

University of South Dakota

USD RED

Honors Thesis

Theses, Dissertations, and Student Projects

Spring 2018

The Relationship Between Hegemonic Masculinity and Cognitive Thought Processes in Predicting Aggressive Behavior in Men

Aimee Wieczorek

University of South Dakota

Follow this and additional works at: <https://red.library.usd.edu/honors-thesis>

Recommended Citation

Wieczorek, Aimee, "The Relationship Between Hegemonic Masculinity and Cognitive Thought Processes in Predicting Aggressive Behavior in Men" (2018). *Honors Thesis*. 34.

<https://red.library.usd.edu/honors-thesis/34>

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Student Projects at USD RED. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Thesis by an authorized administrator of USD RED. For more information, please contact dloftus@usd.edu.

The Relationship Between Hegemonic Masculinity and Cognitive
Thought Processes in Predicting Aggressive Behavior in Men

by

Aimee Wieczorek

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the
University Honors Program

Department of Political Science
The University of South Dakota
May 2018

The members of the Honors Thesis Committee appointed
to examine the thesis of Aimee Wiczorek
find it satisfactory and recommend it be accepted

Dr. Bridget Diamond-Welch
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Director of the Committee

Dr. Sarah Lampert
Assistant Professor of History

Dr. Cindy Struckman-Johnson
Professor of Psychology

ABSTRACT

The Relationship Between Hegemonic Masculinity and Cognitive Thought Processes in Predicting Aggressive Behavior in Men

Aimee Wieczorek

Director: Bridget Diamond-Welch Ph.D.

The purpose of this study was to explore whether there is a relationship between hegemonic masculinity and aggressive cognitive thought processes that ultimately end in aggressive behavior. In order to study this, I recruited male participants through Amazon MTurk, where 350 men completed a three-part survey and 344 were analyzed. First, participants took the Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form (MRNI-SF), a seven-point Likert-type scale that measures seven traits commonly associated with masculinity. They then completed the Conditional Reasoning Test for Aggression (CRTA), which measures a person's implicit thought process in order to see how likely they are to act aggressively in the future. Finally, the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire Short Form (BPAQ-SF) was completed, another seven-point Likert-type scale that measures one's self-perceived level of aggression. Through stepwise regression analysis it was found that, although cognitive thought processes still play a significant role in prediction aggression, masculinity norms are a better predictor overall.

Keywords: Masculinity, Aggression, Thought Processes, Hegemonic Masculinity

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	v
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Literature Review	3
Masculinity	
Masculinity and Aggression	
Socialization	
Information-Processing Models	
Chapter Three: Rationale	15
Chapter Four: Methodology	16
Participants	
Male-Role Norms Inventory – Short Form	
Conditional Reasoning Test for Aggression	
Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire – Short Form	
Chapter Five: Results	21
BPAQ-SF	
Physical Aggression	
Verbal Aggression	
Anger and Hostility	
Chapter Six: Discussion	28
Chapter Seven: Limitations	31
Chapter Eight: Conclusions	33
Appendix	34
References	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics	21
Table 2: Aggression	22
Table 3: Physical Aggression	23
Table 4: Verbal Aggression	24
Table 5: Anger	24-25
Table 6: Hostility	25
Table 7: Correlation Matrix	26
Table 8: Correlation Matrix Continued	27

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

It is well-known that men commit more crimes than women do, whether it be property crimes or violent (Messerschmidt, 2014); this is something society tends to overlook. But criminologists have recently begun to take note and provide theories as to why this phenomenon exists. One theory they have presented is the idea that masculine gender-roles could play a part in the formation of violent, criminal behavior (Messerschmidt, 2014). Although many men do not escalate their behavior as far as becoming violent or even criminal, certain traits associated with hegemonic masculinity, or the masculine ideal in a culture, could explain why men have a tendency to be more violent, or aggressive, than women.

When a young boy is growing up, he goes through a process called gender-role socialization, which helps him to take on behaviors and ideas that are deemed appropriate for his assigned gender (Dietz, 1998). During this socialization, the young boy is exposed to different traits that he may inhabit later on in order to show himself to be masculine; some traits often seen as masculine include toughness, dominance, fear of femininity, homophobia, and more. Depending on how much exposure he encounters relating to different traits, this socialization process could influence the way he eventually thinks about things and sees the world around him. According to information-processing models of aggression, those who are more aggressive than others simply have had more exposure to violent stimuli that have worked to change their thought processes (Huesmann, 1998).

It is my hypothesis that men who conform more to hegemonic masculine standards will have more aggressive thought processes that will influence outward acts of

aggression. I will explore this idea by first reviewing the literature on this topic, going more in depth into hegemonic masculinity, its relationship with aggression, and the development of masculinity through socialization and how this process can impact one's level of acceptance towards aggression and their outward aggressive behavior. I will then look at information-processing models and how socialization also is a factor in the development of the scripts used in information-processing model theories. Once the literature has been discussed, I will dive into the rationale of my study where I will explain further how all the literature relates. Methodology is presented next, detailing the measures I used for my study, leading directly into the results section where the analyses that were run will be shown. Following the results, I will discuss the results that were found and how they support my hypothesis. Finally, I will speak of the limitations of the study and how future research could improve upon it and ending the study with a conclusion to wrap everything up. It is important to remember that there are other theories of the development of aggression, such as biological theories, where researchers suggest aggression is the result of hereditary factors (Geen, 2001). Despite these other theories, I believe that socialization is the key factor in the development of aggression, and masculinity, for that matter.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

I will begin the literature review with a discussion on hegemonic masculinity and different traits associated with the concept. This will lead into a section on masculinity and its relationship to aggression, which will show how aggression/toughness is a trait that is of high value for men. Socialization will follow by delving into the developmental process of masculinity and how the world around us influences which behaviors we pick up and retain. Finally, I will discuss information-processing models, and how these, too, are developed through socialization; the information-processing model for aggression will show that, depending on how one is socialized, their thought processes could change to accept and utilize more aggressive behaviors over others.

Hegemonic Masculinity

Hegemony means the winning and holding of power, and dominance over women (Donaldson 1993). If we were to directly define hegemonic masculinity using this definition, hegemonic masculinity then would mean the domination, winning, and holding of power; specifically, over women. But, as Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue, this definition is slowly losing focus with more and more research about masculinity coming to surface. Hegemonic masculinity is no longer simply about the subordination of women (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), instead it is the embodiment of the ideal man in a culture. Because cultures around the world vary, and so do their definitions of what it is to be a man, we cannot have one formal definition for hegemonic masculinity as it is likely to change from culture to culture, nation to nation, region to region (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). For example; a city that is a bit more

modernized and progressive may have a different concept of the ideal man than a small rural town that lies a short distance away from the city. Two different hegemonic masculinities may emerge from these two very different subcultures.

Despite the variations in different cultures, most cultures still tend to value the same traits and ideals, such as the roles of the father, the worker, and the soldier/protector (Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley, 2010); and the same traits associated with these roles are also seen across most cultures. Another commonality seen in almost every culture is the idea that masculinity, or “manliness,” is earned and not a given privilege (Bosson & Vandello, 2011). At a young age, boys are expected to start proving themselves in order to obtain the respected title of “man,” and a man’s masculinity can be easily taken away when he fails to prove himself over and over. As Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) mention, with hegemonic masculinity being the ideal, most men and boys are unable to live up to the standards set before them. This creates the certain fragileness we so often hear about in reference to men and their ever-wavering masculinity. This is a quality that Bosson and Vandello (2011) refer to as precarious manhood: the need to prove one’s manliness over and over again in order to gain and secure social status.

Some researchers believe there are important traits that were developed as a way to counteract the precarious manhood that so many men experience. Traits often associated with the traditional hegemonic masculinity include toughness or aggression, fear of femininity, emotional stoicism, homophobia, an emphasis on sex, success in wealth, and dominance (Levant et al, 2010). Through his research, O’Neil (1981) has observed that many of these traits may have developed due to a single one: fear of

femininity. In most cultures, men are considered superior to women and anything feminine is not masculine; these are two notions that masculinity is based upon. Societies often tend to devalue feminine traits as they are viewed as inferior, inappropriate, and immature, so the importance of being considered masculine creates a pressure to reject any feminine trait that could lessen that status. Although these views of femininity have been changing, with feminine traits becoming more accepted by men, the fear of the feminine still plays a role in masculine normality.

