

APPROVAL SHEET

Title of Dissertation: **Healing Men and Community: Predictors of Outcome
in a Men's Initiatory and Support Organization**

Name of Candidate: **Christopher K. Burke, Doctor of Philosophy, 2004**

Dissertation and Abstract Approved:

**Kenneth I. Maton, Ph.D.
Professor
HSP Psychology**

Date Approved: **May 17, 2004**

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Christopher Kenneth Burke, M.A.

Address: 3727 Woodland Ave.
Cincinnati, OH 45209

Degree, Date Conferred: Ph.D., 2004.

Date of Birth: November 10, 1962.

Place of Birth: Brighton, MA.

Secondary Education: Portsmouth Abbey School, Portsmouth, RI. 1982.

Collegiate Institutions Attended:

The Colorado College
Colorado Springs, CO
June 1982 - June 1986
B. A. in English Literature, received June 1986.

University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Baltimore, MD
September 1995 – May 2004
Ph.D. in Human Services Psychology (Clinical), May 2004.

Research Publications:

Burke, C. K., Maton, K. I., Anderson, C. W., Mankowski, E. S., & Silvergleid, C. S. (In press). The ManKind Project. In (M. Kimmel and A. Aronson, Eds.), *Men and masculinities: A social cultural and historical encyclopedia*. New York: ABC-Clio.

Mankowski, E. S., Maton, K. I., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S. H. & Anderson, C. W. (2000). Collaborative research with a men's organization: Psychological impact, group functioning, and organizational growth. In E. Barton, (Ed.), *Mythopoetic perspectives of men's work: An anthology for therapists and others*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Research Presentations and Reports:

Burke, C. K., Maton, K. I., Anderson, C. W., Hoover, S. A., & Mankowski, E. S., Silvergleid, C. S. (August, 2001). *Changes associated with participation in the ManKind Project: Eighteen-months follow-up*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Mankowski, E. S., Silvergleid, C. S., Maton, K. I., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S. A. & Anderson, C. W. (August, 2001). *Evaluation of the ManKind Project: Qualitative and quantitative outcome data*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA

Anderson, C. W., Maton, K. I., Mankowski, E. S., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S. A., & Silvergleid, C. S. (2001, August). *Participation in a men's movement: Experiences and changes in masculinity*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Burke, C. K. (2001, April). *Experiences of initiation: Personal perspectives on induction into manhood in the military, a traditional men's group, and a mythopoetic organization*. In D. Davis (Chair), *Experiences of Initiation*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Men's Studies Association, Albuquerque, NM.

Burke, C. K., Maton, K. I., Anderson, C. W., Hoover, S. A., & Mankowski, E. S., Silvergleid, C. S. (August, 2000). *Gender role conflict and psychological well-being: An exploration in men enrolled to attend an "initiatory" weekend*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Men's Studies Association, Colorado Springs, CO.

Mankowski, E., Maton, K. I., Abassi, B., & Burke, C. K. (2000, April). *Predicting participation and retention in a men's mutual support group*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association Conference, Portland, OR.

Burke, C. K., Mankowski, E., Maton, K. I., Anderson, C. A., Silvergleid, C., & Hoover, S. H. (1999, August). *Liberating the Sacred Masculine: A mythopoetic approach to healing men*. In H. Sweet (Chair), *Un-thawing frozen men: Approaches to working with men in depression*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

- Burke, C. K., Mankowski, E., Maton, K. I., & Hoover, S. H. (1998, August). *Qualitative analysis of self-help groups in a men's mythopoetic organization*. In E. Mankowski (Chair), Psychological impact and group characteristics of a mythopoetic men's organization. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Mankowski, E. S., Anderson, C. W., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S.A., & Maton, K. I. (1998, August). *Participation and retention in a men's mutual support organization*. In E. Mankowski and K. Maton (Chairs), Psychological impact and group characteristics of a Mythopoetic men's organization. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Mankowski, E. S., Anderson, C. W., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S. A., & Maton, K. I. (1998, August). *Overview of a men's mutual support organization*. In E. Mankowski and K. Maton (Chairs), Psychological impact and group characteristics of a Mythopoetic men's organization. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Maton, K. I., Anderson, C. W., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S. A., & Mankowski, E. S. (1998, August). *ManKind Project's impact on men's goals, gender role conflict, well-being, and self-development*. In E. Mankowski and K. Maton (Chairs), Psychological impact and group characteristics of a mythopoetic men's organization. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Mankowski, E., Maton, K. I., Burke, C. K., & Hoover, S. (1998, March). *Participation and retention in a men's mutual support organization*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Men's Studies Association, Youngstown, OH.
- Hoover, S.A., Burke, C. K., Maton, K. I., & Mankowski, E. S. (1998, August). *Men's movement or misogyny? Men's group members' attitudes toward women*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Maton, K. I., Zapert, K., & Burke, C. K. (1994, 1995). *Evaluation of the Partnership Program*. Evaluation Reports, University of Maryland Baltimore County.
- Hatala, M. N., & Prehodka, J., & Burke, C. K. (1995, May). Men want sex, women want humor: *A content analysis of gay male and lesbian personal ads*. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association Convention, Providence, RI.

Hatala, M. N., Burke, C. K., & Cooke, D. (1994, May). *A test of the self, the house, and friends as mnemonics using unmixed lists*. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

Hatala, M. N., & Prehodka, J., & Burke, C. K. (1994, April). *Looking for love in the Gay 90's: A content analysis of gay male and lesbian personal ads*. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association Convention, Providence, RI.

Professionally Related Experience:

Psychology Intern, Cincinnati VAMC, Cincinnati, OH,
September, 2002 – September 2003. Supervisors: Diana Rigrish, Psy.D., Jonathan Steinberg, Ph.D., Brian Zinnbauer, Ph.D., Maureen Marks-Cash, Ph.D

Psychology Extern, Outpatient Psychiatry. University of Maryland Medical System, Baltimore, MD, August 2000 – August, 2002. Supervisors: Paul Giannandrea, MD; Steve Levy, Ph.D.; Noreen Honeycutt, Ph.D.; Vicki Beck, LCSWC.

Psychology Extern, Phoenix Counseling Services, Columbia, MD, January 2000 - May 2000. Supervisor: Jennifer Neeman, Ph.D.

Psychology Extern, Veteran's Administration Medical Center, Washington, D. C., May 1999 - August 2000. Supervisors: Angela Gilbert, Psy.D.; Deborah Blumenthal, Ph.D.

Psychology Extern, Crownsville Hospital Center, Crownsville, MD August 1998 - May 1999. Supervisor: Ron Golkow, Ph.D.

Psychology Extern, Howard County Domestic Violence Center, Columbia, MD, July 1996 - June 1998. Supervisors: Chris Murphy, Ph.D.; Jeff Elliot, M.A.

Psychology Extern, Clinical Interventions-linked practicum, University of Maryland, Baltimore County Counseling Center, January 1996 - June 1996. Supervisors: Barbara Baum, Ph.D.; Ron Miaguchi, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: Healing Men and Community: Predictors of Outcome in a Men's Initiatory and Support Organization

Christopher Kenneth Burke, Doctor of Philosophy, 2004

Dissertation directed by: Dr. Kenneth I. Maton, Professor, HSP Psychology (Community-Social)

Many authors state that men are in a state of "crisis" (Levant, 1995), with the male gender having higher rates of addiction, incarceration, disease, and suicide as well as shorter life expectancy. There have been various perspectives that have attempted to understand and more clearly address these conditions (Clatterbaugh, 1997). This study is an examination of an organization that comes from one of those perspectives, The ManKind Project (MKP), a mythopoetic branch of the "men's movement." Participation in the MKP begins with an intensive, experiential "Training Adventure Weekend" (TAW), followed by voluntary participation in a peer-led Integration group (I-group) that meets on a regular basis (1-4 times a month), with various workshops and activities also being offered.

One hundred men completed a pre-TAW questionnaire, an interview one year or more post-TAW, and an 18 month or more post-TAW long-term follow-up (LTFU) questionnaire. The study examined the aggregate effects of participation and explored whether certain pre-existing characteristics (i.e., age, prior self-help group participation, recent life change, and pre-TAW agreement with MKP beliefs) as well as characteristics that might have been affected by participation (MKP beliefs at LTFU, social support at

LTFU, I-group participation, and non-I-group MKP participation) were associated with improved outcomes on the criterion variables--depression at LTFU, two subscales of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1995) at LTFU, and satisfaction with life at LTFU.

T-tests revealed that for the men who chose to participate, there was significant improvement on virtually all of the constructs examined, suggesting that for this population, participation in the MKP has a positive impact. Multiple regression analysis revealed that pre-existing characteristics were not predictive of improved outcome. However, the results showed that agreement with MKP beliefs at LTFU significantly predicted improved outcomes on all criterion variables, and social support at LTFU significantly predicted improved outcomes on 3 of the 4 criterion variables. Neither I-group participation nor non-I-group MKP participation were predictive of outcome. Possible explanation for the findings and the need for further research in this area are discussed.

**HEALING MEN AND COMMUNITY: PREDICTORS
OF OUTCOME IN A MEN'S INITIATORY
AND SUPPORT ORGANIZATION**

by
Christopher Kenneth Burke

**Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2004**

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this study to the following people:

To Ken Maton, who was an excellent and patient mentor. Your guidance, expertise, support, care and concern were instrumental to my advancement as a psychologist and as a human being during my time at UMBC.

To the rest of the dissertation committee - Robert Deluty, Karen Freiberg, Eric Mankowski, and Chris Murphy. You have all played an important role in my education and growth as a psychologist. I was honored to work on this with all of you not only because of your scholarship, but also your great humanity.

To Bob Underhill, who through his generosity of spirit, natural curiosity, warmth and clarity, made numerous interviews without which this study, and the larger MKP research project from which this came, would not have been possible. Not only was Bob a consummate professional, but also a trusted and caring fellow warrior.

To Dennis Kelly, who struggled long and hard with me on this project. Without the countless late hours and energy deciphering and encoding the byzantine structure of the I-groups - broken only by trips to the gym, Monty Python videos, and Red Sox games - this project would have been “broody herr” (inside joke...). Your friendship is deeply appreciated.

To the many blessed men who assisted in the completion of this study: Jeff Duvall, Erick Hoopes, Scott Lissit, Frank Doyle, Vincent DeSanti, Rick Paiva, Will Thompson, Bob Vollinger, Jim Hurley, Pat Noon, Dwight Shenk, Walter Knauff, Matt Campbell, Kevin Settlege—you all were very giving and I deeply appreciated your comradery.

To my fellow graduate students, Ana Sobel, Kenny Gelfand, who were comrades in arms in surviving some of the most challenging aspects of graduate school. Your humor, support and concern made this document possible. My graduate school experience is defined by your friendship.

To my “Fredneck” connection - Jack Bledsoe, Brad Wye, and Akicheta - your support and concern were vital in the darkest of times.

To my family, who have always been loving and supportive of me in my graduate school endeavors. The connection goes deep and defies any words I could write here. From my parents Helen and Bill (who I know are proud of this accomplishment), to my sister Nancy who was a great support, to my youngest niece Caroline, you are all deeply a part of this work.

To the many people in my life who I had to put aside in order to complete this project. This study had its costs, and of them all, the loss of the potential we shared is the most painful to bear.

And last but not least, to the men of the ManKind Project. You have been a joy, a source of growth, and a salvation. I am deeply grateful for all you have shared with me, and your presence and passion has changed me forever.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	Page ii
I. INTRODUCTION	Page 1
A. The State of Men	Page 1
B. Gender: Possible Differences in Emotional and Relational Styles	Page 5
1. Effects of gender within self-help groups	Page 7
2. Mismatch of men's needs and professional psychology	Page 8
C. Men's Reaction to the Changing Times: The Men's Movement	Page 9
D. The Mythopoetic Perspective	Page 13
E. The ManKind Project	Page 16
1. A Brief description and history of the ManKind Project	Page 16
2. Training Adventure Weekend	Page 17
3. Leadership	Page 17
4. Accountability and integrity	Page 19
5. Mission in life/Taking action	Page 19
6. Fatherhood	Page 20
7. Honoring of the men	Page 20
F. Ongoing Involvement: Integration Groups	Page 21
G. Previous Research on Impact with MKP Participants	Page 28
H. The Men's Movement and the MKP as a Self-help Organization	Page 32
1. The men's movement framed as a self-help group	Page 32
2. Men and community psychology: Grassroots efforts for a solution	Page 33
I. Pre-Existing Factors Affecting Outcome in Mythopoetic Men's Group	Page 36

1. The relation of age to effectiveness in men’s work	Page 37
2. Life stage change and mythopoetic men’s work	Page 39
3. Men’s work and the “recovery” movement	Page 45
4. Pre-existing beliefs and mythopoetic men’s work: A question of fit	Page 47
5.Aspects of empowering community/self-help group setting: Variables affected by participation	Page 51
J. Known Factors Which Affect Individual Outcomes in Self-help Groups	Page 53
1. Incorporation of organizational beliefs	Page 53
2. Length of participation	Page 54
3. Social support	Page 56
4. Social networks	Page 58
5. Received support	Page 58
6. Perceived social support	Page 59
7. Research exploring social support in context of self-help groups	Page 61
K. Hypotheses and Focus of the Present Study	Page 65
II. METHOD	Page 68
A. Research Context	Page 68
B. Research Participants	Page 68
C. Procedure	Page 72
1. Survey	Page 72
D. Measures	Page 76
1. Social Support Questionnaire	Page 76
2. MKP related beliefs	Page 77

3. Prior year change	Page 79
4. I-group participation	Page 80
5. MKP participation	Page 81
6. The Gender Role Conflict Scale I	Page 82
7. Depression	Page 85
8. Satisfaction with Life scale	Page 86
9. Demographic and background information	Page 87
10. Interview	Page 88
III. RESULTS	Page 89
A. Preliminary Analyses	Page 89
1. Descriptives	Page 89
2. Tests of representativeness	Page 92
3. Correlations: Predictor variables	Page 92
4. Correlations: Predictors and criteria at LTFU	Page 94
5. Predictors and criteria: MANCOVA	Page 94
6. Correlations: Criterion variables	Page 97
7. Examination of covariates	Page 97
8. Change over time	Page 99
B. Primary Analyses	Page 102
1. Normality, linearity and homoscedasticity	Page 102
2. Hypothesis 1--Effects of age on criterion variables	Page 103
3. Hypothesis 2--Effects of self-help group experience on criteria	Page 106

4. Hypothesis 3–Effects of prior year change on criteria at LTFU	Page 106
5. Hypothesis 4–Effects of pre-TAW MKP belief score on criteria LTFU	Page 107
6. Hypothesis 5--Effects of MKP beliefs on criteria at LTFU	Page 108
7. Hypothesis 6–Effects of change in social support to criteria at LTFU	Page 109
8. Hypothesis 7–Effects of I-group participation to criteria at LTFU	Page 114
9. Hypothesis 8–Effects of MKP participation to criteria at LTFU	Page 116
C. Secondary Analyses	Page 118
1. Hypothesis 1–Different age categorization	Page 118
2. Hypothesis 2–Church group experience	Page 119
3. Hypothesis 7--I-group participation coded continuously	Page 120
4. All significant predictors	Page 121
IV. DISCUSSION	Page 124
A. Aggregate Effects of Participation	Page 124
B. Pre-existing factors	Page 125
1. Age categories and its effect on criterion variables at LTFU	Page 125
2. Prior self-help group involvement	Page 129
3. History of church group involvement	Page 131
4. Prior year change	Page 135
5. Pre-existing agreement with MKP beliefs	Page 137
C. Factors Influenced by MKP Participation	Page 140
1. Beliefs at Long-term Follow-up	Page 140
2. Social support	Page 143

3. I-group participation	Page 147
4. Non-I-group MKP participation	Page 151
5. Significant predictors combined	Page 153
D. Limitations	Page 154
E. Future Research Directions	Page 156
F. Summary	Page 158
V. REFERENCES	Page 160
Appendix A: Significant Chi Square Analyses of Demographic Characteristics Between Men in and Not in the Present Study	Page 178
Appendix B: Pre-Weekend, Post-Weekend, 6 Months Post, and Long-term Follow-up Weekend Questionnaire Research Questionnaire Packet Contents	Page 182
Appendix C: Social Support Questionnaire	Page 202
Appendix D: Self Questionnaire	Page 204
Appendix E: Attitudes Questionnaire	Page 206
Appendix F: Questions Used for MKP Beliefs Scale, and Inter-Item Correlations and Alpha Level with Any Item Removed for the MKP Belief Scale pre-NWTA and LTFU	Page 208
Appendix G: Guidelines for Coding Perceived Year Change Variable	Page 210
Appendix H: I-group Historical Summary	Page 219
Appendix I: MKP Related Activities Recording Instrument (Collected During Interview)	Page 223
Appendix J: MKP Related Activities List and Associated Codings	Page 224
Appendix K: Masculine Gender Role Conflict Scale	Page 226
Appendix L: Depression Measure (Taken from BSI)	Page 228

Appendix M: Life Satisfaction Measure	Page 228
Appendix N: Demographic Information Questionnaire	Page 229
Appendix O: One Year Semi-Structured Interview Outline	Page 230
Appendix P: Independent Sample T-Tests Comparing Baseline Scores on Predictor and Criterion Study Variables between Study Participants and Non-study Participants	Page 238
Appendix Q: Correlations Between Predictors Dichotomously or Continuously Coded and Demographic Variables (Pearson R Coefficient)	Page 239
Appendix R: MANCOVA Results for Age Categories on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 240
Appendix S: MANCOVA Results for I-group Participation on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 247
Appendix T: MANCOVA Results for MKP Participation on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 254
Appendix U: MANCOVA Results for Self-help Group Experience on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 261
Appendix V: MANCOVA Results for Perceived Year Change on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 268
Appendix W: MANCOVA Results to Explore Effects of Cohort on Study Variables	Page 275
Appendix X: Zero-order and Partial Correlations (Controlling for Baseline) Between Criterion Variables at LTFU and Demographic Variables Continuously or Dichotomously Coded	Page 287
Appendix Y: Regression Analyses for Hypothesis 1--4: Effects of Age, Self-help Group Experience, Change Before TAW, and Pre-TAW MKP Beliefs on Long-term Follow-up Criterion Variables	Page 289
Appendix Z: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 5: Effects of MKP Beliefs at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variables	Page 299

Appendix AA: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 6: Effects of Social Support at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variables	Page 304
Appendix BB: Exploratory Regression Analyses on Hypothesis 6: Independent Effects of Social Support Availability and Social Support Satisfaction	Page 309
Appendix CC: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 7: The Effects of I-group Participation on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up	Page 311
Appendix DD: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 8: Effects of Non-I Group MKP Participation at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variables	Page 316
Appendix EE: Secondary Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 1--4: Effects of Age Group (30-45 vs. sample), Church Group Experience (Dichotomously Coded), and Reported Year Change Before TAW on Long-term Follow-up Criterion Variables	Page 321
Appendix FF: Secondary Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 7: The Effects of I-group Participation Continuously Coded on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up	Page 326
Appendix GG: Regressions for Post Hoc Analysis Using All Significant Predictors	Page 331

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Figure 1: Ongoing I-group outline	Page 24
Figure 2: Handout of defining principles	Page 25
Figure 3: Handout stressing adaptive interpersonal behavior	Page 26
Table 1: Sample Demographics	Page 70
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Primary Study Variables	Page 90
Table 3: Correlations among Continuously Coded and Dichotomously Coded Predictor Variables	Page 93
Table 4: Correlations Between Criterion Variables at LTFU and Predictors Continuously or Dichotomously Coded	Page 95
Table 5: Reported F-values on Tests of Significance for Criterion Variables at LTFU on Categorized Predictors Using Unique Sums of Squares Controlling for Baseline Scores (MANCOVA)	Page 96
Table 6: Pearson Zero Order Correlation Between Criterion at Baseline and Criterion at LTFU	Page 98
Table 7: Partial Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up (LTFU) Controlling for Baseline Criterion Scores	Page 100
Table 8: Independent Sample T-Tests Comparing Baseline Scores of Study Participants on Key Study Variables to Post-Weekend and Long Term Follow-up Scores Two-Tailed)	Page 101
Table 9: Summary of Results of Regression Analyses on Hypotheses 1-4: Pre-existing Predictors	Page 104
Table 10: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 5: Effects of Change in MKP Beliefs on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up	Page 110
Table 11: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 6: Effects of Social Support on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up	Page 112

Table 12: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 7: The Effects of I-group Participation on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up	Page 115
Table 13: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 8: Effects of Non-I-group MKP Participation on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up	Page 117
Table 14: Regressions for Criterion at LTFU with All Significant Predictors Entered Simultaneously	Page 122
Table A1: Significant Chi Square Analyses of Demographic Characteristics Between Men in and not in the Present Study	Page 177
Table B1: Sample of Cover Letter from MKP-GW Center Director Included in Pre-packet	Page 181
Table B2: Sample of Research Team Cover Letter Included in Pre-packet	Page 182
Table B3: Sample Cover Letter from MKP Center Director Included in Post-weekend Packet	Page 183
Table B4: Sample of Letter from Research Team Sent in Post-weekend Packet	Page 184
Table B5: Informed Consent Form Sent in Research Packet	Page 185
Table B6: Questionnaire Used for Pre, Post, 6 Months and Long-term Follow-up	Page 187
Table C1: Social Support Questionnaire	Page 201
Table D1: Self Questionnaire	Page 203
Table E1: Attitudes Questionnaire	Page 205
Table F1: MKP Related Questions	Page 207
Table F2: MKP Beliefs Scale and Inter-item Correlations and Alpha Level With Any Item Removed for the MKP Belief Scale Pre-NWTA and LTFU	Page 208
Table G1: Guidelines for Coding Perceived Year Change Variable	Page 209

Table H1: I-group Historical Summary	Page 218
Table I1: MKP Related Activities Recording Instrument (Collected During Interview)	Page 222
Table J1: MKP Related Activities List and Associated Codings	Page 223
Table K1: Masculine Gender Role Conflict Scale	Page 225
Table O1: One Year Semi-Structured Interview Outline	Page 230
Table P1: Independent T-Tests Comparing Baseline Predictor and Criterion Study Variables between Study Participants and Non-study Participants	Page 238
Table Q1: Correlations Between Predictors Dichotomously or Continuously Coded and Demographic Variables	Page 239
Table R1: MANCOVA Results for Age Categories on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 240
Table S1: MANCOVA Results for I-group Participation on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 247
Table T1: MANCOVA Results for MKP Participation on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 254
Table U1: MANCOVA Results for Self-help Group Experience on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 261
Table V1: MANCOVA Results for Perceived Year Change on Criterion Variables at LTFU	Page 268
Table W1: MANCOVA Analyses on Change in Criterion Variables At LTFU on Cohort	Page 275
Table W2: MANOVA Analyses of Baseline Criterion Variables on Cohort	Page 279
Table W3: MANOVA Analyses of Predictor Variables on Cohort	Page 283
Table X1: Partial Correlations Between Demographics and Transformed Variables at LTFU	Page 287

Table X2: Pearson Zero-order Correlations Between Criterion Variables at Baseline, at LTFU, and Demographic Variables Continuously or Dichotomously Coded	Page 288
Table Y1: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 1 - 3: Effects of Age, Self-help Group Experience, and Life Change Before TAW on Criteria at LTFU	Page 289
Table Y2: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 4: Effects of Pre-TAW MKP Beliefs on Criteria at LTFU	Page 294
Table Z1: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 5: Effects of MKP Beliefs at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variables	Page 299
Table AA1: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 6: Effects of Social Support at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variable	Page 304
Table BB1: Summary of Regressions Forcing Social Support Sub-scales into Equation	Page 309
Table CC1: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 7: The Effects of I-group Participation on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up	Page 311
Table DD1: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 8: Effects of Non-I-group MKP Participation at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variables	Page 316
Table EE1: Regressions for Secondary Analysis of Hypothesis 1--4: Effects of Age Group (30-45 vs. sample), Church Group Experience(Dichotomously Coded), and Reported Year Change Before TAW on Long-term Follow-up Criterion Variables	Page 321
Table FF1: Secondary Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 7: The Effects of I-group Participation Continuously Coded on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up	Page 326
Table GG: Regressions for Post Hoc Analysis Using All Significant Predictors	Page 331

Introduction

The State of Men

Being a man is not what it used to be. An article in the Economist, “Are men necessary? The male dodo” (1995), takes a tongue in cheek look into the future where a middle class couple is in the process of selecting the sex of their child. Within this futuristic, but not-too-far-off-and-not-too-unrealistic scenario, the article predicts there is no conceivable way that they would choose the child to be a boy. The reasons for this choice are then given.

For one, males are more likely to be born with inherited diseases, ranging from minor ones like color blindness to more serious ones like hemophilia. Life expectancy, which at the turn of the 20th century was on par with that of women, is now seven years the lesser for men, and this split is continuing to widen. They are more likely to suffer from strokes, ulcers, liver failure, and cancer and they are twice as likely as women to die from heart disease before the age of sixty five (Courtenay, 2000).

In addition, boys tend to have more trouble in their development, with twice the rate of autism, eight times the rate of hyperactivity, and five times the rate of dyslexia and stuttering in comparison with girls. Boys are twice as likely to be held back a grade in school at age 13, to be in special education, and to drop out of school all together, while girls are more likely to go on to college and gain graduate school degrees.

After surviving the hazards of youthful development, the male child would then be faced with a life that is more prone to violence, with 80% of murder victims being men, and men representing 90% of the murderers. On top of that, this male child will be twice

as likely to become addicted to alcohol or drugs, ten times as likely to be put in prison, and four times as likely to successfully commit suicide.

Given that this boy makes it to the age where he would be looking for a career, he would once again find himself in a world that is leaning against him. The number of American men in full-time employment is falling by about one million a year, while the rate of full-time employed women is climbing by the same amount. Economic shifts are dictating that there are fewer job openings in agriculture, manual labor, machine work and operation (traditionally male oriented jobs), while there are increased opportunities in the fields of retailing, word-processing, service sector work and health care--jobs usually taken by women.

The article, after outlining the above-listed hazards he will likely face, then visits this man in middle age:

Suppose that, under-educated, diseased, sclerotic and unemployed, the hypothetical son of our putative couple has made it to middle age sometime in the 2030's. Just as he is thinking about putting his feet on the chair and cracking a can to watch football, the beer stales and the game pales. Unaccountably he finds himself asking 'What is it all about? What has it all been for?' But this familiar mid-life twinge has a new, nasty twist. He is struck with existential doubt not just about himself, but about his gender as a whole. And the bond of male solidarity makes the question no easier to face: what are men for? (Are men necessary, 1995; p.2).

Many authors have echoed this cry of a troubling change in masculinity. Levant

(1995) points out many of the sociological changes that have occurred in our society, including the incorporation of the feminist movement which has spurred the influx of women into the workplace. This change in work dynamics, he believes, has eviscerated the traditional codes of commonly accepted masculine behavior. In addition, based upon his experience as a psychologist for twenty years, he states that men's relationships are becoming increasingly "strained and contentious" (p.3), that men are finding it harder to connect with their families, and that the traditional ways of self-soothing (accomplishment, material goods, etc.) are no longer efficacious. He states that men are in a state of "crisis," and steadfastly defends the use of such a strong word.

Faludi (1999), a well respected feminist author, addresses this issue of the apparent male crisis in her book "Stiffed: The betrayal of the American male." The author spent a considerable amount of time interviewing a diversity of men in an attempt to understand the psycho-social underpinnings of current day masculinity. Originally, Faludi began this latest work hoping to find why men are so resistant to the prospect of women's independence. However, after starting to talk with the men, her question morphed into one entirely different, one which shaped the larger message of her book.

...Why are so many men disturbed by the prospect of women's independence? ...

But in the end, it was not the question that most compelled me ... The more I consider what men have lost—a useful role in public life, a way of earning a decent and reliable living, appreciation in the home, respectful treatment in the culture—the more it seems that men of the late twentieth century are falling into a status oddly similar to that of women at mid-century... the empty compensations of a

“feminine mystique” are transforming into the empty compensations of a masculine mystique, with a gentlemen’s cigar club no more satisfying than a lady’s bake-off, the Nike Air Jordan no more meaningful than the Dior New Look (p. 40).

Suh, Diener, Oishi, & Triandis (1998), in their study of life satisfaction across cultures, state that what they call the "good life" is achieved either through “doing what a person would like to do or by doing what a person thinks he or she should do (p. 482).” There is not much of a literature on life satisfaction looking only at the effects of gender, but applying this formula to modern day man, it is easy to see how men’s satisfaction with life may be in jeopardy. The beer drinking football fan of the putative couple described above has trouble deriving meaning and satisfaction from his life. In addition, Levant (1995) points out that men, in dealing with changing work environments and family structures, are having difficulty in finding out what they should do. Given this conundrum, it would be understandable that men may be having difficulty in understanding their place in the world, and as such, how best to derive life satisfaction.

Again, there is not much of a literature looking at depression in men outside of comparing levels with women. However, despite a lower aggregate rate, there are many depressed men who are in need of intervention. Given the discussion above, this confusion as to men’s roles and/or desires, as well as the ineffectiveness of older, more traditional masculine modes, may contribute to a sense of “learned helplessness” (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1985). Try as they may, men are finding it difficult to be useful in, or derive satisfaction out of their lives, and this conundrum, along with other gender-specific factors, may bring about enhanced depressive symptoms (in the

current research, life satisfaction and depression symptoms are included as criterion variables).

Gender: Possible Differences in Emotional and Relational Styles.

Given a need for the evolution of masculinity, and a desire on the part of men to evolve, there naturally must follow an effective method of intervention to assist men in this daunting task of understanding, accepting, and participating in, the changing societal landscape. However, there are increasing questions of how to best intervene with men, and there is a burgeoning literature that questions if psychotherapy is the most effective way of adjusting men to a post-feminist America.

First off, there is research that suggests that the experience of emotion-- a common target of intervention in traditional psychotherapy--is different for men and women. Schwartz et al. (1980) examined reaction to emotional experiences physiologically by measuring facial muscle EMG activity in both men and women. They found that the women in their study displayed greater levels of emotional intensity in the exposure to emotion state than did men. In a related study, Berenbaum, Snowwhite & Oltmanns (1987) exposed participants to film clips that were designed to elicit emotional responses. They were then given self-report measures to rate their emotional responses to the stimuli and their facial expression was videotaped and rated for emotional expression. They found that men reported experiencing lower levels of emotion, and the rating of their facial expressions also suggested that they experienced lower levels of emotion. There is not enough evidence to make definitive statements on the subject of emotional experience within gender as of yet, but the studies available suggest that men are less prone to

emotional reactions than are women. These findings are consistent with earlier research on the subject (Buck et al., 1974; Schwartz et al., 1980).

In addition to men possibly having a higher threshold for emotional activation, some of the literature suggests that men and women have different styles of interpersonal relatedness as well as suggesting that the effects of interpersonal relatedness on psychological well being may in large part be influenced by gender. For instance, Burda, Vaux, & Schill, (1984) found differing patterns of relatedness based on gender, with men tending to value self-sufficiency and life mastery, and women tending to value social support and social connection, as evidenced by the importance they place on emotional support and friends with whom they can discuss intimate issues. Their study compared college students who were high on the feminine and androgynous scales (high in feminine characteristics, stressing the relational) to those who scored highly on the masculine and undifferentiated scales (low in feminine characteristics, stressing the instrumental; Bem, 1974). In their analysis of the data, the authors concluded that what Bem terms gender socialization mediated many of the differences in availability of, and satisfaction with, social support between genders (with androgyny serving as a proxy for gender). College students who were high on the feminine and androgynous scales had much greater levels of access to, and satisfaction with, levels of social support. The study, however, made no connection between levels of social support and well being.

Billings & Moos (1982) conducted a longitudinal analysis that examined the relation between life efficacy and styles of relatedness as measured by social support in 185 males and 248 females. Although there was a considerable amount of stability in

levels of support reported across time, changes in social support were associated with changes in level of functioning and were mediated by gender. It was found that improvements in support with family members was related to greater gains in level of functioning for women, and greater gains in work support was related to greater gains in levels of functioning for men.

Harrison, Macguire, & Pitceathly (1995), in their study of patterns of confiding in others within a population of cancer patients, interviewed participants within 8 weeks of their cancer diagnosis. They found that men and women were equally likely to have confided their deepest concerns to another individual, but also found that men were more likely to have only told one person, while women were more likely to have told more than one person, and to confide in a wider circle of family and friends.

These findings suggest that men and women have different interpersonal needs and may benefit from different forms of support and relatedness. It follows that the most effective way to relate to an individual--and also to intervene with an individual-- may vary depending upon the gender of the individual. This has obvious implications for both psychotherapeutic and community-based interventions.

Effects of gender within self-help groups. The finding that gender predicts different patterns of response to different forms of support has been found in the literature on self-help groups as well. Taylor et al. (1986) found in looking at the effects of social support on cancer patients, that support groups for cancer victims were more heavily populated by women, and also reported that men tended to prefer support groups that focused on education and family participation rather than groups that stressed

interpersonal sharing and/or relatedness.

Poole et al. (2001), in their review of the literature that looks at gender differences in social support, stated that "... men prefer and seek different types of support and assistance than women do when faced with a major life stressor, such as cancer" (p. 3). Citing research that highlights men and women's different coping styles (including the research finding that men were more likely to report somatic and behavioral symptoms, but less prone to report emotional impacts or the need for affection; Leiber et al., 1976), they concluded that "As a whole, this research suggests that it may be inappropriate to generalize conclusions regarding social support from women to men" (p. 3).

Mismatch of men's needs and professional psychology. Given the research that suggests men have different relational and coping styles than do women, it is not surprising that men apparently are less prone to seek out, or once engaged, to benefit from, traditional, emotion-focused therapy. Kessler, Brown, & Broman (1981), in a study that analyzed data from four large scale surveys on gender and usage of psychotherapy, found that women are significantly more prone to seek out therapy than men, given the same level of psychopathology. Numerous researchers have found that traditional masculine beliefs predict negative attitudes towards help seeking (e.g., Blazina and Watkins, 1996; Good and Wood, 1995; Wisch et al., 1995). Betz and Fitzgerald (1993), in their review of theory and research in counseling psychology, concluded from the studies reviewed that men are less likely to seek psychological help. Although there is no consensus on the causative factor, the conclusions of these various studies are clear--men are less likely to seek out traditional therapy.

However, there is research that shows that men tend to benefit from less emotionally focused therapeutic modalities that emphasize techniques more synchronous with pre-existing masculine norms. Robertson and Fitzgerald (1992), similar to the researchers listed above, found that men high in traditional masculine traits (i.e., independence, self sufficiency) were less prone to undergo psychotherapy with its initial focus on intimacy and vulnerability. In a finding similar to that of Taylor et al. (1986) cited above, they also found that men who scored high on levels of traditionally masculine traits favored alternative methods of assistance (e.g., workshops, seminars) over traditional psychotherapy. In a case study, Williams & Myer (1992) show how alternative therapeutic modes can be effective in working with men who experience resistance to traditional therapy. They describe how the client, who was not responding well to traditional psychotherapy, returned from an alternative men's weekend to progress in therapy at an excellent rate--far exceeding the rate he was setting before his alternative men's weekend.

In addition, many theorists have proposed alternative methods of working with men, and some have noted a strong connection between the small group format and its effectiveness with men (Allen, 1994; Kauth, 1992). An examination of some of these alternative approaches is in order.

Men's Reaction to the Changing Times: The Men's Movement

There is certainly no shortage of opinions on alternative methods of working with men. These views come from numerous disciplines, encompassing the evolutionary-biological perspective (e.g., Geary, 1998), the sociological (e.g., Kimmel, 1996), the

anthropological (e.g., Tiger 1999), the perspective of literature and poetry (e.g., Bly, 1990), the pro-masculinist and pro-feminist perspectives (e.g., Kimmel, 1995), the spiritual (e.g. Rohr, 1994), and the religious (e.g., Promise Keepers, 1994). And suffice it to say that there is nothing close to consensus on this matter between any of these fields, or even within any of these fields. However, there is one common theme that weaves through them all--men and masculinity, in their current form, needs to be altered in some form or manner.

Clatterbaugh (1990) examined the various theories of masculinity, and classified them as falling into one of six perspectives. These perspectives are distilled from the numerous perspectives listed above, and they serve to clarify the literature on masculinity. They are briefly described below, along with known organizations which subscribe most closely with those perspectives.

1. The Conservative Perspective. The dominant theme in the conservative perspective is that it is normal and adaptive for men to take on the traditional role of being providers and protectors of women, and for men to be the more dominant sex. The logic of this argument is that these roles are the most adaptive way of dealing with male tendencies, both biologically driven (as determined by evolution) and morally driven (i.e., that the societal structure of traditional masculinity is necessary to sublimate men's inherent anti-social qualities). The tendency of this perspective is to oppose feminist reforms which are viewed as hurting society's ability to civilize men. Those on the biological side of the conservative perspective are not as concerned with feminist reforms, thinking that biologically derived behavior is not affected by social movements. The

biological conservative perspective is not represented by any grass roots organizations and exists primarily in academia. Organizations such as Focus on the Family and Promisekeepers are representative of the moral conservative perspective.

2. The Profeminist Perspective. This perspective is directly and strongly influenced by feminist writing and political organization. Eschewing the idea that masculine behavior is morally indicated or biologically derived, this perspective maintains that masculinity is based upon the oppression of women and protecting the patriarchal system of male privilege. Secondly, it acknowledges that masculinity is harmful for men as well. What Clatterbaugh terms the radical profeminists assert that the patriarchal structure is maintained by misogyny and violent behavior, and that the way to address this problem is to displace the traditional masculinity with one that is more synchronous with feminine values. Radical profeminists are similar to organizations such as the National Organization for Men Against Sexism (NOMAS) The liberal profeminists believe that masculinity is constraining to men in the same way that femininity is constraining to women. These roles keep men (and women) from self-realization, and the best way for both genders to become more fully human is to break free of these roles and the social structure that reinforces them. The American Men's Studies Association (AMSA) represent the liberal profeminist perspective.

3. Men's Rights Perspective. Clatterbaugh views the men's rights perspective as similar in tone to the liberal profeminist perspective, differing in that it sees the changing role structure as more harmful to men than women. It asserts that Women's Liberation, while creating new options for women, has limited them for men, creating a reversed

sexism, with men as the victims. In addition, men's rights proponents argue that men are now induced to feel guilt for a socialization that they had nothing to do with and that the image of men has been lessened to at best a parody and at worst demonic. This perspective most usually guides organizations that look to counter what is perceived as the current trend of injustice to men, most notably in the fields of domestic violence, divorce and child custody.

4. The Socialist perspective. Clatterbaugh defines the socialist perspective as understanding masculinity as a social reality that is enmeshed within society's "economically determined class structures" (p. 11). As such, the economy, with its patriarchal structure, determines aspects of masculinity in a hierarchical way--who works where, who controls the wealth, and who is able to consume. The problems in masculinity, as defined by the socialist perspective, are the result of men's alienation from society's capitalist structure. The socialist perspective believes the solution to this problem is to replace the capitalistic system with a socialist system that will solve the problem of both men's and women's oppression. This perspective is not adhered to by any major men's organization, but has small groups of adherents throughout the country.

5. The Group-Specific Perspective. The group-specific perspective is largely adhered to by men who do not fit into the white, heterosexual, middle-class category, and who are attempting to address the specific issues that concern them. Thus, gay men have formed groups that help to address/end homophobia in the dominant heterosexual culture. For example, within twelve step organizations like Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), it is common to see meetings that are for gay men only. Black men have formed groups that

attempt to alter anti-black racism in the dominant culture, and to provide support for the men who suffer as a result of it. Here again, it is common to see groups for black men in AA.

6. The Spiritual Perspective. Clatterbaugh states that “The spiritual perspective is founded on the conviction that masculinity derives from deep unconscious tendencies. These tendencies are best revealed through a tradition of stories, myths, and rituals” (p.11). In Clatterbaugh’s lexicon, the spiritual perspective describes what is commonly referred to as the mythopoetic movement. Robert Bly (1990), the spiritual perspective’s main spokesman, advocates that men need to reach down into their psyches and reconnect with parts of themselves from which they have unfortunately been separated. As such, the spiritual perspective is less concerned with enacting social change, and more concerned with creating an environment where men can engage in personal growth and self discovery. The largest advocate of this perspective is the ManKind Project, the organization which will be examined in this study.

The Mythopoetic Perspective

Schwalbe (1996), in his analysis of a regional mythopoetic men’s center in North Carolina, outlined the defining characteristics of the mythopoetic movement. Noting that Schwalbe’s perspective is not necessarily authoritative (or synonymous with the views held by the men in the current study), and relatedly the North Carolina Men’s center is not necessarily representative of all men’s centers or mythopoetic groups in general, these characteristics are noted below.

First, Schwalbe describes the mythopoetic connection to Jungian psychology.

Within this paradigm, men are encouraged to look at both the masculine and feminine energies that the Jungian outlook states are within all of us. Through looking at these internalized genders, it is hoped that men may be able to recognize, integrate, and become more familiar with, the feminine part of themselves, which in Jungian terms, will bring the man closer to individuation. In addition to this, looking at the internalized genders allows a man to look at his own masculinity in a new light, possibly in a positive light for the first time.

In addition, other archetypes are offered as teaching aids and mechanisms of change. Commonly used archetypes are the King, Warrior, Lover and Magician—collectively representing the structure of the archetypal male psyche, as proposed by Moore & Gillette (1990). These archetypes are used to help men discover aspects of themselves with which they may be out of touch, and which may unintentionally induce them to behave in maladaptive ways. Inherent in the nature of all of these archetypes is that they encompass both positive and negative qualities. For instance, the king archetype contains the positive characteristics of helping men act with compassion and generosity, and is the part of one's self which gives blessing to others. On the other hand, the negative characteristics of the king contribute to men acting like tyrants. Thus, by working with both of these energies, men can learn to more fully develop his inherent generosity and compassion, while simultaneously becoming aware of, and eschewing his tendency towards, a negative dominance.

Schwalbe posits that mythopoetic work is based on an increasing awareness of how both the positive and negative characteristics of the archetypes influence behavior.

Schwalbe also points to what he believes is the strong influence of James Hillman, the former head of the Zurich Institute for Jungian Analysis. It is Hillman's focus on explaining men's ontological malaise, need to address matters more soulful in nature, and his attempts to help men to more fully understand their suffering as having meaning that leads Schwalbe to state that Hillman has an important place in the theoretical underpinnings of mythopoetic work.

Schwalbe also points to the Sufi influence, a mystic sect of Islam. This perspective offers a gnostic vision of the divine, and the main pathways to this personalized deity is through an ecstatic and feverish love of God. This quest for God is achieved through activities which engender this ecstasy, including dancing (whirling), and poetry (with an especial love for the poetry of Rumi and Kabir).

In addition, Schwalbe states that a certain religious attitude is also a key to the mythopoetic perspective. Although the mythopoetic perspective adheres to no religious tradition, the use of the archetypal images and the focus on soulfulness engenders a phenomenon that parallels the phenomenon intended to be engendered by mainstream religions. The focus on spirituality (defined as the authentic quest for God) versus religion (defined as an organizational quest for God that is commonly obfuscated by hierarchy and administrative concerns), is often used to define the spiritual perspective of the mythopoetic work.

Schwalbe's analysis of the Men's Center in North Carolina provides a cogent discussion of certain themes that are common to the mythopoetic perspective, e.g., individuation and integration, archetypes, and spirituality. However, the Men's Center

work described in his book is not an accurate representation of all mythopoetic work, and such centers are not the most prevalent settings for men's work. The focus of this study is on the largest practitioner of mythopoetic men's work today, the ManKind Project.

The ManKind Project

The ManKind Project (MKP) is a response to the "masculinity crisis," based on mobilization of peer rather than professional resources. The MKP is an international men's support and self-development organization which describes itself as "an order of men called to reclaim the sacred masculine for our time through initiation, training and action in the world" (New Warrior Network, 1997). As such, the organization is concerned with the support and transformation of men striving to attain a more healthy and mature masculinity, as reflected in their emotional availability, social behavior, and life mission. Inherent in the project's mission is the goal of positively influencing adult men's life goals, gender role-linked behaviors, well-being and self-development (Mankowski et al., 2000b).

A Brief description and history of the ManKind Project. The MKP is a rapidly expanding organization. Founded as "The New Warrior Network" in 1985 by Bill Kauth (an organizational development specialist), Rich Tosi (a businessman with 10 years of Marine Corps experience), and Ron Hering (a university professor), the MKP has grown in size to 23 regional training centers located in the United States, Canada, Europe and South Africa. As of 1997, approximately 10,000 men had completed the experiential weekend training program run by the MKP, and approximately 2000 new men a year since 1997 have attended these weekends (New Warrior Network, 1997). The size and scope

of the MKP make it an important organization for psychologists and others who want to understand the impact or potential impact of the contemporary men's movement on men's lives and society more generally.

Training Adventure Weekend. Participation in the MKP begins with the training adventure weekend (TAW). The TAW is an initiatory, experiential, weekend-long gathering focused on deep, personal work with and among men. The men are encouraged to car pool with other weekend attendees to the site in order to start the bonding process with the other men in the weekend. It begins at 5 PM on Friday and is usually finished by around 4PM on Sunday. The TAW usually takes place in a remote setting that is free from distraction, allows privacy, and allows the attendees to experience a natural setting. In addition, there is a graduation ceremony that is held on the week following the TAW where the men share their experiences and are honored by the larger MKP community. Newly initiated men are encouraged to invite friends and family to the graduation so that they can get a better sense of what the organization is all about, given that the activities of the weekend are confidential. The training has a considerable cost associated with it-- around 600 dollars depending on the center holding it, though scholarships are available if the men have a desire and an inability to pay for it.

The MKP describes six characteristics that they feel define the TAW and the organization (ManKind Project, 2000). These characteristics are described below.

Leadership. The first characteristic is a sense of leadership. This leadership is defined as a sense of confidence to act in new and productive ways. To quote the organization's brochure describing the TAW:

Stepping up to lead or mentor takes courage. It means putting oneself on the line, taking a risk, becoming vulnerable. It means confronting the fear that wants to keep us small and safe...Once we find the courage to stop running away from ourselves, we finally step into our lives as men. We become fully alive and present, able to give our gifts to the world with a sense of purpose and clarity and with neither apology nor arrogance. We step into our relationships more fully: able to commit, able to be intimate, able to listen with our hearts, able to speak our deepest truth. We discover a man who can be open and vulnerable, grounded and powerful (ManKind Project, 2000).

