



2015-04-01

Examining Masculine Gender-Role Conflict and Stress in Relation to Religious Orientation, Spiritual Well-Being, and Sex-Role Egalitarianism in Latter-day Saint Men

Loren B. Brown

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Counseling Psychology Commons](#), and the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Brown, Loren B., "Examining Masculine Gender-Role Conflict and Stress in Relation to Religious Orientation, Spiritual Well-Being, and Sex-Role Egalitarianism in Latter-day Saint Men" (2015). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 5771.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/5771>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Examining Masculine Gender-Role Conflict and Stress in Relation to
Religious Orientation, Spiritual Well-Being, and Sex-Role
Egalitarianism in Latter-day Saint Men

Loren B. Brown

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Marleen S. Williams, Chair
Lane Fischer
Aaron P. Jackson
P. Scott Richards
Ellie L. Young

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education
Brigham Young University

March 2015

Copyright © 2015 Loren B. Brown

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Examining Masculine Gender-Role Conflict and Stress in Relation to Religious Orientation, Spiritual Well-Being, and Sex-Role Egalitarianism in Latter-day Saint Men

Loren B. Brown

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education, BYU
Doctor of Philosophy

This study investigated two aspects of masculine gender role strain—gender role conflict and gender role stress—and their relationship to religious orientation, spiritual well-being, and sex-role egalitarianism among Latter-day Saint (LDS or Mormon) men. To investigate these variables, a sample of 201 LDS undergraduate men who were predominantly White/Caucasian and single completed the Gender Role Conflict Scale, Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale, Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale-Revised, Spiritual Well-Being Scale, and the Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale. As predicted, LDS men who reported higher levels of religiosity and spiritual well-being reported lower levels of gender role strain. This study also found that participants who reported more egalitarian sex-role attitudes reported lower levels of gender role strain. Separate stepwise regression analyses found that, of the five predictor variables (intrinsic religiosity, extrinsic religiosity, existential well-being, religious well-being, and sex-role egalitarianism), existential well-being and sex-role egalitarianism were the strongest predictors of variance in gender role conflict and gender role stress. The discussion focuses on explanations of significant findings, limitations, directions for future research, and implications for clinical practice.

Keywords: men, masculine gender role conflict, spiritual well-being, LDS, Mormon

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my chair, Marleen Williams, for her guidance throughout this entire process. Over the years, I have come to regard her as a wise mentor and a dear friend. I would also like to thank my committee members whose thoughtful feedback has helped me to refine my research. I would like to thank Scott Richards for his generosity in providing funds from a grant which allowed me to purchase some of the measures needed for this study. I am also grateful for my research assistants, Jacob Curtis and Sam Emery, who volunteered their time to help with this project. Thank you also to the members of my family who have offered encouragement during my time in graduate school. Lastly, I would like to thank Anne, my wife, for her editing assistance and unfailing support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
DESCRIPTION OF DISSERTATION STRUCTURE	vii
Background.....	1
Latter-day Saint Gender Roles.....	5
Latter-day Saint Gender Role Socialization	7
Latter-day Saint Masculinity.....	8
Statement of Purpose	9
Research Hypotheses and Questions	9
Method	10
Participants.....	10
Measures	11
Gender Role Conflict Scale	11
Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale	12
Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale	12
Spiritual Well-Being Scale	13
Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale, Short Form	14
Procedure	15
Results.....	16

Regression Analyses 19

Comparison to Samples from Previous Studies..... 19

Discussion..... 21

 Limitations and Future Research 25

 Implications for Practitioners..... 27

 Conclusion 28

References..... 30

APPENDIX A: REVIEW OF LITERATURE 38

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM 70

DISSERTATION REFERENCES..... 71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Means, Ranges, and Standard Deviations for Latter-day Saint Men on Gender Role Conflict, Gender Role Stress, Spiritual Well-Being, Religious Orientation, and Sex-Role Egalitarianism.....	17
Table 2. Comparison of Means on Gender Role Conflict and Gender Role Stress for LDS Men and Samples of Other Religious Men from Previous Research.....	20

DESCRIPTION OF DISSERTATION STRUCTURE

This dissertation is written in a hybrid format. This format combines traditional dissertation requirements with a formatting style similar to journal publications. The preliminary pages of this dissertation are formatted to meet the requirements for submission to the university. The introduction, hypotheses, methods, results, and discussion sections are presented in a journal article format, based on the length typical of research reports submitted to psychological journals for publication and conforming to the style guidelines of the American Psychological Association. A review of the literature is included in Appendix A and a copy of the consent form given to research participants is included in Appendix B. This dissertation contains two lists of references. The first reference list contains references cited in the journal-ready article. The second list contains the references cited in the review of literature in Appendix A.

Examining Masculine Gender-Role Conflict and Stress in Relation to
Religious Orientation, Spiritual Well-Being, and Sex-Role
Egalitarianism in Latter-day Saint Men

During the developmental years and throughout adulthood, most males are socialized to conform to a dominant, culturally-constructed standard of masculinity, often referred to as *hegemonic masculinity* (Connell, 1987; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Donaldson, 1993). This norm of masculine behavior emphasizes control, power, dominance, and competition as ways to prove one's masculinity, and devalues displays of affection, emotions, or vulnerability as feminine and to be avoided (Levant & Pollack, 1995; O'Neil, 1981a). The male socialization process contributes to the psychological distress boys or men experience when they are judged by themselves or by others as deviating from or failing to meet the hegemonic standard of acceptable masculine traits and behaviors (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; O'Leary & Donoghue 1978; O'Neil, 1981b, 2008).

Pleck (1981, 1995) referred to this distress as *gender role strain* and suggested that the hegemonic ideal of masculinity leads to strain because it is, in reality, unattainable and often dysfunctional. Two examples of men's gender role strain that have been previously examined in research are *gender role conflict* (O'Neil 1981a, 1981b, 1990), which occurs when "rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles, learned during socialization, result in personal restriction, devaluation, or violation of others or self" (O'Neil, 1990, p. 25), and *masculine gender role stress* (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Eisler, Skidmore, & Ward, 1988), which occurs when men "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, p. 125).

Religious men may be viewed as males deviating from the hegemonic standard. While hegemonic masculinity encourages men to be dominant and independent, engage in risky behaviors, and avoid emotional expression (Brannon, 1976; Courtenay, 2000; Courtenay, McCreary, & Merighi, 2002), most religious faiths promote submission, communality, avoiding risky behaviors, and expressing emotions in forms such as prayer, testimony, or confession (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993; Ellison & Levin, 1998; Francis, 1997), which may be seen as feminine-type behaviors. In examining religious men, previous research has shown that male clergy and other men endorsing high levels of religiousness have reflected more feminine profiles on measures of personality and gender (Francis, Jones, Jackson, & Robbins, 2001; Francis & Wilcox, 1996).

Given the male socialization process and previous research findings, one would expect that religious men would experience greater gender role strain, since their adoption of religious behaviors perceived as feminine (Zock, 1997) indicates a deviation from the hegemonic norm of masculinity. Research has found, however, that men who report higher levels of religiosity and spiritual well-being report *lower* levels of masculine gender role conflict and gender role stress (Jurkovic & Walker, 2006; Mahalik & Lagan, 2001).

Mahalik and Lagan (2001) conducted a study on a sample of Catholic men, both seminarians and non-seminarian undergraduates. They found that for both seminarians and non-seminarians, men who were rigid in terms of traditional masculinity and who reported greater stress about living up to a perceived standard of masculinity also reported less intrinsic religiosity and spiritual well-being; men who reported higher levels of religiosity and spiritual well-being reported lower levels of gender role strain. Jurkovic and Walker (2006) utilized the same measures as Mahalik and Lagan (2001), conducting their study with a sample of Australian

men who were separated into two groups for data analysis, “religious” and “not religious,” based on participant responses on a self-report measure of religiousness. Of the religious group, participants reported their religion as Protestant, Catholic, nondenominational, Orthodox, or unspecified. They found that religious men experienced lower levels of masculine gender role conflict and stress than nonreligious men. These findings seem somewhat paradoxical based on previous masculine gender role research.

Adding further complexity to the paradox is a body of research which shows that religious populations, especially orthodox and conservative religions, tend to endorse traditional gender roles for men and women and a more patriarchal structure in church and family (Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984; Hoffman & Miller, 1997; Moore & Vanneman, 2003). Feminist critiques of conservative/orthodox religions have argued that adherence to traditional gender roles and patriarchal structures encourages the subordination of women (Beaman, 2001; Stoppler, 2008), suggesting a link between conservative religiosity and the perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity. In contrast, others have pointed to the literature on fathering which has suggested that religious men are more nurturing, affectionate fathers and report higher quality parent-child relationships than nonreligious fathers (Bartkowski & Xu, 2000; King, 2003), highlighting ways in which religious men deviate from the hegemonic standard. Wilcox (2004) proposed a more nuanced view, referring to conservative Protestant men as “soft patriarchs” (p. 131) who are expressive fathers and emotionally engaged husbands while still endorsing strong gender role traditionalism with the man as the head of the household. Although far from resolved, the complexity and contradictions within the research literature on gender roles, gender role strain, and religion suggest that dichotomous typologies are problematic and that within

religiously constructed notions of gender roles, traditional masculinity and hegemonic masculinity are not necessarily synonymous terms.

Given the correlational nature of data on gender and religiosity, it is difficult to draw conclusions on the direction of the causal relationship, and more research in this area is needed. Wilson (1978) stated that “religion is probably the single most important shaper of sex roles” (quoted in Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984, p. 365). Morgan (1987) found that religious devoutness was the most important variable in consistently predicting gender-role attitudes. Lottes and Kuriloff (1992), however, suggest that studies looking at the effect of religion on gender role ideology are contradictory and inconclusive.

In hypothesizing on their findings with a sample of Catholic men, Mahalik and Lagan (2001) suggested that religious or spiritual men “may either be less susceptible to the shaming messages associated with masculine socialization or possibly use their religious and spiritual experiences to cope with the anxiety and stress associated with violating masculine norms” (p. 31). Other research has found that individuals with greater intrinsic religiosity are less self-monitoring, less self-conscious, and report greater existential well-being (Richards, 1994), which suggests that religious or spiritual men may not compare themselves as much to the hegemonic standard and thereby experience lower levels of gender role strain.

This study attempted to further explore the relationship between gender role strain and religiosity among a sample of Latter-day Saint (LDS; also known as Mormon) men. Although there are many similarities in terms of social, political, and moral views among conservative religious denominations, there are also unique differences. Examining a single denomination may allow for an exploration of gender role strain and religiosity among men who experienced a similar socialization process. In particular, the LDS faith is of interest because of its rapid

growth as a relatively young religion (Stark, 1984) and because of its explicit statements regarding gender, gender roles, and the responsibility of parents and others to help children conform to those roles. Additionally, the organizational structure of the LDS church is such that a high level of homogeneity in teachings exists among congregations all over the world. Scriptural texts, sermons from church leadership, and pamphlets and other printed materials are standardized and translated into several languages and widely distributed.

Latter-day Saint Gender Roles

The LDS Church (formally known as The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints) has been very clear in its teachings regarding gender and gender roles (Hartman & Hartman, 1983). In general, the research on gender role attitudes of individuals raised in LDS families is lacking (Thomas, 1983). Of the research that has been done, most studies were conducted in the 1980's and some studies in the early 1990's and the majority focused on women's roles. In the past 20 years, the topic has barely been touched, yet gender roles and societal attitudes have undergone significant changes. Examining whether or not similar changes have occurred among Latter-day Saints could provide information on the stability or evolution of gender roles and gender role attitudes within the context of a conservative religion.

In addition to believing that "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" (Genesis 1:27, KJV), Mormons believe in a spiritual existence prior to birth and that even in that premortal state individuals were gendered beings. In 1922, church leader James E. Talmage stated, "The distinction between male and female is no condition peculiar to the relatively brief period of mortal life. It was an essential characteristic of our pre-existent condition" (as quoted in Oaks, 1993, para. 8). In 1995, the LDS Church published a statement entitled *The Family: A Proclamation to the World*, in which it

states “Gender is an essential characteristic of individual premortal, mortal, and eternal identity and purpose” (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1995, p. 102). According to this statement, gender is an important part of how LDS individuals are taught to view themselves, both physically and spiritually. Later in that same statement, LDS beliefs regarding corresponding gender roles are articulated:

By divine design, fathers are to preside over their families in love and righteousness and are responsible to provide the necessities of life and protection for their families.

Mothers are primarily responsible for the nurture of their children. In these sacred responsibilities, fathers and mothers are obligated to help one another as equal partners.

Disability, death, or other circumstances may necessitate individual adaptation. (p. 102)

Similar to the views held by other Christian faiths and conservative groups, the LDS Church teaches that men’s gender roles include family leadership and working as the breadwinner and women’s gender roles include working as the primary caretaker of children. Common in LDS teachings is the emphasis that these roles for men and women are different but equal.

Although there is some variation in how individual members respond to LDS teachings regarding gender roles (Beaman, 2001; Kline, 2014), as a group, Mormons are found to be the most traditional Christian denomination with regard to gender attitudes and endorsement of a more traditional role for women (Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984; 1985; Jensen & Jensen, 1993). Mormons, however, are also found to be one of the most egalitarian denominations with regards to behaviors such as the division of household labor and familial decision making (Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984). Historian Thomas O’Dea (1957) suggested that this somewhat contradictory finding is a result of a combination of “social idealism born of Mormon beliefs and political

conservatism.” He argued that early Mormons “came close to accepting the equality of women with men” while still “accepting patriarchal ideas of family organization” (p. 255).

Latter-day Saint Gender Role Socialization

The LDS Church is also quite clear about using socialization as the way to instruct children in proper gender roles while still allowing for individuality. Spencer W. Kimball, president of the LDS Church from 1973 to 1985, said, “I sincerely hope that our Latter-day Saint girls and women, and men and boys, will...conform their lives to the beautiful and comprehensive roles the Lord assigned to them” (Kimball, 1975, p. 5). In *A Parent’s Guide* (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985), a manual published by the LDS Church to help parents teach children about sexuality and gender identity, it states,

There is nearly as much variation within each gender as there is between the genders...You should provide opportunities for your children to develop talents in various directions unhindered by improper stereotypes. But you should respect the divinely mandated roles special to the respective sexes. Teach your children that they will grow and be happy by accepting these roles and magnifying them... By example and by discussion, both sexes need to learn about being male or female. (p. 26)

Parents are encouraged to allow diversity in expression of gender characteristics and avoid socializing their children to adhere to improper gender stereotypes (e.g., hegemonic masculinity). Following the “divinely mandated roles,” however, is strongly encouraged and seen as important for life satisfaction.

