three different age groups of Australian men (n=221). Interestingly, intimacy significantly correlated with all other measures of psychological well-being: self-esteem, depression, anxiety, stress, and life satisfaction. They combined these variables to form two univariates. Their Well-Being (WB) univariate consisted of depression, self-esteem, social intimacy, and life satisfaction. Two subscales (RE and RABBM) of the GRCS proved to be retained in the WB univariate regression, and a significant effect was found for both.

Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995) examined differences between college-aged men and middle-aged men in America. Their canonical correlation analysis showed that men who experienced less conflict concerning emotional expression had greater intimacy (as measured by the SIS) regardless of age. Furthermore, restrictive emotionality as measured by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS), had a strong relationship to all of the psychological well-being measures, including intimacy. This study was designed to examine the relationship between gender role conflict and intimacy in romantic couples. Mahalik, Locke, Theodore, Cournoyer, and Llody (2001) conducted a study examining gender role conflict and its relationship to self-esteem and intimacy (as measured by the SIS). They looked at men from different age groups (college-aged vs. middle-aged) and nationalities (American vs. Australian) representing a non-clinical sample (n=325). They found that of the four subscales of

the GRCS, Restrictive Emotionality was significantly correlated with intimacy for college-aged men. For middle-aged men, Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men were both significantly correlated with intimacy.

Fischer and Good (1997) conducted regression analyses on 208 Midwestern undergraduate men and found Restrictive Emotionality and Success, Power, and Competition (subscales of the GRCS) to be significant unique predictors for their criterion variable, fear of intimacy. Along similar lines, Good and colleagues (1996) conducted regression analyses on a clinical sample of 130 college men seeking treatment. These researchers found Restrictive Emotionality to be a predictor of their measure of interpersonal sensitivity.

Overall, gender role conflict has shown consistently to be related to measures of general physical health, psychological disorders, self-esteem, and interpersonal domains such as friendship intimacy. This study examines how gender role conflict relates to the domain of romantic intimacy, a phenomenological construct that involves some of the most intense and emotionally salient relationships that a person experiences in a lifetime. Theoretically, gender role conflict should affect a man's experience of intimacy and subsequent overall life satisfaction.

Chapter III: Methodology

This is a descriptive correlational study. Men who have been in an exclusive romantic relationship for at least six months or more in the past year were compared using a cross-sectional design to examine relationships among variables purporting to measure the construct of intimacy and gender role conflict among men.

Participants

A convenience sample was used in this study. The sample was composed of men throughout the Tulsa, Oklahoma area who were related to the home building and construction industry. The researcher recruited various men, including homeowners, home builders, contractors, subcontractors, journeymen, general laborers, and relatives or friends of these men. This is considered a particularly interesting sample due to the fact that it represents a traditionally stereotyped profession. Participants were given a brief oral or written description of the study (see Appendix A). Once an individual agreed to participate, he was administered a packet that contained an IRB Survey Consent Form (Appendix B) and the instruments. Participants were individually instructed to complete the following instruments: a demographic questionnaire (Appendix E), the Gender Role Conflict Scale, First Edition (GRCS-I, Appendix D), and the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships scale (PAIR, Appendix C). To control for order effects, reverse administration were implemented for approximately half of the participants to facilitate subsequent analyses.

Protection of Human Participants

Procedures were employed to ensure the protection of human participants. All procedures implemented in this study were examined by The University of Oklahoma Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. Prior to the dissemination of the instrument packet, participants were given a verbal synopsis of the purpose of the study along with potential risks and benefits of participation. Upon verbal consent, they were provided a written informed consent form that explained the purpose and risks and benefits of participation. Participants were allowed to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences. All instrument packets were anonymous. Participants were instructed to put their name only on the consent form and not on any individual instruments to ensure anonymity. Upon completion of the instruments, the consent form was separated from the packet and kept in a confidential file.

Measures

The Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR), constructed by Schaefer and Olson (1981), was designed to define the multidimensional process of intimacy. It comprises 36 items (six items per dimension). Participants respond on a 5-point likert scale. Higher scores indicate greater intimacy. Participants used in the validation of this instrument spanned across ages and time in the relationship.

The PAIR is both a theoretically and empirically driven scale. This measure was designed to measure intimacy in five areas: emotional intimacy, social intimacy, sexual intimacy, recreational intimacy, and intellectual intimacy. When the PAIR was developed, Schaefer and Olson not only solicited statements about intimacy from family professionals to get a professionally conceptual perspective, but they facilitated and taped four discussion groups, with lay persons who completed marital enrichment programs resulting in a spiritual intimacy dimension. The spiritual dimension was eventually dropped, because it was empirically "unclear."

Participants in the development of this measure included 192 couples. During development of the PAIR, items with a frequency split closest to 50%-50% were chosen. Second, items had to correlate higher with their own a priori scale than any other scale. Third, items had to have an adequately high factor-loading to meet the criterion prescribed. A factor loading criterion level of .20 was established. Half of the items resulted in a factor loading of over .50. Lastly, each subscale consisted of an equal number of negative and positive scores to control for acquiescence. Schaefer and Olson reported adequate convergent validity, discriminant validity, and split-half reliability and found an internal consistency coefficient of alpha to be greater than .70 for all subscales.

Gender role conflict will be operationalized by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986). This is a 37-item self-report instrument measuring overall gender role conflict which is also divided into four factors: (1) Restrictive Emotionality (RE); (2) Success, Power, and Competition (SPC); (3) Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM);

and (4) Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWF). These four factors were developed from previous theoretical literature. Participants respond on a 6-point likert scale. Higher scores indicate greater gender role conflict.

This instrument was validated by assessing 527 undergraduate men at two Midwestern universities enrolled in introductory psychology classes. The marital status of the participants were 95% single, and 84% were freshman or sophomores. Retention of items was utilized via a three-step procedure. First, content validity was established via a panel of raters on each item. Second, items were excluded if they did not meet the criterion of having a standard deviation of 1.00. Lastly, the factor analysis using oblique rotation yielded all subscale scores with alphas ranging from .75 to .85, resulting in internally consistent factors. The GRCS has also shown to exhibit adequate test-retest reliability over a four week period ranging from .72 to .86 for each subscale factor (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986). O'Neil's (2008) summary of 22 factor analyses and 232 empirical studies yielded remarkably similar data to what was found 20 years ago in regards to structural validity, reliabilities (internal and test-retest), and convergent validity. These psychometric properties have also found consistency across diverse groups.

Data from the instruments were entered into SPSS for analysis. The level of statistical significance for this study was set a priori at $p = .05$. Descriptive statistics of central tendency were employed for the demographic data of this study. A t-test was utilized to ascertain whether order effects of instrument administration impacted participant responding. Based on gender role theory, we predicted men would show higher levels of recreational intimacy than emotional intimacy. To test this

hypothesis, a paired-samples within subjects t-test was utilized. Correlations were computed to look at relationships between gender role conflict variables (overall gender role conflict and restrictive emotionality) and dimensions of intimacy (recreational, emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and overall intimacy). Multivariate and univariate regression analyses were implemented to test for significant relationships between the hypothesized variables. This assisted in determining if intimacy is predicted by gender role conflict. Restrictive emotionality and the overall score of the GRCS were utilized for the regression analyses. These two variables have shown the most consistent significant correlations to indices of relationship well-being. The overall score and each subscale of the PAIR were used as criterion variables.

