HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Pers Individ Dif. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2018 March 26.

Published in final edited form as:

Pers Individ Dif. 2014 October ; 68: 160–164. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.021.

Man enough? Masculine discrepancy stress and intimate partner violence☆

Dennis E. Reidy[a,b,*], **Danielle S. Berke**[b], **Brittany Gentile**[b], and **Amos Zeichner**[b]

[a]Division of Violence Prevention, Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, Atlanta, GA, United States

[b]Department of Psychology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, United States

Abstract

Research on gender roles suggests that men who strongly adhere to traditional masculine gender norms are at increased risk for the perpetration of violent and abusive acts toward their female intimate partners. Yet, gender norms alone fail to provide a comprehensive explanation of the multifaceted construct of intimate partner violence (IPV) and there is theoretical reason to suspect that men who fail to conform to masculine roles may equally be at risk for IPV. In the present study, we assessed effect of masculine *discrepancy stress*, a form of distress arising from perceived failure to conform to socially-prescribed masculine gender role norms, on IPV. Six-hundred men completed online surveys assessing their experience of discrepancy stress, masculine gender role norms, and history of IPV. Results indicated that masculine discrepancy stress significantly predicted men's historical perpetration of IPV independent of other masculinity related variables. Findings are discussed in terms of potential distress engendered by masculine socialization as well as putative implications of gender role discrepancy stress for understanding and intervening in partner violence perpetrated by men.

Keywords

Gender role discrepancy stress; Gender role stress; Intimate partner violence; Masculinity

1. Introduction

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 35% of women in the U.S. have experienced some form of severe Physical Violence (e.g., hit with fist or object, slammed, beaten), completed or attempted rape, or being stalked by a male intimate partner (Black et al., 2011). Notably, men are victims of intimate partner violence (IPV) as well; however, in the U.S. women are victimized at greater rates and they are far more likely to experience fear, post-traumatic stress, injury, missed days of work, or even death as a consequence of IPV (Archer, 2000; Black et al., 2011; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010).

☆The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

*Corresponding author at: Division of Violence Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA 30341, United States. Tel.: +1 (770) 488 0525; fax: +1 (770) 488 1662. dreidy@cdc.gov (D.E. Reidy).

Moreover, the motives that precipitate perpetration of these violent acts may differ by gender of the victim (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). A well-documented risk factor for IPV perpetration by men toward women is associated with masculine gender socialization. That is, men who strongly adhere to masculine norms are more likely to perpetrate acts of violence toward a female intimate partner, and acts of violence in general (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Reidy, Shirk, Sloan, & Zeichner, 2009; Stark & Flitcraft, 1996; Yllo & Strauss, 1984).

Pertinently, research on this topic also indicates that adherence to masculine norms only partially explains men's IPV and that there are likely a number of dispositional and situational factors that play an important role. Indeed, there is reason to suspect that men at the opposite end of the gender role conformity continuum may be likely to engage in aggressive and violent behavior in certain contexts. For example, according to Pleck (1995), *discrepancy stress* is a form of stress that occurs when one fails to live up to the ideal manhood derived from societal mandates of masculine gender roles. Simply put, discrepancy stress arises when a man believes that he *is*, or believes he *is perceived* to be insufficiently masculine. Research suggests that boys learn to expect that violation of masculine norms will result in negative social consequences (Fuchs & Thelen, 1988; Zeman & Garber, 1996). It follows, then, that men who experience a high degree of discrepancy stress would be more likely to act out in stereotypical masculine ways (e.g., aggression) to confirm their masculinity to themselves and/ or others (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). Moreover, they may be more likely to perceive certain interpersonal exchanges within intimate relationships as threatening to their masculinity and, thus, respond more readily with violence (e.g., Holtzworth-Munroe & Hutchinson, 1993; O'Neil & Harway, 1997).

