Joseph Gelfer   *Editor*

Masculinities in a Global Era

Springer

International and Cultural Psychology

Series Editor

Anthony J. Marsella

Joseph Gelfer

Editor

Masculinities in a Global Era

Springer

Editor
Joseph Gelfer
Monash University
MCD University of Divinity
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Contents

Introduction

Joseph Gelfer

Globalization

I was born and raised in England, although haven't set foot in the Old Country for a decade. I did my Ph.D. in New Zealand. I currently live and work in Australia. This introduction is for a book commissioned by a colleague in Hawaii I have never met, and administered from the New York office of an international publishing company historically based in Berlin. And I don't really consider myself that much of a "global" individual. These cursory facts alone give a pointer to what this book is all about: masculinities in a global era. But the global era—or globalization—is more than simply living one's life in an international context.

Arjun Appadurai (1996) offers a cultural take on globalization which he sees as an effect of the rupture between tradition and modernity caused by two interlocking factors: electronic mass media and migration. Film, television, and now the Internet have transmitted stories and possibilities around the world which inform the dreams, aspirations, and identities of people wherever they may be, bringing the global to the local, which are essentially two sides of the same coin. Just as such electronically mediated stories flow across the world, so too its citizens in unprecedented numbers, largely from "developing countries" to the "developed world." This at once makes local, national, and regional roots less important, while at the same time privileging the roots of the drivers of globalization, thus the common—albeit flawed—perception that globalization equates with homogenization, which in turn equates with Americanization.

From a more economic perspective, Saskia Sassen (1999) identifies the construction of "global cities," largely characterized by those in the technology and financial services sectors (think New York, London and Tokyo). Sassen argues that the needs of such global cities have wide-reaching socioeconomic effects. For example, immigration policies are impacted by global cities because they need

J. Gelfer (✉)
Monash University, MCD University of Divinity, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: joseph@gelfer.net

particular types of foreign labor to do business, and this encourages the kind of migration flow to which Appadurai refers. Global cities amplify the discrepancies between the haves and have-nots, not just between global cities and other locations but within global cities as women and minority workforces are required to service the technology and financial professionals that drive the global city economies. And across all these issues, big business based in global cities results in a shift in power away from government and nations to transnational corporations.

Clearly globalization results in winners and losers. Further still, central to the understanding of globalization is that it functions as something of a paradox, which will be demonstrated as the chapters in this collection unfold. As Zygmunt Bauman (1998) notes, for all its unifying elements, "globalization divides as much as it unites … what appears as globalization for some means localization for others; signaling a new freedom for some, upon many others it descends as an uninvited and cruel fate" (p. 2). And these paradoxes themselves are continually evolving in what Bauman (2000) has described as "liquid modernity," where our sense of self is constantly shifting in response to ever-changing parameters and demands: for example, writing in 1998 Bauman could say with some certainty that "being local in a globalized world is a sign of social deprivation and degradation" (Bauman 1998, p. 2), yet 15 years later "local" has become an almost fetish-like object among the environmentally inclined global middle classes. In this context it is not just those who are often considered "losers" in globalization who seek to escape its effects—such as conservative religions retreating into fundamentalism (Thompson 2007)—rather those who have typically been "winners" in globalization but who nevertheless see "local" as "spaces of resistance through which agency and local institutional efforts can manage change in ways which more closely meets their needs" (Feagan 2007, p. 32).

There is a further aspect to all this that I believe has yet to be fully unraveled in the context of globalization and which I have described elsewhere as being "beyond a sense of place" (Gelfer 2009a). By this I mean not just the global nomadism that characterizes a particular type of middle class global citizenry who might be just as at home in Toronto or Hyderabad; rather, I mean the kind of individual who no longer has a concrete sense of place wherever they may be, except perhaps in the spatiality of their online presence and the identities they construct within it which remain largely consistent as they move between one place and the next (with all their cultural specificities). In this space both the global and local can be both regulated and resisted, yet the global–local binary is also problematized: liquid modernity indeed! This is all just the briefest of glimpses at what globalization means in the broadest sense. And so we come specifically to the role of masculinities and globalization.

Masculinities and Globalization

The study of masculinities and globalization exists as one of the more recent waves of the broader study of masculinities. Within the discipline of psychology—and indeed other disciplines—the study of masculinity had its common origins in

sex role theory, which questioned what defines men's roles, and how individual men stood relative to that benchmark (Pleck 1987). Thinking of men in biological terms (being male) then largely gave way to greater emphasis on the social construction of gender (on our context, being masculine) (Hare-Mustin and Marecek 1990; Lorber 1994; Lorber and Farrell 1991; West and Zimmerman 1987), which highlighted the various forms of masculinit*ies* that function in specific historical and cultural contexts (Brod 1987, p. 2), and how hegemonic masculinities operate by regulating both women and atypical men (Carrigan et al. 1987; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005).

Masculinities and globalization as a theme is thus an example of how the study of masculinities continues to proliferate, from the biologically determined to the socially constructed, from the singular to the multiple, and the complex interplay between these sets of binaries. R. W. Connell's (1998) discussion of masculinities and globalization mobilizes the image of globalization presented, for example, by Sassen, but notes that the international capitalist order to which she refers is not just a gender-neutral system in which gendered activities take place, rather one that is reached via an historical process which itself is inherently gendered; this historical process is divided by Connell into three waves. First, global conquest and settlement involved a specific masculine performance; this process was largely undertaken by certain types of men (such as soldiers) who tended towards violence and egocentric individualism. Further still, colonization and settlement required a frontier mentality that resulted in a combative relationship with the land and culture under colonization, and also a significant undercurrent of sexual exploitation of Indigenous women. Second, once the process of settlement was secured, a specific form of masculinity was promoted in the process of empire building; this at once resulted in the regulation of Indigenous masculinities by separating more "manly" castes and tribes from the more "effeminate" but also an impact on colonizer masculinity which became increasingly defined around economic success. Third, in the context of postcolonialism and neoliberalism, masculinity is also embedded in the system where out of empire has emerged a discourse of the market and individualization which is largely one of hegemonic masculine dominance.

