The Precarious Man: Measuring masculine discrepancy and its relationships with aggression and misogyny

Sarah Aadahl

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

In

Sociology

Ashley V. Reichelmann

James E. Hawdon

Katalin Parti

Thomas E. Dearden

October 4, 2024

Blacksburg, VA

Keywords: Masculinity, aggression, misogyny, masculine ideals, masculine discrepancy

The Precarious Man: Measuring masculine discrepancy and its relationships with aggression and misogyny

Sarah Aadahl

ABSTRACT

In the studies of men and masculinity, most of the focus has been on masculine dysfunction strain, or the strain males feel as it relates to the various expectations of masculinity. In contrast, the research on discrepancy strain (or the strain males feel when they fail to meet these expectations) is limited. Unlike dysfunction strain, there are not any widely accepted and utilized scales measuring discrepancy. By combining identity theory and general strain theory with gender and feminist theory, my goal is to examine how masculine discrepancy may be related to the endorsement of aggression and misogyny. The aim of this dissertation is to develop and validate a scale to operationalize masculine discrepancy as it is theorized; this scale will then be used to examine the following research questions: does masculine discrepancy impact males' individual endorsement of aggression and misogyny? And if so, are these impacts moderated by failure to meet particular aspects, or "pillars," of masculinity? I created a masculine discrepancy scale that more accurately operationalizes the theoretical concept of masculine discrepancy. First, I synthesized various masculinity scales, namely the Male Role Norms Inventory, the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory, and the Man Box scale to develop assessments of males' masculine ideals ("ideal") and perceptions of their lived experiences ("actual" or "experiences"). By comparing ideal to actual, we can calculate a discrepancy score, where a score of 0 indicates consistency, and scores further from 0 indicate discrepancy. These scores are calculated both as an overall assessment of discrepancy and by particular pillars of masculinity. Following a pilot study of undergraduate sociology students, 1,000 males above the age of 18 were surveyed. These surveys were conducted via Cint panel distribution in December 2023. I then use factor and cluster analysis as well as regression analyses to test the following hypotheses: (1) Masculine Discrepancy Stress will have a positive relationship with aggression and misogyny. (2) Higher endorsement of masculine ideals and lived experiences will be associated with higher levels of endorsement of aggression and misogyny when compared to lower endorsement of ideals and experiences. (3) Masculine Discrepancy, or the difference between idealized and lived masculine experiences, will be negatively correlated with aggression and misogyny. Individuals with positive discrepancies (lived experiences surpassing their masculine ideals) will exhibit lower levels of aggression and misogyny compared to those with negative discrepancies (masculine ideals surpassing lived experiences). (4) Certain masculine ideals and experiences will have stronger associations with aggression and misogyny than others. (5) Cluster analysis of ideals and experiences will reveal four groups of males: **Norm-Favoring Consistents:** High ideals, high experiences; **Norm-Favoring Discrepants:** High ideals, low experiences; **Norm-Rejecting Consistents:** Low ideals, low experiences; **Norm-Rejecting Discrepants:** Low ideals, high experiences. (6) These clusters will differ in their endorsement of aggression and misogyny. The Norm-Favoring Discrepants will exhibit the highest levels of aggression and misogyny, followed by the Norm-Favoring Consistents. The Norm-Rejecting Consistents will have lower levels than both of the Norm-Favoring groups, and the Norm-Rejecting Discrepants will have the lowest endorsement of aggression and misogyny. Hypotheses 1 through 4 were supported, while hypotheses 5 and 6 had limited support, as the two "Consistent" groups did not clearly differ as "norm-favoring" vs. "norm-rejecting."

The Precarious Man: Measuring masculine discrepancy and its relationships with aggression and misogyny

Sarah Aadahl

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

We currently live in an age where masculinity is the topic of much conversation. To one side, we have talking heads and political pundits decrying what they call “attacks on masculinity” or “attacks on men,” and include suggestions like reading self-help books comparing humans to lobsters and tanning your testicles to regain lost masculinity. To the other side, we have self-professed “kings of toxic masculinity” who charge $8,000/year for a “PhD course” (the PhD standing for “Pimpin’ Hoes Degree”) being arrested for rape and human trafficking. Psychologists have found that having traditional masculine beliefs is associated with sexually aggressive and abusive behaviors and beliefs, coercion, dating violence, hostile sexism, hostility toward women, and self-reported violence and aggression. However, little research has been conducted on the outcomes men face when they fail to meet their own expectations of what they consider necessary to be “real men,” perhaps partially due to the fact that there is no widely used scale measuring this concept of masculine discrepancy. In my dissertation, I create this type of scale in order to ask the question: when men fail to meet their own expectations concerning what it means to be a “real man,” will they have higher rates of aggression and misogyny? And does it matter if men fail to meet one “pillar” of expectation (ex. being a playboy) compared to another “pillar” of expectation (ex. being in control of their emotions)? I explore this question by surveying 1,000 men about their views on what it means to be a “real man,” and their actual experiences as it relates to “being a real man.” I then run several statistical analyses to test my hypotheses regarding the amount of discrepancy and its relationship to the endorsement of aggression and misogyny. I find that the more a man worries about being seen as “manly,” the more likely he is to endorse aggression and misogyny. Similarly, in many cases, the more a man endorses traditional masculine ideals and corresponding experiences, the more likely he is to endorse certain forms of aggression and misogyny. Additionally, I find that men who fail to live up to their own ideals in certain cases have higher endorsement of aggression and misogyny, while men whose experiences surpass their ideals have lower endorsement of aggression and misogyny. When creating groups of men based on discrepancy scores, I find that the group of men who failed to meet their ideals always, on average, had the highest endorsement of aggression and misogyny, while the group of men whose experiences were higher than their ideals also, on average, had the lowest endorsement of aggression and misogyny. One unexpected finding is that men seem to be rejecting the idea that men cannot express emotions or ask for help; I discuss the implications of this finding.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband Aaron and my family, for their unwavering support through both the fun and challenging parts of this dissertation and for years of being sounding boards for countless ideas. This includes my niece Harper who, as a toddler, told me she believed that I could become “a doctor…or a mermaid.” It’s a shame I couldn’t become both.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members for their patience in guiding a qualitative researcher like me through a quantitative dissertation. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Reichelmann for not only her assistance with the technical aspects, but also her endless encouragement and compassion through both the frustrations and celebrations.

I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues at Virginia Tech, who also faced the challenges of navigating a Ph.D. program through the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic – for always being there to empathize or commiserate as we supported each other. I would also like to thank my mentors, friends, and colleagues from George Mason University, who have continued to support me beyond graduation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION:

As acts of mass violence continue to occur, especially within the United States, we must acknowledge and critically examine the major similarities between the perpetrators of these acts. As the media continues to reproduce narratives of "lone wolves" (McCulloch et al. 2019), "bullied teens" (Mears, Moon, and Thielo 2017), and "mental illness" (Brueck and Lebowitz 2019), one uncomfortable fact is ignored. Acts of mass violence are perpetrated almost exclusively by males (Madfis 2014), yet this fact is rarely acknowledged in media discussions (Katz 1999). What is it about maleness that is connected to this type of violence? Is it simply being a man? Or is it "*being a man?"* Or is it the connection between these sentiments, which involves perceptions between *who one is* and *who one should be*? In this dissertation, I examine if perceptions of the "ideal man" and/or failing to meet such perceptions (also known as discrepancy) is linked to endorsement of aggression and/or misogyny. I use the term "ideals" to refer to what males think constitutes a "real man"—what he should do, how he should act and think. This can refer to a variety of aspects of masculinity such as being tough or emotionless, being a sexually successful "playboy," etc.; I refer to these components as "pillars" of masculinity. Utilizing surveys, I seek to establish connections between masculine discrepancy and the endorsement of aggression and misogyny. In this dissertation, I ask: does masculine discrepancy impact males' individual endorsement of aggression and misogyny? And if so, does discrepancy as it relates to certain pillars of masculinity moderate the impact of that discrepancy?

This dissertation uses general strain theory (Agnew 1992) and identity control theory (Stets and Burke 2023) as a general framework, which is then bolstered by men's and masculinity studies and feminist and gender theory. I use these latter theories to assess how individual perception and lived experience of what it means to be a man are related to

endorsement of aggressive and misogynistic attitudes. The fields studying men's identities emerged largely from the discipline of social psychology and are still in their relative youth. Several paradigms that are key to understanding connections between masculinity and violence have only emerged within the last half century. One such paradigm is the gender role strain paradigm (GRSP), which focuses on how gender roles (i.e. how society expects people to act as it relates to their gender—what it means to "be a man" or "be a woman") are formed and maintained by social processes, rather than biology (Pleck 1981). The concept of gender role strain is broken down into three categories: trauma, discrepancy, and dysfunction (Pleck 1995). While the last two categories are both relevant to this dissertation, gender role discrepancy is the focus of this research, given the dearth of empirical literature on discrepancy, in contrast with the abundance of literature on gender role dysfunction.

Masculine discrepancy stress emerges from males' failures to meet society's expectations of a "real man" (Pleck 1981); it produces negative psychological consequences such as low self-esteem, as well as interpersonal conflict in relationships (Pleck 1995). When it comes to the ways that gender expectations affect men, there are substantial contributions to discussions of masculine dysfunction strain (i.e. the inherent negative consequences for males and others resulting from societal expectations of men), but only limited work on discrepancy (Pleck 1995). Additionally, masculinity research often relies on the convenience sampling of college-aged young men. As we know that beliefs about masculinity change over the life course, it is crucial that we expand our research beyond males who have only recently come into adulthood. Ultimately, this dissertation attempts to demonstrate how identity control theory benefits the conceptualization and operationalization of discrepancy, and how general strain theory illustrates connections between discrepancy and outcomes such as aggression and misogyny. I situate

identity control theory and general strain theory within a context of feminist and gender theory in order to answer my research questions.

The core question guiding this dissertation is: how does masculine discrepancy impact the endorsement of aggression and misogyny? In what ways does masculine discrepancy moderate the relationship between males' ideals and the endorsement of aggression and/or misogyny–that is, does a male who fails to meet his masculine ideals have a greater endorsement of aggression and/or misogyny than those who succeed at their ideals? In order to adequately address these connections, I combine literature on identity control and general strain theories, masculinity studies and feminist and gender theory. I explore how gender, specifically masculinity, is constructed in ways that require certain performances to maintain the façade of essentialism upon which patriarchy rests.

My analysis begins by measuring the necessary components that will be used to establish and validate the discrepancy score scales—endorsement of masculine ideals and males' perceptions of their lived experiences (Chapter 6). In the same chapter, I validate the subscales of masculine "pillars" I created via exploratory factor analysis. Using the items that comprise these factors, I then create additive indices for each factor of ideals and experiences. With these additive indexes, I use OLS regressions to assess the relationships between ideals/lived experiences and the outcome variables measuring aggression and misogyny, net of demographic variables. I also calculated discrepancy by subtracting ideals from the experiences, providing either a positive or negative score (or, in cases with no discrepancy, a score of 0). I also utilize OLS regressions to examine the relationships between discrepancy and the outcome variables, again net of demographic variables. In Chapter 7, I conduct a cluster analysis based on participants' ideal and experience scores, creating four categories of men. I then determine

whether there are significant differences between these clusters as it relates to the outcome variables. This type of analysis allows us to assess if the theoretical predictions about masculinity bear out in the empirical analysis. Overall, this dissertation adds to the empirical work on masculine discrepancy; it seeks to move beyond discrepancy *stress* by measuring actual discrepancy between lived masculine experiences and masculine ideals.

This research is motivated by methodological and empirical factors. First, it will fill a much needed methodological and empirical gap in the men and masculinity studies literature by demonstrating how identity control theory and general strain theory serve as supplements. In its creation of a novel instrument, this dissertation offers avenues through which researchers may come to understand the impacts of failing to meet one's masculine ideals. In the application of the various theories, this interdisciplinary research allows us to critically examine how social constructions of gender are related to aggression and misogyny.

The relationships discovered between discrepancy and aggression and misogyny in this dissertation offer us not just insight into some of the impacts of masculinity – we are additionally offered insight into the perpetration of violence against women. This research has potential implications for interventions: the relationship found between discrepancy and the outcome variables implies a more complicated connection between masculinity and endorsement of aggression and misogyny that goes beyond previous research on masculine ideals or experiences alone. One implication for this research is that current approaches to combating toxic masculinity may be unable to adequately address the ever-changing form of hegemonic masculinity – the acceptance of emotions and help-seeking does not necessarily reduce the endorsement of aggression. Other connections' implications for interventions include possibilities such as early

education combatting endorsement of strict gender roles, domination over women, sexual objectification of women, etc.

A few notes:

Throughout this dissertation I refer to gender largely as a system in which men establish domination over others - women, males who do not fit within hegemonic constructions of masculinity, and those who fall outside of binary conceptualizations of gender. While misogyny (as well as aggression) is the focus of this dissertation, I attempt to use inclusive language wherever possible. It should be noted, however, that much of the literature which I quote refers to gender almost exclusively in terms of the binary of men/women, males/females, etc. There is much to be said about the unintentional reinforcement of binaries through exclusive practices such as excluding trans, nonbinary, gender nonconforming, etc. individuals from the discussion of gender and patriarchy. However, I do not have the space to attempt any sort of in-depth discussion of genders which may not fit neatly into the binary.

On a similar note, some may understandably object to my use of the term "male" in my discussions of masculinity, patriarchy, etc. It is not my intention to confuse sex with gender and vice versa. Instead, I use the term "males" to refer to those presumed to have a male body regardless of their "achievement" of "manhood status," following theoretical guidance that masculinity is a process through which males lay claim to patriarchal benefits. Not every male will be granted the status of "man" (Schwalbe 2014) as will be discussed in the section on theories of masculinity. As someone who balks at the dehumanizing use of the term "females" to refer to adult women, I fully anticipate the critiques at my own use of "males." Rest assured that it does not come from a place of misandrist spite – merely an attempt to avoid confusion between

those who have been actively granted the precarious and ephemeral status of "man" and those who may have or have not yet achieved that status.

Notably absent from this dissertation as well is any sort of in-depth discussion of intersectionality. Despite the inseparable nature of various inequalities and oppressions, I only briefly touch on such topics. It would be unfeasible, if not impossible, to even attempt to provide any sort of comprehensive discussion. The topic of intersectionality is much too important to provide only a cursory overview; instead of doing this disservice, I hope to examine these intersecting identities in future projects. I add these notes as a caveat before proceeding with the following sections, as many of these concepts are notably absent from this dissertation. To quote Kate Manne (2018): "Although my limitations will have me daubing at the small corner of the overall canvas, I can reach without overextending myself and inevitably (as opposed to potentially) making a mess of it, I do so partly because of what lies beyond my paintbrush."

2. BACKGROUND LITERATURE:

Introduction:

For most people, the word "masculinity" can bring a multitude of definitions and connotations to mind. We may associate masculinity with "toxic masculinity;" maybe masculinity is "being a real man." To any number of political pundits, masculinity may be in decline, threatened by social justice. Or so they say, at least, in hopes of playing off the insecurities of those who feel disenfranchised by social justice movements (Manne 2018). To some, including numerous sociologists and masculinities scholars, masculinity seems to be different behaviors enacted by someone presumed to have a male body—an extension of the multiple masculinities model proposed by Connell (2005), noting that males enact masculinity differently and in relation to each other in hierarchical ways.

While scholars may disagree on the exact definitions of "masculinity" or how masculinity operates, most would agree on several points: What is seen as "masculine" can be informed by a variety of factors—time, location, culture, etc. There is a right way to "do masculinity" or "be masculine" based on these aspects. But just as there is a "right" way to "do masculinity" there can be a "wrong" way, and both are dictated by the cultural context in which the behavior is taking place. While what makes an "ideal" masculinity may differ from place to place and era to era, males can either succeed or they can fail in achieving these masculine ideals. I am interested in discrepancy, the latter of these two, and how failing to meet masculine ideals can be related to aggression and misogyny.

To frame the relationship discrepancy and aggression/misogyny, this dissertation relies on several key theoretical paradigms, including general strain theory (GST), identity control theory (ICT), feminist theories of gender, and theories of masculinity. First, I examine strain

within the context of GST, establishing a framework connecting discrepancy to negative outcomes such as aggression. I then use ICT to frame how we manage and negotiate identities through our interactions with others. By discussing GST and ICT first, I offer frameworks connecting criminological and sociological theories to gender and feminist theories of masculinity, including theories stemming from empirical psychological studies.

Next, I explore how we have arrived at our current understanding of gender through feminist and gender theory. I trace several of the major historical theories of gender, including the implications for theories such as essentialism. I explore how feminist theory has brought about discussions of gender as not only constructed, but how it is constructed in ways that uphold systems of inequality. Feminist theory tells us how these inequalities are upheld not only through hegemony, but also through violence.

These feminist theories then inform a major paradigm shift in the study of men and masculinities. I discuss several major theoretical understandings of men and masculinity. These understandings include tracing the ways that masculinity harms males individually, as well as society as a whole. While the field of psychology is largely credited with the creation of the "new men's studies," the modern study of men and masculinity as a field is largely interdisciplinary, combining works of psychologists, sociologists, feminist and queer theorists, among others (Brod 1987). I then highlight several key researchers and theories relating to the study of men and masculinity. It should be noted that scholars within these fields may refer to themselves, or their field itself differently - from Men's Studies to Critical Studies of Men and Masculinity to various "Manhood" studies (Precarious Manhood and Manhood Acts).

Despite the variety of names and fields under which these theories may fall, the focus of this background literature is to assess how previous works have addressed the following: how

have we come to understand gender now? And by extension, how have we come to understand masculinity? How does masculinity impact males on an individual level? How does masculinity impact males and others at the interactional level? How is society impacted by expectations of masculinity? By providing answers to these questions, the background literature brings us back to the core questions of this dissertation: is there a relationship between personal masculine discrepancy and males' individual endorsement of aggression and misogyny?

I began this dissertation by discussing acts of mass violence. As noted, these acts of violence are almost always perpetrated by males. While their backgrounds and motives may seemingly differ, they clearly have at least one thing in common: being male. However, the research question of this dissertation, guided in part by incel ("involuntary celibate") violence I will later discuss, asks whether there may be another commonality: masculine discrepancy. Incels exemplify this potential additional connection; they are males with certain ideologies about what it means to "be a man," yet fail to meet their own masculine ideals. My question is whether this discrepancy between ideals and lived experiences contributes to the violence they commit.

General Strain Theory:

General strain theory (GST) (Agnew 1992) offers a potential explanation of how, among other experiences, failing to meet certain outcomes may influence behaviors such as crime. Here I provide a cursory overview into GST, particularly as it relates to discrepancy. Additionally, I draw further connections between the removal of positive stimuli and the presence of negative stimuli to my hypotheses about masculine discrepancy and aggression.

Robert Agnew first established his concept of general strain theory in 1992 in the article *Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency*. In this, Agnew, a

criminologist, built upon previous theories of strain, particularly Merton's theories of deviance and anomie. Merton's work focused largely on societal goals and the legitimate means available to individuals to achieve those societal goals (Merton 1938). Popular criminological work of the time argued that, when those legitimate means to achieve societal goals are blocked, individuals may resort to deviance or criminal behavior to attempt to achieve the societal goals (Brezina 2017). These earlier theories of strain centered around goal blockage, which Agnew argued was simply one aspect of the negative relationships that influenced strain (Agnew 1992). Agnew instead argues that strain goes beyond the failure to achieve goals, generalizing strain to encompass a wider breadth of interactions.

Agnew proposes three categories of strain as it relates to GST: 1) Failure to achieve positively valued goals, 2) removal of positive stimuli, and 3) introduction of negative stimuli (Agnew 1992). Agnew also distinguishes between two different types of goals that can be blocked, referring to the distance between the goal and experiences as "disjunction." Strain had focused largely on the failure to achieve aspirations, but Agnew instead argues that failure to achieve *expectations* are perhaps more relevant to the impacts of strain. *Aspirations*, he argues, may not always be taken as seriously as failing to achieve *expected* goals, since expected goals are grounded in reality (Agnew 1992).

In addition to contributing to theories about types of goal blockage, Agnew also builds upon other aspects that may contribute to strain, and, by extension, crime and delinquency. While goal blockage is one consideration, Agnew also describes the other types of strain: the removal of positively valued stimuli (such as the loss of a partner, friend, career, etc.) and the presentation of negative stimuli (such as exposure to violence or abuse or negative life events).

Additionally, Agnew examines how strain may lead to crime in one case, but not in another. He notes that particular types of strain (for example, strain seen as unjust to the person experiencing the strain) may result in an increased likelihood of perpetration of crime compared to other types of strain that, for example, are lower in magnitude and/or do not have connections to views of injustice. In later works, Agnew builds upon his previous conceptualization of a particular model of strain where actual outcomes do not live up to an individual's ideas of justice or equity (Agnew 1992). That is, strain is more likely to result in crime when the strain is seen as unjust (Agnew 2001). Other types of strain are more likely to contribute to crime when the strains are "seen as high in magnitude, are associated with low social control, and create some pressure or incentive to engage in crime" (Agnew 2001:320).

It is easy to see how these types of strain in particular would be more likely to contribute to stronger emotions, especially feelings of anger, when compared to the failure to meet a lofty aspiration. Agnew notes that a major contributing factor to the connections between strain and delinquency is the feeling of anger (Agnew 1992). Anger, Agnew (1992) states, arises when individuals view their adversities as being caused by others. Agnew elaborates: "Anger is a key emotion because it increases the individual's level of felt injury, creates a desire for retaliation/revenge, energizes the individual for action, and lowers inhibitions, in part because individuals believe that others will feel their aggression is justified" (Agnew 1992:59–60).

If we consider violent males in general, and not just incels, the connections between discrepancy to aggression are relatively straightforward: When males' experiences do not live up to their ideals (especially when they expect that they should), they have failed to reach their own positively valued individual goals of masculinity. When these goals align with traditional masculinity, we can also consider that they have failed to reach a positively valued *societal* goal.

When males fail to meet these goals, they miss some opportunities to reap the rewards patriarchy bestows, which could be perceived as the removal of positive stimuli. Finally, males also face the risk of having their masculine identities actively challenged, resulting in the presence of negative stimuli. Thus, from one source of discrepancy, we may find all three types of strain.

GST, particularly the different types of strain, has been used as one explanation for terrorism (Agnew 2010). Agnew argues that terrorism is more likely to occur in the presence of "collective strains," or strains experienced by specific groups of people (such as religious groups, race/ethnic groups, political groups, etc.) (Agnew 2010:136). He extends his previous discussions of strains that are more likely to result in crime, noting that collective strains that are "high in magnitude, with civilians affected; unjust; and inflicted by significantly more powerful others, including 'complicit' civilians" (Agnew 2010:131). GST has been used to examine far-right terrorism (Skoczylis and Andrews 2022), which has been argued to encompass misogynistic terrorism –including that of incels (Gentry 2022). GST has also been used as a framework for explaining gender differences in intimate partner homicide, examining how emotional responses to strain—such as anger and rage in males—fit within a GST model connecting strain to violence (Eriksson and Mazerolle 2013). These empirical extensions of GST demonstrate how it could be used to discuss topics concerning incels, masculinity, and violence.

By using GST as a framework for this dissertation, I contribute to a well-established literature that (with some exceptions) largely avoids discussions of gender. I provide the examples in the previous paragraph to illustrate the connections between masculine discrepancy and male aggression and, by extension, violence. Anger, as Agnew (1992) argues, is a critical emotional response to strain, and is spurred on when there is a discrepancy between *expected* outcomes in particular and actual, lived outcomes. While I use the phrase "masculine ideals"

throughout this dissertation, constant societal messages about masculinity (through media, interactions, etc.) are much more likely to portray manhood status as an *expected* outcome than any sort of *aspiration* or "ideal." That is, while males are bombarded with messages about the toughness, hypersexuality, domination, etc. that are supposedly synonymous with "being a man," they are simultaneously being primed to expect that these are goals they can (and should) achieve. A male may aspire, fruitlessly, to become a superhero, but they can much more easily embody the tough, stoic, paternal image the superhero represents—and can come to expect these are outcomes they should achieve.

Agnew initially offers no discussion of gender, though he and others later discuss the vast differences between genders in crime perpetration. As Naffine (1987) begins her book, "Perhaps the least contentious proposition one can advance within the discipline of criminology is that women are more law-abiding than men." Women encounter no less strain than men nor do they experience less anger (Broidy and Agnew 1997). How, then, does GST explain these differences? Broidy and Agnew (1997) posit that the differences may lie in the different emotional reactions to strain. Women, they claim, internalize that anger as depression and anxiety, while men direct that anger at others, citing "Men get angry and hostile—women get sad and depressed" (Broidy and Agnew 1997:281). This externalized anger is more conducive to the types of crimes males are more likely to commit, such as violent crimes and destruction of property. De Coster and Zito (2010) add to this explanation by noting that socialization is likely to play an important role—while emotions may be experienced at similar rates across genders, it is the *expression* of that emotion that differs. That is, within a GST framework, gender does not change how individuals *experience* strain, but a gendered lens tells us that different genders are socialized into different ways of expressing those emotions caused by strain.

Recent research further supports this notion by applying GST to cybercrime, revealing that while both genders in the sample experience strain, the specific types of strain leading to cyber-offending likely differ (Parti and Dearden 2024). For example, parental divorce and social supports influence the cyber-offending perpetrated by women, whereas being a victim of crime is more likely to impact men's perpetrations of cyber-offending (Parti and Dearden 2024). Thus, while GST is relevant for understanding cybercrime, the emotional responses and expressions of strain may be gender-specific, highlighting the need for a nuanced approach to studying crime and aggression through a gendered lens.

GST serves as a framework for this dissertation by tracing empirical connections between experiences (such as goal blockage, the absence of positive stimuli, and the presence of negative stimuli) and outcomes such as delinquency. Identity control theory (ICT) supplements GST by providing a theoretical framework that examines how discrepancy (similar to the disjunction between expected outcomes and actual outcomes in GST) can influence certain emotional and behavioral responses outside of GST's focus on crime. GST provides an explanation of gendered crime through men and women's different emotional responses to anger; ICT takes these theories one step further, examining power dynamics and the source of the discrepancy as potential explanations for different emotional responses. While the later theories of gender include discussions of why social constructions of gender may be impactful, ICT and GST tell us *how*. And most importantly to this dissertation, ICT and GST provide frameworks for us to understand how failing to meet socially prescribed constructions of masculinity can be related to outcomes of heightened aggression and misogyny.

Identity Control Theory:

GST describes connections between strain and crime, focusing largely on goals and stimuli. In GST, there appears to be a clear beginning, middle, and end of the process resulting in deviance. While certain aspects (poverty, perceptions of just outcomes, etc.) may influence how particular types of strain can impact an individual, the focus remains on the failure to achieve a goal, the removal of positive stimuli, or the presence of negative stimuli. These "starting points" can then contribute to feelings of anger and injustice, which then result in a sort of endpoint in delinquency and crime. Identity control theory (ICT) instead describes a constant state of identity management.

Classical sociological theory, symbolic interactionism (Blumer 1969) in particular, introduces us to the notion that we see ourselves and our identities in specific ways, often through our interactions with others. Symbolic interactionism, one of the major social psychological framings in sociology, examines how our self-perceptions are often fluid, informed by the interactions through which we come to understand how others see us (Blumer 1969). Most people arguably see themselves as members of various types of identity groups – gender, ethnicity, occupation, etc. The self-meanings associated with these identities may be informed by various cultural norms and expectations of the society in which they live. For example, when we see ourselves as being a particular gender, these views of ourselves as men, women, etc. are often informed by how society defines what it means to be this gender. Society, through interactions, media, etc., informs how individuals come to imbue meaning onto what it means to be a man or a woman (or both, or neither). Most important for this section is understanding that individuals manage their various identities in daily interactions, and that there are emotional, behavioral, etc. outcomes that occur when those identities are contradicted. By

including ICT as a supplemental framework, we are able to more fully conceptualize and operationalize discrepancy as it relates to the questions of this dissertation.

The concept of identity management predates much of the ICT framework as discussed here and is key to modern identity theory. At its core, ICT traces the relationships between the individual and their environment, and how that environment may either confirm or fail to confirm an individual's perception of themselves (Stets and Burke 2014). ICT provides a theoretical framework for understanding how individuals construct and maintain their various identities through interacting with others and the social world around them. It explains how interactions can result in emotional, behavioral, or cognitive responses to an individual's perception of whether their identity is verified or challenged within that interaction. Within ICT, the "identity standard" represents the meanings and expectations a person associates with an identity. The identity standards are shaped by "self-meanings," which are the beliefs, values, etc. that an individual associates with a specific identity. These self-meanings are informed through our interactions with others, which influence how we come to understand what it means to embody a particular identity.

ICT is modeled at the micro-level of the individual, demonstrating how an interaction with one's environment relates to the ongoing process of identity development. The model includes components such as the identity standard (which I often refer to as the "ideal" as it relates to masculinity), the person's self-meanings in regard to that identity standard (which I refer to as perceptions of their identity), as well as their perceptions of a situation in reference to the identity standard (Stets and Burke 2014). ICT thus illustrates how situations (including the discrepancy that can result from interactions within the situations) are connected to behavioral, emotional, and cognitive responses vis-a-vis real or perceived feedback in that situation. That is,

ICT examines how a person views themselves, and how these views of themselves may be influenced by interactions within a situation, which either do or do not validate these self-views. I extend ICT to this dissertation's focus on masculine discrepancy and the potential behavioral/emotional outcome of aggression.

To extend this discussion to masculinity, we can consider any situations in which gender is salient. This would be most situations, considering gender is a "master identity" (Stets and Burke 2014). In these situations, males are (consciously or unconsciously) reading (or "appraising") their interactions for feedback related to their masculine identity standard. That is, males are examining the situation (really, the interactions in the situation) to see whether the other(s) in the situation see(s) them as a "real man." Within situations, an individual comes to understand how others in the situation see them through appraisals (Burke and Stets 2023). Appraisals refer to the perceived judgments of an individual within a particular interaction. These can be: actual appraisals – or the explicit feedback from others letting an individual know how they are being perceived in a situation (Savage et al. 2017); self-appraisals – or an individual's own perception of how they are doing in a situation (Stets and Carter 2011); or reflected appraisals, which are how the individual perceives the other's view of them as it relates to the individual's identity standard (Burke and Stets 2023). A person either perceives themselves as being seen in ways that provide verification (i.e. confirmation for the identity standard) or nonverification (Burke and Stets 2023). Nonverification occurs when an individual perceives a discrepancy between their identity standard and their interpretation of others' appraisals. If their self-meaning is not verified, an error occurs, resulting in an alteration of mindset or behavior (Burke and Stets 2023).

The key to this dissertation and the concept of discrepancy relates to the ICT concept of error. An error occurs when an individual perceives the reflected appraisal as indicating they have not met the identity standard. These errors are caused when there are disturbances in the situation, which are processed through what Stets and Burke (Burke and Stets 2023; Stets and Burke 2005) refer to as the comparator. These disturbances are taken in by the individual and the perceived meanings from these disturbances are compared (hence comparator) to the identity standard (Stets and Burke 2005). Stets and Burke (2023; 2005) discuss these disturbances (and individuals' responses) in ways which are useful to this dissertation, especially as they relate to discrepancy. They note that discrepancy may result from reflected appraisals through the process I have described above, but people may also find discrepancy resulting from a person's self-appraisals, or through the *actual* ways others see the individual in the interaction, referred to as actual appraisals (Burke and Stets 2023).

Responses to Discrepancy:

What is important is not just the discrepancy itself, but the theorized responses to the discrepancy. Burke and Stets (2023) enhance their original model of identity control theory by introducing the various responses an individual may have to the error resulting from the distance between the self-meaning of the behavior and the identity standard. They argue that all errors will result in negative emotions, and the individual's desire to reduce the error may take one of three paths: behavioral, emotional and/or cognitive responses. The reduction processes of identity control may occur simultaneously, with emotional responses such as rage or hostility (Stets and Burke 2005) potentially inducing behavioral responses.

Behavioral responses include actions that attempt to reduce the error to bring the perception in line with the identity standard (Burke and Stets 2023). In other words, when people

feel like others are not seeing them how they see themselves, they try to alter their behavior to present the desired image. This is exemplified by the idea of compensatory masculinity, where a male attempts to regain masculinity that has been challenged. Consider a male who has his "manhood" questioned by another male—he may respond with violence as a way to compensate for this disturbance and the resulting error. Since violence (especially when used to get respect) is associated with "being a man" (Schrock and Schwalbe 2009), this violence serves to reduce the error from the masculine identity standard. Thus, we may understand fights, including physical altercations, as one extension of this form of violence meant to reduce discrepancy and "regain" lost manhood.

Stets and Burke (2005) trace several different emotional responses to the error, ranging from disappointment to rage, emerging in different ways based on several factors. What is of particular importance to this dissertation is the notion that emotional response varies based on the several things. First, emotional response can vary based on the source identity meanings; that is, do the meanings associated with an identity come from the individual with that particular identity, or do the meanings come from others' standards for that identity? Next, responses vary based on the source of the discrepancy (the self or the other). That is, does the discrepancy emerge from an individual's own actions which represent an error from the identity standard, or does it come from an outside source? Finally, emotional responses vary based on the status ("esteem and respect") and power (such as the control of resources) an individual has in relation to the other (Stets and Burke 2005:10).

These are not unlike the ways that strain can influence criminal behavior according to GST (Agnew 2001). That is, the anger that arises from strain which is perceived to be caused by *others* is more likely to result in crime than other types of strain (Agnew 1992). According to

Stets and Burke (2005), when the other person is seen as the source of the discrepancy, we find two emotional responses if the status and the power of the other person are lower than the self: hostility and rage, respectively, both directed at the other person. In contrast, when the other person (who is the source of the discrepancy) is of higher status or power relative to the self, the individual experiences anxiety or fear (Stets and Burke 2005). Additionally, when the self is the source of the discrepancy, we may think of the emotional responses being more directed toward the self regardless of the status or power of the other person (Stets and Burke 2005). That is, whenever the source of the discrepancy is the self, emotional responses include feelings of sadness, embarrassment, disappointment, etc. which may be seen as being reflected much more internally than anger and hostility which are directed outward (Stets and Burke 2005).

Recall GST's assertions that gendered differences in crime may not be an indication of differences in how different genders experience strain, but instead, how they express the emotions resulting from strain. Stets and Burke (1996) discuss gender as both an identity and a status category, which are both salient and reproduced in interactions. Gendered expectations are first learned through interactions with the family (Carter 2014). Individuals are socialized through interactions into the meanings gender imbues on person, role, and social identities (Carter 2014). That is, one's gender is salient for an individual's perception of themselves as a person (such as being an aggressive or passive person); gender is salient in a person's identity with certain roles (such as a husband's role as protector and a mother's role as caregiver); gender is salient in how an individual is socialized into what it means to "be a man" or "act like a lady" (Carter 2014). Stets and Burke (1996) also discuss how status is imbued into gender meanings—women may use more "masculine" behaviors to assert their credibility, which is often challenged due to societal expectations about women's competency when compared to men's. However,

these expectations have changed since 1996; while men in a recent study were still described in more agentic terms, women were also described as having more competence (Stets et al 2023). It remains to be seen whether these changes will have any impact on women's relative status and power.

Discrepancy has largely been explored in relation to the self through self-esteem and other inward-facing psychological outcomes like depression, distress, etc. (Grimmell 1998; Grimmell and Stern 1992; Liu, Rochlen, and Mohr 2005; Stets and Burke 2014). This is similar to how masculinity studies focus largely on the intrapersonal effects of dysfunction and gender role conflict strain, as will be discussed later. Some of these intrapersonal effects include, for example, alcoholism or other forms of addiction (Blazina and Watkins 1996; Groeschel, Wester, and Sedivy 2010; Magovcevic and Addis 2005), amongst many others. We may possibly understand this as the result of stemming from the world of psychology: while psychology does focus largely on the internal emotional responses to strain, it may also be seen as focusing on those situations where the self is the source of the discrepancy. Recall, however, that it is largely when the *other* is the source of the discrepancy that the self may respond with emotions ranging from annoyance to rage (Stets and Burke 2005). This is how identity control theory can supplement masculinity and manhood studies.

Each male has his own identity standard when it comes to being "a man." Let us consider a male whose manhood identity standard is based around a notion that a man ought to be sexually and/or romantically successful. In this scenario, let us imagine a situation where the male is interacting with a woman, who he sees as a potential romantic or sexual partner. In this interaction, when he makes an advance by asking her on a date, she rejects him. The disturbance in this situation is the rejection, which the male perceives and to which he gives meaning.

Through the comparator (by which the male compares the perceptions to his identity standard), he understands that this rejection is not in line with his manhood identity standard of being sexually/romantically successful. An error, or a discrepancy, is produced. He then has several paths he may take to attempt to bring his self-appraisal back in line with his manhood identity standard. He may have negative feelings resulting from the error–much of the psychological study of discrepancy looks at these impacts. We may perhaps understand these emotional responses as being a motivating factor behind behavioral responses. As Burke and Stets (2023) argue, it is not actually the behaviors which are important, but the meanings behind the behaviors. The male in our example may use any number of behaviors to attempt to reduce the error, and thus reduce the negative emotions he is experiencing by his manhood identity standard not being verified.

If we work under the assumption that women are more likely to have less status and power than males, and that the male may consider the other (the woman) as the source of the discrepancy, we may apply Stets and Burke's (2005) assertion that this male could respond emotionally with rage and hostility. Acts of incel ("involuntary celibate") violence may perhaps be understood as one iteration of this assertion. I include this example so as to begin to make my connections between identity theory and gender theory, including research from men's studies fields. The perhaps most infamous act of incel mass violence lies with the Isla Vista killer, who murdered six people and injured 15 more near University of California, Santa Barbara (Beauchamp 2019). In his manifesto, he exhibits emotional reactions of rage when his "alpha male" identity standard is not verified by the "popular kids who live such lives of hedonistic pleasures" (Manne 2020). Second, the connection between his perceived rejections from women and his behavioral response (of violence) is explicitly laid out in the manifesto goals he

attempted to achieve through violence: "[After the violent spree…] You will finally see that I am in truth the superior one. The true alpha male" (Manne 2020). In these statements, his manifesto exemplifies the potential connection between discrepancy and violence.

The Isla Vista killer does not state "in my rage stemming from the error or discrepancy between perceptions and my alpha-male identity standard, I will change my behavior in order to align those perceptions back with the alpha-male identity standard I hold." Nor does he say, "I believe women to not only be the source of my discrepancy, but to also be beneath me in status and power, and thus I react with hostility and rage to their lack of confirmation of my alpha-male identity standard." This is an absurd thought to consider the Isla Vista killer as actively contemplating his actions in ICT terms. While the Isla Vista killer expresses his feelings of superiority over others, and even frames his acts of violence as "retribution," his manifesto and YouTube video fit more closely to the rantings of a cartoon villain (Manne 2020) than any sort of sociological introspection. However, ICT helps us to understand how his violent behavior was linked to the disconnect between his ideal conceptualizations of what it meant to be a man and his actual experiences of being a male. In later sections, I will examine how these artifacts the killer left behind illustrate male frustrated entitlement (Rottweiler, Clemmow, and Gill 2021) to women's bodies, attention, and affection. While Stets and Burke may not discuss an entitlement to validation, they do discuss the sorts of validation we, as gendered beings, may expect as it relates to our gendered identities (Stets and Burke 2014).

Connections between ICT & GST:

While I used identity control theory (ICT) above to illustrate the connections between identity (specifically discrepancy from an identity standard) and a specific type of male violence, this conversation is also served by reconnecting with general strain theory (GST). Through GST, we

can additionally understand this violence within a context of strain. Both describe internal and external responses to particular challenges individuals may face: ICT focuses on perceived challenges to a person's identity, while GST mostly focuses on challenges to achieving goals. While ICT discusses many potential outcomes stemming from discrepancy, GST focuses on the outcomes of crime and delinquency.

Males like the Isla Vista killer epitomize the relationship between strain and aggression that GST describes: They fail to achieve their own (and, arguably, one of society's) positively valued goals of masculine sexual prowess; in believing that they are social rejects, they lack (or at least believe they lack) the positively valued stimuli of a healthy community, which is instead replaced by the toxic incel community which feeds into feelings of resentment and victimization. This community may represent both noxious stimuli, wherein fellow incels degrade and berate others, as well as a negative coping mechanism, encouraging anger and validating feelings of persecution. Incels exemplify a form of relative deprivation (Agnew 2001); they are constantly comparing their own lived experiences with those of other males, often bemoaning the privileges they believe other males have which afford them the sexual success the incels desire—these privileges ranging from looks to money to wrist size (Sparks, Zidenberg, and Olver 2022). While it is clear that not all of these males perpetrate violence, a brief perusal of the most popular incel website will uncover not just misogyny and vitriol, but also an obsession with mass shooters like the Isla Vista killer in particular (Aadahl 2023).

To understand how these types of strain are likely to contribute to crime, we must first examine how males view masculinity and what it means to "be a man." Weaving in discussions of ICT, we can consider gender to be a "master identity" (Stets and Burke 2014). Thus, when males fail to reach their masculine ideals which are key to their masculine identity, this strain

may be considered one of high magnitude. Strains of "high magnitude" comprise the second category of strains which are more likely to result in crime (Agnew 1992). These failures are often seen as unjust, which is the first category of strain more likely to result in crime as per Agnew (1992). They are portrayed as being outside of males' control, with talking heads decrying societal "wokeness" and the feminist movement for males' alleged "emasculation." This creates a dangerous combination as it relates to GST—these factors not only contribute to anger, but that anger from the "injured" individual can energize the individual to enact revenge, which the individual may believe others will see as "justified" (Agnew 1992:59–60).