2. The present study

As a whole, the extant literature provides significant evidence for the relationship of masculine gender roles to deleterious behavior such as IPV (see Moore & Stuart, 2005 for a review). However, to date, little research has examined effect of discrepancy stress on men's behavior, in particular violence toward an intimate partner. Thus, the etiological pathway that leads to men's distress associated with gender role adherence and its consequent violence has not been fully delineated. Specifically, it has yet to be shown that masculine discrepancy stress relates to IPV perpetrated by men against their female partners. In the present study, we examined the relationship of masculine discrepancy stress to the perpetration of psychological, physical, and sexual IPV among heterosexual men. We restricted our investigation to men who identify as heterosexual as men who openly identify as non-heterosexual may likely value conformity to traditional masculine gender roles less and thus experience less distress about gender role discrepancy.

Additionally, we sought to establish the association between discrepancy stress and IPV above and beyond the influence of masculine gender role. Thus we controlled for a number of masculinity- related measures to determine whether discrepancy stress independently related to the perpetration of IPV. In their review of the literature on masculinity and partner violence, Moore and Stuart (2005) discussed three direct approaches to measuring masculine gender role—the trait approach, the normative approach, and the gender role conflict/strain

approach—and their purported association to men's IPV. In keeping with this delineation, we included measures of masculine gender role from each method as control variables. Given the assumption that discrepancy stress is engendered by masculine socialization (Pleck, 1995), we expected that discrepancy stress would demonstrate significant correlations with masculinity measures. However, we expected these correlations will be small in magnitude, as masculine discrepancy distress is hypothesized to be distinguishable from masculinity. Further, we hypothesized that among men endorsing a high level of perceived gender role discrepancy, discrepancy stress would predict historical IPV and that this relationship would remain significant after controlling for other masculinity measures.

3. Methods

3.1. Participants and procedure

Six-hundred men (13% Asian; 7% Black or African-American; 72% Caucasian; 7% Hispanic or Latino) ages 18–50 (M_{age} = 27.2; SD = 6.8) were recruited via Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) web site. This site permits the online collection of data and typically proffers greater sample diversity than typical convenience samples (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). Because gender socialization is culturally driven and may differ by country, we restricted our sample to men from the U.S. Individuals were compensated $2.00 each for completion of the questionnaires. The University IRB approved all consent statements, materials, and procedures used in this study.

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Demographics questionnaire—Participants responded to a series of questions about age, ethnicity, marital status, relationship history, self-identified sexual orientation, and level of education.

3.2.2. Gender role discrepancy and discrepancy stress (Reidy, Brookmeyer, Gentile, Berke, & Zeicnher, 2014)—Respondents answered 5 Likert-type questions (1 "Strongly Agree" to 7 "Strongly Disagree") pertaining to the experience of perceived *gender role discrepancy* (i.e., "I am less masculine than the average guy," "compared to my guy friends I am not very masculine," "most women I know would say that I'm not as masculine as my friends," "most guys would say I'm not very masculine compared to them," "most women would consider me to be less masculine than the typical guy") and 5 Likert-type questions about *discrepancy stress* (i.e., "I wish I was more manly," "I wish I was interested in things that other guys find interesting," "I worry that people judge me because I'm not like the typical man," "sometimes I worry about my masculinity," "I worry that women find me less attractive because I'm not as macho as other guys"). Summing responses to each question type generated scores for each subscale. Maximum Likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization support the presence of two factors via eigenvalue and scree plot inspection; KMO = .91; Bartlett's Test, $\chi^2(120) = 4954.24$, $p < .001$. *Discrepancy Stress*, $\lambda = 6.6$, explained 39% of the variance while *Gender Role Discrepancy*, $\lambda = 2.4$, explained 12% of the variance. All items loaded at .5 or higher onto their respective factors. Cronbach's alphas for the 5-item discrepancy and 5-item discrepancy stress scales were .91 and .86 respectively. The two factors are positively

correlated (r = .61). This measure has also shown to predict risky sexual behavior in men (Reidy et al., 2014).