Based on predictions of low to moderate effect size of variable relationships ($r = .2$) and a conservative approach regarding the proportion of sample size per predictor, we continued recruitment until at least 100 participants had completed the assessment. As these intimacy subscales have not been compared to gender role conflict, the effect size across hypotheses are not predicted as equal.

Chapter IV: Results

Order Effects

A t-test was performed to test for differences between the two test administration orders: PAIR first and GRCS-I first. Overall scores of the PAIR and GRCS-I were used to test for order effects. The results indicated that the mean for the effects of the administration of the PAIR instrument first on the PAIR ($\underline{M}$ = 82.4, $\underline{SD}$ = 17.7) were not significantly different from the administration of the GRCS-I first ($\underline{M}$ = 82.7, $\underline{SD}$ = 19.6), $\underline{t}$ (99) = .08, $\underline{p}$ = .81. The total score on the GRCS-I also indicated non-significant differences between the administration of the PAIR first ($\underline{M}$ = 119.8, $\underline{SD}$ = 26.1) and the administration of the GRCS-I first ($\underline{M}$ = 116.9, $\underline{SD}$ = 24.6), $\underline{t}$ (99) = .58, $\underline{p}$ = .86. The T-test statistic appears to show that the order of instruments filled out did not change the responses to any significant degree.

Recreational vs. Emotional

Subscale scores of recreational intimacy were hypothesized to be higher than scores of emotional intimacy; a score possibly operationalized with a bias towards more feminine styles of achieving intimacy. A within samples t-test was implemented. This sample of males showed significant differences between recreational intimacy scores ($\underline{M}$ = 15.2, $\underline{SD}$ = 3.26) and emotional intimacy scores ($\underline{M}$ = 17.3, $\underline{SD}$ = 5.4), $\underline{t}$ (99) = - 4.64, $\underline{p}$ < .001, but not in the theoretically predicted direction. Emotional intimacy scores actually were significantly higher than recreational scores.

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	SD
Age	44.8	12.8
Level of Education	4.5	1.5
Parents' Education	3.78	1.9
# of siblings	2.15	1.69
Brothers	1.12	1.07
Sisters	1.03	1.16
Level of SES	2.21	.589
GRCS	136	25.16
RE	28.61	9.57
RABBM	24.16	7.60
SPC	44.6	10.66
CBWF	20.78	6.40
Recreational Intimacy	15.26	3.27
Emotional Intimacy	17.25	5.38
Social Intimacy	16.54	4.58
Sexual Intimacy	17.4	5.66
Intellectual Intimacy	16.03	4.17
Overall Intimacy	82.57	18.45

Table 1
(GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; SPC = Success, Power, and Competition)

Correlations

Pearson product-moment correlational coefficients were computed between the overall gender role conflict score and the six intimacy scores. In addition, the gender role conflict subscale score, restrictive emotionality, was also correlated with the intimacy scores to determine its relationship. The level of statistical significance for these correlational computations were set a priori at $p = .05$. The results of the correlational analyses presented in Table 2 show that 9 of 12 correlations were statistically significant. The full correlational matrix between and across subscale scores can be found in Appendix F.

Correlations

Variable Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	GRCS	Restrictive Emotionality
Total Intimacy	-.274** .003	-.343** < .001
Emotional Intimacy	-.199* .047	-.252* .011
Sexual Intimacy	-.340** .001	-.436** <.001
Recreational Intimacy	-.143 .156	-.157 .118
Social Intimacy	-.206* .040	-.242* .015
Intellectual Intimacy	-.160 .112	-.212* .033

Table 2
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Gender role conflict resulted in significant correlations with overall intimacy, emotional intimacy, sexual intimacy, and social intimacy. Consistent with previous findings, gender role conflict showed to be related to these indices of relational functioning. Restrictive emotionality showed to be significantly correlated with all indices of intimacy except for recreational intimacy. The results found in this sample have shown to be consistent with theoretically hypothesized directions and with previous findings.

Multivariate Regressions

Two multivariate regressions were computed to control for alpha and to discover findings that apply to a linear combination of the dependent variables (DV), accounting for the intercorrelations among the DV's. First, a multivariate regression was computed using the five intimacy scores as dependent variables. In the first multivariate regression, the total GRCS score was the independent variable (IV). In order to better understand the data as a composite among the intimacy measures in relation to the gender role conflict score, four of the most commonly used multivariate tests were implemented. Pillar's Trace value of 3.40, $F(335,160) = 1.01$, $p = .47$, Wilks' Lambda value of .002, $F(335,145.30) = 1.04$, $p = .40$, and Hotelling's Trace value of 13.58, $F(335,132) = 1.07$, $p = .33$ are all non-significant. Roy's Largest Root value of 5.72, $F(67,32) = 2.73$, however, yielded strong significance with $p = .001$. Roy's Largest Root focuses on one direction, suggesting there may be one principal component. This helps guide our univariate analyses to ascertain if the significant direction could be closest to one of the univariate measures (Harris, 1985). Sexual intimacy was the closest with a p value of .046. The other four intimacy subscales were greater than .05 and thus interpretability should be made tentatively. Social intimacy ($p = .06$), emotional intimacy ($p = .17$), and intellectual intimacy were the next closest ($p = .2$), while recreational intimacy ($p = .81$) was far away from Roy's Largest Root.

For the primary focus of this study, the second multivariate regression was conducted with Restrictive Emotionality as the IV. As with the previous multivariate

regression, the DV's were the intimacy subscale scores. Consistent with the first multivariate regression, only Roy's Largest Root was found to be significant with a value of 1.18, F (32,68) = 2.51, p = .001. Pillar's Trace had a value of 1.74, F (160,340) = 1.13, p = .17, Wilks' Lambda value was .11, F (160, 322) = 1.15, p = .15, and Hotelling's Trace had a value of 3.00, F (160,312), p = .12. As discussed with the first multivariate regression using the GRCS as the IV, the findings suggest one principal component. The direction was also closest to sexual intimacy with significance (p = .004), followed by emotional intimacy (p = .056), recreational intimacy (p = .080), intellectual intimacy (p= .142), and social intimacy (p = .253).

Previous research has shown inconsistent statistical significance with the other subscale scores of the GRCS in relation with intimacy variables. To confirm this trend in the current sample, multiple regressions were conducted in which overall intimacy was the DV, and it was predicted from the IV's restrictive emotionality, success/power/competition, conflict between work and family, and restrictive affectionate behavior between men. The results showed that indeed, none of the other subscales other than restrictive emotionality yielded statistical significance with overall intimacy as the dependent variable, $R^2 = .14$, F (4,95) = 3.590, p = .009 (Restrictive Emotionality, p = .003, Success, Power, and Competition, p = .742; Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, p = .657; Conflict Between Work and Family, p = .358). This confirmed that the appropriate statistical design was chosen for this sample. These results helped guide statistical decisions on what to include for the univariate regressions.