Finally, males are prevented (as per traditional masculine norms) from accessing the positive coping mechanisms of expressing their feelings or asking for help. Instead, they are offered mechanisms of using violence to solve problems. It is in this way that males are not only directed *toward* aggression, but also *away* from seeking help. This supports GST's discussion of an absence of positive stimuli contributing to strain. It also supports ICT's depiction of behavioral responses to discrepancy. As previously discussed, a male who is facing discrepancy from his masculine identity standard is likely to engage in aggressive ways to bolster his masculinity to realign with the identity standard. However, this same desire to realign with the identity standard prevents him from talking about any feelings of distress that may arise from the discrepancy. Masculinity often involves some sort of emotional restriction that is diametrically opposed to asking for help – doing so would only increase the discrepancy. A male with discrepancy from his masculine identity standard would thus avoid talking about his emotions or asking for help if he wanted to reduce the discrepancy. Each of these aforementioned aspects can contribute to the connections between discrepancy and violence, and when considered altogether, they paint an alarming picture.

While both ICT and GST help explain the outcomes of discrepancy, we are still left with several questions. We may consider masculine ideals to be the positively-valued goals of GST and part of the masculine identity standard of ICT, the question remains: from where do these masculine ideals emerge? Why are certain types of masculinity "positively-valued goals" while others are not? And how can aggression and misogyny as a response serve as a way to reduce error from a masculine identity standard? To understand the complexities of masculinity, we must now look to gender studies, especially feminist gender studies.

Gender/Feminist Studies:

In this section, we examine the theoretical and empirical work that explains how these masculine ideals/goals are crafted. Understanding the ideals to which males aspire is key to understanding the potential relationship between discrepancy and aggression and misogyny. In this section, I explore the gender and feminist studies research that examines connections between gender and systems of domination, laying the foundation for my research question. There are countless other views of gender, so for the sake of brevity, I focus mostly on the theories of how gender upholds systems of inequality – particularly patriarchy, though no form of inequality exists in a vacuum. The studies of men and masculinity are informed by feminist and gender studies, so I must first establish these theories before bringing in conversations of masculinity. This includes frameworks illuminating how gender is not just constructed at the individual level, but at the interactional and institutional levels as well.

Gender and Crime: Statistics

Before theorizing the relationship between masculinity and violence, we must highlight its empirical reality. In 2019 in the US, males far outpaced women in the numbers of arrests in almost all of the identified criminal categories listed in the FBI's Uniform Crime Report (FBI

Criminal Justice Information Services Division 2019). In terms of violent crimes, males accounted for arrest rates of 88% for murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, 96.6% for rape, 76.5% for aggravated assault, 78.9% for arson, 90.4% of weapons charges, and 70.6% of "other assaults" (FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Division 2019). Males made up 72.5% of all arrests in 2019 (FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Division 2019).

In addition to these crimes, males far outpace women in a more specific form of violence: Intimate Partner Violence. Women are more than twice as likely to be murdered by an intimate partner, and while males comprise 14% of victims of intimate partner violence, they are 86% of the defendants, with the numbers being reversed for women (Catalano et al. 2009). Women were also six times more likely to be killed by an intimate partner (41.5%) than males (7.1%) (Cooper and Smith 2011), and homicide is the leading cause of death for pregnant or recently postpartum (less than 1 year) women (Wallace et al. 2021), with the majority being committed by a current or former intimate partner (Cheng and Horon 2010).

As of March 2021, 97.7% of mass shootings were perpetrated by males (Peterson and Densley 2021). In fact, as of 2021, out of the 172 mass shooters studied by The Violence Project, only four were women, two of whom were in partnership with a man during the shooting (Peterson and Densley 2021). Outside of gun violence, female perpetrators only accounted for 10% of all homicides overall, and only 6% of homicides with multiple victims between 1980 and 2008 (Cooper and Smith 2011). In short, males are far more likely to be perpetrators of reported physical violence than women.

Yet, when speaking about violence as a whole, these uncomfortable facts are often left out of the discussion. Mass shooters are, at their very core, perpetrators of violence. We must try to understand the connection between masculinity and mass shootings, as opposed to attempting

to excuse or justify this relationship. To more fully understand the phenomenon, we must acknowledge and examine the similarities between perpetrators of mass violence. And, as discussed above, perhaps the clearest similarity between these men and boys is just that: they are almost exclusively *male.* Despite the fact that there are almost no female mass shooters, and even fewer who commit these acts of violence alone, even news sources reporting on patterns of mass shooters leave out maleness when discussing features "nearly all mass shooters have in common" (Shahid and Duzor 2021).

Essentialists claim that there are biological differences at work when it comes to violence. They may point to testosterone as the cause behind the aggression. Research supporting this theory that testosterone causes an increase in aggression is, at best, inconclusive, and more frequently, disputed (Kilmartin and McDermott 2016). The notion that males are "naturally" more aggressive due to testosterone may not only be inaccurate but may also facilitate men's perpetration of violence.

While essentialism has long been a system of describing gender, this has largely (though not entirely) shifted as modern theorists combat the notion that we are inherently one way or another based on our sex assigned at birth. In combating the implications for essentialism (mostly in its uses as upholding systems of inequality as being "natural"), gender theorists and feminist scholars have since established the notion that gender is not innate. Instead, it is a process which is informed and constructed by the society around us; we "do" (West and Zimmerman 1987) gender, as gender is "done" to us (Salzinger 2003). Whether we say that gender is "performed" (Butler 1990) or enacted, we understand that gender is *not* something that is determined by our hormones, our genitals, or a divine creator. Rather it is something that is constructed in the process of interaction. In the previous section, I explored identity theory in

relation to gender. Identity theory provides a framework to understand that we have meanings assigned to gender categories; it is important to examine how we come to associate those meanings with "being" a gender (Stets and Burke 2014).

Gender as a Process:

If gender is not something biological or innate, then what does it mean to have a gender? What does it mean to *be* gendered? What does it mean to be "feminine" or "masculine?" Countless studies have used the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem 1974) in attempts to understand how people see themselves as gendered beings. Well-meaning in its attempts to challenge the notion that gender roles are dichotomously opposed, the BSRI still manages to reify the notion that certain behaviors and personality traits are "feminine", and others are "masculine." Though many people may exhibit traits from both "sides," the BSRI nevertheless situates gender as opposing forces, instead measuring instrumentality for masculinity and expressiveness for femininity (Davis 2017). While "masculinity" is measured with words like self-reliance and leadership ability, "femininity" is measured with words like "compassionate" and "gentle." But how do we come to imbue meanings on what is considered "feminine" or "masculine?" How do we come to expect certain behaviors of "men" or "women?" There are several different ways that gender is theorized within feminist literature.

As with most theories, contentions abound regarding the *exact* nature of gender - or, at the very least, what words we use to phrase how we view gender. Where sociologists differentiate themselves from the realm of psychology is in their conceptualization of gender as something far beyond the individual's self-concept. While this is important, sociologists focus on how society informs these self-concepts. While I draw on gender and feminist theories, many of the underlying concepts of gender and feminist theories (such as identity, socialization, etc.) are

credited to sociologists. I first discuss gender as something that is "constructed" or "performed" rather than something innate; through covering several key concepts, I also discuss gender as being informed by patriarchy before introducing theories of the study of masculinity.

Gender as a Performance and Social Construct:

What does it mean to say that "gender is constructed?" As Simone de Beauvoir tells us in possibly her most famous quote, "one is not born, but rather, becomes a woman" (Beauvoir and Malovany-Chevallier 1949). We may understand the idea of gender construction as we understand any form of construction, even outside of the realm of the social sciences. Gender, as we construct a building, can be understood as being built little by little. Unlike a building's construction, however, the process of the construction of gender is something rarely noticed. In fact, it is so normalized that it is often seen by society as something that we are born with.

Gender is often described in a myriad of ways. It is often seen by feminist and gender scholars as something that is on-going. The difference I will be discussing here lies in the focus of the individual vs. the systems in which these processes occur. Both groups of scholars describe gender as being interactional – a person constructs their gender within the contexts of the society in which that person lives.

It may serve to begin with a theorist with whom many sociologists are familiar: Goffman and his concept of dramaturgy (Goffman 1959). Like actors, we are often performing our various identities for various audiences in various ways that we hope will not be perceived poorly. But to not make a negative impression on our audience, we must first understand what our audience expects of us in any given role. To draw an example from another Goffman text, if we are performing the role of a waiter, we must understand what the audience – customers, for example

– expects from us in that role (Goffman 1967). These expectations are often unwritten and may vary significantly depending on the context. Nevertheless, we learn how to *perform*.

So, what does it mean that gender is "performed," as argued by Judith Butler (1990)? It begins by first rejecting the notion that gender is something that is inherent. We are not born into specific traits that we associate with being a man or being a woman. We know this because we know that there are no universal, cross-cultural understandings of what a "man" or a "woman" is or should be. Instead, gender is dynamic and fluid, differing from place to place and era to era.

While Stets and Burke argue that social identities are less about "performing" and are instead about "being," they note that part of claiming a social/group identity includes "the display of meaning through dress, behavior, demeanor, and attitudes that convey these membership meanings to self and others so that they and others come to identify and accept their place in the social structure" (Stets and Burke 2014:415). It appears, then, that how we convey meanings through the aforementioned actions/beliefs are an extension of what we believe ourselves to *be* as gendered beings. Part of "doing gender" is the fact that our "gender displays" naturalize gender and present us as being a gender (West and Zimmerman 1987).

The fact that these displays have been widely accepted as "natural" works to hide the notion that these displays are performances through which we (unconsciously) hope to be validated as belonging to the gender with which we identify. Perhaps this is what Stets and Burke (2014) were referring to in regard to "being" a gender – people rarely consciously see gender as being actively performed, instead it is something we *are*. Gender performances are perceived regardless of whether that perception is conscious or not. In fact, one reason why we may consider gender to be a "master identity" is because it is something that is ongoing, something embedded in our everyday interactions (West and Zimmerman 1987).

Let us accept momentarily that gender is something ever-present, at least when it comes to interactions. As West and Zimmerman (1987:130) state, "it does not seem plausible to say that we have the option of being seen by others as female or male." And let us accept that each person has their own meanings they ascribe to what it means to be a "man" or a "woman," and these meanings do not simply emerge from the ether. Nor can they emerge solely from personal interactions. When someone says to a male "be a man!" that comment does not exist in a vacuum. Instead, to "be a man" has specific implications about toughness, stoicism, etc. And these implications have significant impacts on men's well-being.

As noted previously, much of the focus of the psychological research on men and masculinity is directed toward the negative intrapersonal impacts masculinity has on men. I will go over many of these impacts later before directing my attention to the interpersonal impacts, including this dissertation's foci of aggression and misogyny. This may be easier than engaging in the dialectical squabble that comes from the debates on how *exactly* we define these various concepts. However, I must here provide a number of definitions which are key to understanding later discussions of masculinity in order to contextualize the literature discussed thus far as I move into a discussion of the studies of masculinity.

Key Concepts:

I here draw on several theorists to provide the various definitions below. However, it should be noted that the transitive nature of gender norms and masculinity, in addition to its numerous connections to various systems of domination and oppression (race, class, etc.) makes exact, unanimous definitions difficult, if not impossible. I offer the following definitions as they relate to my own academic training without particular endorsement of one definition being superior to others.

Patriarchy:

How, exactly, do we define the term "patriarchy?" While there are countless definitions, I provide here a rather encompassing definition by Gerda Lerner (1986) which includes a preliminary allusion to the ephemerality of patriarchy, similar to the transient nature of gender, despite essentialism's protestations otherwise:

> Patriarchy in its wider definition means the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general. It implies that men hold power in all the important institutions of society and that women are deprived of access to such power. It does not imply that women are either totally powerless or totally deprived of rights, influence, and resources. One of the most challenging tasks of Women's History is to trace with precision the various forms and modes in which patriarchy appears historically, the shifts and changes in its structure and function, and the adaptations it makes to female pressure and demands. (Lerner 1986:161)

Even without consciously participating in society in ways that uphold oppression, those with privileged identities – such as males and/or people who are white-presenting – reap the benefits of those identities, nonetheless. Males, regardless of their exact embodiment of masculinity, gain various benefits from patriarchy. This is true even for males who seemingly contradict hegemonic masculinity; while they may not benefit from patriarchy as much as males who actively endorse it, they still benefit regardless. Consider the "glass escalator," in contrast to the glass ceiling – males in women-dominated professions are granted "structural advantages" by quickly being moved into the higher-status positions (Williams 1992). Notably, however, this occurs almost exclusively for white males – males of color are not granted these benefits (Wingfield 2009). It should be noted that while patriarchy may not extend its benefits equally

across various identities, misogyny (as will be defined in more depth later) knows no bounds. Even those of "marginalized masculinity" may have equal access to the types of misogyny which uphold patriarchy, regardless of whether that patriarchy withholds some of its benefits when compared to males with privileged masculinity (Manne 2018). That is, regardless of other identities, all males are able to find ways to maintain their domination over women; while the types of benefits patriarchy bestow upon males vary according to their other identities, it nonetheless bestows all males certain privileges over women.

These aforementioned patriarchal benefits are mostly contingent on the assumption that males enact what is expected of that identity – that which reinforces the "natural" aspects of the differences between their identity and others (Fenstermaker and West 2002). It is because of this, too, that males have a vested interest in holding other men, in particular, "accountable" for their performances (Schwalbe 2014). Since their privileges rely on this "naturalness," those who do not "fit the mold" are a threat – they challenge that "essential" nature of their manhood, their maleness from which those privileges stem (Fenstermaker and West 2002).

Hegemonic Masculinity:

Before understanding "hegemonic masculinity" we should first define "masculinity." I have already used this term a number of times, but I here define masculinity using C. J. Pascoe's definition, as per sociologists' approach to the subject: Masculinity is "a multiplicity of gender practices (regardless of their content) enacted by men whose bodies are assumed to be biologically male" (Pascoe 2007:6). I use this definition in part as a way to avoid a discussion of "multiple masculinities" or non-hegemonic masculinities, or any other form of masculinity. While I will discuss some of these concepts within the section on masculinity, introducing them here would only confuse the rest of these definitions.

If patriarchy is the system of male dominance over women, then we may think of hegemonic masculinity as one way that patriarchy is enacted. In one iteration by Connell (2005:77), hegemonic masculinity is defined as "the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women." The "hegemony" of hegemonic masculinity references Gramsci's concept of dominance of one group over others, which is maintained not necessarily through force but through cultural influences on society. This group's position of dominance becomes accepted as normal as societal values and beliefs are influenced to align with maintaining that group's domination. Thus, we can think of hegemonic masculinity as a particular type of masculinity that has become socially accepted as "the norm" through cultural practices which are meant to maintain patriarchy.

Additionally, Connell (2014:377) defined hegemonic masculinity as being "constructed in relation to various subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women." In short, hegemonic masculinity is a sort of idealized construction of masculinity that maintains male domination over women (and sometimes other men). It is a conceptualization of masculinity revolving around power that is able to reconfigure itself based on cultural and temporal shifts to maintain patriarchy, all while remaining taken-for-granted as the norm.

Within the original conceptualization of the multiple masculinities model, hegemonic masculinity existed in contrast to complicit masculinity (where males who benefit from hegemonic masculinity do not enact it), subordinated masculinity (where males are oppressed by hegemonic masculinity), and marginalized masculinity (where males may benefit from gender privilege, but not race or class, etc.) (Connell 2005). In this model, most males do *not* meet the

expectations of hegemonic masculinity, but still benefit from it in one way or another through the "patriarchal dividend" (Connell 2005). Yet it is from this model of multiple masculinities that countless iterations of masculinity have sprung: gay masculinity, BIPOC masculinity, working class masculinity, positive masculinity, cool masculinities, etc. (Pascoe 2007)– seemingly as many masculinities as there are men.

I introduce this concept in order to operationalize masculinity in relation to the harms it causes. With the extension of multiple masculinities into a model that seemingly encompasses every "type" of man, we run the risk of imagining that expectations of masculinity may be as equally diverse. Instead, we should understand that masculinity is in itself a structure with particular elasticity–it must have an element of flexibility in order to maintain patriarchy across historical and cultural shifts. We may look to "modern" masculinities like the "hipster" or the "metrosexual" as proof that homophobia, misogyny, etc. are a relic of the past, but to do so would be to underestimate the power patriarchy has over our conceptualizations of masculinity (Bridges and Pascoe 2018).

Males do not need to actively think about policing other males' masculinity to maintain their own manhood status – hegemonic masculinity makes these practices invisible (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). By maintaining a particular cycle, hegemonic masculinity obfuscates the fact that masculinity is not something innate: as certain expectations are upheld by society as the norm when enacting gender, those expectations inform how a person sees themselves as a gendered being, and they then act in ways that reproduce those social norms.

However, simply being perceived as having a male body does not, in fact, grant males the status of being a "real man" (Schwalbe 2014). This is a category reserved for males who best represent these "natural" aspects of "real men" – these are males who are perceived as tough,

emotionless, and successful both sexually and at being the breadwinner, amongst other factors. While the gender binary (in order to be maintained) expects that all males must inherently have certain qualities present (like toughness and emotional restriction), this binary does not expect all males must be equally successful. In fact, some males must fail so that other males may be exemplary men–*real* men. The threat of not being seen as a real man must be present so that males must prove their "true nature" beyond being perceived as male. Manhood status is about much more than simply being male (Schwalbe 2014).

As hegemonic masculinity relies on males accepting their "true nature," and policing other males to do the same, it should be no surprise that these pressures can result in negative outcomes for males. The demands of hegemonic masculinity are significant and numerous. If hegemony insists that males are logical protectors, then males must be emotionally and physically tough. If males are self-reliant, then they must not ask others for help. If testosterone makes males hypersexual, then they must be "playboys." Males, if they do not meet the expectations that hegemonic masculinity necessitates, are not "real men."

Sexism and Misogyny:

It is not uncommon to see the term "misogyny" used interchangeably with "sexism," despite the two are not the same. I have chosen the term "misogyny" over "sexism" for several reasons, but to discuss my decision, I must first define the terms. It may seem odd to have made it this far without defining misogyny, despite having used the term multiple times and the dissertation being centered in part around the concept. However, it is difficult to define the term without the theoretical background in feminist and gender theory that I have provided in this section. While it may seem a simple enough term to define, Kate Manne spends much of her award-winning book *Down Girl: The Logic of Misogyny* crafting a definition that succinctly yet

comprehensively proposes how we should think of "misogyny," both in connection with and in contrast to terms like patriarchy and sexism: "I propose taking sexism to be the branch of patriarchal ideology that *justifies* and *rationalizes* a patriarchal social order, and misogyny as the system that *polices* and *enforces* its governing norms and expectations. So, sexism is scientific; misogyny is moralistic. And a patriarchal order has a hegemonic quality" (emphases hers) (Manne 2018:20). In an earlier definition, which she provides in her introduction, she argues that we should consider misogyny as:

> [s]erving to uphold patriarchal order, understood as one strand amongst various similar systems of domination (including racisms, xenophobia, classism, ageism, ableism, homophobia, transphobia, and so on). Misogyny does this by visiting hostile or adverse social consequences on a certain (more or less circumscribed) class of girls or women to enforce and police social norms that are gendered either in theory (i.e., content), or in practice (i.e., norm enforcement mechanisms). (Manne 2018:17)

Throughout the text, as well as in her following book: *Entitled: How Male Privilege Hurts Women* (Manne 2020), she describes misogyny as the "'law enforcement' branch of patriarchy." This branch punishes women who challenge or contradict those who do not fit neatly into their expectations as they relate to the cult of true womanhood. While there is no universal experience of misogyny, Manne describes any number of forms it and male entitlement can take: from rape culture to incel violence to medical misogynoir. While hegemonic masculinity serves as a conceptualization of what it means to be a "real man" in ways that contribute to the subordination of women, misogyny is the active harm women face when they challenge the assumed "innateness" of their subordination.

Thus far I have attempted the seemingly impossible task of defining several terms and theories which I will be using throughout the rest of the dissertation. These definitions are hardly all-encompassing, but I provide them for context moving forward. As is made clear in these

definitions, we simply cannot separate these concepts from each other. While theorists and researchers may not agree on the exact terminology or paradigms or conceptualizations, they each share the common theme of male domination over women, often in ways that are obscured by hegemony. It is almost comical to think of males as waking up in the morning and saying to themselves "I am going to uphold patriarchy by enacting a form of hegemonic masculinity that maintains the subjugation of women. If a woman dares to challenge me, patriarchy, or even the gender norms that uphold these systems, I will respond with misogynistic intent to keep her in her place." In fact, part of the plot of the recently released live-action Barbie movie practically revolves around the notion that such an explicit display of patriarchy is absurd to the point of being humorous (Gerwig 2023).

Theories of Masculinity:

I extend the previous gender and feminist frameworks into these theories of masculinity, which include both psychological and sociological approaches and theorists. However, key to these understandings is discerning how masculinity operates at various levels: individual, interactional, and institutional. Wherever masculinity operates, we can see the impacts patriarchy has on society. It may at first seem contradictory to discuss masculinity as separate from gender theory. This is especially the case when the modern studies of masculinity emerged from gender and feminist theory. It is nothing new to point out that when we discuss theories of oppression and privilege, we will discuss the oppressed group, not the privileged one. Somewhat similar to the aforementioned invisibility of maleness in discussing perpetrators of violence is the idea that privileged identities are the default, and it is on marginalized bodies that we can study these systems (Ferree 2018).

With maleness being the default identity, and women existing mostly as a deviance from maleness, the study of men as a discipline has only somewhat recently been established. It was not until the past 50 years that maleness and masculinity have been empirically studied in their own right, as opposed to maleness being the norm from which women deviate. The "new psychology of men" (Levant and Pollack 1995) focused largely on how expectations of masculinity harm males.

It is from these expectations that the field of masculinity studies within the world of psychology shifted from the essentialist nature of sex role theory (wherein individuals and society as a whole suffer when individuals did not meet their biologically-prescribed nature according to their sex) and toward a more constructionist approach (Lerner 1986). I would be remiss to not mention the (in)famous Sigmund Freud and his conceptualization of gender, with male being the "normal human" and female being the "deviant," based on who does or does not have a penis (Lerner 1986). For Freud, female "anatomy is destiny," and thus the traditionalist defense of male supremacy took sexism from a religious position to one of scientific authority (Lerner 1986). With a traditionalist understanding that cultural changes stemming from the progression of technology freed males from their "biological necessity," support is lent to the notion of an ever-evolving masculinity (for example, with males being less reliant on the hard, physical labor replaced by the use of machines), while female nurturance is "unchanging and eternal [...] consigned to a lower state of existence, to nature rather than culture" (Lerner 1986:22).

Sex role theory followed closely behind, with these roles being based mostly on biological determinism and "role strain." Until the aforementioned shift away from essentialism, psychology (and functionalist sociology) focused largely on how failing to meet sex roles would

impact individuals' abilities to be "functioning," "normal" adults (Parsons 1954). Society's ability to function, itself, was reliant on individuals meeting those roles: males had "instrumental" roles as breadwinners while women had the "expressive" roles of caretakers (Parsons 1954). "Role strain," as understood by Parsons and others at the time, occurred when individuals progressed into adulthood without proper sex role socialization (Risman and Davis 2013); if occurring normally, girls socialized into domesticity and boys into breadwinning and patriarchal fatherhood (Connell 2018). Yet the following Gender Role Strain Paradigm represented a shift that focused on stereotypes and norms as opposed to assumed biological influences.

The "New Psychology of Men:" The Gender Role Strain Paradigm:

Informed by feminist scholars and gender theory, the psychology of masculinity began to look at how these ideas of traditional gender roles harmed males as well as others (Brooks and Elder 2016). Taking up the notion from gender theory that masculinity is socially constructed (as is the rest of gender), a particular shift occurred in the 1980s with Joseph Pleck's *The Myth of Masculinity* (1981). This offered a new paradigm of gender role strain, in which socialization is important, yet it is the expectations that were harmful. Strain from failing to meet these expectations came from a fear of violating gender roles and resulting social condemnation, *not* from failing to progress into a "normal, functional adult." This represented such a shift, that studies thereafter were considered part of the "new psychology of men" (Levant and Pollack 1995).

While informed by gender theory and feminist scholars, it is important to note that the Gender Role Strain Paradigm (GRSP, originally referred to as the sex role strain paradigm) represented a particular shift in the discipline of the study of men and masculinity. With a shift

toward understanding that those who uphold these societal expectations are rewarded for their behaviors (Pleck 1981, 1995), the focus turned to how these expectations may *simultaneously* negatively impact males' feelings, attitudes, behaviors, etc. In *The Myth of Masculinity,* Pleck (1981) offers ten propositions as it relates to the construction of gender, with many repeat themes from previous literature review sections:

1. Contemporary gender roles are operationally defined by gender role stereotypes and norms.
2. Gender roles are contradictory and inconsistent.
3. The proportion of people who violate gender roles is high.
4. Violation of gender roles leads to social condemnation.
5. Violation of gender roles leads to negative psychological consequences.
6. Actual or imagined violation of gender roles leads people to overconform to them.
7. Violating gender roles has more severe consequences for males than for females.
8. Certain prescribed gender role traits (such as male aggression) are often dysfunctional.
9. Each sex experiences gender role strain in its paid work and family roles
10. Historical change causes gender role strain.

These propositions embody not only the psychology of gender's shift away from essentialism, but also the *practices* of gender construction, which are complex and changing, yet work to uphold patriarchy (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). One of the key distinctions from sex role theory of the previous understandings of gender is the incorporation of "stereotypes and norms" as informing gender roles. Compare this to "Parsonian" theories of gender, where "roles" are formed almost exclusively by either biological or functionalist determinations as they relate to family (and, by extension, societal) structures.

Most important to this dissertation, however, are points 3-6. It is important to note that the ideals of gender roles are *rarely* fully met; yet the consequences of not meeting those ideals are often felt, all the same. As it relates to the processes of gender construction, Pleck breaks down these proposals into three categories of strain: Gender Role Discrepancy, Gender Role Trauma, and Gender Role Dysfunction (Pleck 1995). Dysfunction and discrepancy are the two

categories of interest to this dissertation. Masculine dysfunction strain is likely the most frequently measured, with few empirical studies being conducted on masculine discrepancy strain. This is possibly because there is disagreement as to whether discrepancy can be accurately measured with some of the most frequently used masculinity scales, including that of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (O'Neil 2008). Before moving into a more in-depth discussion of discrepancy, I will first describe these categories of strain so as to differentiate between the groups.

Types of Gender Role Strain – Overview:

Gender Role Trauma is perhaps the least relevant to this dissertation but is nevertheless important. bell hooks illustrates the trauma boys go through as they are socialized into "manhood," and how that trauma remains with them into adulthood: "To indoctrinate boys into the rules of patriarchy, we force them to feel pain and to deny their feelings" (2005:23). hooks quotes Terrence Real in a passage that relates to something hooks deems the "normal traumatization" of boys: "Our sons learn the code early and well, don't cry, don't be vulnerable; don't show weakness–ultimately, don't show that you care" (2005:32). This indoctrination stays with men into the two additional categories with which Pleck provides us: Gender Role Dysfunction and Gender Role Discrepancy.

While the process of socialization into "manhood" is in itself traumatic, we must also understand how the guiding forces behind these processes harm males. Not only did the gender role strain paradigm (GRSP) demonstrate masculinity studies' shift away from essentialism, but it also incorporated how systems of oppression and privilege impact gender role norms and stereotypes. While Pleck's ten previously listed proposals may not explicitly mention privilege, it poses an unwritten question: why does society enforce these norms if they are so harmful, and

they are not based on any sort of biological foundation? The gender and feminist theorists of the previous sections have an answer: males submit themselves to the trauma and dysfunction because it offers benefits they will receive for being "men" (hooks 2005; Schwalbe 2014). The GRSP, no doubt informed by feminist literature, turned the study of men and masculinities toward two seemingly contradictory ideas: that males have a vested interest in upholding gender roles (so as to uphold patriarchy); yet simultaneously, males are being harmed by these expectations which they attempt (and may often succeed) to uphold.

bell hooks's discussion of the "normal traumatization" of boys highlights the painful methods through which masculinity is reproduced. The *process* of being taught the expectations of masculinity is, in and of itself, harmful (hence, traumatic). But part of that trauma stems from the expectations *themselves*; what is created is a vicious and seemingly contradictory cycle when boys are taught that, despite the traumatizing process, they will be rewarded by submitting to patriarchal masculinity. Despite the trauma which boys go through, hooks (2005:26) states: "boys brutalized and victimized by patriarchy more often than not become patriarchal, embodying the abusive patriarchal masculinity that they once clearly recognized as evil."

Consider the expectations boys are indoctrinated into: Emotional restriction, homophobia, rigid gender roles, physical toughness, hypersexuality, dominance (especially over women). These are *hardly* the only expectations boys are taught to embody in order to become "men," but these six "pillars of masculinity" (as I will call them throughout this dissertation) represent major overlapping themes from psychology's study of masculinity. I will discuss these in much more detail later as they implicate specific negative outcomes males face when they submit themselves to these expectations. But for now, it does not require specific empirical data to imagine the impact these pillars have on the males who feel the need to endorse them. What

intrapersonal impacts would an individual face when they restrict their emotions? How might the requirement that someone be physically tough affect an individual's interpersonal interactions? What does it mean for a male to "know" that adherence to strict gender roles (often relying on types of anti-femininity) is required for him to be a man, especially when paired with the "fact" that a "real man" has as many female sexual partners as possible? Even without empirical evidence, answers doubtlessly come to mind.

Part of the harm males face may stem from the fact that the ideal to which they compare themselves and are compared is just that: an ideal. The ideal is something that is almost by definition unachievable–it's something to aspire to. As gender and feminist theorists have argued, these ideals do not simply emerge from the ether: they exist to uphold patriarchy. It is not uncommon to find arguments that the masculine ideals to which (at least American) society holds males stem largely from enforcing the ability to commit violence in preparation for war (hooks 2005; Schwalbe 2014).

Recall the discussion of identity control theory and general strain theory at the beginning of this background literature. We may perhaps consider the masculine ideal as a sort of identity standard, with manhood status being a positively-valued goal in relation to GST. People's identity standards can differ considerably, but they are largely informed, maintained, and sometimes reconstructed in response to interactions. In these interactions, the identity standard can either be confirmed or not be confirmed–creating an error or discrepancy. How many males truly meet society's or their own masculine ideals? The error, or discrepancy, results from a disturbance, and that error/discrepancy may come from either the individual experiencing the discrepancy, or from whomever the individual is interacting with. In a similar vein, another part of the harm stems from the fact that these expectations *themselves* are harmful to men. This is the

concept of dysfunction. Dysfunction refers to the impact of the *ideals*, while discrepancy refers to the impact of the *gap* between the actual and the ideal. The following sections outline how both of these concepts negatively impact males.

How Masculinity Harms Males:

Without going too deeply into the debate regarding multiple and/or hybrid masculinities, we should try to understand that no male escapes patriarchy's grasp. While males may be rewarded differently based on class, race, ability, etc. so long as they are perceived as male, they will face certain expectations. And should they fail to meet one expectation, they may find access in one way or another to fulfillment of the other expectations. These expectations are rooted in the pillars mentioned earlier: Emotional Restriction, Homophobia, Rigid Gender Roles, Physical Toughness, Hypersexuality, and Dominance. While this dissertation focuses on masculine discrepancy strain, there are negative effects not only when males fail to meet these expectations, but also when they *do* meet these expectations. I briefly discussed the notion that each of these pillars has implications for males in terms of intra- and interpersonal conflicts. While I will save masculine discrepancy for the final piece of this discussion, I must first discuss masculine role dysfunction. There is a large body of literature relating to masculine dysfunction, which refers to negative consequences resulting from strict adherence to enacting masculine behaviors, which are often unhealthy (O'Neil 2008).

Returning to GST, we can again consider particular expectations or ideals to be part of a "positively valued goal" of masculinity. However, it is not just in failing to meet these goals that harms males. Many of these ideals or goals themselves are harmful. The notion that a "real man" cannot express emotions, for example, is not only a goal which males can fail to meet (resulting

in negative stimuli when other males challenge their masculinity), but it also represents an absence of positive stimuli. Or, at the very least, the absence of a positive coping mechanism.

Masculine Gender Role Dysfunction and Conflict: The Presence of Negative Stimuli:

While dysfunction strain stems from attempting to embody expectations of masculinity, we may perhaps consider it to be part of a larger picture of gender role conflict (GRC). GRC is defined as "a psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences for the person or others. GRC occurs when rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles result in restriction, devaluation, or violation of others or self" (O'Neil 2008). GRC, as O'Neil (2008) explains it, represents complex interactions based mostly around men's fear of femininity. This fear is informed by how men are socialized, which is informed by masculinity ideologies and norms. To reinterpret GRC within the context of identity theory, we may perhaps think of GRC as conflict stemming solely from having particular identity standards. Regardless of whether or not there is discrepancy, this expectation of masculine identity, *itself*, causes harm.

In a systematic review of 25 years of GRC research, O'Neil (2008) discusses several key themes of masculine gender role conflict: "patterns," "domains," and "contexts." "Patterns" of gender role conflict include: Restrictive Emotionality, Health Care Problems, Obsession with Achievement and Success, Restrictive Sexual and Affectionate Behavior, Socialized Control, Power, and Competition Issues, and Homophobia. The "domains" of gender role conflict (or how we relate to others in terms of gender, as well as our own gender role expectations) include cognitive, affective, behavioral, and unconscious. The "contexts" of gender role conflict are the ways or reasons that gender role conflict occurs. These contexts can be categorized into four themes: GRC caused by gender role transitions, GRC experienced intrapersonally, GRC expressed toward others interpersonally, and GRC experienced from others (O'Neil 2008).

O'Neil's review also offered a suggestion for a contextual research paradigm. In this, they offered a number of potential moderators and mediators (mostly demographics, though Masculinity Ideology, Norms and Conformity are of the most interest to this paper), as well as predictors of the various outcome variables. These predictors of outcomes of GRC are Success, Power, and Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR). While there were a significant number of outcome variables, O'Neil categorized them into three contexts: GRC in Intrapersonal Context, GRC in Interpersonal Context, and GRC in Therapeutic Context. For the purposes of this dissertation, several of the outcome variables (out of the many provided) are of particular note: Stereotyping, attitudes toward women, sex role egalitarianism, abusive attitudes and behaviors, hostile sexism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward sexual harassment, rape myth acceptance, dating violence, sexual aggression and coercion, men's entitlement, victim blaming, and violence against women and other men. These relationships between the predictors and outcomes indicate clear connections between gender role conflict and personal and institutional sexism.

Between 1981 and 2021 there were close to 250 peer-reviewed articles, and over 300 dissertations and theses using the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). Research has found connections between GRC and these measurements of outcomes:

- *Increased alcohol and substance abuse* (Groeschel et al. 2010; Monk and Ricciardelli 2003; Uy, Massoth, and Gottdiener 2014)
- *Increased anxiety and stress* (Blazina and Watkins 1996; Cournoyer and Mahalik 1995; Fragoso and Kashubeck 2000; Hayes and Mahalik 2000; Liang, Salcedo, and Miller

2011; Sharpe and Heppner 1991; Theodore and Lloyd 2000; Wester, Vogel, et al. 2006; Wester, Kuo, and Vogel 2006; Wolfram, Mohr, and Borchert 2009)

- *Reduced attachment, bonding, and family ideation* (DeFranc and Mahalik 2002; Fischer 2007; Fischer and Good 1998; Schwartz, Waldo, and Higgins 2004)
- *Increased biases against sexual and racial minorities* (Kassing, Beesley, and Frey 2005; Robinson and Schwartz 2004; Walker, Tokar, and Fischer 2000; Wilkinson 2004)
- *Increased depression* (Blazina and Watkins 1996; Choi et al. 2010; Cournoyer and Mahalik 1995; Fragoso and Kashubeck 2000; Magovcevic and Addis 2005; Sharpe and Heppner 1991; Sharpe, Heppner, and Dixon 1995; Shepard 2002; Theodore and Lloyd 2000; Wolfram et al. 2009)
- *Increased discrimination and internalized oppression* (Liang et al. 2011; Robinson and Brewster 2014; Sánchez et al. 2010; Szymanski and Carr 2008; Szymanski and Ikizler 2013; Zhang et al. 2015)
- *Decreased help-seeking attitudes* (Davis and Liang 2015; Good et al. 2006; Good, Dell, and Mintz 1989; Groeschel et al. 2010; Mansfield, Addis, and Courtenay 2005; Robertson and Fitzgerald 1992; Vogel et al. 2014; Wisch et al. 1995)
- *Decreased intimacy, self-disclosures, and relationships with fathers* (Cournoyer and Mahalik 1995; Good et al. 1995; Sharpe et al. 1995; Theodore and Lloyd 2000)
- *Decreased self-esteem* (Bingham, Harawa, and Williams 2013; Choi et al. 2010; Hobza and Rochlen 2009; Mahalik et al. 2001; Sharpe and Heppner 1991; Shek and McEwen 2012; Szymanski and Carr 2008)

- *Decreased marital satisfaction, poor family dynamics, and couples gender role conflict* (Breiding 2004; Breiding, Windle, and Smith 2008; Campbell and Snow 1992; Rochlen and Mahalik 2004; Windle and Smith 2009)
- *Increased shame and guilt* (Thompkins and Rando 2003)
- *Increased stigma* (Magovcevic and Addis 2005; Steinfeldt et al. 2009; Vogel et al. 2014; Wester et al. 2010)

However, for this dissertation, there are three others that stand out:

- *Increased negative attitudes, abuse, and violence towards women* (Amato 2012; Amato and Macdonald 2011; Cohn and Zeichner 2006; Glomb and Espelage 2005; Hill and Fischer 2001; Kassing et al. 2005; Kearney, Rochlen, and King 2004)
- *Increased stereotyping and decreased sex role egalitarianism* (Heesacker et al. 1999; Tokar et al. 2000)
- *Increased traditional attitudes toward women* (Robinson and Schwartz 2004)

These are only a handful of the numerous studies examining the connections between gender role conflict and various negative outcomes.

O'Neil (2008:393) states: "Specifically, GRC has been significantly correlated with sexually aggressive behaviors and likelihood of forcing sex (Kaplan 1992; Kaplan, O'Neil, and Owen 1993; Serna 2004), abusive behaviors and coercion (Schwartz et al. 1998; Senn et al. 2000), dating violence (Harnishfeger 1998), hostile sexism (Covell 1998; Schwartz, Waldo, and Daniel 2005), hostility toward women (Rando, Rogers, and Brittan-Powell 1998; Senn et al. 2000; Serna 2004), rape myth acceptance (Davis 1997; Kassing et al. 2005; Rando et al. 1998; Serna 2004), positive attitudes toward and tolerance for sexual harassment (Covell 1998; Glomb and Espelage 2005; Jacobs 1996; Kearney et al. 2004), and self-reported violence and aggression

(Amato 2006; Chase 2000; Cohn and Zeichner 2006; Johnston 2005).” As it related to egalitarianism and attitudes toward women, higher GRC was correlated with being less supportive of gender equality and holding stereotypical views of women (O’Neil 2008).

These are just some examples that exist that illustrate connections between males’ adherence to masculine gender role norms and negative behavioral, emotional, and other health outcomes. Additionally, these are only the studies of men and masculinity which use the Gender Role Conflict Scale, rather than the numerous other scales used to capture masculine ideology. Between 1994 and 2005, the GRCS was the most-often used masculinity scale, with 64% of the 178 articles examined by Whorley and Addis (2006) utilizing it as a method of analysis on masculinity. The next most-often used scale (the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale) was recorded in 17% of the studies–paling in comparison to the GRCS (Whorley and Addis 2006). While it is clear that endorsing traditional masculine gender roles is related to adverse outcomes, such as the aggression and misogyny which are the foci of this dissertation, we may also consider a more hopeful solution in its opposite: might we find positive associations with rejecting these gender roles? And for this dissertation we might ask whether those who reject masculine ideals have lower endorsement of aggression and misogyny, regardless of their lived experiences?

The “Man Box:” The Absence of Positive Stimuli and Rejection of Masculine Goals:

Part of masculinity’s draw is that it provides males with the opportunity to “become men” and reap the rewards of patriarchy. As discussed, males may unconsciously submit themselves to masculinity’s control because it offers rewards to those who are “real men.” It also punishes those who fail to meet these expectations. Returning to GST, we may again examine the idea of

masculinity being a "positively valued goal;" one where the benefits often outweigh the harms. But what happens when males reject this goal altogether, despite the benefits it may offer?

Missing from the conversation so far is the notion that gender dysfunction as it relates to masculinity can only exist if gender is particularly important to males. If a male does not find importance in these qualities which often results in the construction of ideals that cause dysfunction, there is no place from which dysfunction can spring. Similarly, a low endorsement of masculine ideals likely means a smaller chance for discrepancy and, by extension, discrepancy strain, since those ideals are easier to meet.

The importance of masculine ideals is a central component of Man Box studies (Heilman, Barker, and Harrison 2017; Hill et al. 2020; The Men's Project and Flood 2018). These studies reference a "Man Box" first described in Kivel's (1998) "Act Like a Man Box" which discussed the pressures males face to meet traditional masculine norms (Hill et al. 2020). This scale has only recently gone through psychometric validation. The original scale, first published in 2017, had been created through pilot testing in more than 100 countries, and in 2020 a study indicated support for its validity and reliability, as well as for its construct validity through factor analyses (Hill et al. 2020).