An added element of leadership is the modeling of the behaviors and values advocated by the organization. Many men have reported that they were very impressed with the quality of the peer leaders on their weekends. The MKP has a rigorous leadership training program that every “leader” (man in charge of making sure the weekend runs smoothly and is qualified to handle any potential mishaps) must go through, and these men serve as models to not only the weekend initiates, but also to the other staff and the men in the larger community. Michael Segell (1999), in his description of the TAW, describes one of the leaders in the following manner:

Dennis Shackly, skinny, handsome, on the cusp of middle age, about six foot four and wearing a T-shirt that boasts of his having completed a fifty mile run, pulls me over to a corner of the orange yellow shag. He’s flown here from Indianapolis, along with three other (leaders), to direct the guts work. This is his fortieth New Warrior weekend, meaning he’s helped about 1,200 men take a look at their fears,

sorrows, and hatreds--for thirty or forty minutes, anyway. I have watched gestalt therapists at human potential outposts like the Esalen Institute and am surprised to see how efficient and skillful Shackly is...I was awed by his ability to cut to the heart of each man's anger and sorrow and firmly but compassionately lead him through catharsis and to some sort of resolution (p.33).

Accountability and integrity. The second characteristic is accountability and integrity. This consists in giving the men a more complete look at how their actions affect those around them. By aiding the man in seeing how he may be unintentionally influencing the world around him, he is expected to be more able to change in a pro-social direction. To quote the MKP, "Here a man learns how to be fully accountable for his actions and its consequences; how to begin integrating the dark and soulful qualities of our masculine nature... We learn to transcend the momentum of toxic masculinity, finding within us the sacred masculine energy...that seeds life with passion, zeal and creativity." (ManKind Project, 2000).

Mission in life/taking action. The third characteristic is a focus on developing a sense of mission in life, and the fourth characteristic is on encouraging the men to take action in the world. These characteristics are related, in that a new awareness and a clear understanding of what place one may have and/or play in the world (mission), allows greater clarity about the steps a man can take to live in integrity with himself and the world around him (action).

A mature man is one who knows himself well enough to understand why he is here and what he is committed to...we invite a man to step forward and look in the

mirror. What do you see? Are you the leader that you are looking for? Are you living on the edge of your life? What stands between you and taking action in your world? What is the risk for you to take full responsibility for your life, for living it from the inside out?...Are you willing to step into the fullness of who you really are? Are you willing to discover the real joy and terror of being a man? If so, this training may be for you.(ManKind Project, 2000).

Fatherhood. The fifth characteristic of the TAW is its attention to fatherhood. This is, to a large extent, a focus on becoming aware of how men influence each other, both as fathers and as adults and children. This role is not limited to the biological role of father, but also any relationship where an older man gives guidance and mentorship to any younger person, be they male or female.

Our culture is beginning to awaken to the reality that we are collectively suffering from a lack of healthy fathering and mentorship...Our training will not necessarily make a man a better father. But it will certainly put him in touch with the theme of fatherhood that he carries within himself. We often father in precisely the same ways that we were fathered, and if we are to turn the tide, it is essential that we examine the father legacy... (ManKind Project, 2000).

Honoring of the men. The final characteristic of the training listed by the organization is a focus on honoring and blessing the participants. In the words of the organization, “Many of us have grown up either without fathers or with fathers who never quite gave us the attention that we deeply and secretly yearned for. Every young boy needs the clear and loving reflection of an older man, one who sees him not only for who

he is, but for who he might become....Our training creates an opportunity for each man to be honored and blessed...when a man finally accepts and believes that he is enough, then he can step into the world knowing that what he does is enough as well (ManKind Project, 2000).

Ongoing involvement: Integration Groups.

Following the TAW, men have the opportunity to join a small, supportive, ongoing, peer-led "Integration Group" (I group), formed from the weekend participants. Many of the men in the MKP consider the I-groups to be the ongoing cornerstone of their participation in the MKP. As one man put it when in discussing his I-group,

We have succeeded in ...helping each other face our deepest fears, and initiating ourselves into older, soulful thinking and being. We've succeeded in stepping out and modeling what we do for other men. We've succeeded in creating a wonderfully safe and magical place that I didn't know could have existed five years ago...I've developed a circle of men that I can depend on for anything. I know these men will be there for me no matter what. (Quote from I-group representative; unpublished data).

I-groups are formed within two to four weeks after the TAW. The members of the I-groups are almost always participants from the same TAW, although sometimes members from other trainings will join because work or family conflicts made it impossible for them to join an I-group immediately following their TAW. Most commonly, two I-groups are formed after each TAW, unless the training is particularly small or the majority of the attendees for that weekend are from different parts of the country. The main

criteria for selection of a particular post-TAW group is geographic location or availability on a certain night.

Once the group is ready, facilitators (men who have been trained by the ManKind Project to teach group facilitation skills to the I-group members) begin an eight week training and mentoring period after which the group begins to operate autonomously. After the eight week facilitation, the I-groups are similar in structure and function to other peer-led, self-help and mutual aid groups (Borkman, 1991).

The information taught in the facilitation period of I-group development is intended to reinforce and build upon the information and processes presented to the men during the TAW. At first, a format for running an I-group meeting is put into place. It is ordered, and incorporates many ideas broached during the weekend--centeredness and being present, acknowledgment of spirituality in a non-denominational manner, a focus on awareness of body sensations and on emotions, a highly structured process to provide a method of settling differences, a format for working on personal issues, and helping men develop focus on life missions and on sharing gratitude and blessing (see Figure 1).

In addition to presenting a positive group structure, certain concepts are strongly reinforced during the facilitation period. One of the more important ones is providing an environment that fosters honesty, catharsis, and the capacity to confide at a deep level. Honesty and openness is encouraged during the TAW, and is an integral part of the I-group, allowing men to speak honestly about hidden aspects of themselves without suffering embarrassment. Another aspect that is stressed is accountability--in both one's actions (e.g., showing up to group on time) and in understanding and externalization of

Figure 1. Ongoing I-group Outline

Week Four Checklist		
Activity	Time Estimate	Comments/Notes
Outside Check-in	15 minutes	
Logistics	5 minutes	
Smudge (ceremonial burning of sage)	5 minutes	
Invocation	5 minutes	Call in Grandfathers
Silent Minute	2 minutes	Body Sensations.
Round One (Lover): Check-in	15 minutes	Feeling / Sensation
Round Two (Warrior): Accountability	15 minutes	Clearing, Data / Judgement / Feeling / Own / Want
Round Three (Magician): Tonight's Work	15 minutes	If I was to work tonight
Work	75 minutes	Individual process, Work, Bucketing Process, etc.
Mission / Stretch	30 minutes	Mentoring Process
Round Four (King): Check-out	15 minutes	
Closing Circle	5 minutes	

Taken from the MKP Facilitator's Manual

internal conflicts (e.g., realizing anger at a group member/wife/boss is really misplaced anger with Dad). In addition, there is a tremendous focus given to encouraging the men to be very conscious of their “mission,” or encouraging the men to be deliberate about the choices they make in their lives and to aid them in synchronizing their actions with their values. Positive communication skills are strongly reinforced, including active listening and assertiveness. In addition, multiple handouts are given to the men that present a new paradigm of behavior, such as the principles of the organization (see Figure 2), and recommendations on how to approach situations from a perspective of love instead of fear (see Figure 3). In addition to the material presented to the men, the facilitators themselves are meant to serve as models for many of the processes and positive attitudes that the organization attempts to embody.

The MKP has had moderate success in retaining members in I-groups. One study looked at rates of retention in the I-groups in the Washington DC chapter of the MKP, and included 529 men who took part in an I-group between 1990 and 1998 (Mankowski et al., 2000). In total, 295 (55.7%) of those in the sample were I-group dropouts, and 221 (41.7%) were currently active in a MKP-GW I-group. The remaining 13 (2.4%) participants had missing information on start and/or end dates and therefore were not included in the analysis. Of the 45 groups that had formed by 1998, 22 had disbanded and 23 were still active. Groups reported an average of 6.1 ($SD = 1.83$) members, with a high proportion of members attending group meetings ($M = 5.7$, $SD = 1.14$). Group representatives rated their groups as moderately effective ($M = 6.9$ on a scale from 1 to 10,

Figure 2. Handout of defining principles

Introduction to Warrior Work Handout

The ManKind Project: A non-profit organization and network of interdependent centers working together to heal the world one man at a time.

Mission. . . We empower men to missions to service.

Identity Statement. . . We are an order of men called to reclaim the sacred masculine for our time; through initiation, training and action in the world.

Core Organizing and Guiding Principle. . . We empower the evolution of consciousness in each man in our culture.

Principles of our Order

1. I create my own perception of reality.
2. My outer reality exists as a reflection of my inner world.
3. Higher states of consciousness exist and reflect greater abilities to manifest my inner reality.
4. Higher states of consciousness embody a life of service, compassion, and unconditional love.
5. My work towards higher consciousness starts within.
6. My inner work begins with awareness of feelings which become the doorway for discovering and owning my shadows and wounds.
EMOTIONAL LITERACY
7. Healing of my wounds comes from releasing my judgments and forgiving from my heart.
8. My personal life mission becomes my guiding force that transcends my wounds and moves me beyond healing into joyous service.
9. I take personal responsibility and am accountable for living in integrity with my mission.

Principles Poetically Put

We empower men to manifest their potential fully and joyfully, trusting that they will create the healthy solutions needed by our society and planet.

Figure 3. Handout stressing adaptive interpersonal behavior.

Handout- Love/Fear

Am I coming from a place of LOVE or FEAR?

10. Everything seems to flow from love or from fear

11. Two basic energies:

love is a flow of energy from source

- o Its needed for health, growth, abundance, life
- o light / connection to whole

fear is blocking flow of energy

- o abandonment, isolation, disconnection
- o darkness

12. When in love flow, all good things happen

automatically take on positive characteristics and behaviors

not forced

13. When in fear, my shadows come alive and run my life

14. My goal is to tap into the source and come from love

Be aware of where I'm coming from

If I'm coming from Fear, I choose to look at how I might come from
Love instead

Figure 3. Continued

Handout – LOVE / FEAR *continued*

Coming from <i>LOVE</i>	Coming from <i>FEAR</i>
Responsibility	Victim
Pro-Active	Re-Active
Towards	Away From
Own shadows	Defensive, Denial
Growth/ Experience Life	Resist Change/Stay in Comfort Zone
Open/ Vulnerable	Protected/ Attacking
Ask for help	Do it myself
Joy / Bliss / Curiosity/ Peaceful	Anger / Sadness / Shame
Abundance /Coopertn – Win/Win	Scarcity / Competition – Win/Lose
Live in the Moment	Fear Future / Hold onto Past
Empower / Mentor	Control / Dominate
Be of Service, Hear	Use, fix
Pain as Sensation, Information	Pain as Suffering, Bad
Learn Lessons	Withdraw / Punish
Connection	Isolation
Observation / Evaluation/ Choice Does it work or not? Is it empowering?	Judgement / Control/ Obligation Is it good or bad? Is it right or wrong?
I could	I Should
Vision / Mission	Survival
Seek to Understand / Compassion	Judge / Blame
Go Through Fear [conscious choice]	Fight / Flight [un-conscious reaction]
Grateful	Jealous / Envious / Needy
Intention / Surrender	Expectation / Attachment
Ask for what I want	Manipulate

$SD = 1.8$). This level of retention and satisfaction, despite over half of the men no longer participating in an I-group, is considerably higher than has been reported for some other kinds of mutual support groups, and given that it encompasses all groups in an eight year period, may be considered a relatively positive indicator of effectiveness (cf. Luke, Roberts, & Rappaport, 1993).

An array of activities, experiential workshops and additional training programs are available year-round to further assist the men's development. Many men volunteer to staff a TAW, an activity which most men find very rewarding. There is a greater demand to staff than number of staff openings, and the men who do staff (excepting the leaders) pay a seventy five dollar fee to cover room and board and to reduce the cost to the TAW participants.

Other activities include workshops to train the staff leaders of the weekend program and I-groups, workshops focused on specific helpful therapeutic techniques and processes that occur in the TAW or the I-groups, and workshops that focus on specific issues such as money, relationships, or racism/multiculturalism. There is a Lodge Keepers Society, which is in charge of setting up and running "sweats," a native spiritual ritual that many men find spiritually rewarding. Finally, the organization sponsors a number of social events and civic volunteer activities and men are encouraged to participate in them as part of their involvement in the MKP.

Previous Research on the Impact of the MKP on Participants

The MKP has been the subject of five previous research studies. All studies were conducted by men who had attended the TAW and had participated in an I-group. That

prior research has only been conducted by participants may be due in part to the confidential nature of the TAW, and in part to the understandable interest of those who have taken part to study the MKP processes and outcomes.

The earliest of the five (Hartman, 1994) compared levels of gender role stress, a measure of traditional masculine traits that has been linked to poor health outcomes (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987), in participants both pre-TAW and 5 weeks post-TAW. Hartman also employed a comparison group consisting of men on a waiting list to attend a TAW.

Hartman found that the men who attended the TAW reported significantly less gender role stress at the five week follow-up time, while the comparison group reported an increase in gender role stress. Hartman's hypothesis that attendance at a TAW would reduce gender role stress was supported, while he was surprised to find an increase in levels of gender role stress in the comparison group. This increase may in part be due to anticipatory anxiety of the participants in the comparison group who, having waited a fair amount of time to attend a TAW, are soon to be doing so. In a post hoc analysis, Hartman also determined that age was negatively correlated with gender role stress scores, both pre-TAW and in levels of change from pre-TAW to five weeks post-questionnaire. Based on this finding, he concludes that the TAW may be more effective with men over the age of 35.

A second study was conducted by Levin (1997), using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, and two measures of Adlerian constructs pre- and post- TAW, and including a comparison sample group (convenience sample of men interested in men's work,

collected through a snowball technique). Levin found that participants had greater access to both feminine and masculine characteristics post-weekend (as shown in greater levels of feminine and masculine characteristics on the Bem inventory), while the comparison group did not show any changes. No changes were noted on the Adlerian measures. Levin concluded that attendance at a TAW gives men a greater ability to step beyond traditional gender roles by offering increased methods of experiencing a new sense of masculinity. He also found that TAW participants in therapy did not experience higher gains on gender values than men not in therapy, and based on this finding, stated that the TAW is not just a good adjunct to traditional therapy, but is a satisfactory and sufficient intervention for men who suffer from restricted gender role orientation.

Schulz (1997) conducted an in-depth qualitative study of 10 TAW participants. The study looked at childhood difficulties with parents and found that most men had problematic relationships with their fathers and with their mothers, and half reported childhood difficulty with peers. Participants stated problems with male gender role socialization, in that it negatively affected their ability to relate to other men as friends and limited their opportunities to relate to other men on a deeper level. They rated the TAW and their subsequent participation in the MKP as a positive experience, even describing it as transforming. On the negative side, the men were critical of the TAW cost, with the MKP organizational structure, and with difficulties with lay volunteers facilitating what they felt was close to professional therapeutic work.

Richard (1999) conducted a qualitative study that compared participants in a men's therapy group and members of a MKP I-group. Richard found that the responses

from the men in the two conditions were very similar. First, they were almost identical in terms of demographics (white, well educated, and well employed). He reports that members of both groups were influenced to join the respective group/organization primarily to come to terms with what they felt were certain losses, transitions, and unfulfilled aspects of their lives. Both sets of men continued to participate in order to fight a sense of isolation, disconnection, the desire for male friendship, addressing childhood conflicts/deficiencies, and to achieve a more spiritual and meaningful understanding of oneself, others and the world. Richard stated that the major differences between the two sets of men related to the use of language (vernacular) specific to the group in question. The MKP members used terms like archetype and shadow to describe the analytical and spiritual changes they were making. The therapy group members used more pragmatic terms, but still explained similar experiences.

Goll (2001) attempted to measure the effectiveness of the TAW using the Personal Orientation Inventory (a measure of self-actualization; Shostrom, 1976) and the Spiritual Experience Index (a measure of spiritual maturity; Genia, 1997) as indicators of outcome. He compared the pre and post scores of men who attended the TAW and contrasted their scores with those of a comparison sample (members of an Indiana Men's Council and a local moose lodge). Results showed the TAW participants to have increased in assorted subscales of the Personal Orientation Inventory and the Spiritual Experience Index, suggesting that the TAW positively influences men's level of self-actualization and spirituality. This study suffered from a low number of subjects, a loosely organized, multi-site data collection, and small comparison sample.

Nevertheless, it once again suggests that the TAW may have a positive effect on the men who participate.

The results of these previous pre-post test studies on the MKP suggest that involvement in the organization has positive outcomes for the men who chose to participate. The qualitative analysis also revealed that the participants reported a subjectively positive experience.

These studies suffer from a low number of participants, and their designs do not allow strong statements about the effectiveness of the MKP to be made. Nonetheless, the studies as a whole suggest there are aspects of the MKP experience that have positive implications for men in their ability to adjust to changing gender paradigms, Levant's "crisis of masculinity", and the results suggest further research into the organization is needed.

Research on men suggests they have greater health problems and shorter life expectancy. In addition, research shows that men may very well experience emotion differently than women, and are not as well served by traditional psychotherapy. Given these conclusions, the lack of research on alternative interventions for men, and the promising but inconclusive research on the MKP, a discussion of the MKP as an alternative form of assistance for men is next presented.

The Men's Movement and the MKP as a Self-help Organization

The men's movement framed as a self-help group. The majority of men's organizations have attempted to create awareness and promote change to counter what

each feels is problematic about masculinity. In most cases, including the MKP, the small support group has been used to implement their ideas.

This use of the indigenous and grass-roots oriented support group format parallels a larger cultural trend (Wuthnow, 1994). There has been a dramatic increase in support group usage in the last part of the 20th century. In the early nineties, Katz (1993) estimated there are currently 500,000 to 750,000 groups with 10 to 15 million members, and an 8% growth rate among groups, and more recent research suggests that as many as 50 million people have taken part to some degree in a self-help group (Riessman & Banks, 2001).

The success of the self-help group format is in part due to its great flexibility. Levine & Perkins (1997) point out that self-help groups are very loosely structured around certain basic principles that allow them to “...address the ecological fact of diversity among people and their needs by providing relatively precise ideological antidotes that can be tailored to any vulnerable condition” (p. 319).

Apart from effectively helping their members, the growth of self-help groups can also be seen as a result of societal changes. The self-help group format is well suited to fill the “potholes” of need left by the fast-paced and at times impersonal world in which we live. Levine & Perkins (1997) state that self-help groups are growing due to the problems that existing social organizations have in providing social support, in part caused by these organization’s inability to keep up with the breakdowns in the traditional family, increased divorce, and increased employment instability, as well as the changing nature of social services and health care.

Men and community psychology: Grassroots efforts to find a solution. The idea that men may not be well served by traditional mental health counseling is a common theme in the theoretical literature on men and therapy, with many theorists stating that traditional therapy is insensitive to the needs of men. Picchioni (1992) hypothesizes that there are three main reasons why men are not as prone to enter therapy as women. First, a man, by going to therapy, admits that he is hurting and is thus unworthy of his image of the noble “knight” who is invincible and totally inner directed--what Picchioni feels is a common male theme. Thus, the therapeutic process, as it exists, unintentionally embarrasses and humiliates him at the beginning of therapy. Second, men are also reluctant to enter therapy because it is perceived as a relinquishment of control, and existing male norms instruct men to maintain control to the greatest possible extent. And third, men resist therapy due to a fear of intimacy. The focus on high levels of intimacy--a manner of relating that is juxtaposed to an usual male pattern of building and perfecting defenses--may be too strong of a shock for men to integrate too early in the therapeutic process. Unintentionally, Pucchioni states, “...Therapy is a step toward emasculation, since he perceives therapy vaguely as a fellow traveler of those “soft” sciences that project the rival image of the individual as in relationships and in a state of perpetual dependency” (p. 10).

Sternbach (1990), in describing an alternative men’s seminar that he had created, states his opinion on how therapy interacts with men and masculinity:

“Small wonder that men have been resistant and wary of our services. Most clinical situations call for just those attitudes and behaviors least likely to

harmonize with masculinity. Reference to the semantic differential on masculine styles of relating indicate that maleness calls for individuation, independence, cognition, action, strength and above all, control over one's inner feelings as well as the immediate environment. As we know, therapy asks intimacy, dependence, affect, verbalization, vulnerability" (p. 25).

The idea that the prevailing view in mental health counseling is not consonant with existing masculine paradigms is also strongly voiced by Heesacker & Prichard (1992). The main point of their article is to encourage two emotional voices in the therapeutic setting, one the feminine voice, and two, less recognizable and inimical to most mental health counselors, the masculine voice. These authors argue that there are two possible perspectives on men and masculinity: 1) that men have a problem that needs to be fixed; and 2) men have an experience that needs to be understood. In their estimation, the current *Zeitgeist* in clinical psychology is that men have a problem that needs to be fixed, which is embodied in what they call the anti-sexist men's perspective. This is in part evidenced by the nature of many current conceptualizations of masculinity--all negative in nature--that use terms such as gender role *conflict*, gender role *stress*, *masculopathology*, *the death sex*, and *toxic levels of masculinity* to describe masculine attributes (p.277).

While acknowledging that the popular approaches to therapy, which are more consonant with a feminine way of being, are useful and necessary, it is the sole reliance on this method that they feel is unwise. As they state,

It is our contention that many men and some women are being badly served by the currently popular approaches to counseling, which emphasize, in our view, a female-oriented approach and emotional expression . This approach is not inherently wrong. What is wrong is applying it with a "one size fits all" mentality. If the only tool one knows is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. We fear that, perhaps legitimate differences in men's emotional lives and emotional expression are being "hammered" when they need either no repair or other forms of repair.

Seen in this light, the increasing calls for interventions outside of the field of traditional therapy by men's organizations is very much in line with the theory of community psychology. Society reacted to the oppression of patriarchy, in part a result of the rise of women's consciousness raising self-help groups. This change to the societal system--the deserved and needed rise of the economic and cultural status of women--which was mostly the result of women's concerns and demands, has resulted in a disruption of the societal role for men. Given this change, and given that standard psychotherapy may not be well suited to helping all men, it is logical that alternative ways of envisioning and approaching men, including the creation of self-help groups, has taken place around the country.

Pre-Existing Factors That May Affect Outcome in Mythopoetic Men's Groups

Maton (1989b) and Mankowski et al. (2001), among others, have found certain demographic variables (e.g., spirituality) to be predictive of successful participation in self-help groups. However, little is known about any demographic characteristics that

may predict participation in a men's mythopoetic organization. However, some hypothesized characteristics are discussed below.

The relation of age to effectiveness in men's work. It has been suggested that mythopoetic men's work is inherently more appealing to men in their thirties and beyond (e.g., Rohr, 1994). Interestingly, this is consistent with the views of a theorist highly respected in the mythopoetic men's movement, Carl Jung. Jung (1976) proposed that men, as they become older, encounter changes that make introspection and a desire for self-awareness higher priorities. It was Jung's belief that in the first stages of a man's life, he is best suited to focus on externals--to achieve and make his way in the world. As such, he is adapted to the society around him and is well suited to put aside introspection in order to concentrate on gains and achievement. However, Jung posits that as a man grows older, his priorities change, making a fascination with the external goals of achievement and success maladaptive. At that point, Jung believes that a man should become more acclimated to what are more introspective qualities and virtues that were put aside in the more youthful quest for status and security. In an essay on the stages of life, comparing one's lifetime to the course of the sun during the day, Jung (1976) states:

There is an interesting report in the ethnological literature about an Indian warrior chief to whom in the middle of life the Great Spirit appeared in a dream. The spirit announced to him that from then on he must sit among the woman and children, wear woman's clothes, and eat the food of women. He obeyed the dream without suffering a loss of prestige. This vision is a true expression of the

psychic revolution of life's noon, of the beginning of life's decline. Man's values, and even his body, do tend to change into their opposites...The worst of it all is that intelligent and cultivated people live their lives without even knowing the possibility of such transformations... thoroughly unprepared we take the step into the afternoon of life; worse still, we take this step with the false assumption that our truths and ideals will serve us as hitherto. But we cannot love the afternoon of life according to the program of life's morning; for what was great in morning will be little at evening, and what in the morning was true will at evening have become a lie.... Instead of doing likewise [embracing the ephemeral nature of life], many old people prefer to be hypochondriacs, niggards, pedants, applauders of the past or else eternal adolescents—all lamentable substitutes for the illumination of the self, but inevitable consequences of the delusion that the second half of life must be governed by the principles of the first. (pp. 15-16).

The limited research that has been done on the MKP suggests that the training may be more effective with older men. Mankowski et al. (2000a), in their analysis of MKP I-groups in the Washington DC area, found that a significantly higher number of men under the age of 30 prematurely dropped out of the group before the 8 week facilitation period was over. In a follow-up analysis, Mankowski et al. (2000b) found that active members were also older ($M = 44.4$ vs. 40.4 years; $t(349) = 4.9, p < .001$) than members who had left their I-group. Relatedly, a survival analysis revealed that age was a predictor of leaving an I-group. The older members were, the less likely they were to leave the group, such that for every year increase in age, members were 4% more

likely to stay in the group. Nonetheless, only limited conclusions can be drawn from these findings. The findings are correlational, and cannot establish causality. For example, younger men may be more likely to discontinue their I-group involvement due to their moving more frequently than older men. Nonetheless, these findings suggest the value of investigating the experience of younger versus older men in the MKP, as their earlier termination in the I-group may prognosticate lower levels of MKP effectiveness with younger men.

Hartman (1994), in his previously mentioned study on the effects of the TAW, also reported a post hoc finding that is relevant to the age of the participant. He found a positive correlation between age and extent of decrease in gender role stress scores from pre to post TAW. This finding suggests that the TAW may be more effective in reducing gender role stress for older men.

Life stage change and mythopoetic men's work. It is a common perception that often times men, as they grow older, will go through a period of adjustment that involves a reinterpretation of life and its meaning. As such, during this period, men may be more prone to consider a new understanding of themselves and their purpose in life.

Levinson (1978), in an extensive qualitative analysis that helped to inform a theory of development for men, describes a set of stages through which men usually pass. These are: (1) Childhood and adolescence, from ages 0-22, (2) early adulthood, from ages 17-45, (3) middle adulthood, from 40-65, and (4) late adulthood, from 60 until death. There is an overlap in ages between the separate stages. This was intentional, and represents periods of transition that occur between stages, that Levinson

postulates lasts from 3 to 6 years. Each of these periods is marked by certain adaptive behaviors that are in sync with men's biological functioning and social standing, which differ as the stages progress.

In childhood and adolescence, Levinson postulates that the boy learns slowly how to deal with the family and learn the skills he will need to someday function as an adult. As he progresses into the first part of early adulthood, he enters what Levinson calls the "Entering the adult world" period, which Levinson postulates happening between the ages of 22 and 28. During this phase, Levinson postulates that the man is in the prime of his physical and mental stature, yet is burdened with his conflicting desires and his efforts to establish himself in the world. Levinson describes this stage as "both satisfying and stressful."

The next phase of a man's development within the young adult period, occurring between ages 28 and 33, is the "Age 30 transition," where men start to work on the flaws and limitations that become apparent after working through earlier developmental periods. Levinson states that men's life structure is "always new" at the end of the age thirty transition. He also states that this change can take two forms: (1) smooth, where there is no great disruption or state of crisis; and more commonly, (2) stressful, where men find their present life structure intolerable and do not see any viable alternatives. Men experiencing this time as stressful is more "the rule than the exception," and is clear that turmoil at this time is not "merely a delayed adolescent crisis...nor is it a precocious mid-life crisis," but a viable and normal part of this developmental stage (p.58).

Following this phase within early adulthood is the “settling down” period, occurring roughly between 33 and 40. Levinson feels that the transition from the age 30 transition to the settling down period is

” ... one of the crucial steps in adult development. At this time a man may make important new choices, or he may reaffirm old choices. If these choices are congruent with his dreams, talents and external possibilities, they provide the basis for a relatively satisfactory life structure. If the choices are poorly made and the new structure seriously flawed, he will pay a heavy price in the next period” (P. 59).

Levinson states that the settling down period has two major tasks (1) to develop a niche in society by finding one’s role and function in society and (2) striving hard at “making it,” or finding ways to obtain a better life and gain social affirmation.

He also mentions five common patterns that addressing those tasks can take: (1) “advancement within a stable life structure,” where life proceeds more or less according to his and other’s expectations; (2) “serious failure or decline within a stable life structure,” which can mean relationship or work failure, or outward success that leaves the man feeling inwardly vapid; (3) “breaking out--trying for a new life structure,” where previous dissatisfaction with one’s life and society comes to a full head, or he begins to experience feelings of alienation from the world and a sense of suffocation; (4) “advancement which itself produces a change in life structure,” as indicated by the change that may come from a promotion or drastic increase in income; and (5) “unstable

life structure,” where a man’s life structure as well as his relation to his vocation and society remains chaotic throughout the settling down period.

Levinson defines the settling down period as a personal enterprise, a struggle in finding a direction in which to strive, stating it is, to use the term of Jean Paul Satre, a “project.” He uses the image of a ladder, with its image of advancement. He also states that the “ladder” has both objective and subjective aspects, in that these strivings reflect real gains in the outside world, yet just as importantly, these external strivings are the way that men at this stage pursue, manifest or react against their internal sense of purpose and meaning.

The culmination of this period, happening roughly around the age of 40, marks the end of the early adult period, and marks the beginning of the mid-life transition period, which lasts roughly from 40 to 45. It is in part a period of reflection on one’s performance in satisfying his goals in the settling down period. It is a time where he must “come to terms with the past and prepare for the future (p.191).” Levinson feels that there are 3 main tasks involved in the mid-life transition: (1) to terminate the era of early adulthood, (2) prepare to initiate himself into middle adulthood, in part by modifying the negative elements of his present life and to play with different options, and (3) to deal with “the polarities that are the source of deep division in his life (e.g., being young/old, masculine/feminine characteristics, being attached to others/ being autonomous).” (p. 192).

Levinson states that this mid-life transition is tumultuous for the majority of men. He states “Every aspect of their lives comes into question, and they are horrified by

much that is revealed. They are full of recriminations against themselves and others.

They cannot go on as before...” (p. 199). He also states that this transition

...cannot be a cool intellectual process. It must involve emotional turmoil, despair, the sense of not knowing where to turn or of being stagnant and unable to move at all. A man in this state oftentimes makes false starts. He tentatively tests a variety of new choices not only out of confusion or impulsiveness but, equally, out of a need to explore, to see what is possible, to find out how it feels to engage in a particular love relationship, occupation or solitary pursuit. Every genuine reappraisal must be agonizing, because it challenges the illusions and vested interests on which the existing structure is based (p.199).

Levinson also states that this period has the same five possible sequences that were characteristic of the settling down period (see above).

The next period of development is the period of middle adulthood. In this period, a man continues to struggle with many of the same issues that characterized his mid-life transition, primarily the polarities (e.g., masculine dominance versus feminine receptiveness, duty to society and family versus need for autonomy and independence, etc.), and their shifting priorities as the physical realities of aging manifest themselves. Levinson describes the period of middle adulthood as including a slowing down of physical and mental vigor. There is no single marker that universally defines this age--biological or social. Levinson characterizes this phase as changes in “a lived life as it evolves” (p. 24), stating it is a mixture of changes in biological and psychological functioning, the sequence of generations (i.e., a son, father, or grandfather), and the

evolution of careers and enterprises. Because this stage is not clearly marked by outside forces, it is not as clearly forced upon a man as some of the other stages are, and as such, may be more difficultly undertaken. Levinson writes:

It is not at all certain, of course, that development will occur in middle adulthood. For large numbers of men, life in the middle years is a process of gradual or rapid stagnation, of alienation, from the world and from the self. Severe decline and constriction are common enough so that they are often seen as part of normal middle age. In many populations, a good deal of decline is statistically normal in the sense that it occurs frequently. It is not, however, *developmentally* normal (p.26-27).

Levinson mentions that a culminating event oftentimes facilitates crises in middle adulthood. The triggering event itself is not that important, and it can take numerous forms. Thus, it is not the situation that facilitates the transition, but the time of that man's life that makes the event so influential. Levinson writes that when a man at this stage confronts an issue, he is not merely reacting to the situation that is in front of him, "He is reappraising his life" (p. 32).

Levinson feels that a successful middle adulthood is both difficult (as it is not forced on a man like early adulthood's moving out of the home or late adulthood's swift physical decline) and critical to his overall well being. He states,

Mid-life individuation enables us to reduce the tyranny of both the demands society places on us and the demands of our own repressed (instinctual) unconscious. We can begin giving more attention to what Jung calls the

“archetypal unconscious,” an inner source of self definition and satisfaction...Individuation is not without painful transitions and recurrent setbacks, but it holds the possibility of continuing self renewal and creative involvement in one’s own and other’s lives (p.33).

As Levinson states, men no longer in the prime of their youth are often faced with a crisis where they are challenged with making a fundamental change in their outlook and perspective, lacking any clear guidelines or rationales for undertaking this trepidatious transformation.

The MKP, with its focus on accountability, mission, modeling healthy masculinity, action in the world and fatherhood, seems to be addressing many of the issues that Levinson postulates are key issues for men who are going through developmental crises, most especially for the men aged 33 to 45 as well as those who continue to progress through middle and late adulthood. As such, the MKP may be filling a gap that gender socialization has left unfilled, and offer a solution for men that is unique to their particular developmental crises. It would be worth investigating if men facing the challenges of young adulthood, mid-life transition, or a potential middle adulthood stage transformation, as prognosticated by changing life circumstances, would be especially likely to benefit from participation in the MKP.

Men’s work and the “recovery” movement. In addition to the theoretical literature stating that men’s work is synchronous with the self-help group model, the available research suggests that men with experience in self-help groups, especially twelve step “recovery” groups, may be particularly suited to mythopoetic men’s work.

Schwalbe (1995), in his sociological study on a North Carolina mythopoetic men's center, reported that over one third of the men in the center were involved in some form of twelve step work, a percentage significantly higher than in the general population. Kupers (1993) also sees a strong connection between the two. In his observational analysis of mythopoetic men's groups, he states that "Men "in recovery" flock to men's (mythopoetic) gatherings. They suffer from the same gender traps that afflict non-addicts, and they are aware that they fled into addiction while trying desperately to fill the void they feel in the center of their souls" (p. 147).

Although the MKP does not specifically address the concern of addiction, it does address many of the same issues that recovery self-help groups do. Twelve step groups are in part concerned with a sense of community, counter-cultural support, an adaptive cognitive ideology, a safe environment that encourages honesty and confession, healthy role models (leaders) for desired behavior, and practical coping strategies (Levine, 1988), characteristics also encouraged by the MKP. Both organizations address spirituality in a manner that is free from the encumbrances of organized religion.

Given the similarity in mechanisms, it is conceivable that the MKP provides an environment that is comfortable for men who have experienced twelve step recovery, making it a natural fit for them. In addition, the MKP may provide a similar, yet more focused and intense, experience to that undergone in a twelve step group. In fact, one national leader of the MKP has stated that the work done in the MKP is "graduate level twelve step work" (W. Wich, personal communication, November, 1998).

Limited research indicates that a high number of men in recovery from substance abuse take part in mythopoetic work (e.g., Kupers, 1993; Schwalbe, 1995; W. Wich, personal communication, November, 1998). It may be that men with previous self-help/twelve step group experience, due to a familiarity and agreement with the mechanisms employed, will benefit more from the MKP than men with no self-help or twelve step experience.

Pre-existing beliefs and mythopoetic men's work: A question of fit. The question of who is best served by what kind of therapy is a perennial question in psychology research. Beutler (2000), in outlining a revised set of variables that must be taken into consideration when designing a more systematic and effective intervention with depressed patients, proposes four areas of focus. They are: 1) Patient predisposing variables (attributes the patients bring with them to therapy), 2) treatment context variables (parameters of treatment setting and structure), 3) therapist activity/relationship variables (aspects of the activity conducted by therapist and attributes that are an inherent part of the therapist), and 4) match or fit of treatment and patient variables (a focus on aspects of treatment that have been shown to be differentially effective with a certain kind of patient). The first three points are incorporated into the fourth point, in that the patient, setting and the therapist should all be operating harmoniously.

This view that an individual is best matched with a therapeutic environment that is maximally suited to the individual's beliefs was an area of interest to Antze (1976). In his writings on self-help groups, ideology and therapeutic change, Antze posits that a self-help groups teachings "are its very essence" (p. 273). Different from standard forms

of therapy, he posits that the self-help group becomes a “fixed community of belief,” and aside from having the acknowledged function of providing mutual support and the removal of “stigmata” from the root problem, the values and ideologies in and of themselves provide what he terms a “persuasive function” above and beyond more commonly acknowledged factors (p. 274).

In examining the ideologies of three separate self-help organizations, Antze shows how the ideologies are effective in that they provide a defense against a relapse into problematic behaviors. For example, one of the primary ideologies of AA is that one needs to put control of one’s life in the hands of a “Higher Power,” which serves to counteract what is viewed by the organization as a tendency for alcoholics to feel that they are omnipotent and totally responsible for all aspects of their lives--both good and bad. Expressions in AA such as “Let go and let God” serve to not only palliate the member’s distress, but also serve the more important function of helping to prevent a return to a self-centeredness that the organization feels is the root of problem drinking.

In exploring a similar theme, Maton (1989b) used the concept of the “social ecology of ‘fit’” to determine if certain pre-existing ideological characteristics of participants predicted better outcomes for self-help groups with different “mechanism-focal problem” orientations. As Maton states,

Ecological theory in biology assumes that individual members of a species will not all fit equally well in an existing ecological niche, given important individual differences across members of the species. In the social (i.e., human) ecological context, person-environment fit theory asserts that individuals will participate and

benefit maximally in local environments (i.e., niches) with characteristics well matched to their own personal characteristics (p.733).

In his study, Maton analyzed members of three separate self-help groups with different foci and populations (Compassionate Friends--for bereaved parents, Multiple Sclerosis--for sufferers of same, and Overeaters Anonymous--a twelve step group for the overweight) in an attempt to determine how the individual characteristics of members predicted positive outcomes in each of the three self-help groups. Maton found that members of Overeaters Anonymous, an organization that advocates reliance on a "Higher Power," who reported higher levels of spirituality were more likely to provide support to other group members and report higher levels of group satisfaction than were those members with lower levels of spirituality. In addition (and contrary to prediction), this positive relationship between personal spirituality and group satisfaction was also found in members of Multiple Sclerosis. However, this finding of a belief in a higher power was not related to any positive changes in the Compassionate Friends group.

These findings suggest that the particular pre-existing ideological characteristics of group members affected the degree of participation and outcome within certain self-help groups, indicating that additional research examining whether pre-existing beliefs of participants is related to outcome in other types of self-help groups is worth examination.

Mankowski et al. (2001) conducted a similar study examining self-help group usage among veterans who had received inpatient substance abuse treatment. The authors explore similar issues to Maton (1989b). The authors write,

From this view, the degree to correspondence of compatibility between potential members' own beliefs and understandings and those in a given self-help group could be especially important in determining the person's level of attrition to and involvement in the group...The degree of similarity or compatibility between personal and self-help group belief systems may predict how attractive the group is seen to be and how involved the person becomes (p. 539).

Their study examined self-help group involvement (primarily AA and assorted twelve step programs for dealing with chemical addiction), individual beliefs and characteristics, the inpatient treatment "social ecology" (theoretical orientation), and the post treatment "social ecology" (availability of support groups and social support). Relevant to this literature review, they found that the individual characteristics of education level, prior 12-step group involvement, belief in the disease model of alcoholism, religious beliefs/behavior and a post treatment goal of abstinence were all significantly predictive of participation in a twelve step self-help group.

The two studies conducted by Maton (1989b) and Mankowski et al. (2001) strongly suggest that pre-existing beliefs may well predict successful outcomes in various self-help groups. In addition, their findings suggest that specific beliefs are predictive with specific self-help organizations. For instance, Maton found a spiritual perspective was important for predicting member's experience in Overeaters Anonymous (and to a limited extent in the Multiple Sclerosis group), but not for Compassionate Friends. Although Mankowski, Humphreys et al. (2001) did not employ different kinds of self-

help groups in their study, they did find a host of demographic variables that harmonize with the ethos of recovery programs that predicted membership.

This relationship has not to date been studied in a men's support group. It appears well worth exploring, as given that the defining ethos of many of these groups is "alternative" by nature (from standard therapeutic models), a knowledge of how pre-existing beliefs influence outcomes would help researchers know if these settings truly function as "communities of belief."

Aspects of empowering community/self-help group settings: Variables affected by participation. Maton & Salem (1995), using a multiple case study approach that looked at three separate community-based organizations, identified four salient features of empowering community settings. The first is a belief system that is inspiring of growth, strengths based, and based beyond the self. This belief system "includes a view of its members, including their needs, problems, potential, and how they can work within the setting to achieve personal goals" (p. 635). This finding is in line with the work of Antze (1976) described previously, and the idea that ideology plays a vital role in a self-help group's effectiveness, a common finding in research on self-help groups (e.g., Galanter, 1993; Humphreys et al., 1999; Levine & Perkins, 1997; Mankowski et al., 2001).

The second feature of empowering community settings is opportunity role structure. Maton and Salem describe this characteristic as the ability of the organization "to provide meaningful opportunities for individuals to develop, grow and participate" (p. 641). This role structure was found to be pervasive in empowering organizations,

one which is highly accessible, and multi-functional. This conclusion is also supported by Maton's (1987) work exploring the bidirectional support hypothesis. In his study of a mid-western faith community setting, Maton found that participants who both gave and received support from other community members reported greater life satisfaction, independent of need or satisfaction with the community in general. By suggesting improved outcomes for those who are in a position to not only receive but also give support, these findings give credence to the benefits of an active role structure.

The third feature of empowering communities is a support system, or "...resources within a setting which contribute to individuals' quality of life and to their ability to cope with stressful life situations" (p. 648). Maton & Salem state that the support system must be encompassing, peer based, and provide a psychological sense of community.

The fourth feature is effective leadership, or the ability of the setting's leaders to directly lead by inspiring and motivating group members, and to indirectly lead by inspiring and motivating those who may interact with the community members. This leadership is described as inspirational, talented, shared, and committed. This may seem paradoxical, as many self-help groups are adamant in emphasizing egalitarianism, and since given the dissatisfaction of many groups have with professional help and its hierarchical setup. AA for instance, makes an explicit point of their organization being non-hierarchical. They consider each individual group to be above the administration that runs the international office, which in most organizations would be more important. However, within self-help groups, leadership oftentimes takes a different form. Like

AA, which has a strong anti-leader bias, the role of leadership in many other self-help groups is not always hierarchical, but more so relational-- that of people who have successfully overcome their problems and have become role models for new members who look to longer term members for guidance and support.

Other theorists have hypothesized differently constructed sets of factors as central to successful self-help groups (e.g., Levine & Perkins, 1997; Orford, 1992). Maton has even proposed a larger set of six salient factors in effective self-help groups (Maton, 2000). However these other typologies, in some form or another, embody the four principles outlined by Maton and Salem.

Known Factors which Affect Individual Outcomes in Self-help Groups

Incorporation of organizational beliefs. In addition to a pre-existing belief structure being predictive of positive outcomes in a self-help organization, it would be expected that an increase in adoption of key organizational belief system concepts, as a result of participation, would also predict desirable effects. Men's groups make no secret of the alternative viewpoints that they hold (e.g., the "sacred masculine"), and given that the available research suggests they are effective in creating positive changes in their members (as previously cited), it is conceivable that such effectiveness is in part due to men's increasing endorsement of these organizational principles. For example, one of the guiding principles of the MKP is accountability, or in the vernacular of the organization, "making sure your words and your actions match up." The concept of accountability is integral to the I-group structure, and to all of the trainings that are sponsored by the MKP. It is conceivable that prolonged exposure to this concept, and

an increased acceptance of it, may have a positive effect on well being. Accountability, and ensuring one's actions match up with ones values, would likely reduce levels of guilt about oneself and one's actions, provide a clearer sense of life purpose, and give a greater sense of self worth. The resulting sense of purpose is inimical to learned helplessness and hopelessness, and as such, may very well influence depression and life satisfaction in a desirable manner.

Thus, beliefs related to group ideology can be viewed not only as a variable that affects outcomes in the organization based on their existence prior to participation, but also a variable that could influence outcomes based on the level to which they are endorsed. An investigation into the effects of endorsement of organizational beliefs after exposure to them, especially alternative beliefs specifically tailored to men, would help researchers and practitioners better understand the process of men's change and how to better facilitate it.

Length of participation. A review of the literature on the factors affecting successful participation in a self-help group reveals that the strongest predictor of successful outcome in self-help groups is length of participation. Kurtz (1990), in her review of the literature on self-help groups, cited thirteen studies that all found length of participation to be associated with a host of improved outcomes (e.g., lower rates of substance abuse relapse, lower rates of psychiatric hospitalization, improved mood, etc.). This connection of length of involvement to improved outcome held true for many different problems addressed--be they mental health (Galanter, 1988; Kurtz, 1988),

addictions (Corrigan, 1980; Polich et al., 1980), bereavement (Lieberman & Videca-Sherman, 1986; Maton, 1989b), or parenting.

The above findings must be interpreted cautiously. They are from non-experimental studies and the findings may in large part reflect a self-selecting membership within these organizations, a point often raised when discussing research on self-help groups. Levy (1988), as cited in Jacobs & Goodman (1989), states that compared with non-members, self-help group members are probably more motivated to change their lives and carry through on the actions recommended in the group. Studies have suggested that self-help group members tend to have a higher level of social competence and adjustment. All this leads to what Levy calls an “intrinsic positive bias effect.” And to complicate matters, the traditional method to overcome that form of bias, random assignment, is not feasible. For to change the characteristics of self-help group members is to change the nature of the intervention and likely its effects as well.

Study limitations notwithstanding, consistent findings do suggest that longer participation within self-help groups is linked to better outcomes. Participation in and of itself is not a psychological mediating mechanism, as it does not in and of itself cause change in the individual. However, it is quite conceivable that length of involvement is a factor that enables the ideology of the self-help group to become more firmly entrenched and thus more able to assist the individual in improving his life. Levine & Perkins (1997), based on this finding, proposed a research question:

Several testable propositions follow from this viewpoint. A member’s commitment and understanding of the group’s ideology should increase with the

length of time in the group...Using the ideology to help solve other everyday problems results in reduced feelings of hopelessness, increased feeling of self-efficacy, and improved self-esteem.(p. 316).

An examination of whether both length and level of participation is related to commitment to the group ideology and better outcomes in a mythopoetic men's group would aid social scientists in understanding the mechanisms of change within a men's support group, and within support groups in general.