From a theoretical point of view, Connell described this third stage as resulting in "transnational business masculinity" (1998, p. 16). Connell and Wood (2005) explored this form of masculinity ethnographically in the context of Australian managers who at once highlighted connections and departures from more historically specific masculinities. Connell and Wood note, "some continuity with older bourgeois masculinities. The association with power and preoccupations with the techniques of money remain" (p. 361); however, the transnational business masculinity is less bound by cultural context to the point where there is "no rationale at all except profit making," a highly embodied value manifest in "pressure, long hours and tension" (p. 361). Of significance too—specifically within the context of several of the proceeding chapters—transnational business masculinity is sustained through "systemic mutual scrutiny" (p. 362), which demonstrates that even among the "winners" of globalization, regulation is a continual process.

But even within the hegemonic North Atlantic countries, not all masculinities are winners in globalization. Michael Kimmel (2003) examines right-wing groups in both the United States and Norway in which young white men are disenfranchised by globalization. These men are often the sons of farmers or small business owners who have not fared well in globalization and who find themselves on the margins of the workforce, looking in on the center which appears to be not only populated by the wealthy elite, but immigrant workers who have been moved in to service the elites. These groups "have responded to the erosion of public patriarchy (displacement in the political arena) and domestic patriarchy (their wives now work away from the farm) with a renewal of their sense of masculine entitlement to restore patriarchy in both arenas" (p. 606). Kimmel also notes a parallel to these men in the "terrorists" of 9/11, who were largely well-educated middle-class young men who were not prospering under globalization and who sought to restore their privileged masculinity in their campaign for a particular form of Islamist culture.

And it is these non-Western masculinities that have been the focus of the majority of work on masculinities and globalization. Alongside a proliferation of journal articles on the matter, a number of significant books have been published on global masculinities, central to which has been the *Global Masculinities* series from Zed Books. In this series, Bob Pease and Keith Pringle (2001) outline the three benefits of exploring the subject: to provide a critical analysis of men's practices in various cultures, to provide comparative analyses for the main issues underpinning critical studies on masculinity (such as men's violence towards women, how men perform across multiples sites of power, and how to offer a useful gender relational framework), and to identify transnational aspects to men's practices (pp. 2–3). This series went on to canvass men in the global south (Jones 2006), young men (Seidler 2006), Islamic masculinities (Ouzgane 2006), policy development (Cleaver 2003), and men in southern Africa (Morrell 2001).

A useful recent snapshot of international comparative studies on men and masculinities (Pringle et al. 2011, p. 3) highlights a flurry of other region-specific books addressing European countries (Hearn and Pringle 2006; Ervø and Johansson 2003a, b; Novikova and Kambourov 2003), Asia (Louie and Low 2002; Roberson and Suzuki 2003; Brownell and Wasserstorm 2002; Louie 2002), Africa (Lindsay and Miescher 2003; Ouzgane and Morrell 2003), the Middle East (Ghoussoub and Sinclair-Webb 2000), and Latin America (Gutmann 2002). A more recent *Global Masculinities* series from Palgrave Macmillan has been looking at the subject with a greater emphasis on the cultural specificities of Anglophone countries (rather than viewing them merely as normative within a discourse of globalization), including books about masculine performances in Irish cinema (Ging 2012), British literature (Horlacher 2011; Solinger 2012), the trans- and multinational arena (Ruspini et al. 2011), and the American west (Worden 2011).

But a word of caution should be voiced here. Despite the worthy intentions of the editors and authors referred to in the trans- and international collections above (and, to be frank, my own intentions in this collection), one cannot help but notice that these endeavors to explore global masculinities still largely take place from a seat of privilege. As Ronald Jackson and Murali Balaji note, "despite the important work

exploring international or global conceptions of diverse masculinities, masculinity studies has generally become ghettoized by a Eurocentric paradigm of whiteness and its Others" (2011, p. 21). It may be, then, that we never get a fair representation of global masculinities until we genuinely break this persistent Orientalist spell, and this will only happen when the economy of academic knowledge transfer and publications does greater justice to those who do not write in English as a first language (Curry and Lillis 2004; Flowerdew 2007). At that point we will no longer have well-meaning researchers such as myself editing collections from the center and looking out; rather, we will genuinely problematize the center, which in turn will take our understanding of global masculinities in surprising new directions.

This is just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to research on masculinities and globalization. Most of this research has been undertaken within the disciplines of sociology, anthropology, and cultural studies, and less so within the context of psychology. One notable exception is Chris Blazina and David Shen-Miller's (2011a) edited collection *An International Psychology of Men*. This collection is divided into three parts. The first section—theoretical models—explores migration, violence in South Africa, health risk behaviors, multiple perceptions of self, and the pursuit of "positive" masculinity. The second section contains discussions about body image and sexuality. The third section—clinical innovation and programs for men—canvasses abusive men, archetypes, postnatal depression, "traditional" men, and the psychology of Russian men. The international element to this collection of articles is not necessarily foregrounded, but nevertheless when describing the text Blazina and Shen-Miller note, "the contextual nature of the authors' work rose explicitly off the page" (2011b, p. xxxiii), a statement which holds true for the proceeding chapters.

Blazina and Shen-Miller identify a number of challenges and benefits to their collection (2011b, pp. xxxiv-xlii). In terms of challenges they note two interrelated issues: first, the limited utility of theories generated in explaining cross-cultural phenomena and, second, the establishment of generalizability from local constructs, measures, and so on. In terms of benefits they note the following: exposure to different models from around the world, increasing international dialogue among psychologists broadens the range of tools available to clinicians, an international perspective counters an assumed worldwide singular masculinity, the preservation of diverse masculinities around the world, and a better ability to understand intergroup and interethnic conflict.