The "Man Box" is defined as "a set of beliefs, communicated by parents, families, the media, peers, and other members of society, that place pressure on men to be a certain way" (Heilman et al. 2017:8). Studies utilizing this scale measure the outcomes of endorsement of these beliefs about being "a real man." Males can be considered "in the Man Box" or "out of the 'Man Box'" based on their levels of endorsement of masculine norms, with those being "in the 'Man Box'" having higher levels of endorsement and vice versa (Heilman et al. 2017; Hill et al. 2020; The Men's Project and Flood 2018). Those who are "in" the "Man Box" face significantly

higher repercussions for their mental and physical health than those "out" of the Man Box (Heilman et al. 2017; Hill et al. 2020; The Men's Project and Flood 2018).

The Man Box identifies seven pillars: Rigid Masculine Gender Norms (or Rigid Gender Roles), Aggression and Control, Hypersexuality, Self-Sufficiency, Acting Tough, Heterosexuality and Homophobia, and Physical Appearance. However, it combines the first two for analysis due to significant overlap into "Rigid Gender Roles and Aggression and Control." Each pillar was significantly correlated with a variety of life outcomes that the researchers studied (Heilman et al. 2017). In psychometric validation attempts, it was found that higher levels of endorsement of masculine norms were positively correlated with violence-related outcomes, as well as depression, anxiety, and perpetration of sexual harassment and bullying (Hill et al. 2020).

The original study using the Man Box scale paints a more in-depth picture (Heilman et al. 2017). Only three out of the 20 life outcomes the Man Box measured had no significant correlation with any of the pillars: Positive affect, Relationship satisfaction, and Life satisfaction—notably, positive outcomes. In comparison, the "rigid gender roles/aggression and control" category was correlated with increased: Negative affect, binge drinking, experiences of physical violence, being bullied verbally and online, as well as perpetrating physical violence and verbal and online bullying, perpetrating sexual harassment, thoughts of suicide, and traffic accidents. The "Hypersexuality" pillar was associated with increased binge drinking, pornography consumption, experiences of physical violence, being bullied verbally and online, as well as perpetrating physical violence and verbal and online bullying, perpetrating sexual harassment, and thoughts of suicide. The "Self-Sufficiency" pillar was associated with increased binge drinking, increased experiences of online bullying, increased perpetration of online

bullying and physical violence, perpetrating sexual harassment, and thoughts of suicide. It was also associated with decreases in having friends to talk to and seeking help from friends and family. “Acting Tough” was correlated with increased perpetration of physical violence and sexual harassment. It was also associated with decreased thoughts of suicide, though the authors note that it may be that these young men were less likely to report suicidal ideation. “Heterosexuality and Homophobia” was associated with increased connections to physical violence, as both having experienced violence as well as perpetrated it. It was also positively correlated with traffic accidents. “Physical Attractiveness” had low associations with increased depressive symptoms and pornography access.

Few had correlations with positive outcomes. The “rigid gender roles/aggression and control” category, as well as the “heterosexuality and homophobia” pillar, were correlated with decreased pornography consumption. The “hypersexuality” pillar was positively correlated with increased body satisfaction and having friends to talk to. Of particular interest to this dissertation is the arrangement of the “pillars,” which serve as the way I categorize different aspects of masculinity. These pillars are often reflected in the various subscales of psychological masculinity scales, including the already-mentioned GRCS (O’Neil et al. 1986). While they are simply referred to as subscales in other measures, the Man Box Scale defines their pillars as “harmful masculinities” (Hill et al. 2020).

It is clear from studies on dysfunction as well as the endorsement of masculine norms that aspects of masculinity are harmful to males, in both intrapersonal and interpersonal ways. From depression to violence to intimacy, these expectations have deleterious effects as well as those around them. If males are negatively impacted by the expectations themselves, then the next question is: how are males impacted by failing to meet these expectations? Or, at the very

least, how are they impacted by being perceived as having not met these expectations? These questions are some of the first steps to understanding the overarching research question of how failing to meet masculine ideals is related to the endorsement of misogyny and violence.

Precarious Manhood: The Failure to Achieve the Positively-Valued Goal:

While I have discussed at length theoretical implications of masculine discrepancy, I have yet to discuss what happens when a male actively has his masculinity threatened and its potential connections to violence. I have discussed strain as it relates to GST and GRSP but have yet to examine the reactions males respond with when actively faced with that strain. GST has helped to explain the negative health outcomes resulting from the lack of healthy coping mechanisms (since males are not allowed to express their feelings), but I have yet to make connections to potential violence. Aggression is another outcome resulting from strain, and this connection is made clear by the concept of Precarious Manhood. The Precarious Manhood literature perhaps best exemplifies GST's connections between strain and crime, especially if that crime is related to aggression and violence.

One of the key components of understanding discrepancy is the idea that manhood itself is elusive, fluctuating. To fully achieve manhood is an impossible task. As gender theorists point out: no male truly epitomizes *all* aspects of manhood. Certain males may exemplify certain pillars, and, indeed, even multiple pillars. Yet it takes very little to bring fulfillment of these pillars down; a male's manhood is easily called into question over the slightest perceived transgression. Manhood status often hangs by a thread; failing to meet these pillars of masculinity derails the performance of manhood. Masculinity is, in this way, more than simply fickle and tenuous in its expectations, it is also *precarious*.

Precarious manhood literature, often attributed to Jennifer K. Bosson and Joseph A. Vandello, tells us that masculinity is hard won and easily lost (Bosson et al. 2009; Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello et al. 2008; Vandello and Bosson 2013). That is to say that manhood takes effort to establish and maintain. It must be constantly performed so as to not be called into question. Yet a single question or threat may topple a pillar (or pillars) of masculinity. And when one pillar may be called into question, males may perhaps find avenues through other pillars to reclaim (or at least attempt to reclaim) their manhood.

At the very root of this notion is the idea that masculinity and manhood is important to males' overall identities. If it is not, then there is little need for the reclamation of manhood through other avenues – challenges may be ignored. If manhood status *is* important to a male's identity, then it is not simply their personal understanding of their own manhood status, it is that *others* must perceive that manhood status.

Another way to think about this desire to regain manhood status is by framing males' actions in certain scenarios as a way in which males may *compensate* for lost masculinity. The notion of masculinity compensation is not new or unique to the academic understanding of masculinity. However, it has empirical support in the Precarious Manhood literature (Bosson et al. 2009; Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello and Bosson 2013) and elsewhere (Willer et al. 2013). While overcompensation may occasionally serve as the butt of a joke, some jokes, such as a preference for SUVs over smaller vehicles, are actually backed by the research (Willer et al. 2013).

Research over the last decade offers us insights into connections between masculine identity and aggression. A number of studies rely on challenging male participants' masculinity and then measuring these participants' reactions. This research often relies on creating scenarios

through which participants feel as though their gender identity has been threatened. This can occur through the participants being provided with false feedback which indicates that their responses to tests were abnormal for their gender. It can also occur through scenarios in which participants are forced into performing actions which would be considered by many to be outside of (or in contradiction to) what is expected for the participants' gender. These are known as false feedback experiments.

Some examples of false feedback experiments include word completion tasks. In one experiment, participants were asked to complete a "gender knowledge test" which included items associated with masculinity and femininity, such as sports and home repair vs cooking and childcare, respectively (Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello et al. 2008). Participants were then provided with false feedback indicating whether their score was closer to the "average man's" or "average woman's" score (Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello et al. 2008). In order to measure participants' resulting anxiety or aggression, researchers prompted participants with fragments that could be finished to create anxiety-related/unrelated words or aggression-related/unrelated words (Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello et al. 2008). Results suggested that males' identities as men were more bothered by the gender threat represented by the false feedback than women (Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello et al. 2008). Similar tests also indicated males in the threatened condition had higher rates of aggression as opposed to males in the non-threatened condition; women's scores did not differ significantly, regardless of condition (Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello et al. 2008).

In the task-based threats, several themes emerged supporting the notion that males, when their masculinity is challenged, may seek to restore that masculinity through avenues like aggression. Males were required to either braid hair or braid rope, indicating the threat or the no-

threat condition, respectively, and were then given the option to either complete a puzzle or punch a punching bag (Bosson et al. 2009). Males in the no-threat condition (that is, they braided rope instead of hair) were more likely to complete a puzzle than to punch a punching bag. However, in the threat condition (that is, they braided hair instead of rope), the number of males who punched the punching bag more than doubled (Bosson et al. 2009). Males in the threat condition were 1) more likely to choose the aggressive task than non-threatened males and 2) punched harder than the males in the non-threat condition who also chose to punch the punching bag. That is, while some males in the non-threat condition (braided rope) chose to punch the punching bag instead of completing the puzzle, they did not punch as hard as males in the threat condition (braided hair). Measuring word-completion stress scores of participants after a test with the same set-up indicated that men in the threat-aggression condition (i.e. they braided hair and then punched a punching bag) showed *less* anxiety than those in the threat-no-aggression condition (i.e. they braided hair and completed a puzzle instead of punching a punching bag). This may indicate that the aggression of punching a punching bag, in allowing these males to reclaim some lost masculinity and, thus, decreased stress.

These studies provide a number of insights into identity threat: Males feel the threats more strongly than women when their gender identities are challenged. Males who have their manhood challenged are more likely to indicate higher levels of stress and aggression than males who do not have their manhood challenged. Stress, however, was mediated by the ability to perform an aggressive task, perhaps indicating that manhood may be at least slightly reclaimed through aggression. What is clear in all of these studies is that manhood status is not only easily lost, but also that males may use aggression as a way to attempt to reclaim manhood status when it is challenged.

This fits with much of the framing proposed by identity theory. Let us reinterpret the hair-braiding task through an identity control theory lens. Males were not asked about their masculine identity standard (though results provide insight), but with gender being a "master identity," it is probably safe to assume that they have one. These males were then asked to do one of two tasks: braiding hair or braiding rope, with braiding hair being associated with femininity as opposed to braiding rope. Let us refer to the experiment as the "situation," as per the identity model (Burke and Stets 2023; Stets and Burke 2014). In both situations, we may consider the tasks to be disturbances. However, only one task (braiding hair) resulted in an error or discrepancy when the disturbance was considered in reference to the masculine identity standard. Within the context of seeing masculinity as a performance (as is gender), it is likely that the error resulted from reflected appraisals–that braiding hair was perceived by others to be inconsistent with how the participant sees their own masculine identity standard.

To continue with this example, we move to the responses from the participant beyond the comparator. The false feedback experiments indicated that threats to masculinity result in emotional discomfort such as stress. Key to the experiment, however, was the fact that being asked to braid hair resulted in increased aggressive responses (punching a punch bag vs solving a puzzle; punching the punching bag harder than non-threat participants). This could be understood as a behavioral response to the discrepancy–by punching the punching bag, the participant is attempting to reduce the error or discrepancy, realigning participants' perceptions with his masculine identity standard. The resulting emotional response of decreased stress provides further support that the aggressive behavior reduced error.

We may also return here to general strain theory (GST). In contrast with Precarious Manhood literature, GST does not argue that physical violence serves as a way to regain lost

manhood. Instead, GST would argue that the responses of violence occur when manhood status is threatened because achieving manhood status is a positively-valued goal. In this case we may instead understand this violence as a response to threats thwarting the achievement of this goal. Regardless of the exact mechanisms in play, these theories offer explanations as to why challenges to manhood status may result in physical aggression and violence.

Violence and the Construction of Masculinity:

So far, I have discussed the theoretical framework that masculinity and manhood are seen as being socially constructed. This is to make a very important distinction. Thus far I have spoken in great depth, with numerous statistics, about how males commit violence at astronomically higher rates than women. This should *not* be confused with the idea that males are *inherently* violent. It is key to my hypotheses, as well as the hypotheses of others, that this is due to how manhood is constructed as being related to violence. By ignoring the processes through which masculinity and manhood are constructed, we run the risk of promoting essentialist notions of gender, which is at the center of upholding patriarchy. As noted, essentialism not only upholds the gender binary which is necessitated by gender oppression but also serves to remove culpability – after all, "boys will be boys."

Overall, several aspects are key to this dissertation. Maleness is not synonymous with masculinity, which is not synonymous with manhood. Some continue to use "male" as an exact synonym for "man," or use "sex" interchangeably with "gender." This dissertation itself uses "male" to refer to those who may or may not seek manhood status and may or may not have achieved that status. Maleness is something that is granted when someone is assumed to have a male body. To claim to be a man, however, is to claim membership to a specific group of people that has been constructed in certain ways. To claim that membership is to claim access or

entitlement to the benefits that are bestowed upon this group by patriarchy (Schwalbe 2014). Manhood status is not granted as the male status may be; manhood status must be earned. This manhood status is tenuous, fragile, precarious – it must be proven again and again (Bosson et al. 2009; Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello and Bosson 2013). Masculinity could perhaps be seen as how manhood is enacted. More than an individual identity, masculinity is a series of actions, of claims, which may vary from time to time and culture to culture but nevertheless indicate some level of membership to the socially constructed category of men.

To return to the concept of discrepancy, we may be able to make certain assumptions from these conclusions. Discrepancy is felt stronger by males than by women, at least when that discrepancy is caused by the outside threat of being seen as feminine (as opposed to the threat of women being seen as masculine). That discrepancy causes stress or strain in the afflicted party. That discrepancy stress may perhaps be relieved by appealing to alternative pillars of masculinity – in this case, aggression and/or violence. Or this violence may be seen as an extension of strain resulting from failing to meet masculine goals. And each of these conclusions were reached from a context in which the main "challenge" to a male's manhood was being asked to braid hair. What might this mean for males whose manhood statuses face more significant or more constant threats? And finally, what does it mean for the violence that males perpetrate, that aggression is a potential way to "regain" manhood?

Violence as a Manhood Act:

It is no secret that males are the perpetrators of most of the crimes I noted earlier in this dissertation. While males make up 80% of homicide victims overall worldwide, women make up 82% of intimate partner homicide victims worldwide (UNODC 2018). Of all women and girls murdered, less than half are killed by perpetrators outside of the family; 34% are killed by

intimate partners and the rest are killed by other family members (UNODC 2018). While not all intimate partners are males, there are certain connections between pillars of masculinity and violence against women. If certain aspects of masculinity are key to violence, then is violence key to certain aspects of masculinity?

Violence perpetrated by males affects more than women. Yet there still seems to be an apprehension to study violence as it relates to masculinity, despite obvious patterns which have been illuminated numerous times in this dissertation. While some may argue that this is another example of "boys will be boys," there is no questioning as to *how* boys may "be boys," and how that relates to violence. There is a particular apprehension to talk about masculinity being constructed *around* violence. To talk about masculinity as being constructed *at all* is to call into question the essential nature of masculinity. To further claim that there is no essential, biological cause as to why 90% of homicides are committed by males (Cooper and Smith 2011) is to reveal an uncomfortable truth – we cannot blame biology for males' bad behaviors; there is something else at play. GST would argue that this violence emerges from the various types of strain males may face in the performance of masculinity (and the failures to perform masculinity adequately). Or perhaps we may look at violence as simply one means of achieving and/or maintaining that "hard won, easily lost" masculinity (Vandello and Bosson 2013).

Violence and aggression offer much faster and more observable ways to regain manhood status than, say, becoming the breadwinner. Let us also consider the risks of violence – there could be a boost in a male's manhood for winning a fight, but there is a risk of emasculation should he lose. Researchers in the punching bag aggression study suggested that some participants, despite having their masculinity threatened, may still opt to solve a puzzle out of fear of the emasculation of punching the bag with strength perceived to be inadequate (Bosson et

al. 2009; Bosson and Vandello 2011; Vandello and Bosson 2013). Similarly, a fight is a risky path to take but offers faster and perhaps even stronger paths to regaining lost manhood status.

We can also see these connections in some of the impacts discussed earlier of masculine gender role stress, including hostility toward women, acceptance and/or perpetration of intimate partner violence (Franchina, Eisler, and Moore 2001; Jakupcak, Lisak, and Roemer 2002; Mahalik et al. 2005; McDermott and Lopez 2013; Moore et al. 2008; Moore and Stuart 2004), poor mental health outcomes such as risky behaviors, emotional restriction and avoidance of help-seeking (Eisler, Skidmore, and Ward 1988; Graef, Tokar, and Kaut 2010; Saurer and Eisler 1990), and anti-gay attitudes (Parrott 2008, 2009; Parrott, Peterson, and Bakeman 2011).

While the various theories of masculinity may take different approaches to the subject, there is one constant: masculinity is harmful. It harms males, as well as those who are not male. It harms males in its expectations through dysfunction and gender role conflict. It harms others by the various outcomes of those dysfunctions. While sociologists of the past (mostly) may have argued that it was from failing to fulfill these gender norms that society was harmed, it is perhaps the opposite that is true. Failing to fulfill gender norms is harmful not in its impact on the structure of families, but in the negative consequences stemming from failing to meet *expectations*. GST may describe this as failure to achieve a positively-valued goal, and ICT may describe this as error from the identity standard.

While I listed a large number of studies demonstrating the impacts of masculine gender role conflict, these studies are also important on a methodological level. These studies both inform this dissertation's methodology as well as demonstrate the wide variance in how we measure the effect masculinity inflicts, especially in the form of intimate partner violence. These scales are frequently used in the study of violence, especially in intimate partner violence. Thus,

while they are largely emerging from the world of psychology, I include them for empirical demonstration and methodological knowledge.

Measuring Masculinity:

If masculinity is as fluctuating and ephemeral as theorized, then how do we measure masculinity? We measure how masculinity is perceived, by males themselves and by others. These scales largely emerged from the field of psychology, especially the field of social psychology. These scales quantify various aspects of beliefs about masculinity and occasionally gender as a whole. By extension, these scales may be considered to often quantify males' masculine identity standards. Many also include questions not only about these masculine identity standards, but also about how males view society's expectations of them as it relates to manhood. I here provide a timeline and summary of some of the most frequently used scales.

While these measurements vary from scale to scale, there are a few constants: Of the scales that are purported to measure concepts such as "traditional" masculinity norms, many indicate positive correlations between endorsement of negative gender norms and endorsement of violence against women, including intimate partner violence (McCarthy, Mehta, and Haberland 2018). This is expected, recalling the previous discussion of the gender role conflict scale and the various outcomes resulting from GRC. While there have been almost countless scales, I will here include some of the most frequent. I follow the criteria of Thompson and Bennett (2015), describing scales that have been used in empirical studies and were published in mainstream, peer-reviewed psychology or gender-related journals. Additionally, these are not study-specific modifications of earlier scales. Apart from the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI), these are scales measuring masculine *ideology*, not *discrepancy*. That is, these scales ask males about what they believe men should be, or how they should act. Out of

these scales, only the CMNI asks men about their own *behaviors*; however, this scale still does not measure how these behaviors may differ from ideals, and thus does not measure discrepancy.

The Brannon Masculinity Scale (BMS) (Brannon and Juni 1984) sought to measure how people felt about American masculinity. This was based on Brannon's (1976) previous analysis of the "American culture's 'blueprint' of what a man is supposed to be, to want, and to succeed in doing" (Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera 1992:587). It included four standards, which were broken into smaller subscales. The "No Sissy Stuff" standard contains the subscales of avoiding femininity and concealing emotions. The "Big Wheel" standard contains the "breadwinner" subscale, along with the subscale measuring "being admired and respected." The "Sturdy Oak" standard contains the subscales of toughness and "the male machine." Finally, the "Give 'em Hell" standard contains a single subscale of "violence and adventure." Typically, due to the length of the BMS (originally 110 questions), the short form (58 questions) is most frequently used (Thompson et al. 1992).

The Male Role Norm Scale (MRNS) (Thompson and Pleck 1986) was made by reducing the BMS, yet also has its *own* short form. It used a factor analysis to identify three cultural standards – Status norms, Toughness norms, and Anti-femininity norms. This scale assesses beliefs about men's expected behaviors. Some questions included are "A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children" as well as "A man should never back down in the face of trouble." Variations of this scale include the Masculinity Ideology Scale – 21 (Fischer et al. 1998), which adds a component of "rationality" to a status subscale, and breaks toughness into two categories: Tough *image* and *violent* toughness. The Male Role Attitude Scale (MRAS) was another scale associated with Pleck (Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku 1993, 1994), guided by the gender role strain paradigm. That is, this scale sought to measure boys' ideology regarding

masculinity norms and introduced the modification of using the term "guys" instead of "men." For example, one question is "It bothers me when a guy acts like a girl." This is in contrast to scales that have mostly used the terms "man" or "men" when asking about masculinity ideology.

Many of the scales after 1995 were modifications of previous scales so as to measure adolescent masculinity ideology, such as the Male Role Norms Inventory – Adolescent (MRNI-A) (Levant et al. 2008), the Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (AMIRS) (Chu, Porche, and Tolman 2005), and the Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale (MAMS) (Oransky and Fisher 2009), and/or to address cultural differences, such as the Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale (MMIS) (Doss and Hopkins 1998), the Machismo Measure (MM) (Arciniega et al. 2008), and the Macho Scale (Anderson 2012). These scales frequently adjusted phrasings or conceptualizations of these aforementioned scales so as to more accurately measure a wider range of men and masculinity.

Finally, somewhat outside of these ideology scales, the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (O'Neil et al. 1986) is by far the most commonly used scale when it comes to research on masculinity (Whorley and Addis 2006). Differentiating itself from ideology scales, this scale mostly asks men how they would feel when faced with certain scenarios, such as holding a woman's purse in public. Yet again we find that this scale has many of the subscales similar to other scales, such as Success, Power, and Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR). Again, though the names of the subscales may differ and there may be some overlap between different subscales, the patterns remain.

While I noted in the beginning of this section that these scales measure ideology and *not* behavior, I would be remiss to not mention the few previous scholarly attempts at creating a

discrepancy scale. Reidy et al. (2014) measured discrepancy through five questions about how "masculine" participants believe themselves to be in comparison to other males. It also measured discrepancy *stress* via an additional five questions asking about males' desires to be seen as more masculine. An additional set of scholars (Rummell and Levant 2014) attempted to create a discrepancy strain scale using suggestions from Pleck. However, they explain that their methodology may have interfered with their findings, noting that their unacceptably low alpha scores for the subscales may have been due to the limited number of items per subscale and the complexity of the constructs being measured. Rummel and Levant (2014) hypothesized that discrepancy strain would decrease self-esteem. However, they failed to find support for this hypothesis, noting that, amongst other explanations, the homogeneity of the sample (mostly young, white college students) could have been a factor in the participants' scores. Additionally, the authors were unable to run a factor analysis, with their discrepancy scale having 140 items, but only 173 completed surveys.

Despite Rummel and Levant's (2014) findings, the scale that I have created for this dissertation uses a similar methodology in combining separate scales. While I seek to avoid the issue of homogeneity by utilizing a large-scale survey of adult males throughout the US (not just college students), I must note that the two scales used in Rummel and Levant (2014) are two of the three scales I use to create my own discrepancy scale. I introduce the Man Box into my scale creation, but the other two scales (Male Role Norms Inventory and Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory) are also the scales from which Rummel and Levant (2014) created their discrepancy measure.

MRNI, CMNI, Man Box Scale:

While each of these aforementioned scales informed the creation of my discrepancy scale, there are three scales which were integral to the development of the pillars which are foundational to this study. These scales are the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) (Levant et al. 1992), the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) (Mahalik et al. 2003), and the Man Box scale (Heilman et al. 2017; Hill et al. 2020; The Men's Project and Flood 2018, 2020). The MRNI is one of the more commonly used scales to measure masculine ideology (Whorley and Addis 2006), with subscales similar to the aforementioned measures. The CMNI, in contrast, used first-person language to measure males' perceptions of themselves, as opposed to their perception of "men" or "masculinity" as a whole. Finally, the Man Box scale measures males' rejection (or endorsement of) masculinity norms by asking males about what they believe about masculinity, compared to what they think *society* believes about masculinity. Combined, these measures should allow us to capture discrepancy as it is defined when incorporating Identity Theory: How far are males from their own masculine identity standard? And what impact does that have on endorsement of aggression and misogyny?

The Male Role Norms Inventory (Levant et al. 1992) was structured to measure males' masculine ideology, similar to other scales already listed. The MRNI includes statements such as "When the going gets tough, men should get tough" and "A man should try to win at any sport he participates in." In one of its many amended forms (Levant and Fischer 1998), the MRNI was broken into subscales of avoidance of femininity, restrictive emotionality, achievement/status, aggression, self-reliance, fear and hatred of homosexuals, and attitudes toward sex. It also included a nontraditional attitudes subscale, which is sometimes dropped in future versions. The short form of the scale uses the following subscales: Restrictive Emotionality, Self-Reliance

Through Mechanical Skill, Negativity Toward Sexual Minorities, Avoidance of Femininity, Importance of Sex, Dominance, and Toughness (Levant, Hall, and Rankin 2013).

The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) (Mahalik et al. 2003) shifted away from the conventions of measuring how males (and others) felt about masculinity or how men as a *whole* should be. Instead, it focused on the individual attitudes of males toward their own behaviors and attitudes. For example, instead of asking about agreement with the statement that *men* should not ask for help, the CMNI asked males about their agreement with the statement that "*I* hate asking for help." The CMNI uses the following subscales: emotional control, self-reliance, violence, risk-taking, playboy, power over women, disdain of homosexuality, status, primacy of work, and winning.

The Man Box scale prompted males with various "rules" of manhood. That is, participants were prompted with statements similar to previous scales ("a man shouldn't have to do household chores"), framed as a "message" (about what a "real man" is) sent by the Man Box (a set of societally-informed beliefs about how men should be). Their responses were recorded on a Likert-style scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. In this study, males were asked about their personal opinions of what men should be, as well as what they believed society thought men should be. While similar to the MRNI, the Man Box scale added an element of societal pressure to create a "Total Masculinity Score." The Man Box studies introduce differences between what these males believe *society* believes versus what they individually believe makes a "real man." Endorsements were broken into different categories, deemed "pillars," the term I use throughout this dissertation. The "Total Masculinity Scores" were correlated with each of the pillars mentioned earlier in this dissertation, indicating the negative impact of endorsement of gender norms on different life outcomes. Given the research on

masculine gender role dysfunction strain, it is unsurprising that those who were "inside the Man Box" (those who had higher "Total Masculinity Scores") had negative emotional and behavioral outcomes compared to those who were "outside the Man Box"(Heilman et al. 2017; Hill et al. 2020; The Men's Project and Flood 2018, 2020).

Each of the scales bring unique aspects to my discrepancy scale, yet their subscales share key similarities. The themes of these subscales can also be seen in many of the other aforementioned scales which were less foundational (though still relevant) to this research. The MRNI measures males' perceptions of how men should behave, similar to other gender role strain scales. The CMNI measures men's perceptions of masculinity through first-person language, as opposed to questions worded to ask about men as a whole. Finally, the Man Box scale measures males' endorsement or rejection of masculinity norms and compares how they feel about masculinity vs. how they believe society feels about masculinity. In this dissertation, I seek to synthesize these scales by creating a new discrepancy scale which draws on some of the unique features of each scale, as well as their similarities. Again, this novel discrepancy measure will serve not only to first measure discrepancy, but also to measure the outcomes resulting from males' failure or success in achieving their ideals.

The Pillars of Masculinity:

As noted previously, masculinity ideology is frequently measured through different scales and measures. However, patterns become obvious when looking at the various subscales. Many subscales follow a similar design in their distinctions: typically, some form of toughness or violence, anti-femininity or strict adherence to gender roles, status or power or domination, being a "playboy" (having numerous sexual partners), being emotionally restrained, and compulsory heterosexuality. These typically do not have the exact same label across scales, and there may be

overlap. Each concept may not be included in every scale, and there may be additional subscales that are unique to certain measures. Through these similarities, a pattern emerges that paints us a rather specific picture of the pillars of masculinity I use in this dissertation:

Pillar 1: Men should not feel, or at least express emotions (apart from anger) (Emotional Restriction)
Pillar 2: Men should only be heterosexual (Heterosexism/Homophobia)
Pillar 3: Men should be the breadwinner while their significant other does the domestic duties (Rigid Gender Roles)
Pillar 4: Men should not be afraid to resort to physical violence, especially when it comes to earning respect (Physical Toughness)
Pillar 5: Men should have as many sexual partners or as much sex as they can (Hypersexuality)
Pillar 6: Men should dominate others, but especially the women in their lives (Dominance)

3. STUDY CONTRIBUTIONS:

My contributions are two-fold: methodological and theoretical. Methodologically, I develop and validate a new scale—one offering a measure of discrepancy, itself, not just discrepancy stress (which can already be measured by the Masculine Discrepancy Stress scale). While discrepancy stress is correlated with aggression and misogyny, I ask whether the difference between ideals and experiences is also correlated with these outcomes. In addition to this contribution to the study of masculinity, this dissertation also contributes to the guiding literatures: general strain theory (GST), identity control theory (ICT), and gender and feminist literature.

By considering masculine discrepancy as a failure to achieve a positively-valued goal, and by measuring aggression as an outcome variable, I contribute to GST's connections between strain and crime. I extend these connections to include ICT as an examination of masculine identity which becomes interrupted through disturbances to the identity standard. Both GST and ICT describe how emotions such as anger can result from discrepancy and, by extending anger to potential behavioral responses, offer us explanations connecting discrepancy and aggression. Finally, I contribute to gender and feminist literature by examining implications for the relationships between discrepancy and aggression and misogyny.

The fields explicitly studying masculinity may be somewhat new, but the idea of discrepancy is not. One need not be an academic to be familiar with the idea of male compensation, even if compensatory masculinity is a specific theoretical concept. At the heart of compensatory masculinity is the notion that males are afraid of being seen as less of a man, hence the behaviors that make up for that fear of being seen as a failure. Put simply, males fear

the idea that their discrepancy will be uncovered by others and that their "manhood" will be called into question.

It is not enough to simply have a man's body to be granted the status of "manhood." The call to "be a man" or to "man up" indicates to us that not everyone who may be perceived as *male* may be perceived as a "*real man*." As noted before, the supposed "naturalness" of masculinity relies on "proof," which must be constant. As such, in order to be seen as men, they must "prove" that they are men through any number of behaviors - even if those behaviors end up harming them in the end.

Despite the clear harm that expectations of masculinity inflict on males and the rest of society, it still offers males an advantage. The harms of dysfunction are manageable when compared to the "harms" of gender equality males should face if patriarchy is upended. From the gender pay gap to the "second shift," males come out on top both at work and at home. Patriarchy ensures that males are seen as having "valuable," proactive qualities, while women are seen as having passive qualities, which are less valued. And we see this reflected in the different pillars of masculinity.

If masculinity is but one arm of patriarchy and masculinity *must* be accepted as biological, we begin to see why males continue to subscribe to these expectations, even the harmful ones. Maintaining the "biological" aspects of masculinity (and often by extension femininity) necessitates that *everyone* buys into essentialism – and to buy into the essentialism means to act the part. If enough males decide that the benefits of patriarchy are not worth the damage that is done to themselves and society, the entire gender order may come crumbling down, impacting even those who do not feel the same way. Thus, males find themselves rewarded for "playing along," consciously or otherwise.

It has been instilled in males that their value as males relies on their ability to meet certain expectations of masculinity. And, by extension, in the eyes of these males, the value of *other* males is impacted by their successes or failures. Those who do not meet these expectations are failures, pose a threat to patriarchy, and find themselves not only shamed, but also *targeted*. They have become easy prey for other males to bolster their own masculinity. Challenging other males is one way to increase a man's manhood status, but it comes with a risk – should they fail, their status will suffer. A man who is deemed a failure to masculinity is less of a threat, and, thus, an easy way to increase the manhood status of the attacker.

In attacking a "manhood failure," another man conveys several mostly unconscious messages. First, he says "see? In beating this man, I am more of a man, and thus deserving of manhood status." It also says "I am committed to these masculine ideals. In proving my toughness, I am supporting men's 'essential' nature of aggressiveness." And finally, and perhaps most importantly, it says "this is what happens when you fail to meet these expectations. You will become prey for males like me."

It could be argued that discrepancy strain is felt most strongly because of men's personal connections to masculinity as being key to their personal identities. However, it should also be argued that, should that discrepancy become known, a man's weakened manhood status becomes a target. Should a man fail to meet these expectations, he may not only feel personal shame but may also feel the anxiety of becoming prey for other men. Thus, males must not only hide their discrepancy but must also find ways to reclaim their manhood. And *this* is where my dissertation question lies. With the obvious connections masculinity has to violence, is it possible that we could examine violence as less about interpersonal conflict and more about a way to regain lost

manhood status? I study this by assessing how a male's personal discrepancy from his ideals is associated with his endorsement of misogyny and aggression.

Hypotheses:

I expect that a number of themes will emerge over the course of this research. Utilizing GST and ICT frameworks, supplemented by studies of masculinity, I expect to find the following:

Hypothesis 1: Masculine Discrepancy *Stress* will have a significant positive relationship with aggression and misogyny.

Hypothesis 2: Greater endorsement of masculine ideals and lived experiences will be associated with higher levels of endorsement of aggression and misogyny than weaker endorsement of ideals and experiences.

Hypothesis 3: Masculine discrepancy, as measured by subtracting ideals from experiences, will have a negative relationship with aggression and misogyny. Those whose experiences surpass their ideals (thus having positive discrepancy) will have lower aggression/misogyny and/or those whose ideals surpass their experiences (thus having negative discrepancy) will have greater aggression and misogyny.

Hypothesis 4: Certain masculine ideals and experiences (particularly physical aggression, hypersexuality, and domination over women) will have stronger associations with aggression and misogyny than other ideals and experiences.

Hypothesis 5: Cluster analysis will reveal four groups of males: Males with 1) high ideals, high experiences (norm-favoring consistents), 2) high ideals, low experiences (norm-favoring discrepants/negative discrepancy), 3) low ideals, low experiences (norm-rejecting consistents), and 4) low ideals, high experiences (norm-rejecting discrepants/positive discrepancy).

Hypothesis 6: These clusters will differ in terms of their endorsement of aggression and misogyny. The norm-favoring discrepants will have the greatest endorsement of aggression and misogyny, while the norm-rejecting discrepants will have the lowest. The two consistent groups will be in the middle, with the norm-favoring consistents surpassing the norm-rejecting consistents.

To summarize, I have five major questions: 1) Can this newly created scale be validated (Chapter 6)? 2) Are endorsements of masculine ideals and experiences associated with higher

endorsement of aggression and misogyny (Chapter 6)? 3) How does self-reported/perceived failure to meet masculine ideals (i.e. negative discrepancy) impact males' endorsement of aggression and misogyny, net of demographic variables (Chapter 6)? 4) Does Masculine Discrepancy Stress negate all relationships between discrepancy and the outcomes (Chapter 6)? 5) Does belonging to a particular "cluster" of males, based on ideals and experiences, have a relationship with higher endorsement of aggression and misogyny (Chapter 7)? These questions are answered in the subsequent content chapters after a broad discussion of the data collection and variable conceptualization.

4. METHODS

Data Collection:

Pilot Study:

I first conducted a pilot study of undergraduate students for three reasons: 1) to determine a sample size vis-a-vis a power calculation, 2) to analyze whether factor analyses resulted in predicted patterns, and 3) to test the items developed for the purposes of the discrepancy score measures as well as examine the discrepancy scores it produced. The pilot was conducted in a large introductory sociology class of all genders at a large university in the southern United States. I received over 400 responses, 178 of which were responses from male students. 64 of those male respondents either missed at least one attention check or were flagged for straight-lining, leaving me with a final analytical sample of 114. The pilot study allowed me to run power calculations and analyze results as described in the methods section of this dissertation. Small wording changes were made after the pilot study to better capture hypothesized concepts. For example, the pilot study included the question "In general, I control the women in my life." In an attempt to avoid negative associations, I changed this question to be "In general, I have control over the women in my life." Despite these two questions measuring essentially the same concept of control of women, the hope was that the latter version would reduce potential bias associated with the idea of "being controlling" versus "having control."

This pilot study resulted in a surprising finding: The average young man in my pilot sample indicated positive discrepancy. That is, their lived experience scores were actually higher than their endorsement of masculine ideals. In other words, that meant that these young men were often living these masculine expectations, without actually endorsing the ideals, or exceeding even the ideal expectations they had about what it meant to be a "real man."

Data Collection & Sample:

Upon determining a sample size, I utilized Cint survey company's survey panels to collect data for this dissertation. Cint is a large research technology company that provides a software platform for their clients, with a global network of respondents. Cint requires their supply partners to meet industry standards and utilizes several forms of fraud detection (Cint 2024). In November and December 2023, Cint recruited 1,000 U.S. males above the age of 18 to answer this survey. After several rounds of fielding to filter out and replace poor responses, a total of 960 responses were collected. Cint compensated participants with $3.80 for completing the survey, which averaged a 15-minute completion time. Additionally, participants who missed any variables of interest were removed from the analytical sample. I was thus left with an analytical sample size of 705.

I included a number of demographic variables to serve as controls. Considering that MGRS is contingent upon how males understand masculinity, it is important to note that one common understanding of masculinity as a concept is that it varies across ethnicities, religions, geographies, and a multitude of other aspects (Connell 2005). In the Southern United States, for example, "cultures of honor" interact with masculinity (Cohen et al. 1996) in ways that, when paired with Southern politeness norms, could have implications for increased argument-related homicides (Cohen et al. 1999). We know that age has a moderating effect on gender role stress in that men's age determines what factors they find to be more stressful: college-aged males indicated higher stress related to success, power, and competition (SPC), while middle-aged men indicated higher stress related to conflicts between work and family relations (CBWFR) (Cournoyer and Mahalik 1995; O'Neil 2008). Additionally, older men are more likely to endorse rape myths, as are less educated males (Kassing et al. 2005). Despite these differences, most

MGRS studies are done on college-aged males (Thompson and Bennett 2015). Related to MGRS, a summary of the Gender Role Conflict Scale indicated potential factors either mediating or moderating Gender Role Conflict, including (but not limited to): age, masculinity ideology, norms, and conformity, men's diversity (including racial, ethnic, cultural, class, religious and sexual identity), and psychological and physical health variables. In addition to potentially moderating the impacts of masculine discrepancy, including these demographic variables offers the opportunity to corroborate patterns seen in MGRS research. MGRS research is particularly homogenous, so including males who are not predominately white, young, college students could be particularly impactful. In the interest of producing a concise study while also maintaining the most robust sample size, several items were collected, but not used in the regressions in this dissertation. This includes several questions on pornography and sexual experience, as well as membership to male-specific groups, such as college or professional athletics, fraternities, etc. These items were not included, in part, due to their high rates of missing information, in comparison to other control variables.

Sample Statistics:

The analytical sample used for regression analysis consisted of 705 men over the age of 18 with the requirement that participants be American, as this study relies largely on American cultures of masculinity and manhood. The average age was 45.5 years old, with the youngest being 18 and the oldest was 94. The participants were almost entirely cisgender (97%) and predominately white (68%). Half of the participants had an associate's degree or less, and more than half (54%) were married at the time of taking the survey. Almost half of the participants (47%) identified politically as a Democrat. More than half (53%) made less than $60,000 per year, with a household income of less than $80,000 for 54% of participants. Given the significant correlation

between personal and household income (r = .90), only personal income was used in regression analyses. 60% identified religiously with some sect of Christianity (Non-Catholic, Catholic, Mormon, Orthodox) and the majority identified as being only attracted to women (84%). This information is also provided in table 1 and is further discussed in the limitations section. A pairwise correlation matrix with levels of significance can be found in Appendix A.

Table 1: Sample Demographic Statistics

Variable	N = 705	Percent	Variable	N = 705	Percent
Sex Assigned at Birth			**Religion**		
Male	687	97%	Christian	422	60%
Female	18	3%	Jewish	18	3%
			Muslim	98	14%
Education Level			Non-religious	132	19%
Less than high school	21	3%	Other	35	5%
High school/GED	148	21%			
Some college	100	14%	**Relationship Status**		
Trade/vocational/technical	33	5%	Single	157	22%
Associates	54	8%	Dating	81	11%
Bachelors	141	20%	Married	383	54%
Masters	161	23%	Previously married	79	11%
Professional	13	2%	Other	5	1%
Doctorate	32	5%			
Other	2	0%	**Personal Income**		
			Less than $19,999	125	18%
Politics			$20,000 to $39,999	144	20%
Republican	205	29%	$40,000 to $59,999	106	15%
Democrat	329	47%	$60,000 to $79,999	59	8%
Independent	157	22%	$80,000 to $99,999	41	6%
Other	14	2%	$100,000 to $119,999	56	8%
			$120,000 to $139,999	32	5%
Race			$140,000 to $159,999	44	6%
White or Caucasian	479	68%	$160,000 to $179,999	14	2%
Black or African American	130	18%	$180,000 to $199,999	12	2%
Hispanic or Latino	56	8%	Above $200,000	67	10%
Asian	19	3%	Other	5	1%
Other/Prefer not to say	21	3%			
			Household Income		
Employment			Less than $19,999	81	12%
Working full-time or more	391	55%	$20,000 to $39,999	126	18%
Working part-time	55	8%	$40,000 to $59,999	93	14%
Unemployed	55	8%	$60,000 to $79,999	69	10%
Self-employed	39	6%	$80,000 to $99,999	47	7%
Retired	128	18%	$100,000 to $119,999	61	9%
Other	37	5%	$120,000 to $139,999	41	6%
			$140,000 to $159,999	48	7%
Orientation			$160,000 to $179,999	10	1%
Attracted only to women	589	84%	$180,000 to $199,999	17	2%
Attracted only to men	64	9%	Above $200,000	88	13%
Other	52	7%	Other	3	0%

Methodological Decisions – Dependent Variables:

Hostility Toward Women Scale (10 items):

The Hostility Toward Women Scale (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1995) used in this dissertation was created by reducing the length of the original 30-item Hostility Toward Women Scale (Check et al. 1985). 19 items from the 30-item scale were originally chosen for clarity and non-redundancy, and nine items were then eliminated to "strengthen internal consistency" (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1995). Wording was changed slightly by Lonsway and Fitzgerald for clarity. These items measure the trustworthiness of women, as well as general feelings about women. While this scale and the original Hostility Toward Women Scale utilize a dichotomous response scale, I instead used a 7-point Likert scale (from 1 "strongly disagree" to 7 "strongly agree") for ease of interpretation. To facilitate regression analyses, I created an additive index by summing the scores of the ten items, using reverse-coded scores for the two reverse-coded items. The Cronbach's Alpha for this scale was 0.86, demonstrating good internal consistency.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory - Short Form (12 items):

The original Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick and Fiske 1997) is a 22-item measure that breaks sexism into two categories via subscales: Benevolent Sexism and Hostile Sexism. Glick and Whitehead (2010) shorten this scale into a 12-item scale based on the best-performing items across several different studies. This 12-item scale was further validated in 2014 (Rollero, Glick, and Tartaglia 2014). Six items measure "Benevolent Sexism" and the remaining six items measure "Hostile Sexism." While the original scale and short forms use a 6-point Likert scale from 0 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"), I use a scale from 1 to 6 with the same response categories for ease of interpretation, since all other scores begin at 1.