Socialization in the LDS Church occurs both in the home and in church-related settings, and is a blend of influences from family, church, and peers (Cornwall, 1988). Teachings regarding roles and appropriate attributes for men and women can be found in settings ranging

from sermons given by satellite transmission to worldwide church membership by high-ranking church leaders (Christofferson, 2006, 2013; Oaks, 1993, 2014; Packer, 1998, 2009) to local LDS congregations where a part of typical Sunday services includes classes taught separately to adolescent boys and girls with content specific to each gender. Within the home, these teachings are reinforced through stories, conversations, and modeling of behavior (Cornwall, 1988).

Latter-day Saint Masculinity

Within the LDS Church, boys experience gender socialization from an early age; throughout the church there are classes, meetings, and other situations separated by gender where LDS boys and men interact with each other and learn about roles and responsibilities connected to being a man. In a sermon addressed to adolescent boys, church leader Boyd K. Packer (2009) said, “Your gender was determined in the premortal existence. You were born a male. You must treasure and protect the masculine part of your nature. You must have respectful, protective regard for all women and girls.” Packer reaffirms the doctrine previously discussed that gender is part of spiritual identity and highlights that LDS masculinity is linked to attitudes towards women. Although the tone of his message seems to endorse a more traditional definition of masculinity, other church leaders have proposed less traditional definitions as well. Joseph F. Smith, president of the LDS Church from 1901 to 1918, in instructing fathers on interacting with their sons, said, “Speak to them kindly...weep with them if necessary and get them to shed tears with you if possible. Soften their hearts; get them to feel tenderly toward you. Use no lash and no violence” (Smith, 1919, p. 396). Although LDS men are encouraged to emulate the examples of a variety of men described in the Bible and other scriptures, from LDS Church history, or in present day church leadership, all men (and women) are encouraged to adopt the characteristics

of Jesus Christ. *A Parent's Guide* (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985) explains,

Among the traits Christ revealed as proper for men and women alike are faith, hope, charity, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, kindness, godliness, humility, diligence, and love. These virtues transcend gender. They are Christlike attributes to which both sexes should aspire. (p. 25)

These references to LDS Church statements are representative of and similar to statements which have been made throughout the history of the LDS Church regarding the religion's teachings on men and masculinity. These quotes suggest that LDS men grow up socialized to definitions of masculinity which are more nuanced and complex than simple conservative, traditional masculinity or dominant, hegemonic masculinity.

Statement of Purpose

Research on LDS men's gender role attitudes and experiences is needed. Further research on the experience of gender role strain among religious men is also needed. Given that previous samples of religious men have resulted in counter-intuitive findings regarding gender role conflict and stress (i.e., religious men report less gender role conflict and stress in comparison to non-religious men), and given that the LDS Church has explicitly addressed gender roles and gender role socialization, perhaps a sample of LDS men may help contribute to the exploration of how religious functioning in males predicts lower gender role conflict and stress.

Research Hypotheses and Questions

Based on previous research, it was hypothesized that LDS men who reported higher levels of religiosity and spiritual well-being would also report lower levels of gender role conflict

and gender role stress. It was also hypothesized that a negative relationship exists between LDS men's egalitarian gender role attitudes and gender role strain. In this study, we also wanted to identify which predictors (Five predictors: Intrinsic Religious Orientation, Extrinsic Religious Orientation, Religious Well-Being, Spiritual Well-Being, and Sex-Role Egalitarianism) best predict the variance in LDS men's reported gender role conflict and gender role stress. Lastly, we wanted to see if LDS men report higher, lower, or similar levels of gender role conflict and gender role stress in comparison to other previous samples of religious men.

Method

Participants

The initial sample for this study consisted of 213 male, LDS, undergraduate students enrolled in psychology, religion, or student development courses at Brigham Young University (BYU), a private university in Provo, Utah, owned and operated by the LDS Church. A small number of participants ($n = 12$) were removed from this study because they did not give an answer to more than 40% of the questions; the final sample consisted of 201 participants. The mean age for the sample was 21.6 years ($SD = 2.67$) with five participants not reporting their age. The reported race/ethnicity constitution of the sample was White/Caucasian (88.1%), Latino/Hispanic (6%), Asian (3.5%), Pacific Islander (1%), Native American (0.5%), and Other (1%). For this sample, 95% were from the United States, from 32 different states, and 5% were international students from nine different countries. Participants were also asked to select their current relationship status. The reported relationship status constitution of the sample was single/never married (75.1%), married without children (17.4%), married with children (6.5%), and divorced (1.0%). All of the participants reported a Latter-day Saint (Mormon) religious

affiliation, with 6% of the sample identifying as having converted to the LDS faith and 94% identifying as having been raised in a LDS family/household.

Measures

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). The Gender Role Conflict Scale has been used as a measure of gender role conflict for over 25 years (O'Neil, 2008). It was originally developed using item development and reduction, content analysis, factor analysis, and reliability testing (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986). At first, 85 items on a Likert scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) were generated to test a hypothesized six factors. After factor analysis, the number of items was reduced to 37 with 4, rather than 6, factors: success, power and competition (13 items; e.g., "I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man"), restrictive emotionality (10 items; e.g., "I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings"), restrictive affectionate behavior between men (8 items; e.g., "Affection with other men makes me tense"), and conflict between work and family (6 items; e.g., "My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life: home, health, or leisure").

The psychometric properties of the GRCS have been tested and re-tested across a number of studies. One of the early criticisms was the lack of validity studies on diverse samples from racial, ethnic, socioeconomic and sexual orientation minority groups. Since then the GRCS has been factor analyzed for samples from a variety of races and ethnicities within the United States, gay men, adolescents, and men from a variety of countries including Australia, Korea, Japan, Indonesia, Sweden, Canada, Portugal, and Germany (O'Neil, 2008).

O'Neil et al. (1986) reported test-retest reliabilities ranging from .72 to .86. Internal consistency alphas for the four factors range from .75 to .85. Construct validity has also been

supported by studies finding positive relations with measures of depression, traditional male norms, and psychological distress (Good et al., 1995).

Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRS). Eisler and Skidmore (1987) developed this scale as a measure to assess men's experience of stress associated with the male gender role and the perceived failure to meet the societal standards of masculinity. There are 40 items. The scale contains five factors: physical inadequacy, emotional inexpressiveness, subordination to women, intellectual inferiority, and performance failure. Each factor has seven to nine items. Each item is answered using a Likert type scale which ranges from not stressful (0) to extremely stressful (5), asking the respondent to consider each item as if he or she were in the situation. A higher score indicates a greater level of masculine stress.

The MGRS has an internal consistency alpha of .90, with alpha coefficients for each of the five factors ranging from .64 to .83 (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). Construct validity has been shown through correlations between the MGRS and measures of hostility and Type-A behavior. In addition, men score significantly higher on the MGRS than women do, which demonstrates that some stresses in men are gender specific and are related to the negative consequences of commitment to traditional masculine ideology (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). The MGRS also appears to be distinct from other constructs related to masculinity as demonstrated by the near zero correlation ($r=.08$) between the MGRS and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974), an accepted measure of masculinity (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). This suggests that masculine gender role stress is distinct from masculine identification (as measured by the PAQ).

Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (I/E-ROS). Allport and Ross (1967) developed the Religious Orientation Scale, and it has been widely used in measuring Intrinsic (I)

and Extrinsic (E) religious orientations among adults. The original scale has been criticized for using language which would be too difficult for children or adolescents to understand. Gorsuch and Venable (1983) revised the Allport and Ross measure to make it more appropriate for children and adolescents, while still continuing to measure what the Allport-Ross I-E scales measured. Further research suggested that some of the original scales on the “Age-universal” version of the Religious Orientation Scale needed additional revision, leading to an updated version of the measure (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989).

Internal consistency reliability for the Extrinsic (E) subscale is .66 and .73 for the Intrinsic (I) subscale. Others studies have reported a test-retest reliability of .93 for the measure (see Hood, 1970). Construct validity has been demonstrated by positive correlations between intrinsic religiosity and other measures of religious commitment ($r=.76$) (Hood, 1970).

Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS). The Spiritual Well-Being Scale is a self-report, 20 item measure, using a 6-point Likert-style rating system. It has two subscales; each subscale contains 10 items. The Religious Well-Being (RWB) subscale measures one’s well-being in a spiritual sense (degree to which one reports a satisfying relationship with God) and attempts to measure the vertical dimension of spirituality, or the individual spirituality, which can increase or decrease in intensity and depth of feeling. The Existential Well-Being (EWB) subscale measures one’s well-being in an existential sense (one’s sense of life purpose and life satisfaction) and attempts to measure the horizontal dimension of well-being to the surrounding world, including a sense of life purpose (Bufford, Paloutzian, & Ellison, 1991; Ellison, 1983; Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982).

The measure is best used for detecting impaired levels of well-being. Bufford et al. (1991) comment that for those who fall above the 50th percentile, the SWBS has a difficult time

discriminating and determining who is at the highest levels of well-being, suggesting a ceiling effect.

According to Bufford et al. (1991), the SWBS shows a test-retest reliability of approximately .85. It showed an internal consistency alpha above .84 in seven samples. Construct validity has been demonstrated through positive correlations between the SWBS and other standard indicators of well-being. Although the SWBS has been used extensively in research, it lacks established norms. The samples used in testing reliability and validity did not have descriptive data reported.

Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale, Short Form (SRES-BB). The Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale (SRES; Beere, King, Beere, & King, 1984) measures attitudes to equality between the sexes with a particular emphasis on items which reflect attitudes towards men and women in nontraditional roles. The original SRES has two alternate forms (B and K) which each contain 95 items organized into 5 role categories or content domains: marital (e.g., “Cleaning up the dishes should be the shared responsibility of husbands and wives”), parental (e.g., “The family home will run better if the father, rather than the mother, sets the rules for the children”), employment (e.g., “It is wrong for a man to enter a traditionally female career”), social-interpersonal-heterosexual (e.g., “It is worse for a woman to get drunk than for a man”), and educational (e.g., High school counselors should encourage qualified women to enter technical fields like engineering”). Each item consists of a statement and a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (0) to strongly agree (5); several items are reverse-scored. Higher total scores indicate endorsement of more egalitarian attitudes.

King and King (1990) developed abbreviated versions of the SRES forms B and K. To ensure that the short forms were comparable to the original SRES, five items from each of the

five role categories were included in the short forms, BB and KK. The short forms of the SRES each contain 25 items and the same 5-point Likert-scale mentioned previously.

According to King and King (1990), the SRES-BB and the SRES-B have a correlation coefficient of .95. The SRES-BB has a test-retest reliability coefficient of .88 and an internal consistency coefficient of .94.

Procedure

Male Mormon students were recruited from undergraduate courses in psychology, religion, and student development (e.g., career exploration, improving study habits). Some participants were recruited by classroom announcement and those interested in participating put their names and email addresses on a sign-up sheet. Other participants were recruited through the psychology department using a web-based system managed by Sona Systems where individuals who met inclusion criteria (i.e., male and LDS) could sign-up and receive credits for their participation. Interested participants received a link to a website. The informed consent agreement explained that participants would be asked about “gender role attitudes and spirituality among Mormon men.” Once consent was obtained, participants were first given a demographic questionnaire and then given the two measures of gender role strain, the two measures of spirituality/religiosity, and the measure of sex-role egalitarianism. Participation in the study was anonymous.

Although some participants may have received extra credit from course instructors for their participation, all participants were given the option of being entered into a drawing to win one of eight \$25 gift cards as an incentive for participation. At the conclusion of data collection, a random integer generator (www.random.org) was used to select the eight winners from the list

of 182 individuals who provided email addresses to be entered into the drawing. Winners were emailed electronic \$25 gift cards from Amazon.com.

Results

After data collection was completed, the data were exported from Qualtrics and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics software. There were some missing item values due to participant nonresponses. Since the missing values accounted for only 0.26% of the total possible responses, mean substitution was used to replace the missing values.

Each subscale was checked for internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha. All subscales demonstrated acceptable reliability. Specifically, alphas for factors on the MGRS were .79 for physical inadequacy, .71 for emotional inexpressiveness, .83 for subordination to women, .72 for intellectual inferiority, and .84 for performance failure. Alphas for factors on the GRCS were .86 for success, power, and competition, .87 for restrictive emotionality, .84 for restrictive affectionate behavior between men, and .80 for conflict between work and family relations. The two subscales of the I/E-ROS yielded alphas of .79 for internal religious orientation and .74 for external religious orientation. The two subscales of the SWBS yielded alphas of .90 for religious well-being and .86 for existential well-being. Lastly, the alpha for the SRES-BB was .90.

The distributions of scores on the scales were checked for normality. The distributions for total scores on the GRCS and the MGRS were normally distributed. Scores on the external religious orientation scale of the I/E-ROS were also normally distributed. Scores on the SRES-BB showed some skewness of $-.56$ ($SE = .172$). Internal religious orientation was non-normally distributed with skewness of -1.037 ($SE = .172$). Religious well-being was non-normally distributed with skewness of -1.691 ($SE = .172$) and kurtosis of 3.376 ($SE = .341$). Existential

well-being was non-normally distributed with skewness of -1.119 ($SE = .172$) and kurtosis of 2.444 ($SE = .341$).

Mean, standard deviations, and ranges were calculated for scores on each of the scales. In addition to average total scores, average item means and standard deviations were calculated for each scale (see Table 1). Average item means allowed for a comparison of the sample in this present study to a sample of Catholic men (Mahalik & Lagan, 2001) and a mixed-religious group of Australian men (Jurkovic & Walker, 2006) (see Table 2).

