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 Chapter 1: Introduction

Very few studies have examined the effects of media messages on masculine gender norms, but implications exist when conforming to the tenets of masculinity. For example, Springer and Mouzon (2011) found that strong masculine idealization has negative implications for seeking preventative health care. This could be connected to messages men internalize about needing to “be strong”; thus leading to refusing medical care. Additionally, men who strongly conform to masculine norms are more likely to externalize depressive symptoms through acts of aggression and alcohol consumption, whereas those who weakly conform to masculine norms will acknowledge their depressive emotions (Magovcevic & Addis, 2008). These findings are congruent with masculine ideals that include being emotionally restrictive (Kimmel, 2008; Kivel, 2010). Without being able to openly feel depression or sadness, men express themselves through emotions and actions acceptable to masculine gender norms: aggression, anger, and suppression through alcohol consumption.

Bandura states, “In short, there is no single pattern of social influence. The media can implant ideas either directly or through adopters” (2009, pg. 113). In order to understand how one is socialized into their respective gender role, a multitude of influences must be considered. Socialization, defined here as the learning process of social norms, occurs through interpersonal exchanges and experiences with mediated characters found on television and in other media (Bandura, 2009; Bussey & Bandura, 1992; Wood, 2011). Maccoby (1998) finds that gender roles and expectations are learned through interaction with childhood peers. Although Maccoby has found empirical support for her perspective on gender identity, she has been heavily criticized for failing to mention any other social influences, like family and media (Meyer, Murphy, Cascardi, & Birns, 1991). Bussey and Bandura (1992) argue that televised models influence our
mentors and peers, from whom we learn about gender interpersonally. Men specifically are being
given the same message about their gender expression, like being emotionally restrictive and
always needing to be strong, from media portrayals and interpersonal interactions. Thus a
homogenous message about masculinity comes from multiple sources.

Since physiological and psychological risks exist for conformity to masculine ideals
(Springer & Mouzon, 2011; Magovcevic & Addis, 2008), it is important for scholars to closely
examine media’s contribution to idealized masculinity and the internalization of masculine
norms. This research contributes to media effects and gender research by testing the cultivation
effects of media consumption on idealized masculine norms, and the social comparison effects of
idealized norms on gender identity.

Electronic media allows for the rapid communication of messages, including cultural
norms. Within these norms are the expectations of gender roles, more specifically the attitudes
and behaviors of men and women in everyday life. As viewers process large amounts of
messages about gender norms, it is likely they will adhere more to idealized conceptualizations
of gender roles (Shanahan, Signorielli, & Morgan, 2008) because they compare (Festinger, 1954)
themselves to characters on television, in music, films and video games.

Little research has examined the effects of media on masculine ideologies. Extant
literature critically examines media’s construction of idealized masculinity (e.g. WWE, The Man
Show, make-over shows, and music videos) through content analyses of “reality” programs. For
example, in Soulliere’s (2006) analysis of the World Wrestling Entertainment program, results
indicated that this program perpetuates masculine norms by “emphasizing aggression and
violence, emotional restraint, and success and achievement as desirable masculine traits” (pg. 8). These findings on emotional restraint also extend to fictional media representations.

Research demonstrates that fictional television also perpetuates masculine norms. Scharrer (2009) studied men in television police dramas between 1951 and 1995 and found that, although there was an increase in emotional expressiveness in men from the 1950 into the 1980s, during the 1990s, male characters reverted back to a stoic, less expressive stereotype commonly seen in more contemporary police dramas. Aggression and anger displays remained consistent over the course of the time period examined. Over the course of the time examined, aggression and anger displays remained consistent. Scharrer speaks to the changes in gender expression based on societal norms of masculinity, but the media seems to only perpetuate gender norms. Eisend (2010) conducted a meta-analysis to test if gender role stereotypes are maintained (mirroring effect) or if attempts are made to progress gender roles in television and radio advertisements. The author found that marketers only aim to mirror the gender messages already present in society; the aim of advertising is not to project more progressive gender roles. Advertisements only show progressive gender roles when they have already been accepted in society.

Media does play a role in perpetuating masculine gender norms (Bussey & Bandura, 1992), but very few quantitative studies have been conducted using masculinity as an outcome variable. Thus far, researchers tend to focus on how conformity to masculine norms causes other outcome variables, like drive for musculality and body dissatisfaction (McCreary, Saucier, & Courtenay, 2005; Steinfeldt, Gilchrist, Halterman, Gomory, & Steinfeldt, 2011). The goal of this dissertation is to demonstrate media’s impact on the idealization of masculinity and how this influences one’s identity. The current study contributes to both gender and media effects research
by attempting to gain empirical support that reveals a relationship between one’s exposure to mediated messages, self-perceptions of masculine ideals, and masculine identity.

In order to conduct this study a literature review defining masculinity will offer a basis for the use of quantitative measures of masculinity. Next, a theoretical framework is built using cultivation and social comparison theories. Based on the literature review and theoretical foundation, a causal model will specify the relationships between exposure to media, mediated ideals of masculinity, and one’s masculine identity. The methods and measures used to study exposure to media and masculinity are described, findings are discussed and explored, and implications for future research, including limitations, are posited.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Masculinity is not universally experienced (Connell, 2000), and in order to study it quantitatively, some of the rules of masculine culture need to be defined. Other quantitative measures have been created over the years that attempt to encapsulate masculinity at various points in history. Validity and reliability issues arise within each measure that makes it less than ideal as a measure of masculinity. Few, if any, measures have any basis in previous research. Below is a review of some of these measures and their limitations.

Measures of Masculinity

The first measures of masculinity and femininity can be traced to two 1936 scales, one by Terman and Miles, and the other by Strong; both scales defined masculinity and femininity as polar opposites (Smiler, 2004). The scoring of these scales favored masculinity because masculine traits were added up and feminine responses were subtracted to create a single score (Terman & Miles, 1936; Strong, 1936). In addition, placing masculinity and femininity on the same scale polarizes gender and assumes that when a characteristic is not masculine, it becomes feminine.

During the 1970s, the feminist and gay rights movements forced society to view gender as being separate from sex and sex roles (Perry & Ballard-Reisch, 2004). To remove the polarity that existed in masculine and feminine measures, Bem (1974) created the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). A year later, Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) published the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). Both scales positioned masculinity and femininity as distinct, non-polarized characteristics. In fact, they placed masculinity and femininity on two different scales that would measure androgyny. When a participant’s average score was above the median
for masculine and feminine traits, they were considered androgynous. This means it was possible to be both masculine and feminine at the same time.

Canary and Hause (1993) argue that, although BSRI and PAQ are widely used, their foundation was based on sex role stereotypes. The items for the BSRI were created by Bem and then rated by 100 undergraduate judges on how each item was desirable for men and women (1974). When an item was deemed significantly favorable for one gender over the other, it was added to a pool, of which twenty were chosen by the researcher. These items were chosen in the 1970s; gender roles have changed, thus making them outdated (Canary & Hause, 1993).

Starting in the 1980s, there was increased interest in the relationship between conformity to sex and gender roles and psychological well-being (Smiler, 2004). Pleck’s (1981) Sex Role Strain (SRS) paradigm explains that there are difficulties in conforming to sex roles. These difficulties can surface due to contradictory and inconsistent mandates within the masculine construct along with the anxiety of repercussions of failure. The possibility exists to possess seemingly contradictory political views of each sex role (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994). One is able to hold liberal views of women’s roles, and internalize conservative views of masculine roles. In this sense, a man can be feminist, but still maintain strict and rigid masculine ideologies.

O’Neil (2008) explains that conflict with gender roles can permeate four domains of life: cognitive (thinking about gender), affective (feelings about gender), behavior (enactment of gender), and unconscious (influences beyond conscious thought). SRS is the foundation for the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) developed in 1986 by O’Neil and his colleagues (O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David, and Wrightsman, 1986). They developed two scales (GRCS I & GRCS II) to measure personal reports of gender role conflict and situational (contextual) gender conflict.
The personal reports had a higher reliability and O’Neil et al. called for more research using the two scales (O’Neil et al., 1986; see O’Neil, 2008 for a review of research). In a study by McCreary, Saucier, and Courtenay (2005), the alpha reliability measures were moderate to high for all four factors: success, power and competition - .90, restrictive emotionality - .90, restrictive affectionate behavior between men - .89, conflict between work and family - .85.

Another popular measure of masculine gender conflict is by Eisler and Skidmore (1987) who created the Masculine Gender Role Stress (MGRS) scale. This measure posited a five-factor structure, compared to the four factors within the GRCS I. Dillon (2004) examined the MGRS and GRCS structures and found that the MGRS structure did not hold up, being better constructed as three factors, which was renamed MGRS-R. The GRCS was found to be related to interpersonal distress, while the MGRS-R was related to intrapersonal distress (Dillon, 2004).

Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku (1994) created an eight-item scale measuring attitudes toward male roles, but in their initial published study, they found their coefficient alpha only reached .56. Even after a factor analysis, which found two factors for the scale, the coefficient alpha for each was .51 and .50. The low alphas make it less than ideal and it is unlikely that eight items would be enough to evaluate all the attitudes one has about every factor that constitutes masculinity. This puts the validity of this measure into question.

In 1998, Wade formulated the Reference Group Identity Dependence (RGID) theory that states the self-concept of masculinity, based on a male’s level of ego development, can be influenced by how dependent he is on external references with which he identifies: the formulation of masculinity can be externally defined, internally defined, or undifferentiated (no reference group). Based on this theory, Wade and Gelso (1998) created the RGID scale, which is
comprised of 28 items, loading on to four factors. With a sample of 344, the Cronbach's alpha levels were not ideal: no reference group = .78, reference group dependent = .70, reference group nondependent similarity = .73, and reference group nondependent diversity = .70 (Wade & Gelso, 1998).

