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Abstract

The purpose of these studies was to develop a psychometrically sound questionnaire that addresses outstanding empirical issues in adolescent gender role conflict and, in so doing, enhance understanding of the negative consequences of Irish adolescent males’ internalisation of societally enforced masculine expectations. To ensure that a nuanced understanding of gender role conflict informed the scale development process, the combined use of qualitative and quantitative research methods was employed. Four factors relating gender role conflict, namely ‘Expectations’, ‘Restrictions’, ‘Discontinuity’ and ‘Penalty’ were assessed through interviews and focus group discussions. Based on a review of the literature and feedback from both participants and content experts, scale items were iteratively analysed. Four studies using exploratory factor analyses, confirmatory factor analyses, multiple regression, reliability analyses, and tests of validity (i.e., convergent) were conducted, offering support for the psychometric soundness of the new scale entitled, the Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for adolescents (I-GRCS-A). The resultant 9-item scale significantly correlated with measures of self-esteem (rs ranged from -.28 to -.49 in four independent samples), anxiety (r = .41) and depression (i.e., rs = .43 and .46 in two independent samples) providing evidence of the scale’s convergent validity. In the final study, the I-GRCS-A correlated significantly with positive/negative suicide ideation, however, analysis revealed that gender role conflict did not account for a statistically significant proportion of variance in suicide ideation above and beyond the proportions accounted for by depression and self-esteem. Finally, limitations of the research and directions for future research were outlined.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction to the Gender Role Conflict Research Paradigm

1.1 Chapter Overview

The purpose of this chapter was to introduce the core theoretical and empirical literature on Gender Role Conflict (GRC). The chapter covers the development of the GRC theory and underpinning related concepts; the development and psychometric properties of its measure, the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O’Neil, Helm, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986), and adaptations of the GRCS for use with adolescent samples.

1.2 An introduction to the Gender Role Conflict and related constructs

GRC is defined as a psychological state in which the socialised male gender role has negative consequences for the person and others (O’Neil, 2008). GRC occurs when rigid, sexist, or limiting gender roles result in restriction, devaluation, or violation of self and/or others (O’Neil, 1981b). With approximately 240 studies conducted to date, associations between GRC and various indicants of psychological health have been documented.

James O’Neil (2008), the author of GRC theory, published a 25-year literature review of GRC research (1982-2007). This review provides a detailed examination of: a) the theoretical models underpinning the theory; b) the psychometric properties of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; c) principal findings of GRC research; d) criticisms directed at GRC theory and the GRCS; and e) future research avenues for GRC theory. This important review both highlights the existent literature on GRC, and delineates a programme of research addressing some of the gaps in this area.

The GRCS has been regarded as the “most well-known instrument within the traditional counselling literature” that focuses on masculinity (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993, p. 360) and has made an important contribution to men’s health research.
(O’Beaglaoich, Sarma & Morrison, 2013). For example, 11 out of 13 studies reviewed by O’Neil (2008) documented a negative correlation between GRC and self-esteem; 12 out of 15 studies reported a positive correlation between GRC and anxiety; and 24 out of 27 studies found positive correlations between GRC and depression.

The rationale for GRC theory was devised and documented in a number of theoretical papers (O’Neil, 1981a, 1981b, 1982). These papers describe a model that conceptualizes GRC as an “interaction of environmental and biological factors that promote certain masculine values (i.e., the masculine mystique) and the fear of femininity” (O’Neil, 2008, p. 361). As the concepts of masculine ideology (and, more narrowly, hegemonic masculinity) as well as gender role strain are paramount in understanding GRC, each of these terms will be outlined briefly.

**Masculine ideology** refers to an individual’s adoption of cultural beliefs about masculinity and the masculine gender role (Good, Borst & Wallace, 1994). Within Western culture, masculine gender socialisation emphasises characteristics such as stoicism, independence, physical toughness, dominance, restrictive emotional expression, competition and anti-femininity (Brannon & Juni, 1984; Connell, 2005; Levant, 2011; Levant et al., 2007; Mahalik et al., 2003). The psychosocial view of gender acknowledges that cultures have different norms and expectations about masculinity. In other words, masculinity “does not exist within a person but, rather, within an interaction between a person’s experience and the norms of their culture” (Kahn, 2009, p. 211). Masculinity ideology, which is a central concept within the gender role conflict paradigm, refers “to beliefs about the importance of men adhering to culturally defined standards for male behaviour” (Pleck, 1995, p. 19) and implies that within each culture there are varied expectations for males.
Hegemonic masculinity denotes the dominant masculine expression within a given culture at a particular point in time (Connell, 2005), and embodies the “currently most honoured way of being a man” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 832). Hegemonic masculinity is an atheoretical concept and does not particularise how endorsement of a specific form of masculine ideology increases the likelihood of health risks, both physical and psychological. In contrast to normative models (e.g., masculine ideology), gender role conflict/stress models focus on the degree of perceived conflict between one’s internalised or learned gender roles and one’s environment (O’Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995).

Gender role strain paradigm (GRSP, Pleck, 1995) is a social psychological concept which presents ten propositions relating to gender role norms. Implicit in these propositions are three broader ideas about how cultural standards for masculinity, as implemented in gender socialisation, have potentially negative consequences for individual males (Pleck, 1995). These broader ideas are: gender role discrepancy, gender role trauma, and gender role dysfunction.

Gender role discrepancy posits that individuals attempt to conform – to varying degrees – to stereotypic masculine standards and that failing to conform to these prescribed standards can result in negative internalised self-judgments and negative social feedback from others, which, in turn, affect self-esteem and psychological wellbeing (Pleck, 1995). Gender role trauma contends that aspects of male gender role socialization, in particular, the experience of traditional masculine ideology can be inherently traumatic for males (Levant, 2011). For example, by virtue of being socialised in a heterosexist society, gay men may experience normative trauma (Harrison, 1995 as cited in Levant, 2011). The third category, gender role dysfunction proposes that socially desirable and acceptable characteristics associated with the
male role (e.g., avoidance of femininity, homophobia and aggression) can have deleterious consequences for the men themselves and/or other people. O’Neil (2008) deemed this subtype as having the most theoretical relevance to GRC because it “implies negative outcomes from endorsing restrictive gender role norms” (p. 366).

There are numerous situational contexts in which GRC occurs. Men are proposed to have greater GRC when they experience one or more of several trajectories. First, they may have a gender role transition or face difficult developmental tasks over the life span. Second, they may deviate from or violate gender role norms of masculinity ideology. Third, they may try to meet or fail to meet gender role norms of masculinity ideology. Fourth, they may note discrepancies between their real versus ideal self-concepts, based on gender role stereotypes and masculinity ideology. Fifth, men may personally devalue, restrict, and/or violate themselves for failing to meet masculinity ideology norms. Sixth, they may experience personal devaluations, restrictions, and/or violations from others for conforming to or deviating from masculinity ideology. Seventh, and finally, men may personally devalue, restrict, and/or violate others because of their perceived deviation from or conformity to masculinity ideology norms (O’Neil, 2008). These seven trajectories were, subsequently, refined into 4 categories: (a) GRC caused by gender role transitions; (b) GRC experienced intrapersonally (i.e., within the man), (c) GRC expressed toward others, and (d) GRC experienced from others (O’Neil, 1990).

Regardless of the category, gender role conflict is characterised by devaluation, restriction, and violation. O’Neil (2008) contends that gender role devaluations represent negative assessments of the self (or others) when conforming to, or deviating from, the attributes characteristic of traditional or hegemonic masculinity. Gender role restrictions involve constraining oneself (or others) to stereotypic norms
of masculinity ideology. Gender role violations occur when people harm themselves or others (or are harmed by others) when deviating from or conforming to gender role norms of masculinity ideology (O’Neil, 2008).

Boys and men vary in the degree to which they endorse aspects of prescribed masculinity resulting in multifaceted strain and conflict (O’Neil, Helm, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986). The experience of GRC is dependent on cultural, age, and cohort specific definitions of masculine ideologies and gender role stereotypes (Kahn, 2009).

GRC was theorised as having six elements that relate to gender role socialisation and fear of femininity (O’Neil, 1981b): (a) Restrictive Emotionality, (b) Restrictive Sexual and Affectionate Behaviour, (c) Homophobia, (d) Socialised Control, Power and Competition Issues, (e) Obsession with Achievement and Success and (f) Health Care Problems. Each of these elements will be outlined briefly.

Restrictive Emotionality (RE) is defined as having difficulty expressing one’s own feelings or denying others their right to emotional expression (O’Neil, 1981b). RE implies that men will have difficulty giving up emotional control, and being vulnerable to themselves and/or others. These deficits imply that some men will have difficulty in self-disclosure, recognizing feelings, and processing the complexities of interpersonal life.

Restrictive Sexual and Affectionate Behaviour refers to having limited ways of expressing one’s sexuality and affection toward others (O’Neil, 1981b). For men, this is caused by their inability to express their ‘feminine’ sides and also by rigidly adhering to masculine gender role norms and stereotypes (O’Neil, 1981b).

Homophobia denotes a fear of gay men or an irrational concern that one may appear to be gay (O’Neil, 1981b). Homophobia may prevent emotional intimacy
between heterosexual men and may be a significant barrier to male self-disclosure and companionship (O’Neil, 1981b).

Socialised Control, Power and Competition Issues relate to men’s socialised tendencies to dominate, control, and subordinate others (both men and women) in order to maintain their power and masculine role in relationships. The cost of being powerful, dominant, controlling, and competitive is usually high for men in interpersonal relationships, as it may lead to a loss of self-awareness, honesty, spontaneity, and emotional freedom because of the constant need to monitor and control a relationship (Nicholas, 1975 as cited in O’Neil, 1981b).

Obsession with Achievement and Success refers to men’s preoccupation with work and reliance on their occupation to substantiate their sense of themselves as men (O’Neil, 1981b). The primary means of becoming a success is through competing with others, using power and control, and demonstrating competence, which is sometimes accompanied by obsessive fears of failure, ‘workaholic’ behaviour and increased stress (O’Neil, 1981b).

These five elements blend to adversely ‘affect’ men’s physical and psychological wellbeing (i.e., Health Care Problems). Gender role stereotypes project men as tireless, invincible workers with superhuman limits; thus, many men have been socialised to ignore the physical symptoms that lead to acute illness or chronic health problems (O’Neil, 1981a).

1.3 Development of the Gender Role Conflict Scale

This section describes the development of the GRCS, its psychometric properties (i.e., the validity and reliability) and the adaptation of this measure for use with adolescents.
O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David and Wrightsman (1986) generated 85 items to measure the six elements of GRC: Restrictive Affectionate Behaviour between Men (N=17), Obsession with Achievement and Success (N=16), Restrictive Emotionality (N=15), Health Care Problems (N=14), Control, Power and Competition (N=14) and Homophobia (N=9). Three content experts reviewed the items, ensuring they referred specifically to gender-based rather than non-gender-based conflicts (O’Neil et al., 1986). A six-point Likert scale was employed, with response options ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree. Items were then administered to 527 introductory psychology undergraduate students (mean age = 19.8 years). A principal component analysis was conducted which resulted in a 37-item measure. The initial testing of the six theoretical elements of GRC produced four empirically derived subscales: Success, Power and Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behaviour between Men (RABBM) and Conflict between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR).

Supporting the concurrent validity of the GRCS, this measure has been correlated with myriad indices of masculinity: Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986), the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI; Levant et al., 1992), and the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRS: Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). For example, the RABBM correlated significantly with the ‘Rejection of Homosexuals’ subscale of the MRNI (Berger, Levant, McMillan, Kelleher & Sellers, 2005) and the RE was significantly related to the ‘Emotional Inexpressiveness’ scale of the MGRS (Fischer & Good, 1997). Campbell and Snow (1992) supported the convergent validity of the GRCS subscales with significant correlations between CBWFR and the ‘Marital Satisfaction’ subscale of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spainer, 1976). Further, evidence of the convergent validity of the GRCS was
assessed with a significant correlation between SPC and the ‘Performance Failure’ subscale of the MGRS (Fischer & Good, 1997).

Support for the reliability scores for each of the GRCS factors have been tested in many studies across diverse populations. The reliability scores have remained consistent in college-aged students since the scale was developed (i.e., .70 to .89; Good et al., 1995; O’Neil et al., 1986) and good to acceptable reliabilities scores ranging for the four factors from .71 to .91 in diverse samples of men (i.e., international studies with heterosexual and gay men; O’Neil, 2008). Test–retest reliabilities for each of the factors have been assessed in two studies over a 1-month period (Faria, 2000; O’Neil et al., 1986). Both studies reliability scores ranged between .72 and .86 indicating that the GRCS is stable over this time period. Further, the social desirability of the GRCS has been tested and deemed insignificant (Fischer & Good, 1997; Good et al., 1995; O’Neil, 2008).

To investigate the dimensionality of the GRCS, a number of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) have been conducted. Good et al. (1995) supported a four-factor solution after running CFAs on a sample of 401 and 535 participants. However, Rogers, Abbey-Hines and Rando (1997) questioned the suitability of Good et al.’s conclusions, as conventional criteria for acceptable model fit were not employed (e.g., Tucker-Lewis fit index = .83 for samples 2 and 3, respectively). Rogers et al. found similar results (i.e., a four-factor model was obtained); however, model fit statistics, again, fell short of advised guidelines (i.e., Tucker-Lewis fit index < .9). Moradi, Tokar, Schaub, Jome and Serna (2000) argue that the item/factor ratio of the GRCS was higher than recommended and, as a result, endorsed parcelling items within each factor prior to running a CFA. A four-factor solution with better fit to the data was observed when rational (i.e., combining items within the same factor on the basis of
similar content) and random (i.e., combining items within the same factor at random) parcel-level models were tested. Bandalos (2002) and Norwalk, Vandiver, White and Englar Carlson (2011) argue that item parcelling may give inflated results because it often increases reliability and masks error. When parcelling procedures were not applied, Moradi and associates obtained results similar to those reported by Good et al. (1995) and Rogers et al. (1997).

Norwalk et al. (2011) conducted a CFA on the GRCS with two independent samples (European American men, \( N = 483 \); African American men, \( N = 214 \)). They used an alternative models approach to determine how many factors best fit the data, with results indicating that, in comparison to the other models tested, a four-factor solution offered better fit. Factorial invariance also was identified across the two samples. However, similar to past research, the authors reported that most fit indexes failed to meet recommended cut-off values (Good et al., 1995; Moradi et al., 2000; Rogers et al., 1997).

Four versions of the GRCS exist: a) the original measure; b) a short form version; c) an adolescent version; and d) a Korean counterpart of the adolescent version. As they are of greatest relevance to the objectives of this dissertation, the adolescent versions will be outlined briefly.

Blazina, Pisecco, and O'Neil (2005) created an adolescent permutation of the GRCS (henceforth called the GRCS-A). A sample of 464 male students (aged 13-18; \( M = 16.2 \) years) completed measures of masculinity (Male Role Attitude Scale; MRAS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986), psychological distress (Conners-Wells’ Adolescent Self-Report Scale; CASS, Conners & Wells, 1997), the GRCS (adult) and the adapted measure (GRCS-A). The latter consisted of original GRCS (adult) items and an unspecified number of altered items. Item content was adjusted to ensure they...
were “developmentally appropriate” for an adolescent population (e.g., “When I am sexually involved with others, I do not express my strong feelings” was modified to “When I am personally involved with others, I do not express my strong feelings”). An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted resulting in a four-factor solution that accounted for 40.9% of the total variance. On the basis of the EFA, 29 items were retained. The four factors were equivalent to those reported for the original GRCS, although three were renamed to better capture the latent construct represented by the items (i.e., the CBWFR subscale was named “Conflict Between Work, School and Family” [CBWSF]; “Success, Power and Competition” was renamed “Need for Success and Achievement” [NSA]; and the RABBM was named “Restricted Affection between Men” [RAM]). In terms of reliability, scale score internal consistency coefficients ranged from .70 to .82 and test-retest reliability scores varied from .60 to .95. The GRCS-A correlated strongly with the GRCS ($r = .88$) and modestly with the MRAS ($r = .37$). However, the former correlation may be inflated given the common error of items in short and long versions being correlated twice (Smith, McCarthy, & Anderson, 2000). Finally, Blazina, Cordova, Pisecco and Settle (2007) observed a statistically significant correlation between the GRCS-A and the Adolescent Masculine Ideology in Relationships Scale (AMIRS; Chu, Porche & Tolman, 2005).

The GRCS-A has been adapted for use in other cultural contexts such as Korea (K-GRCS-A: Kim, Choi, Kim & Park, 2009). Specifically, Kim et al. translated the 29-item GRCS-A to Korean, with items back translated to English by a bilingual translator. A third translator then verified the translation and back translation processes, with one of the items (“It’s hard for me to express my emotional needs to others”) identified as having a potentially different connotation. After discussing the
item, it was retained. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the four subscales ranged from .67 to .80, and scores on the K-GRCS-A correlated positively with measures of depression and anxiety and negatively with self-esteem. Further research using the K-GRCS-A found that self-esteem mediated the relationship between gender role conflict and depression; that is, individuals experiencing greater levels of conflict evidenced lower levels of self-esteem, which, in turn, was associated with elevated depression (Choi, Kim, Hwang, & Heppner, 2010).

1.4 Conclusion

A series of theoretical papers, inspired by the gender role strain paradigm and the concept of masculine ideology, laid the foundation for the development of the GRCS in 1986. Items were created reflecting six theoretical elements of the GRC theory, with psychometric tests resulting in a four-factor measure (i.e., RE, RABBM, SPC and CBWFR). Numerous validation studies have been conducted and, to date, four versions – two pertinent to adolescents – have been derived from the original scale. Despite the popularity and apparent usefulness of this measure, some researchers have raised a number of criticisms pertaining to both the GRC theory and the psychometric properties of the GRCS (and its derivations). These criticisms will be discussed in Chapter 2.

1.5 Notes

1. ‘The masculine mystique is seen as a front that men put up by giving up their femininity (e.g., expression and emotion) in order to maintain their position or power’ (Kahn, 2009, p.221).

2. We acknowledge that causal language has been used in the presence of many studies that are correlational in nature. However, it is possible that those
evidencing compromised psychological well-being are more likely to regard themselves as “defective men.”
Chapter 2 – A Critique of the Gender Role Conflict theory and measures

2.1. Chapter Overview

The purpose of this chapter was to present an empirical and conceptual critique of the GRC theory, the GRCS and its resultant measures (i.e., GRCS-SF, GRCS-A, and the K-GRCS-A). The chapter concludes by discussing the cultural suitability and application of masculinity measures to different cultures. This review, in part, was published in 2013 (O’Beaglaoich, Sarma & Morrison, 2013) and considers 9 key questions about the GRCS. The argument forwarded is that there is need for a new measure of GRC to be built using a ‘bottom up’ approach.

2.2. An empirical and conceptual critique of the GRCS and GRC theory

This review presents general critiques of the GRC theory and the GRCS. Numerous criticisms have been directed against the development and validation of the GRCS as well as theory it is designed to test.

2.2.1 Do the GRCS items reflect conflict as defined by the GRC theory?

In the development of the GRCS, 85 items were generated, distributed and factor analysed (O’Neil, 1986). GRC has been operationally defined by devaluation, restriction and violation; however, in O’Neil et al.’s (1986) study no systematic approach appears to have been taken to generate items incorporating these elements of GRC. Consequently, some researchers have observed that items on the GRCS do not reflect conflict as it ordinarily understood; that is, conflict being a “result of two competing response tendencies” (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993, p. 360). Indeed, in his review article, O’Neil (2008) concedes that some of the items on the GRCS could be rewritten to assess conflict more directly.
2.2.2 Does the GRCS cover the breadth of the GRC theory?

O’Neil et al. (1986) did not specify the situational contexts that were included in the initial item pool and, consequently, a number of conceptual problems exist due to the absence of this information. First, it cannot be ascertained whether the 48 items excluded from the original item pool were related to a particular situational context. Were most of the items associated with either conformity to or endorsement of masculine norms or did the items reflect conflict due to deviation from or non-conformity to masculine norms?

Theoretically, masculine ideology is considered a cofactor of both GRC and the GRSP and validation studies have evinced positive correlations between masculine ideology measures and the GRCS. Given the various contexts in which GRC can be experienced, it is unclear why one expects to see positive correlations between these facets of GRC and traditional indicants of masculinity. For example, if a male adolescent reports low MI scores (i.e., he does not endorse masculine standards), it is still possible for him to experience GRC. Further, if an individual experiences conflict because of the presence of a masculine norm that he does not endorse, why should MI correlate positively with the GRCS-A? Put differently, failure to endorse masculine standards does not preclude men from experiencing GRC.

2.2.3 Is content overlap problematic?

To date, researchers have not addressed the issue of content overlap, which is problematic because it can inflate correlations and, thus, affect the reliability and validity of a measure (Bozeman & Perrewe, 2001). Inspecting the GRCS, possible overlap amongst the items comprising the RE factor may be a concern. For example, three of the ten items in this factor (i.e., “Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me” [item 13], “Telling others of my strong feelings is not
part of my sexual behaviour” [item 22], and “Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me” [item 30]) seem to measure the same aspect of restricted emotionality in relation to sexual behaviour. Two other items (i.e., “I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings” [item 19], and “I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling” [item 25]) also focus on an inability to express emotions. Additionally, two items on the CBWFR seem to share the same meaning: item 11 (i.e., “My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life”) and item 31 (i.e., “My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life [home, health, leisure]”).

2.2.4 Does the GRCS emphasize conflicts relating to conformity to masculine norms?

As previously mentioned, the GRCS has been associated with the gender role dysfunction subtype of the GRSP\(^3\). O’Neil (2008) deemed this subtype as having the most theoretical relevance to GRCS because it “implies negative outcomes from endorsing restrictive gender role norms” (p. 366). O’Neil et al. (1986) did not specify what situational contexts were included in the initial item pool and on the 37 retained items. Consequently, there seems to be an overemphasis/focus on conflicts associated with the endorsement of masculine standards/norms (see, in particular, the RE, RABBM and SPC factors). In support of this assertion, the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al., 2003) has been shown to correlate highly with the GRCS. The CMNI was developed to measure men’s conformity to eleven masculine norms: ‘Winning,’ ‘Emotional Control,’ ‘Risk Taking,’ ‘Violence,’ ‘Power over Women,’ ‘Dominance,’ ‘Playboy,’ ‘Self-Reliance,’ ‘Primacy of Work,’ ‘Disdain for Homosexuals,’ and ‘Pursuit of Status.’ It differs from masculine ideology measures because the former assesses the extent that men endorse/reject masculine
norms whereas the CMNI measures the extent to which men either conform or do not conform to masculine norms (Levant, 2011). The CMNI and the GRCS were significantly correlated, with strong associations noted among corresponding subscales. For example, the SPC correlated with nine of the CMNI subscales; RE significantly correlated with eight; and the RABBM correlated with seven. In contrast, CBWFR was associated with only two CMNI factors, the strongest being ‘Primacy of Work.’ Some of these correlations are of concern because the GRCS and CMNI are interrelated, yet conceptually distinct, with the former referring to conflict and the latter referring to conformity to masculine norms.

The range of gender role conflicts present in the scale may be too narrow and may not reflect the breadth or global nature of the GRC framework. Thompson, Pleck and Ferrera (1992) criticised the limited scope of gender role conflicts present in the GRCS on the grounds that it excludes non-traditional masculinity standards. For example, gender role conflicts can be experienced by men who engage in non-traditional roles such as nursing and full-time child care.

GRC is theorised to be experienced in three contexts: a) within the self; b) induced by others; and c) expressed towards others (O’Neil, 1990). The latter occurs when individuals devalue, restrict, or violate other persons because they deviate from, or fail to conform to, masculinity ideology norms (O’Neil, 2008). However, this facet of the theory is not reflected in the GRCS. Indeed, only 1 out of 37 questions measure the expression of GRC toward others, albeit in a subtle way. The item (i.e., “I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success”) is arguably assessing ‘devaluation’ as defined by O’Neil (2008). However, as a consequence of this item displaying the largest standardized residual and failing to meet an a priori effect size criterion of 10% in a CFA amongst a sample of European American men, Norwalk et
al. (2011) advised deleting the item to improve model fit. Norwalk et al. also observed that this item failed to meet the same criteria for effect size in a separate sample of African-American men. In a recent study detailing further development of a short-form version of the GRCS, Wester et al. (2012) did not retain this item (i.e., it loaded at .55 and, thus, did not meet the retention criteria of > .68).

It is the incorporation of the definitions of devaluations, restrictions and violations and various situational contexts in which GRC is experienced that (ostensibly) distinguishes GRC items from masculinity ideology items. The endorsement of a masculinity item does not differentiate between males that are affected by the presence of an expectation/masculine norm and those that merely acknowledge its existence.

2.2.5 Does the GRCS possess face validity?

In the development of the GRCS and, subsequently, for its short-form version, there is no reference to face validity (i.e., items were not reviewed by individuals for whom the scale was designed – namely, men). Hardesty and Bearden (2004) contend that face validity is essential “since inferences are made based on the final scale items and, therefore, they must be deemed face valid if we are to have confidence in any inferences made using the final scale form” (p. 99). Items that are not deemed face valid characterize a measure that “cannot be a valid operationalization of the construct of interest” (Hardesty & Bearden, 2004, p. 99). Instead, items on the GRCS were developed based on theoretical papers (O’Neil, 1981a, 1981b) and a perceived need to measure GRC, which emanated from the male and female liberation movements (O’Neil, 2008). Critiques of SPC, RE and CBWFR subscales of the GRCS are discussed below.

2.2.6 Critique of the Gender Role Conflict Factors
Success, Power and Competition Factor (SPC). Three of the thirteen items of the SPC factor are framed in terms of conflict (e.g., failing to meet masculine standards and deviating from or violating standards of masculinity) and the remaining ten items measure different facets associated with masculine ideology, such as the importance of success, winning, competitiveness and dominance. Examples of these non-conflict items are: “Moving up the career ladder is important to me,” “Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man,” “I strive to be more successful than others,” and “Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.”

The SPC factor has been criticized for measuring masculinity ideology more broadly than gender role conflict (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993). Walker, Tokar and Fischer (2000) found statistically significant correlations between the SPC factor and the four factors of the Brannon Masculinity Scale (BMS; Brannon & Juni, 1984; \( r_s = .36 -.56 \)). They contend that the SPC factor might be better conceptualized as a measure of “adherence to traditional male role norms (i.e., masculine ideology) than masculine gender role conflict” (p. 105). Berger, Levant, McMillan, Kelleher and Sellers (2005) also identified a fairly strong correlation (\( r = .50 \)) between SPC and the Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R; Levant & Fischer, 1998). Further, a majority of the SPC items do not directly assess men’s GRC and, therefore, SPC is “defined as a masculine norms/ideology factor that more indirectly assesses GRC by measuring personal attitudes about success pursued through competition and power” (O’Neil, 2008, p. 401).

Three items measure conflict on the SPC factor; namely, “I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man” (i.e., measuring situational contexts of failing to meet masculine standards of success); “I evaluate other people's value by
their level of achievement and success” (i.e., measuring situational contexts of devaluing others for failing to meet masculine standards of success); and “I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school’ (i.e., measuring situational contexts whereby devaluation occurs due to failing to meet masculine standards of success). Unfortunately, all three items failed to meet a priori effect size criteria in CFAs conducted with two samples of men (Norwalk et. al., 2011). The latter item loaded on the CBWFR factor and was the largest contributor to model misfit. In the same study, substantial proportions of GRCS items failed to meet a priori effect size criterion ($R^2 = .10$) for European American and African American samples (30% and 46% of items, respectively). The authors contend that the findings highlight potential “weaknesses in the scale” and underscore the need for a “revision” (p. 138).

The presence of a less than optimal factor (i.e., SPC) also compromises the validity of the inferences made about gender role conflict and related variables. For example, Galligan, Barnett, Brennan and Israel (2010) measured resilience in adolescent males, using the GRCS; SPC correlated with positive coping strategies. The authors then reported that “the SPC component pattern of gender role conflict was associated with a positive change in resilience” (Galligan et al., 2010, p.16). However, as the SPC does not measure conflict per se, the authors’ interpretation that an element of gender role conflict correlates with resilience is misleading.

Is the Conflict between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) subscale conceptually meaningful within the framework of GRC?

As both men and women experience conflict between work and family, the CBWFR has been questioned in relation to whether it is unique to masculinity (Zamarripa, Wampold, & Gregory, 2003 as cited in Liu, Rochlen, & Mohr, 2005).
The CBWFR factor was not designed to measure GRC in women but “the results suggest that some aspects of GRC may be universal” for both sexes (Liu et al., 2005, p. 138). Therefore, the conflict identified by the CBWFR subscale may be best regarded as masculine in nature – albeit with the understanding that both sexes potentially experience it. In addition to queries about its unique applicability to men, concerns about the subscale’s psychometric properties have been articulated. Low correlations between masculinity measures and this component have been documented (Walker et al., 2000; \( p < .21 \) on Brannon Masculinity Scale). Also, as noted earlier, Mahalik et al. (2003) found significant correlations between the CBWFR and only two of nine CMNI factors: ‘Primacy of Work’ and ‘Dominance.’ Norwalk et al. (2011) reported that the four-factor structure of the GRCS did not meet established fit criteria and suggested that “revisions are needed particularly for the CBWFR items” (p. 141).

Is the Restricted Emotionality (RE) subscale content valid?

When creating the GRCS, O’Neil et al. (1986) developed scale items to reflect the RE theme, defining it as “having difficulty expressing one’s feelings or denying others their rights to emotional expressiveness” (p. 340). A review of the items on the GRCS (10 items) and subsequent extensions (e.g., GRCS-A, 8-items) reveals that none of them reflect this theme. If items capturing the aforementioned definition of RE were included in the original item pool, the reasons for their removal remain unclear. Does the non-emergence of items reflecting GRC towards others in the GRCS mean that this aspect possesses little relevance to GRC theory? Or, perhaps, these sorts of items were not included in the original item pool? Regardless, the original definition of RE is not reflected in the RE factor.

2.2.7 Is the response format used compatible with the GRCS items?
Another point of concern is the response format employed by the GRCS. Ryan and Gartland (1999) argue that having a non-response option may hold valuable information for the researcher. If the patterns of responses are not random, then it may indicate respondents are experiencing difficulty because of the wording of an item or possess a genuine lack of opinion. The advantages of including a ‘don’t know’ or a non-forced choice response option is that if problems such as evasion or contamination arise, these issues can be corrected retrospectively (Dolnicar & Rossiter, 2009).

Also, three items loading on the SPC factor (i.e., “I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me,” “I sometimes define my personal value by my career success” and “I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school”); one item loading on the RE factor (i.e., “I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling”); and one item in the RABB M factor (i.e., “I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men”) do not really fit with a strongly agree/disagree response format. The use of words to describe ‘prevalence,’ such as ‘often’ and ‘sometimes’ are problematic because self-reporting ‘strongly disagree’ to these items may still denote some level of conflict. For example, ‘strongly disagreeing’ that you ‘often feel the need to be in charge of those around you’ does not logically imply an absence of this need.

2.3. Critique of the Gender Role Conflict Scale for adolescents

This chapter reveals that none of the psychometric concerns raised about the GRCS were addressed in the adolescent version developed by Blazina et al. (2005) or its Korean extension (K-GRCS-A). In this section of the review, previous critiques relating to the GRCS will be discussed and specific concerns relating to the
development of the GRCS-A and the K-GRCS-A will be discussed. Are the aforementioned critiques applicable to the GRCS-A?

2.3.1 Content Validity. Blazina et al. adapted the items from the adult GRCS. Items that had been previously criticized for not reflecting conflict were neither changed nor improved and only nominal modifications were made to item content (e.g., “When I am sexually involved with others, I do not express my strong feelings” was changed to “When I am personally involved with others, I do not express my strong feelings”).

Critically, in the development of the GRCS-A (and the K-GRCS-A), adolescents did not inform item generation and no contact was made with adolescents to see if the factors were relevant to them (i.e., there is no reference to face or content validity). A psychometrically sound measure that targets adolescent boys should be “grounded in and relevant to [their] experiences” (Chu, Porche & Tolman, 2005, p. 99) as there may be factors used in adult scales that are irrelevant or there may be latent factors that have been unexplored or unrealised due to not involving adolescents in the development of the scale. Further, Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995) found that men might experience different patterns of GRC at different developmental stages, suggesting that adolescent males (potentially) adhere to aspects of masculine ideology dissimilar to their adult counterparts.

To date, only one published study has investigated whether GRC theory, the four factors of the GRCS, and its modified version (GRCS-A) resonated with a small sample of American adolescent boys (N=11, M=16.2 years, SD=1.18; Watts & Borders, 2005). The authors identified general support for the theory and recommended that the wording of some of the items of the GRCS-A be modified (i.e., “men” be changed to “males”). A major limitation with this study, however, is that
the authors constrained the boys’ analysis to the four subscales derived from GRC theory. Thus, the boys were unable to describe forms of gender conflict that (potentially) operate outside the parameters established by the initial formulation of the GRC framework. Also, a systematic approach to asking the participants about the suitability of the items was not undertaken nor were the participants asked how they would reframe/improve certain items.

The recent establishment of a masculine ideology scale for adolescents (Oransky & Fisher, 2009) highlights the importance of involving respondents in the scale development process. The Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale (MAMS) aimed to assess the “degree to which one endorses or rejects traditional male roles” (p. 59). This measure of masculine ideology was informed by a qualitative investigation of boys’ ideas about what it means to be masculine in today’s society (Oransky & Fisher, 2009). The MAMS contains four subscales: Constant Effort (i.e., boys must maintain a confident, tough and strong image in order to perform masculinity); Emotional Restriction (i.e., boys need to be stoic and refrain from sharing their feelings with others in order to be masculine); Heterosexism (i.e., one must not show any attitudes and behaviours associated with femininity or homosexuality); and Social Teasing (i.e., boys must be able to tease other boys and stand up to teasing from other boys in order to be masculine)5.

