MASCULINE IDEOLOGY, PERSONALITY FUNCTIONING, & MEN'S INTERNAL REPRESENTATIONS OF SELF AND OTHER

by

JASON MICHAEL ROYAL

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Clinical Psychology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
The City University of New York

2013

This manuscript has been read and accepted
for the Graduate Faculty in Clinical Psychology
in satisfaction of the dissertation requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Steven Tuber, PhD

Date	Chair of Examining Committee
	Maureen O'Connor, PhD
Date	Executive Officer
Supervisory Committee:	Lissa Weinstein, PhD
	Arietta Slade, PhD
	Ben Harris, PhD
	Robert Grossmark, PhD

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

MASCULINE IDEOLOGY, PERSONALITY FUNCTIONING,

& MEN'S INTERNAL REPRESENTATIONS OF SELF AND OTHER

by

Jason Michael Royal

Advisor: Steven Tuber, PhD

This study investigated whether men with differing levels of masculine ideology, i.e., differing degrees of conformity to traditional masculine norms, would also differ on degree of psychological mindedness and other variables of personality functioning. This study's sample included 87 participants (N = 87), all of whom were male undergraduates at a major urban college and at least 18 years old. Correlational analyses were performed using data for several measures, including the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (which assesses masculine ideology across 11 domains), the Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness, the Need for Closure Scale, and the Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test. Qualitative analyses were also performed using projective (TAT) data from 11 participants (N = 11), combined with self-report data on personality functioning. This study found that specific domains of masculine ideology, related to avoidance of emotional expression, intimacy, and interdependence, correlated negatively and significantly with psychological mindedness. In addition, several domains of masculine ideology correlated significantly with the need for cognitive closure. However, the direction of these correlations was not uniform. Need for closure (relative intolerance of ambiguity) correlated positively with men's desire to appear unambiguously heterosexual and with men's interest in being viewed as high

status. In contrast, men who were more attracted to risk and less averse to violent confrontation reported less need for cognitive closure (i.e., a greater tolerance of ambiguity). These findings suggest that differences in masculine ideology may well index differences in personality functioning, including psychological mindedness and tolerance of ambiguity. However, these findings also suggest that personality functioning may vary significantly between domains of masculine ideology. The global construct of masculine ideology may therefore be too broad to meaningfully capture salient inter-individual differences in personality functioning. Indeed, qualitative findings of this study suggest that the meaning of masculine identity serves varying functions within the self-concept of individual men. Such differences are likely crucial when using the construct of masculine ideology, for example, to inform clinical intervention. Future research should investigate temperamental, developmental, and socio-cultural determinants of specific domains of masculine ideology, especially in relation to psychological distress and resilience.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my advisor and dissertation chair, Steven Tuber, for his inspired teaching, guidance, and warm support throughout my training and especially while completing this dissertation. I also want to thank Lissa Weinstein and Arietta Slade, two of my teachers (and dissertation committee members) who, along with Steve, have shaped my fundamental understanding of what it means to be a clinical psychologist. My dissertation readers, Robert Grossmark and Ben Harris, contributed greatly as well, each in his own way, to the rich discussion of my dissertation defense and to my overall training experience. Beyond my teachers, I want to thank my colleagues-in-training who have become dear friends over these six years—most especially Jane Caflisch, Patricia Yoon, Steven Anen, Lauren DeMille, and Jeff Erbe. They fanned my fervor to keep going while offering laughs, inspiration, and solice in the bargain. Most of all, I want to thank my partner, Arthur Lubow, whose encouraging voice was the tipping point for my plunge into another doctoral degree, and who weathered my long days and graduate student complaints for all these years with love, support, and astounding good nature ("too good!"). I would not have reached this place without him. Finally, I want to acknowledge many others—my parents, family, friends, and several wonderful clinical supervisors—who are not named here, but who were often in my thoughts along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Two men can appear to be traditionally "masculine" to a comparable degree in their gender presentation. Empirical research on the psychology of masculinity suggests, however, that of these two men, the one who more strongly believes that he must conform strictly to the "codes" of masculinity will also be more prone to various forms of psychological distress. This distress may include depression, anxiety, somatic complaints, and obsessive-compulsive symptoms, as well as difficulties with intimacy, interpersonal relationships, and regulation of aggression (Blazina, Settle, & Eddins, 2008; Cohn, Seibert, & Zeichner, 2009; Cohn & Zeichner, 2006; Cohn, Zeichner, & Seibert, 2008; Fragoso & Kashubeck, 2000; Good & Mintz, 1990; Good, Robertson, Fitzgerald, Stevens, & Bartels, 1996; Hayes & Mahalik, 2000; Jakupcak, Tull, & Roemer, 2005; Liu, Rochlen, & Mohr, 2005; Mahalik, Locke, Harry, Cournoyer, & Lloyd, 2001; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Thompkins & Rando, 2003; Wong, Pituch, & Rochlen, 2006). Many of these symptoms have also been identified within the context of differences in character structure and personality functioning between individuals. I will therefore argue that this body of research on the psychology of masculinity converges on a central question: do men with a more restrictive, rigid sense of masculine identity differ in their psychological functioning, and thus in their character structure, from men with a more flexible relationship to ideals of masculinity? The present study aims to help address this question by investigating whether men who report differing levels of conformity to masculine norms may also differ on variables related to personality functioning, including psychological mindedness and capacity to tolerate ambiguity, as well as in the quality of their object-relational (OR) representations—that is, the internal, affective-cognitive schemas that are

thought to shape perceptions of self and other, as well as expectations about interpersonal relationships.

A few concepts and distinctions are relevant to the present work. One of these is the distinction between "sex" and "gender." Following the convention in a number of fields, "sex" here will refer to the biological state of being either male or female. "Gender" will refer to the socially constructed sets of attitudes and behaviors—and ultimately identities—that are associated with masculinity, femininity, or a position in between and that are acquired through a process of socialization.

Two other concepts are also central to current research on the psychology of masculinity: "masculine ideology" and "gender-role strain." "Masculine ideology" (Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992) refers to the internalized standards of behavior, attitude, and even affective experience that define ideal masculinity for individual men. Instruments that assess masculine ideology typically measure men's beliefs about how stringently they conform, or feel they ought to conform, to their own masculine ideology. "Gender-role strain" (Pleck, 1995) refers to the forms of psychological distress that men experience either when they view themselves as failing to live up to masculine ideals or when they succeed in meeting those ideals, but at significant cost to their own human potential (O'Neil, 2008). The presence of gender-role strain presumes the presence of some level of internalized masculine ideology. Nevertheless, these two concepts are distinct (Walker, Tokar, & Fischer, 2000) and their relationship within individual men likely varies (O'Neil, 2008).

Brief History—Research on the Psychology of Masculinity[1]

Interest in measuring aspects of masculinity and femininity began in the first few decades of the last century (Pleck, 1983). Early research used empirical methodology (Pleck, 1983) to define "sex roles," the behaviors and attitudes that were thought to be uniquely associated with each sex. Such distinguishing characteristics for each sex were understood at the time to be inherent—a function of the distinct biology of men and women. By identifying questions about interests, attitudes, and behaviors for which men and women gave differing answers, researchers were able to develop "sex-typing scales", instruments whose items had more "masculine" and more "feminine" answers (Pleck, 1983). Such instruments therefore could be used to assess the degree to which individuals had achieved the appropriate "sex type" based on the net "masculinity" or "femininity" of their answers. Subsequent research used these instruments to focus on within-group differences for both sexes as well, with the aim of identifying sex-atypical personality types. This research continued through the 1960s and often focused on the putative costs—including psychopathology—of failing to develop the "appropriate" sex-role behaviors that were thought to be the mature realization of one's biological sex (Smiler, 2004).

Underpinning the sex-typing research on men was a theoretical assumption that later came to be known as the male sex role identity (MSRI) paradigm (Pleck, 1983). Loosely derived from aspects of Freud's theory of gender development, this theory suggested that although "masculine" behavior is an inherent function of being biologically male, the process of men's development nevertheless entails the active acquisition of masculine characteristics as a way of consolidating biological sex identity. Normal development for men thus was arguably viewed as a process in

[1] This overview of the research on masculinity is indebted to the excellent surveys by Pleck (1983) and Smiler (2004), particularly for work in the field done prior to the 1990s.

which individuals actively realize their own biological heritage as males of the species. Failure to acquire a critical mass of masculine characteristics, on the other hand, was thought to result in a state of "hypo-masculinity," which in turn was linked with more pathological outcomes. Eventually, "hyper-masculinity," too, was recognized as problematic, leading to juvenile delinquency, among other negative outcomes (Smiler, 2004).

Masculinity itself was understood as a single, "culture-free" construct that had its own internal coherence (Smiler, 2004). Moreover, the constructs of masculinity and femininity were understood as bipolar opposites (Pleck, 1983), a conceptualization that held sway in the field well through the 1960s. Indeed, a number of instruments that measured sex-role identity were scored by subtracting, for example, "feminine" responses from "masculine" responses to produce the overall score for masculinity. Thus any response thought to be "feminine" by definition detracted from masculinity and thus from "normality" for men (Pleck, 1983).

The 1970s, however, brought radical shifts in thinking about sex and gender. Constantinople (1973; Smiler, 2004), for example, argued convincingly that many of the findings that supposedly supported both the polarity between masculinity and femininity and associations between opposite-sex characteristics and psychopathology were highly questionable. Later, Pleck (1983) would echo and expand on this critique, demonstrating that much research on male sex-role identity was based on serious methodological flaws and ideological assumptions that were driven by the social status quo related to gender roles, rather than by valid empirical evidence.

The theoretical understanding of the relationship between masculinity and femininity shifted further with the work of Bem (1974, 1979; Smiler, 2004). This research suggested that masculinity and femininity are separate constructs, yet neither diametrically opposed nor mutually

exclusive. Moreover, individuals who scored high on indices for both masculinity and femininity were found to be the most flexible and psychologically adaptive (Bem, 1974). Some have argued that Bem's constructs of masculinity and femininity actually capture the traits of instrumentality and expressivity (Spence & Helmreich, 1980). Androgyny therefore may simply represent an optimal balance of instrumental and expressive traits that would be adaptive for anyone. Yet this fact in itself only further suggests that the understanding of specific traits, such as instrumentality and expressivity, as inherently either "masculine" or "feminine" may largely be an artifact of the social construction of gender and gender roles—an artifact that has a limited relationship with the actual capacities of members of either sex.

Roughly contemporary with the emergence of androgyny research, others began to investigate the specific characteristics of gender roles as identities that inform virtually every aspect of life (Brannon, 1976). From this line of thinking emerged the concept of "masculine ideology," the belief system of "prescriptions and proscriptions" that males feel they must follow in order to be masculine (Smiler, 2004). In an early formulation, Brannon (1976) argued that, although there may be a range of masculine "types," underlying these variations are core beliefs and attitudes that are broadly anti-feminine, focused on status, and oriented toward aggression and risk taking (Brannon, 1976; Smiler, 2004). These tenets are similar to those proposed by earlier theorists of the masculine sex role, who asserted that such characteristics were a function of biological inheritance (Morawski, 1985; Smiler, 2004). Brannon (1976), however, acknowledges that masculinity comprises a set of socially constructed, learned roles, rather than a set of biologically determined behaviors and attitudes, and moreover, that as a social construction, masculinity has built into it limitations and restrictions to lived experience that are undoubtedly

maladaptive, at least in part. Others have noted that theories of masculine ideology view masculinity neither as a bipolar opposite of femininity nor as a unipolar construct unrelated to femininity, but rather as "partially opposed" to femininity (Smiler, 2004).

Measuring masculine ideology—the degree to which men believe that certain standards of masculinity ought to be met—continues to be a fertile line of research within the field of men's psychology. Researchers have used various instruments that have been developed to study the possible associations between degree of adherence to traditional male gender roles and key aspects of psychological health in men, including the presence of psychological distress, difficulties with intimacy and loneliness, differences in attachment style, and deficits in regulation of affect, including aggression, fear, and shame. Early measures of masculine ideology include the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon & Juni, 1984), followed soon after by the Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). In the early 1990s, Levant and colleagues introduced the Male Role Norm Inventory (Levant, et al., 1992). Scores on this measure have been found to correlate notably with increased levels of alexithymia (Levant, et al., 2003). Most recently, Mahalik and colleagues have introduced the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) (Mahalik, et al., 2003a), a 94-item questionnaire that assesses the strength of men's masculine ideology across 11 factors, which range from "winning" and "emotional control" to "self-reliance," "pursuit of status," and "power over women." Various subscores of the CMNI, as well as its total score, have been found to correlate positively and significantly with measure of aggression, social dominance, hostility, social discomfort, and somatization (Mahalik, et al., 2003a).

Perhaps in light of feminists' thinking about the detrimental effects of traditional female gender roles, the 1970s and 1980s also saw an increased interest in investigating how men

themselves experienced the psychological costs of trying to live up to traditional male gender roles. An important watershed in this line of thinking appeared in 1983: Joseph Pleck's groundbreaking work, The Myth of Masculinity, a treatise that methodically and effectively dismantled the MSRI paradigm. In its place, Pleck proposed what he termed the sex-role strain (SRS) paradigm, which includes 10 propositions concerning the ways in which conventional gender roles and ideas about masculinity lead to psychological distress and social dysfunction. Other theorists—some working independently of Pleck and some using his paradigm as a point of departure—continued to conceptualize the ways in which the traditional male gender role may have a negative impact on the psychological lives of men and women.

Pleck's theoretical work has led to the development of instruments that operationalize aspects of his SRS paradigm (O'Neil, 2008). One of the first of these instruments was the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) developed by O'Neil and colleagues (O'Neil, Helms, & Gable, 1986). This scale aims to assess the degree to which men experience psychological conflict in key domains of their lives as a result of trying to live up to ideals of traditional masculinity. Here, conflict is defined as occurring "when rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles result in restriction, devaluation, or violation of others or self" (O'Neil, 2008). Subscales of the GRCS assess four factors related to issues of: success, power, and competition; restrictive emotionality; restrictions on affectionate behavior between men; and conflict between work and family relations. The GRCS has emerged as perhaps the most widely used measure within research on the psychology of masculinity, and scores on the GRCS have been found to correlate positively and significantly with various forms of psychological distress and relational dysfunction (O'Neil, 2008).

Shortly after the appearance of the GRCS, another measure, the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRS), was developed to operationalize SRS as the stress that can arise for men in situations in which they "judge themselves unable to cope with the imperatives of the male role or when a situation is viewed as requiring 'unmanly' or feminine behavior" (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). This instrument therefore measures a variation of what Pleck (1995) called "discrepancy strain," that is, the strain that arises from the cognitive awareness of a discrepancy between men's actual experience and the ideals of masculinity to which they strive to adhere. Subscales of the MGRS pose questions related to physical inadequacy, emotional inexpressiveness, subordination to women, intellectual inferiority, and performance failure (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) Scores on the MGRS have been associated with greater fear of intimacy, (Fischer & Good, 1997), fear of emotions (Jakupcak, Salters, Gratz, & Roemer, 2003), and various forms of hostility and aggression within the context of relationships (Franchina, Eisler, & Moore, 2001; Moore, et al., 2008).

Following the formulations of theorists such as Brannon and Pleck, measures of both masculine ideology and sex-role strain have been used since the early 1990s in a line of research that has investigated a wide range of possible associations between masculinity and men's experiences of psychological distress. Some twenty years of findings have shown that conforming more strictly to traditional masculinity—along with attendant experiences of conflict and stress—is indeed associated with various difficulties in psychological functioning. These difficulties fall into three broad domains: specific symptoms, such as depression and anxiety; disturbances in relational capacities, including loneliness and interpersonal conflict; and deficits in articulating, tolerating, and regulating affect, especially aggression.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW—EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Symptoms of Psychological Distress

Empirical research on the effects of traditional masculinity began with studies on depression. Good and Mintz (1990) were the first researchers to identify a significant positive correlation between depression and gender-role conflict, lending support to a theoretical link that had been proposed by a number of authors during the prior two decades. These investigators collected data from a sample of 401 male undergraduate students. They measured depression by using the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977), and they used two measures to assess aspects of the experience of male gender role: the GRCS-I along with the Attitudes Toward Men Scale (AMS; Downs & Engelson, 1982), which looks at the degree to which individuals endorse stereotypes of masculinity. The authors found that depression correlated significantly with not only overall scores on the GRCS-I, but also with all four of the subscales of the GRCS-I. Depression did not correlate significantly with scores on the AMS, however (Good & Mintz, 1990).

Other findings that supported a correlation between depression and adherence to traditional male gender roles appeared soon after in the literature. Working with a sample of 190 male undergraduates, Sharpe and Heppner (1991) used data from a battery of measures to assess the relationship between gender-role conflict (GRCS-I), depression, and anxiety, as well as between gender-role conflict, self-esteem, degree of intimacy within relationships, and satisfaction in romantic relationships. These researchers found significant positive correlations

between gender conflict and depression and anxiety, although not relationship satisfaction.[2] Another pair of investigators (Fragoso & Kashubeck, 2000), working with a sample of Mexican-American men (N=113) again identified a positive and significant correlation between depression and gender-role conflict, as well as a separate positive correlation between depression and the construct of *machismo*. In yet another study, this time working with a clinical sample, i.e., college-age men presenting at a college counseling center for treatment, Good and colleagues (1996) once more found that gender-role conflict correlated significantly with depression. In addition, Shepard (2002) found that the scores on the "restrictive emotionality" subscale of the GRCS-I correlated positively with a particular constellation of depressive symptoms—self-dislike, feelings of failure, guilt, and pessimism—as measured by the Beck Depression Inventory.

Although empirical investigation of the possible links between traditional male gender roles and men's psychological health began with depression, researchers quickly broadened the scope of their inquiry to other symptoms. Studies subsequent to the early research on depression have identified positive associations between adherence to traditional male gender roles and a wide range of symptoms, including anxiety (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Wong, et al., 2006), stress (Fragoso & Kashubeck, 2000), low self-esteem (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), obsessive-compulsivity (Good, et al., 1996; Hayes & Mahalik, 2000), increased levels of anger, hostility, and aggression (Cohn, et al., 2009; Cohn & Zeichner, 2006; Cohn, et al., 2008; Hayes & Mahalik, 2000), loneliness and social discomfort (Blazina, et al., 2008; Hayes & Mahalik, 2000;

[2] A more recent study found that women's relationship satisfaction correlates negatively with male partners' level of masculine ideology, more than does relationship satisfaction for men themselves (Burn & Ward, 2005).

Mahalik, et al., 2001), shame (Jakupcak, et al., 2005; Thompkins & Rando, 2003), "global distress" (Liu, et al., 2005) and even paranoia and psychoticism (Good, et al., 1996).

Findings have not always been consistent across studies, however. One study found no significant positive correlation between gender-role conflict and either depression or phobic anxiety (Hayes & Mahalik, 2000), although it did identify a positive correlation with levels of hostility, social discomfort, and obsessive-compulsive symptoms—all of which, however, point to the presence of underlying anxiety from a clinical diagnostic perspective. Another research group has questioned whether any link at all exists between gender-role conflict and psychological distress (Good, Heppner, DeBord, & Fischer, 2004). This group found no significant relationship between GRC and psychological distress as measured by a composite of scores for depression, anxiety, and satisfaction with social support. Good and colleagues (2004) propounded the use of more sophisticated statistical models than had been used previously, and in their own study, they used a mediational model with three variables: GRC, psychological distress, and "problem-solving appraisal." This last variable represents individuals' self-appraisal of their own problem solving abilities—rather than their actual problem solving abilities—as measured by scores on an instrument called the Problem Solving Inventory (PSI; Heppner & Petersen, 1982). These researchers found that the association between gender-role conflict and psychological distress was mediated almost entirely by scores on the PSI. These authors in turn claim that there may be no significant link between GRC and depression. However, unlike the samples in previous studies, the zero-order correlations in this sample between GRC and variables of psychological distress (depression, anxiety, and social-support satisfaction) were weak, and the correlations of GRC with depression and with social-support satisfaction were

both insignificant. The absence of strong zero-order correlations on these variables within the sample may therefore account for the lack of significance of GRC within the statistical analysis.

Despite the presence of minor inconsistencies across studies, this first wave of research largely supports a broad network of associations between the effects of adherence to traditional male gender roles and various forms of psychological distress. One could argue justifiably—as Good and colleagues do (2004)—that this first wave of research on masculinity and psychological distress is limited by the predominant use of simple correlational analyses. This first wave of research is also limited, almost certainly, by a reliance on self-report measures, as well as by a reliance on samples of men that are largely college age, middle class, and European-American. Nevertheless, the number of studies with positive findings, along with the fact that most studies use fairly large sample sizes, supports a link between maintaining idealized standards of masculinity and psychological distress. Most researchers working in this area take this link as firmly established.

Intimacy and Loneliness—Men's Object Relations and Attachment Styles

Moving beyond symptoms of general psychological distress in relation to masculinity, other researchers have looked at symptoms that men may experience specifically within the context of relationships—including intimacy, loneliness, and increased levels of interpersonal conflict. Blazina and colleagues, working from a psychoanalytic perspective, have used the theory of object relations as a framework for both generating hypotheses and interpreting data regarding men's experiences of self, others, and relationships. "Object relations" here can be defined broadly as an "individual's interactions with external and internal (real and imagined) other people, and the relationship between their internal and external object worlds" (Greenberg

& Mitchell, 1983). Drawing on the work of psychoanalytic thinkers, including Klein, Mahler, Greenson, and Stoller, Blazina and colleagues have developed an object-relations model that is specific to the process of male gender-role socialization, and they have used this model as a blueprint for empirical research on the relational correlates of male gender-role conflict, as measured with O'Neil's GRCS-I (1986). Blazina's model begins with the psychoanalytic concept of "disidentification," a process in which boys are encouraged and even pressured to move away from their mothers and ultimately to "counteridentify" with their fathers, that is, shift prematurely toward a primarily masculine identification that would repudiate, defend against, and ultimately prevent the integration of adaptive aspects of a developmentally earlier feminine identification.[3] Blazina suggests that for some boys, disidentification may occur at a developmental juncture at which they have not yet integrated their representations of self and other. This premature foreclosure of maternal intimacy, in turn, may contribute to the development of what Blazina calls the "fragile masculine self" (Blazina, 2001a), a representation of self that is "split" between conscious aspects that are rigidly masculine and other disavowed aspects that are experienced as feminine and devalued, and are therefore projected out onto others. Blazina furthermore argues that, by its very nature, disidentification interferes with completion of the separation-individuation process, and that more gender-role conflicted men may mistake counterdependence for true interdependence with intimate others, within which a

[3] An excellent contemporary psychoanalytic account of the development of masculine gender identity can be found in Diamond (2006). Here, "disidentification" is characterized as a premature and therefore fragile masculine identification that precludes the integration of aspects of boys' feminine identifications that would otherwise serve adaptive personality functioning. In contrast, a more integrated developmental process would allow for boys to move toward a masculine identification with the father and to separate from the mother while also integrating selective aspects of feminine identification.

more complete sense of individuation would be achieved. At the same time, such men may rely on exerting interpersonal control over others as a means of regulating their own psychological states. Blazina argues that, as a result, many men are caught in a world of "part-objects" that is characterized by a fear of "engulfment" through intimacy, as well as by a conflicted search for the ideal relationship that will restore the experience of "all-good" maternal care without challenging the integrity of the fragile sense of masculine self (Blazina, 2001a).

Using this theory to generate hypotheses, Blazina and colleagues have used the GRCS-I, in conjunction with various measures of loneliness, relational conflict, attachment, and separation-individuation, among other constructs, to gather empirical support for the idea that the process of male gender-role socialization can trigger a "normative developmental trauma" (Pollack, 1995), which in turn leads to impaired capacities for intimacy and affect regulation. In an early study, Blazina and Watkins (1996) found that various aspects of gender-role conflict correlated with increased levels of trait anger and anxiety, increased report of alcohol use, and a more negative attitude toward seeking psychological services.

In another study, Blazina and Watkins (2000) found that gender-role conflict was associated with greater difficulties in negotiating interpersonal boundaries, weaker parental attachments, and a preference for more traditional gender roles in women. Compared with men who scored lower on gender-role conflict, men with higher scores on gender-role conflict were more likely to report greater difficulty with forming "firm boundaries between self and others" and increased use of "splitting" as a defense mechanism, along with difficulties in relating to others, as measured by the Separation/Individuation Inventory (SII; Christenson & Wilson, 1985). In addition, men who were comparatively more inhibited and fearful toward emotional

expression—as measured by the "restrictive emotionality" subscale of the GRCS-I—were more likely to report weaker attachments to parents on the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). At the same time, men with higher levels of gender-role conflict were more likely to prefer women who adhered to more traditional feminine role models. A canonical-correlation analysis showed that men with more flexible attitudes about gender roles and a lower degree of restrictive emotionality were less likely to experience difficulties with differentiation of self and other and with relationships. (Blazina & Watkins, 2000) In a later re-analysis of the attachment-related data from this study that was collected using the IPPA, Blazina (2001) found that although men with higher levels of gender-role conflict were more likely to report that they "trusted" their parents, these men were also more likely to feel "alienated" from their parents and to have greater difficulty "communicating" with them (Blazina, 2001b).