Emotional stoicism is a perfect example of how the fear of femininity can develop into other traits that men value as masculine. Emotions, and especially expressing emotions, are considered a very feminine trait and therefore some men consider it crucial to avoid them in order to not appear weak and dependent (O'Neil, 1981). Going along with this same line of thought, dominance and success are also two traits that could be derived from a fear of anything feminine and are two central themes of hegemonic masculinity. Men are taught to be in control and powerful above all others, especially the weaker sex, making control and power vital to a man's image; anyone who is seen as uncontrolled or impotent is considered more feminine and therefore less of a man. Success is a crucial aspect of a man's image, as they have historically been expected to be the provider of the family (Levant, et al., 2010). Traits associated with success, such as achievement, status, wealth, and influence, are also commonly associated with masculinity (O'Neil, 1981). Women, on the other hand, are historically associated with the exact opposite of these other traits: unassertive, lack of achievement, wealth, and influence. Homophobia is also associated with the fear of femininity in that when a man associates with a homosexual there may be the automatic conclusion that they are

effeminate and homosexual themselves (O'Neil, 1981), which, of course, threatens their masculinity. Kimmel and Mahler (2003) studied adolescents who committed mass school shootings, they found that, not only were all of them male, other than a single female, they also all had experienced bullying that specifically targeted their suspected sexuality. One offender stated "...for murder is not weak and slow-witted; murder is gutsy and daring," (Kimmel & Mahler, 2003).

As Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) pointed out, hegemonic masculinity is centered on the maintaining of dominance, traits then associated with the ideal, or traditional, form of masculinity may have developed as a way to secure man's power. With females being considered the weaker sex it is plain to see how many traits have developed out of the fear of being seen as feminine and potentially losing their place at the top of the hierarchy. Not all traits, though, are developed out of their fear of femininity; some are developed as other ways to maintain dominance and the image of masculinity such as the importance of sex and toughness or aggression. Sex is oftentimes used as a way to measure a man's performance and masculinity (O'Neil, 1981); for men, having too much sex is never an issue, it is only an issue when they are not having enough. When this occurs, a man may be considered impotent or even emotional if they seek out sex as an act of love and affection rather than for the physical pleasure. The final trait, and the main topic of this paper, is that of aggression.

Masculinity and Aggression

Aggression has been seen as a highly masculine trait for centuries. In the past, it was a source of great shame for a man to not fight for his country or his family; they were deemed a "coward" and directly shunned from their community. As was discussed

earlier, Bosson and Vandello (2011) show that manhood is quite precarious and must be earned over and over again in almost every culture. Physical violence and aggression were seen as adequate ways to demonstrate and defend masculinity, and still are. Old herding communities in Scotland and Ireland found a shepherd's first quarrel the most critical moment for one's reputation, these fights were public and sometimes not even a direct result of an insult just the illusion of one (Nisbett, 1993). In Mississippi, during the 1930s, a man shot into a crowd of workers that constantly made jokes at his expense, injuring one. During his trial only one member of the jury wanted to convict, the others, putting it simply, thought he would not have been much of a man had he *not* shot at them and that proved his innocence (Nisbett, 1993). Being able to over-power another man, especially in light of a threat to their manliness, is the ultimate portrayal of manhood as it encompasses multiple desired traits like dominance, power, control, strength, and toughness.

Recent research shows that these ideas could still survive today. McMahan (2011) studied men in a rural setting at bars. He found that displays of aggression were often used as ways to construct a masculine image and gain social status. Men engaging in altercations will act tough in order to threaten their opponent, which also in turn threatens their masculinity. If a man wishes to uphold his honor his must engage in the fight; if he were to back down, the honor that he had earned for himself as a man would be terminated, forcing him to start over from the bottom. The fight ensues until one ultimately wins or one backs down. Winning, McMahan (2011) observes, brings praise and respect to the victor, pats on the back are given and his masculinity is secured, at least for the time being. The loser, on the other hand, is shunned and sulks away with his

head down, his friends abandoning him and switching sides in favor of the winner. In order to maintain his status, the winner must continue to fight and winning each time is essential, because no matter how many times one has one before it only takes one loss to sink back to the bottom. For those who are not the champions in a fight, they may regain their standing by engaging in another altercation but this time coming out on top (McMahan, 2011). Certain things may trigger an aggressive response, specifically things that threaten someone's manhood as previously noted. Nisbett (1993) found in his study of white southern men that violence was endorsed in relation to defending a man's honor from an insult. This same honor that these men seek to protect could be similar to the concept of masculinity in other regions.

In other research Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996) suggest that a main source of violence is threatened egotism. According to popular belief, we tend to think that those who are violent and antisocial have low self-esteem, but they believe that someone who has a high self-esteem is more likely to act out aggressively when their high idea of themselves is threatened. People who regard themselves as better than others might feel entitled to certain resources, and when denied that right they may respond aggressively (Baumeister, et al., 1996). It is also noted that when their ego is threatened they may aggress as a way to prove just how great they actually are. We can compare threatened egotism to threatened masculinity; egotists may use aggression as a way to defend their particularly high idea of themselves when presented with less than favorable feedback from another source, just as men may use aggression as a way to defend their honor against a threat. Men who conform more to masculine ideals hold their masculinity more

closely to their identity, making it crucial that it stay intact, when someone threatens their manhood they may aggress as a way to prove just how much of a man they actually are.

Clearly, aggression and masculinity are very much correlated, something that has been shown over and over again in research. We know that being tough and aggressive is a desired trait for men to have, but this does not mean that all men who endorse traditional masculine values are aggressive, and not all aggressive men endorse traditional masculine values. This discrepancy could be related to how masculinity and aggression, at least to some extent, are developed.

Socialization

Masculinity is not an innate trait a child is born with; rather, it is something the child is taught through observation and the way he is treated by others (Dietz, 1998; McMahan, 2011; O'Neil, 1981), a process called gender-role socialization. A more formal definition for the term is provided by O'Neil (1981): socialization "...is the process whereby children and adults acquire and internalize the values, attitudes, and behaviors associated with femininity, masculinity, or both." This socialization process has many different sources, with three of the main influences being peers, parents, and the media.

Parents are one of the main influences in gender role socialization (Dietz, 1998; Eccles, Jacobs, & Harold, 1990). In fact, parents start the socialization process. With science advancing to the point where many parents find out the sex of their child before they are even born they may then start gender-socialization as early as the womb. It is common knowledge that boy babies receive blue blankets while girls receive pink. Boys are given more "masculine" toys (cars, balls, action figures, etc.), and girls are given

more “feminine” toys (dolls, dress-up clothes, tiaras, etc.). Parents may unknowingly hold expectations for their child based on their gender and, slowly but surely, their child picks up on these expectations and may conform in order to please and eventually the learned behavior becomes implicit (James & McIntyre, 2000).

Much research has been conducted on peer socialization of gender roles, and what has been found is striking. Boys, no matter the age, who exhibit more masculine characteristics tend to be the most popular among their peers; while the ones who exhibit a combination of masculine and feminine characteristics are excluded and teased (Adler, Kless, & Adler, 1992; Chu, 2014; Ewing Lee & Troop-Gordon, 2011). Walk into any high-school and the football players are almost always revered as the most popular boys in school; this is because sports are seen as a highly masculine activity, and they are a great way for young boys and adolescents to prove themselves as having masculine qualities (Pascoe, 2007). Football, especially, is an aggressive sport, which makes it one of the most “manly” in terms of masculine values, which also makes it one of the most sought-after sports for boys seeking to prove themselves. It encourages boys to adopt the hegemonic masculine traits and use them to gain respect and status on and off the field (Pascoe, 2007; Steinfeldt, Vaughan, LaFollette, & Steinfeldt, 2012). Social inclusion is an important aspect of our lives, and research has shown that when we are excluded we actually lose cognitive functioning (Baumeister, Twenge, & Nuss, 2002). This shows the importance behind being included in our peer group. When boys enter school-age years, they have already most likely been socialized in some degree to a specific gender role and understand the difference between what is “girly” and what is “manly.”

Another large aspect of the socialization process is the media (Dietz, 1998). Media influences are seen just about everywhere including: books, magazines, billboards, TV, movies, and videogames. In many of these examples male characters dominate while leading female characters are hardly anywhere to be seen (Dietz, 1998). This affects not only women but men too; once again, it reinforces gender-roles and the idea that men are superior to women, the central definition of hegemonic masculinity. Men are often depicted as strong and aggressive, but an important reality that Dietz (1998) pointed out is that good and bad guys alike are shown to act aggressively. This shows that aggression is not seen as a bad trait to have but, in fact, it is desired and a principal element to being a man.

