DO PERCEPTIONS OF OTHER MEN AFFECT ONE'S OWN ENDORSEMENT OF MASCULINITY?

By

SAMUEL FARLEY

Bachelor of Science in Psychology
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS
2012

Master of Science in Educational Psychology
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK
2015

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 2018

DO PERCEPTIONS OF OTHER MEN AFFECT ONE'S OWN ENDORSEMENT OF MASCULINITY?

Dissertation Approved:

Hugh Crethar, Ph.D.

Dissertation Adviser

Tonya Hammer, Ph.D.

Diane Stutey, Ph.D.

Randy Hubach, Ph.D.

Jennifer Bryd-Craven, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude towards my dissertation chair, Hugh Crethar, Ph.D. who provided guidance, encouragement, and much needed external motivation to write and complete this dissertation. I also want to express my appreciation to the various members of my dissertation committee including: Tonya Hammer, Ph.D., Randy Hubach, Ph.D; Diane Stutey, Ph.D., and Jennifer Byrd Craven, Ph.D. whom all provided support in all facets of this study. I would also like to extend my immense gratitude to Joe Currin and Colton Brown who both greatly helped me stay on track with each part of this dissertation and the enormous amount of support and encouragement they provided. Also, I want to extend my deepest thanks to my family, cohort members, and friends who remained supportive and encouraging throughout this entire process.

Name: SAMUEL FARLEY

Date of Degree: JULY, 2018

Title of Study: DO PERCEPTIONS OF OTHER MEN AFFECT ONE'S OWN ENDORSEMENT OF MASCULINITY?

Major Field: EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Abstract: Numerous articles have established the negative outcomes associated with holding a traditionally masculine ideology (Berger et al., 2005; Descutner & Thelen, 1991; Gale, 1996; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002; Levant & Wimer, 2014; Santana, Raj, & Decker, 2006). Connell (2005) has speculated that a vocal minority can set the standards of masculinity that a silent or complicit majority follow or must relate too. Few studies have investigated how this process may occur within the area of masculinity. Pluralistic ignorance (the belief that one's attitudes and behavior differ from others, when this difference does not exist; Boon and Yoshimura, 2014) has been shown when present to affect one's own behaviors or attitudes (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003). Casey et al., (2016) have found that men overestimated other men's adherence to traditional masculine norms. This study investigated this concept to see how perceptions of others beliefs might influence one's own behavior. This study had two objectives. The first objective was to determine if participants are endorsing pluralistic ignorance when considering their own and others masculine ideology. The second objective was to determine if this, pluralistic ignorance, then predicted conformity to more traditionally masculine norms. The results supported that men do endorse pluralistic ignorance, perceiving other men to hold more traditional masculine norms. The second hypothesis was not supported, but several correlations were found between pluralistic ignorance and conformity to masculine norms subscales. These results are discussed further as well as the implications this has for counseling psychology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Perceptions of gender play a significant role in the manner in which men and women relate to each other in society (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994). Such perceptions are learned from numerous sources, spanning from the interpersonal to popular media (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994). Television, movies, magazines, and so forth serve as an influential socializing force that disseminates cultural ideals and norms of gender (Sigoloff, 2009). Media impacts how we learn about our world and how we interact interpersonally with one another (Creteau & Hoynes, 2002). The looking glass self describes a similar process by which media's impact on people can be explained as viewing the world as if looking in a mirror and their actions are affected by the expectations they feel are placed upon them (Sigoloff, 2009). Messages within the media help individuals see what is perceived as "normal" and "deviant" behavior within particular societies and therefore what is the idealized image of society's values and attitudes. Studies looking at how media portrays men find that men are typically depicted in higher status roles such as lawyers and doctors, placed in action or drama roles, appear dominant and violent, and engaging in the use of alcohol and tobacco (Fejes, 1992). Researchers have further concluded that representations of men in the media do not typically deviate from traditional patriarchal concepts of men and masculinity (Children Now, 1999; Fejes, 1992). These portrayals of men have been shown to impact children's perceptions of men such as children describing men as angry, leaders, problem solvers, in charge, intelligent, and not expressive of emotion (Children now, 1999). The present study built upon previous research investigating factors

that influence masculine ideology by focusing on how perceptions of others masculinity affects on conformity to masculine norms. The following sections review relevant literature related to masculinity and pluralistic ignorance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Masculine Ideology

Masculine ideology refers to beliefs about the significance of men adhering to socially defined, by the dominant culture, standards of male behavior (Pleck, 1981). This theory separated itself from trait theories by focusing on men's perceived importance of endorsing masculinity rather than the biological trait of being masculine (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993). Masculine ideology theorists saw masculinity as a very distinct and comprehensive role within an individual's life (Smiler, 2004). This role was distinctly defined by the dominant culture, but could change depending on the dominant cultures current standards (Connell, 2005). For example, David and Brannon (1976) identified four categories of traditional masculinity which they named "sturdy oak", "give'em hell", "big wheel", and "no sissy stuff". Men within the "sturdy oak" type are said to be stoic and not showing signs of weakness (i.e., pain or grief). Men that embody the "Give'em Hell" type are described as engaging in extreme activities and having an affinity to violence. The third type that men can exhibit, "big wheel", are described as avoidance of shame and exhibiting control. The final type, "no sissy stuff", men who endorse this type are labeled as avoiding expressing feelings such as sadness and grief out of fear from being perceived as feminine by others and society. Masculine ideology theorists, along with the research community, began seeing and identifying masculinity as a complex and demanding role rather than a context-dependent role (i.e., Chef or house guest) (Smiler, 2004). This theory took a

similar stance to Bem, but furthered the cultural process by explaining it as being internalized by individuals and resting within the person (Smiler, 2004). Within this theory, men are not only taught by society what masculinity is, but it is also internalized to become who they are (Pleck, Sonenstein, Ku, 1994). Also, the ideology movement separated itself by saying that masculinity was not comprised of roles due to a historical accident, but was a belief system that men followed or one to which they conformed (Smiler, 2004). Boys are taught at a young age by society (i.e., parents, teachers, and friends) to be tough, "boys don't cry", to establish control, carry a winning attitude, and essentially what is feminine/unacceptable behavior (Connell, 1987). This is repeated over and over again, to the point of becoming part of who they are (Levant and Richmond, 2007).

Pleck not only identified and defined masculine ideology, but began to see and explore the stress men experience due to societal expectations (Pleck, 1981). Pleck thought that merely being male creates stress for males and that this causes strain on their gender roles (Pleck, 1981). This stress is viewed as always being present and even creating trauma for males through the socializing process (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993). Males are caught in a balancing act, in attempting to fulfill or failing to fulfill masculine roles stress is always present, creating trauma, and impacting their interactions with others (Pleck, 1981). Research that has investigated effects of adherence to masculine ideology found that for adolescents, it's associated with increased suspension from school, repeating grades, increased alcohol consumption, drug use, incarceration, engaging in sexual activity and/or increased number of sexual partners (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993, 1994). For adults, increased endorsement of traditional masculine ideology has been found to be associated with being male (sex), age (being younger), race and ethnicity (African Americans endorse highest levels of traditional masculinity followed by Latino/a Americans then European Americans), geographical location in the United States (Southern residents endorses more traditional masculinity than Northern residents), and nationality (Russian and Chinese citizens endorsing more traditional masculinity than American

citizens) (Levant, Cuthbert, et al., 2003; Levant & Majors, 1997; Levant, Majors, & Kelly, 1998; Levant, Richmond, et al., 2003; Levant, Wu, & Fischer, 1996; Wu, Levant, & Sellers, 2001). Results have also found traditional masculine ideology to be associated with sexual orientation (Levant & Majors, 1997), negative attitudes about condoms (Santana, Raj, & Decker, 2006; Smith, 1996), fear of intimacy (Descutner & Thelen, 1991), lower relationship satisfaction (McGraw, 2001), negative attitudes toward help seeking (Berger et al., 2005), increased acceptance of rape myth (Gale, 1996), and predictive of sexual assault and domestic violence (Gale, 1996; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002). Furthermore, masculine ideology has been found to be theoretically similar (Thompson & Pleck, 1995) and has a positive relationship with authoritarianism (or a conservative mindset) (Cecil, 1996). Masculine ideology describes how cultural ideals are placed on men and represent the ideal male, but can other masculinities exist besides this one ideal?

Multiple Masculinities

Researchers in the 1990's were beginning to recognize competing masculinities that were coexisting with each other within a single society (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Also across cultures and settings, multiple patterns of masculinity have been documented (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). It has been an interdisciplinary consensus that masculinity is not a set identity or set of roles, but a socially created aspect of identity that is developed in relation to customs and expectations within various cultural and historical contexts, resulting in what is often termed masculinities (Connell, 2005). Due to these insights, theorists have begun to view masculinity as not a singular concept, but rather describing multiple masculinities (Smiler, 2004). It is being seen that there are many masculinities that vary from culture to culture and over time (Kimmel & Messner, 1992). Similar to other theories of masculinity, men are socially taught a specific form of masculinity held by their respective culture through gender role socialization (Kimmel & Messner, 1989).

One common way in which multiple masculinities has been demonstrated in research has been through the description of masculine forms within demographically defined groups such as: homosexuals (Connell, 1992), African Americans (Levant, Majors, & Kelley, 1998; Wade, 2008), Latinos (Saez, Casado, & Wade, 2009), and boys and men of different age groups (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995). These forms of masculinity are numerous and vary in specific tenants (Kimmel & Messner, 1992). This is even visible within media that targets male consumers, specifically magazines. Penny (2007) highlighted two types of masculinity being portrayed within different magazines, which are the *new man* and *new lad*. The *new man* is viewed as a feminist-friendly version of masculinity, focused on being fashionable, narcissistic, and body image-oriented (Penny, 2007). The *new lad* is almost a backlash towards feminism and marginal masculinities (Penny, 2007). *New lad's* are seen as reincarnation of traditional masculinity, focusing on being anti-feminine, athletic, hyper-sexual, and drinking and eating whatever they want (Penny, 2007). This is also visible when looking at male high school students who are developing their own identities (Pascoe, 2003). Within high schools there are jocks, goths, skaters, etc. all of which have their own definitions of gender roles and expectations (Pascoe, 2003). Similarly, Fischer and Good (1998) analyzed men's responses to a unitary measure of masculinity and found that men scores varied into four distinct clusters- moderately traditional (endorsing median scores on all scales), high status/low violence (endorsed status items but not violence items), nontraditional (scored low on all subscales), and traditional (scored high on all scales). These findings have been replicated by two different studies including one of which found four cluster, but used different labels for the groups (Casey et al., 2015), The other study was a dissertation that found the same cluster but added a fifth cluster high violence/moderate traditional (scoring high on violence scales and moderate on others scales) (King, 2000). These findings support multiple masculinities by noticing that men score differently on unitary measures (Gray, 2012).

However, researchers have discussed that even though there are multiple masculinities that stand against hegemonic masculinity, dominant notions of masculinity are important within American culture with which men must contend, making hegemonic masculinity a measurement with which masculinity can be understood (Connell, 2005; Courtenay, 2000). Connell has labeled several other types of masculinity including dominant, complicit, subordinate, and marginalized masculinities (Connell, 2005). Subordinate and marginalized masculinities are less valued masculinities that are typically used to when describing non-white or gay men (Connell, 2005). Although there exists these separate groups, definitions and explanations are focused on showing similarities to the dominant group (Barker, 2005; Connell, 2005; Courtenay, 2000; Dworkin, Fullilove, & Peacock, 2009; Pascoe, 2003). For example, Pascoe (2003) found that adolescents in high school who didn't belong in the jocks group (the identified dominant group) found ways of including the jock form of masculinity into their own masculinity. Similar to a study of African American adolescents who and self-identified with dominant aspects of toughness and prowess, however are placed in a subordinate masculinity, due to ethnicity, and therefore act or maintain an appearance of being sexually experienced and a disguise of being indestructible to appear closer to the dominant form (Kerrigan et al., 2007). How might then masculinity be influenced by others? The section below describes pluralistic ignorance as a hypothesized construct that could explain the influence others have on one's masculinity.

Pluralistic Ignorance

Pluralistic ignorance (PI) as defined by Katz and Allport (1931) is "a phenomenon in which individual's believe that their attitudes and behavior differ from others' attitudes and behaviors, even when such differences do not exist" (as cited in Boon & Yoshimura, 2014, p. 259). More specifically, researcher's definition of PI provides the assumption that one's private beliefs is different than other's beliefs, even though their outwards behavior is more in-line with others beliefs (Schroeder & Prentice, 1998). For example, Sandstorm and Bartini (2012) have

found that students will assume (through self-report rating) that others are more accepting of bullying behavior (i.e. tolerant of bullies and less caring toward victims) than they themselves are, but they end up over-rating their peers' acceptance of such behavior. Another study investigating out-group contact, found that White and Black participants assumed their in-group to be unique in wishing to engage in out-group contact, but inferred that the out-group (White or Black individuals) does not wish to engage in contact, which lead to lower out-group contact (Shelton & Richeson, 2005). This phenomenon has been found with various other behaviors like adolescent and college-age drinking (Segrist, Corcoran, Jordan-Fleming, & Rose, 2007; Suls & Green, 2003), sexist attitudes (Do, Samuels, Adkins, Clinard, & Koveleskie, 2013), and relationship violence (Hertzog & Rowley, 2014). Why is it that this behavior continues if most people actually don't endorse such actions?