Factors such as “Constant Effort” and “Social Teasing” were identified as unique factors in the MAMS and underscore the need of involving members of the target population for which the scale has been developed. Through discussions with adolescents, this masculine norm and expectation was identified and items reflecting the salience of this dynamic for adolescent males were included in the development of the MAMS.
2.3.2 Response Format. The same 6-point response option used in the GRCS was adopted for the GRCS-A (i.e., “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”). One item loading on the RE factor (i.e., “I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling”) and one item in the RABBM factor (i.e., “I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men”) do not really fit with this response format.

2.3.3 Subscale Difficulties. Despite criticism of the SPC factor (i.e., that it measures masculine ideology instead of GRC), this issue was not addressed in the development of the GRCS-A (Blazina et. al., 2005). Instead, the factor was reduced from thirteen items to six, and relabelled, “Need for Success and Achievement” (NSA). The absence of items reflecting competition and power over others was notable due to six of those items being excluded from the adapted version and one further item “I judge other people’s value by their level of achievement and success,” loading onto the “Conflict Between Work, School and Family” factor. Most of the remaining items focus on the importance of success through competition, the importance of money and doing well (e.g., “Doing well all the time is important to me” and “I strive to be more successful than others”). Blazina et al. (2005) also observed that the NSA was the only factor not related to negative mental health indicators and suggested these findings indicate “this subscale is more reflective of the positive aspects of masculine ideology rather than measuring gender-role conflict” (p. 43). Galligan et al. (2010) similarly observed that different items need to be developed and that further research relating to success, power and competition be conducted.

Items from the NSA factor were changed to include drive for success within the area of school (e.g., “I sometimes define my personal value by my career success” was changed to “Sometimes I define my personal value by my success at school.”).
This change occurred despite research suggesting that doing well in sports may be a greater priority for boys (Messner, 1992; Steinfeldt, Wong, Hagan, Hoag & Steinfeldt, 2011).

The GRCS-A analogue to the CBWFR factor (i.e., CWSF) has been criticised on the grounds that it is pertinent only to older adolescents (Watts & Border, 2005). The item content also was criticised for the inclusion of activities such as “career” and “job” – activities that seldom apply to younger adolescents – and the omission of extracurricular activities, which are germane to this age group.

2.3.4 Age Appropriateness. As noted earlier, developmental differences in masculine ideology may exist (Oransky & Fisher, 2009) and it is reasonable to assume that such differences are characterised by unique expectations, pressures and restrictions. Some of the features that differentiate adolescent males’ experiences from their adult counterparts are: a) dependence on parents; b) place of residence (i.e., living at home); c) pressures from school (e.g., teachers); and d) being in close proximity with others their own age (e.g., girls and boys). Further, the relevance of different forms of masculinity may be more intense for younger males, especially those functioning within an institutional setting such as secondary school – an environment which Connell (2000) describes as “a masculinity making device” (p. 131). Inspection of the GRCS-A suggests that these unique conflicts are not captured.

2.4. Cultural application of the GRCS-A within an Irish context

This section discusses the varieties of masculine embodiment between cultures and suggests different factors that may influence the development and maintenance of such within an Irish context.

2.4.1 Cultural Suitability. The social constructionist view (or psychosocial view) of gender acknowledges that cultures have different norms with different
expectations about masculinity and that masculinity “does not exist within a person, but rather within an interaction between a person’s experience and the norms of [his or her] culture” (Kahn, 2009, p. 211). Masculinity ideology refers “to beliefs about the importance of men adhering to culturally defined standards for male behavior” (Pleck, 1995, p. 19), implying that within each culture there are varied expectations of males. The difficulties with adopting measures of masculine ideology and gender role conflict from North America are that potential factors relevant to other cultures are left unexplored. Explicitly, one concern about role theories is that when researchers identify and produce specific themes [for a measure], “we can only learn about masculinity as it relates to that theme” (Kahn, 2009, p. 64) which means that experiences of masculinity that are related to a variety of other experiences are omitted.

GRC is manifested differently within different cultures. O’Neil (2010) acknowledged this premise stating that using “American gender role concepts exclusively without grasping the cultural history of another country oversimplifies and clouds the real differences between two cultures” (p. 384) and explaining that theories emanating from any country may “have limited ability to explain attitudes and psychological processes in any other country” (p. 368). Many researchers have called for more international research on GRC theory (Heppner & Heppner, 2008; O’Neil, 2010). Further, Whorley and Addis (2006) noted that the predominant research methodologies in the area of men and masculinities printed in US journals are quantitative in nature. They advocate that more qualitative research be conducted; in particular, research outside of North America. This recommendation concurs with the suggestion that cross-cultural analyses of GRC are essential (e.g., O’Neil, 2008b; Wester, 2008).
2.4.2 Irish Masculinities. Hearn and colleagues (2002) state that research in Ireland has been “slow to incorporate the study of men and masculinities into gender studies, and men as gendered subjects have remained largely outside of the gaze of critical [inquiry]” (p. 393). According to the authors, in comparison to research conducted in North America and the United Kingdom, Irish work in the field of men and masculinity has “barely begun” (p. 394). Traditional Irish masculinity has been characterized as being “essentially rural, based heavily around family, marriage and celibacy” (Ferguson, 2001, p. 120); a view maintained by influential societal structures such as the state, the Gaelic Athletics Association (GAA) and the Catholic Church. Magennis and Mullen (2011) highlighted rapid changes within Irish society in recent years, which include the weakening of the Catholic Church; the liberalization of laws on divorce and homosexuality; and the ideology of the Irish Free State. Further, Ireland underwent radical economic transformations from the 1990s to the present day, transitioning from a period of economic growth (i.e., the Celtic Tiger) to a recession in 2007. The concept of a monolithic masculinity has been challenged by: 1) the first openly gay GAA player (i.e., Dónal Óg Cusak); 2) the 2009 GAA footballer of the year, Paul Galvin, becoming a fashion columnist for one of Ireland’s leading newspapers; and 3) Senator David Norris, the first openly gay man running for the office of President of Ireland. Magennis and Mullen (2011) contend that, given Ireland’s rapidly changing society, “the time is ripe to re-evaluate the representation of masculinity in the Irish context” (p. 1). Further, the Ireland’s National Men’s Health Policy (2008-2013) objectives include recommendations that “baseline measures across different aspects of men’s health” should be developed “that can be monitored to evaluate changes in men’s health status over time” (p. 46).

‘Adolescent masculinity research indicates that many male adolescents are
vulnerable and at risk because of restrictive masculine norms (Kindon & Thompson, 1999; Levant, 2001; Pollack, 2006). Research supports Kindon and Thompson’s assertions that boys grow up in a culture of cruelty that significantly hindering their growth and development. Evidence collected predominantly in North America research include: a) 94% of school shootings in the United States have been committed by males (between 1966 to 2011; School Shooting, 2011); b) boys commit 85% of school violence (Katz, 1999); c) 80% of boys report being bullied (United States Census Bureau, 2005); d) 12% of high school boys report being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property (Center for Disease Control, 2007); and e) five times as many 15-24 year old boys commit suicide compared to girls (Center for Disease Control, 2007). Educational performance statistics indicate: a) compared to girls, boys are three times more likely to be enrolled in a special education class (United States Census Bureau, 2005); and b) compared to girls, three times as many boys are expelled from public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005). The trends in terms of violence and educational achievement are mirrored within an Irish context. For example, 19% of boys surveyed reported having been a victim of school bullying at one point of their lives (McMahon, Reulbach, Perry, Keeley & Arensman, 2010) and with suicide rates among young men aged 15-19 in Ireland the third highest in the European Union (Eurostat, 2009). In terms of educational achievement, girls are outperforming boys in all subjects for the leaving certificate (State Examinations Commission, 2013) and have outperformed boys in subjects that have been traditionally labeled ‘male’ subjects (i.e., physics and technology).

2.5. Introduction and Rationale
This section considers the criticism presented above, and provides the methodological rationale for the development of new measure of GRC for adolescents using best psychometric practices. It also briefly outlines the series of studies that follow.

In the preceding section, a number of criticisms of the GRCS and the adolescent versions of the GRCS were raised. Namely, these criticism include: a) the lack of information relating to the development of scale items (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); b) the fact that not all items measure conflict (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993; O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); c) the observation that elements of devaluation, restriction and violation are missing from scale items (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); d) the limited attention that GRC toward others is given (i.e., it is arguably measured by a single item; O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); e) mismatches between items and the response format (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); and f) conceptual issues relating to what each factor is measuring (e.g., SPC as a measure of masculine ideology; O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013). Criticisms specific to the GRCS-A also were identified and included: a) issues with content validity (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); b) mismatches between items and the response format (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); c) difficulties with interpreting the meaning of the NSA subscale (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); d) questions over the age appropriateness of the items (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); e) the absence of face or content validity from the vantage of adolescent boys (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013); and f) cultural suitability of the items (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013).

In light of these critiques of the GRCS measures, it is important for the purposes of this thesis, to discuss the best psychometric practice when developing scales. For instance, it is recommended that authors identify constructs that warrant measurement by reviewing pertinent research and theory (DeVellis, 2003).
Qualitative methodologies should be used to become grounded in the experiences of the target population (Chu et al., 2005; Levant, 2011); conversely, this approach may identify latent factors left unexplored or unrealised when researchers do not conduct qualitative research or involve adolescents in the formulation of scale items (O’Beaglaoich, Sarma & Morrison, 2013). De Vellis (2003) recommends developing an exhaustive and over inclusive list of items specific to the measurement goal and that these items are subject to a content validity study by both content and lay experts (McGartland Rubio et al., 2003). Items should not be double-barrelled or negatively keyed (Barnette, 2000) and should be concise and unambiguous. Further, items should be adjusted to suit the chosen response options (DeVellis, 2003). The use of adolescents to assist with the creation of scale items is advised as it helps authors to ensure that the phraseology, language and attitudes of boys are reflected in each item (Levant, 2011). Particularly for adolescent samples, the reading level of the items should be set to a level understood by the majority of adolescents (Blazina, Pisecco, & O’Neil, 2005).

When a masterlist of items is developed, the next choice in the scale development process involves choosing the correct step depending on the research goal. There has been much debate in the scale development literature about whether to use principal components analysis (PCA) or exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (Byrne, 2006; Brown, 2006). PCA is a data reduction procedure that “involves taking scores on a large set of measured variables and reducing them to the scores on a smaller set of composite variables that retain as much information from the original variables” (Fabrigar, Wegner, MacCallum & Strahan, 1999, p. 275). That is, PCA reduces a sample of items to represent the larger set of variables included at the start of the analysis. On the other hand, EFA is the analytical procedure used to identify a
set of latent constructs underlying a battery of measured variables. Given the objectives of this thesis (i.e., to investigate the latent factor(s) amongst the variables), EFA was regarded a more suitable analytic choice (Fabrigar et al., 1999, p. 296)\textsuperscript{6}.

Fabrigar et al. and Browne (2006) recommend the use of EFA when the researcher has relatively little theoretical or empirical basis to make strong assumptions about how many factors exist in a set of variables. Although the GRC theory has a strong theoretical base, to date, no qualitative or quantitative research exists that explores the patterns of GRC amongst adolescents; therefore the author made no a priori assumptions about the latent structure of the items and EFA was conducted.

Fabrigar et al. recommend that EFA and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) are used in conjunction with one another and that EFA can be “conducted in an initial study to provide a basis for specifying a CFA model in a subsequent study” (p. 277). In line with Fabrigar et al.’s recommendations, a number of methodological issues were considered during the exploratory factor analysis and include sample size and factor rotation. When researcher(s) possess knowledge of the underlying latent variable structure derived from theory and/or empirical research (i.e., usually from EFA), CFA is recommended (Brown, 2006; Fabrigar et al., 1999) as it is the primary means of assessing the nature of relationships between latent constructs (Jackson, Gillaspy, & Purc-Stephenson, 2009).

Both the critiques of the GRCS-A outlined earlier in this chapter and the best practices to scale development serve as a justification and guidelines to developing a new measure of GRC for adolescents. A series of forthcoming studies are synopsized and discussed in light of these scale development recommendations:
Chapter 3. Given the lack of research on masculinities in Ireland, in particular amongst adolescent boys, it is important to investigate, first, whether or not the GRCS-A, which was developed in North America, has currency amongst a group of Irish adolescent males. Further, this process provides an opportunity for adolescents to suggest improvements to items and to discuss phrases that are more in line with their lived experiences.

Chapter 4. By conducting qualitative research with adolescents, masculine ideologies (Chu et al., 2005) and age and cultural specific patterns of gender role conflict may be uncovered (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013). This study was conducted to assist generate a large pool of items measuring gender role conflict in Irish adolescent males.

Chapter 5. A large body of items will be developed using the best practices previously described, and an exploratory factor analysis will be conducted to: a) investigate the (potential) latent factors; and/or b) reduce the number of scale items generated. With respect to validation of the new measure, theoretically related constructs including measures of masculine ideology and self-esteem will be tested.

Chapter 6. The dimensionality of this reduced set of scale items will be examined using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Scale dimensionality is important because different groupings of items may link divergently with outcome variables (e.g., depression). The proposed scale’s reliability and validity will be investigated. With respect to validation, key tests will focus on whether gender role conflict among adolescent males is negatively associated with psychological well-being variables such as self-esteem, anxiety, depression and a multi-factor measure of masculinity.

Chapter 7. The purpose of this study is to further test the validity of the I-GRCS-A using multiple regression analysis. Of particular interest is whether gender
role conflict accounts for variance in suicidality above and beyond common correlates such as depression and self-esteem. The possibility that gender role conflict will serve as a moderator (i.e., individuals higher in depression and also evidencing greater risk of suicidality) also will be tested. It is predicted that respondents evidencing higher levels of GRC will evidence: 1) lower levels of self-esteem, and 2) greater levels of depression and suicidal ideation and intent. Social scientists have not investigated whether gender role conflict moderates the association between depression and self-esteem and indices of suicidal ideation; thus, no formal hypotheses in terms of moderation are generated.

Therefore, the aims of this thesis are to:

2.5.1 Aims/objectives:
- Develop a measure of adolescent gender role conflict that is psychometrically sound.
- Develop the first measure of gender role conflict designed for use within an Irish context.
- Examine the role that gender role conflict plays in the psychological wellness of adolescent males.
- Determine whether gender role conflict is associated with indices of suicidal ideation.

2.5.2 Central research questions:
1. How does gender role conflict manifest itself among Irish adolescent males?
2. What role does gender role conflict play in Irish adolescents’ psychological well-being? Of particular interest are variables such as self-esteem, anxiety, and depression.
3. Is gender role conflict a risk factor for suicidal behaviour among Irish adolescent males?

2.6 Notes

3. The endorsement of traditional masculinities can have negative consequences for either the male himself or others because many of these characteristics are inherently negative.
4. These contexts are: (a) deviating from or violating gender role norms of masculinity ideology; (b) trying to meet or failing to meet gender role norms of masculinity ideology; (c) experiencing discrepancies between real and ideal self-concepts; (d) devaluing and/or restricting oneself for failing to meet masculinity ideology norms; and (e) experiencing personal devaluations and/or restrictions from others for deviating from masculinity ideology norms; f) personally devaluing, restricting, or violating others because of their deviation from or conformity to masculinity ideology norms (O’Neil, 2008).

5. However, the endorsement of masculine ideology items do not differentiate between males that are affected by the presence of an expectation/ masculine norm and males that merely acknowledge the existence of, but are not affected by, this expectation/ masculine norm.
Chapter 3 - A Qualitative Investigation of the GRCS-A items by Irish Adolescents

3.1. Chapter Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine how the GRC theory and, more specifically, the scale items of the GRCS-A were evaluated by a sample of Irish adolescent males. This type of inquiry serves as a critical step in formulating a measure of GRC that is better attuned to the lived experiences of adolescent boys. The critical questions are: a) do the GRCS-A items reflected the lived experiences of Irish adolescents?; b) did Irish adolescents have any concerns about any scale items?; and c) do Irish adolescents think the scale items were suitable for distribution within an Irish context?

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Participants

As part of a qualitative examination of the patterns of gender role conflict amongst Irish adolescents, a sub-sample of forty-one boys (i.e., of a total of fifty-four students interviewed as part of Chapter 4) were recruited from 6 secondary schools in the Republic of Ireland. Their mean age was 15 years and 10 months ($SD = 1.6$ years; range 13 to 19 years).

Nine focus groups were conducted, with the number of discussants per group ranging from 2 (1 focus group) to 5 (4 focus groups). To maximise the representiveness of discussants’ experiences, boys from every school year were targeted (i.e., one focus group was conducted with 1st year, 2nd year, 3rd year, 5th year and 6th year students and four focus groups were carried out with 4th year students). Four individual interviews also were conducted (i.e., interviews were conducted with 1st, 2nd, 5th, and 6th year students).
Participants were recruited from six schools from both the east and west of Ireland: two schools were from urban areas (i.e., Schools A and B, both in Dublin city), one school was from a semi-urban area (i.e., School C, in Tralee, Co. Kerry) and three schools were from rural areas (i.e., School D, Co. Kerry; School E, Co. Clare; and School F, Co. Mayo).

Two of these schools were English-speaking (Schools E and F) and four were Irish-speaking; however, all of the boys enrolled in the latter institutions were fluent in English. No differences emerged in terms of thematic content between participants from Irish-speaking and English-speaking schools. Four of these schools were co-educational; one school was an all-boys school (E) and one school had mixed-sex classes for senior cycles (School B; 5th and 6th year). Again, no differences emerged in terms of thematic content between participants from mixed-sex and single-sex schools.

### 3.2.2 Procedure

Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee at the National University of Ireland, Galway. Schools were contacted by post or by email (see Appendix A) and were followed-up by phone or, when practical, a face-to-face meeting with the principal of the school. Following approval from the board of management of each school, times and dates were scheduled for the researcher to come to the school and speak with students.

To recruit participants, the researcher addressed a number of classrooms outlining what involvement in the study would entail. A parental letter, information sheets and parental consent forms were handed out for students to bring to their parent(s)/guardian(s) to be signed (see Appendix B, C and D). Only boys returning signed parental consent forms were permitted to take part in a focus group or
individual interview. The interviews were scheduled for the following week and all were conducted within designated classrooms. Adhering to ethical guidelines, each interviewee and focus group discussant signed a consent form, which outlined participants’ rights in terms of anonymity, confidentiality, and freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty (see Appendix E). The interviews/focus groups consisted of two stages: 1) discussing the stresses, expectations and masculine norms associated with being an adolescent boy; and 2) evaluating the GRCS-A. Interviews and focus group discussions were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Individual interviews lasted between 23 and 80 minutes ($M = 48, SD = 19.8$), whereas the focus groups ran from 39 to 120 minutes ($M = 59, SD = 18.9$).

3.2.3 Measures

3.2.3.1 Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents (GRCS-A; Blazina, Pisecco, & O’Neil, 2005 - see Appendix F). As noted earlier, the GRCS-A is a 29-item self-report scale that contains four factors: RE (9 items), RAM (7 items), CBWSF (7 items) and NSA (6 items). For all items, a 4-point Likert type response format is used (i.e., Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree). Total scores can range from 29 to 116, with higher scores indicating greater gender role conflict.

3.2.3.2 Question Guide

At the start of the interviews/focus groups, participants were informed that they could say anything they wanted. General questions such as “What is your age?” and “What classes are you taking?” were used to encourage a conversational exchange.

Stage one, the findings of which are detailed in Chapter 4, consisted of questions that were designed to identify the stresses, expectations and masculine norms prevalent among Irish adolescent males. To minimise the possible impact of
the researcher’s preconceived ideas and expectancies, questions were open-ended and, initially, broadly framed (e.g., “I’m interested in the kinds of stress that young people experience and I was hoping you could say something about this” – see Appendix G for the full interview guide). A list of current themes in the literature was compiled and, as topics naturally arose during the interviews, these themes were checked off the list. Themes that were not explored during the course of the interview/focus group were revisited near the end (e.g., “If there were something bothering a friend of yours, would he talk to somebody about it?”). All questions were subject to revision; that is, any questions participants did not understand and/or had difficulty answering were rephrased. Participants also were encouraged to elaborate on certain topics by use of prompts (e.g., “Can you say a bit more about that?”).

Stage two involved distributing copies of the GRCS-A to participants, and asking them to read through the items and make note of the suitability and appropriateness of each question. Approximately 10 minutes were allocated for this process. Participants then were asked open-ended questions about how they regarded the scale’s items. For example, participants were asked “I was wondering if you’d mind reading through this questionnaire and tell me if you think these questions apply to Irish boys?” Participants were encouraged to discuss the content of each item, paying particular attention to the issue of cultural relevance (i.e., was the item salient to their lives as adolescents residing within the Republic of Ireland?). Items that lacked clarity and relevance were discussed and suggestions on improving items’ phrasing and wording were explored.

3.2.4 Analysis

Stage two is the primary focus of this chapter. The author reviewed the text from the focus group (N=9) and personal interview (N=4) transcripts related to
assessments of the GRCS-A. For the purposes of triangulation, seven transcripts (four focus groups and three interviews) also were inspected by one of the author's co-supervisors. Thematic analysis was conducted, following the five-step process delineated by Braun and Clarke (2006).

Step 1 involved reading the transcripts multiple times and, in so doing, becoming familiar with the data. Interesting and important aspects of the transcripts, including figures of speech, phraseology and gender dichotomies were noted. Step 2 concerned the researcher and one of his co-supervisors reading the transcripts and developing codes for text that were perceived as relevant to: 1) masculine ideologies, idealised representations of masculinity and masculine norms; 2) gender role conflict; 3) the positive and negative elements of each item on the GRCS-A; and 4) general impressions of the scale. In all cases, the author met with his co-supervisor to ensure that their identified codes reflected, for example, masculine ideology and GRC. Any emergent discrepancies between these two persons were discussed and resolved. The author and one of his co-supervisors then coded the remainder of the transcripts. Quoted extracts from these persons were inspected to see if they fit with the generated themes (Step 4). Finally, themes were further refined and, in some cases, consolidated (Phase 5).

3.3 Results

Three dominant themes emerged from the individual and focus group discussions about the GRCS-A. Respondents indicated that some items: 1) were inappropriate worded/phrased and irrelevant to the experiences of Irish adolescent males; 2) were more appropriate for girls or homosexual boys; and 3) had content that would result in boys trivialising the exercise of completing the scale.

3.3.1 Theme 1: Inappropriate wording/phrasing
During the interview discussions, boys highlighted a number of problematic items on the GRCS-A, including items 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 13, 18, 21, 24, 26 – see Table 1 for evaluation of items by adolescents and see Appendix B for the wording of these items). The following sub-themes emerged: a) problems with wording and phrasing of particular items (items 1, 2, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 29); b) contextual issues (item 4); c) the focus of the items (items 18, 21, 24 and 26); and d) elision of cultural differences (items 1, 2 and 7). The proportions of respondents that approved versus disapproved of the items on the GRCS-A also were estimated (see Table 1). Each subtheme is elucidated below.

**a) Problems with wording and phrasing of items**

*Item 1) Verbally expressing my love to another man is hard for me*

Fiún: ‘I’m not gay’
Joe: ‘Yeah, what the hell?’
Fiún: ‘is hard for..’
Aengus: ‘it still sounds wrong’
Cillian: ‘take out the love part’
Derick: ‘Why would we express our love to one another?’

(Focus group, 4th years, 15 years old)

Twenty-seven out of 33 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of this item, many of whom highlighted the word “love” as being inappropriate for use with adolescent samples. Responses to this item, which reflects restrictive affection between men (RAM), suggest that intimate expression between boys does not appear to be part of the adolescent male script. This was evident in Derick’s response (above) when he questioned why we (i.e., adolescent boys) “would express love to one another?” Further, one of the participants wrote beside this item “No, because I don’t find any man attractive” (focus group, 1st year student, 12-13 years old). However, the boys participating in this study made it clear they “knew” they were friends with one another through actions and non-verbal
expressions For example, “going downtown together during lunch time” or “staying
over in a friend’s house” or “playing football” with one another were ways of
“doing,” “showing,” and “knowing” friendship.

The phrase “hard for me” was highlighted in a number of instances and was
followed by laughter because boys associated this expression with getting an erection

When boys were asked how they would improve the item, some suggested
changing the words

“verbally,” “love” and “hard for me” (see below).

_Graham:_ ‘verbally expressing my love to another man’ is that, I’m not being
funny but it….  
_All:_ (laughing)
_Graham:_ Sorry, sorry… I’m not being funny, but in a gay way or in a friend
way?
_Bernard:_ Yeah
_Interviewer:_ Sorry?
_Graham:_ Did you mean that in a gay way or straight?
_Interviewer:_ I think they mean in a friendship way.
_Pádraig:_ Nobody is ever going to say that
_Alex:_ Yeah…
_Graham:_ Yeah, I’d say if you make it in a different context
_Alex:_ Maybe, ah
_Interviewer:_ How would you?
_Alex:_ showing that….
_Graham:_ It’s difficult for me to tell my friends how much they mean to me
_Bernard:_ Yeah
_Alex:_ Yeah
(Focus group, 4th year, 15-16 years old)

Item 2) Affection with other men makes me tense

_All:_ (laughter)
_Eamon:_ …it’s getting weirder
_Pádraig:_ …yeah, it is
_Eamon:_ I don’t get [feel] comfortable about these questions …
(Focus group, 4th year, 15 years old)

Twenty-four out of 32 participants across both focus groups and individual
interviews disapproved of this item.

_Joe:_ ’affection with another man makes me tense’…that’s kind of, again, very
strong like…am…. ‘affection with another man makes me tense’….what kind
of affection, hugging or something? Well, you wouldn’t be affectionate, you’d kind of do, you just kinda d’you know punch them in the arm and kind of laugh about it. You go ‘Oh yeah, you are [a] sound guy’ like, d’you know, it wouldn’t make you tense like really…uncomfortable, I suppose, would be a better word than tense.

(Individual interview, 6th year, 18 years and 4 months)

In response to this item, one boy wrote on the questionnaire “No, unless they are near my thing [penis]” (focus group, 1st year student, 12-13 years old, 1st year student).

Graham suggested the item be removed from the questionnaire.

Alex: ‘affection with other men’… yeah, it does ‘make me tense’, very…am don’t say that even, cause it’s

All: (laughing)

Graham: I’d just get rid of that question

(Focus group, 4th year, 16 years old)

Item 6) Being personal with other men makes me feel anxious

Ten out of 21 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of this item. Respondents commented on the term “anxious” suggesting that it was “too strong a word” (Dara, individual interview, 14 years and 1 months) and Damien (focus group, 6th year, 17 years and 11 months) recommended that “uncomfortable” be used instead.

Item 7) Men who are too friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference

Sixteen out of 23 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews did not sanction the use of this item. They felt it was too broadly framed; lacked clarity; and ignored important situational contexts.

Graham: ‘men who are too friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference’
Pádraig: Definitely not
Bernard: I don’t think they do
Interviewer: Is that ok?
Graham: It depends on how friendly friendly is?
(focus group, 4th group, 15-16 years old)
Being “too friendly” was highlighted as something that men don’t really show and by being “too friendly,” your sexuality was going to be questioned. This point is illustrated in the following exchange:

Tim: I dunno you don’t find men, you wouldn’t find men too friendly like, I suppose the odd one alright
Anthony: You’d be wondering what’s the story with him…?
Interviewer: Would you be wondering if he was gay?
Anthony: Yeah, you would I suppose, yeah.
(Focus group, 5th year, 17 years old)

The item does reflect a dynamic present in male adolescents’ lived experiences (i.e., being “too” friendly with other boys); however, most boys did not agree with the item in its current form. As Eoin commented, “you wouldn’t put those words in it.”

Participants did not understand certain words and phrases present in items 12, 13, and 29. For example, in response to item 12 (i.e., *It’s hard for me to express my emotional needs to others*), Graham said: “What are emotional needs? I don’t know if we’re all thinking that [the same thing] but I don’t know what it really means…” For item 13 (i.e., *When I am personally involved with others, I do not express my strong feelings*), some respondents asked “What does personally involved mean? What do you mean by that?” (Dara, individual interview, 14 years and 1 month). Finally, for item 29 (i.e., *I strive to be more successful than others*), Dominic, for instance, asked “what’s ‘strive’?” (focus group, 2nd year, 15 years old).

**b) Contextual difficulties with items**

**Item 4: Hugging other men is difficult for me**

Fourteen out of 25 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of this item. Some of the participants highlighted that this statement is unclear because under some circumstances hugging is acceptable. For example, Donal responded “I don’t really see the point in that question…..it depends
what way they’re hugging.” Eoin interjected by saying, “If you’re hugging after you score a goal or you’re hugging because…you want a bit of loving (laugh).” Donal added, “cause you’d be grand hugging someone after scoring a goal as I said, but if you just walked up to him on the street and hugged him…it’d be a bit odd like, playing for the wrong team like…” (focus group, 4th year, 15 years old). Homo-negative attitudes surfaced in this exchange suggesting that, in general, restrictions exist concerning intimate expressions between boys; however, in specific situational contexts (i.e., during sports games), physical displays of affection were perceived to be acceptable. Other examples where hugging boys is permissible are articulated below:

Joe: d’you know if you win a match, [would] you go up and hug them like, well, I suppose that could be straightforward. Yeah, it could be a question; yeah, like, most fellas wouldn’t care about hugging another man like… you wouldn’t just go up and hug a lad like….um, but I suppose if he came back after 17 years or something and seeing [him] for the first time and you gave him a hug like I suppose that would be grand, and winning a match and…something like that..

(Individual interview, 6th year, 17 years and 5 months)

For the purpose of measurement, including a specific situational context to this item would be preferable because it would be less confusing to participants.

c) Focus of certain items (e.g., school rather than sport or hobbies).

Item 18) My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life

Item 20) My need to work or study keeps me from my family or leisure more than I would like

Item 21) My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life

The appraisal of these items depended on whether the boys were in exam years (i.e., 3rd year or 5th or 6th year depending on the school). In a focus group interview with 4th year students, Alex qualified these items by saying: “…it depends. I suppose, if you’re in third year or sixth year.” Later in the interview, he said, “I
suppose this year it’s grand because we don’t do much in school” (aged 16 years and 5 months). These items also emphasised the importance of school rather than sport or other hobbies; a criticism that emerged for items 23: Overwork and stress caused by the need to achieve on the job or in school affects or/hurts my life; 24: Getting to the top of my class is important to me; and 26: Sometimes I define my personal value by my success at school⁹. Respondents noted that the emphasis placed on being good at school did not represent hegemonic masculinity as experienced by boys. For example, Tadhg explains that boys can strive to be good at many different activities and not necessarily at school. Further, he suggests that people who are not proficient athletically may compensate by focusing more on school, implying that sports is the hegemonic standard to which boys attempt to excel.

Similar to Watts and Borders’ (2005) findings, Tadhg notes that people have different interests depending on their self-identification (i.e., what their “image” is).

_Interviewer:_ Is that important for fellas?
_Tadhg:_ No, not in general; there’s always, a few [people] that think ‘Oh you have to be [strive to be good at school], there [are] some people…. people like me [want] to be like the best at sport all of the time, it’s more important to me to be honest with you; there’s other people [that] say don’t play sports, they don’t have any other hobbies [that] they are good at, they’re good at school…

_Interviewer:_ It depends on what you’re kind of interested in?
_Tadhg:_ Yeah, there (are) lads in the year... they’re known as, they’re known as really good hurlers and there’s other people in the school and they’re known for being good at school and they feel that they have to be really good at school…I don’t think that question like

_Interviewer:_ If it were reworded to kind of…
_Tadhg:_ If you like getting to the top of…..yeah, of your hobby or something like that or, get to the top of whatever your image is (focus group, 6th years, 17-19 years old)

d) Cultural appropriateness – “like the black people say”

Many of the words used may reflect cultural differences between Ireland and America. For example, commenting on the use of the word “love” (item 1), Kevin said, “like the black people say” (focus group, 2nd year, 14-15 years). This comment
was followed by Dominic’s assertion that “it’s too strong” (focus group, 2nd year, 14-15 years old). This may allude to cultural differences in Irish boys’ use of vocabulary, their interpretation of certain words and their openness to using emotive language.

3.3.2 Theme 2: It’s for homosexuals or girls

Adolescent males interpreted the items in the RE and the RAM factors as being more appropriate for girls or for homosexual boys. When a separate focus group was asked whether they believed the items were suitable for Irish adolescents, Bryan and Joe said “No” and started to laugh. Fiún quickly answered by saying “Yes, if you’re given these sheets to a woman they would” and Bryan added “It’s for homosexuals” (focus group, 4th years, 15 years old).

Ciaran: I think its phrasing is a bit…it nearly makes you sound a bit, well not really, yeah, it kinda nearly makes you sound homosexual the way you say ‘expressing my love to another man’…

(Individual interview, 6th year, 17 years and 5 months)

This theme is expressed succinctly by Donal (focus group): “Expressing my love just sounds like Romeo and Juliet like, Romeo and another man.”

3.3.3 Theme 3: Nobody would answer that seriously

Some respondents indicated that the content of select items would cause them or other boys not to take the scale seriously. For example, when the focus group was presented with the item “Men who are too friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference” (item 7), Donal (focus group, 4th year, 15 years and 4 months old) responded by saying “Nobody would answer that seriously, no boys…they’d only try and act funny; well, I would anyways.” When the group was asked what they thought about the items relating to the RAM factor, Eoin replied “The first five or six, they’re shocking[ly] bad.” When asked to particularise why they would not take those items seriously, Donal replied, “They’re all about loving men; who’s going to take that
serious?” Further, Donal said “I wouldn’t take that serious[ly]…some people are just going to write down stuff…taking the piss.”

The GRCS-A was presented to participants and they were asked to evaluate each item in the context of discussions during stage 1. Bryan said “I didn’t realise the questions would be like this.” Fiún bluntly asserted, “I wouldn’t do it” (focus group, 4th years, 15 years old). Interestingly, during one of the focus group sessions, the interviewer left the room for a couple of minutes. During his absence, the following sentiments were expressed about the scale items: “Joke of a question” (Dara, focus group, 6th year, 18 years and 7 months); “In all fairness, the first ten of those questions are fucking stupid” (Colin, 18 years and 9 months). Laughter followed this statement (referring to the items in the RE and RAM factors). Further, during an individual interview, Garry explained that it would discourage some boys from taking the measure seriously but qualified his statement when he said “[I’m] not saying that all men would.”