There are many instances where a young boy is told “big boys don’t cry,” reinforcing the idea that in order to be a man one must hold back their emotions. Eventually, as this young boy grows into a man, he may not ever cry, and not because he consciously thinks “big boys don’t cry,” but because it has been reinforced so many times that he no longer even thinks about why that is. This process is the same for peers and the media; an idea or behavior that is continually emphasized will develop into ancient memories that implicitly guide our future ideas and behaviors (James & McIntyre, 2000). If this is how a man may learn how to hide their emotions to seem manlier, then this same learning experience is how most of the masculine traits are learned, including aggression.

As a young boy encounters gender-role socialization he will also be directed towards traits that are associated with his gender, just as the previous section described. If he is pushed more towards traditional masculine values the more he will also be pushed more to value those traits; the more he witnesses aggression as part of being a man the

more aggressive he will become, too. Eventually, his aggression will not be him consciously trying to prove himself as a man as this behavior will become implicit and will come naturally. Being socialized to be masculine influences the way we observe and think about aggression which, in the end, could lead to overt aggressive acts. How, exactly, socialization influences and changes the way we think about aggression will be discussed in the following section.

Information-Processing Models

Information-processing models are theories dictating how we take in, process, and store information in order to know how to respond in certain situations. Huesmann (1998) defines them quite well by saying information processing models are “a description of the cognitive data structures a person utilizes and the sequence of cognitive operations the person executes in order to generate the cognitions and behaviors that are output from given input.” Essentially, when faced with unfamiliar or familiar circumstances we draw from our past experiences and memories in order to guide us to an appropriate behavior. Information-processing models guide our every behavior; our actions in any situation can be drawn back to the scripts that we have formed throughout time. It is important to keep in mind that information-processing models are developed through socialization (Huesmann, 1998), a topic that was discussed thoroughly earlier in relation to the development of masculinity. This means simply that everyone’s information-processing model will be different depending on a person’s experiences and what they have observed throughout their life.

Scripts are a sequence of schemas, which is substantial knowledge of a concept, that guide our behaviors by informing us of what is most likely to occur in an event after an action (Huesmann, 1998). For example: when approached by an unfamiliar person, a script would inform a person that, from past experience, we have learned that a small smile and a handshake will most likely lead to a friendly exchange; or a frown and a sigh of annoyance will most likely lead to no exchange at all. Depending on the emotional state at the time and the scripts that are activated, the person will generally act in a similar manner. Scripts that are generated also depend on a person's emotional state as was just mentioned; meaning someone who is in a bad mood may only generate negative scripts and someone who is feeling well may only generate positive scripts.

Going back to schemas, it was briefly discussed that schemas are a generalized knowledge of concepts. For example, everyone has a "self-schema," which is everything we know about ourselves. Schemas, just like the information-processing model, are developed through socialization. Our experiences shape what we know about ourselves and what we know about others. Huesmann (1998) uses the example of a child who is rejected by their peers; in response they develop a schema that deemphasizes the importance of socializing, which could later guide the development of scripts and future behavior.

There is an information-processing model of aggression, and it is just like any other information-processing model, but it is specific towards explaining why aggressive people are aggressive. As we just learned, we enact behaviors after evaluating the situational cues and searching our memory for appropriate scripts. Huesmann (1998) states that it is believed that aggressive people simply have more aggressive scripts. Due

to a larger number of scripts associated with aggression, it would not be uncommon for someone to draw from those aggressive scripts in any given circumstance and act in that manner. If aggressive people simply have more aggressive scripts, then we can assume that they experienced or observed and reinforced more aggressive actions during the development of these scripts than someone who is not aggressive. They may have learned that aggressive behavior is acceptable leading to an aggressive schema which will later lead to aggressive scripts.

As was previously discussed, men are often times taught to act aggressively because aggression is seen as a desirable and masculine trait. If a boy experiences this, and learns that aggression is appropriate in some situations, they may form scripts that allow for this behavior in certain circumstances. For example; a boy learns through the media that a fine way to assert his masculinity is to engage in aggressive behavior. With each villain on his favorite TV show taken down by the flying fists of a superhero, the young boy witnesses the hero being patted on the back and rewarded for his toughness. This, the boy learns, is the epitome of a man; the epitome of what he should aspire to be. Years later, the boy, now a man, engages in an argument with another man at the bar. After his masculinity is threatened by a series of uncouth phrases, his next response is necessary and his scripts come into play attempting to guide his behavior. In his heightened state of emotion, the scripts that generate may be similar to what he used to watch on TV, and aggression is seen as a logical response in this situation. Aggress against the target, win and regain respect. Think back to McMahan's (2011) research at a rural bar and this scenario becomes much more believable.

CHAPTER THREE

Rationale

In order to best study whether men who conform more to masculine norms have different thought processes that could influence later aggressive behavior, I set out to measure the relationship between the three. This was done by sending out a three-section survey that measured conformance to masculine norms, tendency towards aggressive thoughts, and aggressive behavior. Due to my idea that more conformance to masculinity norms influences how cognitive thought processes are developed, I analyzed the results using stepwise regression analysis. This has the ability to rate how significant of a predictor each variable is in comparison to the other variables entered. According to my hypothesis, masculinity would be found to be a better predictor of aggression than cognitive thought processes, although thought processes would still be significant predictors. Although stepwise regression shows the relationship between variables as to the rate or prediction, it does not show causality, so even a significant predictor does not mean it actually leads to the dependent variable being analyzed.

CHAPTER FOUR

Methodology

Participants

Participants for the survey were recruited through Amazon M-Turk, which is an online marketplace where individuals can complete online tasks that include survey research for compensation. Once our survey was completed M-Turk sent it out to every member of their program that matched our required qualifications: they had to be male, 18 years or older, and a United States citizen. We paid each participant \$1.50 for their completion of the survey. A total of 350 people participated in taking the survey; after reviewing the results, those who did not identify as male and those who missed two or more of the three attention checks scattered throughout were omitted from the analysis, leaving 344 participants for the final sample. Minor deception was used for this study, but participants were debriefed after completing the survey explaining why they had been deceived.

Majority of the participants identified as heterosexual (93.3%). Most were white (77.0%), while the next largest group were Asian (6.7%), Blacks and Hispanics/Latinos were the smallest groups to be surveyed and were equal in size (6.4%). Due to the small amount of people of color who participated in the survey, for the analysis all those who identified as a race other than white were grouped together rather than separate alongside the group of those who identified as white. Participants were also asked about their education, with most having completed a bachelor's degree (46.2%) or started college but did not finish (20.6%); the rest fell evenly either above a bachelor's degree or below college at a high-school degree or lower. Income was also asked as part of a control

variable with most participants falling within the range of \$50,000-\$74,999 (23.8%) and \$35,000-\$49,999 (19.5%), with the rest being evenly distributed either above or below these two ranges. These variables were included as our control variables and were controlled for due to the fact that each of these may have some impact on how much one conforms to masculine ideals and/or their level of aggression (Messerschmidt, 2014).

Conditional Reasoning Test for Aggression

Participants first completed the Conditional Reasoning Test for Aggression (CRT-A), which, for the purposes of the discussion, will be referred to as conditional reasoning. A copy of the CRT-A that was used for the survey is located in the Appendix along with the rest of the survey. According to Levant and McIntyre (2000) the CRT-A measures one's implicit preparedness to engage in aggressive behaviors. Generally, this measure is used by employers to assess a potential employee's aggression; the CRT-A uses logical reasoning questions to determine whether or not a person may hold implicit biases that navigate them towards more aggressive thoughts and, therefore, more aggressive behavior. After the logical reasoning question, participants are presented with four potential answers: one is a reasonable answer, one is aggressive in nature, and two are completely illogical. This forces participants to choose between the reasonable and aggressive answers; those who have more aggressive biases are more likely to choose the aggressive answer, because to them this answer is the reasonable one even though to many others it would not be. By measuring these implicit biases we are able to determine how men may think differently depending on how much they conform to masculine values.