More recently, Blazina and colleagues (2008) have found that gender-role conflict correlates with loneliness and relational conflict with parents. The authors found that men with higher levels of gender-role conflict were comparatively more likely to experience loneliness within the context of a broad range of interpersonal relationships (Differential Loneliness Scale; Schmidt & Sermat, 1983). They were also comparatively more likely to experience difficulties with "psychological separation" (Psychological Separation Inventory; Hoffman, 1984), including conflictual relationships with both parents, in which they experienced higher levels of "mistrust, guilt, resentment, and anger" than do less gender-role conflicted men within their parental relationships. However, these men were comparatively more likely to achieve lower levels of "attitudinal independence" from their fathers, i.e., they were less likely to develop "attitudes,

values, and beliefs" that were distinct from their fathers (Blazina, et al., 2008). All of these findings in relation to gender-role conflict were also identified in a previous study by Blazina and colleagues (2007) in relation to the degree to which men ascribe to a more traditional "masculine ideology," as measured with Thompson and Pleck's Male Role Norms Scale (1986).

Taken together, the findings of Blazina and colleagues suggest that men with higher levels of gender-role conflict are at greater risk than less gender-role conflicted men for relational impairments, including more loneliness, more conflicted, less intimate relationships with parents, more difficulties with anger and anxiety. Such men were also more likely to use the primitive defense of "splitting," a finding that echoes previously identified positive associations between higher levels of gender-role conflict and the use of primitive defenses (Mahalik, Cournoyer, DeFranc, Cherry, & Napolitano, 1998). Blazina and colleagues interpret all of these findings as potential sequelae both of disrupted separation-individuation and of the process of male gender-role socialization.

A few studies have also looked at the relationship between masculinity, gender role–related strain, and constructs related to attachment style. Fischer and Good (1998) compared men's levels of gender-role stress and conflict with the quality of their relationships with parents. The quality of parental relationships was assessed in this study using two instruments that were developed as an extension of attachment theory: the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) and the Parental Attachment Questionnaire (Kenny & Donaldson, 1987). Canonical-correlation analysis revealed that men with more secure attachments to parents were more likely to report lower levels of gender-role conflict and stress (Fischer & Good, 1998). DeFranc and Mahalik (2002) carried out a study similar to that of Fischer and Good

(1998), except that these researchers asked men themselves to characterize their fathers' level of gender-role conflict and stress. They found that men who viewed their fathers as having lower levels of gender-role conflict and stress were also more likely to report greater security in their attachment to parents, including lower levels of conflict, particularly with their fathers (Fischer & Good, 1998). Schwartz and colleagues (2004) used a different self-report measure to assess men's attachment styles, the Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). This group's major finding was that men with more a more secure attachment style had lower levels of restrictive emotionality—as measured by a subscale of the Gender-Role Conflict Scale—than did men with preoccupied, dismissing, or fearful styles of attachment (Schwartz, Waldo, & Higgins, 2004). "Restrictive emotionality" here is defined as the presence of "restrictions and fears about expressing one's feelings as well as restrictions in finding words to express basic emotions" (O'Neil, 2008). More recently, men's attachment styles have been investigated in relation to aggression within the context of intimate relationships. Mahalik and colleagues (2005), using the Relationship Questionnaire, along with measures of gender-role stress and controlling behaviors, looked at the relationship between attachment style and controlling behaviors in a sample of men who batter their partners. This group found that both a fearful attachment style and gender-role stress positively predicted levels of controlling behaviors within the context of relationships. Moreover, they found that the relationship between a fearful attachment style and controlling behaviors was partially mediated by gender-role stress (Mahalik, Aldarondo, Gilbert-Gokhale, & Shore, 2005).

Interpreted together, these research findings on masculinity, object relations, and attachment style suggest close connections between all three domains. Most intriguing, this body

of research implies potential links between the quality of men's gender-role identity—whether rigid or flexible—and the quality of early development within the context of parental relationships, as indexed by attachment style and degree of separation-individuation. These findings therefore may represent an important addition to the broader program of research on masculinity, because they point to a model of masculine gender-role socialization that takes into account not only the effects on individual men of society's norms regarding masculinity, but also the variability of how those norms are understood and internalized by individuals, a variability that may be a function of the early developmental environment and the quality of the interaction between parents and child.

Despite the valuable contribution of these studies, however, they suffer from a few key methodological drawbacks. For instance, many of these studies use multiple instruments to measure overlapping constructs, such as gender-role conflict and masculine gender-role stress. Interpretation of results thus becomes difficult because where these related constructs overlap and where they differ has never been established definitively. Indeed, many of the measures used to study the psychology of masculinity correlate with each other to a high degree (Walker, et al., 2000), but how such correlations do or do not translate into identity between the constructs measured remains largely unknown. In addition, a number of these studies rely on canonical-correlation analysis, perhaps to sort out the complexity that stems from using numerous measures of related constructs. Canonical-correlation analysis seems relatively well-suited to identifying "broad strokes" within the relationships between numerous variables. However, such analyses give little support to building more detailed theoretical models that would both explain

relationships between constructs and help in developing more sophisticated hypotheses for further research.

Alexithymia, Restrictive Emotionality, and Affect Regulation

A number of investigators have examined the relationship between masculinity, alexithymia, and restrictive emotionality. Fischer and Good (1997), for example, found in a nonclinical sample that adherence to traditional masculine gender values—measured with two instruments, the GRCS-I (gender-role conflict) and the MGRS (masculine gender-role stress)—accounted for significant variance in men's self-reported levels of alexithymia, as measured by the Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS; Bagby, Parker, & Taylor, 1994). Levant and colleagues (2005), also working with a nonclinical sample, found that levels of alexithymia correlated with all subtests on the Male Role Norms Inventory, which assesses the degree of belief in traditional male roles (i.e., masculine ideology). Levels of alexithymia correlated as well with two subscales on the GRCS-I, those measuring "restrictive emotionality" and "restrictive affectionate behavior between men." A third research group, this one working with a clinical sample of veterans diagnosed with PTSD (Jakupcak, Osborne, Michael, McFall, & Cook, 2006), found that levels of masculine gender-role stress accounted for 16% of the variance in levels of alexithymia, meaning that the presence of masculine gender-role stress and alexithymia are linked to a statistically significant degree, although other factors are also likely to be involved in the degree to which alexithymia is present, beyond masculine gender-role stress. These findings are complemented by a recent meta-analysis of 42 studies (Levant, Hall, Williams, & Hasan, 2009) that examined differential levels of alexithymia across gender. Men overall scored higher on measures of alexithymia than did women across 42 studies, although the effect size was small

(d=.22). Evidence thus suggests that men, and particularly men who adhere to a more traditional view of masculinity, are likely to have greater difficulty verbalizing internal states. In addition, restrictive emotionality, a construct shown to predict levels of alexithymia (Berger, et al., 2005), has also been linked to depression (Shepard, 2002), lower levels of intimacy experienced in relationships (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), anxiety (Wong, et al., 2006), anger and aggression (Cohn, et al., 2009), and insecure attachment styles (Schwartz, et al., 2004).

A central question that is relevant to both alexithymia and restrictive emotionality is whether these constructs capture a socially-driven reticence to express emotional experience, a deficit in the capacity for reflecting on and verbalizing emotional experience, or some combination of the two. However, the limitations of the self-report instruments that have been used in this domain of research arguably have hindered investigators' ability to address this question in a satisfactory way. Fischer and Good (1997), for instance, found that men's adherence to traditional masculinity accounted for more of the variance in men's ability to "describe" emotions than the variance in their ability to "identify" emotions—as measured by subscales of the TAS (Bagby, et al., 1994). These authors therefore argue that the association between more traditional masculine values and alexithymia "may tell us more about what [men] will do … than about what they can do." Yet, for example, two of the items included on the "identifying emotions" subscale of the TAS, items cited in Fischer and Good (1997), clearly inquire about experiences of confusion or lack of control over emotions: "I don't know what's going on inside me" and "I am confused about what emotion I am feeling." Items like these may easily read as unacceptable forms of vulnerability for men who want to see themselves, and to be seen by others, as calm and in control. This is especially likely given the findings that point to a

fear, in many men, of strong emotion and emotional dysregulation (Jakupcak, et al., 2005). Thus using a self-report measure to assess men's capacity to articulate affective experience may actually yield responses that say more about what men are willing to report—or about what they feel they should report—about those capacities, rather than reflecting the actual quality of those abilities. Indeed, using self-report measures to study men's experiences of gender role may well guarantee that the constructs under investigation influence men's responses, thereby distorting the data collected. This issue reflects an inherent risk of self-report.

Beyond the limitations of self-report, moreover, researchers' desire to avoid pathologizing men may lead to interpretations of results that are less clearly supported than might appear at first glance. The protocol of Fischer and Good (1997), for instance, includes two instruments that are used to measure the effects of traditional masculine gender roles—the MGRS and the GRCS-I. Scores on both measures in fact did account for significant variance in men's self-reported ability to "describe" emotions, as the researchers point out. However, while men's ability to "identify" emotions was not predicted by scores on the MGRS—the result that the researchers interpreted as primary—men's ability to identify emotions was in fact predicted significantly by the GRCS-I. Indeed, the GRCS subscale of "restrictive emotionality" accounted for 40% of the variance in men's ability to identify emotions. These researchers thus apparently chose to affirm only those statistical results for which there was agreement across the two instruments. Yet this approach seems questionable given their clear conceptual and statistical differences (Walker, et al., 2000) in the constructs that are measured by the two instruments: gender-role "strain" versus gender-role "conflict." The choice in favor of what appears to be an idiosyncratic interpretation of results therefore might suggest the presence of a bias toward

understanding "male alexithymia" as a social, rather than an intrapsychic, phenomenon. Such a bias only works in tandem with the limitations of self-report discussed above, since some participants themselves may well prefer to see their alexithymia as a choice rather than a deficit.

One danger of such idiosyncratic interpretations of results is that they may be perpetuated in the research literature. Wong and colleagues (2006), following Fischer and Good (1997), hypothesized that men's restrictive emotionality would be a function of socially driven, "negative attitudes toward emotional expression" rather than a function of either men's lack of awareness of affect or an ability to identify emotions (Wong, et al., 2006). Indeed, the analyses in this study showed that the variable of "difficulty identifying emotions" (a subscale of the TAS) shared far less variance with restrictive emotionality than did the variable of "negative attitudes toward emotional expression." The authors of this study therefore interpreted these results as supporting their hypothesis of restrictive emotionality as a function of attitude rather than capacity.

However, other results from this study support this hypothesis far less convincingly, a state of affairs that again opens up the question of interpretive bias. For example, the variable "difficulty identifying emotions," but not "attitudes toward emotional expression," accounted significantly for the association between restrictive emotionality and trait anxiety. Moreover, restrictive emotionality correlated inversely with repression of negative emotions. Thus, although these investigators interpreted their results to support Fischer and Good (1997), some of their analyses seem to imply a very different perspective: that rather than being primarily a response to men's attitudes regarding emotional expression, restrictive emotionality may be related more to internal processes and mechanisms, including difficulty with conceptualizing affective states,

difficulty with repression, and the anxiety that may result. An alternative interpretation of the results of this study—one that includes as a factor the effects of self-report—might be that men with higher levels of restrictive emotionality may be more likely to attribute that characteristic to external, social causes, and yet the degree of anxiety that they experience around restrictive emotionality may be a function more of difficulties both with repression and with symbolizing affect. Of course, such a distinction—between an individual's actual experience and the factors to which he attributes that experience—is difficult to make because of the assumed face validity of the constructs used in self-report measures.

Interpretive biases also may be facilitated further by ambiguities in the constructs under investigation. Both Fischer and Good (1997) and Wong and colleagues (2006), for example, assume that a reticence to "describe" emotions, even when individuals claim to be able to "identify" emotional states, means that these men simply do not want to talk about feelings in any kind of elaborated way. However, a reticence to describe affective states arguably also could stem from a difficulty with reflecting on those states in a nuanced and coherent way—even granting an individual's ability simply to give a name to a particular affective state. Thus, although these two constructs—describing vs. identifying emotions—are distinguished within the Toronto Alexithymia Scale, their theoretical significance and relationship to each other is far from clear, and this in turn leaves room for researcher bias to intervene in the interpretation of results, even inadvertently.

Overall, the literature does suggest the presence of positive associations between masculinity, alexithymia, and restrictive emotionality. However, the methodology used to collect data, most especially the use of self-report instruments, limits researchers' ability to answer with

an acceptable level of clarity the central question of whether "male alexithymia" and restrictive emotionality are a function of social forces or individual capacity. Indeed, the existing research within this domain highlights methodological drawbacks that appear to affect all lines of research within the psychology of masculinity. Central among these drawbacks in the use of self-report measures, in that participants' responses may be subject to the effects of the very constructs under investigation—i.e., masculine ideology and gender-role stress and conflict. Added to the vagaries of self-report instruments may be the presence of unacknowledged interpretive biases of researchers. Moreover, the perpetuation of such biases within the literature may be facilitated further by the theoretical ambiguities that are hidden within constructs whose face validity is assumed.

Affect Regulation and Aggression

Another domain of functioning that has been explored recently in relation to masculinity is that of affect regulation and the degree to which masculinity may be associated with various forms of affect dysregulation, such as higher levels of aggression and a predisposition to violence. Jakupcak, Lisak, and Roemer (2002), for example, have found that levels of masculine ideology and masculine gender-role strain interacted to predict the likelihood of aggression and violence. In the presence of more stringent masculine ideology, higher levels of gender-role stress increased significantly the likelihood that men would engage in aggression or violence. Thus men who held more rigid standards of masculinity were more likely to react with aggression or violence when experiencing gender-role stress than were men who also experienced gender-role stress but who held less stringent standards of masculinity. However, under the condition of lower levels of masculine gender-role stress, men who held higher

standards of masculinity reportedly were less likely to react to situations with aggression and violence than were men with less stringent standards of masculinity (Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002). Thus this research group found that masculine ideology at least partially mediates the association between masculine gender-role stress and aggression and violence.

In another study, published a year later, Jakupcak and colleagues (Jakupcak, et al., 2003) looked at the relationship between masculinity, the reported "global intensity" of individuals' affective experiences, and their fear of strong affective experiences in general. They found that masculine ideology, but not masculine gender-role stress, accounted for a unique and significant amount of the variance in scores for global affective intensity, with higher levels of masculine ideology predicting lower reported global affective intensity. In addition, level of masculine ideology also positively predicted men's fear of emotions, as did level of masculine gender-role stress.

Most revealing, however, were the findings from the further "exploratory" analyses that Jakupcak and colleagues conducted using the individual subscales of the measures for both affective intensity and fear of emotions. Using the Affect Intensity Measure (Larsen, 1984), these researchers found that masculine ideology significantly and negatively predicted levels of "negative reactivity"—i.e., the reported degree to which an individual will outwardly express reactions to negative affective experiences—but predicted neither the actual experienced intensity of negative affect nor the reported intensity or reactivity to positive affective experiences. Thus men with more stringent levels of masculine ideology were less likely to express themselves negatively regarding a negative affective experience than were men who reported less stringent masculine ideology. The actual intensity of affective experiences,

however, did not differ between the groups. Regarding fear of specific emotions, as measure by subscales of the Affect Control Scale (Williams, Chambless, & Aherns, 1997), masculine ideology significantly predicted fear of anger, positive emotions, and depressed mood, but not fear of anxiety, while level of masculine gender-role stress predicted fear of anger, positive emotions, but not fear of either anxiety or depression. These researchers, however, did not offer any theoretical explanations for such correlational patterns.

More recently, Jakupcak and colleagues (2005) investigated whether masculine ideology, gender-role stress, proneness to shame, and fear of emotions would predict levels of the expression of anger, overt hostility, and the ability to control anger. They found that fear of emotion significantly predicted overt hostility, the expression of anger, and a decreased ability to control anger. Masculinity—a variable that combined constructs: masculine ideology and masculine gender-role stress—also significantly predicted overt hostility and aggression, but the magnitude of this relationship decreased when fear of emotions was also included in the regression analysis. In addition, proneness to shame significantly and positively correlated with overt hostility. However, proneness to shame, too, accounted for less of the variance in overt hostility once the regression model included fear of emotion. Thus, fear of emotion, rather than masculinity, emerged as the strongest unique predictor of various forms of aggression. The results of the regression analyses in this study also suggest significant and intriguing overlaps between constructs related to masculinity and those related to fear of emotions, as well as overlap between fear of emotions and proneness to shame.

The work of Jacupcak and colleagues represents an advance over the first wave of research on the psychology of masculinity in a number of ways. From a social-psychology

perspective, their use of multiple measures and regression analysis may help in beginning to tease apart the relationships between the constructs that they are studying. Yet again, a drawback of this approach is that the use of multiple measures of overlapping constructs generates confusion in interpreting findings. For example, in Jacupcak, Tull, and Roemer (2005), masculinity—a variable that itself combined measures of two constructs: masculine ideology and gender-role stress—predicted "overt hostility," as assessed by the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957), which can include "assault," "indirect hostility," or "resentment." However, masculinity did not predict "anger expression," as measured by the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (Spielberger, et al., 1985), which can include "striking out at anger targets." That the constructs of "overt hostility" and "anger expression" overlap is intuitively obvious, but how they differ is not. Formulating an interpretation for why measures of masculinity may predict levels of one but not the other thus becomes impossible, at least within the context of this study.

Nevertheless, the findings of this group may suggest a useful model of the relationship between masculine ideology, gender-role stress, and affect regulation, including defense against affective dysregulation. Levels of masculine ideology and gender-role stress are associated with the extent to which men may fear that they will lose self-control in the presence of strong affect, positive or negative. The fear of such loss of self-control, in turn, may be associated with increased levels of various forms of aggression. This would be true particularly if one assumes that loss of self-control in the presence of strong affect is in itself a source of masculine gender-role stress. On the other hand, men with more stringent levels of masculine ideology tend to report less reactivity to negative affect than men who hold less stringent standards of

masculinity. Thus an interesting discrepancy emerges: it is possible that men with higher levels of masculine ideology may react with more aggression in situations that challenge their sense of masculinity or control, and that this type of reaction may be associated with a fear of loss of emotional control. Yet such men may still report lower reactivity to negative affective experiences compared with less traditionally masculine men and with women, despite the potentially higher likelihood that they may react aggressively.

The relationship between aggression and masculinity has been taken up by other investigators as well. Cohn and colleagues are perhaps the only group researching the psychology of masculinity that uses an experimental paradigm to collect data. These investigators measure "direct physical aggression" using the "Response Choice Aggression Paradigm" (RCAP), in which participants engage in a mock competition of response time in which they can administer shocks, at an intensity of their choice, to an opponent who is supposedly seated in the next chamber. This paradigm is used to evaluate aggression through various operationalized parameters, include the mean intensity of shocks given, how quickly into a session the first shock is given, the strength of the first shock given, and the frequency of shocks administered during the course of a session. Cohn and colleagues have combined this experimental paradigm with measures of gender-role conflict, masculine ideology, aggression, positive and negative affect, and emotional lability, and they have published a series of findings.

Some of the Cohn group's studies have focused on the constructs of gender-role conflict, masculine ideology, and aggression. For example, one study (Cohn & Zeichner, 2006) found that both masculine ideology and gender-role conflict accounted for significant variance in a number of the parameters of aggression measured by the RCAP. Most interestingly, they found that

among men who reported low levels of gender-role conflict, those who reported higher levels of masculine ideology administered more shocks. However, among men who reported a high level of gender-role conflict, level of masculine ideology did not account for significant differences in frequency of shock. Thus, in this study, an interaction existed between gender-role conflict and masculine ideology in relation to the frequency of shocks administered. In another study, (Cohn, et al., 2008), this group found that men who reported high levels of gender-role conflict were more likely to use higher shock intensities when experiencing higher levels of negative affect, suggesting that men with higher levels of gender-role conflict may be less able to inhibit aggression under high levels of negative affect.

Other studies conducted by Cohn and colleagues (Cohn, Jakupcak, Seibert, & Hildebrandt, 2010; Cohn, et al., 2009) have focused on the relationship between aggression and the construct of restrictive emotionality—as measured by a GRCS-I subscale. In the earlier of these studies, men with high trait anger who experienced a threat to their gender identity were found to be more likely to respond aggressively if they also scored high on restrictive emotionality (Cohn, et al., 2009). In the more recent of these studies (Cohn, et al., 2010), Cohn and colleagues looked at the relationship between restrictive emotionality, aggression, and emotion dysregulation—as measured by a multidimensional instrument, the Difficulties with Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS; Gratz & Roemer, 2004). This research group hypothesized a positive association between restrictive emotionality and levels of aggression, and that this relationship would be mediated by levels of emotion dysregulation. Yet they found that, out of the six subscales of the DERS, only two—"impulse control difficulties" and "nonacceptance of emotional responses"—taken together, significantly mediated the relationship between restrictive

emotionality and aggression. Restrictive emotionality itself had only an indirect association with aggression within this mediational model, and that association was negative. Moreover, when examined separately, only "nonacceptance of emotional responses" mediated the relationship between restrictive emotionality and aggression to a significant degree.

Although this group's research, like that of Jakupcak and colleagues, points to the possibility of intriguing associations between affect dysregulation, aggression, and aspects of masculine gender identity, their findings must be interpreted with particular caution. First, although the Cohn group's use of an experimental paradigm allows them to investigate clearly operationalized variables in a standardized setting, the artificial nature of this setting reduces the degree to which this group's findings can be generalized outside of the experimental paradigm. For example, rarely are individuals given permission in everyday life to retaliate physically when they lose in a competitive setting. The fact that participants in this study explicitly were given that permission would likely make participants' experiences within the Cohn group's experimental paradigm distinctly unlike their experiences elsewhere, and this in turn would reduce the generalizability of these experimental findings beyond the laboratory. But beyond issues of internal vs. external validity, these studies by Cohn and colleagues seem to lack a well-developed theoretical framework within which relationships between constructs can be hypothesized and results can be interpreted. When a theoretical relationship between constructs is proposed within these studies, it is usually based loosely on social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), a framework that these researchers then supplement with whatever statistical model emerges as significant within their analyses. The interpretive outcome, however, is often difficult to evaluate.

A good example of this difficulty occurs in the most recently published study, discussed above (Cohn, et al., 2010). Here, Cohn and colleagues suggest that restrictive emotionality "informed by traditional male gender socialization" may lead to "lack of comfort with and decreased awareness and acceptance of emotional states" and ultimately to "general deficits in regulating distress." Thus the "acquisition" of restrictive emotionality through social learning would degrade an existing, albeit perhaps nascent, capacity for affect regulation. Given that restrictive emotionality is placed first within an implied chain of developmental events that would lead to higher levels of aggression, Cohn and colleagues devised statistical analyses to reflect the idea that a positive association would exist between restrictive emotionality and aggression, and moreover that this association would be mediated by various forms of emotion dysregulation.

Their results, however, do not support this model: the link between restrictive emotionality and aggression is, first, negative, and second, only weakly mediated by two aspects of emotion dysregulation—nonacceptance of emotional response and impulsivity. Indeed, only the mediational pathway running through "nonacceptance of emotional response" turned out to be significant. This group then ran additional analyses to see if restrictive emotionality itself was the mediating variable between emotional nonacceptance and aggression. Again the results were nonsignificant.

An alternative theory that might fit the data—a model that stems perhaps from more psychodynamic lines of developmental psychology—would be that restrictive emotionality is actually a defense, although a relatively inadequate one, against affect in response to which some individuals may never have developed adequate capacities for awareness, tolerance, and

modulation. The statistical results of Cohn and colleagues indeed point to restrictive emotionality as functioning not as the catalyst of aggression, but as a relatively weak, ineffective, albeit still statistically significant, deterrent to aggression—in the form of "nonacceptance of emotional response." Essentially, men may attempt to regulate aggression by attempting to deny its existence or suppressing it from consciousness. This interpretive perspective, however, falls outside of the basic learning-theory model that Cohn and colleagues seem to be using. Added to these difficulties with interpreting results are, again, those related to the nature of self-report measures, particularly within the context of asking men with potentially rigid ideals about masculinity to report honestly on emotion dysregulation, i.e., on what are essentially deficits in affect regulation. The multidimensional aspects of the "aggression" paradigm, too, are difficult to interpret: how can we distinguish the real-world significance of higher frequency vs. higher intensity of shocks administered? And how do these operationalized variables relate distinctly to the construct of aggression?