Social support. Solid and nurturing relations with those in one's environment has long been acknowledged as one of the key influences in a person's overall well being. Andrews & Withey (1988), in their large scale, national survey examining factors that influence well-being, found that positive relations with people in their community and social networks was foremost in how people determine their overall satisfaction. This idea, which has long been a core element of common folk wisdom, is increasingly becoming an accepted fact in the social science literature, and effects of social support have been shown beneficial across numerous studies from different disciplines (House et al., 1988).

The social support literature is not unified in its agreement about the theory of how and why social support is helpful, or even the fact that it is universally helpful. In fact, Sarason et al. (1990) have stated in their review of the social support construct that support is not so much a unitary concept as an omnibus term. The reviewers of the social support literature acknowledge there is a connection of social support to well-

being while admitting there are large areas of uncertainty as to the strength of the connection and the pathway of the connection.

For example, Vaux (1988), in his review of the general models of social support, states that “Despite the simplicity of these models, it has proved quite difficult to generate, evaluate, and integrate relevant empirical findings” (p.130). From his review, he draws five conclusions: First, he states there is a good deal of evidence that social support can have a direct and positive effect on well-being, both with and without taking into consideration the effect of life stressors. Second, there is convincing evidence that social support can buffer the effects of life stressors. Third, direct effects tend to occur in studies that focus on affiliation and resources (i.e., network measures) and buffer effects tend to be found on studies that focus on availability and quality of support (i.e., perceived support). Fourth, the effects remain unpredictable, being shaped by personal, social, and contextual factors in unknown ways. Finally, research to date has told us almost nothing about how social support may have its effects (p. 130).

Barrera (2000), in a more recent review of the social support literature, came to similar conclusions. While pointing out many of the positive correlations between well-being and social support, Barrera presents so many caveats that no firm conclusions can yet be made about the connection between outcomes and the form of social support, the population under study, or the theoretical pathways of social support influence.

Sarason et al (1990) concluded that the numerous conceptualizations of social support they reviewed “...(all) come from an established body of knowledge, and all raise questions” (p. 20). Thus, in an attempt to bring a conceptual clarity to the study of

social support, Sarason et al. (1990) conducted an exhaustive review of social support theory and measurement. They categorized the existing attempts to measure social support as falling into three categories, each assessing a different facet of social support: Social networks, received social support, and perceived social support.

Social networks. In their categorization of social networks, Sarason et al. focus on the existence of a link between an individual and those with whom the individual may have personal, social or concrete connections. This construct varies in the level of specificity in defining the relationship, the determination of the kind of network examined (e.g., work support, family support, friends support, etc.), and the degree of emphasis put on examination of different aspects of the network. Sarason et al. found the network construct, given the proper study conditions, is suitable for explaining the level of reciprocity in socially supportive relationships, a factor that has been shown to be predictive of self-help group satisfaction and well being (Maton, 1987). However, they also concluded that network size is at best weakly associated with perceived availability and adequacy of support (important predictors), is a cumbersome construct to assess, and the ability of the network characteristics to predict health and adjustment outcomes is not differentially more effective than using the number of socially supportive relationships (which is very easy to obtain).

Received support. In their review of the construct of received support, Sarason et al. (1990) pointed out many of the inherent difficulties using this construct. The first problem with the use of received support is differentiating between a focus on what is termed enacted support (actual forms of support given to the individual in question) and

received support (where the emphasis is on measuring the recipient's impression of what they may have received from others). The correlations between these two perspectives is low, with givers of support tending to report higher levels of support given than those who received it. In fact, reciprocity between the giver and the receiver of support has been shown to be more predictive of well-being than the actual level of support received (see Maton, 1987).

In addition, the authors point out that received support, as it is currently understood, considers the level of support given in the past and does not necessarily encompass the perception that support will be there in the future if one were to need it (see McCormick, Siegert & Walkey, 1987). However, the most confounding finding of the current literature on received support is a sometimes positive (and counter-intuitive) relationship between level of stress and level of social support--where a greater level of social support is associated with a greater level of stress in a given situation.. There are many potential third variables that may contribute to this association--a feeling of letting those in one's social support network down, a sense of failure for needing support, a loss of prestige, feeling at the mercy of the person who supplies the support, etc.. The conflicting outcomes between studies examining the link between well-being and social support as assessed by received support is a major factor in Sarason et al.'s call for more clear distinctions and theoretical clarity when studying received support.

Perceived social support. Sarason et al. (1990) conclude that in most respects perceived social support is most closely allied with what is commonly understood as the positive aspects of the social support construct. Primary in their defense of this claim,

they cite research showing measures of perceived social support are the most closely linked with positive health outcomes. Secondly, the authors link perceived social support to the concept of cognitive appraisal and its influence on working models of behavior. They cite research by Lazarus and his colleagues (e.g., Lazarus & Launier, 1978) that show levels of stress experienced to be more strongly related to the perception of the stressor than the actual characteristics of the stressor. So, just as the influence of stress is subject to the individual experiencing it, the influence of social support within the stressful situation is also subject to one's perceptions.

Thirdly, Sarason et al. (1990) state that the concept of perceived social support is closely aligned with some of the prominent early theories of social support. For example, Cobb (1976) proposed that "...social support's major role is to convey information to the individual that others care about and value him or her...the support emanates from not so much what is done but from what that indicates to the recipient about the relationship (p. 17)."

The construct of perceived social support tends to focus on two aspects: Availability of support and satisfaction with support. Although some theorists combine both aspects in a single construct, Sarason et al. warn against this. They have found in their extensive research that these two constructs are not highly correlated and may be more closely related to separate constructs than they are with each other (availability may be more highly correlated with social skills; satisfaction with life circumstances and personality factors).

The scale they developed, the social support questionnaire (SSQ), is a measure of perceived social support that separately measures both the availability and satisfaction factors of the social support construct (Sarason et al, 1983). Given the sound psychometric properties of this measure, and given that it assesses the perceived aspects of social support, this measure will be used in the proposed study.

Research exploring social support in the context of self-help groups. The theoretical literature, across multiple academic disciplines, has consistently pointed to social support as a primary factor linked to the beneficial aspects of membership in a self-help group. Levy (2000), in reviewing the early self-help group literature, found that despite the fact that many researchers and theorists had found different factors linked to influence in self-help groups, one of the factors that appears in virtually every model is social support (for instance, see Lieberman 1979, 1983). Knight et al. (1980), in an empirical study of nine different self-help groups, found that self-help groups were very supportive in nature, especially when compared to their professional equivalent--group therapy. Kassel & Wagner (1993) found in their review of the possible mechanisms of change in AA, that there are three change mechanisms, or "process clusters" which facilitate change in AA members--one of which was supportive techniques (e.g., empathy, instillation of hope) (p. 230).

Schwab (1995) conducted a qualitative analysis that explored the different characteristics of recently bereaved individuals who chose to take part in a bereavement support group and those who chose not to. He found that those who chose to attend the group had experienced a more traumatic bereavement (i.e., sudden death), and though

they were happy with their aggregate levels of social support, they desired the additional support that could be uniquely provided by the group.

Sandstrom (1996) conducted a qualitative evaluation of 25 gay men with HIV/AIDS who had participated in a support group to varying degrees for their medical condition. He found that those who chose to participate on a long-term basis in the group had less available social support outside of the group and a greater need for emotional support. Those who did not participate as long, or at all, reported that they were satisfied with their existing social support networks and only had an interest in informational support (i.e., obtaining information from the group).

There have been qualitative studies conducted that show some self-help group participants rate their participation as having a positive impact on their well being. Franko (1987), in a qualitative analysis of a support group for women with anorexia/bulimia, found that six months after participating in the group, the women found an increased sense of social support--an important outcome, as anorexia and bulimia are often crowded in secrecy and many sufferers feel unique and lonely in their affliction. Another qualitative study was conducted by Hilding et al (1995), who examined social support patterns in a support group for persons with coronary heart disease. They found that social support (with a particular focus on the concepts of caring and belonging) was linked both to group member's positive rating of the self-help group experience and to their well being.

Other studies, with quantitative methodology, suggest that self-help groups effectively increase social support and the gains in social support are associated with

better outcomes. In a more methodologically rigorous study, Galanter (1988), in his analysis of Recovery, Inc. (a self-help group for people with psychiatric problems), explored the idea that self-help groups may be good adjuncts to professional care. He concluded that (1) Recovery Inc. elicits very strong feelings of social cohesiveness, both to other members and to the group in general, (2) the members have a strong commitment to their organization's guiding ideology, and (3) affiliative ties to the organization predicted overall well being and improvement in symptomatology since joining the organization (p. 1253).

In a study that explores aspects of social support within a self-help group setting, Maton (1989a) conducted an in depth analysis of religious congregations, bereavement self-help groups and senior centers. In looking at the religious congregations, Maton found that members high on economic stress reported greater levels of well being in congregations with high levels of tangible support, while members who had low levels of economic stress showed comparable levels of well being in congregations with either high or low levels of tangible support. A similar finding was reached in his examination of bereavement groups--recently bereaved parents (who are feeling the stress of bereavement most acutely) reported greater levels of well being in bereavement groups with high levels of cohesion, while non-recently bereaved parents had equal levels of well being in either high or low level cohesion groups. In the senior centers examined, members of centers with high levels of support reported significantly higher levels of well being than members of low support senior centers, independent of the level of the member's personal distress. Overall, the findings suggest that social support is an

important factor in self-help groups, in that elements of the support group experience appear to differentially facilitate improvements in well being for the people who participate.

Humphreys et al. (1999), in a large scale study that included 2,337 veterans across multiple sites, explored the effects of “enhanced friendship networks” on outcomes in three separate twelve step organizations (Alcoholics Anonymous--AA, Narcotics Anonymous-- NA, Cocaine Anonymous--CA). They found that participation in the self-help groups was related to lower levels of substance use/abuse and was mediated in part by improved intermediate friendship network factors.

The studies presented suggest conclusions that are similar to the conclusions made by Vaux about the general social support literature--that there is a good deal of evidence that social support can have a positive effect on well-being, both with and without taking into consideration the effect of life stressors. However, the magnitude and nature of the effects vary considerably, being shaped by personal, social, and contextual factors. The studies done by Levy et al. (1993), Schwab (1995) and Sandstrom (1996), which all dealt with uncontrollable/chronic problems, found weak effects of social support on well being, and suggested that these self-help groups were not differentially better at supplying social support than naturally occurring systems in the community. They were, however, effective at meeting the needs of those who did participate, especially those whose current life resources did not match their needs. The studies done by Franko (1987) and Hildingh et al. (1995) showed a stronger connection between participation in a self-help group, social support and positive outcomes, but

suffered from only having self-report qualitative data, a small number of subjects, and weak study design.

However some of the studies reviewed suggested a stronger link between support and outcomes. Galanter (1988), Humphreys et al. (1999) and Maton (1989a), all conducted studies with strong methodological designs (given the almost overwhelming difficulties inherent in researching self-help groups--see Jacobs & Goodman, 1989) and a high number of subjects. All of these studies suggest that the social support provided by a self-help group aided members in their quest for well being--be it happiness, sobriety, or mental health.

These findings are supportive of the idea that social support is a primary mechanism of change within self-help groups. However, there are still large gaps in the understanding of this mechanism--for instance why certain self-help groups appear to be more effective than others in facilitating social support. In addition, there is not much in the current literature exploring the ability of mythopoetic men's support groups to facilitate social support for its members. Research exploring the ability of men's groups to foster social support and address the traditional male tendency to isolate or repress could help researchers and practitioners work more effectively with men.

Hypotheses and Focus of the Present Study

The present study was undertaken to examine whether certain demographic and psychosocial variables collected at both pre- and post- involvement are linked to positive outcomes for men who participate in the MKP. Building upon the current literature, the pre-existing variables examined were participant age, reported life change in the year

prior to attending the TAW, prior self-help group experience, and agreement with organizational beliefs. The variables examined that might be affected by participation were reported increase in agreement with organizationally consistent beliefs, participation in organizational activities, and perceived social support and participation in group level activities such as I-groups or MKP activities. The primary criterion variables were depression, gender role conflict and satisfaction with life.

Below are listed the study hypotheses exploring the effects of selected variables on outcome in the MKP at long-term follow-up (LTFU):

- 1) Men who are older will report less depression and gender role conflict, and greater life satisfaction from pre-weekend to LTFU than will younger men.
- 2) Men with previous self-help group experience will report less depression and gender role conflict, and greater life satisfaction from pre weekend to LTFU than will men with no previous self-help group experience.
- 3) Men who report that the year prior to attending the TAW was a year of life change will report less depression and gender role conflict, and more life satisfaction from pre weekend to LTFU than will men who report no recent life change.
- 4) Men with higher levels of endorsement of MKP beliefs and philosophy prior to the TAW will report greater less depression and gender role conflict, and greater life satisfaction from pre weekend to LTFU than will men with lower initial levels of endorsement of MKP beliefs.
- 5) Men who show a greater increase in endorsement of MKP related beliefs from pre weekend to LTFU will report less depression and gender role conflict, and greater life

satisfaction from pre weekend to LTFU (LTFU) as compared to men who show a lower increase of MKP beliefs from pre-TAW to LTFU.

6) Men who report increased social support availability and social support satisfaction from pre-weekend to LTFU will report less depression and gender role conflict, and increased life satisfaction from pre weekend to LTFU.

7) Men with more participation in an I-group will report less depression and gender role conflict, and greater life satisfaction from pre weekend to LTFU than will men with lower levels of I-group participation.

8) Men with more participation in MKP related activities and workshops outside of I-group participation will report less depression and gender role conflict, and greater life satisfaction from pre weekend to LTFU than will men with lower levels of participation in MKP related activities.

Method

Research Context

All participants for this study participated in a local chapter of the MKP--the ManKind Project of Greater Washington (MKP-GW). Involvement in the organization begins for all men with an intensive Training Adventure Weekend (TAW), described previously, followed for many men with participation in ongoing self-help "Integration" groups (I-groups) that assist the members with their continuing personal development.

A collaborative research effort between MKP-GW and a research team centered at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County began in 1996. The relationship developed when one of the current research team members, Ken Maton, proposed to the MKP-GW executive council a relationship that would enable exploring aspects of participation in the MKP that could be used by the organization itself and the larger social science community. After gaining the approval of the executive council, Dr. Maton recruited research team members from both within and outside of the MKP.

Currently the research team is composed of three men who have attended the TAW (one of whom is the author), one male non-MKP-participant, and two women. A longitudinal study asked MKP-GW participants to complete a survey before the TAW (pre-TAW), and again two weeks, six months and eighteen months or more after the TAW (long-term follow-up; LTFU). Men were also asked to take part in an interview twelve months after the TAW. The participants in the present study are men from this larger research project that met the following inclusion criteria: completion of a pre-TAW survey, a LTFU survey, and the one year post-TAW interview.

Research Participants

The participants in the larger study are the 240 men who attended any of the nine MKP-GW TAW's that took place between June 1997 and May 1999. Demographic information for this population are based on information provided by 215 of the men who chose to take part in this study and provide demographic information.

The men from the larger study were predominantly middle-aged ($M=43.7$, $S.D.=10.1$, range=19-74). Age distribution was as follows: 7.4 percent below 30; 47.4 percent between 30 and 44; 37.2 percent between 45 and 59; and 7.9 percent 60 or above. A majority of the men were married (53.5 %), though many were single (28.8 %) or divorced (17.7 %). Over a third (39.1%) of those men had children living in the home. The ethnic/racial background of the sample was predominantly Caucasian (93.4 %), with only very few of the men from other groups. The education level of the sample was high, with the majority having at least a bachelors degree (80.5%), and many having some form of professional or graduate degree (48.4%). Eighty-one percent of the men identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual, with the remaining 18.5% as gay or bisexual. For religious background, 52.8 % of the men reported being Christian, 10.2 % Jewish, 8.3% a non-traditional religious preference, and 27.8 % of the men reported having no religious preference. Demographic information on the one hundred men who met inclusion criteria for the present study sample is reported in Table 1.

Chi Square analyses were run to test for representativeness of the sample comparing the demographics of the men included in the final sample with the men for whom there is demographic information but did not meet inclusion criteria. Analyses

Table 1 Demographics of Study Participants

	<i>N (%)</i>		<i>N (%)</i>
Marital Status ^a		Sexual Orientation ^{a*}	
Married	50	Heterosexual	74
Single	16	Gay or Bisexual	25
Divorced	33	Missing	1
Widowed	1	Education ^b	
Ethnicity ^a		Low (H.S. & below)	4
Caucasian	94	Med (some college)	14
African American	3	High (BS and/or grad)	82
Hispanic	2	Self-help Group Experience [*]	
Other	1	None	34
Religion ^a		Less than 5 years	36
Christian	55	More than 5 years	30
Jewish	12	Reported Change Year Prior to TAW	
Other	5	No reported change	26
None	28	Moderate change rep.	31
Age		Major change rep.	43
Under 30	7	Military Experience	
Btwn 30 and 44	45	Yes	25
Btwn 45 and 59	39	No	74
60 and over	9	Missing	1
Children in Home		Lives Remotely from DC/Balt Area	
Yes	37	Yes	37
No	63	No	63

Table 1 Continued. Demographics of Study Participants

	<i>N (%)</i>		<i>N (%)</i>
Therapy Experience*		Church Group Experience*	
Yes	89	No Experience	55
No	11	Less than 5 yrs.	17
		Greater than 5 yrs.	28

Note: N = 100. Therefore, frequency equals percentage of sample.

Continuous Demographic Variables

	<i>N</i>	Mean	St. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Range
Age	100	44.46	10.27	19	72	53
Education ^b	100	7.73	1.67	2	9	7

* Chi-Square Analysis revealed a significant difference for this variable in distribution of categories between the overall study and the present study sample. See Appendix A for results of significant Chi-Square Analyses.

a - Variable coded dichotomously in analyses for better contrast to larger group.

b - Hollingshead SES measure used to quantify this variable.

were run on the following demographic variables: Age category, religious preference, children currently living in the home, education level, sexual orientation, marital status, ethnicity, experience with psychotherapy, involvement in any other form of self-help group (12-step, other men's group, other forms of self-help group), involvement in church activities, military experience, and whether they lived in the local DC-Baltimore area or lived in an area far from many MKP-GW activities.

Four of the Chi-Square analyses were significant: Sexual orientation (with more gay men taking part in the study), experience with psychotherapy (with men having experience being more prone to take part), self-help group experience (with men having self-help group experience more likely to take part), and experience in church-related activities (with men having experience being more likely to have taken part). Results of the Chi-Square analyses are included in Appendix A.

Procedure

Survey. The author contacted the Administrative director of MKP-GW five weeks before every TAW, and made arrangements for the men enrolled to obtain a pre-weekend research packet. The packet included a cover letter from the head of MKP-GW endorsing the research, a cover letter from the research team explaining briefly the nature of the study, the survey, an informed consent form and two separate return envelopes to maintain the anonymity of the information provided (see Appendix B for contents of the research packet). The participants were asked to indicate on the questionnaire the last four digits of their SSN, their mother's maiden name, and the first car that they owned. This allowed the questionnaire to remain anonymous, yet provided

a way to track questionnaires from each participant through the different data collection points. As requested by the research team, 94 participants returned the questionnaire in a business reply envelope. However, six men brought the questionnaire to their TAW, and they were then given to the research team members by the TAW staff.

Somewhat different procedures were used, at different time points, for distribution of the pre-weekend research packet. The June 1997 TAW participants (only) were given the pre-weekend questionnaire packet in a group pre-interview conducted at the time by the MKP-GW, intended to prepare the men for the intense nature of the weekend. The group interview leaders provided a brief description of the research project. The meeting took place approximately 2 weeks before the TAW. Approximately 50% of the men enrolled in the June 1997 TAW attended the pre-interview. Also, due to the fact that the measure was not fully finalized before the June 1997 NWTAs, several items included in the final questionnaire were not collected for the Pre-weekend collection point for the first cohort (June 1997).

For the August 1997, November 1997, TAW, May 1998, August 1998, November 1998, March 1999 and May 1999 TAW trainings, the research packet was sent as a part of a mailing from MKP-GW before each training that includes waivers, general information, and a brief questionnaire (a separate measure used in the TAW process). The attendees of the March 1998 TAW were sent the research packet separately by the MKP-GW. This mailing took place a short time (one week or less) after the MKP TAW packet was sent out.

Due to the fact that some men (estimate of 3-5 men each TAW) sign up for the TAW's a short time (i.e., less than 7 days) before the weekend, not all of the men had an adequate chance to complete the pre-weekend questionnaire. In addition, a large portion of men from the March 1998 training (approximately 10-15 men), due to an oversight on the part of the administrative director of the MKP-GW, were sent the TAW research packet approximately 8 days after the MKP-GW mailing was sent out.

On the Sunday afternoon of each TAW, during a wrap-up session conducted by the weekend leaders, the men from each of the nine cohorts were given a copy of the post-weekend questionnaire, with identical contents to the pre-weekend questionnaire (with cover letters changed as appropriate). In addition, two weeks following the TAW, members of the research team telephoned all of the men who had attended the weekend in order to inform them of the reason for the study, to answer any questions they may have and to encourage them to participate. For the men who could not be reached, a message was left with an offer to explain to them the nature of the research study.

Six months after the TAW, all of the weekend attendees were sent the six month post-weekend follow-up research packet. This included a cover letter from the head of MKP-GW endorsing the research, a cover letter from the research team explaining briefly the nature of the study and why we were requesting information from them at the 6 month period, the same survey, a return envelope, and an informed consent form and separate return envelope.

In addition, two peer report questionnaires were included in the mailing. Men were asked to contact two individuals who knew them well before the weekend so that

each could complete a survey which assessed peer perception of the person's change over time on various dimensions. Informed consent forms for the peer raters were included. Anonymity was maintained by using the last four numbers of the participant's social security number in place of a name on the peer questionnaire. A second mailing was sent out three weeks after the initial mailing to increase questionnaire completion rates, and attempts were made to contact every participant by phone to explain this particular data collection and to offer to answer any questions.

One year after completing their TAW, an attempt was made to interview each man who had attended the training. Not all of the men were able to complete the interview within a reasonable time period of our initial calling (moving, difficulty in reaching, career too busy at the time to help, etc.). Periodic attempts were made through June, 2001 to reach as many men as possible. As a result, what was initially termed a one year interview became in essence a long-term follow-up interview, with times varying from 12 months to 43 months (mean = 17.48). Descriptive information on the time to interview is included in Table 2.

Finally, each attendee at one of the nine TAW's was sent an 18 month long-term follow-up (LTFU) questionnaire. The packet included a cover letter from the head of MKP-GW endorsing the research, a cover letter from the research team explaining briefly the nature of the study, the survey, a return envelope, an informed consent form and a separate return envelope in order to keep the informed consent forms separate from the questionnaire to maintain anonymity. Three weeks later, an identical follow-up questionnaire was sent to improve return rates. The men were called at the 18 month post TAW time period, and

periodically through June, 2001. Once again, due to difficulty in reaching all of the men in the study, what was originally termed an 18 month follow-up turned out to be a long-term follow-up, ranging from 18 months to 42 months (mean = 23.03). In addition, one participant returned a LTFU questionnaire early (15 months), having completed the form intended for his housemate who had also participated in the MKP. Descriptives on the time to completion of the long-term follow-up questionnaire is included in Table 2.

Measures

Social Support Questionnaire. Perceived social support was measured with a subset of questions taken from the Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ), developed by Sarason et al. (1983). This questionnaire assesses two important aspects of the social support construct--perceived availability of social support, and perceived satisfaction with social support. The SSQ is composed of 27 questions that assess different aspects of the social support construct. However, in the research study only three of the questions were used, due to time constraints (Appendix C). These questions were selected for their hypothetical connection to men's work, as perceived by the members of the research team.

The questions were, "Who can you count on to listen openly and uncritically to your innermost feelings?," "Whose lives do you feel that you are an important part of?," and "Who accepts you totally, including your best and worst parts?." To measure the availability of social support, the respondent can list up to nine people. For each person listed, the participant was requested to give the person's gender. In addition, they are asked to provide the relationship to the person listed. These were coded into one of the following categories: parent, extended family member (e.g., aunt, uncle, cousin), sibling, wife/partner, son or

daughter, friend, fellow MKP member, support group member, therapist or counselor, co-worker, and finally the category “other” for those who did not fit into one of the above definitions. In order to allow the participant to list important sources of group support beyond single individuals, a provision was added to allow respondents to list a group, such as a men’s group or a church group as a source of support. The availability of social support (SSQ-N) is obtained by averaging the number of social support sources listed across all three questions.

Levels of social support satisfaction (SSQ-S) were measured with a single item following each of the three questions asking for perceptions of social support. The participants are asked to answer on a Likert scale that ranges from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied). A total SSQ-S score was obtained by averaging the degree of satisfaction with support across the three questions.

In their validation of the SSQ, the authors found that the measure had solid psychometric properties. Both availability and satisfaction were negatively correlated with anxiety and depression, and higher scores on number of social support sources and satisfaction with support were both correlated with an increased ability to persist on a menial task in a laboratory setting. Tardy (1985), in discussing the SSQ in his review of social support measures, states that “This accumulation of evidence suggests that this is a viable measure of social support” (p. 197). Barrera (1986) indicates in his review of social support measurement that the current research on the SSQ indicates that it accurately differentiates between the availability and sense of satisfaction with social support. Reliability analysis was run on the abbreviated version of the SSQ used in the present study. Alpha levels were

adequate (.73 for the SSQ-N subscale and .82 for the SSQ-S subscale) and suggest the SSQ is suitable for use in this study.

MKP related beliefs. A series of seven questions were created for this study in an attempt to examine constructs germane to the MKP experience. Ideas for the constructs to be covered by the questions came from members of the research team who are MKP participants. In addition, the opinions of numerous members of the organization--including weekend leaders from different cities across the country, and highly respected individuals within the MKP-GW community--were sought in order to increase the validity of construct measurement. Questions were interspersed throughout what has been termed the Self Questionnaire (questions 33, 34, 35; see Appendix D) and the Attitudes questionnaire (questions 5, 15, 23, 27; see Appendix E). The seven items are: "I am assertive and clear with others about what I want or need," "I am a man of power, a man among men," "I am learning to be accountable for my own feelings, judgements, opinions, and actions," "I am learning to live in the world with an open heart," "My mission in life is clear," "I am learning how to live from my deepest core being or truth," and "I am learning to accept total responsibility for all aspects of my life." Questions were answered using a five point Likert scale (see Appendix F for a list of the selected questions used).

Item-scale analysis was conducted to ensure sound scale reliability and development (Crocker & Algina, 1986). Intercorrelations between all of the scale items was consistently significant (mean of correlations =.46, with a minimum value of .29 and a maximum value of .69), suggesting strong item consistency. Analysis revealed a Cronbach's Alpha of .85. An item reliability index was also performed, comparing the overall scale reliability to the

reliability of the scale with any item removed, and revealed that every scale item contributed to increased scale reliability. An adequate number of questions and respondents was ensured, using Nunnally's (1967) guidelines for sufficient numbers of respondents for a given number of items (i.e., five to ten times as many respondents as questions). Appendix F contains the results of the item scale analysis for the MKP related beliefs scale.

Given the strength of the findings of the inter item scale analysis, and considering that there are only one hundred participants in this study (considered "poor" for Principle Components analysis (PCA) by Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), and due to these items failing a test of sphericity (a measure of the robustness of a PCA) as well as the incompatibility of a PCA with a low number of initial questions as well as all of the questions being so similar in content, the proposed Principle Components analysis was not performed.

Of note, eight of the 100 study participants (all of the members of the first data collection cohort) do not have complete pre- MKP-related belief scale scores due to the questionnaire not being finalized by the June 1997 pre-weekend data collection point. As such, there is a reduced number of participants that can be included in the analysis of the effects of pre-TAW MKP beliefs and MKP beliefs at LTFU on the criterion variables (hypotheses 4 and 5).

Prior year change. Prior year change was assessed as a part of the interview. The participants were asked "Had your life been pretty much the same in that year before you decided to do the Training, or had there been a lot of change in your life?" Coding for this variable was done ordinally--none/moderate/ a great deal. Two individuals not involved in the study were used as coders. After a set of guidelines was developed on responses from

interviews not included in the present study, coders were trained and practiced on a set of responses not involved in the study, and once they had demonstrated sufficient skill in coding responses, they proceeded to code the responses of the men involved in the study blind to the study hypotheses. The initial inter-rater reliability was .84, and where there was disagreement in the coding of a particular response, a face to face consensus method by the two raters was employed so as to come to a final set of values on which both raters agreed. The guidelines for determining the coding of this variable is contained in Appendix G.

I-group participation. I-group participation levels were derived from a separate study conducted by the MKP research team that longitudinally examines I-group participation for all members of the MKP-GW organization (see Appendix H for the instrument used to collect this data). The information provided from this study provided the total time that the participant was involved in an I-group, the general reason he left the I-group, if he joined another I-group, and the total amount of I-groups of which he has been a member. The information from the I-group participation study was corroborated with the data provided in the interview in order to ensure the highest degree of accuracy in determining the length of I-group involvement. During the interview, participants were asked the following three questions: 1) Did you participate in an I-group?; 2) What are your feelings and judgements about how the 8 week facilitation period influenced your I-group?; and 3) What are your feelings and judgments about your I-group after the 8 week facilitation period ended? Although not specifically asked, commonly participants stated their current and past I-group involvement levels and a qualitative judgement of the experience as well,

which for a large percentage of the interviews provides enough information to either confirm or refute the information provided in the I-group study.

The I-group involvement variable was coded in the following manner: 1) Never participated in an I-group; 2) participated in an I-group but stopped participation before returning the long-term follow-up questionnaire; and, 3) participated in an I-group and continued to participate in an I-group at the time of returning the long-term follow-up questionnaire.

Secondary analysis for I-group involvement employed continuously structured, uncoded time spent in an I-group measured in months. Due to the fact that the I-group study encompasses longer time periods than does the information from which this present study is derived, oftentimes the length of I-group participation provided by the I-group study is significantly longer than is the time longitudinally spent in the current study. In order to address that, continuously coded I-group participation times were shortened in this study to make sure that they were no longer than the time to long-term follow-up questionnaire completion from which the criterion variables were derived.

MKP participation. MKP participation levels were determined from information gathered in the interview. Participants were asked their participation levels in each of the activities that is offered by the organization. Information on the number of times the participant may have taken part in the activity was obtained and the participants were then asked to provide a quick evaluation of their experience in each activity. In addition, the interview asked each participant about various service activities in which he may have participated as a member of the MKP (see Appendix I). A list of the various workshops,

functions and service related activities and the associated values used to calculate this variable can be found in Appendix J.

Participation was coded according to the estimated time necessary to successfully participate in each activity, using half day increments. As it stands, there was no activity available that took less than a half of a day. So, for instance, if a participant attended a TAW graduation ceremony, a commitment that usually required about 4 hours, it was counted as one half day. If a participant staffed a TAW, a four day commitment with two evening meetings prior to the TAW spent in preparation, it was counted as 10 half days of participation. The number of estimated half-days was summed to obtain participation level.

The MKP participation variable used in the present study was coded in the following manner: 1) Never participated in activities outside of the I-group, 2) participated in less than ten half day segments of MKP activities; and, 3) participated in greater than ten half day segments of MKP activities. The decision to make ten half days the cutoff point in levels of participation was made based on the personal experiences of the members of the MKP-GW research team who are actual participants as well as comments made to the research team from selected members of the MKP-GW community. Secondary analyses were conducted with MKP participation coded dichotomously, with the categorical definition being participation beyond attending one's own graduation.

The Gender Role Conflict Scale I (GRCS). The GRCS (O'Neil et al, 1986) is a 37 item self-report instrument designed to assess personal dimensions of gender role patterns, of which only 31 were used for the present study (See Appendix K). Concurrent with Pleck (1981), O'Neil (1981a, 1981b, 1982) developed the theory of gender role conflict, including

the Masculine Mystique and Value System, which they defined as “a complex set of values and beliefs that define optimal masculinity” (O’Neil et al., 1995; p. 171). It was proposed that the Masculine Mystique and Value System produced a fear of femininity in men’s lives, which in turn produced six forms of what they termed gender role conflict in men (O’Neil et al., 1995). The Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) represented a refined attempt to measure this construct.

The stated goal of the GRCS is to “assess mens’ personal gender role attitudes, behaviors and conflicts” (O’Neil et al., 1995; p. 335). A pattern of gender role conflict has been defined as “a set of values, attitudes, or behaviors learned during socialization that causes negative psychological effects on a person or on other people” (Stillson, O’Neil & Owen, 1991, p.460). Exploratory factor analysis showed the GRCS to have 4 factors, resulting from the combination of two of the scales derived from the Masculine Mystique and Value System and the elimination of one (health care problems). The initial common factor analysis with oblique rotation yielded four factors that accounted for 36% of the variance (O’Neil et al. 1986), labeled Success Power and Competition, Restrictive Emotionality, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior between Men, and Conflict between Work and Family Relations. O’Neil et al. found all four subscales to have good reliability Alpha reliability, with a range of .75 to .90, and a mean of .88 (O’Neil et al. 1995).

Participants respond on a 6 point Likert scale (6=Strongly agree, 1= strongly disagree) to statements that concern their personal gender-role attitudes, behaviors, and conflicts with higher scores reflecting higher gender role conflict. The validity of the scale has been supported by factor analyses that corroborate its original structure (O’Neil, Good, &

Holmes, 1995) as well convergence with other similar scales of masculinity, such as the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991) and the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Good et al., 1995). The measure has also been shown to be free from socially desirable responses (Good et al., 1995).

Success, Power and Competition (SPC, 13 items) is described by O'Neil et al. (1995) as having three components. Success is termed as having "persistent worries about personal achievement, wealth, competence, failure, upward mobility and career success" (p. 175). Power is described as being oriented towards "Obtaining authority, dominance, influence or ascendancy over others" (p.175). Competition is defined as "Striving against others to gain something or the comparison of oneself with others to establish one's superiority in a given situation" (p.175). Sample items include: "Moving up the career ladder is important to me," "I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me," and "I like to feel superior to other people." Reliabilities from all known studies that have investigated the scales revealed a range of alpha scores for the SPC scale from .83 to .89, with an average of .86 (O'Neil et al., 1995).

Restrictive Emotionality (RE, 10 items) is defined as "Having difficulty and fears about expressing one's feelings and difficulty finding words to express basic emotions." (p. 175). Sample items include, "I have difficulty telling others I care about them" and "I do not like to show my emotions to other people." O'Neil et al. (1995) report alpha levels ranging from .81 to .91, with an average of .84 for this subscale.

Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABM, 8 items) encompasses "Having limited ways of expressing emotions and feelings with other men as well as difficulty

touching other men” (p. 175). Sample questions include “Affection with other men makes me tense” and “Hugging other men is difficult for me.” O’Neil et al. report a range of alpha scores on this subscale from .82 to .88, with an average of .84.

Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR, 6 items) refers to a man’s difficulty balancing work-school and family relations and having a lack of leisure time. Due to the fact that it was the weakest factor psychometrically (Good et al. 1995), and due to time constraints, Conflict between Work and Family Relations was not assessed in the current research.

Previous research conducted on a portion of the present sample using baseline measures revealed a strong correlation between RE and RABM ($r = .77$), with a weaker relation between RE and SPC ($r = .44$) and RABM and SPC ($r = .47$) (Burke, 2000b). This finding of a much higher correlation between RE and RABM than between SPC has also been found in other research exploring the connection between gender role conflict and well being (e.g., Good & Mintz, 1990). In addition, Sharpe, Heppner & Dixon (1995), in their canonical analysis of gender role conflict and its relation to well being in men, found that two factors were necessary for explaining well being in men: Instrumentality (which consisted primarily of standard measures of well being such as depression, anxiety, self-esteem), and expressiveness, which included both RE and RABM (not SPC) and a scale of intimacy.

These findings suggest that RE and RABM may in large part measure the same construct. Therefore, the present study will combine the RE and RABM scales on the primary analyses into the variable Restrictive Male Expressiveness. (RME). As such, there is no current external reliability or validity information for his measure.

Depression. Depression symptoms were assessed by the depression subscale of the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI), a shortened form of the Symptom Checklist-90 (SCL-90-R; See Appendix L). Participants rated how distressed they were by seven symptoms of depression (e.g., having thoughts of ending your life, feeling lonely, feeling blue) during the past week. The items are rated on a 5 point scale ranging from 0 to 4, with 0 representing “not at all” and 4 representing “extremely.” This measure is widely used, and studies subsequent to the work done by the authors have shown the BSI in general, and this subscale in specific, to have strong internal consistency, and construct validity through corroboration with other measures of depression. (Boulet. & Boss, 1991; Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983).

Satisfaction with Life scale. The satisfaction with life scale (LSS) was created by Diener et al. (1985) to assess the respondent’s overall satisfaction with life (see Appendix M). It measures an aggregate level of satisfaction, and does not measure any one particular domain such as health, finance or relationship issues. It is a five question measure that was distilled down from an original 48 items through factor analysis. The remaining questions were chosen for representativeness and for the minimal loss of alpha reliability to the overall measure (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Sample questions include, “In most ways my life is close to ideal,” “I am satisfied with my life,” and “If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.” Participants respond to these questions on a Likert scale from 1 (not at all accurate) to 5 (completely accurate). The LSS has been shown to have good convergent validity with other measures of emotional well being (Pavot & Diener, 1993). In addition, they determined that the scale was stable over time, but has also been shown to be sensitive

enough to measure changes in well being as a result of a clinical intervention. In addition, the LSS has been shown to have good reliability. Alpha level for the present study was .89.

Demographic and background information. Demographic and background information was collected using a section of the questionnaire specifically designed for that purpose. The information requested included age, ethnicity, marital status, number of children, children living at home, religious preference, prior military service, education level, occupation, self-help group involvement, involvement in psychotherapy, sexual orientation and how the individual found out about MKP. For participants who did not complete a questionnaire, the same demographic and background information was collected as a part of the interview (see Appendix N).

Age was assessed from either the interview or the questionnaire demographics sheet, and was divided into one of the following 4 categories: 1) below age 30; 2) between age 30 and 45; 3) between age 45 and 60; and 4) over 60.

Questions on prior self-help group involvement specifically asked about different kinds of groups. The first question asked if participants are, or have been in the past, a member of a twelve step self-help group. The second question asked participants if they are, or have been in the past, involved in a non-12-step self-help group, excluding any other kind of men's group. The third question asked the men if they are, or have ever been, involved in a men's group other than the MKP. The fourth question asked them if they are, or have been in the past, involved in a church group or religious organization. For each of the above four topics, the participants were asked the length of involvement, if applicable (see Appendix N).

The self-help group variable used in the present study was calculated by adding the length of involvement for three of the kinds of self-help groups: Twelve step, non-twelve step, and men's groups other than the MKP, and it was then subsequently coded into three values: 1) never have participated in a self-help group; 2) participated for less than five years in a self-help group, and 3) participated for greater than 5 years in a self-help group. Due to the fact that the label of church group had different meanings for different participants, with some meaning strict church membership, and others meaning participation in small faith groupings more similar in tone to traditionally held notions of a self-help group, the church group category was not included in the self-help group involvement variable to increase conceptual clarity. Secondary analyses included church group involvement coded dichotomously (no involvement--any involvement) to determine if religious activities contributes to outcomes on the criterion variables.

Interview. Research team members who were participants in the MKP conducted semi structured interviews, lasting 30-60 minutes on the telephone (see Appendix O). The interview addressed three main topics: *Development* (e.g., "What were the main issues in your life during the year just before you did the New Warrior Training Adventure weekend?"); *Impact* (e.g., "Has New Warrior affected those issues and if so, tell me how?"); and *Participation and Evaluation* (e.g., "What are your feelings and judgements about the weekend training?," "What other New Warrior activities have you participated in and what are your feelings and judgments about those activities?"). Interviews were transcribed and entered into a qualitative data management software program (QSR NUD*IST) for analysis for this and other studies to be conducted by the MKP-GW research team. Variables derived

from this instrument include the perception of change the year prior to attending the TAW, level of non-I-group MKP activities, and for persons who did not complete any questionnaires, demographic information.

Results

Results of the preliminary and primary analyses are listed below. The preliminary analyses addressed three aspects of the data. First, descriptive analyses were undertaken, examining the means, standard deviations, range, and reliability of the study variables, as well as a test of representativeness comparing the scores of study participants (when available) to men who did not meet study criteria. Second, an examination of the relation between criterion variables, predictor variables and demographic variables was conducted using correlation, partial correlation and MANCOVA, using the results to determine the covariates in the primary analyses. Finally, change over time was examined, comparing the level of pre-TAW scores to scores at LTFU on all of the variables using t-tests. Following that, the results of the primary analyses testing the study hypothesis are presented.

Preliminary Analyses

Descriptives. The means, standard deviations, number of cases, alpha reliability levels, minimum and maximum values and frequencies for the primary study variables at pre-weekend (where applicable), immediate post-weekend (where applicable), and long-term follow-up (LTFU) are listed in Table 2. In general, responses on all of the predictor

Table 2.

Descriptive Statistics for Primary Study Variables.

CRITERION VARIABLES	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Alpha</u>
Depression	100	2.32	.93	1.00	5.00	.88
Depression LTFU.	100	2.02	.82	1.00	4.71	.89
SPC--success power comp.	100	3.65	.92	1.15	5.77	.88
SPC--Long-term F.U.	100	3.23	.81	1.31	5.15	.86
RME--Emotional Restriction	100	3.35	1.11	1.00	5.78	.94
RME--LTFU	100	2.67	.92	1.00	5.44	.93
Life satisfaction	100	2.45	.86	1.00	4.83	.89
Life satisfactn. Long-term F.U.	100	3.00	.85	1.00	4.83	.88
PREDICTOR VARIABLES						
MKP rel. beliefs	92	3.20	.79	1.29	5.00	.85
MKP rel. blf. Long-term F.U.	100	3.90	.74	1.14	5.00	.89
Social Support--Number (SSN)	100	4.63	2.22	.67	9.00	.73
SSN--Long-term F.U.	100	5.36	2.43	0.00	9.00	.82
Social Support--Satisfact. (SSS)	100	4.27	1.24	1.00	6.00	.83
SSS--Long-term F.U.	99	4.72	1.12	1.00	6.00	.83
MKP Non-I-group participation ^a	100	12.53	15.84	0.00	63.0	
I-group participation ^b	100	15.93	9.24	0.00	36.0	
Self-help group experience ^b	100	45.38	58.36	0.00	258.	
Time to Interview completion ^b	100	17.48	5.58	12.0	43.0	
Time to long-term qnaire compl ^b .	100	23.05	5.76	15.0	46.0	

Table 2 Continued.

CATEGORICAL VARIABLES

	<i>N (%)</i>		<i>N (%)</i>
Year Prior Change		Self-help Group Involvement ^c	
None	26	None	34
Moderate	31	Less than 5 Years	36
Major	43	More than 5 Years	30
Church Group Experience ^c		I-group Participation	
None	55	Never Did	9
Less than 5 years	17	Did but Stopped b/f LTFU	36
More than 5 years	28	Still Attending at LTFU	55
MKP Non-I-group Participation ^a		Twelve Step Group Involvement	
None	31	None	70
Less than 10	30	Less than 5 years	17
More than 10	39	More than 5 years	13
Lives within one hour of DC-Baltimore area			
Lives locally	63		
Lives remotely	37		

a. - Measured in half-day increments.

b. - Measured in months.

c. - Collected with pre-NWTA questionnaire.

and criterion variables at each data collection point showed good variation. Alpha levels for all of the study scales (see Table 2) were acceptable (.73 to .94 for baseline measures, and .82 to .93 for the LTFU measures). For the measure of MKP beliefs, inter-item correlations suggested sound psychometric properties (mean=.49; minimum =.29; maximum=.71), and the analysis of the Alpha level with any item deleted showed that all items contributed to scale reliability (see Appendix F).

Tests of representativeness. A test of representativeness compared predictor and baseline criterion variable scores on the pre-TAW questionnaire in men included in the present study to those men who completed a pre-questionnaire but are not in the present study. Independent samples t-tests revealed no significant differences. Results are included in Appendix P.

Correlations: Predictor variables. The correlations among the predictor variables are included in Table 3. In general, significant correlations tended to center around the social support subscales, level of agreement with MKP beliefs at LTFU, having church group experience (coded yes-no), and participation in non-I-group MKP activities (coded yes-no). The strongest positive correlation was between the social support subscales at LTFU and the MKP related beliefs at LTFU, with men reporting stronger MKP beliefs reporting greater social support availability and satisfaction. The social support subscales at LTFU also had a significant positive correlation with having experience in a church group and engaging in non-I-group MKP activities, with men who have been involved in church groups and men reporting greater levels of participation in non-I-group MKP activities

Table 3

Correlations among Continuously Coded and Dichotomously Coded Predictor Variables.

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. Age (Cont)	1	.13	-.15	-.14	-.17	-.08	.01	-.28**	-.12
2.SHG-(Cont)		1	-.13	.17	.12	.11	.06	.00	.13
3.Ch Grp Y-N			1	-.14	-.23*	-.23*	.00	-.16	-.21*
4. Mkp Blf FU				1	.53***	.50***	.01	.22*	-.02
5. SS-N FU					1	.35***	-.12	.06	.15
6. SS-S FU						1	.18	.24*	.12
7. Igrp Part							1	.41***	-.16
8. MKP Y-N								1	-.04
9. Yr Change									1

(Pearson R Coefficient)

MKP blfs--Mankind Project beliefs; SS-- Social Support Number; SS-S-- Social Support Satisfaction; (cont)--continuously coded in months; (Y-N)--variable coded dichotomously; I Grp part--I-group participation coded in months; MKP --Non I-group MKP participation coded in half days of involvement; ChGrp--Church group involvement coded in months; SHG --combined self-help group participation variable coded in months; Yr chg.--report of perceived level of change in year prior to attending the TAW

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

reporting higher levels of social support availability and satisfaction. Participation in non-I-group MKP activities also had a significant positive correlation with MKP beliefs at LTFU, and a negative correlation to age (with older men less likely to participate). Lastly, a history of church group experience was associated with being more likely to report having the year prior to attending the TAW being one of change. Correlations between predictor variables and demographic variables can be found in Appendix Q.

Correlations: Predictors and criteria at LTFU. The correlations between the criterion variables at LTFU and the predictor variables are included in Table 4. Significant correlations were centered around three predictor variables: MKP beliefs at LTFU, social support availability at LTFU and social support satisfaction at LTFU. All of the correlations between these three variables and all of the criterion variables at LTFU were significant (with higher levels of social support and MKP beliefs associated with more positive scores on the criterion variables), with the exception of SPC at LTFU, which was not significantly correlated with either of the social support subscales. All other correlations between criterion at LTFU and the predictors were non-significant.