Certainly, these challenges and benefits are important to point out, although these kinds of issues have been the bread and butter for various branches of the humanities and social sciences for many years. Indeed, a further word of caution may be due in relation to this particular discussion. While Blazina and Shen-Miller provide many appropriate caveats about how to think about men, masculinity and psychology within an international context in all its diversity, I remain troubled by an essentialist undercurrent. The whole notion of "the international psychology of men" seems somewhat singular and counter to a discourse of multiplicity that underpins the general study of men and masculinities in the humanities and social sciences. Indulge me with this little provocation: how do you feel when you read,

"the international psychology of Jews"? I suspect you would feel something odd was afoot, as clearly this misses the extraordinary diversity of Jewish culture; further still, you might think that some other—rather unsavory—agenda was being pursued. Similarly, "the international psychology of men" (as a phrase) does not do justice to the diversity of men and masculinities; further still, what agenda is best served by such singularity? The promotion of singularity with the context of masculinity serves a hetero-patriarchal agenda, and the fact should not be ignored that it was—an albeit populist rendering of—*psychology* that was mobilized to such problematic effect in the 1990s mythopoetic men's movement which continues to have significant ramifications even today (Gelfer 2009b).

So it is within this context of psychology that the book you are reading extends the conversation. However, the contents of the collection, which are outlined in the next section, are of an interdisciplinary nature: while various contributions are written by psychologists, others are not, although all have been written with the intention of informing how we understand the psychology of men and masculinities within the context of globalization.

Chapter Outline

In the chapters contained within this collection, we will see examples of the different ways masculinities and globalization manifest as outlined in the section above. Some of the chapters refer to the actual effect of globalization upon the masculine performances under consideration, while others refer to masculinities in different parts of the globe that may or may not explicitly speak to the issue of globalization. The chapters are divided into four parts: first, theoretical models of masculinity; second, masculinities and stability; third, masculinities under negotiation; and fourth, sexuality.

The first—theoretical models—section comprises two chapters and begins with *New Directions in Gender Role Conflict Research* by Cormac Ó Beaglaoich, Kiran M. Sarma, and Todd G. Morrison. In this chapter, the authors provide an extensive account of gender role conflict, elements of which appear explicitly and implicitly throughout the remaining chapters. Gender role conflict occurs when expectations of—in our context, masculine—gender result in negative consequences for the individual. The authors map out a number of limitations that have been identified to measure gender role conflict and test how to mitigate the limitations, specifically within the context of adolescent boys/young men in Ireland. Their chapter contains several recommendations on how to adapt the measurement of gender role conflict that does greater to justice to the cultural and contextual specificity of the individuals being questioned.

The second chapter in the theoretical section is my own contribution, *Will the Real Joseph Gelfer Please Stand Up: Multiple Masculinities and the Self*. In this chapter I extend the notion of multiple masculinities within the general study of masculinities beyond different masculine constituencies and instead look at

multiple masculinities within the individual self. Via an autoethnographical examination of sexuality and style, I demonstrate that the "truth" of an individual requires holding different aspects of the self in productive tension. I also extend this to the whole study of men and masculinities, arguing that one must be able to move between the different schools of thought (critical studies on masculinity, men's studies, and so on), in order to do the subject justice. Significantly, the question of the local/global binary leads us down a rabbit hole in this chapter: an Englishman, speaking "from" Australia, mobilizing evidence of the textual self performed through both international print and online media.

The second section—masculinities and stability—comprises three chapters and begins with *Youthful Warrior Masculinities in Indonesia* by Pam Nilan, Argyo Demartoto, and Agung Wibowo. The authors interviewed a number of Indonesian young men in order to surface the cultural influences that contribute towards their understanding of masculinity. Myths, heroic narratives, and legends from Indonesia were all seen to contribute to a masculinity defined by several key themes: the invulnerable hero, the *jago* (strongman), the quiet menace of the hypermasculine warrior, initiation, control, and recognition. The authors conclude by showing how these youthful Indonesian masculinities intersect and diverge from a common Western understanding of hegemonic masculinity.

In their chapter, *Men of Honor: Examining Individual Differences in Masculine Honor Beliefs*, Donald A. Saucier and Jessica L. McManus unravel how honor is understood within the southern culture of the United States. This is particularly interesting in terms of locality in the context of globalization. In general, the United States is considered the source of the globalization narrative, with its local values spreading around the global (resulting in the common perception of homogenization). However, let us not forget that those local values are indeed local rather than generic and have as much cultural specificity as any of the other non-Anglophone masculinities that are often privileged (even fetishized) within the study of globalization. In this chapter, the authors map out what defines honor in the south, how this contributes towards the construction of masculinity in that region, and how this goes on to impact the measurability of other issues such as war, security, and punishment.

The final chapter in this section is *"Men Are Hard . . . Women Are Soft": Muslim Men and the Construction of Masculine Identity* by Asifa Siraj. This chapter examines how Muslim men in Scotland go about constructing their identities. Siraj shows how the participants' identities are formed by an interweaving of class, ethnicity, and country of origin. Religion was also shown to be fundamental to the participants' identities, reinforcing particular understandings of gender difference, marriage, and parenting. In contrast to expectations that the construction of masculinity is a complex negotiation, Siraj's participants were secure in their masculinity due to their role within both the family and out in the public sphere.

The third section—masculinities under negotiation—comprises five chapters and begins with *Making the Global Bhadralok?: Bengali Men and the Transnational Middle Class in India* by Saayan Chattopadhyay. This is a particularly important chapter as it speaks explicitly to both the two main forms of masculinities and globalization: how masculinities are formed in an international corporate state and

how masculinities are performed within a specific non-Western locality. Chattopadhyay shows how Bengali masculinity has been shaped through the colonial and postcolonial periods and how today this intersects with Connell's transnational business masculinity (or whether we are looking instead at a transnational middle-class masculinity). Chattopadhyay also demonstrates how film and popular literature, alongside a global neoliberal hegemony, contribute to the construction of the contemporary *bhadralok*.

In her chapter, *Better Men?: Gendered Culturalized Citizenship in Male Emancipation Projects in the Netherlands*, Iris van Huis examines how migrant men have become a specific target group of Dutch culturalized citizenship politics via the establishment of "male emancipation projects" which offer migrant men the opportunity for self-reflection. Van Huis shows how the emancipation projects appeal to men via certain essentialist masculine "codes" such as "doing stuff" and "learning practical things" as well as how de-essentializing spaces can be opened up through discussion of topics such as fatherhood. Globalization comes into keen focus as the participants must balance the perception of themes such as fatherhood as seen in both their countries of origin and the Netherlands. Van Huis suggests that the projects can be seen as a form of "new paternalism" in which the migrant masculinities in question are brought into line with mainstream Dutch values.

