

6-4-2014

# How Sexism Makes the Man: Examining the Relationship Between Masculinity, Ambivalent Sexism, and Gender Stereotyping

Mariah L. Wilkerson  
*Lawrence University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lux.lawrence.edu/luhp>

 Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Social Psychology Commons](#), [Statistical Methodology Commons](#), and the [Statistical Models Commons](#)

© Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

---

## Recommended Citation

Wilkerson, Mariah L., "How Sexism Makes the Man: Examining the Relationship Between Masculinity, Ambivalent Sexism, and Gender Stereotyping" (2014). *Lawrence University Honors Projects*. 55.  
<https://lux.lawrence.edu/luhp/55>

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by Lux. It has been accepted for inclusion in Lawrence University Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of Lux. For more information, please contact [colette.brautigam@lawrence.edu](mailto:colette.brautigam@lawrence.edu).

How Sexism Makes the Man:

Examining the Relationship between Masculinity, Ambivalent Sexism, and Gender Stereotypes

Mariah L. Wilkerson

Lawrence University

## Abstract

Masculinity is a precarious social status, meaning it can be lost through social and gender transgressions (Bosson & Vandello, 2011). Men often act in stereotypically masculine ways to reassert their masculinity and restore their social status after it has been threatened. The current study also examines masculinity in a new way, as a collective gender identity (e.g., Tajfel, 1982). I hypothesized that threatened men and men who identify as more masculine will display masculinity through more polarized attitudes towards traditional and nontraditional groups of men and women, endorsing traditional gender stereotypes, and intensified ambivalently sexist attitudes. Two empirical studies tested these hypotheses. While the gender threat manipulation was unsuccessful, statistical analyses of results revealed relationships between masculine identification, ambivalent sexism, and gender stereotypes. Hostile sexism predicted negative attitudes towards nontraditional men and women, benevolent sexism predicted favorable attitudes toward men and women. Masculine identification predicted favorable attitudes towards masculine men and traditional women, and negative attitudes towards feminine men. Interestingly masculine identification did not predict unfavorable attitudes towards other nontraditional men. These results suggest masculinity is a collective identity, in which attitudes towards other men and women are influenced by in-group/out-group relations.

*Keywords:* masculinity, precarious manhood, gender stereotypes, ambivalent sexism

### How Sexism Makes the Man:

#### Examining the Relationship between Masculinity, Ambivalent Sexism, and Gender Stereotypes

The psychological understanding of masculinity is limited in two ways. First, research on masculinity has primarily focused in three main areas: precarious manhood theory (Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, & Weaver, 2008), gender orientation, and masculine ideology (Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992). While these frameworks have implications for gender relations, I argue that they are too narrow to provide a full picture of masculinity. Second, the concept of masculinity has been linked to negative outcomes such as increased anxiety, negative attitudes, and destructive behaviors (Bosson & Vandello, 2011) with little focus on potentially positive outcomes (Weaver, Vandello, & Bosson, 2013). Some men also demonstrate strong polarized sexist attitudes towards women: subjectively positive attitudes towards traditional women, and hostilely negative attitudes towards nontraditional women (Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, & Zhu, 1997). The research on masculinity has been too focused on these negative attitudes and outcomes, without adequately exploring subjectively positive areas of masculinity. I address both of these limitations by measuring masculinity through collective identity (Tajfel, 1982) and examining gender stereotyping and sexist attitudes as a subjectively positive response to masculinity.

Stereotypes, “qualities perceived to be associated with particular groups or categories of people” (Schneider, 2004, p. 24) influence men and women’s behaviors, attitudes, and social status by creating a set of gender roles which they are expected to follow (Eagly, 1987). Gender roles govern a number of contexts including occupations, family relationships, and social relationships. Men and women’s gender roles vary in content and pressure to conform. Women have been actively stepping outside of their traditional gender roles by entering into the

workforce, changing their gender roles and stereotypes (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). However, the pressures for men to conform to and demonstrate masculine qualities have not significantly changed (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000). I suggest men's precarious gender identity, and consequent fear of backlash for failing to be masculine enough, may motivate them to more strongly enforce gender stereotypes as a subjectively positive response to masculinity.

### **Gender Roles and Stereotypes**

The origins of gender stereotypes and differences help explain why stereotyping may be a subjectively positive outcome of masculinity. Sexual selection theory (Buss, 1995) and social role theory (Eagly, 1987), provide differing explanations about the origin of gender differences. Sexual selection theory posits that gender differences originated from the evolution of characteristics designed to increase sexual reproduction, while social role theory argues social divisions of labor are the root of these differences. These theories have different implications for the development and content of modern gender roles and stereotypes.

Evolutionary psychology suggests female and male human ancestors developed different characteristics in areas where they faced different adaptive issues, specifically reproduction (Buss, 1995). As a species, humans supposedly carried these evolved sex-specific characteristics with them, causing the current societal gender differences. Within evolutionary psychology, sexual selection theory, "the causal process of the evolution of characteristics on the basis of reproductive advantage, as opposed to survival," (Buss, 1995, p.165) best explains gender differences. Buss outlines two main forms of sexual selection: intrasexual competition and intersexual selection. Intrasexual competition is two (or more) members of one sex competing for access to a mate. Evolutionary psychologists argue that because women and their reproductive abilities were a scarce resource, men often competed with one another to obtain

resources. Men who had the best skills such as dominance and competitiveness would presumably win intrasexual competitions resulting in increased access to women. Intrasexual competition selected for male dominance and competitiveness. Sexual selection theory suggests cultural stereotypes of men's aggression and dominance originated from actual sex differences caused by intrasexual competition.

Intersexual selection is another type of sexual selection (Buss, 1995). Intersexual selection "involves preferential choice exerted by members of one sex for members of the opposite sex possessing certain qualities" (Buss, 1988, p. 616). Theoretically, because women had difficulty acquiring resources during pregnancy and lactation, they valued men who had better access to resources (Buss, 1995). Traits such as dominance, aggression, and competitiveness supposedly increased men's ability to obtain resources through intrasexual competition. However, sexual selection theory suggests women also selected mates who exhibited prosocial behaviors because they sought mates who would commit to providing them and their offspring with resources. Thus, men evolved to have traits such as competitiveness and dominance towards other men, but also pro-sociality specifically towards women (Buss, 1988). This suggests that men may act more aggressive and dominant towards other men, but may act subjectively benevolent towards women.

Intersexual competition also posits an origin for stereotypical feminine traits (Buss, 1995). Men chose mates with communal traits (e.g., caring, warm, friendly, etc.) because those traits suggest an individual who will nurture and care for offspring. Men allegedly valued, and mated with, women who invested more in raising offspring to better secure the continuation of the men's genetic line. This created evolutionary pressure, leading women to develop and

possess more caring and nurturing characteristics. Evolutionary psychology suggests that cultural stereotypes about women's desires to help others reflect evolved gender differences.

By contrast, social role theory argues gender differences originate in the social-structural differences between men and women; people are expected to develop the characteristics needed to carry out their gender role, these expected characteristics then become stereotypes (Eagly & Wood, 1999). The different societal roles of men and women lead to gender differences in behavior and personality. Eagly (1987) argues biological sex differences, combined with the advent of agriculture pushed men and women into different roles through a division of labor; men took on roles (e.g., warrior, herding) which allowed men to secure higher social status, either through physical strength or monopolizing resources (Eagly & Wood, 1999). Men's roles predisposed them to powerful societal positions, and as a result, they developed dominant characteristics such as a desire for control, aggressiveness, and assertiveness.

Eagly and Wood (1999) argue because women had to physically dedicate their bodies to childrearing through pregnancy and nursing, they were predisposed to roles involving child care and dissuaded from roles requiring extended absences (Eagly & Wood, 1999). Women relied on men to provide them with resources while they were preoccupied with caring for offspring. Subordinate behaviors became the most useful to women, as they allowed women to receive resources from men. Economic subordination and dependence theoretically pressured women to develop traits such as compliance and cooperation. Women were pushed into a lower social status because of their dependence on men. A social hierarchy developed from these roles, polarizing gender so men had a better social status than women. Eagly (1987) argues these social roles are the basis for the current cultural and societal power differences and gender stereotypes.

Competing theories argue that gender differences in behaviors, personality, and stereotypes developed through different mechanisms, either sexual selection or social roles. However, both approaches agree the current content of gender stereotypes lie in two dimensions: communality, traits primarily related to concern for others, and agency, traits primarily related to independence from others (Eagly, 1987). Prentice and Carranza (2002) suggest that dominance represents a third dimension, which they showed was distinct from agency. These stereotypes reinforce the gender hierarchy, making it difficult for men and women to engage in roles which challenge traditional gender roles.

Measuring gender stereotypes has helped classify and define their specific cultural content. Bem (1974) created the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) as a way to measure sex-roles and characteristics. She had participants rate whether a series of personality traits were more desirable for men or women in American society. The BSRI also measures the social desirability for these traits in society, which keeps the inventory culturally relevant. The social desirability for some gendered traits are dynamic, changing with time (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000); by measuring social desirability, the BSRI can arguably measure changes in stereotype content. The BSRI contains masculine items, feminine items, and neutral items. The desirable masculine traits in the inventory include characteristics such as aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, self-reliant, and competitive. People expect, and desire, these agentic and dominant qualities in men (Bem, 1974). Generally, people view men's stereotypes more positively than women's (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968). Because social roles are validated through behavior, men demonstrate these traits to affirm their gender roles and assert the gender hierarchy (Eagly, 1987).

The feminine items include traits such as affectionate, compassionate, childlike, gentle, soft-spoken, and warm. These traits are simultaneously communal and reinforce the gender hierarchy (Bem, 1974; Eagly, 1987). Characteristics such as childlike and gentle prohibit women from asserting agentic and dominant characteristics and gaining more societal power, reinforcing men's higher social status. Because women have a lower status than men, men can exert a greater influence over them, and women yield to the influence of men (Eagly & Steffen, 2000). People expect women to act subordinate to men, these expectations lead to behaviors which demonstrate communal qualities, and those behaviors then reinforce the gender roles (Eagly, 1987). Eagly (1987) suggests these gender roles and expectations lead to gender stereotypes and gender stereotyping.

Gender stereotypes take on two roles; they can be expectations of how people are or they can be injunctive rules about how people *should* be (Hall, et al., in press). Each role has different implications for gender interactions and expectations. There are three types of gender stereotypes: descriptive, prescriptive, and proscriptive stereotypes. Descriptive stereotypes are beliefs about how people *typically are*, prescriptive stereotypes are beliefs about how people *ought* to be, and proscriptive stereotypes are beliefs about how people *ought not* to be. While the overall content for each of these categories strongly differs across gender (men more agentic and dominant stereotypes, women more communal stereotypes), men and women can have differing descriptions and prescriptions.

Although descriptive stereotypes represent beliefs about how men and women are in society by biasing perception, they do not pressure men and women into gendered behavior (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Glick, & Phelan, 2012). For example, "women like cooking" and "men like sports" describe how men and women *are*, but are not injunctive; they do not prescribe that

men and women must act these ways (Gill, 2004, p. 620). A recent study by Hall and colleagues (in press) outlined more current stereotypes, both descriptive and prescriptive for men and women. Descriptive stereotypes characterize men as aggressive, assertive, dominant, confident, ruthless, and having a strong personality. Descriptive stereotypes characterize women as cooperative, interested in children, melodramatic, materialistic, and submissive (e.g., Eagly, 1987). These stereotypes reflect societal beliefs about how men and women are; however, they do not represent men and women's prescriptions.