More recently, Mahalik and colleagues developed the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) that measures a person’s adherence to conservative masculine ideals (Mahalik, Locke, Ludlow, Diemer, Scott, Gottfried, & Freitas, 2003). Their factor analysis indicated eleven distinct factors with their reliabilities being barely acceptable to high: winning = .88, emotional control = .91, risk-taking = .82, violence = .84, power over women = .87, dominance = .73, playboy = .88, self-reliance = .85, primacy of work = .76, disdain for homosexuals = .90, and pursuit of status = .72. Although the reliabilities are mostly within the acceptable range of .80, the scale itself is 94 items, making it cumbersome and liable to higher attrition rates if a number of other measures need to be introduced.

Parent and Moradi (2009) narrowed down the CMNI from 94 items to 46 and from eleven factors to nine, thus creating the CMNI-46. Their alpha reliabilities were: emotional control = .86, winning = .83, playboy = .84, violence = .86, self-reliance = .84, risk-taking = .84, power over women = .78, primacy of work = .77, and disdain for homosexuals = .91 (Parent & Moradi, 2009). This seems to be a somewhat reliable instrument, although alphas generally presented lower than the original 94 item scale. In addition, the CMNI-46 scale is proprietary, putting into question its trustworthiness because it was not released to be retested and scrutinized. In a study by Steinfeldt, Gilchrist, Halterman, Gomory, and Steinfeldt (2011), alpha coefficients were moderate to low, ranging from .68 to .83. In addition to reliability issues, the CMNI-46 uses a measurement scale from zero (strongly disagree) to four (strongly agree).
may cause range restriction and prevent participants from varying naturally if they had five or seven points.

Although there have been many scales that seek to capture masculinity, attitudes about masculinity and how one conforms to masculinity, no measure has provided a highly reliable and valid measure. Good measures need to be created and published to be tested and retested. Due to the variability of masculinity within our culture (Kimmel & Messner, 2010), quantifying manhood remains a daunting task.

To create original measures, Kimmel (2008) states that the rules of masculinity are not written down, yet they are universally understood. Reviewing some of the literature that defines these unspoken rules is imperative to be able to quantify a gender norm. Clemens (2012) reviewed findings from previous studies to determine which elements should be included in an original scale based on established measures. Reliabilities ranged from .84 - .91, making it a trustworthy measure of identification with masculine norms. These factors included: success, power, & competition = .87; restrictive emotionality = .90; attitude toward gays = .90; drive for masculinity = .91; and sexual desire inventory = .84. In the following section, these topics within masculine norms will be discussed, and at the end a summary will bring this study’s operationalization of masculinity together using Clemens’ (2012) measure in addition to a new risk-taking factor.

Defining Masculinity

It is common to hear or speak the phrase “Be a man”. What many people do not recognize are the implications of this phrase. Pezzote (2008) explains that, “when people refer to a ‘real man’ in the everyday sense, they actually lump four things together— biological sex (male
or female reproductive organs), gender identity (an inner sense of being a man or woman),
gender expression (the way gender is expressed as masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation
(straight or gay)- together” (pg. 36). Combining all four categories creates the perception that a
heterosexual, masculine, biological male who identifies as a man is the norm to which all other
types of men should aspire. As argued below, there are social repercussions for not fitting into
this norm.

Repercussions are present in relation a hierarchy of power that exists in United States
culture, which is based on characteristics like sex, age, social economic status, sexual orientation,
and education. The same type of hierarchy exists within masculinity, which is experienced
differently based on age, race, ethnicity and sexual orientation (Kimmel & Messner, 2010).
Connell (2000) states that hegemonic masculinity is the most desired type of masculinity, and
ranks at the top of influence and privilege within gender. Kimmel and Messner (2010) state that
the top-ranking masculine form (hegemonic masculinity) includes heterosexual, Caucasian,
middle-class, biological men. This is the same description Pezzote (2008) described earlier in
being told to “be a man”. This form of masculinity is that to which men compare themselves, and
it can only be achieved by performing or having certain traits. Although men cannot change their
ethnic background or sexual orientation, they can possess the traits, attitudes, and behaviors that
will give them the highest amount of social power that individual can achieve. In the next
section, each tenet will be explored in more detail.

Emotion and sexuality.

If hegemonic masculinity is the highest point of the social power structure, then anything
that does not adhere to its rigid definition, like women or homosexuals, is less desirable
Masculinity is considered sexist because it is a preference for maleness and anything considered feminine is devalued (Pezzote, 2008). Emotionality, for example, is a highly feminine act. Sporting events are one of the very few places a man is able to express a full range of emotions, including physical affection toward another man and outwardly crying (Pezzote, 2008). Outside of this exception, men are considered effeminate for the expression of love of another man and sadness. When a man is deemed effeminate, his heterosexuality is questioned (Kimmel, 2008). A heterosexual man should not display effeminate behavior because that is an expectation of homosexual men.

Questioning a man’s sexuality also questions his masculinity, because heterosexual men are on a higher platform of social power. A common stereotype of male homosexuals is being effeminate. Femininity is perceived as weak in comparison to masculinity (Kimmel, 2008; Pezzote, 2008). One does not need to actually be a homosexual to be perceived as one, and to be perceived as homosexual is detrimental to one’s masculinity (Kimmel & Mahler, 2003). Terms used for verbal policing (controlling and monitoring) of a man’s masculinity, including “fag”, “sissy”, and “homo” demonstrate the negative perceptions of homosexual men. All these terms are associated with male homosexuals, and it is concluded that homosexual men are not masculine. Heterosexual men have also been found to hold more negative feelings and attitudes toward homosexual men than do heterosexual women (Herek, 1988). Lesbians fit into the heterosexual male sexual fantasy, but femininity in a male is in contrast to the expected behaviors of a man, and are rejected and ridiculed. If men do not want to be considered weaker in the eyes of other men, they need to constantly prove their masculinity.

One way to prove heterosexuality and masculinity is by having sexual intercourse with women (Kivel, 2010). Zuckerman (1979) discovered through his sensation seeking scale that
men were more likely than women to participate in uninhibited behaviors like drinking, partying, and swinging (sleeping with many sexual partners). In the university setting, the vague term “hooking up” is purposely used to allow women to appear less promiscuous (a rule of femininity) and to make men appear more promiscuous (a rule of masculinity) (Kimmel, 2008). Having sexual intercourse with many women does not prove virility or masculinity unless the conquests are shared and compared with their peers. Competitions between men can determine who is the most masculine in a given male group. It then becomes a competition between men of who can successfully convince women to sleep with them. The sense of sexual competition and success will be explored in more detail next.

**Success, power, & competition.**

Kivel (2010) created the “Act-Like-A-Man” box (see Appendix A) to visualize the expectations society has for men and the punishments associated with non-conformity to masculine norms. As described earlier, the verbal policing (labeled verbal abuse) include feminine or homophobic terms. By forcing men into this box, it perpetuates a gender binary--what does not fit into the masculinity box will, by default, be placed in the feminine box. In the middle of the box is a list of emotions males experience by living inside masculine confines. These emotions include anger, sadness, isolation, confusion, and resentment. Kivel (2010) agrees with Kimmel and Mahler (2003) that enforcing masculine norms creates an atmosphere of competition, and necessitates men being on constant guard. Any sign of weakness and they can lose their masculine label and lose societal power.

When talking about family and gender socialization, Maccoby (1998) states, “Parents, especially fathers, appear to put more pressure on boys to be ‘masculine’ than they do on girls to
be ‘feminine’” (pg. 147). This is a factor than can lead boys and men into policing gender more harshly, especially for men not to be feminine.

Jackson and Warin (2000) studied children at the start of education and those going into high school and found that during these times of transition, there was a strict adherence to gender norms. Although they only studied younger children and teenagers, they posit that these conformities will occur at different times of transition in a person’s life. These findings can be applied to entrance into college, where a teenager may have their first taste of freedom and learning about managing their time, education, and social life. If society stipulates specific rules for males through masculine norms, and during times of transition males adhere to these norms, what does that mean for a young male’s experience at the university level?

Kimmel (2008) coined the term “Guyland” to describe a new stage of life (between ages 16-26) that exists due to changes in our culture that places education ahead of marriage and careers. In this new stage, an unwritten “Guy Code” governs the behaviors, values, and attitudes of males who are not boys anymore, but not yet men. The governing codes include never showing emotion or revealing weakness, winning and success being everything, and women should be viewed as sexual conquests that prove manhood. In Guyland, manhood is questioned, policed, and evaluated by peers. Guyland perpetuates the ideal of being better than one’s peers, in line with masculine expectations. The goal of masculinity is to be at the top of the hierarchy and one up from every other guy (Pezzote, 2008; Tannen, 2007). To demonstrate that one is the better man than another, the sense of competition and the drive for success will drive men to do activities that place their health and life at risk. French poet and dramatist Pierre Corneille is credited with saying, “To win without risk is to triumph without glory.” In other words, to prove masculinity, there needs to be something at stake.
Risk taking.

In order to not be perceived as a failed (gay or feminine) man in the United States, guys need to prove masculinity through excessive risk taking behaviors, like binge drinking or aggressive driving (Kimmel & Mahler, 2003). In Guyland, peers do not have any more experience in defining what is to be an adult man. Due to this inexperience, proving manhood becomes a test of “toughness” using dangerous activities and rituals.