In their chapter, *Fluid Masculinities? Case Study of the Kingdom of Bahrain*, Magdalena Karolak, Hala Guta, and Neva Helena Alexander provide a further example of how local understandings of masculinity are held in tension with more globalized (read Western) values. In this study, four themes emerged from the data gathered from interviews with Bahraini men: hegemonic masculinity versus Muslim masculinity, that which is *not* masculinity, masculinity negotiations, and societal changes and the perception of masculinity. The participants in this study at once aspired to normative and hegemonic masculine ideas but also identified the limitations of these models and were inclined to hold them at a distance from their lived experience. In this study we see not just how masculinity is negotiated within an evolving Arabic culture but also between that Arabic culture and the globalized world it inhabits.

Masculinity in Ambiguity: Constructing Taiwanese Masculine Identities between Great Powers by Ying-Chao Kao and Herng-Dar Bih draws a connection between the ambiguous sovereignty of Taiwan on the international diplomatic stage and the ambiguity of Taiwanese masculinities. The authors chart three common sites of masculine identity-making in Taiwan: *aluba* (a type of initiation process performed by some school boys in Taiwan), *doing soldier* (the military service experienced by most Taiwanese men), and *flower drinking* (a social and business activity in which men visit erotic entertainment venues). The social dynamics between these three sites create masculinities which problematize the binary of hegemonic and subordinate masculinities and which are characterized by ambiguity at the international, institutional, interpersonal, and developmental levels.

The final chapter in this section is *Historical Sediments of Competing Gender Models in Indigenous Guatemala* by Brent E. Metz and Meghan Farley Webb who cast a light on Mayan masculinities. Demonstrating that there are always further layers to the onion, we are shown two different Indigenous masculinities performed in the Kaqchikel and Ch'orti' language groups (the former being one of the largest and well-studied groups, the latter less known). Like various contributions to this volume, the authors show how the masculinities in question at once perpetuate old understandings of masculinity, while also reforming the new. In particular we see how masculinity among the Kaqchikel is being impacted by transnational labor migration between Guatemala and North America.

The fourth section—sexuality—comprises three chapters and begins with *Hypospadias, the "Bathroom Panopticon," and Men's Psychological and Social Urinary Practices* by Stephen Craig Kerry. In this chapter Kerry shows how a regulatory process occurs around men with hypospadias—a configuration of the penis in which the urethral opening is positioned along the shaft rather than the tip—defining what is and is not "normal" genitalia. Kerry draws a comparison with intersex people and how their experience is regulated by the designation of bathrooms as generally either "male" or "female." Writing from Australia, and mobilizing examples from the United Kingdom and the United States, Kerry highlights the impact of the medicalization of "abnormalities" on the masculine self while at the same time challenging its boundaries.

The second chapter in this section is *Cannibals and Ghosts: Forms of Capital, Immobility and Dependence Among Former Javanese Sex Workers in South Bali (Indonesia)* by Matteo Carlo Alcano. In this chapter we witness the construction of a form of masculine subjectivity that originates in the context of sex work. It focuses on the status of being a former sex worker and the ways masculinity is learned, produced, regulated, and critiqued both individually and collectively in a particular context of migration, violence, and sex tourism. The chapter demonstrates the curious solidarity between the sex workers and the gangs that operate them, a stoical attitude towards the rapidly expendable nature of the male body and the paradox of at once being a "slave" to the sex trade while at the same time viewing this activity via an entrepreneurial lens.

The fourth section concludes with *Transgender Identity and Acceptance in a Global Era: The Muxes of Juchitán* by Alfredo Mirandé. In this Mexican context, *muxes* are a group of Indigenous men who openly dress in female Zapotec attire, assume traditional female roles, and are widely accepted by the community. Mirandé shows that while Latino culture is often characterized by machismo, it is also surprisingly accommodating of *muxe* gender performances. Indeed, Mirandé's study suggests that Juchitán may be more progressive than localities such as the United States because muxes tend to have no need to congregate in queer communities as they are fully embedded in mainstream society. This chapter also contributes to a

recent flowering of queer Indigenous studies, one of the least studied and most interesting points of intersectionality.

Conclusion

I laughed when I read Appadurai's comment in his introduction to *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions to Globalization*: "any book about globalization is a mild exercise in megalomania" (1996, p. 18). So what megalomania is revealed in the curation of this collection? I want to resist drawing too many grand conclusions from the text itself. Certainly, it is fair to say that the proceeding chapters demonstrate that masculinities are a continual site of contestation wherever you go. Certainly, it is fair to say that the proceeding chapters demonstrate the diversity of masculinities around the world, even if at the same time showing a worrying commonality around the dominance of normative/hetero-patriarchal masculinity. Rather, I want to take the opportunity to make a couple of points about my curatorial decisions, and the directions I hope they will take the conversation about masculinities in a global era.

First, I want to make a special point about the representation of sexuality in this collection. Sexuality—specifically non-straight flavors—is of crucial importance not just to the study of men and masculinities but to how we might go about *transforming* men and masculinities. Clearly, it is important for the stories and experiences of non-straight men to be heard. There is no consensus on the percentage of people in society who are not straight. To chart a possible spectrum, Anthony F. Bogaert (2004) suggests a figure typically between 1 and 6 percent of people identifying as "homosexual," while Sell et al. (1995)—shifting the focus from homosexual "behavior" to "attraction"—suggest anything up to 20 %. So clearly, any collection of essays about men has to have somewhere between 1 % and 20 % of content relating to non-straight men to be representative of the truth.