This group's ability to draw inferences from their data, and even to develop hypotheses for testing, is thus limited, not only by the use of self-report measures to assess too many theoretically uncharted constructs, but also by a reliance on basic learning theory and even statistical analyses in themselves for an interpretive framework. Finally, as with the Jakupcak group and other researchers within this field, Cohn and colleagues vary from study to study in which measures of masculinity they use. Interpreting findings across studies, in order to build theory for future hypotheses, therefore becomes more haphazard, given that the "target" constructs under investigation shift from one study to another.

Synthesis of Research Findings

Empirical research suggests that the likelihood of men experiencing a wide range of psychological symptoms and deficits increases with the degree to which they believe they ought to conform to more stringent standards of masculinity, as well as with the degree to which they report conflict or stress associated with such conformity. These symptoms may include various forms of psychological distress, such as depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, shame, and externalizing symptoms such as obsessive-compulsivity, along with use of more primitive psychological defenses. These symptoms also may include more frequent relational disturbances and deficits, including higher levels of loneliness and lack of intimacy, more conflicted relationships with parents, and insecure attachment styles. Finally, men who report feeling more strain related to higher levels of masculine ideology also may be less likely to articulate affective experience—whether due to willingness or capacity—and indeed, they may see themselves as less reactive to negative affect than others (Jakupcak, et al., 2003). Yet such men also may be comparatively more labile emotionally, more fearful of experiencing strong emotion of any kind, and thus more likely to use aggression in the face of competition and perceived threat (Cohn, et al., 2008; Jakupcak, et al., 2005).

Taken together, these findings might suggest that, for some men, the strain related to gender role and ideals of masculinity may be associated with a more rigid sense of self, and perhaps a more rigid sense of the strictures around gender role in general (Pleck, 1995; Smiler, 2004). This gender-role strain may also be associated with comparatively more negative perceptions of self and other, and a greater tendency to view relationships as a source of conflict. These more negative perceptions of self and other appear to be accompanied by greater difficulty

with tolerating and regulating strong emotion, as well as a tendency to deny the impact of strong emotion and perhaps an inability to articulate that experience in the first place. Moreover, difficulty processing strong affect internally may lead to the use of externalized aggression to regulate strong affect and to reinforce an image of self-in-relation-to-other that conforms with masculine ideals.

These findings circumscribe an important question that has yet to be investigated directly: do significant differences across men in levels of masculine ideology index differences in character structure, i.e., the internal structure of men's personalities that shape not only men's intrapsychic experiences of self, other, and relationships, but also the attitudes, behaviors, symptoms that men themselves report? Some researchers would argue that men's symptoms, as highlighted in the literature, are a functioning of the social stresses related to masculine ideology (for example, see: Fischer & Good, 1997; Wong et al., 2006). On the other hand, a number of the correlates of masculine ideology, including more rigid, negative conceptions of self and other, as well as difficulties with affect regulation, have also been associated with deficits in personality functioning across the sexes, as is demonstrated by the literature on character pathology (for example, see: Kernberg, 1975). It therefore remains unclear, based on existing findings, whether the symptoms that have been identified in the literature on masculine psychology are a function of masculine ideology itself, or whether level of masculine ideology is a marker of differences in personality functioning that are related to character structure.

The Present Study

This study aimed to help address this question by investigating empirically whether statistical associations exist between level of masculine ideology and specific domains of personality functioning that are related to character structure. This study used masculine ideology as the independent variable. Dependent variables related to psychological functioning included psychological mindedness (Nyklicek & Denollet, 2009); tolerance of ambiguity (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994); and the capacity to read the mental state of another person based on facial cues (Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste, & Plumb, 2001). These variables focus on psychological capacities that are related to the quality of individuals' conscious thinking about self, other, and relationships. Deficits in these capacities have been associated with symptoms linked in the literature with higher levels of masculine ideology and attendant gender-role strain. Correlational analyses determined whether associations between masculine ideology and these dependent variables were present within the sample of this study.

In addition to collecting data for these correlational analyses, this study also collected data regarding men's self-reported adaptive personality functioning in five domains: affective self-control, identity integration, capacity for responsibility, relational functioning, and capacity for social concordance (e.g., cooperation, interdependence). Finally, this study collected projective data as well, using the Thematic Apperception Test, in order to assess the quality of men's unconscious OR representations. Such representations can be understood as reflecting aspects of character structure—i.e., the internal structure of the personality that shapes not only internal experience, but also attitudes, behaviors, and symptoms. Differences in OR representations have been shown to correlate with differences in character structure, differences that in turn

correspond with levels of psychological distress, as well as varying capacities for interpersonal intimacy and affect regulation (Huprich & Greenberg, 2003)—the domains of psychological functioning that also have been identified as key within research on the psychology of masculinity. Data on both adaptive personality functioning and OR representations were incorporated into qualitative analysis of individual men that supplemented quantitative findings.

By investigating the possible statistical associations between variables of masculine ideology and personality functioning, as well as qualitative relationships between these variables and men's adaptive personality functioning and unconscious OR representations, this study aimed to speak to the question of whether differences in levels of masculine ideology and personality functioning vary with differences in the structure of men's characters. Such a finding would lend support to the idea that masculine ideology may serve as a marker for differences in character structure in both its intrapsychic and interpersonal manifestations.

Measuring Masculine Ideology. The CMNI (Mahalik, et al., 2003) is an inventory that assesses the degree to which individuals conform, or feel that they should conform, to a range of norms associated with masculinity within the United States. The CMNI targets 11 masculine norms, ranging from winning and emotional control to heterosexual self-presentation[4] and pursuit of status. (See Appendix A for complete measure). The CMNI was administered to all participants in Phase 1 of data collection.

[4] This subscale was original called "Disdain for Homosexuality," but has been renamed here based on a recommendation by CMNI researchers (Parent & Moradi, 2009) who note that this subscale measures more closely the desire to appear heterosexual to others (or a fear of appearing homosexual).

Use of the CMNI for this study is justified by a number of reasons. First, given its relatively recent development, the CMNI assesses conformity to masculine norms as they are likely to exist currently. The measure also assesses 11 distinct domains of masculinity whose validity has been well demonstrated. This measure thus offers the possibility of analyzing data according to various specific aspects of masculine ideology, rather than in relation to a global score only. In addition, the measure was developed and tested using exceptionally large samples (Liu & Iwamoto, 2007), which again supports its validity.

Another important feature of the CMNI is the fact that it appears to avoid the potential pitfalls of many of the other measures that are widely used in research on the psychology of masculinity. For example, the Gender-Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, et al., 1986) is a well-validated measure that has been used by far the most extensively within the literature. Yet the construct it measures—conflict—requires that men be able to articulate ambivalence about masculine norms. However, I would argue that men with the highest levels of masculine ideology may be reticent to acknowledge ambivalence about many of the norms to which they adhere. Moreover, some have argued that certain domains assessed as conflictual on this measure are not specific to men but rather address conflicts (between work and family, for example) that are endemic in our society for both sexes (Walker, et al., 2000). Another widely used instrument, the Masculine Gender Role Stress scale (MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987), has been shown to measure a construct that is particularly "cohesive" and most distinct from those measured by other instruments used in the field (Walker, et al., 2000). However, the MGRS is known to correlate negatively and significantly with socioeconomic status (i.e., "family income"; see Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002), which would potentially complicate

interpretation of results. Measures of masculine ideology other than the CMNI do exist, and indeed, the CMNI is modeled on one of these, the Brannon Masculinity Scale, developed over 25 years ago (Brannon & Juni, 1984). However, the most recent of these, the Male Role Norm Inventory (Levant, et al., 1992), has yet to be validated to a satisfactory degree.

Aside from the specifics of the CMNI, using a measure of masculine ideology, rather than a measure related to gender-role strain, seemed prudent, given that the construct of masculine ideology appears to be more stable across measures—that is, many of the measures of masculine ideology correlate highly with one another. The operationalizations of gender-role strain—i.e., measures of gender-role conflict and masculine gender role stress—do not. Indeed, statistical analyses suggest that conflict and stress related to gender role are distinct constructs. Thus the use of either "strain" measure for this study may only complicate the interpretation of results, whereas the use of the masculine-ideology construct as a conceptual framework will help to clarify the significance of any results precisely because this construct is comparatively well-defined.

In addition, I would argue that masculine ideology as a construct is more fundamental to the understanding of the psychology of masculinity than either gender-role conflict or stress in relation to men's experience of, for example, increased psychological distress and difficulties with affect regulation. Some studies suggest that forms of gender role–related strain affect men's experience most strongly within the context of high levels of masculine ideology (Jakupcak, et al., 2002). And indeed, increased levels of either gender-role conflict or masculine gender role strain theoretically presuppose the likelihood of underlying higher levels of masculine ideology. Moreover, levels of masculine ideology have been associated with the same symptoms and

deficits as both gender-role conflict (Blazina, et al., 2007; Blazina, et al., 2008) and masculine gender-role stress (Jakupcak, et al., 2002; Jakupcak, et al., 2003). Finally, because of the effects of masculine ideology on perceived social desirability, some men may be more willing, and even more able, to report on beliefs about masculinity than on experiences of the breakdown of those beliefs.

Assessing Aspects of Men's Conscious Thinking about Self and Other. This study examined three previously operationalized constructs that relate to men's capacity to think flexibly and adaptively about states of mind in themselves and other people: (1) psychological mindedness, which is operationalized here as the capacity to recognize and articulate one's own emotional states and mental processes (Nyklicek & Denollet, 2009); (2) intolerance of ambiguity, operationalized as the need for cognitive closure (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994), which arguably relates to the relative rigidity of men's self concept; and (3) the capacity to accurately read the mental states of others based on facial cues (Baron-Cohen, et al., 2001).

Psychological mindedness was measured using the Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness (BIPM; Nyklicek & Denollet, 2009). Psychological mindedness has been associated in previous research with alexithymia (Beitel, Ferrer, & Cecero, 2005), a construct that has been a key element in research on the psychology of masculinity, with a number of studies detecting correlations between alexithymia and constructs related to masculinity (see for example Fischer and Good, 1997). Indeed, scores on the CMNI, the measure of masculine ideology used in the present study, were also found to correlate with alexithymia (Mahalik, et al., 2003b). Beyond associations with the presence of alexithymia, degree of psychological mindedness, as measured by the insight subscale of the BIPM, has been found to correlate negatively with various forms of

psychological distress as well, including depression, somatization, hostility, and interpersonal sensitivity and mistrust—forms of psychological distress that have also been identified in the literature on masculine psychology as reviewed above (see, for example, Mahalik, et al., 2003; O'Neil, 2008).

The BIPM was chosen for use in this study not only because of its correlation with the constructs of psychological well-being that are relevant to the psychology of masculinity, but also because it offers a brief, easy-to-administer length and a clear factorial structure. The BIPM is one of the few existing measures of psychological mindedness. By far the most widely-used measure of this construct is the Psychological Mindedness Scale (PMS; Conte, Ratto, & Karasu, 1996). However, this scale includes items that relate to constructs that are distinct from, although related to, psychological mindedness, i.e., "openness to new ideas and capacity to change" and "belief in the benefits of discussing one's problems" (Nyklicek & Denollet, 2009). Indeed, the PMS comprises five factors that focus on different domains within a broad conceptualization of psychological mindedness. Moreover, not all of the 45 items on the PMS load onto any one of the instrument's five factors. The BIPM, in contrast, contains only 14 items that load onto two factors: "interest" in attending to one's own psychological phenomena and "insight" into those phenomena (Nyklicek & Denollet, 2009). Finally, unlike the PMS, the BIPM focuses only on individuals' interest and insight into their own psychological phenomena, but not that of other people. Although this could be viewed as a limitation, I would argue that the BIPM's narrow focus on just the self reduces the possibility of ambiguous results. The BIPM therefore offers not only brevity of administration but also a good potential for clarity of interpretation.

A second instrument, the Need for Closure Scale (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994), was used to measure men's relative ability to tolerate ambiguity, as operationalized by their need for cognitive closure. Measurement of this construct was interpreted in light of the rigidity of self-concept and the intolerance of ambiguity that have been identified as underlying problematic factors in the adaptational difficulties of men with relatively high levels of masculine ideology (Pleck, 1995; Smiler, 2004).

As a complement to the focus of the BIPM on men's ability to think about their own psychological processes, this study also used the Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RME; Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste, & Plumb, 2001), which focuses on individuals' capacity to read the mental states of other people based on the affective expression that the subject perceives in images of other people's eyes.

Assessing Personality Functioning. An instrument called the Severity Indices for Personality Problems—Short Version (SIPP–SV) was used to assess the level of adaptiveness within the functioning of men's personalities, with a focus on how men relate to others and to themselves. The impetus for the development of the SIPP-118—the original, "long version" of the instrument used in this study (Verheul, et al., 2008)—was the fact that most measures applied within the context of personality-disorders research emphasize the assessment of diagnostic criteria that are related primarily to personality style rather than to the severity of functional impairment. Here, severity of impairment may be defined as the relative absence of adaptive personality functions (as distinct from characteristics of personality style) that would otherwise emerge over the course of optimal development. To address this lack, the SIPP was created to assess the relative absence of core adaptive personality functions across five domains—self-

control, social concordance (e.g., aggression regulation and cooperation), identity integration (including frustration tolerance and enjoyment), relational capacities, and responsibility. The deficits in these domains are understood to cut across personality style and specific categories of personality-disorder diagnoses. Thus the SIPP measures not character style but the severity of maladaptive functioning, regardless of character style (Verheul, et al., 2008). The SIPP-118 was validated with a sample of 2,730 participants, which included both clinical and nonclinical samples. The SIPP-SF, which has 60 items rather than 118, was developed as an instrument for psychotherapy outcome research that assesses the same five core areas of personality function that are measured by the original instrument. The shorter format made this version more practical for the present study.

The SIPP's focus on core domains of adaptive personality functioning, above and beyond character style, also made it ideal for use in this study. First, the sample of course comprised men with a broad range of personality styles. Nevertheless, like the CMNI, the SIPP looks at variations in key attitudes and behaviors across men. Second, the SIPP's emphasis on adaptive functioning echoes the emphasis within the literature on masculine psychology regarding the specifically adaptational costs of investment in more rigid forms of masculine ideology (see, for example, O'Neil et al, 2008). The pairing of the CMNI with the SIPP-SF thus allowed this study to look at the possible qualitative relationships between level of masculine ideology, which includes men's attitudes and thinking about their own masculine identity, and men's level of adaptive functioning in various domains regardless of conscious attitudes about masculinity.

Assessing Schematic Representations of Self and Other. Some investigators in the field of masculine psychology have invoked an early form of object-relations theory, based on

the work of Melanie Klein, to explain the symptoms and characteristics that have been associated with a comparatively rigid sense of masculinity and its attendant strain (Blazina, 2001a, 2001c). However, a number of other researchers, working in the area of psychological assessment, have used object-relations theory as the basis for developing instruments that can assess empirically the quality of an individual's internal OR representations—that is, the individual's affective-cognitive schemata of self, other, and relationships. Such representations are thought to arise out of the earliest relationships between the child, the primary caregiver, and other individuals within the immediate care-giving environment. The nature and quality of these relationships serve as templates through which the child comes to understand what characteristics, affects, attitudes, and behaviors are possible, tolerable, desirable, prohibited, and even taboo within the self, within others, and within relationships in general. Because of their schematic function, OR representations are thought to "substantially influence how one interacts with others" (Huprich & Greenberg, 2003). They are also thought to shape individuals' expectations regarding relationships between self and others. For example, evidence suggests associations between attachment style and quality of object-relational representations (Calabrese, Farber, & Westen, 2005). OR representations thus viably operationalize the construct of "character structure," which itself could also be defined broadly as patterns of thought and affect that are laid down during the course of development and that govern individuals' experience of self and others.

Research suggests that OR representations evolve over the course of development, both in complexity of structure and integration of content (Blatt, Brenneis, Schimek, & Glick, 1976; D. Diamond, Kaslow, Coonerty, & Blatt, 1990; Westen, 1991a; Westen, Lohr, Silk, Gold, & Kerber, 1990; Westen, Ludolph, Lerner, Ruffins, & Wiss, 1990). Although researchers have

varied in how they operationalize developmental aspects of OR representations, many of the scales used to assess OR representations, such as Blatt and colleagues' Concept of the Object scale, attempt to capture the degree to which an individual's OR representations integrate a realistically broad range of characteristics for self and other, while also differentiating between people (Blatt, et al., 1976). Urist's scale for Rorschach protocols (1977) assesses degree of mutual autonomy, the developmentally determined degree to which representations reflect a balance between interpersonal relatedness and mutual differentiation and autonomy. Diamond and colleagues developed the Self-Other Differentiation Scale (D. Diamond, et al., 1990), which explicitly operationalizes separation-individuation (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975). In Westen's Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale (SCORS) (Westen, 1991b, 2002), four of the five dimensions are "developmental": complexity of representations of people, emotional investment in relationships, emotional investment in values and moral standards, and understanding social causality. The SCORS thus assesses aspects of OR maturity that are integral to the other measures as well, including cognitive complexity and differentiation of representations, maturity of interpersonal relatedness (mutuality), and degree of psychological mindedness (Westen, 1991b, 2002).

Because OR representations are the internal and perhaps unconscious schemata of what individuals have learned, cumulatively, about the self, others, and relationships, these representations may well act as part of the mechanism by which such implicit knowledge is transferred to new relational experiences. OR representations thus form a link to an individual's developmental past, helping to organize relational experience and to shape expectations about future interactions based on past learning (Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983; Huprich & Greenberg,

2003). Broadly speaking, more complex, integrated, mature OR representations likely allow an individual to adapt to a broader, more varied range of human experience, and the presence of such relatively complex representations is thought to be an index of psychological health (Westen, 1991b). Less complex, more rigid OR representations, in contrast, may arguably dispose an individual to understanding self and other as capable of a narrower band of traits, affects, and behaviors. Such representations might be linked to more role-driven conceptions of self and other (Krohn & Mayman, 1974), in which deviation from roles—and perhaps especially gender roles—may be more difficult to tolerate. Less complex OR representations also may be associated with greater difficulty with affect regulation and relational dysfunction (Westen, Ludolph, et al., 1990), as well as a history of developmental trauma (Nigg, et al., 1991). In addition, the affective tone of OR representations—e.g., predominantly positive or predominantly negative—can be understood to index whether individuals have reached a developmental integration of "good" and "bad" as aspects of self and others, or if representations of self and other remain "split" (Kernberg, 1975). A tendency toward split representations has been associated with various forms of psychological distress and pathology, ranging from difficulties with affect regulation (Porcerelli, Cogan, & Hibbard, 1998), use of "immature" psychological defenses (Hibbard & Porcerelli, 1995), and various forms of psychopathology (Huprich & Greenberg, 2003).

OR representations have been found to be sensitive to relatively subtle differences between diagnoses and character structures, as well as to the presence of specific deficits in affect regulation and other areas of personality functioning. The quality of OR representations has thus been used reliably as a diagnostic correlate of various symptoms in the domains of

mood and personality functioning that have been associated with psychological distress, affect disorder, and character psychopathology (Ackerman, Clemence, Weatherill, & Hilsenroth, 1999; Blais, Hilsenroth, Fowler, & Conby, 1999; Blatt, Tuber, & Auerbach, 1990; Cogan & Porcerelli, 1996; Farris, 1988; Huprich & Greenberg, 2003; Kaslow, et al., 1997; Lerner & St. Peter, 1985; Marziali & Oleniuk, 1990; Rosenberg, Blatt, Oxman, McHugo, & Ford, 1994; Spear & Sugarman, 1984; Stuart, et al., 1990; Westen, 1991b). Many of these deficits are precisely those that have been identified in the literature on the psychology of masculinity, including more restricted, rigid representations of self and other, reduced capacity for affect regulation, more negative affect in relation to self and other, the comparatively more frequent use of immature defenses, and broader difficulties with self-reflection and empathy, among others. Assessing the quality of OR representations thus offers a viable way to index internal, psychological differences between men—differences in character structure—that underlie the observed variations in the functioning of men's personalities, anterior to any individual attribute or symptom that has been identified in the literature on masculine psychology.

Thematic Apperception Test & Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale.

The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), a projective assessment, was used to collect qualitative data on the quality of men's internal OR representations. The TAT (Murray, 1943) is a projective assessment in which participants are presented with a series of cards, with each card showing a character or characters in a scene of ambiguous significance. Participants are asked to describe what is happening in the picture, what led up to the scene, and what will happen next. Participants are also asked to say what the characters are thinking and what they are feeling. As a projective assessment, the TAT is intended to elicit data, in the form of narrative, that reflects an

individual's own unconscious attitudes and motivations regarding self, other, and their interaction. However, because individuals are not consciously speaking directly about themselves, the impact of social desirability and defensive self-censoring on the data that individuals provide may be largely neutralized (Murray, 1943). In this study, TAT data was used to assess the quality of individual's OR representations of self and other, as well as their schematic expectations regarding relationships in terms of affect and social causality, among other dimensions.

This study focused broadly on the idea that men's level of masculine ideology, as measured by the CMNI, would vary inversely with the developmental quality of their OR representations. If this supposition were true, then men with higher CMNI scores would have OR representations that are, for example, less complex and more affectively negative compared with the OR representations of men with lower CMNI scores. Moreover, this differential in performance would hold true across contexts, given that the same set of internalized OR representations would theoretically shape each individual's performance, regardless of stimulus. Therefore, at least conceptually, the choice of TAT cards that were presented to participants in this study would not have an impact on men's differential performance across scores on the CMNI.

However, the more data that participants produced for each card, the more opportunity there would be to score the quality of OR representations in each individual's performance. I therefore selected for use in this study a battery of eight TAT cards that have been identified in the TAT literature as either most clinically useful, generative of the greatest amount of material (i.e., highest number of themes) across individual performances, or most used in research

(Bellak; Hartman, 1970; Irvin & Vander Woude, 1971; Keiser & Prather). The sequence of cards was as follows: 1, 2, 3BM, 4, 6BM, 7BM, 8BM, and 13MF.

The SCORS was used to score participants' TAT performances for the quality of individuals' OR representations. This scale, designed specifically for use with the TAT, rates narrative data on a 7-point scale in each of five domains: complexity of representations of people, affective quality of representations, emotional investment in relationships, emotional investment in values and morals, and social causality (Westen, 2002). I note that each of these domains has direct relevance to various findings within the literature on the psychology of masculinity. These domains provided a framework within which projective data from three participants was interpreted qualitatively in relation to the other data collected for these individuals.

Counterbalancing the Limitations of Self-Report. A limitation of the research on the psychology of men is that it has relied almost exclusively on data gathered with self-report measures. Shedler, Mayman, and Manis (1993), in their critique of the limitations of self-report measures, suggest that for many self-report measures of psychological distress, such as depression, individuals who report experiencing a higher number of symptoms are more likely to report accurately. On the other hand, individuals who report that they are "healthy"—i.e., that they have fewer symptoms—are likely to fall into one of two groups: those who are in fact experiencing comparatively fewer symptoms and those who deny experiencing symptoms that they actually have, perhaps for reasons related to either social desirability, self-deception, or a combination of the two. Shedler and colleagues refer to this effect as the "illusion of health" that

can be created when psychological symptoms are measured with self-report instruments alone, without further clinical assessment.

Some version of the "illusion-of-health" effect may also occur when researchers use self-report measures to look at the psychological correlates of levels of masculine ideology and gender-role conflict. A variety of examples of this can be found in the research literature on men's psychology, examples in which men with potentially high levels of masculine ideology and the attendant psychological strain are asked to report on characteristics and experiences, such as alexithymia, restrictive emotionality, and affect dysregulation: the act of reporting on these characteristics and experiences may in itself pose a threat to a more rigid masculine identity. With the aim of at least partially circumventing this limitation, this study included data gathered by non-self-report instruments: the TAT gathered projective data, and the RME gathered data via task performance on individuals' capacity to read facial cues for others' affective states.

Study Design

The design of this study included two "phases" of data collection. Phase 1 collected data for correlational analyses from 106 college-age men. The sample ultimately used for statistical analyses was N = 87 (see Results section for further details of the case selection process). The independent variable in Phase 1 was "masculine ideology," i.e., the degree to which men feel that they should conform to more traditional standards of masculinity, as measured by the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI). Scores on the CMNI were correlated with several other measures, including: (1) the Balanced Index of Psychological Mindedness (BIPM), (2) the Need

for Closure Scale (NCS), and (3) the adult Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RME). These instruments were administered to participants online.

Phase 2 collected data from a small group of men (N = 11) who self-selected from Phase 1. Two instruments were administered to each of these participants individually and in person. These two instruments were: (1) The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; a selection of 8 cards), scored with the "Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale" (SCORS) to determine the quality of men's object-relational representations, and (2) the Severity Indices of Personality Problems-Short Form (SIPP-SF), a measure of adaptive personality functioning designed for research. Data on three participants, including data from the SIPP-SF and the TAT, were selected for qualitative analyses.

