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ABSTRACT

Male victims are an underrepresented group within society as research within victimology primarily focuses on female victims and services available typically cater to female populations. This study focuses on male victims and draws attention to the role that victimization may play in criminal offending. Prior research has found that male victims may feel a diminished sense of their own masculinity. While other studies have noted that masculinity plays a role in some men’s decisions to engage in criminal behavior (Messerschmidt, 1993, 2016). It seems logical that these two concepts (masculinity and victimization) would be related. Utilizing self-reported data from 135 college males, the current study analyzes the relationship between childhood victimization, masculinity beliefs, and the decision to engage in criminal/delinquent behavior. Bivariate and multivariate analyses will be utilized to measure the correlation and relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Future research directions and implications are given following the presentation of the findings.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Men are being victimized and society is not talking about it. Most frequently, men are portrayed as the perpetrators of crime rather than the victims (Newburn & Stanko, 1995). A slowly growing body of research has shown that there is in fact a sizeable body of victimized males (Weiss, 2010; Wood, 2004; Wolff, Shi, & Siegel, 2009). The National Criminal Victimization Survey (NCVS)’s annual report found that 5 in every 1,000 men are a victim of serious violent crime (Truman & Morgan, 2016). For violent crime, the rate increases to 16 of every 1,000 men. For females, the rates are 8 in 1,000 and 21 in 1,000 respectively (Truman & Morgan, 2016). While the statistics show that females are victimized on average more often than men, the male population of victims cannot be ignored.

Victimology has taken major strides in the past few decades in researching and describing female victimization. Time and time again, men are being left out of the narrative. The studies that have been conducted about male victimization show a trend, which states that men who are victimized have a diminished ideal of their masculinity (Andersen, 2011; Dunn, 2012; Weiss, 2010). This trend may have important implications in regards to male criminal behavior, as Messerschmidt (1993) found that juvenile boys will engage in delinquent behavior in an effort to “do their gender” when they are unable to do their gender through legitimate means (i.e. education or employment). It is possible that this diminished sense of masculinity could be driving male criminality. If there is a connection between a victimized male’s diminished masculinity and their criminal behavior, then society has been overlooking a cycle of victimization that is perpetuating the crime issue.
This cycle may help to explain a portion of the gender gap found in crime. While research has attempted to understand the rate in which women commit crime, studies have shown that men consistently commit crimes at higher rates than women (Lauritsen & Heimer, 2008; Steffensmeier, Zhong, Ackerman, Schwartz, & Agha, 2006). This may be in part to the masculinity aspect of social identity that is a part of the male experience and is absent in the female narrative. Criminological theory supports the belief that masculinity is important when it comes to criminal behavior (Agnew, 2006), also feminist research has indicated that boys and men will engage in criminal behavior if they are unable to “do their gender” through legitimate means (Messerschmidt, 1993; 2016).

In this study I sought to examine whether prior victimization experiences diminish men’s beliefs of their own masculinity, which subsequently led them to engage in criminal behavior in an attempt to make up for their diminished masculinity. It seems reasonable that criminal behavior occurs as victimized males attempt to “do gender” as a result of their diminished masculinity. To offer a context for this research, I will briefly explain the social construction of hegemonic masculinity (which is crucial to understanding ideals of masculinity), the theoretical framework surrounding masculinity and general strain theory, and previous research on male victimization.

Utilizing a quasi-experimental design, I assessed the relationships between victimization, masculinity beliefs, and the perpetration of criminal behavior. Data for this study was gathered from 135 undergraduate students at a large, southwestern university. Bivariate and multivariate statistics were utilized to measure the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Following the discussion of the findings, I present the limitations of the study as well as future research directions.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The current study utilizes an integrated theory, which includes theories of masculinity, feminist criminology, and general strain theory, to explain the relationship between childhood abuse, masculinity beliefs, and the perpetration of criminal behavior. The current section will provide overviews of these various theoretical concepts, as well as, an overview of prior research that showcases the relationship between victimization and masculinity.

Hegemony

Prior to discussing the concepts of hegemonic masculinity, one must first understand the term “hegemony.” Hegemony refers to a structured system that involves the subordination and oppression of the lower classes by the controlling class (Gramsci, 1971). Through this process, the hegemonic class reinforces their dominant position through the subordination of the lower classes (Saull, 2010). The idea of hegemony was highly utilized by Antonio Gramsci. While Gramsci’s ideas focused primarily on the concept of hegemony in capitalist economies (1971), his works have since inspired the use of hegemonic frameworks in other disciplines. One such example of this adaptation of Gramsci’s ideas is R.W. Connell’s concept of hegemonic masculinity (2005).