Univariate Regressions

Twelve regression analyses were conducted to predict each dimension of intimacy. Six analyses included the full gender role conflict scale factor to predict the various dimensions of intimacy (the criterion variables). The final six excluded all other subscale factors of gender role conflict except restrictive emotionality (predictor variable). The six criterion variables are: recreational intimacy, emotional intimacy, social intimacy, sexual intimacy, intellectual intimacy, and the total intimacy score.

The regression analysis with only the overall gender role conflict factor predicting recreational intimacy was not significant, $R^2 = .02$, $F(1,98) = 2.042$, $p = .16$. Based on these results, gender role conflict does not appear to make a significant contribution to the recreational intimacy variable.

The next regression analysis examined gender role conflict predicting emotional intimacy, yielding a significant result, $R^2 = .04$, $F(1,98) = 4.04$, $p = .047$. Based on these results, the gender role conflict measure appears to be a better predictor of emotional intimacy.

Next, a regression analysis using gender role conflict as a predictor and social intimacy as the criterion was conducted. This regression yielded significant results, $R^2 = .04$, $F(98,1) = 4.34$, $p = .04$. The gender role conflict scale showed to be a sound predictor of social intimacy.

A regression analysis was conducted introducing gender role conflict as a predictor for sexual intimacy. The analysis with only gender role conflict as the sole predictor showed a significant result, $R^2 = .11$, $F(1,98) = 12.78$, $p = .001$.

With the gender role conflict scale as the predictor for intellectual intimacy, a non-significant equation resulted, $R^2 = .03$, $F(1,98) = 2.57$, $p = .11$.

The final regression equation was conducted examining whether the gender role conflict scale would significantly predict the overall intimacy score. Gender role conflict appears to be a viable significant predictor for overall romantic intimacy.

One primary goal for this study was to examine effects of restrictive emotionality on a male's experience of romantic intimacy. The first regression analysis was conducted to predict the overall intimacy score using restrictive emotionality as a predictor. The regression yielded significant results, $R^2 = .12$, $F(1,98) = 13.16$, $p < .001$. Restrictive emotionality appears to be a solid predictor in overall intimacy. As restrictive emotionality increased, overall intimacy decreased.

To further elucidate the effects of restrictive emotionality on intimacy, we conducted regression analyses on the sub-dimensions of intimacy. The first dimension of intimacy examined in this study was recreational intimacy. The regression equation did not yield significant results ($R^2 = .03$, $F(1,98) = 2.49$, $p = .12$). In these analyses, restrictive emotionality does not show to be a valid predictor for a man's experience of recreational intimacy.

A regression analysis was performed to look at restrictive emotionality as a predictor of emotional intimacy. As theory predicts, we showed a significant result, $R^2 = .06$, $F(1,98) = 6.71$, $p = .01$. Restrictive emotionality has demonstrated good predictive value for emotional intimacy.

Next, a multiple regression analysis was conducted with restrictive emotionality attempting to predict social intimacy. This regression equation was

significant, $R^2 = .06$, $F(1,98) = 6.17$, $p = .02$. These results suggest that restrictive emotionality is a significant predictor for social intimacy.

Restrictive emotionality was used as a predictor for sexual intimacy, the criterion variable. This regression equation yielded significant results, $R^2 = .19$, $F(1,98)$, $p < .001$. Restrictive emotionality appears to be a sound predictor for sexual intimacy.

The final regression analysis was conducted to predict intellectual intimacy with restrictive emotionality as a predictor. This equation resulted in significance, $R^2 = .05$, $F(1,98) = 4.65$, $p = .03$. Intellectual intimacy could be retained as a predictor for this model.

Overall, with multivariate and univariate analyses, statistical significance stayed consistent among all tests, even when the F values were converted to T values. That is, although these two-tailed tests are non-directional, the hypotheses were constructed with theoretically predicted directions. Therefore, a conservative approach was taken to ensure that a discussion about this data set would be scientifically sound under a more correct one-tailed test.

Discussion

This study sought to examine intimacy in relation to male gender role conflict and more specifically, restrictive emotionality. Through examining the possible interactions among these constructs, I hoped to further theoretical and practical understanding on what elements influence romantic heterosexual relationships. Another goal for this study was to introduce some delineation in a man's experience of romantic intimacy, an area of research relatively new in attention. This study represents new ground in looking at GRC with romantic intimacy. Previous research has looked at friendship intimacy with GRC, but not of the romantic quality. Regression and multivariate analyses were also conducted in this study to add to the predictive value of these connected constructs. Most findings served to build upon theoretically consistent directions and were found to parallel previous research findings. The hypotheses of this study received general support.

The multivariate analyses helped guide the regressions. This aided in gaining a better understanding of how the intimacy dimensions interrelated. This study was able to examine estimates of the particular weights which define the composite intimacy factor for this sample of men related to the construction industry. The first two hypotheses presented in this study predicted a negative correlation between intimacy and gender role conflict, as well as with restrictive emotionality, the sub-construct of GRC. Supporting other research that has examined the relationship of GRC factors to relationship variables (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), this study found GRC factors to be related to romantic intimacy in the predicted directions. That is,

as men reported more gender role conflict, the lower levels of intimacy they reported. The null hypothesis was rejected and the overall gender role conflict score statistically correlated with the overall intimacy score, the emotional intimacy score, the sexual intimacy score, and the social intimacy score. This showed that as one adhered rigidly to more traditional masculine gender roles, the more this cost them in the arena of emotional connection, sexual intimacy, and social intimacy. The correlations with restrictive emotionality also showed the same results, except additionally, the correlation with intellectual intimacy was also found to be statistically significant. These findings with restrictive emotionality support multiple theoretical postulations on the adverse effects of rigidly ignoring or devaluing the adaptive function that emotions can play in some of men's most influential and significant relationships in adulthood, that with a wife or girlfriend. Though some traditional masculinity scripts dictate the compartmentalization of sexuality from emotional closeness, this appears to be maladaptive. Opposed to sitcoms and comedians that portray a woman needing emotional foreplay to enjoy sex and men to only need physical stimulation, these studies attest to the importance and the inextricable connection between sex and emotion for men engaging in sexual behaviors with romantic partners. The other correlations also speak to the interdependence and overlapping influence that restrictive emotionality has on social activities and intellectual sharing where potentially more superficial or less vulnerable emotions are shared. The only dimension of intimacy measured that did not correlate with either of these factors was recreational intimacy. Perhaps this is due to the fact that further research is needed in understanding the benefits

experienced in doing shared activities other than sharing emotional content, socializing as a couple, sharing ideas, or physical affection behaviors. Conceivably the benefit of the sharing of activities is not impacted by strict gender role adherence or specifically, the restriction of emotion. Another possible explanation for non-significance is due to the instrumentation. It is possible that the sensitivity or operationalization needs to be addressed to capture these effects.

Furthermore, the recreational intimacy variable did not show to be statistically greater than the emotional intimacy score. This null hypothesis was not rejected, but it is interesting that men actually showed statistical significance in the other direction. Men actually reported significantly higher scores on emotional intimacy than recreational intimacy. As stated previously, this may further the distinction between what men feel and what they express and what constrictions are placed on that potential capacity.