Table 1
Means, Ranges, and Standard Deviations for Latter-day Saint Men on Gender Role Conflict, Gender Role Stress, Spiritual Well-Being, Religious Orientation, and Sex-Role Egalitarianism

Variable	Total Scores			Average Item Score	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Gender Role Conflict Scale</i>					
Success, power, and competition	49.82	10.28	26–78	3.83	0.79
Restrictive emotionality	27.86	9.54	10–56	2.79	0.95
Restrictive affectionate behavior between men	21.76	7.63	8–47	2.72	0.95
Conflict between work and family	22.31	5.82	6–35	3.72	0.97
<i>Gender Role Stress Scale</i>					
Physical inadequacy	19.19	7.51	2–36	2.13	0.83
Emotional inexpressiveness	9.21	4.83	0–27	1.32	0.69
Subordination to women	11.46	7.15	0–37	1.27	0.79
Intellectual inferiority	10.79	5.34	0–27	1.54	0.76
Performance failure	26.18	7.04	6–39	3.27	0.88
<i>Spiritual Well-Being Scale</i>					
Existential well-being	46.43	5.99	19–55	4.64	0.60
Religious well-being	44.31	6.24	18–50	4.43	0.62
<i>Internal-External Religious Orientation Scale</i>					
Internal religious orientation	34.97	4.28	18–40	4.37	0.53
External religious orientation	17.76	3.97	7–28	2.96	0.66
<i>Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale</i>					
	100.92	12.75	57–125	4.04	0.51

Note. $n=201$

Correlation Analyses

It was predicted that Mormon males who reported greater intrinsic religiosity and greater spiritual well-being, as measured by scores on the I/E-ROS and the SWBS, would report lower gender role conflict and stress, as measured by total scores on the GRCS and MGRS. Given that the distribution of scores for internal religious orientation on the I/E-ROS and for both subscales of the SWBS showed skewness and kurtosis coefficients suggesting a departure from normality, the Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient (i.e., Spearman's rho) was used to explore the hypothesized relationship between those variables and the GRCS and MGRS. Of the two subscales of the I/E-ROS, a weak negative significant correlation was found between Intrinsic Religiosity (IR) and GRC, $r_s = -.211, p = .001$, and no significant correlations were found between IR and MGRS or between Extrinsic Religiosity (ER) and GRC or ER and MGRS.

Of the two subscales of the SWBS, both Existential Well-Being (EWB) and Religious Well-Being (RWB) were significantly correlated with measures of gender role conflict/stress. A significant negative correlation was found between EWB and GRC, $r_s = -.380, p < .001$. A similar significant negative correlation was found between EWB and MGRS, $r_s = -.326, p < .001$. These results suggest that a greater sense of existential well-being is associated with lower gender role conflict and stress. Total scores on the RWB subscale were also significantly negatively correlated with GRC, $r_s = -.316, p < .001$, and with MGRS, $r_s = -.246, p < .001$. These results suggest that a greater sense of religious well-being is also associated with lower gender role conflict and stress.

Correlation analyses were also conducted to explore the relationship between egalitarian sex-role attitudes and the masculine gender role strain variables. A significant negative correlation was found for total scores on the SRES and the MGRS, $r_s = -.196, p = .003$, suggesting that more egalitarian sex-role attitudes are associated with lower masculine gender

role stress. A similar significant negative correlation was found for the total scores on the GRCS and the SRES, $r_s = -.295, p < .001$, suggesting that more egalitarian attitudes are also associated with lower gender role conflict.

Regression Analyses

In order to find parsimonious models that would best predict gender role conflict and gender role stress in a sample of LDS men, two stepwise regression analyses were performed. For the predictor variables (intrinsic religiosity, extrinsic religiosity, religious well-being, existential well-being, and sex role egalitarianism), levels of F to enter and F to remove were set to correspond to p levels of .05 and .10, respectively, in both stepwise regressions.

Results of the stepwise regression with GRC scores as the dependent variable produced a significant model with existential well-being and sex-role egalitarianism scores included as predictors, $F(2, 198) = 20.74, p < .001$, with an $R^2 = .173$, suggesting that this model accounts for approximately 17.3% of the variance in GRC.

Results of the stepwise regression with MGRS scores as the dependent variable produced a significant model which also included existential well-being and sex-role egalitarianism as predictors, $F(2, 198) = 15.40, p < .001$, with an $R^2 = .135$, suggesting that this model accounts for approximately 13.5% of the variance in MGRS.

Comparison to Samples from Previous Studies

This sample was compared to other samples of religious men from previous studies in order to explore similarities and differences between Latter-day Saint men and religious men from other denominations or faiths using the same measures of masculine gender role conflict and gender role stress. As previously mentioned, average total scores were transformed into average item scores to enable comparison with the samples of Catholic seminarians and non-

seminarians from the study by Mahalik and Lagan (2001). To determine if there were significant differences in reported gender role conflict and gender role stress between LDS men and other religious men, a series of single-sample *t*-tests were performed (see Table 2).

Table 2

Comparison of Means on Gender Role Conflict and Gender Role Stress for LDS Men and Samples of Other Religious Men from Previous Research

Variable	Present Study	Mahalik & Lagan (2001)		Jurkovic & Walker (2006)
	LDS (Mormon) <i>M</i>	Seminarians <i>M</i>	Non- seminarians <i>M</i>	Religious <i>M</i>
<i>Gender Role Conflict Scale</i>				
Success, power, & competition (SPC)	3.83	2.86	3.62	2.62
		<i>t</i> = 17.43**	<i>t</i> = 3.80**	<i>t</i> = 21.73**
Restrictive emotionality (RE)	2.79	3.34	3.26	2.33
		<i>t</i> = -8.23**	<i>t</i> = -7.04**	<i>t</i> = 6.78**
Restrictive affectionate behavior between men (RAM)	2.72	2.81	3.03	2.49
		<i>t</i> = -1.33	<i>t</i> = -4.60**	<i>t</i> = 3.42*
Conflict between work & family (CBWF)	3.72	3.01	3.54	3.07
		<i>t</i> = 10.35**	<i>t</i> = 2.61*	<i>t</i> = 9.47**
<i>Gender Role Stress Scale</i>				
Physical inadequacy (PI)	2.13	1.9	2.04	1.61
		<i>t</i> = 3.96**	<i>t</i> = 1.58	<i>t</i> = 8.89**
Emotional inexpressiveness (EI)	1.32	1.84	1.71	1.18
		<i>t</i> = -10.76**	<i>t</i> = -8.09**	<i>t</i> = 2.80*
Subordination to women (SW)	1.27	0.97	0.97	0.58
		<i>t</i> = 5.41**	<i>t</i> = 5.41**	<i>t</i> = 12.37**
Intellectual inferiority (II)	1.54	1.75	1.71	1.25
		<i>t</i> = -3.88**	<i>t</i> = -3.14*	<i>t</i> = 5.41**
Performance failure (PF)	3.27	2.98	3.53	2.47
		<i>t</i> = 4.71**	<i>t</i> = -4.15**	<i>t</i> = 12.93**

Note. For LDS, *N* = 201; for seminarians, *N* = 74; for non-seminarians, *N* = 77; for religious group, *N* = 73

**significant at the *p* < .001 level

*significant at the *p* ≤ .01 level

The results of the single sample *t*-tests show that in comparison to the Catholic seminarian sample from the study by Mahalik and Lagan (2001), this sample of LDS men scored significantly higher on success, power, and competition; conflict between work and family;

physical inadequacy; subordination to women; and performance failure. Average item scores were significantly lower than Catholic seminarians on restrictive emotionality, emotional inexpressiveness, and intellectual inferiority, and there was no significant difference found on restrictive affectionate behavior between men. In comparison to the sample of Catholic, non-seminarian undergraduates (Mahalik & Lagan, 2001), this LDS sample scored significantly higher on average item scores on success, power, and competition; conflict between work and family; and subordination to women; scored significantly lower on restrictive emotionality, restrictive affectionate behavior between men, emotional inexpressiveness, intellectual inferiority, and performance failure. There was no significant difference found between non-seminarian Catholic and LDS men on physical inadequacy.

The results of the single sample *t*-tests show that this sample of LDS men scored significantly higher than the sample of religious Australian men from the study by Jurkovic and Walker (2006) on average item scores across all scales in both gender role conflict and gender role stress measures.

Discussion

The finding in this study that LDS men reporting higher levels of religiosity and spiritual well-being also reported lower levels of gender role strain is consistent with previous research findings (Jurkovic & Walker, 2006; Mahalik & Lagan, 2001). Given the correlational nature of the data, several explanations are possible. It may be that religious or spiritual men feel less pressure to conform to the hegemonic standard of masculinity, thereby experiencing less gender role conflict and stress. Or it could be that men who are less rigid about male gender roles are less concerned about engaging in activities which may appear to be feminine, thereby experiencing greater freedom to participate in religious activities and adopt spiritual beliefs. Or,

lower gender role strain and increased religiousness could both be explained by the socialization process that occurs for a male growing up in a religious household and/or community.

In finding a significant negative correlation between gender role strain and sex-role egalitarianism, this study introduced a new variable into the investigation of religious men's gender role strain. It was hoped that a measure of sex-role egalitarianism would offer additional information and perhaps a more nuanced understanding. The results showed that, in the presence of the other predictors, sex-role egalitarianism was a strong predictor of variance in gender role conflict and stress; participants endorsing more egalitarian attitudes reported lower gender role strain and vice versa.

This measure was also especially important in attempting to understand LDS men's expressed beliefs regarding gender roles. Although previous research on gender role conflict and egalitarianism has typically separated participants into "traditional" or "egalitarian" as two distinct categories (Livingston & Judge, 2008; Mintz & Mahalik, 1996), data from this study suggest that LDS men may be traditional *and* egalitarian. For example, 73.7% of participants in this study responded with a 4 or 5 (0 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*) on the item "The husband should be the head of the family." The wording of this item parallels common language in LDS teachings such as "By divine design, fathers are to preside over their families" (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1995, p. 102). It would be limiting, however, if concepts of LDS sex-role egalitarian attitudes were formed solely based on responses to this item. Compare that response to other items such as "Important career-related decisions should be left to the husband" ($M = 1.83, SD = 0.93$) or "A husband should not meddle with the domestic affairs of the household" ($M = 1.64, SD = .76$), where the majority of participants indicated disagreement. These findings are similar to research by Brinkerhoff and MacKie

(1984) which suggests that Latter-day Saints are one of the most traditional religious denominations in terms of gender role *attitudes* and also one of the most egalitarian in terms of gender role *behaviors* (e.g., division of household labor and familial decision making). Although the majority of participants endorsed the man being the “head of the family,” responses on other items suggest that there may be different meanings for LDS men in how this role is enacted.

The high reported level of sex-role egalitarianism in this present study could be the result of a variety of factors. Given that 94% of participants were born and raised in a LDS household, it may be that egalitarian attitudes and behavior were learned through church and family socialization. It could also be independent of religious beliefs and be a product of social change as Western culture has become more egalitarian in recent decades; Brinkerhoff and MacKie (1985) suggest that compared to the average individual, university students are typically more modern and attuned to societal changes. Lastly, given that egalitarian attitudes were expressed through self-report rather than direct observation, the level of egalitarianism in this sample could also be a function of socially desirable responding, despite participation being anonymous.

In addition to sex-role egalitarianism, results of the stepwise regression analyses showed that existential well-being was another significant predictor of variance in gender role conflict and gender role stress. Existential well-being (EWB) was measured by a subscale on the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS). The items which loaded on to the EWB subscale do not include any specific reference to God or spirituality but more broadly reference a sense of purpose, direction, and meaning in life. Although previous research has suggested that a positive correlation exists between religiousness and a sense of meaning in life (see Park, 2013), it is also possible that EWB could be strongly influenced by nonreligious factors (e.g., an anticipated career path which one finds meaningful and fulfilling). Whether EWB is shaped by religious

factors, nonreligious factors, or (more likely) an interaction between the two, the findings of this study suggest that LDS men who feel a sense of meaning and direction in their lives tend to report reduced levels of gender role strain.

In comparing LDS men's levels of gender role strain, the results showed that this sample reported higher gender role conflict and stress than the Australian religious sample studied by Jurkovic and Walker (2006). The comparison to the Catholic samples (seminarians and non-seminarians) studied by Mahalik and Lagan (2001) showed mixed results. The higher levels of gender role conflict and stress than the Australian religious sample could be a result of age differences. In the sample of Australian religious men, the average age was 38.90 years ($SD = 13.28$). The two Catholic samples were more similar to the LDS sample; the average age of seminarians was 24.14 years ($SD = 3.81$) and the average age of non-seminarians was 21.06 years ($SD = 2.97$). These results are consistent with previous research conducted by Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995) that found significant differences between college-aged men and middle-aged men in terms of gender role conflict.

In comparison to both the Catholic and the Australian samples, the LDS sample had the highest average item rating on the success, power, and competition (SPC) and conflict between work and family (CBWF) factors of the Gender Role Conflict Scale and the subordination to women (SW) factor on the Gender Role Stress Scale. In examining the average rating on individual items within each factor, ratings for SPC and CBWF were roughly uniform. The high average rating on SPC items may be more reflective of the type of student admitted to BYU, given the competitive admissions process and high academic standards of the university. The uniformly high ratings on CBWF items are most likely a reflection of the importance placed on the family as a central foundation of LDS doctrine and teachings. It is highly valued within the

LDS faith to prioritize family over work; therefore, conflict between work and family would likely lead to increased stress for LDS men.

Ratings on SW items, however, were more varied. In rating whether or not a situation would be stressful ($0 = \textit{not stressful}$; $5 = \textit{extremely stressful}$), average ratings were quite low on two items: “Having a female boss” (mean = 0.697, SD = 1.10) and “Admitting to your friends that you do housework” (mean = 0.26, SD = 0.66). The highest average rating was on the item “Needing your spouse to work to help support the family” (mean = 2.48, SD = 1.41). LDS teachings and culture suggest that the ideal arrangement is a family where the man works as the breadwinner and the woman is able to stay at home and focus on childcare when young children are present: “fathers...are responsible to provide the necessities of life and protection for their families” (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1995, p. 102). Given this religious value, LDS men may feel that they are not measuring up to expectations if a spouse were required to work outside of the home to help financially provide for the family. The variance in ratings on the SW suggests that this may be less about subordination to a woman and more about not living up to cultural expectations or personal goals. It also reemphasizes the idea that LDS men may be both traditional and egalitarian in attitudes towards women and roles for men and women.