Hypotheses & Aim of Study

Three hypotheses were tested with correlational analyses. This study predicted that level of masculine ideology, as measured by the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory, would correlate: (1) negatively with psychological mindedness (BIPM); (2) positively with the need for closure, which here serves as an "inverse" operationalization of the capacity to tolerate ambiguity (NFCS)[5]; and (3) negatively with the ability to read the mental state of others through facial cues (RME).

In addition to testing the hypotheses detailed above, this study also used the data collected in Phase 2, along with the data from Phase 1, for qualitative analyses of individual participants.

[5] The idea here is that masculine ideology would correlate negatively with relative tolerance of ambiguity, but that it would correlate positively with the "inverse" operationalization of tolerance of ambiguity used in this study, i.e., need for closure. For example, a high need for closure would correspond to a lower tolerance of ambiguity.

These qualitative analyses, performed with data from three participants, aimed to elucidate the nature of differences in the role that masculine ideology can play in the psychological economy of individuals.

This study had originally posed further questions for quantitative investigation in relation to the measures for which data was collected in Phase 2, including the TAT and SIPP-SF. These questions were to explore whether groups of men with, respectively, low, intermediate, and high levels of masculine ideology would differ significantly in the quality of their object-relational representations and in their levels of adaptive personality functioning, as well as on Phase 1 measures. However, due to an insufficient sample size for Phase 2, statistically valid group comparisons could not be conducted.

The broader aim of this study—after first determining whether men's personalities differ in terms of structure and functioning in relation to level of masculine ideology—was to use any empirical results to begin to theorize a model of masculine gender-role socialization that accounts not only for the pressures of masculine norms at the level of society, but also for differences in the way in which those norms may be understood and internalized as a function of variability of psychological development across individuals. Finally, the findings of this study have potential implications for the treatment of men for whom a more rigid masculine gender-role identity is a part of the clinical presentation, along with the various forms of psychological distress that may accompany high levels of masculine ideology.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Participants & Sample Size

One hundred and six male undergraduates at the City College of New York were recruited for this study. All 106 individuals answered questionnaires in Phase 1 of data collection (see the Materials section below for a description of instruments). In Phase 2, 11 men who self-selected from Phase 1 had the TAT and SIPP–SF administered to them in individual sessions by the principal investigator.

Recruitment

All participants were male, at least 18 years of age, and enrolled at the City College of New York. Participants for Phase 1 of data collection were recruited through the research participant pool that is maintained by the Department of Psychology at City College. Phase 1 participants recruited from this pool received academic credit within the psychology department, according to departmental protocol. Self-selected participants in Phase 2 of data collection were provided with monetary compensation for their time. The study was advertised as research that would look at "men's attitudes and experiences."

Consent Process & IRB Approval

All participants were required to provide informed consent, which occurred online for Phase 1 and in person, with a signed consent form, for Phase 2. Consent materials, as well as all other materials and procedures for this study, were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the City College of New York.

Materials—Instruments

Demographics Questionnaire. All participants in Phase 1 data collection completed a generic demographics questionnaire that gathered information ranging from age and level of education to relationship status and degree of religiosity.

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory—CMNI. The CMNI (Mahalik, et al., 2003) is an inventory that assesses the degree to which individuals conform, or feel that they should conform, to a range of norms associated with masculinity within the United States. The CMNI has 94 items that are divided into 11 subscales, with each subscale targeting one of 11 masculine norms: winning, emotional control, risk-taking, violence, power over women, dominance, playboy, self-reliance, primacy of work, heterosexual self-presentation, and pursuit of status. Individuals respond to each item using a 4-point scale, with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree (Table 1). These points reflect the authors' intent to assess conformity to masculine norms in terms of a range that runs from extreme conformity to extreme nonconformity. The CMNI was administered online to all participants in Phase 1 of data collection.

Table 1

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory—CMNI: Subscales & sample items

Subscale name	Description	Sample item
Emotional Control	Aversion/avoidance regarding emotional expression	"It is best to keep your emotions hidden"
Winning	Drive to win as a top priority	"In general, I will do anything to win"
Playboy	Desire for multiple sexual partners without strong emotional ties	"If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners"
Violence	The extent to which violence is viewed as potentially justified, necessary, and even desirable, including personal involvement	"I am willing to get into a physical fight if necessary"
Self-reliance	Aversion to asking for help	"I hate asking for help"
Risk-taking	Penchant for risk	"I frequently put myself in risky situations"
Power Over Women	Perceived desirability of gender inequality/male control over women	"Women should be subservient to men"
Dominance	Preference for interpersonal control	"I make sure people do as I say"
Primacy of Work	Viewing work as a primary focus	"My work is the most important part of my life"
Pursuit of Status	Investment in being perceived as important	"It feels good to be important"
Heterosexual Self-Present.	Investment in appearing unambiguously heterosexual	"I would feel uncomfortable if someone thought I was gay"

The CMNI contains 94 items, divide among 11 subscales. Participants respond to items on a four-level scale: "strongly disagree," "disagree," "agree," or "strongly agree."

Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness—BIPM. The BIPM (Nyklicek & Denollet, 2009) is a 14-item scale that measures, using a 5-point scale, individuals' "interest" and "insight" into their own psychological and emotional processes (Table 2). Unlike other, previously developed instruments that assess psychological mindedness, the BIPM is brief and focuses only on individuals' sense of their own internal life, not that of others. In addition, all items of the BIPM load onto one of two factors. The BIPM was administered online to all Phase 1 participants.

Table 2
Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness—BIPM: Subscales & sample items

Subscale name	Description	Sample item
Interest	Interest in reflecting on one's psychological states and processes	"My negative feelings can teach me a lot about myself"
Insight	Capacity for insight into one's psychological states and processes	"I guess I rarely listen to my feelings" (all items on this subscale are reverse scored)

The BIPM contains 14 items, with seven items per subscale. Participants respond to items on a five-level scale: "not true," "a little bit true," "somewhat true," "fairly true," or "very much true."

The Need for Closure Scale—NFCS. The NFCS (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994) is a 42-item instrument that measures, on a 6-point scale, the degree of individuals' "preference for order and structure" and "discomfort with ambiguity." The NFCS thus operationalizes "ambiguity tolerance" in various hypothetical situations and offers a broad assessment of individuals' preferences across situations (Table 3). The NFCS was administered online to all Phase 1 participants.

Table 3
Need for Closure Scale—NFCS: Subscales and sample items

Subscale name	Description	Sample item
Order	A preference for order and structure in one's environment	"I think that having clear rules and order at work is essential for success"
Ambiguity	Affective discomfort with ambiguity, i.e., the absence of closure	"I'd rather know bad news than stay in a state of uncertainty"
Decisiveness	A sense of urgency in striving for closure in judgment and decision making	"I usually make important decisions quickly and confidently"
Predictability	A preference for secure knowledge that is reliable across circumstances and unchallenged by exceptions or disagreements	"I don't like to go into a situation without knowing what I can expect from it"
Close-mindedness	An unwillingness to have one's knowledge confronted by alternative opinions or inconsistent evidence	"I do not usually consult many different opinions before forming my own view"

The NFCS contains 42 items, divided among five subscales. Participants respond to items on a six-level scale: "strongly disagree," "moderately disagree," "slightly disagree," "slightly agree," "moderately agree," and "strongly agree."

Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test—RME. The RME (Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste, & Plumb) is a measure in which participants are asked to view images of individuals' eyes and to identify, through multiple-choice selection, the emotion or state of mind that is indicated by the expression in each set of eyes. The RME thus assesses the degree to which participants can "read" the state of mind of another person based on facial cues. The RME was chosen for use in this study because of its simplicity and its performative, rather than self-report, format. All participants in Phase 1 took the RME online. (The complete version of this measure is searchable online.)

Severity Indices of Personality Problems, Short Form—SIPP-SF. The SIPP-SF (Verheul, et al., 2008) is an instrument designed to assess, using a Likert-like response scale, five core components of personality functioning: self-control, identity integration, relational capacities, responsibility, and social concordance (Table 4). Originally developed by researchers in personality disorders, this instrument is intended for research use and is designed to be sensitive to changes in functioning over time for the purposes of psychotherapy outcome research. This instrument is therefore well-suited to assess the degree of adaptive functioning in a variety of domains that were of interest in the present study. All Phase 2 participants completed the SIPP-SF.

Table 4
Severity Indices of Personality Problems, Short Form–SIPP-SF: Domains & sample items

Domain	Description	Sample item
Self-control	The capacity to tolerate, use, and control one's own emotions and impulses	"I often cannot help expressing my moods inappropriately"
Identity integration	Coherence of identity; the ability to see oneself and one's own life as stable, integrated, and purposeful. Also includes the capacity for enjoyment.	"I often feel that my life is meaningless"
Responsibility	The capacity to set realistic goals and to achieve these goals in line with the expectations you have generated in others	"I have a tendency to start things and then give up on them"
Relational functioning	The capacity to genuinely care about others as well as feeling cared about by them, to be able to communicate personal experiences, and to hear and engage with the experiences of others often but not necessarily in the context of long-term, intimate relationships	"It is hard for me to get attached to someone else"
Social concordance	The ability to value someone's identity, to withhold aggressive impulses towards others, and to work together with others	"At work I get easily irritated about other people's ways of doing things"

The SIPP-SF has 60 items, divided into five domains. Item responses lie on a four-level scale: "fully disagree," "partly disagree," "partly agree," or "fully agree."

Thematic Apperception Test—TAT. The TAT (Murray, 1943) is a projective assessment in which participants are presented with a series of cards, with each card showing a character or characters in a scene of ambiguous significance. Participants are asked to describe what is happening in the picture, what led up to the scene, and what will happen next. Participants are also asked to say what the characters are thinking and what they are feeling. As a projective assessment, the TAT is intended to elicit data, in the form of a narrative, that reflect an individual's own unconscious attitudes and motivations regarding self, other, and their interaction. However, because individuals are not consciously speaking directly about themselves, the impact of social desirability and defensive self-censoring on the data that individuals provide may be largely neutralized (Murray, 1943). In this study, TAT data was used to assess the quality of individual's OR representations of self and other, as well as their schematic expectations regarding relationships in terms of affect and social causality, among other dimensions. All Phase 2 participants provided TAT data.

Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale—SCORS. The SCORS was designed for use in scoring the object-relational representations that are embedded in individual performances on the TAT (Westen, 1991a). Performances on individual cards of the TAT are scored on a 7-point scale in five domains: complexity of representations of people, affective tone of representations, investment in relationships, investment in values and morals, and social causality (Table 5) (Westen, 2002).

Table 5
Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale: Subscales

Subscale	Description
Complexity of Representations of People	Assesses differentiation between self and others; perception of people as having stable, enduring, multidimensional dispositions; recognition of people as psychological beings with complex motives and subjective experience
Affect Tone	Assesses affective expectations of relationships, ranging from profound malevolence or overwhelming pain, to experiences that are benign and enriching
Social Causality	Assesses the extent to which causal attributions of people's actions, thoughts, and feelings are logical, accurate, complex, and psychologically-minded
Investment in Relationships	Assesses the extent to which others are treated as ends rather than means, and the extent to which relationships are experienced as meaningful and committed
Investment in Moral Values and Standards	Assesses whether events are regarded in terms other than need-gratification, and whether moral standards are developed and considered

Each TAT card is scored on a scale of 1 to 7 for each subscale.

Procedures

Phase 1 Data Collection. In Phase 1 of data collection, all consented participants completed a demographics questionnaire and then four instruments—CMNI, BIPM, RME, and NFCS—which comprise 187 items in total. Phase 1 data collection was designed to require no more than 60 minutes and took place entirely online, via a secure webpage. At the end of the Phase 1 survey, participants were asked if they wanted to take part in Phase 2.

Phase 2 Data Collection. The TAT and the SIPP-SF was administered in person and individually to all Phase 2 participants. At the presentation of each of the TAT cards, all participants

were reminded to answer five questions within their responses: what's happening in this scene, what led up to it, what's going to happen, what are the characters thinking, and what are the characters feeling. Administration of Phase 2 measures occurred in a consultation room at the Psychological Center at City College. Performances on the TAT were audio recorded, transcribed, and scored using the SCORS.

Statistical & Qualitative Analyses. All data were entered into a format suitable for statistical analysis with SPSS. Correlational analyses were run with the scores from all four measures from Phase 1. Data for three individuals, from both Phase 1 and 2 measures, were used for qualitative analyses.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Overview—Strategy for Statistical Analyses

Correlational analyses were conducted to test Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 of this study. Correlational analyses included all subscales of the four measures for which data were collected in Phase 1.[6] Because risk of Type I error increases as the number of statistical tests increases, a relatively more stringent p-value threshold of $p < .01$ was used to determine significance for correlations related to Hypotheses 1 through 3.

During hypothesis testing, groupings of CMNI subscales emerged based on differing correlational patterns in relation to both psychological mindedness and need for closure, i.e., CMNI subscales differed in the direction of correlation and level of significance in relation to both variables. A post-hoc factor analysis was therefore conducted to determine whether these groupings of CMNI subscales loaded onto distinct factors. Three CMNI factors emerged from this analysis. A second, post-hoc round of correlational analyses was subsequently conducted between these three CMNI factors and measures for psychological mindedness and need for closure to determine whether these three factors preserved the statistical relationships that were revealed by the first, hypothesis-testing round of correlational analyses. Because factor analysis also effectively served as a data reduction technique, fewer correlational analyses were conducted between CMNI factors and measures for psychological mindedness and need for closure, with a consequent reduction in the likelihood of Type I error. The standard significance threshold of $p < .05$ was therefore used for this second, post-hoc round of correlational analyses.

---

[6] Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI), Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness (BIPM), Need for Closure Scale (NFCS), and the Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RME).

Case Selection for Statistical Analysis

Data from 106 participants were gathered during Phase 1 of this study. All participants were male, 18 years of age or older, and enrolled in an introductory psychology course at City College of New York. Data were gathered via an online survey that required participants to respond to every item. Cases with incomplete data thus occurred only when participants discontinued the online survey before completion. All incomplete cases were excluded from analyses.

The remaining cases with complete data were analyzed for consistency of item response in order to maximize the likelihood that data used in analyses would represent valid responses. Two inconsistency thresholds were designed for this purpose. One inconsistency threshold was devised by estimating the likely minimum amount of time required to attentively complete the entire online survey. Individuals who completed the 187 items of this survey in less time than the designated minimum time threshold were assumed to have completed the survey too quickly to have given thoughtful, valid responses.

A second inconsistency filter was created by evaluating participants' responses to parallel items on the Need for Closure Scale (NFCS). As with most self-report measures, the NFCS asks the same basic question in multiple items with alternative wordings in order to increase the statistical stability of the instruments' subscales. Inconsistency analyses examined whether participants answered such questions consistently. Items from the NFCS were chosen because of the clarity with which they parallel each other in semantic content, and because the NFCS was the final instrument for which participants gave responses. The assumption was that, if participants continued to be consistent during the final measure of the online survey, then they were likely to have been

consistent on previous measures. Participants who responded inconsistently to selected items from the NCFS were excluded from further statistical analyses.

Sample Characteristics

Eighty-seven participants (N = 87) from the original sample of 106 were included in the correlational analyses for this study. Nineteen of the original 106 cases were excluded because they were incomplete, or because they failed the consistency checks described above. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 42 years, with a mean age of 20.44 years, a median age of 19.00 years, and a standard deviation in age of 3.854 years (Table 6). Men who identified as Asian constituted 42% of the sample. Hispanic men constituted about 20% of the sample. Caucasian and Black/African-American men constituted the next two largest groups by race within the sample (Table 7). About 90% of the sample reported completing either a high school diploma or some college (Table 7). In addition, about three-quarters of the sample reported a family income of $50K per year or under (Table 8). About a third of the sample identified as “not at all” religious, with another half identifying as moderately religious, and the remainder of the sample identifying as strongly religious (Table 8).

Table 6

Sample demographics (N = 87)—age

Age (Years)	Frequency	% of Total Sample	Age (Years)	Frequency	% of Total Sample
18	25	28.7	25	2	2.3
19	25	28.7	26	1	1.1
20	13	14.9	27	2	2.3
21	9	10.3	28	1	1.1
22	2	2.3	31	1	1.1
23	3	3.4	36	1	1.1
24	1	1.1	42	1	1.1
			Total	87	100

Statistics (in years): Range: 18-42 Mean: 20.44 Median: 19.00 SD: 3.854

Table 7

Sample demographics (N = 87)—race & education

Race			Education		
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Asian	37	42.5	Some high school	2	2.3
Black/African American	11	12.6	High school diploma	44	50.6
Hispanic/Latino	18	20.7	Some college	34	39.1
White/Caucasian	14	16.2	2-year college degree	4	4.6
Pacific Islander	1	1.1	4-year college degree	2	2.3
Other	6	6.9	Graduate school degree	1	1.1
Total	87	100	Total	87	100

Freq. = frequency of response % = percent of sample

Table 8

Sample demographics (N = 87) —income & religiosity

Income ($)			Religiosity		
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Under 10K	11	12.6	Not at all	28	32.2
10–19.999K	20	23.0	A little bit	17	19.5
20–29.999K	13	14.9	Somewhat	22	25.3
30–39.999K	10	11.5	Quite a bit	15	17.2
40–49.999K	10	11.5	Very	5	5.7
50–74.999K	15	17.2	Total	87	100
75–99.999K	3	3.4			
100–150K	2	2.3			
Over 150K	3	3.4	Freq. = frequency of response		
Total	87	100	% = percent of sample		

Phase 1—Correlational Analyses

Correlational analyses were conducted using Phase 1 data (N = 87). Analyses included the variable of masculine ideology, as measured by the CMNI, along with each of the following variables: psychological mindedness, as measured by the Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness (BIPM); need for closure, as measured by the NFCS; and the capacity to read the psychological states of others based on facial cues, as measured by the Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RME). Correlational analyses included total scores and all subscale scores for each measure (Table 9). Scores for each measure were distributed normally.

A partial-correlation analysis was conducted to determine whether key demographic characteristics—race, religiosity, income—significantly influenced the zero-order correlations between the variables of interest in this study. None of these demographic variables were found to

significantly influence the outcome of correlational analyses. Zero-order correlations are therefore reported throughout.

Table 9

Descriptive statistics—sample data: Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI), Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness (BIPM), Need for Closure Scale (NFCS), and Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RME), N = 87

Measure	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
CMNI	1.89	2.93	2.3727	.21152
BIPM	2.50	5.00	3.5706	.53690
NFCS	2.83	5.10	3.9184	.44982
RME	17.00	32.00	24.6322	3.48457

Instrument scales: CMNI= 4-point scale; BIPM = 5-point scale; NFCS = 6-point scale; RME has 36 items scored correct or incorrect.

Masculine ideology (MI) & Psychological Mindedness—Hypothesis 1. Correlational analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis that strength of masculine ideology (measure: CMNI) would correlate negatively and significantly with psychological mindedness (measure: BIPM) (Table 10).

Total scores for the CMNI correlated negatively with total scores for the BIPM, with a strong trend toward significance ($r = –.209$, $p = .053$). Three CMNI subscales—Emotional Control, Playboy, Self-Reliance—correlated negatively and significantly with BIPM–Total and at least one of two BIPM subscales (Table 10). The CMNI subscale Pursuit of Status correlated positively with BIPM–Total and BIPM–Insight with a trend toward significance. Hypothesis 1 was thus partially supported in that some, but not all, CMNI subscales correlated negatively and significantly with psychological mindedness.

Table 10

Pearson correlations: Conformity to Masculine Norms (CMNI) & Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness (BIPM) (N = 87)

CMNI	BIPM		
	Total	Interest	Insight
Total	–.209 ↑	–.174	–.151
Winning	.144	.051	.159
Emotional control	–.556 **	–.373 **	–.475 **
Risk-taking	.114	.144	.044
Violence	.067	.020	.076
Power over women	–.108	–.079	–.087
Dominance	.030	.083	–.024
Playboy	–.321 *	–.293 *	–.213 ↑
Self-reliance	–.293 *	–.130	–.303 *
Primacy of work	–.019	.048	–.064
Heterosexual self-presentation	.031	–.020	.058
Pursuit of status	.211 ↑	.055	.248 ↑

*p < .01 **p <.001 ↑ = trend toward significance (.6 > p > .01) p-values are two-tailed

MI & Need for Closure—Hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 2 predicted that strength of masculine ideology (measure: CMNI) would correlate positively and significantly with individuals' relative need for cognitive closure (measure: NFCS).

Scores for CMNI–Total did not correlate significantly with either NFCS–Total or with any of the NFCS subscale scores (Table 11). However, two CMNI subscales correlated positively and significantly with two or more scores for the NFCS. Heterosexual Self-Presentation correlated positively and significantly with NFCS–Total and with three NFCS subscales: Order, Predictability,

and Close-Mindedness. The CMNI subscale Pursuit of Status correlated positively and significantly with two NFCS subscales: Order and Decisiveness (Table 11).

In contrast, two other CMNI subscales correlated negatively and significantly with two or more scores for the NFCS. Risk-Taking correlated negatively and significantly with NFCS–Total, as well as with NFCS subscales Predictability and Close-Mindedness. Violence correlated negatively and significantly with NFCS subscales Order and Predictability. In addition, a number of CMNI subscales correlated significantly, either positively or negatively, with a single subscale of the NFCS (Table 11). Hypothesis 2 was thus partially supported and partially contradicted in that some CMNI subscales correlated positively and significantly with scores for the NFCS, while other CMNI subscales correlated negatively with NFCS scores.

Table 11

Pearson correlations: Conformity to Masculine Norms (CMNI) & Need for Closure Scale (NFCS) (N = 87)

CMNI	NFCS					
	Total	ORD	PRE	DEC	AMB	CLO
Total	.132	.088	–.063	.070	.136	.195↑
Winning	.201↑	.298*	.037	.163	.013	.028
Emotional control	.072	–.013	–.040	–.148	.225↑	.264↑
Risk-taking	–.363*	–.276↑	–.421**	.132	–.184↑	–.338*
Violence	–.245↑	–.279*	–.361*	–.054	.000	.038
Power over women	.140	.065	.124	.053	.060	.130
Dominance	.191↑	.117	.086	.291*	.037	.029
Playboy	–.156	–.223↑	–.207↑	–.130	.017	.153
Self-reliance	.064	–.050	–.040	–.101	.130	.331*
Primacy of work	.125	.240↑	.035	–.008	–.016	.069
Heterosexual self-present.	.404**	.315*	.368**	.096	.203↑	.211↑
Pursuit of status	.173	.295*	.024	.330*	.002	–.228↑

NFCS subscales—ORD = Order; PRE = Predictability; DEC = Decisiveness; AMB = Discomfort with ambiguity; CLO = Close-mindedness

*p < .01 **p<.001 ↑ = trend toward significance (.10 > p > .01) p-values are two-tailed

MI and Reading the Mental States of Others—Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 3 predicted that masculine ideology would correlate negatively and significantly with the ability to accurately read the mental states of others based on facial cues (measure: RME). Neither scores for CMNI–Total nor scores for any CMNI subscale correlated significantly with scores for the RME (Table 12). Two CMNI subscales did correlate positively with RME with a trend toward significance: Violence and Pursuit of Status. Nevertheless, Hypothesis 3 was not supported. Moreover, the trends toward significant positive correlations contradict this hypothesis.

Table 12

Pearson correlations: Conformity to Masculine Norms (CMNI) & Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RME) (N = 87)

CMNI subscale	RME	CMNI subscale	RME
Winning	–.149	Playboy	–.080
Emotional control	–.103	Self–reliance	–.185
Risk-taking	–.016	Primacy of work	–.058
Violence	.207 ↑	Heterosexual self-presentation	–.051
Power Over women	–.130	Pursuit of status	.202 ↑
Dominance	–.091	CMNI Total	–.113

↑ = trend toward significance (.07 > p > .01) p-values are two-tailed

Phase 2—Qualitative Analyses

In Phase 2 of this study, additional data were collect from 11 men who also participated in Phase 1 data collection. These data, from the SIPP-SF and TAT, were combined with data from Phase 1 measures for the purpose of qualitative analysis of three individual participants. The details of the qualitative analysis itself are integral to the discussion of qualitative findings. Therefore, both analysis and findings are presented together in the discussion section. Details of the demographic make up of the Phase 2 sample are provided in a table in Appendix A.