Gender scholars, like Bem (1977), believe that risk-taking behaviors are learned as part of sex-role socialization. Historically, sex-role measures have been very polarizing; if something is not masculine, it is, by default, feminine. Bem (1977) improved masculine-feminine measures by focusing on traits instead of interests, and creating two independent measures, allowing a person to have high levels of both masculine and feminine traits (termed androgynous). If socialization was a factor, then sensation seeking behaviors (including risk-taking behaviors) would have been negatively correlated with sex and positively correlated with sex roles, but they were not (Zuckerman, 1994). In fact, the likelihood of men to participate in risk-taking behaviors was consistent across ethnic and racial backgrounds (Zuckerman, 1979, 1994, 2008).

Additionally, evolutionary theory may offer a basis for why men perform risky behaviors. Based on structural differences, like size and muscle distribution, between men and women, it would be evolutionarily adaptive to have the larger sex explore primitive territories to aid in survival (Zuckerman, 1983). Eysenck (1983) agrees with this perspective and adds that risk-taking behaviors are most likely genetically based. Zuckerman (1994) concedes that biological factors do not determine one’s destiny. In fact, socialization can alter biological factors, like how the brain develops and grows, and hormone levels (Brizendine, 2011). For example, after a
woman gives birth, the father’s testosterone level decreases to allow him to be a good caretaker. Whether one takes the nature or nurture perspective, there are consistent findings that sex and gender differences in risk-taking behaviors exist. For the purpose of this study, a nurture approach is taken to determine the socializing factors media plays in perceptions of masculinity, but it does not rule out the biological perspective. Men have a genetic predisposition to be more muscular, but is there also an expectation society places on their shoulders?

Muscularity.

In order to take risks, compete with their peers, or to attempt to play the tough masculine role, a man must physically look the part. A muscular man can appear athletic and intimidating, but more important are the social rewards in conforming to masculine expectations. Two studies using college samples found those who strongly conformed to masculine norms had a stronger drive to be muscular (McCreary, Saucier, & Courtenay, 2005; Steinfeldt, Gilchrist, Halterman, Gomory, & Steinfeldt, 2011). They perceived that their social groups would view them more positively if they were more muscular and would be more appealing to the opposite sex. In conforming to masculine norms, their drive to be accepted also increased their drive to build more muscle. Attraction of the opposite sex allows for more opportunities to fornicate, thus being able to prove virility and masculinity. Muscularity allows men to be more competitive and powerful to withstand risky behaviors, and with success comes the attraction of the opposite sex. Each tenet clearly weaves into another.

Conclusion.

All the characteristics of masculinity discussed in this section are variously intertwined. Having sex with women demonstrates virility, success, and heterosexuality. The more women
“conquered”, the more competitive a man is in proving his success. Muscularity gives the appearance of physical power and can be appealing to the opposite sex, which aids in sexual conquests. Taking risks, being successful, and maintaining emotional composure proves one’s psychological strength, heterosexuality (only gay men show emotion), and physical power. Each of these elements exists to prove or demonstrate masculinity, but they cannot stand alone. This study measured each of these elements and determined how media influenced perceptions of the ideal masculine man, and in what ways it influenced identification with masculinity.

In summary, although masculinity is a culturally defined experience, hegemonic masculinity remains the ideal to which all men should aspire (Connell, 2000; Kimmel & Messner, 2010). When one does not conform to masculine norms there are social punishments (Kivel, 2010). In many cases, peers judge and punish masculine non-conformity, and when the judge is inexperienced in being a man, dangerous situations arise (Kimmel, 2008). The masculine elements operationalized for this study include: being successful, competitive, powerful (Kivel, 2010), never showing emotion or weakness (Pezzote, 2008), being muscular (McCreary, Saucier, & Courtenay, 2005; Steinfeldt, Gilchrist, Halterman, Gomory, & Steinfeldt, 2011), having anti-gay (homophobic) attitudes (Herek, 1988; Kimmel & Mahler, 2003) a strong drive for sex (Kimmel, 2008), and participating in risk-taking behaviors (Eysenck, 1983; Kimmel, 2008, Zuckerman 1983; Zuckerman, 1994).

In the next section, a theoretical framework will elucidate what role the media plays in the socialization of masculinity, using cultivation and social comparison theories. Cultivation research will explain how longer exposures to various media (i.e. television, music, Internet, and movies) can create the perception that the broadcast messages represent reality. Social
comparison theory will explain that men compare themselves to the ideal images perpetuated in the media and will influence a man’s own gender identity.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

Two theories help explain media’s influence on masculine identity. First, a person must consume media and formulate an overall expectation of masculine roles. This can be explained by Gerbner’s (1970) cultivation theory. Second, that same person then evaluates the extent to which they fit the ideal expectation created through exposure to media, and this can be explained through Festinger’s (1954) social comparison theory.

Cultivation.

George Gerbner (1919-2005) started the Cultural Indicators Project in the 1960s (Morgan, Shanahan, & Signorielli, 2009). The project’s focus was threefold: 1) media institutions creating the messages, 2) the messages themselves, and 3) the effects of those messages after many exposures. Researchers most commonly cite Gerbner’s work on effects of televised messages on those who watch more than four hours per day. “The goal was to track the most stable, pervasive, and recurrent images in network television content, in terms of the portrayal of violence, gender roles, race and ethnicity, occupations, and many other topics and aspects of life, over long periods of time” (Morgan and Shanahan, 2010, pg. 339). Gerbner knew that technology’s ability to reach mass audiences brings with it the capacity to alter cultural understandings, thus changing the way people live and communicate. It also held the potential to create in the minds of consumers, a false perception of the real world. This concept of changed attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors was named a cultivation effect.

Gerbner and Gross (1976) conducted one of the first studies on cultivation effects from violent television shows. Results indicated that heavy viewers (an average of four hours or more of television a day) saw the world as a more dangerous place than it was according to real-world
statistics (Gerber & Gross, 1976). For heavy viewers, a television-based reality was created. A similar effect happens for other real-world issues, such as sex roles and gay rights (Shanahan & Morgan, 1999). Gender roles are not static, and can change over time (Connell, 2000). Therefore, any study on sex roles or gender norms needs to be taken as a snapshot of that time period.

Shanahan, Signorielli and Morgan (2008) conducted a longitudinal study that concluded conservative views of sex roles are diminishing over time; this is due to the increased and diversified portrayals of women on television that cultivate a more liberal view of sex roles. They reason this change is occurring only as a reflection of changes in society. They are also careful to point out that sexism still exists on television and this examination was only of messages pertaining to work, marriage and family (Shanahan, Signorielli & Morgan, 2008). This study concentrated on gender roles for women, specifically on behaviors associated with feminine gender roles. Cultivation effects can be extended to include masculine gender roles.

Kimmel (2008) described the rules of masculinity as being unspoken, but generally understood. Television offers a guide to understanding masculine rules and norms through “The Bro Code” on How I Met Your Mother, or the show Guy Code on MTV. Teaching masculine norms need not be as blatant as the previously named programs. Depictions of popular male leads in fiction-based, reality-based, or sports programming can offer multiple idealized models.

Within cultivation theory is the idea that media perpetuates homogenous messages across channels. Mainstreaming is the term given to the homogenization of attitudes and beliefs as a product of media cultivation (Morgan, 1986). If media models play a role in the socialization of masculinity, then it is safe to reason that an increased amount of exposure to and consumption of homogeneous messages will have an effect on perceptions of masculine ideals.
Ward and Freeman (2006) tested cultivation and uses and gratification effects on attitudes toward and beliefs of sex roles. Results indicated that those who watched talk shows and sexually driven prime-time shows supported stereotypical sex roles. Also, girls and boys who watched television as a source of companionship perceived sex as recreational, men as sexually driven, and women as sexual objects. When adolescents used television as a friend, they picked up the social norms and values of the programs they watched (Ward & Freeman, 2006). Similarly, Zurbriggen & Morgan (2006) examined the role of reality dating programming on sexual attitudes and behaviors. They found that men use this type of programming more for learning than do women. Other results indicated that the amount of viewing for learning increased traditional and adversarial attitudes towards dating and sex, sexual double standards, and the importance of appearance. Watching for entertainment correlated with perceiving men as sex-driven and dating as a game. Clearly, television portrayals influence young people’s attitudes toward sex and dating.

Narrowing the focus to masculinity and masculine norms, Johnson (2008) found significant differences in conformity to masculine norms between sports viewers and non-viewers. The greatest amount of variance explained was through sex and sports consumption ($R^2 = .33$), which points toward a cultivation effect. Males who watched sports programming were more likely to conform to masculine norms. Competitiveness, anger (an acceptable emotion), and displays of physical strength are tenets of masculinity which are displayed in contact sports, like football, hockey, and boxing.

In 2005, Scharrer conducted a 3 (control stimulus, violent/fantasy-based/non-hyper-masculine stimulus, violent/reality-based/hyper-masculine stimulus) x 2 (high and low hyper-masculinity) x 2 (high and low trait aggression) experiment testing the effects of hyper-
masculinity and trait aggression on aggressive reactions. Those who were hyper-masculine and had high levels of trait aggression were found to have increased aggressive reactions to the stimulus. Additionally, those who were in the violent/reality-based/hyper-masculine stimulus condition had significantly higher scores than those exposed to the other two stimuli. Since it has been determined that media does influence aggressive reactions to stimuli and conformity to masculine norms, it is predicted that:

H1 – Higher levels of media consumption will positively predict conservative views of ideal masculine men

H1a – Higher levels of media consumption will positively predict the ideal man’s drive to be successful, powerful, and competitive.

H1b – Higher levels of media consumption will positively predict the ideal man’s drive for musculature.

H1c – Higher levels of media consumption will positively predict homophobic attitudes in the ideal man.

H1d – Higher levels of media consumption will positively predict the ideal man’s emotional restrictiveness.