The process through which people form stereotypes includes making automatic and overlearned assumptions about an individual based on his/her gender (Rudman et al., 2012). Descriptive stereotyping occurs in three steps: spontaneous categorization, stereotype activation, and perception. The perceiver first categorizes a target based on automatic associations about the target's group; this activates stereotypes that bias perception of individual targets. The perceiver associates the stereotypes for the group with the target causing them to attribute those characteristics to the target. However, individuals can interrupt this process either through deliberate efforts or receiving individuating information, information identifying the individual as separate from the group (Gill, 2004; Rudman et al., 2012). By actively preventing automatic associations between group characteristics and the target, the perceiver can disrupt descriptive stereotypes. Gill (2004) showed when perceivers receive behavioral information about the target, descriptive stereotypes can be undercut. However, disrupting stereotyping is difficult and specific to descriptive stereotyping. Prescriptive stereotypes persevere even after perceivers get individuating information about the target. This suggests prescriptive stereotypes are more pervasive and may be harder to overcome.

Unlike descriptive stereotypes, prescriptive and proscriptive stereotypes pressure men and women to conform to traditional traits social roles (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Prescriptive stereotypes specify traits desirable for men and women, coercing individuals to conform to gender stereotypes. Proscriptive stereotypes specify socially undesirable traits for each gender, creating pressure to avoid non-stereotypical traits and behaviors. Prescriptive stereotypes suggest men should exhibit athleticism, ambition, decisiveness, aggressiveness; proscriptive stereotypes discourage them from being emotional, yielding, melodramatic, and weak (Hall, et al., in press; Prentice and Carranza, 2002). Prescriptive stereotypes demand women be warm, kind, sensitive, patient, cooperative, and emotionally expressive; they have proscriptive stereotypes discouraging them from exhibiting rebelliousness, stubbornness, and controlling behaviors, or promiscuity. Prescriptive and proscriptive stereotypes enforce traditional gender roles more than descriptive stereotypes by creating a social pressure for men and women to exhibit gender stereotypical behavior.

Differences in the content of descriptive and prescriptive/proscriptive stereotypes reveal inconsistencies in areas in which men and women are described and proscribed the same traits; sometimes men and women are described with a trait they *ought* to not have. For example women are descriptively stereotyped as melodramatic (Hall et al., in press), but this trait is stereotypically proscribed for women (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). This shows a discrepancy between people's expectations and injunctive norms. The difference in their cognitive pervasiveness may suggest a reason for these discrepancies (Gill, 2004); prescriptive stereotypes require more effortful cognitive processing to reduce than descriptive stereotypes. When people receive stereotypically discrepant information about an individual, they more easily adjust descriptive stereotypes to incorporate the new material. However, people are reluctant to let go

their prescriptive stereotypes. This suggests that people may no longer perceptually associate an individual with the qualities of their gender, but still expect and pressure them to conform to traditional gender roles. For example, people may expect women to exhibit dramatic behaviors but pressure them not to display those behaviors. When men and women violate these prescriptive stereotypes, they can elicit responses from others who encourage them to conform to traditional gender roles (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004).

### **Backlash**

Violating prescriptive stereotypes leads to backlash, “social and economic penalties for behaving counter stereotypically” (Rudman et al., 2012, p. 168) for both men and women (Rudman, 1998). Backlash reflects motivations to enforce gender stereotypes and maintain the status-quo; it reinforces stereotypes by limiting the visibility of people who challenge them (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). Both targets, people who exhibit socially deviant behaviors, and perceivers, those who view the behavior, contribute to backlash. Targets perpetuate gender stereotypes by avoiding gender nonconformity because they fear backlash and ostracism. Experiencing backlash also reduces self-esteem and increases feelings of negativity, increasing targets motivation to avoid nonconforming gender roles and stereotypes. Targets seek ways to recover from backlash by various means, such as hiding their “deviant” behaviors or traits. By outwardly conforming to gender norms, targets minimize backlash, and resulting threats to self-esteem.

Perceivers also encourage gender stereotypes as a response to threatened self-esteem (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). Viewing a target who exhibits nontraditional roles and stereotypes activates perceivers’ gender stereotypes and cultural standards, leading to a comparison between the target and a stereotypical member of their group (or gender). The perceiver views the target

an inadequate group members because the target exhibits behaviors conflicting with traditional stereotypes. These conflicting behaviors theoretically threaten the perceiver's self-esteem by challenging beliefs about stereotypes and gender roles. Perceivers tend to respond in intentionally punitive (punishing) or defensive ways because the target's deviance threatens the perceiver's self-esteem. When perceivers enact backlash as a defensive tactic, they feel more justified in punishing actors. Justification is important for perceivers because it validates their negative response to actors and helps them restore their threatened self-esteem by reinforcing traditional stereotypes and roles. Backlash, therefore, leads to increased feelings of self-esteem in the perceiver.

Men and women both experience backlash for violating prescriptive and proscriptive gender stereotypes, but in different ways. Even though, women's stereotypes are more dynamic, changing over time, than men's and are beginning to incorporate more masculine traits (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000), women still face backlash for having those characteristics. Backlash reinforces the gender hierarchy by punishing women who demonstrate agentic, dominant, or leadership qualities typically associated with leadership roles (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2011). By having masculine traits, "agentic women undermine the presumed differences between genders" (Rudman et al., 2011, p. 166) and challenge men's higher social status. Backlash towards women occurs because people view women as competent *or* warm, but not both (Rudman & Glick, 2001). Rudman (1998) found that when women use self-promotion strategies, they are viewed as being as capable as men, but are considerably less liked than men. By contrast, women who did not use self-promotion strategies, were not considered as capable as men, but were liked more. When women exhibit agentic traits, people judge them as equal in competence to men who also display those traits, but as less likable. Women are socially

rejected, rated less favorably, and face more hostile responses, especially in the workplace, for being agentic or dominant. This suggests a double bind: women who demonstrate agency gain perceived competence but are disliked; if women hide their agentic qualities to avoid backlash, their perceived competence diminishes.

Men can also experience backlash for violating traditional gender roles (Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Rudman, 2010b). Men are prescribed to demonstrate agentic and dominant traits (Hall et al., in press; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). When men do not conform to those traits, they experience lowered self-esteem and fear backlash and ostracism (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). As a result, backlash increases pressures for men to conform by hiding their gender “deviant” traits and/or behaviors. For example, Rudman and Mescher (2013) found that men who requested family leave from work, a violation of masculine gender roles, were viewed as less agentic, weaker, and more communal than men who did not request family leave. Because these men did not demonstrate prescribed traits of agency and dominance, they experienced backlash. By stigmatizing family leave as feminine, men may be less likely to ask for it out of fear. This perpetuates the problem, creating a cycle of avoiding backlash by reinforcing gender norms, which in turn contributes to backlash. Similarly, Moss-Racusin and colleagues (2010b) found modest men experienced hiring prejudice, when applying for a managerial position. Unlike modest women, modest men were not punished for being too communal, but were rather punished for not having prescribed traits of agency and dominance. Men experience backlash “because men are obliged to engage in status-enhancing displays” (Moss-Racusin et al., 2010b, p. 148) and when they fail to do so, they undermine men’s power and dominance over women.

While women’s stereotypes are dynamic, people view men’s stereotypes as stable and unlikely to change in the future (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000). Women may be allowed increasing

freedom to demonstrate valued masculine traits, men's burden of conforming to male stereotypes is not changing. When men act incongruent with traditional male stereotypes and roles they experience backlash (Moss-Racusin et al., 2010b) and feel a pressure to reassert their masculinity by demonstrating traditional masculine stereotypes and roles (Vandello et al., 2008).

### **Masculinity**

Vandello and Bosson (2013) outline three ways of understanding manhood and masculine identity: masculine stereotypes, the anti-femininity mandate, and precarious manhood theory. Each illuminates different aspects of manhood; however, considering them together provides a fuller picture of what it means to be masculine and the implications of masculinity. While each of these frameworks can provide a unique view of masculinity, they overlap considerably.

Adhering to masculine stereotypes can contribute to men's masculine identity (Moss-Racusin, Good, & Sanchez, 2010a). Masculine stereotypes, as outlined earlier, consist mainly of agentic and dominant traits. However, because they pressure men to conform to gender roles, prescriptive stereotypes may impact men's masculine identity more than descriptive stereotypes (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Men engage in prescriptive stereotyping more than women (Gill, 2004), which suggests men expect men (including themselves) to conform more to traditional gender roles than women.

Masculinity also includes an anti-femininity mandate, "the rule that boys and men must avoid feminine behaviors, tendencies, and preferences" (Bosson & Michniewicz, 2013, p. 425). Because of the anti-femininity mandate, men dichotomize gender, by perceiving greater differences between typical male and female traits, much more strongly than women (Bosson & Michniewicz, 2013). Gender dichotomization occurs because men view masculinity and

masculine traits (e.g., independent, assertive, etc.) as central to their gender group identity and feminine traits as excluded from that identity. Since masculine traits are more important to men's identity than other gender traits, they perceive a stronger difference between masculine (e.g., assertive, egotistical, etc.) and feminine (e.g., sensitive, moody, etc.) traits in their in-group identity regardless of desirability. Bosson and Michniewicz (2013) found that men who identify strongly as masculine dichotomize their in-group identity more forcibly, suggesting men obtain and value meaning from their masculine identity through eschewing femininity

Precarious manhood theory (Vandello et al., 2008) represents another way of understanding masculinity which helps explain men's sensitivity to being a target of backlash, and tendencies toward sexist behaviors (Bosson & Michniewicz, 2013). Bosson and Vandello's (2011) precarious manhood theory posits manhood as a social status expressing power and dominance, but an unstable status undermined by failures to exhibit masculine ideals.

Masculinity, or manhood, is a unique social status, distinct from womanhood, because it is hard to achieve, but easy to lose; men must earn, prove and achieve their manhood. The precarious manhood theory suggests the following principles: men perceive manhood as an earned status requiring constant proof, they believe it is easily lost through social or gender transgressions, and this creates a social hierarchy based on traditional and ideal masculine behaviors. When men act in gender non-conforming ways, they put their manhood and their social status at risk. Because of the tenuous nature of manhood, men become invested in establishing and maintaining their status, constantly monitoring it relative to other men and their social environment.

Women do not experience the problem of a precarious gender status because, as Vandello et al. (2008) argue, womanhood does not require constant proof. Womanhood is viewed as a developmental certainty, achieved by reaching biological marks (e.g., menstruation and

pregnancy). Even though some women may fail to meet the standards of womanhood and be considered “bad” women, they do not risk losing a high social status as men do. Since women do not experience this risk, they do not suffer the psychological consequences or pressures men experience from constant pressure to maintain their social status. While women certainly face pressures and constraints from society and stereotypes (e.g., Rudman, 1988), their status in society is not determined by their womanhood. Precarious manhood theory emphasizes not the content difference in gender roles, but a structural difference (Bosson & Vandello, 2011).