3.2.3. Hypermasculinity index-Revised (HMI-R; Peters, Nason, & Turner, 2007)—Moore and Stuart (2005) noted that this measure assesses masculinity at the trait level in that it directly measures the degree to which men adhere to the male gender role. The HMI-R is a modification of the original 30-item forced-choice format of the hypermasculinity index (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). The HMI-R presents a choice between two extreme options but, unlike the original, allows respondents to select responses along a "1" to "10" continuum with low numbers reflecting the less masculine option and high numbers reflecting the hypermasculine option. The HMI-R yields more normally-distributed data with higher internal reliability, reduced social desirability bias, and improved detection of underlying structure of hypermasculinity (Peters et al., 2007). Research has shown that hypermasculinity predicts violence against women in laboratory settings and in intimate relationships (Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Reidy et al., 2009). Cronbach alpha for the present sample was .91.

3.2.4. Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986)—According to Moore and Stuart (2005), the MRNS adheres to the normative approach of measuring masculinity in that "rather than examining how men describe themselves, this approach examines masculinity in terms of men's beliefs about how men and women should think, feel, and behave, as well as their rights and roles in society" (p. 49). It is a 26-item Likert-type scale (1 "*strongly disagree*" to 7 "*strongly agree*") that measures traditional Western masculine ideology relating to status, toughness, and antifemininity. Scores on the MRNS correlate with men and women's attitudes toward men and are inversely related to attitudes of gender egalitarianism (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Jakupcak and Colleagues (2002) found that the MRNS correlated strongly with alternative measures of masculinity (r = .74) and that it interacted with the MGRS in predicting violence. Cronbach alpha for the present sample was .93.

3.2.5. Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987)—Moore and Stuart (2005) indicated this measure specifically assesses the degree of conflict men experience when challenges associated with gender role arise. This scale comprises 40 items measuring appraisal of circumstances thought to be more stressful to men than women. Men rate on a continuum, (0 = not stressful to 5 = extremely stressful), the degree of stress they anticipate experiencing in domains of physical inadequacy, expression of tender emotions, subordination to women, threat to intellectual control, and failure in work and sexual behavior (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). The MGRS is different from discrepancy stress in that it assesses situations that men would appraise as stressful; it does not measure men's distress about perceived failures to adequately conform to the masculine gender role. Moore and Stuart (2005) reviewed the literature on the MGRS and IPV and found that scores on the MGRS scale have been associated with IPV in samples of collegiate men and in men mandated to batterer intervention programs (Moore & Stuart, 2005; Moore et al., 2008). Cronbach alpha for the present sample was .94.

3.2.6. Kinsey Scale (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948)—The nature of each man's sexual orientation was assessed using the Kinsey scale. Participants answered two questions rating their historical sexual experiences of sexual attraction/arousal and behavior on a continuum from 1 "exclusively heterosexual" (i.e., all experiences are with women) to 7 "exclusively homosexual" (i.e., all experiences are with men). Although only men self-identifying as heterosexual on the demographic questionnaire were included in analyses, the Kinsey scale was included as an additional degree of control as some men identify as heterosexual yet endorse sexual fantasies, arousal, or behaviors with other men. We reasoned that this variation in sexuality might influence effects of gender variables on interpersonal stress. Cronbach alpha for the present sample was .94.

3.2.7. Conflict Tactics Scale-2 (CTS-2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996)—We used the Psychological, Physical, and Sexual Violence subscales of the CTS-2 to assess men's perpetration of IPV in their current or most recent relationship. Psychometric evidence supports the internal reliability (Psychological Abuse alpha = 0.79, Physical Abuse alpha = 0.86; Straus et al., 1996) and validity of the CTS-2 as a measure of relationship aggression (Straus et al., 1996). Respondents are instructed to rate the frequency they engaged in psychological, physical, or sexually violent behavior as described on the form (between "never" and "more than 20 times") and are provided an option for "not in my current or most recent relationship, but it has happened before." Cronbach alphas for Psychological Aggression, Physical Violence, and Sexual Violence perpetration scales in the present sample were .86, .97, and .83, respectively.