H1e – Higher levels of media consumption will positively predict an increase in the ideal man’s risk taking behavior.

H1f – Higher levels of media consumption will positively predict and increased sex drive in the ideal man.
RQ1 – Does the type of media consumed (i.e. television, music, movies, or the Internet) make a difference in attitudes and perceptions of the ideal masculine man?

**Social comparison theory.**

Social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954) was formulated as a way to explain how people compare themselves and perform self-evaluations. Festinger believed that people evaluated themselves through a comparison with someone like themselves. Wood (1989) argued that individuals may have specific goals when using the comparison. For example, if someone wanted to boost their ego, their comparison point would be someone perceived to be lesser than them. In the case of masculinity, if a heterosexual man disliked beer (a masculine drink), he may compare himself to a gay man (perceived as feminine and weak) and conclude that he is more masculine. While this would involve selecting the individual he compares himself to, not all the comparisons are self-selected (Wood, 1989). Within hegemonic masculinity, men compare themselves with the ideal male figure. Depending on the context, comparisons can be upward for idealized images or downward for those with similar qualities.

An example of downward comparison was demonstrated through audiences’ preferences for news personae and types of stories. Knoblock-Westerwick and Hastall’s (2006) found participants preferred news on same-sex individuals, and young readers favored articles about same-age characters. Self-esteem also played a role in downward comparisons and preference for types of news articles. Specifically, men who had lower self-esteem preferred stories about performance or achievement; women with low self-esteem preferred news items about interpersonal or social issues. The authors speculated that story preferences are linked to
downward comparisons (Knoblock-Westerwick & Hastall, 2006). In order to feel better about their performance of gender roles, comparisons are made with those who have failed.

Social comparisons are not always downward and boost one’s self-esteem. Media is also used for upward comparisons. Viewing media ideals contribute to negative self-evaluations (Farquhar & Wasylkiw, 2007). When one does not live up to the ideal of media, that person will have a poor self-evaluation. Hargreaves and Tiggemann (2009) exposed men to idealized muscular male images in television commercials and found decreased satisfaction with their muscularity and physical attractiveness. Women have been found to be affected by thin-body ideals in media. One study on thin ideals in music videos found women were more dissatisfied with their body (Tiggemann & Slater, 2004). Media not only affects adults, it can also have an impact on children. Exposure to video gaming magazines increased a drive for muscularity in Caucasian boys (Harrison, & Bond, 2007). It seems that regardless of age or gender, many people can be affected by idealized images in media. If media images can cause men and boys to be dissatisfied with their muscularity, is it possible that our perceptions of idealized gender rules, perpetuated through media, can affect body satisfaction?

Identification with masculinity has been used to predict the drive to be muscular, which is considered a masculine trait. These studies, described earlier, examine how a male’s adherence to masculine norms affects evaluations of their body (McCreary, Saucier, & Courtenay, 2005; Steinfeldt, Gilchrist, Halterman, Gomory, & Steinfeldt, 2011). Using a hierarchical multiple regression, Steinfeldt et al. (2011) discovered that 28% of the variance toward the drive for muscularity was explained by masculine traits, like athletic identity, risk taking, emotional control, and primacy of work. McCreary et al. (2005), conducted a similar hierarchical multiple
regression and found that 21% of the variance was explained by traditional (conservative) attitudes about men, which was a significant predictor of a drive for muscularity.

H2 – For each masculine tenet, the perceptions of the ideal man will positively predict identification.

H2a – The ideal man’s drive for success, power, and competition will positively predict identification with success, power, and competition.

H2b – The ideal man’s drive for muscularity will positively predict identification with a drive for muscularity.

H2c – The ideal man’s homophobic attitudes will positively predict identification with homophobic attitudes.

H2d – The ideal man’s emotional restrictiveness will positively predict identification with emotional restrictiveness.

H2e – The ideal man’s increased risk-taking will positively predict identification with increased risk-taking behaviors.

H2f – The ideal man’s increased sex drive will positively predict identification with and increased sex drive.

RQ2 – Does the type of media consumed (i.e. television, music, movies, or the Internet) make a difference in the social comparison effects?

RQ3 – What differences exist between genders on perceptions of ideal masculinity and conformity to masculine norms?
Expected Paths

Based on the literature reviewed, a path model is proposed. See Appendix B. In the model, variables were labeled similarly, but were placed in separate boxes identifying whether they are perceptions of the masculine ideal or part of a person’s identification with masculine norms. For example, the variable “ideal success, power and competition” was placed in a box named “Masculine Ideal”. The same was done for ideal restrictive emotionality, ideal drive for muscul arity, ideal sex drive, and ideal homophobic attitude. The variables measuring adherence to masculine norms have the same name, but are placed into a box named “Masculine Identification”.

The predicted relationships linked increased media consumption with increased stereotypical ideals of men, which were expected to correlate with individual identity. Specifically, when one consumes a large amount of media, they will perceive the ideal man to have an increased drive for success, power and competition; drive for muscul arity; homophobic attitudes; emotional restrictiveness; positive attitudes toward risky behaviors; and sex drive. These ideals, in turn, were expected to correlate with increased participant drive for success, power and competition; drive for muscul arity; homophobic attitudes; emotional restrictiveness; positive attitude toward risky behaviors; and sex drive. Gender differences were expected because those who do not perceive themselves as masculine would react differently to ideal perceptions of masculine men.

In the next section, the research methods used to collect data will be explained. An online cross sectional survey was posted on QuestionPro.com. After presenting results from a power analysis, the participant sample will be broken down by age, gender, and ethnicity. The origins
of each measure, their alpha reliabilities, and the construction of the ideal masculine variables are extrapolated.
Chapter 4: Methodology

Design

This study consisted of a survey posted on QuestionPro.com. Participants were provided a link to log onto the survey. Once the welcome page was read, participants consented to start the survey by clicking to the next page. A series of questions allowed participants to click on the choice that corresponded to their answer. When the survey was completed, a link was provided to a separate survey created by the instructor of an introductory communication course in order to assign course credit. No personal information was handled by nor was control over the linked credit site given to the investigator. Therefore, no personal information was gathered linking participants to their answers.

Sample

Power analysis.

Cultivation studies have been criticized for small effects sizes, ranging from .08-.10 (Hirsch, 1980). A power analysis for multiple regression reveals that with an effect size of .08, power level of .95, and a p-value of .01, at least 263 participants are required. Students were not turned away from earning course credit for participation.

Participants.

Students at a large northeastern university in an introductory communication course were asked to complete the survey. 239 cases were removed because entries were (a) blank (b) duplicated (c) incomplete or (d) under the age of 18. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) requires parental permission to study any person under the age of 18. The incomplete entries that were removed contained less than 80 (70%) questions answered. The sample used for all analyses consisted of 599 participants.
Most of the participants were age 18-23 (99%). A majority of this sample was of European decent (63.9 %). The second largest category represented were those who did not identify in any other ethnicity listed (14%), which included African American (6.0%), Latino/Hispanic American (7.5%), Asian American (7.3%), and Native American (.5%). Although this study concentrates on masculinity, commonly associated with men, women were also asked to participate because gender is experienced by both sexes. Males represented 50.9 % (n = 305), and women represented 48.4% (n = 290) of the sample. Four individuals (.7%) preferred not to identify their gender. In regards to sexual orientation, 565 (94.3) were heterosexual, 24 (4%) were bisexual, and 5 (.8%) were homosexual. Due to the lack of diversity in this sample, only gender was used as an independent variable.

Participants were offered course credit for their participation by the instructor of the introductory communication course. There were no other incentives offered to students, and no one was coerced into taking part in this study.

Measures

Cultivation.

The cultivation measures used were an expansion of the one used by Morgan (1986) that asks, “On the average day, about how many hours do you personally spend watching television?” This question was used, and additional questions included the same wording as Morgan’s question, but “watching television” was replaced with “using the Internet”, “listening to music”, “watching movies”, and “using media”.

These channels were chosen specifically for exposure to messages created by a gatekeeper. A gatekeeper is the corporate institution involved in creating messages that are broadcast or published through mass communication channels. As opposed to interpersonal
communication where one person encodes or creates a message, in mass communication there are many people involved in the creation of messages found in screenplays and advertisements. Within the group of gatekeepers are media corporation owners, writers, producers, and directors. They all have a hand in the creation and editing of messages.

**Masculinity scales.**

The scales used to measure masculinity have historically focused on one’s own masculine traits. These items are described first because they are unedited, unless otherwise indicated. To create scales to measure perceptions of ideal masculinity, the original scales described above were copied and edited to focus on the ideal man. The measures had Likert type scales ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”. The stronger one agreed with each statement, the more they conformed to the conservative masculine norm. The scales that do not use this framework will be described individually. See Appendices H (ideal) and I (original form) for measures and loadings.

For each scale in its original form, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using AMOS 19. Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities were calculated using SPSS 21. To determine whether a measure is reliable, the alpha coefficient should reach .70 or higher (de Vaus, 2013). All scales reached or exceeded reliability standards. Alphas are provided in the descriptions of the measures.

**Gender role conflict.**

The Gender Role Conflict Scale (O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David & Wrightsman, 1986) measures success, power and competition (SPC, 9 items, $\alpha = .85$) and restrictive emotionality (ReEmo, 10 items, $\alpha = .93$) in two separate factors. The full SPC measure contained 13 items, but four items had to be removed because of small loadings, causing a bad fitting model.
**Attitudes towards gays.**

The Attitude Toward Lesbians and Gays Scale (Herek & Glunt, 1993) measures attitudes towards both lesbians and gays, but for this study only the attitude toward gays (ATG) subscale was used (3 items, $\alpha = .93$). The measure originally had five items, but because of a bad fitting model, two reverse coded items were removed.