To fully understand this phenomenon, it is important to include the second aspect of PI's definition that this perceived difference in behavior doesn't exist (Boon and Yoshimura, 2014). Segrist et al. (2007) found that those who perceived peers as normally engaging in drinking and in larger quantities of consumption also elevated in their own drinking behavior. It would seem that PI serves to partially explain why behaviors persist as those who hold PI tend to engage in the behavior they privately discredit (Do, Samuels, Adkins, Clinard, & Koveleskie, 2013; Hertzog and Rowley, 2014; Segrist et al. 2007; Suls & Green, 2003). Boon and Yoshimura (2014) in a study investigating PI in relationship revenge behavior, found, similar to findings in drinking behavior, that the personal perceptions of revenge as unacceptable behavior did not hinder the behavior from happening as participants perceived others as engaging in this behavior. The authors did not expand further on this point, but a possible explanation could be that perceiving others as being more tolerant of revenge behavior increases their likelihood of engaging in the behavior. Do et al. (2013) found a relationship between PI and sexist attitudes (air force cadets believed their egalitarian views of women were not shared by other cadets that were

said to hold sexist attitudes), but also discussed the issue that a vocal minority that harbored sexist attitudes hampered changes in the military culture while the majority held personal views against sexism. In PI, few individuals may hold a certain belief, while the majority discredits that belief, but merely by the perception or illusion that other's generally hold this belief it is engaged in by the majority (Do et al., 2013). Similar to this finding Cook and Lane (2014) found that prison officers held progressive ideas about treating and working with inmates but would act in more authoritative ways as this was the perception of what other's believed. These studies lead to a supported possible conclusion that PI could influence how one acts depending on ones' perception of others beliefs, regardless of their own beliefs. One could be against harmful behaviors (bullying), but not help others or act against this behavior for perceiving that they do not fit with what they perceive to be the majority's held belief and attempting to decrease this discrepancy (Sandstorm and Bartini, 2012).

As PI relates to masculinity, Beatty, Syzdek, and Bakkum (2006) found that men tended to overestimate other men's adherence to masculine norms confirming that pluralistic ignorance can be present within men. Several studies have looked at how men's perceptions of other men's normative health seeking behavior impacts their use health related systems. These perceptions have been shown to predictive of men's self-reported health behaviors (Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007) and act as a mediator between one's endorsement of masculine ideology and their health promotion behaviors (Levant & Wimer, 2014). Also, Miller et al. (2016) found that when investigating men's perceptions of other men's approval of barroom aggression, these perceptions were predictive of their own approval of physical and verbal barroom aggression. These studies lend support for the relationship between masculinity and pluralistic ignorance.

Purpose of the Study

Although studies have used masculinity to help explain men's behaviors and perceptions (e.g., Beatty, Syzdek, & Bakkum, 2006; Berger et al., 2005; Descutner & Thelen, 1991; Gale, 1996; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002; Levant & Majors, 1997; Levant & Wimer, 2014; Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007; McGraw, 2001; Miller et al., 2016; Santana, Raj, & Decker, 2006; Smith, 1996), no research exists to date that investigates how PI relates to conformity to traditional masculine norms. Regardless of the theory of masculinity being used, either traditional or hegemonic masculinity, it is often described as a singular ideal endorsed by a particular culture or the perception that the majority endorse this type of masculinity (Connell, 2005). This description seems to set the stage for PI, in that a construct is being viewed or perceived as being held by the majority. Schroeder and Prentice (1998) found that men perceived more agreement with their peers compared to women in a study of interventions on PI and drinking behavior. Suls and Green hypothesized the perceived agreement in the study by Schroeder and Prentice was due to the need to resolve discrepancies between the participating men and their peers (Suls & Green, 2003). Also, men may be less apt to voice their concerns as they might be perceived as less of a man (Suls & Green, 2003). It could possibly stand to reason that PI might perpetuate traditional masculinity if men perceive that all others are adhering to such standards. Literature has suggested that relatively non-traditional men may overestimate the extent to which other men adhere more to dominant conceptualizations of masculinity, and perceive that misogyny is normative among men (Casey et al., 2016). Similar to research in pluralistic ignorance, Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, and Stark (2003) found that college age men underestimated their peers valuing of consent in sexual relationships or their intervention in peer's sexual mistreatment of women, which these perceptions played a factor in constraining their own intervening behavior. Although this study did not specifically investigate pluralistic ignorance, the outcomes mirrored the concept and adds support for the hypothesis of this study. This study

intended to add to this literature in regard to traditional masculinity, investigating if PI plays a role in one's endorsement of masculinity. Additionally, this study controlled for right wing authoritarianism (RWA) as this has been found to impact men's gender role expression. Duncan, Peterson, and Winter (1997) found that RWA is associated with maintenance of traditional gender roles and negatively associated with nontraditional gender role identities. Other studies have controlled for this variable when investigating masculinity (Barnes, Brown, & Osterman, 2012; Killianski, 2003).

Research Questions

a) How does pluralistic ignorance correlate with men's self-reported scores on the men's conformity to masculine norms?

b) After controlling for right wing authoritarianism and age how much unique variance does the predictor variable (pluralistic ignorance) contribute to the experience of men's self-reported score on the male role norms inventory?

Hypothesis

Ho: The independent variable (pluralistic ignorance) is not a significant predictors of men's conformity to masculine norms.

Ha: The independent variable (pluralistic ignorance) is a significant predictor of men's conformity to masculine norms.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLGY

Participants

Participants were recruited from throughout the United States. Participants were recruited using social media outlets as well as email listservs. Participants were required to be at least 18 years old and identify as male. Upon completion of the data collection, 166 participants initiated the survey, of those 100 cisgender men fully completed the survey (see table 1). Participants were excluded from data analysis for reasons such as incomplete survey completion, identifying with another gender other than cisgender male, and not correctly responding to the three attention check questions. Of the 100 participants, the average age was 34.27 years old (SD=12.43) and ranged from 19-70 years old. The majority of participants identified as White, Non-Hispanic (89%, n= 89), while the remainder of the sample identified as Asian American (3%, n=3), Black/African-American Non-Hispanic (2%, n=2), Hispanic/Latino/a (3%, n=3), Mixed race/ethnicity (2%, n=2), and Native American/Alaskan Native (1%, n=1). In terms of sexual orientation, participants identified as straight (heterosexual) (53%, n=53), gay (34%, n=34), bisexual (12%, n=12), and queer/questioning (1.3%, n=1). Similarly, participants relationship status was evenly distributed with individuals being currently married (34%, n=34), currently in a relationship (31%, n=31), single (never been married) (32%, n=32), and divorced (3%, n=3). The educational status of participants also varied greatly with individuals holding doctorate/medical/law degree (12%, n=13), master's degree (31%, n=31), some graduate school

(10%, n=10), college graduate (BA/BS) (24%, n=24), some college/AA degree/technical school training (18%, n=18), high school graduate or GED (4%, n=4), and did not graduate from High School or earn a GED (1%, n=1). Many participants identified holding a full-time job (59%, n=59) and the rest identified with having part-time employment (7%, n=7), or part-time employment (student; 10%, n=10), and no employment or full-time student (23%, n=23). As for religious affiliation, participants identified within Catholicism (12%, n=12), Protestantism (16%, n=12), Judaism (1%, n=1), Spiritualism (7%, n=7), Atheism (16%, n=16), Agnosticism (21%, n=21), and other (28%, n=28). Participants endorsed, on the daily spiritual experiences scale, a low amount of daily spiritual experiences (M=25.46, SD=8.36). As for distribution of participants based on state located in, participants currently resided in 25 different states and one participant endorsed living outside of the United States.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=100)

Variable:	**Range:**	
Age (M=34.27, SD= 12.42)	19-70	
Variable:	**N**	**%**
Ethnicity:		
White, Non-Hispanic	89	89
Asian American	3	3
Black/African-American	2	2
Hispanic/Latino/a	3	3
Mixed race/ethnicity	2	2
Native American/ Alaskan Native	1	1
Sexual Orientation:		
Straight (Heterosexual)	53	53
Gay	34	34
Bisexual	12	12
Queer/Questioning	1	1.3
Relationship Status:		
Married	34	34
In a relationship	31	31
Single	32	32
Divorced	3	3
Education:		
Doctorate/medical /law degree	13	12
Masters degree	31	31
Some graduate school	10	10
Bachelors degree	24	24
High school GED	4	4
No GED	1	1
Employment:		
Full-time	59	59
Part-time	7	7
Part-time (student)	10	10
Un-employed or full-time student	23	23
Religious Affiliation:		
Catholicism	12	12
Protestantism	12	16
Judaism	1	1
Spiritualism	7	7
Atheism	16	16
Agnosticism	21	21
Other	28	28

Instruments

The participants responded to a 118-item online survey consisting of four separate measures (not including demographic questions) (Appendices D, E, F, and G). The research survey included a brief demographics survey, the male role norms inventory-short form (measure completed twice, once for themselves and the second time measuring their perceived scores for other men), the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46, and the Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale. The survey presented the measures in a randomized order to reduce potential order effects. Below each measure is described in more detail.

Demographics Questionnaire. This questionnaire was used to obtain non-identifying information such as age, marital status, sex, race, ethnicity, level of education, sexual orientation, occupation, resident state, and religious affiliation and spirituality.

Male Role Norms Inventory-Short Form (MRNI-SF). The MRNI-SF, developed off the MRNI-R (Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley, 2010), is a 21-item measure that utilizes a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), with higher scores indicating stronger endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology (Levant, Hall, & Rankin, 2013). This measure is composed of seven subscales evaluating individuals' endorsement of various aspects of traditional masculinity ideology, which are avoidance of femininity, negativity toward sexual minorities, self-reliance through mechanical skills, toughness, dominance, importance of sexuality, and restrictive emotionality (Levant, Hall, & Rankin, 2013). A total score, as well as scores for each of the subscales can be taken from this measure (Levant, Hall, & Rankin, 2013). Although the MRNI-SF is a relatively new measure its predecessor, the MRNI-R, has been found to have convergent validity with other measures of traditional masculinity (Levant et al., 2010), improved reliability from the original MRNI (Levant et al., 2007), and carry reliabilities for the MRNI-R and its subscales ranging from .73 to .96 (Levant et al., 2010). The MRNI-SF total scale score reliability is reported to be .92 and its subscales range

from .79-.90 (Levant, Hall, Weigold, & McCurdy, 2015). For this study, The MRNI-self and MRNI-other both had 21 items and had Cronbach's alpha of .904 and .953 respectively.

Pluralistic Ignorance (PI). PI, within pervious literature, operationally defined as the difference between participant's own scores and their perceptions of others' scores (Prentice & Miller, 1993; Schroeder & Prentice, 1998; Suls & Green, 2003). For this study, PI was operationally defined as the difference between participants scores on their own MRNI-SF score and their perceived others MRNI-SF score. Participants completed the MRNI-SF for their own endorsement of masculine norms and then their perceived view of others endorsement of masculine norms. The instructions at the beginning of the MRNI-R were changed from "Please complete the questionnaire by circling the number which indicates your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement" to "Please complete the questionnaire by circling the number which indicates what you think all other males would circle as their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement." The larger the difference between participants own and other scores the more PI they are endorsing. This is similar to how other studies measuring PI have assessed this construct within their specific focus (Do et al., 2013; Hertzog & Rowley, 2014; Segrist, et al., 2007; Shelton & Richeson, 2005).

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (CMNI-46). Parent and Moradi (2009) developed the CMNI-46, which was developed as an abbreviated measure of the original CMNI, a 94 item measure (Mahalik et al., 2003). After performing a confirmatory factor analysis of the CMNI, Parent and Moradi (2009) retained stronger indictors of each masculine norm, while deleting weaker ones leaving 46 items (4-6 items per subscale). This measure uses a four-point response scale (0- strongly disagree, 3- strongly agree) (Parent & Moradi, 2001). The CMNI-46 measures individual's conformity to nine masculine norms including: Winning, which measures focus on winning or competitiveness (i.e., In general, I will do anything to win); Emotional Control, which measures the degree to which individuals control their expression of emotions (i.e., I never share my feelings); Primacy of Work, which measures work as being a primary focus

of life (i.e., My work is the most important part of my life); Risk-taking, which measures intentional exposure to risky situations (i.e., I enjoy taking risks); Violence, which measures endorsing violence as an primary response (i.e., I am disgusted by any kind of violence); Heterosexual Self-presentation, which measures the perceived importance of being perceived by others as heterosexual (i.e., I would be furious if something thought I was gay); Playboy, which measures the endorsement of casual sex (i.e., I would feel good if I had many sexual partners); Self-reliance, which measures negative attitudes towards asking for help (i.e., I hate asking for help); and Power over Women, which measures perceived control over women (i.e., Women should be subservient to men) (Parent & Moradi, 2011). The original CMNI measured two more masculine norms than the CMNI-46, which were dominance and pursuit of status (Mahalik et al., 2003). The CMNI-46 subscales have been found to have positive correlations with the subscales of the CMNI, and reliability coefficients ranging from .77 to .91 (Parent & Moradi, 2009). Parent and Moradi (2011) demonstrated that the CMNI-46 has convergent validity with various subscales of other masculinity scales including the Brannon masculinity scale and the MRNI. The Cronbach's alpha for the CMNI in this study was .879 with 46 items.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA). Altemeyer (1988) developed the RWA a 30-item measure that assesses one's tendency to endorse ultra-conservative and authoritarian beliefs and behaviors. The RWA utilizes a seven-point Likert scale ranging from one (strongly disagree) to seven (strongly agree) (Altemeyer, 1988). Higher score indicates tendencies to believe in corporal punishment for child rearing, increased jail sentences for felons, and prejudice towards minorities (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Scores have also been correlated to negative views of groups such as Hispanics, Chinese, Japanese, Arabs, and Jews (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Reliability coefficients center around .90 (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Wylie & Forest, 1992). For this study, the RWA had 23 items with a Cronbach's alpha of .928.