Post-Hoc Analysis

Factor Analysis—Subscales of the CMNI. The analyses that were conducted to test Hypotheses 1 and 2 produced a pattern of correlations in which some groups of CMNI subscales correlated significantly with measures of psychological mindedness and need for closure, while others did not. Moreover, of the CMNI subscales that correlated significantly with psychological mindedness and need for closure, some subscales differed from others in the direction of their

correlations. For example, Emotional Control, Playboy, and Self-Reliance correlated negatively and significantly with BIPM scores, whereas Pursuit of Status trended toward a significant positive correlation with BIPM scores. In addition, Both Risk-Taking and Violence correlated negatively and significantly with NFCS–Total and multiple subscales of the NFCS, whereas Heterosexual Self-Presentation and Pursuit of Status both correlated positively with multiple NFCS scores. These results suggested the possibility that, at least for this sample, groups of CMNI subscales, and thus the characteristics that they represent, may be statistically related. This in turn suggests the possibility of higher-order factors within which individual CMNI subscales might be grouped.

In addition, the groupings of CMNI subscales that emerged from correlational analyses also arguably hang together from a theoretical perspective. For example, item analysis of the CMNI subscales Emotional Control, Playboy, and Self-Reliance suggest that each of these subscales represent a facet of an underlying aversion to emotional dependence. To explore the possibility that CMNI subscales may group together statistically in a way that is also theoretically coherent, a post-hoc factor analysis was conducted to determine whether individual subscales of the CMNI loaded differentially on distinct factors.[7] Three factors emerged from this analysis, onto which nine of the subscales of the CMNI loaded (Table 13).

---

[7] Typically, factor analysis may be used as a means of data reduction, in that data from several measures or subscales can be combined into a fewer number of factors. The factors that result from such an analysis, in study designs similar to this one, might then be used for hypothesis testing, in lieu of using the original measures or subscales upon which hypotheses were initially constructed. The advantage of this kind of data reduction is that it reduces the risk of Type I error, because with fewer factors, fewer analyses are conducted. In this study, factor analysis has not been used primarily for data reduction, although data reduction is an obvious secondary result. Rather, factor analysis has been used to test, post hoc, a supposition that subscales for masculine ideology may group together along theoretically coherent lines. These factors, in turn, serve a useful purpose for further theorizing about the nature of masculine ideology. Using only these factors to discuss masculine ideology, however, would result in the significant loss of potential theoretical

Table 13

Factor analysis: Subscales of Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) N = 87

CMNI	Factors		
	1–"Competition"	2–"Distancing"	3–"Uninhibited"
Dominance	.784		
Pursuit of status	.684		
Winning	.576		
Primacy of work	—	—	—
Self-reliance		.643	
Emotional control		.525	
Playboy		.522	
Power over women		.427	–.377
Violence	—	—	—
Heterosexual self-presentation			–.780
Risk-taking			.499

The minimal threshold for a subscale to load onto any factor was set at .25. Neither Primacy of Work nor Violence reached this threshold for any of the three factors.

The first factor included the CMNI subscales of Dominance, Pursuit of Status, and Winning. This first factor therefore corresponded to characteristics that could be associated with "competition." The second factor, which included the CMNI subscales of Self-Reliance, Emotional Control, and Playboy, as well as, at a lesser strength, Power Over Women,

specificity, because the distinct domains of individual subscales—whose meaning is important to a nuanced understanding of the construct of masculine ideology—would be "lumped" together, and therefore obscured, under broader "factors." Framing this factor analysis as a post-hoc analysis (rather than replacing subscales with factors in hypothesis testing) allows for using both factors and the individual subscales of the CMNI in discussion and theoretical interpretation of trends in the data.

corresponded to characteristics that could be associated with emotional "distancing" or avoidance of emotional interdependence. The third factor included Risk-Taking, as well as Heterosexual Self-Presentation and, to a lesser strength, Power Over Women, both of which loaded onto the factor with a valence opposite to that of Risk-Taking.[8] This factor thus can be understood to describe more "uninhibited" characteristics, i.e., with higher scores on the Risk-Taking subscale come lower scores on concerns regarding heterosexual appearance and need for interpersonal control over women. These three factors do not correlate with each other to a statistically significant degree, although the Competition factor correlates negatively with the Uninhibited factor with a trend toward significance (Table 14).[9]

[8] In factor analysis, the sign of loadings are arbitrary and can be reversed as long as such reversal is performed consistently for all loadings (Child, 1976). For the Uninhibited factor, Risk-Taking has been represented as having a positive loading, while Heterosexual Self-Presentation and Power Over Women have been represented as having a negative loading, because this configuration allows for greater clarity in interpreting the meaning of the factor as a whole in the context of subsequent correlational analyses.

[9] These three factors have weak to, at best, adequate reliability. The Crohnbach's Alpha of each is as follows: Competition: .705; Distancing: .548; Uninhibited: .417. These levels of reliability suggest that these factors themselves cannot be reliably used as measurement instruments. However, this is not a critical issue in this study, because these factors are not used for hypothesis testing, but rather are used as a statistically derived heuristic device for further theory building.

Table 14

Pearson Correlations: CMNI factors by CMNI factors, N = 87

CMNI Factor	CMNI Factor		
	Competition	Distancing	Uninhibited
Competition			
Distancing	.095		
Uninhibited	–.197↑	–.004	

↑ = trend toward significance (.10 < p < .05) p-values are two-tailed

Notably, all of the CMNI subscales that correlated negatively and significantly with psychological mindedness loaded onto the Distancing factor, while two of the CMNI subscales that correlated significantly with scores for the NFCS—Risk Taking and Heterosexual Self-Presentation—loaded, with opposite valences, onto the Uninhibited factor. Given that these factor loadings largely reflected the pattern of correlations found previously between CMNI subscales and the BIPM, NFCS, and RME, a second, post-hoc round of correlational analyses was conducted to determine if these factors themselves would yield similar correlational relationships with the BIPM, NFCS, and RME. A standard threshold of p = .05 was used to determine statistical significance.

This analysis revealed that the Distancing factor correlated negatively and significantly with all scores for psychological mindedness (BIPM Total, Interest, and Insight). Moreover, the effect sizes for these correlations ranged from moderate to large[10] (Table 15). In addition, both

[10] Designation of effect size follows Cohen (1988) who—in reference to the behavioral sciences—defines r = .10 as the threshold for a small effect size, r = .30 for a medium effect size, and r = .50 for a large effect size.

the Competition and Distancing factors correlated positively and significantly with scores for the NFCS (Table 16). In contrast, the Uninhibited factor correlated negatively and significantly with scores for the NFCS. However, none of the factors correlated significantly with scores for the RME (Table 17). These three CMNI factors thus largely preserved the patterns of correlations yielded by the correlational analyses at the subscale level in relation to the BIPM, NFCS, and RME.

Table 15

Pearson correlations: Three CMNI factors & Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness (BIPM) N = 87

CMNI	BIPM		
	Total	Interest	Insight
CMNI–Total	–.209↑	–.174	–.151
CMNI–Factors:			
Competition	.168	.077	.170
Distancing	–.517***	–.358***	–.432***
Uninhibited	.032	.079	–.026

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p <.001 p-values are two-tailed ↑ = trend toward sig. (.10 < p < .05)

Table 16

Pearson correlations: Three CMNI factors & Need for Closure Scale (NFCS) N = 87

CMNI	NFCS					
	Total	ORD	PRE	DEC	AMB	CLO
CMNI–Total	.132	.088	–.063	.070	.136	.195↑
CMNI–Factors:						
Competition	.237*	.306**	.059	.323**	.021	–.074
Distancing	–.026	–.146	–.144	–.172	.154	.333**
Uninhibited	–.473***	–.365**	–.470***	–.016	–.238*	–.312**

NFCS subscales: ORD = Order; PRE = Predictability; DEC = Decisiveness; AMB = Discomfort with ambiguity; CLO = Close-mindedness

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p <.001 p-values are two-tailed ↑ = trend toward sig. (.10 < p < .05)

Table 17

Pearson correlations: Three CMNI factors & Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RME) N = 87

	CMNI Factor			
	Competition	Distancing	Uninhibited	CMNI–Total
RME	–.015	–.166	0.32	–.133

There were no statistically significant correlations between CMNI factors and RME score.

Results—Summary

- **Hypothesis 1 was partially supported**: Some, but not all, subscales of the CMNI correlated negatively and significantly with psychological mindedness (BIPM).
- **Hypothesis 2 was partially supported and partially contradicted**: Some subscales of the CMNI correlated positively and significantly with the need for closure (NFCS), while other CMNI subscales correlated negatively and significantly with need for closure.
- **Hypothesis 3 was not supported**: None of the scores for the CMNI, total or subscale, correlated significantly with scores for reading the mental states of others based on facial cues (RME).
- **Post Hoc Analyses:** a factor analysis revealed that nine of the subscales of the CMNI loaded onto three factors: "Competition" (subscales of Dominance, Pursuit of Status, Winning), "Distancing" (subscales of Emotional Control, Playboy, Self-Reliance, Power Over Women), and "Uninhibited" (subscales of Risk-Taking, Heterosexual Self-Presentation, Power Over Women, with the latter two loading negatively onto the factor). These three CMNI factors largely preserved the often strong correlational relationships that were identified between the component subscales of each factor and psychological mindedness and need for closure.
- **Qualitative Analysis:** Qualitative analysis and findings are presented in the discussion section.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The aim of this study was to determine whether differences in level of masculine ideology would predict differences in aspects of psychological functioning that are related to character structure—including psychological mindedness, the capacity to tolerate ambiguity, and the capacity to read the affective states of others based on facial cues. This study also qualitatively examined data related to men's internal representations of self and other, as well as data related to adaptive social functioning, in order to theorize further about the varied ways in which masculine ideology may operate within men's character structure.

This study led to two main correlational findings, both of which relate to aspects of psychological functioning as components of character structure. The first main finding of this study is that specific domains of masculine ideology correlated negatively and significantly with psychological mindedness, defined as the interest and ability to reflect upon one's own psychological states and processes (Nyklicek & Denollet, 2009). The domains of masculine ideology that are involved in this significant negative association broadly relate to an avoidance of emotional expression, intimacy, and interdependence.

The second main finding of this study is that a number of domains of masculine ideology correlated significantly with the need for cognitive closure, defined as the need for order, predictability, and decisiveness, along with an aversion to ambiguity and challenges to one's own thinking (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994). However, these correlations did not occur uniformly in the predicted direction. Need for closure correlated positively with men's desire to appear to others as unambiguously heterosexual, as well as with men's general interest in being viewed by

others as high status. In contrast, men who felt a greater attraction toward risk and less aversion to violent confrontation were less invested in, and possibly even avoidant of, cognitive closure. These differences suggest the presence of important variations in the psychological profiles of men with higher levels of masculine ideology.

In addition, post-hoc analyses revealed that, in this sample, nine subscales of the CMNI loaded onto three factors, in a configuration that largely paralleled the correlational findings between CMNI factors, psychological mindedness, and need for closure. These three factors did not correlate significantly with each other. This suggests that there are salient clusters of characteristics related to masculine ideology and that each cluster may be delineated by common correlates of psychological functioning.

Qualitative Findings. Qualitative analysis of three cases, using data from both Phase 1 and 2, were conducted. Results from this qualitative analysis suggest that, from a theoretical standpoint, masculine ideology, and masculine identity in general, can indeed play differing roles in the economy of individual men's character structure. Qualitative analysis and findings are presented below.

Psychological Mindedness

A question of increasing interest in the literature of men's psychology is whether the reticence toward emotional expression found in men with higher levels of masculine ideology reflects a reduced capacity for emotional self-reflection, or if it simply reflects an unwillingness to communicate, or even acknowledge, an understanding of emotional states that is nevertheless intact. A number of researchers have found positive statistical associations between 'restrictive emotionality' (as measured by a subscale of O'Neill's Gender Role Conflict Scale) and

alexithymia, as well as positive associations between restrictive emotionality and depression (Shepard, 2002), impaired relational intimacy (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), anxiety (Wong, et al., 2006), difficulties with regulating anger and aggression (Cohn, et al., 2009), and insecure attachment styles (Schwartz, et al., 2004). Taken together, these findings suggest the presence of not only a difficulty in articulating emotional states, but also difficulties with consciously acknowledging, tolerating, and regulating strong, conflicted emotions.

On the other side of the debate, some investigators have suggested that the primary motivation behind men's difficulty with acknowledging affect is a desire to meet observed social norms related to masculinity, thus avoiding shame (Mahalik, 2008). In turn, helping men to understand the social contexts in which their self-perceptions have been formed is thought to be crucial to alleviating the psychological impact of restrictive emotionality (Mahalik, 1999).

This study's finding regarding psychological mindedness supports the former view—that increased investment in restricted emotional expression reflects not only a relative lack of interest in one's own psychological states and processes, but also a relative lack of insight into these phenomena. One argument against this conclusion might hinge on the self-report nature of the data used in all of the findings discussed here and elsewhere. Men may well feel that it is un-masculine to acknowledge either interest or insight into one's own psychological processes. However, it arguably would be difficult to verify whether or not this reflects actually reduced internal capacities for self-reflection, because of the potential bias of men's self-report.[11]

[11] In addition, the willingness to volunteer for a study on "men's attitudes and experiences" may distinguish men in this sample from men who would not volunteer for such a study. Thus sampling bias may likely be present as well.

In response to this argument, one might cite the literature on "reflective function"—a construct that operationalizes, with considerable precision, the quality of psychological mindedness (Fonagy & Target, 1997). This literature suggests that the ability to reflect on, and make meaning out of, one's own psychological states, as well as those of others, is a protective factor against psychopathology, and even a protective factor against the effects of ongoing experiences that are potentially traumatic (Fonagy & Target, 1997). This in turn would suggest that—even under significant societal pressure to maintain standards of masculinity—men with higher levels of psychological mindedness would be better able to mitigate the effects of such pressures, because they would be: better able to recognize the external, societal nature of the pressures that they experience in relation to gender role; more effective at distinguishing such pressures from their own private emotional needs; and more able to identify and navigate the conflicts between the two. In contrast, a lower level of psychological mindedness would lead to greater difficulty in distinguishing external pressure from internal need, thus resulting in increased psychological distress. Given the observable protective effects of an optimal level of psychological mindedness, the increased psychological distress in relation to masculine ideology that is reported in the literature suggests that some men with higher levels of masculine ideology may indeed lack the psychologically protective factor of adequate psychological mindedness. Thus the present finding regarding reduced levels of psychological mindedness, albeit self-reported, likely represents an actual deficit rather than underreporting related to a negative attitude toward emotional introspection.

This study's finding regarding psychological mindedness is particularly relevant for the clinical treatment of men with higher levels of masculine ideology. It has been suggested that

men's distress can be alleviated if clinicians clarify that such distress is caused by maladaptive acceptance of society's demands related to masculinity, and that men themselves can gain greater emotional health by choosing not to hold such beliefs so strongly. However, many authors recognize that psychological mindedness is a key factor in the success of psychotherapeutic interventions, whether the approach is psychodynamic or cognitive behavioral (Bjorgvinsson & Hart, 2006; Lewis, 2006). Thus, increasing men's psychological mindedness, which entails a longer process of therapeutic growth, would have to occur before men could, in any meaningful way, distinguish private emotional needs from societal demands—or perhaps more fundamentally, distinguish social roles from a whole psychological self. It is consequently unlikely that a purely psychoeducational approach, as advocated by some authors, would be clinically effective.

Further research is warranted in relation to psychological mindedness and masculine ideology, including the use of methods other than self-report to gather data on the quality of men's psychological functioning. In addition, psychological mindedness is arguably a developmental achievement that shapes individuals' thinking about self and other in all spheres of experience. Thus, future research should devise study designs that can tap into the developmental dimension of psychological mindedness as it exists within men with varying degrees of masculine ideology, with a focus on the relation of psychological mindedness to the formation of men's sense of gendered self. Indeed, numerous contributions in the existing literature on masculine psychology point to developmental contributions to level of masculine ideology (Blazina & Watkins, 2000), thus suggesting a close connection between the two factors.

Tolerance of Ambiguity

No prior research has been conducted on the relationship between masculine ideology and the construct of need for cognitive closure. However, a number of authors have theorized that psychological rigidity, including a rigid sense of self and other, is a core quality of traditional masculinity (Pleck, 1995; Smiler, 2004). In addition, research findings have substantiated aspects of psychological rigidity in relation to masculine ideology, in the form of preference for clear, traditional gender roles (Blazina & Watkins, 2000) and intolerance of a failure to adhere to expected gender roles (Reidy, Shirk, Sloan, & Zeichner, 2009). Both findings suggest that higher levels of masculine ideology are accompanied by a relative intolerance of flexibility—and thus of ambiguity—in gender roles. Moreover, these findings suggest that when such ambiguity does occur, it can be highly dysregulating to men with higher levels of masculine ideology (Reidy, et al., 2009).

These previous findings are supported by the present study, which detected within this sample a strong positive correlation between several domains of masculine ideology and the need for cognitive closure, thus pointing to a relative intolerance of ambiguity. This relationship was most prominently revealed by the strong positive correlation between men's desire to be perceived as unambiguously heterosexual and a general intolerance of ambiguity, manifested particularly in an increased preference for order and predictability. Moreover, factor analysis revealed that, within this sample, men with a greater need to be perceived by others as heterosexual were also more likely to prefer greater interpersonal power over women and more likely to be risk-averse—again suggesting a relationship between a rigid sense of heterosexual

masculine presentation and a high investment in avoiding ambiguity, especially in the domain of identity.

Need for cognitive closure was positively associated with masculine ideology in other domains as well. Men with higher levels of masculine ideology in areas related to status and social competition (CMNI subscales of dominance, pursuit of status, and winning) were more likely to prefer cognitive closure in the form of order and decisiveness. Also, men who tended toward emotional distancing were more likely to endorse higher levels of close-mindedness, defined as a preference to avoid having their own ideas questioned, perhaps in an effort to avoid the introduction of ambiguity and uncertainty into set ways of viewing the world. This preference for avoiding ambiguity may well be related to a desire to limit the psychological distress—including depression (Andersen and Schwartz, 1992) and anxiety (Grenier et al., 2005)—that increased ambiguity may trigger in those who are averse to it.

Yet not all significant correlations between masculine ideology and need for closure were positive. Greater willingness to engage in physical confrontation and greater attraction to risk-taking were both associated with a reduced need for closure. However, item analysis of both the Violence and Risk-Taking subscales of the CMNI is important to the interpretation of these results. The Violence subscale contains items whose wording allows for varied interpretation, from the degree of men's attraction to physical violence ("If there is going to be violence, I find a way to avoid it") to the degree to which men feel that violence can be necessary in some situations ("Sometimes violent action is necessary"). Because of the semantic range of this subscale's items, it is unclear whether this subscale measures personal attraction to physical confrontation or if it measures, at least in part, individuals' sense that violence is sometimes

justified, perhaps, for example, in a political context or for self-protection. The range of items on the Risk-Taking subscale poses a similar difficulty of interpretation. Some items focus on attraction to physical danger ("Taking dangerous risks helps me to prove myself"), while others seem to focus on generic taking of chances ("I never take chances"). Thus the semantic focus of this subscale stretches from interest in danger per se to the ability to tolerate the uncertainty that might be inherent in taking a calculated chance. Consequently, some of the items on these scales suggest impulsivity and recklessness, while others could be interpreted as addressing a willingness to engage in conflict over principles and to take measured risks. All of these characteristics could be understood as traditionally masculine. However, some of these characteristics would represent an aversion to closure that represents a kind of emotional immaturity, while others might represent a more mature ability to tolerate ambiguity and risk for the sake of a longer-term good. It therefore remains open to interpretation whether the negative correlations between scores for Violence and Risk-Taking and need for closure represent positive, more mature aspects of masculine ideology vs. its more reckless, immature aspects. Notably, however, post-hoc factor analysis suggested that, at least within this sample, an increased willingness to take risks was in fact associated with reduced concern with appearing heterosexual to others and with a reduced preference for interpersonal power over women. This "uninhibited" factor thus may potentially capture a relationship between some men's willingness to tolerate risk and uncertainty and a sense of masculine identity that is less dependent on rigidly controlling the gendered behaviors of self and other.

This finding regarding need for closure suggests that there may be important variations in the psychological correlates of masculine ideology, depending on the domain of masculinity in

question. The construct of masculine ideology itself, as operationalized by the CMNI, is understood to be multifaceted. These facets are represented by individual subscales, which, in the original validation studies, positively and significantly correlated with each other (Mahalik, 2003). These positive and significant correlations between subscales apparently support the overall unity of the construct of masculine ideology, despite its complex, multifaceted structure. However, the correlates of various subscales related to psychological functioning may differ significantly, as demonstrated by the findings of this study, regarding need for closure and psychological mindedness. One implication of differing psychological correlates across CMNI subscales is that the symptoms and deficits that are identified in the literature in relation to masculinity in general may actually be correlates of some "masculine" attributes but not others. This in turn suggests that masculine ideology, as an overarching construct, is likely too broad to use as an index of men's psychosocial functioning. Rather, it may be more fruitful to focus on individual aspects of masculine ideology, or clusters of masculine-ideology attributes, that are found to correlate with specific characteristics of psychological functioning.

Broader Domains of Masculine Ideology

The correlational findings across subscales of the CMNI in relation to psychological mindedness and need for closure suggested that CMNI subscales—and thus specific "masculine" characteristics—may tend to group together according to differing sets of psychological correlates. Indeed, post-host factor analysis revealed that such was the case. Reduced psychological mindedness was a correlate of increased aversion to emotional expression, intimacy, and interdependence—represented by the "distancing" factor that was generated. Aversion to ambiguity was associated with investment in domains related to "competition," i.e.,

social dominance, winning, and pursuit of status. A third factor, "uninhibited," captured the inverse relationship between attraction to risk and need for closure, with the added dimension that as willingness to take risks increases, the need to appear unambiguously heterosexual to others decreases, as does the need for interpersonal power over women.

The presence of these factors, at least in this sample, combined with the fact that these factors do not correlate significantly with each other, suggests that while there may be distinct "currents" of characteristics and psychological correlates within the overarching construct of masculine ideology, these currents may combine in individuals in a wide variety of ways. The three factors identified arguably reflect differing modalities in which individuals relate to self and other: through status, gender-role presentation, and emotional relatedness. One can argue that combining these factors, along with their psychological correlates, into hypothetical "profiles" of individual men could help to deepen the theoretical conceptualization of how masculinity and masculine ideology may manifest at various levels within individuals. For example, using these three factors as guidelines, one can imagine an individual man who is averse to emotional expression and intimacy, committed to status and general social dominance, and confident in his heterosexual persona in the eyes of others, and therefore less concerned with it. This individual would be limited in his psychological mindedness and invested in order and personal decisiveness, although not averse to unpredictability or challenges to his ideas. However, another man might well be capable of emotional intimacy and interdependence, uninterested in competition and status, but risk averse and self-conscious about others' perception of his specifically heterosexual status. This man may be capable of a relatively higher degree of psychological mindedness, but he may be relatively intolerant of most forms of ambiguity, and

particularly the ambiguity related to challenges to his way of seeing the world. Both men are conceivably subject to some form of masculine ideology, but its effects are manifested in very different domains of experience.

The goal of this kind of thought exercise is not to develop typologies of masculinity. Rather, the factors of masculine ideology yielded by this study—along with the variation in individual men that one can begin to conceptualize—may be used to elaborate a more complex model of masculinity, a model that accounts for the ways in which masculine identity and ideals intertwine in a nuanced relationship not only with individual character, but also with the ways in which individual attributes, including psychological capacities, can take on varied meanings, for both self and other, in relation to gender-role identity and social perceptions of masculinity. The resulting model would likely generate more refined hypotheses for further research, both quantitative and qualitative.

Profiles of Three Men—A Qualitative Data Analysis

As a first attempt to develop this kind of nuanced profile of masculinity, I selected three participants whose data I analyzed qualitatively. I incorporated into these analyses all quantitative data collected during Phase 1 of this study, as well as the projective data collected in Phase 2. Scores for psychological correlates will be discussed in relation to variables of masculine ideology, and when useful, in relation to the masculinity factors—Competition, Distancing, and Uninhibited—that have been generated by this study's factor analysis. Finally, a closer reading of projective data will allow self-report data to be contextualized within a broad snapshot of character structure, which will be articulated using psychodynamic concepts of drive, conflict and defense. For the sake of simplicity, these profiles will focus on each individual's

relationship to aggression and its derivatives only. These three participants have been chosen for qualitative analysis specifically to illustrate the differing roles that masculine ideology may serve within the economy of individual men's character structure.

Profile Format. Each profile will begin with a demographic sketch of the individual. Then, the "masculinity profile" for the individual will be described based on all scores for the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. This description will go on to include the individual's self-reported levels of psychological mindedness (measure: BIPM) and capacity to tolerate ambiguity (measure: NFCS). After the masculinity profile, each individual's self-reported "adaptive personality functioning" (measure: SIPP-SF) will be outlined across domains of self-control, identity integration, responsibility, relational functioning, and social concordance. Each individual's overall conscious self-concept will then be summarized.