James and McIntyre (2000) identify six biases that aggressive people may utilize as a way to justify their behavior: Hostile Attribution Bias, Retribution Bias, Derogation of Target Bias, Victimization of Powerful Others Bias, Potency Bias, and Social Discounting Bias. Hostile attribution bias refers to when someone has an unconscious inclination to see a hostile motivation behind anyone's behavior. This behavior could be anything and the aggressor will take it as a threat; for example, someone offering to help on a project may be seen as secretly trying to sabotage. Retribution bias comes into play when one prefers to retaliate rather than reconcile. Generally, with this bias, aggression is seen as an appropriate response as long as it is used to regain respect or correct a wrong. Some have an unconscious tendency to seek out the wrong in people and aggress because they feel the target deserves it due to them being immoral, this is called the derogation of target bias. Others may reason that their aggression was warranted because they were correcting inequities or striking against oppression, this is known as the victimization by powerful others bias. The fifth bias is the potency bias; in this bias, individuals see interactions as contests to establish dominance, therefore their aggression is reasonable if they are asserting their power. Finally, social discounting bias is defined by a tendency to have disdain for traditional ideals and conventional beliefs (James & McIntyre, 2000). Some of these biases may be used more by men who are simply conforming to masculinity norms whereas the others may not be utilized at all. Biases that we may expect men to inhabit the more they endorse masculine ideals may be the retribution bias and the potency bias, although this was not measured within this study.

Administering the CRT-A does require some deception as participants cannot be primed in any way to answer aggressively. We were concerned that if participants knew

their implicit aggression was being measured that they may to consciously choose the reasonable answer so as to not seem aggressive. It was also a concern that with priming participants could potentially seek out the aggressive answer if they were to think it was the correct answer. In order to prevent this from happening we told participants that they were taking a Logical Reasoning Test and nothing more. After completing the entire survey participants were debriefed as to why they had to be deceived.

Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form

Participants then completed the Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form (MRNI-SF), which, for the purposes of the discussion, will be referred to as masculinity and is included in the Appendix. Developed by Levant, Hall, and Rankin (2013) the MRNI-SF is a 21 question, seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree; the higher the score, the higher the endorsement of traditional masculine ideals. The MRNI-SF measures one's conformity to seven different traits that are commonly associated with masculinity: Restrictive Emotionality, Self-Reliance through Mechanical Scales, Negativity towards Sexual Minorities, Avoidance of Femininity, Importance of Sex, Dominance, and Toughness.

Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire – Short Form

In order to measure one's past aggressive behavior participants finally completed the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire – Short Form (BPAQ-SF) developed by Bryant and Smith (2001); for the purposes of the discussion the results of this measure will be referred to as aggression, and this measure is included in the Appendix. The BPAQ-SF is a 12 question, seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from Extremely Uncharacteristic to Extremely Characteristic. Four different subscales are found within the BPAQ-SF that

measure four different types of aggression: physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility.

CHAPTER FIVE

Results

Results were analyzed using a stepwise regression analysis in order to show the importance of each variable in predicting aggression. Five analyses were completed, one for the BPAQ-SF overall and the one for each of the four different types of aggression. Included within this section are the tables for each analysis, along with a table for descriptive statistics (Table 1) and a correlation matrix (Table 7 & 8).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Aggression	331	24.00	157.00	24.839	8.948
Physical Aggression	338	3.00	15.00	6.459	3.108
Verbal Aggression	341	3.00	14.00	6.384	2.738
Anger	340	3.00	15.00	5.059	2.628
Hostility	343	3.00	15.00	6.924	3.105
MRNI	321	24.00	157.00	72.034	29.691
Restrictive Emotions	341	3.00	21.00	7.525	4.251
Self-Reliance	341	3.00	21.00	13.299	4.735
Mechanical Neg. Sex. Minorities	338	3.00	21.00	6.902	5.131
Avoidance of Femininity	343	3.00	21.00	9.825	5.406
Importance of Sex	341	3.00	21.00	8.683	4.771
Dominance	341	3.00	21.00	6.369	4.151
Toughness	339	3.00	21.00	10.882	4.658
CRTA	335	.00	17.00	5.603	2.315
Sexuality	344	.00	3.00	1.1076	.442
Education	344	1.00	7.00	4.250	1.283
Income	343	1.00	8.00	3.534	1.694
Race	344	.00	1.00	.797	.403

Aggression

Before separating out all the different subscales we wanted to see how well masculinity and conditional reasoning predict aggression. Also included within this analysis were the four control variables: sex, income, education, and race. With aggression (BPAQ-SF) as the dependent variable and masculinity (MRNI-SF) and conditional reasoning (CRT-A) as the independent variables, it was found that both are significant factors in predicting aggression seen in Table 2. As predicted, the hypothesis was supported in that masculinity has more of an impact on aggression than conditional reasoning or thought processes, but together they only explain a very small variance with an adjusted variance of .053, this goes to show that there is more out there impacting aggression than we are accounting for. Finally, the third most significant predictor of aggression was found to be race, with those who are not white being more likely to act out aggressively than those who are; all together, the adjusted variance explained is .062.

Table 2. Aggression

Predictor	r ²	Adj. r ²	Unstandardized B	Standard Error	t	Sig.
Step 1	.043	.040				
MRNI			.062	.017	3.667	.000
Step 2	.060	.053				
MRNI			.059	.017	3.472	.001
CRTA			.498	.219	2.275	.024
Step 3	.072	.062				
MRNI			.062	.017	3.659	.000
CRTA			.451	.219	2.058	.040
Race			-2.526	1.275	-1.981	.049

Physical Aggression

Once completing the overall Stepwise analysis, the different scales were broken down into their respective subscales. Independent variables included conditional

reasoning, the seven traits measured in the MRNI-SF, and our four control variables: education, race, sex, and income. Table 3 shows the results of the analysis for the dependent variable Physical Aggression. It is important to note that tables using Stepwise analysis exclude variables that were not shown to be significant, so all the variables accounted for are significant in predicting the dependent variable. Toughness was the most statistically significant and important factor in predicting Physical Aggression with an adjusted variance of .085. Support for my hypothesis was found in that a masculine trait was shown to be more important than conditional reasoning, which comes after Toughness, together with an adjusted variance of .108. Finally, the level of education was also a significant predictor of aggression showing a negative response, meaning that the less education one has the more likely they are to be physically aggressive. All three of these significant variables explain a variance of .118.

Table 3. Physical Aggression

Predictor	r ²	Adj. r ²	Unstandardized B	Standard Error	t	Sig.
Step 1	.088	.085				
Toughness			.195	.036	5.415	.000
Step 2	.114	.108				
Toughness			.189	.036	5.310	.000
CRTA			.216	.071	3.022	.003
Step 3	.127	.118				
Toughness			.181	.036	5.069	.000
CRTA			.199	.071	2.781	.006
Education			-.272	.131	-2.083	.038

Verbal Aggression

Verbal Aggression was the next dependent variable to be analyzed. As Table 4 shows only three variables had a significant level of predicting this specific form of aggression. Once again, the hypothesis was supported with conditional reasoning still at a

significant level but having less significance overall than two traits related to the MRNI-SF. Restrictive Emotions is listed as the first significant predictor with an adjusted R Square of .058. Next comes Negativity towards Sexual Minorities, together with a variance of .070; this variable had a negative impact, showing that those who were less negative towards sexual minorities had more of a chance to be verbally aggressive. Finally, conditional reasoning was significant with all three variables explaining a variance of .080.

Table 4. Verbal Aggression

Predictor	r ²	Adj. r ²	Unstandardized B	Standard Error	t	Sig.
Step 1 Restrictive Emotions	.061	.058	.161	.036	4.488	.000
Step 2 Restrictive Emotions	.076	.070	.207	.041	5.017	.000
Neg. Sex. Minorities			-.076	.034	-2.212	.028
Step 3 Restrictive Emotions	.089	.080	.201	.041	4.872	.000
Neg. Sex. Minorities			-.080	.034	-2.339	.020
CRTA			.135	.066	2.055	.041

Anger and Hostility

Table 5 shows the results of the Stepwise analysis for Anger, with only one variable having any significance in predicting anger: Restrictive Emotions, with a variance of .025. All other variables were not found to be significant. Hostility, shown in Table 6, was also only significantly predicted by one variable: Importance of Sex, with a variance of .031.