3.4 Discussion

There was general support for the GRC theory amongst the Irish adolescent sample; however, issues were raised about a number of items presented in the GRCS-A. Many of the problematic items reflecting RE and RAM were criticized for the wording and phrasing used, suggesting that cultural differences exist in the language that Irish adolescents employ in comparison to American students. (Watts and Borders [2005] did not raise these issues.) Emotionally laden words such as “love,” “affection,” and “anxious” were deemed inappropriate and “too strong” for Irish adolescent males, suggesting that different standards or more restricted standards of expression may exist. Across the interviews, items 1, 2 and 7 were highlighted as being most inappropriate. Boys deemed these items, among others, as more suitable for girls and homosexual
boys. A minority of the participants appeared to understand what these “problematic” items were implying; however, they remained critical of the items’ presentation and structure.

Other items on the GRCS-A were criticized for lacking clarity and failing to account for situational contexts, which determined the acceptability of certain behaviours such as affection between men. Items particular to the NSA and CBWSF factors were criticized for not taking into account the hegemonic ideals of adolescent males; for example, participants noted an over-emphasis on academic achievement and limited attention paid to extracurricular activities and hobbies.

Participants’ approval of the items on the CBWSF factor depended on whether or not they were in exam years (i.e., 3rd year and 6th year students). This observation supported Watts and Borders’ (2005) findings that these items were relevant to older adolescents who were preparing for end of school exams.

Participants indicated that if they were presented with the items on the GRCS-A, they would not take the exercise seriously. In its present form, boys suggested that the scale would cause others to “take the piss” or not participate in the research. One respondent explained that certain boys – but not all – might be enticed to spoil their research participation due to the presence of the aforementioned problematic items. This assertion suggests, firstly, that suboptimal items could prompt a sceptical individual to spoil the questionnaire. Secondly, it suggests that a very important cohort of young males may be excluded from this type of research. It is possible that these individuals are cognizant of masculine standards/norms, but will not respond “appropriately” to questions they regard as devoid of personal meaning.

Some researchers have acknowledged that the incorporation of items relating to sexuality may “create an insurmountable obstacle to collecting data with young
adolescents” (Levant, 2011, p. 770). Specifically, in the development of the adolescent version of the Male Role Norm Inventory (MRNI-A; Brown, 2002 as cited in Levant [2011]), the researchers decided not to include both the “Hatred of Homosexuals” and “Non-relational Attitudes towards Sexuality” subscales. Contrary to asserting that “controversial” items should simply be removed, a more fruitful approach may involve asking adolescents to reframe items in language that is age-appropriate. When the boys participating in this study were asked to improved items’ presentation, they devised questions that were deemed more suitable and acceptable to other boys. For example, rather than “Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me,” Graham (focus group, 15-16 years old) provided the alternative: It’s difficult for me to tell my friends how much they mean to me. This item was less explicit than the original and – most importantly – was grounded in language that boys use and understand.

It should be noted that many of the items were deemed appropriate and suitable for adolescent use (see Table 1). Said items appeared across all factors suggesting general support for GRC theory, as measured by the GRCS-A; however, the difficulties evident with participants’ interpretation of the items used to measure this theory underscores the need to include boys in the scale development stage and lends itself to constructing items (and by extension factors) previously viewed as “insurmountable issues.” These results also support psychometric guidelines suggesting the use of qualitative interviews with target populations to inform item development; guidelines incorporated by those developing contemporary masculine ideology scales (e.g., Chu, Porche & Tolman, 2005; Oransky & Fisher, 2009). Further, Levant (2011) suggests that developing instruments should incorporate a “mixed methods approach, starting with focus groups and individual interviews to generate items” (p. 770).
3.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, participants indicated that many of the items, as they were presented, were not applicable to their lived experiences and were far removed from the language they would use in their everyday interactions. The potential cultural misfit of the GRCS-A when administered within an Irish setting in conjunction with the absence of qualitative research exploring patterns of gender role conflicts among adolescents highlight various empirical needs. Specifically, there is a need for researchers to: a) investigate the standards of masculinity and, by implication, the masculine gender role conflicts experienced by Irish adolescents; and b) adopt a “bottom-up” approach when developing scale items to assess GRC.

3.6 Notes

6. A total sample of 41 participants were given the GRCS-A to evaluate each item by indicating an ‘x’ next to the items they deemed inappropriate/unsuitable and a ‘tick’ next to items they deemed appropriate/suitable. Stage 2 of the interview process, in some instances, only lasted a number of minutes, whereas other interviews were longer. As some boys omitted certain items, an estimate of the approval of items is based on those who indicated either a ‘tick’ or an ‘x’ to a specific question. Hence, there is a difference in the total number of participants for each item.

7. The number of participants varies for each item because not all participants discussed all questions.

8. Eight out of 21 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of item 23; 14 out of 19 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of item 24; and 7 out of 17 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of item 26.
9. ‘Taking the piss’ in this instance means that boys would, for their own enjoyment or for the enjoyment of others, intentionally and mockingly write down the wrong answer.’
Chapter 4 - Qualitative Investigation of GRC patterns in adolescents

4.1. Chapter Overview

In order to address gaps in adolescent masculinity research in Ireland, the purpose of this chapter was to highlight how GRC manifests itself among Irish adolescent males. This research aimed to: a) identify the numerous masculine expectations pertinent to Irish adolescents; and b) provide a more comprehensive account of the myriad determinants of gender role conflict. The critical objective of this chapter was to investigate how does GRC manifested amongst Irish adolescents? It was anticipated that emergent themes would offer the foundation for the subsequent studies, which focused on scale development.

4.2 Method

4.2.1 Participants

Fifty-four boys were recruited from 6 secondary schools in the Republic of Ireland. Their mean age was 16 years ($SD = 1.8$ years; range 12 years 6 months to 18 years 11 months).

Eleven focus groups were conducted, with the number of discussants per group ranging from 2 (one focus group) to 5 (five focus groups). To maximise the representativeness of discussants’ experiences, boys from every school year were targeted (i.e., 2 focus groups were conducted with 1st year students; 1 focus group each with 2nd and 3rd year students; 4 focus groups with transition year students; 1 focus group with 5th year students; and 2 focus groups with 6th year students). Nine individual interviews also were conducted (i.e., 4 interviews were conducted with students attending 1st through 4th year [1 interview per year]; 2 interviews were conducted with 5th year students and 3 interviews with 6th year students).

Participants were recruited from six schools from both the east and west of
Ireland; two schools were from urban areas (i.e., School A and B, both in Dublin city), one school was from a semi-urban area (i.e., School C, in Tralee, Co. Kerry) and three schools were from rural areas (i.e., School D, Co. Kerry; School E, Co. Clare; and School F, Co. Mayo).

Two of these schools were English-speaking (Schools E and F) and four were Irish-speaking schools; however, all of the boys enrolled in the latter institutions were fluent in English. No differences emerged in terms of thematic content between participants from Irish-speaking and English-speaking schools. Four of these schools were co-educational schools, one school was an all-boys school (E) and one school had mixed-sex classes for senior cycles (School B; 5th and 6th year).

4.2.2 Procedure

The procedure in relation to securing cooperation and consent was the same as that outlined in chapter 3.

4.2.3.1 Question guide

The interview guide consisted of questions that were designed to identify the stresses, expectations and masculine norms prevalent among Irish adolescent males. To minimise the possible impact of the researcher’s preconceived ideas and expectancies, questions were open-ended and, initially, broadly framed (e.g., “I’m interested in the kinds of stress that young people experience and I was hoping you could say something about this” – see Appendix G for the full interview guide). A list of current themes in the literature was compiled and, as topics naturally arose during the interviews, these themes were checked off the list. Themes that were not explored during the course of the interview/focus group were revisited near the end (e.g., Restrictive Emotionality: “If there was something bothering a friend of yours, would he talk to somebody about it?”). All questions were subject to revision; that is, any
questions participants did not understand and/or had difficulty answering were rephrased. Participants also were encouraged to elaborate on certain topics by use of prompts (e.g., “Can you say a bit more about that?”).

At the start of the interviews/focus groups, participants were informed that they could say anything they wanted. To encourage a conversational exchange, participants were asked general questions (e.g., “What is your age?” and “What class are you missing to participate in this interview/focus group?”).

4.2.4 Analysis

Transcripts of focus groups and interviews were sent to one of the author’s co-supervisors (4 focus groups and 4 individual interviews) as well as an independent researcher with a doctoral degree in psychology (3 focus groups and 5 individual interviews). The author reviewed all of the focus groups and personal interviews following the five steps outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006 – see chapter 3).

4.3 Results

Four inter-related themes were identified: 1) Expectations; 2) Discontinuity; 3) Restriction; and 4) Penalty. A description of each theme and sub-themes, where appropriate, as well as illustrative quotations designed to contextualize the themes are delineated below.

Theme 1 outlines a range of expectations of adolescent males and explores the potential negative consequences related to: a) (over) endorsement of/conformity to masculine expectations; b) failing to meet masculine expectations; and c) inherent contradictions when trying to fulfill these various expectations. Discontinuity (i.e., Theme 2) describes how expectations specific to certain groups and/or people can conflict with the expectation to “be yourself,” “be consistent” and “maintain your image” resulting in contextual variations in self-presentation. Restriction (i.e., Theme
3) highlights the various limitations boys experience when confronted with masculine expectations. Finally, penalty (i.e., Theme 4) relates to the negative consequences associated with violating, failing to meet and/or endorsing masculine expectations. This theme also reveals how perceptions of boys at a group or societal level can have a negative effect on boys’ self-perceptions and their subsequent behaviour.

4.3.1 Theme 1: Expectations

The individuals participating in this study reported that as boys they were subject to certain expectations. The “performance” of Irish hegemonic masculinity necessitates possessing characteristics/skills such as “Not Caring,” “Exuding Confidence,” “Evidencing General Proficiency,” “Investing in Physical Appearance,” “Displaying Strength,” “Being Heterosexual,” “Relating to Girls,” “Possessing a Good Personality,” and “Enhancing/Safeguarding one’s Hierarchical Standing.”

The characteristics discussed encompass both physical and psychological attributes associated with masculine expectations and are conceptualised as either narrow frameworks or dysfunctional/unattainable characteristics that boys are expected to adopt/display. These attributes act as a set of standards by which boys judge themselves and others and are some of the primary components to understanding the maintenance of hierarchies between boys and their peers. For some boys, these expectations may be experienced as pressures/stressors and failure to meet these standards may result in boys feeling inadequate. Further boys may be devalued, restricted or violated based on these standards.

The researcher acknowledges the positive aspects associated with the display of these attributes (see Hammer & Good, 2010). For example, refusing to show one’s vulnerability or express fear (in some contexts referred to as “strength”) can be advantageous in certain situations (i.e., in emergencies). However, rigid or extreme
endorsement of these characteristics in everyday situations can have negative intrapersonal and interpersonal outcomes. Given that the experience of gender role conflict depends on specific masculine expectations, each of the subthemes below will present a masculine expectation followed by the gender role conflicts that potentially derive from it.

**Not caring.** A masculine norm that emerged throughout the transcripts was that boys “don’t care about anything” or “don’t care what people think of them.” This norm surfaced initially when boys were asked to outline the differences between boys and girls. For example:

- **Derick:** You don’t care about half as much things as girls…you don’t care as much about anything.  
  (Focus group, 3rd years, 15-16 years old)

- **Liam:** Fellas don’t care, girls do. Just fellas do anything...  
  (Focus group, 4th year, 15 years old)

This expression surfaced in other contexts and was associated with overt displays of confidence and lack of self-consciousness.

- **Ciaran:** For some lads, it’d be important… how they appear to others, whereas other lads wouldn’t care what people thought about them…  
  (Individual interview, 6th year, 17 years old)

Contrary to this norm, however, some boys experienced and admitted that they do care how others perceive them. For example, Graham, aged 15, explains:

- **Interviewer:** What are the most difficult things about being an adolescent fella?  
  **Graham:** ... looks, what people think (of you)... you kind of contradict yourself when you’re a teenager [be]cause you’re saying you should be yourself and you don’t care what people think [about you] but, you do care  
  **Interviewer:** Would that be true for everyone?  
  **All:** Yeah (all except for Bernard)  
  **Interviewer:** Would you agree with that? [directed at Bernard]  
  **Bernard:** I dunno, I don’t…the lads probably know that I don’t really care what people think, most [of the time]...  
  **Graham:** No, he doesn’t, that is good though cause he’s…  
  **Danny:** Yeah  
  **Graham:** Very funny
Alex: Yeah
Bernard: But I think most people care what people think anyway…especially girls…
(Focus group, 4th year, 15-16 years old)

Ironically, some boys try to project confidence through masking an expression that often directly opposes their internal feelings. This underscores the contradictions inherent in adolescent masculinity. For instance, even Bernard qualifies his statement about not caring what people think with “most of the time.” Also worth noting was how Bernard positioned girls to the extreme end of the spectrum describing them as being “way worse” than boys, suggesting that girls and boys are polarized into distinct categories.

Boys who indicated caring about how they were perceived and, thus, failing to meet this masculine expectation also expressed feeling vulnerable to attack from others. Gary explains that it “draws the wrong type of attention to you” (Individual interview, 4th year, 16 years 11 months). In the following passage, Connor describes the nuances of “not caring” and how the expression should be ideally projected within certain parameters (i.e., “not in an ignorant way”). Implicit in this statement is that breaching this protocol would be viewed as far from ideal and would result in devaluation by others.

Interviewer: How would you describe the ideal male adolescent?
Connor: The ideal male adolescent I suppose… he’d be, the ideal, I suppose he’d be secure, like he wouldn’t give a shit about what other people think but you know not in an ignorant I’ll do what I want kind of a way…
(Individual interview, 5th year, 16 years old)

Exuding Confidence. This characteristic surfaced across all interviews and was commonly expressed through “being in control.” Expressions of “control” were numerous and included self-control, agency, self-reliance, discipline, being able to handle any situation and appearing “confident” to others. Illustrative quotes from interviews/focus group discussions are provided below:
Interviewer: ...what are the main expectations of males?
Connor: ... that they’d kind of be strong and kind of be able to handle any situation that came and all this kind of stuff
(Individual interview, 5th year, 16 years old)

Interviewer: ...what are the most important characteristics about being a fella?
Tim: ... being confident I suppose
All: Yeah
(Focus group, 5th year, 17 years old)

Akin to “not caring,” “confidence” similarly functions within specific parameters; that is, confidence is ideally expressed by the performance of ability (“doing”) combined with modesty. Making one’s achievements known and expressing self-worth or appearing overly confident were deemed incompatible with this masculine ideal and were likely to result in devaluation (i.e., slagging) from others. Joe explains:

Interviewer: Are there certain ways fella should act or feel they should act?
Joe: I suppose most fellas would want to be the best at everything and other fellas would be like, the opposite…modest, some fellas would be modest like and they wouldn’t care what half the lads would say, it would nearly be split down the middle, half the lads wouldn’t say much about d’you know ’ I scored ten goals in the last match’ and other fellas would be telling everybody and, the fellas that do say it you think they are a fucking eejit
Interviewer: If someone was to brag about how they played?
Joe: Yeah, like say most lads like you think men shouldn’t really, you wouldn’t really, men shouldn’t be that way I’d say like
Interviewer: They shouldn’t be bragging is that it?
Joe: Yeah, just take it in your stride type of way
Interviewer: Yeah
Joe: It looks cooler anyway like (laughing)… if you’re saying it to everyone…they’d think he’s an eejit…
(Individual Interview, 6th year [exam year], 18 years old)

Evidencing General Proficiency. For boys, proficiency in the realm of academics or sports was of particular importance for nurturing a sense of self-worth and gaining respect from others. Boys reported feeling pressure from a number of sources (namely, themselves, peers, parents and teachers) to be successful at one or more of these activities.

Interviewer: I am interested in the expectations of young people? I was
hoping you could say something about that
Fiún: They’re high…. they expect you to get on well
Bryan: They expect a lot from you
Pádraig: They expect you to do as well as your other brothers and
sisters….that came before you
Interviewer: And other expectations?
Joe: To do well in school and sport
Interviewer: And where do these expectations come from?
Joe: Parents
Fiún: Parents
Bryan: Teachers and stuff like that
Joe: Friends
(Focus group, 4th years, 15-16 years old)

Academic proficiency featured as a priority for some of the boys, particularly
those in exam years (i.e., 3rd year [junior certificate] and 6th year students [leaving
certificate]).

Interviewer: I’m interested in the kinds of stress young people experience and
I was wondering if you could talk about that?
Tadhg: You get stressed over anything like
Ian: Yeah
Tadhg: Even small things…school
Ian: Sports, girls, the main stuff, sports, girls and school
Tadhg: D’you know, any of them like, anything that you think
Damien: When you’re younger you kind of compare yourself to everyone else
like and like some people get over exams because they think they have to be
as good as like, the best person in the year, their older brother or something
like that, and like, general things [too]
(Focus group interview, 4th year, 16 years old)

Worth noting was the prevalence of disinterest and negative connotations
associated with doing well in school, in contrast to sport, were there were no instances
of negativity related to succeeding in athletics (other than being boastful). As Ciarán
explains:

Interviewer: Why do you think lads aren’t as competitive academically?
Ciaran: I suppose lads don’t really see it as much of an importance to be
competitive academically. They see it more important to themselves to be
competitive physically and in sports like than they would academically. They
wouldn’t see it as much of an importance…
(Individual interview, 6th year, 17 years and 5 months)

In Ireland, sports such as Gaelic football, hurling, rugby and soccer are sports
that are predominantly played by males. Framing these sports as masculine-dominated
arenas, a number of possible gender role conflicts relating to sports were reported: 1)
boys not feeling good enough; 2) under performing; 3) not being picked for a team;
and 4) balancing demands on their time (e.g., going to training versus
homework/social life).

Eoin: Football teams are stressful too, like if you don’t think you’re good
enough..
Derick: Yeah
Eoin: Because teams get older you know, people get dropped and stuff
or…..afraid of being dropped [from the team]
(Focus group, 3rd years, 15-16 years old)

Stresses associated with sports were reported more frequently than the stresses
associated with performance at school. However, boys who participated in
competitive sports and who had ambitions to achieve at school reported experiencing
the most pressure caused by having to juggle both activities.

Interviewer: Is it difficult to balance school with other activities outside of
school?
Joe: Ah yeah, say [with] football in the evenings like, after school you’d be
knackered [tired] and you’d just want to eat and you’d go to training and
you’d come back and you wouldn’t do your homework… there [are] some
fellas that can but most lads would just kind of put it [schoolwork] aside to
play football…it would be tough enough…yeah that would be the main
thing…
(Individual interview, 6th year [exam year], 18 years old)

Interview: Is it difficult to balance school with hobbies/sports?
Fergal: Awh yeah, it was last year
Eoin: Junior cert anyway; yeah, the teachers would be going on saying they
want you to do two and three hours study
Fergal: You’d have training or maybe two trainings at the evening as well like
Interview: Yeah, is that the same for first year and second year as well?
Donal: Ah yeah, but you wouldn’t really be inclined to do homework like, you
just go training; it’s more important but third year there’d be more pressure
like
Fergal: Trying to do both
(Focus Group, 4th years [not exam year], 15-16 years)

Investing in Physical Appearance. Being concerned with one’s appearance,
and striving to be as attractive as possible, which was defined primarily in terms of
possessing a muscular physique, emerged as prominent masculine ideals.

*Interviewer*: If you were to describe the ideal fella, how would you describe him?
*Cathal*: I suppose a funny lad, ah, truthful lad I suppose, a good-looking lad as well
(Individual interview, 3rd year, 15 years 11 months)

*Interviewer*: What’s difficult about being a fella?
*Liam*: Your body
*Interviewer*: Your body?
*Liam*: Yeah, like it’s more like they expect us to be more toned and in shape now than out of shape so people are, more fellas are joining gyms now, trying to stay in shape, to look their best for everybody.
*Interviewer*: Is that recent…
*All*: Yeah
*Interviewer*: Why do you think that has changed?
*Derick*: The way things are going…people are more interested, no one really cared about it before
(Focus group, 3rd years, 15-16 years old)

Further, some boys experienced these standards as stressful and felt that they were more stringent nowadays than in the past.

*Interviewer*: Do fellas think about their image?
*All*: Yeah
*Tadhg*: They say they don’t but they do
*Dáithí*: Yeah
*Tadhg*: Maybe not as much as a girl
*Interviewer*: In what way?
*Dáithí*: Like nobody, nobody doesn’t like to look good in fairness; everyone likes to look the best that they think they can
*Ian*: Yeah… I think lately it’s gotten a lot worse, I’d say in the last few years with hair, clothes, everything, just
*Dáithí*: Everything really,
*Ian*: Like compared to what…. probably, say ten years ago, it wasn’t as bad, clothes, hair or anything but my dad and all didn’t care, they had their fashion things but it wasn’t as bad as it is now, with the amount of money that is spent on stuff
(Focus group, 6th years, 17-19 years old)

*Displaying Strength*. Discussants articulated the importance of being both physically and mentally “strong.” Mental strength was related to: 1) the concept of “self-control” and not letting things get to you; and 2) “endurance” and being mentally tough. Displaying behaviours contrary to this expectation, such as showing
vulnerable emotions, were associated with “weakness” and “femininity.”

_Interviewer:_ Do you think fellas find it difficult to cry in front of their friends?  
_Connor:_ Yeah I’d say so they might, they’d feel that crying in front of their friends might be a sign of you know like a sign of being vulnerable and maybe a bit weak but, you know that they might [think] fellas would think less of them…  
(Individual interview, 5th year, 16 years old)

_Interviewer:_ What do you mean by being mentally tough?  
_Joe:_ Not letting things get to you I suppose and you know not crying like as well, taking things in your stride being more relaxed all that like and, d’you know if you’re getting a slagging just d’you know like just laugh about it and get over it and try and improve it like, not getting worried or stress like..I suppose  
(Individual interview, 6th year, 18 years and 4 months)

Joe includes displays of strength as maintaining an image of invulnerability and coolness, being un-phased and “taking things in your stride” in the face of being teased or slagged.

_“Being” Heterosexual._ There was an expectation for boys to refrain from displaying any behaviour associated with either femininity or homosexuality. Many boys conflated these terms (i.e., femininity and homosexuality) and the expectation of compulsory behavioural and attitudinal displays of heterosexuality results in some boys experiencing certain restrictions.

_Interviewer:_ Are there certain ways a fella should act?  
_Ciaran:_ Well, I suppose within society there would be, like people would expect males to like act a certain way, and if they didn’t act a certain way like, you’d, they’d be classed as maybe being gay or something because of the way they acted like  
(Individual interview, 6th year, 17 years and 5 months)

_Interviewer:_ Are there inappropriate ways for fellas to act?  
_Mark:_ Awh yeah  
_Oisín:_ No many  
_Mark:_ There’s, ah…homosexuality is frowned upon  
_Oisín:_ (laughing)  
(Focus group, 1st years, 13 years old)

_Relating to Girls._ Boys experienced stresses vis-à-vis girls. Many boys articulated that having a girlfriend wasn’t a priority for them; however, there was
consensus that boys’ self-confidence would be negatively affected if they possessed little experience with, or had difficulty “getting” girls.

*Interviewer:* What type of stressors relate to girls?
_Fergal:* If everyone else is getting women and you’re not
_Donal:* Yeah
(Focus group, 4th year, 15 years old)

*Interviewer:* Right so, are there any other expectations?
_Bernard:* People expect you to get a girlfriend
_Padraig:* Yeah
_Bernard:* Fairly lively [quickly], and…it can be stressful sometimes
(Focus group, 4th year, 15-16 years old)

Younger adolescents described that being with girls is a method of “proving” your heterosexuality.

*Interviewer:* Is it important for a fella to have a girlfriend?
_Mark:* Not really, people feel pressure to having them, like cause like everyone has them…
_Oisin:* So they think you’re manly
*Interviewer:* So who thinks you’re manly?
_Conal:* It proves that you’re straight
_Oisin:* [to] your friends
_Denis:* Everyone
_Mark:* To prove that you’re straight, yeah
(Focus group, 1st years, 13-15 years old)

The standards of appearance and attractiveness and resultant pressures experienced by some boys were closely related to how boys were perceived by girls.

_Graham:* Lads care a lot more what girls think nowadays … than what they used to think
_All:* Yeah (4 yeahs)
(Focus group, 4th year, 15-16 years old)

As well as physical attributes, characterological qualities also were expected of the successful male.

_Dóin:* Girls expect you to be funny… to have a good personality and be able to talk to them, do you know?
(Focus group, 4th year, 15-16 years old)

_Possessing a “Good” Personality.* The characterological features described as preferable to girls mirrored the attributes of an ideal adolescent male. Discussants
referred to some of the most important qualities of being male as being “sound” (Ian, focus group, 19 years and 2 months), “being funny” (Fiachna, focus group, age 15 years and 4 months), “being entertaining” (Eamonn, focus group, age 15 years and 1 month) and “being good craic” (Anthony, focus group, 17 years old). Attaining these qualities was perceived as a prerequisite to earning respect amongst different groups (i.e., boys and girls), implying that contrary expressions were not ideal representations of masculinity within Irish culture.

*Enhancing/Safeguarding one’s Hierarchical Standing.* The majority of boys were acutely aware of adolescent hierarchies and how an appropriate display of the previously mentioned attributes ensured they maintained their current social standing (or a possible upgrade within the current hierarchy). The following passage describes this dynamic:

*Mark:* Yeah like there’s a big social circle type of thing, like you have to be at the top or the bottom, or just in the middle…the middle is generally the best place to be
*Oisin:* Um, because you’re not one of those snobby rich, not really rich people but ah, you’re not really one of those snobby people who think they’re going to be rich
*Mark:* The best
*Oisin:* Yeah
*Mark:* Like they are better than everybody else
*Oisin:* And then you’re not going to be at the bottom, where you think all the snobby people start
*Mark:* Where you feel like shit all of the time
*Oisin:* Yeah so like, and you don’t really want to be one of those goth kids and emo kids like
*Mark:* Yeah
*Oisin:* And then you, you just hate your life and you end up killing yourself somehow, but am, the best place to be is in the middle
*Mark:* Yeah probably because like, if you’re up at the top, a lot of stress because you have to stay up top, like you have to feel like you have to stay at the top all the time and then if you’re down at the bottom you feel you have to get to the top, but like generally it’s the people who think, who have their own thing to say who think something that no one else thinks are usually the people at the bottom, like, cause they’re different…
(Focus group, 1st years, 13-15 years old)

Gender role conflict is evident in the exchange between Mark and Óisin who
imply that GRC is an inevitable outcome of hierarchical social systems. Those that
over-conform and pursue status, want to be on “top” or feel they have to “stay on top
all of the time” experience stress in doing so whereas boys at the bottom, who do not
conform, who have “their own thing to say” and are “different” similarly end up
experiencing negative consequences.

The following quote describes and encompasses many of the expectations
previously discussed.

*Interviewer*: What do you think are the most important characteristics of being
a fella?
*Dara*: I’d say the most important are to be strong about stuff… not to like get
too upset about different things, then to help girls like… maybe if a lad’s after
getting hopped on and like…a strong characteristic that someone might expect
of a lad is for another lad to run over and say get off him like, don’t touch him
where like, you might see different characteristics in girls… they might be
more scared to go over and say leave her alone or whatever… I’d say the main
characteristics expected of boys are to be strong about things, to help out when
it is needed…like not to wimp out of stuff and just to be like a lad not to be
like….like how most lads describe different things as gay….maybe the way
you walk or like characteristics… it’s really not a game but a competition to
see who’s the most normal… if you’re a little bit like, maybe you hang around
with girls instead of hanging around with boys, you’re called gay straight
away, there’s no chance that they’d even think for a second about it… I’d say
the main characteristics in boys is being normal, being strong and being there
when you’re needed and being good at sports
(Individual Interview, 1st year, 14 years old)

**4.3.2 Theme 2: Discontinuity**

Participants articulated certain behavioural and attitudinal expectations of boys
when in the presence of specific groups. Competing expectations may be evident; as
well, some of these expectations were perceived as compromising boys’ ability to be
“themselves.” This theme identifies and outlines the global expectations and pressures
boys experience to “perform” masculinity within specific groups highlighting that
certain masculinities can have positive or negative consequences depending on the
context or social groups in which they are displayed. Discontinuity occurs when
group or context specific expectations compete with, and override, boys’ expression
of their “true selves.” This theme posits that certain boys will experience conflict when: a) functioning in contexts that are inimical to expression of one’s “true self;” b) striving to conform to the expectations that are placed upon them; and c) negotiating incompatible expectations in the presence of opposing groups.

Discontinuity will be discussed in relation to male peers (i.e., intragroup regulation of masculinity); non-male peers (i.e., intergroup regulation of masculinity); and points of convergence between male and non-male peers.

*Intragroup Regulation of Masculinity (Male Peers)*

Boys described that, in the presence of other boys, certain attitudes and behaviours were either promoted or restricted. These behaviours were predominantly displayed within male groups or regulated more extensively within male groups. In male-groups, “competitiveness” relating to the ideal performance of expectations outlined in Theme 1 (i.e., Expectations) served to maintain these expectations and fuel “extreme” expressions along given continua (e.g., displays of strength or confidence). In general, boys who violated male group expectations and/or norms were sanctioned strictly (see the forthcoming theme entitled, “Penalty”). Subthemes included “Act Tough,” “Act, Don’t Think,” “Slagging,” “Loyalty,” and “Pressures to Socialise.”

*Act Tough.* Boys described that, in the presence of same-sex peers, they were expected to “act tougher” (Danny, focus group, 4th years, 15-16 years old) than they would around other social groups (i.e., girls). Further, Bernard describes that “you can’t really act sensitive” because other boys “might think you are weird” (Focus group, 4th years, 15-16 years old). “Acting tough” in the presence of other boys was often described as a playful exercise albeit one that served a regulatory function within the group and served to maintain a standard level of toughness. Some boys described this behaviour as a way of exerting dominance and “impressing” others.
Toughness also was framed as essential for boys’ development.

_Interviewer:_ What are other important characteristics about being a fella?
_Tadhg:_ Not be over like, don’t be overly sensitive about things and just take, just take stuff on the chin and go and get on with your life like.
_Interviewer:_ Ok, and if you were overly sensitive?
_Dáithí:_ You just be, you just be, you wouldn’t be in a group basically
_Ian:_ You wouldn’t even say that
_Tadhg:_ Ah, there are lads that are over sensitive, you know
_Aidan:_ People get sick of you if you can’t take a joke
_Dáithí:_ Joke, yeah
_Dáithí:_ If you’re in a huff all the time and everything they’d be like, ah, fuck him
_Tadhg:_ Probably, the chances are, if you’re overly sensitive, people will turn around and say you’re gay
_Dáithí:_ (laughing)
_Tadhg:_ That’s it like, there’s one lad in our year and he’s very sensitive and people think he’s gay

(Focus group, 6th years, 18 years old)

_Act, Don’t Think._ Discussants indicated that, when in the presence of other boys, they are expected to “do” (Oisín, focus group, 1st years, 13 years old); not to “over think” (Dáithí, Focus group, 6th years, 18 years old); and to show “no fear” (Fergal, focus group, 4th years, 15 years old). This relates to other descriptions of boys, such as “boys would do anything” (Anthony, focus group, 5th years, 17 years old), “boys are blunt” (Dáithí, focus group, 4th years, 16 years old) and “boys do things without thinking” (Alex, focus group, 4th years, 16 years old). Showing emotions such as “fear” and “over thinking” were associated with femininity. As noted earlier, boys were expected to “do” and to worry about consequences later: as Tadhg points out, “It’s only after [that] they regret it and think I shouldn’t have done it” (focus group, 6th year, 18 years old). Similarly, Alex says “You wouldn’t mean to say it, it’d be a slip of the tongue and you kinda regret it afterwards” (focus group, 4th years, 16 years old). GRC is reflected in this subtheme when conformity to this masculine norm results in negative consequences such as regretting your actions or engaging in risk-taking behavior (i.e., devaluing oneself for conforming to a
masculine ideology). The dynamic of risk-taking amplified within male groups, often resulting in positive regard or social currency (i.e., respect from peers), conflicted with expectations of other groups (i.e., parents and teachers).

_Slagging._ Teasing was identified as a masculine norm and as a regulator of masculine group norms. Boys framed “slagging” behaviour as an activity that was not meant to hurt others; however, it was acknowledged that when taken too far, it could affect people’s sense of self. This intra-male group dynamic is particularly relevant to GRC theory as it may be the chief process through which boys internalise others’ judgments of the appropriateness of certain behaviours (i.e., gender role norms and rules).

_Interviewer:_ Do boys slag each other a lot?
_All:_ Yeah
_Donal:_ Constantly… it’s harmless enough, slagging though
_Fergal:_ Well, sometimes...
(Focus group, 4th years, 15 years old)

_Ciaran:_ I dunno if it’s something about that lads kinda, they’d slag a lot more than girls would; girls would be a lot more kinda understanding of the type of person that you are than lads would…lads kinda don’t, [they] are kinda narrow-minded; they wouldn’t see anything deeper than what they see, the way you act like, you know...
(Individual interview, 6th year, 17 years old)

Slagging played a regulatory role in boys’ behavior. Boys acknowledged that one of the reasons they don’t talk about their problems is because they don’t want to be slagged.

_Interviewer:_ Why do you think boys don’t talk about their problems?
_David:_ I dunno, I don’t think, like I suppose it’s, well number one is they don’t want anyone else to know I suppose and … they don’t want to get a slagging over that.
(Individual interview, 6th year, 18 years old)

Age differences in slagging between younger and older adolescents also emerged in the transcripts.

_Anthony:_ When you’re older, you get a bit more cop on like d’you know;
there’d be less, there wouldn’t be as bad slagging like d’you know slagging and stuff like, whereas before, like in second year, reckless altogether like; you’d be very cheeky then
Tim: You’d know when to stop now at this stage; you’d only go so far but before I suppose you used to go over that line alright
(Focus group, 5th years, 17 years old)

Loyalty. Amongst male friends, loyalty was a prerequisite for being a member of a male group and was often referred to by the phrase “bros before hos.” When boys were asked how they knew they were friends with other boys, going downtown with male peers, vague descriptions such as “hanging around with them,” and sticking up for friends whilst they were in an argument or in a fight were the most common responses. Some boys felt that the expectation of standing up for a friend at all costs, even when they knew the friend was in the wrong, constituted a source of stress. Failing in this regard would lead to being devalued by others and potential isolation from the group.

