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ABSTRACT

DISSERTATION: Roman Catholic Males’ Religiousness, Masculine Norms, and Attitudes toward Gay Men

STUDENT: David Francis Adams

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

COLLEGE: College of Education (Teachers College)

DATE: July, 2014

PAGES: 107

The present study provides a comprehensive investigation of Roman Catholic males’ endorsement of traditional masculine norms and attitudes toward gay men. This study sought to address methodological issues in past investigations of religiousness, masculine norms, and attitudes toward members of the LGB community. Additionally, the present study employed the use of structural equation modeling (SEM) to better assess the complex relationship among variables of interest. The results of the present study indicate that a clear picture of the relationship among variables was not obtained in either SEM model. However, the results do indicate that stronger endorsements of conservative religiousness and masculine role norms both serve as predictors of attitudes toward gay men. This study provides recommendations for future investigations of these variables as well as research and clinical implications of the results obtained.
Introduction

Religion has been a variable of interest within psychological literature, as it relates to numerous dimensions of human functioning. Tarakeshwar, Stanton, and Pargament (2003) noted religion is a relevant cultural variable for individuals from a multitude of backgrounds. Additionally, these authors reported that religion has been shown to contribute to aspects of human functioning, beliefs, traditions, and attitudes. King (2005) posited that religion has served to impact people’s attitudes and beliefs for centuries and still does today. Authors such as Worthington (2004) have drawn attention to the intersection between religion and sexuality, stating these elements of human life were extremely related as sexual behaviors and attitudes are often regulated by various religious belief systems. Similarly, Yip (2005 highlighted that a large number of religious belief systems have adopted negative and punitive positions regarding homosexuality. Krondorfer (2007) highlighted this as problematic in light of religious perspectives that adopt a minimalistic view of gender and sexuality.

These beliefs regarding homosexuality are reflective of the cultural practice of heterosexism, which is the belief that “people are or should be attracted to people of the other gender” (Lance, 2002, p. 410). Heterosexism is a cultural variable within Western society, which stipulates that “heterosexuality is natural, normal, and morally correct” (Morrison, Kenny, & Harrington, 2005, p. 223). Hunter (2010) identified the presence of heterosexism in numerous belief systems, where a moralistic approach is adopted as a means of repudiating same-sex attraction and/or behaviors. Adamczyk and Pitt (2009) noted that “personal religious beliefs and affiliation are typically seen as powerful predictors of attitudes about homosexuality” (p. 339). They further noted a variety of differences in perspectives on sexuality and, more specifically, homosexuality across religious belief systems and denominations.
Religiousness and Attitudes toward Homosexuality

A body of literature has been amassed over the past few decades assessing the relationship between religiousness and prejudice, specifically negative attitudes toward homosexuality. Herek (2004) detailed that sexual prejudice is understood as negative attitudes toward sexual minorities, and is most commonly endorsed by powerful members of society against those “who engage in homosexual behavior or label themselves gay, lesbian, or bisexual” (p. 16-17). Several authors (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Duck & Hunsberger, 1993; Herek, 1987; Kirkpatrick, 1993; Laythe et al, 2002; Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2011; Mak & Tsang, 2008; Rowatt et al, 2009; Vincent, Parrott, & Peterson, 2011) have found empirical support for an existing relationship between dimensions of religiousness and sexual prejudice. Some are explained below.

**Religious Orientation.** Religious orientation has been defined as encompassing three dimensions within the psychological literature – an intrinsic religious orientation (internalization of one’s religion; Descriptive Statistics), an extrinsic religious orientation (using one’s religion in useful ways; Allport & Ross, 1967; Gorusch & McPherson, 1989), and a quest religious orientation (willingness to entertain existential questions, be self-critical, and be open to change; Batson & Schoenrade, 1991b). A person’s religious orientation has been the focus of several investigations of prejudicial attitudes. For example, Herek (1987) conducted an analysis of the relationship between religious orientation and prejudice, reporting religious teachings that did not emphasize inclusion contributed to prejudice in persons. Herek concluded that persons of religious communities that condemn homosexuality with intrinsic religious orientations were more likely to endorse hostility toward gay men and lesbian women compared to individuals who identified as being members of more accepting religious communities. Herek (1987)
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suggested that religious orientation and prejudice serve to affirm people’s position related to others in society.

Recent research has identified differences between religiousness and sexual prejudice and racial prejudice. Duck and Hunsberger (1993) conducted a multi-study analysis of religious orientation and prejudice, and identified that religious communities often view racial prejudice as proscribed (i.e., prohibited) while prejudicial attitudes toward sexual minorities are often non-proscribed (i.e., legitimized). In a more recent investigation, Mak and Tsang (2008) concluded that “religious orientation is a critical variable in the relationship between religiousness and sexual prejudice” (p. 380), citing numerous studies that have established a correlation between religious orientation and sexual prejudice. These authors utilized questionnaire’s assessing intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest religious orientations. These authors found that intrinsic religiousness was correlated with prejudice against sexually active gay individuals. Additionally, Rowatt, LaBouff, Johnson, Froese, and Tsang (2009) retrieved data from a national sample and found that higher religiousness was significantly correlated with a lack of acceptance toward people identifying as gay or lesbian. However, these authors assessed general religiousness through the use of a four-item measure created for their investigation. This is a common limitation in the study of religiousness that yields no information about the relationships between specific dimensions of religiousness and prejudicial attitudes.

Religious Fundamentalism. Religious fundamentalism has also been the focus of investigations of religiousness and prejudice. Religious fundamentalism is defined as “the belief that there is one set of religious teachings that clearly contains the fundamental, basic, intrinsic, essential, inerrant truth about humanity and deity” (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, p. 118). This dimension of religiousness is unchanging, where the individual believes their faith specifically
enables them to “have a special relationship with the deity” (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, p. 118). In an early investigation, Kirkpatrick (1993) found that religious fundamentalism was positively correlated with negative attitudes toward people identifying as gay or lesbian. Similarly, Jackson and Hunsberger (1999) conducted a multi-study analysis of religiousness and prejudice, and found that fundamentalism was predictive of prejudicial attitudes toward members of other social groups. In a more recent study, Laythe et al. (2002) obtained evidence that religious fundamentalism operated independently of the other variables and was correlated with prejudicial attitudes toward people who identified as gay or lesbian. These authors noted that individuals who identify as religiously fundamental are more likely to find scriptural rationale for homosexual prejudice.

Other more recent investigations have further analyzed the impact of religious fundamentalism on attitudes toward homosexuality. Laythe, Finkel, and Kirkpatrick (2011) found that religious fundamentalism was predictive of negative attitudes toward homosexuality. Additionally, Vincent, Parrott, and Peterson (2011) studied the effects of traditional gender role norms and religious fundamentalism on anger, attitudes, and aggression toward gay men and lesbian women among a heterosexual male population. The authors found that religious fundamentalism and masculine role norms significantly impacted aggression toward gay men and lesbian women. These results also provide evidence of a relationship between religious fundamentalism and traditional masculine role norms. This study suggested that gay men were negatively appraised due to religious fundamentalism and traditional masculine role norms.

**Roman Catholicism and Sexuality**

The Roman Catholic Church’s position on homosexuality has dominated public discussions in recent decades. Some authors have suggested that the Church’s position on
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homosexuality is reflective of a history of negative attitudes toward sexual minorities (Hunter, 2010). Kopp (1988) asserted this position is antithetical to human biology as same-sex attraction and orientation are viewed as errant. Modras (1988) indicated that this position was reinforced in the late Pope John Paul II’s statement that same-sex attraction is caused by sin. Additionally, Modras detailed this stance is reflective of the view that homosexuality is not divinely ordained, contributing to the penal view adopted by the Church.

In their discourse on sexuality, various conservative Roman Catholic authors such as DiIenno and Smith (1989) have used condemning language to reference same-sex attraction. These authors have suggested this sexual orientation is not a trait of human functioning but rather a psychological state which God can help correct. These authors also suggested that proper human development will help avoid the presence of same-sex attraction. In a similar vein, Fastiggi (2009) suggested that same-sex attraction manifests itself in early human development and identified homosexuality as immoral according to the Roman Catholic Church.

Ruether (1989) detailed that this position may contribute to the presence of homophobia among members of the Roman Catholic Church. Thurston (1996) suggested this position has contributed to the perspective that homosexuality is a mental disorder that can and should be treated. Furthermore, Nugent (1988) posited that this perspective is problematic because the focus of sexual orientation and attraction is placed on genital behavior. As this author suggested, other elements of sexual orientation such as attachment are discounted in favor of a discussion on genital contact. Guindon (1988) supported this assertion, noting that the focus on genital contact and sexual gratification displays a lack of understanding of human sexuality.

The current perspective of homosexuality within the Roman Catholic Church has been noted as being overly simplistic and displaying a lack of understanding of sexual orientation. As
is common in heterosexual relationships, sexual activity within same-sex relationships is closely tied to non-physical displays of intimacy, partner attachment, and perceived support (Guindon, 1988; Nugent, 1988). A narrow, restrictive view of sexuality as well as the position that heterosexuality is the only sexual orientation (Fastiggi, 2009) is reflective of a larger problem—an essentialist, categorical view of sexuality (Cheng, 1999). This view is culturally bound (Kimmel, 1987) and displays a lack of recognition for the complexity in understanding multiple masculinities, femininities, and sexual orientations (Connell, 1992). Moreover, this perspective endorsed by the church is reflective of not only heterosexist ideology (Herek, 2004; Hunter, 2010; Lance, 2002; Morrison, Kenny, & Harrington, 2005; Yep, 2002), but it also mirrors hegemonic masculine norms within U.S. culture (Connell, 1992).

**Hegemonic Masculinity**

Hegemonic masculinity is “an idealized form of masculinity linked to power in society” (Durfee, 2011, p. 318). In defining hegemonic masculinity, Donaldson (1993) stated that hegemony is centered on maintaining power and dominance over other social groups, and heterosexuality, negative views towards femininity, and homophobia are seen as “the bedrock of hegemonic masculinity” (p. 645). Connell (1992) stipulated that certain forms of masculinity are lauded while others are subordinated, and this is very important when analyzing the relationship between, for example, straight men and gay men. Cheng (1999) noted that hegemonic masculinity is characterized by “attributes such as domination, aggressiveness, competitiveness, athletic prowess, stoicism, and control” while attributes such as “love, affection pain, and grief are improper displays of emotion” are criticized (p. 298). Herek (1987) supported this discourse, noting “homophobia is thus an integral component of heterosexual masculinity, to the extent that
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it serves the psychological function of expressing who one is not (i.e., homosexual) and thereby affirming who one is (heterosexual)” (p. 76).

The emphasis on heterosexuality as an integral component of the traditional male role has been the focus of a great deal of discussion and research within the psychological literature on men and masculinity for the past several decades. Pleck’s (1995) early writings focused on the masculine socialization process and the strain felt by men. Pleck noted a key element of the traditional male roles was a fear of homosexuality. This promotes societal norms that derogate homosexuality and teach “gay male adolescents and adults that their sexuality is perverse” (Pleck, 1995, p. 13). The internalization of the masculine mystique (Mahalik & Cournoyer, 2000) contributes to strain felt by the individual due to perceived inability to assimilate with the normative group (Pleck, 1995). These societal norms are provided by numerous sources in a culture (Mahalik & Cournoyer, 2000) and serve to dictate appropriate manifestations of one’s gender (Levant, 1995; O’Neil, 1981; Wester et al, 2007).

The issue warranting attention is that the promotion of traditional (i.e., hegemonic) masculinity results in the restriction and depreciation of individuals who do not meet this narrow social definition of masculinity (Good & Wood, 1995). This contributes to conflict experienced by many individuals, where they are left to assimilate into the cultural norm or deviate from it – in either instance conflict will be experienced (O’Neil, 1981). The outcome for many individuals is a restriction in their ability to more fully actualize their potential (Smiler, 2004). As previously noted, homophobia is an integral element of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1992; Corrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985; Donaldson, 1993; Herek, 1987; O’Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995). Therefore, individuals identifying as gay are more likely to experience conflict due to their sexual identity (Connell, 1992). Additionally, these individuals are more likely to experience
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gender role conflict (O’Neil, 1981), attacks (Smiler, 2004), and sexual identity-related stress (SIS; Zuccarini & Karos, 2011).

The purpose of this study is threefold. The first and most general purpose is to contribute to the literature on attitudes toward members of the LGB community. A second purpose is to improve the validity and generalizability of findings by following recommended improvements in methodology by utilizing a homogenous population of Roman Catholic men. The third purpose is to better assess the complex relationships among religiousness, masculine role norms, and attitudes toward gay men by use of structural equation modeling (SEM). SEM will enable the authors to address problems in how constructs have been previously studied. SEM enables the researchers to use multiple inventories for latent constructs, thus more comprehensively measuring the construct while simultaneously accounting for measurement error (Weston & Gore, 2006).

The present study will test three structural models assessing the relationship between dimensions of religiousness, masculine role norms, and attitudes toward gay men. This will entail an examination of the overall fit of the model in addition to specific relationships within the model.

The research questions of interest are as follows:
1. Is there a direct relationship between the two dimensions of religiousness (religious fundamentalism and religious orientation) and attitudes toward masculine role norms, where higher levels of religiousness are related to greater endorsement of masculine role norms?
2. Does a direct relationship exist between the two dimensions of religiousness and attitudes toward gay men, where higher levels of religiousness are related to more negative attitudes toward gay men?
3. Is there a direct relationship between attitudes toward masculine role norms and attitudes toward gay men, where greater endorsement of masculine role norms is related to more negative attitudes toward gay men?

4. If there is no direct relationship between religiousness and attitudes toward gay men, is there a fully meditational effect where the dimensions of religiousness influence attitudes toward gay men only through the variable of endorsement of masculine role norms?

   It is hypothesized that the two dimensions of religiousness as well as endorsement of masculine role norms will be correlated with negative attitudes toward gay men. More specifically, it is hypothesized that increased religious fundamentalism, religious orientation, and masculine role norms will be related to more negative attitudes toward gay men in the present investigation. An alternate model was also constructed to test the hypothesis that there is a meditational effect in the relationship among these variables of interest. Specifically, the alternate model will be used to investigate if the relationship between the dimensions of religiousness and attitudes toward gay men is mediated by masculine role norms. Lastly, it is hypothesized that, based on the empirical and theoretical evidence presented in this study, the primary model will result in a superior fit with the data when compared to the alternate model.

   **Methods**

   **Participants**

   The participants in this study were 216 individuals, between the ages of 18 and 65, who identified as heterosexual Roman Catholic men (see Table 1). Regarding the adequacy of this sample size, there is no consensus on how large a sample is needed in SEM. Schumaker and Lomax (2004) encouraged the general parameter of a sample size between 250-500 participants when using SEM. However, this appears to be a rather conservative estimate as several other
authors have reported that a sample size of at least 200 participants is sufficient for a study utilizing structural equation modeling (Kline, 1998, 2011; Quintana & Maxwell, 1999; Weston & Gore, 2006). Others have suggested that the issue of sample size is overplayed, and that other factors such as the quality of measures used are more important than number of participants (Weston & Gore, 2006).