4. Results

4.1. Data reduction

Respondents completed the online surveys in approximately 30 min (M = 34.0, SD = 38.3, range = 5.3–677.8). We removed 7 respondents who were more than 3 standard deviations from the mean completion time from all analyses. Forty-one men who did not identify as exclusively heterosexual (i.e., gay, queer, bisexual, or transgender) on the demographics questionnaire were excluded from IPV analyses because our goal was to investigate heterosexual men's violence toward female partners. Finally, 195 men indicated they had not been in an intimate relationship within the last year and, therefore, did not complete the CTS-2.[1] Listwise deletion was employed for all analyses.

4.2. Correlational analyses

Correlations among gender role discrepancy, discrepancy stress, and other masculinity variables are presented in Table 1. Gender role discrepancy was inversely related to trait (HMI) and normative (MRNS) measures of masculinity as expected. Gender role discrepancy was not correlated with the MGRS scale and a modest correlation was found between the MGRS scale and discrepancy stress.

[1]The demographic make-up of the reduced sample of 357 men was comparable the overall larger sample (11% Asian; 8% Black or African-American; 73% Caucasian; 8% Hispanic/Latino; M_{age} = 28.1; SD = 6.9).

4.3. Discrepancy stress & IPV

We performed three simultaneous regression analyses wherein we regressed each IPV outcome onto gender role discrepancy, discrepancy stress, and their interaction term while controlling for the MGRS, MRNS and HMI-R. Additionally, although all participants included in these analyses identified as heterosexual (i.e., dating women), we further controlled for variation in the expression of sexual orientation by including respondents' ratings on the Kinsey Scale. For all regression analyses, the interaction term was nonsignificant. Consequently, we only report results from the reduced main effects models. Collinearity diagnostics suggested that multicollinearity was not problematic (all VIF <2.0 and all Tolerance statistics >0.5). Results are presented in Table 2.

When Psychological Aggression was entered as the outcome variable, the full model regression equation was significant $F(6, 232) = 8.76$; $p < .001$; $R^2 = .19$. Examination of the standardized betas indicated that discrepancy stress contributed to prediction ($\beta = .16$) independently and equally to the MGRS ($\beta = .15$) as well as independently of the MRNS and HMI-R. Although discrepancy stress predicted Psychological Aggression against an intimate partner, gender role discrepancy was nonsignificant. The full model regression equation containing Physical Violence as the outcome variable was significant $F(6, 241)=14.85$; $p < .001$; $R^2 = .27$. In examining standardized betas, a pattern similar to Psychological Aggression emerged in which discrepancy stress predicted Physical Violence independently and equally to the MGRS ($\beta's = .18$ and .14, respectively). The HMI-R and the Kinsey score also predicted Physical Violence. However, the MRNS was significantly and inversely related to violence. When Sexual Violence was regressed onto the predictors, the full model was significant $F(6, 231) = 16.85$; $p < .001$; $R^2 = .30$. In this model, only discrepancy stress, the HMI-R, and the Kinsey score predicted Sexual Violence.

4. Discussion

In the present study, we sought to identify masculine discrepancy stress as a risk factor for heterosexual men's perpetration of psychological, physical, and sexual IPV against women. The findings of the present study generally supported this association. Consistent with previous research, measures of masculine gender role conformity were associated with IPV perpetration (Moore & Stuart, 2005; Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Reidy et al., 2009). Moreover, discrepancy stress predicted the historical perpetration of the three assessed forms of IPV against women when controlling for other masculinity measures. These findings may implicate an amplified sensitivity to perceived threats against one's masculinity as a precipitant of violence in intimate relationships. That is, men who experience stress related to perceiving themselves as being less masculine than the typical man, or believing that they are perceived as such by others, may be more likely to interpret ambiguous interactions as challenges to their masculinity. Thus, it would be reasonable to expect that these men would be more likely to respond in a manner intended to demonstrate and, perhaps, bolster their masculine status. Mosher and Sirkin (1984) argue that aggression may be triggered in any situation that challenges or threatens the masculine identity. Acts such as physical violence are, indeed, salient and common methods of demonstrating masculinity (O'Neil & Harway, 1997; Vandello & Bosson, 2013). Findings of the current study suggest that this process may