Procedures

Participants were invited to participate in the online survey through social media sites and email listservs. The primary investigator posted a script describing the nature of his study on Facebook with a link that directed volunteers to the informed consent to review prior to beginning the online survey. The informed consent provided more information on the studies purpose, any potential risks, and benefits of participating in the study. If participants agreed to the consent form, they were directed to the online survey measures. The total time to complete the questionnaire ranged from 30-40 minutes. The measures were displayed in a randomized order to each participant. Upon completing the survey participants were given the opportunity to sign up for a drawing to win one of four 25-dollar Amazon gift cards. Participants provided their emails and name on a separate, secure website if they wished to be part of the drawing. The drawing was completed upon meeting the desired number of participants. All data gathered was kept on a password-protected USB flash drive that was kept in a locked office. All information was kept separate and not linked to the information provided for the drawing.

Data Analysis

The research design utilized for this study was correlational. This study performed a step-wise linear regression, using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, to analyze the data. This method was chosen due to previous articles including Beatty, Syzdek, and Bakkum (2006) and Mahalik, Burns, and Syzdek (2007) that have established a relationship between pluralistic ignorance and masculine ideology. Additionally, Mahalik, Burns, and Syzdek (2007) used hierarchical multiple regression to investigate if participants perceptions of others health related behaviors and endorsement of masculinity predicted their own health seeking behavior. Therefore, stepwise linear regression was used to determine if pluralistic ignorance was predictive of participants CMNI-46 scores. Descriptive statistics, correlations, and a multiple linear regression were computed. The conformity to masculine norms inventory-46 (CMNI-46) was the dependent variable and pluralistic ignorance or the difference between self and other

male role norms inventory-short form (MRNI-SF) was the independent variable. The participants' right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) and age were used as a control variable.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Pluralistic Ignorance

As previously stated, pluralistic ignorance was defined as the difference between participants scores on their own MRNI-SF score and their perceived others MRNI-SF score. The scores can be seen on table 2. The average score for the MRNI-SF-Self total was 43.86 (SD=17.46) and the average score for the MRNI-SF-Other total was 103.91 (SD=23.38). In calculating the pluralistic ignorance score, the average was -60.33 (SD=28.48) indicating that participants rated all other men's endorsement of masculine ideology to be higher than their own. Meaning that they were also endorsing more pluralistic ignorance.

Table 2: Pluralistic Ignorance Averages

Scale:	**M:**	**SD:**
MRNI-SF	43.86	17.46
MRNI-Other	103.91	23.38
Pluralistic Ignorance	-60.33	28.48

Correlations Analysis

A Pearson Correlation Coefficient was computed to understand the relationship between pluralistic ignorance and the participants CMNI total and subscale scores and additionally for RWA and the CMNI total score. This computation yielded several significant positive

correlations (see table 3 for further detail). There was a weak positive correlation between PI and CMNI Power (r(99)=.342, p=.001). A weak positive correlation was found between PI and CMNI Risk (r(99)=.244, p=.015) and between PI and CMNI Work (r(99)=2.40, p=.017). Additionally, PI and CMNI Heterosexual scale had a weak positive correlation (r(99)=.207, p=.040). RWA also had a weak positive correlation to CMNI Total score (r(100)=.337, p=.001). However the original hypothesis of this study was shown to be null as the PI and CMNI total were not significantly correlated (r(99)=.184, p=.068). Additionally, age was not correlated with CMNI Total (r(99)=-.196, p=.052) indicated that age was shown to not be an appropriate control variable.

Table 3: Person Correlation Coefficient Matrix

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	r n	1 99												
2	r n	.184 99	1 99											
3	r n	.286** 99	.337** 100	1 99										
4	r n	.342** 99	.486** 100	.538** 100	1 99									
5	r n	-.030 99	.636** 100	.166 100	.136 100	1 99								
6	r n	.043 99	.649** 100	.307** 100	.307** 100	.227* 100	1 99							
7	r n	.244* 99	.298** 100	-.143 100	.159 100	.133 100	-.157 100	1 99						
8	r n	.087 99	.437** 100	.327** 100	.142 100	.322** 100	.094 100	.169 100	1 99					
9	r n	.113 99	.331** 100	- .333** 100	.079 100	.076 100	.092 100	.268** 100	- .026 100	1 99				
10	r n	-.155 99	.436** 100	.069 100	.101 100	.172 100	.477** 100	-.210* 100	- .163 100	.017 100	1 99			
11	r n	.240* 99	.473** 100	.095 100	.170 100	.201* 100	.197* 100	.311** 100	.023 100	.343* * 100	.132 100	1 99		
12	r n	.207* 99	.505** 100	.405** 100	.386** 100	.205* 100	.301* 100	.058 100	.143 100	-.157 100	.149 100	-.012 100	1 99	
13	r n	.052 98	-.196 99	-.189 99	-.058 99	- .281** 99	-.180 99	.123 99	.025 99	.124 99	-.092 99	- .284** 99	- .117 99	1 99

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01. 1= Pluralistic Ignorance; 2= CMNI Total score; 3= Right wing authoritarianism; 4= CMNI Power over women subscale; 5= CMNI Winning subscale; 6= CMNI Emotional control subscale; 7= CMNI Risk taking subscale; 8= CMNI Violence subscale; 9= CMNI Playboy subscale; 10= CMNI Self-reliance subscales; 11= CMNI Primacy of work subscale; 12= CMNI Heterosexual self-presentation subscale; 13= Age of participant.

Regression

Due to CMNI total not being significantly correlated, the regression does not need to be performed. However, a stepwise linear regression was run to determine if RWA was an appropriate variable to control for within this study (see table 4 for further detail). Upon running the regression, RWA was confirmed to be a significant predictor of CMNI total ($F(1,97)=11.604$, $p=.001$). This confirms that this was an appropriate variable to control for within the study. After controlling for this, PI was confirmed not to be a significant predictor of CMNI total ($F(2,96)=.974$, $p=.326$).

Table 4: Regression Table

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std.Error of the estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Significant F Change
1	.327	.107	.098	13.18324	.107	11.604	1	97	.001
2	.340	.116	.097	13.18502	.009	.974	1	96	.326

Note: 1= Predictors: RWA Total; 2= Predictor: RWA Total, PI

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	Significance	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	83.223	4.194		19.844	.000		
(Constant)	.232	.068	.327	3.406	.001	1.000	1.000
RWA Total							
2	87.302	5.889		14.825	.000		
(Constant)	.212	.071	.299	2.981	.004	.918	1.089
RWA Total	.048	.049	.099	.987	.326	.918	1.089
PI							

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Discussion

This study set out to investigate the relationship pluralistic ignorance has with men's endorsed conformity to masculine norms. The prediction that pluralistic ignorance would be a significant predictor of participants CMNI total score was shown to be null. However, four subscales were correlated with PI indicating relationship between these variables including CMNI power over women, CMNI risk-taking, CNMI heterosexual self-presentation, and CMNI primacy of work. Lastly, RWA was a significant predictor and therefore was appropriately included as a control variable.

The results were surprising considering research that supports the relationship between perceptions of other men adherence to masculinity and their own behavior. Giaccardi, Ward, Seabrook, Manago, and Lippman (2016) investigated the impact media plays on men's adherence to masculine norms and found that media consumption (i.e., TV movies, sports programming, and reality TV) is associated with men's adherence to both the CMNI, masculine ideology, and beliefs about other men. Media is part of the societal messages that reinforce gender roles and therefore this study appears to indicate that men's perceptions of others are related to men's personal endorsement of CMNI (Giaccardi et al., 2016). Furthermore, Mahalik et al. (2007) found that conformity to masculine norms and perceptions of other men's health behaviors predicted participants self-reported health behaviors. Levant and Wimer (2014) expanded Mahalik,

Burns, and Syzdek (2007) study and found that men's perceptions of other men's health behaviors mediated the interaction between conformity to masculine norms and their health promotion behaviors. This impact remained consistent in both directions depending on the perceived normative behavior of other men (Levant & Wimer, 2014b). Another study found that men's perceptions of men's perceptions of other men's approval of barroom aggression predicted both participants verbal and physical barroom aggression (Miller et al., 2016). These studies highlight the important role perceptions of norms plays in men's engagement in masculine behaviors.

Although the original hypothesis was not supported, pluralistic ignorance was positively correlated with several CMNI subscales including power over women, risk-taking, heterosexual self-presentation, and primacy of work. These correlations support the statement of Do and colleagues (2013) that while the majority may discredit or privately deny these masculine norms, the perception that all others follow these tends to be associated with conformity to those norms. These results also support previous studies that have found a relationship between perceptions of others masculinity and scores on the CMNI (Giaccardi et al., 2016; Levant & Wimer, 2014a, 2014b; Mahalik et al., 2007; Miller et al., 2016). Similarly, these results also support studies that indicate that men may identify differently than the perceived norm but tend to adhere to the norm in various ways (Barker, 2005; Betty et al., 2006; Connell, 2005; Courtenay, 2000; Dworkin, Fullilove, & Peacock, 2009; Pascoe, 2003). The finding that PI is correlated to several of the CMNI scales is important as it demonstrates that a relationship does exist but will need to be further investigated to determine the type of relationship and the dynamics present.

The relationship is also important as it has implications for men and their overall physical and mental health. Levant and Wilmer (2014a) showed that masculinity may be a risk factor for positive health behavior and found that the scores on the CMNI-46 are a risk factor for health promotion behavior and the risk-taking subscale is a risk factor for use of health care resources.

Higher scores on the CMNI have also been shown to indicate higher levels of reported help seeking barriers (Heath, Brenner, Vogel, Lannin, & Strass, 2017; Herbst, Griffith, & Slama, 2014), higher help seeking self-stigma and self-disclosure (Heath et al., 2017), negative mental health (Wong, Ho, Wang, & Miller, 2017), negative social functioning (Wong et al., 2017), and inversely related to psychological help seeking (Wong et al., 2017). Risk-taking has also been found to be positively related to psychological distress (Wong, Owen, & Shea, 2012), to both negative and positive mental health (Wong et al., 2017), to alcohol use as a coping method for depression (Herbst et al., 2014), as a risk factor for proper use of health care resources (Levant & Wilmer, 2014a), and predicts verbal male barroom aggression (Miller et al., 2016). Power over women has been shown to be negatively correlated with help seeking (Herbst et al., 2014), less likely to speak with mental health providers (Herbst et al., 2014), negatively associated with negative mental health, positive mental health, and psychological help seeking (Wong et al., 2017). increased risk for both verbal and physical male barroom aggression (Miller et al., 2016). For heterosexual self-presentation, this subscale has been found to decrease risk of verbal and physical male barroom aggression (Miller et al., 2016) and predictive of not obtaining HIV testing (Parent, Torrey, & Michaels, 2012). These findings for each of the three subscales are important as these can have large impacts on men's health and psychological well-being. The primacy of work subscale has not been found to be significantly associated in any of the studies cited within this dissertation and Wong et al. (2017) hypothesized that this is due to work being such a complex category that can have both positive and negative impacts.

Additionally, the results showed that men endorsed pluralistic ignorance, rating other men's scores as higher than their own. This result is similar to other literature that has found that men tend to perceive that other men adhere to masculine norms to a higher degree than themselves (Beatty et al., 2006; Casey et al., 2015). Endorsing pluralistic ignorance has it's own ramifications as numerous studies have found that endorsing this tends to lead to participants

engaging further in the very behavior they privately disagree with (Do et al., 2013; Hertzog & Rowley, 2014; Segrist et al. 2007; Suls & Green, 2003;). These findings add to the implications of PI being correlated with four of the CMNI subscales and the associations discussed above between the subscales and negative mental health outcomes. Meaning that individuals that are endorsing higher PI may be at a higher risk of experiencing the various risk factors associated with the subscales they are endorsing more of.

Lastly, the results showed that RWA and CMNI total were significantly positively correlated. This result was not surprising as previous studies have demonstrated a relationship between masculinity and RWA (Cecil, 1996; Duncan et al., 1997; Goodnight, Cook, Parrot, & Peterson, 2014). Also, several studies have controlled for this variable when investigating masculinities relationship to other constructs (Barnes et al., 2012; Kilianski, 2003). The result that RWA was predictive of participants endorsement of masculine norms measured by the CMNI lend importance for why this construct was controlled for within this study. This relationship could be due to RWA being associated with aggressive stances towards out-groups, which may cause individuals to endorse higher conformity to in-group behaviors (Goodnight et al., 2014).

Limitations

The results of this dissertation have to be considered within the present limitations. This study only included 100 of the 166 participants after deleting participants for various reasons as incomplete surveys, answering attention-check questions incorrectly, and identifying as other than male. Harris (1985) recommended as a general rule of thumb that for regression studies a minimum of 50 more participants per predictor past a minimum base rate of 50 (as cited in Wilson VanVoorhis, & Morgan, 2007). For this study with one predictor, 100 participants would be the minimum number to perform the statistical test. However, having more participants helps to reduce the probability of making a type I error (Wilson VanVoorhis & Morgan, 2007).