Procedure

This study was advertised through the use of social media tools (email and Facebook) using a snowball sampling approach. Also referred to as “respondent-driven sampling” (Salganik & Hechathorn, 2004, p. 196), this procedure has been identified as being beneficial in that it enables participants to be more familiar and comfortable with the research process (Browne, 2005). This sampling method entails the researcher selecting a subset of a sample population, and “existing sample members recruiting future sample members continues until the desired sample size is reached” (Salganik & Hechathorn, 2004, p. 196). This sampling method has been shown beneficial when attempting to study previously overlooked populations (Browne, 2005; Salganik & Hechathorn, 2004). The study was advertised via email to individuals at a Midwest university. The researcher also contacted Roman Catholic parishes in the Midwest via email and telephone to gain permission to recruit potential participants from members of these congregations.

Potential participants were presented with an introductory letter in electronic format via email or Facebook. If they met the inclusion criteria and wished to complete the survey, they had the option of clicking on a link at the bottom of the introductory letter that directed them to the survey. Participants were then presented with an informed consent waiver, and selected the link to the survey if they wished to continue. Participants who chose to proceed with the survey were
then presented with a demographics form, a battery of assessments, and a debriefing form (see Appendix E). In instances where the principle investigator contacted a Roman Catholic parish via telephone, a script for this telephone conversation was used (see Appendix E). When consent was given over the telephone to advertise this study to members of the parish, the principle investigator sent the introductory email to members of the parish. Potential participants then had access to the introductory email, link to the investigation, informed consent, demographics page, battery of assessments, and debriefing form. All participants were encouraged to forward the introductory email on to other Roman Catholic parishes or Roman Catholic men they knew. In all instances, participation in this investigation was anonymous. Appendix E contains the introductory email, informed consent, demographics questionnaire, surveys used, debriefing form, and telephone contact script.

The scales used were presented in a counter-balanced manner in order to reduce a testing effect, which is a threat to internal validity. The instruments were presented to participants in the following order: Intrinsic/Extrinsic-Revised Scale (I/E-R), Quest Scale, Masculine Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R), Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale (ATG), revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale (RFS), the Modern Homogenativity Scale (MHS), and the Fundamentalism Scale. Participants completed the online survey through the use of Qualtrics, an online survey system. While participation in this study was entirely voluntary, an incentive was provided for participants who completed the online survey. Robertson and Bellenger (1978) found that promising a small charitable donation in exchange for survey responses yielded a significantly higher response rate than an equal cash incentive or no incentive offer at all. In an effort to maximize response rates in this study, the researcher donated $0.50 to Catholic Relief Services (http://www.crs.org/) for each study completed.
Measures

**Quest Scale.** The Quest Scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, b) is a measure of a person’s quest religious orientation. Higher scores on this inventory indicate that a person is more willing to face complex existential questions, views religious doubt as a positive experience, and has a higher degree of openness to change (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, b).

The concept of the quest religious orientation developed from Allport and Ross’s (1967) early conceptualization of religious orientation, which only included two dimensions – intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness. Intrinsic religiousness is defined as an internalization of one’s religion, where it is lived and provides fulfillment (Allport & Ross, 1967). An extrinsic religious orientation is defined as using one’s religion in useful ways (Allport & Ross, 1967). A quest religious orientation is qualitatively different from both intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness, as it deals with a person’s willingness to critique their beliefs as a function of faith.

The Quest Scale is a 12-item, self-report questionnaire measured on a Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (9). This scale is a single factor inventory that seeks to understand a person’s (a) “readiness to face existential questions without reducing their complexity, (b) “self-criticism and perceptions of religious doubt as positive”, and (c) “openness to change” (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991b, p. 431). This inventory has been found to have good reliability, with Cronbach’s alphas of .75 and .81 presented in two samples (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991b). Furthermore, the Quest Scale has been found to measure a dimension of religious orientation that is similar to yet distinct from intrinsic religiousness and extrinsic religiousness, thus indicating adequate convergent validity (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a).

**Fundamentalism Scale.** The Fundamentalism Scale (McFarland, 1989) is a measure of a person’s religious fundamentalism. Religious fundamentalism is defined as a person’s strict
adherence to a set of religious teachings they believe contain the ultimate truth (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). A religiously fundamental person has an unchanging religious perspective and views their faith as hierarchically better compared to other belief systems (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). This definition is important as it highlights the stark contrasts between a religiously fundamental orientation and a quest religious orientation. The Fundamentalism Scale is a 6-item, self-report questionnaire measured on a Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). The items on the inventory stress “the perfection and authority of the Bible, the necessity of keeping ‘the true teachings of God’s word,’ and the importance of preparing for heaven and avoiding ‘worldly ideas’” (p. 328). The Cronbach’s alpha presented by McFarland (1989) was .88, and the correlation between this scale and the Religious Fundamentalism Scale was found to be .78 (Leak & Finken, 2011). No other psychometric information regarding this scale has been presented in the psychological literature. However, at present, this second assessment of fundamentalism is the most recent alternative inventory to the RFS with any supportive psychometric data.

Masculine Role Norms Inventory – Revised (MRNI-R). Traditional masculine role norms were assessed in the present study with the use of the Masculine Role Norms Inventory – Revised (MRNI-R) (Levant et al, 2007). This is a 57-item, self-report questionnaire employing the use of a 7-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7). The MRNI-R measures 7 different theoretically derived dimensions of traditional masculinity ideology: Avoidance of Femininity (e.g., Men should not wear make-up, cover-up or bronze), Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals (e.g., Homosexuals should never marry), Extreme Self-Reliance (e.g., A man should be able to perform his job even if he is physically ill or hurt), Aggression (e.g., Men should excel at contact sports), Dominance (e.g., The President of the
U.S. should always be a man), Non-Relational Attitudes Toward Sexuality (e.g., Men should always like to have sex), and Restrictive Emotionality (e.g., A man should not react when other people cry). Subscale scores are obtained by computing means for each item, while total scale scores are obtained by calculating the mean of all items. Higher scores indicate “higher levels of endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology on the measure.

Levant et al (2007) reported the inventory has good internal consistency, reporting Cronbach alphas ranging between .85 and .91 for all subscales and .96 for the total scale. These authors indicated that all items correlated more highly with the total scale ($r = .70$ to $ .87$) than they did with one another ($r = .38$ to $ .72$). Levant et al (2010) conducted follow-up factor analyses employing the use of principle axis factoring, finding that the 7-factor model accounted for most of the variance (40.92%). These authors also indicated that the factors correlated more highly with the overall scale than they did with one another, suggesting the factors are related but distinct from one another. Levant et al (2010) noted the presence of acceptable convergent validity, noting a “significant positive correlation with the other masculinity ideology measures” (p. 32-33). These authors found support for the presence of acceptable discriminant and concurrent validity as well.

**Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale, Revised 5-Item Version (ATG-R-S5).** The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) scale is an assessment of “heterosexuals’ attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women” (Herek & McLemore, 2011, p. 415). The original 20-item version has been adapted to a shorter 10-item version of the inventory. The shorter version of the inventory has been found to highly correlate with the original version ($r = .97$). This self-report assessment tool consists of two comparable versions developed to specifically
assess attitudes toward gay men (ATG) and lesbian women (ATL), and the former will be used in the present study.

The Attitudes Toward Gay Men (ATG; Herek, 1988) inventory employed in the present study was a 5-item measure based on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” (1) to “Strongly Agree” (7). The ATG has been found to be an internally consistent measure, with alpha coefficient values of .91 obtained for the measure (Herek, 1988). The alternate form of the ATG was found to not be significantly different from its original version, yielding an alpha coefficient of .92 (Herek, 1988). The correlation between the original ATG and the newer, shortened version was $r = .83$. This inventory has also been found to be significantly correlated with other attitudinal measures of “sex roles, traditional family ideology, dogmatism, perceived agreement by friends, and positive contact with any lesbian or gay men” (Herek, 1988, p. 459).

**Design and Analysis**

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used in the present study to examine the relationships between variables. The body of literature previously detailed has examined the role that religiousness plays in prejudicial attitudes toward a variety of cultural groups. However, a consistent means of defining and investigating religiousness has yet to be presented. Leak and Finken (2011) present the most recent analysis of religiousness and prejudice, employing the use of SEM to conduct a more comprehensive investigation of religiousness and its impact on attitudes toward others. The present study sought to build on this research by presenting a SEM model that will provide a more comprehensive analysis of two dimensions of religiousness. Additionally, the present model assessed the role of traditional masculine ideology. The current body of literature has just begun to assess the relationship between religiousness and masculine norms. The present study sought to add to this body of literature by investigating the relationship
between dimensions of religiousness and masculine role norms. The primary goal of SEM is to combine various statistical measurement techniques when analyzing the relationship between variables (Weston & Gore, 2006). In doing so, the researcher is able to examine multiple relationships between factors (Weston & Gore, 2006).

**Results**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Prior to testing the structural model, several preliminary analyses were conducted to prepare the data for analysis and address issues related to the measurement model. The initial step in this process was to obtain information regarding scale means, standard deviations, correlations between scales, and inter-item correlations. Table 7 in Appendix C provides an overview of the means, standard deviations, scale ranges, and Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficients for the inventories used in this study. The reliability coefficients obtained for each scale were all adequate and were consistent with results obtained in previous empirical investigations utilizing these inventories.

**Multicollinearity.** When utilizing structural equation modeling in psychological research, multicollinearity is a potential confound that requires preliminary assessment prior to testing of the structural model. This is an issue where scales used as observed variables in the SEM model correlate too highly with one another ($r > .85$), which suggests these scales are measuring the same construct as opposed to related but different constructs. Kline (2011) suggested multicollinearity could impede the analysis of the structural model. The presence of multicollinearity contributed to problems during model estimation, and therefore confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to determine the most favorable scales to be included in the
measurement model. The steps taken in this process are detailed in a later section. Table 8 in Appendix C provides an overview of the correlation matrix.

**Multivariate Normality.** In the present study, multivariate normality was assessed by analyzing the data’s skewness and kurtosis. Based upon these guidelines for skewness and kurtosis (see Chou & Bentler, 1995; Kline, 2011; Weston & Gore, 2006), the data in the present study met the assumptions of multivariate normality. Specific values regarding skewness and kurtosis for each subscale are presented in Table 9 in Appendix C.

**Missing Data.** Missing data is a common issue in SEM (McDonald & Ho, 2002). Preliminary analyses assessed for missing data. A consistent manner in which to assess whether data is missing completely at random (MCAR) or missing not at random (MNAR) has not been established in the literature (Sinharay, Stern, & Russell, 2001). Several steps were taken in the present study to identify missing data, assess the percentage, and address the issue. A visual flowchart of the process used to address missing data can be found in Table 1. The method of listwise deletion was employed to address data that was missing not at random. One hundred four surveys were deleted because the participants opened the survey link but provided no demographic information and completed no survey items. Thirty-three surveys were deleted because participants provided only demographic information and did not respond to any items on any measurement tools (e.g., MRNI-R). Fifty-five surveys were deleted because participants did not complete 1 or more entire measurement tools, and therefore their data was not missing at random. Several participants’ responses were deleted because they did not meet the inclusion criteria outlined for this present investigation. One participant’s responses were deleted because he did not identify as Roman Catholic. Ten surveys were deleted because the participants self-identified as women, and therefore did not meet the criteria of being a male participant. One
participant’s survey was deleted because they did not specify their gender. Fourteen participants were excluded because they did not identify as heterosexual. A total of 216 participants were included in this data analysis because they met the inclusion criteria and completed the survey.

With the total number of participants meeting inclusion criteria established, listwise calculations were conducted to determine if the data was missing completely at random. Each inventory was assessed for percentage of missing data. The largest percentage of missing data for any of the inventories was .424% (Quest) and the total percentage of missing data was .28%. Schumaker and Lomax (2004) recommend that when the number of missing values is minimal the researcher should employ mean substitution of the missing values. In light of the small percentage of data missing at random, mean substitution was employed in the present study.

Table 1
Flow Chart of Missing Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>442 participants opened the survey</th>
<th>104 participants deleted – no demographic information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55 participants deleted – did not complete one or more inventory</td>
<td>33 participants deleted – only provided demographic information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 participants deleted – did not complete one or more inventory</td>
<td>1 participant deleted – not Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 participant deleted – did not specify gender</td>
<td>10 participants deleted – self-identified as women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 participants deleted – did not identify as heterosexual</td>
<td>216 participant included in the data analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model Estimation

The latent variables of interest within this present study were religious fundamentalism, religious orientation, attitudes toward masculine role norms, and attitudes toward gay men. As suggested by Weston and Gore (2006), model estimation entails several steps that include assessing the fit of the model, determining parameter estimates, as well as giving consideration to possible equivalent models. Unstandardized and standardized estimates for the primary and alternative models are included in Tables 11 and 12 in Appendix C. Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) was used to determine the parameter estimates. This process is based on the assumption of multivariate normality and, as suggested by its name, maximizes the likelihood that the data is drawn from this particular population (Kline, 2005). Both the primary and alternate models were assessed, and both models were over-identified, which aids in the process of demonstrating associations between latent and observed variables (Weston & Gore, 2006).

Due to the presence of multicollinearity among several scales within the present study, this issue required a resolution prior to a full testing of the structural model. Preliminary analyses indicated that several measures correlated too highly with one another: the Fundamentalism Scale and the Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale \( (r = .863) \), and the Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale and the Modern Homogenativity Scale \( (r = .870) \). Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for each measure, and inventories that best fit the data were selected as observed variables for their respective latent variable. The Fundamentalism Scale was used to measure religious fundamentalism and the Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale was selected to measure attitudes toward gay men. The Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale and The Modern Homogenativity Scale were both removed and not included in the testing of the full structural model. A complete overview of the confirmatory factor analyses used to compare these
inventories can be found in Tables 13-20 in Appendix D. These tables provide the maximum likelihood estimates (unstandardized and standardized parameter estimates or regression weights, standard error, critical ration, and significance level) as well as the model fit index summary as a result of confirmatory factor analyses run on the MRNI-R, Fundamentalism Scale, ATG-R-S5, and the Quest Scale.

Finally, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to determine the adequacy of the paths from the latent variables to the selected measured variables. A complete list of the results of the confirmatory factor analysis is presented in Tables 11 and 12 in Appendix C. As the table will indicate, all paths from the latent to observed variables in the primary and alternate model were significant (p < .001). The data provided in these tables indicate that all latent variables were adequately measured by the observed variables. These results also indicate that the issue of multicollinearity was appropriately addressed through the use of confirmatory factor analysis and the selection of optimal inventories.