The final hypotheses tested in this study addressed the predictive value of overall gender role conflict and the subscale measuring restrictive emotionality on the overall and sub-dimensions of intimacy. The hypotheses tested are considered a next step in understanding what factors impact men's experience of intimacy. The overall gender role conflict score accounted for 8% of the variance explained by the overall intimacy score. The overall gender role conflict score significantly predicted all levels of intimacy except for recreational intimacy, with GRC predicting 11% of the variance of sexual intimacy (the largest percentage). These findings are consistent with O'Neil's (1981) depiction of the effects of this gender role conflict pattern on men's emotional experiencing and personal relationships. Though this

percentage may not seem large, it does seem practically significant given that this is a variable that does not inherently depend on the compatibility or interaction of the couple, but rather what the male brings to the relationship a priori. The Gender Role Conflict Scale, First Edition does not ask about the male's behavior in the context of the relationship, but in his life overall.

The results of this study were found to parallel theories of emotional processes and gender role strain. Restrictive emotionality successfully predicted the overall intimacy score and all of the dimensions of intimacy except for recreational intimacy. Restrictive emotionality accounted for 19% of the variance explained for sexual intimacy and 12% of the overall intimacy score. If indeed one of the messages we send men is to ignore or restrict the attention and expression of emotions, then this may predispose men to experience limitations and difficulties in achieving their potential in achieving desired levels of the multifaceted experience of romantic intimacy with their chosen partners, a phenomenon commonly thought of as inextricably linked to overall well-being for a man and his romantic partner (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). "The ability to accurately recognize and communicate feelings is seen as necessary for growth and coping with life's problems" (Theodore & Lloyd, 2000, p. 1039). Moreover, Antill (1983) and Campbell and Snow (1992) showed that wives were more satisfied with their marriage when their husbands were more emotionally expressive. "Some reconsideration of society's propensity to romanticize the "strong, silent type" of a man appears warranted" (Good et al., 1995, p. 8). These results suggest that it may be misleading to narrowly conceptualize the construct of intimacy without the consideration of gender roles and other factors

affecting the expression of emotionality. These results support previous findings about the central role that restrictive emotionality appears to play in men's romantic relationships.

Predictive statistics were also conducted to hopefully emphasize the importance of using instruments of masculinity ideology into a battery of diagnostic tools used to assess couples seeking counseling. Specifically, this study could help couples' counseling in two ways: one, the adding of a gender role conflict scale to understand possible barriers in men's willingness or conditioning into expressing emotions, both in and outside a counseling session, and two, the need to understand that there are many ways a man may or can express and experience intimacy.

Furthermore,

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First, correlational designs were used and no variables were actually manipulated or compared to a control sample; hence, causality cannot be accurately determined and deductions must be cautiously qualified accordingly. The current sample consisted primarily of White, working class men living in the Northeastern part of Oklahoma, thus limiting generalizability across men from different ethnicities, geographic locations, nationalities, socioeconomic statuses, etc. Replicating these results with a sample that more closely resembled the ethnic makeup of the general population is recommended. It is , however, a strength that this sample consisted of more traditionally stereotyped males in the construction industry and yet still had a very similar mean on their

report of the overall gender role conflict score compared to other non-clinical samples used to validate the instrument.

Next, the conclusions regarding the constructs of masculine gender role strain and intimacy are restricted and/or limited to the variables that were used to operationalize the constructs in this study. Additional research on what these intimacy subscales are truly measuring is needed. Studies on the how the psychometric properties hold up across different demographic variations (e.g. sexual orientation, cultural factors) are warranted to support the validity and reliability of the PAIR and for use with a wider array of men.

Due to the utilization of a convenience sample, results should only be generalized to men in the Southwestern United States that are at least loosely-connected to the construction industry. In addition to sampling limitations, methodological flaws also exist. Inherent problems exist with the implementation of self-report instruments. The self reported experience of intimacy, emotion, and gender role conflict can only tap into this subjective experience through language symbolizing that experience. It is important to note that this is not a direct measure of feeling, but the outcome of a set of judgments of that feeling or experience (Shields, 2000). The data collected should not be confused for the experience itself. Furthermore, though unavoidable, the behavior of reporting one's experience inherently taps into matters of expressivity, and, thus, is subject to the potential internal and external threats that one experiences as a result of acknowledging these experiences and placing a value judgment on them. It is naïve to think that assurances of confidentiality would preclude these barriers to expressivity.

Although general evaluations of emotional experiencing lend themselves to potential influences of cognitive schemata of gender stereotypes, there is also evidence that warrants the methodological implementation of general evaluations that span across time (versus specific episodic memories). Both the PAIR and the GRCS assess more general evaluations of emotional experiencing across time. Philippot, Schaefer, and Herbette (2003) examined differences in assessing emotionally salient material utilizing episodic memory versus semantic memory that generalizes across situations. Their findings indicated that asking about general experiences yielded closer results to daily logs (diary) than specific episodic memory reporting. They reported that episodic memory actually did not result in as accurate as more general memory due to the "strategic inhibition hypothesis" which states that one will cognitively implement defenses to protect from the emotional intensity of specific memories of specific events, but these defenses will not be recruited when asking more general questions about emotions (other than specific memories). Furthermore, semantic knowledge (general) is considered "tightly organized and is thought to be relatively immune to interference and forgetting" (Robinson & Clore, 2002, p.199). That is, semantic knowledge draws on different cognitive processes than episodic memory and is therefore influenced by different filters and memory strategies.

The complexity of this construct and its multiple sources of variation warrant a more complex model, including the integration of contextual variables (Enns, 2008; O'Neil, 2008; Wester, 2008). The inclusion of moderators and mediators may also prove useful in understanding how some men experience different levels of GRC at

different times and how other men experience GRC at more attenuated levels (Heppner & Heppner, 2008; O'Neil, 2008)

Due to the limitation of the GRCS measuring conflictual dimensions of masculinity, this may present a limited view of outcomes related to the male gender role. It is recommended that future studies (qualitative and quantitative) and instruments measuring aspects of male gender roles also incorporate a lens to view the healthy and adaptive aspects of men's gender roles (O'Neil, 2008; Twohey & Ewing, 1995).

Future recommendations

Future research is also needed to operationalize and examine men's unique experience of intimacy in romantic relationships, with male and female friends, and family members to further our understanding of the relationship between gender role conflict and intimacy across dynamics. Furthermore, it could prove useful to explore what elements actually contribute toward increased feelings of intimacy and/or safety to express emotions more freely which align with more masculine avenues of closeness. Perhaps qualitative studies exploring these experiences may contribute to more accurately operationalizeable instruments geared more toward men's phenomenological experience.

As the intimacy instrument was intended, it may prove informative to look at differences between couples' assessment of where they actually are and where they ideally would have their level of intimacy. Fischer (1997) found the fear of intimacy to be related with gender role conflict. It may also prove informative to look at men

who are not in a romantic relationship and delineate the effects of traditional masculine gender role on a man's willingness to even enter into a romantic dynamic where one has the expectation of the need to express oneself emotionally.

Research could also focus on the impact of gender role conflict in the context of counseling process and outcome. Discussion of congruencies or disparages of appropriate male (and female) gender roles between counselor and client could facilitate improved therapeutic alliances, less resistance, and elucidation of transference and countertransference reactions.