Table 5. Anger

Predictor	r ²	Adj. r ²	Unstandardized B	Standard Error	t	Sig.
Step 1 Restrictive Emotions	.028	.025	.103	.034	3.002	.003

Table 6. Hostility

Predictor	r ²	Adj. r ²	Unstandardized B	Standard Error	t	Sig.
Step 1 Importance of Sex	.035	.031	.121	.036	3.330	.001

Table 7. Correlation Matrix

	Aggression	MRNI	CRTA	Res. Emotions	Self- Reliance	Neg. Sex. Minorities	Avoidance of Femininity	Importance of Sex	Dominance
Aggression	1	.185**	.131*	.236**	.079	.076	.155**	.180**	.177**
MRNI	.185**	1	.101	.781**	.707**	.696**	.879**	.820**	.795**
CRTA	.131*	.101	1	.144**	.041	.108*	.042	.112*	.141**
Res. Emotions	.236**	.781**	.144**	1	.427**	.533**	.633**	.650**	.596**
Self- Reliance	.079	.707**	.041	.427**	1	.329**	.573**	.518**	.429**
Neg. Sex. Minorities	.076	.696**	.108*	.522**	.329**	1	.558**	.440**	.619**
Avoidance of Femininity	.155**	.879**	.042	.633**	.573**	.558**	1	.734**	.660**
Importance of Sex	.180**	.820**	.112*	.650**	.518**	.440**	.734**	1	.604**
Dominance Toughness	.177**	.785**	.141**	.596**	.429**	.619**	.660**	.604**	1
Physical Aggression	.200**	.836**	.049	.625**	.647**	.430**	.722**	.684**	.539**
Verbal Aggression	.713**	.255**	.169**	.277**	.156**	.179**	.223**	.177**	.205**
Anger	.804**	.153**	.127*	.246**	.089	.036	.133*	.136*	.153**
Hostility	.823**	.079	.062	.114*	-.062	-.35	.058	.104	.143**
Sexuality	.750**	.106	.076	.121*	.073	.000	.069	.145**	.067
Income	.002	.069	.056	.006	.044	.091	.121*	.055	.044
Education	-.077	-.061	-.134*	-.116*	-.029	-.045	.031	-.027	-.085
Race	-.102	-.154**	-.102	-.071	-.110*	-.065	-.070	-.074	-.128*
	-.102	.100	-.079	.061	.142**	.025	.099	.038	.026

Table 8. Correlation Matrix Continued

	Toughness	Physical Aggression	Verbal Aggression	Anger	Hostility	Sexuality	Income	Education	Race
Aggression	.200**	.713**	.804**	.823**	.750**	.002	-.077	-.102	-.102
MRNI	.836**	.255**	.153**	.079	.106	.069	-.061	-.154**	.100
CRTA	.049	.169**	.127*	.062	.076	.056	-.134*	-.102	-.079
Res.	.625**	.277**	.246**	.114*	.121*	.006	-.116*	-.071	.061
Emotions									
Self- Reliance	.647**	.156**	.089	-.062	.073	.044	-.029	-.110*	.141**
Neg. Se.	.430**	.179**	.036	.035	.000	.091	-.045	-.065	.025
Minorities									
Avoidance of Femininity Importance of Sex	.722**	.223**	.133*	.058	.069	.121*	.031	-.070	.099
Dominance	.539**	.205**	.153**	.143**	.067	.044	-.085	-.128*	.026
Toughness	1	.301**	.168**	.038	.101	.055	-.007	-.074	.021
Physical Aggression	.301**	1	.442**	.429**	.290**	.066	.033	-.120*	-.088
Verbal Aggression	.168**	.442**	1	.615**	.465**	.008	-.070	-.88	-.031
Anger	.038	.429**	.625**	1	.541**	-.025	-.089	-.049	-.077
Hostility	.101	.290**	.465**	.541**	1	-.048	-.119*	-.054	-.071
Sexuality	.055	.066	.008	-.025	-.048	1	.131*	.034	-.049
Income	-.007	.033	-.070	-.089	-.119*	.131*	1	.324**	.004
Education	-.074	-.120*	-.088	-.049	-.054	.034	.324**	1	-.054
Race	.021	-.088	-.031	-.077	-.071	-.049	.004	-.054	1

CHAPTER SIX

Discussion

Much research has already been done when looking at the relationship between masculinity and aggression; rather than looking at the direct relationship between the two I was more focused on looking at how masculinity can lead one to be more aggressive. This is the first study that looks at how masculinity influences cognitive thought processes that relate to aggression which could then influence future aggressive behavior. My hypothesis predicted that both masculinity and conditional reasoning would be significant in predicting aggressive behavior, but that masculinity would be more significant due to the idea that a higher conformance to masculinity will direct a man towards more aggressive behavior, rather than the other way around where more aggressive thoughts would be the factor that gravitates a man towards masculine values.

Despite not finding many statistically significant results, and the variables that were significant not having a very high variance, my results spawned some surprising insights. Overall, masculinity and conditional reasoning are statistically significant in predicting higher results in aggression, but only on a small scale; this is something I found within all of my results, showing that there are other variables out there that also influence aggressive behavior that I was not looking at. This is only to be expected, as masculinity is not the only factor that has weight in the development of aggression.

Before diving into the other results, it may be important to differentiate between anger, hostility, and aggression. Anger is the emotion that both hostility and aggression come out of, hostility is a feeling of ill-will towards someone or something, and aggression is any word or action that is meant to impose harm on another. As for physical

aggression, toughness being the most statistically significant predictor is not surprising in the slightest; this variable used to be referred to as aggression in the original MRNI scale. Toughness is also sometimes seen as strength, it could be predicted that men who are the strongest are the most likely to act out physically because they may have more confidence in their ability to over-power the other aggressor. Another interesting result to come out of the analysis of physical aggression is the fact that education was shown to be a significant predictor, with the less education one has the more likely they are to be physically aggressive; this, in itself, is not surprising, what is startling is that while education is statistically significant income is not. One might expect the two to go along together as many of those who do not have a higher level of education are also in low-income families. This could show that there is something that we learn, or do not learn, that effects how aggressive one becomes.

Perhaps one of the most confounding results to come out of the entire analysis is that of negativity towards sexual minorities statistically significantly predicting verbal aggression to a negative degree, showing that the less, in short terms – homophobic – one is, the more likely they are to be verbally aggressive. Despite my efforts, I simply cannot explain this outcome. Being homosexual is considered the opposite of being a man, which is why it tends to be a trait of those who are most masculine to also have opposing views of homosexuals; by expressing this indifference or hatred a man would be assumed to be heterosexual, and therefore still a “man,” whereas a man who shows support or is friends with homosexuals may be considered a homosexual himself and his image as a man is ruined. Knowing this, I expected the complete opposite result, and that people who are more homophobic would be more verbal about it; apparently, this is not the case.

Perhaps this could be due to society's views on homosexuals changing as a whole, as in recent years being part of the LGBT community is becoming more acceptable. Even with acceptance levels rising I still would not expect the outcome I got, because if this were the true cause negativity towards sexual minorities would most likely simply not be a statistically significant predictor.

Another result to come out of the verbal aggression analysis was restrictive emotions being the most significant predictor. Restrictive emotions refers to the teaching of holding one's emotions as being too emotional is seen as feminine trait. It may be expected that, if a man, in order to keep his masculinity intact, keeps his feelings inside that he would be less likely to verbalize his anger because this would go directly against what he was taught. But as O'Neil (1981) emphasizes, unexpressed feelings and thoughts can build up and eventually become anger and result in an explosion. If a man keeps everything else hidden, then they may be more likely to verbalize their anger in an aggressive manner because it is the only thing they can express. This result leads directly into the results that came out of the analysis of anger, with restrictive emotions being the only statistically significant predictor. As previously discussed, this could be due to the idea that one of the only acceptable emotions for a man to have is anger or that of stoicism. If a man is taught to not even feel other emotions, and deeply conforms to this idea, then their only option may be anger. Or, as O'Neil (1981) believes, this is the outcome of unexpressed emotions, the building up of anger and hostility.

Hostility was the final analysis I completed; once again, only one significant result came of this: importance of sex. This showed that the more importance a man puts on sex the more likely they are to be hostile. One of the first things that came to mind

after seeing this outcome was the Santa Barbara shooter, who, in his redemption video, declared that his shooting spree was a revenge plot against all the women who had rejected him both physically and emotionally. In a case where sex is an important quality to a man, he may become hostile towards women when they are denying him what he believes he deserves. Neither anger or hostility were predicted by conditional reasoning; this could possibly be due to the fact that the CRT-A measures how likely one is to overtly act out aggressively, which could explain why it is significant in predicting physical and verbal aggression but not the more internal emotions of anger and hostility.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Limitations

Within this study there were a few limitations, one being that the CRT-A was not administered in the way the Test Manual suggests (James & McIntyre, 2000); they suggest that the administration be supervised and timed. I felt that this was only necessary for employers using the test to evaluate employees and would not make a difference for my study. Despite this, there could still be reasons unbeknownst to me as to why this was the suggested way to administer the test. Although I do not feel participants were biased in any way, this is something to be considered. Instead of using the CRT-A to measure cognitive thought processes, more research could have been done to find a scale that more accurately measures what I wanted to measure; perhaps a scale related to information-processing models would have been better fitted for this study.