Precarious manhood theory, like gender stereotypes, has roots in social role theory, which states that the social structure and social roles derived from the division of labor led to the hierarchical nature of manhood (Eagly & Wood, 1999). Men have historically occupied social roles that involve status seeking and attaining resources (Eagly, 1987). They have used these roles through intrasexual competition to show dominance, attract sexual partners, and increase access to resources. Consequently, men are often in protector roles, such as warriors, guards, or law enforcement. The roles men occupy can necessitate or perpetuate traits such as competitiveness, defensiveness, and a struggle to prove one’s worth (Bosson & Vandello, 2011). The constant struggle to attain and provide resources as a way of proving worth can cause manhood to become dependent on acquiring those resources, creating a hierarchy within male populations.

Because, Vandello et al. (2008) argue, manhood depends on proving oneself to others; it inherently involves active social performances. Thus, men often strive harder to demonstrate manhood and masculine traits in front of an audience than when they are not being observed (Weaver, et al., 2013). An audience increases normative constraints on men to exhibit masculine behaviors and prove their social status (Becker & Eagly, 2004). Men can emphasize their

masculinity in several different ways. Men may assert their gender through aggression (Bosson et al., 2009). Aggression is an effective way of establishing masculinity and manhood both to the aggressor and others. Being aggressive asserts stereotypical and idealized masculine traits, allowing men to show others their masculinity.

Swami and Voracek (2013) found men who have more sexist attitudes also have a strong drive for muscularity. They suggest men idealize a muscular body because muscularity is strongly associated with masculinity, enabling aggression when necessary, and is a means of asserting traditional male stereotypes. Sexist men, compared to nonsexist men, are also more likely to claim engaging in athletic and risk taking behaviors (Hammer & Good, 2010). Because men consider physical strength central to masculinity, they may overestimate their athleticism, especially when discussing it with others. Similarly, having a job, and with it the ability to provide for a family, is strongly associated with masculine identity (Eagly & Wood, 1999); thus men feel pressure to assert their masculinity through getting and maintaining a high status job.

Men feel exceptional pressure to act in masculine ways when their masculinity is threatened. According to Bosson and Vandello (2011) masculinity threat comes from any action or event that causes a man to feel his manhood has been diminished. Men may feel their masculinity has been threatened after engaging in a female gendered task (e.g., braiding hair), or receiving opposition from someone who challenges their masculinity (e.g., being called a “wuss”) (Bosson et al., 2009). Paralleling responses to backlash (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004), once men are threatened, they feel anxious and distressed because their social status is at risk. After masculinity threat, men were more likely to use aggressive words in a word completion task, showing an increased accessibility to aggressive thoughts. These stressful feelings, in turn,

motivate men immediately to reassert their dominance and regain their lost status, and to hide and dispel an association with femininity (Vandello et al., 2008).

Much of the research on masculinity threats has focused on negative and aggressive response. Men act more aggressive, competitive, and take greater risks after masculinity threats (e.g., Bosson & Vandello, 2011; Weaver, et al., 2013), which represent increased adherence to traditional male stereotypes. These active demonstrations alleviate tension and anxiety caused by a reduction in social status (Weaver, Vandello, Bosson, & Burnaford, 2010). Weaver and colleagues (2010) found men to perceive aggression as an adequate means of restoring threatened manhood, using it to gain relief from anxiety about gender roles. After publicly engaging in a hair braiding (feminine) task as compared to a rope braiding (gender-neutral) task men exhibited more aggressive posture, selected a punching task more frequently (over a puzzle task), and punched a punching bag with more force. Similarly, in a faux shock-learning task, after masculinity threat, men delivered stronger shocks to the “learner” (Cohn, Seibert, & Zeichner, 2009). This shows men, especially threatened men, understand and use aggression as a means of restoring manhood. Men also use risky and impulsive behaviors in response to a gender threat; they gambled more money in more risky situations (Weaver et al., 2013). Threatened men were motivated to make risky bets, and sacrifice a greater future gain for a smaller immediate gain. Similarly, after a masculinity threat (recalling a time when they transgressed masculine norms), men exhibited a more extreme gender dichotomization, distancing their male identity from feminine qualities more than a control group that did not experience masculinity threat (Bosson & Michniewicz, 2013). Men are willing to overlook potential negative outcomes of their behaviors because they feel a necessity to regain their lost social status.

An audience amplifies men's responses to masculinity threat by creating an environment where men feel the need to demonstrate masculine norms (Weaver et al., 2013). Vandello and Bosson (2013) argue manhood is a social status that depends on the perceived feelings of others. Therefore, men must actively display manhood to others after the threat has occurred to prove to others they are "real" men. Aggressive behaviors and expressing aggressive ideals are seen by men as appropriate and necessary means of achieving manhood (Cohn, et al., 2009; Vandello et al., 2008). After masculinity threats men may engage in, and encourage others to engage in, masculine behaviors such as excessive drinking, driving fast cars, bragging about sex, and excelling at sports to reassert manhood (Vandello, et al., 2009). These behaviors reinstate manhood by conforming to and reiterating perceived masculine norms.

Research exploring precarious masculinity and masculinity threat contains little information about potentially positive responses to and characteristics of masculinity. Becker and Eagly (2004) suggest a link between masculinity, heroism, and chivalry (a form of benevolent sexism). They argue that masculinity pressures men take heroic risks, as a means of displaying manhood that may increase social status and power (Becker & Eagly, 2004). Men may be more likely to exhibit these heroically risky behaviors towards traditional women because men are expected to be chivalrous, and help "damsels in distress." Chivalry, and benevolent sexism, includes an idealization of traditional female gender roles. However, this is only one potentially positive response to masculinity and there is little empirical evidence to support Becker and Eagly's (2004) argument. Research on stereotypes and sexism posits that men assert characteristics and stereotypes as part of the masculine identity (i.e. dominance and agency) (Moss-Racusin et al., 2010b). When men are reminded of the precarious nature of their masculine identity, they reassert masculine norms and ideals. This suggests that when men

experience a masculinity threat, to avoid backlash, reduce anxiety, and assert their masculinity, they may respond in subjectively positive ways by idealizing traditional gender roles and stereotypes. Men may do so to help increase their perceived social status and reinforce their status in the gender hierarchy.

Although the theories of masculinity outlined above enhance the understanding of how masculinity affects behaviors, they do not provide individual measures of masculine identity. Thompson and colleagues (1992) analyzed the measures of masculinity and concluded most masculinity scales measure one of two concepts: gender orientation, inclusion of masculine and feminine traits in one's identity, or gender ideologies, beliefs and attitudes about masculinity. While both gender orientation and gender ideologies have psychological implications, neither measure men's self-concept and self-identity as masculine. Understanding masculinity as collective identity (Tajfel, 1982) helps explain gender relations as broader group interactions.

Social identity theorists (e.g., Tajfel, 1982) suggest that collective, or social, identity is based on a group identity, involving interpersonal bonds originating from identification with a group or social category, creating an in-group (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). An in-group includes individuals who demonstrate and idealize the characteristics associated with the group. To form a collective identity, an individual must first self-categorize, associating their individual traits and characteristics to those of the larger group (Ashmore, Deux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004). This involves internalizing the in-group's norms, characteristics, attitudes, and cognitions (Tropp & Wright, 2001). An individual can have many social identities, but when a specific social identity is more salient, an individual will rely on the in-group as a source for thoughts and behaviors. Individuals judge themselves relative to in-group standards, and can end up self-stereotyping, by reinforcing ideal group characteristics in themselves. Applying collective identity theories to

masculinity, suggests that men incorporate masculine stereotypes into their self and collective identity. Men may then rely on stereotypes to guide thoughts and behaviors.

Collective identity can lead to in-group favoritism, favoring and valuing the traits and individuals included within the in-group, over the out-group (people not part of the in-group) (Brewer, 2007). In-group favoritism is stronger on dimensions important or central to the group (Mummendey & Bernd, 1989). This suggests that men who have a collective masculine identity may value and favor masculine traits and masculine men (i.e. men who exhibit masculine ideals). While some evidence shows in-group favoritism can lead to hostile attitudes and behaviors towards the out-group (e.g., Sherif, 1988), other studies suggest in-group favoritism does not necessarily create out-group hostility (Brewer, 2007). In-group favoritism leads to out-group hostility when the goals and values of the out-group threaten the social identity and maintenance of the in-group.

However, when out-groups do not threaten the in-group, but, for example, reinforce it (e.g., a safely subordinated out-group provides comparisons that reinforce in-group dominance), the in-group may avoid overtly derogating the out-group (unless challenged), but treat them with paternalistic benevolence instead (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). For example, men treat nontraditional women, who threaten in-group dominance, hostilely but traditional women, who reinforce in-group dominance, benevolently (Glick & Fiske, 1997). This leads to ambivalently sexist attitudes towards women.

Ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1997) while closely related to backlash toward women is also related to masculine men's treatment of out-group members. Ambivalent sexism consists of dichotomous subtypes: hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, which represent polarized attitudes towards women (Glick, et al., 1997). Hostile sexism justifies men's dominant

social status through derogatory and hostile treatment of women. Contrarily, benevolent sexism justifies men's dominance through subjectively positive attitudes towards women. Hostile and benevolent sexism expect and enforce traditional gender roles in women, but through different means. Glick and Fiske (1997) created the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) to measure people's sexist attitudes. While benevolent sexism is endorsed by both men and women, cross-culturally men score higher on hostile sexism (Glick et al., 2000). Hostile sexism is closely related to backlash because it represents a punitive attitude towards women who violate traditional gender roles. It leads to negative evaluations of career women who exhibit nontraditional gender roles and stereotypes (Glick et al., 1997). Hostile sexism reflects beliefs in men's superiority and dominance over women, which ultimately encourages hostility towards nontraditional groups of women, who are perceived as threatening the current gender hierarchy.

Benevolent sexism is directed towards traditional types of women (Glick et al., 1997); instead of using hostile attitudes to enforce gender stereotypes, benevolent sexism involves subjectively positive attitudes, or "rewards" for traditional women. Benevolent sexists idealize women who enact traditional roles rather than derogate women who enact nontraditional roles. Traditional women may experience benevolent sexism from men in the form of chivalry, paternalistic behaviors towards women shrouded with extreme politeness (Viki, Abrams, & Hutchison, 2003). Chivalry is benevolently sexist because it reinforces male dominance by implying women's incapability and/or incompetence. These attitudes reward women for submitting to men's power and engaging in traditional gender roles. Benevolent sexism offers protection to traditional women; however, when a woman fails to conform to traditional expectations benevolently sexist attitudes are quickly withdrawn and a hostilely sexist attitude replaces it (Glick & Fiske, 2011). This suggests that in order to maintain protection from men

and avoid hostile sexism, women must engage in traditional gender roles, and avoid non-stereotypical characteristics.