Profiles will focus next on projective data from the TAT: each individual's profile for the quality of OR representations will first be summarized based on the domains of complexity of representations of people, affective tone, social causality, investment in relationships, and investment in values and moral standards—all as assessed by the Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale (SCORS) in combination with the TAT. Specific excerpts from TAT performances will then be examined and interpreted using psychodynamic concepts. Profiles will conclude with a synthesis of conscious and unconscious aspects of each individual's self-concept with a focus on the role played by masculine ideology and images of masculinity in general within the economy of each individual's character structure. (All scores that are used in these profiles can be found in Appendix B. Complete TAT data can be found in Appendix C.)

"John"—Profile 1: Low Masculine Ideology. John is a 19-year-old white male college student, heterosexual and single. He identifies as non-religious, and his household income is under 10K per year. John has the lowest total score for masculine ideology within the Phase 2 sample, as well as the lowest scores for several subscales of the CMNI.

Masculinity. Regarding aspects of competition, John feels that he has a minimal investment in winning as a value in itself, and he does not actively strive for or insist on interpersonal dominance and control. He does have some attraction to having others view him as important, although in relative terms, his interest in status is lower than the other men profiled. John also views himself as capable of various forms of emotional connectedness, with a considerable level of comfort in expressing his emotions and in engaging in interdependent relationships, in which he can ask for and receive help from others. Moreover, John sees himself as valuing emotional intimacy within his romantic relationships, and he views sex as a conduit for emotional intimacy rather than an end in itself. In terms of his gender-role presentation, John reports minimal concern with being viewed as unambiguously heterosexual by those around him; being mistaken for possibly gay is not an issue, which suggests a sense of security in the heterosexual orientation that he endorses. There are two areas, however, in which John scores high on masculine ideology. He scores highest of the three profiles on Risk-Taking, which suggests that he feels it is important to take risks in life. In addition, he scores highest among the three profiles on the importance he attaches to a commitment to his work. What is striking about John's masculinity profile is the near-consistent extremity of his scores. Most notably, John had the lowest or near-lowest possible scores for Power over Women and Heterosexual Self-

Presentation (scores of 1 and 1.1 respectively), perhaps suggesting a particular self-consciousness about the social meaning of these choices.

As predicted by this study's correlational findings, John scored high on his self-report of psychological mindedness, and highest among Phase 2 participants. Again, notably, his scores for psychological mindedness—especially for his sense of his "insight" into his own psychological states—are nearly the highest scores possible on the scale (score for "insight": 4.86 out of a possible 5). This could suggest a sense of psychological mindedness as a value that John holds, as well as a potential ability—given the likelihood that he was consciously aware of endorsing the highest possible score on several items. At a minimum, John is reporting a high level of confidence in his ability to understand his own psychological states through introspection. Regarding the need for closure, John scored lowest of all Phase 2 participants on his overall need for closure, which suggests that he sees himself as generally capable of tolerating ambiguity—indeed, this is predicted by the combination of his relatively high score for risk-taking and relatively low score for heterosexual presentation. However, in two areas, John prefers a moderate, although not high, amount of closure: he prefers some "order" and structure in his environment and daily routines, and he values "decisiveness" in his decision-making.

Adaptive Personality Functioning. This study originally posited that men with lower scores for masculine ideology would report higher levels of adaptive personality functioning in the domains of self-control, responsibility, identity integration, relational capacities, and social concordance. John's profile is consistent with this hypothesis in three of these five domains. He views himself as highly capable of tolerating and regulating his emotions and impulses. He also endorsed a high capacity to set and achieve goals in line with others' expectations, as well a high

capacity to value others, engage in interpersonal cooperation, and to withhold aggressive impulses ("I can easily accept people the way they are, even when they are different"—fully agree). In contrast, John was less secure in the integration of his identity and in his ability to see himself and his life as consistently stable, integrated, purposeful, and pleasurable ("One of my problems is that I cannot easily let myself have a good time"—partly agree; "I often feel that my life is meaningless"—partly disagree). His lowest score was for relational functioning ("It is hard for me to express affection to others"—partly agree; "it is hard for me to get attached to someone else"—partly agree).

Overall, John's conscious self-concept is that of a person who is emotionally available for interdependence and intimacy with others, less interested in competition, ambition, and status, and comfortable with both his gender-role presentation and capable of tolerating ambiguity within the context of having some order and decisiveness in his environment. Indeed taking risks—which involves a high degree of ambiguity tolerance—is a positive value for him. However, although John emphasizes his capacity for self-control, cooperation, and responsibility, he acknowledges some conflict with actually making emotional connections and with some aspects of his identity, including some difficulty with experiencing enjoyment and sustained meaning in his life.

The TAT and Quality of OR Representations. John's TAT protocol is also one of the longest of the sample, and in the performances themselves, he uses language in a way that suggests an investment in reaching for "shades of gray" in trying to articulate something psychological about the characters in the cards. Of the main female figure in Card 2, holding the books, he says:

> She knows what she has to do, but she seems like she had something … else on her mind. She has something she would rather be doing than the farm work. I think from looking at the books in her hands it looks like she is trying to build herself up in a sense in society. She doesn't want to be a farmer, so to speak.

He also combines words of strong affective experience ("overwhelmed"), but then minimizes them through qualification ("slightest bit"):

> She probably is just imagining what she's going to be doing, pondering the task. As far as she's feeling, she seems just overwhelmed by it. Just the fact she's not doing anything else, that she's standing there while everything else is happening … she seems just the slightest bit overwhelmed by it, the whole thing.

Despite the effort suggested by the amount of his verbal production, John has difficulty really pinpointing salient emotions and intentions. Indeed, there is the feeling of obsessional defense to his performance, with apparent detail and objectivity accumulating into a verbal haze that prevents him from reaching the psychological salience that he seems to be striving for. In his story for Card 2, he appears ultimately to be telling the story of an individual's ambition to break away from an old life toward something new and exciting, and yet his story never makes contact with the heat of that emotion. He gives a colorless, somewhat lifeless ending, stumbling on the most charged word, "do":

> Probably what led up to this was the event which eventually led her to make the decision to—whatever she's going to do, *do* whatever she's going to do. It doesn't look like it caused any strife, like no one seems upset by it. But who knows? It could be. And I think just, eventually she's going to be leaving and something, you know, there's going to be a change for pretty much everyone I think. That's it.

On Card 3BM, the defense is more explicit. He spots the gun and then pulls back for a moment to produce a story without the gun:

> I'm trying to see what that is. I'm not quite sure. It almost looks like a weapon, but I don't – I don't know, I can't really say. If that was a weapon, I'd say it looked like someone committed suicide. But as it is, I don't think it's a weapon. Something's happening, maybe, you know, they're not – actually let me think. (p) The person could be an alcoholic maybe.

For Card 4, John attempts to trace out the emotional logic of the scene between the man and woman, but gets into something of a muddle in his understanding of the woman's affect and intention, and how they motivate her response. The man, however, is just angry, as if it is an emotion with a single, simple layer:

> He's feeling very angry. She's just I think probably—it kind of looks like this isn't a new thing. He's not probably typically prone to anger just because of her facial expression. She looks too relaxed. I think if he was prone to rage I think she would be in a more—I think she'd ignore him a little more, ignore his behavior, yeah. So it looks like it was kind of a major thing that happened, and she's trying to convince him (whispered), and that's that.

In Card 8BM, he is able to see and name the "guns in the picture and the knives" and tells a story in which the "young boy" in the foreground has shot a man who is now "having a bullet extracted." He gives the story a fitting, morbid ending, but then again pulls back:

> As for what's going to happen, it kind of looks like this person will die but it's really—just because of the body position it doesn't look—I don't know, that's just me. Yeah, I think that's it (whispered).

On Card 13MF, John avoids stating what happened all together, but he half-acknowledges something disturbing:

> So it's kind of leading me to assume that something happened to her. But I don't know. It's hard to say. … I'd say as far as what's going to happen, it's hard for me to say, just because I don't know what happened to her or if anything happened to her. But probably say there's going to be a little bit of retribution on someone's behalf because of what's going on here. … So far as what led up to it, probably just some, you know, heat of the moment actions that led up to a result which he didn't desire.

John's overall performance might be characterized as a compromise formation between wanting to be able to articulate insight into the characters and scenes that he is narrating and an aversion to seeing clearly, and saying, what is happening, particularly when it involves disturbing morbid content—but also when it involves even a story of ambition toward separation and growth. The aversion to morbid content as well as ambition suggests the presence of conflict around aggression.

Despite the quasi-articulate feel of his verbal expression, John's performances (interpreted within the context of his scores for the quality of his object-relational representations) suggest someone who tends to lose his grasp on the nuance of people and interpersonal relationships: his descriptions sometimes capture a sense of personality and internal state, but they tend to be stereotyped at best, and often somewhat one-dimensional or nebulous at worst. Nuanced perception is likely lost in the crucible of defensive processes.

The emotional content that John attributes to his characters does contain a mixture of positive and negative elements, suggesting a development toward a certain level of integration in his representations of self and other. Yet his descriptions can vary in terms of whether either

positive or negative affect is predominant—and sometimes the positive content is unconvincing. John's sense of interpersonal relationships is restrained, and he tends to remain on the surface. At his best, John does recognize and experience bonds of friendship, caretaking and love, albeit in fairly convention terms. However, in his darker moments, he sees people as motivated by need gratification or mutual self-interest. In terms of values and moral standards, John ranges from a more child-like sense of aversion to wrongdoing for the sake of avoiding punishment, to a more mature level of personal responsibility, with a sense of guilt, respect for authority figure, and generally convention moral views. Most striking, however, is John's difficulty with making sense of social causality: he stumbles in understanding with any clarity the affect and intentions of individuals and how they motivate interactions and relationships with others, as exemplified by the slight confusions and minor incongruences in his understand of the characters in the cards. John seems to want to be psychologically minded, but often cannot quite reach it. In addition, John's difficulty with social causality occurs in Card 4, which shows a man in a state that John's sees as one of raw aggression, along with a woman whose response isn't quite coherent. One could imagine that it is the link between masculinity and aggression that John finds so difficult to think about.

Synthesis. John's performance on a projective instrument supports some of what he self-reports in the areas of identity integration and relational functioning. He has difficulty perceiving without undue conflict what he and others want and what they feel, particularly around aggression and some of its derivatives, such as ambition. This might explain in part the foggy, verbal, obsessional defense that combines detail, abstraction, and isolation of affect. Yet John's

strengths—also an obsessional characteristic— may be the more superego-driven aspects of personality functioning: emotional control, responsibility, and cooperation.

Indeed, this may be the point of intersection with masculinity: One could argue that John uses a particular, perhaps superego-driven, sense of masculinity— what one might term a "reverse masculine ideology"—as an organizing principle, albeit an intellectual one, around which he structures a sense of self. He seems nearly absolute in his sense of the equality of sexes, denial of competition, embracing of emotional intimacy, and disdain for homophobia. He believes that one should take risks and work hard. (Interestingly these are the two areas where John seems to allow himself aggression. They are arguably the least interpersonally oriented of the 11 domains of masculinity measured.) Psychological mindedness here, too, might serve as a value of reverse masculine ideology, rather than a capacity he actually experiences: one "ought" to be psychologically minded and able to think and talk with nuance about feelings and psychological states. One also "ought" to be open to risk and to ambiguity.

In considering the potential depth of John's conflicts around aggression—the healthier derivatives of which might include interpersonal assertion driven in part by his own needs and desires—one might wonder whether John's reverse masculine ideology serves both as a cover for conflict and defense (e.g., his assertion of psychological mindedness as a value conceals his actual experience of conflict-driven foggy thinking around people, affect, and desire), as well as a justification for its effects (e.g., inhibition becomes a high-minded disinterest in competition). A few effects of John's inhibition nevertheless peek out into his conscious thinking: difficulty with experiencing pleasure and establishing intimacy.

"Alex"—Profile 2: High Masculine Ideology. Alex is a 21-year-old, south Asian man, single and heterosexual. He identifies as Muslim but considers himself "not at all" religious. He reports having a graduate degree, although he was enrolled in a City College undergraduate course in psychology. His household income is between 10K and 20K. Alex had the highest total score for masculine ideology within the Phase 2 sample. Alex also had highest score for several subscales of the CMNI within the three men discussed here.

Masculinity. Alex scores high on the Competition factor: he claims a high investment in winning and status, with a strong preference for interpersonal dominance in the sense that he likes others to follow his direction. Regarding his capacity for emotional interdependence, Alex prefers to keep his emotions to himself, with an aversion to asking for help. In addition, he places an exceptionally high value on the possibility of multiple sexual partners, with the sexual act itself being relatively free of emotional ties. He thus also scores high on the Distancing factor. He has a moderately high preference for control over the women in his life, therefore likely preferring more traditional gender roles. Yet he is relatively unconcerned about appearing unambiguously heterosexual to others. Alex is moderately conservative about risk-taking in comparison to other men in the study sample. Unlike John, Alex does not give primacy to a commitment to work. He is strongly attracted to violence and confrontation, and believes it is sometimes necessary, desirable, and even exciting.

In terms of psychological mindedness, Alex's self-report score places him in the mid-range within the sample of Phase 2 men. This runs contrary to the correlational findings of this study, which would have placed him lower on the psychological mindedness spectrum. Also running contrary to prediction, Alex's self-report on the need for closure places him lowest

within the 11 men of the Phase 2 sample. These reports suggest that Alex views himself as reasonably psychologically minded and highly tolerant of ambiguity, with little need for order, predictability, and personal decisiveness, with a perhaps somewhat greater need for certitude and a preference not to have his ideas challenged. Notably, he reports a greater overall tolerance of ambiguity than John.

Adaptive Personality Functioning. Alex reports his adaptive personality functioning to be high in the areas of relational capacities and social concordance. This suggests that he feels he can engage in genuine, reciprocal relationships and can communicate personal experiences ("I have been able to form lasting friendships"—fully agree), and that he can also value the identities of others and curb aggression in the context of cooperation ("I can work with people on a joint project in spite of personal differences"—fully agree). Yet he reports struggles with self-control, and especially with identity integration and responsibility ("I often cannot help expressing my mood inappropriately"—fully agree; "when I try to understand myself, I often get more confused that I was before"—fully agree; "I have a tendency to start things and then give up on them"—fully agree; "Other people have complained about me being not fully reliable"—fully agree).

Alex's conscious self-concept appears as follows: he views himself as highly invested in what might be thought of as the "phallic" values of the masculinity: winning, violence, sexuality without emotional ties, self-reliance, and status. However, he values risk-taking and power over women only moderately, and he is actually relatively low in his investment in appearing unambiguously heterosexual others. He also views himself as moderately psychologically minded, which means he feels that he does have a reasonable amount of interest and insight into

his own psychological states and processes. In addition, one could imagine that Alex views himself as relatively "laid back," given his low sense of need for closure. He also feels that he can get along with others and that he can form meaningful relationships. At the same time, Alex's views of himself are inconsistent in some areas. For example, although he feels he is at least moderately psychologically minded, Alex's sense of identity integration is relatively vulnerable. Moreover, he seems to recognize real difficulty within himself in maintaining motivation to achieve goals and to meet the expectations of others and himself, as well as some issues with emotional regulation.

The TAT and Quality of OR Representations. Alex's TAT performances were difficult to assess because of his limited production of material, despite a written prompt to include the five elements of a TAT story, along with verbal prompts to provide detail and to include all five elements. Not surprisingly, he scored lowest of all Phase 2 participants for four of the five dimensions of the SCORS, including complexity of representations of people, social causality, investment in relationships, and investment in values and moral standards. Only on the dimension of affective tone did he score somewhat higher than he did on the other dimensions.

Broadly speaking, Alex tends to see people as simple and one-dimensional, and his views of people and relationships tend to have a more negative emotional valence, with a clear presence of hostility, disingenuousness, or lack of empathy. In addition, although Alex attributes affect and intention to others, these attributions create a barebones sense of social causality that is often unconvincing in terms of an effective understanding of human motivation. Moreover, Alex's sense of relationships appears to lack depth, and his sense of values and moral standards tends toward the avoidance of wrongdoing in order to avoid punishment. At his worse, Alex

perceives antisocial elements in others. Alex's scores on the TAT/SCORS need to be interpreted with caution because of his inhibited production during the TAT performance. Nevertheless, his performances do contain passages that very clearly suggest that his scores for the quality of his OR representations are not entirely off the mark:

> Card 3BM: So judging by the shoes this looks like a woman. She's probably depressed or pissed off or something or she made a mistake and that's what saddened her, and she's—so what else? She'll probably cry it off and then go back to her usual life. [She'll what?] She'll just cry it off … because then she made a mistake or something and that's why she's—she's actually IN that situation. And then after she gets over it, she'll just go back to a normal life.
>
> Card 4: So the girl, probably couple, or the guy—or they're married. And probably they have—they have had—they had a fight and the guy got upset. Probably maybe the girl was winning the argument and he's trying to leave and the girl is stopping [him] and trying to convince [him] to stay with her. That's all.
>
> Card 6BM: So the woman looks like—[all] … the guy's young, so probably they are mother and son. And the woman is old. So, and guy may have come after a long way to visit her and she doesn't want to really see him. And they're going over some past joys or something.
>
> Card 8BM: So the backdrop, there's a guy on who—two guys are performing an operation, yes. And there's a young kid in front probably holding a gun. That looks like a gun so he's holding a gun and protecting them. So there's an operation. Probably those two are doctors trying to heal the guy from a wound, probably a bullet wound. And it looks like they're in a war zone or something. Yeah, it looks like they're in a war zone. And the guy got shot and the two doctors back there are trying to get the bullet out of him. The young guy's guarding them.

> Card 13MF: So there's the wife—there's a wife and there's a husband. Looks like they're in their bedroom. The wife is naked and—I don't know, the guy is I think—I think the guy just killed her. Maybe the guy—that's why he's looking really tired after probably they had a fight. Probably he choked her to death. That looks like it because that's not how normally you go to sleep, all naked and arms out, like (flailed?) out. And the guy is thinking what he's going to—is about to do next, how he might get rid of the body.

In Card 3BM, Alex's response suggests a dismissive, almost derisive, attitude to the female figure, as though whatever "mistake" she has made is just something she will "cry off." He ignores the gun-like object, and thus sidesteps really engaging with the morbid, more emotionally disturbing aspect of the card. His performance on Card 4 suggests an almost caricatured sense of relations between the sexes: if the woman begins to win an argument, the man will get angry and leave, and she will try to keep him from going. Notably, the intentions and motivations that he attributes to each character stem from a stereotyped view of the sexes, rather than any elaborated sense of the internal life of unique individuals. In Card 6BM, Alex focuses on the maternal figure's disingenuousness—she doesn't really want to see the young man, and yet they are "going over some past joys or something." Thus there is an unsettling disconnect between the surface and what lies behind in other people. Card 8BM suggests the most positive emotional valence: the boy is "protecting" the doctors and the man who has been shot. Card 13MF, which pulls for morbid content with most subjects, elicits from Alex the most clearly antisocial of his responses: he tells the story of a husband who is "tired" after fighting with his wife and then choking her to death, but still needs to "get rid of the body." Affect of any kind, including remorse, or even anxiety, is absent.

Synthesis. Alex's self-report suggests that he wants to see himself as reasonably effective in his life in at least some areas: he can make friends, he isn't overly bothered by ambiguity of various sorts, and he is reasonably able to thinking about his own psychological experiences. On the other hand, he is aware, perhaps uncomfortably so, that he has real difficulty organizing himself in terms of drive and motivation, and that he does indeed have times when he has difficulty understanding himself and in restraining what he expresses to others. His TAT performances suggest that, unconsciously, Alex is haunted by a diffuse aggression and possibly envy that results in a view of people that is often cynical and dismissive, especially of human affect, and at worst he views people as self-serving and antisocial—perhaps impulses that he himself struggles with in the deeper layers of his personality, and the effects of which may subvert his efforts to organize and sustain his interests and desires in his life.

Within this context, masculine ideology may serve the purpose of allowing Alex to create an ideal, masculine self that is more organized in its agentic, phallic qualities than Alex feels himself to be on an unconscious level. Alex may well consciously value, for example, winning; attaining a status as "important" in other people's eyes; being proactive enough to have sex with many women without emotional entanglement; and being goal-directed enough to be self-reliant. Yet the analysis of his profile, conscious and unconscious, suggests that he has difficulty with the kind of sustained investment and self-regulation that would allow him to attain such goals. Thus, in short, Alex's version of masculine ideology may provide him with a self-image in which aggression is focused, agentic, and phallic—it is something that allows him to do things, to act—and this is in direct contrast to the way in which Alex implicitly experiences himself, an

experience that seems characterized by a more diffuse, self-subverting, acerbic form of aggression that tends toward cynicism and dismissal of meaning.

"Paul"—Profile 3: High Emotional Control. Paul is a 23-year-old, black man who views himself as agnostic and "not at all" religious. He has some college education, and he reports his household income as falling in the range of 20-29K. Paul is the only participant of the three profiled who acknowledges some degree of non-heterosexual attraction, albeit limited, reporting that he is "usually attracted to members of the opposite gender."

Masculinity. Within the Phase 2 sample, Paul scored high on the three subscales of masculine ideology that group together on the Distancing factor identified in the factor analysis of CMNI subscales. These scores suggest that Paul generally sees himself as avoiding emotional intimacy and interdependence of various forms. He avoids, for example, expressing his emotional states to others, as well as asking for help. He also reports placing high value on sexuality and the possibility of having multiple sexual partners without emotional intimacy. Paul scores high as well on two of the three subscales that make up the Competition factor. Paul thus acknowledges high investment in being seen as "important" and that he prefers a relatively high level of interpersonal control when interacting with others. He is less interested in winning as a value in itself, however. Paul also self-reports relative confidence in his gender-role presentation in the eyes of others, and can tolerate a level of ambiguity in the minds of others regarding his sexual orientation. He is relatively comfortable in having more equitable relationships with women. In addition, he may see taking risks as sometimes necessary, but not as a hallmark of his masculine identity.

As predicted by the correlational results of this study, Paul reports himself as having a relatively low level of psychological mindedness, with both low interest and insight into his own psychological states. Regarding the need for closure and tolerance of ambiguity, Paul places a premium on decisiveness. However, in other domains, he reports himself to be relatively comfortable with ambiguity.

Adaptive Personality Functioning. Although Paul reports high levels of masculine ideology in various domains, he also reports intermediate to high levels of adaptive personality functioning relative to the other Phase 2 participants. He thus sees himself as capable of a high degree of self-control ("I frequently say things I regret later"—fully disagree), responsibility ("Other people have complained about me being not fully reliable"—fully disagree), social concordance ("It is hard for me to respect people who have ideas that are different from mine"—fully disagree), and identity integration ("Sometimes it seems that everything within me somehow blocks my capacity to have fun"—fully disagree), along with moderately adaptive relational capacities ("I can partly demonstrate my affection for others without too much discomfort"—partly agree).

Paul's self-report profile suggests that he sees himself as experiencing a high level of restraint regarding aspects of emotional interdependence, although he does feel that he is moderately effective in forging meaningful relationships. Paul likes to be decisive in his decision making, but otherwise can tolerate ambiguity. He views himself as someone who, broadly speaking, can get along with others, with a reliable capacity for self-regulation, cooperation, and responsibility. However, he doesn't view himself as particularly psychologically minded, in that he feels he has a relatively low level of interest and insight into his own psychological processes.

Finally, he acknowledges personal investment in aspects of interpersonal relationships, social competition, and status.

The TAT and Quality of OR Representations. Compared with the other Phase 2 participants, Paul's scores for the quality of his OR representations all fall within the intermediate range. His descriptions of people capture some sense of individuals' internal states, but they have limited depth and are often stereotypical. He attributes affective content to people and relationships that can have a positive valence, but he as often attributes negative affective states to others. Regarding his understanding of social causality, Paul at his best can articulate psychological conflict as part of others' intentions. Yet at other times, he simply views behavior at face value without necessarily understanding others' motivations within any psychological depth. Paul is capable of seeing relationships as embodying conventional mutual care and concern, but these perceptions exist side-by-side with his sense that people, and especially men, use relationships in primarily need-gratifying ways. In addition, his sense of morality ranges from simple avoidance of punishment to a developmentally more advanced sense of guilt and internalized sense of right and wrong.

In Card 2, Paul recognizes something of the main character's conflicted feelings about going to school:

> Well it looks like the main character is a female who is headed off to some sort of school. She has books. And she has an expression that makes her seem like she's kind of excited about going, but she's still not too sure … In the background she has someone who looks a little older, could possibly be pregnant, maybe a mother or aunt type figure, older sister. Guy is still working on the farm as usual … They're probably a family that is struggling. And she's going to school, and maybe they're not too happy about this concept because

> they're not engaging with her in this picture. The male's back is turned to her, which is kind of important to signify that maybe he definitely doesn't agree with what's going on as far as the school is concerned. Yeah.