Predictors and criteria: MANCOVA. In order to explore the relation of coded predictor variables to criterion variables at LTFU (untestable through correlation), MANCOVA analyses were run to explore if there was any significant difference in the criterion scores at LTFU on the different levels of the coded predictors (controlling for baseline scores). A summary of results is included in Table 5.

The MANCOVA results showed that the predictor variables with the most significant relationships to the criterion variables at LTFU were age category and I-group

Table 4

Correlations Between Criterion Variables at LTFU and Predictors Continuously or Dichotomously Coded (Pearson R Coefficient).

	Depr LTFU	SPC LTFU	RME LTFU	Lifesat LTFU
Age yrs (cont)	.01	-.07	.04	-.11
MKP blfs LTFU	-.39^{***}	-.32^{***}	-.59^{***}	.60^{***}
SS-N LTFU	-.34^{***}	-.13	-.42^{***}	.50^{***}
SS-S LTFU	-.31^{**}	-.18	-.40^{***}	-.40^{***}
I-group part(cont)	.07	-.12	-.11	.01
MKP part(Y-N)	-.15	.11	-.18	.10
MKP part(cont)	-.08	.10	-.13	.03
SHG total (cont)	-.09	-.09	-.19	.11
CHGRP (yes-no)	.16	-.10	.05	-.15
Year chg. (Y-N)	-.02	-.03	.00	.04

Depr--Depression; LTFU--Long-Term Follow-Up; SPC--Success Power Competition; RME--Emotional Restriction; Life Sat.--Life Satisfaction; MKP blfs--MKP beliefs; SS--Social Support Number; SS-S--Social Support Satisfaction; (cont)--continuous; (Y-N)--dichotomous; Year chg.--perceived change in year prior to TAW; MKP part.--Non I-group participation coded in half days. Coded in months: I-group part--I-group participation; CHGRP--Church group involvement; SHG total--self-help group participation;

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

Table 5

Reported F-values on Tests of Significance for Criterion Variables at LTFU on Categorized Predictors Using Unique Sums of Squares Controlling for Baseline Scores (MANCOVA).

	Age Cat. ^a	SHG Exp. ^b	Year Chg. ^b	I grp part. ^b	MKP part. ^b
DEPR LTFU	1.78	2.04	0.14	0.02	1.08
SPC LTFU	2.47 ^c	1.56	0.22	3.99*	0.14
RME LTFU	3.81**	0.58	2.62 ^d	3.77*	3.74*
LS LTFU	2.70*	0.34	0.28	0.98	0.98

Age Categories: (1) under 30 years old; (2) between 30 and 45; (3) between 45 and 60; and (4) over 60. Self-help Group (SHG) Involvement: (1) Never; (2) less than 5 years; (3) more than 5 years. Report of year change: (1) no change reported; (2) minor to moderate change reported; (3) major change reported. Coding of I-group Participation: (1) never participated, (2) used to participate but not at time of LTFU, and (3) still participating at time of LTFU. Coding of MKP participation: (1) Less than 2 half days of involvement; (2) between 2 and 10 half days of involvement; (3) more than 10 half days of involvement.

See Appendix R through Appendix W for full results of these analyses.

a - Three degrees of freedom for the analysis using this variable.

b - Two degrees of freedom for the analysis using this variable.

c - Approaches significance, $p=.07$.

d - Approaches significance, $p=.08$.

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

participation. Results revealed that scores on RME and life satisfaction were significantly related to age category, with the age group 30-45 having significantly lower scores (see Appendix R for full MANCOVA results on age). Results also revealed that scores on SPC and RME at LTFU were significantly related to I-group participation, with men still involved in an I-group at LTFU having significantly lower scores (see Appendix S for full MANCOVA results on I-group participation). In addition, there was a significant difference between reported RME at LTFU and non-I-group MKP participation, with greater levels of involvement related to lower levels of RME (see Appendix T for full MANCOVA results on non-I-group MKP participation). The remaining MANCOVAs did not reveal any significant findings. The results of the non-significant MANCOVAs are included in Appendix U (for self-help group experience) and Appendix V (for prior year change).

Correlations: Criterion variables. Correlations between the criterion variables at both pre-TAW and LTFU are included in Table 6. Moderately high significant intercorrelations were found among all the criterion variables at baseline, ranging from $-.342$ (SPC and life satisfaction) to $-.522$ (depression and life satisfaction). Moderately high, significant correlations were also found between the criterion variables at LTFU, with the highest correlation being $.559$ (RME and SPC).

Examination of covariates. No significant findings were found on the MANCOVA analyses examining differences across the 9 cohorts on criterion variables at LTFU controlling for baseline scores. In addition, there were no significant findings on the MANOVA analyses examining the differences across the 9 cohorts on baseline criterion

Table 6 :

Pearson Zero Order Correlation Between Criteria at Baseline and Criterion at LTFU.

Pearson Zero Order Correlation Between Criterion Variables at Baseline:

	1	2	3	4
1. Depression	1	.39***	.48***	-.52***
2. SPC		1	.51***	-.34***
3. RME			1	-.44***
4. Life Satisfaction				1

Pearson Zero Order Correlations Between Criterion Variables at LTFU

	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Depr--LTFU.	1	.17	.38***	-.50***
2. SPC--LTFU.		1	.56***	-.21*
3. RME- LTFU.			1	-.43***
4. Life Sat LTFU.				1

Depr--Depression; LTFU--Long-Term Follow-Up; Trans--Variable transformed using SPSS LG10 transformation; SPC--Success Power Competition; RME--Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales; Life Sat.--Life Satisfaction;

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

variable scores or predictor variable scores (see Appendix W for full results of these analyses). In addition, partial correlations between time to interview, time to LTFU completion, and the LTFU criterion variables revealed no significant relations (see Table 7).

Partial correlations between demographic and criterion variables at LTFU (controlling for baseline scores) revealed three significant correlations (see Table 7). Religion had a significant relationship with both SPC and RME at LTFU, with Christian men reporting a lower level of improvement than non-Christian men in both SPC and RME at LTFU. In addition, ethnicity had a significant correlation to life satisfaction at LTFU, with Caucasian men reporting larger increases in life satisfaction than non-Caucasian men. In addition, the correlation between depression at LTFU and both having a child living at home and ethnicity approached significance.

Any demographic variable that had a partial correlation that approached significance ($p < .10$) with the criterion variables at LTFU was included in the primary analyses as a covariate. The findings of partial correlations between the demographic variables and both the transformed and non-transformed criterion variables at LTFU (as well as the zero-order correlations between demographics, baseline criterion and follow-up criterion scores) are included in Appendix X.

Change over time. Paired samples t-tests comparing scores on predictor and criterion variables over time revealed significant positive changes (i.e. decreased depression, SPC and RME, and increased life satisfaction, social support availability, social support satisfaction, and MKP related beliefs) in every variable, suggesting that participation was a

Table 7.

Partial Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Criterion Variables at Long-Term Follow-Up (LTFU) Controlling for Baseline Criterion Scores (Pearson R Coefficient).

	Depr LTFU	SPC LTFU	RME LTFU	Lifesat LTFU
Military experience	-.16	-.10	.14	.12
Religion	-.10	-.30^{***}	-.24*	.04
Child at home	-.17^a	-.11	-.03	.16
Sexual orientation	.09	.09	.02	-.08
Marital Status	.08	.05	-.04	-.01
Ethnicity	.19^a	-.06	.08	-.21*
Time to LTFU qnare	.00	.01	-.03	.06
Time to Interview	-.06	.05	.01	.09

For partial correlations between transformed criterion variables at LTFU and demographics, see Appendix X. Depr--Depression; LTFU--Long-Term Follow-Up; SPC--Success Power Competition; RME--Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales; Life Sat.--Life Satisfaction; Military experience--coded yes(1)-no(2); Religion--Christian(1)versus non-Christian(2); Child at home--yes(1)no(2); Sexual orientation--heterosexual (1)versus gay, bisexual(2); Marital Status--married (1) versus all other conditions (2); Ethnicity--Caucasian(1) other(2); Time to LTFU qnare--coded in months; Time to Interview--coded in months.

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

a - Approaches significance, $p < .10$.

Table 8

Paired Sample T-Tests Comparing Baseline Scores of Study Participants on Key Study Variables to Post-Weekend and Long-Term Follow-Up Scores (two-tailed).

	<u>Pre-Weekend</u>	<u>Long-term F.U.</u>	<u>N</u>
Mean of social support availability	4.63 (2.2)	5.35** (2.4)	100
Mean of social support satisfaction	4.28 (1.2)	4.72** (1.1)	99
Depression	2.32 (.93)	2.02** (.82)	100
SPC--success power competition	3.65 (.92)	3.23** (.81)	100
Emotional restriction (RE and RABM combined)	3.35 (1.1)	2.70** (.92)	100
Life satisfaction	2.45 (.86)	2.99** (.85)	100
MKP related beliefs	3.20 (.79)	3.96** (.66)	92

Mean score listed (standard deviation in parentheses).

** $p < .005$

positive experience for the men in this sample. Results of these t-tests can be seen in Table 8.

Primary Analyses

Normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. Prior to exploring the relation of the predictors to the criterion variables using multiple regression, normality, linearity and homoscedasticity of the residuals underlying all of the regressions were explored using SPSS REGRESSION and SPSS FREQUENCIES to evaluate the assumptions underlying the analyses (Tabachnick.& Fidell, 2001). Results of these regressions indicated a substantial positive skewness and a non-normal distribution of residuals for the criterion variables Depression at LTFU and RME at LTFU. A LG10 transformation (SPSS) was performed for the regressions run exploring hypotheses 1 through 5. Post analysis revealed reduced skewness and improved normality and linearity of the residual values.

In addition, the preliminary regressions exploring hypothesis 7 (I-group participation) led to the transformation of the criterion variables Depression at LTFU and SPC at LTFU with a LG10 transformation (SPSS) to account for a substantial positive skewness and a non-normal distribution of residuals observed in the preliminary regressions. Post analysis revealed reduced skewness and improved the normality and linearity of the residual values.

For all of the regressions run for this study, the baseline criterion score and the covariates discovered in the preliminary analysis were controlled for by being entered in the first two steps. In addition, for hypotheses 5 and 6, both of which predicted outcomes based upon change from pre-TAW to LTFU, baseline predictor scores were controlled for by entrance prior to the step examining the effects of the predictor at LTFU. For each of these

regressions, all of the steps besides the final step served to control for the various covariates (i.e., significantly correlated demographic variables and baseline criterion scores), and as such were virtually identical in all of the regressions. To simplify the presentation of the results, only information on the final step is reported. Results that approached significance ($p < .10$) are reported in order to more fully explain any potential findings. Full information on the regressions, including examination of covariates, is included in the appendices, as indicated below.

Hypothesis 1—The effects of age on criterion variables at LTFU. The results did not support the hypothesis that increasing age (categorized) would be associated with better outcomes on the criterion variables. Table 9 contains a summary of the results of hypotheses 1-4 (i.e., R^2 change values and the final beta weights for the predictor variables after controlling for covariates and baseline scores). The full results of the regressions exploring hypothesis 1-4 are included in Appendix Y.

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, age (category) contributed a non-significant ($p = .11$) 5.2 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline depression, ethnicity and military experience. Examination of the results revealed that men aged 30-45 showed greater improvement on depression scores from pre-weekend to LTFU than did men aged less than 30 years old (Beta = $-.39$; $p < .05$). All other comparisons within age (category) were non-significant.

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, age (category) contributed a non-significant 2.8 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of SPC at baseline and religion.

Table 9

Summary of Results of Regression Analyses on Hypotheses 1-4: Pre-existing Factors.

	<u>Beta At Entry</u>	<u>Final Beta</u>	<u>Step R² Change</u>
<u>Hypothesis 1: Effects of Age</u>			
Depression Trans at LTFU:			.052 ^a
Age: 30-45	-.392*	-.364 ^b	
SPC at LTFU:			.028
RME Transformed at LTFU:			.043*
Age: 30-45	-.307*	-.323*	
Life Satisfaction at LTFU:			.059*
All Comparisons Non-Significant			
<u>Hypothesis 2: Self-help Group Experience</u>			
Depression Transformed at LTFU:			.023
Success Power Competition at LTFU:			.005
RME Transformed at LTFU:			.002
Life Satisfaction at LTFU:			.001
<u>Hypothesis 3: Perception of Prior Year Change</u>			
Depression Transformed at LTFU:			.015
Success Power Competition at LTFU:			.003
RME Transformed at LTFU:			.028 ^c
All Comparisons Non-Significant			
Life Satisfaction at LTFU:			.002

Table 9 Continued.

Hypothesis 4: Pre-TAW Agreement with MKP Beliefs^d

Depression Transformed at LTFU:	.002
Success Power Competition at LTFU:	.000
RME Transformed at LTFU:	.008
Life Satisfaction at LTFU:	.000

This table only includes the regression steps relevant to the first four hypotheses. Details of the full regressions exploring hypotheses 1-4 are included in Appendix Y.

LTFU—Long term follow up; SPC--Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME—Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men). For the first hypothesis: Age category comparison group (not listed): Aged under 30. For the second hypothesis: Self-help group comparison group--those with no reported self-help group experience. For the third hypothesis: Perceived year change comparison group--those with no reported prior year change compared to moderate change and major change. Depression and RME at LTFU was transformed (Log10; SPSS) after examining residuals and outliers.

a - Approaches significance; $p=.110$.

b - Approaches significance; $p=.057$.

c - Approaches significance; $p=.066$.

d - N=92 for this analysis (see Discussion section for explanation).

* $p<.05$

** $p<.01$

*** $p<.001$

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, age (category) contributed a significant 4.3 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of RME at baseline and religion. Examination of the results revealed that men aged 30-45 showed greater

Hypothesis 2--Effects of self-help group experience on criterion variables at LTFU. The results did not support the hypothesis that men with greater levels of self-help group experience would show more improvement on the criterion variables from pre-TAW to LTFU. All of the regressions were non-significant (see Table 9 for summary of results).

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, self-help group experience contributed a non-significant 2.3 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline depression, military experience, ethnicity and age (category).

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, self-help group experience contributed a non-significant 0.5 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline SPC, ethnicity and age (category).

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, self-help group experience contributed a non-significant 0.2 percent of the variance independent of the effects of baseline RME, religion and age (category).

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, self-help group experience contributed a non-significant 0.1 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline life satisfaction, ethnicity and age (category).

Hypothesis 3--Effects of prior year change on criterion variables at LTFU. The results did not support the hypothesis that men who reported greater levels of change in the

year prior to the TAW would show greater improvements on the criterion variables at LTFU.

A summary of the results is included in Table 9.

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, report of year change prior to attending the TAW contributed a non-significant 1.5 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline depression, military experience, ethnicity, age (category) and self-help group experience.

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, report of year change prior to attending the TAW contributed a non-significant 0.3 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline SPC, religion, age (category), and self-help group experience.

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, report of year change prior to attending the TAW contributed 2.8 percent of the variance, approaching significance, independent of the effects of RME at baseline, religion, age (category), and self-help group experience. Examination of the results revealed that there were no significant contrasts to the men who reported no life change.

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, report of year change prior to attending the TAW contributed a non-significant 0.2 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline life satisfaction, ethnicity, age (category), and self-help group experience.

Hypothesis 4—Effects of pre-TAW MKP belief scores on criterion variables at LTFU. Results of the regressions did not support the hypothesis that the pre-TAW MKP beliefs scale score would be associated with greater positive change on the criterion variables from pre-TAW to LTFU. None of the regressions approached significance. (see Table 9).

Eight of the 100 study participants were not able to complete the pre- TAW MKP-related belief scale scores due to the timing of questionnaire development (see Methods section). As such, only 92 of the 100 participants are used in exploring this hypothesis.

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, pre-TAW MKP belief scores accounted for a non-significant 0.2 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline depression, military experience, ethnicity, age (category), self-help group experience and report of year change prior to attending the TAW.

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, pre-TAW MKP belief scores accounted for a non-significant 0.0 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline SPC, religion, age (category), self-help group experience and report of year change prior to attending the TAW.

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, pre-TAW MKP belief scores accounted for a non-significant 0.8 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of RME at baseline, religion, age (category), self-help group experience and report of year change prior to attending the TAW.

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, pre-TAW MKP belief scores accounted for a non-significant 0.0 percent of the variance independent of the effects of baseline life satisfaction, ethnicity, age (category), self-help group experience and report of year change prior to attending the TAW.

Hypothesis 5--Effects of MKP beliefs on criteria at LTFU. The results of the regressions give full support to the hypothesis that change in MKP beliefs would be associated with positive changes on the criterion variables at LTFU. All regressions run were

significant. Table 10 contains a summary of these results (i.e., R^2 change values and the final beta weights for the predictor variables after controlling for covariates and baseline scores). The full results of the regressions exploring the fifth hypothesis are included in Appendix Z.

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, MKP beliefs at LTFU contributed a significant 5.7 percent of the variance (Beta in = $-.29$, $p < .01$), independent of the effects of baseline depression, military experience, ethnicity, age (category) and pre-TAW MKP belief scores, with the men with increased MKP belief scores reporting lower levels of depression.

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, MKP belief scores at LTFU predicted a significant 6.8 percent of the variance (Beta in = $-.31$, $p < .001$), independent of the effects of baseline SPC, religion and pre-TAW belief scores, with the men with increased MKP belief scores reporting lower levels of SPC.

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, MKP beliefs at LTFU predicted a significant 9.5 percent of the variance (Beta in = $-.38$, $p < .001$), independent of the effects of RME at baseline, religion, age (category), perceived year change and pre-TAW MKP beliefs, with the men with increased MKP belief scores reporting lower levels of RME.

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, MKP beliefs at LTFU contributed a significant 14.8 percent of the variance (Beta in = $-.47$, $p < .001$), independent of pre-TAW

Table 10

Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 5: Effects of Change in MKP Beliefs on Criterion Variables at Long-Term Follow-Up.

	<u>Final Beta</u>	<u>R² change</u>
Depression transformed at LTFU	-.293**	.057**
Success Power Competition at LTFU	-.310***	.068***
RME transformed at LTFU	-.384***	.095***
Life Satisfaction at LTFU	.468***	.148***

This table only includes the final step from each of the regressions exploring the fifth hypothesis (i.e., the effects of MKP Beliefs at LTFU on the criterion variables after controlling for covariates). Details of the full regressions are included in Appendix Z.

TAW--Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU--Long-Term Follow-Up; SPC--Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME--Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men).

Depression and RME at LTFU was transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

life satisfaction, ethnicity and age (category) and pre-TAW MKP beliefs, with the men with increased MKP belief scores reporting higher levels of life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6—Effects of change in social support on criterion variables at LTFU.

Results supported the sixth hypothesis that greater increases in social support from pre weekend to LTFU would predict greater decreases in depression, gender role conflict, and greater increases in life satisfaction at LTFU (see Table 11 for a summary of these results and Appendix AA for full details of the regressions). The step that contained both social support predictor subscales explained a significant amount of the variance in three of the four regressions (depression, RME, and life satisfaction). The four regressions run exploring this hypothesis differed from the earlier regressions in that the predictor had 2 subscales, and the final step was both of the social support subscales at LTFU entered together in a simultaneous manner.

The results suggested that the two social support subscales shared significant variance in predicting outcomes. It was not clear from these regressions if the order of entry into the regression would affect the significance of the other subscale, or how each subscale would predict outcome independent of the other subscale. To address this, subsequent analyses were run that explored the independent contributions of each subscale by alternatively forcing them into the equation before the other (see Appendix BB). The results of the subsequent analyses were consistent with the findings of the primary regressions listed below, in that for each criterion variable, the subscale that most strongly predicted outcome was not affected by the prior entry of the other subscale, and the independent contribution of each subscale was similar to the contribution made when entered simultaneously with the

Table 11

Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 6: Effects of Social Support on Criterion Variables at Long-Term Follow-Up.

	<u>Final Beta</u>	<u>Step R² change</u>
Crit. Variable: Depression at LTFU		.050*
SS NUM (LTFU)	-.282*	
Crit. Variable: SPC. at LTFU		.014
Crit. Variable: RME at LTFU		.025*
SS SAT (LTFU)	-.183*	
Crit. Variable: Life Sat. at LTFU		.075***
SS NUM (LTFU)	.346***	

For these regressions, the social support subscales, social support availability and social support satisfaction, were entered together in a simultaneous manner, and only the significant subscales are listed on this table. Full results for Hypothesis 6 are contained in Appendix AA. Subsequent analyses exploring the independent effects of the social support subscales is included in Appendix BB.

LTFU–Long-Term Follow-Up; SPC--Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME–Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (RE and RABM).

RME at LTFU and Depression at LTFU were transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .00$

other subscale. In specific, results from both analyses showed that changes in social support availability at LTFU was more predictive of improvements in depression and life satisfaction, and greater changes in social support satisfaction was more predictive of positive outcomes on RME at LTFU.

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, change in social support at LTFU (i.e., increased social support satisfaction and social support availability) contributed a significant 5.0 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline depression, ethnicity and children living in the home, age (category), and pre-TAW social support scores. Follow-up examination using a stepwise procedure revealed that change in social support availability was retained in the equation (Beta in = $-.282$, $p < .05$), and change in social support satisfaction was not, though it did approach significance (Beta in = $-.185$, $p = .08$).

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, change in social support at LTFU together contributed a non-significant 1.4 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline SPC, religion and pre-TAW social support scores.

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, change in social support at LTFU (i.e., increased social support satisfaction and social support availability) together contributed a significant 2.5 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of RME at baseline, religion, age (category), perceived year change and pre-TAW social support scores. Follow-up examination of this step entered in a stepwise manner revealed that change in social support satisfaction was retained in the equation (Beta in = $-.183$, $p < .05$) and change in social support availability was not, though it did approach significance (Beta in = $-.187$, $p = .051$).

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, change in social support at LTFU (i.e., increased social support satisfaction and social support availability) together contributed a significant 7.5 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline life satisfaction, ethnicity, age (category) and pre-TAW social support scores. Follow-up examination using a stepwise procedure revealed that change in social support availability was retained in the equation (Beta in = $-.346$, $p < .001$), and change in social support satisfaction was not, though it did approach significance (Beta in = $-.161$, $p = .058$).

Hypothesis 7—Effects of I-group participation on criteria at LTFU. The results did not support the hypothesis that I-group participation (coded categorically) would be linked to improvement on the criterion variables at LTFU. Table 12 contains a summary of the findings (for full results, see Appendix CC).

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, length of I-group participation contributed a non-significant 1.6 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline depression, military experience, ethnicity and age (category).

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, I-group participation scores at LTFU predicted 2.8 percent of the variance (approaching significance; $p = .10$), independent of the effects of baseline SPC scores and religion. Despite the overall effect approaching significance, examination of this step revealed that none of the I-group participation categories contributed a significant amount of variance.

Table 12

Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 7: The Effects of I-group Participation on Criterion Variables at Long-Term Follow-Up.

<u>PRIMARY ANALYSIS</u>	<u>Step R² change</u>
Depression Transformed at LTFU	.016
SPC Transformed at LTFU	.028 ^a
Both Comparisons Non-Significant	
RME at LTFU	.018
Life Satisfaction at LTFU	.005

This table contains only a summary of findings from the regressions on Hypothesis 7. Full results are contained in Appendix CC.

SPC at LTFU and Depression at LTFU were transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Coding of I-group Participation: For primary analysis, coded into (1) never participated, (2) used to participate but not at time of LTFU, and (3) still participating at time of LTFU.

TAW--Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU--Long-Term Follow-Up; SPC--Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME--Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales.

a - Approaches significance: $p=.07$

For the regression on RME at LTFU, I-group participation at LTFU predicted a non-significant 1.8 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of RME at baseline, religion, age (category) and reports of perceived year prior change.

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, I-group participation at LTFU contributed a non-significant 0.5 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline life satisfaction, ethnicity and age (category).

Hypothesis 8—Effects of MKP participation on criteria at LTFU. The results did not support the hypothesis that non I-group MKP participation (coded categorically) would be associated with greater levels of improvement on the criterion variables at LTFU. None of the regressions reached significance (although one, RME, approached significance). Table 13 contains a summary of the findings (for full results, see Appendix DD).

For the regression on depression at LTFU, length of MKP participation contributed a non-significant 3.1 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline depression, having children living in the home and ethnicity.

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, MKP participation scores at LTFU predicted a non-significant 0.3 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline SPC scores and religion.

For the regression on RME at LTFU, MKP participation at LTFU predicted 2.5 percent of the variance (approaching significance; $p=.08$), independent of the effects of RME at baseline, religion, age (category) and reports of perceived year prior change. Examination of the results revealed that men who participated in non-I-group MKP activities for more than 10 half day segments showed greater improvement on RME from

Table 13

Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 8: Effects of Non-I-group MKP Participation on Criterion Variables at Long-Term Follow-Up.

	<u>Final Beta</u>	<u>Step R² change</u>
Depression at LTFU		.031
Success Power Competition at LTFU		.003
RME at LTFU		.025 ^a
More than 10 half-day seg.	-.201*	
Life Satisfaction at LTFU		.004

This table contains only a summary of findings from the regressions on Hypothesis 8. Full results are contained in Appendix DD.

LTFU--Long-Term Follow-Up; RME--Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (RE and RABM).

RME at LTFU and Depression at LTFU were transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Year change variable dummy coded-- Category 1 (comparison group): no change reported in year prior to TAW; category 2: moderate change reported in year prior to TAW; category 3: major change reported in year prior to TAW.

a - Approaches significance, $p = .08$

* $p < .05$

pre-weekend to LTFU than did men who did not take part in non-I-group MKP activities (Beta = $-.20$; $p < .05$). All other comparisons within non-I-group MKP participation were non-significant.

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, MKP participation at LTFU contributed a non-significant .04 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline life satisfaction, ethnicity and age category.

Secondary Analyses

Hypothesis 1--different age categorization. The original hypothesis that increasing age would predict positive outcomes (using age categories) was not supported in the primary analysis. However, despite the non-significant overall findings, examination of the results revealed that in all of the significant comparisons, men aged 30-45 reported greater improvements than did men in both the older and younger age categories. To examine this further, a secondary analysis was conducted comparing the category of men aged 30-45 with the category of all other ages combined.

The results of this secondary analysis indicated that for all four criterion variables, men aged 30-45 reported more positive change than men of other ages. Full results for this secondary analysis are contained in Appendix EE.

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, age (dichotomous) contributed a significant 4.1 percent of the variance (Beta = $-.22$; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of baseline depression, ethnicity and military experience, with men aged 30-45 reported greater reductions in depression than did men in both the older and younger age categories.

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, age (dichotomous) contributed a significant 2.0 percent of the variance (Beta = -.15; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of SPC at baseline and religion, with men aged 30-45 reported greater reductions in SPC than did men in both the older and younger age categories.

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, age (dichotomous) contributed a significant 4.0 percent of the variance (Beta = -.21; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of RME at baseline and religion, with men aged 30-45 reported greater reductions in RME than did men in both the older and younger age categories.

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, age (dichotomous) contributed a significant 4.9 percent of the variance (Beta = -.22; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of life satisfaction at baseline, religion, with men aged 30-45 reported greater improvements in life satisfaction than did men in both the older and younger age categories.

Secondary analysis for hypothesis 2--church group experience. As originally planned, secondary analyses were run exploring whether church group experience, coded dichotomously, would predict positive outcomes on the criterion variables at LTFU. Results partially supported the hypothesis that men with church group experience would show greater improvement on the criterion variables at LTFU. Full results for this secondary analysis are contained in Appendix EE.

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, church group experience contributed a significant 3.2 percent of the variance (Beta = -.18; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of baseline depression, military experience, ethnicity and age (dichotomous), with men with church group experience reporting greater decreases in depression.

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, church group experience contributed a non-significant 0.1 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of baseline SPC, religion and age (dichotomous).

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, church group experience contributed a non-significant 0.2 percent of the variance, independent of the effects of RME at baseline, religion and age (dichotomous).

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, church group experience contributed a significant 2.7 percent of the variance (Beta = $-.16$; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of baseline life satisfaction ethnicity and age (dichotomous), with men with church group experience showing greater gains in life satisfaction at LTFU.

Secondary analysis for hypothesis 7--I-group participation coded continuously. The original hypothesis that longer participation in an I-group (using categories of participation) was not supported in the primary analysis. Given the disadvantages in the categorical variable, a secondary analysis that examined the effects of length of I-group participation coded continuously (in number of months) was conducted.

The regression provided mixed results. As predicted, greater levels of I-group participation continuously coded was significantly related to greater improvement on RME at LTFU, and its effects upon SPC at LTFU approached significance. However, greater levels of I-group participation continuously coded significantly predicted higher levels of depression at LTFU—a direction opposite of that predicted (Appendix FF for complete details).

Specifically, for the regression on depression transformed at LTFU, length of I-group participation coded continuously contributed a significant 3.8 percent of the variance

(Beta = .22; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of baseline depression, military experience, ethnicity, and age (category), with higher levels of participation predicting higher levels of depression at LTFU.

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, I-group participation scores coded continuously predicted 1.4 percent of the variance (Beta = -.14; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of baseline SPC scores and religion, with higher levels of participation suggesting lower levels of SPC at LTFU.

For the regression on RME at LTFU, I-group participation coded continuously predicted a significant 2.4 percent of the variance (Beta = -.17; $p < .05$), independent of the effects of RME at baseline, religion, age (category), and reports of perceived year prior change, with higher levels of participation predicting lower levels of RME at LTFU.

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, I-group participation coded continuously contributed a non-significant .03 percent of the variance, independent of pre-TAW life satisfaction, ethnicity, and age category.

All significant predictors. In order to explore the relative contribution of each predictor that significantly predicted changes on a criterion variable at LTFU, a regression for each criterion variable was run that controlled for baseline criterion score with the final step containing every significant predictor variable entered simultaneously. A summary of results are included in Table 14 (for full regression results, see Appendix GG).

Table 14

Regressions for Criterion at LTFU with All Significant Predictors Entered Simultaneously.

	<u>Final Beta</u>	<u>Step R² Change</u>
Depression at LTFU:		.240***
I-group time (continuous)	.293**	
Age (30-45 vs. rest of sample)	-.231*	
SSQ-S LTFU	-.196 ^a	
Success Power Competition at LTFU:		.113**
MKP Beliefs at LTFU	-.385***	
RME Transformed at LTFU:		.190***
MKP Beliefs at LTFU	-.414***	
Age (30-45 vs. rest of sample)	-.134 ^b	
Life Satisfaction at LTFU:		.270***
MKP Beliefs at LTFU	.381***	
SSQ-N LTFU	.224*	

This table contains a summary of the full regressions. For full information on these regressions, refer to Appendix GG. The significant predictors included: Age (30-45 coded 1 and all other ages coded 0, history of church group activity – Yes (1)-No(2), MKP related beliefs at LTFU, SS-N and SS-Q at LTFU, length of I-group participation coded in months.

a - Approaches significance; $p=.085$.

b - Approaches significance; $p=.104$.

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$.

For the regression on depression transformed at LTFU with all significant predictor variables entered simultaneously, independent of the effects of baseline depression, age coded dichotomously significantly predicted depression at LTFU (30-45 versus all other ages; Beta = $-.231$, $p=.024$), and change in social support satisfaction at LTFU approached significance (Beta = $-.196$, $p=.085$), with men aged 30-45 and increased social support satisfaction being associated with lower depression. I-group participation coded continuously also significantly predicted depression at LTFU (Beta = $.293$, $p=.008$), but as in the previous secondary analysis, the directionality was opposite of that predicted. Of note, in this omnibus analysis, the social support satisfaction at LTFU subscale approached significance, while the social support availability at LTFU subscale did not--a different (and opposite) finding from the primary analyses (where social support availability was significant and social support satisfaction only approached significance).

For the regression on SPC at LTFU, MKP beliefs at LTFU significantly predicted outcome (Beta = $-.385$, $p<.001$), independent of the effects of baseline SPC, with higher levels of MKP beliefs associated with lower SPC at LTFU.

For the regression on RME transformed at LTFU, independent of the effects of RME at baseline, change in MKP beliefs at LTFU significantly predicted RME at LTFU (Beta = $-.414$, $p<.001$), and age coded dichotomously (30-45 versus all other ages) approached significance (Beta = $-.134$, $p=.104$), with men aged 30-45 and increased MKP beliefs predicting lower RME.

For the regression on life satisfaction at LTFU, independent of pre-TAW life satisfaction, change in MKP beliefs at LTFU (Beta = $-.381$, $p=.000$) and change in social

support availability at LTFU (Beta = .22, $p=.020$) significantly predicted life satisfaction at LTFU, with increased MKP beliefs and increased social support satisfaction being associated with higher life satisfaction.

Discussion

Aggregate Effects of Participation

Overall, participation in the MKP appears to be associated with improved outcomes on virtually every examined construct. The well being measures--depression and life satisfaction--all showed significant and positive improvements. In addition, constructs closely related to well being were marked by significant and dramatic improvements. Both satisfaction with social support and number of social support contacts increased significantly. Furthermore, SPC, RME and the MKP beliefs scale also changed in a positive direction.

These findings, which are consistent with the findings of prior MKP research (Goll, 2001; Hartman, 1994; Levin, 1997; Mankowski, Silvergleid et al., 2001; Richard, 1999; Schultz, 1997), suggest the MKP is effective in working with men. Addressing issues in an alternative way--a way that the organization feels is more congruent with existing male norms and synchronous with masculine tendencies--is consistent with some of the literature concerning alternative therapies for men (e.g., Heesacker & Prichard, 1992; Picchioni, 1992; Sternbach, 1990). By designing the TAW as an "adventure" (versus a therapy weekend), by conducting the experience in a group setting (versus individual therapy), by modeling more emotionally appropriate and inclusive "masculine" behavior through example, and by encouraging men by that example to behave in ways that are "emotionally literate," the MKP

may have discovered a unique and effective adjunct to the existing methods of working with men and their well being.

However, due to the lack of a suitable control group, interpretation of these findings is problematic. A decision to participate in the MKP may be a proxy for a pre-existing willingness and desire to change that would have occurred regardless of participation in the MKP. In addition, the results are limited due to the narrow population of men who choose to participate in the MKP. Whether or not this positive association would transfer outside of this select group of men, furthermore beyond those men who chose to take part in the larger MKP-GW research project, is unclear. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, the significantly positive change in the outcome variables supports this study's focus on potential factors and processes that influenced outcomes for the men who participated.

Pre-existing Factors

Age and its effect on criterion variables at LTFU. The original hypothesis that increasing age (category) would predict more positive outcomes on the criterion variables at LTFU was not supported. This hypothesis was originally proposed based on prior research showing age to be related to certain outcomes (Hartman, 1994; Mankowski, Silvergleid et al., 2001) as well as a commonly held belief by many MKP members that participation was not as effective for younger men (i.e., under 30 years old).

Perhaps a linearly defined relationship between age and outcome is not an appropriate model to predict change as a result of participation in the MKP. However, this result does not preclude the possibility that there are specific age ranges different from the ones used in the present study that predict more positive outcomes. For example, the MKP

could possibly be harmful for a 21-year-old, neutral for a 30-year-old, extremely effective for a 40-year-old, and moderately effective for a 60-year-old. A unique relationship of particular age groupings to outcome would be challenging to detect in a linear analysis, and may help to explain the difference between the present findings and the observations of MKP members.

Relatedly, the secondary post-hoc analysis revealed that men aged 30 to 45, when compared to the rest of the sample, showed greater improvement on the criterion at LTFU. This post hoc finding is consistent with the findings of Levinson (1978). In his description of men's development, he clearly states that the most tumultuous and transformative time in a man's life starts at age 32 during what he terms the "settling down period" and ends at age 45 with what he calls the end of the "mid-life transition." He found that it is within these ages that men begin seriously questioning their goals, careers and aspects of life they consider important. Before this key period, he states that men are concerned with establishing themselves, acquiring status, and are not necessarily experiencing any conflict between their lives and their goals. He also states that men over the age of 45, though they may continue to struggle with the same issues, do so with a much reduced intensity, and are, in his estimation, more stable concerning those issues. As such, the design of the MKP might be particularly effective with this age and set of life concerns, and a significant number of the men both staffing TAW's and participating in them may add to the effectiveness for that age group.

In addition, although the present findings of greater effectiveness with men aged 30 to 45 may seem to contradict other research on I-group participation (Mankowski, Silvergleid et al., 2001) and TAW impact (Hartman, 1994), both of which found greater impact or participation for older men, it is important to realize that each of these studies—though they all

address the effects of age--examines a different phenomenon and uses different criteria than the present study. For instance, there were several findings from studies on I-group participation (Mankowski et al., 2000a, 2000b) that found older men more likely to participate in I-groups (e.g., men under the age of 30 would often prematurely stop participation in an I-group, men in existing I-groups were older than men in disbanded groups, and for every year of age, a man was four percent less likely to participate in an I-group). This would lead one to believe that perhaps this intervention is more appropriate for older men. However, this study examined I-group participation and not how age affects psychosocial outcomes in the MKP.

Hartman's (1994) conclusions concerning age were based on his finding that older men in his sample showed greater levels of improvement on a scale of gender role stress. However, his analysis was based upon a comparison of 2 age categories divided by the sample median age of 35 years. This age categorization may have in part unknowingly captured the differential effectiveness of the 30 to 45 age grouping found significant in the present study.

The MKP acknowledges a differential effect based on age. One project currently being developed by Bill Kauth (one of the founders of the MKP) and a group of younger men is a weekend similar in style to the TAW based on the movie "The Matrix," which in the opinion of Kauth and the young men who are working with him is more appropriate for younger men. In addition, they feel that this weekend for younger men will allow I-groups to form with a younger age range. These actions were based on feedback from younger men who reported that they had trouble fitting in with a group of older men with much different life concerns (e.g., wife, kids, meaning of life) than theirs (e.g., meeting partners,

establishing relationships, starting a career path). In another attempt to engage younger men, the MKP-GW has stated a “Young Warriors” group, augmenting the normal MKP activities, where younger members get together socially and to conduct volunteer activities as a group.

Similar attention is also paid to older men. A major part of the MKP is the Elder Track. Any man over the age of 50 is considered an elder and encouraged to embrace that role. The MKP considers the role of an elder to be different from the role of men under 50-years-old, who are seen as being in the phase of life when the tasks of fatherhood, career building, and determining one’s place in the community are more common concerns. An elder is viewed as one who has lived through those struggles and is in a position to bless and support the younger men with their life challenges. The elder is also considered a position of reverence, giving value to prior life experience in addition to re-framing the interpretation of growing old--commonly viewed by the men as undesirable before participation in the MKP. This elder role has been institutionalized by a certification process to become a ritual elder. In addition, the role of the elder is strongly embedded in the weekend TAW process itself.

These two aspects of the MKP experience --the young warriors and the Elder Track-- having both evolved through a grass-roots movement, suggest that MKP members in those age ranges feel the need to augment the core elements of the MKP experience to suit their particular needs. The evolution of these two groups, the lack of any unique augmentation for the men between those two age groups, and the current results that show better outcomes for the men aged 30 to 45, may indicate that the MKP is particularly well-suited to meet the needs of those approaching and experiencing middle age.

In examining the relation of age to participation in the MKP, future research is necessary to replicate the current findings. Future research should continue to examine particular age ranges rather than age as a continuous variable. In addition, if the current findings are replicated, future research should explore the mechanisms of participation in the MKP that contribute to the differential effectiveness for different age groups.

Prior self-help group involvement. The hypothesis that prior self-help group involvement would predict positive outcomes on the criterion variables at LTFU was not supported. Several possible explanations exist for this lack of a finding.

For one, prior self-help group experience simply may not contribute to positive outcomes from the MKP experience. This finding is interesting, given that some of the literature has stated that a significantly higher number of the men who take part in mythopoetic men's work are, or have been, involved in 12-step self-help groups (Schwalbe, 1996). Based on this information, as well as personal testimonies from many MKP members stating that the MKP is a natural and important follow-up to 12-step group involvement, the present study hypothesized more positive outcomes for those who have taken part in self-help groups.

However, self-help group experience was not predictive of outcome in this study. In attempting to explain why the general experience of self-help groups is not predictive of positive outcomes, it is noteworthy that Schwalbe also stated there was no clear "kind" of mythopoetic man who had taken part in 12-step groups, making his categorization of 12-step involvement ambiguous. He reported that while some of these men dealt with drug and alcohol dependence, some were members of more ancillary programs like ACOA, sex

addiction programs, codependents, or survivors of abuse--more “victims than perpetrators” (p. 23).

Similar to Schwalbe, the present study was not able to clearly differentiate participation in the different forms of self-help due to procedural restraints. Based on the data available, participation in any form of self-help--be it 12-step chemical addiction, 12-step process addiction, 12-step relationship oriented, or disability related support group--did not contribute to positive outcomes as measured in this study.

A link between prior self-help group experience and outcome may be absent despite a natural affinity for men in self-help groups to participate in the MKP. AA and other 12-step organizations have been criticized for sometimes fostering a sense of complacency, in that participation in them becomes the end, instead of the means, to a better life. Perhaps in the MKP, men with 12-step experience enjoy the novelty of the organization and the male comradery, but fail to use it effectively--treating it more as a “clubhouse” than a way to implement positive change.

Also worthy of consideration is the idea that men with self-help group experience may have a history of participation in experiences similar to the MKP, making the impact of MKP participation less novel and as a result, less impactful. Related to this theory, Rohr (1994), in his role as a highly successful transformational weekend presenter, has examined the connection between powerful transformational experiences and subsequent behavior changes. In describing the experience of the participants in his workshops, he uses the concept of liminal versus “liminoid” space. Liminal space, a sociological term, describes an experience that challenges one’s perception of reality, creating a vulnerability, while also

creating the possibility for positive change. Interestingly, liminal space is often a characteristic ascribed by sociologists to describe the traditional male initiations on which the TAW is based.

Juxtaposed to liminal space is what Rohr calls liminoid space, which he describes as refreshing and stress relieving, in part simulating the cathartic feelings that follow from liminal experiences, but not facilitating any profound change. Perhaps men with self-help group experience have a greater history of participation in transformational experiences, and though they see MKP participation as refreshing and exciting, experience it as merely liminoid, and as such, do not differentially change when compared to other men.

Future research may look more carefully at the different forms of self-help experience and carefully measure participation levels to explore any connections between the various forms of self-help groups and differential outcomes in mythopoetic men's work that the present study missed due to restricted variance and measurement limitations. In addition, collection of data on the transformational impact of past self-help group (and other) experiences might help to more clearly understand the relation of self-help group experience to outcomes in mythopoetic men's work.

History of church group involvement. The proposed secondary analysis revealed that a history of church group involvement was predictive of more positive outcomes on two of the criterion variables at LTFU—depression and life satisfaction. Of note, the men with a history of church group attendance did not show a significantly greater improvement on the Gender Role Conflict related subscales (SPC and RME).

There are several possible explanations for the positive findings for depression and life satisfaction. Related to this topic, Schwalbe (1996) states that mythopoetic men's work has something he labels a "religious attitude," defined as a largely Jungian view of spirituality that fosters a personal sense of connection to the divine and a sense of life purpose. This attitude is somewhat gnostic, non-denominational, and does not encourage nor align with any form of organized religion. He states that it is primarily the non-traditional and non-hierarchical aspect of this spirituality that makes it effective for mythopoetic men.

Schwalbe's observations on the character of the spirituality of mythopoetic men's work are similar to the information provided by the interviews on the spirituality of the MKP. Many men found participation in the MKP to be a very spiritual experience in a non-traditional and powerful way, with one man going so far as to say that he changed from being an atheist to believing in a higher power during the span of the TAW. For many men, the strength of the spirituality was in part due to its separateness from any formal religious organization.

The interplay of traditional religious involvement (that might be indicated by church group involvement) and a personal spiritual quest (a component of the MKP experience) has been researched by Wuthnow (2000). His research has noted the increased popularity of individualized spirituality within American culture, which he feels is indicated by the increased popularity of 12-step, self-help, and small group sharing since the 1950's. However, rather than viewing these two trends in spiritual matters as being inherently conflictual, he considers them as also being complementary, in that individualized spirituality provides individuals with a strong personal relevance to mystical concepts (a shortfall of

traditional religious involvement) and organized church activities provide a forum for the social enactment of principles that may come from an increased personal spirituality (a shortfall of smaller spiritually oriented groups).

Based on this interplay of the private and public aspects of spirituality proposed by Wuthnow (2000), the improved outcomes for men with church group experience could have several different explanations. One is that the MKP, through its focus on individual spirituality, is effective for men who are familiar with the social application of spiritual principles provided by an established church but are not satisfied with the level of personal spirituality provided by organized religion. As such, the MKP may be especially effective in providing a greater personal connection to personal spiritual values for men with greater levels of involvement in institutionalized religions.

Another possible explanation is that men with church group experience have a more clearly established way to socially manifest the tools and insights provided by participation in the MKP. The idea that it is essential for men to turn their insights and discoveries into useful activities in the world is a major focus of the MKP. A increasingly strong component of the organization is its focus on “mission,” ensuring that men are clear about how they are creating a better world through specific social action. This idea was fostered by Bill Kauth, one of the founders of the MKP, who realized that oftentimes MKP participants, despite their improved sense of well being, became too inwardly focused. His development of the mission focus was an attempt to keep men from “wound worship” and remind them that their personal transformations are nugatory unless they are used to create a more balanced and just world. In a similar way, perhaps church group experience facilitates the transformation of

one's personal insights into a socially manifested "mission," creating a more balanced and integrated man.

In exploring the differential effectiveness between those with and without church group experience, it is worth examining the structure of various self-help groups and the structure of church groups. By nature, many self-help groups are very decentralized, with the actual group being the highest point of the organizational structure. As such, individuals with serious resentment towards organizational intrusion and issues with authority tend to have fewer problems with membership in standard 12-step or other self-help groups.

However, church groups--by their very nature--are associated with some form of organized religion, and it is usually the organized religion that creates the group (Wuthnow, 1996). Given that format, it is quite possible that men with church group experience may have a certain tolerance of organizational structure that men with self-help group experience do not have.

Ability to tolerate organizational structure may very well affect participation in the MKP. Despite its strong grass roots origins, the MKP also has a hierarchical organizational structure. It has worked hard to minimize the effects of that structure on the membership, encouraging the I-groups to operate autonomously, and requiring nothing financially or administratively of them. However, the local organization does control many resources that are valuable to the men, such as weekend staff spots, workshops and leadership trainings necessary for advancement in the MKP. In addition, the organization actively solicits an annual contribution from the individual men to fund these resources. Given all of these

factors, some level of organizational tolerance (as prognosticated by church group involvement) may predict better outcomes at LTFU.