To facilitate regression analyses, I created several additive indices by summing the scores of the items for the two separate subscales. The Cronbach's Alpha for the overall scale was 0.85, demonstrating good internal reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha for the Benevolent Sexism subscale was 0.75, indicating acceptable internal reliability, while the Hostile Sexism subscale had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.87. This indicates that the Benevolent Sexism scale had the weakest (though still acceptable) internal reliability, while the overall scale and Hostile Sexism subscale indicated good internal reliability.

Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire - Short Form (12 items):

The original Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire was a 29-item scale developed by Arnold H. Buss and Mark Perry in 1992 and was a refinement of an earlier scale by Buss and Ann Durkee (Buss and Durkee 1957; Buss and Perry 1992). The Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire measured 4 concepts of aggression: Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger, and Hostility. A 12-item short form was developed in 2001 (Bryant and Smith 2001) and was further refined into the validated version I use for this study (Diamond and Magaletta 2006). This scale uses a 5-point Likert scale from 1 ("Not at all like me") to 5 ("Completely like me") to respond to statements such as "Given enough provocation, I may hit another person."

To facilitate regression analyses, I created several additive indices by summing the scores of the items in all four of the subscales, as well as the overall scale. The Cronbach's Alpha for the overall scale was 0.94, demonstrating good internal reliability. Cronbach's Alpha for the subscales were as follows: Physical Aggression (4 items) – 0.86; Verbal Aggression (3 items) – 0.82; Hostile (3 items) – 0.82; Anger (2 items) – 0.79. Apart from the Anger subscale (which just barely missed 0.8), each of these scales/subscales indicated good internal reliability.

Methodological Decisions – Independent Variables:

Measure of Masculine Discrepancy:

The focus of this dissertation is on the creation and validation of a scale measuring differences between males' masculine ideals and their lived experiences. Chapter 6 focuses on the validation of this scale, which was created using questions from the Man Box scale (Hill et al. 2020; The Men's Project and Flood 2018, 2020), the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (Mahalik et al. 2003), and the Male Role Norms Inventory (Levant et al. 1992). This scale is comprised of two major subscales: males' masculine ideals, and their corresponding lived experiences. Each of these two subscales consists of 24 questions, for a total of 48 questions; each "ideals" item corresponds with an "experiences" item and vice versa. These are measured on a 7-point Likert scale with 1 being the lowest ("Strongly disagree" for ideals and "Very false" for experiences) and 7 being the highest ("Strongly agree" for ideals and "Very true" for experiences). These items, along with the rest of the survey, can be found in Appendix B.

Masculine Discrepancy Stress Scale (5 questions):

To measure discrepancy stress, males were provided with five statements taken from Reidy et al. (2014):

1. I wish I was more manly.
2. I wish I was interested in things that other guys find interesting.
3. I worry that people judge me because I'm not like the typical man.
4. Sometimes I worry about my masculinity.
5. I worry that women find me less attractive because I'm not as macho as other guys.

They were then offered a 5-point Likert scale to respond, ranging from "very false" (1) to "very true" (5). To facilitate regression analyses, I created an additive index by summing the scores of the five items. The Cronbach's Alpha for this scale was 0.87, demonstrating good internal consistency.

5. PREFACE TO CONTENT CHAPTERS

Does how a person thinks "what it means to be a man" affect how they act like a man? Psychologists have attempted to measure various outcomes of how beliefs about manhood impact males' well-being through different scales. However, current measures do not fully capture the complex relationship between masculine ideals and lived experiences. This dissertation demonstrates how the concept of success or failure at meeting an ideal masculinity impacts males' attitudes towards misogyny and aggression. Specifically, I supplement psychological work on the Gender Role Strain Paradigm (GRSP), with a focus on discrepancy and strain. One way to think about how masculinity impacts males' attitudes or behaviors is the GRSP, which is broken into three parts: trauma, dysfunction, and discrepancy strain. Most research has been conducted on how traditional masculine ideology is associated with adverse mental and behavioral outcomes (dysfunction strain); meanwhile, little research has been conducted on the impacts of succeeding or failing to meet masculine ideals (discrepancy strain). The following content chapters examine the concept of masculine discrepancy strain through empirical analysis. At present, there is no established measure for discrepancy itself, and my overall contribution is using sociological frameworks to supplement our understanding and measurement of discrepancy as well as demonstrate its empirical effects. In doing so, I add to a growing literature that attempts to explain how violence is correlated with systems of oppression and domination, specifically through my examination of misogyny as an outcome variable.

By utilizing general strain theory (GST) and identity control theory (ICT) frameworks, supplemented by gender and feminist theory, my objective was to create a measure to operationalize discrepancy more completely, allowing us to understand the impact of failing to meet masculine ideals. While the measure I have created draws largely on psychological scales,

my hypotheses were informed by sociological theories of strain, identity, and gender (specifically masculinity). While psychological masculinity studies tell us that endorsement of masculine ideals has significant impacts on males' well-being, this dissertation asks whether these impacts are the result of males' successes or failures in meeting these ideals, rather than simply endorsement. When situated within a strain and identity framework, I expected to find that the varying levels and types of discrepancy have differing relationships to the endorsement of aggression and misogyny. That is, I expected to find that these endorsements were correlated with not only males' ideals, but whether they perceived that they met that ideal, failed to meet that ideal, or surpassed that ideal. This prediction finds support within a GST framework as well, particularly as it relates to participants with negative discrepancy, or those who hold particular goals that are positively valued by society yet fail to meet those goals.

The following content chapters lay out how I establish a measurement of discrepancy in the process of answering the dissertation's research questions**: How do masculine ideals, experiences, and the differences between the two impact males' individual endorsement of aggression and misogyny? Are there significant differences between groups of men clustered around ideals and experiences?** The first content chapter (chapter 6) begins with scale validation, followed by the establishment of the required components necessary to assess the presence of discrepancy: 1) males' masculine ideals and 2) their perception of lived experiences. Chapter 6 next measures the relationships between the outcome variables and the endorsement of masculine ideals, experiences, and males' discrepancy between the two (either positive or negative). In the second content chapter (Chapter 7), I utilized cluster analysis to examine how participants can be categorized into four groups or types of discrepancy (based on their masculine ideals and experiences) and whether group categorization impacted endorsement

of aggression and misogyny. Finally, I examine whether being part of a particular "cluster" of males (based on ideals and experiences) had a significant relationship with endorsement of aggression and misogyny.

6. CONTENT CHAPTER 1: Scale Validation and Discrepancy Measure Creation:

Introduction:

Masculinity-related scales do not *only* ask "how does endorsement of masculinity impact men's behaviors and beliefs?" They also frequently ask "how does endorsement of anti-femininity (as a component of masculinity) impact men's beliefs and behaviors?" or "how does endorsement of physical toughness (as a component of masculinity) impact men's beliefs and behaviors?" As the brief review of subscales of masculinity scales in the literature chapter demonstrates, we may perhaps consider masculinity to be broken into components, or what I refer to as "pillars." These subscales reflect that males who endorse one pillar may not equally endorse another pillar. That is, one man may more fully endorse anti-femininity as a pillar of masculinity than toughness, and vice versa, and these men may have completely different outcomes.

In this chapter, I utilize four analytical methods: 1) univariate analyses of summary statistics and correlation, 2) OLS regression results between demographic variables and the outcome variables, 3) factor analyses to establish the pillars that make up masculine ideals, experiences, and discrepancy, and 4) OLS regression results between demographic variables and the independent variables (males' ideals, lived experiences, and the discrepancy between ideals and experiences), net of control variables. Essentially, this content chapter presents the baseline variables used to create the factors that will be used in Chapter 7 to establish clusters of males, which will then be used to analyze how cluster membership is related to the outcome variables of misogyny and aggression.

Findings:

Summary Statistics:

The following tables present summary statistics for the sample. Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for each item in the ideals and corresponding experiences scales, excluding participants with missing values. The average across the items measuring masculine ideals was 3.419, while the average for experience items was 3.626.

Table 2: Item-Specific Descriptive Statistics

Ideals - Item specific						Experiences - Item specific					
Item name	**Obs.**	**Mean**	**Std. dev.**	**Min.**	**Max.**	**Item name**	**Obs.**	**Mean**	**Std. dev.**	**Min.**	**Max.**
Ideal 1 - Emotional Restriction	705	3.548	2.062	1	7	Exp. 1 - Emotional Restriction	705	4.801	1.902	1	7
Ideal 2 - Emotional Restriction*	705	2.118	1.396	1	7	Exp. 2 - Emotional Restriction*	705	2.177	1.481	1	7
Ideal 3 - Emotional Restriction*	705	2.501	1.611	1	7	Exp. 3 - Emotional Restriction*	705	3.468	2.029	1	7
Ideal 4 - Heterosexism	705	3.913	2.207	1	7	Exp. 4 - Heterosexism*	705	5.089	2.299	1	7
Ideal 5 - Heterosexism*	705	3.418	2.145	1	7	Exp. 5 - Heterosexism*	705	3.611	2.351	1	7
Ideal 6 - Heterosexism	705	4.640	2.185	1	7	Exp. 6 - Heterosexism*	705	5.536	2.212	1	7
Ideal 7 - Strict Gender Roles*	705	2.498	1.661	1	7	Exp. 7 - Strict Gender Roles*	705	3.089	1.928	1	7
Ideal 8 - Strict Gender Roles	705	3.565	2.141	1	7	Exp. 8 - Strict Gender Roles	705	3.709	2.090	1	7
Ideal 9 - Strict Gender Roles*	705	1.949	1.417	1	7	Exp. 9 - Strict Gender Roles*	705	1.952	1.410	1	7
Ideal 10 - Strict Gender Roles	705	4.218	2.015	1	7	Exp. 10 - Strict Gender Roles	705	4.597	1.938	1	7
Ideal 11 - Strict Gender Roles	705	4.627	2.018	1	7	Exp. 11 - Strict Gender Roles	705	4.938	1.924	1	7
Ideal 12 - Physical Violence	705	2.935	2.193	1	7	Exp. 12 - Physical Violence	705	2.932	2.255	1	7
Ideal 13 - Physical Violence	705	2.739	2.035	1	7	Exp. 13 - Physical Violence	705	2.535	2.074	1	7
Ideal 14 - Physical Violence	705	4.519	1.991	1	7	Exp. 14 - Physical Violence	705	4.616	1.999	1	7
Ideal 15 - Hypersexuality	705	3.226	2.151	1	7	Exp. 15 - Hypersexuality*	705	3.128	2.182	1	7
Ideal 16 - Hypersexuality	705	2.670	1.991	1	7	Exp. 16 - Hypersexuality	705	2.410	2.023	1	7
Ideal 17 - Hypersexuality*	705	3.079	2.037	1	7	Exp. 17 - Hypersexuality*	705	3.252	2.250	1	7
Ideal 18 - Hypersexuality	705	4.757	1.785	1	7	Exp. 18 - Hypersexuality	705	3.956	2.182	1	7
Ideal 19 - Hypersexuality	705	2.957	2.091	1	7	Exp. 19 - Hypersexuality	705	3.343	2.274	1	7
Ideal 20 - Dominance	705	3.584	2.078	1	7	Exp. 20 - Dominance*	705	2.962	2.154	1	7
Ideal 21 - Dominance	705	3.681	2.287	1	7	Exp. 21 - Dominance	705	3.814	2.223	1	7
Ideal 22 - Dominance*	705	2.435	1.798	1	7	Exp. 22 - Dominance*	705	2.413	1.755	1	7
Ideal 23 - Dominance	705	4.082	2.164	1	7	Exp. 23 - Dominance	705	3.911	2.141	1	7
Ideal 24 - Dominance	705	4.404	2.104	1	7	Exp. 24 - Dominance	705	4.783	1.960	1	7
Average		3.419				Average		3.626			

An asterisk indicates a reverse-coded item

A few findings were unexpected. First, males' experiences, on average, surpassed their masculine ideals, resulting in *positive* discrepancy – in contrast with what was theoretically expected, but consistent with patterns which were found in the pilot data involving college students. Second, for both ideals and experiences, the items with the lowest scores often revolved

around expressing emotions, such as (when reverse coded) “a man should not tell people he cares about them.” However, these were also the items with the highest positive discrepancy. In contrast, the items with negative discrepancy were often the items about violence and hypersexuality. However, this is consistent with the unexpected findings from the pilot study, which also indicated an overall positive discrepancy.

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics for the outcome variables, as well as the statistics for Masculine Discrepancy Stress (MDS). For most of the outcome variables, the mean score was less than the midpoint for each scale. For example, while the midpoint for the MDS additive index was 15, the mean score was just over 13. The midpoint for the Hostility Toward Women (HTW) additive index was 40, but the mean score was 36.3. However, this was not the case for the Ambivalent Sexism scales, where the mean surpassed the midpoint for each subscale. The Ambivalent Sexism subscales were also the only scales that did not have a true midpoint for each item, as the options were a 6-point Likert scale, which means participants were forced participants to choose a “side” of agree or disagree. That is, participants were not offered a “neither agree nor disagree” option. While the scores for every other scale were slightly lower than the midpoint, and thus disagreed at least slightly, it appears possible that a lack of midpoint in the ASI subscales may have resulted in participants being more likely to select “slightly agree.”

Overall, the means for either the items or the additive index were relatively similar to previous research (Cowan and Mills 2004; Diamond and Magaletta 2006; Şahan 2020). Slight adjustments were necessary to compare means for the short form of the ASI, as articles using this scale often used a range of 0 to 5 instead of 1 to 6; in these cases, even after adjustment, the means for this dissertation were consistently higher than average item means in the

aforementioned studies (Rollero, Bergagna, and Tartaglia 2021; Rollero et al. 2014; Rollero and Tartaglia 2019). This could possibly be explained by differences in samples, as previous studies focused on university students while this dissertation did not.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Outcome Variables

Dependent Variables	Obs.	Mean	Std. dev.	Min.	Max.
Masculine Discrepancy Stress	705	13.138	5.978	5	25
Hostility Toward Women	705	36.261	12.920	10	70
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory					
Benevolent Sexism	705	26.593	5.989	6	36
Hostile Sexism	705	23.650	7.508	6	36
Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire					
Physical	705	8.709	4.903	4	20
Verbal	705	7.040	3.586	3	15
Hostile	705	7.956	3.747	3	15
Anger	705	4.437	2.622	2	10

A correlation matrix of all study items allows us to review bivariate relationships. The matrix can be found in Appendix B. To avoid an unwieldy matrix, I use reference categories for nominal variables. These reference categories consist of the largest category from each group; I also use these categories in the regressions throughout these content chapters. The reference variables are the following: 1) Sex assigned at birth: “Male” 2) Political Affiliation: “Democrat” 3) Race or Ethnicity: “Caucasian or White” 4) Employment status: “Works at least one full time job” 5) Relationship status: “Married” 6) Sexual orientation: “Attracted only to women” and 7) Religion: “Christian”

A few items were highly correlated. For the dependent variables, the Hostility Toward Women scale (HTW) was correlated with the Hostile Sexism subscale of Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI-H) (0.73). As expected, the subscales were often highly correlated with each other. There were no correlations above 0.6 between the demographic variables and any of the

variables of interest. For the independent variables, high correlations were almost exclusively between concepts that had been designed to correspond. For example, the Masculine Dominance ideals additive index variable was highly correlated with the Masculine Dominance experiences additive index, Physicality ideals were highly correlated with Physicality experiences, and Anti-Effeminacy ideals were highly correlated with Anti-Effeminacy experiences. However, Masculine Dominance ideals were also highly correlated with Physicality ideals. Both scales (Masculine Dominance and Physicality) could perhaps be viewed as involving aspects of control over women when considering the questions about sexual dominance which loaded on the Physicality pillar. While the Masculine Dominance pillar reflected domination over women in the workplace and in the home, the Physicality pillar could perhaps be interpreted as viewing women as sexual objects to be dominated.

Regressions between Dependent Variables and the Control Variables:

Table 4 presents the results of separate OLS regression analyses of each outcome variable (Hostility Toward Women – HTW; Ambivalent Sexism - Benevolent/Hostile Sexism subscales – ASI-B/ASI-H; and Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire Physical Aggression/Verbal Aggression/Hostility/Anger subscales – BPAQ-P/BPAQ-V/BPAQ-H/BPAQ-A), as well as Masculine Discrepancy Stress (MDS), on the control variables. The results are presented in the table below.

Table 4: Regressions of Dependent Variables on Controls

	Masc. Disc. Stress	Hostility Toward Women	ASI - Benevolent	ASI - Hostile	BPAQ - Physical	BPAQ - Verbal	BPAQ - Hostile	BPAQ - Anger
Masc. Discrepancy Stress		0.808 ***	0.271 ***	0.439 ***	0.293 ***	0.25 ***	0.272 ***	0.183 ***
		(10.33)	(7.06)	(9.38)	(9.76)	(11.99)	(12.74)	(11.69)
Age	-0.095 ***	-0.142 ***	0.0179	-0.043 *	-0.0656 ***	-0.049 ***	-0.0523 ***	-0.0318 ***
	(-6.44)	(-4.53)	(1.17)	(-2.31)	(-5.46)	(-5.83)	(-6.11)	(-5.08)
Assigned Male at Birth	1.765	-3.684	-0.825	3.526 *	0.458	-0.998	-1.042	0.0901
	(1.34)	(-1.36)	(-0.62)	(2.17)	(0.44)	(-1.38)	(-1.41)	(0.17)
Education	0.238 *	-0.429	-0.0489	-0.0163	-0.226 *	-0.0338	-0.0996	-0.0997 *
	(1.98)	(-1.73)	(-0.40)	(-0.11)	(-2.37)	(-0.51)	(-1.47)	(-2.01)
Democrat	1.66 ***	1.186	0.680	-0.457	-0.176	-0.417	0.0688	0.0662
	(3.73)	(1.28)	(1.50)	(-0.82)	(-0.49)	(-1.68)	(0.27)	(0.36)
White/Caucasian	0.585	-0.769	-0.539	-0.539	0.346	0.635 *	0.629 *	0.330
	(1.25)	(-0.80)	(-1.14)	(-0.93)	(0.93)	(2.46)	(2.38)	(1.71)
Works 40+ Hours/Week	-0.468	1.659	0.869	1.513 *	0.523	0.497	1.067 ***	0.250
	(-0.89)	(1.52)	(1.63)	(2.32)	(1.25)	(1.71)	(3.58)	(1.15)
Personal Income	0.163	0.414 *	0.156	0.315 **	0.0594	0.0327	-0.0464	0.0499
	(1.86)	(2.28)	(1.76)	(2.91)	(0.86)	(0.68)	(-0.94)	(1.38)
Married	1.176 *	0.0683	2.497 ***	0.218	0.705	0.689 *	0.354	0.329
	(2.38)	(0.07)	(4.98)	(0.36)	(1.79)	(2.52)	(1.27)	(1.61)
Attracted to Women	-3.126 ***	-0.689	1.337 *	0.616	-0.821	-0.0213	-0.228	-0.112
	(-5.58)	(-0.58)	(2.31)	(0.87)	(-1.81)	(-0.07)	(-0.71)	(-0.47)
Christian	-0.524	0.188	1.025 *	0.333	-0.665 *	-0.317	-0.379	-0.0677
	(-1.26)	(0.22)	(2.45)	(0.65)	(-2.03)	(-1.39)	(-1.62)	(-0.40)
Constant	15.24 ***	35.41 ***	19.05 ***	14 ***	8.486 ***	6.279 ***	7.631 ***	3.215 ***
	(10.40)	(10.90)	(11.98)	(7.21)	(6.81)	(7.24)	(8.60)	(4.95)
Adjusted R2	0.2065	0.2777	0.1937	0.2353	0.263	0.3314	0.3589	0.3003

t statistics in parentheses
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Masculine Discrepancy Stress (MDS) as an outcome variable had significant positive relationships with education (b = 0.238 p < 0.05), identifying politically as a Democrat (b = 1.66, p < 0.001), and being married (b = 1.176, p < 0.05); it had significant negative relationships with age (b = -0.095, p < 0.001) and being attracted only to women (b = -3.126, p < 0.001). Hostility Toward Women (HTW) had significant positive relationships with MDS (b = 0.808, p < 0.001) and personal income (b = 0.414, p < 0.05); it had a significant negative relationship with age (b = -0.142, p < 0.001). The Benevolent sexism subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI-B) had significant positive relationships with MDS (b = 0.271, p < 0.001), being married (b = 2.497, p < 0.001), being attracted only to women (b = 1.337, p < 0.05), and identifying as Christian (b = 1.025, p < 0.05). The Hostile Sexism subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI-H) had significant positive relationships with MDS (b = 0.439, p < 0.001), being assigned male at birth (b = 3.526, p < 0.05), working 40 or more hours per week (b = 1.513, p <

0.05), and personal income (b = 0.315, p < 0.01); it had a significant negative relationship with age (b = -0.043, p < 0.05). It should be noted, however, that there were only 18 participants out of the 705 who indicated being assigned female at birth, creating a particularly lopsided sample.

The Physical Aggression subscale of the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ-P) had a significant positive relationship with MDS (b = 0.293, p < 0.001) and significant negative relationships with age (b = -0.0656, p < 0.001), education (b = -0.226, p < 0.01), and identifying as Christian (b = -0.665, p < 0.05). The Verbal Aggression subscale of the BPAQ (BPAQ-V) had a significant positive relationship with MDS (b = 0.25, p < 0.001), being white/Caucasian (b = 0.528, p < 0.05), and being married (b = 0.689, p < 0.01); it had a significant negative relationship with age (b = -0.049, p < 0.001). The Hostility subscale of the BPAQ (BPAQ-H) had a significant positive relationship with MDS (b = 0.272, p < 0.001), being white/Caucasian (b = 0.629, p < 0.05), and working 40 or more hours per week (b = 1.067, p < 0.001); it had a significant negative relationship with age (b = -0.0523, p < 0.001). The Anger subscale of the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ-A) had a significant positive relationship with MDS (b = 0.183, p < 0.001) and significant negative relationships with age (b =-0.0318, p < 0.001) and education (b = -0.0997, p < 0.05).

Regression Discussion by Variable:

Masculine Discrepancy Stress (MDS) as a control had highly significant (p < 0.001) positive relationships with all outcome variables: HTW (b = 0.808), ASI-B (b = 0.271, p < 0.001), ASI-H (b = 0.439), BPAQ-P (b = 0.293), BPAQ-V (b = 0.25), BPAQ-H (b = 0.272), and BPAQ-A (b = 0.183). Additionally, as noted before, MDS as an outcome had significant relationships with half of the other demographic variables: age, education, identifying as a Democrat, being married, and being attracted only to women. Given these complicated

relationships, I used MDS as a control variable in all regressions moving forward. In the ANOVA tests in later chapters, MDS, age, education, and personal income were treated as continuous variables. While education and personal income were measured in categories, the ordered nature and number of categories for each variable influenced my decision to treat them as continuous variables to analyze potential linear relationships.

After MDS, age was the second most likely variable to have a significant relationship with the outcome variables. In contrast with MDS, however, these relationships were negative, indicating that the older a participant was, the less likely he was to endorse MDS ($b = -0.095$, $p < 0.001$), HTW ($b = -0.142$, $p < 0.001$), ASI-H ($b = -0.043$, $p < 0.05$), BPAQ-P ($b = -0.0656$, $p < 0.001$), BPAQ-V ($b = -0.049$, $p < 0.001$), BPAQ-H ($b = -0.0523$, $p < 0.001$), BPAQ-A ($b = -0.0318$, $p < 0.001$). Education did not have any significant relationships with any of the misogyny outcome variables. It had a significant positive relationship with MDS ($b = 0.238$ $p < 0.05$), but significant *negative* relationships with BPAQ-P ($b = -0.226$, $p < 0.01$) and BPAQ-A ($b = -0.0997$, $p < 0.05$). In contrast, personal income only had significant relationships with misogyny outcomes: HTW ($b = 0.414$, $p < 0.05$) and ASI-H ($b = 0.315$, $p < 0.01$). However, as we will see in the next series of regressions, these relationships were rendered insignificant upon the addition of masculine ideals and experiences.

In terms of the other controls, again I must note that only dichotomous variables of the largest groups were used. Each of these categories: sex assigned at birth, political affiliation, race/ethnicity, employment status, relationship status, sexual orientation, and religion could (and perhaps should) be analyzed separately in their own research study. As noted, masculinity interacts with countless other aspects of identity, and to attempt to analyze each of these categories in a single dissertation threatens not only to take away from the focus on discrepancy,

but to also muddy these complicated and nuanced interactions. In most (but not all) cases for these original regressions, the relationships between the dichotomous control variables and outcomes were positive.

The first dichotomous control variable was that of sex assigned at birth. Being assigned male at birth only had one significant relationship with an outcome variable: ASI-H ($b = 3.526$, $p < 0.05$). However, as noted previously, even this relationship should be interpreted with caution, given the lopsided sample. Results regarding males assigned female at birth are hardly generalizable when based on 18 participants.

Identifying politically as a Democrat also only had one significant relationship with an outcome variable: MDS ($b = 1.66$, $p < 0.001$). This indicates that Democrats were more likely to express concern over their masculinity. Identifying as white/Caucasian did not have any significant relationships with any of the misogyny variables, but did have significant positive relationships with two of the four BPAQ variables: BPAQ-V ($b = 0.635$, $p < 0.05$) and BPAQ-H ($b = 0.629$, $p < 0.05$). Working at least one full-time job had two significant relationships: ASI-H ($b = 1.513$, $p < 0.05$) and BPAQ-H ($b = 1.067$, $p < 0.001$). Being married had three significant positive relationships: MDS ($b = 1.176$, $p < 0.05$), ASI-B ($b = 2.497$, $p < 0.001$), and BPAQ-V ($b = 0.689$, $p < 0.01$). In one of the few cases where the dichotomous control variable had a significant negative relationship, being attracted only to women was related to MDS ($b = -3.126$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that males who were *not* exclusively attracted to women (such as gay, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, questioning, etc.) had higher Masculine Discrepancy Stress when compared to males who were attracted only to women. In contrast, males who were only attracted to women did have higher Benevolent Sexism scores ($b = 1.337$, $p < 0.05$) when compared to all other males. Finally, in the only other significant negative relationship between a

dichotomous control variable and an outcome variable, identifying religiously as Christian had a significant negative relationship with BPAQ-P ($b = -0.665$, $p < 0.05$). However, the p-value for this relationship was just barely significant ($p = 0.043$) and, as I will later demonstrate, disappears upon the addition of masculine ideals, experiences, and/or discrepancy to the regressions. In contrast, ASI-B begins with (and maintains) a significant positive relationship ($b = 1.025$, $p < 0.05$) with identifying as Christian.

Overall, the sociodemographic variables do not share consistent relationships across the dependent variables in question. Age has the most consistent relationship, being negatively associated with six of the seven dependent variables of interest. No other sociodemographic variables have a relationship with more than two dependent variables of interest. MDS is by far the most consistent independent variable, having a positive association with all seven dependent variables.

Scale Creation and Validation: Measures of "Ideals" and "Experiences:"

Since a primary goal of this research is to create and validate a scale measuring masculine discrepancy, we must first measure the components that make up masculine discrepancy: participants' masculine ideals and their perceptions of their lived experiences. These components exist on a continuum, where men may have high or low endorsement of ideals, as well as high or low perceptions of their lived experiences. In the next chapter, these two components are compared to establish masculine discrepancy (or lack thereof, i.e. "consistency"). But before measuring discrepancy and its outcomes, males' ideal masculinity had to be established, as well as their perception of their lived experiences. The rest of this chapter focuses on validating this

newly-created scale and establishing empirical support for different "pillars" of masculinity, which will then be used to establish discrepancy.

As discussed previously, I created this scale based on different "pillars" of masculinity. These pillars are: Emotional Restriction, Homophobia, Rigid Gender Roles, Physical Toughness, Hypersexuality, and Dominance. These pillars were constructed by first comparing various masculinity scales to examine the different ways that certain aspects of masculinity are frequently categorized. Once I observed a basic pattern, I drew from three scales: The Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) (Levant et al. 1992), the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) (Mahalik et al. 2003), and the Man Box Scale (Hill et al. 2020; The Men's Project and Flood 2018). From these scales, I created a composition of questions that appeared similar across these scales. While there were no exact matches across these scales, many were similar. For example, under the "Self-Reliance" subscale, the MRNI states "A man must be able to make his own way in the world," and the CMNI, also under a "Self-Reliance" subscale, states "Asking for help is a sign of failure," while the Man Box Scale, under "Rigid Gender Roles," states "Men should figure out their personal problems on their own without asking others for help." While these are not worded exactly the same, they measure a similar notion that "real men" do not ask for help. Upon finding similar concepts, I constructed an instrument that attempted to blend items into cohesive statements. For example, the original scales each asked about housework in ways that indicated that it should be women who do the housework, not men. One example of a statement included in my scale to measure rigid gender roles is "A man's significant other should be the one to do the household chores like cooking and cleaning, not him." Another statement, which was present across scales, was "A man should have a masculine or manly job." These items use a 7-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

In order to create a discrepancy measure, I next created an "actual [experience]" subscale which corresponds with the "ideal" subscale. To elaborate, I took the items from the ideals scale and rephrased them in such a way that attempts to measure males' lived experiences. Thus, each "ideal" has a corresponding "experience." For example, one statement measuring males' actual experiences of adhering to rigid gender roles is "My significant other is or will be the one who does the household chores like cooking or cleaning, not me." This is in comparison to the "ideal" statement of "A man's significant other should do the household chores like cooking and cleaning, not him" as listed above. Each pillar is represented by 3-6 questions which were constructed from the original scales (CMNI, MRNI, and Man Box). In order to avoid double negatives, some statements are reverse-coded. These items can be found in Appendix A.

Generation of Pillar Scales:

To accomplish the goals of this dissertation, I generated "pillars" through an exploratory factor analysis. I suspected my scale would be comprised of six subscales, as theoretically informed by previous masculinity studies. Throughout this dissertation I have referred to the following "pillars," around which I structured my scale: Emotional Restriction, Heterosexism/Homophobia, Rigid Gender Roles, Physical Toughness, Hypersexuality, and Dominance. However, a principal component factor analysis of the items used to capture masculine ideals revealed four factors instead. In accordance with this dissertation's largely exploratory nature, I ran a principal component factor analysis, followed by a varimax rotation. The new factors in Table 7, which were limited to factors with eigenvalues above 1, are identified by a theoretical association between the items that loaded above 0.4 on each factor. These factors include:

1. **Masculine Dominance (9 items, eigenvalue = 7.42):** This factor combined items from the Gender Roles and Dominance pillars. It captured an endorsement partially of

paternalistic gender roles, where men have "manly" jobs and bring home the money to provide for the family; however, the key to this factor was an endorsement of women's roles of submission. This factor included items such as "a man, not a woman, should be in charge of the workplace," as well as "a man should generally have control over the women in his life." Interestingly, however, the item about treating women as equals to men did not load on this factor; instead, it loaded on the Anti-Effeminacy pillar. This indicates that, despite the endorsement of women's submissive roles, participants did not similarly indicate a rejection of the idea that women should be treated equally to men. This new pillar had the highest internal reliability, with a Cronbach's Alpha being 0.876 for the nine items.

2. **Physicality (7 items, eigenvalue = 2.69)** Four out of the seven items that loaded above a 0.4 on this scale were from the hypersexuality subscale. Two additional items related to violence: "a man should enjoy fighting" and "A man should do whatever it takes to get respect, including using violence if necessary," indicating that two "physical toughness" items loaded with the hypersexuality items. The final, seventh item also dealt with "the body" in a way—the item "A man should keep it to himself if he is in pain" loaded with these other factors. This pillar also demonstrated good internal validity, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.859 for the seven items.
3. **Anti-Effeminacy (5 items, eigenvalue = 2.06)**: While several masculinity scales refer to "anti-femininity" as a subscale, I here chose to describe this factor as "anti-effeminacy" to indicate a rejection of males acting in ways that are traditionally associated with women. These often include the expression of emotions, and gendered tasks such as caretaking and cooking/cleaning. Fascinatingly, despite high endorsement of many gender role items as they related to women's roles, the items in this factor were largely rejected. That is, the average score on these items indicated a general endorsement of men's ability to express emotions and ask for help. The means for items on this factor were often relatively low, indicating men rejecting these traditional notions of stoicism. Additionally, the item indicating that women should *not* be treated as equals to men loaded on this factor (and, surprisingly, not the Masculine Dominance pillar). However, this pillar teeters on the bottom edge of acceptable internal validity with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.71 for the five items.
4. **Heterosexism/Homophobia (2 items, eigenvalue = 1.12)**: In this factor, two items loaded at above 0.6: "A man should be insulted if someone assumes that he is gay" (0.711) and "a man should only have sexual thoughts about women" (0.730). No other items loaded above 0.4. This is seemingly the most straightforward factor, as both items were on the original "Homophobia" pillar. This pillar, however, fell short of internal reliability, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.545, likely influenced by the fact that it only included two items.

I present the factor analysis here to indicate the conceptualization of the different "pillars" as they were used moving forward. See Table 5 for further illustration of these factors, including loading values.

Table 5: Rotated Factor Loadings for Each Item

Item Category	Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Uniqueness
Ideal 1 - Emotional Restriction	A man should keep it to himself if he's in pain	0.302	0.521	0.150	0.324	0.510
Ideal 2 - Emotional Restriction*	*A man should NOT tell people he cares about them	-0.141	0.116	0.706	0.013	0.468
Ideal 3 - Emotional Restriction*	*A man should NOT be okay talking about his worries or fears	-0.081	-0.015	0.753	0.100	0.417
Ideal 4 - Heterosexism	A man should be insulted if someone assumes that he is gay	0.194	0.224	0.105	0.711	0.396
Ideal 5 - Heterosexism*	*A man should NOT be okay with having gay friends	0.462	-0.259	0.453	0.151	0.491
Ideal 6 - Heterosexism	A man should only have sexual thoughts about women	0.239	0.129	-0.034	0.730	0.393
Ideal 7 - Strict Gender Roles*	*A man should NOT be okay with asking people for help with personal problems	0.048	-0.065	0.691	-0.014	0.515
Ideal 8 - Strict Gender Roles	A man's significant other should be the one to do the household chores, not him	0.696	0.356	0.062	0.141	0.365
Ideal 9 - Strict Gender Roles*	*A man should NOT be okay with his son being taught how to cook and clean and take care of children	0.081	0.061	0.668	-0.016	0.543
Ideal 10 - Strict Gender Roles	A man should have a masculine or manly job	0.728	0.214	0.041	0.199	0.383
Ideal 11 - Strict Gender Roles	A man should bring the money home to provide for his family, not his significant other	0.701	0.076	-0.156	0.162	0.453
Ideal 12 - Physical Violence	A man should do whatever it takes to get respect, including using violence	0.475	0.592	0.078	0.030	0.417
Ideal 13 - Physical Violence	A man should enjoy fighting	0.263	0.659	0.054	0.111	0.481
Ideal 14 - Physical Violence	A man should take risks, even if he might get hurt	0.440	0.336	-0.144	-0.011	0.673
Ideal 15 - Hypersexuality	A man should accept any opportunity to have sex with a woman	0.252	0.714	-0.023	0.115	0.413
Ideal 16 - Hypersexuality	A man should frequently change sexual partners	0.176	0.816	-0.045	0.082	0.295
Ideal 17 - Hypersexuality*	*A man should NOT have to wait until being in a relationship to have sex with someone	-0.429	0.269	0.284	-0.355	0.536
Ideal 18 - Hypersexuality	A man should have sex frequently	0.303	0.428	-0.175	0.112	0.682
Ideal 19 - Hypersexuality	A man should have many sexual partners	0.171	0.858	-0.016	0.058	0.231
Ideal 20 - Dominance	A man, not a woman, should be the boss or supervisor at a workplace	0.647	0.371	0.056	0.193	0.403
Ideal 21 - Dominance	A man should generally have control over the women in his life	0.772	0.301	0.073	0.091	0.300
Ideal 22 - Dominance*	*A man should NOT treat women as equals to men	0.345	-0.113	0.510	-0.257	0.542
Ideal 23 - Dominance	A man should make sure his significant other tells him where they are at all times	0.703	0.264	-0.078	0.011	0.430
Ideal 24 - Dominance	A man should have the final say about major decisions in his relationship	0.760	0.206	0.016	0.115	0.367

It should be noted that these factors were generated on the masculine ideals items. While an exploratory factor analysis on experience items was conducted, a major part of the argument of this dissertation is that males' experiences are often quite different from their ideologies. If that was not the case, there would be no need to study discrepancy, as discrepancy would not exist. While information can undoubtedly be gleaned from using the factors resulting from the EFA conducted on males' experiences, it is not the basis of this dissertation and should be explored in future research. I found that, for the 23 items that comprise an overall ideals pillar, the Cronbach's alpha was 0.8822, while the Cronbach's alpha for the corresponding 23 experiences items was 0.8485.

Development of Indices:

Based on these four pillars, I created an additive index for each category with items loading above 0.4: Masculine Dominance (Factor 1), Physicality (Factor 2), Anti-Effeminacy (Factor 3), and Heterosexism (Factor 4). These were created by adding together the scores on the items that comprised each of the four different pillars. Table 6 displays the descriptive statistics for each pillar (and totals) as they relate to both ideals and experiences.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics by Pillar

Independent Variables	Obs.	Median	Mean	Std. dev.	Min.	Max.
Ideals						
Masculine Dominance	705	36	36.099	13.442	9	63
Physicality	705	20	22.831	10.555	7	49
Anti-Effeminacy	705	10	11.501	5.388	5	35
Heterosexism	705	8	8.553	3.642	2	14
Experiences						
Masculine Dominance	705	36	36.940	10.640	11	63
Physicality	705	21	23.105	8.513	7	46
Anti-Effeminacy	705	12	13.099	5.572	5	35
Heterosexism	705	13	10.626	4.025	2	14
Discrepancy						
Masculine Dominance	705	0	0.841	7.375	-24	35
Physicality	705	1	0.274	6.697	-25	25
Anti-Effeminacy	705	1	1.599	4.778	-19	18
Heterosexism	705	3	2.072	5.553	-12	12

Note: The Masculine Dominance Experiences minimum does not reflect the lowest possible score (9), because there were no participants in these categories who selected 1 for every question which comprised this additive index.

Additionally, Table 6 provides descriptive statistics for a measure of masculine discrepancy. Using the measurements of respondents' "actual/lived experiences" with various masculine expectations and their ideals about how men "should be," I subtracted the "ideal" score from the "experiences" score to create a discrepancy score for each item. Thus, a male whose "ideal" score is close to his "experience" score will have low discrepancy, as his score after subtraction will be close to 0. After establishing males' discrepancy scores, I examine the relationships between this discrepancy and outcome variables.

When it comes to discrepancy using the discussed measure, we are faced with two potential outcomes: (1) A male who indicates that he *does* talk about his worries or fears (by having low agreement, such as a 1 on a Likert scale, with the statement "I do not talk openly about my worries or fears"), but then endorses that it is very important to being a "real man" that

a man not talk about his worries or fears (a 5 on a Likert scale), which results in a negative score (-4) and is thus negatively discrepant, or (2) a man with high agreement to lived experiences, but low importance of an item will have a *positive* score, and thus is also discrepant, but in the opposite "direction." Drawing on terminology used by Liu, Rochlen, and Mohr (2005), I focus on identifying two different types of discrepancy in this content chapter: norm-favoring discrepancy and norm-rejecting discrepancy. The first example (with a low lived experience, but high endorsement of the ideal) is referred to as a "*norm-favoring discrepancy"* or *"negative discrepancy."* The second example (with a low endorsement of the ideal but high lived experience) is referred to as a "*norm-rejecting discrepancy"* or *"positive discrepancy."*

It should also be noted that males with low or no discrepancy may also exist on a continuum. Males with high endorsement of ideals and high lived experiences are in contrast with males with low endorsement of ideals and low lived experiences. While they are both considered non-discrepant, they represent very different scenarios. Thus, the first example (high ideal, high experience) is referred to as "*norm-favoring consistency,*" while the second example is referred to as "*norm-rejecting consistency.*" It is difficult in this limited space to determine the differences between the consistent groups. The next chapter seeks to remedy this through cluster analysis. I here simply provide a brief overview of relationships between discrepancy and the outcome variables.