be particularly relevant to discrepancy-stressed men. Notably, the interaction terms for the discrepancy stress and gender role discrepancy subscales did not reach significance in predicting the perpetration of IPV. This may reflect a deficit in necessary power to detect effects owing to the number of predictors in this study. Alternatively, it may indicate that gender role discrepancy, by itself, does not predispose one to the *experience of distress* and consequent maladaptive behavior. In fact, it is quite likely that there are men who consider themselves to be less masculine (i.e., non-conforming to masculine norms) than the typical man, but who do not experience attendant distress. As such, perceived gender role discrepancy does not, by itself, reflect a dysfunctional state. However, men who place a high value on appearing masculine and who experience distress about being perceived as gender role discrepant may be at risk for behavioral and mental health problems. In fact, as masculine gender role has been linked to a number of negative behavioral and mental health outcomes (e.g., Alfred, Hammer, & Good, 2013; Mahalik, Lagan, & Morrison, 2006; Mahalik, Levi-Minzi, & Walker, 2007; O'Neil, 2008; Sanders, 2011) it follows that men who experience high levels of gender role discrepancy stress would be at risk to engage in a number of unsafe behaviors in attempt to demonstrate and equalize their perceived masculinity to that of other men. Indeed, they may likely possess inflated sensitivity to threat to their masculinity, not only within their intimate relationships, but in all variants of interpersonal relationships. As such, it seems fruitful to investigate the relationship of masculine discrepancy stress to behaviors of high masculinity salience such as general violence, crime, and delinquency as well as other risk taking behavior such as binge drinking, drug use, driving under the influence of substances, and risky sexual behavior.

The predictive relationship of Kinsey Scale ratings to all forms of IPV that emerged in the present findings was unexpected. In the present sample of men identifying as heterosexual, the more they endorsed sexual attraction or sexual behaviors with other men in their past, the more they endorsed acts of violence in their intimate relationships with women. In particular, the relationship between Kinsey ratings and violence was strongest for sexual violence ($\beta = .41$). It is possible that these men experience a form of gender stress associated with an undesired, and undeclared, sexual orientation that constitutes a threat to their masculinity. Acts of sexual violence toward a female partner, in particular, could serve as an attempt to demonstrate to themselves or others their desired, and manifest heterosexuality. However, it is important to note that the Kinsey scores correlated only minimally with both forms of gender stress in the present sample, indicating that it is not a proxy for a redundant form of gender role strain. At this time, it is unclear what specific mechanism facilitates violence associated with the present Kinsey ratings. Nevertheless, these findings inform the need to replicate and further investigate this relationship.

These findings must be interpreted with caution for a number of reasons. First, the effect sizes for individual predictor variables were small suggesting that a number of factors contributing to men's violence against female intimate partners remain unclear. Intimate partner violence is justifiably viewed as multifaceted, owing to a wide range of factors not accounted for by this study (Reidy & Holditch-Niolon, 2012). Indeed, the present data do not speak to the precipitants of female perpetrated IPV or violence in same sex couples. Nonetheless, the data do indicate that these factors contribute to prediction of male perpetrated IPV against a female partner. Second, the design of the present study does not

allow for causal determinations about the role of discrepancy stress in perpetration of IPV. The current research would be strengthened by future studies employing longitudinal designs of developing adolescents that would allow the assessment of temporal associations between gender role socialization, discrepancy stress, and the onset of adolescent dating violence. Pertinently, effect sizes for discrepancy stress on partner violence may be larger in youth populations as the salience of gender socialization might be more acute. Third, self-report measures may not accurately reflect real-world behaviors and their prevalence rates. It is reasonable to suspect that some men may have underreported violence. Finally, although this sample was arguably more diverse than many typical convenience samples used in psychological research, a large proportion of the sample was ethnically homogenous. It remains important to replicate these findings in alternative samples to determine whether they replicate in samples drawn from other cultures.