Of note, church group experience was related to change in levels of depression and life satisfaction, but not gender role conflict. One explanation for this difference is that men with a history of church group involvement may have more traditional values but live in communities that support traditional values, reducing the distress commonly associated with advocating those roles and beliefs. Therefore, in the same way that many men with gender role attitudes that are discordant with the predominant social norms show improved well being scores when their beliefs become more adaptive, perhaps men with church group experience maximize their sense of well being by retaining beliefs that might be consistent with their social and communal surroundings.

Future research might more carefully examine the connection of participation in organized religion and outcomes in mythopoetic men's work. This research could involve several factors not included in this study, including more detailed data on the type and level of involvement and also data regarding the level of satisfaction with traditional religious organizations as a possible predictor of involvement in mythopoetic men's work.

Prior year change. The results did not support the hypothesis that change in the year prior to attending the TAW would predict outcomes. None of the regressions on the criterion at LTFU were significant.

One explanation is that a period of change prior to involvement may not, in fact, predict more positive outcomes in the MKP. It is quite possible that attending a powerful, transformational weekend followed by participation in an I-group is not differentially effective

for men experiencing major life change. Perhaps other forms of intervention that are less intense in nature would be more effective with these men.

Relatedly, it is possible that having recently undergone major change is less predictive of openness to future change than other factors such as long-term job or relationship dissatisfaction. As such, it may be that the MKP is most suitable for men poised for life change, rather than men who have already undergone changing life circumstances.

Another explanation is that participation in the MKP, with its powerful weekend format, might serve to render inconsequential prior life events on MKP outcomes. Interview data revealed a number of men who stated that participation in the MKP was very impactful, suggesting that MKP participation itself is life changing, reducing the importance of previous life events.

Alternatively, these results may also be a result of poor psychometric measurement. The life change information was collected during the interview. Examination of the interview results revealed that this interview question was confusing to a number of the participants, and different men had different conceptualizations of what “change” meant. To more clearly define the magnitude of change, attempts were made to quantify this variable for this study (see Appendix G). However, despite the efforts to clarify this concept, different occurrences may have been construed differently, and as such, the resulting measure may be inadequate.

Future research may want to examine more closely this concept of change in the period prior to engaging in men’s work. A more precise categorization of change may differentiate particularly effective interventions for men experiencing specific kinds of change. For example, categorizing men using Levinson’s (1978) five particular sequences that he

postulates men experience during the settling down period and the mid-life transition (e.g., advancement within a stable life structure, serious failure or decline within a stable life structure, breaking out--trying for a new life structure, advancement which itself produces a change in life structure, and unstable life structure)--all periods of change--may help to more clearly understand the kinds of change that are most effectively addressed with this kind of intervention. Also, an exploration of potential variables that might predict readiness for change (e.g., a high rate of personal or marital distress) rather than a history of recent change may help to determine predictors of successful outcomes in mythopoetic men's work.

Pre-existing agreement with MKP beliefs. The analyses did not support the hypothesis that pre-TAW beliefs would predict positive outcomes on the criterion variables at LTFU, with none of the regressions showing any significant relations. This finding is not consistent with the literature that indicates certain pre-existing beliefs to be predictive of successful outcomes in self-help groups (e.g., a belief in God and AA participation; see Maton, 1989b; Mankowski et al., 2001), and is interesting in light of the fact that change in beliefs from pre-TAW to LTFU was associated with improved outcomes (hypothesis 5). Several possible explanations may account for this finding.

One possible reason is that the MKP is a qualitatively different organization than the more traditional self-help groups examined in the work of Maton and Mankowski. For one, the self-help groups they studied have a more narrowly focused area of concern and method of intervention than the MKP, such as cancer, chronic illness, obesity, alcoholism, a history of abuse, trauma, or drug addiction. The MKP does not have such a sharply defined problem set or specific method for dealing with them.

As such, agreement with a specific set of beliefs may be less predictive of positive outcomes in the MKP as it is in certain self-help groups that are more focused in their intent. The qualitative data from the larger research project support this conclusion, with men reporting positive outcomes for seemingly contradictory reasons. For example, some men reported that the effectiveness of the MKP experience was due to an increasing awareness of the anger they were repressing, while other men (who attended the same TAW) stated that the MKP was impactful because it allowed them to be less angry and more accepting. The salient issues that the men have and the mechanisms of change in the MKP may be much more diverse than for other self-help groups, making prior agreement with organizationally consistent beliefs not as predictive of long-term outcomes.

Secondly, many of the ideas proposed by the MKP are, to some extent, more counter-cultural than some of the concepts proposed in 12-step organizations or other self-help groups. As such, holding beliefs that are consistent with the organization before participation may be unrealistic. It is true that self-help groups often derive their effectiveness from having an alternative perspective on the problem that generates the need for the group in the first place. However, the concept of the traditional self-help group has largely become acceptable in present day American society (Wuthnow, 1996). Therefore, there may be a lower degree of “alternativeness” in traditional self-help organizations when compared to the MKP.

For example, though these areas have improved over the last 30 years, men encouraging other men to focus on what they feel or to make “I” statements is not considered normal male behavior in the general population. In the experience of many men in

the MKP, the mention of these concepts to men not in the MKP can lead to defensiveness or resentment. Commonly, men in the MKP (who have had very positive experiences) state that if they had known before the TAW what was going to happen, they never would have come, but through immersion in the experience, they began to embrace these beliefs.

Another possible reason that pre-existing beliefs are not differentially predictive of outcome is that the MKP has the advantage of starting with a very intense and impactful weekend (TAW), whereas participation in most of these other self-help groups begins in a much less dramatic fashion--akin to the difference between sticking your toe in the water versus jumping in. This powerful intervention may very well obviate the need for pre-existing openness to beliefs for successful outcome, as the TAW will serve to expose the men to these ideas that may be foreign to them. Therefore, the idea that valuing certain organizationally consistent beliefs, when those beliefs are beyond the pale of beliefs commonly held by men, may be unrealistic and not a necessary precursor to positive long-term outcomes for men who chose to participate in the MKP.

Future research might examine other possible characteristics that might predict acceptance of those beliefs, despite prior endorsement or knowledge of them, including personal beliefs predictive of positive outcomes that were not addressed in this study. For instance, it is possible that certain beliefs concerning religious affiliation, beliefs concerning politics, beliefs concerning the role of civic responsibility, or beliefs concerning inclusiveness with respect to race, sexual orientation, or a more specific understanding of their views on gender and masculinity--may predict those men who would subsequently benefit differentially from the MKP.

Factors Influenced by MKP Participation

Beliefs at long -term follow-up. Results indicated strong support for the fifth hypothesis that change in the MKP beliefs scale from pre-TAW to LTFU would predict more positive outcomes on the criterion variables at LTFU. The post hoc omnibus regressions that included all of the significant predictors from the analyses also indicated that increased MKP beliefs at LTFU was the strongest predictor of the criterion variables at LTFU. This finding is important in light of pre-TAW scores non-significant effects on the criterion variables at LTFU.

These results suggest that, for this sample of men, the criterion that was important for positive change was not the pre-existing level of agreement, but the extent to which the men were able to adopt and incorporate these MKP beliefs. Apparently, a greater acceptance of certain MKP principles, as presented through the powerful weekend experience, the follow-on participation in I-groups and the multiple workshops and trainings (resources most self-help groups do not have at their disposal), is predictive of increased well being and adaptive gender roles for this sample of men.

One explanation is that participation in the MKP promotes certain behaviors not commonly practiced by men, resulting in changed beliefs and a consequent improvement in well-being. Many men in the interviews stated that certain behaviors encouraged by the MKP were missing from their lives before participation--being assertive and clear with others, having a sense of personal power, having a detailed sense of life mission, living from one's deep core being, being responsible and accountable, and living with an open heart. The MKP, through encouragement of healthy behaviors not commonly encountered in traditional

masculinity, may foster the adaptation of beliefs as a result of those behaviors, thereby improving their sense of well-being.

One example of how behavior may induce a change in beliefs is how the MKP helps men to be assertive with others. Allen (1994) describes the trouble men have in dealing with conflict, tending to either “stuff” anger or explode in rage—what he calls the “kick-ass/kiss-ass” syndrome. In relation to this problem, the MKP endorses a well-structured method of conflict resolution where any man, regardless of his stature, can air a grievance with any other man at any given time in a clear and assertive way. This encourages MKP members to rationally confront others who they might normally be afraid to confront (e.g., a TAW leader or senior facilitator) and may also help him to resolve the issues that might underlie his sense of upset.

Another example of how behavioral modification may influence beliefs is how the MKP assists men in being more emotionally aware. Levant (1995) states that many men suffer from “alexithymia,” meaning that they do not have the ability to describe their emotions. In addressing this, the MKP begins every meeting—from business to recreation—with an emotional check-in, where men are encouraged and supported to explicitly state their current feelings, helping them to relate to each other in a more emotionally literate way.

These and many other behavioral patterns encouraged by the organization may very well facilitate an increase in MKP beliefs, which in turn would promote well-being. This proposed mechanism is quite plausible, given that the use of behavioral modifications to induce a change in beliefs has a long history in behavioral therapies (Goldfried & Davidson,

1994), and the extant literature shows that incorporation of beliefs similar to those encouraged by the MKP is associated with a greater sense of well-being (Diener et al., 1999).

Another alternate explanation for this finding is that participation in the MKP is a cathartic and transformational experience that simultaneously affects the endorsement of MKP beliefs and levels of depression, life satisfaction and gender role conflict. Interview data revealed that many men feel that participation in the MKP “changed their life,” and stated that the effects of participation gave them a greater sense of optimism about the conditions of their lives and their sense of self, allowing them to see things “through a new set of glasses.” With such major shifts in understanding oneself and the world, it would be understandable that MKP participation would also simultaneously be associated with a change in one’s beliefs and one’s overall sense of well being.

Given that the current study cannot determine the directionality of effects, another explanation for this finding is that change in MKP beliefs may be a result of change in depression, life satisfaction and gender role conflict. Given that so many factors appear to be influenced by MKP participation, it is entirely plausible that a change in beliefs is the end result of other changes--in depression, life satisfaction, gender role conflict, and/or other variables not assessed in this study.

Future research might more carefully examine, over time, the actual mechanisms that influence beliefs and well-being within the organization. Several factors that were not analyzed may affect beliefs or factors that influence beliefs--e.g., participation in an I-group, level of friendships made in the organization, knowledge learned that has helped in one’s family, relationship or work environment, increases or decreases in participation in civic

organizations outside of the MKP, and change in one's life goals. In addition, future research might attempt to determine the causal direction between MKP beliefs and outcome through inclusion of a control group or through path analysis based on assessment of beliefs and outcomes at multiple points in time.

Social Support. The data supported the sixth hypothesis that increases in perceived social support availability and satisfaction would predict more positive outcomes on the criterion variables at LTFU. The results suggest that of the two SSQ subscales, increased social support availability was more predictive of positive change on measures of depression and life satisfaction, while increased social support satisfaction was associated with more positive changes in RME (neither sub-scale was predictive of SPC scores). However, the difference in variance explained between these two sub-scales was minimal, and, as such, this analysis did not allow for a definitive answer regarding the subscale that may have had a more significant effect upon the criterion variables at LTFU.

This overall finding is consistent with the general literature on perceived social support, in that higher levels are associated with greater well being (Barrera, 2000). However, this finding of change in perceived social support challenges the findings of some researchers who conceptualize perceived social support as a stable characteristic of personality, even in the face of situations that would imply a change in social support. For instance, Sarason et al. (1991) found “perceptions of both potential social support availability and satisfaction (using the SSQ) to be stable over periods of up to three years, even during transitional events that led to major changes in network composition” (p. 273). Mankowski and Wyer (1997) also concluded from their experiments on social support (using a role-

playing paradigm) that one's interpretation of present support events and one's self concept as a support recipient are influenced by past experiences of rejection/receipt of social support, and that current levels of perceived social support are colored in a way that reinforces historical perceptions.

One possible explanation for the current findings of change in perceived social support is that the MKP represents an unusually potent environment for increasing one's sense of social support. The MKP community has a strong group focus that promotes greater interaction with men, and this positive environment may be conducive to the development of improved social skills, leading to greater perceived social support. Furthermore, the development of close relationships with other men, including those with whom they meet regularly in the I-group context, likely provides a direct increase in the actual availability of social support.

Another explanation for this change is that participation in the MKP may, in some way, affect a man's core beliefs about himself and about the nature of other people and the world. This view is commonly reported by many men in the MKP (see quotation on page 33). Furthermore, qualitative analysis has shown that men express a greater sense of self confidence and self-esteem as a result of participation in the MKP (Mankowski et al., 2001). They write:

Some men mentioned being more able to state what they need, to ask for what they want, to express their opinions without fear or anxiety, to stand up for themselves and defend themselves compared to before they began involvement in

MKP. "It's renewed the confidence in myself that I know I'm a man now. I know that I'm worth something...(pp. 7-8).

The change in the perception of social support may have been facilitated by a new experience of masculinity and relating to other men. Many men often report greater levels of trust and lower fear of other men, and this factor may contribute to the increased level of perceived social support. Mankowski et al. (2001), in reference to their findings on beliefs concerning other men, stated the following:

This (greater trust and less fear of other men) was probably the most common result and possibly the most appreciated. Men reported feeling a sense of belonging and community, increased friendships with other men, and especially reported greater trust of them. "I learned that I could trust men, which I never did before...I was fearful of men...(p 8-9).

Given the somewhat overlapping variance in criterion variables explained by these sub-scales, it is tempting to assume that they measure the same construct. However, as previously mentioned, Sarason et al. (1990) warn against doing so. For one, although there is a clear correlation between availability and satisfaction $r = .354$, consistent with other studies), other measures have higher correlations with both sub-scales (e.g., MKP beliefs). Therefore, the effects of each subscale, though similar in strength, may be through different mechanisms.

For example, in explaining the differences between social support availability and social support satisfaction, Sarason et al. (1990) suggest that availability is more related to (and potentially changed by) social skills and life circumstances, and satisfaction is

more related to internal personality characteristics (such as level of neuroticism). Given those differences, the MKP focus on groups and community may be conducive to the development of greater social skills and new life circumstances (e.g., new close relationships with other men), resulting in greater social support availability. Concurrently, experiences in the MKP (with its focus on emotional expression) may reduce the level of RME (a construct not unrelated to neuroticism), allowing for a simultaneous change in the levels of social support satisfaction.

However, whether greater levels of social support availability and satisfaction helped to enhance well-being or whether enhanced well-being led to increases in social support is unclear. Quite possibly, given that the omnibus post hoc regressions no longer showed social support to be predictive of outcomes after MKP beliefs are controlled for, an increase in social support may be the result of an increase in MKP beliefs or an increase in well-being. Furthermore, there may be other variables, such as self-esteem, not included in this study which not only affect levels of perceived social support, but also more powerfully explain changes in MKP beliefs and the outcome variables of depression, gender role conflict and life satisfaction.

Future research can further address the direction of causality through path analysis or structural equation modeling. In addition, future research could more closely examine the differential effects of social support availability and satisfaction on outcomes, perhaps through inclusion of a control group. A more detailed look at the information provided on the social support questionnaire (e.g., gender of person available, relationship of person available, changes in gender of support providers from

pre-TAW to LTFU and changes in relationship of support provider to participant from pre-TAW to LTFU) would also help to more clearly understand the mechanisms of change in perceived social support.

I-group participation. The primary analysis, exploring if I-group participation would predict more positive outcomes on the criterion variables at LTFU was not supported. None of the primary regressions exploring this hypothesis were significant.

The reason for categorizing the I-group participation into 3 groupings (never participated; participated at one time but not participating at the time of LTFU; and still participating at time of LTFU) was partially related to earlier research (see Burke et al., 2000a; Mankowski et al., 2000a; Mankowski et al., 2000b). In addition, categorizing the I-group variable was undertaken in an attempt to reduce a potentially large error variance in the continuous coding due to much of the data being collected second hand and retrospectively (see Appendix H). However, despite the attempt to carefully construct this measure, the coded I-group participation variable was not predictive of outcomes in the MKP.

This finding is inconsistent with the literature concerning greater participation levels in self-help groups being predictive of more positive outcomes. Additionally, this finding contradicts a generally agreed-upon maxim in the MKP that taking part in an I-group is a very important way of benefitting from the organization (Kauth, 1992).

This lack of a finding has several possible explanations. One is that participation in an I-group, despite it being an activity that many men chose to take part in, does not affect outcomes. The effectiveness of the MKP may derive from the initial TAW and

activities outside of the I-group, and I-group participation, though often well attended and spoken highly of by the men, may not actually affect levels of depression, gender role conflict or life satisfaction. As such, I-group participation may be more enjoyable than impactful.

On a related note, I-group participation, though effective for some men, may not be necessary for improved outcomes. Within this scenario, some men may have improved dramatically after only attending the TAW, washing out the positive effect that I-group participation may have had for other men. Interview data did reveal some men with important political or business careers were constrained by their professional demands from I-group participation, but reported that the experience of the TAW was “life changing.” Similar to the psychotherapy research that shows better (and faster) treatment outcomes for higher functioning clients (Garfield, 1994), perhaps some of the men—for example these men with important careers--benefitted to a greater extent from the TAW alone than did many of the men who also participated in an I-group.

In addition, there may be other factors that make I-group participation less important for improved outcomes. For instance, some men may already have strong male friendships outside of the MKP, or a strong existing social support structure, or have existing assets that allow them to “integrate” the components of the MKP experience outside of I-group participation. As such, though I-group participation may positively influence outcomes for some men, the presence of highly impacted men, or men with alternative sources of support to assist them in integrating their experience, may confound the effects of I-group participation on outcome.

Another explanation is that I-group participation may have been helpful for some men but counter-productive for others, with the results of these two conditions cancelling each other out. Though the interviews revealed that some men report extremely positive experiences in I-groups, some men have reported negative experiences in I-groups, which involved disagreements with the MKP, disagreements with other group members, or being uncomfortable with the I-group's peer led group structure (Mankowski, Humphreys et al., 2001; Mankowski, Silvergleid et al., 2001). Unfortunately, the present study was not able to incorporate the participant's evaluation of the I-group experience, and was not able to examine its effects on outcome.

The secondary analysis--exploring the effects of I-group participation coded continuously (in months)--gave conflicting results. The analyses suggested that higher I-group participation coded continuously predicted lower levels of RME at LTFU, and the effects of I-group participation coded continuously on SPC approached significance. However, greater levels of I-group participation was associated with higher levels of depression, contrary to prediction. Results indicated no effects regarding life satisfaction.

One possible explanation for these contradictory findings is that participation in an I-group, which actively encourages men to shed traditional male behavior for more emotionally honest and "soulful" ways of communication, is effective at reducing gender role conflict. However, I-group participation, though effective in reducing gender role conflict, may not address depression or actually exacerbate it, as the decrease in restricted emotions may remind them of unpleasant aspects of their lives, thereby causing

an increase in depression.

Another explanation is that the men with higher levels of depression are more drawn to the support provided by I-group participation, whereas the men with lower levels of depression do not have as strong a need for I-group support and chose not to participate. Relatedly, it is possible that the men with higher levels of participation have personalities that are naturally drawn to environments that encourage emotional expression, but this same personality may have a greater tendency towards a depressive outlook.

Alternatively, it may be that I-group participation is effective only for reducing repressed emotions and does not improve, or actually worsens, depression. Pennebaker (1989), in exploring the connection between catharsis and its effects upon health and well-being, states that there are different forms of discussing traumatic material. One is “confrontation,” or as he puts it “... individuals actively thinking and/or talking about significant experiences, as well as acknowledging and understanding relevant emotions” (p. 231). The other he describes as “venting,” or a repeated disclosure of negative emotion without any cognitive assimilation or frame of reference—a behavior he describes as having neutral or negative effects upon health (a conclusion also drawn by Berkowitz, 1982). Given Pennebaker’s research and the present study’s findings, it is possible that I-group participation encourages “venting” of emotional material rather than “confrontation” of significant life events, and as such, increase the levels of depression while decreasing repressed emotions.

Future research into the effects of I-group participation might consider examining

the reasons for terminating participation in an I-group, which prior research has shown to vary considerably, and explore its effect on outcome. The current study was not able to determine if the participant had a positive or negative I-group experience. Additional research might also attempt to explain the differential effectiveness of I-group participation on outcome variables, which may help to explain the salient mechanisms that induce change. Included in this would be an examination of the unexpected finding of increased depression resulting from I-group participation. In addition, collection of evaluative data from participants on the factors involved in I-group participation might help to more clearly understand the many ways it impacts participants. Finally, collection of group-level data on the I-groups may help to inform the mechanisms that influence individual participation as well as outcomes.

Non-I-Group MKP participation. The results did not support the hypothesis that non-I-group MKP participation would lead to more positive gains on the criterion variables at LTFU. This result is surprising, given the generally accepted idea within the MKP that taking part in the various activities, most especially staffing a TAW, is a very powerful and impactful experience. Several possible explanations exist for this finding.

For one, participation in non-I-group activities might be nugatory, in that participation is exciting and fun but actually not influential in reducing depression, SPC, RME, and raising life satisfaction. Another explanation is that at this point in their MKP experience, the men have not yet had an opportunity to take part in some of the activities. Staff spots for the TAW, commonly considered the highest impact non-I-group MKP activity, are notoriously difficult to obtain, and it is common for men to be

rejected three times before obtaining a staff position.

Another factor worthy of consideration is that oftentimes men wait a considerable amount of time before attending some of the more powerful workshops, and some of the men's participation may not have been detected by the present study. MKP participation data was collected on average 17.5 months after the TAW--6 months prior to collection of the LTFU--an unavoidable shortcoming of the study design, which may have potentially underestimated participation levels and their association with the criterion variables.

Future research exploring the effects of non-I-group participation might utilize an extended longitudinal perspective that would allow for examination of participation for all men who eventually choose to participate. In addition, future research might examine specific individual activities to determine if they are differentially effective in promoting positive changes. For instance, staffing a TAW is commonly considered to be extremely impactful, and may be qualitatively different than an equal amount of time spent in any other MKP activity.

Significant predictors combined. The regression analysis that combined all of the significant predictors simultaneously in one step revealed increased MKP beliefs was the most consistent predictor, explaining significant variance in three of the four criterion (all but depression). Age 30 to 45 was the second strongest predictor, significantly predicting depression and approaching significance with RME. In addition, increases in social support availability significantly predicted life satisfaction, and social support satisfaction's effect upon depression approached significance. Also, higher levels of I-

group participation significantly predicted higher depression, similar to the secondary analysis and contrary to prediction.

Overall, these findings suggest increased MKP beliefs at LTFU is the most important predictor of positive outcome. This finding is consistent with prior research (Galanter, 1993; Humphreys et al., 1999; Levine & Perkins, 1997; Mankowski, Humphreys et al., 2001; Maton & Salem, 1995). In addition, given the unique nature of the MKP and its goal of working with all men, perhaps increased internalization of a psycho-socially powerful set of beliefs serves as a stimulus for change in an organization that draws from a broad population.

The fact that age coded dichotomously--30 to 45 versus the rest of the sample--was the second most powerful overall predictor suggests that the MKP might be particularly effective with a particular age range. Enhanced social support availability and satisfaction, which significantly predicted all but SPC at LTFU in the primary analyses, only predicted life satisfaction at LTFU in this omnibus regression. Thus, the variance explained by social support in the primary analyses appears to be more strongly explained by MKP beliefs.

Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. For one, although 90 percent of the potential participants completed some aspect of the research protocol, only 42 percent of the men completed all of the requirements necessary to be included in the present study. Men who did not fully participate in the study may have quite possibly differed in important characteristics or attributes from the

men who chose to fully participate. This limitation would apply to the preliminary findings showing improvements on all of the criterion and predictor variables, as well as the findings of the primary and secondary analyses.

To address this concern, the MKP-GW research team made a concerted effort to identify any possible differences in those included and not included in the present study by conducting interviews with 81 percent of the eligible men and asking for their subjective ratings. Mankowski & Silvergleid (2001), randomly selecting from the interviews, found that 84 percent of the men reported an overall positive experience in the organization, with 12 percent reporting mixed or neutral experiences and a small number (4 percent) reporting a negative experience. In addition, they found that the men who did not complete any surveys but who we were able to interview briefly did not differ substantially from the men in the study in their evaluation of their experiences in the organization.

These findings do suggest that the present sample did not have a significantly different overall experience from the men not in the study. However, it does not rule out the possibility that the men not included in the present study were affected differently--either positively or negatively--in unknown ways when compared to the present study sample.

Another factor to consider is the reliance upon self-report measures. A concern of some feminist scholars (e.g., Kimmel, 1995) is the discrepancy between men's self-report of improved well-being and attitudes towards gender, as a result of men's work, and the lack of a similar assessment from their partners and family members. The lack of

a second and more objective source of data weakens the strength of these self-report findings. In addition, the criterion variables used the present study were not able to clearly or directly measure attributes in the men apropos of the “crisis” of masculinity described in the introduction (unemployment, violence, family roles, health, etc.).

This study also suffered from the lack of a control sample or comparison group with which to compare results. Though on the aggregate the men showed improvement, it is not clear from these findings if that improvement was lessened or impeded by participation. Added to this is the fact that the demographic characteristics of this sample of men is unique and might have affected the outcomes. A comparison group of men with different demographic characteristics might help to uncover if these results are due to this being a unique sample of men. In addition, with no comparison group, be it another men’s organization (e.g., Knights of Columbus) or an organization with a powerful weekend experience (e.g., Landmark Forum), it is difficult to understand MKP participation without a grounding to other more established forms of intervention. Furthermore, it is important to take into account the considerable contact made with the participants and the number of data points in the present study, as the outcomes may have been influenced by contact with the research team or by the numerous assessments administered (see Franke & Kaul, 1978, for discussion of the “Hawthorne effect”).

In addition, several of the constructs in this study (e.g., prior year change, participation, self-help group involvement) as well as many of the demographic variables (self-help group involvement, religious affiliation, etc.) may have suffered from a lack of conceptual clarity, measurement, or data collection limitations. As such, more research

on these constructs that are difficult to quantify would need to be collected and analyzed before stronger conclusions could be drawn.

Future Research Directions

Many specific suggestions for possible future research have been considered and noted above. However, more general suggestions are also worthy of consideration.

For one, efforts should be made to find a control group for a study on the effects of the MKP, most likely through the use of a wait-list for weekend attendance. Though exploration of long-term effects would be difficult using a wait-list condition, a comparison of these two conditions two to five months after the TAW would allow for a deeper understanding of the effects of participation. In addition, use of a comparison group—be it another alternative men’s organization (such as one of the religious men’s programs or the “Sterling” men’s weekend), a more traditional men’s organization (such as The Shriners, Masons, or the Knights of Columbus) or another transformational weekend (such as Life Success or Landmark Forum) would help to more clearly identify the unique factors affected by participation in the MKP.

In order to obtain data outside of self-report, efforts might include obtaining more objective criterion measures, such as medical record data. This avenue would permit comparison of the MKP participation data to an objective and important benchmark such as health. In addition, attempts to measure aspects of the men’s lives more closely associated with some of factors involved in the “crisis” of masculinity (e.g., satisfaction with being parent-partner-husband, job satisfaction, attitudes towards

violence, etc.) would allow research to more precisely determine the effects of participation.

Future research would also benefit from a closer examination of potential predictors of change. For example, examination of readiness to change using Prochaska et. al's (1992) stages of change model for specific life circumstances or a measure of satisfaction on current circumstances (e.g., satisfaction with job-family-role as father), might indicate more precisely who would benefit from participation in the MKP.

Another option would be to obtain interviews with partners of the MKP participants to gain a more careful understanding of how MKP participation might affect aspects of gender, parenting, division of labor in the home, and relationship dynamics-- concerns that feminist scholars have stated mythopoetic work may sidestep. The present study made an attempt to collect peer questionnaires in order to gain an alternative perspective (e.g., from partner, co-worker, friend, etc.) on the constructs under consideration. However, the return rate for the peer questionnaires for the 100 men in this study was only 49 percent, making analysis of that data impractical. Future research might make the collection of peer or partner data a more central aspect of their research data design and collection.

Summary

This study suggests that the MKP is effective in fostering positive change for the men who choose to participate. Virtually every construct examined—including measures of well-being, social support, gender role attitudes--showed significant improvement. In

addition, subjective evaluations of the overall MKP experience obtained in the interviews suggest it is a positive experience for the men who take part.

The results exploring the differential effects of the pre-existing factors were not as strong. None of the pre-TAW predictors explored in the primary analyses were significant, though secondary analysis did show better outcomes for men aged 30 to 45 and those with church group experience.

Based on the finding for age, MKP participation may have been more effective for men approaching and experiencing middle age. Though no firm conclusions can be made from this study, this unique intervention might have positive effects on men near the mid-point of their lives. In addition, given the spiritual nature of the MKP, participation in the MKP was possibly affected by previous experience in religious activities.

Generally speaking, the predictors affected by MKP participation were more successful in predicting positive outcomes. Increased MKP beliefs and perceived social support were strongly predictive of positive outcomes on the criterion variables at LTFU. In addition, although I-group participation coded categorically did not reveal any significant predictions, I-group participation coded continuously was predictive of both improving (RME and in part SPC) and worsening (depression) outcome scores. Non I-group MKP participation had no significant findings.

Overall, the MKP appears to offer a valuable opportunity for the men who choose to participate, and this study provides several possible pathway of influence. These findings also outline areas that would benefit from further research, such as an

exploration of effectiveness based on age grouping, the effects of participation on men with experience in organized religion, the role of participation in small, self-led support groups for mythopoetic men, the influence of adaption of beliefs on outcome, and the effects participation has upon social support.

References

- Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. D. (1985). *Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation*. In J. C. Coyne (Ed.), *Essential papers on depression*. (pp.259-301). New York: New York University Press.
- Allen, M., & Robinson, J. (1994). *Angry men, passive men: Understanding the roots of men's anger and how to move beyond it*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Andrews, F. M., & Withey, S. B. (1988). *Social indicators of well-being: Americans' perceptions of life quality*. New York: Plenum.
- Antze, P. (1976). Role of ideology in peer psychotherapy groups. In M. A. Lieberman, L. D. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Self-help groups for coping with crisis: Origins, members, processes, and impact*. (pp. 272-304) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Are men necessary?: The male dodo. (1995, December 23). *The Economist*, pp. 1-5.
- Barrera, M. (1986). Distinctions between social support concepts, measures, and models. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *14*, 413-445.
- Barrera, M. (2000). Social support research in community psychology. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology*, (pp.215-245). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 165-174.

- Berenbaum, H. R., Snowwhite, R., & Oltmanns, T. F. (1987). Anhedonia and emotional responses to affect evoking stimuli. *Psychological Medicine, 17*, 677-684.
- Berkowitz, L. (1982). Aversive conditions as stimuli to aggression. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology: Volume 15*, (pp 249-288). New York: Academic Press.
- Betz, N. E., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1993). Individuality and diversity: Theory and research in counseling psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 44*, 343-381.
- Beutler, L. E. (2000). David and Goliath: When empirical and clinical standards of practice meet. *American Psychologist, 55*, 997-1007.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*, 461-465.
- Bly, R. (1990). *Iron John: A book about men*. New York: Random House.
- Borkman, T. (1991). Introduction to the special issue. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 19*, 643-650.
- Brown, S. D. (1993). Therapeutic processes in Alcoholics Anonymous. In B. S. McCrady & W. R. Miller (Eds.), *Research on Alcoholics Anonymous: Opportunities and alternatives* (pp.137-152). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies.

- Buck, R., Miller, R. E., & Caul, W. F. (1974). Sex, personality and physiological variables in the communication of affect via facial expression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 587-596.
- Burda, P. C., Vaux, A., & Schill, T. (1984). Social support resources: Variation across sex and sex role. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10, 119-126.
- Burke, C. K., Maton, K. I., Anderson, C. W., Hoover, S. H., Mankowski, E. M., & Silvergleid, C. S. (August, 2001) *Changes Associated with Participation in the ManKind Project: Eighteen Months Follow-up*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA .
- Burke, C. K., Maton, K. I., Anderson, C. A., Hoover, S. H., Mankowski, E. M., Silvergleid, C. (July, 2000a). *Gender role conflict and psychological well-being: An exploration in men enrolled to attend an "initiatory" weekend and subsequent organizational involvement*. Paper presented at the National Organization for Men Against Sexism (NOMAS), Colorado Springs, CO, July 2000.
- Burke, C. K. (2000b). *Gender role conflict and psychological well-being: An exploration in men enrolled to attend an "initiatory" weekend*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD.

- Clatterbaugh, K. (1997). *Contemporary Perspectives on Masculinity: Men, Women, and Politics in Modern Society*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 38, 300-314.
- Corrigan, E. M. (1980) *Alcoholic women in treatment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Engendering health: A social constructionist examination of men's health beliefs and behaviors. *Psychology of men and masculinity*, 30, 4-15.
- Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. W. (1990). Type of social support and specific stress: Toward a theory of optimal matching. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce, (Eds.) *Social support: An interactional view* (pp. 319-366). New York: Wiley.
- Diener, E., Sue, E. M., Lucas, R. E. & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276-302.
- Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification*, 11, 123-136.
- Faludi, S. (1999). *Stiffed: The betrayal of the American man*. New York: William Morrow.

- Felner, R. D., Brand, S., Adan, A. M., Mulhall, P. F., Flowers, N., Sartain, B., & DuBois, D. L. (1993). Restructuring the ecology of the school as an approach to prevention during school transitions: Longitudinal follow-ups and extensions of the school transitional environment project (STEP). *Prevention in Human Services, 10*, 103-136.
- Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1997). Men and psychotherapy: An investigation of alexithymia, intimacy, and masculine gender roles. *Psychotherapy, 34*, 160-170.
- Fowler, J. W. (1993). Alcoholics Anonymous and faith development. In B. S. McCrady & W. R. Miller, (Eds.) *Research on Alcoholics Anonymous: Opportunities and alternatives* (pp.113-136). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies.
- Franke, R. H., & Kaul, J. D. (1978). The Hawthorne experiments: First statistical interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 43*, 623-643.
- Franko, D. L. (1987). Anorexia nervosa and bulimia: A self-help group. *Small Group Behavior, 18*, 398-407.
- Fujita, F., Diener, E., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Gender differences in negative affect and well being: The case for emotional literacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 427-434.
- Galanter, M. (1988). Zealous self-help groups as adjuncts to psychiatric treatment: A study of Recovery, Inc.. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 145*, 1248-1253.
- Garfield, S. L. (1994). Research on client variables in psychotherapy. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (4th ed., pp. 190-228). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Geary, D. C. (1998). *Male, female: The evolution of human sex differences*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Genia, V. (1997). The spiritual experience index: Revision and reformulation. *Review of Religious Research, 38*, 344-361.
- Goll, J. (March, 2001). *The impact of men's initiation training on self-actualization and spiritual maturity*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Men's Studies Association, Albuquerque, NM.
- Good, G. E., Borst, T. S., & Wallace, D. L. (1994). Masculinity research: A review and critique. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 3*, 3-14.
- Good, G. E., Dell, D. M., & Mintz, L. B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help-seeking in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 295-300.
- Good, G. E., & Mintz, L. B. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence for compounded risk. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69* (Sept./ Oct.), 17-21.
- Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., O'Neil, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Stevens, M., DeBord, K. A., Bartels, K. M., & Braverman, D. G. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 3-10.
- Good, G. E., & Wood, P. K. (1995). Male gender role conflict, depression and help seeking: Do college men face double jeopardy? *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74* (Sept. / Oct.), 70-75.

- Glodfried, M. R., & Davidson, G. C. (1994). *Clinical behavior therapy*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gottlieb, B. H. (1988). Marshaling social support: The state of the art in research and practice. In B. H. Gottlieb (Ed.) *Marshaling social support: Formats, processes, and effects*. (pp.11-51). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hall, A. & Wellman, B. (1985). Social networks and social support. In S. Cohen & S. Syme (Eds.) *Social support and health*. (pp. 23-41). New York: Academic Press
- Hardin, S. I., & Yaniko, B. J. (1983). Counselor gender, type of problem and expectations about counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*, 294-297.
- Harrison, J., Macguire, P., & Pitcealthy, C. (1995). Confiding in crisis: Gender differences in pattern of confiding among cancer patients. *Social Science Medicine, 41*, 1255-1260.
- Hartman, B. T. (1994). *Masculine gender role stress and the men's movement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, Bloomington, IN.
- Heesacker, M., & Prichard, S. (1992). In a different voice, revisited: Men, women and emotion. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 274-290.
- Heppner, P. P. (1995). On gender role conflict in men--Future directions and implications for counseling: Comment on Good et al. (1995) and Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 20-23.
- Hildingh, C., Fridlund, B., & Segesten, K. (1995). Social support in self-help groups, as experienced by persons having coronary heart disease and their next of kin. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 32*, 224-232.

- House, J. S., (1987). Social support and social structure. *Sociological Forum*, 2, 135-146.
- House, J. S., Umberson, D., & Landis, K. R. (1988). Structures and processes of social support. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 293-318.
- Humphreys, K., Mankowski, E., Moos, R. H., & Finney, J. W. (1999). Do enhanced friendship networks and active coping mediate the effect of self-help groups on substance abuse? *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 21, 54-60.
- Jacobs, M. K., & Goodman, G. (1989). Psychology and self-help groups: Predictions on a partnership. *American Psychologist*, 44, 536-545.
- Jung, C. G. (1976). The stages of life. In J. Campbell (Ed.), *The portable Jung* (3-22). NY: Viking.
- Katz, A. H., & Bender, E. I. (1990). *Helping one another: Self-help groups in a changing world*. Oakland, CA: Third Party Publishing.
- Kahn, R., & Antonucci, T. (1980). Convoys over the life course: Attachments, roles, and social support. In P. Baltes & O. Brim (Eds.), *Life span development and behavior* (Vol. 3, pp. 253-286). New York: Academic Press.
- Kauth, B. (1992). *A circle of men*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kessler, R. C., Brown, R. L., & Broman, C. L. (1981). Sex differences in psychiatric help seeking: Evidence from four large-scale surveys. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 22, 49-64.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. New York: Free Press.

- Kimmel, M. S. (Ed.). (1995). *The politics of manhood: Pro-feminist men respond to the Mythopoetic men's movement (and the mythopoetic leaders answer)*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Knight, B., Wollert, R., Levy, L. H., Frame, C. L., & Padgett, V. P. (1980). Self-help groups: The member's perspectives. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 8, 53-65.
- Kupers, T. A. (1993). *Revisioning men's lives: Gender, intimacy and power*. New York: Guilford.
- Kurtz, L. F. (1988). Mutual aid for affective disorders: The Manic Depressive and Depressive Association. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 58, 152-155.
- Kurtz, L. F. (1990). The self-help movement: Review of the past decade of research. *Social Work with Groups*, 13, 101-115.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Launier, R. (1978). Stress related transactions between person and environment. In L.A. Pervin & M. Lewis (Eds.), *Perspectives in interactional psychology*, (pp.287-327). New York: Plenum.
- Levant, R. F., & Kopecky, G.(1995). *Masculinity reconstructed: Changing the rules of manhood: At work, in relationships and in family life*. New York: Penguin.
- Levin, J. (1997). *Psychological impact of a mythopoetic initiation on participants*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Adler School of Professional Psychology, Chicago, IL.

- Levy, L. H., Derby, J. F., & Martinkowski, K. S. (1993). Effects of membership in bereavement support groups on adaptation to conjugal bereavement. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21*, 1993.
- Levy, L. H. (2000). Self-help groups. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology*, (pp. 591-613). New York: Plenum.
- Lieberman, M. A. (1979). Help seeking and self-help groups. In M. A. Lieberman & L. D. Borman (Eds.), *Self-help groups for coping with crisis: Origins, members, processes, and impact* (pp. 116-149). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lieberman, M. A. (1983). Comparative analysis of change mechanisms in groups. In H. H. Blumberg, A. P. Hare, V. Kent, & M. Davies (Eds.), *Small groups and social interaction*, (Vol. 2, pp. 57-81). London: Wiley.
- Lieberman, M. A., Borman, L. D., & Associates (1976). *Self-help groups for coping with crisis: Origins, members, processes, and impact*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lieberman, M. A., & Videca-Sherman, L. (1986). The impact of self-help groups on the mental health of widows and widowers. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56*, 435- 449.
- Levine, M. (1988). An analysis of mutual assistance. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 16*, 167-188.
- Levine, M., & Perkins, D. V. (1997). *Principles of community psychology: Perspectives and applications*. (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Luke, D.A., Roberts, L., & Rappaport, J. (1993). Individual, group context, and individual-group fit predictors of self-help group attendance. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 29*, 216-238.
- ManKind Project. (2000). *The New Warrior Training Adventure* [Brochure]. Malone, NY: Author.
- Mankowski, E. S., Humphreys, K., & Moos, R. H. (2001). Individual and contextual predictors of involvement in twelve step self-help groups after substance abuse treatment. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 29*, 537-563.
- Mankowski, E. M., Maton, K. I., Benafsha, A. & Burke, C. K. (2000a, April). *Predicting participation and retention in a men's mutual support group*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Portland, OR.
- Mankowski, E. M., Maton, K. I., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S. H., & Anderson, C. A. (2000b). Collaborative research with a men's organization: Psychological impact, group functioning, and organizational growth. In E. Barton (Ed.), *Mythopoetic perspectives on men's healing work: An anthology for therapists and others* (pp.183-203). Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Mankowski, E. S., Silvergleid, C. S, Maton, K. I., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S. A., Anderson, C. W., & Martin, C. (August, 2001). *Evaluation of the Mankind Project: Qualitative and quantitative outcome data*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA

- Mankowski, E. M., & Wyer, R. S. (1997). Cognitive causes and consequences of perceived social support. In G. R. Pierce, B. Lakey, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Sourcebook of social support and personality*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Maton, K. I. (1989a). Community settings as buffers of life stress? Highly supportive churches, mutual help groups and senior centers. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 17*, 203-232.
- Maton, K. I. (1989b). Towards an ecological understanding of mutual-help groups: The social ecology of fit. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 17*, 729-753.
- Maton, K. I. (2000). Mutual help and self-help. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology*, (pp. 357-360). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- McCormick, I. A., Siegert, R. J., & Walkey, F. H. (1987). Dimensions of social support: A factorial confirmation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15*, 73-77.
- McCrary, B. S., & Miller, W. R. (Eds.). (1993). *Research on Alcoholics Anonymous: Opportunities and alternatives*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies.
- Moore, R., & Gillette, D. (1990). *King, warrior, magician, lover: Rediscovering the archetypes of the mature masculine*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Morganstern J., & McCrary, B. S. (1993). Cognitive processes and change in disease-model treatment. In B. S. McCrary & W. R. Miller, (Eds.), *Research on Alcoholics Anonymous: Opportunities and alternatives.*, (pp.153-166). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies.

- Naroll, R. (1983). *The moral order: An introduction to the human situation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- New Warrior Network (1997). *The New Warrior Handbook*. London: Author.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Olds, D. L. (1988). The prenatal/early infancy project. In R. H. Price, E.L. Cowen, R. P. Lorion, & J. Ramos-McKay, (Eds.), *Fourteen ounces of prevention: A casebook for practitioners* (pp. 9-23). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- O'Neil, J. M.. (1981a). Male sex-role conflict, sexism, and masculinity: Implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologist. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 9, 61-80.
- O'Neil, J. M.. (1981b). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 60, 203-210.
- O'Neil, J. M.. (1982). Gender role conflict and strain in men's lives: Implications for psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human service providers. In K. Solomon & N. B. Levy (Eds.), *Men in transition: Changing male roles, theory, and therapy* (pp. 61-80). New York: Plenum.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles*, 14, 335-350.
- O'Neil, J. M., Good, G. E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New paradigms for empirical research. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.) *A new psychology of men*, (pp.146-167). New York: Basic Books.

- Orford, J. (1992). *Community psychology: Theory and practice*. New York: Wiley.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment, 5*, 164-172.
- Pennebaker, J. W. (1989). Confession, inhibition and disease. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology: Volume 22*. (pp.211-244). New York: Academic Press.
- Picchioni, A. (1992). Men, masculinity and therapy. *TCA Journal, 20*, 9-17.
- Polich, J. M., Armor, D. J., & Braiker, H. B. (1980). *The course of alcoholism: Four years after treatment*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Poole, G., Poon, C., Achille, M., White, K., Franz, N., Jittler, S., Watt, K., Cox, D. N., & Doll, R. (2001). Social support for patients with prostate cancer: The effects of support groups. *Journal of Psychosocial Oncology, 19*, 1-16.
- Prochaska, J. O., DiClemente, C. C., & Norcross, J. C. (1992). In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behaviors. *American Psychologist, 47*, 1102-1114.
- Promise Keepers. (1994). *Seven promises of a promise keeper*. Colorado Springs, CO: Focus on the Family Publishing.
- Robertson, J. M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1992). Overcoming the masculine mystique: Preferences for alternative forms of assistance among men who avoid counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 240-246.
- Richard, D. J. (1999). *The therapeutic status of the mythopoetic approach: A psychological perspective*. Unpublished manuscript, Northeastern University, Boston, MA.

- Richards, T.J., & Richards, L. (1994). Using computers in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 445-462). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Riessman, F. & Banks, E. C. (2001). A marriage of opposites: Self-help and the health care system. *American Psychologist*, 56, 173-174.
- Rohr, R. (1994). *The quest for the grail*. New York: Crossroad Publishing.
- Room, R. (1993). Alcoholics Anonymous as a social movement. In B. S. McCrady & W. R. Miller (Eds.), *Research on Alcoholics Anonymous: Opportunities and alternatives* (pp.167-188). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies.
- Sandstrom, K. L. (1996). Searching for information, understanding, and self-value: The utilization of peer support groups by gay men with HIV/AIDS. *Social Work in Health Care*, 23, 51-74.
- Sarason, B. R., Pierce, G. R., Shearin, E. N., Sarason, I. G., & Waltz, J. A. (1991). Perceived social support and working models of self and actual others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 273-287.
- Sarason, B. R., Sarason, I. G., & Pierce, G. R. (1990). Traditional views of social support and their impact on assessment. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce (Eds.), *Social support: An interactional view*, (pp. 9-25). New York: Wiley.
- Sarason, I. G., Levine, H. M., Basham, R. B., & Sarason, B. R. (1983). Assessing social support: The social support questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 127-139.