**Model Evaluation Using Fit Indices**

Several fit indices were used in this study to assess the overall fit of the primary and alternative models with the data. Fit indices such as the goodness of fit index (GFI) and the chi-square ($\chi^2$) were used because they directly assess how the models fit the sample data (Weston and Gore, 2006). A non-significant $\chi^2$ indicates that the model adequately fits the data, but an over-reliance on this indicator of model fit is discouraged (Kline, 2011). In the present study, the primary model resulted in $\chi^2(267, N = 216) = 740.325, p < .001$, and the alternate model resulted in $\chi^2(267, N = 216) = 740.325, p < .001$. These results show that both models do not adequately fit the data.
Other measures of model fit were also employed in the present investigation. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) were both used to compare the tested model to a null model (Kline, 2011; Weston & Gore, 2006). The results of this study suggested that neither the primary or alternative models differed from one another in terms of overall fit with the data. The fit indices for the primary model showed that this model did not adequately fit with the data (GFI = .787, CFI = .860, and TLI = .844). Similarly, the alternative model did not fit with the data either (GFI = .787, CFI = .860, and TLI = .844). To further assess fit with the data, the root mean square of approximation was also used because it corrects for model complexity in the assessment of overall model fit (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Similar results were achieved, where both the primary and alternative models yielded a RMSEA value of .90, suggesting that neither model adequately fit the data. Table 5 provides a complete overview of the fit statistics employed in the present study.

**Structural Model Parameter Estimates**

While neither structural model achieved an adequate fit with the data, several significant relationships were found between latent variables. Tables 3, 4, and 5 provide an overview of the standardized direct and indirect effects, and covariance for the primary and alternative models. The results suggest that in both models religious fundamentalism and a quest religious orientation had a significant covariant relationship with one another (-.695). The results suggest complex relationships between the dimensions of religiousness and masculine role norms. Masculine role norms and religious fundamentalism were found to positively correlate with one another (.546). Additionally, masculine role norms and religious orientation were found to negatively correlate with one another (-.381). However, the alternate model found that religious
fundamentalism had a significant positive direct effect on masculine role norms (.544) while religious orientation had no direct effect on masculine role norms (-.003).

Several direct paths were found to be significant in both the primary and alternative models.

Both models found that religious fundamentalism (.463) and endorsement of masculine role norms (.375) both had positive direct effects on attitudes toward gay men. To better explain this, these standardized effects suggest that when religious fundamentalism or endorsement of masculine role norms goes up by 1 standard deviation, negative attitudes toward gay men go up by 0.463 and 0.375 standard deviations, which are medium effects. Conversely, religious orientation had a significant negative direct effect on attitudes toward gay men (-.199). In other words, as one’s quest orientation goes up by 1 standard deviation, negative attitudes toward gay men go down by .199 standard deviations. This is considered a small effect. The alternate model also tested indirect paths among latent variables. The results suggested that religious orientation impacted endorsement of masculine role norms, which then impacted attitudes toward gay men, with a negative indirect effect of religious orientation on attitudes toward gay men (-.001).

Therefore, the impact of religious orientation is a very small, negative effect that is mediated through endorsement of masculine role norms. Religious fundamentalism also impacted endorsement of masculine role norms, which then impacted attitudes toward gay men, with an indirect effect of religious fundamentalism on attitudes toward gay men (.204). The impact of religious fundamentalism is a small effect on attitudes toward gay men that is mediated through endorsement of masculine norms.

**Structural Model Testing**

The final step in structural equation modeling is to compare the fit of the primary and alternative models with one another. Table 7 provides an overview of these results. As was the
case when evaluating the model, several indices were used to determine comparative fit. Since the two models are subsets of one another, the chi-square statistic was used to compare the fit between the primary and alternative models (Kline, 2005). Both the primary and alternative models had the same number of paths, indicating that one model was not more complex than the other. The nature of the relationships between latent variables changed from the primary to alternative models, but the complexity of the models did not change. The primary model yielded a chi-square value of 740.325 with 269 degrees of freedom, and the alternative model also yielded a chi-square value of 740.325 with 269 degrees of freedom. Therefore, no difference was found between the primary and alternative models, and therefore the null hypothesis that both models identically fit the data could not be rejected.

The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) for each model was also compared. Model evaluation is a particularly important procedure in structural equation modeling research, for the researcher is faced with having to choose the best model from a list of models in the same data set (Bozdogan, 2000). The best-fitting model is the model with the smallest AIC value (Bozdogan, 2000). In the present study, the primary model (AIC = 852.325) and the alternate model (AIC = 852.325) both fit the data identically, and therefore no significant difference was obtained between the two models that were tested. This data combined with the chi-square difference statistic indicates that neither model showed a superior fit with the data in the present study.
Table 2
Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th># of Cases (N=216)</th>
<th>% of Cases (N=216)</th>
<th>Missing Values</th>
<th>% of Missing Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-Older</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span/His/Lat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/AA/PI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 .5%

Note. Span/His/Lat = Spanish/Hispanic/Latino; Asian/AA/PI = Asian/Asian-American/Pacific Islander; Rel. Ident. = Religious Identity
Table 3
*Standardized Direct and Indirect Effects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary Model Estimates</th>
<th>Alternate Model Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATGM ← RO</td>
<td>-.199**</td>
<td>-.199**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM ← RF</td>
<td>.463***</td>
<td>.463***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM ← MRN</td>
<td>.375***</td>
<td>.375***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN ← RO</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN ← RF</td>
<td>.544***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary Model Estimates</th>
<th>Alternate Model Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATGM ← MRN ← RO</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM ← MRN ← RF</td>
<td>.204***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM ← RO</td>
<td>(Total Effect) -.229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM ← RF</td>
<td>(Total Effect) 1.488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ATGM = Attitudes Toward Gay Men; RO = Religious Orientation; RF = Religious Fundamentalism; MRN = Masculine Role Norms; *** *p < .001; ** *p < .05; The total mediational effects of religious orientation on attitudes toward gay men and religious fundamentalism on attitudes toward gay men were calculated using both direct and indirect paths.

Table 4
*Primary Model Covariance: Unstandardized and Standardized Parameter Estimates or Regression Weights, Standard Error, Critical Ratio, Significance Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent and Measured Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimate (Regression Weights)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Standard. Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRN ↔ RF</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>5.068</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN ↔ RO</td>
<td>-.507</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-4.237</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF ↔ RO</td>
<td>-.549</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-4.986</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-.695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* MRN = Masculine Role Norms; RO = Religious Orientation; RF = Religious Fundamentalism; S.E. = Approximate Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio; *** *p < .001, unless otherwise listed; Standard. Estimate = Standardized Estimate.
Table 5
Alternate Model Covariance: Unstandardized and Standardized Parameter Estimates or Regression Weights, Standard Error, Critical Ratio, Significance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RF ←→ RO</td>
<td>-.549</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-4.986</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-.695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. RO = Religious Orientation; RF = Religious Fundamentalism; S.E. = Approximate Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio; *** p < .001, unless otherwise listed; Standard. Estimate = Standardized Estimate.

Table 6
Model Fit Index Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>740.325</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>740.325</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. χ² = Chi Square Test; DF = Degrees of Freedom; GFI = Goodness of Fit Index; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; RMSEA = Confidence Interval for Root Mean Square Error of Approximation.

Table 7
Comparative Model Fit Index Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²_D</th>
<th>DF_D</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary - Alternate</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>852.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>852.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>852.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. χ² = Chi-Square Difference; DF_D = Chi-Square Degrees of Freedom Difference; P = Significance of Chi-Square Difference Statistic, ** = p <.001; AIC = Akaike Information Criterion.
Figure 1. Primary Structural Model – Influence of religious fundamentalism, religious orientation, and masculine role norms on attitudes toward gay men.

Note. RF = Religious Fundamentalism; MRN = Masculine Role Norms; ATGM = Attitudes Toward Gay Men; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; FHH = Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals; ESR = Extreme Self-Reliance; AGR = Aggression; DOM = Dominance; NRATS = Non-Relational Attitudes toward Sexuality; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RF = Religious Fundamentalism; RO = Religious Orientation; FS = Fundamentalism Scale Item; Q = Quest Item; ATG = Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale Item; e = Error.
Figure 2. Alternate Structural Model – Influence of religious fundamentalism, religious orientation, and masculine role norms on attitudes toward gay men.

Note. RF = Religious Fundamentalism; MRN = Masculine Role Norms; ATGM = Attitudes Toward Gay Men; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; FHH = Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals; ESR = Extreme Self-Reliance; AGR = Aggression; DOM = Dominance; NRATS = Non-Relational Attitudes toward Sexuality; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RF = Religious Fundamentalism; RO = Religious Orientation; FS = Fundamentalism Scale Item; Q = Quest Item; ATG = Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale Item; e = Error.
Discussion

Summary of Major Findings

The present study yielded mixed results regarding the relationship among variables of interest. To begin, the primary and alternative models did not differ on any of the fit indices. The major distinction between the two tested models was the nature of the relationship between dimensions of religiousness and masculine role norms. The lack of differentiation between the two models following data analysis suggests that a clearer understanding of the relationship between religiousness and masculine role norms was not achieved in the present investigation. Additionally, the results of the present study indicated that neither full structural model adequately fit the data, and therefore do not completely capture the nature of the relationships among the specified variables.

Since neither the primary or alternative model adequately fit the data, an interpretation of the various significant paths cannot be conducted. Several issues were present in this study that likely contributed to this limitation in the interpretation of the data. As previously detailed, responses from roughly half of the participants who began the survey had to be removed from inclusion due to a variety of factors. One hundred ninety two of the surveys required deletion due to the fact that significant portions of data were missing. A trend in the pattern of missing data was observed. Participants tended to stop responding when asked about their religious orientation and attitudes toward gay men. This trend in the data suggests that Catholic men in the present investigation potentially experienced anxiety when asked to report about their religious orientation and attitudes toward gay men. This is substantiated by the numerous email responses to the primary investigator from participants stating negative reactions and critiques to such an
investigation. The lack of complete participation by so many potential participants contributed to fewer and a less diverse sample population.

Problems within the measurement model likely contributed to the lack of model fit and the inability to interpret significant results found in the present investigation. It has been suggested that using more than one observed variable per latent construct is preferable in SEM (Schumaker & Lomax, 2004). This has advantages as it avoids operationalization that is narrow in focus due to the use of a single measure (Heppner et al, 1999). The use of multiple measures also allows the researcher to better account for and assess error in the measurement model (Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). It has been suggested that utilization of beyond four observed variables creates a scenario of diminishing returns within the measurement model (Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). Within the present investigation, a single instrument was used per latent variable. In most cases, the items were used as observed variables, while in the case of the MRNI-R the subscales were used as observed variables. This is considered to be acceptable practice within the SEM literature when researchers are not able to use multiple measures due to a variety of issues (Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). The practice of using items of a scale as separate indicators is known as parceling, and it is an acceptable practice (Quintana & Maxwell, 1999; Weston & Gore, 2010). However, it is possible that the narrow means by which variables were measured in the present study contributed to both the primary and alternative models inadequately fitting the data.

A major contributor to mono-operationalization in the present investigation was the presence of multicolinearity. As previously reported several inventories correlated too highly with one another, resulting in one of the measures being deleted. Additionally, several items had to be removed from the Quest scale due to poor factor loading. The result was an incomplete
inventory used as the sole means of measuring religious orientation in the present study. Not only does this represent a narrow means of measuring this variable, but it is also an example of an incomplete assessment of a latent variable. The result of item deletion during confirmatory factor analysis is an incomplete investigation of this variable of interest, which likely contributed to the lack of significant findings in the present study.

**Research Implications and Future Directions**

The current investigation furthers the psychological study of religion and masculinity in its exploration of how these variables relate and contribute to social perceptions and attitudes. The methodological considerations of Tarakeshwar, Stanton, and Pargament (2003) were adopted in the present study. These authors noted that religion greatly contributes to attitudes and behaviors regarding gender, sexuality, and masculinity. Therefore, they suggest that investigations of rather homogenous sample populations would help to control for potential confounds in the psychological study of religion.

Structural equation modeling was used in the present investigation as it enables the researcher to test the complex relationships among variables of interest (Schumaker & Lomax, 2004; Weston & Gore, 2006). The added complexity creates flexibility in being able to model multiple and complex relationships among variables (Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). Additionally, this methodology allows the researcher to account for error in measurement to assess the reliability of instruments used (Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). While this was the rationale for using SEM in the present investigation, other means of data analysis may have proven more beneficial (e.g., regression analysis, path analysis). The path model in the present study analyzed the impact of various predictor variables on one dependent variable – attitudes toward gay men. The use of a regression analysis may have been more appropriate, yielding more usable data to
better understand the relationship among the variables of interest. SEM is used to test complex models; it is possible that the primary and alternative models were not complex enough to optimally assess these variables. Furthermore, the use of single measures to represent latent variables, problems in the measurement model, and the presence of multicollinearity (all highlighted above), all contributed to models that may have been too simplistic to investigate through the use of SEM.

A final point worth noting in regards to the limited interpretability of the present results relates to the inventories used to measure the latent variables of interest. The present investigation utilized the Quest Scale, published by Batson and Shoenrade in 1991, and the Fundamentalism Scale, published by McFarland in 1989. It appears that the validity of these inventories may be low due to history – a common threat to internal validity. As time has passed since their initial development, these instruments have not been updated with new diverse populations. As a result they may not consist of appropriate language that best captures people’s current conceptualizations and experiences of religiousness. Within the psychological literature investigating dimensions of religiousness, these inventories may not adequately represent a current understanding of the construct of religiousness and its dimensions. In combination, the possibly low construct validity of these instruments, plus the previously mentioned inconsistent methodology, may have contributed to difficulties in adequately capturing the hypothesized, complex relationships between variables. Ward and Cook (2011) suggest “inconsistencies in the literature are likely a result of previous studies’ capturing only one or a few aspects of the multidirectional relationship between these constructs” (p. 52). Unfortunately, until these inventories are modified, tested, and updated, they may continue to contribute to error in construct validity.
Theoretical Implications

Several important theoretical implications can be drawn from the results of the present study. The results of this study stand in contrast to previous investigations that have drawn the conclusion that religiousness and masculinity have no relationship with one another (e.g., (Jurkovic & Walker, 2006; Mahalik & Lagan, 2001; Thompson & Remmes, 2002; Ward & Cook, 2011). Thompson and Remmes (2002) suggested a more feminine gender role orientation contributed to men being more religiously oriented. Similarly, Mahalik and Lagan (2001) reported that religiousness was associated with femininity, and traditional masculinity was negatively related to religious orientation and spiritual well-being. Additionally, Ward and Cook (2011) also asserted that men are less religious compared to women. However, a closer look at these investigations shows that such conclusions were drawn based on narrow definitions of religiousness. Past investigations by Jurkovic and Walker (2006) and Mahalik and Lagan (2001), religious orientation was measured simply by using a single assessment tool – Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (I/E ROS). Other researchers, like Thompson and Remmes (2002), have adopted to include single-item questions that assess frequency of church attendance or involvement to measure religious orientation. The current investigation was able to improve upon such methodological shortcomings by including multiple dimensions of relationships and assessing how they relate to one another.

The results of the present study found that a quest religious orientation and religious fundamentalism were negatively correlated. A quest orientation indicates that a person is open to change, interpersonal reflection, and challenging their own beliefs (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, b). Conversely, religious fundamentalism entails a strict adherence to a belief system that is less open to change and critique (Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992; 2004). This is the first known
study to provide empirical support for the notion that these two dimensions of religiousness are uniquely distinct from one another.