Regarding theory development, findings in this study suggest building a model of gender role development in the context of significant relationships as there is likely a bidirectional influence of social construction. Longitudinal research should prove useful to determine and demarcate the course of intimacy across the life of a romantic relationship. Tracking men as well as women in these relationships may show that different levels of emotional expressiveness affect the respective gender to different degrees and in different behavioral correlates throughout the relationship's lifespan.

References

Addis, M. E. & Cohane, G. H. (2005). Social scientific paradigms of masculinity and their implications for research and practice in men's mental health. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 6, 633-647.

Allen, J. G. & Haccoun, D. M. (1976). Sex differences in emotionality: a multidimensional approach. Human Relations, 29, 711-722.

Antill, J. K. (1983). Sex role complimentarity versus similarity in married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 145-155.

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126,* 651-680.

Averill, J. R. (1983). Studies on anger and aggression: implications for theories of emotion. *American Psychologist, 38,* 1145-1160.

Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N., & Pleck, J. (1991). Men's multiple roles and their relationship to men's psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 348-367.

Barnett, R. C., Davidson, H., & Marshall, N. (1991). Physical symptoms and the interplay of work and family roles. *Health Psychology, 10,* 94-101.

Barrett, L. F., Robin, L., Pietromonaco, P. R., Eyssell, K. M. (1998). Are women the "more emotional" sex? Evidence from emotional experiences in social context. *Cognition and Emotion, 12,* 555-578.

Baumeister, R. F, & Sommer, K. L. (1997). What do men want?: Gender differences and two spheres of belongingness: comment on Cross and Madson (1997). *Psychological Bulletin, 122,* 38-44.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42,* 155-162.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: a cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88,* 354-364.

Birnbaum, D. W. (1983). Preschooler's stereotypes about sex differences in emotionality: a reaffirmation. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 143,* 139-140.

Birnbaum, D. W., Croll, W. L. (1984). The etiology of children's stereotypes about sex differences in emotionality. *Sex Roles, 10,* 677-691.

Birnbaum, D. W., Noshanchuk, T. A., & Croll, W. L. (1980). Children's stereotypes of about sex differences in emotionality. *Sex Roles, 6,* 435-443.

Blazina, C., Watkins, C. E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*, 461-465.

Blier, M. J.,Blier-Wilson, L. A. (1989). Gender differences in self-rated emotional expressiveness. *Sex Roles, 21*, 287-295.

Bly, Robert (1990). *Iron John: A Book about Men*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Boehm, S., Selves, E. J., Raleigh, E., Ronis, D., Butler, P. M., & Jacobs, M. (1993). College students' perception of vulnerability/susceptibility and desire for health information. *Patient Education and Counseling, 21*, 77-87.

Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: our culture's blueprint for manhood and what it's done for us lately. In D. David and R. Brannon (Eds.), *The Forty-nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role* (1st Edition, pp. 1-48). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brannon, R. and Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. *Psychological Documents, 14,* (University Microfilms No. 2612).

Brisco, M. (1982). Sex differences in psychological well-being. *Psychological Medicine, Monograph Supplement, 1*, 1-46.

Brody, L. R. (1997). Gender and emotion: beyond stereotypes. *Journal of Social Issues, 53 (2),* 369-394.

Brody, L. R. & Hall, J. A. (1993). Gender and emotion. In M. Lewis and J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (1st Edition, pp. 447-460). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, E. E., & Rosencrantz, D. S. (1972). Sex role stereotypes: a current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues, 28*, 59-78.

Bussey, K., Bandura, A (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review, 106*, 676-713.

Camarena, P. M., Sarigiani, P. A., Petersen, A. C. (1990). Gender-specific pathways to intimacy in early adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 19*, 19-32.

Caldwell, M. A., & Peplau, L. A. (1982). Sex differences in same-sex friendship. *Sex Roles, 8,* 721-732.

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

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Consedine, N. S., Magai, C., Bonnano, G. A. (2002). Moderators of the emotion inhibition-health relationship: a review and research agenda. Review of General Psychology, 6, 204-228.

Cournoyer, R. J., & Mahalik, J. R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42,* 11-19.

Courtenay, W.H. (2001). Engendering health. a social constructionist examination of men's health beliefs and behaviors. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1,* 4-15.

Crandall, C. S., Schiffhauer, K. L., and Harvey, R. (1997). Friendship pair similarity as a measure of group value. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 1,* 133-143.

Cusack, J., Deane, F. P., Wilson, C. J., & Ciarrochi, J. (2006). Emotional expression, perceptions of therapy, and help-seeking intentions in men attending therapy services. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 7,* 69-82.

Demasio, A. R. (1994). Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Dindia, K., & Allen, M. (1992). Sex differences in self-disclosure: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 106-124.

Eisler, R. M. (1995). The relationship between masculine gender role stress and men's health risk: the validation of a construct. In R. F. Levant and W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A New Psychology of Men* (1st Ed., pp. 229-252). New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Eisenberg, N., & Lennon, R. (1983). Sex differences in empathy and related capacities. *Psychological bulletin, 94,* 100-131.

Englar-Carlson, M. (2006). Masculine norms and the therapy process. In M. Englar-Carlson and M. A. Stevens (Eds.), *In the Room with Men: A*

Casebook of Therapeutic Change (1st Ed., pp. 13-47). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Enns, C. Z. (2008). Toward a complexity paradigm for understanding gender role conflict. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 446-454.

Fagot, B. I., Rodgers, C. S., and Leinbach, M. D. (2000). Theories of gender socialization. In T. Eckes and H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The Developmental Social Psychology of Gender* (1st Edition, pp. 65-90).

Field, T. (1978). Interaction behaviors of primary versus secondary caretaker fathers. *Developmental Psychology, 14*, 183-184.

Fischer, A. R., Good, G. E. (1997). Men and psychotherapy: an investigation of alexithymia, intimacy, and masculine gender roles. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 34*, 160-170.

Fischer, A. R., Tokar, D. M., Good, G. E., & Snell, A. F. (1998). More on the structure of male role norms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 135-155.

Fivush, R. (1989). Exploring sex differences in the emotional content of the mother-child conversations about the past. *Sex Roles, 20*, 675-691.

Fuchs, D., & Thelen, M. (1988). Children's expected interpersonal consequences of communicating their affective state and reported likelihood of expression. *Child Development, 59*, 1314-1322.

Galambos, N. L., Almeida, D. M., Petersen, A. C. (1990). Masculinity, femininity, asn sex role attitudes in early adolescence: exploring gender intensification. Child Development, 61, 1905-1914.

Goldberg, C. (2000). Basic emotional communication (BEC) for intimate relating: guidelines for dialogue. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 30*, 61-70.

Golombok, S., Fivush, R. (1994). Gender Development. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Good, G. E. (1995). Missing an underrepresented aspect of men's lives. *SPSMM bulletin, 3*, 1-2.

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

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

Good, G. E., Thomson, D. A., Brathwaite, A. D. (2005). Men and therapy: critical concepts, theoretical frameworks, and research recommendations. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*, 699-711.

Good, G. E., & Mintz, L. B. (1990). Depression and the male gender role: evidence for compounded risk. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 17-21.

Gottman, J. M., Levenson, R. W. (1988). The social psychophysiology of marriage. In N. Patricia and M. A. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *Perspectives on Marital Interaction, I*, (1st Ed., pp. 182-200). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Greenberg, L. S. (2002). Integrating an emotion-focused approach to treatment into psychotherapy integration. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 12*, 154-189.