- Schwab, R. (1995). Bereaved parents and support group participation. *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 32*, 49-61.
- Schwalbe, M. (1996). *Unlocking the iron cage: The men's movement, gender politics, and American culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schwartz, G. E., Brown, S. L., & Ahern, G. L. (1980). Facial muscle patterning and subjective experience during affective imagery: Sex differences. *Psychophysiology, 17*, 75-82.
- Schulz, G. (1997). *The rise of the mythopoetic men's movement: A psychosocial analysis*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Long Beach.
- Sharpe, M. J., Heppner, P. P., & Dixon, W. A. (1995). Gender role conflict, instrumentality, expressiveness, and well-being in adult men. *Sex Roles, 33*, 1-18.
- Sharpe, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). Gender role, gender role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 323-330.
- Shostrom, E. L. (1974). *Personal orientation inventory manual: An inventory for the measurement of self-actualization*. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Sternbach, J. (1990). The men's seminar: An educational and support group for men. *Social Work with Groups, 13*, 23-39.0
- Stillson, R. W., O'Neil, J. M., & Owen, S. V. (1991). Predictors of adult men's gender-role conflict: Race, class, unemployment, age, instrumentality-expressiveness, and personal strain. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 458-464.

- Suh, E., Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Triandis, H. C. (1998). The shifting basis of life satisfaction judgments across cultures: Emotions versus norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 482-493.
- Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tardy, C. H. (1985). Social support measurement. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*, 187-202.
- Taylor, S. E., Falke, R. L., Shoptaw, S. J., & Lichtman, R. (1986). Social support, support groups, and the cancer patient. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54*, 608-615.
- Tiger, L. (1999). *The decline of males*. New York: Golden Books.
- Tolsdorf, C. (1976). Social networks, support, and coping: An exploratory study. *Family Process, 15*, 407-417.
- Vaux, A. (1988). *Social support: Theory, research and intervention*. New York: Praeger.
- Williams R. C., & Myer, R. A. (1992). The men's movement: An adjunct to traditional counseling approaches. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 393-404.
- Wisch, A. F., Mahalik, J. R., Hayes, J. A., & Nutt, E. A. (1995). The impact of gender role conflict and counseling technique on psychological help seeking in men. *Sex Roles, 33*, 77-89.
- Wuthnow, R. (1994). *Sharing the journey: Support groups and America's new quest for community*. New York: Free Press.

Wuthnow, R. (2000). *After heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950's*. Berkeley:
University of California Press.

Appendix A: Significant Chi Square Analyses of Demographic Characteristics Between
Men in and not in the Present Study (Table A1).

Chi-Square Tests Comparing Sexual Orientation on Study Versus Non Study

		In Study		Total	
		No	Yes		
Sexual orientation	Hetro	Count	98	74	172
		% within orient.	57.0%	43.0%	100.0%
	Gay- bi	Count	14	25	39
		% within orient.	35.9%	64.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	112	99	211

Chi-Square Tests For Sexual Orientation on Study Versus Non Study

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	5.672	1	.017

Table A1 Continued.

Chi Square analysis comparing therapy experience within study inclusion

		In Study		Total	
		no	yes		
therapy experience	no	Count	30	11	41
		% within therapy experience	73.2%	26.8%	100.0%
	yes	Count	93	89	182
		% within therapy experience	51.1%	48.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	123	100	223

Significance levels for Chi Square on Therapy Experience

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.591	1	.010

Table A1 Continued.

Chi-Square Tests For Self-help Group Experience on Study Versus Non Study

classification of shg involvement		In Study		Total
		no	yes	
never	Count	61	34	95
	% within SHG	64.2%	35.8%	100.0%
< 5 years	Count	28	36	64
	% within SHG	43.8%	56.3%	100.0%
> 5 years	Count	34	30	64
	% within SHG	53.1%	46.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	123	100	223

Chi-Square Tests For Self-help Group Experience on Study Versus Non Study

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.622	2	.036

Table A1 Continued.

Chi-Square Tests For Church Group Experience on Study Versus Non Study

church group experience		Within study		Total
		no	yes	
never	Count	90	55	145
	% within ch. group	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%
< 5 years	Count	17	17	34
	% within ch. group	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
> 5 years	Count	16	28	44
	% within ch. group	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	123	100	223

Chi-Square Tests For Church Group Experience on Study Versus Non Study

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.449	2	.009

Appendix B: Pre-weekend, post-weekend, 6 months post-weekend, and long -term
follow-up weekend questionnaire research questionnaire packet contents.

Table B1: Sample of Cover Letter from MKP-GW Center Director Included in Pre-packet.

February, 1998

Men,

I want to take this opportunity to honor you for your commitment to attend the New Warrior Training Adventure weekend. It is a powerful and life-changing experience from which many men, including myself, have drawn great strength and wisdom. It is a courageous step into self- exploration, and one that will allow you to live in a manner more vigorous and exciting than you ever thought possible. Congratulations!

Today, I am excited about this chance to introduce a unique opportunity we all have to improve New Warrior and to learn more about men's work and our shared experience as men. Three New Warrior brothers, Ken Maton, Clinton Anderson and Chris Burke, have begun a study that will provide us information about the success of our training program and about many important aspects of our lives and beliefs. After careful deliberation, we on the New Warrior Council and Leader Body have given our full support to these men in their efforts. They have shown that they can be fully trusted and are men of integrity.

To date, over 100 men have participated in the research. Feedback from these men about the study has been positive. I encourage you to become involved in the research project by responding to the important and wide-ranging questions about men's lives on the enclosed survey.

The questions asked in the study should bring up important topics that many within our organization have felt to be key to their development as men. Use it as a guide to some of the possible issues you may want to bring up at the training. Not only will this study help guide you in your development as a man, but it will help us to better understand how men's lives are affected by the training. It will let the psychological community know that New Warrior is a viable option for men who are looking for a more invigorating way to live their lives. It will, in essence, help us to be a stronger organization.

Please read their cover letter as it describes the study more fully. Do not hesitate to call Ken or Chris if you have any questions or comments about their work. They are good men and have a love for what they do. Although your participation in this study is voluntary and will in no way affect your involvement in the weekend training, it is my judgment that this research will be beneficial for men in our society and for New Warrior.

Once again I congratulate you for your taking actions to improve your life. I look forward to seeing you at the weekend training.

Sincerely,

Robert Powell
Center Director and New Warrior Network Center Director

Table B2:

Sample of Research Team Cover Letter Included in Pre-packet.

August, 1997

Men,

As Robert Powell described in his letter, we are conducting a study about the lives of men involved in New Warrior training weekends and the Integration groups that follow. Two important goals inspired us to do this research. We wanted to help make New Warrior a more effective organization. How can the training be improved to meet the needs of the men in New Warrior? We also wanted to understand more about the lives, experiences, and development of men in these changing times.

We are asking you to take part in this study. Your participation would involve answering the enclosed questionnaire before your weekend training and sharing with us your experiences about your life and your viewpoints at several times after the training. Your involvement is voluntary, and is not a requirement of the New Warrior training. However the participation of as many men as possible is needed to ensure that our results are valid and a true representation of the organization.

We ask that you complete the following steps:

- 1) Read and sign the consent form, which further describes the work we are doing and clearly states the nature of your involvement.
- 2) Return the consent form in the small stamped addressed envelope enclosed.
- 3) Fill out the questionnaire. It should take about 30 minutes of your time.
- 4) Return the questionnaire in the larger envelope provided. It is important that you complete and return the questionnaire before the start of your weekend training.

If you have any questions about the research, please contact either Ken (410-455-2567 / MATON@umbc2.umbc.edu) or Chris (410 536 2046 / CBURKE2@umbc2.umbc.edu). We are passionate about and fully committed to our work, and it would be a pleasure to discuss it with you. The results of the study will be made available to all interested participants. If you decide not to participate, please return all materials in the stamped envelope provided.

In closing, we want to congratulate you on your decision to attend the weekend training. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Warmly,

Ken Maton

Clinton Anderson

Chris Burke

Table B3

Sample Cover Letter from MKP Center Director Included in Post-weekend

Packet.

November 1997

Men,

It brings me great joy to write you all now as initiated men. As you are now aware, the training adventure is challenging physically, mentally, emotionally and spiritually. It is a courageous step that you have taken, and I hope that you found it rewarding.

I want to encourage each man to complete the enclosed questionnaire. It is the second in a series of questionnaires that New Warrior brothers Ken Maton, Chris Burke and Clinton Anderson (a new member of the team) and their colleagues are putting out to help us more clearly understand how New Warriors affects mens' lives. I honor their gift of time, effort and talent. I am in close contact with them and I judge their motives and energy to be good. In addition, many men in the Warrior community are very interested in seeing the outcome of this work.

Once again, use this questionnaire as a guide to help you more clearly understand how the weekend may have affected you. In addition, your completion of the questionnaire will help both Warriors and the larger society to more clearly understand the impact of the weekend on men.

Welcome to the New Warrior Washington community. I am pleased to have you among us. I encourage you to take part in the community, and I look forward to getting to know you better.

Robert Powell

Joyous Timber Wolf

Center Director and New Warrior Network Center Director

Table B4

Sample of Letter from Research Team Sent in Post-weekend Packet.

November 1997

Men,

Congratulations on your completion of the New Warrior Training Adventure. We hope that it had a positive and life changing effect upon you.

You may recall that we are conducting a study that looks at how New Warrior affects views of manhood. We hope that you were given the chance to complete a questionnaire before the training weekend. **This questionnaire is the follow-up to the one given before the weekend and will allow us to see how the training affected your responses in certain key areas.** Even if you did not have the chance to complete the pre-weekend questionnaire, we ask that you complete this one, as it will still help us to show the social science community and ourselves the effect that New Warriors has on mens' lives.

We ask that you do the following:

- ▶ The questionnaire has taken most men between 25 and 30 minutes to complete, although a small number of men have taken up to an hour on it.
- ▶ **The questionnaire does not have to be completed in one sitting and can be done in small sections.**
- ▶ The last page asks for background information. Please fill out the background information page if you did not do so on the questionnaire given before the weekend.
- ▶ Please return the questionnaire in the self addressed stamped envelope attached to this package.

We are interested in your feedback and your viewpoints. We will be calling you sometime in the next month to gain your perspective and answer any questions you may have about the work we are doing. If you have any questions about our work, please do not hesitate to call us at the numbers below. Thank you for your time completing the questionnaire and helping to improve NW and mens' lives.

Sincerely,

Ken Maton
(410) 455-2567
maton@umbc2.umbc.edu

Chris Burke
(410) 536-2046
cburke2@umbc2.umbc.edu

Clint Anderson
(202)336-6037
cwa.apa@email.apa.org

Table B5

Informed Consent Form Sent in Research Packet.

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

TITLE: Change Over Time in a Men's Support Organization

I. PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY: I am aware that the purpose of the new research is to examine change over time in men who become involved in New Warrior Washington (NWW), a men's support organization.

II. PROCEDURES: I will be contacted by mail prior to the weekend and asked to complete and return a self-report questionnaire. The same questionnaire will be given to me immediately after the weekend, and again 6 months and 18 months following the weekend.

I may also be asked to take part in an interview 1 year after the training weekend. The interviews will be tape recorded, and will be held either in my home, or over the phone, depending on logistical considerations. Finally, I will be asked to select two individuals who have known me well over an extended period of time who I feel would be willing to provide information to the research team about their perspectives on how I have changed since beginning participation in NWW.

III. POSSIBLE BENEFITS: Participation in this research will potentially benefit NWW and its participants by providing information that may enable the program to more effectively meet the needs of its participants.

IV. POSSIBLE RISKS: There are no known risks.

V. CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS: All questionnaire information provided will be fully anonymous. Any information learned from this study in which I may be identified will be confidential and disclosed only with my permission. By signing this form, however, I allow the research study investigator to make my records available to the University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office and regulatory agencies as required by law. If information learned from this study is published, I will not be identified by name.

VI. OFFER TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AND RESEARCH INJURY NOTIFICATION: The principle investigator, Dr. Kenneth Maton, who is responsible for this research study, has offered to and has answered any and all questions regarding my participation in this research study. If I have further questions or in the event of a research related injury, I can contact Dr. Kenneth Maton at (410) 455-2567, 455-2209 or 455-3110.

Table B5 Continued.

VII. EXPLANATION OF TREATMENT AND COMPENSATION FOR INJURY: It is the UMBC policy that in the event of physical injury to a research participant, resulting from research procedures, appropriate medical treatment will be provided by UMBC to the injured research participant but financial compensation will not be available.

VIII. VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION WITH RIGHT OF REFUSAL: I have been informed that my participation in this study is voluntary. I am free to withdraw my consent for participation in this study at any time.

IX. IRB REVIEW AND IMPARTIAL THIRD PARTY: This study has been reviewed and approved by the UMBC Institutional Review Board (IRB). A representative of that Board, from the IRB office, is available to discuss the review process or my rights as a research participant. The telephone number of the IRB office is (410) 455-2737.

X. SIGNATURE FOR CONSENT: The above-named investigator has answered my questions and I agree to be a research subject in this study.

Print Participant's Name: _____ Date: _____

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Investigator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Table B6

Questionnaire Used for Pre, Post, 6 Months and Long-term Follow-Up.

PRE-WEEKEND RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire asks you about several areas of your life. On average it has taken the previous men 30 minutes to complete, although some have spent up to an hour on it. We recommend that you use these parameters to estimate the length of time that it may take you to complete it. If it helps you in planning to complete this, **it does not have to be answered in one sitting.** We encourage you to answer the questions as honestly as possible.

We value your privacy and our intention is to maintain strict anonymity throughout the research. However, we do need a way of identifying the same person who will fill out several questionnaires at different points in time. In order that we may be able to do this, we are asking you to give us information which will allow us to identify future questionnaires you complete, but will not allow us to identify you by name.

Please fill out the following three questions.

First car that you owned (Include color) _____
Your mother's maiden name _____
Last 4 digits of your Social Security Number _____

Date of questionnaire Completion: __/__/__

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT!

Table B6 Continued

Background Information

People have different stereotypes about who takes part in men's groups like New Warrior. To help us provide more accurate information about New Warrior participants, please fill out the information below.

- 1.Age _____ 2.Marital Status _____
 3.Ethnicity _____ 4.Religious Preference _____
 5.Number of children living in your home _____
 6.Last level of education completed _____
 7.Current Occupation/Job Description _____
 8.Sexual Orientation _____ 9.Ever Served in the Military?

Please indicate your current and past involvement in the following.

- | | Currently
Involved | Ever
Involved | Length of
involvement | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| 10. 12-step self-help groups | Yes | No | Yes | No _____ |
| 11. Other types of self-help groups, except men's groups | Yes | No | Yes | No _____ |
| 12. Other men's groups | Yes | No | Yes | No _____ |
| 13. Church groups or religious organizations | Yes | No | Yes | No _____ |
| 14. Therapy with a therapist who has done the NW training | Yes | No | Yes | No _____ |
| 15. Therapy with a therapist not connected with NWW | Yes | No | Yes | No _____ |
| 16. Did you receive a scholarship for the weekend? | Yes | No | | |
| 17. How did you find out about the NWW training weekend: | | | | |
| a. Existing warrior | Yes | No | | |
| b. Media (Books, TV, etc) | Yes | No | | |
| c. Therapist | Yes | No | | |
| d. Other _____ | | | | |

Table B6 Continued

Below are listed a number of goals people might have for their life.

For each goal listed, first indicate how important a personal goal this is for you, using the first set of numbers listed.

Then, for each goal listed, indicate how satisfied you are about your current level of achievement of the goal, using the second set of numbers listed. In both cases, please use the following scale.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Pretty	Very
		How important is the goal to you?			How satisfied are you with your level of achievement of the goal?
1. Being successful in my line of work		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
2. Having a happy family life		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
3. Having a high quality relationship with a spouse/partner		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
4. Having lots of money		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
5. Having strong friendships		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
6. Having strong friendships with other men		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
7. Assuming leadership roles		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
8. Developing leadership qualities		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
9. Working to correct social, racial, or economic inequalities		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
10. Having leisure time to enjoy my own interests		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
11. Serving as a model for other men		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
12. Helping other men develop and grow		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
13. Being effective and "present" as a father (if applicable)		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
14. Having a deep spiritual life		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
15. Having good physical health		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
16. _____		1 2 3 4 5			1 2 3 4 5
Any other important life goal we did not ask about? Please write in)					

Table B6 Continued

Below are listed 31 statements. Please circle the number in the right hand column that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	1	2	3	4	5	6			
	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree			
1. Moving up the career ladder is important to me.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. I have difficulty telling others I care about them.				1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.				1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Affection with other men makes me tense.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
7. I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.				1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
9. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
10. I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
11. Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
12. Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
13. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
14. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
15. Hugging other men is difficult for me.			1	2	3	4	5	6	

Table B6 Continued	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree
16. Doing well all the time is important to me.						
			1	2	3	4
17. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
18. I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
19. I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
20. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
21. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
22. Competing with others is the best way to succeed.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
23. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
24. Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
25. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
26. I do not like to show my emotion to other people.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
27. I strive to be more successful than others.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
28. Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
29. I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
30. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4
31. I like to feel superior to other people.			1	2	3	4
			1	2	3	4

Table B6 Continued

This is a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Please read each one carefully. After you have done so, please circle the number that best describes HOW MUCH DISCOMFORT THAT PROBLEM HAS CAUSED YOU DURING THE PAST WEEK INCLUDING TODAY.

HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY							
	1	2	3	4	5		
	Not at all	A little	Moderately	Pretty Much	Extremely		
1. Nervousness or shakiness inside			1	2	3	4	5
2. Thoughts of ending your life			1	2	3	4	5
3. Suddenly scared for no reason			1	2	3	4	5
4. Feeling lonely			1	2	3	4	5
5. Feeling blue			1	2	3	4	5
6. Feeling no interest in things			1	2	3	4	5
7. Feeling fearful			1	2	3	4	5
8. Your feelings being easily hurt			1	2	3	4	5
9. Feeling hopeless about the future			1	2	3	4	5
10. Feeling tense or keyed up			1	2	3	4	5
11. Spells of terror or panic			1	2	3	4	5
12. Feeling so restless you couldn't sit still			1	2	3	4	5
13. Feelings of worthlessness			1	2	3	4	5

Table B6 Continued

For the next set of items, indicate in the past week, how often you:

	0 Never	1 Once	2 Twice	3 Three or more times
1. Spent an hour with a child?		0	1	2 3
2. Spent an hour with a spouse/partner?		0	1	2 3
3. Spent an hour with a female friend?		0	1	2 3
4. Spent an hour with a male friend?		0	1	2 3
5. Had someone closely listen to your problem/concern?		0	1	2 3
6. Been drunk/drank too much?		0	1	2 3
7. Been high?		0	1	2 3
8. Had sex or masturbated?		0	1	2 3
9. Hurt someone else physically?		0	1	2 3
10. Listened closely to someone else's problem/concern?		0	1	2 3

The next set of items focus on how you spend your time:

1. In general, how many hours a week do you spend at work? _____

Do you feel this is: too much about right not enough?

2. In general, how many hours a week do you spend with your
children? _____ (if applicable)

Do you feel this is: too much about right not enough?

3. In general, how many hours a week do you spend with your primary
partner? _____ (if applicable)

Do you feel this is: too much about right not enough?

4. In general, how many hours a week do you spend on hobbies or fun
activities? _____

Do you feel this is: too much about right not enough?

Table B6 Continued

Please use the scale below, and honestly indicate how accurately each item does, or does not, describe you. Just circle the number that best describes how accurate the statement is as a description of how you see yourself.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all accurate		somewhat accurate		completely accurate
1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal with others.			1	2	3 4 5
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.			1	2	3 4 5
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.			1	2	3 4 5
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.			1	2	3 4 5
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.			1	2	3 4 5
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.			1	2	3 4 5
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.			1	2	3 4 5
8. I certainly feel useless at times.			1	2	3 4 5
9. I wish I could have more respect for myself.			1	2	3 4 5
10. At times, I think I am no good at all.			1	2	3 4 5
11. There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have.			1	2	3 4 5
12. Sometimes I feel that I am being pushed around in life.			1	2	3 4 5
13. I have little control over the things that happen to me.			1	2	3 4 5
14. I can do just about anything I really set my mind to do.			1	2	3 4 5
15. I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life.			1	2	3 4 5
16. What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me.			1	2	3 4 5
17. There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life.			1	2	3 4 5

Table B6 Continued	1	2	3	4	5		
	Not at all accurate		Somewhat accurate		completely accurate		
18. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.			1	2	3	4	5
19. The conditions of my life are excellent.			1	2	3	4	5
20. I am satisfied with my life.			1	2	3	4	5
21. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.			1	2	3	4	5
22. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.			1	2	3	4	5
23. I have discovered clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose.			1	2	3	4	5
24. I do not divide life into sacred and secular; I believe all of life is infused with sacredness.			1	2	3	4	5
25. Contact with the transcendent, spiritual dimension has given me a sense of personal power and confidence.			1	2	3	4	5
26. Contact with the transcendent, spiritual dimension has enhanced my emotional health.			1	2	3	4	5
27. Involvement in ritual has contributed to my personal growth and development.			1	2	3	4	5
28. Involvement in ritual has enhanced my emotional health.			1	2	3	4	5
29. I carry around a lot of negative feelings (anger, mistrust, fear) towards women.			1	2	3	4	5
30. I carry around a lot of negative feelings (anger, mistrust, fear) towards men.			1	2	3	4	5
31. I carry around a lot of shame, especially involving sexuality and other aspects of my masculinity.			1	2	3	4	5
32. I carry around a lot of pain and unhealed wounds from my childhood.			1	2	3	4	5
33. I am assertive and clear with others about what I want or need.			1	2	3	4	5
34. I am a man of power, a man among men.			1	2	3	4	5
35. My mission in life is clear.			1	2	3	4	5

Table B6 Continued

The following three questions ask about people in your environment who provide you with help or support. Each question has two parts. For the first part, list all the people you know, excluding yourself, whom you can count on for help or support in the manner described. **Give the person's initials (under INIT.), their gender (under GEND.), and their relationship to you (under RELAT.) (see example).** Do not list more than one person next to each of the letters beneath the question.

In place of a specific individual, if there is a group of people (a church group, a support group, etc.) you feel is particularly important, more so than any individual within it, you may list the group in place of naming all the individual members.

For the second part, circle how satisfied you are with the overall support you have.

If you have no support for a question, check the words "No one," but still rate your level of satisfaction. Do not list more than nine persons per question.

EXAMPLE: Who can you really count on to be dependable when you need help?

No One

<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>
1)			4)			7)		
2)			5)			8)		
3)			6)			9)		

How satisfied?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very	fairly	a little	a little	fairly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied

QUESTIONS

1. Who can you count on to listen openly and uncritically to your innermost feelings?

No One

<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>
1)			4)			7)		
2)			5)			8)		
3)			6)			9)		

How satisfied?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very	fairly	a little	a little	fairly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied

Table B6 Continued

2. Whose lives do you feel that you are an important part of?

No One

<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>
1)			4)			7)		
2)			5)			8)		
3)			6)			9)		

How satisfied?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very	fairly	a little	a little	fairly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied

3. Who accepts you totally, including your best and worst points?

No One

<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>
1)			4)			7)		
2)			5)			8)		
3)			6)			9)		

How satisfied?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very	fairly	a little	a little	fairly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied

Table B6 Continued

Please use the scale below, and honestly indicate how accurately each item does, or does not, describe you or your attitudes. Just circle the number that best describes how accurate the statement is as a description of how you see yourself.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all accurate		somewhat accurate		completely accurate
1. There should be more women leaders in important jobs in public life, such as politics.					1 2 3 4 5
2. The women's movement has made society a better place for women.					1 2 3 4 5
3. I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.					1 2 3 4 5
4. There is a just as much a need for a men's movement as for a women's movement.					1 2 3 4 5
5. I am learning how to live from my deepest core being or truth.					1 2 3 4 5
6. Many of the problems men experience are the result of what men do to each other.					1 2 3 4 5
7. A man is never justified in hitting a woman.					1 2 3 4 5
8. I share my feelings easier with women than with other men.					1 2 3 4 5
9. A man's personal growth requires tapping an inner, untamed part of himself.					1 2 3 4 5
10. I feel uncomfortable around gay men.					1 2 3 4 5
11. If a woman has a job outside the home, her husband should share the housework, such as washing dishes, cleaning, and cooking.					1 2 3 4 5
12. The women's movement has made society a better place for men.					1 2 3 4 5
13. Generally it is safer not to trust women.					1 2 3 4 5
14. Helping men reclaim their personal power and control over their lives should be just as important a goal for our society as helping women do so.					1 2 3 4 5
15. I am learning to accept total responsibility for all aspects of my life.					1 2 3 4 5

Table B6 Continued

	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all		somewhat		completely
	accurate		accurate		accurate
16. Many of the problems men experience are the result of what women do to men.					1 2 3 4 5
17. It is okay for men at times to be sexually aggressive, even when a women does not seem interested.					1 2 3 4 5
18. I spend most of my recreational/free time with women.					1 2 3 4 5
19. Men's personal growth requires tapping a unique source of untamed and wild energy.					1 2 3 4 5
20. There is something wrong about homosexuality.					1 2 3 4 5
21. I dislike it when men treat women as sex objects.					1 2 3 4 5
22. Sometimes women bother me by just being around.					1 2 3 4 5
23. I am learning to be accountable for my own feelings, judgements, opinions, and actions.					1 2 3 4 5
24. Many problems men experience are the result of what society expects from and does to men.					1 2 3 4 5
25. A number of men suffer unfairly due to women's false charges of rape and sexual harassment.					1 2 3 4 5
26. Men often develop intimacy in distinctly male ways, including through comradeship and "shoulder to shoulder" activities (in contrast to direct sharing of feelings).					1 2 3 4 5
27. I am learning to live in the world with an open heart.					1 2 3 4 5
28. Many of the problems men experience are the result of men not facing up to and working through their inner problems.					1 2 3 4 5
29. An important challenge for men today is to transform natural aggressive energy into a creative and positive force for the world.					1 2 3 4 5

Please continue to the next page

Table B6 Continued

Thank you for your time and effort.

REMINDER: We will be asking you to fill out this same questionnaire again, after the weekend training. This will allow us to see what kind of impact the New Warrior Training Adventure has on men. If you have any questions or comments about this project, please contact us. We are happy to answer any questions you may have about our work.

(410 455-2567; maton@umbc2.umbc.edu)

We look forward to working with you in the future.

Appendix C: Social Support Questionnaire (Table C1).

The following three questions ask about people in your environment who provide you with help or support. Each question has two parts. For the first part, list all the people you know, excluding yourself, whom you can count on for help or support in the manner described. **Give the person's initials (under INIT.), their gender (under GEND.), and their relationship to you (under RELAT.) (see example).** Do not list more than one person next to each of the letters beneath the question.

In place of a specific individual, if there is a group of people (a church group, a support group, etc.) you feel is particularly important, more so than any individual within it, you may list the group in place of naming all the individual members.

For the second part, circle how satisfied you are with the overall support you have.

If you have no support for a question, check the words "No one," but still rate your level of satisfaction. Do not list more than nine persons per question.

EXAMPLE: Who can you really count on to be dependable when you need help?

No One

<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>
1)			4)			7)		
2)			5)			8)		
3)			6)			9)		

How satisfied?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very	fairly	a little	a little	fairly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied

QUESTIONS

1. Who can you count on to listen openly and uncritically to your innermost feelings?

No One

<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>
1)			4)			7)		
2)			5)			8)		
3)			6)			9)		

How satisfied?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very	fairly	a little	a little	fairly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied

Table C1 Continued.

2. Whose lives do you feel that you are an important part of?

No One

<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>
1)			4)			7)		
2)			5)			8)		
3)			6)			9)		

How satisfied?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very	fairly	a little	a little	fairly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied

3. Who accepts you totally, including your best and worst points?

No One

<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>	<u>INIT.</u>	<u>GEND.</u>	<u>RELAT.</u>
1)			4)			7)		
2)			5)			8)		
3)			6)			9)		

How satisfied?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very	fairly	a little	a little	fairly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied

Appendix D: Self Questionnaire (Table D1).

Please use the scale below, and honestly indicate how accurately each item does, or does not, describe you. Just circle the number that best describes how accurate the statement is as a description of how you see yourself.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all accurate		somewhat accurate		completely accurate
1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal with others.			1 2 3 4 5	
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.			1 2 3 4 5	
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.			1 2 3 4 5	
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.			1 2 3 4 5	
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.			1 2 3 4 5	
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.			1 2 3 4 5	
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.			1 2 3 4 5	
8. I certainly feel useless at times.			1 2 3 4 5	
9. I wish I could have more respect for myself.			1 2 3 4 5	
10. At times, I think I am no good at all.			1 2 3 4 5	
11. There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have.			1 2 3 4 5	
12. Sometimes I feel that I am being pushed around in life.			1 2 3 4 5	
13. I have little control over the things that happen to me.			1 2 3 4 5	
14. I can do just about anything I really set my mind to do.			1 2 3 4 5	
15. I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life.			1 2 3 4 5	
16. What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me.			1 2 3 4 5	
17. There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life.			1 2 3 4 5	

Table D1 Continued.

	1 Not at all accurate	2	3 somewhat accurate	4	5 completely accurate
18. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.			1	2	3 4 5
19. The conditions of my life are excellent.			1	2	3 4 5
20. I am satisfied with my life.			1	2	3 4 5
21. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.			1	2	3 4 5
22. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.			1	2	3 4 5
23. I have discovered clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose.			1	2	3 4 5
24. I do not divide life into sacred and secular; I believe all of life is infused with sacredness.			1	2	3 4 5
25. Contact with the transcendent, spiritual dimension has given me a sense of personal power and confidence.			1	2	3 4 5
26. Contact with the transcendent, spiritual dimension has enhanced my emotional health.			1	2	3 4 5
27. Involvement in ritual has contributed to my personal growth and development.			1	2	3 4 5
28. Involvement in ritual has enhanced my emotional health.			1	2	3 4 5
29. I carry around a lot of negative feelings (anger, mistrust, fear) towards women.			1	2	3 4 5
30. I carry around a lot of negative feelings (anger, mistrust, fear) towards men.			1	2	3 4 5
31. I carry around a lot of shame, especially involving sexuality and other aspects of my masculinity.			1	2	3 4 5
32. I carry around a lot of pain and unhealed wounds from my childhood.			1	2	3 4 5
33. I am assertive and clear with others about what I want or need.			1	2	3 4 5
34. I am a man of power, a man among men.			1	2	3 4 5
35. My mission in life is clear.			1	2	3 4 5

Appendix E: Attitudes Questionnaire (Table E1)

Please use the scale below, and honestly indicate how accurately each item does, or does not, describe you or your attitudes. Just circle the number that best describes how accurate the statement is as a description of how you see yourself.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all accurate		somewhat accurate		completely accurate
1. There should be more women leaders in important jobs in public life, such as politics.				1 2 3 4 5
2. The women's movement has made society a better place for women.				1 2 3 4 5
3. I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.				1 2 3 4 5
4. There is a just as much a need for a men's movement as for a women's movement.				1 2 3 4 5
5. I am learning how to live from my deepest core being or truth.				1 2 3 4 5
6. Many of the problems men experience are the result of what men do to each other.				1 2 3 4 5
7. A man is never justified in hitting a woman.				1 2 3 4 5
8. I share my feelings easier with women than with other men.				1 2 3 4 5
9. A man's personal growth requires tapping an inner, untamed part of himself.				1 2 3 4 5
10. I feel uncomfortable around gay men.				1 2 3 4 5
11. If a woman has a job outside the home, her husband should share the housework, such as washing dishes, cleaning, and cooking.				1 2 3 4 5
12. The women's movement has made society a better place for men.				1 2 3 4 5
13. Generally it is safer not to trust women.				1 2 3 4 5
14. Helping men reclaim their personal power and control over their lives should be just as important a goal for our society as helping women do so.				1 2 3 4 5
15. I am learning to accept total responsibility for all aspects of my life.				1 2 3 4 5

Table E1 Continued.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			somewhat	completely
accurate			accurate	accurate
16. Many of the problems men experience are the result of what women do to men.				1 2 3 4 5
17. It is okay for men at times to be sexually aggressive, even when a women does not seem interested.				1 2 3 4 5
18. I spend most of my recreational/free time with women.				1 2 3 4 5
19. Men's personal growth requires tapping a unique source of untamed and wild energy.				1 2 3 4 5
20. There is something wrong about homosexuality.				1 2 3 4 5
21. I dislike it when men treat women as sex objects.				1 2 3 4 5
22. Sometimes women bother me by just being around.				1 2 3 4 5
23. I am learning to be accountable for my own feelings, judgements, opinions, and actions.				1 2 3 4 5
24. Many problems men experience are the result of what society expects from and does to men.				1 2 3 4 5
25. A number of men suffer unfairly due to women's false charges of rape and sexual harassment.				1 2 3 4 5
26. Men often develop intimacy in distinctly male ways, including through comradeship and "shoulder to shoulder" activities (in contrast to direct sharing of feelings).				1 2 3 4 5
27. I am learning to live in the world with an open heart.				1 2 3 4 5
28. Many of the problems men experience are the result of men not facing up to and working through their inner problems.				1 2 3 4 5
29. An important challenge for men today is to transform natural aggressive energy into a creative and positive force for the world.				1 2 3 4 5

Appendix F: Questions Used for the MKP Beliefs Scale and Inter-item Correlations and Alpha Level with any Item Removed for the MKP Belief Scale Pre-NWTA and LTFU.

Table F1

MKP Related Questions.

MKP related questions:

From Self Questionnaire:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 33. I am assertive and clear with others about what I want or need. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. I am a man of power, a man among men. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. My mission in life is clear. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

From Attitudes Questionnaire:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. I am learning how to live from my deepest core being or truth. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I am learning to accept total responsibility for all aspects of my life. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. I am learning to be accountable for my own feelings, judgements, opinions, and actions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. I am learning to live in the world with an open heart. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Table F2

MKP Beliefs Scale and Inter-item Correlations and Alpha Level with Any Item Removed for the MKP Belief Scale Pre-NWTA and LTFU.

PRE WEEKEND MKP Belief Scale Reliability Values

Item Total Statistics

	Mean	Variance	Std. Dev	N of Variables
Statistics for Scale	22.75	33.12	5.76	7

Reliability Coefficients for entire scale

Alpha = .8681 Standardized item alpha = .8707

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Var. if Item Deleted	Corrctd Item-Total Correl.	Squard Mult Corrl.	Alpha if Item Deleted
I am assertive and clear with others about what I want or need	20.04	25.58	0.62	0.46	0.85
I am a man of power, a man among men.	20.26	25.66	0.55	0.43	0.86
My mission in life is clear	20.29	24.40	0.64	0.47	0.85
I am learning how to live from my deepest core being or truth	19.32	23.78	0.65	0.53	0.85
I am learning to accept total responsibility for all aspects of my life	18.83	24.71	0.69	0.56	0.84
I am learning to be accountable for my own feelings, judgements, opinions, and actions	18.68	25.61	0.70	0.59	0.84
I am learning to live in the world with an open heart.	19.09	24.84	0.68	0.55	0.84

Appendix G: Guidelines for Coding Perceived Year Change Variable (Table G1).

RULES FOR DECISION MAKING ON EXTENT OF CHANGE YEAR PRIOR TO NWT

Rules for NO CHANGE:

- 1) clearly stated in interview that there was no change
- 2) nothing offered as examples of change

Rules for MAJOR CHANGE:

- 1) Clearly stated in the interview that there was a lot of change in the year prior.
- 2) Use of superlatives in describing the level of change. E.G., big, big time change; tremendous change; a lot of change;
- 3) Description of major life stressors: See below.
- 4) If multiples of smaller events occur all at once, it combines to become a major change. E.G., Moved across town, bought a new home, got married, changed jobs, combines into major change.

Rules for MINOR-MODERATE CHANGE:

- 1) Clearly stated in the interview by the interviewee that the change was of a moderate level (e.g., “there was change, but it wasn’t too drastic”).
- 2) If participant plays down what would be considered a major life event in a convincing way. E.G., mothers death, but she was sick for a while, she had a good life, I had said goodbye and I had resolved all of my issues with her and I am glad she is out of pain, etc...
- 3) The stated changes are listed below as minor, and there are not numerous changes listed concurrently.

Closing comments: Remember, we are trying to code the level of change in the year prior, and NOT the effect of that change. One thing Levinson posits with his studies on the developmental progression for men, is that around mid life, there is a tendency for minor events to trigger huge shifts in the man’s life. So, given that, it is important to keep the actual aspects that make the year a year of change separate to the greatest extent possible from the actual effect on the man. Granted, that is nearly impossible to do, but it should be a goal for us in attempting to code this variable. It seems there would be a natural tendency to over rate the change in the year prior, and it would be best to avoid that. Secondly, remember that we are looking for change, not thinking about things which may lead to change. Thinking about getting married is NOT getting married. It may be paradigmatic of other changes going on, but it is in and of itself not change per se.

Remember too, that these answers are largely contextual. In going through a few dry runs with Brian Henry (a guy who is helping out with interview coding), we found that the information given in the node report was not sufficient to make an accurate

Table G1 Continued.

determination. When we went to the actual text of the interview, it became very clear what the coding should be. For instance, their answers to the question of change were heavily referenced to, and in large part a follow on to, the Issues in their life of the weekend, the question immediately preceding the change one. In some cases, important chunks were missing from the node report. Thus, in short, if you have any doubts, go to NUD*IST and review the actual transcript and get a sense of how the interview was going before the actual comments are made. When I have done that, it became very clear to both Brian and myself how the level of change should be coded.

EVENT CODES:**D. Career/job change****I retired**

- ii **quit job** (If the job was held for a considerable amount of time, code it was a major stressor. If it was a job held for a short period of time, or was one of many jobs held in the last few years, the coding of change in year prior would be little.)
- iii **started school** (If the participant was younger, so that going to school was developmentally appropriate, this would then not be a major stressor, but a little one. IF on the other hand, the participant was older and quit their job in order to go back to school, then the classification of this event would be major).
- iv. **graduated from school** (Like above, this can be looked at as a different situation for old and young. However, remember graduation, be it younger or older, is inherently stressful, and the tendency in this one is to lean towards major change).
- v. **started new job** (this too can be looked at in different ways. Contract worker starting a new one year contract? Little change. Used to work for IBM and now starting to teach in an inner city school? Major change)

E. geographical move

- i. **new city** major change, with an understanding that context could make it minor if this is a pattern, or individual does not think it was difficult.
- ii. **within same city** depends, though this would tend to be minor, as you don't lose all of your friends, etc.
- iii. **new home/apartment** Same as above, knowing that if they state it was major it may just be
- iv. **traveling**

Table G1 Continued.

1. due to work This, I would say, is relatively minor, with the added caveat that they may state that it was a major change.
2. leisure This would be best coded as minor. It is a change, but tending towards not being a life changing one, and more of a pleasurable one. Positive stress, but nonetheless, probably one that is radically changing one's world view.

F. relationship

- i. divorce Big change, and I don't see too many instances where it would otherwise.
- ii. Engagement In and of itself, a minor change. Commonly associated with bigger changes, like moving, changing jobs, etc.
- iii. new child Big change
- iv. child moving away Big change
- v. marriage Like engagement, big change
- vi. Relationship troubles Need to call this as you see it. If it is the end of a month long relationship, probably minor. If it is the end of a 18 year committed relationship, I would see it as no different from divorce, and thus a major change.
- vii. death
 1. parents Big change, unless stated intentionally that it was no big deal.
 2. friends Big change, depending in large part on the context of which it is said.
 3. relatives Again, big change, with the understanding that it is largely dependent on the context

G. healthphysical

1. quit drugs, alcohol Big time change
2. Disease Going blind, cancer, etc. Big time change

mental

3. in therapy I am going to say that this is a little change, as going to therapy alone is no real indication of anything, unless of course he has been scared of it his whole life and finally got up and did it. This, however will probably happen in conjunction with a death, divorce or radical career shift, so the actual entering into therapy, in and of itself, will probably not indicate a large change
4. Ontological wake up This is stuff like "I woke up one day and realized I am a bad father," or "I started to realize that I was angry all the time." This is tending towards minor change. To be fair, it may portend larger changes, and like Levinson postulates, this small event may provide the precipitating event that brings about huge life shifts. Nonetheless, the ontological change in and of itself is not big.
5. redefining sexual orientation This would be considered major.

Table G1 Continued.

6. medicine for depression This in and of itself is not a major change. May be a proxy, but this, alone, is a minor change.
7. support groups Minor change in and of itself. Going to support groups does not happen in a vacuum, however...

Exercise to enhance ability to code level of change

Listed below are some examples of things commonly said in interviews in reference to the question of whether the year before the NwTA was a year of change or not. Using the rules listed above, and the outline of events that constitute change, see if you can rate the level of change listed below.

- 1) After a 15 year marriage, my wife decided that the marriage was no longer working and left me with the kids to go back to school. It was pretty dramatic.
- 2) Oh, the usual stuff, but nothing sticks out in my mind. I would say that not much changed.
- 3) Well a lot was going on. I got engaged to a woman I had been with for about 4 years, and I was choosing to start living my life in connection to others. The weekend seemed like a good place to help me do that.
- 4) The big thing that happened that year is that my cousin, who is my age, died of a heart attack. He was fairly young, and it got me to thinking about making sure I took care of myself.
- 5) The only thing that was different is that I started to see this therapist, who incidentally recommended the training.
- 6) I did seem to be going through some changes in the year before. I started to realize that I am not getting any younger, and I wanted to make sure that I was living deliberately and that I made the most out of my life.
- 7) My life has always been crazy, and the year prior was no different than all the other years of my life. I would say no real change.
- 8) Yes it was a year of change. My uncle, with whom I was really tight, died. He basically raised me after my Father died, and I was very close to him.
- 9) Yes, my mother died. INTERVIEWER: That must have been quite a shock.
INTERVIEWEE: Well, she had alzheimers, and we knew it was coming and had known for a long time. They call it the long goodbye, and I can see why now. As such, her death was not a real shock, and I was actually glad that she was out of her misery.

ANSWER KEY:

- 1) Major change. Divorce from a 15 year marriage that came out of the blue
- 2) NO change. Self stated, and nothing offered.
- 3) Minor change. Engagement was the only real change, aside from an ontological wake up. As listed above in the description of kinds of change section, engagement alone does not constitute a major change, and since nothing else was listed, this is coded as minor.
- 4) Minor change. It was a death, but the death is described in fairly distant terms, i.e. it was not a loss, but a reminder that health is important, and that life will one day end.

Table G1 Continued.

- 5) Minor change. He stated that the only thing is that he started to see a therapist. That as listed above, is not a major change. If he started to see a therapist because he was hating his line of work and was depressed and his wife was leaving him, then it would be major. However, given what he gave us there, there is no major change.
- 6) Minor change. Ontological in nature. As listed above, ontological by itself is considered minor.
- 7) NO change. First, nothing offered as an indication of change. Secondly, stated in his own words that he did not feel it was a year of change.
- 8) Major change. Death of a relative to whom one is close, as stated in the list above, qualifies as a major life change
- 9) Minor change. It was a parent, but was convincingly shown to be minor due to the circumstances of the death and the relationship of the parent and the child.

SELF DEFINED:

___ NO CHANGE – “no”

___ Little “not typical,” “some”

___ Lot “major”

LANGUAGE:

These are examples from actual interviews and Dennis’s initial codings of the level of change in the year prior. They give an idea of the actual answers provided by participants.

1. LOT - 0050 Went off everything (i.e., substance abuse) and stayed - not a typical year
2. LOT 0206 there was change taking on this young man - big-big time change
3. SAME 0403 About the same. I had been increasingly more and more frustrated with my lack of ability to build close relationships like I wanted.
4. LITTLE 0532 major change left job after four or five months; it was a year of change, I guess. not that I changed that much. A bunch of change.
5. LOT 0570 But I had left my, my house, moved into my new apartment I, I lived six or eight months at a friend's place and traveling a great deal so I was never here and then I settled down in my new place. So all this was a lot of change.
6. LITTLE 0661 ongoing process of six or seven more years and decided to do more.
7. LOT 0714 fairly significant change in work real significant shift - big job change after 10 years and that was big

Table G1 Continued.

8. NO 0778 no, pretty much the same, hasn't changed much – settling into marriage and child - but getting dragged down by it
9. LOT 0836 not terribly different, a lot of changes– got certified to get job in fall but not as regular teacher – certainly different
10. NO 0984 before I did the training it's been pretty much the same.
11. LITTLE 1012 NO change – parents dying – that was basically the way my life had been, on and off medication for three years.
12. LOT 1020 I had made geographical changes, I have job changes.
13. LOT 1110 Well there was a lot of change.
14. LOT 1540 started a new job with new organization, thinking about getting married and locations – defining new role, transition
15. LOT 1608 undergoing a lot of change in my life
16. LITTLE 1612 there hadn't been a lot of change, things were gathering like a pimple ready to burst at training.
17. LOT 1685 that was a big change for me, under school pressure - school - being isolated from culture due to start of program
18. LOT 1708 for two years (up to weekend) it was a major change for me – I crashed two years before doing the weekend. Was in therapy for two years.
19. LITTLE 1830 there was certainly some change going on in the year before workshop
20. LOT 1850 there was still a lot of change going on, still working out my feelings around that. It's still screwing me up.
21. LITTLE 1902 during that year my life was pretty consistent but it had been a change. So prior to the 12 months in the year there had been a lot of change.
22. NO 1954 no I had a lot of change in the years before that but not then.
23. LOT 2061 There had been a lot of change, previously left state to do graduate work, was having trouble with a woman, started therapy (saw parallels with family of origin issues, - very difficult year for me, saw how I was emotionally abused
24. LOT 2077 there had been change in my life
25. LOT 2094 there had been a lot of change

Table G1 Continued.

26. LOT 2399 I would say a lot of change
27. SAME 2459
28. LOT 2752 quite a bit change – relocated to DC area from CA, married, new job.
29. SAME 3100 I think it would more of the same, for the most part. I mean things happen, but nothing that eventful, or major that was my doing. There wasn't any change particularly that I was behind
30. LOT 3137 year with quite a lot, lot of trauma and lot of change
31. LOT 3180 there had been a lot of change – moved from NY to DC after 18 years to fill in for colleague who died - uprooted from normal routine
32. LOT 3571 there had been a lot of change
33. LOT 3627 only constant was change - three different jobs at three different times – didn't have sense of stability
34. LOT 3696 – there had been a lot of change, period of a lot of change – breakup, moving out of house we shared, involved with a (new) woman, contemplated moving to new state, NC, to be with her.
35. LOT 3886 oh, there's been constant change
36. LOT 3943 there had been quite a bit of change, there had been a lot of change
37. LOT 4169 there was a great deal of mental, inward change
38. SAME 4574 No, it was pretty much the same. I had a busy schedule. I think the shock value part was everything that was happening the same month and there was, you know, there was a lot of anxiety I guess about that. Not only on my part but just in
39. LITTLE 4765 there'd been some change – wife expecting first child – that's a big change
40. LOT 4846 there'd been a fair amount of change – there was bigger change the year before that when realized was providing parenting needs to children but left wife to do it.
41. LOT 4971 a lot of change in my life – got engaged and was building a house
42. LOT 5148 a lot of change in the two years prior – relocated to new city and knew nobody, gay and came out – caused a great deal of difficulty in my life

Table G1 Continued.