Limitations and Future Research

Since the aim of this study was to examine gender role strain and religiosity among a single religious denomination (i.e., LDS), one should generalize these results to other denominations or groups of men with caution. In addition, one should even be cautious in generalizing these results to other Latter-day Saints. Brinkerhoff and MacKie (1985) suggested that BYU students could be more traditional and more committed than the average Mormon

young adult; however, they also reported that university students are usually more modern and open to social change, which could suggest that a sample of BYU students may be less traditional in gender role attitudes than a random sample of highly religious Mormons outside of BYU.

In addition, although a wide variety of regional differences was represented in this sample, participants were predominantly White/Caucasian students. Given that race has been found to be a significant influence on the shaping of masculine identity (Connell, 2005), further research is needed examining the variance in gender role strain among religious men from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.

The statistical analyses comparing this sample to other samples of religious men from previous studies should also be interpreted with caution. The number of pairwise comparisons of mean differences used in the analysis increases the risk of making a Type I error. The magnitude of the correlations may also have been somewhat underestimated due to the restricted range of scores on the religious orientation and spiritual well-being measures.

This study also employed quantitative measures and analyses, which limit the richness and nuance needed to deeply understand how gender role strain occurs among LDS men. Whorley and Addis (2006) found that, over 10 years of research on men and masculinity, the majority of studies employed quantitative methodologies, especially correlational designs, and 94.9% of studies did not use any observational methods. Given the complexity of constructs like masculinity and spirituality, and given the influence of male socialization across the lifespan, future research could be improved by employing a greater diversity of methodology including qualitative and longitudinal/developmental methods.

Implications for Practitioners

Mahalik and Lagan (2001) said, “Developing a religious life may help mediate the effects of men’s gender role strain and prove to be an important part of men’s social, psychological, and physical health” (p. 30). The results of the present study as well as previous findings indicate that their suggestion merits further attention. The inverse relationship between religiousness and gender role strain may have several potential implications for mental health and medical practitioners.

Men’s health care has been receiving growing attention in recent years. Men are less likely than women to seek psychological help (Galdas, Cheater, & Marshall, 2005). Good, Dell, and Mintz (1989) found that this reluctance to use counseling services is correlated to gender role conflict, specifically restrictive emotionality, concerns about expressing emotions, and concerns about expressing affection to other men. They found that as men’s values regarding masculinity became less rigid, attitudes towards psychological help-seeking became more positive. In medical health care, previous research has found that men are less likely than women to use self-care techniques and engage in preventative practices (e.g., cancer screenings, self-examinations) (Courtenay et al., 2002; Garfield, Isacco, & Sahker 2013). Similar to religious participation, utilizing medical services and practicing healthy habits (e.g., going on a diet) are sometimes viewed as feminine behaviors; consequently, many of the social practices which negatively affect men’s health are related to displaying masculinity and avoiding femininity (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Courtenay, 2000). If a religious or spiritual life helps to reduce men’s effort to conform to the hegemonic standard, it may also help improve men’s attitudes towards utilizing psychological and medical services and reduce gender stereotype barriers towards help-seeking.

The finding that an increased sense of existential well-being is correlated with lower gender role strain may also have implications for clinical practice. Although many individuals find a sense of meaning and purpose in life through religious participation, a similar sense of direction could exist independently of religious beliefs. Utilizing interventions to foster existential well-being in men may feel like a more appropriate, ethical approach for instructors, therapists, physicians, and other practitioners working in secular settings. Further research is needed to see if increasing existential well-being can lead to a reduction in gender role strain.

Conclusion

As a rapidly growing religion with a strong organizational structure, unique culture, and clear statements on gender and gender roles, the beliefs and attitudes of Latter-day Saints merit further study (Stark, 1984). In recent years, qualitative research has investigated the LDS concept of womanhood and has given a richer and deeper understanding of how LDS women navigate their roles and how they view themselves within the context of their religion (Beaman, 2001; Kline, 2014). Some of the contradictory findings from the quantitative analyses in this study suggest that LDS men may also go through a navigation process to understand their roles and responsibilities. More research, especially research employing observational and qualitative methodologies, is needed to better understand how LDS men view themselves within the LDS church.

It is hoped that this study draws attention to what researching LDS men has to offer. Studying how masculinity and male gender roles are defined, expressed, encouraged, and valued within the LDS church could form a foundation for understanding how male socialization occurs for men growing up in a religious context. In combination with previous research, this could lead to a more explicit model of adaptive male socialization, which could inform parents,

religious leaders, educators, physicians, and psychotherapists and lead to interventions designed to reduce gender role strain and help boys and men avoid the damaging effects of the hegemonic model.

References

- Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist*, *58*(1), 5-14. DOI:10.1037/0003-066X.58.1.5
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *5*(4), 432-443. DOI: 10.1037/h0021212
- Bartkowski, J. P., & Xu, X. (2000). Distant patriarchs or expressive dads? The discourse and practice of fathering in conservative Protestant families. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *41*(3), 465-485.
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *The religious experience: A social-psychological perspective*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Beaman, L. G. (2001). Molly Mormons, Mormon feminists, and moderates: Religious diversity and the Latter-day Saints church. *Sociology of Religion*, *62*(1), 65-86.
- Beere, C. A., King, D. W., Beere, D. B., & King, L. A. (1984). The sex-role egalitarianism scale: A measure of attitude toward equality between the sexes. *Sex Roles*, *10*(7/8), 563-576.
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role—And what it's done for us lately. In R. Brannon & D. Davids (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority* (pp. 1–40). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brinkerhoff, M. B., & MacKie, M. M. (1984). Religious denominations' impact upon gender attitudes: Some methodological implications. *Review of Religious Research*, *24*(4), 365-378.
- Brinkerhoff, M. B., & MacKie, M. (1985). Religion and gender: A comparison of Canadian and American student attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *47*(2), 415-429.

- Bufford, R. K., Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1991). Norms for the Spiritual Well-Being Scale. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 19*(1), 56-70.
- Christofferson, D. T. (2006, October). Let us be men. In *October 2006 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/2006/10/let-us-be-men>
- Christofferson, D. T. (2013, October). The moral force of women. In *October 2013 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/2013/10/the-moral-force-of-women>
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (1995, November). The family: A proclamation to the world. *Ensign, 25*(11), 102.
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (1985). *A parent's guide*. Salt Lake City, UT: Author.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society, 19*(6), 829-859. DOI: 10.1177/0891243205278639
- Cornwall, M. (1988). The influence of three agents of religious socialization: Family, church, and peers. In D. L. Thomas (Ed.), *The religion & family connection: Social science perspectives* (pp. 207-231). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Religious Studies Center.
- Cournoyer, R. J., & Mahalik, J. R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*(1), 11-19. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.42.1.11

- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: a theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 50(10), 1385-1401.
- Courtenay, W. H., McCreary, D. R., & Merighi, J. R. (2002). Gender and ethnic differences in health beliefs and behaviors. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 7(3), 219-231.
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity?. *Theory and society*, 22(5), 643-657.
- 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. DOI: 10.1177/01454455870112001
- Eisler, R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine gender-role stress: Predictor of anger, anxiety, and healthy-risk behaviors. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 133-141.
- Ellison, C. G., & Levin, J. S. (1998). The religion-health connection: Evidence, theory, and future directions. *Health Education & Behavior*, 25(6), 700-720.
- Ellison, C.W. (1983). Spiritual well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 11(4), 330-340.
- Francis, L. J. (1997). The psychology of gender differences in religion: A review of empirical research. *Religion*, 27(1), 81-96.
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., Jackson, C. J., & Robbins, M. (2001). The feminine personality profile of male Anglican clergy in Britain and Ireland: A study employing the Eysenck Personality Profiler. *Review of Religious Research*, 43(1), 14-23.
- Francis, L. J., & Wilcox, C. (1996). Religion and gender orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20(1), 119-121.

- Galdas, P. M., Cheater, F., & Marshall, P. (2005). Men and health help-seeking behaviour: Literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 49(6), 616-623. DOI:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03331.x
- Garfield, C. F., Isacco, A., & Sahker, E. (2013). Religion and spirituality as important components of men's health and wellness: An analytic review. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, 7(1), 27-37.
- Good, G. E., Dell, D. M., & Mintz, L. B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36(3), 295-300. DOI:10.1037/0022-0167.36.3.295
- Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., O'Neil, J., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., DeBord, K.A., et al. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological stress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42(1), 3-10. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.42.1.3
- Gorsuch, R. L., & McPherson, S. E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-revised and single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28(3), 348-354.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & Venable, G. D. (1983). Development of an "age universal" I-E scale. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 22(2), 181-187.
- Hartman, M. & Hartman, H. (1983). Sex-role attitudes of Mormons vs. non-Mormons in Utah. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 45(4), 897-902.
- Hoffmann, J. P., & Miller, A. S. (1997). Social and political attitudes among religious groups: Convergence and divergence over time. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36(1), 52-70. DOI: 10.2307/1387882
- Hood, R., Jr. (1970). Religious orientation and the report of religious experience. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 9, 285-291.

- Jensen, L. & Jensen, J. (1993). Family values, religiosity, and gender. *Psychological Reports*, 73(2), 429-430.
- Jurkovic, D., & Walker, G. A. (2006). Examining masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to religious orientation and spiritual well-being in Australian men. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 14(1), 27-46.
- Kimball, S. W. (1975, October). The Lord's plan for men and women. *Ensign*, 5(10), 2-5.
- King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1990). Abbreviated measures of sex role egalitarian attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 23(11/12), 659-673.
- King, V. (2003). The influence of religion on fathers' relationships with their children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65(2), 382-395.
- Kline, C. (2014). The Mormon Conception of Women's Nature and Role: A Feminist Analysis. *Feminist Theology*, 22(2), 186-202.
- Levant, R. F., & Pollack, W. S. (1995). *The new psychology of men*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Livingston, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2008). Emotional responses to work-family conflict: An examination of gender role orientation among working men and women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 207-216. DOI:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.207
- Lottes, I. L., & Kuriloff, P. J. (1992). The effects of gender, race, religion, and political orientation on the sex role attitudes of college freshmen. *Adolescence*, 27(107), 675-688.
- Mahalik, J. R., & Lagan, H. D. (2001). Examining masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to religious orientation and spiritual well-being. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 2(1), 24-33. DOI: 10.1037//1524-9220.2.1.24

- Mintz, R. D., & Mahalik, J. R. (1996). Gender role orientation and conflict as predictors of family roles for men. *Sex Roles, 34*(11-12), 805-821.
- Moore, L. M., & Vanneman, R. (2003). Context matters: Effects of the proportion of fundamentalists on gender attitudes. *Social Forces, 82*(1), 115-139.
- Morgan, M. Y. (1987). The impact of religion on gender-role attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*(3), 301-310.
- Oaks, D. H. (1993, October). The great plan of happiness. In *October 1993 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1993/10/the-great-plan-of-happiness>
- Oaks, D. H. (2014, April). The keys and authority of the priesthood. In *April 2014 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/2014/04/the-keys-and-authority-of-the-priesthood>
- O'Dea, T. F. (1975). *The Mormons*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- O'Neil, J.M. (1981a). Male sex role conflicts, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologist. *The Counseling Psychologist, 9*(2), 61-80. DOI: 10.1177/001100008100900213
- O'Neil, J.M. (1981b). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*(4), 203-210.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1990). Assessing men's gender role conflict. In D. Moore, F. Leafgren (Eds.), *Problem solving strategies and interventions for men in conflict* (pp. 23-38). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling.

- O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the Gender Conflict Scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*(3), 358-445. DOI: 10.1177/001100000831705
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*(5-6), 335-350. DOI: 10.1007/BF00287583.
- Packer, B. K. (1998, April). The Relief Society. In *April 1998 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1998/04/the-relief-society>
- Packer, B. K. (2009, April). Counsel to young men. In *April 2009 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/2009/04/counsel-to-young-men>
- Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being and the quality of life. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy* (pp. 224—236). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Park, C. L. (2013). Religion and meaning. In R. Paloutzian & C. L. Park (Eds.) *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (2nd ed.) (pp. 357-379). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Richards, P. S. (1994). Religious devoutness, impression management, and personality functioning in college students. *Journal of Research in Personality, 28*(1), 14-26. DOI:10.1006/jrpe.1994.1003
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4*, 43-44.
- Smith, J. F. (1919). *Gospel Doctrine: Selections from the Sermons and Writings of Joseph F. Smith*. Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret News.

- Stark, R. (1984). The rise of a new world faith. *Review of Religious Research*, 26(1), 18-27.
- Stoppler, G. (2008). Rank usurpation of power: The role of patriarchal religion and culture in the subordination of women. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy*, 15, 365-397.
- Thomas, D. L. (1983). "Family in the Mormon Experience." In W. V. D'Antonio and J. Aldous (Eds.), *Families and Religions: Conflict and Change in Modern Society* (pp. 267–88). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Whorley, M. R., & Addis, M. E. (2006). Ten years of psychological research on men and masculinity in the United States: Dominant methodological trends. *Sex Roles*, 55(9-10), 649-658. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-006-9120-1
- Wilcox, W. B. (2004). *Soft patriarchs, new men: How Christianity shapes fathers and husbands*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Zock, H. (1997). The Predominance of the Feminine Sexual Mode in Religion: Erikson's Contribution to the Sex and Gender Debate in Psychology of Religion. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 7(3), 187-198.

APPENDIX A: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In psychological research and clinical practice, there has been a growing interest in studying men and critically examining masculinity—its social construction, biological roots, evolution over time, and consequences (positive or negative) for men, women, and society (Englar-Carlson & Stevens, 2006; Levant & Pollack, 2008; Kimmel, Hearn, & Connell, 2005). Research has also suggested that *masculinities* may be a more appropriate term (Connell, 2005), given the wide variety of differences in definitions and expressions of masculinity among various groups of men (e.g. racial/ethnic, religious, sexual orientation, age, regional, occupational). Researchers and clinicians are attempting to understand the differences and similarities, strengths and weaknesses, and possible benefit and harm which may be connected with these various masculinities in an effort to protect men from damage to self, others, or society and to help men lead authentic lives (Addis, 2011; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010).