Grossman, M., Wood, W. (1993). Sex differences in intensity of emotional experience: a social role interpretation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 1010-1022.

Hanson, S. (1988). Divorced fathers with custody. In P. Bronstein and C. P. Cowan (Eds.), *Fatherhood Today: Men's Changing Role in the Family*, 166-193. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Harris, R. J. (1985). A Primer of Multivariate Statistics. New York: Academic Press.

Haviland and Malatesta (1981). The development of sex differences in nonverbal signals: Fallacies, facts, and fantasies. In C. Mayo and N. M. Henly (Eds.), Gender and NonVerbal Behavior.

Hayes, J. A. & Mahalik, J. R. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological distress in male counseling center clients. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1*, 116-125.

Heesacker, P. (1994). Mythopoetry, antisexism, and the zax: a reply to Foley, Good and Mintz, and Scher. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 16, 245-260.

Heesacker, P. & Prichard, S. (1992). In a different voice, revisited: men, women, and emotion. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 274-290.

Heesacker, P., Wester, S. R., Vogel, D. L., Wentzel, J. T., Mejia-Millan, C. M., Goodholm, C. R. (1999). Gender-based emotional stereotyping. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 483-495.

Heller, P. E., & Wood, B. (1998). The process of intimacy: similarity, understanding, and gender. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 24*, 273-288.

Henley, N. M. (1985). Psychology and gender. *Signs, 11*, 101-119.

Heppner, P. P. & Heppner, M. J. (2008). The gender role conflict literature: Fruits of sustained commitment. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 455-461.

Jansz, J. (2000). Masculine identity and restrictive emotionality. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and Emotion* (1st. Ed., pp. 166-186). New York, NY, US: University Press.

Jakupcak, M., Salters, K., Gratz, K. L., Roemer, L. (2003). Masculinity and emotionality: an investigation of men's primary and secondary emotional responding. *Sex Roles, 49*, 111-120.

Jung, C. (1969). The stages of life. *Collected Works, 6*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jung, C. (1971). Psychological types. *Collected Works, 6*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Keltner, Ellsworth, Edwards (1993). Beyond simple pessimism: effects of sadness and anger on social perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,64*, 740-752.

Kenrick, D. T. (1987). Gender, genes, and the social environment: a biosocial interactionist perspective. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 7*, 14-43.

Kessler, R. C., McGonagle, K. A., Zhao, S., Nelson, C. B., Hughes, M., Eshelman, S., et al. (1994). Lifetime and 12-month prevalence of DSM-III-R psychiatric disorders in the United States: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 51*, 8-19.

Kurdek, L. A., Schmitt, J. P. (1986). Interaction of sex role self-concept with relationship quality and relationship beliefs in married, heterosexual cohabitating, gay, and lesbian couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 365-370.

LaFrance, M. & Banji, M. (1992). Toward a reconsideration of the gender-emotion relationship. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Emotion and Social Behavior* (1st Ed., pp.178-201). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Laurenceau, J., Rivera, L. M., Schaffer, A. R., & Pietromonaco, P.R. (2004). Intimacy as an interpersonal process: current status and future directions. In D. J. Mashek & A.P. Aron (Eds.), *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy* (1st Ed., pp. 61-78). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York, NY: Springer.

Levant, R. F. (1996a). The new psychology of men. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 27,* 259-265.

Levant, R. F. (1996b). The crisis of connection between men and women. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 5*, 1-12.

Levant, R. F. (2001). Desperately seeking language: understanding, assessing, and treating normative male alexithymia. In M. Englar-Carlson and M. Stevens (Eds.), *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men: A comprehensive guide to settings, problems, and treatment approaches, Vol. 1 & 2* (1st Ed., 424-443). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Levant, R. F., Good, G. E., Cook, S. W., O'Neil, J. M., Smalley, K. B., Owen, K., Richmond, K. (2006). The normative alexithymia scale: measurement of a gender-linked syndrome. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*, 212-224.

Levant, R. F., & Kopecky, G. (1995). *Masculinity Reconstructed*. New York, NY: Dutton.

Levant, R. F., Richmond, K. (2005). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the male role norms inventory. *See reference- consult APA*

Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Majors, R.G., Inclan, J. E., Rossello, J. M., Heesacker, M., Rowan, G. T., Sellars, A. (2003). A multicultural investigation of masculinity ideology and alexithymia. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4*, 91-99.

Levant, R. F. (1992). Toward a reconstruction of masculinity. In R. F. Levant and W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *New Psychology of Men* (1st Ed. pp.229-251). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Levenson, R. W., Cartensen, L. L., Gottman, J. M. (1994). Influcen of age and gender on affect, physiology, and their interrelations: a study of long-term marriages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 56-68.

Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: a meta-anaylsis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109*, 267-296.

Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships: a developmental account. *American Psychologist, 45,* 513-520.

Macklin, E. D. (1983). Effect of changing sex roles on the intimate relationships of men and women. *Marriage and Family Review, 6,* 97-113.

Mahalik, J. R. (1999). Interpersonal psychotherapy with men who experience gender role conflict. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 30,* 5-13.

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

Mahalik, J. R., Good, G. E., Englar-Carlson, M. (2003). Masculinity scripts, presenting concerns, and help seeking: implications for practice and training. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 34,* 123-131.

Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Theodore, H., Cournoyer, R. J., Llody, B. F. (2001). A cross-national and cross-sectional comparison of men's gender role conflict and its relationship to social intimacy and self-esteem. *Sex Roles, 45,* 1-14.

Manstead, A. S. R. (1992). Gender differences in emotion. In A. Gale and M. W. Eysenck (Eds.), Handbook of Individual Differences: Biological Perspectives (1st Edition, pp. 355-387). Oxford, England: John Wiley and Sons.

Mazur, E., Olver, R. R. (1987). Intimacy and structure: sex differences in imagery of same-sex relationships. *Sex Roles, 16,* 539-558.

McCarthy, J., Holliday, E. L. (2004). Help-seeking and counseling within a traditional male gender role: an examination from a multicultural perspective. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 82,* 25-30.

Mead, Margaret (1935). Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies. New York, NY:Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.

Miller, R. S. & Lefcourt, H. M. (1982). The assessment of social intimacy. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 46,* 514-518.

Moradi, B., Tokar, D. M., Schaub, M., aJome, L. M., Serna, G. S. (2000). Revisiting the structural validity of the gender role conflict scale. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1,* 62-69.

Notarius, C. I., Johnson, J. S. (1982). Emotional expression in husbands and wives. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44,* 483-489.

O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of Gender role conflict and strain: sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *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. B. Levy (Eds.), *Men in Transition: Changing Male Roles, Theory, and Therapy*, (1st Ed., pp. 5-44). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: college men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335-350.

O'Neil, J. M., Egan, J. (1992). Men's gender role transitions over the life span: transformations and fears of femininity. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 305-324

O'Neil, J. M., Good, G. E., Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: new paradigms for empirical research. In R. F. Levant and W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *New Psychology of Men* (1st Ed. pp.164-206). New York, NY: Basic Books.