Additionally, the sample is mostly Caucasian males, which narrows the diversity of the sample in terms of culture. This hinders the impact of the results and ability to generalize the results. Also, the sample consisted of 34% gay men and 12% bisexual men, which could impact expressions of masculinity. Sexual orientation is associated to expressions of masculine ideology and findings vary in context of stating that gay and bisexual men tend to be more non-gender conforming or have higher adherence to specific aspects of masculinity (Murray et al., 2017). This could impact the results as gay and bisexual men experience additional stress related to their sexual orientation that could further impact their endorsement of masculinity and view of others masculinity.

The study was also conducted using an online survey, which can have implications for the type of men taking the study. An inducement was used to entice more men to participate, which could also lead to individuals participating just for a chance to get money and not providing accurate responses. This was also advertised through Facebook and email, which could be narrowed based on the individuals who took the time to share the advertisement and those who took the time to participate. Also, with the study being online can have an impact on participants accurately portraying their ratings versus having the study filled out in a lab setting.

Another limitation of this study is that the study is cross-sectional rather than longitudinal. Participants are providing a snapshot of their endorsement of masculine ideology and conformity rather than tracking their ratings over a length of time. Many variables can have an impact on their endorsement of masculinity at various points in time. Zeglin (2016) found that, through analyzing masculine films, that CMNI emotional control, risk-taking, violence, and dominance are more commonly portrayed than other masculine norms. This could lead to assumptions that other men follow these certain traditional norms. Additionally, the political climate within the U.S. could cause men to feel more pressure to conform or feel more polarization from other men (Winter, 2010). Winter (2010) found that the political parties have been gendered both at the implicit and explicit level, which can have implications on the citizens

within that culture. It has to be recognized that individual's endorsement of masculinity may change over time and that these results may be more related to current environmental changes.

Lastly, the measures being used are self-report and can have implications on the accuracy of participants' reports. Participants may inaccurately rate themselves differently to potentially make themselves fit into a perceived norm. Also, the measures being used were designed several years ago and may not fully represent the most up-to-date masculine norms. This could cause participants scores to misrepresent their current endorsement of masculinity.

Clinical Implications

As mentioned previously, the results of this study do not stand alone. Men have been shown to endorse more risky behaviors and engage in less health-promoting behaviors (Courtenay 2000; Levant & Wilmer, 2014a, 2014 b). Masculinity has also consistently been shown to be associate with negative mental health and negatively associated with positive mental health (Wong et al., 2017). The question becomes, how do we as counseling psychologists take this knowledge and help men that are at risk, but that typically do not seek help? Part of the answer may reside in the effect of pluralistic ignorance. That although the perceived difference doesn't exist, individuals shift their behaviors to act in line with the perceived norm (Do et al., 2013; Hertzog & Rowley, 2014; Segrist et al. 2007; Suls & Green, 2003;). If the perception is the potential piece that is driving men to adjust their behavior, then it stands to reason that if we target this with interventions it would help reduce potential risky masculine behavior. Several articles have suggested this as a method of addressing the issue. Levant and Wilmer (2014b) offered a solution of building restructuring programs around normative gender roles and challenging perceived norms to promote a healthier balance. Beatty et al. (2006) attempted a similar intervention strategy by providing psychoeducation on perceived group norms versus actual group norms for men and found that men, post-intervention, more accurately rated other

men's masculine behavior and experienced reduction in their own restrictive emotionality. Wong et al. (2017) pushed this further by recommending that we focus on specific dimensions rather than the total construct such as emotion control, power over women, and self-reliance rather than masculinity as a whole. It is also recommended that program target areas shown to highly employ men (Herbst et al., 2014). This approach could be achieved through use of outreach programming on middle, high school, and university campuses as well as in sports programs and male-dominated businesses. By expanding our reach and providing education to many you can spread a message faster and also potentially use the group to help reinforce the message among each other. Additionally, in therapy, clinicians can assess for adherence to masculine norms (Herbst et al., 2014), explore the benefits and costs for conforming to these norms and not necessarily assume that this will have detrimental impacts (Wong et al., 2012).

Conclusion

This study set out to investigate the relationship between pluralistic ignorance (PI) and conformity to masculine norms. The results displayed that although the relationship is not predictive, PI is correlated with several subscales within masculinity that lends support for a relationship between the two variables. Future studies could further investigate this relationship to understand how perceptions of male peers impact men's adherence to masculine norms Additionally, this relationship could be explored with more participants across diverse categories to understand how this relationship exists among men who experience a variety of social influences that can vary across cultures and identities. The relationship between pluralistic ignorance and masculine ideology could also investigate how this might impact gender role conflict and further inform treatment of men who experience difficulty related to gender identity. This research can also inform clinical treatment of men and prevention services that seek to help improve men's utilization of mental health and healthcare services. One must also consider the limitations of this study and not generalize these results to all men but seek to expand this

literature to further inform service. In conclusion, this study found that men's perceptions of their peers masculine ideology is related to their conformity to specific masculine constructs of power over women, risk-taking, heterosexual self-presentation, and primacy of work indicating that men's perception of others impacts men's conformity to masculine norms.

REFERENCES

Altemeyer, B. (1988). Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. E. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest and prejudice. International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2, 113-133.

Anderson, E. (2005). Orthodox and inclusive masculinity: competing masculinities among heterosexual men in a feminized terrain. Sociological perspectives, 48, 337–355.

Anderson, E. (2007). Inclusive masculinity in a fraternal setting. Men and Masculinity, 10(5), 604-620.

Anderson, E. (2008). 'Being masculine is not about who you sleep with . . .': heterosexual athletes contesting masculinity and the one-time rule of homosexuality. Sex roles, 58(1–2), 104–115.

Anderson, E. (2009). Inclusive masculinity: the changing nature of masculinities. New York: Routledge.

Anderson, E., & McGuire, R. (2010). Inclusive masculinity theory and the gendered politics of men's rugby. Journal of Gender Studies, 19(3), 249-261.

Barker, G. T. (2005). Dying to be men: Youth, masculinity and social exclusion. New York: Routledge.

Barnes, C. D., Brown, R. P., & Osterman, L. L. (2012). Don't tread on me: Masculine honor ideology in the U.S. and militant responses to terrorism. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38(8), 1018-1029.

Beatty, A., Syzdek, M., & Bakkum, A. (2006). The saint john's experience project: Challenging men's perceptions of normative gender role conflict. Journal of Men's Studies, 14(3), 322-336.

Bem. S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Bem. S. L. (1975). Sex-role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 634-643.

Bem. S. L. (1979). Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1047-1054.

Bem. S. L. (1985). Androgyny and gender schema theory: A conceptual and empirical integration. In T. B. Sonderegger (Ed.). Nebraska symposium on motivation: Psychology' of gender (pp. 179-226). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Berger, J. M., Levant, R. F., McMillan, K. K., Kelleher, W., & Sellers, A. (2005). Impact of gender role conflict, traditional masculinity ideology, alexithymia, and age on men's attitudes toward psychological help seeking. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 6, 73-78.

Boon, S. D., & Yoshimura, S. M. (2014). Pluralistic ignorance in revenge attitudes and behavior in interpersonal relationships. Personal Relationships, 21, 258-271.

Boys to Men Entertainment Media: Messages about Men and Masculinity. Children's NOW Organization, 1999.

Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role- And what it's done for us lately. In R. Brannon & D. Davids (Eds.), The forty-nine percent majority (pp. 1−40). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brewer, A. M. (1998). The relationships among gender role conflict, depression, hopelessness, and marital satisfaction in a sample of African-American men (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1998). Dissertation Abstracts International, 59, 3049.

Burke, K. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological well-being: An exploration in men enrolled to attend an initiatory weekend. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland (Baltimore County).

Casey, E. A., Masters, N. T., Beadnell, B., Wells, E. A., Morrison, D. M., & Hoppe, M. J. (2016). A latent class analysis of heterosexual young men's masculinities. Archives of Sex Behavior, 45, 1039-1050.

Cecil, A. G. (1996). Comparing male cadet attitudes for masculinity ideology within civilian and military college environments (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from PsychINFO

Chang, C., & Hitchon, J. C. B. (2004). When does gender count? Further insights into gender schematic processing of female candidates' political advertisements. Sex Roles, 51(3), 197-208.

Chen, Y. N., Lee, C. S., Yu, T. H., & Shen, J. Y., (2014). Effects of gender role and family support on work adjustment among male flight attendants in Taiwan. Social Behavior and Personality, 42(3), 453-464.

Collinson, D., & Hearn, J.. (1994). Naming men as men: Implications for work, organization and management. Gender, Work and Organization, 1(1), 2-22.

Connell, R. W. (1987). Gender and power. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. W. (1992). A very straight gay: Masculinity, homosexual experience, and the dynamics of gender. American Sociological Review, 57, 735-75.

Connell, R.W. (2005). Masculinities. 2nd ed. Las Angeles, California: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity rethinking the concept. Gender & Society, 19(6), 829-859.

Cook, C. L., & Lane, J. (2014). Professional orientation and pluralistic ignorance among jail correctional officers. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 58(6), 735-757.

Cournoyer, R. J., & Mahalik, J. R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42, 11-19.

Courtney, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. Social Science and Medicine, 50, 1385-1401.

DeHeer, N. D., Wampold, B. E., & Freund, R. D. (1992). Do sex-typed and androgynous subjects prefer counselors on the basis of gender of effectiveness? They prefer the best. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39(2), 175-184.

Descutner, C., & Thelen, M. (1991). Development and validation of a Fear-of-Intimacy Scale. Psychological Assessment, 3, 218-225.

Do, J. J., Samuels, S. M., Adkins, D. J., Clinard, M. E., & Koveleskie, A. J. (2013). Gender bias and pluralistic ignorance in perceptions of fitness assessments. Military Psychology, 25, 23-35.

Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? Theory and Society, 22, 643-57.

Duncan, L. E., Peterson, B. E., & Winter, D. G. (1997). Authoritarianism and gender roles: Toward a psychological analysis of hegemonic relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23, 41-49.

Dworkin, S. L., Fullilove, R. E., & Peacock, D. (2009). Are HIV/AIDS prevention interventions for heterosexually active men in the United States gender-specific? American Journal of Public Health, 99, 981-984.

Fabiano, P. M., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A. D., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. Journal of American College Health, 52, 105-112.

Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1998). New directions for the study of gender role attitudes: A cluster analytic investigation of masculinity ideologies. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22, 371-384.

Fragoso, J. M., & Kashubeck, S. (2000). Machismo, gender role conflict, and mental health in Mexican American men. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1, 87-97.

Fejes, Fred J. "Masculinity as Fact". Men. Masculinity, and the Media Thousand Oaks, California. Sage Publications. 1992.

Gale, S. R. (1996). Male role norm endorsement and acquaintance sexual aggression among college students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Giaccardi, S., Ward, L. M., Seabrook, R. C., Manago, A., & Lippman, J. (2016). Between media consumption and young men's acceptance of traditional gender ideologies. Sex Roles, 75, 151-163.

Gray, M. E. (2012). "Man up": A longitudinal evaluation of adherence to traditional masculinity among racially/ethnically diverse adolescent inmates. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from PsychINFO

Gerschick, T. J., and A. S. Miller. (1994). Gender identities at the crossroads of masculinity and physical disability. Masculinities, 2(1), 34-55.

Goodnight, B. L., Cook, S. L., Parrott, D. J., & Peterson, J. L. (2014). Effects of masculinity, authoritarianism, and prejudice on antigay aggression: A path analysis of gender-role enforcement. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 15(4), 437-444.

Hanke, R. (1992). Redesigning men: Hegemonic masculinity in transition. In Men, masculinity, and the media, edited by S. Craig. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Heath, L. A. (2005). An intergenerational examination of male gender role conflict and psychological distress. Unpublished honors thesis, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

Heath, P. J., Brenner, R. E., Vogel, D. L., Lannin, D. G., & Strass, H. A. (2017). Masculinity and barriers to seeking counseling: The buffering role of self-compassion. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 64, 94-103.

Herbst, D. M., Griffith, N. R., & Slama, K. M. (2014). Rodeo cowboys: Conforming to masculine norms and help-seeking behaviors for depression. Journal of Rural Mental Health, 38, 20-35.

Hertzog, J. L., & Rowley, R. L. (2014). My beliefs of my peers' beliefs: Exploring the gendered nature of social norms in romantic relationships. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29(2), 348-368.

Holter, O. G. (1997). Gender, patriarchy and capitalism: A social forms analysis. Oslo, Norway: University of Olso.

Hudak, M. A. (1993). Gender schema theory revisited: Men's stereotypes of American women. Sex Roles, 28(5), 279-293

Ibson, J. (2002). Picturing men: a century of male relationships in everyday life. Washington, DC: Smithson Books.

Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3, 97-106.

Kerrigan, D., Andrinopoulos, K., Johnson, R., Parham, P., Thomas, T., & Ellen, J. M. (2007). Staying strong: Gender ideologies among African-American adolescents and the implications for HIV/STI prevention. Journal of Sex Research, 44, 172-180.

Kilianski, S. E. (2003). Explaining heterosexual men's attitudes toward women and gay men: The theory of exclusively masculine identity. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4, 37-56.