These results do not support a claim that men are less religious. Rather, they suggest that a stronger quest orientation, a perspective where one is open to challenging their faith, is related to less rigid attitudes toward the masculine gender role. Additionally, the present study found that religious fundamentalism and endorsement of masculine role norms were strongly related to one another. These findings are consistent with previous theoretical literature noting the presence of a strong relationship between religiously conservative teachings and stronger attitudes in favor of traditional masculine gender role norms (Franklin, 1984; King, 2005; Worthington, 2004). Religiously fundamental beliefs often entail stronger adherence to traditional gender role norms (Dowland, 2009; Dubbert, 1979). These views are consistent with strict views regarding traditional masculine gender role norms (Cheng, 1999; O’Neil, 1981; O’Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995; Pleck, 1995). Conversely, Jurkovic and Walker (2006) reported that “men who hold less stereotyped views about being ‘male’ experience less gender-role conflict and stress, more intrinsic religiousness, and more well-being” (p.42).

The results of the present investigation are consistent with these previous studies, suggesting that religious fundamentalism is related to a stronger adherence to traditional gender role norms while a quest religious orientation is related to less traditional views regarding gender role norms. These results do not suggest a lack of relationship between religiousness and masculine role norms. Rather, they add to the literature by suggesting that this relationship is more complex where various dimensions of religiousness relate to masculine gender role norms in very different ways.
The evidence provided in this study is also consistent with past literature regarding attitudes toward gay men. More conservative views regarding religion (fundamentalism) and gender were found to contribute to increased negative attitudes toward gay men. However, a more open stance on religion (Quest) contributed to less negative attitudes toward gay men. For example, increased religious fundamentalism contributed to more negative attitudes toward gay men within this sample. This is consistent with previous literature that has suggested strict religious views contribute to negative attitudes toward sexual minorities (Hunter, 2010). Religious institutions often provide specific stances on sexuality (King, 2005; Worthington, 2004), and rigid perspectives can contribute to prejudicial attitudes (Kopp, 1988; Leak & Finken, 2011). The results of the present study are consistent with this literature, and suggest that increased religious fundamentalism can serve as a predictor of prejudicial attitudes toward gay men.

Additionally, the literature on men and masculinity has found similar evidence. A stronger endorsement of traditional masculinity entails a social assessment of those who do not conform to these traditional gender role norms (Donaldson, 1993). Homophobia has been noted as being an integral element of traditional masculinity (Badinter, 1995; Connell, 1992; Donaldson, 1993; Durfee, 2011; Herek, 1987). The results of the present study are consistent with this literature, and suggest that higher endorsement of masculine gender role norms contributes to more negative assessments of gay men.

It is important to note that this investigation also found evidence that a higher quest orientation contributed to less negative attitudes toward gay men. The quest orientation entails the process of “honestly facing existential questions in their complexity, while at the same time resisting clear-cut, pat answers” (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991, p.417). It is therefore likely that
individuals with a higher quest orientation are more willing to challenge the positions of their religious belief system and react more favorably toward members of the LGB community. This is consistent with the findings from the present study that religious fundamentalism and a quest orientation are two distinct dimensions of religiousness, and therefore appear to separately impact attitudes toward gay men in different ways.

**Limitations**

Several limitations in the present study warrant attention. To begin, the present study utilized only one measure per latent construct. It has been suggested that the use of more than one observed variable per latent construct is preferable (Schumaker & Lomax, 2004). This has advantages as it avoids operationalization that is narrow in focus due to the use of a single measure (Heppner et al, 1999). The use of multiple measures also allows the researcher to better account for and assess error in the measurement model (Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). The present study was not able to use multiple inventories per latent construct due to the presence of multicollinearity (Kline, 2011). While this issue had to be addressed, the use of only one measure per latent construct increases the likelihood of error in the measurement of constructs.

Another important limitation is the lack of generalizability of results. The utilization of a rather homogenous sample population was intentional, but also hinders a discussion of how the relationship among the variables applies to other cultural groups. The sample consisted of heterosexual men who identified as Roman Catholic, and almost all of them identified as Caucasian and from the Midwest. It is possible that the results of the present study do not generalize to other populations. Other populations of Roman Catholic men from other cultural backgrounds in other regions of the U.S. may respond very differently to assessments of religiousness, male gender role norms, and attitudes toward gay men.
Conclusions

The present study provides valuable information regarding the relationship of religiousness, male gender role norms, and attitudes toward gay men among a Roman Catholic male sample. Several conclusions can be drawn from these findings. First, the relationship between religiousness and male masculinity is more complex than suggested in previous investigations. More conservative religious beliefs appear to be strongly related to more conservative beliefs about gender. However, a more open, liberal religious orientation appears to be related to more open views regarding gender. Not surprisingly, these two dimensions of religiousness are qualitatively different and divergent from one another. Additionally, more rigid beliefs about religion and gender contribute to increased negative attitudes toward gay men. Conversely, more open views regarding religion contribute to more positive attitudes toward gay men. This study is a positive step in the direction of better understanding the complex relationship among these variables. Future research is greatly needed to provide clarity to the relationship among religiousness, male gender role norms, and attitudes toward gay men among diverse populations.
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Appendix A – Review of Literature

The current literature in the psychological study of men and masculinity has provided a wealth of information regarding gender role strain (Pleck, 1981), gender role conflict (O’Neil, Good & Holmes, 1995), as well as conformity to masculine norms (Levant, et al. 2007; Mahalik et al., 2003). These similar but somewhat divergent theories regarding men and masculinity emphasize that the socialization process plays a vital role in strain, conflict, and conformity. Additionally, various cultural variables have been highlighted as playing important roles in this socialization process, including family (Dunn & Munn, 1985; Franklin, 1984; Lindsey, 1990; St. Clair, 1996), peers (Franklin, 1984; Lindsey, 1990; Maguire & Dunn, 1997; McElwain & Volling, 2002), schools (Best, 1983; Lee & Daly, 1987; Lindsey, 1990), social media (Franklin, 1984; Lindsey, 1990), and language (Dautenhaun, 1997; Lewis, 2010; Turnbull & Carpendale, 1999). However, as the understanding of men and masculinity in the psychological sciences has been developing over the past several decades (Ward & Cook, 2011) there has been a marked lack of diversity in this scholarship as well as an inattention to various cultural influences (Wong et al., 2010). Specifically, various authors have highlighted the important role that religion plays within culture and its impact on socialization (Franklin, 1984; King, 2005; Worthington, 2004). This lack of attention appears problematic in light of the literature that suggests conservative religious beliefs and adherence have contributed to negative attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001; Macgillvray, 2008; McQueeney, 2009) as well as rigid gender expectations (Mahalik & lagan, 2001). In light of this gap in the literature, the present study seeks to further investigate the complex relationship between religiousness, conformity to masculine norms, and attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men.
Cultural Socialization

Lindsey (1990) noted that the socialization process is a key dimension to the understanding of gender, gender role identity, and sexuality and their meaning. This author defines socialization as “the process through which individuals learn their culture and prepare to become functioning members of society” (p.37). Lindsey also noted the importance of social interaction in this process, and emphasized the cultural context when discussing development and socialization. Mahalik (2000) suggested that men and women receive messages about socially appropriate behavior from a variety of sources. Lindsey (1990) posited that agents of socialization are the family, peers, language, television, and school. Donaldson (1993) reaffirmed this position, noting that hegemonic masculine ideals are instilled through the socialization process, identifying various influential figures who promote hegemony as “priests, journalists, advertisers, politicians, psychiatrists, designers, playwrights, film makers, actors, novelists, musicians, activists, academics, coaches, sportsmen” (p.646). Mahalik and Cournoyer (2000) support Donaldson’s position that important figures aid in the socialization process, noting that parents, peers, schools, and members of the community serve as active agents in the gender socialization process. These authors underline the fact that socialization is influenced by a variety of sources, which will be detailed as a means of better understanding specific dimensions of the socialization process.

Family. Lindsey (1990) stressed the primary importance of the family, as they begin to interact with the child from birth. Families often purchase toys and clothes for the child that are gender-specific, and they will continue to “receive reinforcement for behavior which is gender appropriate” (p.44) throughout their development. Carpendale and Lewis (2004) suggested that social understanding begins immediately in infancy, occurring in the dyadic relationship between
the child and their caregiver. Several other authors support this stance, serving to bolster the importance of investigating the impact that the family setting has on development and the socialization process (St. Clair, 1996; Franklin, 1984; Dunn & Munn, 1985). Lindsey (1990) noted that early developmental experiences within the family “provide the basis for gender role identity in later life” (p.45). These findings are enlightening because they suggest social understanding is present at a very young age, and this understanding contributes to behavioral modifications on the part of the child.

**Peers.** As noted previously, peers play an integral role in the socialization process as well. Lindsey (1990) further noted that peers play an important role in the socialization process, noting that play activities for boys and girls are often different. This assessment is supported by other scholars assessing the importance of play in the development of social understanding. McElwain and Volling (2002) noted gender differences in their social experiment, where boys experienced more conflict in sharing tasks while girls experienced more conflict in free play tasks. Maguire and Dunn (1997) found that girls assumed more power and control than did boys in their social settings. The authors noted that these children were rather young participants and the girls had not “fallen into ‘gender-appropriate’ behavior in this respect” (p.682). Franklin (1984) noted that peer groups serve to reward boys for manifesting qualities such as “competitiveness, aggressiveness, and violent behavior” (p.39).

**School.** Children spend a great deal of time interacting and playing with peers while in a school setting, which reinforces the importance of the role that the school setting has on the socialization process. Lindsey (1990) noted that schools often assume the responsibility of “ensuring that children are trained in the ways of society so that they can eventually assume the positions necessary for the maintenance of society” (p.53). Lindsey continued by noting that
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boys and girls in the school setting are therefore encouraged to endorse gender-stereotypic behaviors, and they are also instructed that their career potentials will take divergent paths. Best (1983) defined this socialization in the school setting as the second curriculum, where boys are encouraged to be aggressive and dominant while girls are encouraged to be submissive and passive. This second curriculum is problematic, because it emphasizes the essentialist perspective that there are inherent biological differences between men and women that accelerate or hinder the success of the individual. Children in this setting are encouraged to seek out divergent career paths – boys ought to seek positions of power while women are taught they are best fit in positions that are subservient to men (Best, 1983; Lee & Daly, 1987). These early interactions reward boys for displays of aggression, independence, and restrictions of emotion (Wester et al, 2007; Levant, 1995). Thus, as Mahalik and Cournoyer (2000) posited, this socialization process affirms the culturally normative belief that men are superior to women and all displays of femininity are not accepted but are to be avoided. Eisler (1995) noted that this contributes to the development of a masculine schema that encourages conformity to social gender role norms.

Social Media. As previously noted, the social media plays a role in the socialization process as well. Lindsey (1990) noted that “children’s television is generally sexist and gender stereotyped” (p.52), suggesting that television themes and advertising further reinforces gender stereotypes. Beyond television, other social media outlets such as “radio, newspaper, magazines, [and] popular lyrics” (Franklin, 1984, p. 40) serve as major contributors in the socialization process. This is not a recent phenomenon, as U.S. culture has put forth public figures that have served as highly visible displays of the cultural ideal of a hegemonic male, such as “John Wayne, Humphrey Bogart, Clark Gable, and James Cagney” (Cheng, 1999, p.298). These figures served
as examples of the cultural ideal that masculinity ought to entail physical stature, strength, and aggression. These figures are often linked with the “American-as-cowboy” mentality that was espoused by various political leaders such as General Patton (Dubbert, 1979) as well as Presidents Jackson, Theodore Roosevelt, Johnson, and Reagan (Kimmel, 1987). Various influential figures in American history (e.g., Theodore Roosevelt, George Patton, and Lyndon Johnson) have been extolled for their displays of traditional masculine characteristics (Kimmel, 1987; Dubbert, 1979; Smiler, 2004).

**Language.** Language has also been noted as a major contributor to the socialization process. Dautenhaun’s (1997) highlights the importance of verbal and nonverbal communication as well as context of communication in the development of social understanding. Carpendale and Lewis (2010) noted that language and social understanding are inextricably linked, underlining that language allows individuals to understand and appreciate differences in beliefs, attitudes, etc. that are present between people. Turnbull and Carpendale (1999) reinforced the importance of language as a cultural variable of interest in social understanding. These authors noted that the verbal dimension of linguistic communication is not the only important variable. Additionally, these authors highlighted that nonverbal behavior, silence, and voice inflection (among other factors) play vital roles in communication and vary across culture. It is evident, therefore, that language is a multidimensional concept that is not merely defined by verbal utterances and is also culturally bound. Lindsey (1990) reinforced the importance of language in the socialization of gender role norms, noting that when language is learned “we have a great deal of knowledge about how the culture defines the two sexes” (p.47).
Masculine Gender Role Socialization

Various inventories have been developed over time to assess the impact of gender role socialization on the male population. The focus of men and masculinity research in the past several decades has gradually changed over time. The more structured and empirical investigations of men and masculinity began with David and Brannon’s (1976) assessment of modern masculinity, which stipulates how men should act. As Brannon concluded, men are not to take part in “sissy stuff”, success and power are integral to being a man, they are to be like a “sturdy oak” in their display of confidence and toughness, and men should be aggressive, and violent. The current literature on men and masculinity has advanced Brannon’s early perspective and addressed differing theories related to gender role socialization, gender role strain, gender role conflict, masculine mystique, hegemonic masculinity, and conformity to masculine norms. Scales were developed to assess David and Brannon’s (1976) conceptualization of four main elements to masculinity, which included the Brannon Masculinity Scale and the Hypermasculinity Index (Smiler, 2004). Following Brannon’s work on masculinity, research in this area focused on the strain that men experience when trying to conform to Brannon’s outlined masculine stereotypes. Pleck’s (1981) gender role strain paradigm sought to investigate the outcome of this strain on men; however, no measure was constructed to assess this concept (Smiler, 2004). Pleck’s theory also emphasized the degree to which, on the individual level, a man felt it was important to adhere to socially defined beliefs about men and masculinity (Smiler, 2004). Pleck (1995) stipulated that violations of gender role norms would lead to negative consequences for men, and posited that the outcome of violation of norms was more extreme for men than for women. Furthermore, Pleck (1995) hypothesizes that over-conformity
Religiousness, Masculinity, and Attitudes toward Gay Men

The Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) sought to operationally define and empirically investigate the conflict that Pleck discusses in his gender role strain paradigm (Smiler, 2004). Rigid, sexist, and confining gender roles contribute to the restriction of the person’s capabilities and potential (Good & Wood, 1995). Men can either assimilate into the cultural norm of masculinity or deviate from it (O’Neil, 1981); however, in either case the male will experience an adverse outcome. Overconformity is characterized by hyper-masculine behaviors such as violence, crime, bodybuilding, repressive social attitudes, and demeaning women (an extreme example of this is rape and sexual assault) (Pleck, 1981). An integral aspect of gender role conflict is the fear of and avoidance of femininity, which contributes to restrictive emotionality, excessive uses of power, and negative attitudes toward the LGBT population (O’Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995). This is where gender role conflict not only has the potential to greatly impact the male experiencing it, but can also affect others and restrict their capabilities and potential. Fear of femininity contributes to the belief that men are superior to women as well as non-heterosexual people (O’Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995).