O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the Gender Role Conflict Scale. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 358-445.

Pederson, E. L., & Vogel, D. L. (2007). Male gender role conflict and willingness to seek counseling: Testing a mediation model on college-aged men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 373-384.

Pennebaker, J. (1989). Confession, inhibition, and disease. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 22*. 211-244.

Pennebaker, J., Kiecolt-Glaser, J. and Glaser, R. (1988). Disclosures of trauma and immune infection. Health implication for psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 239-245.

Petrie, K. J., Fontanilla, I., Thomas, M. G. (2004). Effect of written emotional expression on immune function in patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection: a randomized trial. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 66*, 272-275.

Philippot, P., Schaefer, A., & Herbette, G. (2003). Consequences of specific processing of emotional information: Impact of general versus specific autobiographical memory priming on emotion elicitation. *Emotion, 3*, 270-283.

Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The Myth of Masculinity* (1st Ed.). Cambridge, MA, US: MIT Press.

Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: an update. In R. F. Levant and W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *New Psychology of Men* (1st Ed. pp. 11-32). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity Ideology and its correlates. In B. C. McVicker and J. K. Norem (Eds., 1st Edition), *The Gender and Psychology Reader*, 308-326. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Radin, N. (1994). Primary caregiving fathers in intact families. In A. Gottfried and A. Gottfired (Eds.), *Redefining Familiesfor Children's Development*, 11-54. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Rehman, U. S. & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2006). A cross-cultural analysis of the demand-withdraw marital interaction observing couples from a developing country. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74*, 755-766.

Richardson, D. S. (2005). The myth of female passivity: Thirty years of revelations about female aggression. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 238-247.

Richey, M. H. & Richey, H. W. (1980). The significance of best-friend relationships in adolescence. *Psychology in the Schools, 17*, 536-540.

Roberts, T., Pennebaker, J. W. (1995). Gender differences in perceiving internal state: toward a his-and-hers model of perceptual cue use. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, 27*, (1st Ed., pp. 143-175). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.

Robinson, M. D. & Clore, G. L. (2002). Episodic and semantic knowledge in emotional self-report: Evidence for two judgment processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 198-215.

Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science, 3*, 184-256. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Schaefer, M. T. & Olson, D. H. (1981). Assessing intimacy: the PAIR inventory. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy,7*, 47-60.

Scher, M. (1981). Men in hiding: a challenge for the counselor. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*, 199-202.

Schiedel, D. G. & Marcia, J E. (1985). Ego identity, intimacy, sex role orientation, and gender. *Develepmental Psychology, 21*, 149-160.

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

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

Shields, S. A. (1987). Women, men, and the dilemma of emotion. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 7*, 229-250.

Shields, S. A. (2000). Thinking about gender, thinking about theory: gender and emotional experience. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and Emotion: Social Psychological Perspectives*, (1st Ed., pp. 3-23). New York, NY, US: University Press.

Simonsen, G., Blazina, C., Watkins, C. E. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological well-being among gay men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 85-89.

Smith, C. A. & Pope, L. K. (1992). Appraisal and emotion: the interactional contributions of dispositional and situational factors. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 14*, 32-62.

Skaggs, E. B. (1942). Sex differences in feeling and emotional disposition in a university population. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 16*, 21-27.

Slatcher, R. B., Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). How do I love thee? Let me count the words: the social effects of expressive writing. Psychological Science, 17, 660-664.

Smiler, A. P. (2004). Thirty years after the discovery of gender: psychological concepts and measures of masculinity. *Sex Roles, 50*, 15-26.

Sprecher, S., Metts, S., Burleson, B., Hatfield, E., Thompson, A. (1995). Domains of expressive interaction in intimate relationships: associations with satisfaction and commitment.

Stewart, A. J., McDermott, C. (2004). Gender in psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 519-544.

Stillson, R. W., O'Neil, J. M., & Owen, S. V. (1991). Predictors of adult men's gender-role conflict: race, class, unemployment, age, instrumentality-

expressiveness, and personal strain. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38,* 458-464.

Thompson, E. H., Grisant, C., & Pleck, J. H. (1985). Atttitudes toward the male role and their correlates. *Sex Roles, 13,* 483-489.

Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1995). Masculinity ideologies: a review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. *New Psychology of Men* (In R. F. Levant and W. S. Pollack (Eds.), 129-163. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles, 27,* 573-607.

Timmers, M., Fischer, A. H., Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Gender differences in motives for regulating emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,* 974-985.

Tognoli, J. (1980). Male friendship and intimacy across the life span. *Family Relations, 29,* 273-279.

Tolman, D. L., Spencer, R., Harmon, T., Rosen-Reynoso, M., & Striepe, M. (2004). Getting close, staying cool. In N. Way and J. Y. Chu (Eds.), *Adolescent Boys: Exploring Diverse Cultures in Boyhood*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Twohey, D. & Ewing, M. (1995). The male voice of emotional intimacy. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 17,* 54-62.

Way, N. (2004). Intimacy, desire, and distrust in the friendships of adolescent boys. In N. Way & J. Y. Chu (Eds.), *Adolescent Boys: Exploring Diverse Cultures of Boyhood*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Wester, S. R. (2008). Thinking complexly about men, gender role conflict, and counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36,* 462-468.

Wester, S. R. & Vogel, D. L. (2002). Working with the masculine mystique: male gender role conflict, counseling self-efficacy, and the training of male psychologists. *Professional Psychology, Research, and Practice, 33,* 370-376.

Wester, S. R., Vogel, D. L, Pressly, P. K., Heesacker, M. (2002). Sex differences in emotion: a critical review of the literature and implications for counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 30,* 630-652.

Whalen, P. J., Rausch, S. L., Etcoff, N. L., McInerny, S., Lee, M. B., & Jenike, M. A. (1998). Masked presentations of emotional facial expressions modulate

amygdala activity without explicit knowledge. *Journal of Neuroscience, 18,* 411-418.

Whiting, B., Edwards, C. (1988). Children of Different Worlds: The Formation of Social Behavior. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wong, Y. J., Pituch, K. A., & Rochlen, A. B. (2006). Men's restrictive emotionality: An investigation of associations with other emotion-related contstructs, anxiety, and underlying dimensions. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7,* 113-126.

Wong, Y. J., Rochlen, A. B. (2005). Demystifying men's emotional behavior: new directions and implications for counseling and research. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 6,* 62-72.

Wood, J. T., Inman, C. C. (1993). In a different mode: masculine styles of communicating closeness. *Journal of Applied Communication Research,21* , 279-295.

Wood, W., Rhodes, N., Whelan, M. (1989). Sex differences in positive well-being: a consideration of emotional style and marital status. *Psychological Bulletin, 106,* 249-264.

Wilcox, D. W., Forrest, L. (1992). The problems of men and counseling: gender bias or gender truth? *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14,* 291-304.

Zamarripa, M. X., Wampold, B. E., & Gregory, E. (2003). Male gender role conflict, depression, anxiety: Clarification and generalizability to women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50,* 333-338.