While in-group members can exhibit polarized attitudes towards the out-group like ambivalent sexism, they can display a similar, but stronger, polarization towards the in-group. Specifically, they display hostility towards members of the in-group who do not live up to group standards, known as the black sheep effect (Marques, Yzerby, & Leyens, 1988). Members of the in-group who violate the standards and norms of the in-group are treated more negatively than members of an out-group. This creates dichotomous attitudes, in which members of the in-group are perceived relative to out-group members, such that in-group members are treated more positively (if they exhibit group standards) or more negatively (if they fail to embody group standards) than out-group members. This suggests men who view manhood as a strong part of their identity will treat feminine men, and other men who violate masculine norms, more harshly than men who do not maintain masculinity as a collective identity. Whether masculine men perceive feminine men as part of the out-group or in-group, they will likely experience hostile attitudes and behaviors from masculine men.

A collective identity's explicit importance, "the individual's subjective appraisal of the degree to which a collective identity is important to her or his overall sense of self" (Ashmore, et al., 2004, p. 83), influences perceptions of the self, other in-group members, and out-group members. Brewer and Gardner (1996) found when collective identities are more important, people use in-group/out-group categorization to evaluate others as opposed to individuating information. As individuals' perceptions of similarities between themselves and the in-group increases, they view the out-group in terms of more simplified categories and may discriminate against a threatening out-group more. Brewer and Gardner (1996) also showed the degree of

collective identification affects perceptions of the in-group and out-group, such that stronger in-group identifiers perceive a larger separation between the in-group and the out-group. This evidence suggests men who identify as more masculine may have more negative attitudes towards men and women who exhibit nontraditional stereotypes and roles, but more positive attitudes towards men and women exhibiting traditional stereotypes and roles.

The theories reviewed above lead to hypotheses about both precarious manhood theory and individual differences in masculine identity. First, I hypothesized: 1) threatened men will have stronger prescriptive stereotypes for men and women than non-threatened men, 2) men who experience a masculinity threat will show more polarized attitudes towards men and women than men who do not experience a gender threat; showing more favorable attitudes for men and women in traditional roles than men and women in nontraditional roles, 3) threatened men will demonstrate higher scores on ambivalent sexism than non-threatened men. Additionally, research on collective identity leads to two more broad hypotheses about the relationship between masculine identification, sexism, and stereotypes. I hypothesized: 4) men who identify as more masculine will be more ambivalently sexist than men who do not identify as strongly as masculine, 5) men who have a stronger masculine identity will have polarized attitudes towards men *and* women 6) increased masculine identification will lead to more polarized attitudes towards men *than* women.

### **Study 1**

I measured participants' prescriptive and descriptive stereotypes about men and women on three basic gender stereotype dimensions: dominance, agency, and communality. I hypothesized that men who experience a masculinity threat and men who strongly collectively identify as masculine would have more polarized gender stereotypes for men and women.

Specifically, these men should describe and prescribe women as more communal and men as more dominant and agentic. In other words, I expected participants who feel their masculinity threatened would more strongly reinforce and prescribe gender stereotypes to alleviate anxious cognitions and fear of backlash.

## **Methods**

**Participants and procedure.** Participants were 211 men recruited through the website MTurk. Research has shown there are no significant differences between results collected on MTurk and results collected offline, in a laboratory setting (Mason & Suri, 2011). Data collected with MTurk participants and undergraduates are similarly reliable. While MTurk has a high diversity of workers, only MTurk workers in the United States with a work acceptance rate of 85% or higher were offered the chance to participate in this study. For their participation, workers were paid \$0.60. The study was advertised as a survey about men's attitudes towards other men and women in today's society. Once participants accepted the work on MTurk, they were directed to a survey hosted on another website ([www.qualtrics.com](http://www.qualtrics.com)). This was a 2 (threat: gender, control) x 2 (stereotype: descriptive, prescriptive) x 2 (target gender: men, women) mixed design. Participants were randomly assigned into two conditions: gender threat or control. In the threat condition they recalled and wrote about a time they acted unmanly; in the control condition they recalled and wrote their last meal. Afterwards, participants were randomly assigned to either rate descriptive stereotypes or prescriptive stereotypes. In the descriptive condition, subjects were asked if men and women in American society had dominant, communal, or agentic traits. In the prescriptive condition participants were asked if dominant, communal, or agentic traits were desirable in American men and women. After recording their attitudes,

participants completed the ASI (Glick & Fiske, 1997) and answered questions about their masculinity and sexual orientation.

**Materials.** For specific materials of Study 1 see Appendix A.

***Descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes.*** Participants were asked to assess descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes about dominant, communal, and agentic characteristics in both men and women. Hall and colleagues (2013) tested and found reliable the specific traits which compose each stereotype. The dominance stereotype consisted of seven traits: dominating, threatening, forceful, ruthless, aggressive, intimidating, and controlling. The communality stereotype was composed of eight traits: agreeable, compassionate, warm, polite, helpful, friendly, sensitive to others' needs, cooperative. The agency stereotype entailed seven traits: confident, independent, persuasive, career-oriented, ambitious, assertive, and competitive. All scales were reliable ( $\alpha = .84$  to  $\alpha = .94$ )

In the descriptive condition subjects reported the degree to which men and women in today's society possessed such traits by responding to the question "how *common* is it for American men/women to possess the trait?" using a scale of 1 to 9 (1= not at all typical, 9= very typical). In the prescriptive condition, participants responded to the question "how *desirable* is it for American men/women to possess the trait?" using the same scale as the descriptive condition. Responses were averaged within conditions to form a stereotype score; in the descriptive condition a higher score indicated stronger beliefs about how group members are. In the prescriptive condition, a higher score indicates a stronger belief about how group members should be.

***Ambivalent sexism.*** Participants then completed the ASI. The ASI consists of two subsections measuring hostile sexism (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS) (Glick & Fiske, 1997).

The subsections each consisted of 11 items which participants agreed or disagreed with on a 0 to 5 scale. The HS section measured negatively sexist attitudes towards women (e.g., “women are too easily offended”); while the BS section measured positively sexist attitudes towards women (e.g., “women should be cherished and protected by men”). The participants’ responses were averaged to form an HS score and a BS score, in which a larger number indicated a stronger sexist attitude. Both HS ( $\alpha = .81$ ) and BS ( $\alpha = .89$ ) were reliable measures.

***Masculine identification.*** Finally participants were given five statements about their masculinity and asked to agree or disagree with them on a scale of 1 to 5 (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree): 1) I identify strongly with other men. 2) Being a man is an important part of who I am. 3) I feel strong ties with other men. 4) I feel a sense of solidarity with other men. 5) Being masculine is an important part of who I am. Participants’ responses were averaged to form a masculine identity score, in which a larger number indicated a participant with a stronger masculine collective identity. This scale was adapted from Crisp et al. (2006). Masculine identification score ( $\alpha = .92$ ) was reliable.

## **Results**

ANOVAs showed no significant differences between the gender threat and control conditions for any of the dependent measures. This suggests the manipulation was ineffective, and men did not perceive a masculinity threat. However, multiple regression models and correlations show relationships between the predictor variables (HS score, BS score, and masculinity identification) and prescriptive and descriptive stereotypes for men and women. The means and correlations between the predictor variables are recorded in Table 1. Men were asked to rate their prescriptive and descriptive stereotypes (between-subjects) for both men and women (within-subjects). The ratings of specific stereotypes were averaged within three categories:

dominance, communality, and agency. Each regression included all three predictor variables to control for differences between the predictors.

**HS Score.** HS score positively predicts descriptive stereotypes of men's dominance ( $\beta = .26, p < .05$ ) and women's dominance ( $\beta = .60, p < .01$ ) (Table 2). It is a negative predictor for descriptive stereotypes of women's communality ( $\beta = -.45, p < .01$ ). HS score did not predict any prescriptive stereotypes of men or women. Participants with higher HS scores view both men and women as more dominant, and women as less communal. This suggests men high in HS perceive men and women in a power struggle for dominance

**BS Score.** BS score positively predicts descriptive stereotypes of men's communality ( $\beta = .22, p < .05$ ) and women's communality ( $\beta = .45, p < .01$ ) (Table 3). BS score is not a predictor for any prescriptive stereotypes of men or women. These results show that men higher in BS perceive women as exhibiting traditional stereotypes, but also view themselves as having the same communal qualities.

**Masculine Identity Score.** Masculine identification positively predicts descriptive stereotypes of men's communality ( $\beta = .33, p < .05$ ) and women's communality ( $\beta = .23, p < .05$ ) (Table 4). Masculine identification also positively predicts prescriptive stereotypes of men's communality ( $\beta = .37, p < .01$ ), men's agency ( $\beta = .32, p < .05$ ), and women's communality ( $\beta = .28, p < .01$ ). Men who identify more strongly as masculine have stronger descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes of communality and agency for men, expressing the notion men are, and should be, more communal and agentic. Men with higher masculine identity scores also have increased descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes for women's communality.

Masculine identity was also significantly correlated with HS ( $r = .41, p < .01$ ), ( $r = .23, p < .05$ ) and BS ( $r = .37, p < .01$ ), ( $r = .33, p < .01$ ) in the descriptive condition and prescriptive

conditions, respectively. This shows that participants who identified as more masculine had both increased hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes.

## **Discussion**

Results from Study 1 did not support hypotheses about masculinity threat because the manipulation was unsuccessful. However, the results did support the hypotheses that men who identify as more collectively masculine have more sexist attitudes than men who identify as less masculine. HS, BS, and masculine identification overlap but are also distinct in how they predict stereotypes. However, the results provide inconsistent evidence suggesting that more masculine men do not have polarized descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes for men and women.

In the current study, HS positively predicted men and women's described dominance, which shows men higher in hostile sexism more strongly view men and women as being dominating, forceful, ruthless, and aggressive. Similarly, men with higher HS scores viewed women as less communal. This may reflect hostile sexist men's negatively competitive attitudes towards nontraditional women (Glick et al., 1997). Past research shows men have negative attitudes towards women with masculine qualities (e.g., Glick et. al., 1997). These men may fear that women will encroach on male gender roles and take power and social status away from men. Viewing women as more dominant and less communal fits with hostile sexists' view that women are seeking to challenge men's power.

Conversely, men who were high in BS were more likely to descriptively stereotype men and women as communal. This may reflect benevolent sexists' views of gender cooperation and interdependence. Benevolent sexism involves valuing traditional women and their characteristics (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Theoretically, men high in benevolent sexism idealize traditional women and would be more likely stereotype women as having positive prescriptive traits. BS also

positively predicted descriptive stereotypes of men as more communal, socially desirable traits, suggesting men high in benevolent sexism have a positive view of men as a group. This supports Glick and Fiske's (1997) research that benevolent sexism reflects a belief about men and women's cooperative interdependence (but not their equality). However, BS did not predict descriptive stereotypes of agency for men, a set of subjectively positive but also masculine traits (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). This suggests that for men high in benevolent sexism, communal stereotypes may not be exclusively associated with femininity. Benevolently sexist men may view communal stereotypes as reflecting positive attributes for both men and women; this may show their focus on cooperative interdependence between men and women, which is evident in the BS scale's items (e.g., a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman). However, these results do not suggest that benevolently sexist men view this interdependence as a reflection of gender equality.