But the importance of non-straight sexuality is far greater than "merely" representing the experiences of a minority of men. I believe this issue is of crucial importance to *all* men, as it gets right to the heart of how masculinity is policed, largely by other men, but also by women. Non-straight men are, as it were, the "canaries in a coal mine." What happens to non-straight men is an amplification of the regulatory processes that coalesce around *all* men. Therefore, all men should have a vested interested in how their queer brothers are treated, because if those queer masculinities are shut down, it is only a few very short steps for straight masculinities that fall marginally outside of the hegemonic center to also be shut down. Conversely, if those queer masculinities are given room to flourish and are celebrated, so too will the multiplicity of atypical masculinities performed by straight men (leaving to one side here the reification of the gay–straight binary). The "queer issue" is, therefore, not a "queer issue," rather an "everybody issue." And that is why there is a relatively high degree of queer content in this collection. Shifting from the practical to the theoretical, we see a similar story with queer theory. The great value of queer

theory—understood simply as the troubling of categories and the regulatory function of defining what is "normal"—is not just to queer people but *all* people. So despite a growing rumor that queer theory is dead (Warner 2012), it may well be that we are in the calm before the storm that is *queer theory for everyone*.

Second, it is time to move beyond the tired binary of feminisms and men's rights advocates in the study of men and masculinities. Second-wave feminism offered a powerful analysis of patriarchy and how men enjoy its dividends and functioned as the basis for critical studies on masculinities. At the same time, men's rights advocates claim that they are not privileged and that men are on the wrong end of the stick with numerous measures such as poor health and education and increased levels of violence, homelessness, suicide, and incarceration. These two groups have been talking at cross-purposes for decades for one clear reason: in general, feminist discourse is systemic, and men's rights discourse is personal. So here's the simplistic but powerful way forward: Feminists need to realize that men's rights pain is often genuine and that at the individual level not all men have power; men's rights advocates need to realize that they often *do* enjoy the dividends of patriarchy even when they feel they have little personal power and most importantly that the advances of women *do not come at the expense of men*. The clear way forward in gender politics is for women and men to work in alliance to dismantle socially constructed masculinities—and femininities—that have a negative impact on the well-being of all people and the environment in which we live.

Our global era offers unique challenges, but it also offers unique possibilities. As the proceeding chapters demonstrate, we are mostly in a time of transition, volatility, and anxiety; however, never before have people been able to organize and share experiences in such a powerful manner. One can only hope that while some aspects of globalization force some to retreat into old ways of doing gender, it will catalyze in others the desire to embody the new.

References

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions to globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Blazina, C., & Shen-Miller, D. S. (2011a). *An international psychology of men: Theoretical advances, case studies and clinical innovations*. New York: Routledge.

Blazina, C., & Shen-Miller, D. S. (2011b). Introduction. In C. Blazina & D. S. Shen-Miller (Eds.), *An international psychology of men: Theoretical advances, case studies and clinical innovations* (pp. xxiii–l). New York: Routledge.

Bogaert, A. F. (2004). The prevalence of male homosexuality: The effect of fraternal birth order and variations in family size. *Journal of Theoretical Biology, 230*(1), 33–37.

Brod, H. (1987). Introduction: Themes and theses of men's studies. In H. Brod (Ed.), *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies* (pp. 1–20). Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Brownell, S., & Wasserstorm, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Chinese femininities/Chinese masculinities: A reader*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carrigan, T., Connell, R. W., & Lee, J. (1987). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. In H. Brod (Ed.), *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies* (pp. 63–100). Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Cleaver, F. (Ed.). (2003). *Masculinities matter! Men, gender and development*. London: Zed Books.

Connell, R. W. (1998). Masculinities and globalization. *Men and Masculinities, 1*(1), 3–23.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society, 19*(6), 829–859.

Connell, R. W., & Wood, J. (2005). Globalization and business masculinities. *Men and Masculinities, 7*(4), 347–364.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 663–688.

Ervø, S., & Johansson, T. (Eds.). (2003a). *Moulding masculinities—Volume one: Among men*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Ervø, S., & Johansson, T. (Eds.). (2003b). *Moulding masculinities—Volume two: Bending bodies*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Feagan, R. (2007). The place of food: Mapping out the 'local' in local food systems. *Progress in Human Geography, 31*(1), 23–42.

Flowerdew, J. (2007). The non-Anglophone scholar on the periphery of scholarly publication. *AILA Review, 20*, 14–27.

Gelfer, J. (2009a). Beyond a sense of place. In F. J. Kolapo (Ed.), *Immigrant academics and cultural challenges in a global environment* (pp. 263–266). Amherst: Cambria Press.

Gelfer, J. (2009b). *Numen, old men: Contemporary masculine spiritualities and the problem of patriarchy*. London: Equinox Publishers.

Ghoussoub, M., & Sinclair-Webb, E. (Eds.). (2000). *Imagined masculinities: Male identity and culture in the modern Middle East*. London: Saqi Books.

Ging, D. (2012). *Men and masculinities in Irish cinema*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gutmann, M. (2002). *Changing men and masculinities in Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Marecek, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Making a difference: Psychology and the construction of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hearn, J., & Pringle, K. (Eds.). (2006). *European perspectives on men and masculinities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Horlacher, S. (Ed.). (2011). *Constructions of masculinity in British literature from the middle ages to the present*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jackson, R. L., & Balaji, M. (2011). Introduction. In R. L. Jackson & M. Balaji (Eds.), *Global masculinities and manhood* (pp. 17–30). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Jones, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Men of the global south: A reader*. London: Zed Books.

Kimmel, M. S. (2003). Globalization and its mal(e)contents: The gendered moral and political economy of terrorism. *International Sociology, 18*(3), 603–620.

Lindsay, L., & Miescher, S. (2003). *Men and masculinities in modern Africa*. Portsmouth: Heineman.

Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lorber, J., & Farrell, S. A. (Eds.). (1991). *The social construction of gender*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Louie, K. (2002). *Theorizing Chinese masculinity: Society and gender in China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Louie, K., & Low, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Asian masculinities: The meaning and practice of manhood in China and Japan*. London: Routledge.

Morrell, R. (Ed.). (2001). *Changing men in southern Africa*. London: Zed Books.

Novikova, I., & Kambourov, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Men and masculinities in the global world*. Helsinki: Kikimora Publishers, Aleksantteri Institutue.

Ouzgane, L. (Ed.). (2006). *Islamic masculinities*. London: Zed Books.