These discrepancy pillars should not be confused with Masculine Discrepancy Stress (MDS). While these discrepancy pillars seek to measure males' actual, *lived* discrepancy, the MDS looks at *beliefs* about a male's own discrepancy. While a male may fall under the norm-favoring consistent category, he may still feel as though he is failing to achieve manhood status. This is also why MDS is measured as both an outcome and used as a control – a male may have

a form of discrepancy in his lived experiences, but may not feel concerned about this discrepancy (even when it is negative). Therefore, I also ask: How does the *perceived* failure to meet specific masculine norms mediate the relationships between *actual* discrepancy and aggression and misogyny?

Findings: Relationships between Pillars and Outcome Variables:

After establishing these new pillars, my next step was to examine each pillar's relationship to the outcome variables, looking at ideals, experiences, and discrepancy, net of control variables. These regression analyses are presented in Tables 7 through 9. Similar to the earlier analyses between control variables and outcome variables, I used a dichotomous version of the variable of the largest group of each nominal variable to serve as the comparison group within these regressions. For example, for the "Employment" variable, I used those who indicated working at least one full-time job or more (seen in the regressions as "works 40+ hours/week), as slightly more than half of the participants indicated that they worked at least full-time. Similarly, most participants indicated being married, only attracted to women, etc. As we saw previously, in most cases the dichotomous variables had positive relationships with the outcome variables.

Table 7: Outcome Variable Regressions on Ideals, with Dichotomous Controls

	Masc. Disc. Stress	Hostility Toward	ASI - Benevolent	ASI - Hostile	BPAQ - Physical	BPAQ - Verbal	BPAQ - Hostile	BPAQ - Anger
Ideal - Masc. Dominance	0.098 ***	0.286 ***	0.17 ***	0.24 ***	-0.0271	0.0113	0.0133	0.00106
	(4.54)	(6.81)	(7.68)	(9.56)	(-1.65)	(0.93)	(1.03)	(0.12)
Ideal - Physicality	0.16 ***	0.304 ***	-0.055 *	0.106 ***	0.215 ***	0.104 ***	0.0708 ***	0.0911 ***
	(6.78)	(6.49)	(-2.22)	(3.80)	(11.70)	(7.64)	(4.90)	(9.05)
Ideal - Anti-Effeminacy	-0.102 **	0.196 **	-0.246 ***	-0.0157	-0.0247	-0.052 **	-0.045 *	-0.0236
	(-2.84)	(2.84)	(-6.76)	(-0.38)	(-0.91)	(-2.60)	(-2.12)	(-1.58)
Ideal - Heterosexism	-0.046	0.394 ***	0.187 **	0.228 **	0.195 ***	0.0884 *	0.0762 *	0.0524 *
	(-0.74)	(3.32)	(3.00)	(3.22)	(4.20)	(2.58)	(2.08)	(2.05)
Masc. Disc. Stress		0.389 ***	0.155 ***	0.184 ***	0.144 ***	0.161 ***	0.205 ***	0.115 ***
		(5.33)	(4.03)	(4.23)	(5.05)	(7.61)	(9.10)	(7.30)
Age	-0.051 ***	-0.067 *	0.0227	0.000249	-0.062 ***	-0.044 ***	-0.049 ***	-0.0272 ***
	(-3.41)	(-2.33)	(1.49)	(0.01)	(-5.43)	(-5.29)	(-5.54)	(-4.37)
Assigned Male at Birth	0.541	-6.196 **	-0.915	2.275 *	-0.449	-1.474 *	-1.378	-0.316
	(0.45)	(-2.68)	(-0.75)	(1.64)	(-0.50)	(-2.20)	(-1.93)	(-0.63)
Education	0.159	-0.273	-0.189	-0.0206	-0.150	-0.0228	-0.0955	-0.0813
	(1.41)	(-1.27)	(-1.66)	(-0.16)	(-1.78)	(-0.37)	(-1.44)	(-1.75)
Democrat	1.116 **	0.968	0.449	-0.700	-0.214	-0.486 *	0.0148	0.0188
	(2.71)	(1.22)	(1.07)	(-1.48)	(-0.69)	(-2.12)	(0.06)	(0.11)
White/Caucasian	0.479	-0.186	-0.272	-0.131	0.355	0.651 **	0.654 *	0.324
	(1.11)	(-0.22)	(-0.62)	(-0.27)	(1.10)	(2.72)	(2.56)	(1.82)
Works 40+ Hours/Week	-0.928	-0.0606	0.502	0.536	-0.0747	0.166	0.816 **	-0.00410
	(-1.91)	(-0.06)	(1.02)	(0.96)	(-0.20)	(0.61)	(2.83)	(-0.02)
Personal Income	0.0151	0.0151	0.0433	0.0633	-0.0176	-0.0192	-0.0873 *	0.0121
	(0.18)	(0.10)	(0.53)	(0.68)	(-0.29)	(-0.42)	(-1.81)	(0.36)
Married	0.467	-1.561	1.943 ***	-0.884	0.513	0.519 *	0.216	0.213
	(1.02)	(-1.77)	(4.18)	(-1.68)	(1.49)	(2.03)	(0.79)	(1.12)
Attracted to Women	-2.16 ***	-1.021	1.23 *	0.367	-0.378	0.229	-0.0613	0.103
	(-4.09)	(-1.00)	(2.28)	(0.60)	(-0.94)	(0.77)	(-0.19)	(0.47)
Christian	-0.229	0.692	0.929 *	0.488	-0.266	-0.134	-0.252	0.0892
	(-0.60)	(0.95)	(2.41)	(1.12)	(-0.93)	(-0.63)	(-1.12)	(0.57)
Constant	9.817 ***	19.6 ***	18.54 ***	5.951 **	5.648 ***	4.943 ***	6.656 ***	2.038 **
	(6.39)	(6.46)	(11.60)	(3.28)	(4.76)	(5.62)	(7.11)	(3.12)
Adjusted R2	0.3361	0.4773	0.325	0.4475	0.4437	0.4305	0.4083	0.4126

t statistics in parentheses
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Masculine Dominance Ideals had significant positive relationships with MDS (b = 0.098, p < 0.001), HTW (b = 0.286, p < 0.001), ASI-B (b = 0.17, p < 0.001), and ASI-H (b = 0.24, p < 0.001). It had no significant relationships with any of the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire subscales. Physicality ideals had significant positive relationships with all scales (MDS: b = 0.16, p < 0.001; HTW: b = 0.304, p < 0.001; ASI-H: b = 0.106, p < 0.001; BPAQ-P: b = 0.215, p

< 0.001; BPAQ-V: b = 0.104, p < 0.001; BPAQ-H: b = 0.104, p < 0.001; and BPAQ-A: b = 0.0911, p < 0.001) *except* for the ASI-B subscale, where it had a significant *negative* relationship (b = -0.055, p < 0.05). Anti-Effeminacy ideals had a surprising finding in that almost all of the significant relationships were *negative*. Anti-Effeminacy ideals had significant negative relationships with MDS (b = -0.102, p < 0.01), ASI-B (b = -0.246, p < 0.001), BPAQ-V (b = -0.052, p < 0.01) and BPAQ-H (b = -0.045, p < 0.05). The only significant positive relationship was with HTW (b = 0.196, p < 0.01). Interestingly, however, the relationship with the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI (which features similar concepts) was not significant (p = 0.705). Heterosexism ideals had significant positive relationships with almost all of the outcomes: HTW (b = 0.394, p < 0.001), ASI-B (b = 0.187, p < 0.01), ASI-H (b = 0.228, p < 0.01), BPAQ-P (b = 0.195, p < 0.001), BPAQ-V (b = 0.0884, p < 0.05) BPAQ-H (b = 0.0762, p < 0.05), and BPAQ-A (b = 0.0524, p < 0.05). This was the only masculine ideal which did not have a significant relationship with MDS (p = 0.460).

Table 8: Outcome Variable Regressions on Experiences, with Dichotomous Controls

	Masc. Disc. Stress	Hostility Toward Women	ASI - Benevolent	ASI - Hostile	BPAQ - Physical	BPAQ - Verbal	BPAQ - Hostile	BPAQ - Anger
Exp. - Masc. Dominance	0.132 ***	0.414 ***	0.18 ***	0.295 ***	0.0210	0.0387 **	0.0349 *	0.0213 *
	(5.94)	(9.05)	(7.60)	(10.72)	(1.25)	(3.04)	(2.57)	(2.25)
Exp. - Physicality	0.0672 *	0.347 ***	0.0233	0.146 ***	0.266 ***	0.121 ***	0.0631 ***	0.096 ***
	(2.45)	(6.30)	(0.82)	(4.40)	(13.10)	(7.90)	(3.84)	(8.37)
Exp. - Anti-Effeminacy	-0.0161	0.236 ***	-0.245 ***	0.0539	0.0269	-0.0123	-0.0235	0.00949
	(-0.46)	(3.35)	(-6.72)	(1.27)	(1.03)	(-0.63)	(-1.12)	(-0.65)
Exp. - Heterosexism	-0.48 ***	-0.333 **	0.163 *	-0.0627	-0.181 ***	-0.109 **	-0.156 ***	-0.0863 **
	(-7.87)	(-2.61)	(2.47)	(-0.81)	(-3.85)	(-3.06)	(-4.12)	(-3.25)
Masc. Disc. Stress		0.443 ***	0.201 ***	0.248 ***	0.137 ***	0.16 ***	0.196 ***	0.115 ***
		(5.81)	(5.10)	(5.40)	(4.88)	(7.51)	(8.65)	(7.25)
Age	-0.0452 **	-0.0494	0.0411 **	0.0113	-0.0384 ***	-0.0319 ***	-0.0398 ***	-0.0198 ***
	(-3.21)	(-1.74)	(2.80)	(0.66)	(-3.67)	(-4.04)	(-4.71)	(-3.35)
Assigned Male at Birth	0.528	-6.25 **	-1.371	2.084	-0.436	-1.517 *	-1.418 *	-0.288
	(0.44)	(-2.61)	(-1.11)	(1.45)	(-0.49)	(-2.28)	(-1.99)	(-0.58)
Education	0.187	-0.239	-0.141	0.0524	-0.165 *	-0.0170	-0.102	-0.0868
	(1.70)	(-1.08)	(-1.24)	(0.39)	(-2.02)	(-0.28)	(-1.55)	(-1.89)
Democrat	0.985 *	0.849	0.287	-0.761	-0.192	-0.496 *	-0.0499	0.0150
	(2.41)	(1.03)	(0.68)	(-1.54)	(-0.64)	(-2.17)	(-0.20)	(0.09)
White/Caucasian	0.541	-0.404	-0.724	-0.414	0.459	0.673 **	0.645 *	0.359 *
	(1.27)	(-0.47)	(-1.65)	(-0.81)	(1.46)	(2.83)	(2.55)	(2.03)
Works 40+ Hours/Week	-0.852	-0.305	0.258	0.318	-0.133	0.116	0.84 **	-0.0237
	(-1.76)	(-0.31)	(0.51)	(0.54)	(-0.37)	(0.43)	(2.91)	(-0.12)
Personal Income	0.00438	0.114	0.0988	0.147	-0.0281	-0.0223	-0.0928	0.0104
	(0.05)	(0.71)	(1.19)	(1.51)	(-0.47)	(-0.50)	(-1.94)	(0.31)
Married	0.786	-1.309	1.747 ***	-0.845	0.660	0.583 *	0.314	0.278
	(1.72)	(-1.43)	(3.69)	(-1.53)	(1.96)	(2.28)	(1.15)	(1.46)
Attracted to Women	-0.339	0.893	0.918	0.910	0.559	0.741 *	0.626	0.498 *
	(-0.59)	(0.77)	(1.53)	(1.30)	(1.31)	(2.29)	(1.81)	(2.07)
Christian	-0.304	0.262	0.788 *	0.201	-0.318	-0.180	-0.284	0.0505
	(-0.80)	(0.35)	(2.01)	(0.44)	(-1.14)	(-0.85)	(-1.26)	(0.32)
Constant	12.32 ***	16.42 ***	15.99 ***	2.637	3.859 **	4.017 ***	7.289 ***	1.68 *
	(7.27)	(4.66)	(8.78)	(1.24)	(2.97)	(4.09)	(6.95)	(2.29)
Adjusted R2	0.3505	0.4413	0.3055	0.3988	0.4731	0.4368	0.4116	0.4147

t statistics in parentheses
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Masculine Dominance experiences had significant positive relationships with all outcome variables except for BPAQ-P. This includes MDS (b = 0.132, p < 0.001), HTW (b = 0.414, p < 0.001), ASI-B (b = 0.18, p < 0.001), ASI-H (b = 0.295, p < 0.001), BPAQ-V (b = 0.0387, p < 0.01), BPAQ-H (b = 0.0349, p < 0.05) and BPAQ-A (b = 0.0213, p < 0.05). Physicality experiences had significant positive relationships with all scales (MDS: b = 0.0672, p < 0.05; HTW: b = 0.347, p < 0.001; ASI-H: b = b = 0.146, p < 0.001; BPAQ-P: b = 0.266, p < 0.001; BPAQ-V: b = 0.121, p < 0.001; BPAQ-H: b = 0.0631, p < 0.001; and BPAQ-A: b = 0.096, p < 0.001) *except* for the ASI-B subscale, with which it did not have any significant relationship.

Anti-Effeminacy experiences (when compared to Anti-Effeminacy ideals) had a different sort of surprising finding when it came to the outcome variables: Only two of the eight outcomes were significant. HTW had a significant positive relationship ($b = 0.236$, $p < 0.001$), while ASI-B had a significant negative relationship ($b = -0.245$, $p < 0.001$). Heterosexism experiences had significant relationships with all of the outcomes except for the ASI subscales: MDS ($b = -0.48$, $p < 0.001$), HTW ($b = -0.333$, $p < 0.05$), BPAQ-P ($b = -0.181$, $p < 0.001$), BPAQ-V ($b = -0.109$, $p < 0.01$), BPAQ-H ($b = -0.156$, $p < 0.001$), and BPAQ-A ($b = -0.0863$, $p < 0.01$). When it came to the ASI subscales, ASI-B had a positive relationship ($b = 0.163$, $p < 0.05$) while ASI-H had no significant relationship.

Table 9: Outcome Variable Regressions on Discrepancy, with Dichotomous Controls

	Masc. Disc. Stress	Hostility Toward Women	ASI - Benevolent	ASI - Hostile	BPAQ - Physical	BPAQ - Verbal	BPAQ - Hostile	BPAQ - Anger
Disc. - Masc. Dominance	-0.0417	-0.154 *	-0.0611	-0.111 **	-0.00884	-0.00505	-0.0126	-0.00481
	(-1.45)	(-2.58)	(-1.96)	(-3.07)	(-0.39)	(-0.31)	(-0.75)	(-0.40)
Disc. - Physicality	-0.0998 ***	-0.173 **	0.0109	-0.102 **	-0.00199	-0.0114	-0.0201	-0.0189
	(-3.32)	(-2.75)	(0.33)	(-2.67)	(-0.08)	(-0.66)	(-1.13)	(-1.47)
Disc. - Anti-Effeminacy	-0.0200	-0.114	-0.0304	-0.00390	0.00586	0.0111	-0.0152	-0.0119
	(-0.50)	(-1.37)	(-0.70)	(-0.08)	(0.19)	(0.49)	(-0.65)	(-0.71)
Disc. - Heterosexism	-0.340 ***	-0.701 ***	-0.131 **	-0.347 ***	-0.356 ***	-0.193 ***	-0.171 ***	-0.142 ***
	(-8.93)	(-8.39)	(-3.01)	(-6.84)	(-11.29)	(-8.46)	(-7.26)	(-8.32)
Masc. Disc. Stress		0.489 ***	0.213 ***	0.269 ***	0.168 ***	0.180 ***	0.206 ***	0.128 ***
		(6.18)	(5.17)	(5.61)	(5.63)	(8.37)	(9.23)	(7.97)
Age	-0.0851 ***	-0.144 ***	0.0190	-0.0456 *	-0.0740 ***	-0.0536 ***	-0.0548 ***	-0.0341 ***
	(-6.10)	(-4.86)	(1.23)	(-2.52)	(-6.59)	(-6.61)	(-6.54)	(-5.64)
Assigned Male at Birth	1.044	-4.593	-0.911	3.098 *	0.181	-1.161	-1.221	-0.0641
	(0.86)	(-1.82)	(-0.69)	(2.02)	(0.19)	(-1.68)	(-1.71)	(-0.12)
Education	0.230 *	-0.391	-0.0527	-0.00767	-0.190 *	-0.0140	-0.0840	-0.0851
	(2.07)	(-1.68)	(-0.44)	(-0.05)	(-2.16)	(-0.22)	(-1.28)	(-1.80)
Democrat	1.303 **	0.972	0.676	-0.547	-0.205	-0.437	0.0340	0.0348
	(3.15)	(1.12)	(1.50)	(-1.04)	(-0.63)	(-1.86)	(0.14)	(0.20)
White/Caucasian	0.734	-0.216	-0.375	-0.213	0.632	0.787 **	0.756 **	0.428 *
	(1.69)	(-0.24)	(-0.79)	(-0.39)	(1.85)	(3.19)	(2.96)	(2.32)
Works 40+ Hours/Week	-0.606	1.259	0.814	1.350 *	0.287	0.372	0.955 ***	0.154
	(-1.24)	(1.24)	(1.53)	(2.18)	(0.75)	(1.34)	(3.33)	(0.74)
Personal Income	0.0272	0.162	0.104	0.179	-0.0273	-0.0154	-0.0950 *	0.0113
	(0.33)	(0.95)	(1.17)	(1.73)	(-0.42)	(-0.33)	(-1.98)	(0.33)
Married	1.030 *	0.118	2.530 ***	0.237	0.839 *	0.755 **	0.395	0.363
	(2.25)	(0.12)	(5.08)	(0.41)	(2.33)	(2.90)	(1.47)	(1.86)
Attracted to Women	-1.435 **	1.779	1.779 **	1.818 **	0.482	0.685 *	0.391	0.405
	(-2.62)	(1.55)	(2.98)	(2.62)	(1.12)	(2.20)	(1.21)	(1.74)
Christian	-0.138	0.859	1.156 **	0.699	-0.419	-0.179	-0.245	0.0399
	(-0.36)	(1.08)	(2.77)	(1.44)	(-1.39)	(-0.82)	(-1.09)	(0.24)
Constant	15.51 ***	40.81 ***	19.92 ***	16.84 ***	10.37 ***	7.354 ***	8.706 ***	4.099 ***
	(11.42)	(13.27)	(12.43)	(9.02)	(8.94)	(8.78)	(10.05)	(6.55)
Adjusted R2	0.3221	0.374	0.2082	0.3165	0.3813	0.3964	0.4089	0.3697

t statistics in parentheses
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Masculine Dominance discrepancy only had significant relationships with HTW, (b = -0.154, p < 0.05), ASI-H (b = -0.111, p < 0.01). Physicality discrepancy had significant negative relationships with MDS (b = -0.0998, p < 0.001), HTW (b = -0.173, p < 0.01), and ASI-H (b = -0.102, p < 0.01). Anti-Effeminacy discrepancy did not have any significant relationships with outcome variables. In direct contrast, Heterosexism discrepancy had significant negative relationships with every outcome variable: MDS: (b = -0.340, p < 0.001), HTW (b = -0.701, p < 0.001), ASI-B (b = -0.131, p < 0.01), ASI-H (b = -0.347, p < 0.001), BPAQ-P (b = -0.356, p <

0.001), BPAQ-V (b = -0.193, p < 0.001), BPAQ-H (b = -0.171, p < 0.001), and BPAQ-A (b = -0.142, p < 0.001).

Findings of Control Variables:

It has already been noted several times that the control variables utilized dichotomous versions of the demographic group for ease of interpretation of the variables of interest. Again, these control variables are not the focus of this dissertation, as the focus is instead on discrepancy. However, it must be noted here that there were numerous cases where these variables lost the significance they originally had in the first regressions with just controls, or gained significance they did not originally have upon the additions of ideals/experiences/discrepancy pillars. I here discuss the control variables and their subsequent maintenance or changes of significant relationships with the outcome variables.

First, recall that Masculine Discrepancy Stress as an outcome variable had significant positive relationships with education, identifying politically as a Democrat, and being married, and a significant negative relationships with age and being attracted only to women. Upon the addition of the four masculine ideals pillars, education and being married were no longer significant. Age (b = -0.051, p < 0.001), identifying as a Democrat (b = 1.66, p < 0.01), and being attracted only to women (b = -2.16, p < 0.001) maintained significant relationships. Upon the addition of the four masculine experience pillars, only age (b = -0.0452, p < 0.01) and identifying as a Democrat (b = 0.985, p < 0.05) maintained significant relationships. Upon the addition of the discrepancy between the four pillars of ideals and experience, the relationships from the first regressions maintained significance. That is, when adding the discrepancy between masculine ideals and experiences, age (b = -0.0851, p < 0.001) and being attracted only to women (b = -1.435, p < 0.01) maintained significant negative relationships while education (b =

0.230 $p < 0.05$), identifying as a Democrat ($b = 1.303$, $p < 0.01$), and being married ($b = 1.030$, $p < 0.05$) maintained significant positive relationships.

Hostility Toward Women (HTW) initially had a significant negative relationship with age and significant positive relationships with MDS and personal income. Upon the addition of the four masculine ideals pillars, personal income was no longer significant, while MDS ($b = 0.389$, $p < 0.001$) and age ($b = -0.067$, $p < 0.05$) maintained significance. However, being assigned male at birth had a newly significant relationship with HTW ($b = -6.196$, $p < 0.01$). Being assigned male at birth also had a significant negative relationship with HTW upon the addition of the four masculine experience pillars, ($b = -6.25$, $p < 0.01$), though it should be noted again that the sample was particularly lopsided when it came to this demographic. Masculine Discrepancy Stress ($b = 0.443$, $p < 0.001$) maintained a significant negative relationship upon this addition of experience pillars, while age and personal income were no longer significant.

Recall that the Benevolent Sexism subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI-B) had significant positive relationships with MDS, being married, being attracted only to women, and identifying as Christian. Upon the addition of the four masculine ideals pillars, each of these four variables - MDS ($b = 0.271$, $p < 0.001$), being married ($b = 1.943$, $p < 0.001$), being attracted only to women ($b = 1.23$, $p < 0.05$), and identifying as Christian ($b = 0.929$, $p < 0.05$) maintained significance. Likewise, MDS ($b = 0.201$, $p < 0.001$), being married ($b = 1.747$, $p < 0.001$), and identifying as Christian ($b = 0.788$, $p < 0.05$) maintained significant relationships upon the addition of the four masculine experience pillars. However, being attracted only to women was no longer significant, and age ($b = 0.201$, $p < 0.01$) indicated a new significant relationship. Notably, this was the only time age had a significant positive relationship with any of the outcome variables. Similar to the addition of ideals, the addition of the discrepancy pillars

did not change the relationships between ASI-B and MDS ($b = 0.213$, $p < 0.001$), being married ($b = 2.530$, $p < 0.001$), being attracted only to women ($b = 1.779$, $p < 0.01$), and identifying as Christian ($b = 1.156$, $p < 0.01$).

The ASI-H had a significant negative relationship with age, and significant positive relationships with MDS, being assigned male at birth, working 40 or more hours per week, and personal income. Personal income was no longer significant upon the addition of ideals, experiences, or discrepancy. Upon the addition of the four masculine ideals pillars, age and working 40 or more hours per week were also no longer significant, while MDS ($b = 0.184$, $p < 0.001$) and being assigned male at birth ($b = 2.275$, $p < 0.05$) maintained significance. Age and working 40 or more hours per week were similarly rendered non-significant upon the addition of the four masculine experience pillars, as was being assigned male at birth. Only MDS ($b = 0.248$, $p < 0.001$) maintain significance. Upon the addition of the discrepancy between the four pillars of ideals and experience, MDS ($b = 0.269$, $p < 0.001$), age ($b = -0.0456$, $p < 0.05$), being assigned male at birth ($b = 3.098$, $p < 0.05$), and working 40 or more hours per week ($b = 1.350$, $p < 0.05$) all maintained their significance. However, being attracted only to women ($b = 1.818$, $p < 0.01$) developed a new significant relationship with ASI-H when the discrepancy pillars were added.

Recall that BPAQ-P had a significant positive relationship with MDS and significant negative relationships with age, education, and identifying as Christian. Identifying as Christian was no longer significant when adding any of the four pillar groups: ideals, experiences, or discrepancy. Upon the addition of the four masculine ideals pillars, education was also no longer significant, while MDS ($b = 0.144$, $p < 0.001$) and age ($b = -0.062$, $p < 0.001$) maintained significance. MDS ($b = 0.137$, $p < 0.001$) and age ($b = -0.0384$, $p < 0.001$) similarly maintained

significance upon the addition of the four masculine experience pillars; however, education ($b = -0.165$, $p < 0.05$) also maintained significance in this regression. Similarly, MDS ($b = 0.168$, $p < 0.001$), age ($b = -0.0740$, $p < 0.001$), and education ($b = -0.190$, $p < 0.05$) maintained their significance upon the addition of the discrepancy pillars. However, being married ($b = 0.839$, $p < 0.05$) developed a new significant relationship in these regressions, when it was not originally significant.

BPAQ-V originally had a significant negative relationship with age and had significant positive relationships with MDS, being white/Caucasian, and being married. This outcome had several relationships that were not originally significant, but became significant. Two such relationships were being assigned male at birth and identifying as a Democrat for regressions adding the ideals pillars ($b = -1.474$, $p < 0.05$; $b = -0.486$, $p < 0.05$, respectively) and the experiences pillars ($b = -1.517$, $p < 0.05$; $b = -0.496$, $p < 0.05$, respectively). Additionally, being attracted to women developed significant negative relationships upon the addition of experiences pillars ($b = 0.741$, $p < 0.05$) and the discrepancy pillars ($b = 0.685$, $p < 0.05$). The original four relationships maintained significance across the rest of the regressions. That is, MDS ($b = 0.161$, $p < 0.001$), age ($b = -0.044$, $p < 0.001$), being white/Caucasian ($b = 0.651$, $p < 0.01$), and being married ($b = 0.519$, $p < 0.05$) maintained significant relationships with BPAQ-V when adding the ideals pillars. They also maintained significance when the four experience pillars were added (MDS: $b = 0.16$, $p < 0.001$; age: $b = -0.0319$, $p < 0.001$; being white/Caucasian: $b = 0.673$, $p < 0.01$; being married: $b = 0.583$, $p < 0.05$), as well as when the discrepancy pillars were added (MDS: $b = 0.180$, $p < 0.001$; age: $b = -0.0536$, $p < 0.001$; being white/Caucasian: $b = 0.787$, $p < 0.01$; being married $b = 0.755$, $p < 0.01$).

Recall that BPAQ-H had a significant negative relationship with age and significant positive relationships with MDS, being white/Caucasian, and working 40 or more hours per week. BPAQ-H maintained these relationships upon the addition of the four masculine ideals pillars: MDS ($b = 0.205$, $p < 0.001$), age ($b = -0.049$, $p < 0.001$), being white/Caucasian ($b = 0.654$, $p < 0.05$), and working 40 or more hours per week ($b = 0.816$, $p < 0.01$), while also developing a new significant negative relationship with personal income ($b = -0.0873$, $p < 0.05$). Personal income similarly became significant upon the addition of the discrepancy pillars ($b = -0.095$, $p < 0.05$). The initial four variables also maintained significance upon the addition of experiences pillars (MDS: $b = 0.196$, $p < 0.001$; age: $b = -0.0398$, $p < 0.001$; being white/Caucasian: $b = 0.645$, $p < 0.05$; working 40 or more hours per week: $b = 0.84$, $p < 0.01$) and the discrepancy pillars (MDS: $b = 0.206$, $p < 0.001$; age: $b = -0.0548$, $p < 0.001$; being white/Caucasian: $b = 0.756$, $p < 0.01$; working 40 or more hours per week: $b = 0.955$, $p < 0.001$). However, being assigned male at birth ($b = -1.418$, $p < 0.05$) became significant upon the addition of the experiences pillars, but not in any of the other regressions. Unlike the previous regressions, personal income did not become significant upon the addition of the experiences pillars.

BPAQ-A initially had a significant positive relationship with MDS and significant negative relationships with age and education. MDS ($b = 0.115$, $p < 0.001$) and age ($b = -0.0272$, $p < 0.001$) maintained significance upon the addition of the masculine ideals pillars, while education was no longer significant. This pattern was also seen when adding the experiences pillars (MDS: $b = 0.115$, $p < 0.001$; age: $b = -0.0198$, $p < 0.001$) and discrepancy pillars (MDS: $b = 0.128$, $p < 0.001$; age: $b = -0.0341$, $p < 0.001$). However, being white/Caucasian gained significant positive relationships upon the addition of experiences ($b = 0.359$, $p < 0.05$) and

discrepancy ($b = 0.428$, $p < 0.001$). Being attracted only to women ($b = 0.498$, $p < 0.05$) also gained a significant relationship upon the addition of masculine experience pillars, but not in any of the other regressions.

Discussion:

Several patterns emerged within these regressions. First, Masculine Discrepancy Stress (MDS) as a control had a very significant ($p < 0.001$) positive relationship with every outcome variable. No other variables were this consistent in their relationships. Age was somewhat consistent in its negative relationship with the outcome variables. While it did not have a significant relationship with ASI-B in the original regressions, it gained a significant positive relationship when adding the masculine experiences pillars. This suggests that age might not directly influence benevolent sexism, but instead works indirectly through masculine experiences. That is, how someone scores on the masculine experience measures appears to be influenced by their age, and in turn, those experiences influence how likely they are to hold benevolent sexist views. This is particularly interesting in light of the fact that this was also the only case in which age had a significant *positive* relationship. In every other case, as males aged, their misogyny and aggression scores *decreased*.

Being assigned male at birth was interesting in its relationships when masculine ideals were added to the regressions. While being assigned male at birth had a significant positive relationship with hostile sexism, it had a significant *negative* relationship with the Hostility Toward Women (HTW) scale, indicating that those assigned female at birth actually had higher HTW scores. However, as has been noted numerous times, interpretation should be approached with caution. Only 18 participants (3%) indicated being assigned female at birth, indicating a highly skewed sample.

While the Masculine Dominance pillars had no significant relationships with any of the BPAQ subscales, it consistently had significant positive relationships with the misogyny scales (HTW and ASI subscales) when adding either Masculine Dominance ideals or experiences. This is even when holding MDS constant as a control, indicating that MDS did not completely mediate relationships between these variables. When adding discrepancy pillars, Masculine Dominance discrepancy had a significant negative relationship with HTW and ASI-H. While this does not necessarily explain consistent males, it indicates that those with high positive discrepancy had on average lower outcome scores, while those with greater negative discrepancy had on average higher outcome scores. Physicality discrepancy also had significant negative relationships with HTW and ASI-H.

The interpretation of the Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism relationships offered a much more complicated picture. Starting with Anti-Effeminacy, its discrepancy was never significant. Anti-Effeminacy ideals had a significant positive relationship with HTW, indicating that males who agreed with statements such as "a man should tell people he cares about them" had lower HTW scores than males who disagreed with those statements. However, Anti-Effeminacy ideals had significant *negative* relationships with MDS, ASI-B, BPAQ-V and BPAQ-H. Anti-Effeminacy experiences also had a significant negative relationship with ASI-B. Heterosexism, in contrast, was almost always significant. While Heterosexism ideals had positive relationships with the outcomes, the significant Heterosexism experiences and discrepancy relationships were almost negative.

These two pillars were the most difficult to interpret, largely due to the inconsistent nature of the relationships. This is in contrast with the Masculine Dominance and Physicality pillars, where their significant relationships were almost always positive when it came to

ideals/experiences, and always negative when it came to the significant relationships with discrepancy. Recall also the scores in Table 1, Anti-Effeminacy items had much lower endorsement among participants than the Masculine Dominance and Physicality pillars described in the previous paragraph. Items in the Anti-Effeminacy pillar, in particular, had some of the lowest means, frequently scoring less than 3, while the Masculine Dominance pillar, for example, frequently scored above 4. Additionally, the Cronbach's Alpha for Anti-Effeminacy teetered on the edge of being acceptable, and was poor when it came to the Heterosexism pillar.

Heterosexism was confounding in its associations largely because Heterosexism ideals, when significant, were always positive, while Heterosexism experiences, when significant, were almost always negative. We may be able to interpret it like this: participants who endorsed the two items comprising the Heterosexism ideals (that men should only be attracted to women and should be insulted if someone assumes he is gay) were more likely to endorse the outcome variables of aggression and misogyny. However, the negative *experience* associations indicate that there was an association between having sexual thoughts about other men, and having been assumed to be gay, and endorsement of aggression and misogyny. These relationships indicate a complicated interplay between ideals and experiences when related to the Heterosexism pillar. When considered together, it is possible that this is a type of manifestation of internalized homophobia. At the very least, males who have the experiences of having sexual thoughts about other men (low experiences score) indicate increased endorsement of masculine discrepancy stress, hostility toward women, hostile sexism, and all measured forms of aggression.

So, while Masculine Dominance and Physicality were largely consistent in having significant positive relationships with the outcome variables, this was not the case for the Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism pillars. This could possibly be due to the lower internal reliability

for both of these pillars. Based on masculinity research, it was not surprising to find that, the greater the endorsement of Masculine Dominance ideals and experiences, the greater the endorsement of misogyny and aggression. Anti-Effeminacy, when significant, frequently had negative relationships with the outcome variables.

Conclusion:

The overall intention of this dissertation was to fill the empirical void concerning discrepancy. This study's primary goals were to first establish a scale to measure masculine discrepancy, and then to use that scale in order to test whether that discrepancy was related to heightened endorsement of aggression and/or misogyny. While the scale was crafted around six pillars (Emotional Restriction, Homophobia, Gender Roles, Physical Toughness, Hypersexuality, and Dominance), an exploratory factor analysis indicated the presence of four factors: Masculine Dominance, Physicality, Anti-Effeminacy, and Heterosexism. This factor analysis revealed that some of the original pillars overlapped: Masculine Dominance included items from the Gender Roles and Dominance pillars (largely endorsing women's submissive roles in both romantic and professional relationships), Physicality combined items from the Hypersexuality and Physical Toughness pillars, and Anti-Effeminacy combined items from the Emotional Restriction and Gender Roles pillars. Heterosexism was the only factor to feature items exclusively from a previously theorized pillar – Homophobia. Thus, while I did not find the six separate pillars, similar concepts that were key to the overall construction of masculinity were found in these new factors; the factor analysis simply reduced the number of pillars through combination.

There are several implications in these findings. First, it was unexpected, though not surprising, to find Hypersexuality and Physical Toughness items loading on the same factor.

Unlike the Gender Roles and Dominance pillars, which had similar overarching themes regarding women's and men's roles in relationships and the workforce (and thus unsurprising to find that they loaded together on the new Masculine Dominance factor), Hypersexuality and Physical Toughness are quite clearly two distinct concepts. While sex and violence may make sense to masculinity theorists in that a person who endorses one may be predicted to endorse the other, this finding provides empirical support for some notion of masculinity that is centered around these two concepts. This "Physicality" pillar could almost be seen in one of two ways: 1) it represents a physical exertion (and typically some form of control) upon another person, or 2) these are items that are simply dealing with some aspect of the physical body. Either way, this further complicated the research questions: how can we parse out the physical aggression of those who endorse hypersexual ideologies about masculinity, when physical aggression is intrinsically linked to the endorsement of these ideologies as well, despite being a distinct concept? This will undoubtedly be explored in future papers, as I do not have the space to address it fully within this dissertation.

Second, it would be easy to theoretically locate Emotional Restriction, Gender Roles, and Dominance on one overarching understanding of masculinity centered around the traditional societal roles we expect men to play as the logical, stoic providers for their families. Indeed, Talcott Parsons would perhaps argue that these expectations are key to a functioning family, and thus to a functioning society. Upon closer examination, however, one surprising finding stood out. While males largely indicated at least slight disagreement with most of the statements throughout the survey, the average man at least slightly endorsed paternalistic views of masculinity where men should a) have a manly job and take risks, b) bring home the money for their family, c) ensure that his partner tells him where they are at all times, and d) have the final

say about major decisions in his relationships. *However,* gone, it seems, are the days of masculine stoicism. The items with the lowest endorsement indicated that participants feel that a man *should* talk about their feelings (including his affection for others, as well as his worries and fears), *should* ask for help with personal problems, and *should* learn how to do household tasks like cooking, cleaning, and taking care of children. While this final item had the strongest responses, indicating that sons should be taught these tasks, participants did not nearly as readily reject the idea that a man's significant other should do the household chores.

Thus, while men are largely still expected to fill these paternalistic roles, the shift is notable. Not only is this rejection somewhat surprising, but it is also interesting to consider the Anti-Effeminacy pillar in relation to the Masculine Dominance pillar. While males may have predominantly rejected the Anti-Effeminacy pillar, the endorsement of Masculine Dominance is still quite telling. While males may be able to now shake off some of the trauma that resulted from masculinity's demands for emotional restriction and self-sufficiency, women are still resigned to roles of submission in their relationships. These endorsements occurred while males simultaneously indicated that they agreed (at least somewhat) that women should be treated as equals to males.

Additionally, as it related to the Masculine Dominance pillar, I would have expected to find one of the final items, reverse-coded to indicate that women should *not* be treated the same as men, would have loaded on the Masculine Dominance pillar. After all, I would have expected that men who endorse ideals like "a man should be in charge of the workplace," "a man should have the final say about major decisions in his relationships," or "a man should have control over the women in his life" to also endorse the idea that women should not be treated as equals to men. However, this item did load on the Anti-Effeminacy pillar, implicating a relationship

between embracing emotional restriction and the belief that women should not be treated as equals.

This chapter establishes several key parts of this dissertation. First, it examines how control variables interact with the outcome variables. Next, in validating the newly created scale, this chapter establishes several factors that are largely similar to the hypothesized pillars, simply condensed. Next, through regression analyses, this chapter supported masculinity studies' findings that higher endorsement of masculine ideals often results in greater endorsement of misogyny and aggression. However, this was not consistent across all pillars of masculinity. While largely consistent across Masculine Dominance and Physicality ideals/experiences, Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism proved less predictable. However, these relationships mostly supported previous literature and findings on masculine ideology.

Of particular importance to this dissertation is the presence of significant relationships between discrepancy and the outcome variables, net of control variables (including MDS). Masculine Dominance and Physicality discrepancy had significant negative relationships with two of the misogyny scores: HTW and ASI-H. Additionally, Physicality discrepancy had a significant negative relationship with MDS. Heterosexism discrepancy additionally had significant negative relationships with all outcome variables; however, these findings should be interpreted with caution considering the unacceptable Cronbach's Alpha (0.545).

These relationships between discrepancy and outcomes were always negative. How, then, do we interpret this? It is possible that these relationships could be explained by either positive discrepants (low ideals, high experiences), negative discrepants (high ideals, low experiences), or possibly both. For the first possibility, these findings support the hypothesis: those with positive discrepancy have lower outcome variables. Identity control theory explains this connection –

those with positive discrepancy will have lower endorsement of aggression and misogyny, as they will seek to realign with their masculine identity standard. That is, they are not enacting masculinity in a way that coincides with what they believe "a man should be." These males have masculine identity standards which believe a man should not be violent, or that he should not be controlling/dominating over his female partner, or that men do not need to have "manly" jobs, nor be in charge of the workplace (as opposed to women being in charge). Yet, in their lived experiences, they are exhibiting these traits. That is, as it relates to the above examples, he may be violent or controlling over his partner, or he may have a manly job or have only worked in places where males were in charge. His masculine identity standard may reject traditional masculinity, but he is still enacting these traits in his lived experiences, and thus his daily life is in conflict with his non-traditional masculine identity standard. Endorsing aggression and misogyny, which are associated with traditional masculinity, would only further increase this discrepancy from their non-traditional identity standard. By extension, we may also view their lack of endorsement of aggression and misogyny as a way of distancing themselves from a traditional masculinity they largely reject, at least ideologically.

Additionally, the second explanation based on *negative* discrepancy also fits into this pattern. The inverse relationship between discrepancy and outcome variables indicates that greater negative discrepancy (that is, further from 0) is related to higher endorsement of aggression and misogyny. That is, those who do endorse a traditional masculinity standard, but fail to fully enact it (resulting in negative discrepancy), have increased endorsement of misogyny. According to ICT, this would serve as a way to increase their lived masculinity, which is currently discrepant from how they believe a man "should be." While this pattern was not always the case in this data, it does lend support to the stated hypotheses.

While the relationships between greater negative discrepancy and high aggression/misogyny can be easily explained by general strain theory, the relationships between high positive discrepancy and low aggression/misogyny are less easily explained. In the former, males fail to meet their ideals when their low experiences and their high ideals do not match. In the latter, males' ideals and experiences also do not match, which could theoretically result in strain. However, these males actually *surpass* their low ideals. In contrast to the males with negative discrepancy, these males with positive discrepancy have experiences that not only meet their ideals, but they actually go beyond what they believe men should be/do. Thus, even though the ideals and experiences do not match, it could be argued that positive discrepancy does not result in perceived strain in the same way negative discrepancy. Therefore, strain theory would explain the lack of a strain outcome due to the individual not perceiving their experience of surpassing ideals as a strain.