Another limitation could be related to the fact that women did not participate in the study; upon reflection, women could have provided the opportunity for a more comparative analysis. By comparing the results gathered from men and the results from women could have been used to show the differences between how masculinity influences behavior and how femininity does. Further research could involve women in the study and, for further comparison, perhaps also include a scale that measures conformance to feminine norms.

There were also a few unexplainable results, specifically the result that men who are less negative towards sexual minorities are more likely to be verbally aggressive. It was previously discussed that, try as we might, we could not find an explanation for this

result. This is something that further research could look more into in order to determine why this may be.

A final important factor to consider as a limitation is that masculinity changes from region to region; some men, depending on where they are from, may have different ideas as to what makes a man a man. Although hegemonic masculinity is seen in many cultures as the ideal type, there are also many cultures that may not agree, and this could be reflected in the results. It was considered to add a question into the demographics in order to determine which region of the United States participants lived, but I opted out of this because I felt it was too difficult to define what a region encompasses as this also differs around the country. Once again, upon reflection, it was found that an easy answer to this problem could have been asking whether participants lived in a rural community or urban. Further research could look at this variable.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Conclusion

Due to masculinity influencing the development of aggression and thought patterns, it was hypothesized that men who conform more to masculine values will also have more aggressive biases and will, in the end, act aggressively. In the terms of the study conducted, it was predicted this would be shown by the traits in the MRNI-SF having more of a significance in predicting aggressive behavior, but that conditional reasoning would follow behind it, because masculinity is where it all begins. Throughout my research this hypothesis was supported by the results, but only to a very small degree as it explained very little variance. Further research could be conducted into what else is out there that I was not looking at that could explain more of the variance. It is clear, though, that being socialized towards more masculine values is not the only factor that influences aggressive thoughts or aggressive behavior, although it does explain some of it.

APPENDIX

Logical Reasoning and Self-Perception

PROJECT DIRECTOR:

Bridget K. Diamond-Welch

PHONE #:

(605) 677-5702

Department:

Political Science

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this research study is to see how males' self-perception effects their logical reasoning skills. You were selected as a possible participant because you are an MTurk worker, are male, above the age of 18, and a resident of the United States.

HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL PARTICIPATE?

Approximately 400 people will take part in this study.

HOW LONG WILL I BE IN THIS STUDY?

Your participation in the study will last about 30 minutes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN DURING THIS STUDY?

You will be asked to answer questions in a survey that is split into two sections. The first section involves questions examine your logical reasoning skills. The second section asks you questions about how you think of yourself and some demographic information.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF THE STUDY?

There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this study.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF THIS STUDY?

You will not benefit personally from being in this study. However, we hope that, in the future, other people might benefit from this study because it will help us to understand how self-perception effects logical reasoning.

WILL IT COST ME ANYTHING TO BE IN THIS STUDY?

You will not have any costs for being in this research study.

WILL I BE PAID FOR PARTICIPATING?

You will be paid for being in this research study. You will receive \$1.50 for completion. You will be given a unique code at the end of the survey to enter into MTurk. Within three (3) days of study completion, the researchers will review your participation. The survey will include several questions that will check if you are paying attention. If you answer more than one of these incorrectly, you will not be paid for your participation. If you do not want to take this study, you have the alternative to take another study on mTurk.

WHO IS FUNDING THE STUDY?

The University of South Dakota and the research team are receiving no payments from other agencies, organizations, or companies to conduct this research study.

ARE MY RECORDS CONFIDENTIAL?

The records of this study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. In any report about this study that might be published, you will not be identified. Your study record may be reviewed by government agencies, Office of Human Subjects Protection and The University of South Dakota- Institutional Review Boards.

Any work performed on MTurk can be linked to your user's public profile page. You may wish to restrict what information you chose to share (see <https://www.mturk.com/mturk/contact> for more information). Further, when you email the researchers through MTurk, Amazon automatically inserts your email and may also include your name. If you wish to remain anonymous, you can contact the researchers through the contact information provided above and below this document instead of through MTurk.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law.

At the end of the study you will create a continuity code that is anonymous but unique to you. This continuity code will be kept with you. You will paste this code into MTurk to receive payment. This will result in your Worker ID being associated with the continuity code on the PI's password protected MTurk account.

If we write a report or article about this study, the results will be described in a summary manner so that you cannot be identified.

IS THIS STUDY VOLUNTARY?

Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with The University of South Dakota.

WHOM MAY I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

You may ask any questions you have now or later. The researchers conducting this study are:

Bridget Diamond-Welch
and Aimee Wieczorek

You can reach them during the day over the phone at (605)677-6660 or at night via email Bridget.K.Welch@usd.edu. You may call these numbers if you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the research.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may contact The University of South Dakota- Office of Human Subjects Protection at (605) 677-6184. You may also call this number about any problems, complaints, or concerns you have about this research study.

Please print this document for future reference.

If you chose not to participate, thank you for your time. Please make sure to close the browser window.

If you agree to participate, please click "NEXT" below.

Logical Reasoning and Self-Perception

In this next section, you will read a series of scenarios. Please read each carefully and select the answer you agree with most.

1. Joe is usually on time for work and for meetings with his boss and clients. He is also on time for appointments with his doctor, dentist, and priest. However, Joe is always five or more minutes late for meetings with Bill.

Which of the following is the most logical explanation for Joe being late for meetings with Bill?

- Bill gets up later than Joe.
- Joe is usually on time for people he respects, so he must not respect Bill.
- Joe and Bill are both self-employed.
- Joe and Bill are friends, so they don't care about being on time for each other.

2. People who are pushy about getting what they want are often disliked by others. However, aggressively going after customers is often needed to be successful in sales. People who are successful in sales are usually respected by others.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- Doctors are not respected by most people.
- Sales is the only job that requires pushiness.
- Pushy salespeople may be successful but will often be disliked.
- Salespeople who are not pushy will not be successful or respected.

3. History shows that many generals who were good leaders in war were not as good during peacetime. Also, many generals who were promoted during peacetime were not good at leading soldiers in war.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- Weak people with friends in high places are often chosen to be generals during peacetime.
- It is hard to know how officers will do in battle until they are actually in a war.
- Generals and privates usually sit together at meals.
- Modern wars are more often fought at sea than in the air.

4. The old saying, “an eye for an eye,” means that if someone hurts you, then you should hurt that person back. If you are hit, then you should hit back. If someone burns your house, then you should burn that person’s house.

Which of the following is the biggest problem with the “eye for an eye” plan?

- It tells people to “turn the other cheek.”
- It offers no way to settle a conflict in a friendly manner.
- It can only be used at certain times of the year.
- People have to wait until they are attacked before they can strike.

5. Most bosses do not like to criticize employees. It makes both the boss and the employee uneasy.

Which of the following is the most logical explanation for the above?

- Bosses and employees like a friendly place to work.
- Annual performance reviews happen only once a year.
- Employees who are uneasy are always more productive.
- Bosses are afraid to criticize problem workers.

6. New technology has changed the American workplace. A job that is here today could be gone tomorrow. People can no longer expect to work on the same job for very long. On the other hand, many new jobs are being created.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- People will spend more time in school learning new skills.
- More people will buy their homes rather than rent.
- Trying to be steady and dependable will not be as important in future jobs.
- The America workplace never changes.

7. Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts teach young people a sense of discipline. They also teach respect for authority, neatness, dependability, and loyalty.

Which of the following is the most logical prediction of what Scouts will be like when they grow up?

- They will be easily controlled by leaders.
- They will be reluctant to attend foreign films.
- They will be self-conscious about their height.
- They will be ready to take on responsibility.

8. People in a rich neighborhood in New York were pushed around for years by a homeless man. This man slept in alleys, stayed drunk or high on drugs, and cursed and threatened to hurt many of the residents. The police were called many times. But the homeless man always got a lawyer and returned to the neighborhood and caused trouble.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion regarding the people who lived in this neighborhood?

- They were used to dealing with the cold weather.
- They were afraid of the man, and would not fight back.
- They worked in New Jersey.
- They did all that they could do within the law.

9. Businesses say they want to give customers a good product at a low price. To keep costs down, companies have cut back to the smallest workforce possible. And the pay for most workers does not buy as much as it used to.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- Getting customers depends on keeping costs low.
- Many companies pay employees monthly.
- As long as their prices are low, companies don't care about the quality of life of their employees.
- Companies usually raise prices to attract customers.