Kimmel, M. S., & Messner, M. A. (Eds.) (1989). Men's lives. New York: Macmillan.

Kimmel, M. S. & Messner, M. A. (Eds.) (1992). Men's lives (2nd Ed.) New York: Macmillan.

King, E. V. (2000). Men's definitions of masculinity and male power. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from PsychINFO

Levant, R. F., Cuthbert, A. C., Richmond, K., Sellers, A., Matveev, A. Matina, O., … Heesacker, M. (2003). Masculinity ideology among Russian and U.S. young men and women and its relationship to unhealthy lifestyle habits among young Russian men. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4, 26-36.

Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., & Rankin, T. J. (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, 228–238.

Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., Weigold, I. K., & McCurdy, E. R. (2015). Construct distinctiveness and variance composition of multi-dimensional instruments: Three short-form masculinity measures. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 62(3), 488-502.

Levant, R. F., & Majors, R. G. (1997). An investigation into variations in the construction of the male gender role among young African American and European American women and men. Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health, 2, 33-43.

Levant, R. F., Majors, R. G., & Kelley, M. L. (1998). Masculinity ideology among young African American and European American women and men in different regions of the United States. Cultural Diversity and Mental Health, 4, 227-236.

Levant, R. F., Rankin, T. J., Williams, C., Hasan, N. T., & Smalley, K. B. (2010). Evaluation of the factor structure and construct validity of scores on the Male Role Norms Inventory–Revised (MRNI-R). Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11, 25–37.

Levant, R. F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the male role norms inventory. The Journal of Men's Studies, 15(2), 130-146.

Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Majors, R. G., Inclan, J. E., Rosello, J. M., Rowan, G., et al. (2003). A multicultural investigation of masculinity ideology and alexithymia. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4, 91-99.

Levant, R. F., Smalley, K. B., Aupont, M., House, A., Richmond, K., & Noronha, D. (2007). Validation of the Male Role Norms Inventory—Revised. Journal of Men's Studies, 15, 85–100.

Levant, R. F., & Wimer, D. J. (2014a). Masculinity constructs as protective buffers and risk factors for men's health. American Journal of Men's Health, 8(2), 110-120.

Levant, R. F., & Wimer, D. J. (2014b). The relationship between conformity to masculine norms and men's health behaviors: Testing a multiple mediator model. International Journal of Men's Health, 13(1), 22-41.

Levant, R. F., Wu, R., & Fischer, J. (1996). Masculinity ideology: A comparison between U.S. and Chinese young men and women. Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health, 1, 217-220.

Levasseur, J. B. (1997). Authoritarianism and political orientation: Validation of a left-wing authoritarianism scale. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from PsychINFO

Lily, R. L. (1999). Gender role conflict among Black/African American college men: Individual differences and psychological outcomes (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri–Columbia, 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International, 61, 1088.

Mahalik, J. R., Burns, S. M., & Syzdek, M. (2007). Masculinity and perceived normative health behaviors as predictors of men's health behaviors. Social Sciences &Medicine, 2201-2209.

Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Frietas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4, 3–25.

Martin, P.Y. (1998). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Reflections on Connell's masculinities. Gender & Society, 12(4), 472-474.

Martino, W. (1995). Boys and literacy: Exploring the construction of hegemonic masculinities and the formation of literate capacities for boys in the English classroom. English in Australia, 112, 11-24.

McCormack, M. (2010). The declining significance of homohysteria for male students in three sixth forms in the south of England. British educational research journal, 1–17.

McDermott, R., Johnson, D., Cowden, J., & Rosen, S. (2007). Testosterone and aggression in a simulated crisis game. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 614, 15-33.

Mcgraw, S. L. (2001). Masculinity ideologies, men's relationship behavior, and relationship satisfaction in heterosexual couple relationships. Dissertation Abstracts International, 62(3), 1588B.

McIntyre, M.H., Li, A.Y., Chapman, J.F., Lipson, S.F., & Ellison, P.T. (2011). Social status, masculinity, and testosterone in young men. Personality and Individual Differences, 51, 392-396.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). Masculinities and crime: Critique and reconceptualization of theory. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Miller, P., Zinkiewicz, L., Hayley, A., Sonderlund, A., Litherland, S., Medew-Ewen, T. Wells, S., & Graham, K. (2016). Barroom aggression among Australian men: Associations with heavy episodic drinking, conformity to masculine norms, and personal and perceived peer approval of barroom aggression. Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 77, 421-430.

O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the gender role conflict scale. The Counseling Psychologist, 36(3), 358-445.

Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2011). An abbreviated tool for assessing conformity to masculine norms: Psychometric properties of the conformity to masculine. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12(4), 339-353.

Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2009). Confirmatory factor analysis of the conformity to masculine norms inventory and development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory-46. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10(3), 175-189.

Pascoe, C. J. (2003). Multiple masculinities? Teenage boys talk about jocks and gender. American Behavioral Scientist, 46, 1423-1438.

Pleck, J. H. (1981). The Myth of Masculinity. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships. Journal of Social Issues, 49(3), 11-29.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology and its correlates. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), Gender issues in contemporary society (pp. 85-110). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1994). Attitudes toward male roles among adolescent males: A discriminant validity analysis. Sex Roles, 30(7/8), 481-501.

Penny, J. (2007). Making multiple masculinities in men's magazines: Constructions and portrayals of 21st century man and attendant implications for counseling. Counseling Psychology Review, 22(2), 5-13.

Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1993). Pluralistic ignorance and alcohol use on campus: Some consequences of misperceiving the norm. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 243-256.

Rowe, R., Maughan, M., Worthman, C.M., Costellow, E.J., & Angold, A. (2004). Testosterone, antisocial behavior, and social dominance in boys: pubertal development and biosocial interaction. Biological Psychiatry, 55, 546-552.

Rummell, C. M., & Levant, R. F. (2014). Masculine gender role discrepancy strain and self-esteem. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15(4), 419-426.

Saez, P. A., Casado, A., & Wade, J. C. (2009). Factors influencing masculinity ideology among Latino men. Journal of Men's Studies, 17(2), 116-128.

Sandstrom, M. J., & Bartini, M. (2010). Do perceptions of discrepancy between self and group norms contribute to peer harassment at school? Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 32, 217-225.

Santana, M. C., Raj, A., & Decker, M. R. (2006). Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate partner violence perpetration among young adult men. Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 83(4), 575-585.

Schmitt, B. H., Leclerc, F., & Dube-Rioux, L. (1988). Sex typing and consumer behavior: A test of gender schema theory. Journal of Consumer Research, 15, 122-128.

Schroeder, C. M., & Prentice, D. A. (1998). Exposing pluralistic ignorance to reduce alcohol use among college students. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28(23), 2150-2180.

Segrist, D. J., Corcoran, K. J., Jordan-Fleming, M. K., & Rose, P. (2007). Yeah, I drink… but not as much as other guys: The majority fallacy among male adolescents. North American Journal of Psychology, 9(2), 307-320.

Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2005). Intergroup contact and pluralistic ignorance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88, 91-107.

Signorella, M. L., Jamison, W., & Krupa, M. H. (1989). Predicting spatial performance from gender stereotyping in activity preferences and in self-concept. Developmental Psychology, 25(1), 89-93.

Sigoloff, J. (2009). Hegemonic Masculinity and representations of men on television (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from PsychINFO.

Shek, Y. L. (2005). The relationship of racial identity and gender role conflict to self-esteem of Asian American undergraduates men (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 2005). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 1904

Skelton, A. (1993). On becoming a male physical education teacher: The informal culture of students and the construction of hegemonic masculinity. Gender and Education, 5(3), 289-303.

Smiler, A. P. (2004). Thirty years after the discovery of gender: Psychological concepts and measures of masculinity. Sex Roles, 50(1), 15-26.

Smith, J. A. I. (1996). Assessment of gender variables in heterosexual condom use. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Dakota.

Sobiraj, S., Rigotti, T., Weseler, D., & Mohr, G. (2015). Masculinity ideology and psychological strain: Considering men's social stressors in female-dominated occupations. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16(1), 54-66.

Suls, J., & Green, P. (2003). Pluralistic ignorance and college student perceptions of gender-specific alcohol norms. Health Psychology, 22(5), 479-486.

Swain, J. (2006a). The role of sport in the construction of masculinities in an English independent junior school. Sport, education and society, 11, 317–335.

Swain, J. (2006b). Reflections on patterns of masculinity in school settings. Men and masculinities, 8(3), 331–349.

Thompson, E. H., Jr. & Pleck, J. H. (1995). Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men (pp.129-163). NY: Basic Books.

Wade, J. C. (2008). Traditional masculinity and African American men's health-related attitudes and behaviors. American Journal of Men's Health, 3, 165-173.

Welch, K. (2011). Think human sexuality. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Welling, L.L.M., Moreau, J.P.M., Bird, B.M., Hansen, S., Carré, J.M. (2016). Exogenous testosterone increases men's perceptions of their own physical dominance. Psychoneuroendocrinology, 64, 136-142

Wetherell, M., & Edley. N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. Feminism and Psychology, 9(3), 335-356.

White, A. M. (2002). Gender role conflict and racial identity as indicators of Black men's help seeking attitudes (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 2002). Dissertation Abstracts International, 63, 2567.

Wilson VanVoorhis, C. R., & Morgan, B. L. (2007). Understanding power and rules of thumb for determining sample sizes. Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 3 (2), 43-50.

Winter, N. J. G. (2010). Masculine republicans and feminine democrats: Gender and americans' explicit and implicit images of the political parties. Political Behavior, 32, 587-618.

Wong, Y. J., Ho, M. R., Wang, S., & Miller, S. K. (2017). Meta-analyses of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and mental health-related outcomes. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 64, 80-93.

Wong, Y. J., Owen, J., & Shea, M. (2012). A latent class regression analysis of men's conformity to masculine norms and psychological distress. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59(1), 176-183.

Wu, R., Levant, R. F., & Sellers, A. (2001). The influence of sex and social development on masculinity ideology of Chinese undergraduate students. Psychological Science, 24, 365-366.

Wylie, L., & Forest, J. (1992). Religious fundamentalism, rightwing authoritarianism and prejudice. Psychological Reports, 71, 1291-1298.

Zeglin, R. J. (2016). Portrayals of masculinity in “guy movies”: Exploring viewer-character dissonance. Journal of Men’s Studies, 24, 42-59.

APPENDIX A

EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW

Perceptions of gender play a significant role in the manner in which men and women relate to each other in society (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994). Such perceptions are learned from numerous sources, spanning from the interpersonal to popular media (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994). Television, movies, magazines, and so forth serve as an influential socializing force that disseminates cultural ideals and norms of gender (Sigoloff, 2009). Media impacts how we learn about our world and how we interact interpersonally with one another (Creteau & Hoynes, 2002). The looking glass self describes a similar process by which media's impact on people can be explained as viewing the world as if looking in a mirror and their actions are affected by the expectations they feel are placed upon them (Sigoloff, 2009). Messages within the media help individuals see what is perceived as "normal" and "deviant" behavior within particular societies and therefore what is the idealized image of society's values and attitudes. Studies looking at how media portrays men find that men are typically depicted in higher status roles such as lawyers and doctors, placed in action or drama roles, appear dominant and violent, and use alcohol and tobacco (Fejes, 1992). Researchers have further concluded that representations of men in the media do not typically deviate from traditional patriarchal concepts of men and masculinity (Children Now, 1999; Fejes, 1992). These portrayals of men have been shown to impact children's perceptions of men such as children describing men as angry, leaders, problem solvers, in charge, intelligent,

and not expressive of emotion (Children now, 1999). The present study built on previous research investigating factors that influence masculine ideology by focusing on how perceptions of others masculinity affects one conformity to masculine norms. The following sections will review relevant literature related to masculinity and pluralistic ignorance.

Gender as a Biological Variable

When beginning to discuss gender or sex, two distinct areas of research butt heads over what explains differences between men and women. The argument is most often referred to as nature (biological) versus nurture (environmental). The nature side of the argument focuses on the biological aspects inherent in humans that effect our behavior and even gender formation (Welch, 2011; Sigoloff, 2009). Prior to birth, during fertilization infants receive a chromosome from their mothers and fathers, which then determines the infants' sex (XX for females, and XY for males; Welch, 2011). These chromosomes also begin the differentiation of males' and females' hormone production. Men produce testosterone and dihydrotestostrone and women produce estrogen and progesterone. These hormones have been heavily researched and correlated with various behaviors to form the biological argument for biology's influence on gendered behaviors (Welch, 2011).

Testosterone has been investigated for men in its relation to aggression, dominance-seeking, criminality, and various other concepts. It has also been associated with aggression and high sex drive in men (Welch, 2011). Welling, Moreau, Bird, Hansen, and Carre (2016) found evidence that testosterone increases men's self-perceived dominance and that this may result in shifts in mating effort, risk-taking, mate-seeking, and aggression. Similarly, McDermott, Johnson, Cowden, & Rosen (2007) found evidence that males and those with high testosterone were more likely to display aggressive reactions. However, when discussing gender research, the environment plays a role also. Testosterone has also been negatively associated with status with

social context serving as a moderator of its behavioral influences (McIntyre, Li, Chapman, Lipson, & Ellison, 2011). Other studies have discussed similar findings such as Vietnam veteran's testosterone and deviance association only being impactful for men not well integrated into society and in an adolescent sample that testosterone was associated with nonaggressive antisocial behaviors, but also found increases in peer association with deviant peers (Rowe, Maughan, Worthman, Costellow, & Angold, 2004). These articles highlight the importance of both nature and nurture in understanding the behaviors of men and women as well as highlighting the difficulty in identifying one clear cause of behavioral differences between genders. The present study focuses more on the nurture side of research while acknowledging the role that nature plays in gender expression. The sections to follow will discuss the various theories that have been developed to explain masculinity and gender differences between males and females.