Pressures to socialize. Many boys experienced pressure from their peers to go out on the weekend to socialize and drink. If boys did not participate in these activities, they were subject to repercussions.

Alex: There’d be pressure on you then to go out, and you might, you might kind of want to but not want to drink, or you mightn’t be allowed to and then your friends are like whatever. People you’ll be going out with might be putting pressure on you to go, you can’t really say, that I’m not allowed and things like that, or those kind of things.…
Graham: Yeah
(Focus group, 4th year, 15-16 years old)

Interviewer: What would fellas expect you to do?
Derick: To go out, to be ready.
Arthur: Expect you to do what basically, do what they wanna do.
Derick: Yeah
Arthur: If they wanna drink, you’re supposed to go drinking with them. If they wanna smoke, you’re supposed to do smoking with them.
Interviewer: And if you didn’t feel like it?
Arthur: They’d just start slagging you then again.
(Focus group, 3rd year, 15-16 years old)

Tadhg: Whereas most of the lads like would come out, but then there’s other
people you know, maybe people who have stricter parents than others or they just are not as comfortable like, that wouldn’t be able to socialise as much like, [and], you know, sometimes you get rumours starting about them people….

(Focus group, 6th year, 18 years old)

Interviewer: Are there certain ways fellas feel they should act?
Tim: I suppose there is alright…well, I suppose in drinking terms you’d nearly [be] expected to be if your friends… there’s a lot of pressure alright on some fellas..
Anthony: Act certain ways as well
Interviewer: To act any way like…?
Anthony: Yeah there would be I suppose, drinking and stuff like, everyone else would sort of follow them… they’d be under pressure as well like because they’d probably be left behind otherwise…

(Focus group, 5th years, 17 years old)

**Intergroup Regulation of Masculinity**

Boys described that, when in the presence of girls, parents and teachers, they had to alter their behaviours and attitudes due to the presence of different expectations.

*Girls.* When around girls, boys were expected to: a) listen more; b) refrain from acting rough; c) avoid slagging girls to the same degree they would slag boys; d) be quieter and more respectful; and e) evidence greater accommodation to the interests of girls. It is important to note that boys discussed caring more about what girls thought of them “nowadays” and described girls as “accepting you for who you are.” Participants also maintained that conflict arose when trying to integrate male and female group expectations:

*Tadhg:* If there is a girl around the place or if you have like a girl out with you, you’re not going to act the same around her; well, all the lads will still be acting, as they would with a group of lads and then you’ll kinda, you’ll kinda quiet down a bit. You won’t be as boisterous as everybody else and all the lads will turn around and they’ll abuse you for not being one of the lads while your girlfriend is there or something

*All:* (laughing and jeering)

*Damien:* Not everybody has the same idea of how you should act like
*Tadhg:* Some lads would think like, you gotta, no matter who you’re with, like if you’re with a guy, if you’re with the lads or if you’re with the girls, you should act the same like; you should still be up for the laugh; you should still
be acting boisterous. [Whereas] other lads think you know, kinda, if you’re around a group of girls that it’s expected of you to calm down a bit… People have different opinions like, so…there’s always going to be different expectations from everybody.
(Focus group interview, 4th year, 16 years old)

In another interview, David describes how his male friends would know if he were acting differently around different people. He describes how you have to “watch yourself” otherwise boys will talk about you.

David: Yeah, wilder. That’s the main thing; they’re [boys] wilder and they’d say anything like (laugh)…they’d mind themselves around females I’d say…
Interviewer: If you’re used to acting a certain way in front of your female friend…
David: Yeah… you might be self-conscious then like, you don’t want…if your friends know who you are, they know exactly who you are … and they know if you’re messing or they know your kind of humour and d’you know but if you’re acting differently or saying around girls like they’d be like ‘Oh, he’s weird’… girl’s talk like…
Interviewer: He’s what?
David: He’s weird like d’you know or he’s an eejit or d’you know…they talk about you…..yeah … you’d be watching yourself alright....they’d say it to you afterwards…yeah they would…they would, believe it…. They’d say it to each other anyway…

Connor acknowledges these conflicting expectations but contends that being able to adapt to these expectations is a critical skill.

Connor: Being able to adapt to you know like, when they are with their friends, you hardly want to go talking to them… about something with a girl like, say clothes with fellas you know like….they don’t really want to hear about that whereas you talk about a rugby match to a girl, chances are she doesn’t want to hear that you know so it’s like you wouldn’t go speaking French to German, you know so…
(Individual interview, 5th year, 16 years and 11 months old)

Also, worth noting was that girls contributed to the maintenance of masculine standards. That is, boys reported that girls sought males who displayed promise in the following dimensions: “physical attractiveness,” “exuding confidence,” “possessing a good personality,” “evidencing general proficiency,” displaying “strength” and being “respected” by peers.

Parents. Male group norms and expectancies often compete with parental
expectations. Boys spoke about not being allowed to go out at night to socialize or being required to “hide” aspects of themselves from their parents.

Mark: ...like I wouldn’t tell my parents everything I do, like outside the house obviously like you know, like it’s none of their business...I end up telling them some things but not the stuff ... I was like going around for like half of this year like pretending to be inside my home… to be all good and nice and everything is ok but outside, doing stuff (laughing).[…that] shall not be named (Focus group, 1st years, 14 years old)

Teachers/Figures of Authority. A number of masculine expectations such as “being entertaining,” “taking risks,” “having no fear,” and “refusing to back down” were triggered in the presence of authority figures, which often caused conflict for boys. For example, within a classroom setting, many of these predominantly masculine expressions were looked upon favourably by peers; however, conformity to these specific masculinities were in direct opposition to the objectives of teachers, resulting in negative consequences for the boys.

Interviewer: Are there differences in the way fellas act in front of parents/teachers and the way they would generally act without them being around?
Fergal: Yeah
Donal: Yeah
Interviewer: What would they be?
Eoin: They’d be more open in front of their friends rather than to parents and teachers
Donal: It’d be all innocent in front of the parents and teachers like…well, sometimes…
Fergal: Some of them would be acting hard then in front of their friends…
Interview: Acting hard in front of their friends is it?
Fergal: Yeah
Donal: Yeah
Fergal: When the teachers
Interview: Teachers are there, yeah, and why would they do that?
Fergal: To get popular
Donal: Yeah
Interview: Does that work?
Fergal: (laugh) Yeah
Donal: Yeah
Interview: And why does that work?
Donal: Well, if they’re funny like, they’re a bit of entertainment, everyone likes entertainment (laugh)
(Focus group, 4th year, 15 years old)
4.3.3 Theme 3: Restriction

Prescribed roles and norms restrict the affective and behavioural options of boys. Due to gender role socialization, some boys may feel constrained in terms of their freedom of expression – both emotionally and behaviourally.

*Emotional Restriction.* Participants specified that, as boys, their emotions needed to be controlled and monitored. In most of the interviews, boys said they kept their feelings “in” (Alex, focus group, 4th year, 16 years and 5 months old). Expressions of vulnerable feelings were associated with femininity and the absence of rationality. Participants also espoused essentialist beliefs in terms of gender differences in emotional displays: “girls are more emotional than boys” (Ian, focus group, 6th years, 19 years and 2 months old) and “boys aren’t as sensitive as girls” (Fiun, focus group, 4th year, 15 years and 2 months old).

Emotional displays were permissible, however, under specific/unique circumstances and/or with specific targets. Boys would be more likely to show their emotions if they were: a) on their own rather than in a same-sex group; b) in serious physical pain (e.g., a broken leg); c) intoxicated; d) located in a suitable venue for emotional disclosure; e) involved in a situation that was deemed of sufficient magnitude to warrant an emotional display; and f) able to rely on a close friend.

Failure to engage in affective regulation has implications for how boys feel and/or may be perceived. The reasons boys gave for not talking about problems were multifaceted. Boys said that talking wasn’t part of “boy culture;” that within male groups boys were expected to keep exchanges “light” (i.e., good craic) and that, if a boy disclosed his feelings, other boys wouldn’t know how to react. They envisioned emotional interactions with other men resulting in themselves and other boys feeling awkward and being unable “to handle it” (Aengus, Focus group, 4th years, 15 years...
and 8 months).

David: It was awkward, ah ya very awkward yeah….that’s probably why as well like you know, you feel very awkward talking about your feelings or someone else’s….you know…awful… awful like…. Something you don’t want to have to do like…. d’you know, you’d nearly run away before you’d have to deal with something like that…
(Individual interview, 6th year, 18 years and 6 months)

Boys also said that they feared how same-sex peers would perceive them and how it would affect their image.

Tadhg: It’s the same thing as not saying anyone, saying something to anyone, you just don’t want them to know
Dáithí: Same as your image, kind of
Ian: Yeah, same thing; image that you show them that you’re a man, why would you cry over some shit?
(Focus group interview, 4th year, 16 years old)

Boys refrained from talking to other boys about emotional matters because they did not trust boys’ reactions. First, they feared other boys would slag them.

Fergal: Lads don’t talk to each other about stuff; girls are always talking to each other like
Donal: Yeah, they don’t, they keep to themselves more than the girls
Interview: Why is that?
Donal: Insecure probably
Fergal: (laughing)
Donal: I’m serious…
Interview: And you reckon that’s because they are insecure?
Donal: I suppose, they’re probably afraid of getting a slagging if they say something to them yeah
Fergal: They’d start taking the piss out of you…they’d be calling you a pussy if you were crying like…they wouldn’t feel any sympathy for you like
(Focus group, 4th year, 15 years and 4 months)

Joe: You would only talk to one lad on his own cause if you talk to a group they’d probably slag you about it
(Individual interview, 6th year, 18 years and 4 months)

Participants expressed concerns that boys wouldn’t keep the information to themselves and would use this knowledge in a spiteful way at a later point in time, causing further stress.

Anthony: Yeah d’you know they could easily just keep blackmailing you bout it like d’you know if you didn’t want them to say anything
Ironically, when asked the differences between boys and girls, boys described girls as being more “bitchy” and more likely to talk about each other behind their back. Conversely, boys described themselves (and their peers) as being “straight up” and not as “two-faced” as girls.

Donal: Sure you couldn’t trust other fellas if you told them there was problem
Eoin: Yeah, most lads are only going to go off and tell other lads
Donal: They’ll only use it against you

(Pédraig: It depends on who you trust as well like; if you trust a person or like, you’ll tell them but if you don’t, like if you’re not sure about them and he goes off then telling this person and then…it’s just like an avalanche attack.

Disclosing their feelings affected how boys perceived themselves. Discussions with Garry revealed that boys refrained from speaking about sensitive topics to their male friends because the act of disclosure has implications for self-perceptions.

Interviewer: Why wouldn’t you talk to boys about things that bother you?
Garry: I dunno cause your friends would kind of see you as kinda maybe, kind of a strong character, not physically strong but kinda… a steady person and then if they see you like that d’you know… you’d feel embarrassed… because they think of you like that; you don’t want to see them… or you don’t want to see yourself, kind of as less than what they think of you…

(Individual interview, 4th year, 16 years and 11 months)

Some boys indicated that because they were boys they “weren’t allowed” to have feelings (Joe, focus group, 4th years, 15 years and 6 months old). Others acknowledged that not talking was a problem for boys and that “you [boys] don’t know any better really” and “you [boys] get used to it” (Fergal, focus group, 4th year, aged 15 years old). Boys recognized that there were limited outlets/opportunities to talk about things that bothered them. For example, Donal describes that “there’s no one to talk to really, other than Childline [a free 24 hour counseling service for children and adolescents]…” and that “you just pretend it’s not bothering you”
(Donal, focus group, 4th year, aged 15 years old).

Many boys did not conceptualise talking about feelings within a strong/weak framework; however, they assumed that other boys would.

*Interviewer*: Are there certain ways a fella should act?
*Connor*: I dunno just kinda be strong and all that, well you know in the right kind of circumstances, when I say be strong I don’t mean like going down and getting into a fight, but if somebody is upset and all that, you know kinda be there for them and all that. Now whether they do that or not … varies from person to person
(Individual interview, 5th year, 16 years and 11 months)

*Cathal*: Yeah…talk to each other [other boys] about like if they’re having problems at home or in school or something….try and clear it up and listen to them…
(Individual interview, 3rd year, 15 years and 11 months)

*Interviewer*: Are there other ways that you’d show a fella that you care about them, other than stand up for them?
*Eamon*: If they’re getting bullied, cause
*Fiún*: Let them talk about things to you
*Aengus*: Yeah…or listen to them
*Eamon*: Listen to them
(Focus group, 4th years, 15 year olds)

Interestingly, when boys were asked with whom they would talk, many said they were more likely to confide in and rely upon girls.

*Ian*: Unless you have a best mate that’s there for ages and you already know from past experience that you can talk to him but other than that, girls [are] your best bet
*Dáithí*: I think so, yeah
*Ian*: You can confide in a girl but you can’t really confide in lads. It makes you, the exact same thing, they kinda of look down [on you].
(Focus group, 6th years, 17-19 year olds)

*Behavioural Restriction*. Behaviours perceived as either insufficiently masculine or related to femininity were censured. These included the ways boys walked, dressed, their body language and their subject choices in school.

*Dara*: …like how most lads describe different things as gay….maybe the way you walk or like characteristics… it’s really not a game but a competition to see who’s the most normal… if you’re a little bit like, maybe you hang around with girls instead of hanging around with boys, you’re called gay straight away. There’s no chance that they’d even think for a second about it…
(Individual interview, 1st year, 14 years old)

*Interviewer:* Are there differences in stresses for girls compared to fellas?
*Liam:* Girls can wear anything they want, any design, anything, doesn’t make any difference; once it’s just not like, horrible...nothing would get said to them.
*Derick:* There’s no, like, logos for girls as much like, you can buy something in Topshop and it’d be the same thing, you wouldn’t notice.
*Interviewer:* So are fellas more conscious of logos?
*All:* Yeah

(Focus groups, 3rd year, 15-16 years old)

*Interviewer:* So you mention not acting gay, can you explain that a bit further?
*Ciaran:* Say like those lads that did home economics down in the girls’ school or something; you know they’d be classed as, well not necessarily, like you get slagging from lads if you did something like that, but like not necessarily from girls...

(Individual interview, 6th year, 17 years and 5 months)

### 4.3.4 Theme 4: Penalty

Boys that are incapable or unwilling to “do” gender in the manner prescribed by Irish society are subject to various disciplinary sanctions such as slagging, rebuking, social ridicule, isolation, and devaluation of status. This theme related to penalties incurred by boys for: 1) failing to meet masculine standards/expectations; 2) not-conforming to or violating masculine expectations; 3) endorsing/conforming to masculine expectations; and 4) simply being boys.

*Failing to meet masculine expectations.* As mentioned previously, boys failing to meet certain standards of masculinity were subject to various criticisms and devaluations (of self and from others). For example, boys who failed to meet the standards of “general proficiency,” “strength” and “toughness” reported experiencing negative consequences. That is, situational contexts demand certain behavioural and attitudinal displays from boys and failing to perform situationally specific demands resulted in negative repercussions. These repercussions included: a) devaluation of “status” or “hierarchical standing” (i.e., people thinking less of you); b) perceived or real negative judgments from others (i.e., overt [slagging] or covert [fear of boys...
talking about you behind your back]]; and c) negative self-judgments.

Not conforming to or violating masculine expectations. Many boys expressed that behaving in a way considered contrary to prescribed social norms was met with condemnation, social devaluation and social isolation. Boys seemed to be governed by the fear of breaking or violating a masculine norm because in so doing, they faced being labeled or branded for life.

Interviewer: Are there certain ways fellas should act?
Ciaran: I suppose within society ... people would expect males to ... act a certain way, and if they didn’t act a certain way like, you’d....they’d be classed as maybe being gay or something because of the way they acted like, you know there is kind of a .... certain behaviour like that you know lads should be such and such a way and then if they don’t react that way... they could be classed as being gay or something because of the way they acted.
(Individual interview, 6th year, aged 17 years and 5 months)

Endorsement/(over)conformity to certain masculine expectations. As described in Theme 2 (i.e., Discontinuity), for example, the endorsement/(over)conformity of specific masculine expectations outside of the contexts in which their display is considered suitable also result in penalties for boys. For example, masculine expectations revered among groups of boys (e.g., “acting tough” and “slagging”) were subject to censure when performed within the contexts of girls, parents and teachers.

Penalties incurred for being a boy. Participants felt that: a) people automatically think the worst of boys; b) boys can’t be boys; c) boys are guilty until proven innocent; and d) robust double standards exist that are disadvantageous for boys. Each of these elements will be discussed briefly.

People think the worst of boys. Participants asserted that people have a low expectation of boys and seldom have anything positive to say about adolescent boys. This is illustrated in the following example:

Interview: What do people expect of fellas?
Donal: They don’t expect much I don’t think…..I dunno, we don’t get much praise in school like
Fergal: Yeah, no one has something good to say about us
Donal: Yeah, we never seem to get any praise or anything; males don’t at our age
Fergal: It’s always people complaining about us… a few, bad, a few lads start doing it, the whole
Interview: Everyone’s painted with the same brush is it?
Donal: Yeah
Fergal: Yeah, kinda like, if I was messing in the, all three of us would get in trouble
Donal: It’s a bit harsh, but even if we’re being good and all they wouldn’t give us any praise
(Focus group, 4th year, 15-6 years old)

Boys expressed that people and society-at-large think the worst of young men and this dynamic makes it difficult for boys. Ciaran describes how this prevailing attitude potentially contributes to a self-fulfilling prophecy for more vulnerable boys.

Interviewer: What’s difficult about being an adolescent boy?
Ciaran: …I suppose what’s expected of you, like you see people that just because you’re a young person, they automatically think that you’re going to cause trouble, or you’re going to be drinking on the streets or you’re going to be, drinking down in a pile of bushes or something like, they just kinda, it’s the perception that people have of you like, that’d make things more difficult than actually being an adolescent… there isn’t that much difficulty with it but it’s the perception that people put on you, kinda makes it difficult because you are automatically assumed to be doing something [wrong]
Interviewer: How does that affect people?
Ciaran: There’s some people that’d find it difficult because they would automatically give in you know, that that’s the age they are and that’s what they do like, you know so they kind of give in to it, whereas if someone has enough self-confidence to say you know, I don’t go out drinking, I do something else like you know? It depends if you have your own self-confidence to say, you know I don’t do what other adolescents do, you know?
(Individual interview, 6th year, aged 17 years and 5 months)

Boys can’t be boys. Some participants felt that parents and authority figures put pressure on boys to become adults. There is a sense that boys are accorded insufficient time to be boys and are expected to behave like adults from a very young age.

Interviewer: What’s expected of adolescent fellas?
Ian: Become adults, but well…
All: (laughing)
*Ian:* Well... be mature, not be sort of kiddish or do stupid things... look to the future straightaway

(Focus group interview, 6th years, 17-19 years old)

*Interviewer:* What’s expected of adolescent fellas?

*Dáithí:* You’re sort of expected, sort of...

*Damien:* Expected to be adults

*Dáithí:* Yeah, exactly all of our lives like

*Tadhg:* No, you’re expected to become more mature, like some adults. Some adults look at you and expect like, aw, that chap is sixteen or whatever and they go, he should be grown up... cause like you get compared to the last generation, and it’s different, like they were pretty aware of being like when, at this age now... when I was your age I had a job already and all this. You’re expected to be more mature or whatever but like, it’s not the same so you can’t really compare it to, you’re expected to act like an adult even though you’re not yet like...

(Focus group interview, 6th years, 17-19 years old)

Many boys, including Dáithí (below) expressed frustration towards their parents for not understanding the stresses experienced by boys nowadays.

*Dáithí:* It’s different; you can’t really compare when your parents say something to you... I think it’s a bit stupid like, it’s completely different times we grew up in...

(Focus group interview, 6th years, 17-19 years old)

*Guilty until proven innocent.* Boys were frustrated by the approach taken by society to deal with disruptive boys. They felt that society and authority figures harboured the attitude that boys were presumed guilty until proven innocent.

Participants were aware of the perception that boys are generally more troublesome than girls but stated there was variability amongst boys (i.e., not all boys cause trouble). They viewed a minority of disruptive boys as contributing to negative stereotypes about teenage boys and that society and authority figures fail to recognise this and, subsequently, paint all boys “with the same brush.” The following interview extract presents boys discussing the difficulties faced trying to get into nightclubs:

*Dáithí:* You’re, you’ve gotta, you’re always accused beforehand; they always expect the worst of you

*Tadhg:* It’s kinda like you’ve got something to prove more than, they expect, they’ve got like the worst expectation of you and you’ve got to prove that you’re above that, whereas girls like, there’s no expectation and it take a lot to
prove that they are underneath like that, so there’s more responsibility on you to look good or

Ian: More innocent
(Focus group interview, 6th years, 17-19 years old)

Cathal describes the discrimination he experienced when he went into a shop wearing his hoody up.

Cathal: …and like if a lad, if lads are wearing hoodies, if you walk into a shop, you have to tell them to take it down and girls don’t; they just walk in, just leave them off, cause the last day we were in Lidl and we walked in with our hoodies on [and] we had our hoo d up and they came along and told us to take down our hoodies and ah, three girls walked in then afterward and they didn’t say anything to them…..it’s just I dunno, people just expect teenage boys to act the maggot [i.e., cause trouble] really I suppose……d’you know like, they never suspect anything with girls….if you get in trouble they come down a lot harder on you if you’re a boy as well
(Individual interview, 3rd year, 15 years and 11 months)

Gender double standards. Related to the previous element (being guilty until proven innocent), boys also voiced frustration about perceived “double standards” in the ways they were treated in comparison to girls. This included how boys were punished; how they were monitored by authority figures; and depicted in media coverage. For example, when asked if teachers “would act differently to a fella that was messing [around] than a girl messing around,” Joe’s response was:

Yeah… ‘Mr. O’Brien’ used to go crazy at us and now [the school is mixed-sex], it’s very quiet and he says nothing to the girls, but if it was the lads he’d go crazy.
(Individual interview, 6th year, 18 years and 4 months)

Similarly, Oisin stated “lads they can’t get away with as much as the girls…they can get away with anything really” (Focus group, 1st years, 13 years old)

4.4 Discussion

In the first qualitative investigation to explore patterns of gender role conflict amongst adolescents, four broad and inter-related themes were identified with a sample of fifty-four Irish males. These themes provide a comprehensive list of expectancies perceived to be directed at young males and highlight the complexity,
diversity and inconsistencies placed on boys within Irish society. Theme 1 (i.e., Expectations) outlines ten masculine expectations that through the endorsement of, failure to meet, or violation of can result in negative intrapersonal and social consequences for boys. Theme 2 (i.e., Discontinuity) outlines a number of group-specific expectations and competing expectations that conflict with boys’ expression of their “true-selves.” The third theme (i.e., Restrictions) describes how masculine socialization confines and restricts boys’ behavioral, attitudinal and emotional expressions. Theme 4 (i.e., Penalty) detailed various penalties boys experience due to the presence of masculine expectations and highlights how negative societal attitudes of boys can affect their self-perceptions.

4.5. Conclusion

Given the breadth of GRC theory and the themes/subthemes identified in this qualitative study, it is recommended that new measures of GRC consider: 1) the age of the participant; 2) the situational contexts of GRC; 3) the different sources of GRC (intra- and interpersonal); and 4) the conflicts potentially emerging from both traditional and non-traditional masculine expectations. The objective of the next study was to use this qualitative information to develop a measure of gender role conflict that offers a more nuanced and in-depth understanding of this construct as it pertains to boys/men residing within Ireland (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013).

4.6 Notes

10. Masculine expectations will be used as a broad overarching term that encompasses masculine stereotypes, ideals and norms (Pleck, 1995).
11. The goal was to create an expansive list of themes; that is, we weren’t interested in proving that one person’s interpretation was more accurate or truthful than another person’s (see, for example, Morrison & Tallack, 2005).

12. Higher scores indicate easier readability and range from 0 to 100.
Chapter 5: Item Pools’ Psychometric Exploration

5.1. Chapter Overview

The purpose of this study was to develop a large number of scale items that: 1) assess gender role conflict within the person and emanating from others; 2) reflect the tenets of GRC theory, as identified in Chapter 4 (i.e., expectations, discontinuity, restrictions, and penalty); 3) are suitable for use by adolescents; and 4) have been vetted by content experts in the area. Further, a factor analysis was conducted to explore the latent factor structure amongst these items.

Indicators of masculine ideology (i.e., the AMIRS; Chu et al., 2005) and psychological health (i.e., RSE; Rosenberg, 1965) were included to test the convergent validity of this newly developed scale. As articulated in Chapter 1, O’Neil (2008) has supported the use of masculinity measures to validate the GRCS (adult version) and has cited positive correlations with masculinity measures (e.g., Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale [MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987] and the Brannon Masculinity Scale [BMS; Brannon & Juni, 1984]). According to O’Neil, the “low to moderate correlations” (i.e., rs range from .32 to .49) obtained between the GRCS (adult version) and these indicators of masculinity suggest that the former scale “measures a different construct” (p. 372). Positive associations between the GRCS-A and the AMIRS and the MRAS also have been identified. However, as noted earlier, it is reasonable to assert that conflict may occur in the absence of endorsing traditional indicators of masculine ideology. Thus, for the current study, no hypothesis regarding the directional association between the Irish measure of gender role conflict (henceforth referred to as the I-GRCS-A) and the AMIRS was formulated.

Pleck (1995), author of the GRSP, posits that not conforming to standards, expectations and norms of masculinity (i.e., identical to the situational contexts
outlined by O’Neil [2008]) can have negative consequences for “self-esteem and other outcomes reflecting psychological well-being” (p. 13) because of the negative social feedback received and the internalisation of negative self-judgements. The GRCS (adult version) has been associated with self-esteem in 11 out of 13 studies (O’Neil, 2008). Although the relationship between the original GRCS-A and self-esteem has not been tested, Kim and colleagues (2009) reported a significant negative correlation between the K-GRCS-A and esteem ($r=-.29$). Thus, it is predicted that scores on the I-GRCS-A will be inversely related to self-esteem (i.e., greater levels of conflict will be associated with lower levels of self-esteem: H1).

5.2 Item Development

In line with scale development guidelines (DeVellis, 2003), a thorough review of the literature on gender role conflict theory and masculinity-related constructs (i.e., masculine ideology and gender role stress paradigm) was conducted. Scale items were informed by this process and by the thematic analysis carried out in Study 1 (Chapter 4). Further, suggested revisions by Irish adolescents for the GRCS-A (Chapter 3) were considered and adopted in the construction of items. Illustrative quotations as well as participants’ phraseology, beliefs, and feelings expressed throughout the qualitative stage and self-reported behaviours relevant to GRC were incorporated into the generated items.

To ensure that the theoretical constructs underpinning GRC theory were reflected in the items, the situational contexts of GRC, articulated in Chapter 1, also informed items’ content and structure. As discussed in Chapter 2, the breadth of the items of the GRCS seem to reflect the GRC experience within the self and experienced from others, rather than towards others (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013). To ensure continuity between the proposed and past GRC measures and to address the
conceptual shortcoming that those experiencing conflict induced by others may or may not perpetuate this process, items were developed to reflect GRC experienced within the self and experienced from other persons.

To distinguish gender role conflict from masculine ideology, each proposed item was framed such that endorsement reflected experiencing a conflict that pertains to a hegemonic masculine expectation. For example, one of the items reflecting the theme entitled Discontinuity states: “It bothers me that when you’re with a group of lads, you are expected to be up for anything.” Deconstructing the constitutive elements of this item reveals that: a) the stem, “It bothers me,” reflects a negative state or discomfort; b) the context concerns being “with a group of lads;” and c) the expectation is that “you are expected to be up for anything.” A similar assessment of an item developed to reflect the theme entitled Restriction (i.e., “It bothers me that if a lad is overly sensitive, other lads will think he is gay”) reveals that: a) the stem, “It bothers me,” reflects a negative state or discomfort; b) the context pertains to violating a key expectation (i.e., lads are NOT overly sensitive) and c) the penalty one incurs for doing so is articulated (i.e., “other lads will think he is gay”).

In most of the items that were generated, stems were used that reflect a negative appraisal or negative affective state (e.g., see Appendix H for list of items). These sorts of stems are used in a number of psychological inventories. For example, the term “bothers me” has been used in the Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Inventory (Radlof, 1977) and for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC: Spielberg, 1973).

A five-point response format was incorporated to measure the prevalence of the conflict (i.e., Almost Always = 5, Often = 4, Sometimes = 3, Rarely = 2, and Never = 1). Answering “Almost Always” to an item (e.g., “It bothers me that, under
most circumstances, lads don’t respect a lad for showing his emotions”) would indicate a high level of self-reported conflict, whereas answering “Never” would suggest a low level of conflict. In comparison to existing versions of the GRCS (i.e., GRCS, GRCS-SF, GRCS-A and K-GRCS-A), including this type of stem and response format permits one to differentiate between males that report being negatively affected by the expectation and males that do not. Further, the use of a prevalence response format allows one to differentiate the extent to which a respondent reports being negatively affected.

De Vellis (2003) recommends developing an exhaustive and over inclusive list of items specific to the measurement goal. Both the author and one of his co-supervisors independently generated a list of items (N=463, collated). Items that were very similar were reworked and duplicates were deleted. Concise and unambiguous items were prioritised as were items that were not double-barreled or negatively keyed (Barnette, 2000). The language difficulty of the items was calculated and deemed appropriate for adolescent use (i.e., Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level = 2.8; Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease = 91). Items also were adjusted to suit the response options (i.e., Almost Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never). The application of these criteria resulted in the initial pool being winnowed to 231 prospective items.

5.3 Content Validity

To examine the items’ content validity (i.e., “the degree to which an instrument has an appropriate sample of items for the construct being measured” [Polit & Beck, 2004, p. 243]), guidelines by McGartland Rubio, Berg-Weger, Tebb, Lee and Rauch (2003) were adopted. Three content experts (Drs. James O’Neil, Jess Steinfield and Stephen Wester) reviewed the items on the following dimensions: 1) representativeness (i.e., the “ability to represent the content domain as described in
the theoretical definition” [McGartland Rubio et. al., 2003, p. 96]); 2) clarity; 3) factor structure (i.e., identifying the proposed theme to which the item belongs) and 4) comprehensiveness (i.e., whether or not the list of items encompass the breadth of GRC theory). The content experts were encouraged to include items they deemed important; however, no additional items were suggested. Content experts recommended various changes (i.e., several double barrelled items were identified; the theoretical grounding of some items was questioned; as was the clarity of select items).

A convenience sample of adolescent boys ($N = 5$) was recruited to assess the validity of the expectations included in the items as well as the clarity and comprehensiveness of the items. Feedback relating to the stems used for the items indicated that “it bothers me” and “it affects me” were considered to be most appropriate; an assessment that was shared by the adolescents who took part in the qualitative investigation (Chapter 3). A number of items were flagged as being very similar/repetitive and it was recommended they be removed or amended. Suggestions were made by adolescents to alter the “directness” of some questions as a means of improving the honesty of respondents. For example, the item “It bothers me that if I were to act sensitively amongst a group of lads, other lads would think I was gay” was regarded as being “too much.” By removing the first person tense and changing the focus of the items towards other lads, the boys approved the resultant item: “It bothers me that if a lad is overly sensitive, other lads will think he is gay.”

As a result of this assessment process, 101 items were deleted. Thus, a final pool of 130 items was subject to psychometric testing.
5.4 Data Management

Missing data are the norm in most studies (Allison, 2001; Nakagawa & Freckleton, 2008; Scheffer, 2002), and how this issue is addressed is critical to minimise bias and maximise the use of available information (Allison, 2001). Missing data are categorised in three ways: 1) data can be missing completely at random (MCAR); 2) missing at random (MAR); and 3) not missing at random (NMAR). When data are MCAR, it suggests that “missingness” is not dependent on either the variable of interest or any other variables observed in the dataset. When they are MAR (or conditionally missing at random: Graham, 2009), this suggests that missing data values carry no information about probabilities of “missingness” to the variable of interest (although they are related to some other variable in the data set: Little & Rubin, 1987; Schafer & Graham, 2002; Scheffer, 2002). Data that are NMAR (or informatively missing) occur when the “missingness” mechanism depends on the actual value of the missing data (Scheffer, 2002) and is a more serious problem for researchers.

In the past, missing data were dealt with using case deletion (listwise or pairwise) or imputation of the mean score (Scheffer, 2002); however, these conventional methods possess liabilities and newer imputation procedures such as expectation maximisation (EM) are now recommended (Allison, 2001; Graham, 2009; Nakagawa & Freckleton, 2008; Scheffer, 2002). EM analysis was undertaken to impute missing data. EM is considered an excellent procedure for handling missing data (Allison, 2001; Graham, 2009), and is advised when data are MCAR or MAR (Scheffer, 2002) and the percentage of missing data is, at most modest (i.e., less than 30%: Owen et al., 2007; Peugh & Enders, 2004). In SPSS, Little’s test is used to determine whether data are MCAR: if the resultant chi-square value is statistically
significant \((p < .05)\), data are not considered MCAR. Little’s missing completely at random test (MCAR) was statistically significant \(\chi^2[10212] = 10873.453, p < .001\) suggesting the data were not missing completely at random (MCAR). In the current study, the highest level of “missingness” was 22.6%. Thus, the expectation maximization (EM) algorithm for imputing missing data was employed\(^{14}\).

### 5.5 Method

#### 5.5.1 Participants

A sample of 301 boys aged thirteen to nineteen took part in the research. The mean age was 15.7 years \((SD = 1.45)\). Participants were comprised of 2\(^{nd}\) year students \((n = 107; 35\% \text{ of the sample})\), 4\(^{th}\) year students \((n = 54; 18\% \text{ of the sample})\), 5\(^{th}\) year students \((n = 62; 21\% \text{ of the sample})\) and 6\(^{th}\) year students \((n = 77; 26\% \text{ of the sample})\) who attended a mixed secondary school along the west coast of Ireland\(^{15}\).