Hegemonic Masculinity

Hegemonic masculinity is a sociological term first coined in 1987 by R.W. Connell. The concept refers to the power structure within a patriarchal society, or in other words, a society dominated by men (Connell, 2005; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Men vie to be at the top of this societal masculinity hierarchy. It is believed that those at the top of the hierarchy are seen as the strongest and have the most resources within society. Men at the top of this hierarchy often
hold positions of power and are thus more secure financially and socially (Connell, 2005). It should be noted that Connell bases her concept of hegemonic masculinity off of traditionally Western ideals of masculinity (e.g., toughness, aggression, domination of women, etc.).

![Diagram of Hegemonic Masculinity]

**Figure 1.** Hegemonic Masculinity (Connell, 2005)

Within this hierarchy, there are a multitude of different roles that a man may take. For example, a man may realize that he does not have the highest intellect or body strength. Because of this he takes a position of complicit masculinity, where he does not obtain the highest ascendant rank, but due to his position in the hierarchy, he still receives some of the benefits bestowed by the patriarchy (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Complicit masculinities are not at the top of the hierarchy, but take a position slightly underneath it. Men within the complicit masculinity construct may be in relationships where they share some of the housework or duties with their wife or girlfriend (Connell, 2005). These men do not believe that their wives or
girlfriends are above or below them, but may not believe in social ideas such as feminism (Connell, 2005).

Located below complicit masculinity status on the hierarchy are the subordinated masculinities. Subordinated masculinities often consist of the males that are dominated by other males in society (Connell, 2005). Most frequently this group consists of gay males. Not only are gay males often belittled by homophobic ideals, but also laws (such as sodomy statutes) and religious ideals that frequently attack gay males for their sexuality (Connell, 2005). It is believed that gay males are frequently subordinated due to the fact that the males in the hegemonic status frequently attribute the gay lifestyle to femininity (Connell, 2005). This belittlement and oppression helps the males within the hegemonic group to gain dominance over the subordinated group. A study conducted by Dunn in 2012 found that some gay males will hide their sexuality and, in certain instances, participate in the victimization of other gay males in an effort to keep their masculinities intact when in groups of straight males.

At the bottom of the masculinity hierarchy are the marginalized masculinities. Minority groups and lower-class males make up this category. Hegemonic masculinity is typically defined by middle- or upper class, heterosexual white males (Connell, 2005). Because of this, most minorities or lower-class males do not make it further up the masculinity hierarchy. This is often attributed to a lack of financial opportunities and institutionalized racism (Connell, 2005). Males within the hegemonic domain often hold positions of power (e.g. political, building ownership) and utilize these positions to oppress those who do not fit the hegemonic ideals (Connell, 2005). Because of these social forces, minority groups will frequently develop their own masculinity ideals in order to feel successful as males (Connell, 2005).
Two examples of this developed masculinity can be seen in African American and Latino groups. Elijah Anderson (1999) details the idea of African American masculinity in his book, *Code of the Street: Decency Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. In his book, Anderson asserts that in inner-city African American communities respect is extremely important and is seen as a resource that can be obtained by those willing to engage in violence if necessary (Anderson, 1999). This level of respect is often measured through an individual’s appearance, clothing, vehicle, money, etc. and is often termed as “juice.” “Juice” may also be earned through the dominance of women and the use of violence (Anderson, 1999; Mitchell, Fahmy, Pyrooz, & Decker, 2017). Men perceived to have high levels of juice rank highly within their subculture. Because of this, it is these males that are seen as the most dangerous by their peers (Anderson, 1999).

Latino communities have also developed their own ideals of masculinity. The two types of masculinity that have been developed in Latino communities are machismo and caballerismo (Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, & Tracey, 2008). Machismo is described as aggressive, sexist, chauvinistic, and hypermasculine (Arciniega, et al., 2008). Caballerismo is the inverse and focuses on nurturing, being family centered and chivalrous to women (Arciniega, et al., 2008). Antisocial behavior and low education are often attributed to a Latino male adopting the machismo masculinity (Arciniega, et al., 2008). While both the African American and Latino masculinities differ from the traditional white hegemonic masculinity, they all share the characteristics of hypermasculinity, risk-taking, and the subordination of women.

Within primarily white populations, hegemonic masculinity can be seen as the currently accepted strategy to earn the highest rank of masculinity (Connell, 2005, p. 77). Connell states that masculinity is fluid and what may be the highest rank of masculinity at one point in time
may not stay that way forever (Connell, 2005, p. 77). At times the current group that makes up hegemonic masculinity may be weakened and a new strategy of masculinity will take its place.