Ouzgane, L., & Morrell, R. (Eds.). (2003). *African masculinities: Men in Africa from the late nineteenth century to the present*. London: Palgrave.

Pease, B., & Pringle, K. (2001). Introduction. In B. Pease & K. Pringle (Eds.), *A man's world? Changing men's practices in a globalizing world* (pp. 1–17). London: Zed Books.

Pleck, J. H. (1987). The theory of male sex-role identity: Its rise and fall, 1936 to the present. In H. Brod (Ed.), *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies* (pp. 21–38). Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Pringle, K., Hearn, J., Pease, B., & Ruspini, E. (2011). Introduction: Transforming men's practices around the world. In E. Ruspini, J. Hearn, B. Pease, & K. Pringle (Eds.), *Men and masculinities around the world: Transforming men's practices* (pp. 1–13). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberson, J., & Suzuki, N. (Eds.). (2003). *Men and masculinities in contemporary Japan: Dislocating the salaryman doxa*. London: Routledge.

Ruspini, E., Hearn, J., Pease, B., & Pringle, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Men and masculinities around the world: Transforming men's practices*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sassen, S. (1999). *Globalization and its discontents: Essays on the new mobility of people and money*. New York: The New Press.

Seidler, V. J. (Ed.). (2006). *Young men and masculinities: Global cultures and intimate lives*. London: Zed Books.

Sell, R. L., Wells, J. A., & Wypij, D. (1995). The prevalence of homosexual behavior and attraction in the United States, the United Kingdom and France: Results of national population-based samples. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 24*(3), 235–248.

Solinger, J. D. (2012). *Becoming the gentleman: British literature and the invention of modern masculinity, 1660–1815*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thompson, G. (2007). Religious fundamentalisms, territories and 'globalization'. *Economy and Society, 36*(1), 19–50.

Warner, M. (2012). Queer and then. The end of queer theory? *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved Dec 1, 2012, from http://chronicle.com/article/QueerThen-/130161/.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society, 1*(2), 125–151.

Worden, D. (2011). *Masculine style: The American west and literary modernism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Part I
Theoretical Models

New Directions in Gender Role Conflict Research

Cormac Ó. Beaglaoich, Kiran M. Sarma, and Todd G. Morrison

Gender role conflict (GRC) is defined as a psychological state in which the socialized male gender role has negative consequences for the person and others (O'Neil 2008a). GRC occurs when rigid, sexist, or limiting gender roles result in restriction, devaluation, or violation of self and/or others (O'Neil 1981b). With approximately 240 studies conducted to date, associations between GRC and various indicants of psychological health have been documented.

James O'Neil (2008a), the author of GRC theory, published a 25-year literature review of GRC research (1982–2007) which provides a detailed examination of (a) the theoretical models underpinning the theory, (b) the psychometric properties of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS), (c) principal findings of GRC research, (d) criticisms directed at GRC theory and the GRCS, and (e) future research avenues for GRC theory.

The GRCS has been regarded as the "most well-known instrument within the traditional counseling literature" that focuses on masculinity (Betz and Fitzgerald 1993, p. 360) and has made an important contribution to men's health research. For example, 11 out of 13 studies reviewed by O'Neil (2008a) documented a negative correlation between GRC and self-esteem, 12 out of 15 studies reported a positive correlation between GRC and anxiety, and 24 out of 27 studies found positive correlations between GRC and depression.

The rationale for GRC theory was devised and documented in a number of theoretical papers (O'Neil 1981a, b, 1982). These papers describe a model that conceptualizes GRC as an "interaction of environmental and biological factors that promote certain masculine values (masculine mystique[1]) and the fear of femininity" (O'Neil 2008a, p. 361). As the concepts of masculine ideology (and, more narrowly,

C.Ó. Beaglaoich (✉) • K.M. Sarma
School of Psychology, National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland
e-mail: cormacbegley@gmail.com; kirnan.sarma@nuigalway.ie

T.G. Morrison
Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK, S7N5A5, Canada
e-mail: todd.morrison@usask.ca

hegemonic masculinity) as well as gender role strain are paramount in understanding GRC, each of these terms will be outlined briefly.

Masculine ideology refers to an individual's adoption of cultural beliefs about masculinity and the masculine gender role (Good et al. 1994). Within Western culture, masculine gender socialization emphasizes characteristics such as stoicism, independence, physical toughness, dominance, restrictive emotional expression, competition, and antifemininity (Brannon and Juni 1984; Connell 2005; Levant et al. 2007; Levant 2011; Mahalik et al. 2003).

Hegemonic masculinity denotes the dominant masculine expression within a given culture at a particular point in time (Connell 2005) and embodies the "currently most honoured way of being a man" (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, p. 832). Hegemonic masculinity is an atheorethical concept and does not particularize *how* endorsement of a specific form of masculine ideology increases the likelihood of health risks, both physical and psychological. In contrast to normative models (e.g., masculine ideology), gender role conflict/stress models focus on the degree of perceived conflict between one's internalized or learned gender roles and one's environment (O'Neil et al. 1995).

Gender role strain paradigm (GRSP, Pleck 1995) is a social psychological concept which presents ten propositions relating to gender role norms. For example, "Gender roles are operationally defined by gender role stereotypes and norms," "Violating gender role norms leads to negative psychological consequences," and "Violating gender role norms has more severe consequences for males than females." Implicit in these propositions are three broader ideas about how cultural standards for masculinity, as implemented in gender socialization, have potentially negative consequences for individual males (Pleck 1995). These are gender role discrepancy, gender role trauma, and gender role dysfunction.

Gender role discrepancy posits that individuals attempt to conform—to varying degrees—to stereotypic masculine standards and that nonconformance to these prescribed standards can result in negative internalized self-judgments and negative social feedback from others affecting self-esteem and psychological well-being[2] (Pleck 1995). *Gender role trauma* contends that aspects of male gender role socialization, in particular, the experience of traditional masculine ideology, can be inherently traumatic for males (Levant 2011). For example, by virtue of being socialized in a heterosexist society, gay men may experience normative trauma (Harrison 1995 as cited in Levant 2011). The third category, *gender role dysfunction* proposes that socially desirable and acceptable characteristics associated with the male role (e.g., avoidance of femininity, homophobia, and aggression) can have negative consequences for either the males themselves or others because many of these characteristics are inherently negative. O'Neil (2008a) deemed this subtype as having the most theoretical relevance to GRC because it "implies negative outcomes from endorsing restrictive gender role norms" (p. 366).