10. Doreen has noticed that a new girl at her high school has been looking at her from across the cafeteria. The new girl is like Doreen in many ways. She is pretty, wears nice clothes, cuts her hair short, and seems to get along with both girls and boys. Doreen notices that the new girl is checking out who Doreen's friends are and how Doreen acts around boys.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- The new girl is planning on joining the soccer team.
- The new girl is checking Doreen out as a likely rival.
- Doreen has algebra during second period.
- The new girl may become friends with Doreen.

11. 100 years ago, male college students often fought duels with swords. One or both fighters were cut. Some people argued that duels should be outlawed. Other people stood up for dueling. They said that duels were a good way to pick out leaders who were brave and strong. In those days, leaders in the military and business often had dueling scars. Ultimately, however, duels were outlawed.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- Guns made duels less dangerous.
- Colleges wanted to be known as places of learning rather than fighting.
- Without duels, it became harder to identify good leaders.
- People interested in business stopped attending college.

12. More people are getting permits to carry guns. Most of these people say that they want to carry a gun to protect themselves.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- These people would not mind shooting someone if threatened or attacked.
- These people would gladly buy a new car.
- These people think they are less likely to be hurt if they have a gun.
- Bullets for guns are expensive and difficult to get.

13. American cars have gotten better in the last 15 years. American car makers started to build better cars when they began to lose business to the Japanese. Many American buyers thought that foreign cars were better made.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusions based on the above?

- America was the world's largest producer of airplanes 15 years ago.
- Swedish car makers lost business to America 15 years ago.
- The Japanese knew more than Americans about building good cars 15 years ago.
- American car makers built cars to wear out 15 years ago, so they could make a lot of money selling parts.

14. Store employees are told to watch out for people who look like shoplifters. If a customer looks like a shoplifter, then employees are supposed to watch the customer closely.

Which of the following is the biggest problem with this practice?

- Most retail stores don't open until 10:00 in the morning.
- Many customers who don't look like shoplifters are honest and do not steal.
- Parking is getting harder to find in shopping malls.
- Abuse by store employees who use it as an excuse to bother people they don't like.

15. Many companies use bonuses to reward their employees. For example, salespeople are supposed to make a certain number of sales. If they sell more than they are supposed to, then they receive a bonus. Bonuses include extra pay and time off from work.

Which of the following is the most logical explanation for why companies use bonuses?

- Bonuses give new employees a way to learn more about the business.
- Bonuses give customers a reward for being loyal.
- Bonuses give managers a way to have more control over their employees.
- Bonuses give hard-working employees a way to earn each money or time off.

16. People who work for restaurants often have their purses or bags searched. Managers search employees as they leave work. The reason given for the searches is that they reduce theft of food and equipment.

Which of the following is the biggest problem with this reasoning?

- Most restaurant employees are honest and feel embarrassed by the searches.
- Many restaurant employees receive tips from customers.
- Employees who steal are too smart to be caught by this type of search.
- More restaurants are opening up for lunch.

17. Gangs have formed in many large cities. Gangs often fight over territory, drug deals, and insults. Gang members are often killed in these fights. Few murders of gang members are solved.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- The police don't really care about the death of a few gang members.
- Gangs never use weapons in fights.
- Most police are trained in hand-to-hand combat.
- Too many people are in gang fights to know who committed the murders.

18. Wild animals often fight to see who will breed. This ensures that only the strongest animals reproduce. When strong animals reproduce, their young tend to grow into strong and powerful animals. Unlike animals, people who are not strong often reproduce.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- People who are not strong can be successful.
- Animals breed most often in the Fall.
- The study of biology is getting less popular.
- Humans are becoming physically weaker.

19. Many hold-ups take place on city streets. Hold-up victims are usually not hurt if they do everything the robber wants.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion regarding hold-up victims who do get hurt?

- They resisted, refused to turn over money, or started a fight.
- They met a robber with a taste for violence.
- They were held up during the day rather than at night.
- They were able to outrun their attacker.

20. Half of all marriages end in divorce. One reason for the large number of divorces is that getting a divorce is quick and easy. If a couple can agree on how to split their property fairly, then they can get a divorce simply by filling out forms and taking them to court. They do not need lawyers.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- People are older when they get married.
- If one's husband or wife hires a lawyer, then he or she is not planning to play fair.
- Couples might get back together if getting a divorce took longer.
- More men than women get divorced.

21. Some companies treat employees badly. For example, some companies lay people off and then expect one person to do the work of two people. Managers get big raises in some companies, but employees get only small increases. To get even, some employees have damaged company equipment, slacked off on the job, or faked being sick. However, most employees do not act in these ways.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- Most employees are afraid of being caught.
- Most employees never get sick.
- Most employees drive to work rather than walk.
- Most employees value good behavior at work.

22. Germany took over many small countries before World War II. Other countries thought that they could stop Germany. They had Germany sign agreements promising not to attack again. Germany broke these promises many times.

Which of the following is the most logical conclusion based on the above?

- Only weak countries follow agreements.
- Signing agreements works best when all countries can be trusted.
- England should not have invaded France.
- Small countries are always more powerful than large countries.

Logical Reasoning and Self-Perception

23. Please complete the following questions by clicking the circle that indicates your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	No Opinion	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Homosexuals should never marry.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The President of the US should always be a man.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men should be the leader in any group.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men should watch football games instead of soap operas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men should own a gun in order to protect their home.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All homosexual bars should be closed down.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Select strongly agree if you are paying attention.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men should have home improvement skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men should be able to fix most things around the house.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	No Opinion	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
A man should prefer watching action movies to reading romantic novels.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men should always like to have sex.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boys should prefer to play with trucks rather than dolls.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A man should not turn down sex.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A man should always be the boss.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Homosexuals should never kiss in public.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A man should know how to repair his car if it should break down.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A man should never admit when others hurt his feelings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men should be detached in emotionally charged situations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is important for a man to take risks, even if he might get hurt.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A man should always be ready for sex.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When the going gets tough, men should get tough.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think a young man should try to be physically tough, even if he's not big.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Select slight disagree if you are paying attention.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men should not be too quick to tell others that they care about them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree No Opinion Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

Men should be able to conceal carry guns so they can take matters into their own hands in the event of an emergency.

A real man could never be raped.

Logical Reasoning and Self-Perception

24. For the following questions, please indicate how uncharacteristic or characteristic each of the following statements is in describing you.

	Extremely Uncharacteristic	Somewhat Uncharacteristic	Neither Uncharacteristic or Characteristic	Somewhat Characteristic	Extremely Characteristic
I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have threatened people I know.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you are paying attention, select somewhat characteristic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have trouble controlling my temper.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I often find myself disagreeing with people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other people always seem to get the breaks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Finally, we will ask you a few questions about your characteristics.

25. My age at my last birthday was (in years):

26. Please select your sex:

- Male
- Female
- Gender Fluid
- Gender Binary
- Other (please specify)

27. I identify my sexuality as:

- Heterosexual
- Gay
- Bisexual
- Other (please specify)

28. How would you describe yourself (select as many as apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian/Native American | <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic/Latino |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian | <input type="checkbox"/> White/Caucasian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African American | <input type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islander |

29. What was your family's gross income (before taxes) from all sources on your last tax return?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Less than \$20,000 | <input type="radio"/> \$75,000 to \$99,999 |
| <input type="radio"/> \$20,000 to \$34,999 | <input type="radio"/> \$100,000 to \$149,999 |
| <input type="radio"/> \$35,000 to \$49,999 | <input type="radio"/> \$150,000 to \$199,999 |
| <input type="radio"/> \$50,000 to \$74,999 | <input type="radio"/> \$200,000 or more |

30. What is your present religion, if any?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Protestant (for example, Baptist, Methodist, Non-denominational, Lutheran, | <input type="radio"/> Muslim |
| <input type="radio"/> Presbyterian, Pentecostal, Episcopalian, Reformed, Church of Christ, etc.) | <input type="radio"/> Buddhist |
| <input type="radio"/> Roman Catholic | <input type="radio"/> Hindu |
| <input type="radio"/> Mormon (Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints or LDS) | <input type="radio"/> Atheist |
| <input type="radio"/> Orthodox (such as Greek, Russian, or some other Orthodox church) | <input type="radio"/> Agnostic |
| <input type="radio"/> Jewish | <input type="radio"/> Nothing in particular |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) | |

31. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Did not finish high school | <input type="radio"/> Completed a Bachelor degree (BA, BS, etc.) |
| <input type="radio"/> Graduated from high school/GED | <input type="radio"/> Completed a Masters degree (MA, MS, etc.) |
| <input type="radio"/> Attended college but did not complete degree | <input type="radio"/> Completed a Doctoral or Professional degree (JD, MD, PhD, etc.) |
| <input type="radio"/> Completed an Associate degree (AA, AS, etc.) | |

Debriefing Form for Participation in a Research Study

University of South Dakota

Thank you for your participation in our study! Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Purpose of the Study:

Earlier in our consent form we informed you that the purpose of the study was to see how self-perception effects logical reasoning skills. You were selected to participate because you are an MTurk worker, are male, above the age of 18, and are a resident of the United States. In actuality, our study is to see if men who conform more to male-role norms are more aggressive.