**Drive for muscularity.**

The Drive for Muscularity Scale (McPherson, McCarthy, McCreary & McMillan, 2010) measures many factors of attitudes toward being muscular. The muscularity-oriented body image factor was used in this study (DFM, 7 items, $\alpha = .91$). All items were confirmed to load onto one factor.

**Sexual Desire.**

The dyadic desire scale factor from the Sexual Desire Inventory - 2 (Spector, Carey & Steinberg, 1996) measures sexual desire in many contexts (SexDesire, 3 items, $\alpha = .83$). The dyadic desire sub-scale will be used and edited down from nine to five items to measure sexual desire/lust for relevance. During the CFA, two reverse coded items had small loadings and caused the model fit to decrease. These two reverse coded items were removed.

**Risk-taking behavior.**

Zuckerman’s (1994) Sensation Seeking scale includes a thrill and adventure seeking subscale that was used to measure risk-taking behaviors (RiskTaking). The subscale was comprised of ten questions ($\alpha = .73$) offering a choice between two statements. An example is: (a) A sensible person avoids activities that are dangerous. (b) I sometimes like to do things that are a little frightening. In this instance, the “b” choice would be considered the more risky behavior.
Ideal Masculinity Scales

In order to determine ideal perceptions of masculinity using the measures discussed above, the items from each scale were re-worded to ask about the attitudes and behaviors of the ideal masculine man. These edited scales were examined through exploratory factor analysis using the statistical program SPSS 21. Alpha reliabilities were also measured using the same program. See Appendix H for all EFA factor loadings.

Stevens (2002) suggests that for a sample size of 300, the factor loadings should be greater than .298, and for sample sizes around 600, factor loadings should be greater than .21. In this study, with a sample of n=599, a conservative cutoff point of .35 was used to determine significant loadings.

Ideal gender role conflict.

The Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David & Wrightsman, 1986) measures success, power and competition (IdealSPC, 9 items, \( \alpha = .89 \)) and restrictive emotionality (IdealReEmo, 10 items, \( \alpha = .91 \)) were edited to focus on their perceptions of the ideal masculine man.

All IdealReEmo items loaded onto one factor. Initially, IdealSPC loaded onto two factors. When four items were removed, one factor remained. The four dropped items were also removed during the CFA of the original measure because of a bad model fit.

Ideal attitudes towards gays.

The attitude toward gays subscale (Herek & Glunt, 1993) was edited to ask about attitudes of the ideal masculine man (IdealATG, 3 items, \( \alpha = .92 \)). The subscale originally
contained five items, but two reverse coded items loaded onto a separate factor and brought down the measure’s reliability. The two reverse coded items were removed.

**Ideal drive for muscularity.**

The Drive for Muscularity Scale (McPherson, McCarthy, McCreary, & McMillan, 2010) subscale of muscularity-oriented body image was used to determine the ideal masculine man’s perceptions of his musculature (IdealDFM, 7 items, $\alpha = .90$). This scale when freely allowed to loading into factors broke into two factors. When constrained, they loaded into one factor with loadings from .63 to .86. Since our cutoff is .40, these are decent loadings.

**Ideal sexual desire.**

The dyadic desire scale factor from the Sexual Desire Inventory - 2 (Spector, Carey & Steinberg, 1996) measures sexual desire in many contexts (3 items, $\alpha = .79$). The dyadic desire sub-scale (IdealSexDrive) was edited to focus on the ideal masculine man. Similar to the issues conducting a CFA with the original truncated measure, the reverse coded items loaded onto a separate factor. The reliabilities also decrease exponentially, and the two reverse coded items were removed.

**Ideal risk-taking behavior.**

The Sensation Seeking (Zuckerman, 1994) subscale measuring thrill and adventure seeking was edited to measure risk-taking behaviors of the ideal masculine man (IdealRiskTaking). The subscale was comprised of ten items ($\alpha = .71$) offering a choice between two statements, like the original measure, but edited toward the ideal masculine man.

All significant items for each scale were averaged into a separate variable. The names of the variables are listed within the measure descriptions above. The averaged variables for the original measures are: SPC_Self, ReEmo_Self, ATG_Self, DFM_Self, SexDrive_Self, and
RiskTaking_Self. The variables averaged for the edited ideal man are: IdealSPC, IdealReEmo, IdealATG, IdealDFM, IdealSexDrive, and IdealRiskTaking. These labels were used in the models created in AMOS 19. They will not be referenced in the text in this manner.

**Data Analysis**

Each measure was subjected to factor analyses (confirmatory factor analysis for original measures, and exploratory factor analysis for altered measures), and averaged into variables. V.I.F. indices revealed multicollinearity was not an issue. Field (2009) suggests VIF indices should not be larger than 1 to indicate multicollinearity is not an issue and none of the indices for these models were above 1.

Before the hypothesis model was tested, each hypothesis and research question was tested through linear multiple regression to determine paths for research questions in the tested model. The hypothesis model was tested using AMOS 19, but the model was not a good fit. Non-significant relationships were removed and the model was re-tested as a fixed model. This model fit was better, but not ideal. Based on bivariate correlations, modification indices provided in AMOS 19, and the literature, new paths were tested and a good fitting model was found. The final model can be viewed in Appendix G.
Chapter 5: Results

Before testing the hypothesis model in AMOS, linear regressions were conducted using SPSS to test the hypotheses. Conducting these tests in SPSS allowed for an exploration of the research questions, and the results were included in the model tests using in Amos 19.

Hypothesis Tests

The first hypothesis predicted that the more one uses media, the more likely they will have conservative views of the ideal masculine man. Specifically, there is a direct relationship between amount of media used and one’s conservative views of ideal masculine norms, including (a) ideal success, power, and competition; (b) ideal drive for muscularity; (c) ideal attitude toward gays (i.e. homophobic attitudes); (d) ideal restrictive emotionality; (e) ideal sex drive; and (f) ideal risk taking. Support was found for ideal success, power, and competition ($\beta = .10, p = .01$). The other tests had non-significant results. Only H1a was supported.

The second hypothesis predicted that the ideal perceptions of masculinity would positively predict one’s identification with masculine norms. Specifically, (a) as ideal success, power, and competition increases, so would identification with success, power and competition; (b) as ideal drive for muscularity increases, identification with drive for muscularity would also increase; (c) an increase in homophobic attitudes (Attitude Toward Gays) would be associated with an increase in the individuals’ homophobic attitudes; (d) as ideal restrictive emotionality increases the individual would also be more emotionally restrictive; (e) ideal risk taking would positively correlate with identification with risk taking; and (f) ideal sex drive perceptions would predict a person’s sex drive.
All of the predictions in hypothesis two were significant. Ideal success, power, and competition significantly predicted identification with this variable ($\beta = .55$, $p < .00$); ideal drive for muscularity correlated with increased drive for muscularity for the individual ($\beta = .28$, $p < .00$); ideal homophobic attitudes positively predicted one’s own homophobic attitudes ($\beta = .69$, $p < .00$); (d) ideal restrictive emotionality positively predicted a person’s own emotional restrictiveness ($\beta = .36$, $p < .00$); (e) ideal risk taking positively correlated with one’s own risk taking behavioral intentions ($\beta = .47$, $p < .00$); and ideal sex drive did predict the individual’s own sex drive ($\beta = .36$, $p < .00$). Hypothesis two found full support.

The three research questions inquired whether gender and media selection would have any effects on the ideal perceptions of or identification with masculine norms. A correlation matrix was conducted to seek out possible relationships. See Appendix C. Significant relationships were found between being female and watching TV; ideal success, power, and competition; ideal homophobic attitudes; ideal sex drive; identification with homophobic attitudes; and identification with a drive for muscularity. Watching television correlated with ideal success, power, and competition; ideal homophobic and identification with homophobic attitudes; and one’s own drive for muscularity. Correlations with being female were stronger than media use. To this point, all three research questions have significant findings.

Research question one asked if the choice of medium would have any effect on perceptions of ideal masculine norms. Regressions were run on each ideal masculine variable and all masculine identification variables; watching TV, using the Internet, listening to music, watching movies, and female gender were predictor variables. Watching TV predicted ideal homophobic attitudes ($\beta = .10$, $p = .01$). This was the only significant relationship found for all
ideal masculine norms. Research question one found support for only one medium (watching TV) and one outcome variable (ideal homophobic attitudes).

Research question two asked if the choice of medium used would predict identification with masculine norms. Using the Internet ($\beta = -.13$, $p = .00$) negatively predicted one’s own risk taking behaviors, and watching TV ($\beta = .11$, $p = .01$) positively predicted individual homophobic attitudes. This lends partial support for research question two.

Research question three asked if gender played a role in perceptions of ideal masculinity and identification with masculine norms. Results indicate that the ideal success, power, and competition ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .00$) and ideal homophobic attitudes ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .00$) are negatively predicted by female gender. Female gender also related positively with the perception of the ideal sex drive ($\beta = .12$, $p = .00$). Turning to identification with masculine norms, female gender significantly predicted identification with success, power, and competition ($\beta = -.19$, $p < .00$), restrictive emotionality ($\beta = -.09$, $p = .03$), homophobic attitudes ($\beta = -.33$, $p < .00$), and drive for muscularity ($\beta = -.60$, $p < .00$). It is important to note that all the relationships predicted by female gender, except ideal sex drive, are negative. This question found more significant and stronger relationships than did the use of any particular medium.

**Structural Equation Modeling**

AMOS 19 was used to test the models and does not allow for missing data if modification indices are to be selected. Before being loaded into AMOS, means replacement in SPSS filled in all missing data.