One area which has shown potential for reducing damage and facilitating authenticity is men's spirituality. Although gender and religion have had a complicated history, especially for women (Stoppler, 2008), research has also found many correlations between religiousness or spirituality and diverse positive physical/mental health outcomes (Garfield, Isacco, & Sahker, 2013; Ivtzan, Chan, Gardner, & Prashar, 2011; Seybold & Hill, 2001). For example, recent research has found that men who report higher levels of religiousness and spirituality report lower levels of conflict and stress over not measuring up to an idealized stereotype of masculinity (Jurkovic & Walker, 2006; Mahalik & Lagan, 2001). It may be that a religious or spiritual life acts as a buffer against the more damaging aspects of some definitions of masculinity without eschewing masculinity altogether.

The present study aims to expand upon this research and further investigate the relationship between religiousness and gender attitudes among men. In particular, the study will examine the nature of this relationship among Latter-day Saint (LDS or Mormon) men. The LDS faith is of particular interest for several reasons. Not only is the LDS faith a relatively young, rapidly growing religious denomination (Stark, 1984), but its teachings and doctrine are uniquely explicit on the definitions and nature of gender and gender roles for both men and women (Hartman & Hartman, 1983). In addition, the religion has a strong, top-down organizational structure which creates homogeneity across congregations in terms of attitudes, beliefs, and practices. In combination with observed religious practices in the home, this affects the way in which boys (and girls) are socialized to understand their gender and gender roles within a religious context (Cornwall, 1988). Examining the experience of LDS men may help form a model of how this occurs.

This review of literature will be used to provide some of the historical context and previous research findings which form a foundation for the present study. This review will present key terminology and research studies related to gender, gender roles, masculinity, male socialization, religiousness/spirituality, and Latter-day Saints. It is hoped that this review of literature will familiarize the reader with research in each of these areas and will further demonstrate why additional research in the area of masculine gender roles and religion/spirituality, especially among LDS individuals, is needed.

Gender

The first concept in understanding and examining masculinity is the distinction between sex and gender. Although the word *male* is commonly linked with the word *masculine*, they are two distinct constructs: male describes someone's sex and masculine describes someone's

gender. *Sex* is a term which refers to whether an individual is male or female depending on genes and organs. *Gender* is a term which refers to whether an individual is masculine or feminine depending on how the individual is socialized to think and act in a prescribed manner linked with biological sex (Basow, 1986).

Early research on differences and similarities between men and women has treated terms like *sex* and *gender* as if they were synonymous, which then leads to the problematic assumption that biological sex is the cause of uniform differences in attitudes and behavior between men and women (Mintz & O'Neil, 1990). Treating sex and gender as distinct but inseparably linked is also problematic. It leads to a bipolar dichotomy, with each sex on opposite ends of a single continuum (Bem, 1974). Since (for most human beings) one is either male or one is female, the assumed link between sex and gender would also suggest that one is either masculine or feminine and that males are masculine and females are feminine. Additionally, if this inseparable link were true, a male who is less masculine would also somehow be less male and, given the assumption of a dichotomous continuum, if he is less masculine then he must be more feminine and somehow more female. This type of thinking was not only common in psychology but also in society in general (Bem, 1974; West & Zimmerman, 1987).

According to Bem (1974), these sex and gender dichotomies appear to rule out two hypotheses: first, that it might be possible for an individual to be both masculine *and* feminine and able to adapt given what is needed in a given situation and second, that strongly sex-typed individuals (i.e., males who are only masculine and females who are only feminine) might actually be limited in some way depending on the situation (p. 155). Bem referred to the individual who has both masculine and feminine traits as *androgynous* and suggested that “in a society where rigid sex-role differentiation has already outlived its utility, perhaps the

androgynous person will come to define a more human standard of psychological health” (p. 162). Since that statement was made in 1974, there has indeed been a movement in society towards androgyny, first happening for women, especially in the workforce, and more recently happening for men as evidenced by the emergence of terms like *metrosexual*, used to describe a man who embraces aesthetic, grooming, and fashion interests which have previously been associated with feminine concern for beauty and appearance (Simpson, 2002).

According to Bem’s theory, gender is a trait; one is masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated (i.e., low on both masculinity and femininity). Other researchers have suggested that rather than being a relatively static trait, gender is better conceptualized as an action or performance (West & Zimmerman, 1987). West and Zimmerman (1987) refer to this as “doing” gender. They argue that “doing gender involves a complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micropolitical activities that cast particular pursuits as expressions of masculine or feminine ‘natures’” (p. 126). This suggests that gender may be a social construct, occurring in relation to others; the determination that a particular activity is masculine or feminine requires a socially-constructed perception based on expectations of others (groups or individuals).

So is gender predetermined or constructed? Is it a trait or a performance? Researchers and theorists continue to debate over gender and differences between men and women. Although the answers are inconclusive and often contradictory, it seems that gender does involve some interaction between biological sex, traits, and performance. For example, aggression is often associated with the stereotype for masculinity, and aggression in a particular man could be an interaction between testosterone levels, restricted range of emotions, and the desire to look “tough” in the presence of other guys. The continuing debates over gender highlight the

complexity of gender as a concept and the need for additional research and dialogue on the subject.

Gender Roles

Often connected with ideas about gender is the concept of gender roles. In addition to socially-constructed notions of what traits are considered masculine or feminine there are also notions of particular roles which are appropriate and/or expected with being male or female. By association, these roles become gendered and are seen as masculine or feminine. Over time, these categories of gender roles have changed dramatically in some ways or for some individuals, but have also remained the same for many men and women.

In Western society during the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries, definitions of appropriate attitudes and behaviors for women and men have shown some change. This change has come as a result of politics, psychological research, economic change, urban industrialization, immigration, social movements, and the secularization of society (Cushman, 1995). Gender and gender roles are also changed on the individual level by persons who choose to accept or reject the culturally prevailing notions of masculine and feminine and the gender roles assigned by society to males and females. This shifting landscape of gender politics has created tension within the various subgroups and conflict within individuals striving to navigate the landscape and arrive at an understanding of identity (Cushman, 1995).

Female gender roles. The more prominent changes have been seen for females in American society. Urbanization and industrialization in the latter half of the 19th century led to greater numbers of women entering the workforce as factory laborers. Women entered the political arena speaking out for abolition of slavery and universal suffrage for women, demanding equality with men in the power of voting. Throughout the 60s, 70s, and 80s, women

continued to push for equality with men, especially in the areas of employment. Political landmarks like *Roe vs. Wade*, the Equal Rights Amendment, and Title IX show several of the changes that occurred for women.

Male gender roles. Most surveys of masculinity have followed the changes in gender roles for middle- and upper-class males. As society became more industrialized and the middle class emerged, male gender roles shifted from the wealthy, cultured, nonworking gentry to the rational, calculating, hardworking merchant middle-class. With increasing industrialization and growing urbanization, men changed from being independent providers for families through self-owned farms or small businesses to becoming employees in factories working in teams under management supervision. With management, unions, and the socioeconomic spectrum visible in mixed and crowded cities, the concept of a ladder of advancement emerged. This process increased a focus on ambition, independence, and focusing on work over family as stereotypically masculine attributes. Then with World War I, the distinction between gentry and middle class narrowed as both categories of men were involved in warfare (although there still remained the separate officer corps). During times of warfare, men's roles changed from being providers for a family to defending the country. Following World War II, men returned to the role of provider, but as industry and science continued to progress, competitiveness continued to increase as men ranked themselves based on technical skills. The man of the 1950's was also seen as emotionally inexpressive and restricted. Dominance over others (e.g., wife, children, coworkers) continued to be part of masculine gender roles, culminating in the 1980's with the ideal of the business entrepreneur searching out territories and markets to be conquered (Connell, 1993).

Gender Role Socialization

Given the argument that gender and gender roles are, in large part, socially constructed, how then does one learn them? The process has been referred to as *gender role socialization*. This process can begin in pregnancy, as soon as parents become aware of the sex of their child (Kane, 2006) and it continues to occur throughout the lifespan. Bem (1981) explained that over time, this socialization leads to the formation of a *gender schema*. Through social learning and modeling, a child learns what attributes and behaviors are linked to his or her sex, including features which are directly related to males and females (e.g., reproductive functions) and features which are more remotely related to sex (e.g., rounded abstract shapes are feminine and angular abstract shapes are masculine); “as children learn the contents of the society’s gender schema, they learn which attributes are to be linked with their own sex and, hence, with themselves” (p. 355). The gender schema then becomes a standard by which the individual is able to measure and regulate his or her behavior so it conforms to social norms of maleness and femaleness. Fagot, Rodgers, and Leinbach (2000) add that “the gender category system is infused with affect to an extent few other knowledge bases can match, making it what is perhaps the most salient parameter of social categorization for the young child” (p. 65). This process begins early and happens quickly, with some suggesting that before the age of two, a child is aware of the social relevance of gender (Kane, 2006).

For most men growing up in Western society, the gender role which is most salient and valued is a dominant, culturally-constructed standard of masculinity, often referred to as *hegemonic masculinity* (Connell, 1987; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Donaldson, 1993). Connell (1995) argues that “at any given time, one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted” (p. 77). This current form of exalted masculine behavior emphasizes control,

power, dominance, and competition as ways to prove one's masculinity, and devalues displays of affection, emotions, or vulnerability as feminine and to be avoided (Levant & Pollack, 1995; O'Neil, 1981a).

In Western society it has become acceptable, and even encouraged, for women to adopt certain stereotypically masculine traits, but it still remains unacceptable for men to adopt certain feminine traits (Berkel, Vandiver, & Bahner, 2004; Kane, 2006). It is seen as advantageous for women to change from traditional gender role attitudes to more egalitarian ones that encourage equal opportunities for educational and vocational privileges (Berkel et al., 2004). Men, however, are aware that many aspects of femininity are still devalued in society; they avoid situations where they could be perceived as feminine, which would be equated with a loss of power, failure, and emasculation (O'Neil, 1981b).

Parents play an important role in this male gender socialization process. In the home, parents participate in encouraging certain models of gender in their children through many of the decisions they make regarding their sons or daughters (e.g., toy selections, room décor). A meta-analysis conducted by Lytton and Romney (1991) examined the literature on gender and parental behavior, looking at various areas of gender socialization to determine if parents are systematically different in how they raise their sons and daughters. Lytton and Romney found a significant effect in the area of encouragement of sex-typed activities (e.g., play activities, household chores), and found that, in this area, fathers made somewhat larger differences between sons and daughters than mothers. In a qualitative study of interviews with parents of preschool-aged children, Kane (2006) found that although many parents respond positively to some gender nonconformity in children, especially in their daughters, this positive response is limited for nonconformity in sons. Parents expressed support for sons exhibiting empathy,

nurturance, and domestic skills, but also encouraged “an ideal of masculinity that was defined by limited emotionality, activity rather than passivity, and rejection of material markers of femininity” (p.172). Kane (2006) found that this was especially important for heterosexual fathers and suggested that some men “explicitly judge their success as a father based on the degree to which they are raising adequately masculine sons” (p. 167). These findings suggest that hegemonic masculinity is not only involved in the model to which sons are socialized, but also affects the practice of fathering itself.

For many men, gender role socialization has typically involved some form of punishment when they have demonstrated gender nonconformity, deviating from the hegemonic standard. In a review of research on how others react to males who deviate from the hegemonic male standard, O’Leary and Donoghue (1978) found that boys who display sex role deviance are more severely punished (e.g. teased, excluded, bullied, abused) than girls who show similar sex role deviance. They also found and that deviation from the hegemonic male role in early childhood works against psychological adjustment. As a result of childhood punishment, men may learn to punish or devalue themselves when they perceive that they do not measure up to the masculine ideal. Given that the hegemonic ideal of masculinity is, in reality, unattainable, most men feel that they do not measure up to the masculine ideal in some way or another. Most men, subsequently, experience some degree of gender-related distress, or gender role strain, which can be quite damaging for men’s physical, mental, and emotional well-being (Pleck, 1995).

Gender Role Strain

Pleck (1981, 1995) first presented the *gender role strain* model for masculinity. Gender role strain comes from the difference between societal gender role standards and an individual’s own characteristics (Pleck, 1995). His model was based on ten propositions:

1. Gender roles are operationally defined by gender role stereotypes and norms.
2. Gender role norms are contradictory and inconsistent.
3. The proportion of individuals who violate gender role norms is high.
4. Violating gender role norms leads to social condemnation.
5. Violating gender role norms leads to negative psychological consequences.
6. Actual or imagined violation of gender role norms leads individuals to over-conform to them.
7. Violating gender role norms has more severe consequences for males than females.
8. Certain characteristics prescribed by gender role norms are psychologically dysfunctional.
9. Each gender experiences gender role strain in its paid work and family roles.
10. Historical change causes gender role strain. (Pleck, 1981, p. 9)

These propositions suggest that gender is based in social definitions that are perceived to be standards by which gender is evaluated. Individuals who contradict or fail to meet these standards are seen as violating norms, which results in social consequences.

Pleck (1981, 1995) also formulated three types of male gender role strain: *discrepancy strain*, *dysfunction strain*, and *trauma strain*. Discrepancy strain occurs when a man evaluates himself on whether or not he matches his own ideal of masculinity, which is often close to the hegemonic standard (e.g., a man with a dead car battery who doesn't know how to properly use jumper cables to jump-start his car and feels inadequate because he believes that basic knowledge about cars is part of being a true man). Dysfunction strain can occur even when a man does feel like he matches the ideal standard of masculinity because of the negative side-effects which can occur for men and those close to them as a result of hegemonic masculinity

(e.g., a successful businessman who feels competitive and powerful in the workplace, but who also experiences tension in the relationship with his spouse and emotional distance with his children as a result of the long hours he spends at work to be competitive). Trauma strain occurs for certain groups of men such as male survivors of childhood sexual abuse, soldiers and veterans, racial/ethnic minorities, and gay or bisexual men. These groups may have particularly harsh or traumatic experiences in connection to male gender role socialization (e.g., a gay man who came out in high school and was bullied and repeatedly referred to as a “girl” or “femme guy” by his peers). As men attempt to successfully enact the hegemonic definition of masculinity, they may experience one or all of these types of strain.