Masculine identification was positively related to descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes of both men and women's communality; it also predicted prescriptive stereotypes that men should be agentic. Men who identified as more masculine seem to view and prescribe women to be communal (e.g., warm, friendly, polite, etc.). Masculine men may assign these traits to women, because communal traits suit women for complementary gender roles. Although some research suggests in-group members display hostile attitudes towards out-group members (e.g., Sherif, 1988), these results support Brewer's (2007) argument that the in-group does not necessarily have hostile or negative attitudes towards the out-group.

In this study, men who identified as more masculine prescribed agentic traits for their group; this is consistent with research on in-group favoritism (Mummendy & Bernd, 1989). Communal and agentic qualities are typically perceived as positive and desirable traits (Prentice

& Carranza, 2002); by describing and prescribing men as both, men seem to be attributing positive characteristics to their in-group. Because people want and expect members of the in-group to display characteristics distinguishing their group from other groups (Marques, et al., 1988), the current results imply that communality is not specifically associated with women, or proscribed for men. However, masculine men also described and prescribed men to be agentic, showing that while men are expected to be communal, masculine men also expect men, but not women, to be agentic. In sum, masculine men seem to think that women must be communal, but men must be both communal and agentic.

Masculine identification was also significantly correlated with HS and BS scores, such that men who have a stronger masculine collective identity are more ambivalently sexist. Masculine men's attitudes towards out-group women may therefore depend on whether the women threaten the men's in-group characteristics or reaffirm them (Brewer, 2007). However, because the data only shows a correlation between ambivalent sexism and masculine identification, the causal influences between the two constructs cannot be defined.

## **Study 2**

Study 2 examined the relationship between masculinity threat, masculine identification, ambivalent sexism, and gender subtypes. Gender subtypes can vary along traditional-nontraditional dimensions based on typical stereotypes the subtype displays (Eckes, 1994). Men and women are most often evaluated at the subtype level, which leads to more nuanced attitudes towards gender (Carpenter & Trentham, 2001). This study expands on the results from Study 1 by fleshing out men's attitudes towards traditional and nontraditional subtypes of men and women (e.g., ambitious career men and women). Study 2 also expanded on Study 1 by assessing evaluations of these subtypes. Study 1 focused on the content of stereotypes, while Study 2

focused on participants' attitudes towards nontraditional men and women. Participants rated their attitudes towards subtypes of traditional and nontraditional groups of men and women. I hypothesized that men who experienced a masculinity threat would demonstrate more polarized attitudes towards traditional and nontraditional groups of men and women. As a means of reinstating their threatened manhood, men would negatively rate nontraditional subtypes (e.g., feminist men), and positively rate traditional subtypes (e.g., masculine men). These polarized attitudes may reflect men's cognitive attempts to relieve anxiety in response to masculinity threat (Vandello et al., 2008), and a fear of backlash (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004).

I also hypothesized that differences in masculine identification would lead to different ratings of the gender subtypes. Men who have a stronger collective masculine identification may display polarized attitudes towards subtypes of men and women, reflecting in-group favoritism towards traditional subtypes who reinforce men's status, and out-group hostility towards subtypes who challenge men's status. Masculine men may show more favorable attitudes towards groups of men who endorse masculine norms. While in-group favoritism does not necessarily lead to out-group hostility, I hypothesized that masculine men will less favorably rate feminine men because they perceive feminine men as undermining and challenging masculine men's characteristics, traits, and social standing. However, women who do not challenge masculine men's identity will not be rated less favorably, because they do not present a threat to masculine collective identity.

## **Methods**

**Participants and procedure.** Participants were 159 men recruited through the website MTurk. Research has shown there are no significant differences between results collected on MTurk and results collected offline, in a laboratory setting (Mason & Suri, 2011). Data collected

with MTurk participants and undergraduates are similarly reliable. While MTurk has a high diversity of workers, only MTurk workers in the United States with a work acceptance rate of 85% or higher were offered the chance to participate in this study. Upon completion of the survey, participants were paid \$0.75. The study was advertised as a survey about men's attitudes towards other men and women in today's society. Once participants accepted the work on MTurk, they were directed to a survey hosted on another website ([www.qualtrics.com](http://www.qualtrics.com)). This was a 3 (threat: gender, moral, neutral) x 2 (gender type: traditional, nontraditional) mixed design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: gender threat, moral threat, and neutral. They recalled and wrote about a time they engaged in a gender transgression, moral transgression, or did not write at all, respectively. During the study participants were asked to record their attitudes towards different groups of traditional and nontraditional men and women. After evaluating the groups, participants completed the ASI (Glick & Fiske, 1997) and answered questions about their masculine identification and sexual orientation.

**Materials.** For specific materials of Study 2 see Appendix B.

***Traditional and nontraditional groups.*** Participants were instructed to evaluate two stereotypical subtypes of traditional men (ambitious career and masculine men), three stereotypical subtypes of nontraditional men (stay-at-home dads, feminist men, and feminine men), two stereotypical subtypes of traditional women (stay-at-home moms, and feminine women), and three stereotypical subtypes of nontraditional women (ambitious career women, feminist women, and masculine women). These items ( $\alpha = .89$  to  $\alpha = .94$ ) formed a reliable scale. For each group, participants rated five items on a scale of -3 (highly negative) to 3 (highly positive): 1) What is your overall evaluation or general attitude toward the group? 2) What is the degree the group has positive/negative personality traits? 3) When you come into contact with

the group do you what type of experience do you have? 4) What are your emotions towards the group? 5) To what extent does the group hold values, traditions, and beliefs you agree /disagree with? Participant responses were averaged across subtypes, creating a score for each subtype, in which a higher score indicated a more positive attitude towards the group. These items formed a reliable scale ( $\alpha = .89$  to  $\alpha = .94$ ) measuring attitudes towards gender subtypes.

***Ambivalent sexism.*** Next participants completed the ASI. The ASI consisted of two subsections measuring Hostile Sexism (HS) and Benevolent Sexism (BS) (Glick & Fiske, 1997). The subsections each consisted of 11 items which participants agreed or disagreed with on a 0 to 5 scale. The HS section measured negatively sexist attitudes towards women (e.g., women are too easily offended); while the BS section measured subjectively positively sexist attitudes towards women (e.g., women should be cherished and protected by men). The participants' responses were averaged across the subsections to form an HS score and a BS score, in which a larger number indicated more sexist attitudes. Both HS ( $\alpha = .84$ ) and BS ( $\alpha = .90$ ) were reliable measures.

***Masculine identification.*** Finally participants were given five statements about their masculinity and asked to agree or disagree with them on a scale of 1 to 5 (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree): 1) I identify strongly with other men. 2) Being a man is an important part of who I am. 3) I feel strong ties with other men. 4) I feel a sense of solidarity with other men. 5) Being masculine is an important part of who I am. Participants' responses were averaged to form a masculine identity score, in which a larger number indicated a participant with a more salient collective masculine identity. This scale was adapted from Crisp, Stone, and Hall (2006). Masculine identification score ( $\alpha = .94$ ) was reliable.

## **Results**

ANOVAs showed no significant differences between the gender threat, moral threat, and neutral conditions for any of the dependent measures. This suggests the manipulation was ineffective, and men did not experience masculinity threat. However, multiple regression models and correlations show a relationship between the HS score, BS score, masculine identification, and the ratings of traditional and nontraditional groups of men and women (Table 5). Each regression included all three predictor variables to control for differences between the predictors.

**HS Score.** HS score was a significant negative predictor for stay-at-home dads ( $\beta = -.23$ ,  $p < .01$ ), effeminate men ( $\beta = -.33$ ,  $p < .01$ ), feminist men ( $\beta = -.56$ ,  $p < .01$ ), feminist women ( $\beta = -.42$ ,  $p < .01$ ), masculine women ( $\beta = -.30$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and career women ( $\beta = -.21$ ,  $p < .05$ ) (Table 6). HS score negatively predicted favorable attitudes towards nontraditional groups of men, and stereotypically dominant groups of women. Participants with higher HS scores had more negative evaluations of stay-at-home dads, effeminate men, and feminist men, groups of men who violate traditional masculine gender roles. As participants' HS scores increased, their ratings of feminist women, masculine women, and career women became more negative. These are groups of women who transgress stereotypically traditional feminine roles. Participants with higher HS scores have increased negative attitudes towards gender groups who violate typical gender roles.

**BS Score.** Unlike HS score, BS score only predicted views about women, which suggests benevolent sexism is exclusively tied to men's attitudes towards women. BS score was a significant positive predictor for stay-at-home moms ( $\beta = .16$ ,  $p < .05$ ), effeminate women ( $\beta = .23$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and career women ( $\beta = .21$ ,  $p < .01$ ) (Table 7). BS score positively predicted favorable attitudes towards stereotypically communal groups of women, stay-at-home moms and effeminate women. However, BS score also positively predicted favorable attitudes towards

career women, suggesting benevolently sexist men may view women's gender roles as changing, and now expect women to contribute to family income.

**Masculine Identification Score.** Masculine identification positively predicted stay-at-home moms ( $\beta = .33, p < .01$ ), effeminate women ( $\beta = .20, p < .05$ ), career women ( $\beta = .18, p < .05$ ), career men ( $\beta = .37, p < .01$ ), and masculine men ( $\beta = .58, p < .01$ ). It is also a negative predictor for effeminate men ( $\beta = -.17, p < .05$ ) (Table 8). Participants who strongly identified as masculine had increased favorable attitudes towards groups of men and women who are stereotypically traditional. Like BS, masculine identification positively predicted evaluations of career women, also suggesting women's traditional gender roles may now include and expectation to contribute to family income. Masculine identification was not a negative predictor towards nontraditional groups of women or feminists of either gender, indicating masculine identification does not necessarily lead to hostile attitudes towards women or feminists.

Masculine identification was also significantly correlated with HS ( $r = .32, p < .01$ ) and BS ( $r = .19, p < .05$ ). This shows men who identify as more masculine display increased hostilely and benevolently sexist attitudes towards women.

## Discussion

Similar to Study 1, the results from Study 2 suggest HS, BS, and masculine identification show separate but complementary relationships to gender stereotypes. HS predicted less favorable attitudes toward nontraditional types of women (feminist, career, and masculine women) and nontraditional types of men (feminist and effeminate men, and stay-at-home dads). This suggests that men high in HS dislike groups of men and women who challenge or deviate from traditional gender roles. Hostile sexism derogates women who challenge men's power and higher social status (Glick & Fiske, 1997). These results extend that argument by showing men

high in HS also have unfavorable ratings of men in nontraditional roles. Participants may have been exhibiting backlash towards these groups by expressing disapproval through less favorable ratings. These results may also shed light Study 1, which found that more hostilely sexist men viewed both men and women as dominant, and women as less communal. Study 2 shows that hostilely sexist men have negative attitudes towards nontraditional women who are attributed dominant stereotypes (e.g., ambitious career women). This suggests that hostilely sexist men may view women as dominant and have negative attitudes towards dominant women. This argument is consistent with previous research on hostile sexism (Glick et al., 1997).

Contrary to HS, which only correlated with more negative evaluations of nontraditional subtypes, BS correlated positively with attitudes towards several female subtypes (career and effeminate, and stay-at-home moms). The relationship between benevolent sexism and evaluations of traditional types of women was expected; past research has shown that benevolent sexism involves positive attitudes towards subordinate and communal women (Glick et al., 1997). However, BS also positively predicted ratings of career women, who are typically viewed as having traits prescribed for men (e.g., ambition) (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). These results may suggest a change in attitudes towards career women due a growing dependence of men on wives' incomes. Women's stereotypes are more dynamic than men's, changing to incorporate more masculine and agentic traits over time (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000). These results may reflect such changes. However, this does not necessarily suggest that benevolently sexist men view career women as equals.