43. LOT 5222 there had been a lot of changes
44. LOT 5250 fuck yeah, nothing going on, some pretty dramatic change
45. LOT 5288 a lot of change in my life
46. LITTLE 5372 there had been some change up into that point – my wife and I ...
47. LITTLE 5469 period of some change – changed jobs in that year, challenge in our relationship, period of real introspection and personal growth – period of change at emotional and spiritual level
48. LOT 5645 oh lots of change
49. LOT 5761 lot of changes - I moved across country. I graduated school – those were two big ones.
50. LITTLE 5790 there was some change – some of the years before were more difficult with people dying that year before. And having step-children. – difficult that year before.
51. LOT 5792 lot of change? Yeah. – her leaving was the biggest change of eleven or twelve years.
52. LOT 5939 had just got engaged. – so it was a lot of change.
53. LITTLE 6008, substantial but not something that overwhelmed me.
54. LOT 6114 there was a lot of change in my life – wife up and left me, she moved to CO from MD, I started going to Codependents Anonymous – so I was in a state of change then
55. LITTLE 6204 there had been some change – had first real serious traffic accident and spent number of months recovering - some good change, some internal momentum going on, feeling stressed out and not in control of my life as I wanted or in way I need to be.
56. LOT 6260 I'd say so - moved from Southern CA to VA, mom passed away
57. LOT 6701 yes there was a lot of change
58. LOT 7028 – yeah those were all huge changes, basically everything in my life had changed and in my view had fallen to the ground
59. NONE 7182 No, pretty much the same.
60. LITTLE 7385 yeah, things change on a glacial pace and instantaneously. This was somewhere in between.
61. LOT 7568 there had been a lot of changes. My life's been chaotic, flowing and changes but that year was like real jam-packed.

Table G1 Continued.

62. LOT 7828 there was a lot of change – I got married, bought a home – a lot of healing in that I did many things that I wanted. So it was a wonderful year
63. LITTLE 7926 I'd put in between. It wasn't the same.
64. LOT 8004 marriage with wife had been on rocks three times in 14 years and this was one of those times, coming to terms with who he was and what he believed in. I was feeling frustrated with that.
65. LOT 8131 tremendous change
66. LOT 8305 a progressively worse year than most
67. LOT 8476 I would say I had switched, more active, was taking antidepressant medicine, critically changing
68. LOT 8564 been a lot of change in my life
69. LOT 8808 last six months it (life) fell apart
70. LOT 8894 quite a lot of changes – did a program in England, moved to CO and lived away from family for first time – definitely not the same that year
71. LOT 9223 everything was a complete change for me - wife got into alcohol, raising two sons because of wife
72. LOT 9234 son moving to college – that was most significant change – business partnership was pushing the limits of comfort
73. LOT 9510 yes, right – there had a lot of stressful situations that had come up in my work and dealing with my relationship with my wife
74. LOT 9594 there were significant things going on – I lost my mother for one and a very close uncle (like a second father), significant shifts in job responsibility
75. LOT 9750 awful lot of change - retired from teaching, wife's death, took up dancing and less structured lifestyle
76. LOT 9767 Um, well I mean in that relationship I was feeling, no it was
77. definitely different.
78. LOT 9811 a lot of changes – business, relationship with mother, wife.
79. LOT 9926 lot of change – it was just it was progressive

Appendix H: I-group Historical Summary (Table H1).

ManKind Project Of Greater Washington**I-GROUP HISTORICAL SUMMARY****April 2000**

1. Your Name _____
2. Mailing Address _____
3. Phone number _____ Email _____
4. Your I-Group name _____
5. How long have you been involved in this I-Group? _____
6. When did the group start? (month & year) _____
7. (If applicable) When did the I-group stop meeting? (month & year) _____
8. Please list the facilitators of the initial 8-week I-group training:
(Indicate the leader of facilitation and if there were any trainees)
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____
 4. _____
9. On the next page, please list the members who attended the original 8-week training as well as every member who has at one time or another been a member of this I-group. This should include dropouts from the initial 8-week training, additions from group mergers or who joined after the initial training, and all members who have left up to this point.

If known, please use a give their reason for leaving. If none of the selections fit accurately put an asterisk in the reason left column and write the answer on the back.

Table H1 Continued.

Reasons for leaving the I-Group

- 1 - Moved
- 2 - Work too busy
- 3 - Family life too busy
- 4 - Disagreement with the group
- 5 - Disagreement with individual in group
- 6 - Disagreement with New Warrior Washington
- 7 - Just stopped going
- 8 - Got what wanted from group
- 9 - Unknown
- * Other, please specify _____

Name	Current Age	Date joined (month/yr)	Date left (month/yr)	Reason(s) left
1 (your name)				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				

Table H1 Continued.

10. (For verification) How many members are currently involved in the I-group? _____

11a. Has your I-group ever merged with another one? _____

11b. If yes, what was the name of the group that you merged with? _____

11c. When did you merge with the group? (month & year) _____

11d. How many members did the group have immediately before the merger? _____
 After the merger _____?

11e. What was the reason(s) for the merger? _____

11e. Was the merger successful? Please explain. _____

12. Below, please list the location in which your I-group met for each year it has (or had) been in existence and the frequency it meets or met (usually every week or every other week). In addition, please estimate the average rate of attendance for the group as a whole for each year of its existence. If there are any situations that are unique to your group, please use the comments section below the table.

Year of I-group	Frequency of meeting 1 - every week 2 - every 2 weeks	Location (e.g., church, someone's home, library)	<u>Average number of members</u> at a typical meeting
Year 1			
Year 2			
Year 3			
Year 4			
Year 5			
Year 6			
Year 7			
Year 8			
Year 9			

Table H1 Continued.

Additional comments

13a. Rate your group's effectiveness for each year of its existence using the scale below:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not effective

Moderate

Very effective

Year 1 _____

Year 2 _____

Year 3 _____

Year 4 _____

Year 5 _____

Year 6 _____

Year 7 _____

Year 8 _____

Year 9 _____

Year 10 _____

13b. What aspects of the group were particularly effective? _____

13c. What aspects were less effective or not effective? _____

Appendix I: MKP Related Activities Recording Instrument

(Collected During Interview) (Table I1).

Other ManKind Project Activities Matrix.

E. "What other New Warrior activities have you participated in and what are your feelings and judgments about those activities?"

	How many times?	Evaluation?
Own graduation		
Other graduation		
Brother Circle/Dance/Sweat		
GUTS Training		
Staffing training weekends		
Other trainings		
Inner King		
Your Mother's pillow		
Mission weekend		
Other trainings		
Council Meetings		
LKS		
Community events		
Service activities		
Friendship networks		
Other activities		

Appendix J: MKP Related Activities List and Associated Codings (Table J1)

<u>MKP Sponsored Activity</u>	<u>Associated Coding</u>
Attend a NWT A Graduation	1
Brother Circle/Dance/Sweat	2
GUTS Training (instruction in psychodrama)	4
Staffing, cooking for, or Man of Service for the NWT A	10
Inner King Workshop	7
Next Step Training - Mission Workshop	5
Couples Weekend	5
Basic Staff Development Training	5
I-group Facilitation Training	5
Your Mother's Pillow Workshop	5
Voice Dialogue Training	4
Four Quarters Training	4
Group Dynamics in I-group Workshop	2
Attend a council meeting	1
Wizard I-group Training	1
MKP National Conference	4
Buffalo Gap Weekend Retreat	4
Brothers and Others Weekend Retreat	4
Massage Pot Luck	2
Lodge Keepers Society	2 per mo. of involv.
I-group Retreat	5
<u>Volunteer Activities</u>	
Cooking for Executive Retreat	6
Organizing/participating in a Gateway Openhouse	2
Creating Artwork for the NWT A	5

Table J1 continued.

Assisting in physical set up for NWTA	2
Adopt a highway program	2
Staff the MKP Booth at the Gay Pride Festival	2
Men's council duties	1
Staff selection committee	2 per mo. involv.
Prison outreach	4 per mo. involv.

Appendix K: Masculine Gender Role Conflict Scale (Table K1).

Below are listed 31 statements. Please circle the number in the right hand column that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6 Strongly Agree			
1. Moving up the career ladder is important to me.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. I have difficulty telling others I care about them.				1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.				1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Affection with other men makes me tense.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
7. I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.				1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
9. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
10. I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
11. Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
12. Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
13. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
14. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.			1	2	3	4	5	6	
15. Hugging other men is difficult for me.			1	2	3	4	5	6	

Table K1 Continued.

	1	2	3	4	5	6		
	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree		
16. Doing well all the time is important to me.			1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.			1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.			1	2	3	4	5	6
19. I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.			1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.			1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.			1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Competing with others is the best way to succeed.			1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.			1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference.			1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.			1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I do not like to show my emotion to other people.			1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I strive to be more successful than others.			1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.			1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.			1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.			1	2	3	4	5	6
31. I like to feel superior to other people.			1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix L: Depression Measure (Taken from BSI).

This is a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Please read each one carefully. After you have done so, please circle the number that best describes HOW MUCH DISCOMFORT THAT PROBLEM HAS CAUSED YOU DURING THE PAST WEEK INCLUDING TODAY.

HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY

	1 Not at all	2 A little	3 Moderately	4 Pretty Much	5 Extremely	
1. Nervousness or shakiness inside		1	2	3	4	5
2. Thoughts of ending your life		1	2	3	4	5
3. Suddenly scared for no reason		1	2	3	4	5
4. Feeling lonely		1	2	3	4	5
5. Feeling blue		1	2	3	4	5
6. Feeling no interest in things		1	2	3	4	5
7. Feeling fearful		1	2	3	4	5
8. Your feelings being easily hurt		1	2	3	4	5
9. Feeling hopeless about the future		1	2	3	4	5
10. Feeling tense or keyed up		1	2	3	4	5
11. Spells of terror or panic		1	2	3	4	5
12. Feeling so restless you couldn't sit still		1	2	3	4	5
13. Feelings of worthlessness		1	2	3	4	5

Note: Questions in bold are the depression questions. The other questions measure anxiety, which is not included in the present study.

Appendix M: Life Satisfaction Measure.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all accurate		somewhat accurate		completely accurate
18. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.			1 2 3 4 5		
19. The conditions of my life are excellent.			1 2 3 4 5		
20. I am satisfied with my life.			1 2 3 4 5		
21. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.			1 2 3 4 5		
22. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.			1 2 3 4 5		

Questions were located in the Self Questionnaire, numbers 18-22.

Appendix N: Demographic Information Questionnaire.

Background Information

People have different stereotypes about who takes part in men's groups like New Warrior. To help us provide more accurate information about New Warrior participants, please fill out the information below.

- 1.Age _____ 2.Marital Status _____
 3.Ethnicity _____ 4.Religious Preference _____
 5.Number of children living in your home _____
 6.Last level of education completed _____
 7.Current Occupation/Job Description _____

8.Sexual Orientation _____ 9.Ever Served in the Military?
 Please indicate your current and past involvement in the following.

	Currently Involved In:	Ever Involved In:	Length of involvement
10. 12-step self-help groups	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	_____
11. Other types of self-help groups, except men's groups	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	_____
12. Other men's groups	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	_____
13. Church groups or religious organizations	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	_____
14. Therapy with a therapist who has done the NW training	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	_____
15. Therapy with a therapist not connected with NWW	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	_____
16. Did you receive a scholarship for the weekend?	Yes No		
17. How did you find out about the NWW training weekend:			
a. Existing warrior	Yes No	b. Media (Books, TV, etc)	Yes No
c. Therapist	Yes No	d. Other _____	

Appendix O: One Year Semi-Structured Interview Outline (Table O1).

NWW Research Group Impact Study: 12 month post weekend interview

Participant Name

Last 4

Mothers maiden name

First car

Informed Consent Already On File: Yes No

Appointment: Day of the Week Date Time Phone #

II. Demographics

A. "We are interested in knowing the demographics factors of the men in New Warrior. We are interested to see if certain kinds of men are affected differently by the training. We realize that commonly demographic information is collected by corporations who wish to sell us goods or services. We want to make it clear our purpose for collecting this data. We are not going to use it in any way outside of the study we are conducting. In no way will this information be given to any one else. In no way will your data be able to be identified with you. As you may recall, any results we come up with will be reviewed by the executive council, the council, and the center director. Do you have any questions about our use of this information?"

Based on the fact that we do not know the names of the participants in our study, we would like to know if we have your demographic information from a previous questionnaire. The only way that we can do that is if you tell us your mother's maiden name, the first car you owned, or the last 4 numbers of your social security number. Could you give us that now so that we can check if we have your demographic information already?

1. What was the make and color of your first car? _____
2. What was your mother's maiden name?
3. What are the last four digits of your Social Security Number? _____

Check list for these identifiers.

Table O1 Continued.

If we do not have their demographics, collect now.

B. I would like to ask you now a few demographic questions that will help us understand how New Warrior is evaluated by men from different backgrounds."

1. "What is your age?"
2. "What is your race or ethnicity?"
3. "Are you Hispanic?"
4. "What is your Religious Preference?"
5. "What is your sexual orientation?"
6. "What is your Marital or non-marital relationship Status?"
7. "How many Children live in your home?"
8. "What is the highest level of education you completed?"
9. "What is your Current occupation? (Have them describe their job)"
10. "Have you ever served in the military?"
11. "Have you ever participated in any other self-help group besides NewWarrior?"

"What kind of groups were they?"

12-steps

Religious group

Other

13. "Have you ever participated in any other kind of men's group besides New Warrior?"

14. "Have you ever been in psychotherapy?" (Get duration)

15. "Was the psychotherapist connected with New Warrior?"

Table O1 Continued.

16. "Did you receive a scholarship for the New Warrior Training Adventure?"

Start of the Interview

III. Developmental Period

"I want to begin by giving you an overview of the interview. First, I will ask you some questions about the year of your life just before you did the New Warrior Training Adventure Weekend. Then I will ask about the year of your life since you did the New Warrior Training Adventure Weekend. Following that I will ask for your feelings and judgments about the various New Warrior activities in which you have participated. Then the last section of the interview will involve some demographic questions. Are you ready to begin?"

"Before we begin, I want to point out that I am using the term New Warrior in a very general way to include the weekend training and all other activities. I am aware that other terms, such as ManKind Project, for example, may be used by some people, but to make the interview simpler, I will only use the term New Warrior. Is that ok with you?"

"Just one more thing, before we begin. Please try to avoid mentioning people by their names. That way you may feel free to comment on others without revealing to me who you are talking about. OK?"

"Ok, let's begin. Please take a moment to think back over the year of your life just before you participated in the New Warrior Training Adventure weekend."

Wait (count to 10).

A. "How did you find out about the New Warrior Training Adventure?"

B. "Why did you choose to do the New Warrior Training Adventure when you did?"

Table O1 Continued.

C. "What were the main issues in your life during that year just before you did the New Warrior Training Adventure weekend, if you remember?"

D. "Had your life been pretty much the same in that year before you decided to do the Training or had there been a lot of change in your life?"

Pretty much the same. _____ A lot of change. _____

"OK, that's the end of the first part of the interview."

IV. Impact

"In the second part of the interview now, I'd like to ask you a few questions about the possible impact New Warrior has had on your life in the last year, the year since you completed the New Warrior Training Adventure weekend."

"Take a moment now to think back over the last year of your life, the year since you did the New Warrior Training Adventure."

Wait (count to 10).

If the interviewee mentions other factors that have affected him in the last year or raises the issue of distinguishing between the effects of those factors and the effects of New Warrior,

"Just do the best you can to tell us about how New Warrior has affected you. We will take careful note of other things you mention that have also affected you and in reviewing your answers to our questions, we will do our best to take those other factors into account."

A. "Has New Warrior affected you or your life in the past year, and, if so, tell me how?"

Table O1 Continued.

B. "Earlier you reported that the main issues in your life at the time of the training weekend were [Refer back to IIC]. Has New Warrior affected those issues, and, if so, tell me how?"

OK, that's the end of the second section of the interview. OK, that's the end of the second section of the interview.

V. Participation and Evaluation

"Now in the third section of interview, I would like to ask you some questions about your experiences in New Warrior."

For each open-ended question, the following probes should be used as appropriate to follow up the interviewee responses, when it seems the interviewee has stopped generating new feelings or judgements.

"Mostly you have shared feelings; what are your judgements about the _____?"

"Mostly you have shared judgements; what are your feelings about the _____?"

"Mostly you have made positive comments; what are your negative

Table O1 Continued.

comments?"

"Mostly you have made negative comments; what are your positive comments?"

A. "Let's start with the New Warrior Training Adventure weekend. Now, one year later, what are your feelings and judgments about the weekend training?"

Follow-up probes if necessary.

B. "Did you participate in an I-group?"

C. "What are your feelings and judgements about how the 8 week facilitation period influenced your I-group?"

Follow-up probes if necessary.

D. "What are your feelings and judgments about your I-group after the 8 week facilitation period ended?"

Follow-up probes if necessary

Table O1 Continued.

Other ManKind Project Activities Matrix.

E. "What other New Warrior activities have you participated in and what are your feelings and judgments about those activities?"

	How many times?	Evaluation?
Own graduation		
Other graduations		
Brother Circle/Dance/Sweat		
GUTS Training		
Staffing training weekends		
Other trainings		
Inner King		
Your Mother's pillow		
Mission weekend		
Other trainings		
Council Meetings		
LKS		
Community events		
Service activities		
Friendship networks		
Other activities		

Table O1 Continued.

"Now, that is the end of section three of the interview.

VI. End of Interview

A. "Do you have any feedback to New Warrior, either positive or negative?"

B. "The interview is completed. Thank you for your participation. Do you have any comments you would like to make that might help us in doing this research?"

Reason for Not returning Questionnaires.

"It would be very helpful to us to understand why you chose not to return the questionnaires. Please tell me your reasons."

too private

didn't have time

forgot to do questionnaire

didn't understand why it was important

"Thanks again. Goodbye."

Appendix P: Independent T-Tests Comparing Baseline on Predictor and Criterion Study
Variables between Study Participants and Non-study Participants (Table P1).

	N	Mean	S.D.	p-value	d.f.
<u>Depression</u>					
Study	100	2.32	.93	.955	138
Non-study	40	2.33	.91		
<u>GRC - SPC</u>					
Study	100	3.65	.92	.698	138
Non-study	40	3.72	.85		
<u>GRC - RME</u>					
Study	100	3.35	1.11	.287	138
Non-study	40	3.13	1.12		
<u>Life Satisfaction</u>					
Study	100	2.45	.86	.103	138
Non-study	40	2.73	.95		
<u>Social Support Availability</u>					
Study	100	4.63	2.22	.668	138
Non-study	40	4.45	2.41		
<u>Social Support Satisfaction</u>					
Study	100	4.27	1.24	.880	138
Non-study	40	4.24	1.33		
<u>MKP Beliefs</u>					
Study	92	3.20	.79	.216	128
Non-study	38	3.40	.87		
<u>Age (continuous)</u>					
Study	100	44.46	10.27	.119	138
Non-study	40	41.53	9.32		
<u>I-group Involvement (continuous)</u>					
Study	100	15.93	9.24	.169	119
Non-study	21	12.68	12.11		

Appendix Q: Correlations Between Predictors Dichotomously or Continuously Coded and Demographic Variables (Pearson R Coefficient) (Table Q1).

	Age	MKP blf	SS-N FU	SS-S FU	Igrp (cont)	MKP part	SHG part	Year chg	Crch Grp
Mil exp	-.416***	.130	.008	.166	.070	.047	-.033	.129	.015
Relig.	-.237*	.101	-.110	.027	-.001	-.078	.128	.170	.072
Child	-.057	.167	.109	.105	-.017	-.039	-.053	-.018	-.079
Sex orient	-.026	-.030	.077	-.045	.122	.132	.214*	.017	-.033
Mar. Stat.	-.296**	.085	.148	.037	-.064	.012	.087	.091	-.050
Ethn.	-.090	-.160	-.090	-.165	-.034	-.008	-.079	.150	-.026

FU--Long-term Follow-up; MKP blf--MKP beliefs at LTFU; SS-- Social Support Number; SS-S-- Social Support Satisfaction; MKP part.--Non I-group MKP part. coded in ½ days; *The following coded in months:* I Grp--I-group participation; Crch grp--Church group involvement; SHG--self-help group participation; Time to LTFUqna; Time to Interview. *The following coded yes-no:* Year chg.--perceived change in year prior to attending the TAW, yes(1) no (2); Mil exp--Military experience, yes(1) no (2); Child at home, yes(1) no (2). Religion--Christian (1) versus non-Christian (2); Sexual orientation--heterosexual (1) versus gay, bisexual and transgendered (2); Marital Status -married (1) versus all other conditions (2); Ethnicity--Caucasian (1) versus all other ethnicities (2);

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

Appendix R: MANCOVA Results for Age Categories on Criterion Variables at LTFU
(Table R1).

MANOVA for Depression at LTFU on Age Category (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..depression 18 months

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	2.306	.432	7
AGECAT	2	1.844	.755	45
AGECAT	3	2.187	.931	39
AGECAT	4	2.032	.791	9
For entire sample		2.027	.824	100

Variable .. DEPR	FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
depression	AGECAT	1	2.510	.857	7
	AGECAT	2	2.362	.929	45
	AGECAT	3	2.282	.890	39
	AGECAT	4	2.143	1.286	9
	For entire sample		2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for depression at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	57.18	95	.60		
REGRESSION	6.95	1	6.95	11.55	.001
AGECAT	3.22	3	1.07	1.78	.156
(Model)	9.99	4	2.50	4.15	.004
(Total)	67.17	99	.68		

R-Squared = .149

Adjusted R-Squared = .113

Table R1 Continued.

MANOVA for Depression (transformed)at LTFU on Age Category

(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. Depression transformed					
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.		N
AGECAT	1	.356	.083		7
AGECAT	2	.235	.161		45
AGECAT	3	.303	.182		39
AGECAT	4	.282	.155		9
For entire sample		.274	.167		100

Variable .. DEPR					
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.		N
AGECAT	1	2.510	.857		7
AGECAT	2	2.362	.929		45
AGECAT	3	2.282	.890		39
AGECAT	4	2.143	1.286		9
For entire sample		2.322	.934		100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for Depr. transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	2.29	95	.02		
REGRESSION	.33	1	.33	13.66	.000
AGECAT	.15	3	.05	2.12	.103
(Model)	.48	4	.12	4.96	.001
(Total)	2.77	99	.03		

R-Squared = .173

Adjusted R-Squared = .138

Table R1 Continued.

MANOVA for SPC at LTFU on Age Category (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..SPC - success power competition 18 month

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	3.511	.769	7
AGECAT	2	3.100	.783	45
AGECAT	3	3.341	.832	39
AGECAT	4	3.137	.887	9
For entire sample		3.226	.810	100

Variable ..SPC - success power competition

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	3.582	.376	7
AGECAT	2	3.716	.857	45
AGECAT	3	3.662	.971	39
AGECAT	4	3.350	1.345	9
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPCQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	32.22	95	.34		
REGRESSION	30.88	1	30.88	91.03	.000
AGECAT	2.51	3	.84	2.47	.067
(Model)	32.75	4	8.19	24.14	.000
(Total)	64.97	99	.66		

R-Squared = .504

Adjusted R-Squared = .483

Table R1 Continued.

MANOVA for SPC transformed on Age Category (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. SPC transformed

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	.536	.102	7
AGECAT	2	.475	.125	45
AGECAT	3	.509	.119	39
AGECAT	4	.479	.134	9
For entire sample		.493	.122	100

Variable .. SPC - success power competition

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	3.582	.376	7
AGECAT	2	3.716	.857	45
AGECAT	3	3.662	.971	39
AGECAT	4	3.350	1.345	9
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPC transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	.72	95	.01		
REGRESSION	.70	1	.70	92.33	.000
AGECAT	.05	3	.02	2.28	.084
(Model)	.74	4	.19	24.35	.000
(Total)	1.47	99	.01		

R-Squared = .506
Adjusted R-Squared = .485

Table R1 Continued.

MANOVA for RME at LTFU on Age Category (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..Emotional restriction RE and RABM at LTFU

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	3.057	.924	7
AGECAT	2	2.522	.830	45
AGECAT	3	2.875	1.009	39
AGECAT	4	2.512	.864	9
For entire sample		2.696	.920	100

Variable .. Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	3.443	1.161	7
AGECAT	2	3.487	.994	45
AGECAT	3	3.289	1.231	39
AGECAT	4	2.901	1.150	9
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *
*

Tests of Significance for EMORSTRQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	43.51	95	.46		
REGRESSION	36.53	1	36.53	79.77	.000
AGECAT	5.23	3	1.74	3.81	.013
(Model)	40.36	4	10.09	22.03	.000
(Total)	83.86	99	.85		

R-Squared = .481

Adjusted R-Squared = .459

Table R1 Continued.

MANOVA for RME (transformed)at LTFU on Age Category (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. RME transformed

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	.470	.124	7
AGECAT	2	.377	.153	45
AGECAT	3	.430	.168	39
AGECAT	4	.378	.144	9
For entire sample		.404	.157	100

Variable ..RME	Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.			
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	3.443	1.161	7
AGECAT	2	3.487	.994	45
AGECAT	3	3.289	1.231	39
AGECAT	4	2.901	1.150	9
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests of Significance for RME transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	1.22	95	.01		
REGRESSION	1.13	1	1.13	87.81	.000
AGECAT	.14	3	.05	3.52	.018
(Model)	1.23	4	.31	23.78	.000
(Total)	2.45	99	.02		

R-Squared = .500
Adjusted R-Squared = .479

Table R1 Continued.

MANOVA for Life Satisfaction at LTFU on Age Category (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..life satisfaction 18 months

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	3.214	.559	7
AGECAT	2	3.128	.894	45
AGECAT	3	2.778	.791	39
AGECAT	4	3.111	.935	9
For entire sample		2.996	.846	100

Variable ..life satisfaction

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
AGECAT	1	2.619	.966	7
AGECAT	2	2.348	.945	45
AGECAT	3	2.455	.695	39
AGECAT	4	2.852	.941	9
For entire sample		2.454	.855	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for Liffe satisfaction at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	44.01	95	.46		
REGRESSION	23.80	1	23.80	51.37	.000
AGECAT	3.75	3	1.25	2.70	.050
(Model)	26.89	4	6.72	14.51	.000
(Total)	70.89	99	.72		

R-Squared = .379
Adjusted R-Squared = .353

Appendix S: MANCOVA Results for I-group Participation on Criterion Variables
at LTFU (Table S1).

MANOVA for Depression at LTFU on I-group participation (controlling
for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. DEPRQ		depression 18 months			
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
IG3WAY	0	2.111	1.167	9	
IG3WAY	1	2.060	.682	36	
IG3WAY	2	1.992	.859	55	
For entire sample		2.027	.824	100	

Variable .. DEPR		depression			
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
IG3WAY	0	2.587	1.198	9	
IG3WAY	1	2.361	.837	36	
IG3WAY	2	2.252	.957	55	
For entire sample		2.322	.934	100	

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for DEPR at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	60.37	96	.63		
REGRESSION	6.64	1	6.64	10.55	.002
IG3WAY	.03	2	.02	.02	.976
(Model)	6.80	3	2.27	3.61	.016
(Total)	67.17	99	.68		

R-Squared = .101

Adjusted R-Squared = .073

Table S1 Continued.

MANOVA for Depression (transformed) at LTFU on I-group participation
(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. Depression (transformed)

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	.270	.231	9
IG3WAY	1	.291	.143	36
IG3WAY	2	.264	.172	55
For entire sample		.274	.167	100

Variable .. DEPR depression

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	2.587	1.198	9
IG3WAY	1	2.361	.837	36
IG3WAY	2	2.252	.957	55
For entire sample		2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for DEPR transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	2.43	96	.03		
REGRESSION	.32	1	.32	12.70	.001
IG3WAY	.01	2	.01	.26	.772
(Model)	.34	3	.11	4.44	.006
(Total)	2.77	99	.03		

R-Squared = .122

Adjusted R-Squared = .094

Table S1 Continued.

MANOVA for SPC at LTFU on I-group participation (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. SPC - success power competition 18 month

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	3.350	.910	9
IG3WAY	1	3.479	.746	36
IG3WAY	2	3.041	.800	55
For entire sample		3.226	.810	100

Variable .. SPC	SPC - success power competition			
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	3.556	.556	9
IG3WAY	1	3.775	.923	36
IG3WAY	2	3.588	.975	55
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPC at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	32.07	96	.33		
REGRESSION	28.57	1	28.57	85.54	.000
IG3WAY	2.66	2	1.33	3.99	.022
(Model)	32.90	3	10.97	32.83	.000
(Total)	64.97	99	.66		

R-Squared = .506
Adjusted R-Squared = .491

Table S1 Continued.

MANOVA for SPC transformed on I-group participation (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. SPC transformed

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	.509	.130	9
IG3WAY	1	.530	.105	36
IG3WAY	2	.466	.126	55
For entire sample		.493	.122	100

Variable .. SPC	SPC - success power competition			
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	3.556	.556	9
IG3WAY	1	3.775	.923	36
IG3WAY	2	3.588	.975	55
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPC transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	.72	96	.01		
REGRESSION	.65	1	.65	86.87	.000
IG3WAY	.05	2	.03	3.60	.031
(Model)	.74	3	.25	32.99	.000
(Total)	1.47	99	.01		

R-Squared = .508

Adjusted R-Squared = .492

Table S1 Continued.

MANOVA for RME at LTFU on I-group participation (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. Emotional restriction RE and RABM at LTFU

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	3.135	1.273	9
IG3WAY	1	2.811	.929	36
IG3WAY	2	2.549	.831	55
For entire sample		2.696	.920	100

Variable .. Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	3.245	1.313	9
IG3WAY	1	3.406	1.330	36
IG3WAY	2	3.338	.930	55
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for RME at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	45.19	96	.47		
REGRESSION	35.28	1	35.28	74.93	.000
IG3WAY	3.55	2	1.77	3.77	.027
(Model)	38.67	3	12.89	27.38	.000
(Total)	83.86	99	.85		

R-Squared = .461

Adjusted R-Squared = .444

Table S1 Continued.

MANOVA for RME (transformed) at LTFU on I-group participation(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. RME transformed

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	.465	.177	9
IG3WAY	1	.422	.165	36
IG3WAY	2	.383	.148	55
For entire sample		.404	.157	100

Variable .. Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
IG3WAY	0	3.245	1.313	9
IG3WAY	1	3.406	1.330	36
IG3WAY	2	3.338	.930	55
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for RME transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	1.29	96	.01		
REGRESSION	1.09	1	1.09	81.48	.000
IG3WAY	.07	2	.04	2.69	.073
(Model)	1.16	3	.39	28.87	.000
(Total)	2.45	99	.02		

R-Squared = .474

Adjusted R-Squared = .458

Table S1 Continued.

MANOVA for Life Satisfaction at LTFU on I-group participation

(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..life satisfaction 18 months					
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.		N
IG3WAY	0	3.222	.950		9
IG3WAY	1	2.824	.783		36
IG3WAY	2	3.071	.865		55
For entire sample		2.996	.846		100

Variable .. LIFESAT					
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.		N
IG3WAY	0	2.711	.976		9
IG3WAY	1	2.380	.868		36
IG3WAY	2	2.461	.835		55
For entire sample		2.454	.855		100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for LIFESATQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	46.81	96	.49		
REGRESSION	22.25	1	22.25	45.63	.000
IG3WAY	.95	2	.48	.98	.381
(Model)	24.09	3	8.03	16.47	.000
(Total)	70.89	99	.72		

R-Squared = .340

Adjusted R-Squared = .319

Appendix T: MANCOVA Results for MKP Participation on Criterion Variables at
LTFU.(Table T1).

MANOVA for Depression at LTFU on MKP participation (controlling for
baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. depression 18 months

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	2.041	.851	31
MKPCOD	1	2.214	.995	30
MKPCOD	2	1.872	.623	39
For entire sample		2.027	.824	100

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	2.290	.924	31
MKPCOD	1	2.470	.990	30
MKPCOD	2	2.233	.908	39
For entire sample		2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for DEPR at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	59.07	96	.62		
REGRESSION	6.11	1	6.11	9.92	.002
MKPCOD	1.33	2	.66	1.08	.343
(Model)	8.10	3	2.70	4.39	.006
(Total)	67.17	99	.68		

R-Squared = .121
Adjusted R-Squared = .093

Table T1 Continued.

MANOVA for Depression (transformed) at LTFU on MKP participation(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. DEPR transformed

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	.275	.177	31
MKPCOD	1	.304	.191	30
MKPCOD	2	.251	.137	39
For entire sample		.274	.167	100

Variable ..depression

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	2.290	.924	31
MKPCOD	1	2.470	.990	30
MKPCOD	2	2.233	.908	39
For entire sample		2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for DEPR transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	2.42	96	.03		
REGRESSION	.30	1	.30	12.00	.001
MKPCOD	.03	2	.01	.53	.592
(Model)	.35	3	.12	4.65	.004
(Total)	2.77	99	.03		

R-Squared = .127

Adjusted R-Squared = .099

Table T1 Continued.

MANOVA for SPC at LTFU on MKP participation (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..SPC - success power competition 18 month

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	3.146	.773	31
MKPCOD	1	3.203	.821	30
MKPCOD	2	3.308	.844	39
For entire sample		3.226	.810	100

Variable .. SPC - success power competition

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	3.460	.982	31
MKPCOD	1	3.592	.784	30
MKPCOD	2	3.852	.959	39
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPC at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	34.63	96	.36		
REGRESSION	29.87	1	29.87	82.80	.000
MKPCOD	.10	2	.05	.14	.867
(Model)	30.34	3	10.11	28.04	.000
(Total)	64.97	99	.66		

R-Squared = .467

Adjusted R-Squared = .450

Table T1 Continued.

MANOVA for SPC at LTFU on MKP participation (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. SPC transformed		Mean	Std. Dev.	N
FACTOR	CODE			
MKPCOD	0	.484	.115	31
MKPCOD	1	.490	.125	30
MKPCOD	2	.503	.127	39
For entire sample		.493	.122	100

Variable .. SPC - success power competition

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	3.460	.982	31
MKPCOD	1	3.592	.784	30
MKPCOD	2	3.852	.959	39
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPC transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	.77	96	.01		
REGRESSION	.69	1	.69	85.61	.000
MKPCOD	.00	2	.00	.30	.743
(Model)	.70	3	.23	28.83	.000
(Total)	1.47	99	.01		

R-Squared = .474
Adjusted R-Squared = .457

Table T1 Continued.

MANOVA for RME at LTFU on MKP participation (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. Emotional restriction RE and RABM at LTFU

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	2.787	1.086	31
MKPCOD	1	2.855	.934	30
MKPCOD	2	2.502	.738	39
For entire sample		2.696	.920	100

Variable .. Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	3.045	1.293	31
MKPCOD	1	3.682	1.043	30
MKPCOD	2	3.348	.955	39
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for RME at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	45.21	96	.47		
REGRESSION	36.16	1	36.16	76.77	.000
MKPCOD	3.53	2	1.76	3.74	.027
(Model)	38.65	3	12.88	27.35	.000
(Total)	83.86	99	.85		

R-Squared = .461

Adjusted R-Squared = .444

Table T1 Continued.

MANOVA for RME (transformed) at LTFU on MKP participation (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. RME transformed				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	.410	.183	31
MKPCOD	1	.429	.164	30
MKPCOD	2	.380	.128	39
For entire sample		.404	.157	100

Variable .. Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	3.045	1.293	31
MKPCOD	1	3.682	1.043	30
MKPCOD	2	3.348	.955	39
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for RMEXYZ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	1.30	96	.01		
REGRESSION	1.11	1	1.11	82.21	.000
MKPCOD	.06	2	.03	2.34	.102
(Model)	1.15	3	.38	28.44	.000
(Total)	2.45	99	.02		

R-Squared = .471
Adjusted R-Squared = .454

Table T1 Continued.

MANOVA for Life Satisfaction at LTFU on MKP participation (controlling
for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..life satisfaction 18 months				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	3.091	.745	31
MKPCOD	1	2.761	.929	30
MKPCOD	2	3.100	.840	39
For entire sample		2.996	.846	100

Variable .. LIFESAT				
life satisfaction				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
MKPCOD	0	2.798	.894	31
MKPCOD	1	2.133	.767	30
MKPCOD	2	2.427	.805	39
For entire sample		2.454	.855	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for LIFESATQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	46.81	96	.49		
REGRESSION	21.72	1	21.72	44.56	.000
MKPCOD	.95	2	.48	.98	.380
(Model)	24.09	3	8.03	16.47	.000
(Total)	70.89	99	.72		

R-Squared = .340

Adjusted R-Squared = .319

Appendix U: MANCOVA Results for Self-help Group Experience on Criterion

Variables at LTFU.(Table U1).

MANOVA for Depression at LTFU on Self-help Group Experience (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..depression 18 months

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	2.223	.848	34
SHGTOT	1	1.873	.827	36
SHGTOT	2	1.990	.773	30
For entire sample		2.027	.824	100

Variable ..depression

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	2.370	1.094	34
SHGTOT	1	2.454	.883	36
SHGTOT	2	2.108	.778	30
For entire sample		2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests of Significance for Depression @ LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	57.93	96	.60		
REGRESSION	7.05	1	7.05	11.68	.001
SHGTOT	2.47	2	1.23	2.04	.135
(Model)	9.24	3	3.08	5.10	.003
(Total)	67.17	99	.68		

R-Squared = .138
Adjusted R-Squared = .111

Table U1 Continued.

MANOVA for Depression (transformed) at LTFU on Self-help Group
Experience (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. Depression transformed

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	.318	.159	34
SHGTOT	1	.237	.174	36
SHGTOT	2	.269	.162	30
For entire sample		.274	.167	100

Variable ..depression

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	2.370	1.094	34
SHGTOT	1	2.454	.883	36
SHGTOT	2	2.108	.778	30
For entire sample		2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for Depression trans. using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	2.31	96	.02		
REGRESSION	.34	1	.34	14.21	.000
SHGTOT	.13	2	.07	2.78	.067
(Model)	.46	3	.15	6.35	.001
(Total)	2.77	99	.03		

R-Squared = .166

Adjusted R-Squared = .139

Table U1 Continued.

MANOVA for SPC at LTFU on Self-help Group Experience (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..SPC - success power competition 18 month

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	3.382	.855	34
SHGTOT	1	3.182	.811	36
SHGTOT	2	3.103	.754	30
For entire sample		3.226	.810	100

Variable .. SPC - success power competition

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	3.676	.941	34
SHGTOT	1	3.744	.890	36
SHGTOT	2	3.516	.960	30
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPC at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	33.64	96	.35		
REGRESSION	29.97	1	29.97	85.54	.000
SHGTOT	1.09	2	.55	1.56	.215
(Model)	31.33	3	10.44	29.81	.000
(Total)	64.97	99	.66		

R-Squared = .482
Adjusted R-Squared = .466

Table U1 Continued.

MANOVA for SPC (transformed) on Self-help Group Experience(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. SPC transformed

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	.512	.131	34
SHGTOT	1	.487	.122	36
SHGTOT	2	.478	.112	30
For entire sample		.493	.122	100

Variable .. SPC - success power competition

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	3.676	.941	34
SHGTOT	1	3.744	.890	36
SHGTOT	2	3.516	.960	30
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPC transformed using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	.76	96	.01		
REGRESSION	.69	1	.69	86.95	.000
SHGTOT	.02	2	.01	1.10	.336
(Model)	.71	3	.24	29.84	.000
(Total)	1.47	99	.01		

R-Squared = .483

Adjusted R-Squared = .466

Table U1 Continued.

MANOVA for RME at LTFU on Self-help Group Experience (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..Emotional restriction RE and RABM At LTFU

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	2.783	1.080	34
SHGTOT	1	2.719	.928	36
SHGTOT	2	2.570	.707	30
For entire sample		2.696	.920	100

Variable ..Emotional restriction RE and RABM

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	3.344	1.175	34
SHGTOT	1	3.563	1.030	36
SHGTOT	2	3.115	1.124	30
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for RME at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	48.16	96	.50		
REGRESSION	34.95	1	34.95	69.68	.000
SHGTOT	.58	2	.29	.58	.562
(Model)	35.71	3	11.90	23.72	.000
(Total)	83.86	99	.85		

R-Squared = .426
Adjusted R-Squared = .408

Table U1 Continued.

MANOVA for RME (transformed) at LTFU on Self-help Group Experience(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. RME transformed

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	.412	.175	34
SHGTOT	1	.408	.159	36
SHGTOT	2	.391	.137	30
For entire sample		.404	.157	100

Variable .. RME

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	3.344	1.175	34
SHGTOT	1	3.563	1.030	36
SHGTOT	2	3.115	1.124	30
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for RMEXYZ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	1.35	96	.01		
REGRESSION	1.10	1	1.10	78.32	.000
SHGTOT	.02	2	.01	.54	.587
(Model)	1.11	3	.37	26.28	.000
(Total)	2.45	99	.02		

R-Squared = .451

Adjusted R-Squared = .434

Table U1 Continued.

MANOVA for Life Satisfaction at LTFU on Self-help Group Experience

(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..life satisfaction 18 months

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	2.975	.840	34
SHGTOT	1	3.007	.926	36
SHGTOT	2	3.006	.779	30
For entire sample		2.996	.846	100

Variable .. Life satisfaction

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
SHGTOT	0	2.451	.850	34
SHGTOT	1	2.344	.892	36
SHGTOT	2	2.589	.826	30
For entire sample		2.454	.855	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for LIFESATQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	47.42	96	.49		
REGRESSION	23.45	1	23.45	47.48	.000
SHGTOT	.34	2	.17	.34	.709
(Model)	23.47	3	7.82	15.84	.000
(Total)	70.89	99	.72		

R-Squared = .331
Adjusted R-Squared = .310

Appendix V: MANCOVA Results for Perceived Year Change on Criterion Variables at
LTFU (Table V1).

MANOVA for Reported Year change on Depression (controlling for
baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

FACTOR	Variable ..depression CODE	18 months		N
		Mean	Std. Dev.	
YRCHANGE	none	2.049	.893	26
YRCHANGE	moderate	1.922	.813	31
YRCHANGE	major ch	2.090	.800	43
For entire sample		2.027	.824	100

FACTOR	Variable ..depression CODE			N
		Mean	Std. Dev.	
YRCHANGE	none	2.308	1.071	26
YRCHANGE	moderate	2.164	.809	31
YRCHANGE	major ch	2.444	.934	43
For entire sample		2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for DEPRQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS		60.23	96	.63	
REGRESSION	6.42	1	6.42	10.23	.002
YRCHANGE	.17	2	.09	.14	.872
(Model)	6.95	3	2.32	3.69	.015
(Total)		67.17	99	.68	

R-Squared = .103
Adjusted R-Squared = .075

Table V1 Continued.

MANOVA for Report Yr. change on Depression (transformed)(controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. DEPRESSION TRANSFORMED	FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
YRCHANGE	none		.276	.175	26
YRCHANGE	moderate		.249	.175	31
YRCHANGE	major ch		.291	.158	43
For entire sample			.274	.167	100

Variable .. Depression	FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
YRCHANGE	none		2.308	1.071	26
YRCHANGE	moderate		2.164	.809	31
YRCHANGE	major ch		2.444	.934	43
For entire sample			2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for DEPRXYZQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	2.43	96	.03		
REGRESSION	.30	1	.30	12.00	.001
YRCHANGE	.01	2	.01	.24	.789
(Model)	.34	3	.11	4.43	.006
(Total)	2.77	99	.03		

R-Squared = .122
Adjusted R-Squared = .094

Table V1 Continued.

MANOVA for Reported Year change on SPC (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..SPC - success power competition 18 month					
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
YRCHANGE	none	3.269	.924	26	
YRCHANGE	moderate	3.278	.795	31	
YRCHANGE	major ch	3.163	.761	43	
For entire sample		3.226	.810	100	

Variable .. SPC					
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
YRCHANGE	none	3.748	.849	26	
YRCHANGE	moderate	3.642	.765	31	
YRCHANGE	major ch	3.602	1.076	43	
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100	

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPCQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	34.58	96	.36		
REGRESSION	30.09	1	30.09	83.55	.000
YRCHANGE	.16	2	.08	.22	.805
(Model)	30.40	3	10.13	28.13	.000
(Total)	64.97	99	.66		

R-Squared = .468

Adjusted R-Squared = .451

Table V1 Continued.

MANOVA for Reported Year change on SPC transformed(control for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. SPC transformed		Mean	Std. Dev.	N
FACTOR	CODE			
YRCHANGE	none	.496	.133	26
YRCHANGE	moderate	.501	.122	31
YRCHANGE	major ch	.486	.117	43
For entire sample		.493	.122	100

Variable .. SPC		SPC - success power competition		N
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	
YRCHANGE	none	3.748	.849	26
YRCHANGE	moderate	3.642	.765	31
YRCHANGE	major ch	3.602	1.076	43
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPCXYZQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	.77	96	.01		
REGRESSION	.69	1	.69	85.63	.000
YRCHANGE	.00	2	.00	.21	.809
(Model)	.69	3	.23	28.72	.000
(Total)	1.47	99	.01		

R-Squared = .473
Adjusted R-Squared = .457

Table VI Continued.

MANOVA for Reported Year change on RME (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.at LTFU					
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
YRCHANGE	none	2.696	.957	26	
YRCHANGE	moderate	2.876	.954	31	
YRCHANGE	major ch	2.566	.871	43	
For entire sample		2.696	.920	100	

Variable ..Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb. Baseline					
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
YRCHANGE	none	3.488	.872	26	
YRCHANGE	moderate	3.253	1.032	31	
YRCHANGE	major ch	3.346	1.299	43	
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100	

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for RME at LTFU using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	46.22	96	.48		
REGRESSION	35.91	1	35.91	74.60	.000
YRCHANGE	2.52	2	1.26	2.62	.078
(Model)	37.65	3	12.55	26.07	.000
(Total)	83.86	99	.85		

R-Squared = .449

Adjusted R-Squared = .432

Table V1 Continued.