Especially striking is the portrayal of the "male"—both regarding the idea that men "work," with the implication that this is all they do, and also that men express themselves, and particularly their displeasure, by silence and action ("the male's back is turned to her …"). For Card 4, Paul gives perhaps his most penetrating response in that he captures the conflict of the man in the scene:

> So in the scene it looks like two lovers together. The male looks like he's ready to leave or depart. And the woman doesn't quite want him to go. I would say that they got here because that's actually his mistress. He's married and that's his mistress. And she looks like she has a seductive look and she's feeling like you know I want to keep him so I'm trying to seduce him to stay but he really wants to go because he's married, so he wants to get back to his wife. A very classic scene. He doesn't necessarily feel remorse for having a mistress, but at the same time he knows that he's doing something wrong. What's going to happen? Possibly he'll leave her and go back to the wife and reveal everything.

Paul's response to Card 4 captures the levels of moral and relational development that he himself may waiver between. The man in the scene, for example, is caught between the desire for frank need gratification ("he doesn't necessarily feel remorse for having a mistress") and a prototypically internalized sense of right and wrong ("he knows that he's doing something wrong").

What is interesting about Paul's response to Card 6BM is that he is attuned to details of both figures in a way that allows him to infer psychological states of mind. At the same time, the mental states that he does infer for both figures involve being stunned, confused, and in their

own way, isolated in their struggles to make sense of their "grief." Also notably, the "son" figure is confused, and the "mother figure" is unavailable ("somewhere completely different"):

> Looks like something unexpected happened in this scene. Looks like there's maybe a mother, grandmother, or aunt figure, an older, I mean a younger male. And they looked like they received news of maybe death or something shocking that they wouldn't expect. He's—the way he's clutching his hat makes him seem a little concerned, confused by the way his eyebrows (indiscernible) together, like he's very confused by what's going on. And she looks kind of almost distant as she's somewhere completely different as she's gazing out the window. So they definitely just received news of something bad. And as far as what's going to happen, well, I'm not too sure about what's going to happen with the situation. Hopefully everything will work itself out, but they have to both deal with the grief of whatever tragedy just happened.

In Card 7BM, when only men are included in the scene, themes of power, need gratification, and the absence of affect and ethics emerge, along with excitement as articulated by the last line—perhaps representing Paul's own attraction to this specifically "male" way of being:

> This looks like kind of a mob story. They're doing something shady. There's some dealing going on. Looks like a guy is almost sitting at something. His attention is towards whatever that is. And there's another guy who's kind of, you know, maybe whispering things to him or telling him things but trying to keep it so it's not obvious. Some type of dealings going wrong whether it be—whether it be death or drugs or whatever associated with some type of mob or Mafia type deal or organized crime. They both have very serious expressions and they both—you can tell that whatever's going on, it's very business-like. Not much emotion is being put into it. And whatever deal they're making is going to go through for sure.

Synthesis. Paul views himself as functioning relatively well across areas of personality development, in his relations with himself and with others. However, Paul's version of masculine

ideology, along with his unconscious representations of men, suggest that, from one perspective, he views men as driven by self-interest and gratification when left to their own devices (Card 7BM). And in part, Paul may feel a certain amount of excitement about the possibility of living the life of this kind of man. At the same time, he can see men—and perhaps himself—as being in constant struggle against this gratification-driven way of being, in order to do what is "right" in relation to others (i.e., women) and in relation to their own emotional commitments (Card 4). Thus for Paul, masculine ideology may represent the "lower" masculine self, a way of being that is both exciting and aversive. Nevertheless, his efforts to temper this masculine self appear to occur without much help from others—as implied by the relative psychological isolation of many of his TAT characters. Perhaps this is echoed in his high scores for emotional control. Indeed, such isolation in the struggle to reach for something higher is portrayed in Paul's story for Card 1:

> In this picture I see a boy who had just come from violin practice. There was a concert that he just couldn't quite grasp or understand, so he was really frustrated. That's why the violin is placed in front of him like that, and he has this kind of sad look. He's trying to figure out ways to possibly get over the difficulty that he was having from his lesson, but he doesn't look like he's very hopeful in doing that. He feels upset and frustrated.

Qualitative Analysis—Findings. Taken together, these brief profiles of three participants suggest that masculine ideology can play radically differing roles in the psychological makeup of individual men. Moreover, these differences in the "use" of masculine ideology are directly related to intrapsychic conflict and deficits in personality organization, some of which are developmentally appropriate, given the age of the men profiled. For John, an investment in the values of a "reverse" masculine ideology appears to help him consolidate a

sense of self that compensates for neurotic-level conflicts around even healthy derivatives of aggression. In short, John seems highly inhibited around the possibility of becoming, as it were, too phallic. Alex, on the other hand, appears to experience an underlying diffusion in his sense of self and in his ability to organize himself libidinally around desired goals and ambitions. For Alex, masculine ideology seems to serve almost as a scaffolding for an ideal self that is able to use phallic aggression in an organized, productive way, in order to realize focused desires and personal investments. Such an ideal self may also help Alex defend against more troubling experiences of primitive, diffuse aggression, the cynical expressions of which tend to break down meaning, satisfaction, and the possibility of relatedness with others, rather than to make them possible. Finally, for Paul, images of masculinity seem to represent a gratification-driven, "lower" masculine self—simultaneously exciting and forbidden—that he must resist, albeit on his own, in order to "do the right thing" in relation to others and in relation to his own emotional ties. One might argue that, for John, a "reverse" masculine ideology is aligned with the superego, whereas for Paul, masculine ideology appears aligned with the id. And in the case of Alex, masculine ideology perhaps represents an effective, phallic ego that can successfully tolerate and navigate conflicts between id and superego.

This analysis is admittedly schematic. However, it makes the point that, beyond the quantitative strength of masculine ideology in various domains, the meaning of masculinity for individual men and the role played by images of masculinity within their psychological economy can differ strikingly across men—and even between men whose "scores" for masculine ideology are comparable. Moreover, this qualitative analysis warrants further investigation in the nature of self-report data and its relation to men's self-concept, both conscious and unconscious. Judging

by these three profiles, self-report can indeed portray part of the reality of men's experiences of themselves. However, distortions in self-report clearly occur, and they are based on the unconscious functions of masculine identity that men, perhaps unknowingly, wish to preserve. Finally, although the quantitative findings of this study still stand—they cannot be undone by the analysis of three individual cases—one must view them with an added layer of skepticism, given that, for example, an individual's claim of a high level of psychological mindedness may not be all that it first appears to be.

Toward an Integrative Model

Although this study contributes to the evidence regarding differences in men's psychological functioning, further theoretical elaboration and research are needed to produce a broader systemic model of the development of masculine gender-role identity, a model that ideally would include, among other factors, the psychological environment of the family, characterological profiles of parents, attachment styles, cultural values, specific attitudes toward the gender of children being raised, and "internal" variables, such as the quality of object-relational representations, as this study attempted to measure.

Such a systemic view would synthesize the existing models that are either sketched out in the literature or implied by theoretical and research findings. One of these models—outlined by several researchers on masculine psychology—proposes that masculine ideology and its attendant psychological distress may index the developmental effects of a gender socialization process that aims specifically at making male children masculine. This socialization process would include a premature emotional isolation from the mother and anything thought to be feminine, with the effect that many male children grow up unable to access affective experiences and ways of

relating that are in fact highly adaptive and psychologically protective (Blazina & Watkins, 2000). A second possible model is that increased masculine ideology may be—along with, for example, reduced psychological mindedness and intolerance of ambiguity—one of several by-products of the general psychological environment of the family, as influenced by culture and parental history, rather than the sequela of specifically gendered childrearing practices.

A third model would posit masculine ideology as a social construct that serves various purposes related to organizing and interpreting psychological features within self and other, features that do not necessarily have their roots specifically in the gender socialization process. For example, reduced psychological mindedness and fear of emotional connection appear to be linked with each other based on the findings from the present study sample. Both attributes can be understood as developmental deficits that arise, at least in part, from the psychological environment of the family during infancy and childhood. According to the literature, these deficits can lead to anxiety, depression, and other forms of psychological distress. However, the internalization of masculine ideology may allow men to re-cast these deficits as social virtues, thereby reducing—albeit probably ineffectively—the sense that the anxiety, distress, and perhaps shame that they experience are functions of some personal vulnerability. On the contrary, these forms of distress may be interpreted, by self and others, as the necessary cost of a masculine identity that is socially valued. The "cost" of this social value is of course at the core of previous theoretical work in the psychology of masculinity (Pleck, 1983, 1995). I would argue, however, that an important nuance is added to this theory by the idea that socio-cultural ideals of masculinity—although unreachable and ultimately distress-inducing—provide not only social cachet as a secondary gain, but also internal relief, insofar as such ideals allow men to transform

experiences of psychological vulnerability (e.g., “I don’t know what others are thinking”) into “masculine” strength (e.g., “Women worry about what others think”).

Finally, some of the literature suggests that the codes of masculinity may essentially provide a “template” for regulation of behavior and affect—a model that substitutes for internal resources such as psychological mindedness and various forms of ambiguity tolerance. This fourth model is suggested by research that examines the relationship between aggression, masculinity, and an underlying fear of strong emotion (Jakupcak, et al., 2005), as well as by findings that masculine ideology correlates with a relatively greater suppression of negative affect, until that negative affect reaches a threshold beyond which higher masculine ideology predicts a relatively more aggressive reaction (Jakupcak, et al., 2003). Thus masculinity may provide a substitute system of affect regulation that is behaviorally effective at times, but limited in the degree that it allows for a flexible modulation of affect that is appropriately responsive to interpersonal context.

The complexity of conceptualizing masculinity as a construct, along with applying that construct to research, is related to the fact that all four of these models, among other possible variations, likely capture important aspects of the roles that masculinity plays within the organization of individuals’ character structure and ways of relating to self and other. Nevertheless, the value and richness of studying gender-role identity lies in the fact that masculinity, and femininity, are, on the one hand, core aspects of individual identity and self-representation that are readily identifiable on an intuitive level; yet on the other hand, forms of gender-role identity—including psychological attributes that are felt to be aspects of, for example, the specifically masculine mind—are products of a complex cycle of internalization and

externalization that potentially can be traced from the level of society, through the family structure and the minds of parents, down to the internal representations of the developing individual, and back again to the level of society. Thus the study of masculinity may lead not only to a more layered understanding of the development of gender-role identity in men and its relation to individual character, but also to a more complex conception of the cyclical relationship between the social world and the internal world of individuals.

Limitations & Further Research

A significant limitation of this study was that it obtained a sufficiently large sample only for the collection of self-report data, but not for projective data. This study was thus able to produce statistically valid results for self-report data only and is therefore subject to the same limitations of self-report measures that affect most other studies on the psychology of masculinity. Added to the limitations of sample size, this study used a sample composed almost entirely of urban college-age men. Although this sample was quite diverse in terms of ethnicity (which distinguishes it from many studies in this field), the relatively narrow age range of participants, as well as their urban milieu, may limit the generalizability of findings to men of different ages and to men who live in more sparsely populated, and thus culturally isolated, areas. Finally, this study was ultimately exploratory in nature and thus tested hypotheses that were purposefully broad in their specification. Although valuable for refining questions for further research and theory development, this approach limits the specificity of findings.

Future research should continue to focus on the psychological correlates of masculine ideology, with special attention to clusters of "masculine" attributes that are characterized by specific correlates with psychological functioning. In addition, self-report data should be

supplemented with other means of data collection, e.g., projective data or experimental paradigms—not only to correct for the potential distortions in self-report that are a function of the constructs under investigation, but also to investigate whether the discrepancy between self-report and non-self-report is itself a correlate of masculine ideology. The difference between what men will say about their experiences and the unconscious nature of those experiences is likely to be a fruitful area of inquiry, given that the construct of masculine ideology operates on multiple levels, including both conscious and unconscious representations of self and other. Finally, all quantitative measures, including those used in this study, can usefully be supplemented by qualitative data. Such data will help to clarify the nature of the constructs that are supposedly measured, as well as yield insight regarding how individuals interpret their own experiences of masculinity.

APPENDIX A:

Demographics Data for Phase 2 Sample (N = 11)

Demographics: Phase 2 Sample (N = 11) vs. Total Study (Phase 1) Sample (N = 87)

Age (Years)

	Range	Mean	Median	SD
Phase 2 Sample (N = 11)	18–36	21.45	19.00	5.203
Total Study Sample (N = 87)	18–42	20.44	19.00	3.854

Race

	% Phase 2 (N = 11)	vs.	% Total Sample (N = 87)
Asian	18.2		42.5
Black/African American	36.4		12.6
Hispanic/Latino	9.1		20.7
White/Caucasian	27.3		16.2
Pacific Islander	0.0		1.1
Other	9.1		6.9
Total	100		100

Education

	% Phase 2 (N = 11)	vs.	% Total Sample (N = 87)
Some high school	0.0		2.3
High school diploma	54.5		50.6
Some college	36.4		39.1
2-yr college degree	0.0		4.6
4-yr college degree	0.0		2.3
Grad. school degree	9.1		1.1
Total	100		100

Income ($)

	% Phase 2 (N = 11)	vs.	% Total Sample (N = 87)
Under 10K	36.4		12.6
10–19.999K	27.3		23.0
20–29.999K	9.1		14.9
30–39.999K	9.1		11.5
40–49.999K	9.1		11.5
50–74.999K	9.1		17.2
75–99.999K	0.0		3.4
100–150K	0.0		2.3
Over 150K	0.0		3.4
Total	100		100

Religiosity

	% Phase 2 (N = 11)	vs.	% Total Sample (N = 87)
Not at all	54.5		32.2
A little bit	9.1		19.5
Somewhat	18.2		25.3
Quite a bit	18.2		17.2
Very	0.0		5.7
Total	100		100

Note: Statistical comparisons (chi-square tests) on demographic variables across the two samples are not reported because of statistical instability due to the low sample size in Phase 2 (N =11).

APPENDIX B:

Three Qualitative Profiles—Individuals Scores for All Measures

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory—CMNI scale range: 1–4

ID	CMNI–TOT	CMNI–WIN	CMNI–EC	CMNI–RT	CMNI–VIOL	CMNI–POW
"John"	2.02	1.90	1.91	3.60	2.38	1.00
"Alex"	2.71	2.90	2.82	2.30	3.25	2.00
"Paul"	2.51	2.30	3.27	2.60	1.38	1.56
M(SD)–N=87	2.37 (.21)	2.51 (.51)	2.40 (.44)	2.49(.39)	2.35 (.52)	2.01 (.49)

CMNI subscales—TOT: total; WIN: winning; EC: emotional control; RT: risk taking; VIOL: violence; POW: power over women

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory—CMNI (continued) scale range: 1–4

ID	CMNI–DOM	CMNI–PLA	CMNI–SREL	CMNI–WRK	CMNI–HET	CMNI–STA
"John"	2.25	1.42	1.83	2.63	1.10	2.83
"Alex"	3.00	3.67	2.83	2.00	1.80	3.50
"Paul"	3.50	3.50	3.00	2.13	1.50	3.50
M(SD)–N=87	2.55 (.41)	2.05 (.61)	2.11 (.52)	2.21 (.40)	2.71 (.68)	2.87 (.48)

CMNI subscales—DOM: dominance; PLA: playboy; SREL: self-reliance; WRK: primacy of work; HET: heterosexual self-presentation; STA: pursuit of status

Balanced Inventory of Psychological Mindedness—BIPM scale range: 1–5

ID	BIPM–TOT	BIPM–INT	BIPM–INS
"John"	4.64	4.43	4.86
"Alex"	3.64	3.43	3.86
"Paul"	2.50	2.00	3.00
M(SD)–N=87	3.57 (.54)	3.26 (.61)	3.88 (.78)

BIPM subscales—TOT: total; INT: interest; INS: insight

Need for Closure Scale—NFCS scale range: 1–6

ID	NFC-TOT	NFC-ORD	NFC-PRE	NFC-DEC	NFC-AMB	NFC-CLO
"John"	3.36	4.00	2.88	4.14	3.78	1.88
"Alex"	3.14	3.00	2.63	2.57	4.11	3.25
"Paul"	3.74	4.20	3.00	5.57	4.00	2.00
M(SD)–N=87	3.92 (.45)	4.34 (.79)	4.01 (.80)	3.68 (.87)	4.40 (.58)	2.97 (.68)

NFCS subscales—TOT: total; ORD: order; PRE: predictability; DEC: decisiveness; AMB: ambiguity; CLO: close-mindedness

Severity Indices of Personality Problems, Short Form—SIPP-SF total score range: 12–48

ID	SIPP-SC	SIPP-II	SIPP-SCON	SIPP-RES	SIPP-REL
"John"	46	39	44	40	31
"Alex"	33	30	43	19	38
"Paul"	45	46	43	46	35
Sample Range N=11	22–46	24–47	28–44	19–46	16–45

SIPP-SF domains—SC: self-control; II: identity integration; SCON: social concordance; RES: responsibility; REL: relational functioning

Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale—SCORS with TAT scale range: 1–7

ID	SCORS-COMP	SCORS-AT	SCORS-SC	SCORS-REL	SCORS-VMS
"John"	3.00 (range: 2-4)	3.63 (range: 2-5)	2.56 (range: 2.5-3)	3.13 (range: 2-5)	3.75 (range: 3-5)
"Alex"	2.38 (range: 2-3)	3.63 (range: 2-5)	2.50 (range: 2.5-2.5)	2.75 (range: 1-5)	3.38 (range: 1-4)
"Paul"	3.00 (range: 2-4)	3.63 (range: 2-5)	3.63 (range: 2.5-7)	3.38 (range: 2-5)	3.75 (range: 2-5)
Range for Ind. Means, N=11	2.38–5.00	3.63–4.88	2.50–5.94	2.75–4.50	3.38–4.38

SCORS subscales: COMP: complexity of representations of people; AT: affect tone: SC: social causality; REL: investment in relationships; VMS: investment in moral values and standards

APPENDIX C:

Three Qualitative Profiles—Complete TAT Data

“John”

CARD 1

You can almost -- it looks -- obviously it seems like he's just -- this is his first time he's come, encountered, with it. He's just received the violin probably for like a present. Maybe a birthday present or something like that. But I think he looks frustrated with it, like he's been trying to play it for a bit, because I've played violins before. I know it can be pretty frustrating. So he looks like he’s having a little bit of trouble with it, kind of wondering what he's going to do with it.

As far as leading up to it, I imagine he's just been practicing for quite a while. It's kind of beginning to irritate him a bit. He's going to try and figure out how to play it in a way. I don't think he has a tutor yet, so it seems like he's going to eventually figure out the hand positions and all that.

Right now, I said before, he's thinking about what he has to do in order to eventually overcome this little obstacle and -- but right now he's feeling frustrated by it. He's not really sure what to do.

CARD 2

Right now it looks like it's the middle of the day. It's farming. Probably, obviously it looks kind of antique, maybe a couple hundred years ago I'd probably say. But there's -- at least the guy is farming right now. The other two, it's kind of -- they seem a little like they were just in the scene right now, at least her. She doesn't seem to have much to do with the scene. She seems to be -- she's a little introspective I'd say. It's like she doesn't -- she knows what she has to do, but she seems like she has something. There's something else on her mind. She has something she

“John”

would rather be doing then the farm work. I think from looking at the books in her hands it looks like she is trying to build herself up in a sense in society. She doesn't want to be a farmer, so to speak. And so it looks like she has some kind of land. I don't know if it's maybe looking, seeing if it's like maybe in the Midwest or whatever. Maybe she could be doing some kind of missionary work or something I'd say, and thinking about what she's preparing to do; preparing to leave.

As far as just what she's thinking, she just – she’s probably just imagining what she's going to be doing, pondering the task. As far as she's feeling, she seems just overwhelmed by it. Just the fact she's not doing anything else, that she's standing there while everything else is happening seems, that she seems just the slightest bit overwhelmed by it, the whole thing.

Probably what led up to this was the events which eventually led her to make the decision to whatever she's going to do, do whatever she's going to do. It doesn't look like it caused any strife, like no one seems upset about it. But who knows? It could be. And I think just eventually she's going to be leaving and something, you know, there's going to be a change for pretty much everyone I think. That's it.

CARD 3BM

I'm trying to see what that is. I'm not quite sure. It almost looks like a weapon, but I don't -- I don't know, I can't really say. If that was a weapon, I'd say it looked like someone committed suicide. But as it is, I don't think it's a weapon. So the person is either in distress or they're sort of out of their mind. Something's happened, maybe, you know, they're not -- actually let me think.

“John”

The person could be an alcoholic maybe. And, you know, that kind of could be it. Just the fact that he or she is in this awkward position probably seems like there's been a night of heavy drinking and come home and just kind of slumped over what looks like a couch. I think the person's sleeping right now, just cause I can't imagine anyone being sort of crying or whatever in that kind of position. I don't know. Maybe that's just me.

What's going to happen is probably the same thing as tonight. If this person's an alcoholic, it's going to be -- it's going to happen many times. It's not going to be a single event. As far as what they're thinking, I'd say they're asleep. But whatever is causing it is obviously creating some strife for the person. They're not happy with themselves. They're life is incomplete somehow. And that's kind of it.

CARD 4

At first glance it kind of seems like the guy is very angry at something and, in a kind of sort of typical movie scene, the woman is kind of holding him back, trying to convince him otherwise of whatever he's planning on doing. What's going to happen is it looks like he's really determined. He doesn't look like he has any intention -- if he was going to stop he probably would be looking at her, not away like this. So I'm imagining he's going to try and do whatever he feels is -- whatever his anger is, you know, convincing him is right. I think he's thinking about what he's going to do. He's feeling very angry.

She's just I think probably -- it kind of looks like this isn't a new thing. He's not probably typically prone to anger just because of her facial expression. She looks too relaxed. I think if he was prone to rage I think she would be in a more -- I think she'd ignore him a little more, ignore his

"John"

behavior, yeah. So it looks like it was kind of a major thing that happened, and she's trying to convince him (whispers words), and that's that.

CARD 6BM

Lots of disappointment here but a little bit of shock. A lot of disappointment on his part. Disappointment but mostly shock on her part. She doesn't know how to cope with something that's happened. Looking at his -- the way he's dressed he obviously seems to be at least middle to high class in some way. Perhaps he is a businessman or some sort of, I didn't know. But yeah, he's obviously done something that -- and told his mother, I suppose, what happened and neither of them are in a particularly good mood about it right now. Yeah, I would say it looks like someone has died, but I don't know. Just from his look it looks more like disappointment then sadness to me.

What's going to happen? It's hard to say just because I have no idea where they've come from. If I were to build something up I'd say there's been some kind of failure in his life and eventually he's going to leave, return to his home, whatever. And it's going to take a little bit of time for it to kind of pass over. There's going to be a cloud over their, you know, family relationship or whatever. I think he's just thinking about what's happened and she's obviously very much deep in thought about what happened. And I think disappointment and such has kind of set in.

CARD 7BM

At first it kind of looked like, my first thought was it was two politicians, and one is kind of leaning over to say something to another during a meeting, but I don't know. It's -- this card -- this one almost seems like another scene from the same setting of the last card, but with a different older man. Yeah, because this seems to be afterwards almost that something difficult to deal with

“John”

has happened and he's still a bit disoriented by it, not quite sure how to progress from that point.

This person though seems to have a completely different mindset. He doesn't look disappointed. He looks very, just relaxed about whatever's happened and it almost seems like he's trying to console this guy in some ways. I think, like I said, I think he's feeling very disappointed, very burdened. I think that he's feeling just very calm about the whole situation. I think whatever led up to it obviously caused some kind of strife. But as far as what's going to happen, this is a little more clear because you can see what he’s attempting to do and I don't think this guy’s going to remain burdened forever with someone else supporting him. And yeah, I think that's pretty much it.

CARD 8BM

This one really seems like -- as far as this -- seeing as the gun’s in the picture and the knives, it looks like their trying to extract a bullet from this person. I'd probably say, seeing as the gun is kind of more in focus with the young boy I suppose, I would guess that he shot this person. Seeing as they're using a knife and it's kind of in an old time setting, I'd say it could be a war setting that this person is or was a soldier of some sort and he shot an enemy of his which led up to him being in the hospital, having a bullet extracted, and him kind of defiantly just not caring about what he's done quite as much. Not feeling remorse, you know, in the typical sense. Yeah, he's obviously in pain, but, yeah, I think that's what he's feeling.

As for what's going to happen, it kind of looks like this person will die but it's really -- just because of the body position it doesn't look -- I don't know, that's just me. Yeah, I think that's (whispers).