Despite its limitations, the present research adds to the existing literature in that it clarifies the nature of masculine discrepancy stress and its relation to IPV. Additionally, the results have pertinent implications for understanding and preventing men's relationship violence. The present data indicate that prevention efforts for men's violence against women should focus on the role of masculine socialization, acceptance of gender norms, and how they may engender distress in adolescents and adult men. Notably, in one of the few interventions found effective in the prevention of violence in adolescent dating relationships, changes in gender norms were shown to facilitate positive prevention effects (Foshee et al., 2005). Importantly, the present results do not address the role of discrepancy stress in developing adolescent males. It is feasible that the influence of such stress on violent behaviors could be greater in younger populations that may be more malleable and susceptible to the pressures of gender role socialization and, therefore, indicate an ideal time for intervention. Intervening at an early age to prevent violence in teen dating relationships may avert a series of consequences across the lifespan including the perpetration of IPV in future adult relationships (e.g., Foshee & Reyes, 2009).

References

Alfred, GC., Hammer, JH., Good, GE. Male student veterans: Hardiness, psychological well-being, and masculine norms. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 2013. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031450

Archer J. Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin. 2000; 126:651–680. [PubMed: 10989615]

Black, MC., Basile, KC., Breiding, MJ., Smith, SG., Walters, ML., Merrick, MT., et al. The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention & Control, Centers for Disease Control & Prevention; 2011.

Buhrmester M, Kwang T, Gosling SD. Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? Perspectives on Psychological Science. 2011; 6:3–5. [PubMed: 26162106]

Dobash, RE., Dobash, RP. Violence against wives. New York: Free Press; 1979.

Eisler RM, Skidmore J. Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. Behavior Modification. 1987; 11:123–136. [PubMed: 3508379]

Foshee VA, Bauman KE, Ennett ST, Suchindran C, Benefield T, Linder GF. Assessing the effects of the dating violence prevention program "Safe Dates" using random coefficient regression modeling. Prevention Science. 2005; 6:245–258. [PubMed: 16047088]

Foshee, VA., Reyes, HLM. Primary prevention of dating abuse: When to begin, whom to target, and how to do it. In: Whitaker, DJ., Lutzer, JR., editors. Preventing partner violence: Research and

evidence-based intervention strategies. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2009. p. 141-168.

Fuchs D, Thelen M. Children's expected interpersonal consequences of communicating their affective state and reported likelihood of expression. Child Development. 1988; 59:1314–1322. [PubMed: 3168642]

Holtzworth-Munroe A, Hutchinson G. Attributing negative intent to wife behavior: The attributions of maritally violent versus nonviolent men. Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 1993; 10:206–211.

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

Kinsey, AC., Pomeroy, WB., Martin, CE. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: Saunders; 1948.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling J. Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence in the Unites States. Sex Roles. 2010; 62:179–193.

Mahalik JR, Lagan HD, Morrison JA. Health behaviors and masculinity in Kenyan and U.S. male college students. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 2006; 7:191–202.

Mahalik JR, Levi-Minzi M, Walker G. Masculinity and health behaviors in Australian men. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 2007; 8:240–249.

Moore TM, Stuart GL. A review of the literature on masculinity and partner violence. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 2005; 9:82–89.

Moore TM, Stuart GL, McNulty JK, Addis ME, Cordova JV, Temple JR. Domains of masculine gender role stress and intimate partner violence in clinical sample of violent men. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 2008; 9:82–89.

Mosher DL, Sirkin M. Measuring a macho personality constellation. Journal of Research in Personality. 1984; 18:150–163.

O'Neil JM. Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the gender role conflict scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. The Counseling Psychologist. 2008; 36:358–445.