Gender Schema Theory

Androgyny theory, first of the movements, was spurred on by Sandra Bem (Smiler, 2004). Bem (1974) described three beliefs within society that were the foundation for gender differences which are: that men and women have fundamentally different psychological and sexual natures, men are inherently the dominant and superior gender, and that male-female differences and male dominance are natural. Bem (1974) hypothesized that these beliefs were once thought to be created by god, but now considered to be evolutionary. As this became an evolutionary aspect of society, Bem (1974) argued that we began to see gender polarization (i.e., differences between women and men as a structure within society) and biological essentialism (i.e., that gender differences and men as being dominant are natural due to biological differences). As this began to take hold, Androcentrism, masculinity as the norm and femininity as the other, became a stable aspect of gender (Bem, 1974). She further clarified that as these aspects began to take root and become accepted people formed gender schemas (i.e., filters that help process stimuli and help us to integrate stereotype congruent information), which is a large aspect of

gender schema theory (Bem, 1974). Gender schema theory offers an explanation of how gender is transmitted to individuals by developing schemata that allow specific information to be integrated easier than others (Bem, 1975). For example, adolescents must process information to decipher behaviors as male or female and gender schemas help to regulate behavior to conform to societal definitions of male and female. Bem described gender as varying among individuals and said this was based on how sex-typed they are (Bem, 1974, 1975, 1985).

Bem was known for was hypothesizing gender as androgynous, that both genders could have similar traits or act in similar ways (Smiler, 2004). Both men and women could either present as more masculine, feminine, or androgynous (Bem, 1974, 1975, 1985). Individuals could vary on their sex-type based on four categories according to Bem (1974) which are: sex typed- individuals process and integrate information in line with their gender, cross-sex-typed- individuals process and integrate information that is in line with the opposite gender, androgynous- individuals process and integrate traits and information from both genders, and undifferentiated- do not show efficient processing of sex-typed information.

One of the core assumptions of this theory is, as stated by Bem (1979), "largely as a result of historical accident, the culture has clustered a quite heterogeneous collection of attributes into two mutually exclusive categories, each category considered both more characteristic of and more desirable for one or the other of the two sexes" (p. 1048). This assumption sets forth the idea that sex roles are culturally based, as they are clustered due to the culture's idea of what it is to be male or female. Also this assumption explains that these characteristics are considered to be explicit to that sex and well known by those within the culture (Bem, 1979). The second assumption of this theory is that individuals differ in the extent to which they endorse these culturally defined traits with their personality (Bem, 1979). Bem (1979) saw people as either being sex-typed and endorsing more of the culturally determined behaviors as to not violate the image or being androgynous and not following one or the other. This movement rejected the idea

of gender being biologically inherent, but rather learned at young ages and becoming a basis for biological sexes (Smiler, 2004). An interesting and unique aspect of this movement is the proposition that individuals can identify as something other than masculine or feminine. This was one of the first theories to acknowledge the idea of gender not being simply a unipolar construct.

Researchers' outcomes of investigating how gender schema theory relates to other constructs has been mixed. Hudak (1993) looked at men's stereotypes of women found that sex-typed men carried more stereotypical views of men compared to those who were more androgynous, which saw women as equally presenting masculine and feminine traits. Results have also provided support that men adjust better in feminine dominated work environments when endorsing a sex-typed schema compared too androgynous or cross-sex typed, which had poor work adjustment and needed more family support (Chen, Lee, Yu, & Shen, 2014). Also, Chang and Hitchon (2004) results indicated that participants relied more on their gender schema in making judgements on political advertisements when other relevant information was absent. Although there have been studies that support Bem's theory, other researchers have found little support for gender schema theory. Gender schema theory has been found to not have an effect between genders on areas such as consumer behavior (Schmitt, Leclerc, & Dube-Rioux), spatial performance (Signorella, Jamison, & Krupa, 1989), and counselor preference (DeHeer, Wampold, & Freund, 1992). Around the same time that Bem was theorizing sex-types and gender schemas, a theory and researchers were placing focus on how gender is taught through culture to men (Smiler, 2004).

Masculine Ideology

Masculine ideology refers to beliefs about the significance of men adhering to socially defined, by the dominant culture, standards of male behavior (Pleck, 1981). This theory separated itself from trait theories by focusing on men's perceived importance of endorsing masculinity

rather than the biological trait of being masculine (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993). Masculine ideology theorists saw masculinity as a very distinct and comprehensive role within an individual's life (Smiler, 2004). This role was distinctly defined by the dominant culture, but could change depending on the dominant cultures current standards (Connell, 2005). For example, Brannon (1976) identified four categories of traditional masculinity which they named "sturdy oak", "give'em hell", "big wheel", and "no sissy stuff". Men within the "sturdy oak" type are said to be stoic and not showing signs of weakness (i.e., pain or grief). Men that embody the "Give'em Hell" type are described as engaging in extreme activities and having an affinity to violence. The third type that men can exhibit, "big wheel", are described as avoid shame and exhibit control. The final type, "no sissy stuff", men who endorse this type are labeled as avoiding expressing feelings such as sadness and grief out of fear from being perceived as feminine by others and society. Masculine ideology theorists, along with the research community, began seeing and identifying masculinity as a complex and demanding role rather than a context-dependent role (i.e., Chef or house guest) (Smiler, 2004). This theory took a similar stance to Bem, but furthered the cultural process by explaining it as being internalized by individuals and resting within the person (Smiler, 2004). Within this theory, men are not only taught by society what masculinity is, but it is also internalized to become who they are (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994). Also, the ideology movement separated itself by saying that masculinity was not comprised of roles due to a historical accident, but was a belief system that men followed or one to which they conformed (Smiler, 2004). Boys are taught at a young age by society (i.e., parents, teachers, and friends) to be tough, "boys don't cry", to establish control, carry a winning attitude, and essentially what is feminine/unacceptable behavior (Connell, 1987). This is repeated over and over again, to the point of becoming part of who they are (Levant & Richmond, 2007).

Pleck not only identified and defined masculine ideology, but began to see and explore the stress men experience due to societal expectations (Pleck, 1981). Pleck thought that merely

being male creates stress for males and that this causes strain on their gender roles (Pleck, 1981). This stress is viewed as always being present and even creating trauma for males through the socializing process (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993). Males are caught in a balancing act, in attempting to fulfill or failing to fulfill masculine roles stress is always present, creating trauma, and impacting their interactions with others (Pleck, 1981). Research that has investigated effects of adherence to masculine ideology found that for adolescents, it's associated with increased suspension from school, repeating grades, increased alcohol consumption, drug use, incarceration, engaging in sexual activity and/or increased number of sexual partners (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993, 1994). For adults, increased endorsement of traditional masculine ideology has been found to be associated with being male (sex), age (being younger), race and ethnicity (African Americans endorse highest levels of traditional masculinity followed by Latino/a Americans then European Americans), geographical location in the United States (Southern residents endorses more traditional masculinity than Northern residents), and nationality (Russian and Chinese citizens endorsing more traditional masculinity than American citizens) (Levant, Cuthbert, et al., 2003; Levant & Majors, 1997; Levant, Majors, & Kelly, 1998; Levant, Richmond, et al., 2003; Levant, Wu, & Fischer, 1996; Wu, Levant, & Sellers, 2001). Results have also found traditional masculine ideology to be associated with sexual orientation (Levant & Majors, 1997), negative attitudes about condoms (Santana, Raj, & Decker, 2006; Smith, 1996), fear of intimacy (Descutner & Thelen, 1991), lower relationship satisfaction (McGraw, 2001), negative attitudes toward help seeking (Berger et al., 2005), increased acceptance of rape myth (Gale, 1996), and predictive of sexual assault and domestic violence (Gale, 1996; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002). Furthermore, masculine ideology has been found to be theoretically similar (Thompson & Pleck, 1995) and has a positive relationship with authoritarianism (or a conservative mindset) (Cecil, 1996). In an effort to understand the stress and other negative psychological impacts of masculine ideology, Pleck designed the gender role

strain paradigm (GRSP), discussed in following section and O'Neil developed gender role conflict (GRC), also discussed in a latter section.

Gender Role Strain

Pleck (1981) developed the gender role strain paradigm (GRSP) in the early 80's in an effort to help understand the hypothesized negative psychological impacts of masculine ideology. GRSP was originally titled sex role strain paradigm, but changed due to a need to remain consistent with contemporary usage of gender instead of sex (Pleck, 1995). As previously stated, masculine ideology is defined as society's expectations of what it means to be man (Pleck, 1981). This definition carries advantages and disadvantages for men (Pleck, 1995). Being male can carry power, status, and privileges, but also may be associated with negative psychological outcomes as well (Pleck, 1981). Within this paradigm, variations are not merely biological, but rather a combination of biological, social, and psychological experiences that construct an individual's conception of their masculinity or femininity (Pleck, 1981).

More specifically, GRSP proposed the following concerning gender roles: (1) contemporary gender roles are contradictory and inconsistent, (2) a high number of people violate these gender roles, (3) people who violate gender roles are condemned and therefore suffer negative psychological consequences, (4) people will over-conform to a gender role in response to real or imagined pressure, (5) consequences are more severe for men who violate gender roles, (6) certain prescribed gender role traits are actually harmful to men, (7) how each person experiences gender role strain depends on a variety of factors (Pleck, 1981). Dominant beliefs of a given culture, regarding male or female gender roles, influence how parents, teachers, and peers socialize children. This socialization affects the children's cognitions, emotions, and behaviors in relation to gender. Through various methods (i.e., positive reinforcement, observation, learning, or punishment) young boys learn to conform to masculine norms (Pleck, 1981). GRSP posits that

strain is not only felt when not conforming to gender roles, but also when conforming (Pleck, 1981). Pleck (1995) later added three types of strain to GRSP; discrepancy strain, dysfunction strain, and trauma strain. Discrepancy strain was defined as when one fails to live up to one's internalized (influenced by society) ideals on masculinity (Pleck, 1995). Dysfunction strain was described as when one actually fulfills the societal masculine norms yet experiences negative side effects in their mental and physical health (Pleck, 1995). Lastly, trauma strain was applied to men who have experienced gender role strain, but on a particularly harsh level (marginalized groups, military, and athletes (Pleck, 1995).

Gender role strain has had few articles that have looked at its impact and have found mixed results and also have cited the issue of measurement as a factor for the lack of research (Rummell & Levant, 2014). Rummell and Levant (2014) sought to investigate the relationship between self-esteem and gender role discrepancy and found that Pleck's hypothesis of a negative relationship between the two concepts was not supported. Another study looking at dysfunction strain and social stressors had results that supported Pleck's hypothesis of dysfunction strain (Sobiraj, Rigotti, Weseler, & Mohr, 2015). Also in the early 1980's another theory was gaining popularity among masculinity researchers and was similar to gender role strain, but with differences in men's hypothesized experiences of stress (O'Neil, 2008).

Gender Role Conflict

A popular concept within sex role strain is the gender role conflict (GRC) theory (O'Neil, 2008). Gender role conflict "occurs when rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles result in personal restriction, devaluation, or violation of self or others" (need page numbers on all quotes). GRC is defined as a psychological state where societal based gender roles have negative outcomes for persons (O'Neil, 2008). In its most basic sense, GRC is the strain, pressure, tension, and constriction of a person's potential due to society's gender role norms (O'Neil, 2008). Also,

GRC is the concrete outcomes of gender role strain that can be understood and measured. GRC theorists hypothesize the following three aspects concerning gender role and strain: (a) deviations of gender roles could lead to negative psychological consequences, (b) some of the qualities of gender roles are dysfunctional, and (c) males and females experiences conflict because of role strain. Men respond in two ways to society's enforcement of gender roles: (a) not adhering to the gender role norms may result in fear of being either punished or shamed, feeling guilty or defensive or (b) intense anger towards restrictive individuals who impose certain roles. GRC is similar to GRSP, but differs in having men identify or report their level of perceived conflict where GRSP posits that stress is always present for men. Operationally GRC is defined by four psychological domains, various situational contexts, and three personal experiences (O'Neil, 2008). The psychological domains of GRC have been defined as cognitive (how one thinks about gender roles), affective (how one feels about gender roles), behavioral (how one acts), and unconscious (gender role interactions below our awareness; O'Neil, 2008). This explains how one experiences GRC within themselves.

GRC can also be broken down into situational contexts including (a) GRC caused by gender role transitions, (b) GRC experienced intrapersonally, (c) GRC experience interpersonally, and (d) GRC experienced from others (O'Neil, 1990). One can experience GRC in any context whether it be in a life transition, interacting with others, or others experiences of GRC can effect another's experience, and one's own experience (O'Neil, 2008). Gender role transitions can be any new role that a male is experiencing (i.e., beginning school, getting married, and having children; O'Neil, 2008). Intrapersonal context is when a male experiences aversive emotions or thoughts when facing gender role devaluations, restrictions, and violations (O'Neil, 2008). Interpersonal contexts arise when gender role difficulties result in confining or devaluing another person (O'Neil, 2008). GRC from others when someone confines, diminishes, or violates another person who deviates from or adheres to masculine ideology (O'Neil, 2008).