Finally, I found that Masculine Discrepancy Stress does not fully negate relationships between masculine discrepancy and the outcome variables. This means that MDS does not fully explain the relationship. While MDS always had a significant positive relationship with outcome variables, it did not fully render discrepancy non-significant. By using MDS as a control, I provide support for the notion that the presence of discrepancy, itself (and not just discrepancy *stress*) has significant relationships with several outcome variables.

In running regression analyses, however, we run into a clear problem. While the regression analysis allows for differentiation between individuals with negative and positive discrepancies, the consistent groups, both with a discrepancy score of 0, do not fit neatly into a linear relationship. At the beginning of this chapter, we saw that masculine ideals and masculine experiences both often had significant positive relationships with outcome variables. We could

thus expect to find that those with norm-favoring consistency (high ideals, high experiences) would have high scores on the outcome variables; norm-rejecting consistency (low ideals, low experiences) would have low scores. Despite the clear theoretical distinctions between these groups (high ideals/experiences vs low ideals/experiences), a regression analysis, which assumes a linear relationship, is unable to distinguish between these groups since they both have no discrepancy (and thus both have a score of 0). The nuances of these groups are lost when examined within a linear analysis like a regression, especially if these groups may potentially have a U-shaped relationship. In the next chapter, I attempt to analyze potential differences between norm-favoring consistents (high ideal and experience scores) and norm-rejecting consistents (low ideal and experience scores) as well as further explore previously found differences between discrepants.

7. CONTENT CHAPTER 2: Cluster Analysis

Introduction:

In the previous chapter, I created a measure of discrepancy by following Grimmell (1998) and subtracting the ideal scores from the experience scores. This left me with two major categories of how males' experiences could relate to their ideals: 1) Consistency, where the actual (lived experience) is close to the ideal, and thus the score upon subtracting the ideal from the actual results in a score of close to 0, and 2) Discrepancy, where there is a difference between the ideal and the actual–in this case, the score can be either positive or negative. Each of these categories could then be separated into 3) norm-favoring, where the ideal is high, and 4) norm-rejecting, where the ideal is low. This leaves us with four types of males: norm-favoring discrepants, norm-favoring consistents, norm-rejecting consistents, and norm-rejecting discrepants.

Unfortunately, this method of measuring discrepancy by subtraction did not allow me to analyze the two distinct groups of consistents. However, the two forms of consistency were hypothesized to be drastically different from one another. Norm-favoring consistency occurs when both the ideals and the lived experiences are high. I expected that norm-favoring consistency, in certain scenarios, would also be associated with heightened endorsement of aggression and misogyny. Norm-rejecting consistency, however, I expected to have the lowest associations with endorsement of aggression and misogyny. Norm-rejecting consistency occurs when both the ideal and actual lived experience are low. Informed by masculine gender role stress studies, I expected to find that both versions of norm-rejection (discrepancy and consistency) had lower endorsement of aggression and misogyny. Again, while the previous chapter allowed me to establish a negative relationship between discrepancy and outcomes, both norm-favoring and norm-rejecting consistents individuals would have resulted in a score of 0 (or close to it) and would not be distinguishable from each other. Hence, in this chapter, I look to determine whether certain groups of males can be established, and what the differences are between those males, in both their endorsement of ideals/experiences as well as their endorsement of outcome variables.

In this chapter, I ask: what are the types of males we can expect to see when it comes to the potential discrepancies between the ideals and the experiences? I had hypothesized that I would be able to create four groups of men via cluster analysis: Norm-favoring discrepant (who has negative discrepancy), norm-favoring consistent, norm-rejecting consistent, and norm-rejecting discrepant (who has positive discrepancy). Informed by identity control theory (ICT), I predicted that the norm-favoring discrepant would have the highest endorsement of misogyny and aggression, while the norm-rejecting discrepant would have the lowest of these

endorsements. General strain theory (GST), however, might predict that any discrepancy, whether norm-favoring or norm-rejecting, could result in negative outcomes like these dependent variables.

Analytical Decisions:

I sought to answer the question of whether males could be separated into distinct groups via cluster analysis. To create these clusters, I ran a k-means cluster analysis of eight variables, for which I had created an additive index in the previous chapter. That is, the grouping was done based on the additive indexes for each of the four factors, for both ideals and for experiences, totaling eight variables. I then ran one-way ANOVAs between the different clusters with Tukey post-hoc tests to determine whether there were significant differences between the various clusters as it relates to the different pillars. Finally, I present regressions with control variables, using one cluster as the reference group.

Findings:

Cluster Creation and Descriptive Statistics:

The clusters were somewhat different than hypothesized, though indicated clear patterns as it related to ideals and experiences. ANOVA analyses indicated significant ($p < 0.001$) differences between the clusters' scores on ideals, experiences, and discrepancy except in one case: Anti-Effeminacy discrepancy ($p = 0.223$). I here present the means, as grouped by pillars, and discuss each cluster before presenting Tukey post-hoc tests examining differences in greater depth.

Table 10: Cluster Means

Masculine Dominance			
Pillars	Ideals	Exp.	Disc.
Cluster 1	47.660	46.965	-0.695
Cluster 2	20.483	25.699	5.215
Cluster 3	52.122	47.809	-4.313
Cluster 4	34.022	34.763	0.741
Physicality			
Pillars	Ideals	Exp.	Disc.
Cluster 1	19.794	19.908	0.114
Cluster 2	14.517	17.761	3.244
Cluster 3	39.985	35.611	-4.374
Cluster 4	22.469	22.790	0.321
Anti-Effeminacy			
Pillars	Ideals	Exp.	Disc.
Cluster 1	11.794	12.631	0.837
Cluster 2	8.612	11.483	2.871
Cluster 3	10.405	11.046	0.641
Cluster 4	14.652	16.103	1.451
Heterosexism			
Pillars	Ideals	Exp.	Disc.
Cluster 1	8.943	12.319	3.376
Cluster 2	6.479	10.947	4.469
Cluster 3	11.435	6.695	-4.741
Cluster 4	8.558	11.558	3.000

Masculine Dominance and Physicality pillars maintained patterns across ideals, experiences, and discrepancy. For both pillars, Cluster 3 always had the greatest ideals, experiences, and negative discrepancy (where their ideals surpassed their experiences) scores, while Cluster 2 had the lowest ideals and experiences, and the highest *positive* discrepancy (where their experiences surpassed their ideals). For Masculine Dominance, Cluster 1 had the second greatest ideals, experiences and negative discrepancy, while Cluster 4 had the second *lowest* ideals, experiences,

and positive discrepancy. When it came to the Physicality pillars, Cluster 1 had the second *lowest* and Cluster 4 had the second *highest*.

Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism pillars were somewhat more complicated. When it came to discrepancy, Clusters 2 and 3 maintained their patterns: Cluster 2 had the greatest *positive* discrepancy while Cluster 3 had the greatest *negative* discrepancy. Anti-Effeminacy was the only discrepancy pillar where Cluster 3 had a slight positive discrepancy. However, all four Clusters had positive discrepancy when it came to Anti-Effeminacy; Cluster 3 still had the lowest positive discrepancy.

Based on these patterns, I present an explanation and appropriate label for each cluster:

1. **Cluster 1 – Traditionalist Males** (Norm-Favoring Consistent), n = 141: This group had the second-highest levels of endorsement of all Masculine Dominance and Anti-Effeminacy pillars (ideals, experiences, negative endorsement), typically only after Cluster 3 (which often had the highest scores). However, for Physicality, they had the third-greatest scores across ideals, experiences, and discrepancy. In most ideals and experiences pillars, their scores were higher than the overall mean. By this I mean that typically, this group was more likely than average to express support for traditional masculine ideals (apart from Physicality ideals) and were more likely to have more lived experience than the average participant (apart from Physicality and Anti-Effeminacy experiences). This cluster's total discrepancy was the closest to zero (0.908 when averaging all four discrepancy pillars). These males can perhaps be considered "traditionalists" because of their endorsement of the majority of pillars about gender roles and dominance, while not endorsing the pillar largely revolving around sex and violence.
2. **Cluster 2 – Nonconforming Males** (Norm-Rejecting Discrepant); n = 209: These participants were perhaps the most consistent in their rankings compared to other clusters. They almost always had the lowest levels of endorsement for both ideals and experiences, with the exception of Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism experiences, in which case they had the second-lowest levels of endorsement. This group also had the highest positive discrepancy. That is, their experiences actually exceeded their ideals. This means that, despite having low levels of endorsement of masculine ideology, their behaviors paint a different picture. While they have low endorsement of ideals and experiences, their experiences still *exceed* their ideals. For example, they may reject the notion that a man should have the final say about major decisions in their relationships, while simultaneously saying that, when it comes to their lived experiences, they are the

ones who have the final say about major decisions in their relationships. ICT would hypothesize that this group would have the lowest endorsement of aggression and misogyny, theoretically in an attempt to realign themselves with a masculine identity standard that largely rejects masculine ideals. This group is referred to as "Nonconforming males" due to their overall rejection of traditional masculine norms.

3. **Cluster 3 – Precarious Males** (Norm-Favoring Discrepant); n = 131: This group of participants almost always had higher endorsement of both ideals *and* experiences than every other cluster; in some cases, their ideals were over twice that of other clusters. The three exceptions, however, were notable in the fact that they were often noticeably lower than the other clusters. When it came to the Anti-Effeminacy pillar, these participants were the lowest in their experiences, and second-lowest in their endorsement of Anti-Effeminacy ideals. Since these are reverse-coded items, this indicated that these participants felt that a man *should* tell others that he cares about them, and *should* be okay with talking about his worries and fears, etc. Their experience score in the Anti-Effeminacy pillar indicates that they are likely to do this (express their feelings and ask for help) in their own lives. The final exception was that of Heterosexism experience. Despite the fact that these males had the highest endorsement of Heterosexism ideals, their Heterosexism experiences were actually the lowest. So, despite endorsing statements like "a man should only have sexual thoughts about women," in their experiences they disclosed that they have had sexual thoughts about other men. This group, due both to its high endorsement of ideals and experiences, paired with their high negative discrepancy, is expected to have the highest levels of endorsement of aggression and misogyny.
4. **Cluster 4 – Stoic Males** (Average, Consistent); n = 224: This group's scores were often close to the overall averages. For Masculine Dominance, they were consistently the third-highest scoring group, while for Physicality, they were consistently the second-highest score group (across ideals, experiences, and discrepancy). However, for Anti-Effeminacy they scored the highest in both ideals and experiences, indicating the greatest endorsement of the notion that men should *not* talk about their feelings nor ask for help. Their discrepancy scores were always positive and were relatively close to the average discrepancy score of all four clusters. In the Masculine Dominance and Physicality pillars, their discrepancy scores were the closest to 0, indicating very little discrepancy. This group, being largely consistent, was expected to fall between clusters 2 and 3 in their endorsement of aggression and misogyny. However, their heightened endorsement of Anti-Effeminacy and Physicality calls into question if that hypothesis is true across all outcome variables.

While the means provide us an overview of each cluster, it is also important to determine whether the clusters are actually different from each other. Again, ANOVA results indicated that

there were significant ($p < 0.001$) differences between the different clusters when it came to each of the ideals, experiences, and discrepancy pillars (apart from Anti-Effeminacy Discrepancy). But it is important to see if these observed differences between groups are statistically significant.

Table 11: Tukey Post-Hoc Ideals, Experiences, Discrepancy Tests

Ideals - Masculine Dominance (with controls)					**Experience - Masculine Dominance (with controls)**					**Discrepancy - Masculine Dominance (with controls)**				
Group vs. group	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*	*Group vs. group*	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*	*Group vs. group*	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*
1 vs. 2	47.66	20.48	27.18	63.82 *	1 vs. 2	46.96	25.70	21.27	48.99 *	1 vs. 2	-0.70	5.22	5.91	11.69 *
1 vs. 3	47.66	52.12	4.46	10.48 *	1 vs. 3	46.96	47.81	0.84	1.95	1 vs. 3	-0.70	-4.31	3.62	7.16 *
1 vs. 4	47.66	34.02	13.64	32.03 *	1 vs. 4	46.96	34.76	12.20	28.11 *	1 vs. 4	-0.70	0.74	1.44	2.84
2 vs. 3	20.48	52.12	31.64	74.30 *	2 vs. 3	25.70	47.81	22.11	50.94 *	2 vs. 3	5.22	-4.31	9.53	18.85 *
2 vs. 4	20.48	34.02	13.54	31.80 *	2 vs. 4	25.70	34.76	9.06	20.88 *	2 vs. 4	5.22	0.74	4.47	8.85 *
3 vs. 4	52.12	34.02	18.10	42.51 *	3 vs. 4	47.81	34.76	13.05	30.05 *	3 vs. 4	-4.31	0.74	5.05	10.00 *
Ideals - Physicality (with controls)					**Experience - Physicality (with controls)**					**Discrepancy - Physicality (with controls)**				
Group vs. group	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*	*Group vs. group*	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*	*Group vs. group*	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*
1 vs. 2	19.79	14.52	5.28	11.82 *	1 vs. 2	19.91	17.76	2.15	4.90 *	1 vs. 2	0.11	3.24	3.13	6.55 *
1 vs. 3	19.79	39.98	20.19	45.20 *	1 vs. 3	19.91	35.61	15.70	35.87 *	1 vs. 3	0.11	-4.37	4.49	9.39 *
1 vs. 4	19.79	22.47	2.67	5.99 *	1 vs. 4	19.91	22.79	2.88	6.58 *	1 vs. 4	0.11	0.32	0.21	0.43
2 vs. 3	14.52	39.98	25.47	57.02 *	2 vs. 3	17.76	35.61	17.85	40.78 *	2 vs. 3	3.24	-4.37	7.62	15.93 *
2 vs. 4	14.52	22.47	7.95	17.80 *	2 vs. 4	17.76	22.79	5.03	11.49 *	2 vs. 4	3.24	0.32	2.92	6.11 *
3 vs. 4	39.98	22.47	17.52	39.22 *	3 vs. 4	35.61	22.79	12.82	29.29 *	3 vs. 4	-4.37	0.32	4.70	9.82 *
Ideals - Anti-Effeminacy (with controls)					**Experience - Anti-Effeminacy (with controls)**					**Discrepancy - Anti-Effeminacy (with controls)**				
Group vs. group	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*	*Group vs. group*	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*	*Group vs. group*	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*
1 vs. 2	11.79	8.61	3.18	8.70 *	1 vs. 2	12.63	11.48	1.15	2.95 *	1 vs. 2	0.84	2.87	2.03	5.62 *
1 vs. 3	11.79	10.40	1.39	3.80 *	1 vs. 3	12.63	11.05	1.59	4.08 *	1 vs. 3	0.84	0.64	0.20	0.54
1 vs. 4	11.79	14.65	2.86	7.81 *	1 vs. 4	12.63	16.10	3.47	8.93 *	1 vs. 4	0.84	1.45	0.61	1.70
2 vs. 3	8.61	10.40	1.79	4.90 *	2 vs. 3	11.48	11.05	0.44	1.13	2 vs. 3	2.87	0.64	2.23	6.16 *
2 vs. 4	8.61	14.65	6.04	16.52 *	2 vs. 4	11.48	16.10	4.62	11.88 *	2 vs. 4	2.87	1.45	1.42	3.92 *
3 vs. 4	10.40	14.65	4.25	11.62 *	3 vs. 4	11.05	16.10	5.06	13.00 *	3 vs. 4	0.64	1.45	0.81	2.24
Ideals - Heterosexism (with controls)					**Experience - Heterosexism (with controls)**					**Discrepancy - Heterosexism (with controls)**				
Group vs. group	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*	*Group vs. group*	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*	*Group vs. group*	*Group Means*		*Difference*	*HSD-test*
1 vs. 2	8.94	6.48	2.46	10.37 *	1 vs. 2	12.32	10.95	1.37	5.99 *	1 vs. 2	3.38	4.47	1.09	3.39
1 vs. 3	8.94	11.44	2.49	10.49 *	1 vs. 3	12.32	6.69	5.62	24.54 *	1 vs. 3	3.38	-4.74	8.12	25.16 *
1 vs. 4	8.94	8.56	0.39	1.62	1 vs. 4	12.32	11.56	0.76	3.32	1 vs. 4	3.38	3.00	0.38	1.17
2 vs. 3	6.48	11.44	4.96	20.86 *	2 vs. 3	10.95	6.69	4.25	18.56 *	2 vs. 3	4.47	-4.74	9.21	28.55 *
2 vs. 4	6.48	8.56	2.08	8.75 *	2 vs. 4	10.95	11.56	0.61	2.66	2 vs. 4	4.47	3.00	1.47	4.55 *
3 vs. 4	11.44	8.56	2.88	12.11 *	3 vs. 4	6.69	11.56	4.86	21.22 *	3 vs. 4	-4.74	3.00	7.74	24.00 *

When it came to the different ideal pillars, we can see that each of the clusters statistically varied from each other, with one exception: Cluster 1 and Cluster 4 did not significantly differ according to the Tukey post-hoc test, but only when it came to scores on the Heterosexism pillar. For experience, several more clusters did not differ. For Masculine Dominance pillars, Clusters 1 and 3 did not differ. For Anti-Effeminacy experiences, Clusters 2 and 3 did not significantly differ. For there to be any similarities between 2 and 3 is interesting,

considering they were opposites in terms of most ideals and experiences, with Cluster 2 almost always having the lowest scores, and Cluster 3 having the highest. Finally, Cluster 4 did not differ from Clusters 1 nor 2 when it came to Heterosexism experiences.

Discrepancy pillars had the highest number of similarities – unsurprising when we consider the reported means for each pillar. Clusters 1 and 4 were never significantly different for any of the four discrepancy pillars. These were the only similarities when it came to Masculine Dominance and Physicality discrepancy; each of the other comparisons indicated significant differences. Despite the ANOVA results, Anti-Effeminacy discrepancy was equally split in terms of similarities and differences. Three comparisons indicated significant differences (Cluster 1 vs. 2, Cluster 2 vs. 3 and 2 vs. 4), and the other three comparisons indicated no significant difference: Cluster 1 vs. 3, 1 vs. 4, and Cluster 3 vs. 4. Finally, Heterosexism discrepancy scores did not differ between Clusters 1 vs. 2 nor 1 vs. 4. We see that, across comparisons, Clusters 1 and 4 were the least likely to differ in terms of the indices used to create the clusters. They were also the least likely to differ in terms of discrepancy – in fact, they never differed across any of the four discrepancy pillars.

Now that the differences (and similarities) have been established, I move on to examine the clusters' outcome scores. Table 12 presents the means for each of the four Clusters' outcome scores. I then discuss the means as they relate to the outcome variables.

Table 12: Cluster Outcome Variable Means

	MDS	HTW	ASI-B	ASI-H	BPAQ-P	BPAQ-V	BPAQ-H	BPAQ-A
Cluster 1	13.532	38.028	29.142	26.560	7.121	7.092	7.830	4.071
Cluster 2	9.852	25.703	23.923	17.455	5.990	5.005	6.062	2.986
Cluster 3	18.970	49.290	30.679	30.733	14.473	10.962	11.603	7.428
Cluster 4	12.545	37.380	25.089	23.455	8.875	6.612	7.670	4.272

A clear pattern emerges when looking at the means – one that largely followed the patterns we saw when comparing the means across the clusters' ideals, experiences, and discrepancy. Without fail, Cluster 2 (Nonconforming Males, who frequently had the lowest ideals/experiences, and greatest positive discrepancy) had the lowest outcome scores out of the four clusters (and thus were the least misogynistic and aggressive). In contrast, Cluster 3 (Precarious Males, who frequently had the greatest ideals, experiences, and negative discrepancy) always had the highest outcome scores, meaning they had the greatest endorsement of all measures of misogyny and aggression. For MDS, HTW, ASI-B, ASI-H, BPAQ-V, and BPAQ-H, Cluster 1 (Traditionalist Males) had the second highest outcome scores, followed by Cluster 4 (Stoic Males). Finally, Cluster 4 had the second highest scores for BPAQ-P and BPAQ-A, followed by Cluster 1. While these scores indicate a clear pattern, and the ANOVA tests indicated that there were significant differences ($p < 0.001$) between the clusters, it is important to determine to what extent these clusters do or do not differ from each other.

Comparing Cluster Outcomes:

Table 13 presents the Tukey post-hoc results following ANOVA tests which utilized the dichotomous versions of demographic variables as controls. It should again be noted that, for ease of interpretation, the following variables were treated as continuous: age, MDS (as a control), education, and personal income.

Table 13: Tukey Post-Hoc Test Results Using Dichotomous Demographic Controls

Masculine Discrepancy Stress					Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire - Physical				
Group vs. group	Group Means		Difference	HSD-test	Group vs. group	Group Means		Difference	HSD-test
1 vs. 2	13.532	9.852	3.680	9.643 *	1 vs. 2	7.121	5.990	1.130	3.917 *
1 vs. 3	13.532	18.970	5.438	14.248 *	1 vs. 3	7.121	14.473	7.353	25.483 *
1 vs. 4	13.532	12.545	0.987	2.587	1 vs. 4	7.121	8.875	1.754	6.081 *
2 vs. 3	9.852	18.970	9.118	23.891 *	2 vs. 3	5.990	14.473	8.483	29.400 *
2 vs. 4	9.852	12.545	2.693	7.056 *	2 vs. 4	5.990	8.875	2.885	9.997 *
3 vs. 4	18.970	12.545	6.425	16.835 *	3 vs. 4	14.473	8.875	5.598	19.403 *
Hostility Toward Women					**Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire - Verbal**				
Group vs. group	Group Means		Difference	HSD-test	Group vs. group	Group Means		Difference	HSD-test
1 vs. 2	38.028	25.703	12.325	16.386 *	1 vs. 2	7.092	5.005	2.087	9.846 *
1 vs. 3	38.028	49.290	11.262	14.972 *	1 vs. 3	7.092	10.962	3.870	18.252 *
1 vs. 4	38.028	37.380	0.649	0.863	1 vs. 4	7.092	6.612	0.481	2.267
2 vs. 3	25.703	49.290	23.587	31.358 *	2 vs. 3	5.005	10.962	5.957	28.098 *
2 vs. 4	25.703	37.380	11.676	15.523 *	2 vs. 4	5.005	6.612	1.607	7.579 *
3 vs. 4	49.290	37.380	11.911	15.835 *	3 vs. 4	10.962	6.612	4.350	20.519 *
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory - Benevolent					**Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire - Hostile**				
Group vs. group	Group Means		Difference	HSD-test	Group vs. group	Group Means		Difference	HSD-test
1 vs. 2	29.142	23.923	5.218	13.068 *	1 vs. 2	7.830	6.062	1.768	7.867 *
1 vs. 3	29.142	30.679	1.538	3.850	1 vs. 3	7.830	11.603	3.773	16.793 *
1 vs. 4	29.142	25.089	4.053	10.148 *	1 vs. 4	7.830	7.670	0.160	0.713
2 vs. 3	23.923	30.679	6.756	16.918 *	2 vs. 3	6.062	11.603	5.541	24.660 *
2 vs. 4	23.923	25.089	1.166	2.920	2 vs. 4	6.062	7.670	1.607	7.154 *
3 vs. 4	30.679	25.089	5.590	13.999 *	3 vs. 4	11.603	7.670	3.933	17.506 *
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory - Hostile					**Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire - Anger**				
Group vs. group	Group Means		Difference	HSD-test	Group vs. group	Group Means		Difference	HSD-test
1 vs. 2	26.560	17.455	9.106	20.439 *	1 vs. 2	4.071	2.986	1.085	6.946 *
1 vs. 3	26.560	30.733	4.173	9.366 *	1 vs. 3	4.071	7.428	3.357	21.484 *
1 vs. 4	26.560	23.455	3.105	6.969 *	1 vs. 4	4.071	4.272	0.201	1.289
2 vs. 3	17.455	30.733	13.278	29.805 *	2 vs. 3	2.986	7.428	4.442	28.430 *
2 vs. 4	17.455	23.455	6.001	13.470 *	2 vs. 4	2.986	4.272	1.287	8.236 *
3 vs. 4	30.733	23.455	7.278	16.335 *	3 vs. 4	7.428	4.272	3.155	20.195 *

While we saw clear patterns in the basic presentation of the means, the Tukey post-hoc tests illustrate whether the clusters have statistically significant differences or not. Again, while the ANOVA results indicated significant differences between the four clusters, not every cluster comparison differed.

A brief glance illustrates one particular pattern: the clusters least likely to differ when it came to the outcome variables were the two consistent clusters. Cluster 1 (Traditionalist Males) and Cluster 4 (Stoic Males) were also the two clusters that were least likely to differ across the ideals, experiences, and discrepancy. However, and quite notably, this was almost exclusively as

it related to discrepancy scores. While Cluster 1 and 4 were never significantly different when it came to any of the four discrepancy pillars, this makes sense considering both groups were largely consistent, having experiences that were close to their ideals, and thus had discrepancy scores of close to 0. For ideals and experiences, clusters 1 and 4 *did* differ significantly across three of the four pillars. They were not significantly different when it came to Heterosexism ideals or experiences.

In fact, the majority of the cases where two clusters did not significantly differ were in the comparisons between Clusters 1 and 4. That is, they were not significantly different when it came to MDS, HTW, BPAQ-V, BPAQ-H, and BPAQ-A. Outside of these comparisons, only the Benevolent Sexism subscale of the ASI had any other non-significant differences. For ASI-B, Clusters 1 and 3 did not have a significant difference according to the Tukey post-hoc tests, nor did Clusters 2 and 4. Considering Cluster 3 and Cluster 2 had the highest number of significant differences, I could have chosen either to be my reference group for the following regressions. Considering negative discrepancy has been the focus of this dissertation, I chose Cluster 3 as the reference group for the regressions. These regressions, like the ANOVAs, utilized dichotomous demographic variables.

Regressions Adding Cluster Variables

Finally, after looking at the key differences between the clusters, both as they related to the independent variables (ideals, experiences) and the dependent variables (MDS, ASI, and BPAQ), I ran regressions examining how including cluster membership (particularly as they related to the reference cluster, Cluster 3) was related to the outcome variables. Additionally, I briefly examine how this addition changes previous relationships found in the first set of regressions including just the control variables.

Table 14: Regression Analyses with Cluster Variables

	Masc. Disc. Stress	Hostility Toward Women	ASI - Benevolent	ASI - Hostile	BPAQ - Physical	BPAQ - Verbal	BPAQ - Hostile	BPAQ - Anger
Cluster 3 (Reference)								
Cluster 1	-4.298 ***	-8.420 ***	-1.024	-3.137 ***	-6.228 ***	-2.867 ***	-2.359 ***	-2.630 ***
	(-6.95)	(-6.68)	(-1.53)	(-4.20)	(-12.88)	(-8.06)	(-6.26)	(-10.04)
Cluster 2	-7.131 ***	-18.93 ***	-5.030 ***	-11.37 ***	-6.297 ***	-3.844 ***	-2.659 ***	-2.970 ***
	(-10.83)	(-13.49)	(-6.75)	(-13.68)	(-11.70)	(-9.72)	(-6.34)	(-10.19)
Cluster 4	-4.536 ***	-9.143 ***	-4.069 ***	-6.047 ***	-4.368 ***	-3.038 ***	-2.177 ***	-2.281 ***
	(-7.32)	(-7.22)	(-6.05)	(-8.06)	(-8.99)	(-8.51)	(-5.75)	(-8.67)
Masc. Disc. Stress		0.422 ***	0.175 ***	0.214 ***	0.156 ***	0.171 ***	0.216 ***	0.120 ***
		(5.63)	(4.40)	(4.83)	(5.43)	(8.08)	(9.65)	(7.68)
Age	-0.0521 ***	-0.0518	0.0405 **	0.0137	-0.0462 ***	-0.0358 ***	-0.0443 ***	-0.0225 ***
	(-3.63)	(-1.82)	(2.67)	(0.81)	(-4.22)	(-4.45)	(-5.19)	(-3.79)
Assigned Male at Birth	0.338	-6.748 **	-1.724	1.624	-0.532	-1.637 *	-1.477 *	-0.392
	(0.28)	(-2.80)	(-1.35)	(1.14)	(-0.58)	(-2.41)	(-2.05)	(-0.78)
Education	0.226 *	-0.282	-0.0923	0.0263	-0.192 *	-0.0397	-0.102	-0.0967 *
	(2.01)	(-1.27)	(-0.78)	(0.20)	(-2.25)	(-0.63)	(-1.54)	(-2.09)
Democrat	1.222 **	0.795	0.496	-0.724	-0.356	-0.547 *	-0.0240	-0.0305
	(2.95)	(0.97)	(1.14)	(-1.49)	(-1.13)	(-2.36)	(-0.10)	(-0.18)
White/Caucasian	0.565	-0.595	-0.462	-0.408	0.382	0.671 **	0.651 *	0.353 *
	(1.30)	(-0.70)	(-1.02)	(-0.81)	(1.16)	(2.78)	(2.55)	(1.99)
Works 40+ Hours/Week	-0.933	0.0486	0.335	0.398	0.228	0.245	0.919 **	0.0866
	(-1.89)	(0.05)	(0.65)	(0.69)	(0.61)	(0.89)	(3.16)	(0.43)
Personal Income	0.0429	0.150	0.0800	0.149	-0.0161	-0.0173	-0.0796	0.0129
	(0.52)	(0.93)	(0.93)	(1.56)	(-0.26)	(-0.38)	(-1.65)	(0.39)
Married	0.532	-1.192	1.806 ***	-0.847	0.546	0.429	0.212	0.188
	(1.14)	(-1.29)	(3.69)	(-1.55)	(1.54)	(1.65)	(0.77)	(0.98)
Attracted to Women	-2.492 ***	-0.908	1.352 *	0.346	-0.359	0.207	-0.0201	0.101
	(-4.70)	(-0.86)	(2.40)	(0.55)	(-0.88)	(0.69)	(-0.06)	(0.46)
Christian	-0.366	0.226	1.056 **	0.323	-0.516	-0.239	-0.313	0.00127
	(-0.95)	(0.30)	(2.62)	(0.72)	(-1.77)	(-1.12)	(-1.38)	(0.01)
Constant	19.89 ***	51.82 ***	24.36 ***	24.13 ***	14.87 ***	10.37 ***	10.52 ***	6.349 ***
	(13.69)	(16.05)	(14.22)	(12.62)	(12.01)	(11.40)	(10.91)	(9.47)
Adjusted R^2	0.3201	0.4345	0.2581	0.4126	0.4221	0.4167	0.3999	0.4076

t statistics in parentheses

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.0001

As we saw with the Tukey post-hoc test, Clusters 1 (b = -4.298, p < 0.001), 2 (b = -7.131, p < 0.001), and 4 (b = -4.536, p < 0.001) had significantly lower MDS scores when compared to Cluster 3 as the reference cluster. As had been the case with all of the other regressions for MDS as an outcome, age (b = -0.0521, p < 0.001) had a significant negative relationship with MDS. Similarly consistent across regressions, identifying as a Democrat (b = 1.222, p < 0.01) had a significant positive relationship with MDS. Education (b = 0.226 p < 0.05) also had a significant

positive relationship, similar to the original regressions with just the controls, as well as when the discrepancy pillars were added to the regression. Being attracted to women ($b = -2.492$, $p < 0.001$) had a significant negative relationship with MDS.

Similar to MDS, Clusters 1 ($b = -8.420$, $p < 0.001$), 2 ($b = -18.93$, $p < 0.001$), and 4 ($b = -9.143$, $p < 0.001$) had significantly lower HTW scores when compared to Cluster 3 as the reference cluster. MDS ($b = 0.422$, $p < 0.001$) was still significant for this regression, as it had been for every other regression. However, being assigned male at birth ($b = -6.748$, $p < 0.01$) suddenly had a significant negative relationship, similar to the regressions where ideals pillars or experience pillars were added. That is, while being assigned male at birth was not significant in the initial regressions looking at relationships between control variables and outcome variables, it was now significant in these regressions. Again, it must be noted that the sample was particularly lopsided when it came to sex assigned at birth.

ASI-B was the only outcome variable where one of the clusters did not significantly differ from Cluster 3; as shown by the Tukey Post-hoc tests, Cluster 1 was not significantly different from Cluster 3. However, Clusters 2 ($b = -5.030$, $p < 0.001$) and 4 ($b = -4.069$, $p < 0.001$) did have significantly lower scores than Cluster 3 (though, according to the Tukey test, 2 and 4 did not differ from each other). MDS maintained its original consistent relationships with ASI-B ($b = 0.175$, $p < 0.001$), as did being married ($b = 1.806$, $p < 0.001$), and identifying as Christian ($b = 1.056$, $p < 0.01$). Being attracted only to women ($b = 1.352$, $p < 0.05$) was non-significant when adding experience pillars to regressions, but otherwise was consistently significant in its relationship with ASI-B, including this regression where clusters were added. Age was an interesting variable in that it was not originally significant, but became significant in the regressions that added the experiences pillars. Additionally, while all other relationships age

had with outcome variables were negative (except the relationship between ASI-B and age in the regression adding experience pillars), age ($b = 0.0405$, $p < 0.01$) here had a significant *positive* relationship with ASI-B.

As with every other outcome apart from ASI-B, Clusters 1 ($b = -3.137$, $p < 0.001$), 2 ($b = -11.37$, $p < 0.001$), and 4 ($b = -6.047$, $p < 0.001$) had significantly lower outcome scores when compared to Cluster 3 for ASI-H. MDS ($b = 0.214$, $p < 0.001$) had the only other significant relationship. These were also the only significant relationships. This is in alignment with the regressions that included the experience pillars. However, the original regression showed additional significant relationships with age, being assigned male at birth, working at least one full-time job, and personal income. When the discrepancy pillars were added to the regressions, personal income lost its significance, while being attracted to women *gained* significance. When ideals pillars were added, only MDS and being assigned male at birth remained significant. Finally, as previously mentioned, in this final regression, only MDS and the cluster variables had significant relationships with ASI-H.

Moving to BPAQ scores, Clusters 1 ($b = -6.228$, $p < 0.001$), 2 ($b = -6.297$, $p < 0.001$), and 4 ($b = -4.368$, $p < 0.001$) had significantly lower BPAQ-P scores when compared to Cluster 3. MDS ($b = 0.156$, $p < 0.001$), age ($b = -0.0462$, $p < 0.001$), and education ($b = -0.192$, $p < 0.05$) maintained their original significant relationships across all regressions.

For BPAQ-V, Clusters 1 ($b = -2.867$, $p < 0.001$), 2 ($b = -3.844$, $p < 0.001$), and 4 ($b = -3.038$, $p < 0.001$) each had significantly lower outcome scores when compared to Cluster 3. MDS ($b = 0.171$, $p < 0.001$) and age ($b = -0.0358$, $p < 0.001$) again maintained their significant relationships across all regressions, as did being white/Caucasian. Both being assigned male at birth ($b = -1.637$, $p < 0.05$) and identifying as a Democrat ($b = -0.547$, $p < 0.05$) were not

originally significant, but was newly significant in these regressions, as well as the regressions where the ideals pillars or experiences pillars were added.

Clusters 1 ($b = -2.359$, $p < 0.001$), 2 ($b = -2.659$, $p < 0.001$), and 4 ($b = -2.177$, $p < 0.001$) continued the pattern of having significantly lower BPAQ-H scores when compared to Cluster 3. Likewise, MDS ($b = 0.216$, $p < 0.001$) and age ($b = -0.0443$, $p < 0.001$) maintained their significant relationships across all regressions, as did being white/Caucasian ($b = 0.651$, $p < 0.05$) and working at least one full-time job ($b = 0.919$, $p < 0.01$). Being assigned male at birth ($b = -1.477$, $p < 0.05$) was significant in this set of regressions (as well as when experiences pillars were added), but was not originally significant, nor was it significant when ideals pillars or discrepancy pillars were added.

Finally, Clusters 1 ($b = -2.630$, $p < 0.001$), 2 ($b = -2.970$, $p < 0.001$), and 4 ($b = -2.281$, $p < 0.001$) were significantly lower on their BPAQ-A scores when compared to Cluster 3. Age ($b = -0.0225$, $p < 0.001$) maintained its significant relationship with BPAQ-A across all regressions. Education ($b = -0.0967$, $p < 0.05$) was significant in the original regressions with just control variables but had no longer been significant upon the addition of masculine ideals, experiences, or discrepancy pillars. In contrast, being white/Caucasian ($b = 0.353$, $p < 0.05$) was not significant originally, but gained significance in this regression, as it had in regressions adding experiences and discrepancy pillars.

Discussion:

To review, the previous content chapter established that both ideals and experiences are related to increased endorsement of the outcome variables of aggression and misogyny. It also found that the negative discrepancy relationships were not entirely negated by MDS—that is, the presence of discrepancy itself occasionally had a relationship with outcome variables, regardless

of whether males were concerned about their masculinity. However, it did little to establish differences between males who had consistency between their ideals and lived experiences.

The findings in this chapter indicate several points related to this limitation of the first content chapter. First, we are offered a glimpse into different groupings of males based on their masculine ideals and lived experiences. While I initially expected to find a very specific grouping of men (norm-favoring/rejecting discrepants/consistents), the findings were somewhat different. The k-means cluster analysis resulted in four groups of participants:

Cluster 1 represented a "traditionalist masculinity," which was both norm-favoring and consistent. This cluster was similar to Cluster 4—these two clusters had the fewest number of significant differences when compared. In fact, they were never significantly different when it came to discrepancy scores (unsurprisingly, considering they were largely consistent across ideals/experiences), and were only ever significantly different in their scores for 3 of the 8 outcome variables. Cluster 2 represented a "nonconforming masculinity," which existed largely in opposition to Cluster 3. Cluster 2 always had the lowest endorsement of all outcome variables, likely due to its low endorsement of masculine ideals/experiences. However, this pillar had the greatest positive discrepancy, where their experiences surpassed their ideals. This is in alignment with the ICT-informed hypotheses, predicting that those who have experiences that are not in alignment with their identity standard will adjust behaviors to realign their perceptions with the standard. Despite the presence of discrepancy, which GST could argue results in strain, this discrepancy resulted from a *surpassing* of ideals, as opposed to a failure to meet ideals. Thus, we could argue that these males do not experience strain. Indeed, as the tukey post-hoc tests indicated, these males had significantly lower Masculine Discrepancy *Stress* scores, indicating

that, while their experiences were almost always the lowest, they were not as concerned about their masculinity when compared to the other clusters.

Cluster 3, in contrast with Cluster 2, represented a “precarious masculinity,” where participant scores for both ideals and experiences were higher than average in most cases. Excluding Anti-Effeminacy ideals and experiences and Heterosexism experiences, Cluster 3 always had the highest scores for ideals/experiences. Despite these high scores, these males had a significant negative discrepancy; so, while their experiences surpassed those of the other clusters, they did *not* meet their own ideals. These males had the highest endorsement of all outcome variables, significantly higher than all other clusters (apart from ASI-B, where Cluster 3 did not significantly differ from Cluster 1). Cluster 4 represented a “stoic masculinity,” with high consistency and ideals/experiences means that were relatively close to the average, meaning they were neither particularly norm-favoring nor norm-rejecting. However, their Anti-Effeminacy endorsement was higher than the other pillars and the average, indicating these males endorsed the notion that men should not express their emotions, nor ask for help. They also had the second greatest endorsement of the Physicality pillars for ideals and experiences.

Upon closer analysis, we see that patterns of the endorsement of aggression and misogyny largely followed the patterns of the endorsement of Masculine Dominance and Physicality pillars. We find that Cluster 3, the cluster with the highest ideals and experiences, also had the greatest negative discrepancy, meaning that, despite their "success" over other males, they still were not meeting their own ideals. Meanwhile, the cluster with the lowest ideals and experiences also had the highest *positive* discrepancy, meaning that, despite their low scores, they were still surpassing their own ideals. As hypothesized, the high ideals/experiences/negative discrepancy cluster (Cluster 3) had the greatest endorsement of aggression and misogyny, while

the low ideals/experiences/high positive discrepancy cluster (Cluster 2) had the lowest endorsement of aggression and misogyny.

While several patterns regarding Masculine Dominance and Physicality pillars were clear, especially as it related to Clusters 2 and 3, clusters 1 and 4 were more difficult to interpret. As the Tukey post-hoc tests indicated, Clusters 1 and 4 were least likely to be significantly different in the scores for the outcome variables; apart from the ASI subscales (ASI-B and ASI-H) and BPAQ-P. They were never different when it came to the discrepancy scores, and they were not significantly different when it came to Heterosexism ideals or experiences.

The goal of this chapter was to build on the findings of the previous content chapter. As the previous chapter established, ideals and experiences often have a significant positive relationship with the outcome variables. Discrepancy, particularly Masculine Dominance and Physicality discrepancy, also has significant negative relationships with several outcome variables, especially as it relates to measures representing misogyny. Clusters 2 and 3 support this finding. Looking at discrepancy alone, Cluster 3 had the greatest negative discrepancy, and was associated with the highest level of endorsement of all outcome scales. In contrast, Cluster 2 had the greatest positive discrepancy and had the lowest level of endorsement of all outcome scales. Additionally, the previous chapter may also help to explain why Clusters 1 and 4 had fewer significant differences than Clusters 2 and 3 (or 1 and 2 or 1 and 3 or 2 and 4 or 3 and 4). Since clustering was conducted to attempt to analyze consistents, who I was unable to analyze in the previous chapter based on discrepancy alone, it is insightful in and of itself that the two consistent clusters (1 and 4) did not often significantly differ from one another, despite having different endorsements of ideals and experiences. This means consistent groups, when compared with discrepant groups, are less likely to significantly differ, lending support for the notion that

the presence of discrepancy does, in fact, impact males' endorsement of aggression and misogyny.