The hypothesis model was a bad fit: ($\chi^2 (94) = 375.73$, $p < .00$, CFI=.88, RMSEA = .071, PCLOSE = .00). See Appendix D. General media use did not have a significant effect on any
other ideal masculine variable, except ideal success, power, and competition ($\beta = .11, p = .01$). Television watching was predicted to have a negative influence on ideal perceptions of masculine homophobia and identification, but neither relationship found significant support. Internet use had a small, but significant negative relationship with individuals’ risk taking behavior ($\beta = -.09, p = .01$). Of significant interest was the support found for all relationships predicted by gender. Of the seven significant relationships, only one was a positive: Ideal Sex Drive ($\beta = .14, p < .00$). Additionally, the effects of masculine ideals on identity also found strong support. The strongest relationships found were ideal homophobic attitudes predicting one’s own homophobic attitudes ($\beta = .64, p < .00$) and ideal success, power, and competition predicting the individual’s own drive for success, power and competition ($\beta = .52, p < .00$).

To fix the model, the non-significant regression estimates were deleted, and the model was tested again. The fit was better, but not within the guidelines of acceptable fit indices scores: $\chi^2 (111) = 389.62, p < .00, \text{CFI} = .88, \text{RMSEA} = .065, \text{PCLOSE} = .00$. See Appendix E.

Next, modification indices suggested other possible significant relationships. The suggestions were carefully examined based on the literature, the correlation matrix of masculine measures in Appendix F, and logic. A final model was created and the model fit indices indicated it was a good fitting model: ($\chi^2 (110) = 178.48, p = .00, \text{CFI} = .97, \text{RMSEA} = .03, \text{PCLOSE} = 1.00$.) See Appendix G. In addition to predicting ideal success, power and competition, general media use was found to significantly correlate with TV use ($\beta = .14, p < .00$), Internet use ($\beta = .53, p < .00$), listening to music ($\beta = .29, p < .00$), and watching movies ($\beta = .13, p = .00$). Gender seems to be a large predictor of differences. In addition to the significant relationships previously discussed, female gender negatively correlated with TV use ($\beta = -.11, p = .01$); ideal drive for muscularity ($\beta = -.08, p = .03$); and one’s own risk taking behaviors ($\beta = -.09, p = .02$).
Variables within ideal masculinity measures also had significant relationships, which included: ideal restrictive emotionality predicted ideal homophobic attitudes ($\beta = .37$, $p < .00$), and ideal drive for muscularity predicted the ideal sex drive ($\beta = .36$, $p < .00$). Interestingly, the same relationships were significant within the identification with masculine norms measures: restrictive emotionality predicted homophobic attitudes ($\beta = .07$, $p = .03$), and drive for muscularity predicted sex drive ($\beta = .11$, $p = .01$), with the addition of restrictive emotionality negatively predicting sex drive ($\beta = -.12$, $p = .00$).

In the discussion section, the results of the final model will be explored in more detail, including a comparison with previous research and implications for future theory construction. Limitations of this study are examined with regard to ideas for future research in the area of media effects on gender role identity and conformity.
Chapter 6: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the cultivation effects of media on perceptions of the ideal man and how, through social comparison, it can predict one’s own identity. Here a discussion is offered of the hypotheses, research questions, and the final model as it applies to previous research. Next, the importance and implications of the findings are presented. Finally limitations and future implications are offered.

Hypotheses

The goal of this study was to determine cultivation (Gerbner, 1970) and social comparison (Festinger, 1954) effects of media on perceptions of ideal masculinity and masculine identity. Hypothesis one predicted that with higher levels of media consumption, perceptions of the ideal masculine man would be more conservative and stereotypical. Those who used media for longer periods of time were more likely to interpret the ideal man’s success, power, and competition drive to be stronger than those who used media for a lesser amount time. This was the only significant relationship between media use and ideal masculinity. Content analyses determined that men are more likely to be presented as having well defined jobs, in a leadership position with power over others, and with clear-set goals (Glascock, 2001; Lauzen & Dozier, 2004; Lauzen, Dozier, & Horan, 2008). With the consistent messages broadcast in media, it is not surprising that the ideal man would be perceived to be successful, powerful, and competitive.

To be clear about the measures of cultivation, general media use was measured as one item, and then other items measured each specific medium use, including television, music, the Internet, and movies. Effects of specific media will be addressed within the research questions in the next section.
Hypothesis two predicted, through the lens of social comparison theory, that perceptions of ideal masculinity will positively predict one’s identification with masculine norms. This hypothesis found full support: Ideal success, power, and competition, ideal drive for muscularity, ideal homophobic attitudes, ideal restrictive emotionality, and ideal risk taking ideal sex drive significantly related to their masculine identification counterparts. These relationships provide support for social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954). Other studies found that after viewing masculine ideal bodies, men had a stronger drive for muscularity (Hargreaves & Tiggemann, 2009; Harrison & Bond, 2007; Hobza, Walker, Yakushko, & Peugh, 2007). When the perceived ideal is muscular, then the individual must be muscular to identify and be accepted as masculine. Also, there were significant differences between men and women on these measures, which will be discussed next in the research questions section.

**Research Questions**

The first research question asked if the type of media used would influence ideal masculine perceptions. When the hypothesis model was tested, heavy viewers of television reported the ideal man would be more homophobic. When corrections were made for the fixed model (i.e. non-significant regressions were removed), the homophobic prediction was determined to be non-significant. There were no direct connections between a specific medium and ideal masculinity.

Similar to the first question, the second research question inquired about individual types of media correlated with masculine identification. After testing the hypothesis model, television viewing predicted identification with homophobic attitudes. When the model was fixed to remove non-significant relationships, television was determined not to be a significant indicator
of homophobic attitudes. Hicks and Lee (2004) found that those who read newspapers had more positive attitudes toward homosexuals. They posited this difference presented itself due to levels of education and interest in current affairs. Media has not been found to be a significant predictor of homophobic attitudes. Instead, sex, religion, education, and ideology are more significant predictors (Altemeyer, 2001; Herek, 2002; Lewis, 2003). This explains why media use did not predict ideal homophobic attitudes or identification with homophobic attitudes.

Using the Internet had a negative relationship with one’s own risk taking behaviors. Zuckerman (1994) would argue that heavy users of the Internet have naturally high set points of arousal and are less likely to take risks. Those with naturally high set points of arousal (anxious or fearful people) would be more likely to use media for more calming activities. Alternatively, decreased risk taking behaviors for heavy Internet users could indicate that those who do not want to put their well-being at risk use the virtual world as an alternative to real-life activities.

Research question three asked if any gender differences existed on ideal or identification with masculinity. In fact, female gender had an influence on the greatest amount of variables. The first correlated variable finds that women use television less than men. This is in contrast to the Nielsen Company (2013) that found women watch more television on average across all age brackets. The discrepancy may be due to 99% of the sample being between the ages of 18-23. The Nielsen (2013) report clumps all 18-49 year olds together. It is possible that the smaller age range within this sample would find a different viewing pattern. In addition, a confounding variable not measured in the present study is education. A sample of college students may affect the amount of time they have available to watch television on a regular basis.
Females were more likely to perceive the ideal man as having a strong sex drive, less drive to be muscular, and less homophobic attitudes. One of the tenets of masculinity is fornicating with as many women as possible (Kivel, 2010). It may be that women think men are more sexually promiscuous than is actually true. Kimmel (2008) explains that using a vague term like “hooking up” allows men to embellish their sexual experiences when talking to their friends.

Unsurprisingly, females were less likely to be emotionally restrictive, were less homophobic, and had less drive for muscularity. Femininity rules dictate that women be more emotional because expressing emotion is a weakness, according to masculine norms. Women also feel less threatened by gay men than heterosexual men (Herek, 1988). Homosexuality does not threaten women’s femininity. Being perceived as gay would be detrimental to a man’s masculinity (Kimmel, & Mahler, 2003). Also, the ideal woman according to media is thin, not muscular. Tiggemann and Slater (2004) found that after watching music videos with the idealized thin female body, women were dissatisfied with their bodies. Due to differences between gender roles, women experience the opposite of the previously discussed masculine norms.

Surprising results indicated that women had less drive to be success, powerful, and competitive and less drive to take risks. The measures for success, power, and competition contained items that measured how much one wanted/needed to dominate over other people. Females do want to be successful, but may not need to express domination over other people. Tannen (2007) posits that women focus their communication on building and maintaining relationships, while men speak to compete and show dominance over others. Being dominant would not fit within these feminine communication norms (Wood, 2011). Along those lines, women were found to participate less in risky behavior. Growing up, boys participate in rough
and tumble/competitive games and girls play more cooperative games, like house or school (Maccoby, 1998). In addition, messages from television reinforce that women are seen as being less competitive and in less powerful positions (Glascock, 2001; Lauzen & Dozier, 2004; Lauzen, Dozier, & Horan, 2008). The females in this sample are demonstrating a cultivation effect about their feminine role. Within the rules of femininity, women are supposed to be docile and submissive toward men (Jhally & Media Education Foundation, 2007; Kilbourne, Jhally, Rabinovitz, & Media Education Foundation, 2010). The findings presented from this study are consistent with previous research.

**Other Significant Paths**

Media use was strongly related to TV use, Internet use, listening to music, and watching movies. At face value, this seems like an unimportant finding, but it lends credence to the need to expand cultivation research to measure all media. This study did not find any significant results for television use. Had television been the only cultivation measure, as suggested by Shanahan and Morgan (1999), it would have missed any influence of mass communicated messages on masculinity. In the next section, an argument about our convergent culture (Jenkins, 2006) is made to expand cultivation measures to include those used in this study.