This paradigm of gender role strain stimulated research, further investigating the three varieties of strain that Pleck proposed. This research has led to the formulation of additional constructs, attempting to understand how gender role strain is experienced in men’s lives. Two examples of these new constructs are *gender role conflict* (O’Neil 1981a, 1981b, 1990) and *masculine gender role stress* (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Eisler, Skidmore, & Ward, 1988).

Gender role conflict. O’Neil (1981) proposed that many of men’s psychological problems are connected with gender role conflict. He suggested that the rigid gender role socialization process that men go through, limits men from being fully functioning human beings. This proposed model established men’s gender role conflict (GRC) as an area of inquiry and research in the field of psychology (O’Neil, 2008). Over time, an operational definition of GRC has developed: “GRC is defined as a psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences for the person or others. GRC occurs when rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles result in restriction, devaluation, or violation of others or self” (O’Neil, 2008, p. 362). In a study of gender role conflict and psychological well-being, Sharpe and

Heppner (1991) found that gender role conflict was negatively correlated to most of the measures of psychological well-being. Shepard (2002) found a connection between the restrictive emotionality aspect of GRC and patterns of depressive symptoms connected to a negative state of mind (e.g., feelings of failure, pessimism, guilt, self-dislike). These studies and the research conducted by O'Neil (see O'Neil, 2008 for a review) suggest that gender role conflict may have several potentially damaging effects for men.

Masculine gender role stress. Eisler and Skidmore (1987) defined masculine gender role stress as “the cognitive appraisal of specific situations as stressful for men” (p. 125). Given that the standards of socially acceptable masculine behavior is learned and internalized, men are able to evaluate possible situations using those standards. Eisler and Skidmore (1987) explained that

Based on traditional masculine gender roles, this implies that men will experience stress when 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. (p. 125)

Stress increases with the degree to which a man is committed to culturally sanctioned gender role behavior. With the increased commitment comes greater stress when there is some form of failure to meet the culturally sanctioned behavior. Gender role stress has also been shown to correlate with anger and anxiety (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Eisler, Skidmore, & Ward, 1988).

Men and Religion

While hegemonic masculinity encourages men to be dominant and independent, engage in risky behaviors, and avoid emotional expression (Brannon, 1976; Courtenay, 2000; Courtenay, McCreary, & Merighi, 2002), most religious faiths promote submission, communality, avoiding risky behaviors, and expressing emotions in forms such as prayer,

testimony, or confession (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993; Ellison & Levin, 1998; Francis, 1997), which may be seen as feminine-type behaviors. Some theorists have even suggested that the feminine mode is the primary mode for internal or intrinsic religiousness (Zock, 1997).

Given the previous discussion of male gender socialization, one might conclude that many men would avoid participating in a religious life, especially a more intrinsically spiritual one.

Decades of research examining gender differences in religious activity consistently finds that women are more religious than men (Argyle & Beit-Hallahmi, 1975; Batson et al., 1993; DeVaus & McAllister, 1987). Compared to women, men participate in religious worship and rituals less often, identify as “less religious,” hold less devout beliefs, and give different reasons for religious participation (Batson, et al., 1993).

Explaining the gender differences. Several researchers have attempted to account for these gender differences in religiosity. Francis (1997) suggests that these theories can be organized into two groups: social/contextual influences and individual psychological characteristics. The first group examines the social or contextual influences and how they lead to the different responses of men and women to religion. Social influences are explained by *gender role socialization theories*, e.g., boys are socially conditioned to value independence rather than being part of a community or congregation (Levant & Pollack, 1995); contextual influences are explained by *structural location theories*, e.g., the traditional location of the woman in the home raising children makes her primarily responsible for their spiritual/moral education and promoting the value of religion (Devaus & McAllister, 1987; Douglas, 1977). The second group of theories explains gender differences in religion by individual psychological characteristics which vary between women and men. This latter group can be divided into three subcategories: *personality theories*, e.g., women are more prone to feeling guilt than men and religion helps

alleviate that guilt (Argyle & Beit-Hallahmi, 1975); *depth psychology theories*, e.g., from a psychoanalytic perspective God is a projected father figure to which girls have a greater attachment since he is the love object of their infantile sexuality (Batson et al., 1993); and *gender orientation theories*, e.g., both men and women with feminine orientations will be more religious than those with masculine orientations (Francis & Wilcox, 1996; Thompson, 1991; Thompson & Remmes, 2002). Gender orientation theories have received the most attention in the psychological research in recent years.

Religious men. Given the male gender socialization process and the differences in religiosity between men and women, the man who reports a deep, personal commitment to a religious or spiritual tradition is an intriguing phenomenon. This has led to research specifically examining gender and religious men, with topics of investigation such as male spirituality and how it uniquely differs from female spirituality, gender orientation theories in relation to religious men, how and to what extent religious men experience gender role strain, and the gender role attitudes of religious men.

Male spirituality. Spirituality as a broader construct (which may or may not include formal religious practices) has a diversity of definitions among faith traditions (Rose, 2001). Through qualitative interviews with a variety of religious professionals from multiple religious traditions, Rose (2001) found themes describing a basic set of characteristics which form the criteria for spirituality: (a) some type of religious or comparable experience, (b) consistent effort or practices which are maintained, and (c) the experience of love (p. 193). He also found, however, that some respondents believed that there is a difference between female spirituality and male spirituality. These differences may be in how spirituality is defined, experienced, or both.

Harris (1997) conducted both quantitative and qualitative studies, specifically examining how men view their identities as males and how spirituality is a part of that identity. In one stage of his research, he found that, from a list of 24 male messages or social gender roles, many participants ranked the pressure towards norms such as “nature lover,” “be the best you can,” “scholar,” and “good Samaritan” as more influential on identity formation than male messages such as “rugged individuals,” “bosses,” “lovers,” and “workers,” which led him to hypothesize that spirituality may have a positive effect on male behavior (p. 36). In another stage of his research, he asked men “What does spirituality mean to you?” and used item analysis of responses to form what he refers to as the Ten Tenets of Male Spirituality. In later research asking participants to rank order the ten tenets in level of importance, Harris found that the tenet “Belonging to something great” was most highly ranked. This tenet is typified by a belief such as “I believe in a higher power. My spiritual journey devotes me to a force in this universe greater than myself” (Harris, 1997, p. 34). This suggests that a spiritual life may shift a man’s focus away from himself (i.e., comparing himself to the hegemonic standard) and towards a different set of values and possibly a new definition of masculinity, which is similar to other research which has found that individuals with greater intrinsic religiosity are less self-monitoring, less self-conscious, and report greater existential well-being (Richards, 1994).

Other research examining male spirituality has considered it within the context of the Men’s Movement (Castellini, Nelson, Barrett, Nagy, & Quatman, 2005; Clatterbaugh, 1997). Male spirituality is especially prominent in two subgroups of the Men’s Movement: the mythopoetic movement, founded by poet Robert Bly, and the Christian men’s movement, most notably the Promise Keepers (Clatterbaugh, 1997; Wood, 2008). The mythopoetics conceptualize male spirituality as deeply rooted in a mythic, primordial, earthy manhood and see

reconnecting with nature as the way for men to find wholeness, whereas the Promise Keepers conceptualize male spirituality as represented in the responsibilities given to men by God (e.g., husband, father) and see reconnecting with the Bible and God's commandments as the way for men to find wholeness (see Wood, 2008). Although these two movements are quite different, both movements believe that there is a spirituality inherently connected with being male and which is distinct from female spirituality. Both groups often employ all-men groups or meetings, believing that something is facilitated or gained which cannot be achieved in mixed gender groups. It may be that movements like these "masculinize" religiousness or spirituality sufficiently or in such a way that it reduces the extent to which religious men fear that religious/spiritual beliefs and behaviors will be perceived as feminine.

Religious men and gender orientation. After several studies confirmed that women, in general, are more religious than men, researchers attempted to understand why this occurs. The gender orientation theories have received quite a bit of attention and debate in the research literature. The gender orientation explanation of religious differences in men and women is based, in part, on Bem's (1974, 1981) theory of psychological androgyny, which posits that a man or woman could be some combination of both masculine and feminine. Thompson (1991; Thompson & Remmes, 2002) was one of the first researchers to use Bem's theories in investigating religious differences between men and women. Thompson (1991) found that when a multivariate analysis controlled for a feminine orientation, the hypothesis that women would be more religious than men was not supported and that a feminine orientation was a better predictor of religiousness than sex. He also found that "among men, the relationship between gender outlook and religiousness was particularly important and reliable" (p. 389).

Other research conducted in the United Kingdom using Anglican samples has found that male clergy and other men endorsing high levels of religiousness have reflected more feminine profiles on measures of personality and gender (Francis, Jones, Jackson, & Robbins, 2001; Francis & Wilcox, 1996). Francis et al. (2001) found that, in comparison with other men, Anglican clergy exhibit “lower levels of risk-taking, manipulation, sensation seeking and masculinity, and higher levels of responsibility and reflectiveness” (p. 20) and present a characteristically feminine profile on the Eysenck Personality Profiler.

Religious men and gender role strain. Given the research findings previously discussed, one would expect that religious men would experience greater levels of gender role strain. Research has found, however, that men who report higher levels of religiosity and spiritual well-being report *lower* levels of masculine gender role conflict and gender role stress (Jurkovic & Walker, 2006; Mahalik & Lagan, 2001). Mahalik and Lagan (2001) conducted a study on a sample of Catholic men, both seminarians and non-seminarian undergraduates. They found that for both seminarians and non-seminarians, individuals who were rigid in terms of traditional masculinity and who reported greater stress about living up to a perceived standard of masculinity also reported less intrinsic religiosity and spiritual well-being; men who reported higher levels of religiosity and spiritual well-being reported lower levels of gender role strain. Jurkovic and Walker (2006) utilized the same measures as Mahalik and Lagan (2001), conducting their study with a sample of Australian men who were separated into two groups for data analysis, “religious” and “not religious,” based on participant responses on a self-report measure of religiousness. Of the religious group, participants reported their religion as Protestant, Catholic, nondenominational, Orthodox, or unspecified. They found that religious men experienced lower levels of masculine gender role conflict and stress than nonreligious men.

These findings seem somewhat paradoxical based on previous masculine gender role research. In hypothesizing about their findings with a sample of Catholic men, Mahalik and Lagan (2001) suggested that religious or spiritual men “may either be less susceptible to the shaming messages associated with masculine socialization or possibly use their religious and spiritual experiences to cope with the anxiety and stress associated with violating masculine norms” (p.31).

Religious men and gender role attitudes. Wilson (1978) stated that “religion is probably the single most important shaper of sex roles” (quoted in Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984, p. 365). Morgan (1987) found that religious devoutness was the most important variable in consistently predicting gender-role attitudes. Research has also consistently found that religious populations, especially orthodox and conservative religions, tend to endorse traditional gender roles for men and women and a more patriarchal structure in church and family (Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984; Hoffman & Miller, 1997; Moore & Vanneman, 2003). Lottes and Kuriloff (1992), however, suggest that studies looking at the effect of religion on gender role ideology are contradictory and inconclusive and that further research is needed.

Latter-day Saint Perspectives

The LDS Church (formally known as The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints) has been very clear in its teachings regarding gender and gender roles (Hartman & Hartman, 1983); however, sociological and psychological research in this area is lacking (Stark, 1984; Thomas, 1983). In the 1980’s, Thomas (1983) stated that, “research evidence is virtually nonexistent that compares the extent to which children reared in Mormon families either accept or reject traditional sex roles” (p. 280) and Stark (1984) argued that “the ‘miracle’ of Mormon success makes them the single most important case on the agenda of the social scientific study of religion” (p. 26). Since that time, some research has been conducted examining LDS gender-role

attitudes (Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984, 1985) and investigating the role-related experiences of LDS women within the patriarchal system of the LDS Church (Beaman, 2001). In the past 20 years, however, gender roles and societal attitudes have undergone significant changes.

Examining whether or not similar changes have occurred among Latter-day Saints could provide information on the stability or evolution of gender roles and gender role attitudes within the context of a conservative religion.

Although scientific research on LDS gender role attitudes and behaviors is lacking, the topic has been frequently addressed in LDS teachings. Clear and specific statements regarding roles and appropriate attributes for men and women can be found in settings ranging from sermons given by satellite transmission to worldwide church membership by high-ranking church leaders (Christofferson, 2006, 2013; Oaks, 1993, 2014; Packer, 1998, 2009) to local LDS congregations where a part of typical Sunday services includes classes taught separately to adolescent boys and girls with content specific to each gender.

A key LDS doctrine regarding gender is succinctly explained in *The Family: A Proclamation to the World*, a document that was first read in a worldwide conference and later translated into several languages and distributed throughout the church as well as sent to government and civic leaders in many countries. It states, “Gender is an essential characteristic of individual premortal, mortal, and eternal identity and purpose” (“The Family,” 1995, p. 102). Although written in 1995, this statement is consistent with LDS beliefs throughout the history of the church, even to its beginnings in the early 1800’s. This belief contributes to LDS beliefs about gender roles, gender role socialization, and societal changes in gender role attitudes. And, of particular relevance for the present study, it contributes to LDS definitions and standards of masculinity.

The following sections will attempt to provide the reader with a basic overview of LDS gender-related beliefs. Although the statements made by church leadership on gender roles and gender-related behaviors are too numerous to be presented comprehensively, each section contains a selection of quotes from either church leaders speaking to the worldwide church membership, the proclamation on the family, or from *A Parent's Guide* (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985), which is an official manual published by the LDS Church to help parents teach children about sexuality and gender identity. The quotes are presented chronologically to offer the reader some sense of how gender has been addressed in the LDS church over time. Following the quotes is a brief discussion as well as a summary of relevant research findings. It is hoped that these quotes and discussions will highlight how specifically and explicitly the LDS Church addresses gender and gender roles and that they will illustrate some of the beliefs which may contribute to the unique way in which males growing up in LDS homes and congregations are socialized.

Latter-day Saints and gender. From early in church history, LDS leaders have discussed how males and females are distinct, but have also discussed attributes, traits, or virtues to which both men and women are encouraged to aspire. The following quotes highlight these teachings regarding gender.

The distinction between male and female is no condition peculiar to the relatively brief period of mortal life. It was an essential characteristic of our pre-existent condition.

(Talmage, 1922, as quoted in Oaks, 1993)

There is nearly as much variation within each gender as there is between the genders.