Conclusion:

In the previous content chapter, I examined relationships between masculine ideals and experiences and the outcomes of aggression and misogyny. I also created and validated a new scale to use for measuring masculine discrepancy. Using this scale, I was able to determine that masculine discrepancy has a negative relationship with the outcome variables, indicating that, the greater the *positive* discrepancy (where experiences surpass the ideals), the lower the endorsement of aggression and misogyny. This can also potentially be interpreted as, the greater the *negative* discrepancy (where ideals surpass experiences), the greater the endorsement of aggression and misogyny. However, this did not allow me to examine any potential differences between the two consistent categories (those whose ideals match their experiences).

Based on findings from the previous chapter regarding the relationships between ideals/experiences and outcome variables, I could predict what might be found in this chapter, which sought to examine differences between the two consistent groups. In most cases, both ideals and experiences had relationships with the outcome variables, though Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism were much less predictable than Masculine Dominance and Physicality (which consistently had positive relationships with outcomes for both ideals and experiences, apart from the negative relationship between Physicality ideals and ASI-B). Based on Masculine Dominance and Physicality pillars (which indicated the highest internal reliability when compared to Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism), I predicted that norm-favoring consistents (with high ideals and matching high experiences) would have greater endorsement of aggression and misogyny than norm-rejecting consistents (with low ideals and matching low experiences).

However, this chapter also explored exactly how males could separate into these groups by using cluster analysis – whether they would follow the hypothesized pattern, or if other "groupings" of males would occur.

In my original hypothesis, I expected to find four groups: norm-favoring discrepants (with negative discrepancy), norm-favoring consistents, norm-rejecting consistents, and norm-rejecting discrepants (with positive discrepancy). Informed by theory and the findings in the last chapter, I expected to find that the norm-favoring discrepants would have the highest endorsement of aggression and misogyny, with norm-rejecting discrepants having the lowest. I expected norm-favoring consistents to likely come in second, behind the norm-favoring discrepants, and norm-rejecting consistents to follow, again placing norm-rejecting discrepants in last, having the lowest endorsement of aggression and misogyny.

Upon conducting k-means clustering, I found that the four groups did not align exactly with the norm-rejecting/favoring and consistent/discrepant categorization as I had expected. While Cluster 2 (the Nonconforming Males) consisted of norm-rejecting discrepants (in that their experiences surpassed their ideals), their experiences were still often the lowest out of all categories. That is, they did not necessarily have low ideals, *high* experiences as much as they had low scores for both experiences and ideals, yet their experiences (despite being the lowest out of all four clusters) still managed to surpass their ideals. Similarly, Cluster 3 (the Precarious Males) had high ideals, which surpassed their experiences, resulting in negative discrepancy, and could thus be considered norm-favoring discrepants. Despite failing to match their ideals, their experiences were *also* often the greatest out of all four clusters. However, the presence and direction of the discrepancy (positive in the case of Cluster 2 and negative in the case of Cluster

3) was of greater interest than the levels of ideals/experiences, which have already been explored in previous empirical works.

The main finding of this chapter was actually in the lack of significant differences between the two consistent groups (Clusters 4 and 1). While Cluster 1 was frequently higher than average in their endorsements of both ideals and experiences, Cluster 4 was often lower than average (with the exception of Physicality ideals/experiences and Heterosexism experiences). While their endorsements of both ideals and experiences were frequently significantly different, their discrepancy scores were *never* significantly different. Similarly, while their Ambivalent Sexism Inventory subscale scores were significantly different, these was an exception to the pattern that reflected an overwhelming lack of significant differences. In fact, for outcome variables, the only other time clusters 4 and 1 differed significantly was in reference to BPAQ-P. This significant difference makes sense within the context of the Physicality scores – the main pillar where Cluster 4 surpassed Cluster 1.

In summary, the two consistent groups differed on every one of the ideal and experience pillars, with the exception of the Heterosexism pillars; however, they did *not* significantly differ as it related to any of the discrepancy pillars. So, despite the frequent significant differences between the ideals/experiences of the clusters, the fact that these clusters rarely differed in endorsement of outcome variables is telling. Discrepancy, it seems, is still the main predictor of the relationships (or lack thereof) with the outcome variables.

8. CONCLUSION:

Over the last two chapters I have attempted to answer my research questions focusing on theoretical, methodological, and empirical issues involving discrepancy. In summary, my questions were: How do ideals, experiences, and the discrepancy between the two impact males' endorsement of aggression and misogyny, net of control variables? Additionally, are there significant differences in endorsement of aggression and misogyny when comparing groups of males clustered around ideals and experiences, particularly as it relates to males whose experiences and ideals are aligned?

My hypotheses found general support. Masculine Discrepancy Stress, as well as masculine ideals and experiences, net of control variables, had significant positive relationships with the outcome variables of aggression and misogyny (hypothesis 2). Masculine Dominance and Physicality were particularly consistent in their relationships, while Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism were more difficult to predict (hypothesis 4). This could have been due to the comparatively lower internal reliability of the Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism pillars, or because anti-effeminacy and heterosexism play a smaller role in universally shaping modern masculinity. Masculine Dominance discrepancy had significant negative relationships, though typically only with the scales measuring misogyny – Hostility Toward Women (HTW) and the Hostile Sexism subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI-H), supporting hypotheses 3. However, as it related to ASI, Masculine Dominance discrepancy did not have significant relationship with the Benevolent sexism subscale, only, as noted, the Hostile Sexism subscale (ASI-H). Masculine Discrepancy *Stress* (MDS) *always* had significant positive relationships with the outcome variables (hypothesis 1), but did not always negate the significant relationships between ideals, experiences, discrepancy, cluster membership and the outcome variables. In

other words, these relationships were maintained even when using MDS as a control – including in discrepancy's relationships with the outcome variables. This indicates that the presence of discrepancy, itself, can have significant relationships with outcome variables, regardless of a male's concern over being seen as "not manly enough." This finding speaks to the impact the perception of discrepancy can have on males.

Finally, the cluster analysis indicated that males were not so easily clustered into norm-favoring/rejecting consistents/discrepants (rejecting hypothesis 5). While I did find two consistent clusters and two discrepant clusters (the latter finding both positive and negative discrepants), the two consistent clusters were not as clearly norm-favoring or norm-rejecting. While Cluster 1 was more likely to endorse Masculine Dominance and Heterosexism pillars, Cluster 4 was more likely to endorse Physicality and Anti-Effeminacy pillars. Despite these "consistent" (i.e. their discrepancy scores were close to 0) groups' differences in both ideals and experiences, they often only differed when it came to the ASI. Apart from one subscale of the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ), these two consistent groups did not differ in terms of aggression or MDS. The cluster analysis provided insight into hypothesis 5, which sought to explore how males may be grouped together based on their ideals and experiences. It also provided some support for hypothesis 6 in finding differences in the endorsement of the outcome variables of the norm-favoring discrepants and norm-rejecting discrepants in all cases, with the norm-favoring discrepants (represented by Cluster 3, the "Precarious Males") always having the *highest* outcome scores, with the norm-rejecting consistents (represented by Cluster 2, the "Nonconforming Males") always having the *lowest* outcome scores.

However, the cluster analysis also indicated a frequent lack of difference between the two consistent groups when it came to the outcome variables. That is, while I correctly predicted that

the norm-favoring discrepants would have the greatest endorsement of outcome variables and the norm-rejecting discrepants would have the lowest endorsement, the two consistent groups (norm-rejecting and norm-favoring) would be somewhere in the middle. While the cluster analysis did not find an exact "norm-favoring" vs. "norm-rejecting" as I had hypothesized, the regressions indicated that the two consistent groups (Cluster 1, the "Traditionalist Males" and Cluster 4, the "Stoic Males") were, in fact, often in the middle when it came to the outcome scores. Additionally, these two groups were also likely to be significantly different from both of the discrepant groups – significantly higher than the norm-rejecting discrepants (Cluster 2), and significantly lower than the norm-favoring discrepants (Cluster 3). However, these two consistent groups were the least likely to differ from *each other* when it came to the outcome variables. While Cluster 1 had significantly higher scores on both of the ASI subscales and Cluster 4 had significantly higher scores on the Physical Aggression subscale of the BPAQ, they did not significantly differ from each other when it came to any of the other outcome scales.

Some of the previous empirical work from the studies of masculinity found clear support in this dissertation's analyses of relationships between masculine ideals and experiences, and Masculine Discrepancy Stress and the outcomes, particularly as it related to Masculine Dominance and Physicality. However, the findings regarding Anti-Effeminacy go largely unexplained. Not only are the Anti-Effeminacy items some of the lowest scores, but relationships between Anti-Effeminacy and the outcome variables are, when significant, almost always negative. Additionally, there were no significant relationships between Anti-Effeminacy discrepancy and the outcomes. Finally, Cluster 3, the cluster with the significantly greater outcome scores when compared to the other clusters, was the group most likely to reject Anti-

Effeminacy experiences, and the second most likely to reject Anti-Effeminacy ideals. This indicates that these males would be most likely to express their emotions, ask for help, etc.

The somewhat consistent lack of significance between Anti-Effeminacy ideals, experiences, and discrepancy challenges our understanding of a sort of stoic masculinity, where men cannot express a particular form of vulnerability. Additionally, the several significant *negative* relationships between Anti-Effeminacy ideals/experiences and several of the outcome variables directly seems to contradict the notion that expressing emotions and asking for help will decrease aggression and misogyny. That is, in certain cases, endorsing notions that men can express their emotions and ask for help (in contrast with traditional masculine ideology) was actually related to an *increased* endorsement of several aggression/misogyny variables. If we consider these actions (expressing emotions, asking for help) as giving males to access a positive coping mechanism, this finding challenges not just a masculinity framework, but a general strain theory (GST) framework. While males may still have connections between strain and aggression, my original argument that masculine discrepancy represents each of the three components of strain no longer stands.

The negative relationships between discrepancy and the outcome variables offer another challenge to a GST framework. While identity control theory (ICT) offers the explanation that positive discrepancy would result in lower outcome scores in order to realign with the identity standard, GST struggles to explain this connection. Any discrepancy represents some form of distance from an individual's positively-valued goal. While a positive relationship between negative discrepancy and the outcome variables fits well within a GST framework, we are searching for an explanation for positive discrepancy's lower scores on the outcome variables. One explanation is that, while these males may not be meeting their own ideals, they are meeting

societal positively valued goals. Perhaps both of the norm-favoring groups (consistent or discrepant) see manhood status as the "expected outcome," but the norm-rejecting groups have no such expectation. In the two norm-rejecting groups' lack of interest in manhood status, they are not angered by their discrepancy in the same way that a norm-favoring discrepant is angered by failing to achieve the manhood status that society has promised him. That is, the norm-favoring discrepant has a particular expected outcome (resulting in anger when unachieved), while the norm-rejecting discrepant does not have this expected outcome, and is thus not angered when they are surpassing their masculine ideals.

Overall, the answer to the dissertation's questions is largely "it's complicated." While discrepancy does play a role in the endorsement of aggression and misogyny, it is not the only factor. With ideals, experiences, and MDS all having significant relationships with the outcomes, as well as often having relationships with each other, the answer is that each of these factors is part of a much larger picture. What is clear, however, is that masculinity does have a connection to aggression and misogyny. While there may not be a simple answer, this dissertation does offer insight into numerous connections between masculinity and the endorsement of aggression and misogyny. I look forward to continuing to examine this complex web of connections in research to come, but for now, this work contributes to the idea that discrepancy can be measured and should be captured in future research in order to more completely understand its relationship to modern masculine violence.

Limitations:

While this dissertation has significant and important findings, it is also crucial to acknowledge limitations and indicate how future research can seek to remedy those limitations. First, the sample did not fully reflect the general US population; the most significant differences were in

religion and political affiliation. While the US population is only approximately 1% Muslim, 14% of this sample identified as Muslim. Additionally, while less than 30% of Americans identified as Democrats in 2023 (Gallup 2024), a whopping 47% of these participants identified as Democrats. Future research should seek to utilize a population that more clearly reflects US demographics. These distinctions are important for generalizability. This dissertation claims to represent a snapshot of American men, but if particular groups are oversampled, the findings may be biased. This is particularly important to consider in light of the numerous significant relationships between the variables of interest and identifying as a Democrat.

Also, while those who missed both attention checks were discarded, I decided to include participants who only missed one attention check. With the length of the survey being over 100 questions, it seemed feasible that a participant could be both attentive, while also making a mistake. However, those who missed an attention check and finished the survey in a borderline-impossible amount of time (the fastest 10% of participants, who averaged around 3 seconds per question) were also discarded. There were two rounds of fielding, with the goal of the second round to replace poor responses from the first round. Poor responses were then dropped from that second round and remained unreplaced, leaving me with 960 usable responses.

While I could have used these 960 responses, my final limitation involved a methodological decision to drop participants who missed any question in the variables of interest. I chose to remove any participant who did not answer one or more of the questions used in the regressions, even when utilizing dichotomous versions. Instead, I wanted to rely only on the participants' responses, saving analyses with imputation for a future project. This further reduced my sample size from 960 responses to 705 responses. Additionally, it prevented me from running any regressions with any pornography or sexual history questions, as well as

questions about membership in male-dominated groups, such as fraternities or the military. These questions were frequently skipped and including them in the regression analysis would have meant having to drop any participant who had not answered these questions. In fact, including all four questions regarding pornography and sex (frequency of pornography consumption, age when a participant first started watching pornography, age when a participant had sex for the first time, and number of sexual partners) would have reduced my analytical sample by almost 200 participants.

Future research should first attempt to address these limitations as well as further explore unexpected results. In particular, an examination of Anti-Effeminacy should be a priority. Not only was the result unexpected, but the fact that this pillar included *only* reverse-coded items means we should interpret the findings with caution. Additionally, while the Cronbach's Alpha was acceptable, it teetered on the edge of being unacceptable. If the finding stands with further tests, Anti-Effeminacy's surprisingly low scores could represent a shift in masculinity. The Heterosexism pillar, which had unpredictable relationships and a poor Cronbach's Alpha, should also be reexamined in future studies.

The final point for this section is perhaps just a caveat instead of a limitation. My dissertation survey had over 100 questions in total. Between the demographics and numerous scales and subscales, it would be unrealistic to attempt to examine every complicated relationship, correlation, etc. in any one manuscript alone. I must concede that there are undoubtedly countless interactions I have not yet considered; however, this dissertation tested the ones that were supported by specific theoretical frameworks. Comparing scores across demographic groups would undoubtedly prove insightful, and it would be a disservice to provide only a cursory glance instead of saving these comparisons for future research. In addition, I

would like to further examine the cluster analysis, particularly as it relates to the consistent Clusters (1 and 4). While Cluster 4 did not significantly differ from Cluster 1 in the HTW scale, Cluster 4 *did* have significantly lower scores than Cluster 4 on the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI. This and some of the other various similarities/differences between the pillars warrant further investigation. I would also be interested in exploring if discrepancy and MDS interact to have a differing effect on the outcome variables. For instance, does MDS have a larger effect on aggression as discrepancy increases?

Final Thoughts:

In this dissertation, I set out to answer the questions: does the discrepancy between masculine ideals and their related experiences impact males' endorsement of aggression and misogyny? The difficult answer is "it depends." While Masculine Dominance and Physicality discrepancy often had significant negative relationships with misogyny scales, Heterosexism had negative relationships with all scales, indicating that the answer is not as simple as "yes" or "no." This indicates that certain pillars have unique relationships with the other variables of interest or, sometimes, no relationship at all. This is also highlighted in the different pillars' relationships between ideals/experiences and the outcomes. While Masculine Dominance and Physicality consistently had significant positive relationships, Anti-Effeminacy and Heterosexism sometimes had significant negative relationships with the outcome variables.

The goal of this dissertation is to add to a growing body of literature examining masculinity, particularly by filling the gap in empirical work on discrepancy. Additionally, this dissertation contributes to ICT and GST by providing empirical tests of theorized relationships. While ICT helps explain the negative relationships between discrepancy and the outcome variables, the application of GST to masculinity is complicated. Males who have positive

discrepancy are distant from their own "goals" (ideals), and thus, according to GST, should have higher endorsement of aggression. However, the aggression subscales only had significant relationships with Heterosexism discrepancy, failing to support GST's prediction of heightened aggression.

At the beginning of my literature review, I pose several questions to be answered: how have we come to understand gender now? And by extension, how have we come to understand masculinity? How does masculinity impact males on an individual level? How does masculinity impact males and others at the interactional level? How is society impacted by expectations of masculinity? Overall, my participants' averages on masculine ideals were below a 4, which marks the median of "neither agree nor disagree." In particular, they agreed with the reverse-coded questions about expressing emotion and asking for help. This was in contrast with the idea that men must be emotionless and view asking for help as a sign of weakness. However, the items that scored the highest (though still close to or just above an average of 4) were paternalistic notions of masculinity and gender roles. That is, males still at least slightly endorsed the notion that a man should be the breadwinner, make the major decisions, and take risks. While the original Hypersexual questions were joined with the Physical Violence pillars by factor analysis to create the Physicality pillar, males on average rejected many of these items. Items about fighting and frequently changing or having many sexual partners averaged scores lower than 3. While it seems that some (like Cluster 3) do still endorse a playboy conceptualization of manhood, these were mostly rejected.

This dissertation lends support to previous studies and understandings of masculinity in that endorsement of masculine ideals and/or experiences is related to the endorsement of aggression and/or misogyny, with the latter of the two seemingly having the more consistent

relationships. It also supports the overall hypothesis of this dissertation: masculine discrepancy also has relationships with misogyny, *and* these relationships are not entirely negated by Masculine Discrepancy Stress. That is, the very presence of discrepancy (either positive or negative) is related to hostility toward women, regardless of whether males feel worried about their masculinity and how that masculinity (or lack thereof) is viewed by others.

This dissertation indicates that males, on average, do not completely endorse traditional aspects of masculinity. However, they also do not completely reject them. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the answers trended towards "neither agree nor disagree" on average, and males were more likely to endorse items supporting paternalistic notions of masculinity: men should be the breadwinners through their "manly" jobs, and they should make the important decisions. These items also were key to the Masculine Dominance pillar, which also included items such as "a man, not a woman, should be the boss or supervisor at the workplace" and "A man should generally have control over the women in his life." As noted, males who endorsed these ideals had greater endorsement of all sexism scores, while those who endorsed Physicality ideals also had greater endorsement of misogyny (specifically through hostility toward women) *and* aggression. Those who endorsed greater Masculine Discrepancy experiences had higher outcome scores on every scale except the physical aggression subscale of the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire. This is in contrast with the endorsement of Masculine Dominance ideals which only found significant relationships with the sexism scales and masculine discrepancy stress.

What this dissertation also does is add yet another layer of nuance to the already complicated conceptualization of masculinity. Again, the most surprising finding was that Anti-Effeminacy items were often some of the least-endorsed statements. Emotional restriction and/or

inexpressiveness were part of many masculinity scales I first examined when beginning this dissertation. In fact, much of the dissertation's literature review focuses on the potential repercussions of males experiencing the pressure of repressing their emotions. As it related to GST, I argued that we may consider the inability to express emotions as the "removal of positive stimuli." It could be (and has been) hypothesized that male aggression and violence are a result of concealing any emotions outside of anger. If we are to believe that anger is the only "safe" emotion males allow themselves to feel for fear of having their masculinity penalized, what does it mean if the modern man claims to no longer be restricted by this pillar?

While there have been emerging nonprofits and a general social movement challenging toxic masculinity by promoting "healthy" masculinity, the question remains – what is "healthy" masculinity? With much of social psychological theory's focusing on emotional restraint, the realm of masculinity and men's studies are left on shaky ground when we are faced with these implications: As the relationship between Cluster 3 (the Precarious Males) and the outcome variables indicate, embracing emotions, talking about their problems, and expressing love for others does not completely negate other negative aspects of masculinity. While there may be jokes about telling men to "just go to therapy" in response to toxic masculinity, we can see that the most "toxic" of men (such as Cluster 3) may certainly talk about their emotions while still maintaining heightened endorsement of Masculine Dominance and Physicality, as well as the greatest endorsement of *all* outcome variables.

This historical shift related to Anti-Effeminacy may seem surprising at first, but is not impossible when we consider hegemonic masculinity's demand that masculinity be malleable. While some talking heads and masculinity-based grifters may decry the disappearance of "real men," it is clear that patriarchy is still alive and well. This dissertation lends support to the idea

that patriarchy *does* allow for shifts away from what may be considered "traditional" masculinity. Despite these shifts, we can clearly see that the other aspects of masculinity – domination (especially sexual) over women, and physical domination over other men—remain. Likewise, rejecting Anti-Effeminacy *also* does not preclude endorsing aggression and misogyny.

Perhaps this acceptance of the "vulnerability" aspects of Anti-Effeminacy, like acceptance of emotions, is in line with a "new" masculinity – one that not only embraces emotions, but may weaponize them. In the same way 4chan attempted to weaponize feminism, though unsurprisingly without any success (Alfonso III 2014), therapy-speak can be manipulated to create a seemingly more "vulnerable," though certainly no less toxic, type of person (Waldman 2021), especially within the context of relationships (Aponte 2023). Suddenly, controlling behavior becomes "setting boundaries" (Thomas 2023). This is not exactly any revelation, but it does lend support for the notion that hybrid masculinities do *not* undermine gender inequality (Bridges and Pascoe 2018), and can simply be the evolving face of patriarchy, making it harder to observe and thus potentially with less mobilization to dismantle. One suggestion for future research would be to include questions regarding emotional manipulation, such as weaponizing therapy-speak, guilt-tripping, gaslighting, love bombing, etc.

In actuality, hybrid masculinities offer patriarchy and toxic masculinity a way to hide behind the guise of progress. This "progress," wherein nonhegemonic practices are incorporated into "new" masculinities, is superficial at best, and nefarious at worst. Indeed, "goldilocks masculinity," a type of hybrid masculinity where males tread carefully between being "too masculine" and being "too feminine" (Abelson 2019), is one example. Men have been allowed to express emotions in the past – however, those emotions were limited, ones such as anger and indignation (Manne 2020). If expressing more emotions allows males to achieve that "just right"

middle ground of goldilocks masculinity, then they do not have to make any substantive changes to other, perhaps more toxic aspects of masculinity. Recall that, while the Anti-Effeminacy pillar had lower support, the Masculine Dominance pillar held some of the items with the highest endorsement. Men, it seems, are now allowed to express emotions and ask for help. However, women's roles, according to these same males, are passive—their male partners should provide for the family and make the major decisions while the women do the household chores. While males rejected the idea that their sons should *not* be taught how to cook and clean and take care of children, they were still more accepting of the thought that women should be the ones doing the household chores.

As discussed, a shifting cultural masculine landscape is no real challenge to hegemonic masculinity; it simply makes it harder to observe. Since hegemony in general relies on influencing cultural norms to maintain a dominant group's power (in this case, men's power), it simply needs to incorporate the old masculine landscape into the new. The seemingly "progressive" celebrity, politician, academic, etc. may espouse feminist views while still enacting "quid pro quo" tactics or abusing power dynamics in their interactions with women. As any fan of the pop-punk music genre knows, a man can paint his nails and still abuse women at the same time. Allowing men to express emotions does not negate male domination. To quote a character only listed as "Corporate Man" in the recent Barbie film, "We're actually doing patriarchy very well…we're just better at hiding it" (Gerwig 2023). Superheroes may be allowed to cry on screen now, but that does not change the absolutely abysmal gender ratios of the U.S. government systems. Emotional restriction may have been part of a previous cultural norm that situated women as the illogical, emotion-ridden, oft-"hysterical" counterpart that, naturally, needed to be led by men; however, this dissertation reveals that endorsing the idea that men

should express emotions was actually related to increased endorsement of verbal aggression, hostility, and benevolent sexism.

While further analyses would certainly help continue to explain the endorsement of aggression and misogyny, there is only so much that can be done in one dissertation. Referring back to the quote in the introduction, I fear that further over-extension of my statistical "paintbrush" runs the risk of "making a mess of [the overall canvas]" (Manne 2018). This will undoubtedly require significant exploration in future work, which I look forward to continuing throughout my career. But for now, I remain satisfied with the answer that masculinity is, indeed, complicated. When we continue to limit ourselves to studying masculine ideals alone, discrepancy alone, or other factors alone, we are missing a much, *much* larger picture. And this picture, with its connections to misogyny, aggression, and violence, is an important one. While we cannot test every single potential factor in every single article, book, or publication, we must still at least consider these potential interactions. My dissertation, in its answer of "masculinity is complicated" simply argues for future research that is more expansive than the current research. Grandiose intentions aside, no one person can hope to fully examine every single complex relationship of which the web of masculinity is woven. We can only work to dismantle patriarchy by trying to better understand the features that uphold it, and by adding to this literature, I believe that, in perhaps the smallest of ways, my dissertation may contribute to this daunting, yet critically important effort.

CITATIONS

Aadahl, Sarah E. 2023."'I'm a Nice Guy; Why Won't These B*tches F*ck Me?' A Content Analysis of Incel Rhetoric of Victimization and Entitlement." Presented at the Eastern Sociological Society Annual Conference, February 25, Baltimore, MD.

Agnew, Robert. 1992. "Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 30(1):47–88. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01093.x.

Agnew, Robert. 2001. "Building on the Foundation of General Strain Theory: Specifying the Types of Strain Most Likely to Lead to Crime and Delinquency." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38(4):319–61. doi: 10.1177/0022427801038004001.

Agnew, Robert. 2010. "A General Strain Theory of Terrorism." *Theoretical Criminology* 14(2):131–53. doi: 10.1177/1362480609350163.

Alfonso III, Fernando. 2014. "What Is the Fourth Wave of Feminism and What Does 4chan Have to Do with It?" *Daily Dot*. Retrieved (https://www.dailydot.com/unclick/4chan-fourth-wave-feminism/).

Amato, Felix J. 2006. "Understanding Male Violence Using Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms: A Forensic Sample." Ph.D., Boston College, United States -- Massachusetts.

Amato, Felix J. 2012. "The Relationship of Violence to Gender Role Conflict and Conformity to Masculine Norms in a Forensic Sample." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 20(3):187–208. doi: 10.3149/jms.2003.187.

Amato, Felix, and John Macdonald. 2011. "Examining Risk Factors for Homeless Men: Gender Role Conflict, Help-Seeking Behaviors, Substance Abuse and Violence." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 19(3):227–35. doi: 10.3149/jms.1903.227.

Anderson, Patricia. 2012. "Measuring Masculinity in an Afro-Caribbean Context." *Social and Economic Studies* 61(1):49–93.

Aponte, Catherine. 2023. "Are You 'Weaponizing' Mental Health Terminology?" *Psychology Today,* August 28.

Arciniega, G. Miguel, Thomas C. Anderson, Zoila G. Tovar-Blank, and Terence J. G. Tracey. 2008. "Toward a Fuller Conception of Machismo: Development of a Traditional Machismo and Caballerismo Scale." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 55(1):19–33. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.19.

Beauchamp, Zack. 2019. "Our Incel Problem: How a Support Group for the Dateless Became One of the Internet's Most Dangerous Subcultures." *Vox*.

Beauvoir, Simone De, and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. 1949. *The Second Sex*. Place of publication not identified: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Bem, Sandra L. 1974. "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42(2):155–62.

Bingham, Trista A., Nina T. Harawa, and John K. Williams. 2013. "Gender Role Conflict Among African American Men Who Have Sex With Men and Women: Associations With Mental Health and Sexual Risk and Disclosure Behaviors." *American Journal of Public Health* 103(1):127–33. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2012.300855.

Blazina, Chris, and C. Edward Watkins. 1996. "Masculine Gender Role Conflict: Effects on College Men's Psychological Weil-Being, Chemical Substance Usage, and Attitudes Toward Help-Seeking." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 43(4):461–65.

Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bosson, Jennifer K., and Joseph A. Vandello. 2011. "Precarious Manhood and Its Links to Action and Aggression." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 20(2):82–86. doi: 10.1177/0963721411402669.

Bosson, Jennifer K., Joseph A. Vandello, Rochelle M. Burnaford, Jonathan R. Weaver, and S. Arzu Wasti. 2009. "Precarious Manhood and Displays of Physical Aggression." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 35(5):623–34. doi: 10.1177/0146167208331161.

Brannon, Robert, and Samuel Juni. 1984. "A Scale for Measuring Attitudes about Masculinity." *Psychological Documents* 14 (Doc.# 2612).

Breiding, Matthew J. 2004. "Observed Hostility and Dominance as Mediators of the Relationship Between Husbands' Gender Role Conflict and Wives' Outcomes." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 51(4):429–36. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.51.4.429.

Breiding, Matthew J., Chaunce R. Windle, and David A. Smith. 2008. "Interspousal Criticism: A Behavioral Mediator Between Husbands' Gender Role Conflict and Wives' Adjustment." *Sex Roles* 59(11–12):880–88. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9491-6.

Brezina, Timothy. 2017. "General Strain Theory." in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Oxford University Press.

Bridges, Tristan, and C. J. Pascoe. 2018. "13. On the Elasticity of Gender Hegemony: Why Hybrid Masculinities Fail to Undermine Gender and Sexual Inequality." Pp. 254–74 in *Gender Reckonings*, edited by J. W. Messerschmidt, M. A. Messner, R. Connell, and P. Y. Martin. New York University Press.

Brod, Harry, ed. 1987. *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Abingdon, Oxon New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Broidy, Lisa, and Robert Agnew. 1997. “Gender and Crime: A General Strain Theory Perspective.” *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34(3):275–306. doi: 10.1177/0022427897034003001.

Brooks, Gary R., and William B. Elder. 2016. “History and Future of the Psychology of Men and Masculinities.” Pp. 3–21 in *APA handbook of men and masculinities.*, edited by Y. J. Wong and S. R. Wester. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Brueck, Hilary, and Shana Lebowitz. 2019. “The Men behind the US’s Deadliest Mass Shootings Have Domestic Violence — Not Mental Illness — in Common.” *Business Insider*.

Bryant, Fred B., and Bruce D. Smith. 2001. “Refining the Architecture of Aggression: A Measurement Model for the Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire.” *Journal of Research in Personality* 35(2):138–67. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.2000.2302.

Burke, Peter J., and Jan E. Stets. 2023. *Identity Theory: Revised and Expanded*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buss, Arnold H., and Ann Durkee. 1957. “An Inventory for Assessing Different Kinds of Hostility.” *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 21(4):343–49. doi: 10.1037/h0046900.

Buss, Arnold H., and Mark Perry. 1992. “The Aggression Questionnaire.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 63(3):452–59. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.63.3.452.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Campbell, James L., and Brent M. Snow. 1992. “Gender Role Conflict and Family Environment as Predictors of Men’s Marital Satisfaction.” *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 6(1):84–87.

Carter, Michael. 2014. “Gender Socialization and Identity Theory.” *Social Sciences* 3(2):242–63. doi: 10.3390/socsci3020242.

Catalano, Shannan, Erica Smith, Howard Snyder, and Michael Rand. 2009. “Female Victims of Violence.”

Chase, Lorraine Alexander. 2000. “Gender Role Conflict and the Level of Physical Violence: A Study of Physically Abusive Men.” D.S.W., The Catholic University of America, United States -- District of Columbia.

Check, James V. P., Neil M. Malamuth, Barbara Elias, and Susan A. Barton. 1985. “On Hostile Ground.” *Psychology Today* 19(4):56–61.

Cheng, Diana, and Isabelle L. Horon. 2010. “Intimate-Partner Homicide Among Pregnant and Postpartum Women.” *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 115(6):1181–86. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0b013e3181de0194.

Choi, Heecheol, Ji-Hyeon Kim, Mae-Hyang Hwang, and Mary J. Heppner. 2010. “Self-Esteem as a Mediator Between Instrumentality, Gender Role Conflict and Depression in Male Korean High School Students.” *Sex Roles* 63(5–6):361–72. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9801-7.

Chu, Judy Y., Michelle V. Porche, and Deborah L. Tolman. 2005. “The Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale: Development and Validation of a New Measure for Boys.” *Men and Masculinities* 8(1):93–115. doi: 10.1177/1097184X03257453.

Cint. 2024. “Cint Quality Charter.” *Cint*. Retrieved (https://www.cint.com/quality).

Cohen, Dov, Richard E. Nisbett, Brian E. Bowdle, and Norbert Schwarz. 1996. “Insult, Aggression, and the Southern Culture of Honor: An ‘Experimental Ethnography.’” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70(5):945–60.

Cohen, Dov, Joseph Vandello, Sylvia Puente, and Adrian Rantilla. 1999. “‘When You Call Me That, Smile!’ How Norms for Politeness, Interaction Styles, and Aggression Work Together in Southern Culture.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 62(3):257. doi: 10.2307/2695863.

Cohn, Amy, and Amos Zeichner. 2006. “Effects of Masculine Identity and Gender Role Stress on Aggression in Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 7(4):179–90. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.7.4.179.

Connell, R. W. 2005. *Masculinities*. 2nd ed. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. “Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept.” *Gender & Society* 19(6):829–59. doi: 10.1177/0891243205278639.

Connell, Raewyn. 2018. “Conclusion: Reckoning with Gender.” in *Gender reckonings: new social theory and research*, edited by J. W. Messerschmidt, P. Y. Martin, and M. A. Messner. New York: New York University Press.

Connell, Raewyn W. 2014. *Gender and Power Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. 1., Auflage. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Cooper, Alexia, and Erica J. Smith. 2011. *Homicide Trends in the United States, 1980-2008*. NCJ 236018. U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Cournoyer, Robert J., and James R. Mahalik. 1995. “Cross-Sectional Study of Gender Role Conflict Examining College-Aged and Middle-Aged Men.” *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 9.

Covell, Andrea. 1998. “Characteristics of College Males Who Are Likely to Sexually Harass Women: A Test of a Mediated Model.” Ph.D., University of Southern California, United States -- California.

Cowan, Gloria, and Renee D. Mills. 2004. “Personal Inadequacy and Intimacy Predictors of Men’s Hostility Toward Women.” *Sex Roles* 51(1/2):67–78. doi: 10.1023/B:SERS.0000032310.16273.da.

David, Deborah Sarah, and Robert Brannon, eds. 1976. *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role*. First edition. New York: Random House.

Davis, Jason M., and Christopher T. H. Liang. 2015. “A Test of the Mediating Role of Gender Role Conflict: Latino Masculinities and Help-Seeking Attitudes.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 16(1):23–32. doi: 10.1037/a0035320.

Davis, Shannon N. 2017. “Bem Sex-Role Inventory.” *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

Davis, Tracy Lee. 1997. “The Effectiveness of a Sex Role Socialization-Focused Date Rape Prevention Program in Reducing Rape-Supportive Attitudes in College Fraternity Men.” Ph.D., The University of Iowa, United States -- Iowa.

De Coster, Stacy, and Rena Cornell Zito. 2010. “Gender and General Strain Theory: The Gendering of Emotional Experiences and Expressions.” *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 26(2):224–45. doi: 10.1177/1043986209359853.

DeFranc, William, and James R. Mahalik. 2002. “Masculine Gender Role Conflict and Stress in Relation to Parental Attachment and Separation.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 3(1):51–60. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.3.1.51.

Diamond, Pamela M., and Philip R. Magaletta. 2006. “The Short-Form Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ-SF): A Validation Study With Federal Offenders.” *Assessment* 13(3):227–40. doi: 10.1177/1073191106287666.

Doss, Brian D., and J. Roy Hopkins. 1998. “The Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale: Validation from Three Cultural Perspectives.” *Sex Roles* 38.

Eisler, Richard M., Jay R. Skidmore, and Clay H. Ward. 1988. “Masculine Gender-Role Stress: Predictor of Anger, Anxiety, and Health Risk Behaviors.” *Journal of Personality Assessment* 58(1):133–41.

Eriksson, Li, and Paul Mazerolle. 2013. “A General Strain Theory of Intimate Partner Homicide.” *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 18(5):462–70. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.002.

FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Division. 2019. *Crime in the United States, 2019*. United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Fenstermaker, Sarah, and Candace West, eds. 2002. *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change*. New York: Routledge.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2018. “1: ‘Theories Don’t Grow on Trees;’ Contextualizing Gender Knowledge.” in *Gender reckonings: new social theory and research*, edited by J. W.

Messerschmidt, P. Y. Martin, and M. A. Messner. New York: New York University Press.

Fischer, Ann R. 2007. “Parental Relationship Quality and Masculine Gender-Role Strain in Young Men: Mediating Effects of Personality.” *The Counseling Psychologist* 35(2):328–58. doi: 10.1177/0011000005283394.

Fischer, Ann R., and Glenn E. Good. 1998. “Perceptions of Parent-Child Relationships and Masculine Role Conflicts of College Men.” *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 45:346–52.

Fischer, Ann R., David M. Tokar, Glenn E. Good, and Andrea F. Snell. 1998. “More on The Structure of Male Role Norms: Exploratory and Multiple Sample Confirmatory Analyses.” *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 22(2):135–55. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00147.x.

Fragoso, Jose M., and Susan Kashubeck. 2000. “Machismo, Gender Role Conflict, and Mental Health in Mexican American Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 1(2):87–97. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.1.2.87.

Franchina, Joseph J., Richard M. Eisler, and Todd M. Moore. 2001. “Masculine Gender Role Stress and Intimate Abuse: Effects of Masculine Gender Relevance of Dating Situations and Female Threat on Men’s Attributions and Affective Responses.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 2(1):34–41. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.2.1.34.

Gallup. 2024. “Party Affiliation.”

Gerwig, Greta, dir. 2023. *Barbie*. Warner Bros. Pictures.

Glick, Peter, and Susan T. Fiske. 1997. “Hostile and Benevolent Sexism: Measuring Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes Toward Women.” *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21(1):119–35. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x.

Glick, Peter, and Jessica Whitehead. 2010. “Hostility Toward Men and the Perceived Stability of Male Dominance.” *Social Psychology* 41(3):177–85. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000025.

Glomb, Stephen M., and Dorothy L. Espelage. 2005. “The Influence of Restrictive Emotionality in Men’s Emotional Appraisal of Sexual Harassment: A Gender Role Interpretation.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 6(4):240–53. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.4.240.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Woodstock, New York: The Overlook Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*. London: Allen Lane.

Good, Glenn E., Don M. Dell, and Laurie B. Mintz. 1989. “Male Role and Gender Role Conflict: Relations to Help Seeking in Men.” 36(3):295–300.

Good, Glenn E., John M. Robertson, James M. O'Neil, Louise F. Fitzgerald, Mark Stevens, Kurt A. DeBord, Kim M. Bartels, and David G. Braverman. 1995. "Male Gender Role Conflict: Psychometric Issues and Relations to Psychological Distress." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 42(1):3–10.

Good, Glenn E., Laura H. Schopp, Doug Thomson, Stefani Hathaway, Tiffany Sanford-Martens, Micah O. Mazurek, and Laurie B. Mintz. 2006. "Masculine Roles and Rehabilitation Outcomes among Men Recovering from Serious Injuries." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 7(3):165–76. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.7.3.165.

Graef, Stephen T., David M. Tokar, and Kevin P. Kaut. 2010. "Relations of Masculinity Ideology, Conformity to Masculine Role Norms, and Masculine Gender Role Conflict to Men's Attitudes toward and Willingness to Seek Career Counseling." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 11(4):319–33. doi: 10.1037/a0019383.

Grimmell, Derek. 1998. "Effects of Gender-Role Self-Discrepancy on Depressed Mood." *Sex Roles* 39(314).

Grimmell, Derek, and Gary S. Stern. 1992. "The Relationship between Gender Role Ideals and Psychological Well-Being." *Sex Roles* 27(9–10):487–97. doi: 10.1007/BF00290005.

Groeschel, Brian L., Stephen R. Wester, and Sonya K. Sedivy. 2010. "Gender Role Conflict, Alcohol, and Help Seeking among College Men." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 11(2):123–39. doi: 10.1037/a0018365.

Harnishfeger, Brady Richard. 1998. "The Relationship of Gender Role Conflict to Male College Students' Receipt and Use of Violence in Heterosexual Dating Relationships." Ph.D., Western Michigan University, United States -- Michigan.

Hayes, Jeffrey A., and James R. Mahalik. 2000. "Gender Role Conflict and Psychological Distress in Male Counseling Center Clients." 10.

Heesacker, Martin, Stephen R. Wester, David L. Vogel, Jeffrey T. Wentzel, Cristina M. Mejia-Millan, and Carl Robert Goodholm. 1999. "Gender-Based Emotional Stereotyping." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 14.

Heilman, Brian, Gary Barker, and Alexander Harrison. 2017. *The Man Box: A Study on Being a Young Man in the US, UK, and Mexico*. Washington, DC and London: Promundo - US and Unilever.

Hill, Amber L., Elizabeth Miller, Galen E. Switzer, Lan Yu, Brian Heilman, Ruti G. Levtov, Kristina Vlahovicova, Dorothy L. Espelage, Gary Barker, and Robert W. S. Coulter. 2020. "Harmful Masculinities among Younger Men in Three Countries: Psychometric Study of the Man Box Scale." *Preventive Medicine* 139:106185. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106185.