“John”

CARD 13MF

I would say it's kind of like a morning after some kind of romance. But it doesn't -- I don't know, there seems to be something not right about it because, just because of where he's standing and the fact that he's totally clothed doesn't seem quite right. He seems a little burdened. I want to say something happened to her, but it's doubtful. I would say this was sort of an affair because I don't think he would be in this position standing there. So that's kind of leading me to assume something happened to her. But I don't know. It's hard to say. He seems somewhat disappointed with what's happened, with whatever happened during the night. But at the same time it's just his position. I don't know.

I'd say as far as what's going to happen, it's hard for me to say just because I don't know what happened to her or if anything has happened to her. But I’d probably say there's going to be a little bit of retribution on someone's behalf because of what's going on here. I'd say as far as what he's thinking, he seems just a bit -- he seems quite in distress because of whatever's happened.

So as far as what led up to it, probably just some, you know, heat of the moment actions that led up to a result which he didn't desire.

“Alex”

CARD 1

Let's let -- the boy is observing something. Can't really make out what he's observing. Looks like (indiscernible), maybe he found it somewhere and then he's thinking what to do with it. No, no, that's a violin. So he's thinking whether he should play it or not right now and maybe eventually he'll decide to play it after a while. What else? That's it.

CARD 2

So it looks like a farm, three people in there. Looks like a husband, a wife, and their daughter. The daughter has two books in her hands so he's probably going to school or something. And the husband is working the farm. And the woman is right beside her, probably contemplating on something. That's all. [Interviewer prompts regarding “giving detail” to make a “good story.”]

CARD 3

So judging by the shoes this looks like a woman. She's probably depressed or pissed off or something or she made a mistake and that's what saddened her, and she's -- so what else? She'll probably cry it off and then go back to her usual life. [She'll what?] She'll just cry it off. [Cry it off?] Yeah. Because then she made a mistake or something and that's why she's -- she's actually in that situation. And then after she gets over it, she'll just go back to a normal life.

CARD 4

So the girl, probably a couple, or the guy -- or they're married. And probably they have -- they have had -- they had a fight and the guy got upset. Probably maybe the girl was winning the argument and he’s trying to leave and the girl is stopping him and trying to convince him to stay with her. That's all.

“Alex”

CARD 6BM

So the woman looks like -- all (phonetic), the guys young, so probably they are mother and son. And the woman is old. So, and guy may have come after a long way to visit her and she doesn't want to really see him. And they're going over some past joys or something.

CARD 7BM

So an older guy and a younger guy. And the older guy is looking at the younger guy and the younger guy looks angry about something. Probably they're at a court, at a hearing or something, and the guy is not liking what the other guy is telling about him. And the older guy looks like he's his lawyer.

CARD 8BM

So the backdrop, there's a guy on who -- two guys are performing an operation, yes. And there's a young kid in front probably holding a gun. That looks like a gun so he's holding a gun and protecting them. So there's an operation. Probably those two are doctors trying to heal the guy from a wound, probably a bullet wound. And it looks like they're in a war zone or something. Yeah, it looks like they're in a war zone. And the guy got shot and the two doctors back there are trying to get the bullet out of him. The young guy's guarding them.

CARD 13MF

So there's the wife -- there's a wife and there's a husband. Looks like they're in their bedroom. The wife is naked and -- I don't know, the guy is I think -- I think the guy just killed her. Maybe the guy -- that's why he's looking really tired after probably they had a fight. Probably he choked her to death. That looks like it because that's not how normally you go to

“Alex”

sleep, all naked and arms out, like (flailed?) out. And the guy is thinking what he's going to -- is about to do next, how he might get rid of the body.

“Paul”

CARD 1

In this picture I see a boy who had just come from violin practice. There was a concert that he just couldn't quite grasp or understand, so he was really frustrated. That's why the violin is placed in front of him like that, and he has this kind of sad look. He's trying to figure out ways to possibly get over the difficulty that he was having from his lesson, but he doesn't look like he's very hopeful in doing that. He feels upset and frustrated. Okay.

CARD 2

Well it looks like the main character is a female who is headed off to some sort of school. She has books. And she has an expression that makes her seem like she's kind of excited about going, but she's still not too sure. In the background she has someone who looks a little older, could possibly be pregnant, maybe a mother or aunt type figure, older sister. Guy is still working on the farm as usual. Not much (indiscernible) this one. They're probably a family that is struggling. And she's going to school, and maybe they're not too happy about this concept because they're not engaging with her in this picture. The male's back is turned to her, which is kind of important to signify that maybe he definitely doesn't agree with what's going on as far as the school is concerned. Yeah.

CARD 3BM

Put a modern spin on this. She just had a really, really fun night, but she definitely regretting the effects partying, maybe, drugs, alcohol, (indiscernible)-sane. Looks very tired, kind of just hung over and over it. She's regretting it now, but she was having fun probably about 20 minutes ago. She was having a great time about 20 minutes ago and it kind of all stopped. Not sure

“Paul”

what that is in the corner, but that's what it looks like. [What's going to happen?] She'll get better and she'll recover and she'll do it again next weekend. [What's she thinking or feeling now?] Well right now she's regretting that extra drink that she had that she shouldn't of had or that -- or just probably (indiscernible) in general because she didn't expect to feel this way. Kind of that feeling that people go through once they've had too much as far as partying is concerned. Yeah, gonna go with that.

CARD 4

So in the scene it looks like two lovers together. The male looks like he's ready to leave or depart. And the woman doesn't quite want him to go. I would say that they got here because that's actually his mistress. He's married and that's his mistress. And she looks like she has a seductive look and she's feeling like you know I want to keep him so I'm trying to seduce him to stay but he really wants to go because he's married, so he wants to get back to his wife. A very classic scene. He doesn't necessarily feel remorse for having a mistress, but at the same time he knows that he's doing something wrong. What's going to happen? Possibly he'll leave her and go back to the wife and reveal everything.

CARD 6BM

Looks like something unexpected happened in this scene. Looks like there's maybe a mother, grandmother, or aunt figure, an older, I mean a younger male. And they looked like they received news of maybe death or something shocking that they wouldn't expect. He's -- the way he's clutching his hat makes him seem a little concerned, confused by the way his eyebrows (indiscernible) together, like he's very confused by what's going on. And she looks kind of almost

“Paul”

distant as she's somewhere completely different as she's gazing out the window. So they definitely just received news of something bad. And as far as what's going to happen, well, I'm not too sure about what's going to happen with the situation. Hopefully everything will work itself out, but they have to both deal with the grief of whatever tragedy just happened.

CARD 7BM

This looks like kind of a mob story. They're doing something shady. There's some dealing going on. Looks like a guy is almost sitting at something. His attention is towards whatever that is. And there's another guy who's kind of, you know, maybe whispering things to him or telling him things but trying to keep it so it's not obvious. Some type of dealings going wrong whether it be -- whether it be death or drugs or whatever associated with some type of mob or Mafia type deal or organized crime. They both have very serious expressions and they both -- you can tell that whatever's going on, it's very business-like. Not much emotion is being put into it. And whatever deal they're making is going to go through for sure.

CARD 8BM

Well, here in the background it looks like some kind of I'd say emergency medical procedure going on where there is a male who seems to be operating as, you know, the person who knows what they're doing as far as they have a scalpel in their hand and they are cutting woman (phonetic) open. And then there's a guy, not sure if this is emergency. And there's a guy supervising in the background, maybe helping out in the situation, kind of a heroic feeling because of the person in the foreground. Can't quite tell if it's a male or female. Could be a female who takes on a male -- a man gender, expression. But definitely a sense of heroism in this because it

“Paul”

doesn't look like anything malicious is going on. And whoever the doctor is in the foreground or whoever is holding the scalpel definitely saved the day. Both the person who has got to be tense and definitely concerned because, you know, this looks like something that was brought upon him, wasn't something that he had planned. The person with that can't really read much of an expression or any type of feeling from the way it's drawn. And the person in the foreground seems kind of aloof. Definitely not aware of whatever's going on behind them, but in the background, but, stern and very serious. But the eyes look a little worried.

CARD 13MF

So in this picture I see a guy who's possibly come into a room after maybe getting dressed this morning, maybe for work, because everything is on and suited. And he's noticed that his wife or his lover, girlfriend, is no longer alive, because of the way her arms are strewn over the bed. He seems kind of confused, upset, but with possible maybe guilt for whatever reason. And what's -- as far as what could possibly happen next is that then he'll call authorities, but he'll be very nervous about doing it, because he'll definitely be questioned, and he doesn't seem like he is completely innocent in whatever happened. [And thinking and feeling?] He has very frantic thinking, kind of exciting, not sure what's going to happen next and it kind of scares him, so he kind of has a sense of fear.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, S. J., Clemence, A. J., Weatherill, R., & Hilsenroth, M. J. (1999). Use of TAT in the assessment of DSM-IV cluster B personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 73*, 422-448.

Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 427-449.

Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D., & Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale—I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 38*, 33-40.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Hill, J., Raste, Y., & Plumb, I. (2001). The "Reading the Mind in the Eyes" Test revised version: a study with normal adults, and adults with Asperger syndrome or high-functioning autism. *Journal Of Child Psychology And Psychiatry, And Allied Disciplines, 42*(2), 241-251.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 61*, 226-244.

Beitel, M., Ferrer, E., & Cecero, J. J. (2005). Psychological Mindedness and Awareness of Self and Others. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*(6), 739-750.

Bellak, L. (1999). My perceptions of the Thematic Apperception Test in psychodiagnosis and psychotherapy. In L. Geiser & M. I. Stein (Eds.), *Evocative Images: The Thematic*

Apperception Test and the Art of Projection. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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

Bem, S. L. (1979). Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 37*, 1047-1054.

Berger, J. M., Levant, R., McMillan, K. K., Kelleher, W., & Sellers, A. (2005). Impact of gender role conflict, traditional masculinity ideology, alexithymia, and age on men's attitudes toward psychological help seeking. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 6*(1), 73-78.

Bjorgvinsson, T., & Hart, J. (2006). Cognitive behavioral therapy promotes mentalizing. In J. G. Allen & P. Fonagy (Eds.), *Handbook of mentalization-based treatment* (pp. 157-170). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Blais, M. A., Hilsenroth, M. J., Fowler, J. C., & Conby, C. A. (1999). A Rorschach exploration of the DSM-IV borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 55*, 563-572.

Blatt, S. J., Brenneis, C. B., Schimek, J. G., & Glick, M. (1976). Normal development and psychopathological impairment of the concept of the object on the Rorschach. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 85*, 364-373.

Blatt, S. J., Tuber, S. B., & Auerbach, J. S. (1990). Representation of interpersonal interactions on the Rorschach and level of psychopathology. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54*, 711-728.

Blazina, C. (2001a). Analytic psychology and gender role conflict: The development of the fragile masculine self. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 38*(1), 50-59.

Blazina, C. (2001b). Gender-role-conflicted men's poor parental attachment and separation/individuation difficulties: Knights without armor in a savage land. *Journal of Men's Studies, 9*(2), 257-265.

Blazina, C. (2001c). Part objects, fantasies, and intrapsychic boundaries: An object relations perspective on male difficulties with intimacy. *Journal of Men's Studies, 10*(1), 89-98.

Blazina, C., Eddins, R., Burridge, A., & Settle, A. G. (2007). The relationship between masculine ideology, loneliness, and separation-individuation difficulties. *Journal of Men's Studies, 15*(1), 101-109.

Blazina, C., Settle, A. G., & Eddins, R. (2008). Gender role conflict and separation-individuation difficulties: Their impact on college men's loneliness. *Journal of Men's Studies, 16*(1), 69-81.

Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes towards help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(4), 461-465.

Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. (2000). Separation/individuation, parental attachment, and male gender role conflict: Attitudes toward the feminine and the fragile masculine self. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1*(2), 126-132.

Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our cultures blueprint for manhood and what it's done for us lately. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes toward masculinity. *Psychological Documents, 14*, 6-7.

Burn, S. M., & Ward, A. Z. (2005). Men's Conformity to Traditional Masculinity and Relationship Satisfaction. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*(4), 254-263.

Buss, A. H., & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 21*, 343-349.

Calabrese, M. L., Farber, B. A., & Westen, D. (2005). The relationship of adult attachment constructs to object relational patterns of representing self and others. *Journal of the american Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry, 33*(3), 513-530.

Child, D. (1976). *The Essentials of Factor Analysis*: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Christenson, R. M., & Wilson, W. P. (1985). Assessing pathology in the separation-individuation process by an inventory: A preliminary report. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 173*, 561-565.

Cogan, R., & Porcerelli, J. H. (1996). Object relations in abusive partner relationships: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*, 106-115.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohn, A. M., Jakupcak, M., Seibert, L. A., & Hildebrandt, T. B. (2010). The role of emotion dysregulation in the association between men's restrictive emotionality and use of physical aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*(1), 53-64.

Cohn, A. M., Seibert, L. A., & Zeichner, A. (2009). The role of restrictive emotionality, trait anger, and masculinity threat in men's perpetration of physical aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*(3), 218-224.

Cohn, A. M., & Zeichner, A. (2006). Effects of masculine identity and gender role stress on aggression in men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*(4), 179-190.

Cohn, A. M., Zeichner, A., & Seibert, L. A. (2008). Labile affect as a risk factor for aggressive behavior in men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 9*(1), 29-39.

Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity–femininity: An exception to the famous dictum. *Psychological Bulletin, 80*, 389-407.

Conte, H. R., Ratto, R., & Karasu, T. B. (1996). The Psychological Mindedness Scale: Factor structure and relationship to outcome of psychotherapy. *Journal of Psychotherapy Research and Practice, 5*, 250-259.

DeFranc, W., & Mahalik, J. R. (2002). Masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to parental attachment and separation. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3*(1), 51-60.

Diamond, D., Kaslow, N., Coonerty, S., & Blatt, S. J. (1990). Changes in separation-individuation and intersubjectivity in long-term treatment. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 7*(3), 363-397.

Diamond, M. J. (2006). Masculinity unraveled: The roots of male gender identity and the shifting of male ego ideals throughout life. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 54*(4), 1099-1129.

Downs, A. C., & Engleson, S. A. (1982). The Attitudes toward Men Scale: An analysis of the role and status of men and masculinity. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 12*, 45.

Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification, 11*(2), 123-136.

Farris, M. A. (1988). Differential diagnosis of borderline nad narcissistic personality disorders. In H. D. Lerner & P. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Primitive Mental States and the Rorschach*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1997). Men and psychotherapy: An investigation of alexithymia, intimacy, and masculine gender roles. *Psychotherapy, 34*(2), 160-170.

Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1998). Perceptions of parent-child relationships and masculine role conflicts of college men. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 45*(3), 346-352.

Fonagy, P., & Target, M. (1997). Attachment and reflective function: Their role in self-organization. *Development and Psychopathology, 9*, 679-700.

Fragoso, J. M., & Kashubeck, S. (2000). Machismo, gender role conflict, and mental health in Mexican American men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1*(2), 87-97.

Franchina, J. J., Eisler, R. M., & Moore, T. M. (2001). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of masculine gender relevance of dating situations and female threat on

men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 2*(1), 34-41.

Good, G. E., Heppner, P., DeBord, K. A., & Fischer, A. R. (2004). Understanding men's psychological distress: Contributions of problem-solving appraisal and masculine role conflict. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 5*(2), 168-177.

Good, G. E., & Mintz, L. B. (1990). Gender Role Conflict and Depression in College Men: Evidence for Compounded Risk. *Journal of Counseling and Development : JCD, 69*(1), 17.

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 & Development, 75*(1), 44-49.

Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 26*, 41-54.

Greenberg, J. R., & Mitchell, S. A. (1983). *Object relations theory in psychoanalytic theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hartman, A. A. (1970). A basic TAT set. *Journal of Projective Techniques, 34*, 391-396.

Hayes, J. A., & Mahalik, J. R. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological distress in male counseling center clients. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*(2), 116-125.

Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem solving inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29*, 66-75.

Hibbard, S., & Porcerelli, J. H. (1995). Further validation for the Cramer Defense Mechanism Manual. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 70*, 460-483.

Hoffman, J. A. (1984). Psychological separation of late adolescents from their parents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*(2), 170-178.

Huprich, S. K., & Greenberg, R. P. (2003). Advances in the assessment of object relations in the 1990s. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*, 665-698.

Irvin, F., & Vander Woude, K. V. (1971). Empirical support for a basic TAT set. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 27*, 514-516.

Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3*(2), 97-106.

Jakupcak, M., Osborne, T. L., Michael, S., McFall, M., & Cook, J. W. (2006). Implications of masculine gender role stress in male veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*(4), 203-211.

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*(3/4), 111-120.

Jakupcak, M., Tull, M. T., & Roemer, L. (2005). Masculinity, Shame, and Fear of Emotions as Predictors of Men's Expressions of Anger and Hostility. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*(4), 275-284.

Kaslow, N., Reviere, S. L., Chance, S. E., Rogers, J. H., Hatcher, C. A., Wasserman, F., et al. (1997). An empirical study of the psychodynamics of suicide. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 46*, 777-796.

Keiser, R. E., & Prather, E. N. (1990). What is the TAT? A review of ten years of research. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 55*(3/4), 800-803.

Kenny, M. E., & Donaldson, G. A. (1987). The extent and function of parental attachment among first-year college students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 17-29.

Kernberg, O. F. (1975). *Borderline Conditions and Pathological Narcissism*. New York: Aronson.

Krohn, A., & Mayman, M. (1974). Object representations in dreams and projective tests. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 38*, 445-466.

Larsen, R. J. (1984). Theory and measurement of affect intensity as an individual difference characteristic. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 45*(07B).

Lerner, H. D., & St. Peter, S. (1985). Patterns of object relations in neurotic, borderline, and schizophrenic patients. *Psychiatry, 47*, 77-92.

Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., Williams, C. M., & Hasan, N. T. (2009). Gender differences in alexithymia. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*(3), 190-203.

Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L., Celentano, E., Cozza, T., Hill, S., & MacEachern, M. (1992). The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 325-337.

Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Majors, R. G., Rossello, J. M., Rowan, G. T., Sellers, A., et al. (2003). A multicultural investigation of masculinity ideology and alexithymia. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*(2), 91-99.

Lewis, L. (2006). Enhancing mentalizing capacity through dialectical behavior therapy skills training and positive psychology. In J. G. Allen & P. Fonagy (Eds.), *Handbook of mentalization-based treatment* (pp. 171-182). Chichester, Englang: Wiley.

Liu, W. M., & Iwamoto, D. K. (2007). Conformity to masculine norms, Asian values, coping strategies, peer group influences and substance use among Asian American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 8*(1), 25-39.

Liu, W. M., Rochlen, A., & Mohr, J. J. (2005). Real and ideal gender-role conflict: Exploring psychological distress among men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 6*(2), 137-148.

Mahalik, J. R. (1999). Interpersonal psychotherapy with men who experience gender role conflict. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 30*(1), 5-13.

Mahalik, J. R. (2008). A biopsychosocial perspective on men's depression. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 15*(3), 174-177.

Mahalik, J. R., Aldarondo, E., Gilbert-Gokhale, S., & Shore, E. (2005). The role of insecure attachment and gender role stress in predicting controlling behaviors in men who batter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(5), 617-631.

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*(3), 247-255.

Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Harry, T., Cournoyer, R. J., & Lloyd, 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*(1/2), 1-14.

Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., et al. (2003a). Development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*(1), 3-25.

Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., et al. (2003b). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4*(1), 3-25.

Mahler, M. S., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant*. New York: Basic Books.

Marziali, E., & Oleniuk, J. (1990). Oject representations in descriptions of significant others: A methodological study. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54*, 105-115.

Moore, T. M., Stuart, G. L., McNulty, J. K., Cordova, J. V., Temple, J. R., & Addis, M. E. (2008). Domains of masculine gender role stress and intimate partner violence in a clinical sample of violent men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 9*(2), 82-89.

Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality 53*, 196-223.

Murray, H. A. (1943). *Thematic Apperception Test Manual*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nigg, J. T., Silk, K., Westen, D., Lohr, N., Gold, L. J., Ogata, S., et al. (1991). Object representations in the early memories of sexually abused borderline patients. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 148*, 864-869.

Nyklicek, I., & Denollet, J. (2009). Development and Evaluation of the Balanced Index of Psychological Mindedness (BIPM). *Psychological Assessment, 21*(1), 32-44.

O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on Men's gender role conflict using the gender role conflict scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*(3), 358-445.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., & Gable, R. K. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*(5/6), 335-350.

Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2009). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory and development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*(3), 175-189.

Pleck, J. H. (1983). *The Myth of Masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

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

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

Porcerelli, J. H., Cogan, R., & Hibbard, S. (1998). Cognitive and affective representations of people and MCMI-II personality psychopathology. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 70*, 535-540.

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*(3), 385-401.

Reidy, D. E., Shirk, S. D., Sloan, C. A., & Zeichner, A. (2009). Men who aggress against women: Effects of feminine gender role violation on physical aggression in hypermasculine men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*(1), 1-12.

Rosenberg, S. D., Blatt, S. J., Oxman, T. E., McHugo, G. J., & Ford, R. Q. (1994). Assessment of object relations through lexical content analysis of the TAT. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 63*, 345-362.

Schmidt, N., & Sermat, V. (1983). Measuring loneliness in different relationships. *Journal of Personality And Social Psychology, 44*(5), 1038-1047.

Schwartz, J. P., Waldo, M., & Higgins, A. J. (2004). Attachment Styles: Relationship to Masculine Gender Role Conflict in College Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 5*(2), 143-146.

Sharpe, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). Gender role, gender-role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(3), 323-330.

Shedler, J., Mayman, M., & Manis, M. (1993). The Illusion of Mental Health. *American Psychologist, 48*(11), 1117-1131.

Shepard, D. S. (2002). A negative state of mind: Patterns of depressive symptoms among men with high gender role conflict. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3*(1), 3-8.

Smiler, A. P. (2004). Thirty years after the discovery of gender: Psychological concepts and measures of masculinity. *Sex Roles, 50*(1/2), 15-26.

Spear, W. E., & Sugarman, A. (1984). Dimensions of internalized object relations in borderline and schizophrenic patients. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 1*, 113-129.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1980). Masculine instrumentality and feminine expressiveness: Their relationships with sex role attitudes and behaviors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5*(2), 147-163.

Spielberger, C. D., Johnson, E. H., Russell, S. F., Crane, R. J., Jacobs, G. A., & Worden, T. J. (1985). The experience and expression of anger: Construct and validation of an Anger Expression Scale. In M. A. Chesney & R. H. Rosenman (Eds.), *Anger and hostility in cardiovascular and behavioral disorders*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stuart, J., D., W., Lohr, N., Benjamin, J., Becker, S., Vors, N., et al. (1990). Object relations in borderlines, depressives, and normals: An examination of human reponses on the Rorschach. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 55*, 296-318.

Thompkins, C. D., & Rando, R. A. (2003). Gender role conflict and shame in college men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4*(1), 79-81.

Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male norm roles. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29*, 531-543.

Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles, 27*(11/12).

Urist, J. (1977). The Rorschach test and the assessment of object relations. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 41*, 3-9.

Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1325-1339.

Verheul, R., Andrea, H., Berghout, C. C., Conor, D., Busschbach, J. J. V., Van Der Kroft, P. J. A., et al. (2008). Severity of personality problems (SIPP-118): Development, factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Psychological Assessment, 20*(1), 23-34.

Walker, D. F., Tokar, D. M., & Fischer, A. R. (2000). What are eight popular masculinity-related instruments measuring? Underlying dimensions and their relations to sociosexuality. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1*(2), 98-108.

Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1994). Individual Differences in Need for Cognitive Closure. *Personality Processes and Individual Differences, 67*(6), 1049-1062.

Westen, D. (1991a). Clinical assessment of object relations using the TAT. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 56*(1), 56-74.

Westen, D. (1991b). Clinical assessment of object relations using the TAT. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 56*, 56-74.

Westen, D. (2002). TAT Scoring Manual for the Social Cognition and Object Relations Scales; *Unpublished*.

Westen, D., Lohr, N., Silk, K., Gold, L. J., & Kerber, K. (1990). Object relations and social cognition in borderlines, major depressives, and normals: A thematic apperception test analysis. *Psychological Assessment, 2*(355-364).

Westen, D., Ludolph, P., Lerner, H., Ruffins, S., & Wiss, F. C. (1990). Object relations in borderline adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 29*, 338-348.

Wester, S. R. (2008). Thinnking complexly about men, gender role conflict, and counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*(3), 462-468.

Williams, K. E., Chambless, D. L., & Aherns, A. (1997). Are emotions frightening? An extension of the fear of fear construct. *Behavior and Research Therapy, 35*, 239-248.

Wong, Y. J., Pituch, K. A., & Rochlen, A. B. (2006). Men's restrictive emotionality: An investigation of associations with other emotion-related constructs, anxiety, and underlying dimensions. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*(2), 113-126.