Relationships were found between ideal emotional restrictiveness and ideal homophobic attitudes. This relationship was also significant for the identification measures. The connection between emotional restrictiveness and homophobic attitudes indicates that those who hide their emotions are more conservative and may not be open to men different from themselves. The results of a recent series of studies by Weinstein, Ryan, DeHaan, Przybylski, Legate, and Ryan (2012) suggests that homophobic feelings are associated with repressed homosexual feelings.
This idea was originally posited by Freud (1961), but it seems to persist today. The indication here is that there is still a strong negative stigma associated with being a homosexual. This corroborates Kimmel and Mahler’s (2003) argument about being or perceived as a homosexual or feminine is at the opposition of current masculine norms. People in progressive areas of the United States, especially in the university setting believe that homophobic attitudes are outdated and in the past, but clearly there is more to be learned.

Next, ideal drive for muscularity was positively related to ideal sex drive. Once again, this relationship was significant for identification measures. When a man has a strong drive for muscularity his sex drive increases. As men lift weights to build muscle, their bodies increase production of testosterone (Weiss, Cureton, & Thompson, 1983). Testosterone is the hormone that increases the sex drive (Brizendine, 2011). The more men work out, the more they will want to have sex because of increased testosterone levels.

Lastly, the individual’s emotional restrictiveness negatively correlated with sex drive. There are two possible explanations for this finding. First, Biology may play a role in decreased emotional restrictiveness leading to increased sex drive. With increased testosterone levels, men want more intercourse (Brizendine, 2011). Additionally, testosterone has been linked to other behaviors, such as risk-taking behaviors (Apicella, Dreber, Campbell, Gray, Hoffman, & Little, 2008), aggression (Archer, 2006), sensation-seeking (Roberti, 2003), and mate-seeking behaviors (Roney, Mahler, & Maestripieri, 2003). If an increase in testosterone makes men both want intercourse and seek it out, then those men have a decreased sex drive because they seek it out more often. A cycle may exist where the increased testosterone leads to mate-seeking behavior, and once that urge is satisfied, testosterone levels decrease for a period of time. Some time later, testosterone levels increase again, thus continuing the sex-seeking cycle.
A second explanation for increased restrictive emotionality predicting decrease sex drive comes from gender socialization. If men are not willing to express their emotions due to social pressure, they may not want to admit to having a strong sex drive. If a man is open with his emotions, he is also willing to express his sexual desire. Additionally, one stereotype is that men are one-track minded and focused on sexual intercourse. It is acceptable to discuss sexual desire with other male compatriots because masculinity is a homosocial act (Kimmel, 2008), but it is considered politically incorrect to reveal outside the male group.

**Importance & Implications**

Implications from this research affect three areas of research: media effects, gender studies, and health communication. First, Nielsen (2013) published a report stating that television remains the most used medium in our country. Shanahan and Morgan (1999) argue that based on Nielsen’s analysis, researchers should continue to measure television use, as was posited in Gerbner and Gross’ (1976) seminal study. There is no need to expand research into other specific media, like Internet use, listening to music, or watching movies. In fact, there is no need to measure digital media use in general.

This conservative perspective is problematic because of the trends of media ownership. Global media has seen a fast trend toward conglomeration, which has led the top 10 companies to account for more than 80% of all media revenue (Winseck, 2011). Instead of a competitive market, an oligopoly exists. With a small group of companies owning so much of media outlets, it is unlikely that messages on topics, like gender norms, will vary widely. Cultivation research has determined that for heavy viewers of television, topics that would normally present a variety of polarized viewpoints are reduced to very similar opinions, a phenomenon called a
mainstreaming effect (Dudo, Brossard, Shanahan, Scheufele, Morgan, & Signorielli, 2011; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1980). Combining Winseck’s (2011) analysis of the concentration of media ownership and the concept of Gerbner et al’s (1980) mainstreaming effect, there is no reason other media channels or media as whole should not be used in cultivation studies. Furthermore, technology has exceeded traditional single-use limitations, creating a convergent culture (Jenkins, 2006). Television programs, for example, are being viewed on multiple media channels, like cell phones, iPads, and laptops. We no longer need an actual television to watch television programming. This study demonstrated that a general media measure found more support than any other medium, thus demonstrating the importance of expanding cultivation measures.

Next, this study informs gender studies on the role media plays on forming gender identity. Bussey and Bandura (1992) agree that media influence gender identity formation directly and indirectly through others we model in our lives. Much of the literature focuses on criticizing the roles of women in media (Signorielli, 2012; Smith & Granados, 2009), homosexual depictions (Becker, 2006; Gross, 2001), and feminism on television (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2011). More research needs to be done on the effects of media portrayals on gender schemas, like Signorielli and Lears (1992). Their study of over 500 fourth and fifth graders indicated that heavy television viewers held more sex-stereotyped attitudes about household chores. In a meta-analysis, Oppliger (2007) determined that significant relationships exist between media exposure and increased sex-typed behavior and sex-role stereotyped attitudes. If children are learning that gender identity is a result of a rigid paradigm, then psychological, emotional, and physical ramifications may soon follow.
Men were found to have a lower body satisfaction and sense of attractiveness after being exposed to masculine ideal images (Hargreaves & Tiggemann (2009), and they were also more likely to have a drive for muscula

rity based on conservative masculine gender role identities (McCreary, Saucier, & Courtenay, 2005; Steinfeldt, Gilchrist, Halterman, Gomory, & Steinfeldt, 2011). The influence of media stereotypes also includes the expectations one has for the opposite sex. Two studies found that those who watched pornographic films were less satisfied with their partners’ attractiveness and sexual performance (Zillman & Bryant, 1988b; Yucel & Gassanov, 2010). In addition, men were found to be more likely to think rape is not so severe, sexual practices in the films are more prevalent in reality, and trust in their partner is misplaced (Zillman & Bryant, 1988b). In a separate study, after exposure to pornographic films, men and women promoted the acceptance of men playing the dominant role and women playing the submissive role (Zillman & Bryant, 1988a). If men increasingly accept the de-humanizing portrayals of women, then it is more likely that sexual aggression and rape will occur (Jhally & Media Education Foundation, 2007; Kilbourne, Jhally, Rabinovitz, & Media Education Foundation, 2010). Although the processing of media messages is mediated by many demographic and cognitive factors, there are still social, well-being, and health-related ramifications.

There are also health risk factors associated with conformity to masculine norms. Springer and Mouzon (2011) found that strong masculine idealization has negative implications for seeking preventative health care. This could be connected to the messages men hear about needing to always “be strong” and thus refuse medical care. Kimmel (2008) points out risk-taking behaviors, like heavy consumption of alcohol during power hour (when someone turns 21.
they drink as much can in the first hour), has led to many deaths. In both these cases, being strong emotionally and refusing to admit weakness may end up killing men.

Additionally, men who strongly conform to masculine norms are more likely to externalize depressive symptoms through acts of aggression and alcohol consumption, whereas those who weakly conform to masculine norms will acknowledge their depressive emotions (Magovcevic & Addis, 2008). Health campaigns have been designed to specifically reach men, encouraging acceptance and treatment for depression by appealing to their masculinity (Rochlen, Whilde, & Hoyer, 2005). Globally, men are more likely to commit suicide than women by a ratio of 2:1, and that ratio increases to 6:1 in the United States (Payne, Swami, & Stanistreet, 2008). In their review of literature, Payne, Swami, and Stanistree (2008) posit that the differences in suicide statistics are most likely a result of masculine gender norms that require men to be emotionally restrictive and never show pain or weakness.

In sum, media effects research on masculinity is important to consider when looking at the implications it has on both men and women. If overall depictions of women are de-humanizing, then women may become victims to male sexual fantasies or need for aggression release. Conforming to masculine norms causes men to suffer psychologically and physically by refusing healthcare and keeping pain to themselves, leading to, and in extreme cases, leading to suicide.

**Limitations**

Due to the use of a convenience sample, the results from this study cannot be generalized to the entire population. In addition, this sample was predominantly Caucasian and heterosexual.
Such a homogenous sample also limits the generalizability to other ethnicities and sexual orientations.

As is the case with all survey research, causality cannot be determined. Correlational research does not have any controls in place for third unknown variables like those in experimental research.

Although risk-taking behavior measures had acceptable alpha reliabilities, the measures were very different from the rest of the survey. Participants were asked to choose from two statements that best represented their viewpoint. Having only two choices per question could cause range restriction.

Future Research

As we demonstrated in the discussion on measurements of masculinity, no masculine instrument has been able to accurately measure all factors that construct masculinity in all arenas. Connor (2000) posited that masculinity means something different to men of different cultures and that masculinity is not necessarily linked solely to men. If there are to be studies of effects of media on masculinity, we need to understand the standard to which the comparison is made. In the literature, conformity to masculine norms (Parent & Moradi, 2009) has measured the individual’s perceptions of their own masculinity, but if they are learning about masculine ideology from media through cultivation (Gerbner & Gross, 1986), how does the media institution construct the ideal image of masculinity? Future research needs to evaluate the depicted masculine ideals and how those depictions can be altered to present a healthier type of masculinity. Could a healthier form of masculinity be accepted by men?

Along those same lines, gender development is also an interpersonal experience. Perhaps looking at the primary male figure/model in a man’s childhood would help predict their own
views of masculinity. Those perceptions could be compared to the ideal masculinity one views in media. A study that does look at both interpersonal and media influences on masculinity has not been done to this point.

Like Johnson (2008), perhaps a genre of media consumption might offer insight into how different media can influence different aspects of masculinity. For example, if men watch comedies, perhaps they will be more emotionally expressive than those who consume large amounts of sports programming. In addition, the context in which one normally consumes media might add a different dynamic that has not been explored before. An example might explore how men who watch romantic comedies with women view their masculinity differently than when they watch sports with women. Another variation of that could be watching the same genre with different company. Watching sports with male friends might induce a different kind of masculinity from watching sports with a significant other.