Hill, Melanie S., and Ann R. Fischer. 2001. "Does Entitlement Mediate the Link Between Masculinity and Rape-Related Variables?" *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 48(1):12.

Hobza, Cody L., and Aaron B. Rochlen. 2009. “Gender Role Conflict, Drive for Muscularity, and the Impact of Ideal Media Portrayals on Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 10(2):120–30. doi: 10.1037/a0015040.

hooks, bell. 2005. *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity, and Love*. 1. paperback edition. New York London Toronto Sydney: Washington Square Press.

Jacobs, Jeffrey Ronald. 1996. “Psychological and Demographic Correlates of Men’s Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Sexual Harassment.” Ph.D., University of Southern California, United States -- California.

Jakupcak, Matthew, David Lisak, and Lizabeth Roemer. 2002. “The Role of Masculine Ideology and Masculine Gender Role Stress in Men’s Perpetration of Relationship Violence.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 3(2):97–106. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.97.

Johnston, CL. 2005. “An Examination of Gender Role Conflict among Male Forensic Inpatients.” *Clinical Research Project, Argosy University, Phoenix, Arizona*.

Kaplan, R., JM O’Neil, and S. Owen. 1993. “Sexist, Normative, and Progressive Masculinity and Sexual Assault: Empirical Research.”

Kaplan, Randy Scott. 1992. “Normative Masculinity and Sexual Aggression among College Males.” ProQuest Information & Learning, US.

Kassing, Leslee R., Denise Beesley, and Lisa L. Frey. 2005. “Gender Role Conflict, Homophobia, Age, and Education as Predictors of Male Rape Myth Acceptance.” *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 27(4):311–28. doi: 10.17744/mehc.27.4.9wfm24f52kqgav37.

Kearney, Lisa K., Aaron B. Rochlen, and Eden B. King. 2004. “Male Gender Role Conflict, Sexual Harassment Tolerance, and the Efficacy of a Psychoeducative Training Program.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 5(1):72–82. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.1.72.

Kilmartin, Christopher, and Ryon C. McDermott. 2016. “Violence and Masculinities.” Pp. 615–36 in *APA handbook of men and masculinities.*, edited by Y. J. Wong and S. R. Wester. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Kivel, Paul. 1998. *Men’s Work: How to Stop the Violence That Tears Our Lives Apart*. Center City, Minnesota: Hazelden.

Lerner, Gerda. 1986. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Levant, Ronald F., and Jeffrey Fischer. 1998. “The Male Role Norms Inventory.” *Sexuality-Related Measures: A Compendium* 2:469–72.

Levant, Ronald F., Stephen T. Graef, K. Bryant Smalley, Christine Williams, and Neil McMillan. 2008. “Evaluation of the Psychometric Properties of the Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent (MRNI-A).” *Boyhood Studies* 2(1). doi: 10.3149/thy.0201.46.

Levant, Ronald F., Rosalie J. Hall, and Thomas J. Rankin. 2013. “Male Role Norms Inventory–Short Form (MRNI-SF): Development, Confirmatory Factor Analytic Investigation of Structure, and Measurement Invariance across Gender.” *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 60(2):228–38. doi: 10.1037/a0031545.

Levant, Ronald F., Linda S. Hirsch, Elizabeth Celentano, and Tracy M. Cozza. 1992. “The Male Role: An Investigation of Contemporary Norms.” *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*.

Levant, Ronald F., and William S. Pollack, eds. 1995. *A New Psychology of Men*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Liang, Christopher T. H., Jime Salcedo, and Holly A. Miller. 2011. “Perceived Racism, Masculinity Ideologies, and Gender Role Conflict among Latino Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 12(3):201–15. doi: 10.1037/a0020479.

Liu, William Ming, Aaron Rochlen, and Jonathan J. Mohr. 2005. “Real and Ideal Gender-Role Conflict: Exploring Psychological Distress Among Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 6(2):137–48. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.2.137.

Lonsway, Kimberly A., and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1995. “Attitudinal Antecedents of Rape Myth Acceptance: A Theoretical and Empirical Reexamination.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68(4):704–11.

Madfis, Eric. 2014. “Triple Entitlement and Homicidal Anger: An Exploration of the Intersectional Identities of American Mass Murderers.” *Men and Masculinities* 17(1):67–86. doi: 10.1177/1097184X14523432.

Magovcevic, Mariola, and Michael E. Addis. 2005. “Linking Gender-Role Conflict to Nonnormative and Self-Stigmatizing Perceptions of Alcohol Abuse and Depression.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 6(2):127–36. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.2.127.

Mahalik, James R., Etiony Aldarondo, Steven Gilbert-Gokhale, and Erika Shore. 2005. “The Role of Insecure Attachment and Gender Role Stress in Predicting Controlling Behaviors in Men Who Batter.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20(5):617–31. doi: 10.1177/0886260504269688.

Mahalik, James R., Benjamin D. Locke, Larry H. Ludlow, Matthew A. Diemer, Ryan P. J. Scott, Michael Gottfried, and Gary Freitas. 2003. “Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 4(1):3–25. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3.

Mahalik, James R., Benjamin D. Locke, Harry Theodore, Robert J. Cournoyer, and Brendan F. Lloyd. 2001. “A Cross-National and Cross-Sectional Comparison of Men’s Gender Role Conflict and Its Relationship to Social Intimacy and Self-Esteem.” *Sex Roles* 14.

Manne, Kate. 2018. *Down Girl: The Logic of Misogyny*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Manne, Kate. 2020. *Entitled*. First edition. New York: Crown.

Mansfield, Abigail K., Michael E. Addis, and Will Courtenay. 2005. "Measurement of Men's Help Seeking: Development and Evaluation of the Barriers to Help Seeking Scale." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 6(2):95–108. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.2.95.

McCarthy, Katharine J., Ruchi Mehta, and Nicole A. Haberland. 2018. "Gender, Power, and Violence: A Systematic Review of Measures and Their Association with Male Perpetration of IPV" edited by A. R. Dalby. *PLOS ONE* 13(11):e0207091. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0207091.

McCulloch, Jude, Sandra Walklate, JaneMaree Maher, Kate Fitz-Gibbon, and Jasmine McGowan. 2019. "Lone Wolf Terrorism Through a Gendered Lens: Men Turning Violent or Violent Men Behaving Violently?" *Critical Criminology* 27(3):437–50. doi: 10.1007/s10612-019-09457-5.

McDermott, Ryon C., and Frederick G. Lopez. 2013. "College Men's Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes: Contributions of Adult Attachment and Gender Role Stress." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 60(1):127–36. doi: 10.1037/a0030353.

Mears, Daniel P., Melissa M. Moon, and Angela J. Thielo. 2017. "Columbine Revisited: Myths and Realities About the Bullying–School Shootings Connection." *Victims & Offenders* 12(6):939–55. doi: 10.1080/15564886.2017.1307295.

Merton, Robert. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review* 3:672–82.

Monk, Debra, and Lina A. Ricciardelli. 2003. "Three Dimensions of the Male Gender Role as Correlates of Alcohol and Cannabis Involvement in Young Australian Men." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 4(1):57–69. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.57.

Moore, Todd M., and Gregory L. Stuart. 2004. "Effects of Masculine Gender Role Stress on Men's Cognitive, Affective, Physiological, and Aggressive Responses to Intimate Conflict Situations." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 5(2):132–42. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.132.

Moore, Todd M., Gregory L. Stuart, James K. McNulty, Michael E. Addis, James V. Cordova, and Jeff R. Temple. 2008. "Domains of Masculine Gender Role Stress and Intimate Partner Violence in a Clinical Sample of Violent Men." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 9(2):82–89. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.9.2.82.

Naffine, Ngaire. 1987. *Female Crime: The Construction of Women in Criminology*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

O'Neil, James M. 2008. "Summarizing 25 Years of Research on Men's Gender Role Conflict Using the Gender Role Conflict Scale: New Research Paradigms and Clinical Implications." *The Counseling Psychologist* 36(3):358–445. doi: 10.1177/0011000008317057.

O'Neil, James M., Barbara J. Helms, Robert K. Gable, Laurence David, and Lawrence S. Wrightsman. 1986. "Gender-Role Conflict Scale: College Men's Fear of Femininity." *Sex Roles* 14(5–6). doi: 10.1007/BF00287583.

Oransky, Matthew, and Celia Fisher. 2009. "The Development and Validation of the Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 10(1):57–72. doi: 10.1037/a0013612.

Parrott, Dominic J. 2008. "A Theoretical Framework for Antigay Aggression: Review of Established and Hypothesized Effects within the Context of the General Aggression Model." *Clinical Psychology Review* 28(6):933–51. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.02.001.

Parrott, Dominic J. 2009. "Aggression Toward Gay Men as Gender Role Enforcement: Effects of Male Role Norms, Sexual Prejudice, and Masculine Gender Role Stress." *Journal of Personality* 77(4):1137–66. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00577.x.

Parrott, Dominic J., John L. Peterson, and Roger Bakeman. 2011. "Determinants of Aggression toward Sexual Minorities in a Community Sample." *Psychology of Violence* 1(1):41–52. doi: 10.1037/a0021581.

Parsons, Talcott. 1954. *Essays in Sociological Theory*. Free Press.

Parti, Katalin, and Thomas Dearden. 2024. "Cybercrime and Strain Theory: An Examination of Online Crime and Gender." *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology* 13:211–26. doi: 10.6000/1929-4409.2024.13.19.

Pascoe, C. J. 2007. *Dude, You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Peterson, Jillian, and James Densley. 2021. *Mass Shooter Database*. The Violence Project.

Pleck, Joseph H. 1981. *The Myth of Masculinity*. 3. print. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Pleck, Joseph H. 1995. "The Gender Role Strain Paradigm: An Update." Pp. 11–32 in *A new psychology of men*, edited by R. F. Levant and W. S. Pollack. Basic Books.

Pleck, Joseph H., Freya L. Sonenstein, and Leighton C. Ku. 1993. "Masculinity Ideology: Its Impact on Adolescent Males' Heterosexual Relationships." *Journal of Social Issues* 49(3):11–29. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01166.x.

Pleck, Joseph H., Freya L. Sonenstein, and Leighton C. Ku. 1994. "Attitudes toward Male Roles among Adolescent Males: A Discriminant Validity Analysis." *Sex Roles* 30(7–8):481–501. doi: 10.1007/BF01420798.

Rando, Robert A., James R. Rogers, and Christopher S. Brittan-Powell. 1998. "Gender Role Conflict and College Men's Sexually Aggressive Attitudes and Behavior." *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 20(4):359–69.

Reidy, Dennis E., Danielle S. Berke, Brittany Gentile, and Amos Zeichner. 2014. “Man Enough? Masculine Discrepancy Stress and Intimate Partner Violence.” *Personality and Individual Differences* 68:160–64. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.021.

Risman, Barbara J., and Georgiann Davis. 2013. “From Sex Roles to Gender Structure.” *Current Sociology* 61(5–6):733–55. doi: 10.1177/0011392113479315.

Robertson, John M., and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1992. “Overcoming the Masculine Mystique: Preferences for Alternative Forms of Assistance Among Men Who Avoid Counseling.” *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 39(2):7.

Robinson, Dianne T., and Jonathan P. Schwartz. 2004. “Relationship Between Gender Role Conflict and Attitudes Toward Women and African Americans.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 5(1):65–71. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.1.65.

Robinson, Matthew A., and Melanie E. Brewster. 2014. “Motivations for Fatherhood: Examining Internalized Heterosexism and Gender-Role Conflict with Childless Gay and Bisexual Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 15(1):49–59. doi: 10.1037/a0031142.

Rochlen, Aaron B., and James R. Mahalik. 2004. “Women’s Perceptions of Male Partners’ Gender Role Conflict as Predictors of Psychological Well-Being and Relationship Satisfaction.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 5(2):147–57. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.147.

Rollero, Chiara, Elisa Bergagna, and Stefano Tartaglia. 2021. “What Is Violence? The Role of Sexism and Social Dominance Orientation in Recognizing Violence Against Women.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 36(21–22):NP11349–66. doi: 10.1177/0886260519888525.

Rollero, Chiara, Peter Glick, and Stefano Tartaglia. 2014. “Psychometric Properties of Short Versions of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory.” *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology* (1):149–59. doi: 10.4473/TPM21.2.3.

Rollero, Chiara, and Stefano Tartaglia. 2019. “The Effect of Sexism and Rape Myths on Victim Blame.” *Sexuality & Culture* 23(1):209–19. doi: 10.1007/s12119-018-9549-8.

Rottweiler, Bettina, Caitlin Clemmow, and Paul Gill. 2021. *Misogyny, Violent Extremism and Interpersonal Violence: Examining the Mediating and Contingent Effects of Revenge Motivation, Hypermasculinity, Collective Narcissism and Group Threats*. *preprint.* PsyArXiv. doi: 10.31234/osf.io/sy84m.

Rummell, Christina M., and Ronald F. Levant. 2014. “Masculine Gender Role Discrepancy Strain and Self-Esteem.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 15(4):419–26. doi: 10.1037/a0035304.

Şahan, Özlem Melike. 2020. “The Role of Masculinity/Femininity Discrepancy Stress and Ambivalent Sexism on Controlling Behaviors in Young Adult’s Romantic Relationship.” Masters Thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University, Gazimağusa, North Cyprus.

Salzinger, Leslie. 2003. *Genders in Production: Making Workers in Mexico’s Global Factories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sánchez, Francisco J., John S. Westefeld, William Ming Liu, and Eric Vilain. 2010. “Masculine Gender Role Conflict and Negative Feelings about Being Gay.” *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 41(2):104–11. doi: 10.1037/a0015805.

Saurer, M. Kaye, and Richard M. Eisler. 1990. “The Role of Masculine Gender Role Stress in Expressivity and Social Support Network Factors.” *Sex Roles* 23(5–6):261–71. doi: 10.1007/BF00290047.

Savage, Scott V., Jan E. Stets, Peter J. Burke, and Zachary L. Sommer. 2017. “Identity and Power Use in Exchange Networks.” *Sociological Perspectives* 60(3):510–28. doi: 10.1177/0731121416644788.

Schrock, Douglas, and Michael Schwalbe. 2009. “Men, Masculinity, and Manhood Acts.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 35(1):277–95. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115933.

Schwalbe, Michael. 2014. *Manhood Acts: Gender and the Practices of Domination*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Schwartz, J., M. Waldo, J. Bloom-Langell, and R. Merta. 1998. “Gender Role Conflict: Relationship to Spouse Abuse, Self-Esteem, Acculturation, and Intervention Group Outcome.”

Schwartz, Jonathan P., Michael Waldo, and David Daniel. 2005. “Gender-Role Conflict and Self-Esteem: Factors Associated With Partner Abuse in Court-Referred Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 6(2):109–13. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.2.109.

Schwartz, Jonathan P., Michael Waldo, and Anissa J. Higgins. 2004. “Attachment Styles: Relationship to Masculine Gender Role Conflict in College Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 5(2):143–46. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.143.

Senn, Charlene Y., Serge Desmarais, Norine Verberg, and Eileen Wood. 2000. “Predicting Coercive Sexual Behavior across the Lifespan in a Random Sample of Canadian Men.” *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 17(1):95–113.

Serna, George Steven. 2004. “The Confounding Role of Personality in the Relation to Gender Role Conflict and Substance Abuse and Sexual Aggression against Women.” Ph.D., The University of Akron, United States -- Ohio.

Shahid, Sharon, and Megan Duzor. 2021. “VOA Special Report: History of Mass Shooters.” *VOA News*, June 1.

Sharpe, Mark J., and P. Paul Heppner. 1991. “Gender Role, Gender-Role Conflict, and Psychological Weil-Being in Men.” *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 9.

Sharpe, Mark J., P. Paul Heppner, and Wayne A. Dixon. 1995. “Gender Role Conflict, Instrumentality, Expressiveness, and Well-Being in Adult Men.” *Sex Roles* 33(1–2):1–18. doi: 10.1007/BF01547932.

Shek, Yen Ling, and Marylu K. McEwen. 2012. “The Relationships of Racial Identity and Gender Role Conflict to Self-Esteem of Asian American Undergraduate Men.” *Journal of College Student Development* 53(5):703–18. doi: 10.1353/csd.2012.0065.

Shepard, David S. 2002. “A Negative State of Mind: Patterns of Depressive Symptoms among Men with High Gender Role Conflict.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 3(1):3–8. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.3.1.3.

Skoczylis, Joshua, and Sam Andrews. 2022. “Strain Theory, Resilience, and Far-Right Extremism: The Impact of Gender, Life Experiences and the Internet.” *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 15(1):143–68. doi: 10.1080/17539153.2022.2031137.

Sparks, Brandon, Alexandra M. Zidenberg, and Mark E. Olver. 2022. “Involuntary Celibacy: A Review of Incel Ideology and Experiences with Dating, Rejection, and Associated Mental Health and Emotional Sequelae.” *Current Psychiatry Reports* 24(12):731–40. doi: 10.1007/s11920-022-01382-9.

Steinfeldt, Jesse A., M. Clint Steinfeldt, Bre England, and Quentin L. Speight. 2009. “Gender Role Conflict and Stigma toward Help-Seeking among College Football Players.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 10(4):261–72. doi: 10.1037/a0017223.

Stets, Jan E., and Peter J. Burke. 2005. “New Directions in Identity Control Theory.” Pp. 43–64 in *Social Identification in Groups*. Vol. 22, *Advances in Group Processes*, edited by S. R. Thye and E. J. Lawler. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Stets, Jan E., and Peter J. Burke. 2014. “The Development of Identity Theory.” Pp. 57–97 in *Advances in Group Processes*. Vol. 31, edited by S. R. Thye and E. J. Lawler. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Stets, Jan E., and Michael J. Carter. 2011. “The Moral Self: Applying Identity Theory.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 74(2):192–215. doi: 10.1177/0190272511407621.

Szymanski, Dawn M., and Erika R. Carr. 2008. “The Roles of Gender Role Conflict and Internalized Heterosexism in Gay and Bisexual Men’s Psychological Distress: Testing Two Mediation Models.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 9(1):40–54. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.9.1.40.

Szymanski, Dawn M., and Ayse S. Ikizler. 2013. “Internalized Heterosexism as a Mediator in the Relationship between Gender Role Conflict, Heterosexist Discrimination, and Depression among Sexual Minority Men.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 14(2):211–19. doi: 10.1037/a0027787.

The Men's Project, and Michael Flood. 2018. *The Man Box: A Study on Being a Young Man in Australia*. Jesuit Social Services: Melbourne.

The Men's Project, and Michael Flood. 2020. *Unpacking the Man Box: What Is the Impact of the Man Box Attitudes on Young Australian Men's Behaviours and Wellbeing?* Jesuit Social Services: Melbourne.

Theodore, H., and B. F. Lloyd. 2000. "Age and Gender Role Conflict: A Cross-Sectional Study of Australian Men." *Sex Roles* 16.

Thomas, Holly. 2023. "Opinion: Jonah Hill's Misappropriation of Popular Therapy-Speak." *CNN*, July 12.

Thompkins, Christine Durham, and Robert A. Rando. 2003. "Gender Role Conflict and Shame in College Men." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 4(1):79–81. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.79.

Thompson, Edward H., and Kate M. Bennett. 2015. "Measurement of Masculinity Ideologies: A (Critical) Review." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 16(2):115–33. doi: 10.1037/a0038609.

Thompson, Edward H., and Joseph H. Pleck. 1986. "The Structure of Male Role Norms." *American Behavioral Scientist* 29(5):531–43.

Thompson, Edward H., Joseph H. Pleck, and David L. Ferrera. 1992. "Men and Masculinities: Scales for Masculinity Ideology and Masculinity-Related Constructs." *Sex Roles* 27(11–12):573–607. doi: 10.1007/BF02651094.

Tokar, David M., Ann R. Fischer, Michael Schaub, and Bonnie Moradi. 2000. "Masculine Gender Roles and Counseling-Related Variables: Links With and Mediation by Personality." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 14.

UNODC. 2018. *Global Study on Homicide 2018: Gender-Related Killing of Women and Girls*. Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.

Uy, Philip J., Neil A. Massoth, and William H. Gottdiener. 2014. "Rethinking Male Drinking: Traditional Masculine Ideologies, Gender-Role Conflict, and Drinking Motives." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 15(2):121–28. doi: 10.1037/a0032239.

Vandello, Joseph A., and Jennifer K. Bosson. 2013. "Hard Won and Easily Lost: A Review and Synthesis of Theory and Research on Precarious Manhood." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 14(2):101–13. doi: 10.1037/a0029826.

Vandello, Joseph A., Jennifer K. Bosson, Dov Cohen, Rochelle M. Burnaford, and Jonathan R. Weaver. 2008. "Precarious Manhood." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 95(6):1325–39. doi: 10.1037/a0012453.

Vogel, David L., Stephen R. Wester, Joseph H. Hammer, and Teresa M. Downing-Matibag. 2014. “Referring Men to Seek Help: The Influence of Gender Role Conflict and Stigma.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 15(1):60–67. doi: 10.1037/a0031761.

Walker, Donald F., David M. Tokar, and Ann R. Fischer. 2000. “What Are Eight Popular Masculinity-Related Instruments Measuring? Underlying Dimensions and Their Relations to Sociosexuality.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 1:98–108.

Wallace, Maeve, Veronica Gillispie-Bell, Kiara Cruz, Kelly Davis, and Dovile Vilda. 2021. “Homicide During Pregnancy and the Postpartum Period in the United States, 2018–2019.” *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 138(5):762–69. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000004567.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. “Doing Gender.” *Gender & Society* 1(2):125–51.

Wester, Stephen R., David Arndt, Sonya K. Sedivy, and Leah Arndt. 2010. “Male Police Officers and Stigma Associated with Counseling: The Role of Anticipated Risks, Anticipated Benefits and Gender Role Conflict.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 11(4):286–302. doi: 10.1037/a0019108.

Wester, Stephen R., Ben C. H. Kuo, and David L. Vogel. 2006. “Multicultural Coping: Chinese Canadian Adolescents, Male Gender Role Conflict, and Psychological Distress.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 7(2):83–100. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.7.2.83.

Wester, Stephen R., David L. Vogel, Meifen Wei, and Rodney McLain. 2006. “African American Men, Gender Role Conflict, and Psychological Distress: The Role of Racial Identity.” *Journal of Counseling & Development* 84(4):419–29. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2006.tb00426.x.

Whorley, MySha R., and Michael E. Addis. 2006. “Ten Years of Psychological Research on Men and Masculinity in the United States: Dominant Methodological Trends.” *Sex Roles* 55(9–10):649–58. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9120-1.

Wilkinson, Wayne W. 2004. “Authoritarian Hegemony, Dimensions of Masculinity, and Male Antigay Attitudes.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 5(2):121–31. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.121.

Willer, Rob, Bridget Conlon, Christabel L. Rogalin, and Michael T. Wojnowicz. 2013. “Overdoing Gender: A Test of the Masculine Overcompensation Thesis.” *American Journal of Sociology* 118(4):980–1002.

Williams, Christine L. 1992. “The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the ‘Female’ Professions.” *Social Problems* 39(3):16.

Windle, Chaunce R., and David A. Smith. 2009. “Withdrawal Moderates the Association between Husband Gender Role Conflict and Wife Marital Adjustment.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 10(4):245–60. doi: 10.1037/a0016757.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2009. “Racializing the Glass Escalator: Reconsidering Men’s Experiences with Women’s Work.” *Gender & Society* 23(1):5–26. doi: 10.1177/0891243208323054.

Wisch, Andrew F., James R. Mahalik, Jeffrey A. Hayes, and Elizabeth A. Nutt. 1995. “The Impact of Gender Role Conflict and Counseling Technique on Psychological Help Seeking in Men.” *Sex Roles* 33(1–2):77–89. doi: 10.1007/BF01547936.

Wolfram, Hans-Joachim, Gisela Mohr, and Jenni Borchert. 2009. “Gender Role Self-Concept, Gender-Role Conflict, and Well-Being in Male Primary School Teachers.” *Sex Roles* 60(1–2):114–27. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9493-4.

Zhang, Chunyu, Aaron J. Blashill, Stephen R. Wester, James M. O’Neil, David L. Vogel, Jia Wei, and Jinfu Zhang. 2015. “Factor Structure of the Gender Role Conflict Scale-Short Form in Chinese Heterosexual and Gay Samples.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 16(2):229–33. doi: 10.1037/a0036154.

Appendix A – Survey Questions:

Thank you for your interest in taking this survey. This survey seeks to examine different aspects of masculinity, including beliefs and behaviors, and with a focus on masculine discrepancy. The data collected from this survey will be analyzed and used in the fulfillment of a sociology dissertation; IRB protocol 23-770. This anonymous survey is expected to take about 15 minutes to complete and participation is voluntary; you may quit the survey at any time and can skip any questions you do not feel comfortable answering. You may contact the researcher at seaadahl@vt.edu with any questions, comments, or concerns. Do you consent to taking this survey?

1. Yes
2. No

Do you commit to answering these questions as truthfully and thoughtfully as possible?

1. Yes
2. No

How old are you (in years)?

Demographic Variables:

What sex were you assigned at birth?

1. Male
2. Female
3. Intersex
4. Other _____

What is your highest level of completed education?

1. Less than high school
2. High school/GED
3. Some college
4. Trade/vocational/technical
5. Associates
6. Bachelors
7. Masters
8. Professional
9. Doctorate
10. Other

Which most closely describes your political affiliation?

1. Republican
2. Democrat
3. Independent
4. Other

Open-Ended:

Think of up to three words or short phrases to describe men, then complete the following statement: MEN usually are...

Think of up to three words or short phrases to describe women, then complete the following statement: WOMEN usually are...

Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire
BPAQ - Physical
For the next set of questions, rate how closely the following statements describe YOUR experiences:
Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

There are people that have pushed me so far that we have come to blows.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

I have threatened people I know

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

I have trouble controlling my temper.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

BPAQ - Verbal
I often find myself disagreeing with people.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

I can’t help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

BPAQ - Hostile

At times I feel like I have gotten a raw deal out of life.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

Other people always seem to get the breaks.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

BPAQ - Anger

Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode

1. Not at all like me
2. A little like me
3. Somewhat like me
4. Very much like me
5. Completely like me

Masculine Discrepancy Stress Scale

For the next set of questions, rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:
I wish I was more manly.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

I wish I was interested in things that other guys find interesting.

1. Strongly disagree

2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

Sometimes I worry that people judge me because I'm not like the typical man.
1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

Sometimes I worry about my masculinity.
1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

I worry that women find me less attractive because I'm not as macho as other guys.
1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

Hostility Toward Women Scale
For the next set of questions, rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:
I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

I believe that most women tell the truth. [REVERSE]
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

I usually find myself agreeing with women. [REVERSE]
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

I think that most women would lie just to get ahead.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

Generally, it is safer not to trust women.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

I am easily angered by women.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

I am sure I get a raw deal from the women in my life.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

Sometimes women bother me just by being around.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

Women are responsible for most of my troubles.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree

3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory
ASI - Benevolent
For the next set of questions, rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:
Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Men are incomplete without women

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Women should be cherished and protected by men

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

ASI - Hostile

When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Women exaggerate the problems they have at work

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Women seek to gain power by getting control over men

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Somewhat Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Masculine Experiences Measure

For the next set of questions, rate how closely the following statements describe YOUR experiences:

I pay attention to surveys for attention checks: Please select somewhat true

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false

4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

Emotional Restriction

I keep it to myself if I am in pain

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I tell people that I care about them [REVERSE]

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I openly talk about my worries and fears [REVERSE]

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

Homophobia

There have been times when someone assumed that I was gay [REVERSE]

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I am (or would be) friends with a gay man [REVERSE]

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I have had sexual thoughts about other men [REVERSE]

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false

4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

Gender Roles

I have asked others for help solving personal problems [REVERSE]

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

My significant other is (or will be) the one to do the household chores like cooking and cleaning, not me

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I am okay with my son (if I have/had one) being taught how to do things like cooking and cleaning and taking care of children [REVERSE]

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I would describe my job as a masculine or manly job

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I am (or will be) the one who brings the money home to provide for my family, not my significant other

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

Physical Toughness

I have used violence when it was necessary to get respect

1. Very false
2. Somewhat false

3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I enjoy fighting
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I take risks, even if I might get hurt
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

Hypersexuality
I have turned down an opportunity to have sex with a woman [REVERSE]
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I frequently change sexual partners
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I only have sex with someone once I am in a committed relationship with them [REVERSE]
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I have sex frequently
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false

4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I have had a lot of sexual partners
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

Dominance
I have work supervisors or bosses who are women [REVERSE]
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

In general, I have control over the women in my life
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I treat women as equals to men [REVERSE]
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I make sure (or will make sure) my significant other tells me where they are at all times
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false
5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

I have the final say about major decisions in my relationships
1. Very false
2. Somewhat false
3. Slightly false
4. Neither true nor false

5. Slightly true
6. Somewhat true
7. Very true

Masculine Ideals Measure
For the next set of questions, rate how much you agree/disagree with the following statements according to what YOU think a man should be:

A man should know this question is an attention check: Please select "Slightly disagree"
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

Emotional Restriction
A man should keep it to himself if he is in pain
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should tell people that he cares about them
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should be okay with openly talking about his worries and fears
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

Homophobia
A man should be insulted if someone assumes that he is gay
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should be okay with having gay friends

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should only have sexual thoughts about women

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should be okay with asking others for help solving personal problems

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man's significant other should be the one to do the household chores like cooking and cleaning, not him.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should be okay with his son being taught how to do things like cooking and cleaning and taking care of children

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should have a masculine or manly job

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should bring the money home to provide for his family, not his significant other

1. Strongly disagree

2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should do whatever it takes to get respect, including using violence if necessary

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should enjoy fighting

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should take risks, even if he might get hurt

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should accept any opportunity to have sex with a woman

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should frequently change sexual partners

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should only have sex with someone once he’s in a committed relationship with them

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree

4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should have sex frequently
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should have many sexual partners
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man, not a woman, should be the boss or supervisor at a workplace
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should generally have control over the women in his life
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should treat women as equals to men
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should make sure his significant other tells him where they are at all times
1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree

6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

A man should have the final say about major decisions in his relationships

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Somewhat agree
7. Strongly agree

How would you describe your race or ethnicity? If you fit identify as biracial or multiracial, please select "other" and describe

1. Hispanic or Latino
2. American Indian or Alaska Native
3. Asian
4. Black or African American
5. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
6. Caucasian or White
7. Prefer not to say
8. Other _____

How would you describe your employment status? If you fit multiple categories, please select "other" and describe

1. Working multiple full-time jobs
2. Working one full-time job and one or more part-time jobs
3. Full-time
4. Part-time
5. Unemployed
6. Self-employed
7. Stay-at-home parent/guardian/homemaker
8. Student
9. Retired
10. Military
11. Other _____

What is your personal income?

1. Less than $19,999
2. $20,000 to $39,999
3. $40,000 to $59,999
4. $60,000 to $79,999
5. $80,000 to $99,999
6. $100,000 to $119,999
7. $120,000 to $139,999
8. $140,000 to $159,999
9. $160,000 to $179,999
10. $180,000 to $199,999
11. Above $200,000
12. Other

What is your household income?

1. Less than $19,999
2. $20,000 to $39,999
3. $40,000 to $59,999

4. $60,000 to $79,999
5. $80,000 to $99,999
6. $100,000 to $119,999
7. $120,000 to $139,999
8. $140,000 to $159,999
9. $160,000 to $179,999
10. $180,000 to $199,999
11. Above $200,000
12. Other _____

How would you describe your relationship status?

1. Single
2. Dating but not serious/exclusive
3. Dating one person exclusively
4. Living together but unmarried
5. Married
6. Separated
7. Divorced
8. Widowed
9. Polyamorous (ethical non-monogamy)
10. Other _____

How would you describe your sexual orientation? If you do not see your sexual orientation, please select "other" and describe

1. Attracted to men
2. Attracted to women
3. Attracted to both men and women
4. Gender does not matter to me/attracted to any gender
5. I do not experience sexual attraction
6. Questioning or unsure
7. Other _____

What is your current religion, if any?

1. Christian (non-Catholic)
2. Catholic
3. Mormon
4. Orthodox such as Greek or Russian Orthodox
5. Jewish
6. Muslim
7. Buddhist
8. Hindu
9. Atheist
10. Agnostic
11. Nothing in particular
12. Other _____

Have you ever been involved in any of the following groups where most others in the group were also men? If you have belonged to multiple, please select "other" and describe

1. Athletics team (college or professional)
2. College Fraternity
3. Military
4. Incarceration
5. General fraternity, NOT college (such as Freemasons, etc.)
6. Other (including general clubs/groups/programs for men or about masculinity) or multiple. Please describe: _____
7. None of the above

How frequently do you watch pornography?

1. Never
2. Less than once a year
3. A few times a year
4. 1-3 times per month
5. Once a week
6. Several times a week
7. Once a day
8. Several times a day

What age were you (in years) when you watched pornography for the first time?

1. Less than 5
2. 5-7
3. 8-10
4. 11-13
5. 14-16
6. 17-19
7. 20 or older
8. Other _____
9. I have never watched pornography

How many sexual partners have you had in your lifetime?

1. 0
2. 1
3. 2-4
4. 5-9
5. 10-14
6. 15-19
7. 20 or more

How old were you (in years) when you had sex for the first time?

Appendix B – Correlation Matrix

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	MDS	HTW	ASI - B	ASI - H	BPAQ - P	BPAQ - V	BPAQ - H	BPAQ - A	Ideal - Masc. Dominance	Ideal - Physicality	Ideal - Anti-effeminacy	Ideal - Heterosexism	Exp. - Masc. Dominance	Exp. - Physicality	Exp. - Anti-effeminacy	Exp. - Heterosexism	Disc. - Masc. Dominance	Disc. - Physicality	Disc. - Anti-effeminacy	Disc. - Heterosexism	Age	Education	Income - Personal	Income - Household	Assigned Male at Birth	Democrat	White/Caucasian	Works 40+ Hours/Week	Married	Attracted to women	Christian
Cluster 1	1																																	
Cluster 2	-0.325	1																																
Cluster 3	-0.239	-0.310	1																															
Cluster 4	-0.341	-0.443	-0.326	1																														
Masc. Disc. Stress	0.033	-0.357	0.466	-0.068	1																													
Hostility Toward Women	0.068	-0.531	0.482	0.059	0.469	1																												
ASI - Benevolent	0.213	-0.290	0.326	-0.172	0.325	0.249	1																											
ASI - Hostile	0.194	-0.536	0.451	-0.018	0.426	0.730	0.425	1																										
BPAQ - Physical	-0.162	-0.360	0.562	0.023	0.451	0.558	0.238	0.440	1																									
BPAQ - Verbal	0.007	-0.369	0.523	-0.082	0.513	0.548	0.304	0.474	0.742	1																								
BPAQ - Hostile	-0.017	-0.328	0.465	-0.052	0.532	0.547	0.291	0.461	0.679	0.717	1																							
BPAQ - Anger	-0.070	-0.360	0.545	-0.043	0.506	0.548	0.281	0.451	0.807	0.783	0.731	1																						
Ideal - Masc. Dominance	0.430	-0.755	0.570	-0.106	0.466	0.599	0.462	0.633	0.420	0.467	0.434	0.445	1																					
Ideal - Physicality	-0.144	-0.512	0.777	-0.024	0.495	0.581	0.262	0.525	0.621	0.559	0.497	0.578	0.620	1																				
Ideal - Anti-Effeminacy	0.027	-0.348	-0.097	0.399	-0.084	0.121	-0.196	0.038	-0.001	-0.059	-0.048	-0.030	0.101	0.023	1																			
Ideal - Heterosexism	0.054	-0.370	0.378	0.001	0.176	0.364	0.292	0.391	0.318	0.272	0.223	0.262	0.450	0.404	0.022	1																		
Exp. - Masc. Dominance	0.471	-0.686	0.488	-0.140	0.402	0.538	0.442	0.576	0.368	0.421	0.379	0.395	0.837	0.530	0.115	0.372	1																	
Exp. - Physicality	-0.188	-0.408	0.702	-0.025	0.408	0.516	0.219	0.444	0.639	0.537	0.451	0.544	0.464	0.774	-0.010	0.342	0.458	1																
Exp. - Anti-Effeminacy	-0.042	-0.188	-0.176	0.368	-0.176	0.000	-0.260	-0.038	-0.080	-0.138	-0.156	-0.135	-0.043	-0.075	0.620	0.054	-0.062	-0.109	1															
Exp. - Heterosexism	0.211	0.052	-0.467	0.158	-0.457	-0.322	-0.061	-0.213	-0.429	-0.383	-0.407	-0.397	-0.187	-0.425	0.192	-0.047	-0.120	-0.457	0.292	1														
Disc. - Masc. Dominance	-0.104	0.385	-0.334	-0.009	-0.271	-0.315	-0.205	-0.324	-0.234	-0.244	-0.244	-0.242	-0.615	-0.365	-0.018	-0.285	-0.083	-0.184	-0.011	0.167	1													
Disc. - Physicality	-0.012	0.288	-0.332	0.005	-0.262	-0.261	-0.135	-0.264	-0.167	-0.198	-0.210	-0.219	-0.387	-0.593	-0.050	-0.203	-0.253	0.052	-0.020	0.090	0.342	1												
Disc. - Anti-Effeminacy	-0.080	0.173	-0.096	-0.021	-0.110	-0.136	-0.082	-0.088	-0.093	-0.095	-0.129	-0.124	-0.164	-0.114	-0.404	0.038	-0.202	-0.115	0.467	0.124	0.007	0.033	1											
Disc. - Heterosexism	0.118	0.280	-0.587	0.114	-0.446	-0.472	-0.236	-0.410	-0.519	-0.456	-0.441	-0.460	-0.431	-0.573	0.125	-0.690	-0.331	-0.555	0.176	0.756	0.307	0.198	0.065	1										
Age	-0.115	0.386	-0.271	-0.053	-0.297	-0.358	-0.089	-0.272	-0.353	-0.359	-0.393	-0.343	-0.408	-0.328	-0.154	0.036	-0.377	-0.330	0.025	0.235	0.199	0.096	0.202	0.147	1									
Education	0.189	-0.111	0.268	-0.277	0.240	0.122	0.234	0.200	0.074	0.178	0.131	0.127	0.339	0.195	-0.174	0.045	0.291	0.133	-0.242	-0.132	-0.198	-0.139	-0.087	-0.125	-0.050	1								
Income - Personal	0.200	-0.277	0.336	-0.181	0.288	0.255	0.283	0.306	0.204	0.272	0.218	0.250	0.472	0.321	-0.030	0.117	0.416	0.252	-0.152	-0.188	-0.259	-0.186	-0.143	-0.214	-0.263	0.589	1							
Income - Household	0.212	-0.245	0.321	-0.213	0.264	0.243	0.285	0.282	0.185	0.268	0.215	0.247	0.441	0.295	-0.054	0.081	0.412	0.225	-0.194	-0.170	-0.208	-0.179	-0.164	-0.176	-0.247	0.626	0.903	1						
Assigned Male at Birth	0.036	-0.072	0.054	-0.005	0.010	-0.046	0.018	0.087	-0.010	-0.053	-0.057	-0.001	0.055	0.052	0.035	0.035	0.068	0.023	0.013	0.061	-0.004	-0.053	-0.025	0.022	0.045	0.036	0.050	0.015	1					
Democrat	0.094	-0.147	0.248	-0.144	0.253	0.191	0.202	0.148	0.122	0.117	0.172	0.163	0.271	0.214	-0.086	0.035	0.263	0.152	-0.167	-0.182	-0.115	-0.145	-0.098	-0.155	-0.135	0.314	0.276	0.285	0.079	1				
White/Caucasian	0.017	0.060	0.000	-0.073	0.015	-0.073	0.030	-0.029	-0.021	0.053	0.014	0.017	-0.036	-0.004	-0.098	-0.033	-0.008	-0.050	-0.099	0.033	0.055	-0.057	-0.005	0.045	0.260	0.193	0.130	0.133	0.004	-0.082	1			
Works 40+ Hours/Week	0.213	-0.318	0.296	-0.118	0.234	0.264	0.234	0.285	0.224	0.278	0.312	0.249	0.419	0.316	0.011	0.097	0.419	0.292	-0.119	-0.140	-0.159	-0.127	-0.151	-0.165	-0.429	0.427	0.509	0.536	0.018	0.323	-0.010	1		
Married	0.224	-0.166	0.248	-0.237	0.212	0.123	0.330	0.174	0.135	0.214	0.155	0.173	0.345	0.206	-0.061	0.098	0.337	0.130	-0.135	-0.037	-0.142	-0.159	-0.088	-0.091	-0.005	0.480	0.496	0.543	0.014	0.247	0.224	0.324	1	
Attracted to Women	0.107	-0.030	-0.181	0.089	-0.221	-0.133	0.028	-0.039	-0.160	-0.123	-0.153	-0.126	-0.039	-0.170	0.129	0.050	-0.031	-0.178	0.137	0.490	0.026	0.042	0.015	0.323	0.097	-0.017	-0.013	0.003	0.219	-0.068	-0.002	-0.013	0.023	1
Christian	0.041	0.012	-0.085	0.024	-0.079	-0.053	0.068	-0.014	-0.117	-0.088	-0.102	-0.063	-0.034	-0.121	-0.010	-0.041	0.013	-0.110	0.006	0.115	0.081	0.050	0.018	0.110	0.091	0.029	-0.038	-0.016	0.051	-0.058	0.076	0.000	0.033	0.066