Eighty-nine percent of participants identified as Irish, 8% identified as “any other white background,” and 1% identified as “African” or “Other.” Approximately 89\% \((n = 268)\) of respondents identified as being “exclusively heterosexual,” 3\% \((n = 9)\) as “more heterosexual than gay,” 0.3\% \((n = 1)\) as “bisexual,” 1\% \((n = 3)\) as “more gay than heterosexual,” and 1.3\% \((n = 4)\) identified as “exclusively gay.” Seventeen participants (5.6\%) did not report their sexual orientation.

Three percent of the sample indicated being “Very Religious,” 17.4\% identified as “Religious,” 29.4\% as “Somewhat Religious,” 30.4\% as “Not very Religious,” and 20\% as “Not at all Religious.” Twelve percent of participants reported going to church once a week; 14\% reported going every week; 16\% reported going to church once a month; 38\% reported going rarely; and 20\% reported never going to church.

#### 5.5.2 Validation Measures
5.5.2.1 The Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationship Scale (AMIRS; Chu & Tolman, 2005 – see Appendix I). The 12-item AMIRS is a unifactorial measure (determined by an unspecified factor analysis) of adolescent boys’ internalization of masculine norms, attitudes and behaviours as displayed within interpersonal relationships. This scale employs a 4-point Likert-type response format (i.e., Disagree A Lot, Disagree, Agree, Agree A Lot). Total scores can range from 12 to 48, with higher scores denoting stronger endorsement of masculine norms. Five of the items are reverse scored. A sample item is “I think it’s important for a guy to go after what he wants even if it means hurting other people’s feelings.” Researchers have found that the AMIRS has acceptable psychometric properties (Smiler & Epstein, 2010; α = .75). As evidence of convergent validity, the AMIRS was positively related to the Male Role Attitude Scale (Blazina et al., 2007); negatively correlated with self-esteem (Chu et al., 2005); and positively correlated with the Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents (Blazina et al., 2007). In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha was .74 (95% CI = .69 – .79).

5.5.2.2 Family Affluence Scale II (FAS II; Boyce & Dallago, 2004 – see Appendix J)

The FAS II is a four-item scale developed by the World Health Organisation Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HSBC) study as an alternative measure of family wealth for adolescent use. The scale uses a mixed response option, employing a No [0]/Yes [1] option to one of the items (i.e., “Do you have your own bedroom for yourself?”); a No [0]/Yes, one [1]/Yes, two or more [2] option for one item (i.e., “Does your family own a car, van or truck?”); a Not at all [0]/Once [1]/Twice [2]/More than twice [3] option for one item (i.e., “During the past 12 months, how many times did you travel away on holiday with your family?”); and a None [0]/One
Family affluence is calculated using a three point ordinal scale, where scores 0-2 indicate low affluence; 3-5 denote middle affluence; and 6-9 suggest high affluence. Boyce, Torsheim, Currie, and Zambon (2006) report that scale score reliability is “not a prerequisite for formative indexes such as the FAS” (p. 481). Therefore, Cronbach’s alpha was not calculated; however, as noted by Boyce et al. (2006), the items did intercorrelate. For example, the item ‘Does your family own a car, van or truck?’ correlated significantly with the item ‘How many computers does your family own?’ \( (r = .78, p < .001) \). In terms of validity, the FAS was positively related to life expectancy figures for both males (.73) and females (.72), and negatively related to infant mortality (-.62).

In the current study, 61.2% of participants were in the high SES bracket \( (n = 128) \), 36% were in the medium bracket \( (n = 75) \) and 3% were in the low SES group \( (n = 6) \).

5.5.2.3 Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965 – see Appendix K). The RSE is a widely used, 10–item unifactorial trait measure of global self-esteem. It employs a 4-point Likert-type response format (i.e., Not At All, Somewhat, Moderately So, Very Much So), with total scores ranging from 10 to 40. Higher scores indicate greater self-esteem. A sample item is “I take a positive attitude toward myself” and five items are reverse scored. The RSE has excellent psychometric properties (Mullan & Nic Gabhainn, 2002) and has been used in a number of studies to determine the validity of adolescent masculinity-related constructs (e.g., Chu & Tolman, 2005; Oransky & Fisher, 2009). For example, Oransky and Fisher (2009) and Chu and Tolman (2005) reported acceptable psychometric properties (scale score reliability coefficients of .71 and .72, respectively). In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha was .77 (95% CI = .73 – .81).
5.5.3 Procedure

Ethical approval was obtained by the Research Ethics Committee at the National University of Ireland, Galway. Schools were contacted by letter which detailed the protocol involved in the research study (see Appendix L). A secondary school in Western Ireland agreed to take part and, following approval from the board of management of the school, the principal asked the guidance counsellor to oversee the procedure. Consent forms were distributed to boys during class time and participants were asked to bring the information sheets and consent forms to their parent(s)/guardian(s) (see Appendix M). Participants whose parents did not want their child to take part in the research were asked to bring the signed consent form to the guidance counsellor. The guidance counsellor went around to each class within a week to remind participants to bring the consent forms home.

Two weeks later, the questionnaire battery was distributed to students. Participants were reminded that if their parent(s)/guardian(s) had not returned the consent forms they were unable to take part in the research. The questionnaire battery, which was presented to participants in an A4 sealable envelope, consisted of a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix N), the GRCS items, a measure of masculinity and self-esteem. The information sheet and consent form also were included. On completion, consent forms were collected and participants were instructed to seal the questionnaire battery in the provided envelope. The questionnaire took approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

5.5.4 Analytic Plan

In line with Fabrigar et al.’s recommendations, a number of methodological issues were considered during the exploratory factor analysis. Fabrigar et al. advise that, after having decided on the variables to include in the study, researchers should
direct their attention to the issues of sampling and sample size. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) provide a general rule of thumb: “it is comfortable to have at least 300 cases for a factor analysis” (p. 613) and Comrey and Lee (1992) indicate that a sample size of 300 for EFA is ‘good.’ Based on these rules of thumb, the sample used in the current study is of sufficient size\(^{17}\) (i.e., \(N = 301\)). Fabrigar and colleagues (1999) also recommend the use of the principal axis factoring (PAF) because it does not have any distributional assumptions.

Benson and Vincent’s (1980) item reduction criteria were employed. Items were removed if: a) more than 50% of responses fell into one category on the 5-point Likert scale (7 items removed); b) two combined responses were less than 10% (10 items removed); and c) four categories did not have a minimum response rate of 10% (33 items removed). Items also were eliminated if they were skewed (skewness/standard error of skew > |3.29|; 31 items removed) or kurtotic (kurtosis/standard error of kurtosis > |3.29|; 21 items removed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Out of a sample of 130 items, 28 items were retained for factor analysis.

To ensure the data were suitable for EFA, two diagnostic statistics were evaluated: 1) the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, which evaluates whether the partial correlations among variables are small, was .92; and 2) Bartlett’s test of sphericity was statistically significant at \(p < .001\) (\(\chi^2 = 2471.228\), allowing one to reject the null hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix (Ferguson & Cox, 1993). Both of these indices suggest the data are factor analysable (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Principal axis factoring and oblique rotation were used (Fabrigar et al., 1999) and to assist with factor retention, parallel analysis (Blashill & Vander Wal, 2009) and the scree test (Fabrigar et al., 1999) were employed.
5.6 Results

5.6.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis

After inspecting the eigenvalues, scree plot and running a parallel analysis\textsuperscript{18}, a one-factor solution appeared to be most reasonable. For the real data the eigenvalue for the first factor was 10.82 (38.65% variance accounted for) exceeding that of the first eigenvalue for the random data 1.61; the eigenvalue for the next factor in the real data was 1.66 (5.93% variance accounted for) exceeding that of the second eigenvalue for the random data 1.52. Each succeeding eigenvalue score in the real data set exceeded that of the random set.

All twenty-eight items loaded onto the first factor (factor loadings ranged from .46 to .73), with the possible exception of one item that cross-loaded on another factor. Therefore, a one-factor solution was forced resulting in the elimination of two items that did not have factor loadings of .50 or higher (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Twenty-six items were retained. The eigenvalue was 10.43 (40.11% variance accounted for), and factor loadings ranged from .52 to .73.

5.6.2 Reliability Analysis and Convergent Validity

Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the 26-item measure of adolescent gender role conflict (i.e., the I-GRCS-A) was .94 (95% CI = .93 – .95) - see Table 2. As predicted, participants’ level of self-esteem correlated negatively with their experience of gender role conflict, $r (284) = -.45, p < .001$. Further, adolescent boys evidencing stronger internalisation of masculine norms (AMIRS) also reported lower levels of gender role conflict, $r (292) = -.16, p < .05$; however, the magnitude of this correlation was small.

Finally, to test the incremental validity of the I-GRCS-A, two partial correlations were computed and then compared using Steiger’s Z test. First, the association between self-esteem and scores on the AMIRS was computed, partialling
out the I-GRCS-A. Second, the relationship between self-esteem and I-GRCS-A was determined, with the AMIRS treated as a covariate. The resultant $r$ values were (in order): -.12, $p = \text{ns}$ and -.49, $p < .001$, $Z = -5.98$, $p < .01$. Thus, scores on the measure of self-esteem correlated more strongly with participants’ level of gender role conflict than with their level of masculine norm endorsement.

### 5.8 Discussion

An extensive list of items was created to reflect the tenets of the GRC theory. This process was informed by current masculinity research (Chu et al., 2005; Oransky & Fischer, 2009; Oransky & Marecek, 2009; Stoudt, 2006); by qualitative work with adolescent males in Ireland (Chapters 3 and 4); and by item development guidelines (DeVellis, 2003). Items were created to reflect conflict within the person and from others (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013) and to incorporate situational contexts outlined by O’Neil (2008). The development of items was informed by adolescents and, thus, reflected their phraseology, language and attitudes. The reading level was calculated for each item and deemed suitable. Items also were evaluated by three content experts and by five adolescent respondents prior to being factor analysed. Twenty-six items were retained, which loaded on a single factor. These items also evidenced good scale score reliability.

The validity of the I-GRCS-A was investigated by testing its association with measures of self-esteem and masculine norm internalisation (i.e., the RSE and the AMIRS, respectively). As predicted, and consistent with past GRC research, higher scores on the I-GRCS-A, denoting greater gender role conflict, were associated with lower levels of self-esteem. Contrary to research conducted with the GRCS-A (i.e., Chu et al., 2005), scores on the AMIRS did not correlate positively with scores on the I-GRCS-A. Instead, a statistically significant – though weak – negative correlation
was observed suggesting that adolescent boys who reject cultural standards of masculinity experience greater GRC. It should be noted that this finding supports a key tenet of the GRC theory: namely, GRC is experienced when boys reject or deviate from masculinity ideologies/norms (O’Neil, 2008).

However, another premise of the GRC theory posits that GRC can be experienced when boys are devalued by others for conforming to masculine ideologies/norms (O’Neil, 2008). The discrepancy between the current study’s findings and results from other studies using the GRCS-A (i.e., identifying a positive relationship with measures of masculine ideology such as the AMIRS: Blazina et al., 2007; Chu et al., 2005) suggest that the I-GRCS-A represents a different framework of conflicts relating to adolescent masculine ideology. The GRCS-A may capture gender role conflicts pertaining to the endorsement of, or conformity to, masculine norms (i.e., gender role dysfunction; O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013), in comparison to the I-GRCS-A that incorporates a broader definition of GRC (i.e., items/conflicts identified through the qualitative process relate to adolescent experiences of failing to meet masculine standards as well as the restrictive nature of masculine expectations).

Further validation studies should be conducted using multidimensional measures of masculinity such as the MAMS (Oransky & Fischer, 2009). To investigate the convergent validity of the I-GRCS-A, it would be beneficial to target measures of psychological health (e.g., anxiety and depression). O’Neil (2008) explains that men’s gender roles have been conceptually linked to anxiety through the GRSP and investigated empirically using the MGRSS. In 12 of the 15 studies reviewed by O’Neil (2008), GRC was significantly correlated with men’s anxiety. Although the relationship between GRC and depression “lacks a full theoretical explanation,” O’Neil (2008) notes that research examining this construct has been extensive over
the past two decades. The relationship between the I-GRCS-A and positive health indicators also should be investigated as potential tests of discriminant validity. That is, the I-GRCS-A may only correlate with negative health indicators and not with positive ones.

5.8. Conclusion

Based on these findings, it would appear that the I-GRCS-A possessed a unidimensional factor structure, and yielded scores with good reliability. However, psychometric testing is an incremental process; thus, further assessment of the measure’s validity and factor structure is warranted. The next chapter outlines additional psychometric tests that were conducted on the I-GRCS-A using two new samples of adolescent boys.

5.9 Notes

13. One participant didn’t specify what year he attended.

14. EM has been used in studies were missing data were as high as 60 to 70% (Owen et al., 2007).

15. There were no significant differences found in GRC scores between participants categorised in the high vs medium SES brackets.

16. For further reading on this topic consult Fabrigar, Wegner, MacCallum and Strahan (1999).

17. However, MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang and Hong (1999) argue that ‘when communalities are all high, sample size will have relatively little impact on quality of solutions, meaning that accurate recovery of population solutions may be obtained using a fairly small sample (p. 90). Further, ‘rules of thumb’ are not stringent guidelines and have been subject to criticism (Costello & Osbourne, 2005).
18. Parallel analysis involves the creation of 100 (or more) random data sets from the original data set and the computation of eigenvalues for each resultant random set (through principal axis factoring). Then, for each eigenvalue, a 95th percentile value (or mean) is computed for the 100 random data sets. Only eigenvalues from the original data set that are greater than the averaged 95th percentile (or mean) from the 100 random data sets are retained (Blashill & Vander Wal, 2009).
Chapter 6 – Confirmatory Factor Analysis

6.1. Chapter Overview

The purpose of this chapter was to test the factor structure of the factor structure revealed in Chapter 5 (i.e., EFA stage) and to further investigate the I-GRCS-A’s reliability and validity using measures of masculine ideology, self-esteem, anxiety and depression.

Proper measurement of constructs is critical to quantitative research in psychology and CFA plays a crucial role scale development as it tests theoretical prepositions by evaluating the fit of specified models to data (Browne, 2006). When researcher(s) possess knowledge of the underlying latent variable structure derived from theory and/or empirical research, CFA is recommended (Brown, 2006; Fabrigar et al., 1999) as it is the primary means of assessing the nature of relationships between latent constructs (Jackson, Gillaspy, & Purc-Stephenson, 2009).

The purpose of this study was to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the 26-item I-GRCS-A in two samples of Irish adolescent boys. Both Fabrigar et al. (1999) and Browne (2006) recommend specification and testing of a CFA model based on results of an EFA in a different study/data set. The findings obtained from the EFA stage (Chapter 5) served as justification for the tested one-factor model (i.e., the current study aims to confirm the \textit{a priori} hypothesised 26-item, single-factor structure of the I-GRCS-A). It is appropriate in CFA-type analyses to have competing models of assessment, in order to examine whether model fit may be improved across several alternatives (Byrne & Campbell, 1999; Schreiber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, & King, 2006). Thus, the possibility that a more parsimonious version of the I-GRCS-A exists also was evaluated. The reproducibility of the model identified using CFA with Sample 1 was tested using a second sample of Irish male adolescents.
In the previous study described in Chapter 5, the association between scores on the I-GRCS-A and the AMIRS was investigated. However, to date, the relationship between scores on the I-GRCS-A and other multidimensional indices of adolescent masculinity (e.g., Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale [MAMS; Oransky & Fisher, 2009]) has not been subject to empirical scrutiny. Given the nature of the relationship between the I-GRCS-A and the AMIRS ($r = -.16$) and based on theoretical reasons articulated in Chapter 2 (also see O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013), no directional predictions have been made between the two constructs. It is, again, predicted that scores on the I-GRCS-A will correlate negatively with scores on a measure of self-esteem (H1). The convergent validity of the I-GRCS-A was further tested using a measure of anxiety. Past research with the GRCS has found significant correlations between GRC and anxiety (in 12 of 15 studies [O’Neil, 2008]). Further, Kim et al. (2009) reported a positive correlation between the K-GRCS-A and anxiety ($r = .48$); however, the relationship between these variables has yet to be examined amongst Irish adolescent males. It is predicted that the I-GRCS-A will be significantly related to anxiety (H2). The relationship between the I-GRCS-A and depression also has not been tested amongst Irish adolescent populations; however, based on past research using the GRCS (O’Neil, 2008) and the K-GRCS-A (Choi et al., 2010), it is predicted that the I-GRCS-A will be positively related to depression (H3).

6.2 Method

6.2.1 Data Management

Sample 1 consisted of 284 respondents from a secondary school along the west coast of Ireland. Little’s test was not statistically significant, $\chi^2 (649) =577.52, p = .979$) suggesting the data were missing completely at random (MCAR). Therefore, the
expectation maximization (EM) algorithm for imputing missing data was deemed to be appropriate (Scheffer, 2002) and employed.

Sample 2 consisted of 207 boys from a secondary school along the west coast of Ireland. In total, 7 cases were deleted due to 8 or more items of the I-GRCS-A being missed (Norwalk et al., 2011). Little’s missing completely at random test (MCAR) was not statistically significant ($\chi^2[92] = 87.505, p = .613$) suggesting the data were missing completely at random (MCAR). Thus, as with Sample 1, the expectation maximization (EM) algorithm for imputing missing data was employed. Comparisons across age, socioeconomic status (SES) and I-GRCS-A scores indicated there was no difference between the initial sample ($n=207$) and the analytic sample ($n=200$).

6.2.2 Participants

Sample 1. A sample of 284 boys aged thirteen to nineteen ($M_{age} = 15.25, SD = 1.63$) took part in the research. Participants were students attending 1st year through 6th year at a mixed secondary school situated along the west coast of Ireland. Ninety-three percent of participants identified as Irish, 6% identified as “any other white background,” and less than 1% identified as “African,” “Chinese” or “Other.” Approximately 92% ($n = 252$) of respondents identified as being “exclusively heterosexual,” 4.7% ($n = 13$) as “more heterosexual than gay,” 1.1% ($n = 3$) as “bisexual,” 1.1% ($n = 3$) as “more gay than heterosexual,” and 1.4% ($n = 4$) identified as “exclusively gay.” Nine participants (3.2%) did not report their sexual orientation.

In terms of indicators of religiosity, 4.7% ($n = 13$) self-reported being very religious; 22.5% ($n = 64$) were religious; 23.9% ($n = 68$) were somewhat religious; 25.4% ($n = 72$) were not very religious; and 20.8% ($n = 59$) were not at all religious. Eight participants (2.8%) did not report their religiosity. Approximately 17% ($n = 47$) of the sample indicated attending church or another religious institution at “least once a
15.1% (n = 42) attended “almost every week;” 12.6% (n = 35) attended “about once a month;” 31.3% (n = 87) rarely attended; and 24.1% (n = 67) never attended. Six participants (2.1%) did not indicate how often they attended church/religious services.

Sample 2. Two hundred boys aged twelve to eighteen (M = 14.5, SD = 1.48) took part in the research. First (n = 58; 29.3%), 2nd (n = 50; 25.3%), 3rd (n = 61; 30.8%), 4th (n = 12; 6.1%), and 5th (n = 17; 8.6%) year students were included, all of whom attended a mixed secondary school along the west coast of Ireland. A majority (n = 156, 79.2%) identified as Irish, 15.7% (n = 31) identified as “any other white background,” 3.6% (n = 7) identified as “African,” 1% (n = 2) identified as “Chinese,” and 0.5% (n = 1) identified as “any other Asian background.” (Three participants didn’t specify their ethnicity.) Approximately 96% (n = 184) identified as “exclusively heterosexual,” 2.1% (n = 4) as “more heterosexual than gay,” 0.5% (n = 1) as “bisexual,” and 1% (n = 2) identified as “exclusively gay.” Eight participants (4%) did not report their sexual orientation. Religiosity and prevalence that respondents attend church were estimated. Thirteen participants (6.7%) self-reported they were very religious; 19.2% (n = 37) were religious; 24.4% (n = 47) were somewhat religious; 24.9% (n = 48) were not very religious; and 24.9% (n = 48) were not at all religious. Seven participants did not report their religiosity. Forty-three participants (22.3%) self-reported attending church/other religious services “at least once a week;” 10.9% (n = 21) attended church/other religious services “almost every week;” 16.1% (n = 31) self-reported attending “about once a month;” 28% (n = 54) “rarely” attended, and 22.8% (n = 44) “never” attended church. Seven participants did not indicate how often they attended church or other religious services.

6.2.3 Validation Measures – Sample 1
6.2.3.1 *Family Affluence Scale II* (*FAS II*; Boyce & Dallago, 2004). A description of this measure is provided in Chapter 5.

6.2.3.2 *Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents* (*I-GRCS-A* – see Appendix O [26-items]). A detailed description of the development and validation of this measure is found in Chapters 4 and 5. The reliability coefficient (and 95% confidence intervals) for the version resulting from the CFA is given in Table 3.

6.2.3.3 *The Meaning of Adolescent Masculinity Scale* (*MAMS*; Oransky & Fisher, 2009 – see Appendix P). The MAMS is a multidimensional scale that assesses the degree to which adolescent boys “endorse or reject traditional male roles” (p. 59). The scale contains 27 items, which fall into one of four subscales: Constant Effort (CE: 7 items; i.e., boys must maintain a confident, tough and strong image in order to perform masculinity); Emotional Restriction (ER: 7 items; i.e., boys need to be stoic and refrain from sharing their feelings with others in order to be masculine); Heterosexism (H: 8 items; i.e., one must not show any attitudes and behaviours associated with femininity or homosexuality); and Social Teasing (ST: 5 items; i.e., in order to be masculine, boys must be able to tease other boys and stand up to teasing from other boys). For all items, a 4-point Likert type response format is used: Strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. Total scores can range from 27 to 108, with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of masculine norms. Individual subscale scores also can be computed. Oransky and Fisher (2009) reported satisfactory scale score reliability coefficients for three of the four subscales: CE ($\alpha = .79$); ER ($\alpha = .80$); and H ($\alpha = .80$). The ST scale yielded a lower Cronbach’s alpha (.61). The authors also furnished evidence attesting to the measure’s convergent validity. For example, CE correlated positively with peer popularity; ER was negatively associated with intimate exchange among friends; H was positively
associated with anti-femininity; and ST was positively correlated with normative beliefs about aggression. In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha for the total scale was .90 (95% CI = .88 – .92) and alpha coefficients for the CE, ER, H and ST were .76 (95% CI = .71 – .80), .81 (95% CI = .77 – .84), .83 (95% CI = .80 – .86), and .66 (95% CI = .59 – .72), respectively.

6.2.3.4 Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965). A description of this measure is provided in Chapter 4. Cronbach’s alpha was .77 (95% CI = .73 – .82).

6.2.3.5 State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC; Spielberg, 1973 – see Appendix Q). The STAIC is a widely used measure of anxiety and consists of two 20-item measures for state and trait anxiety. State anxiety is regarded as a person’s current level of anxiety (e.g., “I feel… very upset, upset, not upset”). Respondents are asked to rate how they feel at the present moment in time using a 3-point response format (Very Worried, Worried, and Not Worried). In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha was .86 (95% CI = .83 – .88). Trait anxiety refers to a general level of stress that is characteristic of an individual and related to personality. That is, trait anxiety varies according to how individuals have conditioned themselves to respond to and manage the stress. Respondents are instructed to rate the frequency with which they experience anxiety symptoms (e.g., “I am secretly afraid”) using a 3-point response scale (i.e., Hardly Ever, Sometimes, and Often). In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was low (.60, 95% CI = .52 – .67). For both the state and trait anxiety scales, total scores can range from 20 to 60, with higher scores representing more of the construct.

6.2.4 Validation Measures - Sample 2
6.2.4.1 Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D; Radlof, 1977 – see Appendix R). The CES-D is a 20-item screening measure of depression has been used extensively in non-clinical samples of adults, children and adolescents (Garrison, Addy, Jackson, McKeown & Waller, 1991; Radlof, 1991). It uses a 4-point Likert response format (Rarely or none of the time [less than 1 day]; some or a little of the time [1-2 days], occasionally or a moderate amount of time [3-4 days], most or all of the time [5-7 days]). Scores can range from zero to sixty, with scores of 16 points or more indicating depression. For a review of the psychometric properties of the CES-D please consult Garrison, Addy, Jackson, McKeown and Waller (1991). In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha was .87 (95% CI = .84 – .90).

6.2.4.2 Family Affluence Scale II (FAS II; Boyce & Dallago, 2004). A description of this measure is provided in Chapter 5.

6.2.4.3 Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents (I-GRCS-A – see Appendix S [9-items]). A detailed description of the development and validation of this measure are found in Chapters 4 and 5. Reliability scores are presented in Table 3.

6.2.4.4 Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965). A description of this measure is provided in Chapter 5. With this sample, Cronbach’s alpha was .84 (95% CI = .81 – .88).

6.2.5 Procedure

The procedure employed in this study was identical to the one outlined in Chapter 5 (i.e., the EFA stage of the scale development process). Data from samples 1 and 2 were analysed using SPSS 20.0 and AMOS 20.0.

6.2.6 Criteria for Model Specification
Several criteria were used to assess the goodness of fit of the hypothesized models to the observed data. The first criterion was the chi-square statistic. As factor analysis is based on asymptotic (i.e., large-sample) theory (Cole, 1987; Costello & Osborne, 2005), improper and (often) spurious model solutions and non-convergence have been found when sample sizes are small (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991; Cole, 1987). Further, Comrey and Lee (1992) suggest that researchers obtain at least 500 observations, with a rough rating scale suggesting that an analysis containing 500 to 1000 cases is very good to excellent. Due to its sensitivity to sample size and the relatively small ns used in the current study (284 and 200 respondents for samples 1 and 2, respectively), additional criteria were employed: 1) a ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom less than 2 (Byrne, 2006; Brown, 2006); 2) three incremental indices (comparative fit index \([\text{CFI}>.90; \text{Bentler & Bonett, 1980; Hu & Bentler, 1995; Byrne, 2006; Brown, 2006}]\)\(^{20}\), Tucker-Lewis Index \([\text{TLI}>.90; \text{Bentler & Bonett, 1980; Browne & Cudeck, 1992; Hu & Bentler, 1995; Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988}]\) and non-normed fit index \([\text{NNFI} > .95; \text{Hu & Bentler, 1995}]\)); 3) a standardized root mean square residual \([\text{SRMR}] < .05; \text{Bentler & Bonett, 1980; Browne & Cudeck, 1992; Hu & Bentler, 1995}]\); and 4) the root mean square error of approximation \([\text{RMSEA}] < .05; \text{Byrne, 2006; Browne, 2006}]\)\(^{21}\).

### 6.3 Results

#### 6.3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The first model to be tested was the unidimensional one identified in the EFA study (see Chapter 5). None of the criteria for adequate model fit were satisfied (see Table 4) and inspection of the modification indices suggested that numerous items warranted deletion. Further, various items deemed suitable for inclusion at the exploratory stage were no longer deemed appropriate for the undimensional factor
model. For example, item 4 “It bothers me that, because I am a lad, I find it hard to talk to my father about my personal problems” and item 25 “It frustrates me that my father doesn’t understand the amount of pressure that young lads are under” would not be suitable for adolescents whose fathers were absent/dead. Ultimately, 9 items were retained (see Table 4), with inter-item correlations ranging from .42 to .70. Scale score reliability was satisfactory (α = .79; 95% CI = .75 – .83)

The replicability of the 9-item unidimensional solution identified with sample 1 was tested with sample 2. Excellent fit was identified (see Table 4). Scale score reliability, as assessed by Cronbach’s alpha, was good (α = .82; 95% CI = .78 – .85), with inter-item correlations ranging from .48 to .65.

6.3.2 Validation Indices – Sample 1 and 2

Sample 1. Scores on the 9-item I-GRCS-A did not correlate significantly with any of the MAMS subscales: ER (r [246] = -.05; p = ns), CE (r [243] = -.07, p = ns), H (r [245] = -.01, p = ns), and ST (r [248] = -.06, p = ns). Thus, rejection or acceptance of traditional male roles was not associated with the level of gender role conflict reported by this sample. Scores on the 9-item I-GRCS-A correlated significantly with both indicators of anxiety: trait, r (231) = .41, p < .01 and state, r (230) = .27, p < .01. Thus, male adolescents reporting greater gender role conflict also reported being more anxious. Replicating the finding reported in Chapter 5, gender role conflict was inversely related to self-esteem, r (219) = -.29, p < .01.

Sample 2. Consistent with Sample 1, a statistically significant inverse association was obtained between gender role conflict and self-esteem, r (164) = -.28, p < .01. As predicted and in accordance with past research using the GRCS (adult), the I-GRCS-A correlated significantly with depression, r (173) = .43, p < .01. That is,
as boys’ self-reported level of gender role conflict increased so, too, did their level of depressive symptomatology (see Table 5).

6.4 Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the dimensionality, reliability and the validity of the I-GRCS-A with new samples of Irish adolescent males. Confirmatory factor analyses indicated that the 26-item one-factor model did not meet established fit criteria (i.e., the model failed to meet recommended conventional fit indices for CFI, NNFI, TLI, RMSEA and SRMR). Numerous items were identified as being problematic (i.e., items 1, 2, 13, 8 and 25) and substantive alterations to the scale were warranted.

A 9-item one-factor model provided optimal fit to the data (e.g., Sample 1: Cmin/df<2; TLI = .93 and CFI =.95) and evinced good scale score reliability (αs =.79 to .82; with maximal lower and upper bound estimates of .75 and .85). Disparate strands of evidence suggesting this iteration of the I-GRCS-A was construct valid also emerged. Specifically, gender role conflict correlated positively with trait and state anxiety; negatively with self-esteem; positively with depression; and did not correlate significantly with endorsement/rejection of traditional roles for males.

As articulated in Chapter 2, and supported by data in this chapter, the weak correlations between the 9-item I-GRCS-A and the MAMS suggest that it may be inappropriate to use masculine ideology measures to determine the convergent validity of GRC scales. Also, consistent with the results detailed in Chapter 5 for the AMIRS, scores on the MAMS (and its subscales) did not correlate significantly with self-esteem. These findings differ from published research using North American samples (e.g., AMIRS; Chu, Porche, & Tolman, 2005; r = -.32, p < .001) in which self-esteem and endorsement of masculine ideology are inversely related. Such
differences intimate that the conceptualisation of masculinity adopted for use with an Irish sample is (potentially) related to different psychological and behavioural correlates. Given that little research has been conducted with adolescent males in Ireland and the studies outlined in Chapters 5 and 6 of this thesis are the first to employ both the AMIRS and the MAMS, future research should examine their respective factor structure as it pertains to Irish adolescents. Preliminary estimates suggest that the AMIRS (.74) and each subscale of the MAMS ($r_s = .66 – .83$) possessed satisfactory scale score reliability when completed by young men residing in Ireland; however, subsequent research should investigate the factor structure of these measures to justify their continued use among members of this cultural group.

### 6.4.1 Limitations

A primary limitation of this study was the absence of an alternative model of the I-GRCS-A, which is recommended in confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) and linear modelling studies (Byrne, 2005; Byrne, 2006; Byrne & Campbell, 1999). While a previous exploratory factor analysis (EFA; Chapter 5) gave no indication of additional factors, in the absence of a competing model, it is appropriate to state that the I-GRCS-A’s unidimensional structure cannot be disproven, until alternative factor models are presented and comparatively assessed.

### 6.5 Conclusion

Consistent with the GRC theory, it would appear that higher I-GRCS-A scores are related to lower self-esteem scores, higher anxiety and depression scores for boys. Based on these findings the I-GRCS-A possesses good reliability and validity. Psychometric testing is an incremental process and considering that very ‘little research exists on the moderators and mediators of men’s GRC’ (O’Neill, 2008, p.403), the next chapter further assesses the relationship between I-GRCS-A, RSE,
Depression and a negative health indicator that, to date, has received limited research attention, suicide ideation.

6.6 Notes

19. Two participants didn’t specify what year in school they attended.

20. There are different opinions within the research regarding estimates of fit indices. For example, some researchers recommend that cut-off point for CFI are optimal when they are scores above .90 (Bentler & Bonett, 1980), whereas as others demand higher and more stringent fit indices (> .95; Hu & Bentler, 1995). For the purpose of this thesis, scores of .90 and above were deemed acceptable scores for model fit.

21. RMSEA and SRMR less than .10 indicate an acceptable fit for sample sizes smaller than 500 (Weston & Gore, 2006).
Chapter 7 – Does Gender Role Conflict predict suicide ideation?

7.1. Chapter Overview

The purpose of the study reported in this chapter is to further test the validity of the I-GRCS-A and to test the associations among gender role conflict, self-esteem, depression and suicidal ideation in Irish adolescent males.

In all countries except China and India, men die much more frequently by suicide than women and the male to female ratio of completed suicide is 4 to 1 in most developed countries (World Health Organisation, 2005). In Ireland, information from the Central Statistics Office (2005) reveals that, for all age groups, rates of suicide are higher in men than in women and it is speculated that approximately 32,000 people are affected – to varying degrees – each year by suicide deaths (McCarthy, 2008).

Suicide amongst adolescents has emerged as a significant public health problem (Beautrais, 2000; Bridge, Goldstein & Brent, 2006). In many countries, suicide is one of the leading causes of death amongst adolescents and has significantly increased from the 1960s to the present day (Beautrais, 2000; Gould, Greenberg, Velting & Shaffer, 2003). The prevalence of suicide ideation in adolescence in the United States is approximately 15-25%, ranging in severity from thoughts of death to specific suicidal ideation with intent or plan (Grunbaum et al., 2004). In Ireland, among 15-24 year olds, the rate of suicide is 6 times higher for males (CSO, 2005) and suicide is now the leading cause of death for males in this age-range (Lynch, Mills, Daly, & Fitzpatrick, 2004). The high incidence of adolescent suicide is assumed to be indicative of societal stress in the lives of young people (Turner, Kaplan, Zayas, & Ross, 2002); stress that may be attributable to myriad factors. For example, Beautrais (2000) indentifies several variables that are significantly related to
suicide ideation in adolescents. These include: a) sexual orientation; b) affective mood disorders; c) substance use disorders; and d) antisocial behaviour (namely, conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder and antisocial personality disorder).