Masculine identification, like BS, was positively correlated with attitudes towards traditional women (career and effeminate women, and stay-at-home moms) and like HS negatively correlated with attitudes towards nontraditional men (effeminate men). However,

masculine identification was also positively correlated with attitudes towards traditional men (masculine men). These results suggest that men who have a stronger masculine collective identity may view feminine men as black sheep (Marques et al., 1988). Men who identify as more masculine may rate masculine men more positively because of in-group favoritism. The subtype of masculine men is associated with desirable agentic qualities (Prentice & Carranza, 2002); men who identify as strongly masculine may value stereotypical masculine traits because they may represent male in-group standards. Interestingly, the results did not show that more masculine men necessarily have more negative attitudes towards nontraditional women. This study does not show that masculine men display hostile attitudes toward nontraditional subtypes of women, suggesting masculine men may not experience out-group hostility towards nontraditional women.

As in Study 1, masculine identification was also correlated with HS and BS, such that, men who identified more strongly as masculine were more ambivalently sexist. This correlation suggests masculine identification is related to ambivalent sexism; however, because the data is only correlational, a causal influence cannot be determined.

### **General Discussion**

While the masculinity threat manipulation failed to yield statistically significant results, using HS, BS, and masculine identification as measures for predicting gender stereotypes suggests a new potential model for understanding how masculinity relates to gender attitudes. The regression models show using ambivalent sexism as predictors for gender stereotypes and subtypes reaffirms previous research, demonstrating both negative attitudes towards nontraditional women and positive attitudes towards traditional women (Glick et al., 1997). While the results from the studies expand previous research between ambivalent sexism and

gender to include views of men, the results are not surprising. However, examining masculine identification as a broader collective identity shows new and unexpected implications for gender stereotypes and sexism.

### **Ambivalent Sexism**

HS and BS showed similar relations to gender stereotypes that previous research has established (Glick & Fiske, 1997); more hostilely sexist men view women as dominating and maintain more negative attitudes towards women who violate traditional gender roles. Study 1 shows hostilely sexist men's descriptive stereotypes, while Study 2 illuminates how hostile sexists evaluate specific subtypes of men and women. Hostilely sexist men described both men and women as dominant in Study 1; however, Study 2 shows unfavorable attitudes towards subtypes of women who, in hostile sexist ideology are characterized as nontraditional (i.e. career, masculine, and feminist women). The content of the hostile sexism scale implies derogatory attitudes towards women who threaten men's dominance. This explains why men with higher HS scores had more negative attitudes towards all three subtypes of nontraditional women. These women challenge men's dominant social status by infringing on idealized stereotypes of men and disregarding traditional feminine stereotypes. Men high in hostile sexism are more likely to characterize women in a derogatory way (Glick & Fiske, 1997), by describing women as less communal and more dominant. Hostilely sexist men not only perceive women as threatening but attribute them negative characteristics (e.g., ruthless, forceful, etc.) and maintain negative attitudes towards them.

While Study 1 did not reveal a relationship between hostile sexism and prescriptions or proscriptions for men, Study 2 suggests that men with high HS scores hold similarly negative attitudes towards nontraditional women *and* men. HS also predicted negative attitudes towards

nontraditional men (stay-at-home dads, effeminate men and feminist men). The concept of feminism contradicts the values hostilely sexist men hold, believing men are more powerful than women (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Men who are in nontraditional gender roles also challenge men's higher social power by undermining the beliefs hostilely sexist men have about gender relations specifically the belief that men are more powerful than women.

The studies also showed consistent evidence regarding benevolent sexism. Men with higher BS scores had more positive attitudes towards traditional women (stay-at-home moms and effeminate women). This supports previous research on benevolent sexism, which argues that benevolently sexist men hold subjectively positive views of traditional women as a means of reinforcing and justifying their power (Glick & Fiske, 1997). While women are typically described as more communal (Prentice & Carranza, 2002), Study 1 showed that men with higher BS scores view women as more communal, further supporting the original theory of benevolent sexism.

Benevolently sexist men also viewed men as more communal, which contradicted my hypothesis that men would dichotomize gender stereotypes. However, this result does not necessarily contradict ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Benevolently sexist men treat women in subjectively positive ways, which implies they view themselves in a positive manner. They treat women paternalistically, but with the self-view that they are protecting women. People generally perceive communal traits as positive (Prentice & Carranza, 2002); however my results suggest communality may not be explicitly associated with femininity. Study 1 shows that benevolently sexist men do not eschew or avoid communal characteristics. The anti-femininity mandate posits that men avoid displaying or showing feminine traits because it contradicts their masculinity (Bosson & Michniewicz, 2013). Therefore if high BS men

associated communal traits with femininity, they would supposedly be unwilling to describe themselves as communal. Thus, one possibility is that the communal traits used in Study 1 are no longer solely associated with femininity.

### **Masculine Identification**

Measuring masculinity as a broader collective identity provides a new approach to understanding masculinity and its relations to gender stereotypes and sexism. Previous research measured masculinity as an ideology, social status, and gender orientation (Bosson & Michniewicz, 2013; Thompson et al., 1992) but not as a collective identity. While some studies have used masculinity as a means of measuring collective identity (e.g., Tropp & Wright, 2001), researchers have not used collective identity as a means of measuring masculinity. Both Studies 1 and 2 used a scale modified from Crisp and colleagues (2006) to measure men's masculine collective identity, specifically the importance and centrality of men's masculinity to their identity (Ashmore, et al., 2004). The same scale has been used to prime men's gender identity (Hundhammer & Mussweiler, 2012), but the researchers did not explicitly research how this scale related to their dependent variables. Measuring masculinity through collective identity elaborates on previous research by providing a new framework through which to understand masculinity.

Bosson and Michniewicz (2013) found that men tend to eschew femininity from their in-group identity. This is not consistent with results from Study 1, which showed that men who identify as masculine prescribe and describe men as communal. Communal stereotypes are typically described and prescribed for women (Bem, 1974; Eagly, 1987; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Although women's stereotypes are dynamic, showing changes over time, and have begun to incorporate more agentic traits, men's stereotypes remain static (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000).

Thus, the attribution and prescription of communal traits to men is not likely due to a dynamic shift in men's stereotypes. Bosson and Michniewicz's (2013) results may be more valid than mine because they used a more robust measure for gender identification, which contrary to my research showed masculine men avoid attributing men feminine traits. However, in the current studies, men's communal descriptions and prescriptions of men may also reflect in-group favoritism. The communal stereotypes used in this study reflect positive attributes (Hall et al., in press) and are not stereotypes proscribed for men (Prentice & Carranza, 2002); men may be more willing to view themselves and other men as having these specific communal traits because they attribute more positive characteristics to them.

Study 2 more clearly shows in-group favoritism. Men who viewed masculinity as more important to their identity showed stronger in-group favoritism through positive ratings of traditional subtypes of men (i.e. masculine men and career men). These results parallel findings from research on in-group favoritism (Brewer, 1979), in which in-group members have strongly favorable attitudes towards other in-group members who display the group's ideals. The traditional groups of men are associated with agentic and dominant stereotypes (Prentice & Carranza, 2002), characteristics which masculine men hold central to the group identity. These subtypes of men are then included as part of the collective identity, and masculine men have more positive attitudes towards them.

Results from Study 2 support the hypotheses that men who view masculinity as salient to their collective identity will have more negative attitudes towards feminine men. Feminine men may be viewed as threatening men's collective social status because feminine traits are viewed as nice but low in status. However, the black sheep effect (Marques, et al., 1988) better explains why men derogate feminine men; it occurs when people exclude members of the in-group who

do not demonstrate typical in-group characteristics. Specifically, masculine men showed negative attitudes towards feminine men but positive attitudes towards traditional men (polarization). By contrast, although masculine men had more positive attitudes towards traditional women, they did not have negative attitudes towards nontraditional women.

“Black sheep” threaten and challenge the group’s collective identity more strongly than out-group members do. In-group members who strongly identify with their group expect other in-group members to conform to the in-group ideals. In-group deviants experience negative reactions because they violate the collective identity norms, threatening other group members’ collective self-esteem. This causes a polarized attitude towards in-group members, such that normative in-group members are treated more favorably than normative out-group members, and deviant in-group members are treated more harshly than deviant out-group members. The black sheep effect suggests that masculine men perceive feminine men as deviant in-group members who threaten masculine identification by failing to uphold prescriptive stereotypes.

Study 1 showed that masculine men describe and prescribe women as communal; however Study 2 suggested that masculine men do not necessarily have negative attitudes towards nontraditional women. This does not support the hypothesis that masculine men would have unfavorable attitudes towards nontraditional women. When controlling for HS and BS, masculine identification did not predict negative attitudes towards any nontraditional women, suggesting masculine identity does not inherently involve derogatory attitudes towards nontraditional women. Consistent with Brewer’s (2007) argument that in-group favoritism does not necessarily lead to out-group hostility, masculine men did not have directly negative attitudes towards feminist or masculine women, both subtypes which violate traditional gender norms (Eagly, 1987; Prentice & Carranza, 2002).

While HS and BS typically correlate with each other (as in Study 1), it is not unusual for some sample populations to not show a correlation (as in Study 2) (Glick et al., 2000). However, both Study 1 and Study 2 showed that masculine identification correlates with HS, and BS. This supports the hypothesis that masculine men have more sexist attitudes (i.e. that men who view masculinity as central to their identity display more sexism, both benevolent and hostile). While, masculine identification may not directly predict negative attitudes towards nontraditional women, it is positively correlated with hostile sexism, which does. The relationship between masculine identification and sexism in these studies is purely correlational, so a directional relationship is not clear; however, these results suggest more masculine men are more sexist, both benevolently and hostilely.

### **Limitations**

While these studies suggest a new understanding of masculinity as collective identity, there are several limitations to the research. There were no significant differences between men who received masculinity threat compared to men who did not receive masculinity threat in their perceptions of stereotypes and evaluations of subtypes; the relationship between gender threat, sexism, and stereotyping remains unclear. The results could not support or refute the first three hypotheses outlined in the introduction because of the failed masculinity threat manipulation. Due to ethical concerns about using the false-feedback paradigm that deceives participants (e.g., about scores on a “masculinity test”) (Vandello et al., 2008), I had participants recall and write about a time they acted “unmanly.” The typical false feedback methodology has been shown to cause anxiety and defensive behaviors associated with responses to masculinity threat and backlash (Bosson & Vandello, 2011). To avoid risks associated with deception, a less effective but more ethical threat manipulation was used. Although participants thought and wrote about a

time they transgressed gender norms, they were not instructed to elaborate on details or ruminate on their feelings about their memories. Because of this, participants likely did not experience the anxious thoughts and cognitions associated with threatened masculinity (Vandello et al., 2008). Whatever the specific cause, the threat manipulation consistently failed to have effects on dependent variables, including those prior research has shown it should affect. Thus, I assume manipulation was ineffective; my studies were unable to test the relationship between masculinity threat and the dependent measures.