Each human being is unique...Development of a person's gifts or interests is one of life's

most enjoyable experiences. No one should be denied such growth. (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985, p.26)

Among the traits Christ revealed as proper for men and women alike are faith, hope, charity, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, kindness, godliness, humility, diligence, and love. These virtues transcend gender. They are Christlike attributes to which both sexes should aspire. (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985, p. 25)

Opportunities for development of spiritual and intellectual potential are equal. Masculinity has no monopoly on the mind, and femininity has no exclusive dominion over the heart. (Nelson, 1989)

Our Church doctrine places women equal to and yet different from men. God does not regard either gender as better or more important than the other. (Ballard, 2013)

In addition to believing that men and women were created as separate and unique beings, e.g., “God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them” (Genesis 1:27, KJV), Latter-day Saints believe in a spiritual existence prior to birth and that even in that premortal state individuals were gendered beings. Gender is an important part of how LDS individuals are taught to view themselves, both physically and spiritually. There is an understanding that there are some attributes that are unique to each gender, and others are available to both. From an outside perspective, these virtues, which transcend gender, may be categorized into masculine or feminine using hegemonic standards or modern stereotypes; however, for the LDS individual, pursuing these virtues is seen as following the example of Christ.

Latter-day Saints and gender roles. Similar to the views held by other Christian faiths and conservative groups, the LDS Church teaches that men's gender roles include family leadership and working as the breadwinner and women's gender roles include working as the primary caretaker of children. The following quotes highlight LDS teachings regarding gender roles.

By divine design, fathers are to preside over their families in love and righteousness and are responsible to provide the necessities of life and protection for their families.

Mothers are primarily responsible for the nurture of their children. In these sacred responsibilities, fathers and mothers are obligated to help one another as equal partners.

(The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1995, p. 102)

Men and women, though spiritually equal, are entrusted with different but equally significant roles. These roles complement each other. Men are given stewardship over the sacred ordinances of the priesthood. To women, God gives stewardship over bestowing and nurturing mortal life, including providing physical bodies for God's spirit children and guiding those children toward a knowledge of gospel truths. These stewardships, equally sacred and important, do not involve any false ideas about domination or subordination. (Ballard, 2003)

We do not diminish the value of what women or men achieve in any worthy endeavor or career—we all benefit from those achievements—but we still recognize there is not a higher good than motherhood and fatherhood in marriage. (Christofferson, 2013)

Common in LDS teachings is the emphasis that the prescribed roles for men and women are different but equal. Although there is some variation in how individual members respond to LDS teachings regarding gender roles (Beaman, 2001; Kline, 2014), as a group, Mormons are

found to be the most traditional Christian denomination with regard to gender attitudes and endorsement of a more traditional role for women (Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984; 1985; Jensen & Jensen, 1993).

Latter-day Saints and gender role egalitarianism. Although the LDS Church teaches that there are separate roles for men and women, there is also an emphasis in the doctrine that one role is not better than the other, and that within the family unit, men and women are meant to work together in mutually fulfilling their prescribed roles. The following quotes highlight the LDS definition of gender role egalitarianism.

We believe that women are useful, not only to sweep houses, wash dishes, make beds and raise babies, but that they should stand behind the counter, study law or physics, medicine, or become good bookkeepers and be able to do the business in any counting house, and all this to enlarge their sphere of usefulness for the benefit of society at large. In following these things, they but answer the design of their creation. (Brigham Young [1801-1877], as quoted in Arrington, 1986, p. 339)

May the fathers in Israel live as they should live; treat their wives as they should treat them; make their homes as comfortable as they possibly can; lighten the burden upon their companions as much as possible. (Smith, 1909)

It is unchristianlike, unfair, and displeasing to God for any husband or father to assume the role of dictatorship and adopt the attitude that he is superior in any way to his wife. (Tanner, 1973)

Husbands, recognize your wife's intelligence and her ability to counsel with you as a real partner regarding family plans, family activities, and family budgeting...Remember, brethren, love can be nurtured and nourished by little tokens. Flowers on special

occasions are wonderful, but so is your willingness to help with the dishes, change diapers, get up with a crying child in the night, and leave the television or the newspaper to help with the dinner. (Benson, 1987)

A man who holds the priesthood accepts his wife as a partner in the leadership of the home and family with full knowledge of and full participation in all decisions relating thereto. The Lord intended that the wife be a helpmeet for man (meet means equal)—that is, a companion equal and necessary in full partnership. Presiding in righteousness necessitates a shared responsibility between husband and wife; together you act with knowledge and participation in all family matters. For a man to operate independent of or without regard to the feelings and counsel of his wife in governing the family is to exercise unrighteous dominion. (Hunter, 1994)

A man, a father, can do much of what is usually assumed to be a woman's work. In turn, a wife and a mother can do much—and in time of need, most things—usually considered the responsibility of the man, without jeopardizing their distinct roles. (Packer, 1998)

We know that a father's role does not end with presiding, providing, and protecting family members. On a day-to-day basis, fathers can and should help with the essential nurturing and bonding associated with feeding, playing, storytelling, loving, and all the rest of the activities that make up family life. (Ballard, 2003)

Although Latter-day Saints tend to endorse a traditional family structure with the man as the primary breadwinner and the woman as the primary caretaker, they are also found to be one of the most egalitarian denominations with regards to behaviors such as the division of household labor and familial decision making (Brinkerhoff & MacKie, 1984). Historian Thomas O'Dea (1957) suggested that this somewhat contradictory finding is a result of a combination of

“social idealism born of Mormon beliefs and political conservatism.” He argued that early Mormons “came close to accepting the equality of women with men” while still “accepting patriarchal ideas of family organization” (p. 255).

Latter-day Saint gender role socialization. In addition to teachings regarding the distinct and separate roles for men and women, leaders within the LDS Church have also discussed how to teach these roles to young children through a socialization process which occurs both within the church and within the home. The following quotes illustrate some of the language used by church leaders in encouraging church members to socialize children towards a specific understanding of gender.

I sincerely hope that our Latter-day Saint girls and women, and men and boys, will...conform their lives to the beautiful and comprehensive roles the Lord assigned to them. (Kimball, 1975)

How, then, can you teach your children these eternal roles during the precious interlude years? Do it in the Lord’s own way. Work and play alongside your children in all the tasks and enjoyments of womanhood and manhood. (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985, p. 29)

You should provide opportunities for your children to develop talents in various directions unhindered by improper stereotypes. But you should respect the divinely mandated roles special to the respective sexes. Teach your children that they will grow and be happy by accepting these roles and magnifying them... By example and by discussion, both sexes need to learn about being male or female. (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985, p. 26)

In cases where a parent is missing through divorce, death, or excessive activities outside the home, it is crucial that a substitute give enough example of the missing gender behavior, including approval and love, to partially overcome the child's loss. When fathers fail or are missing, mothers must be able to call on their extended family and the Church for help. (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985, p. 20)

The LDS Church is quite clear about using socialization as the way to instruct children in proper gender roles while still allowing for individuality. Parents are encouraged to allow diversity in expression of gender characteristics and avoid socializing their children to adhere to improper gender stereotypes (e.g., hegemonic masculinity). Following the "divinely mandated roles," however, is strongly encouraged and seen as important for life satisfaction. Parental modeling is emphasized as the main process by which this occurs.

Cornwall (1988) examined the influence of church, family, and peers on religious socialization within the LDS church. She found that within the home, LDS teachings are often reinforced through stories, conversations, and modeling of behavior. These provide symbolic references which a child is able to use in the construction of reality or making sense of the world. Cornwall suggested that "the more religiously oriented the family, the more central religion will be within the child's personal construction of reality" (p. 229). She also found that family had a greater influence on personal religiosity (beliefs, spiritual commitment, etc.) and peers had a greater influence on institutional religiosity (church commitment, frequency of church attendance, etc.). Although her research touched on gender socialization as part of religious socialization, additional research is needed which specifically examines the role of church, family, and peers on gender socialization in LDS families and communities (Thomas, 1983).

Concerns about gender-related changes in society. As gender roles began to be modified in the United States during the societal changes of the 1960's and 1970's, leaders within the LDS Church began to voice concerns regarding these changes. Such concerns continue to be discussed by contemporary church leaders. The following quotes illustrate some of the specific concerns raised in regards to changing societal norms around gender and gender roles.

There are some voices in our society who would demean some of the attributes of masculinity. A few of these are women who mistakenly believe that they build their own feminine causes by tearing down the image of manhood. (Faust, 1973)

Some people are ignorant or vicious and apparently attempting to destroy the concept of masculinity and femininity. More and more girls dress, groom, and act like men. More and more men dress, groom, and act like women. The high purposes of life are damaged and destroyed by the growing unisex theory. (Kimball, 1974)

We live in a day when there are many political, legal, and social pressures for changes that confuse gender and homogenize the differences between men and women. Our eternal perspective sets us against changes that alter those separate duties and privileges of men and women that are essential to accomplish the great plan of happiness. We do not oppose all changes in the treatment of men and women, since some changes in laws or customs simply correct old wrongs that were never grounded in eternal principles. (Oaks, 1993)

[An] area of concern comes from those who, in the name of equality, want to erase all differences between the masculine and the feminine. Often this takes the form of pushing women to adopt more masculine traits—be more aggressive, tough, and

confrontational....In blurring feminine and masculine differences, we lose the distinct, complementary gifts of women and men that together produce a greater whole.

(Christofferson, 2013)

Despite contemporary rhetoric suggesting that there are few, if any, inherent differences between men and women, the LDS Church continues to state that differences exist and are important. Within LDS teachings, there seems to be the understanding that these differences lead to a productive dialectic with masculinity and femininity complimenting one another. The tone of these quotes suggest strong emotions on the part of church leaders, a willingness to speak out in defense of traditional notions of gender roles even if that goes against the tide of popular opinion.

Research has found that Latter-day Saints tend to be fairly homogenous in terms of social and political views. In virtually every study of political attitudes, LDS individuals have been found to endorse conservative values on economic, social, and lifestyle issues (see Fox, 2003). Looking at change over time, Christensen and Cannon (1978) found that LDS students at Brigham Young University became more conservative between 1935 and 1973, and suggested that this represented a movement towards religious fundamentalism, even though society at that time was moving towards less conservative or traditional values. In general, research has shown that Latter-day Saint values and attitudes remain fairly stable over time, especially attitudes regarding gender and gender roles.

Latter-day Saint masculinity. From the beginnings of the LDS Church, leaders have encouraged a model of masculinity which includes expressing feelings, showing compassion, working in cooperation with others, and leading by example. The following quotes illustrate

specific teachings regarding masculinity and the role of men, especially in their role towards women and children.

Fathers...for the love that should exist between you and your boys... when you speak or talk to them, do it not in anger, do it not harshly, in a condemning spirit. Speak to them kindly; get them down and weep with them if necessary and get them to shed tears with you if possible. Soften their hearts; get them to feel tenderly toward you. Use no lash and no violence, but ... approach them with reason, with persuasion and love unfeigned. (Smith, 1919, p. 396)

Holding the priesthood does not mean that a man is a power-broker, or that he sits on a throne, dictating in macho terms, or that he is superior in any way. Rather, he is a leader by authority of example. (Faust, 1988)

It seems that everyone at some time or another is invited by peers to smoke, drink, steal, or engage in other immoral acts, all under the pretense of manhood. And when someone refuses to participate, he is often ridiculed and called names like pansy, mamma's boy, idiot, chicken, sissy, and religious fanatic...We see colorful advertisements on billboards, in magazines, and on the television screen promoting cigarettes, beer, and other vices.... They would have us believe that a person with a cigarette or alcoholic beverage in hand is a man, when in reality he is nothing more than a slave to a destructive substance. They would have us believe that a person who engages in illicit sex is a man, when in reality he is nothing more than an abuser of those who are "tender," and "chaste," and "delicate" (Jacob 2:7). They would have us believe that brute force, or crude behavior, uncontrolled temper, foul language, and dirty appearance make a man, when in reality these characteristics are animalistic at best and the opposite of manhood at worst. (Asay, 1992)

We must arise from the dust of self-indulgence and be men! It is a wonderful aspiration for a boy to become a man—strong and capable; someone who can build and create things, run things; someone who makes a difference in the world. It is a wonderful aspiration for those of us who are older to make the vision of true manhood a reality in our lives and be models for those who look to us for an example... In large measure, true manhood is defined in our relationship to women. (Christofferson, 2006)

Your gender was determined in the premortal existence. You were born a male. You must treasure and protect the masculine part of your nature. You must have respectful, protective regard for all women and girls. (Packer, 2009)

Within the LDS Church, boys experience gender socialization from an early age; throughout the church there are classes, meetings, and other situations separated by gender where LDS boys and men interact with each other and learn about roles and responsibilities connected to being a man. Masculinity is frequently referenced in relation to how to properly treat women. And although LDS masculinity is connected to concepts of the priesthood and leadership roles, it is also emphasized that leadership, both in the family and in the church, involves humility, service, kindness, sincerity, and respect, which is in contrast to equating leadership roles with domination, power, and authoritarianism. These quotes suggest that LDS men grow up socialized to definitions of masculinity which are more nuanced and complex than simple conservative, traditional masculinity or dominant, hegemonic masculinity.

Research specifically focusing on masculinity within the LDS religion is virtually non-existent. Some research has been conducted on the practice of fathering within the LDS faith; most of this research has focused on fathers of children with special needs (see Marks & Dollahite, 2001). In previous decades, research specifically focusing on LDS women was

motivated, in part, by the Women's Movement and the Equal Rights Amendment, of which the LDS Church was a vocal opponent. The 1980's and early 1990's was a time of great social change for women, and LDS women were a part of that moment. In the present day, men seem to be experiencing a time of social change, ranging from the emergence of new groups such as metrosexuals to various critics and gender theorists describing this time as "the end of men." Additionally, the LDS Church has become increasingly visible through public relations campaigns (e.g., "I'm a Mormon"), prominent LDS politicians (e.g. Mitt Romney, Harry Reid), and participation in social issue debates (e.g., same-sex marriage). It may be timely to research current gender role attitudes of Latter-day Saints, especially of LDS men or attitudes towards LDS masculinity given the changing social landscape.