The study of masculinity and media is still new, compared to other areas of communication research. It will grow and evolve as more researchers become interested in this area. The implications of this research have their bearings in how society views masculinity, and how gender can influence well-being, both psychologically and physiologically. Masculinity today is not like it was 50 years ago, and it is time for a new form of masculinity to emerge that includes gender and sexual orientation equality. This type of research will aid in attaining this goal.
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Figure 1. “Act Like a Man” Box

Verbal Abuse:  
- wimp  
- girl  
- sissy  
- mama’s boy  
- nerd  
- fag  
- bitch  
- mark  
- punk  
- tough  
- aggressive  
- competitive  
- in control  
- no feelings  
- don’t cry  
- take charge  
- don’t make mistakes  
- have sex with women  
- anger  
- isolation  
- sadness  
- love  
- confusion  
- connection  
- low self-worth  
- curiosity  
- resentment  
- have money  
- never ask for help  
- angry  
- yell  
- intimidate  
- responsible  
- take it  
- don’t back down  
- succeed  

Physical Abuse:  
- hit/beat up  
- teased  
- isolated  
- rejected  
- forced to play sports  
- sexual assault

**APPENDIX C**

Table 1.

*Correlations for Gender and Time with Media*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Media Use</th>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Movies</th>
<th>Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>-.111**</td>
<td>.136**</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.127**</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>.101*</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.161**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdealSPC</td>
<td>-.205**</td>
<td>.102*</td>
<td>.094*</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdealReEmo</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdealATG</td>
<td>-.224**</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.117**</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdealDFM</td>
<td>-.092*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdealSexDrive</td>
<td>.119**</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdealRiskTaking</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC_Self</td>
<td>-.195**</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReEmo_Self</td>
<td>-.090*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG_Self</td>
<td>-.339**</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.145**</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFM_Self</td>
<td>-.608**</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.100*</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexDrive_Self</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RiskTaking_Self</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.109**</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01 level.  
*p < 0.05 level.
Table 2.

Correlation Matrix of Masculine Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ideal SPC</th>
<th>Ideal ReEmo</th>
<th>Ideal ATG</th>
<th>Ideal DFM</th>
<th>Ideal Sex Drive</th>
<th>Ideal Risk Taking</th>
<th>SPC Self</th>
<th>ReEmo Self</th>
<th>ATG Self</th>
<th>DFM Self</th>
<th>Sex Drive Self</th>
<th>Risk Taking Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal SPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal ReEmo</td>
<td><strong>.323</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal ATG</td>
<td><strong>.398</strong></td>
<td><strong>.381</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal DFM</td>
<td><strong>.464</strong></td>
<td><strong>.351</strong></td>
<td><strong>.365</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Sex Drive</td>
<td><strong>.196</strong></td>
<td><strong>.139</strong></td>
<td><strong>.138</strong></td>
<td><strong>.346</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Risk Taking</td>
<td><strong>.101</strong></td>
<td><strong>.034</strong></td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td><strong>.198</strong></td>
<td><strong>.254</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC Self</td>
<td><strong>.547</strong></td>
<td><strong>.143</strong></td>
<td><strong>.268</strong></td>
<td><strong>.274</strong></td>
<td><strong>.159</strong></td>
<td><strong>.122</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReEmo Self</td>
<td><strong>.129</strong></td>
<td><strong>.364</strong></td>
<td><strong>.123</strong></td>
<td><strong>.105</strong></td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG Self</td>
<td><strong>.314</strong></td>
<td><strong>.167</strong></td>
<td><strong>.688</strong></td>
<td><strong>.189</strong></td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td><strong>.158</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFM Self</td>
<td><strong>.216</strong></td>
<td>.062</td>
<td><strong>.168</strong></td>
<td><strong>.276</strong></td>
<td><strong>.045</strong></td>
<td>.094**</td>
<td><strong>.283</strong></td>
<td><strong>.166</strong></td>
<td><strong>.294</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Drive Self</td>
<td><strong>.167</strong></td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td><strong>.118</strong></td>
<td><strong>.358</strong></td>
<td><strong>.136</strong></td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td><strong>.096</strong></td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.106**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking Self</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td><strong>-0.085</strong></td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td><strong>.101</strong></td>
<td><strong>.470</strong></td>
<td><strong>.124</strong></td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td><strong>.123</strong></td>
<td><strong>.174</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01 level.
*p 0.05 level.
## APPENDIX H

### Table 3.

### Exploratory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictive Emotionality</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone who is masculine has difficulty expressing their emotional needs to their partner</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone who is masculine has difficulty expressing their tender feelings</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about feelings during sexual relations is difficult for someone who is masculine</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling their partner about their feelings for them during sex is difficult for those who are masculine</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling others of their strong feelings is not part of a masculine person’s sexual behavior</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine people do not like to show their emotions to other people</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong emotions are difficult for masculine people to understand</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine people often have trouble finding words that describe how they are feeling</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing feelings makes a masculine person feel open to attack by other people</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being masculine means having difficulty telling others they care about them</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Success, Power, and Competition - Ideal

| Winning is a measure of a masculine persons value and personal worth                        | .765    |
| Being masculine means one should strive to be more successful than others                   | .750    |
| Competing with others is the best way to succeed as a masculine person                      | .735    |
| Being masculine means being in charge of those around them                                 | .731    |
| Being masculine means one should feel superior to other people                             | .728    |
| Being smarter or physically stronger than other men should be important                    | .718    |
| Masculine people should sometimes define their personal value by their career success      | .676    |
| Masculine people should evaluate other peoples value by their level of achievement and success | .671    |
| Doing well all the time should be important to masculine people                             | .604    |

### Attitude Toward Gays – Ideal

| Being masculine means thinking think male homosexuals are disgusting                       | .944    |
| Being masculine means thinking male homosexuality is a perversion                          | .934    |
| Being masculine means thinking homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong    | .914    |
**Drive For Muscularity – Ideal**
Masculine people think that their chest is not muscular enough .860
Masculine people think that their arms are not muscular enough .855
Masculine people think that their legs are not muscular enough .825
Masculine people think that they would feel stronger if they gained a little more muscle mass .800
Masculine people think they would look better if they gained 10 pounds in bulk .797
Those who are masculine would feel more confident if they have more muscle mass .751
Masculine people should strive to be more muscular .639

**Sex Drive - Ideal**
How strong would a masculine persons desire to engage in sexual activity with a partner be .862
How important would it be for a masculine person to fulfill their sexual desire through activity with a partner .854
Compared to other people of their age and sex how would a masculine person rate their desire to behave sexually with a partner .802
The ideal man believes skiing fast down a high mountain slope is a good way to end up on crutches .631
The ideal man thinks he would enjoy the sensations of skiing very fast down a high mountain slope.

**Risk Taking – Ideal**
The ideal man would not like to take up water-skiing .610
The ideal man would like to take up the sport of water-skiing.

The ideal man prefers the surface of the water to the depths .600
The ideal man would like to go scuba diving.

The ideal man would not like to try surf-board riding .550
The ideal man would like to try surf-board riding.

The ideal man can’t understand people who risk their necks climbing mountains .543
The ideal man often wishes he could be a mountain climber.

The ideal man doesn’t like the feeling he gets standing on the high board (or he doesn’t go near it at all) .515
The ideal man likes to dive off the high board.
Risk Taking – Ideal (Continued)
The ideal man would never want to try jumping out of a plane with or without a parachute.
The ideal man would like to try parachute jumping.

The ideal man believes sailing long distances in small sailing crafts is foolhardy.
The ideal man would like to sail a long distance in a small but seaworthy sailing craft.

The ideal man would not like to learn to fly an airplane.
The ideal man would like to learn to fly an airplane.

The ideal man believes a sensible person avoids activities that are dangerous.
The ideal man sometimes likes to do things that are a little frightening.
APPENDIX I

Table 4.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Power and Competition</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me.</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty telling others I care about them.</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like to show my emotions to other people.</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictive Emotionality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strive to be more successful than others.</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing with others is the best way to succeed.</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to feel superior to other people.</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing well all the time is important to me.</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Gays</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think male homosexuals are disgusting.</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong.</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male homosexuality is a perversion.</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drive For Muscularity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think I would feel more confident if I had more muscle mass</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that I would feel stronger if I gained a little more muscle mass</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish that I were more muscular</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that my chest is not muscular enough</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that my arms are not muscular enough</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that I would look better if I gained 10 pounds in bulk</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that my legs are not muscular enough</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sex Drive

How strong is your desire to engage in sexual activity with a partner?  .838

How important is it for you to fulfill your sexual desire through activity with a partner?  .813

Compared to other people of your age and sex, how would you rate your desire to behave sexually with a partner?  .703

Risk Taking

I can’t understand people who risk their necks climbing mountains.  .517
I often wish I could be a mountain climber.

I don’t like the feeling I get standing on the high board (or I don’t go near it at all).  .509
I like to dive off the high board.

I would not like to try surf-board riding.  .506
I would like to try surf-board riding.

Skiing fast down a high mountain slope is a good way to end up on crutches.  .473
I think I would enjoy the sensations of skiing very fast down a high mountain slope.

Sailing long distances in small sailing crafts is foolhardy.  .453
I would like to sail a long distance in a small but seaworthy sailing craft.

A sensible person avoids activities that are dangerous.  .440
I sometimes like to do things that are a little frightening.

I prefer the surface of the water to the depths.  .428
I would like to go scuba diving.