The methodology was also limited in that men's attitudes were measured but not their behavior. This decreases the external validity of the results because I did not assess how men respond or act towards women or men who fail to conform to traditional gender standards. The attitudes the men shared in this study may reflect precursor attitudes to backlash towards nontraditional others (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004), but the results cannot suggest conclusions about men's possible actions.

Originally, the masculine identification was designed as a secondary dependent variable. A short five-question scale, while appropriate for a secondary measure, may not be enough to provide a robust picture of men's masculine identification. The masculine identification scale only measured the importance of masculinity to men's identity; whereas Ashmore and colleagues (2004) argue that collective identity is a more complex, broader construct that includes many other elements, such as collective self-esteem. Research has shown many other elements of collective identity, such as evaluation and social embeddedness, can influence in-group/out-group attitudes (Ashmore et al., 2004).

These results also relied on multiple regression and correlational data; while these data reveal correlational relationships, they cannot lead to causal conclusions. It is unclear whether

masculine identification causes an increase in sexist attitudes, if sexist attitudes cause an increase in masculine identification, or if these relationships occur due to additional variables related to both sexist attitudes and masculine identification. While previous research on collective identity (Tajfel, 1982) implies that masculine identification could cause increases in sexist attitudes, to enhance group esteem, the results from these two studies cannot definitively support that hypothesis.

### **Future Directions**

Research should be done with a more effective gender threat manipulation (e.g., false feedback) to explore the relationship between precarious manhood and sexist attitudes, potentially with masculine identification as a moderator variable. By using a proven gender transgression, participants will be more likely to perceive their gender status as threatened, which could lead to differences in sexist attitudes and/or sexist behaviors. Further while past research has exclusively focused on the negative behaviors men engage in after to masculinity threat (Bosson & Vandello, 2011), the relationship of masculinity threat with benevolent sexism may suggest potential subjectively positive responses to masculinity threat. Masculinity can be demonstrated through heroism and chivalry (a form of benevolent sexism) (Becker & Eagly, 2004). Heroic actions often involve a willingness to take risks, physical strength, and courage, all of which are components of negative behaviors (e.g., aggression) associated with masculinity threat in prior research (e.g., Bosson & Vandello, 2011). I hypothesize that men may attempt to prove their masculinity by acting heroically (e.g., rescuing a damsel in distress). Research should be done to see if masculinity threat could pressure men into acting in subjectively positive (e.g., over-helping) or heroic ways.

While the current studies used a masculine identification scale modified from Crisp and colleagues (2006), the scale only measured the importance of masculinity to men's collective identity. Research has shown other aspects of collective identity can influence the strength and salience of an individual's collective identity (Ashmore et al., 2004). In the future, research should use a more robust scale, measuring masculine identification through other collective identity constructs such as evaluation, attachment, social embeddedness, behavioral involvement, sense of interdependence, content and meaning, and ideology. Measuring these constructs will provide a more comprehensive understanding of masculine identification as a unique gender framework.

Although the results from Study 2 suggest a clear relationship between masculine identification and gender subtypes, a small number of subtypes were used. Future research should explore attitudes towards other gender subtypes, focusing on a continuum of subtypes ranging from more to less traditional and nontraditional. Additionally, future research should explore the implications masculine identification and sexist attitudes have on behaviors, leading to more external validity, so researchers can better understand gender interactions in situations outside the experimental setting.

Future research should also explore intersectionality, such as the intersection of race and gender. Hall and colleagues (in press) found that black men and women are assigned different descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes than white men and women. Black men are prescribed as more communal than white men; while black women are described as more dominant than white women. Adding race to both the stereotypes in Study 1 and the gender subtypes in Study 2 may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between gender and race.

## **Conclusions**

The results of Studies 1 and 2 elaborate on and support previous research on ambivalent sexism and attitudes towards traditional and nontraditional men and women (Glick et al., 1997), as well as suggest a new framework for understanding masculinity, as collective identity. Masculinity has been assessed in various ways, but prior research has not measure masculinity as a collective identity (Thompson et al., 1992). These two studies show that masculine identification, as a collective identity, can predict attitudes about gender stereotypes and subtypes not accounted for by sexist ideologies suggesting masculine identification is a separate and important construct. In the current research, masculine identification predicted positive evaluations of both traditional men and women, but without derogating nontraditional women. It also uniquely predicted negative evaluations of feminine men. When assessed as a collective identity, masculinity seems to reinforce traditional gender roles by idealizing gender role conformity, but only punishing male role nonconformity.

### References

- Ashmore, R., Deux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*(1), 80-114.
- Becker, S. W., & Eagly, A. H. (2004). The heroism of women and men. *American Psychologist, 59*(3), 163-178.
- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162.
- Bosson, J. K., & Michniewicz, K. S. (2013). Gender dichotomization at the level of ingroup identity: What it is, and why men use it more than women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(3), 425-442.
- Bosson, J. K., & Vandello, J. A. (2011). Precarious manhood and its links to action and aggression. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(2), 82-86.
- Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Burnaford, R. M., Weaver, J. R., & Wasti, S. A. (2009). Precarious manhood and displays of physical aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(5), 623-634.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*(2), 307-324.
- Brewer, M. B. (2007). The importance of being we: Human nature and intergroup relations. *American Psychologist, 62*(8), 728-738.

- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"?: Levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*(1), 83-93.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). The evolution of human intrasexual competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(4), 616-628.
- Buss, D. M. (1995). Psychological sex differences. *American Psychologist*, *50*(3), 164-168.
- Carpenter, S., & Trentham, S. (2001). Should we take "gender" out of gender subtypes?: The effects of gender, evaluative valence, and context on the organization of person subtypes. *Sex Roles*, *45*(7), 455-480.
- Cohn, A. M., Seibert, A. L., & Zeichner, A. (2009). The role of restrictive emotionality, trait anger, and masculinity threat in men's perpetration of physical aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *10*(3), 218-224.
- Crisp, R. J., Stone, C. H., & Hall, N. R. (2006). Recategorization and subgroup identification: Predicting and preventing threats from common ingroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*(2), 230-243.
- Diekmann, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(10), 1171-1188.
- Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-role Interpretation*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *15*(4), 543-558.

- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior. *American Psychologist*, *54*(6), 408-423.
- Eagly, A., & Steffen, V. (2000). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men in social roles. In C. Strangor (Ed.), *Stereotypes and Prejudice* (pp. 142-160). Ann Arbor: Taylor & Francis.
- Eckes, T. (1994). Exploration in gender cognition: Content and structure of female and male subtypes. *Social Cognition*, *12*(1), 37-60.
- Fiske, S., Cuddy, A. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(6), 878-902.
- Gill, M. (2004). When information does not deter stereotyping: Prescriptive stereotyping can bias judgments under conditions that discourage descriptive stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(5), 619-632.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 119-135.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (2011). Ambivalent Sexism Revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *35*(3), 530-535.
- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes towards women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*(12), 1323-1334.

- Glick, P., S Fiske, A. M., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., Adetoun, B., . . . Lopez, W.L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(5), 763-765.
- Hall, E. V., Phillips, K. W., Glick, P., Livingston, R., Rudman, L., & Washington, E. (in press). Laying the groundwork for future research in intersectionality: Descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes for black and white women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Hammer, J., & Good, G. E. (2010). Positive psychology: An empirical examination of beneficial aspects of endorsement of masculine norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *11*(4), 303-318.
- Hundhammer, T., & Mussweiler, T. (2012). How sex puts you in gendered shoes: Sexuality-priming leads to gender-based self-perception and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*(1), 176-193.
- Marques, J. M., Yzerbyt, V. Y., & Leyens, J.P. (1988). The "black sheep effect": Extremity of judgements towards ingroup members as a function of group identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *18*, 1-16.
- Mason, W., & Suri, S. (2012). Conducting behavioral research on Amazon's mechanical turk. *Behavior Research Methods*, *44*(1), 1-23.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Good, J. J., & Sanchez, D. T. (2010a). Impact of collective gender identity on relationship quality: When men feel devalued. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *11*(1), 65-75.

- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Rudman, L. A. (2010b). When men break the gender rules: Status incongruity and backlash against modest men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*(2), 140-151.
- Mummendy, A., & Bernd, S. (1989). Better or different? III: The impact of comparison dimension and relative in-group size upon intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 28*(1), 1-16.
- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 269-281.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self concepts in college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32*(3), 287-295.
- Rudman, L. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(3), 629-645.
- Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2013). Penalizing men who request a family leave: Is flexibility stigma a femininity stigma? *Journal of Social Issues, 69*(2), 322-340.
- Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2011). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 48*, 165-179.

- Rudman, L., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(2), 157-176.
- Rudman, L., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 743-762.
- Rudman, L., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Glick, P., & Phelan, J. (2012). Reactions to vanguards: Advances in backlash theory. In P. Devine, & A. Plant, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 45, pp. 167-227). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Schneider, D. (2004). *The Psychology of Stereotyping*. New York, New York: The Guilford Press.
- Sherif, M. (1988). *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Swami, V., & Voracek, M. (2013). Associations among men's sexist attitudes, objectification of women, and their own drive for muscularity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*(2), 168-174.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*, 1-39.
- Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles, 27*, 573-607.
- Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup identification as the inclusion of ingroup in the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(5), 585-600.

- Vandello, J. A., & Bosson, J. K. (2013). Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research of precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *14*(2), 101-113.
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*(6), 1325-1339.
- Viki, G. T., Abrams, D., & Hutchison, P. (2003). The "true" romantic: Benevolent sexism and paternalistic chivalry. *Sex Roles*, *49*, 533-537.
- Weaver, J. R., Vandello, J. A., & Bosson, J. K. (2013). Intrepid, imprudent, or impetuous?: The effects of gender threats on men's financial decisions. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *14*(2), 184-191.
- Weaver, J. R., Vandello, J., Bosson, J. K., & Burnaford, R. (2010). The proof is in the punch: Gender differences in perceptions of action and aggression as components of manhood. *Sex Roles*, *62*, 241-251.

Table 1.

*Study 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Masculine Identification, HS, and BS.*

| <b>Descriptive Stereotypes</b> |             |                  |                           |           |           |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Variable</b>                | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b> | <b>Masculine Identity</b> | <b>HS</b> | <b>BS</b> |
|                                |             |                  | <b>r</b>                  | <b>r</b>  | <b>r</b>  |
| Masculine Identity             | 4.36        | 1.03             | -                         | .41**     | .37**     |
| HS                             | 3.51        | 1.07             | .41**                     | -         | .35**     |
| BS                             | 3.22        | .87              | .37**                     | .35**     | -         |

  

| <b>Prescriptive Stereotypes</b> |             |                  |                           |           |           |
|---------------------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Variable</b>                 | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b> | <b>Masculine Identity</b> | <b>HS</b> | <b>BS</b> |
|                                 |             |                  | <b>r</b>                  | <b>r</b>  | <b>r</b>  |
| Masculine Identity              | 4.30        | 1.20             | -                         | .23*      | .33**     |
| HS                              | 3.41        | .99              | .23*                      | -         | .26**     |
| BS                              | 3.29        | .85              | .33**                     | .26**     | -         |

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 2.