Following the work done by O’Neil and colleagues, several other authors have developed inventories to assess different theories of masculinity as well as address limitations in the gender role strain paradigm. Ronald Levant and colleagues developed the Masculine Role Norms Inventory (MRNI, MRNI-R) as a means of further assessing the gender role strain paradigm. This inventory builds upon work done by O’Neil and colleague by investigating 7 theoretically defined constructs of masculinity (as opposed to 4 in the GRCS). This measurement tool has undergone revisions to assess its subscales, which has led to the deletion of some and addition of
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others. Furthermore, the benefit of this inventory is that it measures both traditional and non-traditional masculine ideology (Levant et al, 2007).

Mahalik and colleagues have posited that there are problems inherent in the MRNI-R, as it is based on the gender role strain paradigm and assumes a perspective that pathologizes masculinity. As these authors indicate, the GRCS and Eisler’s Gender Role Stress Scale assess multiple dimensions of masculinity, but place sole emphasis on the stress and conflict (Mahalik et al, 2003). These authors developed the Conformity to Male Norms Inventory (CMNI), which advances positive changes enacted by Levant and colleagues. The CMNI conducts a broader assessment of masculinity, assessing affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions of masculine gender role norms. This measure also assesses more dimensions of masculinity (11) than the GRCS and the MRNI-R, as well as serves to assess nonconformity to masculine norms in addition to conformity (Mahalik et al, 2003).

Masculinity and Religion

What has been often overlooked in the literature on masculinity and gender studies are various cultural variables that serve to mediate the relationship between gender role socialization and attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women. The current body of literature has highlighted the American view of masculinity; however, little attention has been given to all of the aspects that make up this socially sanctioned form of masculinity. For example, Goffman (1963) described the social expectation that an “ideal man” is White, attractive, able-bodied, heterosexual, and Christian. As previously discussed, the formation of schemas is based upon life experiences that continually reinforce outlooks on appropriate behavior (Mahalik & Cournoyer, 2000), and these images and stereotypes present in American culture detail how men should act
within a specific culture (Pleck, 1981). Connell (2001) further supports this position by suggesting that masculinity is culture-specific.

As was previously outlined, there are numerous agents that serve to greatly influence the socialization process. However, little attention has been given to empirically analyzing the relationship between masculinity and religiousness. Franklin (1984) highlighted the importance of religious institutions on the socialization process. This author noted “that parents tremendously influence religious identity and in turn are influenced by their religious affiliation” (p.44), which suggests that religion has the potential to influence other previously mentioned agents of socialization. As Franklin detailed, much of the modern dialogue within religious institutions has focused on gender appropriate behavior for men and women within and outside of the family context. The language used by many religious institutions greatly impacts the role of the family, peer interactions, and school settings, which will be detailed later in this review of literature.

Ward and Cook (2011) suggested that an individual’s level of religious commitment may be largely due to the socialization process. However, there is still a death of literature focused on the relationship between gender socialization and religion. Additionally, in the study of men and masculinity no empirical studies have been conducted that assessed the impact of religion as a variable that impacts gender role socialization and attitudes toward sexuality. Ward and Cook (2011) reported that the relationship between masculinity and religion has not been well detailed “largely because the concept of masculinity has been evolving over the past 30 years” (p.43). Worthington (2004) posited that “religion and sexuality are inextricably intertwined for many people because virtually every religion regulates sexual behavior and dictates a specific set of values regarding human sexuality” (p.741). King (2005) supported Worthington’s stance, noting
that “the symbolic order and institutional structures created by religions have deeply affected and inspired human existence over millennia; they continue to do so for countless people in today’s postmodern world” (p.3296). King detailed that gender studies have paid little attention to the relevance of religion and the impact of “scriptural statements, religious rites, beliefs, theological doctrines, institutional offices, and authority structures” (p.3297) on the beliefs and attitudes of people. This could be potentially enlightening when analyzing the relational dynamics of gender and sexuality, for many religious perspectives hold that God created the world in such a way that cannot be altered.

The Current Status of Religion in Psychological Research. Tarakeshwar, Stanton, & Pargament (2003) examined articles published in four cross-cultural journals during the past three decades as a means of assessing the attention given to religion as a relevant factor in research. These authors found that religion has played a small role in these journals for the past several decades. They noted numerous studies have found that various cultural dimensions greatly impact individuals’ lives and their functioning; however, the impact of religion as a cultural variable has not been fully assessed. These authors reported that religion is worth studying in a cultural context for several reasons. For one, they noted that “although the significance of religion may vary over time and place, it is clear that religion is salient for people across cultures” (p.379). Furthermore, religion has been found to have an important role to play in the health setting across cultures. They noted that religion has been found to be a strong predictor of various cultural dimensions such as motivation, values, and adherence to tradition. Lastly, these authors noted that religion can greatly predict various dimensions of culture such as attitudes toward death, attitudes toward health, and values.
Wong et al’s (2010) content analysis of articles in *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* from 2000 to 2008 supported Krondorfer’s assertion that there is a dearth of empirical investigations within the field of men’s studies, which focuses on the relationship between masculinity and religion. Wong and colleagues found that most articles within this journal were based on the gender role strain paradigm, placing an emphasis on the negative consequences of conformity and violations of gender role norms. Furthermore, Wong et al’s assessment found that the GRCS was the most commonly used inventory. These authors also detailed that the studies in *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* from 2000 to 2008 displayed a lack of theoretical diversity as well as a lack of diversity in the sample populations utilized. Little attention was given to the influence of cultural factors such as religion/spirituality in the gender role socialization process, gender role conflict, or conformity to male gender role norms.

**Methodological Considerations.** Tarakeshwar et al (2003) suggested the use of a multidimensional approach to studying religion in an empirical manner that would allow for the investigation of various ideologies, rituals, experiential aspects, as well as intellectual and social elements. The authors noted that the social dimension to various religions can be particularly illuminating as it relates to how religion impacts the social lives of individuals in various cultures. Tarakeshwar and colleagues noted that religion greatly contributes to attitudes and behaviors regarding gender, sexuality, and masculinity. With this in mind, these authors suggested that researchers attend to theory and methodology, among other things. These authors suggested that making a “sample homogenous by examining the variables of interest only within one religious group” (p.386) is a means of controlling for potential confounds in the psychological study of religion.
While Tarakeshwar and colleagues provided a very detailed, multidimensional approach to the study of religion, Krondorfer (2007) highlighted the lack of scholarship aimed at studying religion, gender, and sexuality, noting that this is problematic in light of the conservative and restrictive approaches regarding these variables adopted by conservative religious traditions throughout history. Krondorfer pointed out that gay theologians and scholars have given a voice to this area of study, but noted there is a lack of dialogue between gay scholars and heterosexual authors in the field of men’s studies. This author stated the latter group has given very little attention to the convergence of men’s studies and religion, noting that “gay scholarship in religion and theology can still count more predictably on the ire of conservative folks than on a nuanced, non-homophobic critique by their heterosexual colleagues” (p.264).

Krondorfer posited that the lack of a heterosexual voice in this dialogue may be due to personal and professional anxiety experienced by such authors. Heterosexual men do not share the same experiences of plight as gay men, but rather they experience a great deal of privilege in Western society. This hypothesized indifference is attributed to “an anxiety about one’s professional reputation” (p.264). On the professional level, many gay scholars do not stay within the bounds of their discipline when publishing, and this is often viewed as problematic and is discouraged. Additionally, many gay theologians have discussed homosexuality within Christianity and have “been gay-ing religious spaces and religious figures” (p.266), which may cause personal anxiety for some and contribute to a lack of desire to engage in such a dialogue. Also, scholars of religion who identify as gay often add autobiographical insertions to their writings so as to discuss lived experiences of the issues being discussed. Krondorfer suggested this requires a great deal of vulnerability, which may be why heterosexual authors have not engaged with gay theologians in academic settings and public writings. The author detailed that
these various factors have played a major role in the lack of a heterosexual voice in the discussion on sexuality and religion.

**Masculinity and Sexuality within Roman Catholicism**

Hunter (2010) detailed that these various forms of heterosexism have been found to be present in conservative religious beliefs, practices, and teachings. Hunter reported that strict views regarding gender and negative attitudes toward lesbian and gay individuals is present in communities such as Jehovah’s Witnesses, the Church of Christ, the United Church of Christ, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Mormon Church, Judaism, and the Roman Catholic Church. Conservative believers view they are upholding moral, religious teachings when they reject same-sex attraction, which serves to legitimize their approach and behaviors toward these groups. Hunter advocates that these religious denominations often take a rejecting and punitive approach that has been used to discriminate groups and perpetuate a patriarchal culture. In light of Hunter’s analysis of various religious denominations, the present study seeks to provide a critical analysis of a specific religious group – Roman Catholicism. This approach is supported by previously identified authors that stipulate conceptualizations of masculinity is culture-specific (Pleck, 1981; Connell, 2011), and that religious institutions provide very specific stances on gender and sexuality (Worthington, 2004; King, 2005). Additionally, this approach is guided by Tarakeshwar et al.’s (2003) assertion that psychological investigations of religion focus on a specific religious belief system due to the complexity and lack of unity across religions.

The Roman Catholic stance on homosexuality has been criticized by some authors, such as Kopp (1988), who state that its restricting view on sexuality is an example of heterosexism and patriarchy. Kopp further reported that the Roman Catholic perspective on sexuality and same-sex attraction has been influenced by a variety of sources, which include a naïve
understanding of human biology, a perspective that sex is “evil and unclean” (p.43) and that men are superior to women. The Roman Catholic Church views same-sex sexual orientation as deviant and sinful and therefore these sexual acts are also viewed as sinful. Pope John Paul II “repeated an official condemnation of same-sex sexual orientation and banished lesbian and gay support from access to church property and funds” (Hunter, 2010, p.19), while the current pope views same-sex behavior as immoral and inappropriate. Modras (1988) highlights Pope John Paul II’s assertion that “homosexuality is the result of sin” (p.124). Modras further detailed that this approach views it impossible that God would create same-sex attraction, and therefore homosexuality is viewed as disordered.

The dialogue presented by the teaching body of the Roman Catholic Church helps to show how the discourse is used to guide followers’ beliefs and attitudes. DiLenno and Smith (1989) posited that homosexuality is a “condition” in which people find themselves, and they posit that this is “tragic” and leads to “suffering” of the person. These authors further reported that same-sex attraction is a psychological state, and “God can bring good out of a psychological evil” (p.32). The dialogue here focuses on the notion that humans are born either male or female, and heterosexuality is “instinctual” and must be trained over the course of development. Therefore, this religious perspective details that same-sex attraction is “an acquired characteristic” (p. 79). These authors highlight the importance of early development, noting that the family environment plays a critical role in the development of a healthy sexual orientation. More specifically, they noted that in unhealthy families the father is inadequate and “too weak to discipline guide and control the family’s aggressive impulses; the dominant mother is ineffectual by reason of being dominant” (p.86). This stance places an emphasis on a gender-ordered hierarchy within the family so as to provide stability. It views the “role-reversed family” as
problematic, for men and women are then not properly displaying masculinity and femininity. The family where the female has a stronger voice is therefore implicated in the child’s development of same-sex attraction, and these authors therefore put forth a dialogue that seeks to guide parents in proper roles and displays of masculinity and femininity to aid in the development of heterosexuality.

Fastiggi (2009) adopted a similar position, acknowledging that that the oppression of individuals based on race or ethnicity is reprehensible. However, this author notes that homosexuality is subject to discrimination because it involves behavior that is viewed by the Roman Catholic Church as immoral. Fastiggi further details that same-sex attraction develops in early childhood, and the parents are blamed for this unnatural state of being. Fastiggi goes so far as to posit that, for boys, “lack of hand/eye coordination, failure in sports, and subsequent teasing often contribute to a weak masculine identity and homosexual tendencies” (p.81). This author’s position is similar to DiLenno and Smith’s (1989), in that a gender hierarchy and proper displays of masculinity and femininity within the family are viewed as being able to help the child properly develop a heterosexual orientation.

Ruether (1989) detailed that the Church’s perspective on homosexuality is derived from a negative view of sex found in Church history. Furthermore, the view of homosexuality as disordered largely grew out of Freud’s perspective of same-sex attraction “as a developmental disorder” (p.24). Furthermore, the Church also proposes that homosexual sexual orientation contributes to the individual being incomplete, therefore reinforcing heterosexism and the patriarchal perspective of male dominance in heterosexual relationships. Ruether highlights how this has contributed to homophobia, which is largely due to how people in U.S. culture have “been socialized to hate and fear our own capacity for same-gender sexual feeling” (p.30).
Ruether highlights that the Church is a patriarchal system whose teachings and mandates have contributed to how individuals are socialized to view gender and sexuality. Thurston (1996) detailed that “we have seen from the history of the medicalization of homosexuality that the view of homosexuality as a pathology is a product or this theological position.” (p.140-141). Thurston highlighted that the literature linking religiousness and negative attitudes toward homosexuality gives evidence to the impact of the Roman Catholic perspective.

The literature outlined above provided a display of heterosexism within the Roman Catholic Church. Hunter (2010) highlighted that cultural heterosexism operates on a cultural and an individual level. Hunter further noted that cultural heterosexism is “so pervasive that we may not notice it until something comes along like the gay marriage issue” (p.3). Individual heterosexism manifests itself in an individual’s cognitions, behaviors, and feelings, which contributes to gay men and lesbian women having to “contend with stigma, prejudice, discrimination, and sometimes violence and death” (p.4). Yep (2002) identified four categories of heterosexism that impact people’s lives on many levels. Interior-individual (internalized homophobia) develops at a young age and contributes to the view that same-sex attraction is deviant and immoral. Exterior-individual (externalized heterosexism) manifests itself in various forms of violence and discrimination of lesbian and gay individuals. Interior-collective heterosexism is displayed when lesbian and gay individuals are pathologized and identified as different from heterosexuals. Lastly, exterior-collective heterosexism is the term used for institutional violence.

The church’s position is evidence of heterosexism on a global level that is then passed down to individuals through dogma and teachings. However, several authors have put forth criticisms of the Roman Catholic perspective on sexuality and homosexuality. Nugent (1988)
detailed the importance in defining homosexuality as multi-faceted, where the emphasis is not merely placed on orgasmic pleasure but on the fact that sexual orientation also includes “intimacy needs, interpersonal communication, and relationships involving companionship and mutual support” (p.51). Nugent explained that the Church’s conceptualization of homosexuality has disregarded this perspective and has “equated ‘homosexuality’ with homogenital behavior” (p.53). Nugent further reported that this is a grave misunderstanding of sexual orientation, where one’s orientation is conceptualized as being purely directed to sexual behavior. This unidirectional approach therefore does not appreciate the complexity of sexual orientation. Guindon’s (1988) conceptualization of human sexual activity as “language” further supports Nugent’s stance. Guindon highlighted that sexual activity is a means of expression between two people, where they communicate with one another. Thus, the narrow perspective of homosexuality as sexual gratification is a gross misunderstanding of same-sex attraction and sexuality in general.