O'Neil JM, Harway M. A multivariate model explaining men's violence toward women. Violence against Women. 1997; 3:182–203. [PubMed: 12294813]

Parrott DJ, Zeichner A. Effects of hypermasculinity on physical aggression against women. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 2003; 4:70–78.

Peters J, Nason C, Turner WM. Development and testing of a new version of the hypermasculinity index. Social Work Research. 2007; 31:171–182.

Pleck, JH. The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In: Levant, RF., Pollack, WS., editors. A new psychology of men. New York: Basic Books; 1995. p. 11-32.

Reidy, DE., Holditch-Niolon, PH. Directions for future research on the nature and prevention of intimate partner violence. In: Guevara, BC., Becerra's, NA., editors. Psychology of aggression: New research. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers; 2012. p. 179-186.

Reidy DR, Shirk SD, Sloan CA, Zeichner A. Men who aggress against women: Effects of feminine gender role violation on physical aggression by hypermasculine men. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 2009; 10:1–12.

Reidy, DE., Brookmeyer, KA., Gentile, B., Berke, DB., Zeicnher, A. Gender role discrepancy stress, high-risk sexual behavior, and sexually transmitted disease. 2014. Manuscript submitted for publication

Sanders JM. Coming of age: How adolescent boys construct masculinities via substance use, juvenile delinquency, and recreation. Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse. 2011; 10:48–70. [PubMed: 21409704]

Stark, E., Flitcraft, A. Women at risk: Domestic violence and women's health. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc; 1996.

Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, Sugarman DB. The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. Journal of Family Issues. 1996; 17:283–316.

Thompson EH, Pleck JH. The structure of male role norms. American Behavioral Scientist. 1986; 29:531–543.

Thompson, EH., Pleck, JH. Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. In: Levant, R., Pollack, W., editors. A new psychology of men. New York: Basic Books; 1995. p. 130-163.

Vandello JA, Bosson JK. Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 2013; 14:101–113.

Yllo K, Strauss M. Patriarchy and violence against wives: The impact of structural and normative factors. Journal of International and Comparative Social Welfare. 1984; 1:1–13.

Zeman J, Garber J. Display rules for anger, sadness, and pain: It depends on who is watching. Child Development. 1996; 67:957–973. [PubMed: 8706538]

Table 1

Correlation coefficients between predictor and control variables.

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. GRD	–	.61**	.05	−.20**	−.25**	.11*
2. DS		–	.31**	.11*	−.01	.11*
3. MGRS			–	.46**	.27**	.12*
4. MRNS				–	.53**	−.02
5. HMI-R					–	.09†
6. KS						–

Note: GRD = Gender Role Discrepancy; DS = Discrepancy Stress; MGRS = Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale; MRNS = Male Role Norms Scale; HMI-R = Hypermasculinity Index-Revised; KS = Kinsey Score.

† $p = .06$.

* $p \leq .01$.

** $p \leq .001$.

Pers Individ Dif. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2018 March 26.

Table 2

Coefficients for regression analyses of intimate partner violence.

Measure	*β*	t
Psychological aggression		
GRD	−.03	−0.30
DS	.16*	1.89
MGRS	.15*	2.19
MRNS	−.09	−1.14
HMI-R	.22**	3.11
KS	.26***	4.18
Physical violence		
GRD	−.05	−0.64
DS	.18**	2.42
MGRS	.14*	2.17
MRNS	−.16*	−2.19
HMI-R	.32***	4.85
KS	.32***	5.69
Sexual violence		
GRD	−.07	−0.89
DS	.18*	2.38
MGRS	.10	1.54
MRNS	−.05	−0.66
HMI-R	.24***	3.62
KS	.41***	7.06

Note: GRD = Gender Role Discrepancy; DS = Discrepancy Stress; MGRS = Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale; MRNS = Male Role Norms Scale; HMI-R = Hypermasculinity Index-Revised; KS = Kinsey Score.

* $p \leq .05$.

** $p \leq .01$.

*** $p \leq .001$.