Suicide appears to be a gendered problem, with researchers identifying numerous factors that place males at greater risk and including: a) alcohol or substance use, misuse, or abuse, especially as they relate to increased impulsivity and decreased inhibition (Russell, Gaffney, Collins, Bergin, & Bedford, 2004; Russell & Judd, 1999); b) individualism that isolates people from the support available from the greater social network (Eckersley & Dear, 2002; Möller-Leimkühler, 2003); and c) reluctance to seek assistance for personal problems (Kapur et al., 2005; Möller-Leimkühler, 2003; Russell et al., 2004). Given this gender difference, it is rather surprising that the relationship between suicidality and masculinity (and, in particular, GRC) has received little attention. Furthermore, notwithstanding the fact the GRC research paradigm has repeatedly shown correlations between the GRCS and the above risk factors for males (O’Neil, 2008), only two published studies have investigated the associations between GRC and suicide.

Houle, Mishara, and Chagnon (2008) interviewed two groups of Canadian men (40 men that had attempted suicide and 40 men that had no history of suicide attempts). Both groups had experienced stressful life events, comparable in severity, during the 12 months preceding the study. Structured interviews were conducted in which participants’ adherence to the traditional male gender role (as measured by the GRCS), social support, help-seeking behaviour, suicide acceptability, drug abuse and depression were measured. Results indicated that gender role conflict appeared to increase the risk of suicidal behaviour. To account for this relationship, Houle et al. postulated a mediation model in which gender role conflict contributes indirectly to
suicide risk by exercising a negative influence on social support, mental state, help seeking, increasing the acceptability of suicide.

More recently, among a large sample of American adolescents \( (N = 2,189; \ 58.3\% \text{ male}; 13-18 \text{ years old}) \), Jacobson, Marrocco, Kleinman and Gould (2011) found that Restrictive Emotionality (RE) correlated positively with depressive symptoms and suicide ideation/intent. Further, those obtaining higher RE scores were eleven times more likely to report elevated depression scores; three times more likely to report suicide ideation (after controlling for depressive symptoms); and more than twice as likely to report attempting suicide (again, after controlling for depressive symptoms). Unfortunately, these researchers did not examine the association between the other GRCS-A factors and suicide ideation/intent.

Depression has been shown to be one of the primary predictors of suicide ideation (De Man & Ludec, 1995; Harlow, Newcomb & Bentler, 1986; Lee, Wong, Chow & McBride-Chang, 2006) and negative self-esteem predisposes adolescents to depression and other psychiatric difficulties (Garber, Robinson, & Velentiner, 1997). Lower self-esteem also has been found to be significantly related to suicidal ideation and accounts for variations in suicide ideation beyond that explained by depression (Overholser, Adams, Lehnert & Brinkman, 1995). Conversely, higher self-esteem appears to serve as a protective function against suicidal ideation/attempts (De Man & Gutiérrez, 2002).

Within an Irish context, no study has investigated the relationship between GRC and suicide ideation, and no study has investigated the GRC/suicidality relationship among those at greater risk of committing suicide (i.e., individuals between the ages of 15-24). The purpose of the current study was to address that
omission by investigating the relationship between the I-GRCS-A and a measure of suicidality.

7.2 Method

7.2.1 Data Management

Little’s missing completely at random test (MCAR) was statistically significant ($\chi^2 [1343] = 1528.704, p < .001$) suggesting the data were not missing completely at random (MCAR). In the current study, the highest level of “missingness” was 2.8%. Thus, the expectation maximization (EM) algorithm for imputing missing data was employed (for additional details, see Fish, Hogan, Morrison, Stewart, & McGuire, 2013).

7.2.2 Participants

One-hundred and seventy-six boys aged fifteen to twenty ($M = 16.8, SD = 0.94$) from six schools in the Republic of Ireland took part in this study. Fourth ($n = 21; 11.9\%$), 5th ($n = 64; 36.4\%$) and 6th ($n = 91; 51.7\%$) year students were included, all of whom attended either a mixed or single-sex secondary school in the Republic of Ireland. A majority ($n = 154, 88\%$) identified as Irish: 7.4% ($n = 13$) identified as “any other white background,” and 4.6% ($n = 8$) identified as “any other Asian background.” One participant didn’t specify his ethnicity. Approximately 87.9% ($n = 153$) identified as “exclusively heterosexual,” 5.7% ($n = 10$) as “more heterosexual than gay,” 2.9% ($n = 5$) as “bisexual,” and 1.7% ($n = 3$) identified as “exclusively gay.” Two participants (1.1%) did not report their sexual orientation. In terms of religiosity, two participants (1.1%) reported being “very religious,” 14.4% ($n = 25$) were “religious,” 21.8% ($n = 38$) were “somewhat religious,” 26.4% ($n = 46$) were “not very religious,” and 36.2% ($n = 63$) were “not at all religious.” Two participants did not report their religiosity. Seventeen participants (9.8%) attended church/
religious service “at least once a week,” 13.8% \((n = 24)\) attended “almost every week,” 9.2% \((n = 16)\) attended “about once a month,” 33.9% \((n = 59)\) attended “rarely,” and 32.8% \((n = 57)\) ‘never’ attended church/religious services. Three participants did not indicate how often they attended church.

### 7.2.3 Validation Measures

**7.2.3.1 Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D; Radlof, 1977)**. A description of this measure is provided in Chapter 6. With this sample, Cronbach’s alpha was \(.80\) (95% CI = \(.74 – .84\)).

**7.2.3.2 Family Affluence Scale II (FAS II; Boyce & Dallago, 2004)**. A description of this measure is provided in Chapter 5.

**7.2.3.3 Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents (I-GRCS-A)**. Details about this measure appear in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. With the current sample, Cronbach’s alpha was \(.83\) (95% CI = \(.79 – .86\)). The 9-item unidimensional scale was used in this study – see Appendix S.

**7.2.3.4 Positive and Negative Suicide Ideation Inventory (PANSI; Osman, Guitierrez, Kopper, Barrios & Chiros, 1998 – see Appendix T)**. The PANSI is a 14-item two-dimensional self-report screening instrument that assesses the frequency of negative risk and protective factors related to suicide behaviour. This measure was developed for use with clinical and non-clinical samples and consists of two subscales: 1) Positive Suicide Ideation (PANSI-Positive; 6 items); 2) the Negative Suicide Ideation (PANSI-Negative; 8 items). A sample item for the PANSI-Positive is “Felt hopeful about the future because things were working out for you?” and a sample item for the PANSI-Negative is “Seriously considered killing yourself because you could not live up to the expectations of other people?” Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (none of the time) to 5 (most of the time).
time frame for rating PANSI items is “the past 2 weeks, including today.” Scores on the PANSI-Positive can range from 6 to 30, with higher scores indicating lower suicidal ideation. For the PANSI-Negative, scores can range from 8 to 40 (Higher scores indicate greater suicidal ideation). Osman et al. (2002) reported good scale score reliability scores for the two factors: PANSI-Positive (α = .89) and PANSI Negative (α = .96). The authors also furnished evidence attesting to the measure’s concurrent validity. For example, the PANSI-Positive correlated moderately and negatively with a traditional measure of suicidal behaviour such as the Suicide Probability Scale (SPS; Cull & Gill, 1982) and the PANSI-Negative was moderately and positively associated with the SPS (r = .59). The convergent validity of the PANSI also has been tested: the PANSI-Negative correlated with scores on the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis, 1992) and the Beck Hopelessness Scale (BHS; Beck, Weissman, Lester, & Trexler, 1974). A confirmatory factor analysis also revealed that, among a sample of American adolescents (N = 217; 53% boys; 14 to 19 years of age), a two-factor solution provided optimal fit: χ² [76] = 1.24, RMSEA = .03, NNFI = .96, CFI = .96 (Osman et al., 2003). In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were: .82 (95% CI = .77 – .86) for the PANSI-Positive and .95 (95% CI = .94 – .96) for the PANSI-Negative.

7.2.3.5 Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965). A description of this measure is provided in Chapter 5. With this sample, Cronbach’s alpha was .88 (95% CI = .84 – .90).

7.2.4 Procedure

Ethical approval was obtained by the Research Ethics Committee at the National University of Ireland, Galway. In September 2012, 43 schools were contacted at random from a list of schools provided by the Department of Education’s
website. Of the 43 schools that were contacted, two schools agreed to take part in the research. Schools were contacted initially by a letter to the Principal/Board of Management (see Appendix U) and then by telephone. Two hundred and fifty consent forms were administered to School A and 197 consent forms were sent to School B. Following approval from the Board of Management of the schools, the guidance counsellors in each school co-ordinated and oversaw the procedure. Posters for support agencies (i.e., Aware, Spunout.ie and the Samaritans) and specially designed business cards (see Appendix V) were put up on the schools’ noticeboards. Consent forms were distributed to boys during class time and participants were asked to bring the information sheets and consent forms to their parent(s)/guardian(s) (see Appendix W). Participants whose parents wanted their child to take part in the research were asked to bring the signed consent form to the guidance counsellor within a two week window. During this period, guidance counsellors also reminded participants to bring the consent forms home to be signed. The numbers of consent forms returned were: 170 (School A; 68% return) and 41 (School B; 21% return).

Due to tragic circumstances (i.e., the suicide of a student attending School A), administration of the questionnaire was cancelled in School A. Consequently, more schools had to be contacted to partake in the research. In January 2013, an additional 48 schools were contacted. Five schools agreed to take part in the study bringing the total number of schools to six.

The response rates were: School B (30 out of 42 students returning the consent forms participated); School C (40 out of 47; 94 forms distributed initially); School D (36 out of 53; 150 forms distributed]); School E (18 out of 42; 110 forms distributed); School F (11 out of 22; 80 forms distributed); and, finally, School G (41 out of 47; 100 consent forms distributed).
Two weeks after the consent forms had been distributed, the questionnaire battery was administered to students. Respondents that did not return signed parental/guardian consent forms were unable to take part in the research. The questionnaire battery, which was presented to participants in a A4 sealable envelope, consisted of a demographic questionnaire, the I-GRCS-A items, and measures of self-esteem, depression and suicidal ideation. The information sheet and consent form were included as was a business card listing contact details of relevant support agencies. The questionnaire took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

7.2.5 Analytic Strategy

Adhering to the seminal article written by Baron and Kenny (1986), Rose, Holmbeck, Coakley, and Franks (2004) detail the steps involved in testing for moderation using multiple regression analysis. In the current study, the predictor variables are gender role conflict, depression, and self-esteem and the outcome variable is suicidality. It should be noted, however, that as the indicator of suicidality contains two subscales (PANSI-Positive and PANSI-Negative), separate regressions were conducted for each outcome. Prior to performing the regression analysis, the continuous predictor variables were mean-centred (i.e., the mean score for the I-GRCS-A, for example, would be subtracted from the raw score obtained for each participant on this measure). A similar process was completed for the remaining predictors: depression and self-esteem. The rationale underlying mean-centring is to reduce the potential for multicollinearity to arise when using the same variables to calculate interaction terms. Interaction terms were created by multiplying the mean centred variables (e.g., I-GRCS-A x CES-D; I-GRCS-A x RSE; RSE x CES-D). A three-way interaction term also was created: I-GRCS-A x CES-D x RSE. If the two-way or three-way interaction terms involving the I-GRCS-A emerge as statistically
significant predictors of the PANSI-Positive and/or PANSI-Negative, then gender role conflict will have moderated the impact of the other variable (depression/self-esteem) on the outcome.

7.3 Results

7.3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Reliability coefficients, means, standard deviations and scale score ranges for the self-report measures (raw scores) are presented in Table 6. Correlations among these variables\(^24\) are presented in Table 7.

7.3.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

Inspection of the correlations reported in Table 7 revealed that all \( r \) values were well below .90 and, thus, variable redundancy did not appear to be of concern (Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007). The Durbin-Watson test approximated 2 suggesting that autocorrelation among the residuals was not problematic. Finally, Cook’s distance was less than 1 suggesting there were no influential outliers (O’Connor & Morrison, 2001).

Hypothesis 1. To test the hypothesis that GRC moderates the relationship between depression, self-esteem and negative suicide ideation, the main effect variables were entered separately in blocks, to determine incremental variance accounted for. Three variables correlated significantly with negative suicide ideation (i.e., PANSI-Negative). These were GRC, self-esteem, and depression. (None of the demographic variables were associated with scores on the PANSI-Negative and, thus, were not included as predictors.). GRC, self-esteem and depression were entered in the first block. The two-way interaction terms (e.g., I-GRCS-A x RSE) were entered on the second block; with the three-way interaction entered in the third, and final, block.
The final model was statistically significant, accounting for 55% of the variance in negative suicide ideation, $F(7, 175) = 32.028, p < .001, R^2 = .57, \text{Adj } R^2 = .55$). No main effect was observed for gender role conflict ($\beta = .08, t = 1.28, p = \text{ns}$). However, both self-esteem and depression emerged as statistically significant predictors ($\beta = -.34, t = -5.05, p < .01$ and $\beta = .26, t = 3.73, p < .01$). The direction of the standardized beta weights suggest that as self-esteem decreases and depression increases so, too, does negative suicide ideation. Squared semi-partial correlations indicate that 13% and 8% unique variance in negative suicide ideation is accounted for by the two predictors. These main effects, however, were qualified by a statistically significant two-way interaction between depression and self-esteem.

Neither the two-way nor three-way interactions involving gender role conflict were statistically significant ($p\text{s} = \text{ns}$). These findings indicate that, while gender role conflict – as measured by the I-GRCS-A – correlated with negative suicide ideation, the relationship was not sustained when depression and self-esteem were forced into the model together. Furthermore, the absence of interactions involving gender role conflict suggested that the magnitude of the relationship between negative suicide ideation and both self-esteem and depression did not change as a function of gender role conflict.

*Hypothesis 2.* GRC, self-esteem, and depression also correlated significantly with positive/protective suicide ideation (again, no demographic correlates were noted and, thus, are not considered further.) The same series of blocks were employed. The final model was statistically significant, accounting for 51% of the variance in protective suicide ideation, $F(7, 175) = 26.934, p < .001, R^2 = .53, \text{Adj } R^2 = .51$). The only variable to emerge as a statistically significant predictor was self-esteem ($\beta = .69, t = 9.70, p < .01$).
The squared semi-partial correlation reveals that self-esteem accounts for 36% unique variance in protective suicide ideation. No other main effects or interactions emerged as significant predictors (see Table 8 and 9 for regression output).

7.4 Discussion

This is the first study to examine the direct and indirect relationships between gender role conflict, self-esteem, depression and suicide ideation amongst Irish adolescents. Results indicated that, while gender role conflict correlates significantly with both positive and negative suicide ideation, this association becomes non-significant when depression and self-esteem are taken into consideration. Further, moderation testing suggested that gender role conflict, as measured by the I-GRCS-A, neither intensifies nor diminishes the correlations observed between depression/negative suicide ideation, self-esteem/negative suicide ideation, and self-esteem/protective suicide ideation.

Although moderation did not emerge, these findings support Houle et al.’s (2008) conclusion that GRC is associated with variables that, in turn, may play a role in suicidality. Specifically, in the current study, scores on the I-GRCS-A correlated moderately with both self-esteem and depression, variables which – in turn – were linked with negative suicide ideation. (Self-esteem was the lone variable to emerge as a unique predictor of scores on the PANSI-Positive subscale.) This study goes beyond that of Houle et al. by investigating the relationship between self-esteem, depression and suicidal ideation with a non-clinical sample of adolescent boys. Using a ‘normal’ sample of adolescent males, this research provides tentative support for the GRC theory’s proposition that restrictive gender roles can have negative consequences for males.
Future research may want to employ more complex models by treating gender role conflict as a mediator. For example, it is possible that adolescent boys experiencing gender role conflict are vulnerable to depression and compromised self-esteem which, in turn, increases their risk of suicidality. A large sample would be recommended for this type of work, however, as improper and false mediation models may emerge when sample sizes are small (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991; Cole, 1987).

One limitation that is worth noting concerns the recruitment of participants. Finding schools that were willing to participate in this research was the biggest obstacle in conducting the current study. Due to many schools being over burdened with workloads and the sensitive issues relating to conducting research related to suicidal ideation, many schools did not respond to or refused to take part. Of the 6 schools that had taken part in the research, 4 had not experience suicide in the school in the past 4 years, many of which had actively participated in government suicide prevention and educational strategies. It is possible that these results are an underestimate in comparison to the broader schools spectrum. That is, it is possible that the students participating in this research, due to the fact that they attended ‘proactive’ schools, were better informed/availed of mental health supports in comparison to students from schools that did not participate.

Further, an estimate of the boys whose parents refused to allow their children to take part was not recorded; thus, a comparison between boys that participated with boys that did not was not possible. That is, the generalizability of the results may be limited because the “profile” of respondents may be similar/dissimilar to the “profile” of non-respondents.

7.5 Conclusion
In conclusion, the I-GRCS-A demonstrated good reliability and the 9-item factor structure was confirmed with a sample of Irish adolescents. Although scores on the I-GRCS-A correlated significantly with depression, self-esteem, and suicidality, the linkage between gender role conflict and suicide ideation disappeared when depression and self-esteem were considered. Also, the I-GRCS-A did not serve a moderational function. The implications of this study as well as recommendations for future research direction for the GRC will be discussed in Chapter 8.

7.6 Notes

22. More females, compared to males, die by completed suicide in China, particularly in rural areas, where access to highly lethal insecticides is increased and treatment facilities are harder to access (World Health Organisation, 2005).

23. The response rate varied from school to school and higher response rates were observed in schools that were more organised (i.e., some schools sent text messages to parents to remind them to sign parental consent forms).

24. Pearson correlations (continuous variables) and \( \chi^2 \) tests (dichotomous variables) showed no statistically significant relationship between the demographic variables of age, ethnicity, religiosity and SES and the self-report measures (i.e., I-GRCS-A, RSE, CES-D, PANSI-P and PANSI-N).
Chapter 8 – General Discussion

8.1 Chapter Overview

In this final chapter, a summary of the criticisms of the GRCS and GRCS-A will be presented, followed by a summary of the aims/objectives and findings. Further, implications of the thesis, limitations and recommendations for future research are discussed.

8.2 A summary of the criticisms of the GRCS and GRCS-A

The GRCS has been regarded as the “most well-known instrument within the traditional counselling literature” that focuses on masculinity (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993, p. 360) and has made a significant contribution to men’s health research (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013). However, numerous criticisms have been directed against the development and validation of the GRCS and its offshoots (i.e., the GRCS-SF, the GRCS-A and the K-GRCS-A – see O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013). These criticisms include: a) the lack of information relating to the development of scale items; b) the fact that not all items measure conflict (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993); c) the observation that elements of devaluation, restriction and violation are missing from scale items; d) the limited attention that GRC toward others is given (i.e., it is arguably measured by a single item; e) mismatches between items and the response format; and f) conceptual issues relating to what each factor is measuring (e.g., SPC as a measure of masculine ideology). Criticisms specific to the GRCS-A also were identified and included: a) issues with content validity; b) mismatches between items and the response format; c) difficulties with interpreting the meaning of the NSA subscale; d) questions over the age appropriateness of the items; e) the absence of face or content validity from the vantage of adolescent boys; and f) cultural suitability of the items.

8.3 Summary of the Aims/Objectives and Findings
Use of suboptimal questionnaires may lead to erroneous findings and invalid research (DeVellis, 2003). Thus, the principal objective of the series of studies outlined in this dissertation was to develop a measure of gender role conflict using current best psychometric practices. To achieve this goal, the author followed recommended guidelines on scale development (DeVellis, 2003), thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), exploratory factor analysis (Fabrigar et al., 1999), confirmatory factor analysis (Brown, 2006) and multiple regression. In accordance with more recent examinations of adolescent masculinity (i.e., Oransky & Fischer, 2009), this research used a mixed methodology approach (i.e., qualitative [inductive] and quantitative [deductive]) that enriches the results in ways that one form of data does not allow (Brewer & Hunter, 1989; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

The absence of knowledge about Irish adolescent masculinities and gender role conflict suggested that an exploratory approach would be appropriate to establishing a baseline picture and inform the scale development process (Rowan and Wulff, 2007). Greene and Caracelli (1997) contend that the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods enables researchers to: a) test theoretical models and to modify them based on participant feedback; and b) amend the content of psychometric measures using field-based information. Each stage of the scale development process is outlined below.

8.3.1 Overview of Study 1. The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the items on the GRCS-A were suitable for use within an Irish context. Data from focus groups and personal interviews with Irish adolescents illustrate that a number of items were identified as problematic. Firstly, the phrasing and wording of items was criticized, with many questions regarded as inappropriate for boys and deemed more suited for girls and gay males. Secondly, participants explained that
presenting the items without alteration would preclude boys from taking the questionnaire seriously or refusing to complete the measure altogether. These assertions have serious consequences for the utility of GRCS-A, at the very least amongst Irish boys (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013).

8.3.2 Overview of Study 2. As recommended by DeVellis (2003), the author identified constructs that warranted measurement by reviewing pertinent research and theory on gender role conflict (Chu et al., 2005; Kahn, 2009; O’Neil, 2008; Pleck, 1995; Oransky & Fischer, 2009; Oransky & Marecek, 2009; Stoudt, 2006). Rowan and Wulff (2007) recommend the use of qualitative methods to inform scale development and Levant (2011) noted that conversations with males should inform the development of masculinity-based questionnaires. Thus, using a triangular process recommended by Wadsworth (2000), individual interviews and focus groups were conducted with adolescent males residing in Ireland. Thematic analysis identified four broad and inter-related themes relating to gender role conflict: 1) Expectations; 2) Discontinuity; 3) Restriction; and 4) Penalty. These themes provide a comprehensive list of expectancies and contradictory expectations that young males experience and highlight the complexity, diversity and inconsistencies placed on boys within Irish society. Theme 1 (i.e., Expectations) outlines ten masculine expectations that through their endorsement, failure to meet, or violation of can result in negative intrapersonal and social consequences for boys. Theme 2 (i.e., Discontinuity) describes a number of group-specific expectations and competing expectations that conflict with, or override boys’ expression of their “true-selves.” The third theme, entitled “Restrictions,” delineates how masculine socialization confines and restricts boys’ behavioral, attitudinal and emotional expressions. Theme 4 (i.e., Penalty) concerns the penalties boys experience due to the presence of masculine expectations and highlights how
boys may be affected by negative societal attitudes about members of their group.

Emergent themes, in conjunction with an understanding of relevant empirical research, the criticisms of the GRCS and the age specific stresses identified in Study 1, informed the generation of items for the new scale. Items were developed to reflect conflict within the person and from others (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013) and to incorporate numerous situational contexts described by O’Neil (2008). Also, the use of adolescents to assist with the creation of scale items ensured that the phraseology, language and attitudes of boys were reflected. Adopting guidelines specified by McGartland Rubio et al. (2003), the pools of items were subjected to a content validity study. A small group of adolescents as well as context experts were invited to appraise items on various dimensions such as item clarity and the degree to which each item represented the content domain. Their feedback guided final revisions to the item pool.

8.3.3 Overview of Study 3. The item pool as well as validation questionnaires (i.e., the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and the Adolescent Masculinity in Relationships Scale) were distributed to 317 boys residing in schools in Ireland. The psychometric properties of the new scale were investigated, with particular attention paid to the scale’s factor structure, reliability, and validity. The measure’s dimensionality was elucidated by exploratory factor analyses and guided by expert recommendations (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Fabrigar et al., 1999). Having inspected factor loadings, the scree plot and results from a parallel analysis, the I-GRCS-A was best represented by a uni-dimensional factor solution. The I-GRCS-A correlated negatively with self-esteem, and was weakly associated with the indicator of masculine ideology. The latter finding brings into question the legitimacy of using measures of masculine ideology to validate measures of GRC. Favourable Cronbach’s
alpha coefficients suggested that the I-GRCS-A possessed good scale score reliability.

8.3.4 Overview of Study 4. The psychometric properties of the I-GRCS-A were further assessed with a sample of 284 participants who completed this scale in conjunction with the Meanings for Adolescent Masculinity Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and Trait-State anxiety scales. A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted; however, the fit indices did not support the 26-item unidimensional factor structure of the scale. Thus, a number of items were subsequently deleted, with 9 items being retained. This version was then tested with a second sample of 200 adolescents. For both samples, Cronbach’s alpha was satisfactory. In support of the scale’s convergent validity, predicted relations between scores on the I-GRCS-A and measures of anxiety, self-esteem and depression emerged. Again, results suggest that the I-GRCS-A is not related to masculine ideology, a construct that was assessed by the Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale.

8.3.5 Overview of Study 5. A sample of 176 boys completed the I-GRCS-A as well as measures of self-esteem, depression, and suicide ideation. Pearson correlations indicated that scores on the I-GRCS-A correlated significantly with depression, self-esteem, and positive/negative suicide ideation. However, multiple regression analysis revealed that gender role conflict did not account for a statistically significant proportion of variance in suicide ideation above and beyond the proportions accounted for by depression (negative ideation only) and self-esteem (negative and positive ideation). The need for more complex modelling (e.g., mediation) with larger samples was articulated.

8.3.6 Synthesis of Key Findings

Many of the expectations that emerged throughout the qualitative studies mirror themes/factors of qualitative and quantitative research conducted with North
American adolescents (e.g., ‘emotion restriction,’ ‘constant effort,’ [Oransky & Fisher, 2009]; ‘social teasing’[Oransky & Fisher, 2009; Stoudt, 2006]; ‘emotional invulnerability’ [Chu et al, 2005]; ‘pursuit of status’ [Brannon & Juni, 1984]; ‘strength’ and ‘heterosexuality’ [Connell, 2000]) supporting the position that hegemonic masculinities transcend cultural boundaries. However, a number of masculine ideologies and attitudes surfaced throughout the interviews that may be culturally specific to Ireland. Some hegemonic expectations were differentially expressed and maintained within an Irish context. For example, in relation to emotional restriction, Irish boys cited the requirements of being ‘up for a laugh,’ being ‘entertaining’ and keeping exchanges ‘light’ in the presence of other boys as obstacles to evidencing vulnerability. Also, the requirement that boys be ‘modest’ in relation to informing others about achievements was noteworthy. That is, Irish boys were required to evidence proficiency in specific domains (e.g., athletically and academically) and, yet, not to boast about their success, a nuance that appears to contradict masculine expectations of adolescents in North America. Furthermore, in comparison to the findings reported by Watts and Border (2005), Irish adolescents’ reactions to many of the GRCS-A items, in particular items form the RE and RAM factors, suggest that verbal expressiveness may be subject to greater regulation in comparison to their North American counterparts. These findings underpin the importance of continued research on masculinities outside of a North American context (Whorley & Addis, 2006).

Each item of the I-GRCS-A incorporates expectations acknowledged by Irish adolescents as causing ‘stress’ or ‘conflict’ (see Appendix H), thus, ensuring that items are grounded in the lived experiences of boys. Each theme, derived from the qualitative analysis, is reflected in the 9-item I-GRCS-A, which in turn provides
evidence of the measure’s content validity and its relevance to GRC theory. Another psychometric advantage is that, in comparison to existing measures of GRC (i.e., GRCS [37-items], GRCS-SF [16-items], GRCS-A and K-GRCS-A (29-items), the I-GRCS-A is shorter and, consequently, less burdensome to complete.

The items underwent extensive psychometric testing and resulting in a measure that evidenced consistent acceptable reliability scores (see Table 11). Concurrently, the significant correlations, seen across four independent samples, between the I-GRCS-A and self-esteem (rs ranged from -.28 to -.49) provide further evidence of the scale’s consistency vis-à-vis its convergent validity. These findings support past research using the GRCS (O’Neil, 2008) and the K-GRCS-A (r = -.29; Kim et al., 2009). The statistically significant correlations between the I-GRCS-A and anxiety (r = .41) and depression, in two independent samples (i.e., rs = .43 and .46 in chapters 6 and 7, respectively), concur with the results of Kim et al., (2009) who reported similar relationships between the K-GRCS-A and anxiety (r = .48) and depression (r = .37). Furthermore, the factor structure of the I-GRCS-A was supported with optimal CFA model-fit indices across two independent samples.

The validity of the I-GRCS-A, and by extension the GRC theory, was supported by: a) qualitative research with adolescent boys; b) reviews by content experts; c) confirmation of predicted associations between the I-GRCS-A and negative psychological variables such as lower self-esteem, greater anxiety and elevated depression. Although the I-GRCS-A was not directly relate to suicide ideation, or account for variance in suicidality above that of depression and self-esteem, the I-GRCS-A has shown to be consistently and moderately related to risk-factors associated with suicide ideation; namely, depression and self-esteem.

8.4 Implications
There are a number of implications of the current research and they will be discussed under the following headings: a) a guide to best practice in the development of GRC measures; b) support for tenets of the masculine ideology approach and GRC theory; and c) implications for masculinity research.

8.4.1 A guide to best practice in the development of GRC measures. The I-GRCS-A is the first measure of gender role conflict to be developed outside of North America. Thus, it represents an initial attempt to explore gender role conflict patterns experienced by adolescent males residing outside of the USA. Consequently, this research could encourage further research in this area and underscores the importance of using mixed methods designs for scale development. Also, within an Irish context, a broad number of age-specific masculinities were identified and further qualitative and quantitative research in the area will be encouraged, based on the findings of this study.

A guide to best practice in developing GRC measures would involve the following steps: 1) identifying and defining the cohort of males for which the scale is to be used; 2) identifying masculine ideologies and gender role conflicts that are specific to the population of interest (i.e., by conducting individual and focus group interviews); 3) using relevant research and qualitative findings to develop an exhaustive list of items (i.e., each item should reflect conflict based on a masculine expectation); 4) choosing an appropriate response option that is compatible with the developed items; 5) distributing the items to content experts in the field; 6) applying EFA and CFA on the generated items; 7) assessing the retained items’ scale score reliability; and 8) assuming a composite score can be computed for the retained items (i.e., scale score reliability is satisfactory), testing the resultant scale’s validity (e.g., examining the association between scores on the new scale and scores on measures
that should, for theoretical and empirical reasons, be related to conflict).

The importance of including the target population (i.e., adolescents) was underscored in this thesis, demonstrating the necessity of involving adolescents in the item development process. The benefits include: a) identifying a number of problematic items; b) developing items that were age appropriate; and c) receiving feedback on how to improve items to reflect cultural nuances in masculinity standards and ideals specific to adolescents residing in Ireland.

The I-GRCS-A is the first measure of GRC to meet conventional model-fit criteria, validating both the process involved in the development of this measure and legitimacy of the GRC theory. Thus, the process used in the development of this measure can be used as a step-by-step guide for developing more GRC measures in the future. Many researchers have called for more international research on the GRC theory (Heppner & Heppner, 2008; O’Neil, 2010) and researchers can use this ‘template’ as a guide for best practice in developing GRCSs.

8.4.2 Support for tenets of the masculine ideology approach and GRC theory. The results of this thesis, in particular the qualitative portion, confirm the theoretical tenets of the masculine ideology approach and the GRC theory. That is, the findings from the interviews/focus groups support tenets of the masculinity ideology approach, which implies that, within each culture and age-cohort, there are varied expectations of males.

8.4.3 Implications for Masculinity Ideology Research

Questions pertaining to the use of masculine ideology measures were raised and discussed based on findings of Chapter 4 and 5. That is, neither the AMIRS nor the MAMS correlated with the I-GRCS-A in predicted ways. Further, neither measure of masculine ideology correlated with self-esteem in predicted ways. This may reflect
that American standards of masculinity do not apply to the same degree within an Irish context. Future research in Ireland should conduct CFAs on the AMIRS and MAMS to see if the factor structures are replicated. More importantly, a measure of adolescent masculinity should be developed specifically for use within an Irish context using current psychometric best practices.

8.5 Limitations

There are numerous limitations that warrant discussion. First, in Studies 1 and 2, an Irish male interviewer in his mid-twenties conducted each interview and it is possible that his nationality, gender, and age influenced boys’ responses. Researchers examining men’s health have found that interviewers’ gender can shape men’s talk during interviews (e.g. Broom, 2004; Broom, Hand, & Tovey, 2009; Oliffe & Morz, 2005). Future research may benefit from using both a male and a female interviewer. Secondly, it is possible that participants opting for individual interviews may have differed from those electing to serve in focus groups. Thus, self-selection bias may be a concern. Furthermore, as Study 2 was the first qualitative paper to outline the masculine expectations of Irish adolescent boys, follow-up work is needed to determine whether these themes are idiosyncratic or robust.

The omission of other tests of validity is a limitation of Studies 3 through 5. First, discriminant validity tests whether concepts or measurements that are supposed to be unrelated are, in fact, unrelated (Campell & Fiske, 1959; John & Benet-Martinez, 2000). Levant (2011) recommends administering questionnaire items to females, as a means of testing the discriminant validity of masculinity-related measures. Secondly, more specific tests of validation of the I-GRCS-A could be conducted. For example, in order to test the assumptions of the gender role trauma tenet of the GRSP (Pleck, 1995; Levant, 2011), I-GRCS-A scores could be compared
for boys identifying as gay versus heterosexual.

A critical, though routinely overlooked (see Charter, 2003; Hogan, Benjamin, & Brezinski, 2000), dimension of reliability is test-retest. Test-retest reliability is important as it assesses the degree to which there is equality between the ratio of true variance to error score variance when scale scores are produced at two different times (Furr & Bacharach, 2008). Thus, to examine the I-GRCS-A’s temporal stability, the measure should be distributed to a sample of adolescent boys on two different occasions, preferably between two to eight weeks apart (Furr & Bacharach, 2008).

For studies 3 through 5, the correlational nature of this research cannot confirm the causal directions between the I-GRCS-A and psychological health indices (i.e., self-esteem, anxiety and depression). Future research should consider the use of structural equation modelling (SEM) to further examine these variables of interest. Unlike other statistical procedures (i.e., ANOVA or multiple regression), SEM allows researchers to specify relatively “error free” latent variables by correcting for biases that could result from random error and variance not attributable to the targeted constructs (McCallum & Austin, 2000). Reaching model-fit criteria in SEM establishes the ‘conceptual soundness of the latent variables used in the final model’, ensuring that the conclusions drawn from the associations between variables are not ‘misleading’ (Schreiber et al., 2006, p.335).