Furthermore, GRC is a personal experience of negative outcomes from adhering to, deviating, or violating from gender role norms (O'Neil, 2008). These personal experiences are devaluations, restrictions, and/or violations (O'Neil, 2008). Devaluations are negative appraisals of one's or others adherence or deviation from gender roles (O'Neil, 2008). Devaluations product is decreasing positive regard and stature. Restrictions are the confinement to specific gender role norms such as controlling one's behavior or individuality (O'Neil, 2008). Restrictions result in controlling people's behavior or limiting one's potential (O'Neil, 2008). Lastly, violations are the harming of self, others, or being victimized by others for adhering or deviating from gender role norms (O'Neil, 2008). Violations outcome is becoming the victim or abused (O'Neil, 2008). Each of these personal experiences led to negative experiences and restrictions of a person's potential. These domains of GRC lead to difficulties in men's personal, family, career, and health lives (O'Neil, 2008). Also these domains have been shown to be related to depression, anxiety, restricted emotionality, and various other difficulties (O'Neil, 2008). Four patterns emerge within GRC: (a) success/power/competition (SPC), (b) restrictive emotionality (RE), (c) restrictive affectionate behavior between men (RABBM), and (d) conflict between work and family relations (CBWFR) (O'Neil, 2008). These four patterns make up the design of the GRC scale and are used much in the literature to describe the areas where men struggle with GRC (O'Neil, 2008). GRC is an encompassing theory that puts much of its focus on the negative outcomes of adhering to and/or deviating from gender role norms specifically around masculine ideology. Research on GRC focuses on the construct as a whole and is broken up to specific findings among the four patterns of GRC (O'Neil, 2008). Specifically, research has provided evidence that GRC is related to (a) African American men's low self-esteem, anxiety, depression (Lily, 1999), and negative attitudes towards help seeking (White, 2002); (b) Hispanic/Latino men's higher levels depression and stress (Fragosa & Kashubeck, 2000); (c) low self-esteem for Asian American men (Shek, 2005); and (d) younger age men endorse more GRC than older men specifically in the areas of SPC and RABBM (Brewer, 1998; Burke, 2000; Heath, 2005). Around

the same time that the theories of GRC and GRSP were being introduced, researchers began to theorize about the role that power and how men's place in society is established, a discussion of this theory is provided below.

Hegemonic Masculinity

Connell (2005) coined the term hegemonic masculinity to describe the pattern she saw of a type of masculinity that is hailed over other recognized masculinities. At any given point there is an idyllic concept of masculinity that is raised over others culturally and is the basis for how men are judged and perceived. Hegemonic masculinity has been more formally described as a "configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (Connell, 2005; pg. 77). Heterosexuality and homophobia are considered core factors in providing the environment where hegemonic masculinity is favored culturally (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Donaldson, 1993). Similarly, the same authors argued that the oppressive nature of the relationship of men to women lays a foundation to understanding hegemonic masculinity. The male sex role, portrayed by common cultural perceptions of heterosexual relationships, best embodies hegemonic masculinity since it is the culturally idealized form of a masculine character (Donaldson, 1993). However, this portrayal of masculinity may not be an accurate representation of the behaviors and attitudes of men in a given society (Donaldson, 1993). Also, homosexuality runs counter to hegemonic masculinity specifically in three ways: (a) hostility to homosexuality is seen as fundamental to male heterosexuality, (b) homosexuality is associated with effeminacy, and (c) homosexual pleasure is itself considered subversive (Connell, 2005). Homosexual relationships challenge the oppressive nature of heterosexual relationships as well as the concept of hegemonic masculinity and is seen as a threat.

Hegemonic masculinity is a type of masculinity wherein men follow or act in such a manner that maintains a present circumstance in gender relations by imposing and maintaining male power in a male world, often through subordinating women, gay men, and other types of masculinities (Connell, 2005; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). This type of masculinity is not merely a set of gender roles men simply follow, but instead a set of masculinities focused on males maintaining dominance over females. Hegemonic masculinity is strongly focused on how men gain and protect their power without the use of violence (Connell, 2005). This concept is not practiced by all men, in fact only a small group of men practice this type of masculinity, although all men benefit from its practice/existence (Connell, 2005; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Donaldson, 1993). The cultural ideals that the men in power create and perpetuate may not even be closely tied to all other men or even themselves (Donaldson, 1993). The focus hegemonic masculinity places on dominance gives men an inherent claim to higher status (Connell, 2005). This relatively small group of men are often public figures in positions of power creating the impression that hegemonic masculinity is normative (Connell, 2005). Hegemonic masculinity closely embodies the most honored way of being a man, which requires all other men to position themselves in relation to it, and further legitimatizes the global subordination of women (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Those men who benefit from this concept, without enacting it themselves, are referred to as carrying out complicit masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Hegemonic masculinity has been used to aid theories in explaining dynamics and relationships in areas such as education (Martino, 1995; Skelton, 1993), criminology (Messerschmidt, 1993), media representation of men (Hanke, 1992), and men's health (Gerschick & Miller, 1994). Following are some of the main critiques that have been made concerning hegemonic masculinity.

Critiques of Hegemonic Masculinity

Around the same time of the concept of hegemonic masculinity was gaining prominence so to was criticisms of the field of masculinity and hegemonic masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). The first of the critiques was that the underlying concept of masculinity is flawed (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Collinson and Hearn (1994) discuss the issue of masculinity being unclear in its meaning. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) elaborate on this critique by focusing on the field's tendency to look at masculinity as difference between gender rather than within genders and confusion between theories of masculinity in its meaning. Another criticism is that hegemonic masculinity is ambiguous and inconsistent sometimes referring to a fixed type or whatever is the dominant type of masculinity at the time (Martin, 1998). Holter (1997) added to the criticism by discussing how hegemonic masculinity places emphasis on power without giving recognition to the structural factors that place women in subordinate positions. Lastly, Wetherell and Edley (1999) criticisms include masculinity placing men in specific role rather than acknowledging the changes. Below are two theories that have been gaining more recognition and build on criticisms of previous theories.

Inclusive Masculinity

Anderson (2005) was the first describe and define the term of inclusive masculinity. Inclusive masculinity is the social construct concerning a masculinity that challenges the principles of hegemonic masculine values, but is valued among male peers (Anderson, 2005). This term came about when Anderson began to recognize the existence of two revered types of masculinity emerging, orthodox (hegemonic) masculinity (endorsing homophobic and misogynistic values) and inclusive masculinity (does not endorse these values; Anderson & McGuire, 2010). This is contrary to Connell's perspective, which acknowledges the existence of multiple masculinities, but that one masculinity is exalted over the others as dominant (Anderson & McGuire, 2010, Connell, 2005).

Connell (2005) describes men as being forced to look up to or find relation to this one form of masculinity, the dominant form. Even when considering a competing form of masculinity, Connell hypothesizes that this protest masculinity (term used by Connell to describe a competing masculinity) becomes the new form of hegemonic masculinity through the struggle of challenging the dominant form of masculinity (Connell, 1995, 2005). Anderson (2005) states that in periods of high homophobia, Connell is correct in that only one dominant masculinity exists. Homophobia along with heterosexuality serve to form the foundation of hegemonic masculinity, which without these constructs hegemonic masculinity struggles to maintain legitimacy (Anderson & McGuire, 2010; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Donaldson, 1993). In the absence of or decrease of homophobia, consequently decreasing the power of hegemonic masculinity, men are allowed more freedom in their expression allowing for competing masculinities to become more acceptable (Anderson & McGuire, 2010). As this continues, multiple masculinities are allowed to exist in a non-stratified configuration and one or more forms of inclusive masculinity are able to dominate without becoming hegemonic (Anderson & McGuire, 2010). Inclusive masculinity is viewed as incorporating and expanding on Connell's theorizing based on the idea that if there is no hegemony then there is no hegemonic masculinity and therefore inclusive masculinity serves as the social constructivist theory that describes this absence of hegemony Anderson & McGuire, 2010). Inclusive masculinity has been shown to exist in numerous settings over previous years such as fraternities (Anderson, 2007), sports (Anderson & McGuire, 2010), and school settings (Anderson 2008, 2009, McCormack 2010). Other theorists have also described this concept for example Swain (2006a, 2006b) refers to this concept as personalized masculinity and describes it as men being more free to choose whatever form of masculinity they desire without being forced by their culture. Ibson (2002) similarly discusses that in a culture of homophobia, softer more tactile forms of masculinity will proliferate. Inclusive masculinity explains masculinity in the absence of specific societal beliefs,

but a growing body of research has provided support for various masculinities existing between and within societies even during (Smiler, 2004).

Multiple Masculinities

Researchers in the 1990's were beginning to recognize competing masculinities that were coexisting with each other within a single society (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Also across cultures and settings, multiple patterns of masculinity have been documented (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). It has been an interdisciplinary consensus that masculinity is not a set identity or set of roles, but a socially created aspect of identity that is developed in relation to customs and expectations within various cultural and historical contexts, resulting in what is often termed masculinities (Connell, 2005). Due to these insights, theorists have begun to view masculinity as not a singular concept, but rather describing multiple masculinities (Smiler, 2004). It is being seen that there are many masculinities that vary from culture to culture and over time (Kimmel & Messner, 1992). Similar to other theories of masculinity, men are socially taught a specific form of masculinity held by their respective culture through gender role socialization (Kimmel & Messner, 1989).

One common way in which multiple masculinities has been demonstrated in research has been through the description of masculine forms within demographically defined groups such as: homosexuals (Connell, 1992), African Americans (Levant, Majors, & Kelley, 1998; Wade, 2008), Latinos (Saez, Casado, & Wade, 2009), and boys and men of different age groups (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995). These forms of masculinity are numerous and vary in specific tenants (Kimmel & Messner, 1992). This is even visible within media that targets male consumers, specifically magazines. Penny (2007) highlighted two types of masculinity being portrayed within different magazines, which are the new man and new lad. The new man is viewed as a feminist-friendly version of masculinity, focused on being fashionable, narcissistic, and body image-oriented

(Penny, 2007). The new lad is almost a backlash towards feminism and marginal masculinities (Penny, 2007). New lad's are seen as reincarnation of traditional masculinity, focusing on being anti-feminine, athletic, hyper-sexual, and drinking and eating whatever they want (Penny, 2007). This is also visible when looking at male high school students who are developing their own identities (Pascoe, 2003). Within high schools there are jocks, goths, skaters, etc. all of which have their own definitions of gender roles and expectations (Pascoe, 2003). Similarly, Fischer and Good (1998) analyzed men's responses to a unitary measure of masculinity and found that men scores varied into four distinct clusters- moderately traditional (endorsing median scores on all scales), high status/low violence (endorsed status items but not violence items), nontraditional (scored low on all subscales), and traditional (scored high on all scales). These findings have been replicated by two different studies including one of which found four cluster, but used different labels for the groups (Casey et al., 2015), The other study was a dissertation that found the same cluster but added a fifth cluster high violence/moderate traditional (scoring high on violence scales and moderate on others scales) (King, 2000). These findings support multiple masculinities by noticing that men score differently on unitary measures (Gray, 2012).

However, researchers have discussed that even though there are multiple masculinities that stand against hegemonic masculinity, dominant notions of masculinity are important within American culture with which men must contend, making hegemonic masculinity a measurement with which masculinity can be understood (Connell, 2005; Courtenay, 2000). Connell has labeled several other types of masculinity including dominant, complicit, subordinate, and marginalized masculinities (Connell, 2005). Subordinate and marginalized masculinities are less valued masculinities that are typically used to when describing non-white or gay men (Connell, 2005). Although there exists these separate groups, definitions and explanations are focused on showing similarities to the dominant group (Barker, 2005; Connell, 2005; Courtenay, 2000; Dworkin, Fullilove, & Peacock, 2009; Pascoe, 2003). For example, Pascoe (2003) found that adolescents in

high school who didn't belong in the jocks group (the identified dominant group) found ways of including the jock form of masculinity into their own masculinity. Similar to a study of African American adolescents who and self-identified with dominant aspects of toughness and prowess, however are placed in a subordinate masculinity, due to ethnicity, and therefore act or maintain an appearance of being sexually experienced and a disguise of being indestructible to appear closer to the dominant form (Kerrigan et al., 2007). How might then masculinity be influenced by others? The section below describes pluralistic ignorance as a hypothesized construct that could explain the influence others have on one's masculinity.

Pluralistic Ignorance

Pluralistic ignorance (PI) as defined by Katz and Allport (1931) is "a phenomenon in which individual's believe that their attitudes and behavior differ from others' attitudes and behaviors, even when such differences do not exist" (as cited in Boon & Yoshimura, 2014, p. 259). More specifically, researcher's definition of PI provides the assumption that one's private beliefs is different than other's beliefs, even though their outwards behavior is more in-line with others beliefs (Schroeder & Prentice, 1998). For example, Sandstorm and Bartini (2012) have found that students will assume (through self-report rating) that others are more accepting of bullying behavior (i.e. tolerant of bullies and less caring toward victims) than they themselves are, but they end up over-rating their peers' acceptance of such behavior. Another study investigating out-group contact, found that White and Black participants assumed their in-group to be unique in wishing to engage in out-group contact, but inferred that the out-group (White or Black individuals) does not wish to engage in contact, which lead to lower out-group contact (Shelton & Richeson, 2005). This phenomenon has been found with various other behaviors like adolescent and college-age drinking (Segrist, Corcoran, Jordan-Fleming, & Rose, 2007; Suls & Green, 2003), sexist attitudes (Do, Samuels, Adkins, Clinard, & Koveleskie, 2013), and

relationship violence (Hertzog & Rowley, 2014). Why is it that this behavior continues if most people actually don't endorse such actions?