MANOVA for Reported Year change on RME transformed (controlling for baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. RME transformed		Mean	Std. Dev.	N
FACTOR	CODE			
YRCHANGE	none	.405	.154	26
YRCHANGE	moderate	.432	.163	31
YRCHANGE	major ch	.383	.156	43
For entire sample		.404	.157	100

Variable .. RME baseline		Mean	Std. Dev.	N
FACTOR	CODE			
YRCHANGE	none	3.488	.872	26
YRCHANGE	moderate	3.253	1.032	31
YRCHANGE	major ch	3.346	1.299	43
For entire sample		3.354	1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for RMEXYZ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	1.30	96	.01		
REGRESSION	1.11	1	1.11	82.33	.000
YRCHANGE	.06	2	.03	2.38	.098
(Model)	1.15	3	.38	28.49	.000
(Total)	2.45	99	.02		

R-Squared = .471
 Adjusted R-Squared = .454

Table V1 Continued.

MANOVA for Reported Year change on Life Sat. (controlling for
baseline)

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable ..life satisfaction 18 months				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
YRCHANGE	none	2.942	.876	26
YRCHANGE	moderate	3.032	.926	31
YRCHANGE	major ch	3.002	.785	43
For entire sample		2.996	.846	100

Variable ..Life satisfaction				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
YRCHANGE	none	2.276	.663	26
YRCHANGE	moderate	2.653	.992	31
YRCHANGE	major ch	2.419	.842	43
For entire sample		2.454	.855	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for LIFESATQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	47.49	96	.49		
REGRESSION	23.29	1	23.29	47.08	.000
YRCHANGE	.27	2	.14	.28	.759
(Model)	23.41	3	7.80	15.77	.000
(Total)	70.89	99	.72		

R-Squared = .330

Adjusted R-Squared = .309

Appendix W: MANCOVA Results to Explore Effects of Cohort on Study Variables .

Table W1

MANCOVA Analyses on Criterion Variables by Cohort (Controlling for Baseline).

Cell Means and Standard Deviations						
Variable .. DEPRQ		depression 18 months				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.		N	
COHORT	1	2.000	.972		8	
COHORT	2	1.816	.513		7	
COHORT	3	1.901	.957		13	
COHORT	4	2.286	.945		11	
COHORT	5	2.200	1.113		15	
COHORT	6	1.750	.585		8	
COHORT	7	2.226	.402		12	
COHORT	8	2.038	.841		15	
COHORT	9	1.805	.656		11	
For entire sample		2.027	.824		100	

Variable .. DEPR		depression				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.		N	
COHORT	1	2.232	1.074		8	
COHORT	2	2.367	.611		7	
COHORT	3	2.110	.971		13	
COHORT	4	2.584	.611		11	
COHORT	5	2.371	1.023		15	
COHORT	6	2.188	.923		8	
COHORT	7	2.889	1.154		12	
COHORT	8	2.219	.864		15	
COHORT	9	1.896	.879		11	
For entire sample		2.322	.934		100	
* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *						
Tests of Significance for DEPRQ using UNIQUE sums of squares						
Source of Variation		SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS		58.58	90	.65		
REGRESSION		5.25	1	5.25	8.07	.006
COHORT		1.82	8	.23	.35	.944
(Model)		8.59	9	.95	1.47	.172
(Total)		67.17	99	.68		
R-Squared =		.128				
Adjusted R-Squared =		.041				

Table W1 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. SPCQ	SPC - success power competition 18 month			
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
COHORT	1	3.563	.430	8
COHORT	2	3.407	.498	7
COHORT	3	3.266	.820	13
COHORT	4	3.091	.778	11
COHORT	5	3.046	1.109	15
COHORT	6	2.808	.773	8
COHORT	7	3.497	.673	12
COHORT	8	3.123	.887	15
COHORT	9	3.350	.790	11
For entire sample		3.226	.810	100

Variable .. SPC	SPC - success power competition			
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
COHORT	1	4.298	.470	8
COHORT	2	3.910	.532	7
COHORT	3	3.817	1.155	13
COHORT	4	3.541	.577	11
COHORT	5	3.207	1.114	15
COHORT	6	3.433	.956	8
COHORT	7	3.994	.535	12
COHORT	8	3.638	1.123	15
COHORT	9	3.350	.854	11
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 *

Tests of Significance for SPCQ using UNIQUE sums of squares					
Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	32.62	90	.36		
REGRESSION	27.90	1	27.90	76.99	.000
COHORT	2.11	8	.26	.73	.665
(Model)	32.35	9	3.59	9.92	.000
(Total)	64.97	99	.66		

R-Squared = .498

Adjusted R-Squared = .448

Table W1 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. EMORSTRQ	Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.1		
FACTOR	CODE	Mean Std. Dev.	N
COHORT	1	3.024 1.042	8
COHORT	2	2.497 .473	7
COHORT	3	2.511 .743	13
COHORT	4	2.737 .814	11
COHORT	5	2.683 1.283	15
COHORT	6	2.194 .929	8
COHORT	7	2.945 .544	12
COHORT	8	2.954 1.095	15
COHORT	9	2.521 .826	11
For entire sample		2.696 .920	100

Variable .. EMORSTR	Emotional restriction RE and RABM comb.		
FACTOR	CODE	Mean Std. Dev.	N
COHORT	1	4.056 .857	8
COHORT	2	2.631 1.153	7
COHORT	3	3.280 1.015	13
COHORT	4	3.306 .756	11
COHORT	5	3.341 1.151	15
COHORT	6	3.194 1.433	8
COHORT	7	3.801 1.344	12
COHORT	8	3.522 1.018	15
COHORT	9	2.858 1.033	11
For entire sample		3.354 1.113	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for EMORSTRQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	46.25	90	.51		
REGRESSION	31.92	1	31.92	62.12	.000
COHORT	2.49	8	.31	.61	.770
(Model)	37.62	9	4.18	8.13	.000
(Total)	83.86	99	.85		

R-Squared = .449
Adjusted R-Squared = .393

Table W1 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. LIFESATQ		life satisfaction 18 months		
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
COHORT	1	2.854	1.160	8
COHORT	2	3.143	.729	7
COHORT	3	3.359	.760	13
COHORT	4	2.697	.878	11
COHORT	5	3.178	.981	15
COHORT	6	3.406	.804	8
COHORT	7	3.167	.546	12
COHORT	8	2.356	.523	15
COHORT	9	3.015	.848	11
For entire sample		2.996	.846	100

Variable .. LIFESATQ		life satisfaction		
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
COHORT	1	2.396	.972	8
COHORT	2	2.357	.325	7
COHORT	3	2.723	.772	13
COHORT	4	1.833	.422	11
COHORT	5	2.689	.779	15
COHORT	6	2.771	1.054	8
COHORT	7	2.347	1.136	12
COHORT	8	2.211	.641	15
COHORT	9	2.758	1.055	11
For entire sample		2.454	.855	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for LIFESATQ using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	41.55	90	.46		
REGRESSION	17.99	1	17.99	38.97	.000
COHORT	6.21	8	.78	1.68	.113
(Model)	29.35	9	3.26	7.06	.000
(Total)	70.89	99	.72		

R-Squared = .414
Adjusted R-Squared = .355

Table W2

MANOVA Analyses of Baseline Criterion Variables on Cohort.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. DEPR	CODE	depression	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
FACTOR					
COHORT	1		2.232	1.074	8
COHORT	2		2.367	.611	7
COHORT	3		2.110	.971	13
COHORT	4		2.584	.611	11
COHORT	5		2.371	1.023	15
COHORT	6		2.188	.923	8
COHORT	7		2.889	1.154	12
COHORT	8		2.219	.864	15
COHORT	9		1.896	.879	11
For entire sample			2.322	.934	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for DEPR using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	78.79	91	.87		
COHORT	7.61	8	.95	1.10	.371
(Model)	7.61	8	.95	1.10	.371
(Total)	86.40	99	.87		

R-Squared = .088
Adjusted R-Squared = .008

Table W2 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations					
Variable .. SPC	SPC - success power competition				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
COHORT	1	4.298	.470	8	
COHORT	2	3.910	.532	7	
COHORT	3	3.817	1.155	13	
COHORT	4	3.541	.577	11	
COHORT	5	3.207	1.114	15	
COHORT	6	3.433	.956	8	
COHORT	7	3.994	.535	12	
COHORT	8	3.638	1.123	15	
COHORT	9	3.350	.854	11	
For entire sample		3.652	.924	100	

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for SPC using UNIQUE sums of squares					
Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	74.46	91	.82		
COHORT	10.06	8	1.26	1.54	.156
(Model)	10.06	8	1.26	1.54	.156
(Total)	84.52	99	.85		

R-Squared = .119
Adjusted R-Squared = .042

Table W2 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. RME	Emotional restriction	RE and RABM comb.	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.
COHORT	1	4.056	.857
COHORT	2	2.631	1.153
COHORT	3	3.280	1.015
COHORT	4	3.306	.756
COHORT	5	3.341	1.151
COHORT	6	3.194	1.433
COHORT	7	3.801	1.344
COHORT	8	3.522	1.018
COHORT	9	2.858	1.033
For entire sample		3.354	1.113

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for EMORSTR using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	109.17	91	1.20		
COHORT	13.43	8	1.68	1.40	.208
(Model)	13.43	8	1.68	1.40	.208
(Total)	122.59	99	1.24		

R-Squared = .110
 Adjusted R-Squared = .031

Table W2 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations					
Variable .. LIFESAT		life satisfaction			
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.		N
COHORT	1	2.396	.972		8
COHORT	2	2.357	.325		7
COHORT	3	2.723	.772		13
COHORT	4	1.833	.422		11
COHORT	5	2.689	.779		15
COHORT	6	2.771	1.054		8
COHORT	7	2.347	1.136		12
COHORT	8	2.211	.641		15
COHORT	9	2.758	1.055		11
For entire sample		2.454	.855		100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for LIFESAT using UNIQUE sums of squares					
Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	63.51	91	.70		
COHORT	8.94	8	1.12	1.60	.135
(Model)	8.94	8	1.12	1.60	.135
(Total)	72.45	99	.73		

R-Squared = .123
Adjusted R-Squared = .046

Table W3

MANOVA Analyses for Predictor Variables by Cohort.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations
Variable .. AGE

FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
COHORT	1	49.750	7.942	8
COHORT	2	46.143	11.437	7
COHORT	3	49.769	9.576	13
COHORT	4	43.364	11.102	11
COHORT	5	44.667	9.217	15
COHORT	6	43.625	14.793	8
COHORT	7	36.667	8.648	12
COHORT	8	43.800	8.377	15
COHORT	9	44.091	9.944	11
For entire sample		44.460	10.270	100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for AGE using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	9074.39	91	99.72		
COHORT	1366.45	8	170.81	1.71	.106
(Model)	1366.45	8	170.81	1.71	.106
(Total)	10440.84	99	105.46		

R-Squared = .131
Adjusted R-Squared = .054

Table W3 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. MNSSNUM	mean of social support number		
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.
COHORT	1	3.958	2.774
COHORT	2	6.095	1.912
COHORT	3	4.282	2.337
COHORT	4	3.970	2.095
COHORT	5	4.511	1.914
COHORT	6	5.208	2.108
COHORT	7	4.472	2.528
COHORT	8	4.622	2.475
COHORT	9	5.212	1.840
For entire sample		4.633	2.223

* * * * * A n a l y s I s o f V a r I a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for MNSSNUM using UNIQUE sums of squares					
Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	457.52	91	5.03		
COHORT	31.92	8	3.99	.79	.610
(Model)	31.92	8	3.99	.79	.610
(Total)	489.44	99	4.94		

R-Squared = .065
Adjusted R-Squared = .000

Table W3 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. MNSSST	mean of social support satisfaction				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.		N
COHORT	1	3.542	1.194		8
COHORT	2	3.857	1.620		7
COHORT	3	4.692	.918		13
COHORT	4	3.955	1.391		11
COHORT	5	4.389	1.266		15
COHORT	6	4.583	1.179		8
COHORT	7	4.319	1.236		12
COHORT	8	4.289	1.133		15
COHORT	9	4.439	1.375		11
For entire sample		4.273	1.236		100

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for MNSSST using UNIQUE sums of squares

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	141.00	91	1.55		
COHORT	10.20	8	1.27	.82	.585
(Model)	10.20	8	1.27	.82	.585
(Total)	151.20	99	1.53		

R-Squared = .067
Adjusted R-Squared = .000

Table W3 Continued.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations					
Variable .. MKPBLF	MKP related beliefs				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
COHORT	2	3.265	.806	7	
COHORT	3	3.077	.852	13	
COHORT	4	2.831	.534	11	
COHORT	5	3.210	.716	15	
COHORT	6	3.393	.986	8	
COHORT	7	3.202	.871	12	
COHORT	8	3.238	.622	15	
COHORT	9	3.442	1.051	11	
For entire sample		3.197	.791	92	

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * *

Tests of Significance for MKPBLF using UNIQUE sums of squares					
Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS	54.25	84	.65		
COHORT	2.69	7	.38	.59	.759
(Model)	2.69	7	.38	.59	.759
(Total)	56.93	91	.63		
R-Squared =	.047				
Adjusted R-Squared =	.000				

Appendix X: Zero-order and Partial Correlations (Controlling for Baseline) Between Criterion Variables at LTFU and Demographic Variables Continuously or Dichotomously Coded.

Table X1

Partial Correlations Between Demographics and Transformed Variables at LTFU.

	Depr LTFU	Depr Trans.	SPC LTFU	SPC Trans.	RME LTFU	RME Trans.	Lifesat LTFU
Military experience	-.16	-.17^a	-.10	-.09	-.14	-.07	.12
Religion	-.09	-.12	-.30^{**}	-.28^{**}	-.24[*]	-.23[*]	.04
Child at home	-.17^a	-.15	-.11	-.12	-.03	-.07	.16
Sexual orientation	.09	.10	.08	.08	.02	.08	-.08
Marital Status	.08	.11	-.05	-.04	-.04	-.03	-.01
Ethnicity	.19^a	.17^a	-.06	-.08	.08	.06	-.21[*]
Time to LTFU qr	-.00	.00	.08	.09	.13	-.12	.15
Time to Interview	-.05	-.03	.05	.06	-.01	-.04	-.09

Depr--Depression; LTFU--Long-Term Follow-Up; SPC--Success Power Competition; RME--Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales; Life Sat.--Life Satisfaction; Military experience--coded yes(1)-no(2); Religion--Christian(1)versus non-Christian(2); Child at home--yes(1)no(2); Education--Hollingshead categories; Sexual orientation--heterosexual (1)versus gay, bisexual(2); Marital Status--married (1) versus all other conditions (2); Ethnicity--Caucasian(1) other(2); Time to LTFU qnare--coded in months; Time to Interview--coded in months.

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

a - Approaches significance, $p < .10$.

Table X2

Pearson Zero-order Correlations Between Criterion Variables at Baseline, at LTFU, and Demographic Variables Continuously or Dichotomously Coded (Pearson R Coef).

	Depr	Depr FU	SPC	SPC FU	RME	RME FU	Life Sat	Lifsat FU
Milit exper.	.13	.11	-.01	-.08	.03	-.09	-.14	-.01
Ethn.	-.09	.15	-.07	-.09	-.01	.06	-.09	-.22*
Relig.	.02	-.09	-.03	-.24*	.01	-.18 ^a	-.02	.02
Chld at home	-.05	-.17^a	.12	-.00	-.01	-.03	.11	.19 ^b
Educ.	.10	-.03	.21*	.13	.12	.02	.03	-.07
Sexual orient.	-.14	.04	-.06	.02	-.09	-.05	-.06	-.10
Marital Status	.00	-.08	-.11	-.04	-.14	-.12	-.12	.08

Depr--Depression; FU--Long-Term Follow-Up; SPC--Success Power Competition;

RME--Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale

subscales; Life Sat.--Life Satisfaction; Military experience--coded yes(1)-no(2);

Religion--Christian(1)versus non-Christian(2); Child at home--yes(1)no(2); Education--

Hollingshead categories; Sexual orientation--heterosexual (1)versus gay, bisexual(2);

Marital Status--married (1) versus all other conditions (2); Ethnicity--Caucasian(1)

other(2); Distance From DC - lived within one hour of either DC or Baltimore (1) or

not (2); Time to LTFU qnare--coded in months; Time to Interview--coded in months.

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

a - Approaches significance, $p < .10$.

Appendix Y: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 1 - 4: Effects of Age, Self-help Group

Experience, Change Before TAW, and Pre-TAW MKP Beliefs on Criteria at LTFU

Table Y1: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 1 - 3: Effects of Age, Self-help Group

Experience, and Life Change Before TAW on Criteria at LTFU

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Depression at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW Depression			.123***
Pre-TAW Depression	.350***	.383**	
Step 2 :Covariates			.060*
Ethnicity	.191*	.205*	
Military Experience	-.190*	-.131	
Step 3: Age Categories			.052 ^b
Age: 30-45	-.392*	-.364 ^a	
Age: 45-60	-.198	-.216	
Age: over 60	-.133	-.147	
Step 4: Self-help Group Experience			.023
Less than 5 yrs. SHG	-.183 ^c	-.188 ^d	
More than 5 yrs. SHG	-.063	-.065	
Step 5: Year Change			.015
Year Change Moderate	-.113	-.113	
Year Change Major	-.022	-.022	
Final equation F (10, 88)=3.301**, R ² =.273			

Table Y1 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Success Power Competition at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW SPC			.465***
Pre-TAW SPC	.682***	.686***	
Step 2 :Covariates			.048***
Religion	-.218***	-.195**	
Step 3: Age Categories			.028
Age 30-45	-.302*	-.285 ^e	
Age 45-60	-.178	-.180	
Age over 60	-.123	-.114	
Step 4: Self-help Group			.005
Less than 5 yrs. SHG	-.079	-.080	
More than 5 yrs. SHG	-.054	-.056	
Step 5: Year Change			.003
Year Change Moderate	.068	.068	
Year Change Major	.021	.021	
Final equation F (9, 90)=12.153***, R ² =.549			

Table Y1 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: RME at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW RME.			.445***
Pre-TAW RME	.667***	.698***	
Step 2 :Covariates			.030*
Religion	-.173*	-.150*	
Step 3: Age Categories			.043*
Age: 30-45	-.307*	-.323*	
Age: 45-60	-.110	-.135	
Age: over 60	-.098	-.101	
Step 4: Self-help Group			.002
Less than 5 yrs. SHG	-.004	-.015	
More than 5 yrs. SHG	-.048	.050	
Step 5: Year Change			.028 ^g
Year Change Moderate	.158 ^f	.158 ^f	
Year Change Major	-.018	-.018	
Final equation F (9, 90)=12.114***, R ² =.548			

Table Y1 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction			.326***
Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.571***	.584***	
Step 2 : Covariates			.031*
Ethnicity	-.176*	-.192*	
Step 3: Age Categories			.059*
Age: 30-45	.076	.085	
Age: 45-60	-.178	-.169	
Age: over 60	-.080	-.078	
Step 4: Self-help Group			.001
Less than 5 yrs. SHG	-.015	-.018	
More than 5 yrs. SHG	-.038	-.039	
Step 5: Year Change			.002
Year Change Moderate	-.037	-.037	
Year Change Major	.005	.005	
Final equation F (9, 90)=7.212***, R ² =.419			

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-Term Follow-Up; SHG - Self-help Group; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict

Table Y1 Continued.

Scale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men).

Note: For every equation, MKP related beliefs was not included in the regression due to preliminary analyses which showed it to be non-significant, and in order to obtain a higher number of participants (see discussion in methods section).

Age category is dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): Aged under 30.

Depression and RME at LTFU was transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Self-help group variable dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): no self-help group experience.

Year change variable dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): no change reported in year prior to TAW.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

a - Approaches significance; $p = .057$.

b - Approaches significance; $p = .110$.

c - Approaches significance; $p = .100$.

d - Approaches significance, $p = .097$.

e - Approaches significance; $p = .055$.

f - Approaches significance; $p = .080$.

Table Y2: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 4: Effects of Pre-TAW MKP Beliefs on Criteria at LTFU.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Depression at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW Depression			.115***
Pre-TAW Depression	.340***	.359**	
Step 2 :Covariates			.045
Ethnicity	.117	.147	
Military Experience	-.197*	-.122	
Step 3: Age Categories			.063 ^a
Age: 30-45	-.393*	-.384*	
Age: 45-60	-.161	-.217	
Age: over 60	-.142	-.162	
Step 4: Self-help Group Experience			.030
Less than 5 yrs. SHG	-.204 ^a	-.201 ^b	
More than 5 yrs. SHG	-.036	-.065	
Step 5: Year Change			.012
Year Change Moderate	-.125	-.126	
Year Change Major	-.025	-.024	
Step 6: Pre-TAW MKP Beliefs scale			.000
	-.012	-.012	
Final equation F (11, 79)=2.592**, R ² =.265			

Table Y2 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Success Power Competition at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW SPC			.483***
Pre-TAW SPC	.695***	.694***	
Step 2 :Covariates			.036**
Religion	-.191***	-.177*	
Step 3: Age Categories			.029
Age 30-45	-.290*	-.279 ^c	
Age 45-60	-.157	-.178	
Age over 60	-.127	-.123	
Step 4: Self-help Group			.006
Less than 5 yrs. SHG	-.096	-.094	
More than 5 yrs. SHG	-.031	-.030	
Step 5: Year Change			.004
Year Change Moderate	.069	.070	
Year Change Major	.018	.020	
Step 6: Pre-TAW MKP Beliefs scale			.000
	-.019	-.019	
Final equation F (9, 90)=12.153***, R ² =.549			

Table Y2 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: RME at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW RME.			.426***
Pre-TAW RME	.653***	.629***	
Step 2 :Covariates			.031*
Religion	-.177*	-.164*	
Step 3: Age Categories			.049*
Age: 30-45	-.309*	-.356*	
Age: 45-60	-.098	-.175	
Age: over 60	-.076	-.088	
Step 4: Self-help Group			.004
Less than 5 yrs. SHG	-.033	-.014	
More than 5 yrs. SHG	-.042	.063	
Step 5: Year Change			.035*
Year Change Moderate	.162 ^d	.160 ^e	
Year Change Major	-.043	-.038	
Step 6: Pre-TAW MKP Beliefs scale			.008
	-.116	-.116	
Final equation F (10, 81)=10.028***, R ² =.553			

Table Y2 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction			.279***
Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.529***	.552***	
Step 2 : Covariates			.020
Ethnicity	-.140	-.145	
Step 3: Age Categories			.077*
Age: 30-45	.076	.087	
Age: 45-60	-.216	-.191	
Age: over 60	-.064	-.058	
Step 4: Self-help Group			.002
Less than 5 yrs. SHG	-.035	-.026	
More than 5 yrs. SHG	-.017	-.020	
Step 5: Year Change			.002
Year Change Moderate	-.005	-.006	
Year Change Major	.045	.045	
Step 6: Pre-TAW MKP Beliefs scale			.008
	-.018	-.018	
Final equation $F(10, 81) = 4.960^{***}$, $R^2 = .380$			

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-term Follow-up; SHG - Self-help Group; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict

Table Y2 Continued.

Scale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men).

Note: MKP related beliefs was included in the regression, which reduced the N to 92 (see discussion in methods section).

Age category is dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): Aged under 30.

Depression and RME at LTFU was transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Self-help group variable dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): no self-help group experience.

Year change variable dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): no change reported in year prior to TAW.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

a - Approaches significance, $p = .087$

b - Approaches significance, $p = .091$

c - Approaches significance, $p = .064$.

d - Approaches significance, $p = .090$.

e - Approaches significance, $p = .092$.

Appendix Z: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 5: Effects of MKP Beliefs at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variables (Table Z1).

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Depression transformed at LTFU			
Step 1. Pre-TAW Depression			.110***
Pre-TAW Depression	.331 ***	.323 **	
Step 2. Covariates			.099 ^c
Ethnicity	.089	.053	
Child in Home	-.117	-.111	
Age Category 2	-.358 ^a	-.313 ^b	
Age Category 3	-.082	.112	
Age Category 4	-.106	-.132	
Step 3. Pre-TAW MKP beliefs			.002
Pre-TAW MKP beliefs	.060	.194	
Step 4. MKP beliefs (LTFU)			.057**
MKP beliefs (LTFU)	-.293**	-.293**	
Final F equation (8,83)=3.806***, R ² =.268			

Table Z1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Success Power Competition at LTFU			
Step 1. Pre-TAW SPC			.483***
Pre-TAW SPC	.695***	.713***	
Step 2. Covariates			.036**
Religion	-.191**	-.136 ^d	
Step 3. Pre-TAW MKP beliefs			.000
Pre-TAW MKP beliefs	.004	.163 ^e	
Step 4. MKP beliefs (LTFU)			.068***
MKP beliefs (LTFU)	.310***	.310***	
Final F equation (4,87)=30.996*** , R ² =.588			

Table Z1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: RME transformed at LTFU			
Step 1. Pre-TAW RME			.426***
Pre-TAW RME	.653***	.632***	
Step 2. Covariates			.116***
Religion	-.151*	-.105	
Age Category 2	-.324*	-.325*	
Age Category 3	-.116	-.219 ^f	
Age Category 4	-.064	-.120	
Year Change 1	.165 ^g	.128	
Year Change 2	-.041	-.067	
Step 3. Pre-TAW MKP beliefs			.007
Pre-TAW MKP beliefs	-.102	.058	
Step 4. MKP beliefs (LTFU)			.095***
MKP beliefs (LTFU)	-.384***	-.384***	

Final F equation (9,82)=16.583***, R²=.644

Table Z1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			
Step 1. Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction			.279***
Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.529***	.574***	
Step 2. Covariates			.096**
Ethnicity	-.147 ^h	-.094	
Age Category 2	.076	.016	
Age Category 3	-.216	-.157	
Age Category 4	-.064	-.029	
Step 3. Pre-TAW MKP beliefs			.000
Pre-TAW MKP beliefs	-.017	-.281*	
Step 4. MKP beliefs (LTFU)			.148***
MKP beliefs (LTFU)	-.468***	-.468***	
Final F equation (7, 84)=13.188***, R ² =.524			

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-term Follow-up; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men). Age category is dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): aged under 30; category 2: aged 30-45; category 3: aged 45-60; category 4: aged over 60.

Table Z1 Continued

RME at LTFU and Depression at LTFU were transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Year change variable dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): no change reported in year prior to TAW; category 2: moderate change reported in year prior to TAW; category 3: major change reported in year prior to TAW.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

a - Approaches significance; $p = .06$.

b - Approaches significance; $p = .10$.

c - Approaches significance; $p = .07$.

d - Approaches significance; $p = .06$.

e - Approaches significance; $p = .06$.

f - Approaches significance; $p = .10$.

g - Approaches significance; $p = .08$.

h - Approaches significance; $p = .09$.

Appendix AA: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 6: Effects of Social Support at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variables (Table AA1).

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Depression at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW Depression			.098**
Pre-TAW Depression	.313**	.279**	
Step 2: Covariates			.110*
Ethnicity	.191*	.153 ^a	
Child in Home	-.142	-.132	
Age: 30-45	-.275	-.264	
Age: 46-60	-.030	-.067	
Age: over 60	-.063	-.115	
Step 3: Pre-TAW Social Support			.003
Pre-TAW SS NUM	-.060	.097	
Pre-TAW SS SAT	-.001	-.009	
Step 4: Social Support (LTFU) - SS NUM and SS SAT			.050*
SS NUM (LTFU)	-.282*	-.282*	
Excluded: SS SAT (Beta In = -.185, p=.080)			
Final F equation (9, 89)=3.489***, R ² =.261			

Table AA1 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Success Power Competition at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW SPC			.466***
Pre-TAW SPC	.683***	.714***	
Step 2: Covariates			.046**
Religion	-.214**	-.202**	
Step 3: Pre-TAW Social Support - SS NUM and SS SAT			.014
Pre-TAW SS Number	.129	.129	
Pre-TAW SS Satisfaction	-.012	-.012	
Step 4: SS (LTFU) - SS NUM and SS SAT			.014
	Excluded: SS NUM (Beta In = -.122, p=.154)		
	Excluded: SS SAT (Beta In = -.079, p=.318)		
Final F equation (4, 94)=26.020***, R ² =.525			

Table AA1 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: RME at LTFU			
Step 1: RE and RABM			.423***
RE and RABM	.650***	.693***	
Step 2: Covariates			.116**
Religion	-.149*	-.143 ^b	
Age: 30-45	-.317*	-.338*	
Age: 46-60	-.105	-.154	
Age: over 60	-.067	-.079	
Year Change Moderate	.154 ^c	.167 ^d	
Year Change Major	-.034	-.023	
Step 3: Pre-TAW Social Support			.005
Pre-TAW SS Number	.059	.102	
Pre-TAW SS Satisfaction	-.073	-.066	
Step 4: SS SAT (LTFU) - SS NUM and SS SAT			.025*
SS SAT (LTFU)	-.183*	-.183*	
Excluded: SS NUM (Beta In = .187, p=.051)			
Final F equation (10, 88) = 11.598***, R ² =.569			

Table AA1 Continued.

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			.324***
Step 1: Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction			
Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.569***	.493***	
Step 2: Covariates			
Ethnicity	-.196*	-.169*	.095**
Age: 30-45	.076	.084	
Age: 46-60	-.179	-.116	
Age: over 60	-.109	-.030	
Step 3. Pre-TAW Social Support			
MSS Number	.135	-.053	.017
MSS Satisfaction	.048	.061	
Step 4. Social Support (LTFU) - SS NUM and SS SAT			
SS NUM (LTFU)	.346***	.346***	.075***
Excluded: SS SAT (Beta In = .161, p=.058)			
Final F equation (8, 90)=11.715***, R ² =.510			

Table AA1 Continued.

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-term Follow-up; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men).

Age category is dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): aged under 30; category 2: aged 30-45; category 3: aged 45-60; category 4: aged over 60.

RME at LTFU and Depression at LTFU were transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Year change variable dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): no change reported in year prior to TAW; category 2: moderate change reported in year prior to TAW; category 3: major change reported in year prior to TAW.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

a - Approaches significance; $p = .11$

b - Approaches significance; $p = .06$

c - Approaches significance; $p = .09$

d - Approaches significance; $p = .07$

Appendix BB: Exploratory Regression Analyses on Hypothesis 6: Independent Effects
of Social Support Availability and Social Support Satisfaction (Table BB1).

Social Support Availability entered First

	<u>Beta At Entry</u>	<u>Final Beta</u>	<u>Step R² Δ</u>
<u>Depression Trans at LTFU:</u>			
SS Availability	-.282*	-.257*	.050*
SS Satisfaction		-.185 ^a	.025 ^a
<u>SPC at LTFU:</u>			
SS Availability		N.S.	.010
SS Satisfaction		N.S.	.003
<u>RME Transformed at LTFU:</u>			
SS Availability	-.204*	-.187*	.022*
SS Satisfaction		-.170*	.021*
<u>Life Satisfaction at LTFU:</u>			
SS Availability	.346***	.322***	.050***
SS Satisfaction		.161 ^a	.025 ^a
Social Support Satisfaction entered First			
<u>Depression Trans at LTFU:</u>			
SS Satisfaction	-.214*	-.185 ^a	.035*
SS Availability		-.257*	.040*
<u>SPC at LTFU:</u>			
SS Satisfaction		N.S.	.010
SS Availability		N.S.	.003
<u>RME Transformed at LTFU:</u>			
SS Satisfaction	-.183*	-.170*	.025*
SS Availability		-.187*	.019*
<u>Life Satisfaction at LTFU:</u>			
SS Satisfaction	.200*	.161 ^a	.031*
SS Availability		.322***	.063***

Table BB1 continued.

Regressions used for this analysis alternatively forced social support availability at LTFU into the equation before forcing social support satisfaction at LTFU, and then forced social support satisfaction at LTFU into the equation before forcing in social support availability.

In steps prior to the ones listed in this table, all covariates discovered in the preliminary analyses and prior primary analyses were controlled for.

a - Approached significance; $p < .10$.

Appendix CC: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 7: The Effects of I Group
Participation on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up (Table CC1).

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Δ
Criterion Variable: Depression Transformed at LTFU			
Step1. Pre-TAW Depression			.123***
Pre-TAW Depression	.350***	.398***	
Step 2. Covariates			.112*
Ethnicity	.209*	.204*	
Child in Home	-.136	-.139	
Age 30-45	-.392*	-.529**	
Age 45-60	-.198	-.315	
Age over 60	-.144	-.228	
Step 3. I Group Participation			.016
Partic. but no longer at LTFU	.246	.267	
Still partic. at LTFU	.253	.240	
Final F equation (8, 91)=3.76***, R ² =.239			

Table CC1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Δ
Criterion Variable: SPC at LTFU			.471***
Step 1. Pre-TAW SPC	.686***	.668***	
Step 2. Covariates			.042**
Religion	-.205**	-.184**	
Step 3. I Group Participation			.028°
Partic. but no longer at LTFU	-.007	-.007	
Still partic. at LTFU	-.175	-.175	
Final F equation (4, 95)=27.96***, R ² =.541			

Table CC1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Δ
Criterion Variable: RME at LTFU			
Step 1. Pre-TAW RME			.419***
RE and RABM	.647***	.676***	
Step 2. Covariates			.113***
Religion	-.147*	-.135 ^a	
Age 30-45	-.312*	-.190	
Age 45-60	-.099	-.008	
Age over 60	-.101	-.032	
Year Change: Moderate	.170 ^b	.166 ^c	
Year Change: Major	-.015	-.025	
Step 3. I Group Participation			.018
Partic. but no longer at LTFU	-.200	-.200	
Still partic. at LTFU	-.251 ^d	-.251 ^d	
Final F equation (9, 90) = 12.19***, R ² = .549			

Table CC1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Δ
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			.326***
Step1. Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.571***	.569***	
Step 2. Covariates			.090**
Ethnicity	-.195*	-.189*	
Age: 30-45	-.076	-.107	
Age: 45-60	.178	.142	
Age: over 60	-.080	-.055	
Step 3. I Group Participation			.005
Partic. but no longer at LTFU	-.103	-.112	
Still partic. at LTFU	-.039	-.025	
Final F equation (7, 92) = 9.57***, R ² = .421			

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-term Follow-up; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales. Year change variable dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): no change reported in year prior to TAW; category 2: moderate change reported in year prior to TAW; category 3: major change reported in year prior to TAW. Age category is dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): aged under 30; category 2: aged 30-45; category 3: aged 45-60; category 4: aged over 60. RME at LTFU and Depression at LTFU were transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Table CC1 Continued

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

a - Approaches significance: $p = .07$

b - Approaches significance: $p = .06$

c - Approaches significance: $p = .07$

d - Approaches significance: $p = .09$

Appendix DD: Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 8: Effects of Non-I Group MKP
Participation at Long-term Follow-up on Criterion Variables (Table DD1).

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Δ
Criterion Variable: Depression at LTFU			
Step1: Pre-TAW Depression	.318***	.316**	.101***
Step 2: Covariates			.109*
Ethnicity	.191*	.200*	
Child in Home	-.142	-.161 ^a	
Step 3: MKP Non I Group Participation			.031
Less than 10 half-day seg.	.137	.137	
More than 10 half-day seg.	-.030	-.030	
Final F equation (8, 91) = 3.46**; R ² =.233			

Table DD1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Δ
Criterion Variable: Success Power Competition at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW SPC			.465***
Pre-TAW SPC	.682***	.681***	
Step 2: Covariate			.048**
Religion	-.218**	-.227**	
Step 3: MKP Non I Group Participation			.003
Less than 10 half-day seg.	.045	.045	
More than 10 half-day seg.	-.019	-.019	
Final F equation (4, 95) = 25.34***; R ² =.516			

Table DD1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Δ
Criterion Variable: RME at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW RME	.647***	.685***	.419***
Step 2: Covariates			.113*
Religion	-.147*	-.146 ^b	
Age: 30-45	-.312*	-.295*	
Age: 45-60	-.099	-.141	
Age: over 60	-.101	-.124	
Year Change Moderate	.170 ^c	.172*	
Year Change Major	-.015	-.039	
Step 3: MKP Non I Group Participation			.025 ^d
Less than 10 half-day seg.	-.094	-.094	
Final F equation (9, 90) = 12.57 *** R ² =.233			

Table DD1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Δ
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.571***	.565***	.326***
Step 2: Covariate			.090**
Ethnicity	-.195*	-.200*	
Age: 30-45	.076	.073	
Age: 45-60	-.178	-.169	
Age: over 60	-.080	-.082	
Step 3: MKP Non I Group Participation			.004
Less than 10 half-day seg.	.041	.041	
More than 10 half-day seg.	-.037	-.037	
Final F equation (4, 95) = 12.57*** R ² =.557			

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-term follow-up; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men).

Age category is dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): aged under 30; category 2: aged 30-45; category 3: aged 45-60; category 4: aged over 60.

RME at LTFU and Depression at LTFU were transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Table DD1 Continued

Year change variable dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): no change reported in year prior to TAW; category 2: moderate change reported in year prior to TAW; category 3: major change reported in year prior to TAW.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

a - Approaches significance; $p = .10$

b - Approaches significance; $p = .06$

c - Approaches significance; $p = .06$

d - Approaches significance; $p = .08$

Appendix EE: Regressions for Secondary Analysis of Hypothesis 1 - 4: Effects of Age Group (30-45 vs. Sample), Church Group Experience(Dichotomously Coded), and Reported Year Change Before TAW on Long-term Follow-up Criterion Variables (Table EE1).

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Depression Transformed at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW Depression			.119***
Pre-TAW Depression	.389***	.391***	
Step 2 :Covariates			.057*
Ethnicity	.203*	.216*	
Military Experience	-.180 ^a	-.111	
Step 3: Age (30-45 vs rest of sample)	-.224*	-.224*	.041*
Step 4: Church Group Experience			.034*
Church Group Exp. (Y-N)	-.184*	-.175 ^d	
Step 5: Year Change			.008
Year Change None	-.055	-.055	
Year Change Major	.109	.109	
Final equation F (5, 92)=6.186***, R ² =.252			

Table EE1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Success Power Competition at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW SPC			.458***
Pre-TAW SPC	.675***	.687***	
Step 2 :Covariates			.049***
Religion	-.222***	-.193**	
Step 3: Age (30-45 vs rest of sample)	-.146*	-.144*	.020*
Step 4: Church Group Experience	-.013	-.001	.000
Step 5: Year Change			.003
Year Change None	-.065	-.065	
Year Change Major	-.018	-.018	
Final equation F (9, 90)=17.339***, R ² =.531			

Table EE1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: RME Transformed at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW RME.			.433***
Pre-TAW RME	.658***	.697***	
Step 2 :Covariates			.031*
Religion	-.176*	-.136 ^e	
Step 3: Age (30-45 vs rest of sample)	-.207**	-.206**	.040**
Step 4: Church Group Experience	-.034	-.005	.001
Step 5: Year Change			.027 ^s
Year Change None	.164 ^f	-.164 ^f	
Year Change Major	-.007	-.007	
Final equation F (6, 92)=17.485***, R ² =.533			

Table EE1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			
Step 1: Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction			.327***
Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.572***	.597***	
Step 2 : Covariates			.032*
Ethnicity	-.179*	-.194*	
Step 3: Age Categories	.224**	.229**	.049**
Step 4: Church Group Experience	-.162*	-.179*	.026*
Step 5: Year Change			.006
Year Change None	.090	.090	
Year Change Major	.075	.075	
Final equation F (9, 90)=9.185***, R ² =.449			

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-term follow-up; SHG - Self-help Group; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate beh. btwn men).

Note: For every equation, MKP related beliefs was not included in the regression due to preliminary analyses which showed it to be non-significant, and in order to obtain a higher number of participants (see discussion in methods section).

Age category is dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): Aged under 30.

Table EE1 Continued

Depression and RME at LTFU was transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Self-help group variable dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): no self-help group experience.

Year change variable dummy coded - Comparison group (not listed): no change reported in year prior to TAW.

a - Approaches significance; $p=.06$.

b - Approaches significance; $p=.09$.

c - Approaches significance; $p=.11$.

d - Approaches significance; $p=.08$.

e - Approaches significance; $p=.06$.

f - Approaches significance; $p=.11$.

g - Approaches significance; $p=.08$.

h - Approaches Significance; $p=.06$

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Appendix FF: Secondary Regression Analysis for Hypothesis 7: The Effects of I-group Participation Continuously Coded on Criterion Variables at Long-term Follow-up (Table FF1).

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Depression Transformed at LTFU			
Step 1. Pre-TAW Depression Transformed			.123***
Pre-TAW Depression	.350***	.403***	
Step 2. Covariates			.112*
Ethnicity	.209*	.226*	
Military	-.144	-.172	
Age under 30	.202*	.271*	
Age 45-60	.184 ^a	.212*	
Age over 60	.078	.103	
Lives outside DC-Balt	.023	.074	
Step 3. I-group Participation			.042*
Partic. Continuous (months)	.224*	.224*	
Final F equation (8, 90)=4.31***, R ² =.277			

Table FF1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Success Power Competition Transformed at LTFU			
Step 1. Pre-TAW SPC			.471***
Pre-TAW SPC	.686***	.664***	
Step 2. Covariates			.046**
Religion	-.213**	-.216**	
Lives outside DC-Balt	-.062	-.094	
Step 3. I-group Participation			.028*
Partic. Continuous (months)	-.140*	-.140*	
Final F equation (4, 95)=27.36***, R ² =.535			

Table FF1 Continued

Criterion Variable: RME at LTFU

Step 1. Pre-TAW RME			.419***
RE and RABM	.647***	.678***	
Step 2. Covariates			.116***
Religion	-.157*	-.163*	
Age under 30	.159*	-.112	
Age 45-60	.205**	.175*	
Age over 60	.079	.054	
Year Change: Moderate	.166 ^b	.159 ^b	
Year Change: Major	.006	-.021	
Lives outside DC-Balt	-.067	-.094	
Step 3. I-group Participation			.024*
Partic. Continuous (months)	-.169*	-.169*	
Final F equation (9, 90) = 12.68***, R ² = .559			

Table FF1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			
Step1. Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction			.326***
Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.571***	.583***	
Step 2. Covariates			.096**
Ethnicity	-.201**	-.197*	
Age: under 30	-.043	-.026	
Age: 45-60	-.254**	-.245**	
Age: over 60	-.129	-.122	
Lives outside DC-Balt	.079	.089	
Step 3. I-group Participation			.003
Partic. Continuous (months)	.055	.055	
Final F equation (7, 92) = 9.71***, R ² = .425			

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-term follow-up; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men).

Age category is dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): aged under 30; category 2: aged 30-45; category 3: aged 45-60; category 4: aged over 60.

Table FF1 Continued

Depression at LTFU and SPC at LTFU were transformed (Log10) after examining residuals and outliers.

Year change variable dummy coded - Category 1 (comparison group): no change reported in year prior to TAW; category 2: moderate change reported in year prior to TAW; category 3: major change reported in year prior to TAW.

a - Approaches significance: $p=.10$

b - Approaches significance: $p=.07$

c - Approaches significance: $p=.06$

d - Approaches significance: $p=.07$

e - Approaches significance: $p=.06$

f - Approaches significance: $p=.06$

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

Appendix GG: Regressions for Post Hoc Analysis Using All Significant Predictors

(Table GG1).

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Depression at LTFU			
Step 1: Covariates			.098**
Pre-TAW Depression	.309**	.225*	
MKP Beliefs (pre)	.069	.203	
Social support availability	.006	.253 ^a	
Social support satisfaction	-.038	-.117	
Step 2 :All Significant Predictors			.240***
Age: 30-45	-.231*	-.231*	
Church Group Exp. (Yes-no)	.063	.063	
MKP Beliefs at LTFU	-.171	-.171	
SS-N at LTFU	-.176	-.176	
SS-S at LTFU	-.196 ^b	-.196 ^b	
I-Group Participation (cont.)	.293**	.293**	
Final equation F (10,80)=4.090***, R ² =.338			

Table GG1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Success Power Competition at LTFU			
Step 1: Covariates			.496***
Pre-TAW SPC	.700***	.742***	
MKP Beliefs (pre)	-.095	.106	
Social support availability	.180 ^a	.181 ^c	
Social support satisfaction	-.002	-.045	
Step 2 :All Significant Predictors			.113**
Age: 30-45	-.090	-.090	
Church Group Exp. (Y-N)	-.051	-.051	
MKP Beliefs at LTFU	-.385***	-.385**	
SS-N at LTFU	.032	.032	
SS-S at LTFU	.060	.060	
I-Group Participation (cont.)	.000	.000	
Final equation F (10,80)=12.494***, R ² =.610			

Table GG1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: RME at LTFU			
Step 1: Covariates			.401***
Pre-TAW RME	.598***	.572***	
MKP Beliefs (pre)	-.163	.039	
Social support availability	.175	.214*	
Social support satisfaction	-.021	-.066	
Step 2 :All Significant Predictors			.190***
Age: 30-45	-.134 ^d	-.134 ^d	
Church Group Exp. (Y-N)	-.057	-.057	
MKP Beliefs at LTFU	-.414***	-.414***	
SS-N at LTFU	.021	.021	
SS-S at LTFU	.037	.037	
Final equation F (10,80)=11.581***, R ² =.591			

Table GG1 Continued

Variable	Beta At Entry	Final Beta	Step R ² Change
Criterion Variable: Life Satisfaction at LTFU			
Step 1: Covariates			.295***
Pre-TAW Life Satisfaction	.536***	.536***	
MKP Beliefs (pre)	-.127	.127	
Social support availability	.122	.047	
Social support satisfaction	.063	.122	
Step 2 :All Significant Predictors			.270***
Age: 30-45	.131	.131	
Church Group Exp. (Y-N)	-.052	-.052	
MKP Beliefs at LTFU	.381***	.381***	
SS-N at LTFU	.224*	.224*	
SS-S at LTFU	.070	.070	
I-Group Participation (cont.)	-.041	-.041	
Final equation $F(10,80)=10.398***$, $R^2=.565$			

TAW - Training Adventure Weekend; LTFU - Long-term follow-up; SHG - Self-help Group; SPC - Success, Power and Competition Subscale of the Gender Role Conflict Scale; RME - Emotional Restriction, a combination of 2 of the Gender Role Conflict Scale subscales (restricted emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men). SS-N - Social support availability; SS-S - Social support satisfaction.

Table GG1 Continued

Age compares those aged 30-45 to the rest of the sample.

Church group coded dichotomously into history or no history of experience.

I-group participation coded continuously in months.

Staff coded dichotomously into whether had participated in any aspect of the TAW or not.

a - Approaches significance; $p=.07$.

b - Approaches significance, $p=.08$.

c - Approaches significance; $p=.09$.

d - Approaches significance; $p=.10$.

* $p<.05$

** $p<.01$

*** $p<.001$