Another limitation of the I-GRCS-A is the breath of the conflicts measured by the scale. Specifically, one facet of GRC theory that is not assessed by the I-GRCS-A concerns the expression of conflict toward others. As discussed in Chapter 2, the breadth of the items of the GRCS seem to reflect the GRC experience within the self and experienced from others, rather than towards others (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013).
To ensure continuity between the I-GRCS-A and past GRC measures, items were developed to reflect GRC experienced *within* the self and experienced *from* other persons.

A further limitation resides in the possibility that this work may be misconstrued by its readers as intimating that boys are, somehow, more disadvantaged than girls (Chrisler, 2013). The intent of this research wasn’t to establish a ‘hierarchy of victimisation’ but to present the perceived stresses experienced by boys. The broader implication limitation of this research is to highlight how restrictive roles, for both sexes, can have limiting and negative effects.

### 8.6 Future Research

Beyond further psychometric work, which is important given its incremental and on-going nature, other avenues for additional inquiry should be considered. These include: a) theoretical refinement; b) cross-cultural research; and c) the development of new measures of GRC.

#### 8.6.1 Theoretical refinement

The critique outlined in Chapter 2 and the results from this thesis pose difficult questions for the GRC paradigm. It is possible that researchers may find the breadth of GRC theory difficult to navigate. Firstly, the theoretical ambiguity and the reliance of the GRC on the GRSP may be confusing to some researchers due to distinctions between these constructs not being clearly delineated. To date, researchers have not looked at (dis)similarities between these paradigms (O’Neil, 2008) and more theoretical work is needed to clearly identify the tenets and parameters of each theory. In the qualitative analysis, difficulty in analysing the results arose from not having clear boundaries between these constructs. For example, many of the situational contexts in which GRC is experienced (O’Neil,
2008) map onto one of the three GRSP subthemes (i.e., gender role discrepancy strain, gender role dysfunction and gender role trauma).

Secondly, the difference between the various situational contexts in which GRC is experienced and the ones currently included in the existing instruments (i.e., the GRCS [adult], the GRCS-SF, the GRCS-A and the K-GRCS-A) need to be clarified.

Thirdly, the definition of GRC “has evolved” (O’Neil, 2008, p. 362) since the concept was originally theorized in the early 1980s (O’Neil, 1981a, 1981b, 1982). During this period, progress has been made in terms of gender equality and the dissemination of gender research findings has made an impact on the public consciousness. For example, RABBM scores have significantly decreased over the past 25 years (McGinness, 2011) suggesting that comfort with same-sex relationships has increased during this period. Further, the theoretical relationship between GRC and depression has not been explained (O’Neil, 2008) and outlining the processes and tenets of these relationships would allow researchers to test the mediational factors, other than self-esteem, that contribute to the development of depression in adolescent males.

Fourth, O’Neil (1981, 1981a, 1981b, 2008) outlines two tenets that may distinguish the GRC theory from the GRSP: 1) fear of femininity and 2) the masculine mystique. Theoretically, it would be useful to outline how each tenet relates to, for example, gender role conflict experienced within the self, experienced from others and GRC expressed towards others. That is, fear of femininity and the masculine mystique may cause different conflicts in males based on whether it is experienced from others versus expressed towards others. Take “Restrictive Emotionality,” for example: men who experience conflict because they feel restricted in their emotional
expression may be evincing an “embracement of femininity” rather than a “fear of femininity”. They may fear being devalued for expressing vulnerable emotions (i.e., devaluation for breaking a masculine norm) rather than fearing femininity. Likewise, expressing GRC towards others (e.g., restricting others emotional expressions) may reflect a ‘fear of femininity’ on the part of the oppressor rather than the recipient of the behaviour.

8.6.2 Cross-cultural testing of the I-GRCS-A. To determine the utility of the I-GRCS-A within international research, it may be of interest to assess its psychometric properties in cultures other than Ireland. The cross-cultural utility of the I-GRCS-A cannot be guaranteed simply if the factor structure or group means, variances, reliabilities, and criterion validity are seen to be equivalent in different cultures; rather, the invariance of a scale across groups is a prerequisite which must be systematically assessed (Byrne & Campbell, 1999; Chen, 2007; Chen, Sousa, & West, 2005). An interesting comparison could be made between the utility of the GRCS-A and I-GRCS-A within a sample of North American adolescents. Researchers might conduct a face validity study of the I-GRCS-A with North American adolescents to see if the items are suitable/understood within that cultural context.

8.6.3 Developing new measures. Addis, Mansfield and Syzdek (2010) critiqued research pursued by those in the field of men and masculinities and, in particular, the use of masculinity measures. They argue that measures of masculinity, such as the GRCS, were “not designed to be sensitive to contextual influences of social learning” (p. 80); rather, they proceed from a trait-like methodological framework because respondents are required to describe themselves in general terms that generates a single score (or subscale score) for each individual. They argue that the extent that people can learn about masculinity through the use of traditional
masculinity measures is that “men who are generally like this, are also generally like that” (p.81) and that the nature of gendered social learning is missed through this process.

Standards of measurement have progressed in the past 26 years with the emergence of CFA cut-off points, standards that were not available during the period when the GRCS was developed (Norwalk et al., 2011). Examinations of the dimensionality of the GRCS, when tested using CFA, have consistently fallen short of established cut-off points. In spite of social and psychometric developments, the same measure of GRCS exists and has been unchanged since it was designed in 1986. Given the success of the GRCS since its inception and acknowledgement that “measures of gender-related conflicts or stresses of manhood are likely to predict males' behavior more directly than measures of masculinity ideology” (Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992, p. 573), it is surprising that other measures of conflict have not been developed. The popularity and utility of the GRCS and the contribution it has made to the field of men and masculinities may have awarded it more latitude with respect to its performance on indices of psychometric quality (O’Beaglaoich et al., 2013).

Norwalk et al. (2011) recommend that “revising and updating the GRCS would not only improve its psychometric properties, but also increase its viability as a current and future measure of gender role conflict in men” (p. 141). Attempts have been made to improve the psychometric properties of the GRCS by developing a short-form version of the measure (GRCS-SF). However, many of the criticisms relating to the foundation of the measure and the validity of the items still apply to this short-form version.

Given the breadth of GRC theory, the GRCS may be attempting to measure too
much. For instance, how can one measure account for each situational context outlined by O’Neil (2008)? Notwithstanding, Addis et al.’s (2010) critique, more specific and tailored measures should be developed that test and focus on individual aspects of GRC. The author proposes that measures should be developed that capture: 1) GRC within the person and experienced from others; 2) GRC expressed towards others; 3) the experience of restriction caused by masculine ideology; and 4) the experience of devaluations based on conforming/not conforming to masculine ideology. Developing numerous measures tapping into different aspects of the theory would allow researchers to investigate how these conflicts interact with one another. For example, if an adolescent measure of the GRC “towards others” was developed, one could test how higher GRC experienced “towards others” interacted with higher expression of GRC “from others.” This approach would offer a more nuanced understanding of how GRC causes negative effect for the person and others.

### 8.6.4 Modifying Gender Role Conflict in Adolescent Boys

Pederson and Vogel (2007) contend that gender role conflict associated with gender role socialization can be addressed and gradually changed. One method of gathering evidence of this would be to conduct gender-based education programs in schools and, if successful, to apply the programs’ curriculums nation-wide. Many researchers have recommended the incorporation of gender psychoeducational programs to teach young boys about the challenges of growing up as an adolescent boy and the negative consequences associated with restrictive gender role socialising (Addis & Cohane, 2005; O’Neil & Lujan, 2009; Paulsen, 1999). For example, Paulsen (1999) developed a curriculum that attempted to delineate and deconstruct hegemonic adolescent masculinities in Australia. Similarly, O’Neil, Challenger, Renzulli, Crasper and Webster (2013) implemented a two day intervention with fifty-one American
adolescent boys aged 13 and 14 years. In contrast to Paulsen’s (1999) study, participants in O’Neil and colleagues’ (2013) program were evaluated pre- and post-intervention. Group discussion, disclosure from adult males and an educational video were used to promote empowerment themes to encourage psychosocial growth. A three week follow-up showed that: a) 72% of boys reported that the intervention made them think more about the problems associated with being a boy; b) 91% thought about how to cope with their next gender role transition (i.e., going into 8th grade); c) 84% said they had positive feelings about the intervention; and d) 72% wished the programme would continue. Although no standardised measures were used in this study, within an Irish context, future interventions similar to O’Neil et al. (2013), informed by the qualitative themes in Chapter 1, could measure baseline scores of I-GRC-A to assess the effectiveness of interventions before and after.

8.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, best practices in scale development were incorporated in the development of the I-GRCS-A. Numerous incremental advances were made. These included: a) the thesis summarises findings obtained from the first qualitative research to explore gender role conflict among Irish adolescents; b) a new measure assessing gender role conflict in Irish adolescent boys was tested and subject to extensive psychometric testing; and c) the resultant measure is the first to meet certain hallmarks of psychometric acceptability (e.g., satisfying conventional CFA model fit criteria). The limitations of this research, as well as possible directions for future research also were delineated.
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Table 1: The frequency and percentages for each item’s approval and disapproval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>Non-response</th>
<th>% of answered items (√)</th>
<th>% of answered items (x)</th>
<th>% of total items (√)</th>
<th>% of total items (x)</th>
<th>% of non-response items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column 2 (√): The number of participants that endorsed the use of the corresponding item within an Irish context.

Column 3 (x): The number of participants that did not endorse the use of the corresponding item within an Irish context.

Note: 9 of the 29 items received greater proportions of disapproval.
Table 2: Alpha scores, Mean scores, Possible Range and Attained Range for Gender Role Conflict, AMIRS, Self-esteem and the Family Affluence Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Alpha (95% CI)</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Attained Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>.94 (.93-.95)</td>
<td>95.59 (21.56)</td>
<td>26-130</td>
<td>39-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMIRS</td>
<td>.74 (.69-.79)</td>
<td>24.55 (6.52)</td>
<td>8-40</td>
<td>11-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>.77 (.73-.81)</td>
<td>12.70 (6.29)</td>
<td>7-35</td>
<td>7-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS II</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36.36 (8.95)</td>
<td>12-60</td>
<td>16-58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I-GRCS-A = Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents; AMIRS = The Adolescent in Masculine Relationship Scale (12 items: Chu & Tolman, 2005); RSE - Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (10 item; Rosenberg, 1965); FAS II = Family Affluency Scale II (4 items; Boyce and Dallago, 2004).
Table 3: Alpha scores, 95% Confidence Intervals, Mean scores and Standard Deviation scores for the 9-item I-GRCS-A in Sample 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-GRCS-A</th>
<th>Sample 1 (9-items)</th>
<th>Sample 2 (9-items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.75 - .83</td>
<td>.78 - .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Summary of Fit Indexes for Models of the Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents Derived From Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>χ²/df</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>90%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 1 (N = 284)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-items</td>
<td>764.036</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.07-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-items</td>
<td>53.685</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.04-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2 (N = 200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-items</td>
<td>1183.81</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-items</td>
<td>38.06</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.00-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All chi-square tests were statistically significant at .001; GFI = Goodness of fit index; CFI = Comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean-square error of approximation.
Table 5: Correlations among Gender Role Conflict, MAMS subscales, Self-esteem and Depression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>RSE1</th>
<th>TRAIT</th>
<th>STA1T</th>
<th>RSE2</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlations significant at <.01
* Correlations significant at <.05

Meaning for masculine ideology scale subscales: ER (Emotional Restriction), CE (Constant Effort), H (Homophobia) and ST (Social Teasing); Rosenberg Self-Esteem (RSE1 – Sample 1; RSE2 – Sample 2); State Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC); Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (TRAIT); Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression (CES-D – Sample 2).
Table 6: Alpha scores, 95% Confidence Intervals, Mean scores, Range and Standard Deviation scores for I-GRCS-A, RSE, CES-D, PANSI-P and PANSI-N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.79 - .86</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>9 – 45</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.84 - .90</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>10 – 40</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.74 - .84</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>12-76</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANSI-P</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.77 - .86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANSI-N</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.94 - .96</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale (I-GRCS-A); Rosenberg Self-Esteem (RSE); Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression (CES-D); Positive and Negative Suicide Ideation – Positive (PANSI-P); Positive and Negative Suicide Ideation – Negative (PANSI-N).
Table 7: Correlations among Gender Role Conflict, Self-esteem, Depression, and Suicidality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I-GRCS-A</th>
<th>RSE</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>PANSI-P</th>
<th>PANSI-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>- .49**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANSI-P</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANSI-N</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlations significant at < .01
* Correlations significant at < .05

Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale (I-GRCS-A); Rosenberg Self-Esteem (RSE); Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression (CES-D); Positive and Negative Suicide Ideation – Positive (PANSI-P); Positive and Negative Suicide Ideation – Negative (PANSI-N).
Table 8: Hierarchical multiple regression analysis – PANSI-Negative.

Note. ** = p < .01. I-GRCS-A = Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents; RSE = Rosenberg Self-esteem Inventory; CES-D = The Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\beta^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.219</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td>-5.575</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.474</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.068</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.324</td>
<td>-4.910</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxRSE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxCESD</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSExCESD</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>-3.223</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 3</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.028</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.344</td>
<td>-5.047</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.732</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxRSE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxCESD</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSExCESD</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td>-3.213</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxRSExCESD</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-esteem Inventory; CES-D = The Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale.
Table 9: Hierarchical multiple regression analysis – PANSI-Positive.

Note. ** = \( p < .01 \). I-GRCS-A = Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents; RSE = Rosenberg Self-esteem Inventory; CES-D = The Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Adj. ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \beta^a )</th>
<th>SE( ^b )</th>
<th>( \beta^c )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( P )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>Sig. ( F ) change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-1.111</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>10.149</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.654</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxRSE</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-1.342</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxCESD</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.615</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSExCESD</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 3</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-GRCS-A</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>9.704</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxRSE</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>-1.306</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxCESD</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.549</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSExCESD</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCxRSExCESD</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-esteem Inventory; CES-D = The Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale.
Table 10: Alpha scores, Mean scores and Possible Range for the Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for adolescents across four samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-GRCS-A</th>
<th>Alpha (95% CI)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>.93 (.92-.95)</td>
<td>95.59</td>
<td>26-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA – Sample 1</td>
<td>.79 (.75-.83)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>9-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA – Sample 2</td>
<td>.82 (.78-.85)</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>9-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
<td>.83 (.79-.86)</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>9-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Dear Principal,

My name is Cormac O Beaglaoich; I am a Ph.D. student in the School of Psychology at NUI, Galway. I am currently undertaking research which is looking at masculine ideology among adolescent males’ and examining the association of these attitudes with self-reported levels physical and psychological health. A lot of research has been conducted on how the endorsement of masculine ideology (such as stoicism, restrictive emotional expression, physical toughness, dominance, competition and anti-femininity) have been associated with lower levels of self-esteem, higher levels of depression and anxiety in adults. There is little research done in this area with regards to adolescents, especially within Ireland.

We are looking to recruit males’ from secondary schools across the country. This is crucial, because younger individuals will need to be included in if any interventions are to be developed based on findings from this study. We are therefore writing to you to ask you for your permission recruit participants and to conduct research within your school. We are looking for students’ aged 13 and over, as it is suggested by the Research Ethics Committee at NUI, Galway.

Included with this letter are a consent form and an information sheet. We are using “active consent” procedures which are a common procedure in adolescent research in Ireland and internationally. What this means is that signed parental consent must be obtain prior to participation in the study. If you have any queries about any of this research please do not hesitate to contact me or my supervisor (Contact details are listed below).

What is required from the school is the permission to recruit 8 to 10 pupils to participate in this research, and the use of a room to conduct interviews in. We are hoping to conduct 3 focus group interviews (4 students each) and to conduct 3-5 individual interviews. The recruitment process would involve the researcher going around to designated classes to briefly explain the research and to hand out consent forms to be signed by parents. This would take less than 5 minutes of class time and could be co-ordinated to occur during religion/civics lesson. The consent forms would be collected the
following day and the interviews conducted over the course of the week. Each interview would last approximately 1 hour.

As we do not anticipate any risk to students in conducting this research, safety procedures will be emphasised. A local psychologist or school counsellor will be contacted and informed of the research, and contact details will be provided. Pupils retain the right at all times to withdraw from the research without penalty and are not compelled to complete it unless they so desire. It should be noted that this research has been approved by both the School of Psychology at NUI, Galway and by the Research Ethics Committee at NUI, Galway.

In terms of the benefits of this study, it is hoped that our results will broaden the understanding of how masculine ideologies are developed, maintained and demonstrated within Irish society. This has not previously been studied in Ireland, and this research may give great insight into the lives and attitudes of this under represented group. We also believe that students will benefit by gaining insight into: 1) how psychologists conduct research; and 2) how certain aspects of masculine ideology can have negative consequences for others and themselves.

The interviews will be audio-recorded and all information that is collected, during the course of the research, will be kept strictly confidential (i.e., the researchers will keep any information collected secret) and will not be shared with anyone else other than the research team. The information collected in this research study also will be stored in a way that protects student’s identities. All data collected will be kept securely for up to 5 years after which they will be destroyed. Finally, a full debriefing report and the general result of the findings will be made available at www.nuigalway.ie/psy/ at the end of the study.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact myself Mr. Cormac O Beaglaoich by phone at 091-512360 or by email at cormacbegley@gmail.com or my research supervisor, Dr. Kiran Sarma by at phone: 091-495715 or by email: kiran.sarma@nuigalway.ie. My thanks for taking the time to read this letter and I hope to hear from you soon.

Yours Sincerely,

Cormac O Beaglaoich, School of Psychology, NUI Galway, Galway, Ireland
Tel: 091 – 512361 (ext. 2801)  Mob: 0879625425  E-mail: cormacbegley@gmail.com
Dear Parent/Guardian,

I am a Ph.D. student in the School of Psychology at NUI, Galway conducting research into masculine ideology among adolescent males in Ireland. The research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Kiran Sarma, Chartered Psychologist, NUI, Galway. We are interested in examining the association between masculine ideologies and self-reported levels of physical and psychological health. We hope to recruit students’ aged 13 and over from your son’s school and are seeking consent from parents to do so. The research has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee at NUI, Galway and by the Board of Management of the school.

Included with this letter is a parental information sheet and a consent form. We are using an “active consent” process, in line with national and international practice. What this means is that adolescents who wish to participate in research can do so only if their parents or guardians have given their consent to do so.

During the next week or so male students aged 13 and over will be invited to participate in interview (individual and focus group). They are, of course, free to withdraw from the research at any time.

The data collected will be stored electronically and in a way that cannot lead to the identification of individual research participants. A full debriefing report and the general result of the findings will be made available to the Board of Management of your school and posted online at www.nuigalway.ie/psy/ at the end of the study.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact myself Mr. Cormac O Beaglaoich by phone at 091-512361 or by email at cormacbegley@gmail.com or my research supervisor, Dr. Kiran Sarma by at phone: 091-495715 or by email: kiran.sarma@nuigalway.ie.

Yours sincerely,

_______________________________
Cormac O Beaglaoich
Appendix C

Information Sheet for Parents/Guardians of Participants
Development and Validation of Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents

Invitation to participate
You son has been invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether you would like him to participate or not, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involves. This Information Sheet will tell you about the purpose, risks and benefits of this research study. If you agree for your son to take part, we will ask him for his consent to participate. If there is anything that you are not clear about, we will be happy to explain it to you. Please take as much time as you need to read it. You should only consent to participate in this research study when you feel that you understand what is being asked of your son, and you have had enough time to think about your decision.

The research
The current research assesses males’ beliefs about being a male within Irish society and aims to improve understanding of its contributory factors. We are interested in young men between the ages of 13 and 18 years old. Your son has been asked to take part as he matches these criteria. Please note that his participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and that he may withdraw at any time, without penalty or consequence. His participation in this study involves engaging in a individual interview where questions concerning his beliefs and attitudes will be discussed. It is anticipated that each interview will last around 90 minutes. It is hoped that the current research will broaden understanding of adolescent males’ experiences in Ireland.

The discussions will be tape-recorded and transcribed for analysis. However, all information that is collected about your son during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential and will not be shared with anyone else. The information collected in this research study will be stored in a way that protects your sons’ identity. We will store the original recordings securely for 5 years after which they will be destroyed. Results from the study will not identify your son in any way. A full debriefing report will be made available @ www.nuigalway.ie/psy at the end of the study.

Contact details for people should you have concerns/questions about the research
If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact Dr. Kiran Sarma, Clinical Doctorate Programme, Floor 2, Woodquay Court, Galway @ (091)495751 or Mr. Cormac O Beagloich, Room 102, Cois Abhainn, NUI, Galway @ (091)512361. If you have any concerns about this study and wish to contact someone independent and in confidence, you may contact the Chairperson of the NUI Galway Research Ethics Committee, c/o Office of the Vice President for Research, NUI Galway, ethics@nuigalway.ie

What you should do now
If you are happy for your son to take part in this research you do not need to do anything further now. A researcher will visit the school in the coming weeks and your son will be invited to take part in the research.

If you do NOT wish your son to participate in the research please sign the enclosed form, and return to the school principal using the freepost envelope that is provided, within one week of receipt of this letter.

We appreciate your taking the time to read the information sheet, and be assured that your son will suffer no adverse consequences due to your desire not to have them participate.
Appendix D

8th of April, 2013

Dear parent/guardian,

If you **DO** wish your son to participate in this research please sign this form, and return to the school principal within one week of receipt of this letter. We appreciate your taking the time to read the information sheet, and be assured that your son will experience no adverse consequences due to your desire not to have them participate.

Sincerely,
Mr. Cormac O Beaglaoich.

If you **DO** wish your child/ward to participate in the research please sign here:

Signature_________________________________________________

Please write your child’s name here: ________________________________

Cormac O Beaglaoich, School of Psychology, NUI Galway, Galway, Ireland
Mob: 0879625425    E-mail: cormacbegley@gmail.com
Appendix E

Consent Form

Thank you for your participation in this study of ‘Development and Validation of a Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents’. We will conduct an interview with you and others, where we will ask you about your attitudes, opinions and experiences of growing up as a male in Ireland. We will take notes during our conversation and audio record you during the course of your visit. Your identity will be protected at all stages of the data analysis.

We do not intend to share specific information that you provide with anyone not involved in this research. However we may share general findings from this study in research presentations and publications. We will endeavour to protect your identity on these occasions. Information will be kept in a safe location for up to 5 years before being destroyed.

During the discussion, feel free to decline to answer any questions and end your participation in the research at any stage if you are uncomfortable. If you have questions or concerns about this permission form or about the research, please contact:

Cormac Ó Beaglaoich,
Rm. 102,
Cois Abhainn,
School of Psychology,
National University of Ireland, Galway.
Tel: 091 512361
Mob: 087 9625425
Email: cormacbegley@gmail.com

By signing this form, you agree that:
- You have read and understand the information sheet on the research
- You understand how you will be participating
- Your participation in this study is completely voluntary
- Your name and address will be kept confidential

Name Printed: _______________________________________
Signature:  __________________________________________
Date: _________________________
Appendix F

The Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents (GRCS-A; Blazina, Pisecco & O’Neil, 2005)

Restricted Affection Between Men (RAM)
1. Verbally expressing my love to another man is hard for me.
2. Affection with other men makes me tense
3. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky
4. Hugging other men is difficult for me.
5. I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might judge me.
6. Being very personal with other men makes me feel anxious.
7. Men who are too friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).

Restricted Emotionality (RE)
8. I have difficulty telling others I care about them.
9. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.
10. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.
11. It’s hard for me to talk about me feelings with others.
12. It’s hard for me to express my emotional needs to others.
13. When I am personally involved with others, I do not express my strong feelings.
14. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.
15. I do not like to show my emotions to other people.
16. Telling others about my strong feelings is difficult to me.

Conflict Between Work, School, and Family (CWSF)
17. I feel torn my between my hectic work or school schedule and caring for my health.
18. My career, job, or school effects the quality of my leisure or family life.
19. I judge other people’s value by their level of achievement and success.
20. Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
21. My need to work or study keeps me from my family or leisure more than I would like.
22. My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, health, leisure).

23. Overwork and stress caused by the need to achieve on the job or in school effects or/ hurts my life.

Need for Success and Achievement (NSA)

24. Getting to the top of my class is important to me.

25. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.

26. Sometimes I define my personal value by my success at school.

27. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.

28. Doing well all the time is important to me.

29. I strive to be more success than others.
Appendix G

Expectations of Adolescent Males
1. I'm interested in the expectations that young people experience and I was hoping you could say something about this.
2. What are the sources of these expectations?
3. Are there differences in these expectations with age?
4. How do you deal with these expectations?

Stress in Adolescents
5. I'm interested in the kinds of stress that young people experience and I was hoping you could say something about this.
6. What are the sources of these stresses?
7. Are there differences in stresses with age?
8. How do you deal with these stresses?

Social Norms
9. Generally speaking, are there differences in the ways fellas act as opposed to how girls act?
10. Are there differences in the way fellas act in front of parents/teachers and the way they would generally act without parents/teacher being around?
11. Are there differences in the way fellas act when they’re older or younger?
12. Are there certain ways a fella should act?
13. Are there inappropriate ways for a fella to act?
   If so, (a) Why?
   (b) What would happen if someone acted like this? (deviating or violating norms)
   (c) What is likely to be said to someone/about someone if they did?
   (d) Would people think less of someone as a result? If so, in what way?
14. Are there differences between how fellas act around their male friends and how they might act around their female friends?
   If so, (a) Why?
   (b) What are these differences?
Appendix H

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then CIRCLE the number to the RIGHT of the statement to indicate how you feel AT THIS MOMENT. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer that seems to BEST describe your present feelings.

1. It bothers me that because I’m male, I am expected to be independent.
2. I get concerned that I don’t react to getting slagged as well as other lads do.
3. It bothers me that because I’m male, I’m expected to ‘take things on the chin.’
4. It bothers me that because I’m male, I am expected to be physically strong.
5. It bothers me that I’m not as athletic as boys should be.
6. I am bothered by the fact that because I’m male, there is an expectation that I should be successful.
7. It bothers me that because I am a lad, there is an expectation that I should be competitive.
8. It bothers me that because I am a lad, I am pressured to play sport.
9. It bothers me that because I am a lad I am expected to protect my reputation.
10. It bothers me that because I’m a lad I have to worry about getting respect.
11. I resent the fact that because I’m a lad I am expected to always be up for a bit of craic.
12. It bothers me that because I am a lad I am expected to take things in my stride.
13. It bothers me that I’m not as confident as lads should be.
14. It bothers me that I’m not as skilled at sport as compared to most lads.
15. It bothers me that I get more emotional than lads should get.
16. It bothers me that if you have a problem boys expect you to just get on with it.
17. It bothers me that most lads are pressured by their fathers to excel at sports.
18. It annoys me that boys are expected to get a job.
19. It bothers me that lads have to act differently around different people
20. It bothers me that I try to impress other people.
21. I pretend that I don’t care so that people will think I am more confident.
22. It annoys me that if a lad weren’t interested in sport, other lads would think less of him.
23. It bothers me that if a lad walks away from a fight other lads will think he’s a pussy.
24. It bothered me that if I were with a girl other lads considered ugly they would think less of me.
25. It bothers me that lads judge you by who you hang around with.
26. It bothers me that no one has anything good to say about lads my age.
27. It bothers me that people are always complaining about lads my age.
28. It annoys me that people automatically think boys are going to cause trouble.
29. I don’t think it’s fair that society doesn’t seem that interested in the welfare of boys.
30. It annoys me that just because I’m male, I’m expected to do more physical work compared to girls.
31. It annoys me that if boys cry they have to worry about their image.
32. It annoys me that people dismiss my opinion just because I am a lad.
33. I feel that I can’t talk to my friends about things that happen at home.
34. It bothers me that I have to pretend that I’m not affected by lads teasing me.
35. I wouldn’t give a boy that slagged me the satisfaction of seeing me upset.
36. It bothers me that there aren’t many ways that lads can show other lads they care about them as friends.
37. It frustrates me when girls assume they are more mature than me, just because I’m a lad.
38. It annoys me that just because I’m male, I’m expected to be more responsible than girls.
39. I feel that more and more demands are being placed on lads all the time.
40. I get annoyed by the fact that, because I’m a lad, I am expected to get drunk.
41. It annoys me that even if a lad were injured while playing a sport, people would expect him to play on.
42. It bothers me that people expect boys to able to do well in both sports and school.
43. It bothers me that boys are put under so much pressure to do well at school.
44. It bothers me that boys are put under so much pressure to do well in exams.
45. The demands that are placed on lads such as sports training, homework, social life and family life negatively affect the quality of my life.
46. Because of the demands that are placed on lads, it’s difficult for me to balance sports, schoolwork and social life.
47. Because of the demands that are placed on lads, it is difficult to balance the pressures from parents, friends, schoolwork and sports training.
48. It annoys me that if you do well in school lads will slag you about it.
49. If I did badly in an exam I wouldn’t want anyone to know because they might think less of me.
50. It bothers me that lads are pressured by other lads to take the piss out of people.
51. It annoys me that, in order to be popular, lads have to be good at certain sports.
52. It bothers me that when you’re with a group of lads, you are expected to be up for anything.
53. It bothers me that when a lad is with a group of lads he is expected to be tough.
54. When I am out with a group of lads, I feel pressure to drink.
55. When I am with a group of lads, I feel pressure to be entertaining.
56. It bothers me that lads expect you to be good craic even when you’re in bad form.
57. It annoys me that lads are expected not to care about what other people think of them.
58. It bothers me that lads don’t expect you to be annoyed when someone takes the piss out of you.
59. It bothers me that a group of lads can put pressure on you to do things you don’t want to do.
60. It bothers me that when I’m around other lads, I feel I have to pretend to be someone I’m not.
61. It bothers me that when you’re with other lads, you can never be your ‘true’ self.
62. It annoys me that around certain groups of lads I have to dumb myself down.
63. It bothers me that some boys in a group act a lot tougher than they do when they are on their own.
64. I find it hard to be myself around a group of lads.
65. It annoys me that it isn’t acceptable for lads to fail.
66. I pretend I don’t care what other lads think about me even when I really do.
67. It bothers me that most lads have to change themselves to fit the situation they are in.
68. It bothers me that most lads are expected to show different sides of themselves when they are around different groups of people.
69. If I hugged another lad I’d feel weird.
70. I don’t do what I really want to do because I am concerned about how other lads will judge me.
71. I would feel awkward hugging one of my male friends.
72. Showing another lad that I think he is a good friend is difficult for me to do.
73. It bothers me that when I talk with other lads the conversations aren’t very deep.
74. I would feel embarrassed if I cried in front of a group of lads.
75. I have wanted to talk about certain things in front of another lad but haven’t done so because I’ve been worried that he would take the piss out of me.
76. It bothers me that a lad can be emotional in front of other lads only under rare circumstances (e.g., a funeral).
77. If a lad does something bad to me I can’t show him that he has gotten to me.
78. It annoys me that a lad is expected to help out his mates even if he knows they are in the wrong.
79. It bothers me that no one has anything good to say about lads my age.
80. It annoys me that boys who are good looking have it easier than those who aren’t.
81. It bothers me that if a lad is overly sensitive, other lads will think he is gay.
82. It bothers me that, under most circumstances, lads don’t respect a lad for showing his emotions.
83. I worry that if I tell another lad something is bothering or upsetting me, he may think I’m weak.
84. It bothers me that because I’m male, if I told my friends that I care about them, they might perceive me as gay.
85. It bothers me that if I acted in any way that was considered ‘gay’ around a group of lads they would think less of me.
86. It bothers me that boys will think less of you if you act ‘soft’ around them.
87. It annoys me that if I were to wear something ‘different’, some lads might think I was gay.
88. It bothers me that boys will think less of you if you admit to acting differently around different people.
89. It bothers me that I have to get drunk in order to express my emotions.
90. It bothers me that you can’t be the same person around lads as you would be around girls.
91. It’s difficult to find the balance between how to act around a group of lads and girls.
92. It annoys me that some boys act differently around boys than they do around girls.
93. It bothers me that I can act like myself more around girls than I can around other lads.
94. Even if he doesn’t want to, a lad is expected to be more serious around girls than other lads.
95. A lad can’t be himself around girls.
96. I wish I could show how I really feel in front of girls.
97. It bothers me that even if you wanted to, you couldn’t slag a girl like you’d slag a boy.
98. It frustrates me that girls dismiss what I have to say just because I am a lad.
99. If you get in trouble people come down a lot harder on boys than they do on girls.
100. It bothers me that people are harder on boys than they are on girls just because they think boys can take it.
101. It bothers me that if lads saw how I acted around girls they would think less of me.
102. It really gets to me when some lads slag you when you are around girls.
103. It frustrates me that girls get away with being physically aggressive with lads just because they are girls.
104. It frustrates me that a girl thinks she can say whatever she wants to a boy but if a boy were to say the same thing back to a girl, people would think that it was inappropriate.
105. It annoys me that just because I am a lad, girls think they can get away with hitting you.
106. It frustrates me that girls think they can get away with insulting me just because I’m a boy.
107. It frustrates me when teachers think boys are less mature than girls.
108. It frustrates me that girls expect you to act a certain way around them.
109. It bothers me that even if I don’t want to be, I have to be more considerate of girls’ feelings.
110. It frustrates me when girls think they are smarter than me just because I am a lad.
111. Girls would think less of me if I didn’t play sport.
112. I wish I could show my emotions as freely as girls seem to do.
113. It annoys me that I have to change who I am in front of girls so that they will like me.
114. I find it hard to be myself around a group of girls.
115. When I am stressed I don’t let girls see it because of how they might think about me.
116. I pretend I don’t care what girls think about me when I really do.
117. I pretend I don’t care what teachers think about me when I really do.
118. I pretend I don’t care what my father thinks about me when I really do.
119. I pretend I don’t care what my mother thinks about me when I really do.
120. I pretend I don’t care what teachers think about me when I really do.
121. I find it hard to be myself around my parents.
122. I find it hard to be myself around my family.
123. It bothers me that my brother would think less of me if I didn’t play any sport.
124. It frustrates me that my mother doesn’t understand the amount of pressure that young lads are under.
125. It bothers me that you can’t be the same person around your parents as you can be around the lads.
126. It bothers me that, because I am a lad, I can’t talk to my mother about my personal problems.
127. It bothers me that I find it difficult to communicate with my mother.
128. When I don’t live up to my mother’s expectations, I feel like she thinks less of me as a son.
129. When I don’t live up to my mother’s expectations, I think less of myself.
130. Because I am a lad, I find it difficult to tell my mother I love her.
### Appendix I

**The Adolescent Masculine Ideology in Relationships Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree A lot</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It’s important for a guy to act like nothing is wrong, even when something is bothering him.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In a good dating relationship, the guy gets his way most of the time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I can respect a guy who backs down from a fight.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It’s ok for a guy to say no to sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guys should not let it show when their feelings are hurt.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A guy never needs to hit another guy to get respect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If a guy tells people his worries, he will look weak.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I think it’s important for a guy to go after what he wants, even if it means hurting other people’s feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I think it is important for a guy to act like he is sexually active even if he is not.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would be friends with a guy who is gay.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It’s embarrassing for a guy when he needs to ask for help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

The Family Affluence Scale II (FAS II; Boyce and Dallago, 2004)

(Please Tick/Write in the appropriate option).