To fully understand this phenomenon, it is important to include the second aspect of PI's definition that this perceived difference in behavior doesn't exist (Boon and Yoshimura, 2014). Segrist et al. (2007) found that those who perceived peers as normally engaging in drinking and in larger quantities of consumption also elevated in their own drinking behavior. It would seem that PI serves to partially explain why behaviors persist as those who hold PI tend to engage in the behavior they privately discredit (Do, Samuels, Adkins, Clinard, & Koveleskie, 2013; Hertzog and Rowley, 2014; Segrist et al. 2007; Suls & Green, 2003). Boon and Yoshimura (2014) in a study investigating PI in relationship revenge behavior, found, similar to findings in drinking behavior, that the personal perceptions of revenge as unacceptable behavior did not hinder the behavior from happening as participants perceived others as engaging in this behavior. The authors did not expand further on this point, but a possible explanation could be that perceiving others as being more tolerant of revenge behavior increases their likelihood of engaging in the behavior. Do et al. (2013) found a relationship between PI and sexist attitudes (air force cadets believed their egalitarian views of women were not shared by other cadets that were said to hold sexist attitudes), but also discussed the issue that a vocal minority that harbored sexist attitudes hampered changes in the military culture while the majority held personal views against sexism. In PI, few individuals may hold a certain belief, while the majority discredits that belief, but merely by the perception or illusion that other's generally hold this belief it is engaged in by the majority (Do et al., 2013). Similar to this finding Cook and Lane (2014) found that prison officers held progressive ideas about treating and working with inmates but would act in more authoritative ways as this was the perception of what other's believed. These studies lead to a supported possible conclusion that PI could influence how one acts depending on ones' perception of others beliefs, regardless of their own beliefs. One could be against harmful

behaviors (bullying), but not help others or act against this behavior for perceiving that they do not fit with what they perceive to be the majority's held belief and attempting to decrease this discrepancy (Sandstorm and Bartini, 2012).

As PI relates to masculinity, Beatty, Syzdek, and Bakkum (2006) found that men tended to overestimate other men's adherence to masculine norms confirming that pluralistic ignorance can be present within men. Several studies have looked at how men's perceptions of other men's normative health seeking behavior impacts their use health related systems. These perceptions have been shown to predictive of men's self-reported health behaviors (Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007) and act as a mediator between one's endorsement of masculine ideology and their health promotion behaviors (Levant & Wimer, 2014). Also, Miller et al. (2016) found that when investigating men's perceptions of other men's approval of barroom aggression, these perceptions were predictive of their own approval of physical and verbal barroom aggression. These studies lend support for the relationship between masculinity and pluralistic ignorance.

Purpose of the Study

Although studies have used masculinity to help explain men's behaviors and perceptions (e.g., Beatty, Syzdek, & Bakkum, 2006; Berger et al., 2005; Descutner & Thelen, 1991; Gale, 1996; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002; Levant & Majors, 1997; Levant & Wimer, 2014; Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007; McGraw, 2001; Miller et al., 2016; Santana, Raj, & Decker, 2006; Smith, 1996), no research exists to date that investigates how PI relates to conformity to traditional masculine norms. Regardless of the theory of masculinity being used, either traditional or hegemonic masculinity, it is often described as a singular ideal endorsed by a particular culture or the perception that the majority endorse this type of masculinity (Connell, 2005). This description seems to set the stage for PI, in that a construct is being viewed or perceived as being held by the majority. Schroeder and Prentice (1998) found that men perceived more agreement

with their peers compared to women in a study of interventions on PI and drinking behavior. Suls and Green hypothesized the perceived agreement in the study by Schroeder and Prentice was due to the need to resolve discrepancies between the participating men and their peers (Suls & Green, 2003). Also, men may be less apt to voice their concerns as they might be perceived as less of a man (Suls & Green, 2003). It could possibly stand to reason that PI might perpetuate traditional masculinity if men perceive that all others are adhering to such standards. Literature has suggested that relatively non-traditional men may overestimate the extent to which other men adhere more to dominant conceptualizations of masculinity, and perceive that misogyny is normative among men (Casey et al., 2016). Similar to research in pluralistic ignorance, Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, and Stark (2003) found that college age men underestimated their peers valuing of consent in sexual relationships or their intervention in peer's sexual mistreatment of women, which these perceptions played a factor in constraining their own intervening behavior. Although this study did not specifically investigate pluralistic ignorance, the outcomes mirrored the concept and adds support for the hypothesis of this study. This study intended to add to this literature in regard to traditional masculinity, investigating if PI plays a role in one's endorsement of masculinity. Additionally, this study controlled for right wing authoritarianism (RWA) as this has been found to impact men's gender role expression. Duncan, Peterson, and Winter (1997) found that RWA is associated with maintenance of traditional gender roles and negatively associated with nontraditional gender role identities. Other studies have controlled for this variable when investigating masculinity (Barnes, Brown, & Osterman, 2012; Killianski, 2003).

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT

IRB STUDY # ED-16-192

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDY INFORMATION SHEET & INFORMNED CONSENT
MASCULINE NORMS CONFORMITY STUDY

You are invited to participate in a research study looking at men's conformity to masculine norms based on various constructs. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

The study is being conducted by Samuel Farley, MS, a doctoral student at Oklahoma State University.

STUDY PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to gain insight into predicting men's conformity to masculine norms.

PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY:

If you agree to be in the study, you will do the following things:

You will be completing an online questionnaire that is estimated to take between 30-45 minutes of your time. Some of the questions in this study will ask about conformity/adherence to masculine norms and authoritarian behaviors. As discussed in the confidentiality section below, the study is an anonymous questionnaire, no identifying information will be collected and the records of the study will be kept private.

RISKS OF PARTICIPATION

There are no risks that are anticipated from your participation in the study. Some of the questions may make you feel uncomfortable, but you are free to decline to answer any questions you do not wish to answer or stop participation in the study.

BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION

The anticipated benefit of participation is to provide insight into construct impacting men's conformity to societal standards and inform counseling interventions working with male populations.

CONFIDENTIALITY

This study includes an anonymous questionnaire; as such the records of this study will be kept private. Any written results will discuss group findings and will not include information that will identify you. Research records will be stored on a password-protected computer in a locked office and only researchers and individuals responsible for research oversight will have access to the records. Data will be destroyed three years after the study has been completed.

Note that Qualtrics has specific privacy policies of their own. If you have concerns you should consult this service directly. Qualtrics' privacy statement is provided at:
http://qualtrics.com/privacy-statement.

PAYMENT

For your participation in the study, you have the option of entering a lottery for four $25 amazon gift cards. At the end of this survey, a link will be provided that will route you to a separate

survey where you can then enter your email information so that you can be entered into the lottery. The information in the two surveys will not be able to be matched and your responses will still remain anonymous if you choose to receive a gift certificate.

CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

For questions about the study, contact the researcher, Samuel Farley at samuel.farley@okstate.edu , or his advisor Hugh Crethar, PhD, at crethar@okstate.edu .
For questions about your rights as a research participant or to discuss problems, complaints or concerns about a research study, or to obtain information, or offer input, contact the IRB Office at 223 Scott Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-3377 or irb@okstate.edu

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF STUDY

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part or may leave the study at any time. Leaving the study will result in not being entered into the lottery for the gift cards.

CONSENT DOCUMENTATION:

I have been fully informed about the procedures listed here. I am aware of what I will be asked to do and of the benefits of my participation. I also understand the following statements:
I affirm that I am 18 years of age or older.

- YES
- NO

I have read and fully understand this consent form. I hereby give permission for my participation in this study.

- YES
- NO

APPENDIX C

STUDY MEASURES

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (CMNI-46)

The CMNI-46 cannot be published as per the author's requirements. If interested in viewing the measure or using it in additional research projects, please contact Mike C. Parent at michael.parent@austin.utexas.edu.

Male Role Norms Inventory-Short Form (MRNI-SF)

The MRNI-SF cannot be published as per the author's requirements. If interested in viewing the measure or using it in additional research projects, please contact Ronald F. Levant, Ed.D. at Levant@uakron.edu

Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale

Altemeyer's RWA Scale (Altmeyer, 1981 as cited in Levasseur, 1997).

Please read the statements below and respond to them, using the following scale.
1=Strongly disagree
2=Disagree
3=Somewhat disagree
4=Somewhat agree
5=Agree
6=Strongly Agree

_____ Being kind to loafers or criminals will only encourage them to take advantage of your weakness, so it's best to use a firm, tough hand when dealing with them.

_____ The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.

_____ It may be considered old fashioned by some, but having a decent, respectable appearance is still the mark of a gentleman and, especially, a lady.

_____ Organizations like the army and the priesthood have a pretty unhealthy effect upon men because they require strict obedience of commands from supervisors.*

_____ Capital punishment should be completely abolished.*

_____ Our prisons are a shocking disgrace. Criminals are unfortunate people who deserve much better care, instead of so much punishment.*

_____ Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

_____ If a child starts becoming a little too unconventional, his parents should see to it he returns to the normal ways expected by society.

_____ People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.*

_____ National anthems, flags, and glorification of one's country should all be de-emphasized to promote the brotherhood of all men.*

_____ In these troubled times laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up.
_____ Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

_____ Our customs and national heritage are the things that have made us great, and certain people should be made to show greater respect for them.

_____ The courts are right in being easy on drug offenders. Punishment would not do any good in cases like these.*

_____ A lot of our society's rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.*

_____ Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.*

_____ One good way to teach certain people right from wrong is to give them a good stiff punishment when they get out of line.

_____ A " women's place" should be where ever she wants it to be. The days of when women are submissive to their husbands and social conventions belong strictly in the past.*

_____ Rules about being "well mannered" and respectable are chains from the past which we should question very thoroughly before accepting.*

_____ It's one thing to question and doubt someone during an election campaign, but once a man becomes the leader of our country we owe him our greatest support and loyalty.

_____ Women should always remember the promise they make in marriage the ceremony to obey their husbands.

_____ Youngsters should be taught to refuse to fight in a war unless they themselves agree the war is just and necessary.*

_____ Homosexuals are just as good and virtuous as anybody else, and there is nothing wrong with being one.*

_____ Laws have to be strictly enforced if we are going to preserve our way of life.

*- Denotes items that were reverse coded for scoring purposes.

Demographics Questionnaire

What is your identified gender?
- Male
- Female
- Transgendered female to male
- Transgendered male to female

What best describes your race/ethnicity?
- Black/African-American Non-Hispanic
- White, Non-Hispanic
- Hispanic/Latino(a)
- Asian American

- Pacific Islander
- Native/American Indian/Alaska Native
- Mixed

What is your sexual/affectional orientation?
- Gay or Lesbian
- Straight (Heterosexual)
- Bisexual
- Queer/Questioning

Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?
- Single (Not in a committed relationship)
- In a committed relationship
- Currently married
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Separated

What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Select one)
- no formal education
- Did not graduate from High School or earn a GED
- High School Graduate or GED
- Some College/AA degree/Technical School Training
- College Graduate (BA/BS)
- Some graduate school
- Master's Degree
- Doctorate/Medical/Law Degree
- Refuse to answer

Are you currently employed?
- No employment or full-time student
- Part time (student)
- Part-time
- Full-time

Please select you identified religion. (Please select the one of best fit)
- Catholicism
- Protestantism
- Buddhism
- Judaism
- Islam
- Hindu
- Spiritualism
- Atheism
- Agnosticism
- Other

DSE <p>The following questions deal with possible spiritual experiences. To what extent can you say you experience the following:

	Many Times a Day	Everyday	Most Days	Some Days	Once in a While	Never or Almost Never
1. I feel God's presence	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
2. I find strength and comfort in my religion	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
3. I feel deep inner peace or harmony	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
4. I desire to be closer to or in union with God	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
5. I feel God's love for me, directly or through others	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
6. I am spiritual.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Within which state were you primarily raised?

Which state do you currently reside in?

How old are you? _____

Appendix D

IRB Approval

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date:	Thursday, January 26, 2017
IRB Application No	ED16192
Proposal Title:	Do perceptions of other men affect one's own endorsement of masculinity?

Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 1/25/2020

Principal Investigator(s):

Samuel Farley
434 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74078

Hugh C. Crethar
422 Williard
Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

☒ The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval. Protocol modifications requiring approval may include changes to the title, PI advisor, funding status or sponsor, subject population composition or size, recruitment, inclusion/exclusion criteria, research site, research procedures and consent/assent process or forms.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of the research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Dawnett Watkins 219 Scott Hall (phone: 405-744-5700, dawnett.watkins@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Jennifer Byrd-Craven, Vice- Chair
Institutional Review Board

VITA

Samuel T. Farley

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: DO PERCEPTIONS OF OTHER MEN AFFECT ONE'S OWN ENDORSEMENT OF MASCULINITY?

Major Field: Educational Psychology - Counseling

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in your major at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 2018.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in your major at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in 2015.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Science in your major at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas in 2012.