**Roman Catholicism and Hegemony.** The Roman Catholic position on sexuality follows a strict, essentialist line of thinking. Essentialism adopts the perspective that biological sex determines and drives behavior (Cheng, 1999). This creates a false dichotomy where the focus is on either male or female, masculine or feminine. Essentialism stands in contrast to a social constructionist perspective that views gender as relational, learned, and acted out by individuals within socio-cultural settings (Cheng, 1999). Fastiggi (2009) detailed the Roman Catholic view that God ordained us as male and female, acknowledging humans are sexual beings while making the case that heterosexuality is the only true form of sexuality. Cheng (1999) suggested that an essentialist view of biological sex and gender is problematic, because it forces the placement of categories on us. Furthermore, when operating from an essentialist view of gender,
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masculinity is always in a dominant position. Cheng (1999) suggested a perspective that analyzes masculinities and femininities, which acknowledges the presence of multiple presentations of masculinity and femininity in both women and men. Bird (1996) suggested that an appreciation for the multiple definitions of masculinity and femininity are essential when analyzing the relationship between men and women on complex levels. Connell (1992) further supported this stance, stating that an understanding of multiple masculinities and femininities is essential in the study of the relationships between gender and sexuality. Kimmel (1987) noted that one’s understanding of sexuality is very culturally bound, and within American culture there is emphasis placed on the dichotomy between heterosexuality and homosexuality and “society clearly approves of one identity and not the other” (p.74).

Connell’s theory of hegemonic masculinity is relevant to the discussion of religion, masculinity and sexuality, for there is an overlap between the Roman Catholic perspective and hegemonic ideals. Hegemonic masculinity is “an idealized form of masculinity linked to power in society” (Durfee, 2011, p.318). In defining hegemonic masculinity, Donaldson (1993) stated that hegemony is centered on maintaining power and dominance over other social groups, and heterosexuality, negative views toward femininity, and homophobia are seen as “the bedrock of hegemonic masculinity” (p.645). Connell (1992) stipulated that certain forms of masculinity are lauded while others are subordinated, and this is vitally important when analyzing the relationship between, for example, straight men and gay men. Cheng (1999) reported that hegemonic masculinity is characterized by “attributes such as domination, aggressiveness, competitiveness, athletic prowess, stoicism, and control” while attributes such as “love, affection pain, and grief are improper displays of emotion” (p.298). Herek (1987) supported this discourse, noting that “homophobia is thus an integral component of heterosexual masculinity, to the extent
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that it serves the psychological function of expressing who one is not (i.e., homosexual) and thereby affirming who one is (heterosexual)” (p.76).

Connell (1992) discussed that homosexuality is equated with femininity, which is seen as opposite of masculinity. Other authors have supported this stance, noting that hegemonic masculinity seeks to obtain and maintain the position of dominance over those who do not conform to traditional definitions of masculinity (Donaldson, 1993). Furthermore, Donaldson (1993) noted that “heterosexuality and homophobia are the bedrock of hegemonic masculinity and any understanding of its nature and meaning is predicated on the feminist insight that in general the relationship of men to women is oppressive” (p.645). Donaldson further posited that conformity to masculine norms further reinforces and perpetuates homophobia and fear of femininity. Cheng (1999) posited that nonconformity is threatening to hegemony. This author noted that “hegemony is the defining performance of Euro-American males; in addition to being White and male, important characteristics include being able-bodied, heterosexual, Christian (or perhaps Jewish), first world (as opposed to colonized men), and between 20 and 40 (although the upper end is rising as baby boomers get older)” (p. 298). Cheng’s discussion further reinforces Goffman’s description of the “ideal” man in Western culture.

As previously highlighted, Cheng’s definition of the ideal hegemonic male in American culture shows that this is a very rigid conceptualization, and thus creates a divide between those who fit this social norm and those who do not. Therefore, marginalized individuals are those that do not have characteristics of the dominant group, and include blue collar immigrants, women, non-Caucasian individuals, members of the LGBT community, and non-Christians. Homosexuality is viewed as standing in opposition to the Western definition of masculinity in much the same way as femininity. As Kim (2006) suggested, this is an example of hegemonic
masculinity operating from a position of power that enables the oppression of non-traditional displays of masculinity, femininity, and homosexuality. Badinter (1995) supported the discussion that homophobia is integral to heterosexual masculinity, noting that “to be a man signifies not to be feminine, not to be homosexual; not to be effeminate in one’s physical appearance or manners; not to have sexual or overly intimate relations with other men; not to be impotent with women” (p.115). Badinter further noted that while homophobia has the advantage of bolstering one’s display of heterosexuality and masculinity, it can greatly impact relationships with other as they are more likely to be restricted.

Connell (1992) indicated that gay men experience “structurally-induced conflicts about masculinity – conflicts between their sexuality and their social presence as men, about the meaning of their choice of sexual object, and in their construction of relationships with women and with heterosexual men” (p.737). Connell further identified the term “homosexual” as controversial because it emphasizes the person’s same-sex attraction as the key identifier of who they are. Connell further stated that examples of structural oppression creating conflicts can be seen in the sociology’s past discourses on homosexuality (e.g., normality-deviance spectrum) and psychology’s former pathological conceptualization of homosexuality (e.g., diagnosable mental disorder in DSM). History shows that gay activists and liberationists “attacked the social practices and psychological assumptions surrounding gender relations”, for the social view that men are hierarchically dominant over women greatly contributed to homophobic beliefs since homosexuality does not fit into this societal hierarchy (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985, p.584).

Gay men experience oppression because they do not conform to social criteria for masculinity, “and are told that they are weak, effeminate, maladjusted, and so on” (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985, p.585). Gay liberation movement challenged the hegemonic norm that
emphasizes heterosexuality and positions women as sexual objects and men in competition with one another for sexual attention (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985). Gay liberationists address the problems with hegemonic masculinity, highlighting the problematic view that this is the ideal male role, the dichotomous relationship it creates between heterosexuality and homosexuality, and the “institution of heterosexuality, as in the family” has contributed to the oppression of women and non-heterosexuals (p.586). Sherman (1988) reported that women also experience oppression in a similar manner compared to gay men. Sherman (1988) detailed the struggles that lesbian women in the Church face, noting that they are viewed as inferior and subordinate to men as well as perceived “to have an objective disorder and to possess a disordered sexual inclination which is essentially self-indulgent” (p.161).

Grammick (1989) detailed that lesbian women in the religious community face a great deal of difficulty due to their sexual orientation and membership in the Church. The notion of same-sex individuals within the Roman Catholic Church has increasingly become an issue for the church. Nugent (1989) highlighted the church’s negative view of gay men in the priesthood. The Roman Catholic Church sexual abuse scandal solidified the exclusion of gay men in the priesthood, as the Roman Catholic Church viewed that homosexuality was at fault in a vast majority of the cases.

The Impact of Religious Discourse. The literature that has been provided above has detailed the impact that religion, specifically Roman Catholicism, has on the masculine gender role socialization process and attitudes toward sexuality (Ruether, 1989). As has been described, this religious perspective has presented a discourse that has focused on the divergence between men and women, where men are viewed as superior to women (Fastiggi, 2009; King, 2005; Kopp, 1988). Furthermore, this religious perspective has also emphasized that same-sex
attraction is unnatural and immoral (DiIenno & Smith, 1989; Fastiggi, 2009). This discourse is reflective of hegemonic norms, where rigid gender definitions are proffered and heterosexuality and homophobia are viewed as essential (Ruether, 1989; Thurston, 1996; Hunter, 2010; Yep, 2002). This has also emphasized the importance of social agents in healthy development, specifically detailing that the family is of great importance. Roman Catholic dogma and discourse therefore impact family ideals, schools, and peer interactions.

Religious beliefs and practices are often patriarchal, which serves to contribute to the perspective that sex is divinely ordained in a binary manner (man and woman) (King, 2005). Robinson and Spivey (2007) noted that deities are often gendered in religious perspectives, and movements such as the ex-gay movement “asserts that sex differences are divinely created and ordained, justifying distinct social and sexual scripts in the family and society” (p.658). Robinson and Spivey further noted that this religious perspective adopts the position that homosexuality is not masculine, and therefore gay men and lesbian women are acting in ways that are not appropriate to their gender. These authors highlight that religious authorities and perspectives such as these serve to perpetuate male hegemony, which impact people on an individual and interactional level. Messages regarding gender and sexuality are provided as a means of informing people how to act within their cultural context.

Examples of these messages can be seen in movements such as the Catholic mythopoetic movement, which identifies feminism as the cause of major problems in society and views men as needing to adopt a more virile definition of masculinity (Gelfer, 2008). This is similar to other movements such as the Promise Keepers movement, which seeks to redefine masculinity with men as “protectors and providers and women as child bearers, care givers and nurturers come under attack” (Cole, 1999, p.115). These are examples of more modern movements aimed at
Redefining masculinity (Pleck, 1987), and these are cultural movements that are examples of how gender, masculinity, and religion are coalescing in public spaces. Bartowski (2000) wrote that the Promise Keeper’s movement promotes a rigid, traditional view of gender and masculinity.

Bartowski also stated that little room is left for women and non-heterosexual men: “underlying this strict essentialist view of gender is a belief in the divinely ordained appropriateness of heterosexuality as well as an explicit critique of homosexuality and any attempts at perceived ‘gender blending’ (e.g., feminism, gay-rights advocacy)” (p.48). Newton (2005) reported that men attracted to these movements identify as White, heterosexual males in their middle-age years who take the stance that homosexuality is a sin. Singleton (2004) suggests that the discourse used by such groups “ultimately defends and reinforces men’s privileges, rather than encouraging any real and substantive change in gender relations” (p.162). Movements such as these utilize the Bible as a means of promulgating the notion that men are to be leaders and protectors of their family and society, therefore placing men hierarchically above women in society. Men are viewed as to take the sin out of the world and are needed to help women and children avoid sin faults (Cole, 1999).

**Religion, gender, and sexuality: Putting it all together**

The present literature review has highlighted several important points. To begin, the socialization process that occurs throughout human development is rather culturally specific. Cultural variables such as family (Dunn & Munn, 1985; Franklin, 1984; Lindsey, 1990; St. Clair, 1996), peers (Franklin, 1984; Lindsey, 1990; Maguire & Dunn, 1997; McElwain & Volling, 2002), schools (Best, 1983; Lee & Daly, 1987; Lindsey, 1990), social media (Franklin, 1984; Lindsey, 1990), language (Dautenhaun, 1997; Lewis, 2010; Turnbull & Carpendale, 1999), and religion (Franklin, 1984) are integral in the gender role socialization process. This process must
be understood in a culture-specific context (Connell, 2001), and it entails the individual learning appropriate displays of gender within their cultural context (Lindsey, 1990). Second, the present review also detailed the significance that religion plays in the formation of an individual’s attitudes and beliefs (King, 2005). Religion was noted as an important cultural variable (Tarakeshwar, Stanton, & Pargament, 2003), specifically in investigations wishing to integrate religion and sexuality (Worthington, 2004). Thirdly, a focus was placed on the Roman Catholic Church and its discourse on gender and sexuality (Ruether, 1989). However, the question still remains as to how religion, gender, and sexuality interact with one another in the context of psychological research. To date, few empirical investigations have studied the impact that religion has on both attitudes toward gender and sexuality. The purpose of this section is to present the results of the few investigations of religion as a predictor of attitudes toward gender and sexuality.

Macgillivray (2008) conducted an ethnographic investigation of the role that religion plays on attitudes toward gender and sexuality within public schools. The population of interest in Macgillivray’s investigation was individuals identified as members of the “Christian Right” (p.31). Participants identified as parents and teachers were comfortable addressing racism in the school setting, but expressed discomfort addressing antigay harassment and heterosexism out of fear that they would be viewed as condoning homosexuality. Macgillivray also found that participants held beliefs that “the legitimization of homosexuality would lead to the downfall of society, that Christians are now the ones being discriminated against, and that the [public school] policies violated parental rights” (p.37). As a result of these beliefs, there were attempts made by participants to minimize and ignore discussions of differences in sexual orientation within the public school setting. This serves as an example of heterosexism, where members of the
dominant group deny the existence of realities faced by individuals in the LGBT community (Sue & Sue, 2008).

Macgillivray’s (2008) investigation provided further evidence for how one cultural variable (religion) can greatly influence another cultural variable (schools) within a particular socio-cultural context. This author notes that conservative Christian groups have made efforts to influence public school policies on prayer, sex education, gender issues, and sexual orientation. Macgillivray’s study provides qualitative evidence highlighting the role that religion can have on attitudes toward discussions of sexuality and gender within the school setting. The conservative Christian group in this investigation endorsed strict views regarding gender and sexuality that were guided by their religious perspective, where heterosexuality was assumed to be an integral part of traditional gender identities.

Other investigations have found further evidence for the role that religion can have on one’s perspectives regarding gender and sexuality. McQueeny (2009) collected data from 200 hours of direct observation and 25 in-depth interviews of participants in two Protestant churches. This author indicated that a common conservative Christian perspective on gender and sexuality is that God created man and woman to have sexual relationships (endorsement of heterosexism) where men are positioned hierarchically above women (endorsement of sexism). The results of this investigation yielded several important findings. For one, the author found evidence that religious participants who identified as gay or lesbian experienced a conflict between their sexual orientation and their religious orientation that was not directly felt by straight allies in the same community. This is an example of heterosexual privilege, where members of the straight community do not have to experience sexual identity-related stress (SIS) because of their sexual orientation (Zuccarini & Karos, 2011).
Participants in this investigation also participated in minimization of homosexuality so as to present their Christianity as a unifying aspect of everyone’s identity. Heterosexual as well as gay and lesbian participants endorsed this perspective, which served to uphold the “heterosexual assumption” present within U.S. culture (p.158). Sexuality is therefore treated as a secondary identifying characteristic viewed as being incapable of uniting people. The results also indicated that participants’ religious perspective influenced their views on gender and sexuality. Participants indicated using the Bible as a means of advocating for male headship of the family and for men to “enact conventional masculinity” (p.165). Similar results were found regarding attitudes toward women and femininity. Praise was given for women occupying feminine and motherly roles, as this gave these individuals “immediate normal and moral legitimacy” (p.166).

McQueeny (2009) indicated that the participants’ attempts at religious-based inclusivity were met with numerous challenges. For one, “by essentializing sexuality and defining its expression as proper only in two forms” (p.170), participants were less inclusive of people identifying as bisexual, transgender, or who occupied different gender or sexual roles. Second, the focus of inclusivity suggested that the dominant group ought to be accepting of other groups. This serves to keep in place hegemonic norms by framing subordinate groups “as in need of help and approval and gives credit for the act of inclusion to the privileged group” (p.170). McQueeny highlighted that the emphasis on “monogamy, manhood, and motherhood” (p.170) was based on a traditional gender role value system. Therefore, those who benefit most are “already closest to the mainstream” (p.170), and issues of sexism and heterosexism are not addressed. The author suggests that future empirical investigations seek to determine how variables such as religion, gender, and sexuality intersect with one another “among diverse groups in a range of social contexts” (p.170).
Mahalik and Lagan’s (2001) investigation provides evidence for how religion, gender, and sexuality intersect with one another among Roman Catholic male participants. These authors surveyed 74 Roman Catholic Seminarians and 77 Roman Catholic undergraduate students to better explore the relationship between religiousness and gender. The results of their investigation found that adherence to more traditional gender role norms contributed to less religiousness among participants. For undergraduate men, restrictive emotionality contributed to less religiousness and lower psychological well-being. For seminarians, a focus on competition and restrictive affectionate behavior between men both contributed to lowered religiousness and well-being. Religious commitment among seminarians was predictive of increased discomfort being affectionate with other men. These results suggest that these participants’ religious commitment contributed to rigid views of gender and homophobia. This provides further evidence of a relationship between religiousness, masculine role norms, and sexuality. Mahalik and Lagan indicated that “regardless of the causal direction of the relationship” more research was needed that investigated the relationship between these variables (p.30).