There are numerous situational contexts in which GRC occurs. Men are proposed to have greater GRC when they experience one or more of several trajectories. First, they may have a gender role transition or face difficult developmental tasks over the life span. Second, they may deviate from or violate gender role norms

of masculinity ideology. Third, they may try to meet or fail to meet gender role norms of masculinity ideology. Fourth, they may note discrepancies between their real self-concepts and their ideal self-concepts, based on gender role stereotypes and masculinity ideology. Fifth, men may personally devalue, restrict, and/or violate themselves for failing to meet masculinity ideology norms. Sixth, they may experience personal devaluations, restrictions, and/or violations from others for conforming to or deviating from masculinity ideology. Seventh, and finally, men may personally devalue, restrict, and/or violate others because of their deviation from or conformity to masculinity ideology norms (O'Neil 2008a). These seven trajectories were, subsequently, refined into four categories: (a) GRC caused by gender role transitions, (b) GRC experienced intrapersonally (i.e., within the man), (c) GRC expressed *toward* others, and (d) GRC experienced *from* others (O'Neil 1990).

Regardless of the category, gender role conflict is characterized by devaluation, restriction, and violation. O'Neil (2008a) contends that gender role devaluations represent negative assessments of the self (or others) when conforming to, or deviating from, the attributes characteristic of traditional or hegemonic masculinity. Gender role restrictions constitute constraining oneself (or others) to stereotypic norms of masculinity ideology. Gender role violations occur when people harm themselves or others (or are harmed by others) when deviating from or conforming to gender role norms of masculinity ideology (O'Neil 2008a). Boys and men vary in the degree to which they endorse aspects of prescribed masculinity resulting in multifaceted strain and conflict (O'Neil et al. 1986). That is, "men who describe themselves differentially in terms of gender role characteristics may show differential aspects of gender role conflict" (O'Neil et al. 1986, p. 339). The experience of GRC is dependent on cultural-, age-, and cohort-specific definitions of masculine ideologies and gender role stereotypes (Kahn 2009).

GRC was theorized as having six elements that relate to gender role socialization and fear of femininity (O'Neil 1981b): (a) Restrictive Emotionality; (b) Restrictive Sexual and Affectionate Behavior; (c) Homophobia; (d) Socialized Control, Power, and Competition Issues; (e) Obsession with Achievement and Success; and (f) Health-Care Problems. Each of these elements will be outlined briefly.

Restricted Emotionality (RE) is defined as having difficulty expressing one's own feelings or denying others their right to emotional expression (O'Neil 1981b). RE implies that men will have difficulty giving up emotional control and being vulnerable to themselves, others, and new experiences. These deficits imply that some men will have difficulty in self-disclosure, recognizing feelings, and processing the complexities of interpersonal life.

Restrictive Sexual and Affectionate Behavior refers to having limited ways of expressing one's sexuality and affection toward others (O'Neil 1981b). For men, this is caused by their inability to express their "feminine" sides and also by rigidly adhering to masculine gender role norms and stereotypes (O'Neil 1981b).

Homophobia denotes a fear of gay men or an irrational concern that one may appear to be gay. Homophobia may prevent emotional intimacy between heterosexual men and may be a significant barrier to male self-disclosure and companionship (O'Neil 1981b).

Socialized Control, Power, and Competition Issues relate to men's socialized tendencies to dominate, control, and subordinate others (both men and women) in order to maintain their power and masculine role in relationships. The cost of being powerful, dominant, controlling, and competitive is usually high for men in interpersonal relationships, as it may lead to a loss of self-awareness, honesty, spontaneity, and emotional freedom because of the constant need to monitor and control a relationship (Nicholas 1975 as cited in O'Neil 1981b).

Obsession with Achievement and Success refers to men's preoccupation with work and reliance on their occupation to substantiate their sense of themselves as men (O'Neil 1981b). The primary means of becoming a success is through competing with others, using power and control, and demonstrating competence which is sometimes accompanied by obsessive fears of failure, workaholic behavior, and increased stress, which can produce emotional and physical problems for men (O'Neil 1981b).

These six elements blend to adversely "affect" men's physical and psychological well-being. Gender role stereotypes project men as tireless, invincible workers with superhuman limits; thus, many men have been socialized to ignore the physical symptoms that lead to acute illness or chronic health problems (O'Neil 1981a).

O'Neil et al. (1986) generated a total of 85 items to measure these six elements: Restrictive Emotionality ($N=15$); Health-Care Problems ($N=14$); Obsession with Achievement and Success ($N=16$); Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men ($N=17$); Control, Power, and Competition ($N=14$); and Homophobia ($N=7$). Three content experts reviewed the items, ensuring they referred specifically to gender-based rather than non-gender-based conflicts (O'Neil 1981a). A six-point Likert scale was employed, with response options ranging from $1=$ strongly disagree to $6=$ strongly agree. Items were then administered to 527 introductory psychology undergraduate students (mean age $=19.8$ years). A principal component analysis was conducted which resulted in a 37-item measure. The initial testing of the six theoretical elements of GRC previously mentioned produced four empirically derived subscales: Success, Power, and Competition (SPC); Restrictive Emotionality (RE); Restrictive Affectionate Behavior between Men (RABBM); and Conflict between Work and Family (CBWFR).

To assess the convergent validity of the GRCS, the measure has been correlated with many masculinity measures: Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS; Thompson and Pleck 1986), the Male Role Norm Inventory (MRNI; Levant et al. 1992 as cited in Levant 2011), and the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRS: Eisler and Skidmore 1987). The convergent validity of each subscale has been demonstrated. For example, the RABBM correlated significantly with the "Rejection of Homosexuals" subscale of the MRNI (Berger et al. 2005), the RE was significantly related to "Emotional Inexpressiveness" (Fischer and Good 1997), the CBWFR correlated significantly with "Marital Satisfaction" (Campbell and Snow 1992), and the SPC was significantly associated with "Performance Failure" (Fischer and Good 1997).