1. How many computers does your family own?
   - None
   - One
   - Two
   - More than two

2. Do you have your own bedroom for yourself? No □ Yes □

3. During the past 12 months, how many times did you travel away on holiday with your family?
   - Not at all
   - Once
   - Twice
   - More than twice

4. Does your family own a car, van or truck?
   - No
   - Yes, one
   - Yes, two or more

Thank you for your responses. Please continue to the next section.
**Appendix K**

*Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Inventory (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965)*

**DIRECTIONS:** A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then **CIRCLE** the number to the **RIGHT** of the statement to indicate how you feel **AT THIS MOMENT**. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer that seems to **BEST** describe your present feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately So</th>
<th>Very Much So</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel I am a person of worth at least on an equal plane with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. At times I think that I am no good at all.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Principal,

My name is Cormac O Beaglaoich; I am a Ph.D. student in the School of Psychology at NUI, Galway. I am writing to you to ask you for your permission to conduct research within your school. I am currently undertaking research which is looking at masculine ideology among adolescent males’ within Ireland and examining the association of these attitudes with self-reported levels physical and psychological health. A lot of research has been conducted on how the endorsement of masculine ideology (such as stoicism, restrictive emotional expression, physical toughness, dominance, competition and anti-femininity) have been associated with lower levels of self-esteem, higher levels of depression and anxiety in adults. There is little research done in this area with regards to adolescents. We would therefore be grateful for your support in this matter, and hope that the visible support from the Dept. will convince you of the importance that is being attached to this research.

Participation in this study involves consent forms and information sheets being sent to parents/guardians of all students aged 13 and over. We will send on all materials so that all that is required is filling in the names of the parents. We are using passive consent procedure that is common procedure internationally and in Ireland. Essentially consent forms and information sheets will be sent to the parents/guardians. Included will be a slip of paper which can be returned to the school should the parents not wish their child to be included in the research.
One week following the consent forms being sent to the parents/guardians, survey packs will be sent to the school for all the students aged 13 and over. These packs include the questionnaire and information sheets. I have included a copy of this survey pack for your inspection. It should be noted that this survey has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee at NUI, Galway. Students will spend approximately 10-15 minutes reading the information sheet and completing the questionnaire. They retain the right at all times to withdraw from the research without penalty and are not compelled to complete it unless they so desire. The principal researcher will accompany the teacher in handing out the survey packs and informing the students as to the total anonymity and confidentiality of the study (i.e., telling students NOT to write their names on the questionnaires) and collecting them after completion. We envisage that these questionnaires could be administered during a religion/civics lesson so as to foster a class discussion on what is a major facet of Irish life. As we do not anticipate any risk to students in conducting this research, safety procedures will be emphasised. A local psychologist or school counsellor will be contacted and informed of the research, and numbers for support organisations (the Samaritans and Aware) will be provided for students on their information sheets. Also, on the behalf of schools and students, the principal investigator can contact support groups (such as the Samaritans and Aware) to come to the school shortly after the research has been conducted, if deemed appropriate.

In terms of the benefits of this study, it is hoped that our results will broaden the understanding of how masculine ideologies are developed, maintained and demonstrated within Irish society. This has not previously been studied in Ireland, and this research may give great insight into the lives and attitudes of this under represented group. We also believe that students will benefit by gaining insight into: 1) how psychologists conduct research; and 2) how certain aspects of masculine ideology can have negative consequences for others and themselves.

The data collected will be recorded electronically or on paper. However, all information that is collected, during the course of the research, will be kept strictly confidential (i.e., the researchers will keep any information collected secret) and will not be
shared with anyone else other than the research team. The information collected in this
research study also will be stored in a way that protects student’s identities and signed consent
forms collected on the day will be separate from the questionnaire packet. All participants
will be invited to take part in a follow study (in a few years time). All data collected will be
kept securely for up to 5 years after which they will be destroyed. Participants who wish to
take part in a follow up study will have their data stored for up to 10 years before being
destroyed. Finally, a full debriefing report and the general result of the findings will be made
available to the Board of Management of your school and at www.nuigalway.ie/psy/ at the
end of the study.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact myself Mr. Cormac
O Beaglaoich by phone at 091-512360 or by email at cormacbegley@gmail.com or my
research supervisor, Dr. Kiran Sarma by at phone: 091-495715 or by email:
kiran.sarma@nuigalway.ie.

My thanks for taking the time to read this letter and I hope to hear from you soon.
Yours Sincerely,
Appendix M

National University of Ireland, Galway
Ollscoil na hÉireann, Gaillimh

Information Sheet
Development and Validation of Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents

Invitation to participate
Your son has been invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether you would or would not like him to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. This Information Sheet will tell you about the purpose, risks and benefits of this research study. If you agree for your son to take part, we will ask him for his consent to participate. If there is anything that you are not clear about, we will be happy to explain it to you.

If you do not consent to your son’s participation in this research please return the attached ‘refusal’ letter in the envelope.

The research
The current research assesses adolescent boys’ beliefs about being a man within Irish society. We need to recruit males between the ages of 13 and 18 years old. Please note that your son’s participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and that he may withdraw at any time, without penalty or consequence. Your son’s participation in this study involves completing a questionnaire packet concerning masculine ideology, anxiety, self-esteem and depression. It is anticipated that this will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. It is hoped that the current research will broaden the understanding of adolescent males’ experiences in Ireland.

All data will be kept strictly confidential. The information collected in this research study will be stored in a way that protects your son’s identity. We will store the data securely for 5 years after which they will be destroyed. Results from the study will not identify your child in any way. A full debriefing report will be made available @ www.nuigalway.ie/psy at the end of the study.

Contact details for people should you have concerns/questions about the research
If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact Dr. Kiran Sarma, Clinical Doctorate Programme, Floor 2, Woodquay Court, Galway @ (091)493266 or Mr. Cormac O Beaglaoich, Room 102, Cois Abhainn, NUI, Galway @ 087 9625425. If you have any concerns about this study and wish to contact someone independent and in confidence, you may contact the Chairperson of the NUI Galway Research Ethics Committee, c/o Office of the Vice President for Research, NUI Galway, ethics@nuigalway.ie

Contact details for help/support organisations
It is not anticipated that the questions in this research will be distressing or cause upset. However, you may wish to talk to somebody about issues raised by the research. In the event of this occurring, you
are welcome to contact either Mr. Cormac Ó Beaglaoich or Dr. Kiran Sarma who will be able to provide contact details for relevant support organisations.

Dr. Kiran Sarma, C.Psychol.  Cormac Ó Beaglaoich (PhD candidate),
Lecturer in Psychology  School of Psychology,
NUI Galway  NUI, Galway
091 495715  0879625425
kiran.sarma@nuigalway.ie  cormacbegley@gmail.com

Appendix N

Demographics Questionnaire

(Please Tick/Write in the appropriate option).

1. Age: __________ Years (e.g., 13, 16, 18)

2. What year are you in?: __________ (e.g., 1st year, 3rd year, 5th year)

3. Ethnic or cultural background:
   - Irish
   - Any other white background
   - African
   - Any other black background
   - Chinese
   - Any other Asian background
   - Other (Please Specify): __________________

4. How many brothers do you have?: __________ (e.g., 0, 1, 3)

5. How many sisters do you have?: __________ (e.g., 0, 2, 4)

6. In your family, how many siblings do you have that are OLDER than you? __________
   (Note: if you are the oldest child, then write 0)

7. What month were you born in?: __________ (e.g., January, February, March, November, etc.)

8. How religious do you consider yourself to be?
   - Very religious
   - Religious
   - Somewhat religious
   - Not very religious
   - Not at all religious

9. How often do you attend a church/synagogue/temple?
   - At least once a week
   - Almost every week
   - About once a month
   - Rarely
   - Never

10. Sexual Orientation:
Exclusively Heterosexual (straight)  □
More Heterosexual (straight) than Gay  □
Bisexual  □
More Gay than Heterosexual (straight)  □
Exclusively Gay  □
Please write in: __________________

Appendix O

The Irish Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents (26 items)

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then CIRCLE the number to the RIGHT of the statement to indicate how you feel AT THIS MOMENT. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer that seems to BEST describe your present feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It bothers me that people are harder on boys than they are on girls just because they think boys can take it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It annoys me that people automatically think boys are going to cause trouble.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It bothers me that if I were with a girl other lads considered ugly they would think less of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It bothers me that, because I am a lad, I find it hard to talk to my father about my personal problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Because of the demands that are placed on lads, it is difficult to balance the pressures from parents, friends, schoolwork and sports training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It bothers me that, under most circumstances, lads don’t respect a lad for showing his emotions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It bothers me that when you’re with a group of lads, you are expected to be up for anything.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It bothers me that most lads have to change themselves to fit the situation they are in.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It bothers me that lads expect you to be good craic even when you’re in bad form.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It bothers me that lads don’t expect you to be annoyed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It bothers me that a group of lads can put pressure on you to do things you don’t want to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I pretend I don’t care what other lads think about me even when I really do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When I am with a group of lads, I feel pressure to be entertaining.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. It bothers me that most lads are expected to show different sides of themselves when they are around different groups of people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It bothers me that a lad can be emotional in front of other lads only under rare circumstances (e.g., a funeral).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It bothers me that if a lad is overly sensitive, other lads will think he is gay.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It bothers me that lads are pressured by other lads to take the piss out of people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It bothers me that boys will think less of you if you act ‘soft’ around them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It bothers me that you can’t be the same person around lads as you would be around girls.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It bothers me that people expect boys to able to do well in both sports and school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It annoyed me that a lad is expected to help out his mates even if he knows they are in the wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If you get in trouble people come down a lot harder on boys than they do on girls.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. It’s difficult to find the balance between how to act around a group of lads and girls.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. It really gets to me when some lads slag you when you are around girls.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. It frustrates me that my father doesn’t understand the amount of pressure that young lads are under.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The demands that are placed on lads such as sports training, homework, social life and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family life negatively affect the quality of my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. A guy should always seem as manly as other guys that he knows.

2. A guy should be able to take teasing from his friends.

3. Acting manly should be the most important goal for guys.

4. A guy must always appear confident even if he isn’t.

5. It is normal for guys to make fun of their friends.

6. It is not important for guys to listen to each other’s problems.

7. Guys should try to appear manly in almost all situations.

8. It is not a guy’s job to comfort a friend who is upset.

9. Getting made fun of helps guys become tough.

10. A good way to seem manly is to avoid acting gay.

11. It would be embarrassing for a guy to admit he is interested in being a hair dresser.

12. When a guy has a fear, he should keep it to himself.

13. It is hard to respect a guy who shows his feelings.

14. If a guy is upset about something, he should hold it in.

15. A guy who wears nail polish is hard to take seriously.

16. It is embarrassing to have a lot of gay friends.

17. Being thought of as gay makes a guy seem like less of a man.

18. Guys should not talk about their worries with each other.

19. Guys do not pick on each other to be mean.

20. In order to fit in, guys must be able to tease other guys.

*Appendix P – The Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale*
Appendix Q


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is something wrong if a guy wants to do activities usually done by girls.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A guy should never back down from a challenge in public.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “Real” guys never act like a girl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is nothing wrong with a guy who picks on his friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No matter what happens, a guy should seem strong to others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is weird for a guy to talk about his feelings with other guys.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A guy should be embarrassed to ‘run like a girl’.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DIRECTIONS:** A number of statements which boys and girls use to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and decide if it is *hardly ever* or *sometimes* or *often* true for you. Then for each statement, put an X in the box in front of the word that seems to DESCRIBE YOU BEST. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement. Remember: choose the response which seems to describe how you usually feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>hardly ever</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I worry about making mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel like crying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel unhappy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel have trouble making up my mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is difficult for me to face my problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I worry too much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I get upset at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am shy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel troubled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Unimportant thoughts run through my mind and bother me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I worry about school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I have trouble deciding what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I notice my heart beats fast.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I worry about my parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My hands get sweaty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I worry about things that may happen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is hard for me to fall asleep at night.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I get a funny feeling in my stomach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I worry about what others think of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix R*
**DIRECTIONS:** Below is a list of ways you might have felt or behaved. Please tell me **how often** you have felt this way **during the past week**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the Past Week – please tick the box □</th>
<th>Rarely or none of the time (less than one day)</th>
<th>Some or a little of the time (1-2 days)</th>
<th>Occasionally or a moderate amount of the time (3-4 days)</th>
<th>Most or all of the time (5-7 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I was just as good as other people.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt depressed.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that everything I did was an effort.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt hopeful about the future.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought my life had been a failure.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt fearful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sleep was restless.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was happy.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talked less than usual.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt lonely.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People were unfriendly.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed life.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had crying spells.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt sad.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that people dislike me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not get “going”.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S

9-item I-GRCS-A

1. It bothers me that people are harder on boys than they are on girls just because they think boys can take it.

2. It bothers me that lads expect you to be good craic even when you’re in bad form.

3. It bothers me that a group of lads can put pressure on you to do things you don’t want to do.

4. When I am with a group of lads, I feel pressure to be entertaining.

5. It bothers me that a lad can be emotional in front of other lads only under rare circumstances (e.g., a funeral).

6. It bothers me that boys will think less of you if you act ‘soft’ around them.

7. It bothers me that people expect boys to able to do well in both sports and school.

8. It’s difficult to find the balance between how to act around a group of lads and girls.

9. The demands that are placed on lads such as sports training, homework, social life and family life negatively affect the quality of my life.
Appendix T

Positive and Negative Suicide Ideation (PANSI) Inventory

Read each statement and then **CIRCLE** the number to the **RIGHT** of the statement to indicate how you have felt in the **PAST TWO WEEKS, INCLUDING TODAY**. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer that seems to **BEST** describe your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>None of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seriously considered killing yourself because you could not live up to the expectations of other people?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Felt that you were in control of most situations in your life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Felt hopeless about the future and you wondered if you should kill yourself?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Felt so unhappy about your relationship with someone you wished you were dead?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thought about killing yourself because you could not accomplish something important in your life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Felt hopeful about the future because things were not working out well for you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thought about killing yourself because you could not find a solution to a personal problem?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Felt excited because you were doing well at school or at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Thought about killing yourself because you felt like a failure in life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thought that your problems were so overwhelming that suicide was seen as the only option for you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Felt so lonely or sad you wanted to kill yourself so that you could end your pain?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Felt confident about your ability to cope with most of the problems in your life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Felt that life was worth living?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Felt confident about your plans for the future?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Principal/Board of Management,

My name is Cormac O Beaglaoich. I am a Ph.D. student in the School of Psychology at NUI Galway. I am writing to you to seek permission to conduct research within boys attending your school.

I am currently undertaking research that looks at masculine ideology among adolescent males within Ireland and examining the association of these attitudes with self-reported levels of physical and psychological health. A lot of research has been conducted on how boys have been socialised (how boys may have been brought up to be ‘tough’, ‘dominant’, ‘competitive’ and not to show any emotions) and how that is related to low self-esteem, depression and anxiety in adults. There is little research done in this area with adolescents and especially amongst Irish adolescents. This research hopes to investigate the links between how boys are brought up, self-esteem, depression and suicide ideation and intent (e.g. whether boys think about or intend to commit suicide).

Participation in this study involves consent forms and information sheets being sent to parents/guardians of all students aged 16 and over. We are employing an active consent procedure that is common procedure internationally and in Ireland. Essentially, consent forms and information sheets will be sent to the parents/guardians (by post or handed to students to bring home). Included will be a slip of paper which can be returned to the school should the parents wish their child to be included in the research.

Two weeks following the consent forms being sent to the parents/guardians, survey packs will be brought to the school and given to students aged 16 and over. These packs include the questionnaire and information sheets. I have included a copy of this survey pack for your inspection. This project has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee at NUI, Galway. Research that asks adolescents about topics such as gender role conflict, self-esteem, depression and suicide ideation may be upsetting for some boys. In this study we do not expect distress to arise from participation in this research, but have a protocol in place to manage distress should it arise. The measures included in this study are the;

a) Positive and Negative Suicide Ideation Inventory; b) the Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents; c) Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory; d) Cedscale Depression Inventory; and e) demographic information (age, ethnicity, etc.).

Students will spend approximately 15 minutes reading the information sheet and completing the questionnaire. They retain the right at all times to withdraw from the research without penalty and
are not compelled to complete it unless they so desire. I will accompany the teacher in handing out the survey packs and informing the students as to the total anonymity and confidentiality of the study (e.g., telling students NOT to write their names on the questionnaires) and collecting them after completion. Individuals will not be identifiable from the information they provide and the research team will not be able to follow-up with participants. In the event of participants experiencing distress, the research team will: a) encourage students before and after completing the questionnaire battery that if they would like to discuss any issues raised that the school counsellor will be available to speak with them; b) include help agency contact details (i.e., Aware or Spunout.ie) in each questionnaire packet; and c) put posters for help agencies on notice boards. We envisage that these questionnaires could be administered during a religion/civics lesson so as to foster a class discussion on what is a major facet of Irish life.

In terms of the benefits of this study, it is hoped that our results will broaden the understanding of how masculine ideologies are developed, maintained and demonstrated within Irish society. This has not previously been studied in Ireland, and this research may provide insight into the lives and attitudes of adolescent males. We also believe that students will benefit by gaining insight into: 1) how psychologists conduct research; and 2) how certain aspects of masculine ideology can have negative consequences for others and themselves.

The data collected will be recorded on paper. However, all information that is collected during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential and will not be shared with anyone else other than the research team. The information collected in this research study also will be stored in a way that protects students’ identities and signed consent forms collected on the day will be held separately from the questionnaires. All paper-based data collected will be kept securely for up to 5 years after which they will be destroyed. Finally, a full debriefing report and the general results of the findings will be made available to the Board of Management of your school and posted online at www.nuigalway.ie/psy/ at the end of the study.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact myself Mr. Cormac O Beaglaoich by phone at 087-9625425 or by email at cormacbegley@gmail.com, or my research supervisor, Dr. Kiran Sarma by phone (091-493266) or by email: kiran.sarma@nuigalway.ie . My thanks for taking the time to read this letter.

Yours Sincerely,
Appendix V

If you wish to talk to someone about issues raised by the research, please contact:
Dr. Sarma (091 495715)
or Mr. Ó Beaglaoich (087 9625425)

Relevant Support Organisations
\nAware 1890 303 302
Samaritans 1850 60 90 90
Childline 1800 666 666
Spun Out info@spunout.ie
Appendix W

Information Sheet

Invitation to participate
Your son has been invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether you would or would not like him to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. This Information Sheet will tell you about the purpose, risks and benefits of this research study. If you agree for your son to take part, we will ask him for his consent to participate. If there is anything that you are not clear about, we will be happy to explain it to you.

If you DO consent to your son’s participation in this research please sign and return the attached ‘consent’ form in the envelope.

The research
The current research assesses adolescent boys’ beliefs about being a man within Irish society. We need to recruit males between the ages of 16 and 19 years old. Please note that your son’s participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and that he may withdraw at any time, without penalty or consequence. Your son’s participation in this study involves completing a questionnaire packet concerning masculine ideology, self-esteem, depression, suicide ideation and intent. It is anticipated that this will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. It is hoped that the current research will broaden the understanding of adolescent males’ experiences in Ireland.

All data will be kept strictly confidential. The information collected in this research study will be stored in a way that protects your son’s identity. We will store the data securely for 5 years after which they will be destroyed. Results from the study will not identify your child in any way. A full debriefing report will be made available @ www.nuigalway.ie/psy at the end of the study.

Contact details for people should you have concerns/questions about the research
If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact Dr. Kiran Sarma, Clinical Doctorate Programme, Floor 2, Woodquay Court, Galway @ (091)493266 or Mr. Cormac O Beaglaoich @ 087 9625425. If you have any concerns about this study and wish to contact someone independent and in confidence, you may contact the Chairperson of the NUI Galway Research Ethics Committee, c/o Office of the Vice President for Research, NUI Galway, ethics@nuigalway.ie

Contact details for help/support organisations
It is not anticipated that the questions in this research will be distressing or cause upset. However, you may wish to talk to somebody about issues raised by the research. In the event of this occurring, you are welcome to contact either Mr. Cormac O Beaglaoich or Dr. Kiran Sarma who will be able to provide contact details for relevant support organisations.

Dr. Kiran Sarma, C.Psychol.
Lecturer in Psychology
NUI Galway
091 495715
kiran.sarma@nuigalway.ie

Cormac Ó Beaglaoich (PhD candidate),
School of Psychology,
NUI, Galway
0879625425
cormacbegley@gmail.com
Cormac Ó Beaglaoich
Cuas, Baile na nGall,
Trá Lí, Co. Chiaraí, Ireland.
cormacbegley@gmail.com

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Masculinity, gender role conflict, adolescence and psychometrics

EDUCATION

National University of Ireland, Galway PhD in Arts (Psychology)
2008 – Present

National University of Ireland, Galway B.A. Psychology (Honours)
2003 – 2006

National University of Ireland, Galway Diploma in Irish (Distinction)
2004 – 2006

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS

O’Beaglaoich, C., Sarma, K., & Morrison, T.G. (2013). New directions in gender role conflict research. In J. Gelfer (Ed.), Masculinities in a global era (pp. 17-51). New York: Springer. As senior author, I was responsible for all phases of the research (e.g., recruitment of discussants) and played an integral role in all elements of manuscript preparation.

Morrison, T.G., Beaulieu, D., Brockman, M., & O’Beaglaoich, C. (2012). A comparison of polyamorous and monoamorous persons: Are there differences in indices of relationship well-being and sociosexuality? Psychology & Sexuality, 1-17. As co-author, I was responsible for reviewing relevant literature, addressing feedback received from the reviewers and (re)editing the document prior to its resubmission.


Ryan, T.A., Morrison, T.G., & O’Beaglaoich, C. (2010). Adolescent males’ body image: An overview of research on the influence of mass media. In M. Kehler & M. Atkinson (Eds.), Boys and bodies (pp. 21-50). Peter Lang
Publishers. As co-author, I was responsible for reviewing relevant literature, addressing feedback received from the reviewers and (re)editing the document prior to its re-submission.

**Peer Reviewed Publications Under Consideration**


**Manuscripts in Preparation**


**Presentations**

New directions in gender role conflict research. Invited speaker, Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan (November 26th, 2012).

Gender role conflict in Irish adolescent males. Invited speaker, Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan (October 25th, 2010).

A qualitative investigation of gender role conflict amongst Irish adolescent males. Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences 2 (QMSS 2) programme at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland (August 18th, 2010).


**Poster Presentations**


AWARDS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

Academic Awards
Irish Research Council Award (2010-2012 [16,000 Euro per annum]). This highly prestigious award was granted on the basis of academic and research excellence.

National University of Ireland, Galway Travel Bursary (2010 [490 Euro])

School of Psychology Research Award, National University of Ireland, Galway (2011 [500 Euro per annum]). This award was granted on the basis of research excellence.

Department of Psychology Research Assistant Award, University of Saskatchewan (2010 [1,000 Canadian Dollars]). This honorarium was granted in recognition of research assistance on several projects, one of which was published in a peer-reviewed academic journal (i.e., Psychology & Sexuality).

School of Psychology Research Award, National University of Ireland, Galway (2010 [500 Euro]). This award was granted on the basis of research excellence.

Pedagogic Stipend, National University of Ireland, Galway (2010 [300 Euro]). This funding was given to facilitate attendance at the Social Sciences 2 (QMSS 2) programme at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland.

Kerry County Council Grant (2008 - 2012 [18,000 Euro])

Kerry County Council Grant (2003 - 2006 [18,000 Euro])
Awards for Musicianship
I am the founder, organiser and artistic director of the ‘Tunes in the Church’ concert series. This initiative promotes the authentic presentation of traditional Irish music in three churches along the west coast of Ireland (Westport, Galway and Killarney). Each concert supports and features different combinations of musicians, singers and dancers and are geared at both tourist audiences and Irish music followers. One of the aspects of this concert series that differentiates it from other formal traditional concerts is the element of interactive involvement by the audience. These concerts are held during the summer months (June, July and August) and, to date, over 175 different performers have performed to date. In 2011, 2012 and 2013, I organised 74 concerts per year. ‘Tunes in the Church’ has received 5 awards: 1) 2nd place in the Student Union Entrepreneur Award (2012 [5,000 Euro]); 2) Finalist in the Student Union Entrepreneur Award (2012 [500 Euro]); 3) Galway City Arts Council Award (2010, 2012 [2,000 Euros]); and 4) Deis Award from Arts Council of Ireland Traditional Arts Initiative (2011 [19,000 Euro]). The latter is highly prestigious and granted on the basis of the cultural significance of traditional Irish music. In July 2013, I produced a compilation CD entitled, ‘Tunes in the Church’ featuring many of the performers that have played at the ‘Tunes in the Church’ over the past 4 years. This CD received a 4-star review in the ‘Irish Times’ and was described as a ‘snapshot in time that is sure to stand its test with no small touch of class’ (Siobhán Long, August 2013).

Kerry County Council Traditional Irish Music Recording Scheme (2012 [1,500 Euros]). My family and I were given this award to record a family album based on music from the West Kerry Peninsula.

‘Na Fir Bolg’, a duet CD that I recorded with Jack Talty, a fellow concertina player, was awarded the prestigious ‘CD of the Year 2011’ (TradConnect, 2011).

Reviews of the duet track recorded with my sister Clíodhna on the ‘Tunes in the Church CD’:
‘Sublime’ – Tradconnect (July, 2013)
‘Track of the week’ – Tradconnect (July, 2013)
‘A masterclass in timeless musicianship and restrained emotion, with Cormac exploiting the bellows of his instrument to the fullest’ (Siobhán Long, Irish Times, August 2013).

Culture Ireland Funding Award to support and promote the presentation of Irish arts internationally (2010 [3,400 Euro]). My family and I were awarded this prestigious award to travel to Cuba, Havana, to perform at the inaugural Celtfest Cuba Festival (April, 2010).
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING

- Reviewer for publications submitted to:
  Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science (CJBS) – 2 Reviews
  Canadian Psychological Association's Annual Convention (2010) – 9 Abstract Reviews
- Completed National University of Ireland, Galway-certified course in Postgraduate Development (2009).
- Successfully applied for admission into the prestigious German Social Science Infrastructure Services (GESIS) Postgraduate Teaching Program for social scientists. The program I attended was entitled, ‘Categorical Latent Variable Models: Extended Class Analyses’ (March 11-18, 2011).
- Successfully applied for admission into the prestigious Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences 2 (QMSS 2) programme. I attended the program “Understanding survey quality” at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland (August 13-20, 2010).
- Participated in workshops on structural equation modelling offered at the National University of Ireland, Galway (February, 2010).
- Received training in psychometric and data analytic techniques (Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis) at the University of Ulster (July, 2009).
- Received training in N-Vivo (qualitative analysis software) at the National University of Ireland, Galway (January, 2009).
- Attended a two-day master class with Dr. Lisa Jewell who is an expert on qualitative methodology. We discussed issues relating to thematic analysis and how to utilize qualitative research to inform item generation for scale development (October, 2010).

TEACHER TRAINING & EXPERIENCE

- Served as a tutor for first year psychology students (2008-2010). My responsibilities included: providing lectures; facilitating group discussion, and marking MCQ tests and essays.
- Completed a module called Small Group Teaching Skills for Arts Postgraduates as part of the Certificate in Postgraduate Development offered at the National University of Ireland Galway.

VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE
• In 2010, I volunteered for a call-centre help-line. I have received training on how to engage with people who are experiencing feelings of distress or despair and suicide ideation.

• During the summer months of 2006, I went to Sri Lanka to engage in volunteer work under the supervision of Dr. Peter Doray-Raj, Clinical Psychologist), Brothers of Charity, Galway. While there, I worked within communities that were directly affected by the tsunami. The work varied, from overseeing psychosocial community programs (specifically targeting children and adolescents) and administering psychological tests, to teaching English and Music.

**Professional Memberships**

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Professional Membership</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Member of the 1st European chapter of Psi Chi (International Honours Society in Psychology)</td>
<td>2010 – Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
<td>2008 – Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Psychological Study of Men &amp; Masculinity (APA, Division 51)</td>
<td>2008 – Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dr. Todd G. Morrison,
Department of Psychology,
University of Saskatchewan,
Saskatoon,
SK, S7N 5A5, Canada.
(001) 306-966-6700
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Rev. Gary Hastings,
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The Rectory,
Taylor’s Hill,
Galway,
[091] 521914
gryhastings@iol.ie

James Harrold,
Galway Arts Officer,
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City Hall,
College Road,
Notes

1. The masculine mystique is seen as a front that men put up by giving up their femininity (e.g., expression and emotion) in order to maintain their position or power’ (Kahn, 2009, p.221).

2. We acknowledge that causal language has been used in the presence of many studies that are correlational in nature. However, it is possible that those evidencing compromised psychological well-being are more likely to regard themselves as “defective men”.

3. The endorsement of traditional masculinities can have negative consequences for either the male himself or others because many of these characteristics are inherently negative.

4. These contexts are: (a) deviating from or violating gender role norms of masculinity ideology; (b) trying to meet or failing to meet gender role norms of masculinity ideology; (c) experiencing discrepancies between real and ideal self-concepts; (d) devaluing and/or restricting oneself for failing to meet masculinity ideology norms; and (e) experiencing personal devaluations and/or restrictions from others for deviating from masculinity ideology norms; f) personally devaluing, restricting, or violating others because of their deviation from or conformity to masculinity ideology norms (O’Neil, 2008).

5. However, the endorsement of masculine ideology items do not differentiate between males that are affected by the presence of an expectation/ masculine norm and males that merely acknowledge the existence of, but are not affected by, this expectation/ masculine norm.

6. For further reading on this topic consult Fabrigar, Wegner, MacCallum and Strahan (1999).

7. A total sample of 41 participants were given the GRCS-A to evaluate each item by indicating an ‘x’ next to the items they deemed inappropriate/ unsuitable and a ‘tick’ next to items they deemed appropriate/suitable. Stage 2 of the interview process, in some instances, only lasted a number of minutes, whereas other interviews were longer. As some boys omitted certain items, an estimate of the approval of items is based on those who indicated either a ‘tick’ or an ‘x’ to a specific question. Hence, there is a difference in the total number of participants for each item.

8. The number of participants varies for each item because not all participants discussed all questions.

9. Eight out of 21 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of item 23; 14 out of 19 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of item 24; and 7 out of 17 participants across both focus groups and individual interviews disapproved of item 26.
‘Taking the piss’ in this instance means that boys would, for their own enjoyment or for the enjoyment of other’s, intentionally and mockingly write down the wrong answer.’

Masculine expectations will be used as a broad overarching term that encompasses masculine stereotypes, ideals and norms (Pleck, 1995).

The goal was to create an expansive list of themes; that is, we weren’t interested in proving that one person’s interpretation was more accurate or truthful than another person’s.

Higher scores indicates easier readability and range from 0 to 100.

EM has been used in studies were missing data were as high as 60 to 70% (Owen et al., 2007).

One participant didn’t specify what year he attended.

There were no significant differences found in GRC scores between participants categorised in high vs medium SES bracket.

However, MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang and Hong (1999) argue that ‘when communalities are all high, sample size will have relatively little impact on quality of solutions, meaning that accurate recovery of population solutions may be obtained using a fairly small sample (p. 90). Further, ‘rules of thumb’ are not stringent guidelines and have been subject to criticism (Costello & Osborne, 2005).

Parallel analysis involves the creation of 100 (or more) random data sets from the original data set and the computation of eigenvalues for each resultant random set (through principal axis factoring). Then, for each eigenvalue, a 95th percentile value (or mean) is computed for the 100 random data sets. Only eigenvalues from the original data set that are greater than the averaged 95th percentile (or mean) from the 100 random data sets are retained (Blashill & Vander Wal, 2009).

Two participants didn’t specify what year in school they attended.

There are different opinions within the research regarding estimates of fit indices. For example, some researchers recommend that cut-off point for CFI are optimal when they are scores above .90 (Bentler & Bonett, 1980), whereas as others demand higher and more stringent fit indices (> .95; Hu & Bentler, 1999). For the purpose of this thesis, scores of .90 and above were deemed acceptable scores for model fit.

RMSEA and SRMR less than .10 indicate an acceptable fit for sample sizes smaller than 500 (Weston & Gore, 2006).

More females compared to males die by completed suicide in China, particular in rural areas, where access to highly lethal insecticides is increased and treatment facilities are harder to access (World Health Organisation, 2002).

The response rate varied from school to school and higher response rates were observed in schools that were more organised (i.e., some schools sent text messages to parents to remind them to sign parental consent forms).

Pearson correlations (continuous variables) and χ² tests (dichotomous variables) showed no statistically significant relationship between the demographic variables of age, ethnicity, religiosity and SES and the self-report measures (i.e., I-GRCS-A, RSE, CES-D, PANSI-P and PANSI-N).