The results of these investigations provide evidence to support the assertion that religiousness contributes to attitudes toward gender and sexuality. Several other investigations previously outlined have assessed the relationship between religiousness and prejudice (e.g., Leak & Finken, 2011) as well as religiousness and masculine role norms (e.g., Ward & Cook, 2011). However, the studies conducted by Macgillivray (2008), McQueeny (2009), and Mahalik and Lagan’s (2001) represent recent investigations attempting to study the interconnectedness of all three variables. They provide evidence that suggests religiousness may predict both attitudes toward gender and sexuality. Additionally, these investigations provide initial evidence indicating the presence of a relationship between gender and sexuality. Krondorfer (2007) noted
that few scholars have sought to study the complex relationship between religion, gender, and sexuality. King (2005) suggests that such investigations could provide a wealth of information regarding “cultural and religious differentiation” (p.3305) that would break from the traditional gender role perspective. This is consistent with the results of McQueeny’s (2009) investigation that suggested participants’ adherence to the traditional gender role perspective contributed to a lack of appreciation for cultural differences.

While the above studies provide evidence for the interconnectedness of these variables, they are small in number. There is a lack of quantitative investigations seeking to determine the relationship among religiousness, gender, and sexuality. The current body of literature, therefore, does not provide a complete picture as to the relationship of these variables. More specifically, there is little information as to how this relationship plays out in various cultural and religious groups within U.S. culture. Mahalik and Lagan’s (2001) study was applied to a Roman Catholic population, but further research is needed to add to this small body of evidence. The empirical literature would greatly benefit from quantitative studies employing more sophisticated means of data analysis focused on specific cultural and religious denominations. Such an approach would, as McQueeny (2009) suggested, begin to enhance our knowledge of the interconnectedness of these variables in specific religious and cultural contexts.
Appendix B – Definition of Important Terms

Religious Fundamentalism

Religious fundamentalism is defined as “the belief that there is one set of religious teachings that clearly contains the fundamental, basic, intrinsic, essential, inerrant truth about humanity and deity” (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, p. 118). Individuals with this perspective have an unchanging religious perspective and a perspective that their beliefs system allows them to “have a special relationship with the deity” (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, p. 118). For the present study, religious fundamentalism will be measured by using the revised version of the Religious Fundamentalism Scale (RFS) developed and revised by Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992; 2004). This is the most commonly used inventory to assess religious fundamentalism. Additionally, the Fundamentalism Scale developed by McFarland (1989) will be used as an additional means of measuring religious fundamentalism.

Religious Orientation

Religious orientation has been defined as encompassing three dimensions within the psychological literature – intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness (Gorusch & McPherson, 1989) and quest religiousness (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, b). Intrinsic religiousness is defined as an internalization of one’s religion, where it is lived and provides fulfillment (Allport & Ross, 1967). An extrinsic religious orientation is defined as using one’s religion in useful ways (Allport & Ross, 1967). A quest religious orientation is defined as a willingness to entertain existential questions, be self-critical, and be open to change (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991b). The intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation styles will be assessed using the Intrinsic/Extrinsic-Revised (I/E-R) Scale developed by Gorusch and McPherson (1989). The quest orientation will be assessed using the Quest Scale developed by Batson and Schoenrade (1991a, b).
Masculine Role Norms

The definition of traditional masculinity ideology was derived from David and Brannon’s (1976) early conceptualization of this paradigm. Traditional masculinity ideology is defined in the present study as encompassing seven distinct dimensions: avoidance of femininity, fear and hatred of homosexuals, extreme self-reliance, aggression, dominance, non-relational attitudes toward sexuality, and restrictive emotionality (Levant et al, 2007). This variable will be assessed using the Masculine Role Norms Inventory – Revised developed by Levant et al (2007; 2010).

Attitudes toward Gay Men

Heterosexual individuals’ attitudes toward gay men will be assessed in the present study. Attitudinal measures often assess positive (e.g., “male homosexuality is a natural expression or sexuality”) and negative (e.g., “sex between two men is just plain wrong”) perspectives. This approach can help identify discriminatory attitudes as well that suggest gay individuals are not oppressed and bring their oppression on themselves. Two inventories will be used as a means of assessing these attitudes in the present study – the Attitudes Toward Gay Men scale developed by Herek (1988) and the Modern Homogenativity Scale developed by Morrison and Morrison (2003).

Quest

The psychological study of religion has focused on, among many constructs, religion as “quest”. Quest is identified as a dimension of religiousness that is defined as an individual’s “honestly facing existential questions in their complexity, while at the same time resisting clear-cut, pat answers” (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991, p.417). This construct has been used as an additional dimension of religiousness that is unique from an intrinsic/extrinsic religious orientation (Batson & Schoenrades, 1991). Recent authors have found this concept to be
multifaceted (Beck & Jessup, 2004) and have used it as predictor variable in numerous psychological studies of religion.
Appendix C – Additional Model Fit Tables

Table 8
*Scales, Means, Standard Deviations, Ranges, and Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Variable</th>
<th>% Cases (N=216)</th>
<th>Scale Range</th>
<th>Mean Coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>12-108</td>
<td>60.58</td>
<td>17.019</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNI-R</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>53-371</td>
<td>153.96</td>
<td>49.019</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>8-56</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>9.513</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHH</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>10-70</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>13.185</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>7-49</td>
<td>26.39</td>
<td>7.712</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>7-49</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>8.264</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>7-49</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>7.556</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRATS</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>6-42</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>5.722</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>8-56</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>8.724</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>6.145</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>100% (n=216)</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td>5.589</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* MRNI-R = Masculine Role Norms Inventory-Revised; AF = Avoidance of Femininity (MRNI-R Subscale); FHH = Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals (MRNI-R Subscale); ESR = Extreme Self-Reliance (MRNI-R Subscale); Aggression = Aggression (MRNI-R Subscale); Dominance = Dominance (MRNI-R Subscale); NRATS = Non-Relational Attitudes Toward Sexuality (MRNI-R Subscale); RE = Restrictive Emotionality (MRNI-R Subscale); ATG = Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale; FS = Fundamentalism Scale
### Table 9: Correlation Matrix for Measured Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IER</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>-.365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHH</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggr.</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom.</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRATS</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>-.547</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFS</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>-.677</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For all correlations, Pearson Correlation Coefficient is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).*
### Table 10

*Multivariate Normality Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Variables</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quest</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AF</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FHH</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>-.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ESR</td>
<td>-.603</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aggression</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>-.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dominance</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. NRATS</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>-.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RE</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. AG</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-1.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. FS</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Quest = Quest Scale; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; FHH = Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals; ESR = Extreme Self Reliance; NRATS = Non-Relational Attitudes Toward Sexuality; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; AG = Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale; FS = Fundamentalism Scale
Table 11
Primary Model Maximum Likelihood Estimates: Unstandardized and Standardized Parameter Estimates or Regression Weights, Standard Error, Critical Ratio, Significance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Regression Weights)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM  RF</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>4.936</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM  RO</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-2.842</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM  MRNI</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>6.660</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM  var1</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>12.380</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF  MRN</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHH  MRN</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>13.153</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR  MRN</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>9.987</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression  MRN</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>13.115</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance  MRN</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>14.292</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRATS  MRN</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>9.813</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE  MRN</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>13.365</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS6  RF</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS5  RF</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>7.267</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4  RF</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>7.252</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3  RF</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>7.067</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS2  RF</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>7.917</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS1  RF</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>6.834</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG1  ATGM</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG2  ATGM</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>13.562</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG3  ATGM</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>15.484</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG4  ATGM</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>19.280</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG5  ATGM</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>15.355</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12  RO</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10  RO</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>8.528</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9  RO</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>7.286</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5  RO</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>7.179</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3  RO</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>8.579</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2  RO</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>8.561</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1  RO</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>6.196</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ATGM = Attitudes Toward Gay Men; RF = Religious Fundamentalism; RO = Religious Orientation; var1 = variance; MRN = Masculine Role Norms; AF = Avoidance of Femininity Subscale; ESR = Extreme Self Reliance Subscale; Aggression = Aggression Subscale; Dominance = Dominance Subscale; RE = Restrictive Emotionality Subscale; FS = Fundamentalism Scale Item; ATG = Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale Item; Q = Quest Scale Item; S.E. = Approximate Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio; *** p < .001, ** p < .05, unless otherwise listed; Standard. Estimate = Standardized Estimate.
### Table 12
*Alternate Model Maximum Likelihood Estimates: Unstandardized and Standardized Parameter Estimates or Regression Weights, Standard Error, Critical Ratio, Significance Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Regression Weights)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN (\rightarrow) RF</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>4.442</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN (\rightarrow) var2</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>14.539</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM (\rightarrow) RF</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>4.936</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-2.842</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-1.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATGM (\rightarrow) MRN</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>6.660</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF (\rightarrow) var1</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>12.380</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF (\rightarrow) MRN</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHH (\rightarrow) MRN</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>13.153</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR (\rightarrow) MRN</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>9.987</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression (\rightarrow) MRN</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>13.115</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance (\rightarrow) MRN</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>14.292</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRATS (\rightarrow) MRN</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>9.813</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE (\rightarrow) MRN</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>13.365</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS6 (\rightarrow) RF</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS5 (\rightarrow) RF</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>7.267</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4 (\rightarrow) RF</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>7.252</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3 (\rightarrow) RF</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>7.067</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS2 (\rightarrow) RF</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>7.917</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS1 (\rightarrow) RF</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>6.834</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG1 (\rightarrow) ATGM</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG2 (\rightarrow) ATGM</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>13.562</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG3 (\rightarrow) ATGM</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>15.484</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG4 (\rightarrow) ATGM</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>19.280</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG5 (\rightarrow) ATGM</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>15.355</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>8.528</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>7.286</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>7.719</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>8.579</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>8.561</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 (\rightarrow) RO</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>6.196</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ATGM = Attitudes Toward Gay Men; RF = Religious Fundamentalism; RO = Religious Orientation; var1 = variance; MRN = Masculine Role Norms; AF = Avoidance of Femininity Subscale; ESR = Extreme Self Reliance Subscale; Aggression = Aggression Subscale;*
Religiousness, Masculinity, and Attitudes toward Gay Men

Dominance = Dominance Subscale; RE = Restrictive Emotionality Subscale; FS = Fundamentalism Scale Item; ATG = Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale Item; Q = Quest Scale Item; S.E. = Approximate Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio; *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .05$, unless otherwise listed; Standard. Estimate = Standardized Estimate.
Appendix D – Factor Analysis Results

MRNI Factor Analysis

Table 13
MRNI – R Maximum Likelihood Estimates: Unstandardized and Standardized Parameter Estimates or Regression Weights, Standard Error, Critical Ratio, Significance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHH</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>11.670</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>10.476</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggr.</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>13.580</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom.</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>13.881</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRATS</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>10.366</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>13.707</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AF = Avoidance of Femininity; FHH = Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals; ESR = Extreme Self-Reliance; Aggression = Aggression; Dominance = Dominance; NRATS = Non-Relational Attitudes Toward Sexuality; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; S.E. = Approximate Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio; *** p < .001.

Table 14
Model Fit Index Summary for Masculine Role Norms Inventory – Revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven Factor</td>
<td>44.880</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.206</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2$ = Chi Square Test; df = Degrees of Freedom; CMIN/DF = maximum likelihood estimation chi-square divided by degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CI for RMSEA = Confidence Interval for Root Mean Square Error of Approximation.
**Fundamentalism Scale Factor Analysis**

Table 15

*Fundamentalism Scale Maximum Likelihood Estimates: Unstandardized and Standardized Parameter Estimates or Regression Weights, Standard Error, Critical Ratio, Significance Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS2</td>
<td>1.509</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>10.534</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>8.931</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>9.001</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS5</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>8.932</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS6</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>6.283</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. FS1 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 1; FS2 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 2; FS3 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 3; FS4 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 4; FS5 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 5; FS6 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 6; S.E. = Approximate Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio; *** p < .001.*

Table 16

*Model Fit Index Summary for Fundamentalism Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six Factor</td>
<td>37.702</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.189</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $\chi^2$ = Chi Square Test; df = Degrees of Freedom; CMIN/DF = maximum likelihood estimation chi-square divided by degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CI for RMSEA = Confidence Interval for Root Mean Square Error of Approximation.*
Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale Factor Analysis

Table 17
Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale Maximum Likelihood Estimates: Unstandardized and Standardized Parameter Estimates or Regression Weights, Standard Error, Critical Ratio, Significance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATG1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG2</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>13.186 ***</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG3</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>15.094 ***</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG4</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>18.659 ***</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG5</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>14.999 ***</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. FS1 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 1; FS2 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 2; FS3 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 3; FS4 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 4; FS5 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 5; FS6 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 6; S.E. = Approximate Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio; *** p < .001.

Table 18
Model Fit Index Summary for Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five Factor</td>
<td>17.941</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2$ = Chi Square Test; df = Degrees of Freedom; CMIN/DF = maximum likelihood estimation chi-square divided by degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CI for RMSEA = Confidence Interval for Root Mean Square Error of Approximation.
Quest Scale Factor Analysis

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>6.982</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>7.063</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>6.558</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>6.242</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>6.840</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>5.903</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. FS1 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 1; FS2 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 2; FS3 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 3; FS4 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 4; FS5 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 5; FS6 = Fundamentalism Scale Question 6; S.E. = Approximate Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio; *** p < .001.

Table 20

Model Fit Index Summary for Quest Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Factor</td>
<td>278.070</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.149</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Factor</td>
<td>190.160</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.322</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Factor</td>
<td>153.980</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.399</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Factor</td>
<td>132.957</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.924</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Factor</td>
<td>116.166</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.508</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Factor</td>
<td>90.713</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.479</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Quest = Quest Scale; $\chi^2$ = Chi Square Test; df = Degrees of Freedom; CMIN/DF = maximum likelihood estimation chi-square divided by degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CI for RMSEA = Confidence Interval for Root Mean Square Error of Approximation.
Appendix E – Measures

Introductory Letter

Greetings,

I hope this message finds you all well. My name is David Adams and I am a third-year doctoral student in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Services at Ball State University. I am currently conducting a study for my dissertation exploring the relationship between religiousness, masculinity, and sexuality among Catholic men. The relationship between masculinity and religion has not been well detailed in the psychological study of masculinity (Ward & Cook, 2011). The results of this investigation promise to help therapist and social scientists better understand the relationship between religion, gender, and sexuality.