Appendix A

Oral Description for Recruitment

Hello, My name is Scott Rainwater. I am a doctoral candidate in Counseling Psychology. I am conducting a study looking at aspects of the male gender role and how it relates to different dimensions of intimacy. I am interested in learning about and improving romantic relationships. Participants that qualify for this study include men who have been in a romantic relationship for over 6 months in the past year. All results will be completely anonymous. Your name will not be associated with the packet once completed. Thank you so much for your consideration and time. If you agree to participate, I will need you to fill out this consent form and the following research packet.

Appendix B

University of Oklahoma
Institutional Review Board
Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Project Title:	An Examination of the Dimensions of Intimacy and Male Gender Role Conflict
Principal Investigator:	Scott M. Rainwater, M.Ed.
Department:	Educational Psychology

You are being asked to volunteer for this research study. This study is being conducted at The University of Oklahoma. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a male college student who has been in a romantic relationship for over 6 months in the past year.

Please read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

Purpose of the Research Study

The purpose of this study is: to better understand what influences a male's experience of romantic relationships.

Number of Participants

About 100 people will take part in this study.

Procedures

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

Fill out some questionnaires asking about your experience.

Length of Participation

This should take less than thirty minutes to complete.

This study has the following risks:

There are no anticipated risks other than exposure to possibly emotional material.

Benefits of being in the study are

None

Confidentiality

In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you without your permission. Research records will be stored securely and only approved researchers will have access to the records.

There are organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis. These organizations include the OU Institutional Review Board.

Compensation

You will be reimbursed for your time and participation in this study. Extra credit will be awarded to you per your professor's discretion. If you decide to withdraw from this study prior to completion of these instruments, you will still be compensated fully.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you withdraw or decline participation, you will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the study. If you decide to participate, you may decline to answer any question and may choose to withdraw at any time.

Contacts and Questions

If you have concerns or complaints about the research, the researcher(s) conducting this study can be contacted at 918-407-4610 or rainwater@ou.edu. My advisor's name is Cal Stoltenberg, Ph.D. His number is 405-325-5974 and his email address is cstoltenberg@ou.edu.

Contact the researcher(s) if you have questions or if you have experienced a research-related injury.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than individuals on the research team or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records. If you are not given a copy of this consent form, please request one.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received satisfactory answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature Date

Appendix C

Gender Role Conflict Scale

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. Moving up the company ladder is important to me. _____
2. I have difficulty telling others I care about them. _____
3. Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me. _____
4. I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health. _____
5. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man. _____
6. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand. _____
7. Affection with other men makes me tense. _____
8. I sometimes define my personal value by my career success. _____
9. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people. _____
10. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky. _____
11. My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life. _____
12. I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success. _____
13. Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me. _____
14. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man. _____
15. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner. _____
16. Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable. _____
17. Finding time to relax is difficult for me. _____
18. Doing well all the time is important to me. _____
19. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings. _____
20. Hugging other men is difficult for me. _____
21. I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me. _____
22. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior. _____
23. Competing with others is the best way to succeed. _____
24. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth. _____
25. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling. _____
26. I am sometimes hesitant to show affection to other men because of how others might perceive me. _____
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. _____
33. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable. _____
34. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me. _____
35. Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women). _____
36. Overwork, and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life. _____
37. I like to feel superior to other people. _____

Appendix D
Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships

Please respond in the way you feel/felt when in the relationship.

0	1	2	3	4
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

1. My partner listens to me when I need to someone to talk to. _____
2. We enjoy spending time with other couples. _____
3. I am satisfied with the level of affection in our relationships. _____
4. My partner helps me clarify my thoughts and feelings. _____
5. We enjoy the same recreational activities. _____
6. My partner has all of the qualities I've always wanted in a mate. _____
7. I can state my feelings with him/her getting defensive. _____
8. As a couple, we usually "keep to ourselves." _____
9. I feel our level of affection is just routine. _____
10. When having a discussion, it seems we have little in common. _____
11. I share in few of my partner's interests. _____
12. There are times when I do not feel a great deal of love and affection for my partner. _____
13. I often feel distant from my partner. _____
14. We have few friends in common. _____
15. I am able to tell my partner when I want sexual intimacy. _____
16. I feel "put-down" in a serious conversation with my partner. _____
17. We like playing and having fun together. _____
18. Every new thing I have learned about my partner has pleased me. _____
19. My partner can really understand my hurts and joys. _____
20. Having time together with friends is an important part of our shared activities. _
21. Because of my partner's lack of caring, I "hold back" my sexual interest. _____
22. I feel it is useless to discuss some things with my partner. _____
23. We enjoy the out-of-doors together. _____
24. My partner and I understand each other completely. _____
25. I feel neglected at times by my partner. _____
26. Many of my partner's closest friends are also my closest friends. _____
27. Sexual expression is an essential part of our relationship. _____
28. My partner seldom tries to change my ideas. _____
29. We seldom find time to do fun things together. _____
30. My partner has some negative traits that bother me. _____
31. I sometimes feel lonely when we're together. _____
32. My partner disapproves of some of my friends. _____
33. My partner seems disinterested in sex. _____
34. We have an endless number of things to talk about. _____
35. We share few of the same interests. _____
36. I have some needs that are not being met by my relationship. _____

Appendix E

Demographic Sheet

(circle one)

Highest Level of Education (circle one): Some High School

High School Diploma/GED Some College Associate's Degree

Bachelor's Degree Master's Ph. D/Psy D/MD/JD/ Or Equivalent

With what ethnicity do you identify?

_____

Age _____

Highest Level of Education of your parent(s)? _____

# of siblings you grew up with in your household _____ brothers ____ sisters _____

Growing up as a child, what SocioEconomic Status did your family belong to? (circle one)

Lower Class / Lower Middle Class / Upper Middle Class / Upper Class

Appendix F

Correlational Matrices

Pearson Sig. 2 tail	RE	RABBM	SUCC	CBWF	GRCS
RE					
RABBM	.598 .000				
SUCC	.305 .002	.347 .000			
CBWF	.311 .002	.336 .001	.390 .000		
GRCS	.768 .000	.761 .000	.744 .000	.639 .000	
Recreat Intimacy	-.157 .118	-.090 .368	-.066 .516	-.124 .220	-.143 .156
Emotion Intimacy	-.252 .011	-.105 .296	-.047 .642	-.141 .162	-.199 .047
Social Intimacy	-.242 .015	-.179 .073	-.071 .484	-.153 .130	-.206 .040
Sexual Intimacy	-.436 .000	-.203 .042	-.122 .226	-.184 .067	-.340 .001
Intellect Intimacy	-.212 .033	-.043 .670	-.064 .524	-.102 .315	-.160 .112
Intimacy Total Score	-.343 .000	-.163 .104	-.095 .349	-.180 .074	-.274 .006

RE = restrictive emotionality, RABBM = restrictive affectionate behavior between men, SUCC = success, power, and competition, CBWF = Conflict between work and family, GRCS = gender role conflict total score

Appendix F cont'd

Pearson Sig. 2 tail	Recreat Intimacy	Emot Int	Soc Int	Sex Int	Intlcl Int
Emotion	.560 .000				
Social	.210 .035	.398 .000			
Sexual	.569 .000	.762 .000	.389 .000		
Intellect	.602 .000	.785 .000	.419 .000	.640 .000	
Intotal	.702 .000	.900 .000	.615 .000	.870 .000	.861 .000