Unfortunately, in order to properly find out if men who conform more to male-role norms are more aggressive, we could not provide you with all of these details prior to your participation. This ensures that your answers in this study were not influenced by prior knowledge of the purpose of this study. If we had told you the actual purposes of our study, you may have paid closer attention to your responses during the logical reasoning questions, which was used to measure aggression. These logical reasoning questions measured implicit thought processes, or thoughts that happen without thinking. It was important that you answered these questions truthful to your thought processes and beliefs without influence. We regret that deception but we hope you understand the reason for it.

Confidentiality:

Please note that although the purpose of this study has changed from the originally stated purpose, everything else on the consent form is correct. This includes the ways in which we will keep your data confidential. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by means of removing your MTurk worker IDS from the data set and not linking your ID with your key responses. The data will be stored in password protected files only accessible to the researchers on the project.

Now that you know the true purpose of our study and are fully informed, you may decide that you do not want your data used in this research. If you would like your data removed from the study and permanently deleted please email the principle investigator, Bridget Diamond-Welch, at bridget.k.diamond-welch@usd.edu.

Whether you agree or do not agree to have your data used for this study, you will still receive the \$1.50 for your participation.

Please do not disclose the research purpose of this study to anyone who might participate in this study in the future as this could affect the results of the study.

Useful Contact Information:

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, its purpose or procedures, or if you have a research-related problem please feel free to contact the researcher(s), Bridget Diamond-Welch at bridget.k.diamond-welch@usd.edu.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact the University of South Dakota Office for Human Subjects Protections at 605-677-6184 or humansubjects@usd.edu.

If you feel upset after having completed the study or find that some questions or aspects of the study triggered distress, talking with a qualified clinician may help. You can find information about mental health and locate treatment services in your area by calling the SAMHSA Treatment Referral Hotline Monday-Friday 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. EST at 1-877-SAMHSA7 (1-877-726-4727). In the case of an emergency please call 911.

Please keep a copy of this form for your future reference. Once again, thank you for your participation in this study!

32. Please create a continuity code and then paste it into MTurk for verification. This completion and your attention to the questions will be reviewed within 3 business days.

To make sure you are paid, CAREFULLY follow the directions.

1. Type your favorite color
2. Type the four digit year of your birth
3. Type the name of your favorite show
4. Type your pet/kid/or family member first name

And example: GREEN1978SHERLOCKCOURAGE (THIS IS AN EXAMPLE, not the code to use)

5. Copy this code
6. Hit "NEXT"

Logical Reasoning and Self-Perception

If you have copy and pasted your code into MTurk, you may close this window. Thank you for your participation.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. A., Kless, S. J., & Adler, P. (1992). Socialization to Gender Roles: Popularity among Elementary School Boys and Girls. *Sociology Of Education*, 65(3), 169-187.
- Barrett, Frank J. (1996). The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case of the US navy. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 3(3), 129-142
- Baumeister, R. F., & Smart, L. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review*, 103(1), 5.
- Baumeister, R. F., Twenge, J. M., & Nuss, C. K. (2002). Effects of Social Exclusion on Cognitive Processes: Anticipated Aloneness Reduces Intelligent Thought. *Journal Of Personality & Social Psychology*, 83(4), 817-827. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.83.4.817
- Bosson, J. K., & Vandello, J. A. (2011). Precarious Manhood and Its Links to Action and Aggression. *Current Directions In Psychological Science*, 20(2), 82-86. doi:10.1177/0963721411402669
- Bryant, F. B., & Smith, B. D. (2001). Refining the Architecture of Aggression: A Measurement Model for the Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35(2), 138-167. doi:10.1006/jrpe.2000.2302
- Chu, Judy Y. (2014) *When boys become boys*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639

- Dietz, T. L. (1998). An Examination of Violence and Gender Role Portrayals in Video Games: Implications for Gender Socialization and Aggressive Behavior. *Sex Roles*, 38(5/6), 425-442.
- Donaldson, Mike. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory and Society, Special Issue: Masculinities*, 22(5), 643-657.
- Eccles, J. S., Jacobs, J. E., & Harold, R. D. (1990). Gender Role Stereotypes, Expectancy Effects, and Parents Socialization of Gender Differences. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(2), 183-201. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1990.tb01929.x
- Ewing Lee, E. A., & Troop-Gordon, W. (2011). Peer socialization of masculinity and femininity: differential effects of overt and relational forms of peer victimization. *The British Journal Of Developmental Psychology*, 29(Pt 2), 197-213. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2010.02022.x
- Geen, R. G. (2001). *Human aggression*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Goodnight, B. L., Cook, S. L., Parrott, D. J., & Peterson, J. L. (2014). Effects of masculinity, authoritarianism, and prejudice on antigay aggression: A path analysis of gender-role enforcement. *Psychology Of Men & Masculinity*, 15(4), 437-444. doi:10.1037/a0034565
- Harris III, F., & Harper, S. R. (2008). Masculinities go to community college: Understanding male identity socialization and gender role conflict. *New Directions For Community Colleges*, 2008(142), 25-35.
- Huesmann, Rowell L. (1988). An information processing model for the development of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 14(01), 13-24.

- Huesmann, Rowell L. (1998). The role of social information processing and cognitive schema in the acquisition and maintenance of habitual aggressive behavior. In Russel G. Geen & Edward Donnerstein (Eds.), *Human aggression: Theories, research, and implications for social policy* (73-109). Academic Press.
- James, L. R. (1998). Measurement of personality via conditional reasoning. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*(2), 131-163.
doi:10.1177/109442819812001
- James, L. R., McIntyre, M. D., Glisson, C. A., Bowler, J. L., & Mitchell, T. R. (2004). The Conditional Reasoning Measurement System for Aggression: An Overview. *Human Performance, 17*(3), 271-295.
- James, Lawrence R., & McIntyre, Michael D. (2000) *Conditional reasoning test of aggression*. Knoxville, Tennessee: Innovative Assessment Technology, LLC.
- Kimmel, M. S., & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent Masculinity, Homophobia, and Violence. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46*(10), 1439-1458.
doi:10.1177/0002764203046010010
- Lafollette, J. R., Steinfeldt, J. A., Vaughan, E. L., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2011). Bullying Among Adolescent Football Players: Role of Masculinity and Moral Atmosphere. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. doi:10.1037/e695042011-001
- Levant, R. F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A Review of Research on Masculinity Ideologies Using the Male Role Norms Inventory. *Journal Of Men's Studies, 15*(2), 130-146.
- Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., & Rankin, T. J. (2013). Male Role Norms Inventory--Short Form. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. doi:10.1037/t27378-000

- Levant, R. F., Rankin, T. J., Williams, C. M., Hasan, N. T., & Smalley, K. B. (2010). Evaluation of the factor structure and construct validity of scores on the Male Role Norms Inventory—Revised (MRNI-R). *Psychology Of Men & Masculinity, 11*(1), 25-37. doi:10.1037/a0017637
- McMahan, D. T. (2011). Heartland: Symbolic Displays of Aggression and Male Masculinity in Rural America. *Qualitative Research Reports In Communication, 12*(1), 51-59. doi:10.1080/17459435.2011.601525
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (2014). *Crime as structured action: Doing masculinities, race, class, sexuality, and crime*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & littlefield.
- Nisbett, R. E. (1993). Violence and U.S. regional culture. *American Psychologist, 48*(4), 441-449. doi:10.1037//0003-066x.48.4.441
- O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of Gender Role Conflict and Strain: Sexism and Fear of Femininity in Mens Lives. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*(4), 203-210. doi:10.1002/j.2164-4918.1981.tb00282.x
- Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Smith, R. M., Parrott, D. J., Swartout, K. M., & Tharp, A. T. (2015). Deconstructing hegemonic masculinity: The roles of antifemininity, subordination to women, and sexual dominance in men's perpetration of sexual aggression. *Psychology Of Men & Masculinity, 16*(2), 160-169. doi:10.1037/a0035956