As an incentive for participation in the study, I am making a small contribution to Catholic Relief Services for each completed survey. This study has received approval from Ball State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The link to the informed consent page and the full survey can be found at the bottom of this email.

1. If you meet the criteria for inclusion in this study (Catholic, male, heterosexual, at least 18 years of age, living in the United States), please invest some time in completing the survey.

2. After completion of the survey, or if you do not meet the criteria for inclusion, please forward this request to Catholic men or other organizations that might help promote the study.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

https://qtrial.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_eVayxhS7pmDYSr

Regards,
David Adams, M.A.
Doctoral Student
Counseling Psychology
Ball State University
Department of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Services
Teacher’s College
Muncie, IN 47306
Informed Consent

My name is David Adams and I am a third-year doctoral student in the Department of Counseling Psychology & Guidance Services at Ball State University. I am in the process of collecting data for my dissertation investigating the potential relationship between masculinity, religiousness, and sexuality. This study has been approved by Ball State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The purpose of this investigation is to better understand the relationship between religiousness, masculinity, and sexuality. The relationship between masculinity and religion has not been well detailed in the psychological study of masculinity (Ward & Cook, 2011). The results of this investigation promise to help therapists and social scientists better understand the relationship between religion, gender, and sexuality.

In order to participate in this study, you must identify as a Catholic, heterosexual male, living in the United States, and are at least 18 years of age. This study consists of a demographics form and seven instruments. It should take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete.

All surveys will be completed anonymously. Participants will not be asked for their names, social security numbers, or any identifying information. Also, data collected will be stored in a password-protected file on a designated flash drive, which be kept in the researcher’s locked file cabinet for three years, then deleted. Only members of the research team will have access to the data.

The only anticipated risk associated with participation in this study is emotional discomfort from discussing the topics of masculinity, religion, and/or sexuality. Persons uncomfortable with the topic may choose not to participate or to skip items with which they are not comfortable.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw your permission at any time for any reason without penalty or prejudice from the researcher (which is reinforced by the anonymous nature of the study). If you do choose to participate, the researcher will donate $0.50 to Catholic Relief Services for each survey completed. Should any emotional discomfort surface as a result of participation in this study, please contact the Principle Investigator who will help you find an appropriate referral in your location.

For one’s rights as a research subject, you may contact the following: Research Compliance, Sponsored Programs Office, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu. Please feel invited to contact the researcher or the researcher’s faculty advisor with any questions or concerns regarding this study.

Principle Investigator:
David Adams, M.A.
3rd Year Doctoral Student
Counseling Psychology
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Email: dfadams@bsu.edu

Faculty Supervisor:
Donald Nicholas, PhD
Counseling Psychology
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Email: dnichola@bsu.edu
Phone Contact Script

My name is David Adams and I am a third-year doctoral student in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Services at Ball State University. I am currently conducting a study for my dissertation exploring the relationship between attitudes about religion, masculinity, and sexuality among Catholic men. This study has received approval from Ball State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). As an incentive for participation in the study, I am making a small contribution to Catholic Relief Services for each completed survey. I was wondering if I might be able to advertise this study to members of your congregation via email.

For further contact, my phone number is (309) 738-8202 and my email address is dfadams@bsu.edu. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

David Adams
Demographic Questionnaire

Please check only those responses that apply.

1. The gender I identify with is:
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Male to Female Transgender
   d. Female to Male Transgender
   e. Androgynous
   f. Prefer not to answer
   g. Other

2. My age falls within the range of:
   a. 18-20
   b. 21-30
   c. 31-40
   d. 41-50
   e. 51-60
   f. 61-Older

3. I identify as:
   a. Gay
   b. Lesbian
   c. Bisexual
   d. Heterosexual
   e. Transsexual
   f. Pansexual
   g. Other (please specify)

4. What is your race/ethnicity?
   ___ Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
   ___ White
   ___ Black/African American
   ___ American Indian or Alaska Native
   ___ Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander
   ___ Other (please specify) _________________________

5. Present Marital Status: _____ Married _____ Single _____ Divorced
   _____ Remarried _____ Widowed

6. Educational Level: (Check the highest level that fits you.)
   _____ High School Diploma _____ Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior
   _____ Master’s Degree _____ Ph.D. _____ Other
7. I grew up primarily in a
   a. Rural area
   b. Suburban area
   c. Urban area

8. The state in which I currently live is:

9. I currently live in a
   a. Rural area
   b. Suburban area
   c. Urban area

In completing this survey, you have indicated that you identify as Roman Catholic. Please respond to the following prompts to provide further information.

10. I was born into the Roman Catholic faith:
    _____ Yes   _____ No

11. I converted to the Roman Catholic faith:
    _____ Yes   _____ No

12. I have been a Roman Catholic for the following number of years (please specify below):
    _____ Please Specify

13. I am religiously:
    _____ Conservative
    _____ Moderate
    _____ Liberal
    _____ Other

15. How did you learn about this survey?

16. If you are an undergraduate student at Ball State University in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Services and you wish to receive CPSY course credit, you may contact the principle investigator via email at dfadams@bsu.edu. Indicate that you have completed the survey, as well as the course you wish this credit to be applied. Please provide the name of your current instructor as well. Please be aware that contacting the principle investigator of your completion of the study makes your participation in this study no longer anonymous.
Intrinsic/Extrinsic-Revised (I/E-R) Scale (Gorusch & McPherson, 1989)

Following are the items included in the I/R scale. All items are scored as follows:

1 = strongly disagree  4 = I tend to agree
2 = I tend to disagree   5 = I strongly agree
3 = I’m not sure

1. (I) I enjoy reading about my religion.
2. (Es) I go to church because it helps me to make friends.
3. (I)** It doesn’t much matter what I believe so long as I am good.
4. (I) It is important to me to spend time in private thought and prayer.
5. (I) I have often had a strong sense of God’s presence.
6. (Ep) I pray mainly to gain relief and protection.
7. (I) I try hard to live all my life according to my religious beliefs.
8. (Ep)* What religion offers me most is comfort in times of trouble and sorrow.
9. (Ep) Prayer is for peace and happiness.
10. (I)** Although I am religious, I don’t let it affect my daily life.
11. (Es) I go to church mostly to spend time with my friends.
12. (I) My whole approach to life is based on my religion.
13. (Es)* I go to church mainly because I enjoy seeing people I know there.
14. (I)** Although I believe in my religion, many other things are more important in life.

* Single-item measures for that factor
** Reverse-scored
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**Quest Scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, b)**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the items by using the following scale:

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. As I grow and change, I expect my religion to grow and change.
2. I am constantly questioning my religious beliefs.
3. It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties.
4. I was not very interested in religion until I began to ask questions about the meaning and purpose of my life.
5. For me, doubting is an important part of what it means to be religious.
6. (-) I do not expect my religious convictions to change in the next few years.
7. (-) I find religious doubts upsetting.
8. I have been driven to ask religious questions out of a growing awareness of the tensions in my world and in my relation to the world.
9. My life experiences have led me to rethink my religious convictions.
10. There are many religious issues on which my views are still changing.
11. God wasn’t very important to me until I began to ask questions about the meaning of my own life.
12. Questions are far more central to my religious experience than are answers.

*Note.* (-) indicates reverse-scoring. Items 4, 8, 9, and 11 tap the “existential questions” aspect. Items 3, 5, 7, and 12 tap the “doubting as positive” aspect. Items 1, 2, 6, and 10 tap the “openness to change” aspect.
Masculine Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R) (Levant, et al, 2003)  

Please complete the questionnaire by circling the number which indicates your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. Give only one answer for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Homosexuals should never marry.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. The President of the US should always be a man.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Men should be the leader in any group.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. A man should be able to perform his job even if he is physically ill or hurt.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Men should not talk with a lisp because this is a sign of being gay.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Men should not wear make-up, cover-up or bronzer.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Men should watch football games instead of soap operas.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. All homosexual bars should be closed down.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Men should not be interested in talk shows such as Oprah.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. Men should excel at contact sports.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Boys should play with action figures not dolls.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. Men should not borrow money from friends or family members.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Men should have home improvement skills.

14. Men should be able to fix most things around the house.

15. A man should prefer watching action movies to reading romantic novels.

16. Men should always like to have sex.

17. Homosexuals should not be allowed to serve in the military.

18. Men should never compliment or flirt with another male.

19. Boys should prefer to play with trucks rather than dolls.

20. A man should not turn down sex.

21. A man should always be the boss.

22. A man should provide the discipline in the family.

23. Men should never hold hands or show affection toward another.

24. It is ok for a man to use any and all means to “convince” a woman to have sex.

25. Homosexuals should never kiss in public.

26. A man should avoid holding his wife’s purse at all times.
27. A man must be able to make his own way in the world.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

28. Men should always take the initiative when it comes to sex.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

29. A man should never count on someone else to get the job done.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

30. Boys should not throw baseballs like girls.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

31. A man should not react when other people cry.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

32. A man should not continue a friendship with another man if he finds out that the other man is homosexual.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

33. Being a little down in the dumps is not a good reason for a man to act depressed.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

34. If another man flirts with the woman accompanying a man, this is a serious provocation and the man should respond with aggression.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

35. Boys should be encouraged to find a means of demonstrating physical prowess.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

36. A man should know how to repair his car if it should break down.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

37. Homosexuals should be barred from the teaching profession.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

38. A man should never admit when others hurt his feelings.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

39. Men should get up to investigate if there is a strange noise in the house at night.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. A man shouldn’t bother with sex unless he can achieve an orgasm.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41. Men should be detached in emotionally charged situations.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42. It is important for a man to take risks, even if he might get hurt.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43. A man should always be ready for sex.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44. A man should always be the major provider in his family.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45. When the going gets tough, men should get tough.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46. I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love story.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

47. Fathers should teach their sons to mask fear.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

48. I think a young man should try to be physically tough, even if he’s not big.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

49. In a group, it is up to the men to get things organized and moving ahead.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

50. One should not be able to tell how a man is feeling by looking at his face.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

51. Men should make the final decision involving money.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

52. It is disappointing to learn that a famous athlete is gay.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

53. Men should not be too quick to tell others that they care about them.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale, Revised 5-Item Version (Herek, 1988)

*Attitudes Toward Gay Men (ATG-R-S5)*

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following items by using the following scale:

1. Sex between two men is just plain wrong.
2. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.
3. Male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in men. (Reverse scored)
4. Male homosexuality is a perversion.
5. Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned. (Reverse scored)
Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004)

Instructions: This survey includes a number of statements about religious opinions. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements and disagree with others, to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each of the statements by marking your opinion to the left of each statement, according to the following scale:

1 = Very Strongly Disagree
2 = Strongly Disagree
3 = Moderately Disagree
4 = Slightly Disagree
5 = Neutral
6 = Slightly Agree
7 = Moderately Agree
8 = Strongly Agree
9 = Very Strongly Agree

1. God has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed.
2. No single book of religious teachings contains all the intrinsic, fundamental truths about life.\(^a\)
3. The basic cause of evil in this world is Satan, who is constantly and ferociously fighting against God.
4. It is more important to be a good person than to believe in God and the right religion.\(^a\)
5. There is a particular set of religious teachings in this world that are so true, you can’t go any “deeper” because they are the basic, bedrock message that God has given humanity.
6. When you get right down to it, there are basically only two kinds of people in the world: the Righteous, who will be rewarded by God; and the rest, who will not.
7. Scriptures may contain general truths, but they should NOT be considered completely, literally true from beginning to end.\(^a\)
8. To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, fundamentally true religion.
9. “Satan” is just the name people give their own bad impulses. There is really no such thing as a diabolical “Prince of Darkness” who tempts us.\(^a\)
10. Whenever science and sacred scripture conflict, science is probably right.\(^a\)
11. The fundamentals of God’s religion should never be tampered with, or compromised with others’ beliefs.
12. All of the religions in the world have flaws and wrong teachings. There is no perfectly true, right religion.\(^a\)

\(^a\) indicates the item is worded in the con-trait direction, for which the scoring key is reversed.
Modern Homogenativity Scale – Gay Men

After the statement, please select the statement which best represents your opinion.

1 = Strongly Disagree   4 = Agree
2 = Disagree            5 = Strongly Agree
3 = Don’t Know

1. Gay men have all the rights they need.*
2. Gay men have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights.*
3. Gay men should stop shoving their lifestyle down people’s throats.*
4. Gay men seem to focus on the ways in which they differ from heterosexuals, and ignore the ways in which they are similar.*
5. Gay men who are “out of the closet” should be admired for their courage.* [R]
6. Many gay men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special rights and privileges.*
7. Gay men no longer need to protest for equal rights.*
8. In today’s tough economic times, American’s tax dollars shouldn’t be used to support gay men’s organizations.*
9. The notion of universities providing degrees in gay and lesbian studies is ridiculous.
10. Gay men should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society, and simply get on with their lives.
11. Celebrations such as “Gay Pride Day” are ridiculous because they assume that an individual’s sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride.
12. If gay men want to be treated like everyone else, they need to stop making such a fuss about their sexuality/culture.

Note. [R] = Item requires reverse scoring. If using the invariant items only, standardized scores are recommended (total MHS-L score divided by 10 and total MHS-G score divided by 8). *Items identified as invariant between Canadian and American samples of university students (M.A. Morrison et al, 2009). For the purposes of this administration, the word “Canadian” was removed from the original measure and replaced with “American”.
Fundamentalism Scale (McFarland, 1989)

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the items by using the following scale:

- 1. Strongly Disagree
- 2. Disagree
- 3. Neutral
- 4. Agree
- 5. Strongly Agree

1. I am sure the Bible contains no errors or contradictions.
2. It is very important for true Christians to believe that the Bible is the infallible Word of God.
3. The Bible is the final and complete guide to morality; it contains God’s answers to all important questions about right and wrong.
4. Christians should not let themselves be influence by worldly ideas.
5. Christians must try hard to know and defend the true teachings of God’s word.
Debriefing Information

The study you just participated in was designed to assess the relationship between religious fundamentalism, religious orientation, masculine role norms, and attitudes toward gay men. Past research has suggested that higher levels of religiousness as well as greater endorsement of masculine role norms is related to more negative attitudes toward gay men. The goal of this study was to determine if religiousness and masculine role norms directly impacted attitudes toward gay men. Additionally, the study is interested in determining if the relationship between religiousness and attitudes toward gay men is mediated by endorsement of masculine role norms.

As stated before you agreed to participate in the study, should you experience any emotional discomfort as a result of your participation in this research study, please contact the Principle Investigator who will help you find an appropriate referral in your location. If you would like to read more about this topic, you may contact the Principle Investigator, who can direct you to helpful empirical and theoretical literature.

Thank you for your participation in this study!

If you would like to know the results of the study, you may contact the principal investigator for further information.

Principle Investigator:  
David Adams, M.A.  
3rd Year Doctoral Student  
Counseling Psychology  
Ball State University  
Muncie, IN 47306  
Email: dfadams@bsu.edu

Faculty Supervisor:  
Donald Nicholas, PhD  
Counseling Psychology  
Ball State University  
Muncie, IN 47306  
Email: dnichola@bsu.edu