*Correlation and Multiple Regressions for Predicting Descriptive and Prescriptive Stereotypes of Men and Women by HS Score*

| <b>Descriptive Stereotypes</b>  |          |          |              |          |          |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|
| <b>Men</b>                      |          |          | <b>Women</b> |          |          |
|                                 | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |              | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |
| Dominance                       | .27**    | .26*     | Dominance    | .51**    | .61**    |
| Agency                          | .12      | .01      | Agency       | .03      | -.09     |
| Communality                     | .06      | -.16     | Communality  | -.21*    | -.45**   |
| <b>Prescriptive Stereotypes</b> |          |          |              |          |          |
| <b>Men</b>                      |          |          | <b>Women</b> |          |          |
|                                 | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |              | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |
| Dominance                       | .09      | .03      | Dominance    | -.11     | -.13     |
| Agency                          | .21*     | .15      | Agency       | .07      | .10      |
| Communality                     | .09      | -.01     | Communality  | .21*     | .14      |

*Note.* β's represent standardized regression weights when controlling for Masculine Identification and BS.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 3.

*Correlation and Multiple Regressions for Predicting Descriptive and Prescriptive Stereotypes of Men and Women by BS Score*

| <b>Descriptive Stereotypes</b>  |          |          |              |          |          |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|
| <b>Men</b>                      |          |          | <b>Women</b> |          |          |
|                                 | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |              | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |
| Dominance                       | .21**    | .16      | Dominance    | .06      | -.09     |
| Agency                          | .14      | .06      | Agency       | .19*     | .17      |
| Communality                     | .29**    | .22*     | Communality  | .35**    | .43**    |
| <b>Prescriptive Stereotypes</b> |          |          |              |          |          |
| <b>Men</b>                      |          |          | <b>Women</b> |          |          |
|                                 | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |              | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |
| Dominance                       | .19      | .14      | Dominance    | .01      | .17      |
| Agency                          | .10      | -.05     | Agency       | .03      | -.02     |
| Communality                     | .19      | .14      | Communality  | .14      | .01      |

*Note.* β's represent standardized regression weights when controlling for HS and Masculine Identification.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 4.

*Correlation and Multiple Regression for Predicting Descriptive and Prescriptive Stereotypes of Men and Women by Masculine Identification Score*

| <b>Descriptive Stereotypes</b>  |          |          |              |          |          |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|
| <b>Men</b>                      |          |          | <b>Women</b> |          |          |
|                                 | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |              | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |
| Dominance                       | .05      | -.12     | Dominance    | .05      | -.17     |
| Agency                          | .24*     | .21      | Agency       | .17      | .14      |
| Communality                     | .35**    | .33*     | Communality  | .20*     | .23*     |
| <b>Prescriptive Stereotypes</b> |          |          |              |          |          |
| <b>Men</b>                      |          |          | <b>Women</b> |          |          |
|                                 | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |              | <b>r</b> | <b>β</b> |
| Dominance                       | .17      | .12      | Dominance    | -.09     | -.12     |
| Agency                          | .34**    | .32**    | Agency       | .11      | .10      |
| Communality                     | .39**    | .37**    | Communality  | .32**    | .28**    |

*Note.* β's represent standardized regression weights when controlling for HS and BS.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 5.

*Study 2 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Masculine Identification, HS, and BS.*

| Variable           | Mean | Std. Dev. | Masculine Identity | HS    | BS   |
|--------------------|------|-----------|--------------------|-------|------|
|                    |      |           | r                  | r     | r    |
| Masculine Identity | 4.50 | 1.09      | -                  | .32** | .19* |
| HS                 | 3.01 | 1.10      | .32**              | -     | .07  |
| BS                 | 2.93 | .90       | .19*               | .07   | -    |

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 6.

*Correlation and Multiple Regressions for Predicting Ratings of Traditional and Non-Traditional Groups of Men and Women by HS Score*

|                   | Male Subtypes |         | Female Subtypes   |         |        |
|-------------------|---------------|---------|-------------------|---------|--------|
|                   | r             | $\beta$ | r                 | $\beta$ |        |
| Stay-at-home Dads | -.20*         | -.23**  | Stay-at-home Moms | .05     | -.06   |
| Effeminate Men    | -.39**        | -.33**  | Effeminate Women  | .01     | -.07   |
| Feminist Men      | -.55**        | -.56**  | Feminist Women    | -.41**  | -.41** |
| Masculine Men     | .28**         | .06     | Masculine Women   | -.29**  | -.30** |
| Career Men        | .24**         | .12     | Career Women      | -.13    | -.21*  |

*Note.*  $\beta$ 's represent standardized regression weights when controlling for Masculine Identification and BS.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 7.

*Correlation and Multiple Regressions for Predicting Ratings of Traditional and Non-Traditional Groups of Men and Women by BS Score*

|                   | Male Subtypes |         | Female Subtypes   |             |
|-------------------|---------------|---------|-------------------|-------------|
|                   | r             | $\beta$ | r                 | $\beta$     |
| Stay-at-home Dads | .00           | .00     | Stay-at-home Moms | .21** .16*  |
| Effeminate Men    | -.07          | -.01    | Effeminate Women  | .26** .23** |
| Feminist Men      | .05           | .08     | Feminist Women    | .11 .14     |
| Masculine Men     | .14           | .02     | Masculine Women   | -.13 -.12   |
| Career Men        | .07           | -.01    | Career Women      | .23** .21** |

*Note.*  $\beta$ 's represent standardized regression weights when controlling for HS and Masculine Identification.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 8.

*Correlation and Multiple Regressions for Predicting Ratings of Traditional and Non-Traditional Groups of Men and Women by Masculine Identification Score*

|                   | <b>Male Subtypes</b> |          | <b>Female Subtypes</b> |          |       |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|-------|
|                   | <b>r</b>             | <b>β</b> | <b>r</b>               | <b>β</b> |       |
| Stay-at-home Dads | .01                  | .09      | Stay-at-home Moms      | .34**    | .33** |
| Effeminate Men    | -.28**               | -.17*    | Effeminate Women       | .22**    | .20*  |
| Feminist Men      | -.15                 | .02      | Feminist Women         | -.09     | .02   |
| Masculine Men     | .62**                | .58**    | Masculine Women        | -.08     | .04   |
| Career Men        | .41**                | .37**    | Career Women           | .15      | .18*  |

*Note.* β's represent standardized regression weights when controlling for HS and BS.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

## Appendix A

### Study 1 Materials

This study is about attitudes towards men and women in today's society. All of your answers are completely confidential. You may withdraw at any time, and your answers will not be included in the study. Thank you for participating!

#### Masculinity Threat (Modified from Bosson & Michniewicz, 2013)

##### Condition: Gender Transgression

Please write about a time in your life when you did something (or something happened to you)—*in front of other people*—that made you feel bad about your status as a “real man” and perhaps even insecure about your masculinity. This should be something that would make most other people see you as “not a real man.”

##### Condition: Control

Please write about your most recent meal. Include things like when you ate, what you ate, who you ate with, and how you felt. Try to use as much detail as possible.

#### Gender Descriptions and Prescriptions (Hall et al., in press).

##### Descriptive:

How **common** is it for American **women/men** to possess the following characteristics? (1= not at all typical, 9 = very typical)

##### Prescriptive/Proscriptive:

How **desirable** is it for American **women** to possess the following characteristics? (1= not at all typical, 9 = very typical)

##### Traits:

- Dominance: Dominating, Threatening, Forceful, Ruthless, Aggressive, Intimidating, Controlling
- Agency: Confident, Independent, Persuasive, Career-oriented, Ambitious, Assertive, Competitive
- Communality: Agreeable, Compassionate, Warm, Polite, Helpful, Friendly, Sensitive to other's needs, Cooperative

#### Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1997)

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale: 0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = agree somewhat; 5 = agree strongly.

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for “equality.”
3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.
4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
5. Women are too easily offended.
6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
13. Men are complete without women.
14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own wellbeing in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.
22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Masculine Identification (Modified from Crisp et. al, 2006)

Below are a series of statements about your feelings about your gender. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale: 0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = agree somewhat; 5 = agree strongly.

1. I identify strongly with other men
2. Being a man is an important part of who I am.
3. I feel strong ties with other men.
4. I feel a sense of solidarity with other men.
5. Being masculine is an important part of who I am.

Sexual Orientation:

- Heterosexual
- Homosexual
- Bisexual
- Other
- Prefer not to say

## Appendix B

### Study 2 Materials

This study is about attitudes towards men and women in today's society. All of your answers are completely confidential. You may withdraw at any time, and your answers will not be included in the study. Thank you for participating!

#### Masculinity Threat (modified from Bosson & Michniewicz, 2013)

##### Condition: Gender Transgression

Please write about a time in your life when you did something (or something happened to you)—*in front of other people*—that made you feel bad about your status as a “real man” and perhaps even insecure about your masculinity. This should be something that would make most other people see you as “not a real man.”

##### Condition: Moral Transgression

Please write about a time in your life when you did something (or something happened to you)—*in front of other people*—that made you feel bad about your status as a “moral person” and perhaps even insecure about your morality. This should be something that would make most other people see you as “not a moral person.”

##### Condition: Neutral

No writing task for this condition

### Evaluating Subtypes

You will be asked to rate 5 male and 5 female “types” according to how you feel about them. There are no right or wrong answers; we are interested in **your** opinion.

| <b>Traditional women</b> | <b>Non-traditional women</b> | <b>Traditional men</b>  | <b>Non-traditional Men</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Stay at home moms     | 2. Ambitious career women    | 3. Ambitious career men | 4. Stay at home dads       |
|                          | 5. Feminist women            |                         | 6. Feminist men            |
| 7. feminine women        | 8. masculine women           | 9. masculine men        | 10. feminine men           |

1. What is your overall evaluation or general attitude toward [the group]? (-3 = highly negative, 3=highly positive)
2. What is the degree [the group] has positive/negative personality traits? (-3 = highly negative, 3 = highly positive)

3. When you come into contact with [the group] do you what type of experience do you have? (-3 = highly negative, 3 = highly positive)
4. What are your emotions towards [the group]? (-3 = highly negative, 3 = highly positive)
5. To what extent does [the group] hold values, traditions, and beliefs you agree /disagree with? (-3 = highly disagree, 3 = highly agree)

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1997)

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale: 0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = agree somewhat; 5 = agree strongly.

23. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
24. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."
25. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.
26. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
27. Women are too easily offended.
28. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
29. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
30. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
31. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
32. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
33. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
34. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
35. Men are complete without women.
36. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

37. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
38. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
39. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
40. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
41. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
42. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own wellbeing in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
43. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.
44. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

#### Masculine Identification (Modified from Crisp et. al, 2006)

Below are a series of statements about your feelings about your gender. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale: 0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = agree somewhat; 5 = agree strongly.

6. I identify strongly with other men
7. Being a man is an important part of who I am.
8. I feel strong ties with other men.
9. I feel a sense of solidarity with other men.
10. Being masculine is an important part of who I am.

#### Sexual Orientation:

- Heterosexual
- Homosexual
- Bisexual
- Other
- Prefer not to say