To investigate the dimensionality of the GRCS, a number of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) have been conducted. Good et al. (1995) supported a four-factor

solution after running CFAs on a sample of 401 and 535 participants. However, Rogers et al. (1997) questioned the suitability of Good et al.'s conclusions as the latter did not employ conventional criteria for acceptable model fit (i.e., Tucker-Lewis fit index = .83 for samples 2 and 3, respectively; RMSEA = .54 and .59 for samples 2 and 3, respectively; and AGFI = .83 and .80 for samples 2 and 3, respectively). Rogers et al. found similar results (i.e., a four-factor model was obtained); however, model fit statistics, again, fell short of advised guidelines (i.e., Tucker-Lewis fit index > .9; RMSEA < .50; AGFI > .90). Moradi et al. (2000) argue that the item/factor ratio of the GRCS was higher than recommended and, as a result, suggested that parceling of items within each factor should be carried out *prior* to running a CFA. A four-factor solution with better fit to the data was observed when rational (i.e., combining items within the same factor on the basis of similar content) and random (i.e., combining items within the same factor at random) parcel-level models were tested. However, Bandalos (2002) and Norwalk et al. (2011) argue that the use of item parceling may give inflated results because item parceling often increases the reliability scores and masks error. When parceling procedures were not applied, Moradi and associates observed results similar to those reported by Good et al. and Rogers et al. These researchers concluded that the similar dimensionality observed across all three studies provides support for the structural validity of the GRCS.

Norwalk et al. (2011) conducted a CFA on the GRCS with two independent samples (European American men, N = 483; African American men, N = 214). They used an alternative models approach to determine how many factors best fit the data, with results indicating that, in comparison to the other models tested, a four-factor solution offered better fit. Factorial invariance across the two samples revealed the models were the same, suggesting that GRCS' dimensionality was the same across both samples. However, similar to past research, the authors reported that most fit indexes failed to meet recommended cutoff values (Good et al. 1995; Rogers et al. 1997; Moradi et al. 2000).

Three modified versions of the GRCS exist: (a) a short-form measure and (b) an adolescent measure and its Korean counterpart. Each measure will be discussed briefly.

Short-Form Version. Wester et al. (2012) developed a short-form version of the GRCS (GRCS-SF). An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the GRCS items (37 items) using a random sample of participants (N = 399) from previously published studies (Total N = 1,415; Wester et al. 2006a, b; Wester et al. 2005; Wester et al. 2007). A four-factor model was forced and items with the highest loadings on each factor were retained (4 items per factor, 16 items in total). The reliability coefficients of the factors were RE = .77, RABBM = .78, SPC = .80, and CBWFR = .77. A confirmatory factor analysis then was conducted on the 16 items using the remaining sample of 1,031. The four-factor model was supported with acceptable scores on a number of fit indexes (e.g., CFI = .96; TLI = .96; RMSEA = .057) and was superior to a one-factor model. Using a separate sample of 495 college students, the researchers examined the correlations between the

GRCS and the GRCS-SF. They found the two measures to be significantly related and the corresponding subscales of each measure to be substantially correlated (range = .90–.96). Unfortunately, the authors appear to have computed these correlations between the short and long forms using the *same* sample. As noted by Smith et al. (2000), this is a common "methodological sin" (p. 105) because it invariably inflates the resultant correlation coefficients (i.e., the items in the short form are being counted twice).

An adolescent version of the GRCS also was developed (GRCS-A; Blazina et al. 2005). A sample of 464 male students (aged 13–18; $M = 16.2$ years) completed measures of masculinity (Male Role Attitude Scale; MRAS; Thompson and Pleck 1986), psychological distress (Conners-Wells' Adolescent Self-Report Scale; CASS, Conners and Wells 1997), the GRCS (adult), and the adapted measure (GRCS-A). The latter consisted of original GRCS (adult) items and an unspecified number of altered items. Item content was adjusted to ensure they were "developmentally appropriate" for an adolescent population (e.g., "When I am sexually involved with others, I do not express my strong feelings" was modified to "When I am personally involved with others, I do not express my strong feelings"). An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the items, resulting in 29 retained items and a four-factor solution that accounted for 40.9 % of the total variance. The observed four-factor solution consisted of factors equivalent to those reported for the GRCS, three of which were renamed to capture what the cluster of items represented (i.e., the CBWFR subscale was named "Conflict Between Work, School, and Family" [CBWSF]; "Success, Power, and Competition" was renamed "Need for Success and Achievement" [NSA]; and the RABBM was named "Restricted Affection Between Men" [RAM]). Scale score reliability coefficients ranged from .70 to .82 and test-retest reliability scores were .60 for CBWSF, .95 for NSA, .83 for RAM, and .87 for RE. The GRCS-A correlated strongly with the GRCS ($r = .88$) and modestly with the MRAS ($r = .37$). However, the former correlation may be inflated given the "methodological sin" (Smith et al. 2000) alluded to earlier (i.e., some of the same items were being measured in the short and long forms). Finally, Blazina et al. (2007) observed significant correlations between the GRCS-A and the Adolescent Masculine Ideology in Relationships Scale (AMIRS; Chu et al. 2005; $r = .45$).

The GRCS-A has been adapted for use in other cultural contexts such as Korea (K-GRCS-A: Kim et al. 2009). Kim et al. translated the 29-item GRCS-A to Korean, with items back translated to English by a bilingual translator. A third translator verified the translation and back translation and one of the items (i.e., "It's hard for me to express my emotional needs to others") was identified as having a potentially different connotation from the original item. Cronbach alpha coefficients for the four subscales ranged from .67 to .80, and scores on the K-GRCS-A correlated positively with measures of depression ($r = .29$) and anxiety ($r = .48$) and negatively with self-esteem ($r = -.29$). Further research using the K-GRCS-A found that self-esteem mediated the relationship between gender role conflict and depression; that is, individuals experiencing greater levels of conflict evidenced lower levels of self-esteem which, in turn, was associated with greater levels of depression (Choi et al. 2010).