Conclusion

Gender research and theory continues to evolve, becoming more nuanced and complex over time as we move away from rigid definitions and simple dichotomies. The growing field of research of the psychology of men and masculinity has not only highlighted the complexity of masculinities and the male socialization process but has also drawn attention to some of the negative effects, or gender role strain, experienced by men. In order to be able to better help men, we need to focus our research on understanding these processes and how they occur. This will then allow us to create interventions for individuals and for communities aimed at reducing men's gender role strain and increasing their ability to lead healthy, authentic lives.

Religious men appear to be a unique group among men, who do not experience gender role strain in the same way or to the same extent as other men. Research in this area has suggested that a developing a religious or a spiritual life may help to mediate some of the more damaging effects of hegemonic male socialization and could be potentially important for men's

health and well-being (Mahalik & Lagan, 2001). In particular, LDS men may experience a male socialization process that provides a different model of masculinity. Although scientific research in this area is lacking, a variety of statements made by LDS Church leaders suggest that the socialization process is especially clear and explicit for Latter-day Saints. The present study aims to begin to investigate this process and assess the levels of gender role strain and religiousness in a sample of LDS men. It is hoped that this will be the beginning of a program of research which may help us better understand how to help the men in our society.

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

IMPLIED CONSENT

You are being invited to participate in this research study of gender role attitudes and spirituality among Mormon men. I am a graduate student at Brigham Young University working with Dr. Marleen Williams from the department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education and I am conducting this survey as part of my doctoral dissertation. I am interested in finding out about the attitudes male, Latter-day Saint, BYU students have towards gender roles, masculinity, and spirituality.

Your participation in this study will require the completion of the attached surveys. This should take approximately 15 minutes of your time. Your participation will be anonymous and you will not be contacted again in the future. You will not be paid for being in this study. As an incentive, however, you have the option of being entered into **a drawing for one of eight \$25 gift cards from Amazon.com**. If you would like to be entered into the drawing, please provide an email address when prompted at the end of the survey questions. Email addresses will be kept confidential and separate from survey responses. Winners will be notified after all data are collected.

This survey involves minimal risk to you. The benefits, however, may impact society by helping increase knowledge about how masculinity, gender roles, and spirituality are part of the life experiences of college-age men who are members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer for any reason. We will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem you may contact me, Loren Brown at loren_brown@byu.edu or my advisor, Dr. Marleen Williams at marleen_williams@byu.edu; (801) 422-3035.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the IRB Administrator at A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu; (801) 422-1461. The IRB is a group of people who review research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research participants.

The completion of this survey implies your consent to participate. If you choose to participate, please complete the attached surveys. Thank you!

- Yes, I consent to participate
- No, I do NOT consent to participate

DISSERTATION REFERENCES

- Addis, M. (2011). *Invisible men: Men's inner lives and the consequences of silence*. New York, NY: Times Books.
- Argyle, M., & Beit-Hallahmi, B. (1975). *The social psychology of religion*. London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Arrington, L. (1986). *American Moses*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Asay, C. E. (1992, April). Be men!. In *April 1992 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1992/04/be-men>
- Ballard, M. R. (2003, August). The sacred responsibilities of parents. In *August 19, 2003 BYU Campus Education Week Devotional*. Retrieved from <http://speeches.byu.edu/?act=viewitem&id=895>
- Ballard, R. M. (2006, March). The sacred responsibilities of parenthood. *Ensign*, 36(3), 26-33.
- Ballard, M. R. (2013, August). Let us think straight. In *August 20, 2013 BYU Campus Education Week Devotional*. Retrieved from <http://speeches.byu.edu/?act=viewitem&id=2133>
- Basow, S. A. (1986). *Gender stereotypes: Traditions and alternatives*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishers.
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *The religious experience: A social-psychological perspective*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Beaman, L. G. (2001). Molly Mormons, Mormon feminists, and moderates: Religious diversity and the Latter Day Saints Church. *Sociology of Religion*, 62(1), 65-86.
- Beit-Hallahmi, B., & Argyle, M. (1997). *The psychology of religious behavior, belief and experience*. London, England: Routledge.

- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender Schema Theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, 88(4), 354-364. DOI:10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42(2), 155-162. DOI: 10.1037/h0036215
- Benson, E. T. (1987, October). To the fathers in Israel. In *October 1987 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1987/10/to-the-fathers-in-israel>
- Berkel, L. A., Vandiver, B. J., & Bahner, A. D. (2004). Gender role attitudes, religion, and spirituality as predictors of domestic violence attitudes in white college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 119-133. DOI: 10.1353/csd.2004.0019
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role—And what it's done for us lately. In R. Brannon & D. Davids (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority* (pp. 1–40). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brinkerhoff, M. B., & MacKie, M. (1985). Religion and gender: A comparison of Canadian and American student attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 47(2), 415-429.
- Brinkerhoff, M. B., & MacKie, M. M. (1984). Religious denominations' impact upon gender attitudes: Some methodological implications. *Review of Religious Research*, 24(4), 365-378.
- Castellini, J. D., Nelson, W. M., Barrett, J. J., Nagy, M. S., & Quatman, G. L. (2005). Male spirituality and the men's movement: a factorial examination of motivations. *Journal of Psychology & Theology*, 33(1).
- Christensen, H. T., & Cannon, K. L. (1978). The fundamentalist emphasis at Brigham Young University: 1935-1973. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 17(1), 53-57.

- Christofferson, D. T. (2006, October). Let us be men. In *October 2006 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/2006/10/let-us-be-men>
- Christofferson, D. T. (2013, October). The moral force of women. In *October 2013 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/2013/10/the-moral-force-of-women>
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (1995, November). The family: A proclamation to the world. *Ensign*, 25(11), 102.
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (1985). *A parent's guide*. Salt Lake City, UT: Author.
- Clatterbaugh, K. (1997). *Contemporary perspectives on masculinity* (2nd ed). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R. W. (1993). The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history. *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 597-623. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/657986>
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society*, 19(6), 829-859. DOI: 10.1177/0891243205278639
- Cornwall, M. (1988). The influence of three agents of religious socialization: Family, church, and peers. In D. L. Thomas (Ed.), *The religion & family connection: Social science perspectives* (pp. 207-231). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Religious Studies Center.
- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: a theory of gender and health. *Social science & medicine*, 50(10), 1385-1401.

- Courtenay, W. H., McCreary, D. R., & Merighi, J. R. (2002). Gender and ethnic differences in health beliefs and behaviors. *Journal of Health Psychology, 7*(3), 219-231.
- Cushman, P. (1995). *Constructing the self, constructing America: A cultural history of psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Da Capo Press.
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity?. *Theory and society, 22*(5), 643-657.
- Douglas, A. (1977). *The feminization of American culture*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- 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*, 123-136. DOI: 10.1177/01454455870112001
- Eisler, R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine gender-role stress: Predictor of anger, anxiety, and healthy-risk behaviors. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(1), 133-141.
- Ellison, C.G. (1991). Religious involvement and subjective well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 32*, 80-99.
- Englar-Carlson, M. E., & Stevens, M. A. (2006). *In the room with men: A casebook of therapeutic change*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Fagot, B. I., Rodgers, C. S., & Leinbach, M. D. (2000). Theories of gender socialization. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.) *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 65-89). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Faust, J. E. (1973, October). Happiness is having a father who cares. In *October 1973 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1973/10/happiness-is-having-a-father-who-cares>

Faust, J. E. (1988, April). The highest place of honor. In *April 1988 General Conference*.

Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1988/04/the-highest-place-of-honor>

Fox, J. C. (2003). A typology of LDS sociopolitical worldviews. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 42*(2), 279-289.

Francis, L. J., & Wilcox, C. (1998). Religiosity and femininity: Do women really hold a more positive attitude toward Christianity? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 37*(3), 462-469.

Francis, L. J., & Wilcox, C. (1996). Religion and gender orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 20*(1), 119-121.

Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., Jackson, C. J., & Robbins, M. (2001). The feminine personality profile of male Anglican clergy in Britain and Ireland: A study employing the Eysenck Personality Profiler. *Review of Religious Research, 43*(1), 14-23.

Garfield, C. F., Isacco, A., & Sahker, E. (2013). Religion and spirituality as important components of men's health and wellness: An analytic review. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine, 7*(1), 27-37.

Harris, I. I. (1997). The ten tenets of male spirituality. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 6*(1), 29-53.

Hartman, M. & Hartman, H. (1983). Sex-role attitudes of Mormons vs. non-Mormons in Utah. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 45*(4), 897-902.

Hoffmann, J. P., & Miller, A. S. (1997). Social and political attitudes among religious groups: Convergence and divergence over time. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 36*(1), 52-70. DOI: 10.2307/1387882

- Hunter, H. W. (1994, October). Being a righteous husband and father. In *October 1994 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1994/10/being-a-righteous-husband-and-father>
- Ivtzan, I., Chan, C. P., Gardner, H. E., & Prashar, K. (2013). Linking religion and spirituality with psychological well-being: Examining self-actualisation, meaning in life, and personal growth initiative. *Journal of religion and health, 52*(3), 915-929.
- Jensen, L. & Jensen, J. (1993). Family values, religiosity, and gender. *Psychological Reports, 73*, 429-430.
- Jurkovic, D., & Walker, G. A. (2006). Examining masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to religious orientation and spiritual well-being in Australian men. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 14*(1), 27-46.
- Kane, E. W. (2006). "No way my boys are going to be like that!" Parents' responses to children's gender nonconformity. *Gender & Society, 20*(2), 149-176.
- Kimball, S. W. (1974, October). God will not be mocked. In *October 1974 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1974/10/god-will-not-be-mocked>
- Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J., & Connell, R. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kiselica, M. S., & Englar-Carlson, M. (2010). Identifying, affirming, and building upon male strengths: The positive psychology/positive masculinity model of psychotherapy with boys and men. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 47*(3), 276-287.
- Kline, C. (2014). The Mormon conception of women's nature and role: A feminist analysis. *Feminist Theology, 22*(2), 186-202.

- Levant, R. F., & Pollack, W. S. (Eds.) (1995). *A new psychology of men*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Lottes, I. L., & Kuriloff, P. J. (1992). The effect of gender, race, religion, and political orientation on the sex role attitudes of college freshmen. *Adolescence*, 27(107), 675-688.
- Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' different socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109(2), 267-296.
- Mahalik, J. R., & Lagan, H. D. (2001). Examining masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to religious orientation and spiritual well-being. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2(1), 24-33. DOI: 10.1037//1524-9220.2.1.24
- Marks, L. D., & Dollahite, D. C. (2001). Religion, relationships, and responsible fathering in Latter-day Saint families of children with special needs. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18(5), 625-650.
- Mintz, L. B., & O'Neil, J. M. (1990). Gender roles, sex, and the process of psychotherapy: Many questions and few answers. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 68, 381-387.
- Moore, L. M., & Vanneman, R. (2003). Context matters: Effects of the proportion of fundamentalists on gender attitudes. *Social Forces*, 82(1), 115-139.
- Nelson, R. M. (1989, October). Woman – of infinite worth. In *October 1989 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1989/10/woman-of-infinite-worth>
- Oaks, D. H. (1993, October). The great plan of happiness. In *October 1993 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1993/10/the-great-plan-of-happiness>
- O'Dea, T. F. (1975). *The Mormons*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

- O'Leary, V. E., & Donoghue, J. M. (1978). Latitudes of masculinity: Reactions to sex-role deviance in men. *Journal of Social Issues, 34*, 17-28.
- O'Neil, J.M. (1981a). Male sex role conflicts, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologist. *The Counseling Psychologist, 9*(2), 61-80. DOI: 10.1177/001100008100900213
- O'Neil, J.M. (1981b). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*(4), 203-210.
- O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the Gender Conflict Scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*(3), 358-445. DOI: 10.1177/0011000008317057
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*(5-6), 335-350. DOI: 10.1007/BF00287583.
- Packer, B. K. (1998, April). The relief society. In *April 1998 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1998/04/the-relief-society>
- Packer, B. K. (2009, April). Counsel to young men. In *April 2009 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/2009/04/counsel-to-young-men>
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11-32). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Richards, P. S. (1994). Religious devoutness, impression management, and personality functioning in college students. *Journal of Research in Personality, 28*(1), 14-26. DOI:10.1006/jrpe.1994.1003

- Rose, S. (2001). Is the term 'spirituality' a word that everyone uses, but nobody knows what anyone means by it?. *Journal of Contemporary Religion, 16*(2), 193-207.
- Seybold, K. S., & Hill, P. C. (2001). The role of religion and spirituality in mental and physical health. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 10*(1), 21-24.
- 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.
- 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. DOI: 10.1037//1524-9220.3.1.3
- Simpson, M. (2002, July 22) Meet the metrosexual. *Salon*. Retrieved from <http://www.salon.com/2002/07/22/metrosexual>
- Smith, J. F. (1909, October). Discourse by President Joseph F. Smith. In *October 1909 Millennial Star*. Retrieved from https://archive.org/stream/millennialstar7143eng/millennialstar7143eng_djvu.txt
- Stark, R. (1984). The rise of a new world faith. *Review of Religious Research, 26*(1), 18-27.
- Stoppler, G. (2008). Rank Usurpation of Power-The Role of Patriarchal Religion and Culture in the Subordination of Women. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy, 15*, 365-397.
- Tanner, N. E. (1973, October). No greater honor: The woman's role. In *October 1973 General Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1973/10/no-greater-honor-the-womans-role>
- Thomas, D. L. 1983. "Family in the Mormon Experience." Pp. 267-88 in W. V. D'Antonio and J. Aldous (eds.), *Families and Religions: Conflict and Change in Modern Society*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Thompson, E. H., Jr., (1991). Beneath the status characteristic: Gender variations in religiousness. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30(4), 381-394.
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Remmes, K. R. (2002). Does masculinity thwart being religious? An examination of older men's religiousness. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(3), 521-532.
- Thomas, D. L. 1983. Family in the Mormon Experience. In W. V. D'Antonio & J. Aldous (Eds.), *Families and Religions: Conflict and Change in Modern Society* (pp. 267–88). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, 1(2), 125-151.
- Wood, J. T. (2008). The rhetorical shaping of gender: Men's movements in America. In *Gendered lives: Communication, gender, and culture* (8th ed.) (pp. 82-103). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.