Gender Norms

Gender norms must be understood if one is to fully grasp the effect that hegemonic masculinity has on male populations. Gender norms, in regards to males, are the different ways in which masculinity can be acted out (Lindsey, 2011). These norms include not only attitudes towards certain groups or beliefs, but also behavior. A cross-cultural study of masculine and feminine gender norms found that male norms typically consisted of antifeminine beliefs, dominance over women, toughness, aggression, and autonomy (Williams & Best, 1990).

Antifeminine Beliefs

It is commonly found within the hegemonic masculinity that the men occupying this position in the hierarchy attempt to subordinate women and stigmatize feminine behavior (Lindsey, 2011). This norm is perhaps the most overarching norm as most male gender norms place men above women within society. It is from this belief that the stigmatization and subordination of gay men is developed (Wilczak, 2017). This belief that men should not act feminine has been found across multiple cultures (Williams & Best, 1990).

Interpersonal Relations

This norm focuses on how men will interact with women and other men. Often men will not attempt to rely on other men for emotional support (Lindsey, 2011). This is due to the fact that boys are socialized at an early age by their male role models to be tough and maintain a certain emotional distance from other men. This belief, coupled with the avoidance of femininity, often leads most men to become emotionally isolated (Lindsey, 2011; Wilczak,
Anger is socially acceptable to show to other men, but a man may be seen as weak if he shows sadness or attempts to build an emotional relationship with another man.

**Success**

Masculinity may be measured by a man’s ability to move forward in the work force and provide for his family (Lindsey, 2011; Wilczak, 2017). Traditionally, men view themselves as the “breadwinner” or provider in a relationship (Cleaver, 2018). A man’s success not only heightens his masculinity by providing for those he cares for, but also the success he has over other men around him. For example, if a man works the same job as another man and makes more money, he may feel as though he is subordinating the other man and thus his masculinity is heightened that much more. It should be noted that a man’s success is also measured by the occupation in which he earns that success (Lindsey, 2011). If a man earns success through a typically feminine occupation (e.g., hair stylist, elementary school teacher, etc.) then his masculinity may not be heightened and may even be subordinated (Lindsey, 2011).

A man may be measured by his intellectual success as well as his economic success. It is a particular belief within the hegemonic norm that men should be smarter than women (Lindsey, 2011; Wilczak, 2017). A woman who surpasses a man intellectually may be seen as a threat to that man’s masculinity.

**Toughness and Aggression**

Toughness and aggression are the typical gender norms that are thought of when the topic of masculinity is brought up. Men are often seen as protectors and leaders (Connell, 2005; Lindsey, 2011; Wilczak, 2017). If a man is unable to protect himself, or those around him, then he may be seen as feminine and thus subordinated. Self-confidence is important when talking about toughness as a man that lacks self-confidence is often seen as weak (Lindsey, 2011).
Aggression is often tied into toughness and the ability to defend oneself. If a man is not aggressive and does not act first in a physical situation, then he may not be seen as tough (Connell, 2005; Lindsey, 2011; Messerschmidt, 1993, 2012). Aggression also plays into a man’s risk-taking behavior. If a man is not aggressive, then he may not be willing to take the chance on an opportunity that may provide financial or intellectual success. Violent behavior can provide an outlet for boys and men to prove their heterosexual masculine prowess (Messerschmidt, 2012). Society often perpetuates the beliefs of toughness and aggression through rewarding those who take risks with titles such as “hero” or “patriot” (Lindsey, 2011; Wilczak, 2017).

**Sexual Prowess**

A man’s heterosexual sexual prowess also plays a very important role within the masculinity hierarchy. Having a large number of sexual partners implies that a man is desirable to women and is able to have high levels of reproductive success. As men emerge from adolescence, they begin to realize that having an increased number of sexual partners is a way to earn the respect of other males and subordinate those men with lower levels of sexual partners (Lindsey, 2011). According to Kimmel, young men compete for a higher number of sexual partners (2008). This peer support for having a high number of sexual partners reiterates the traditional gender norms regarding sexual prowess.

Sexual prowess is also a way for heterosexual men to subordinate women. Men may be sexually aggressive and attempt to coerce women into having sex with them as a form of subordination (Lindsey, 2011). This belief is reinforced through the viewing of pornography, a frequent occurrence during the late stages of adolescence, which typically places women into subservient or submissive roles. The sexual harassment of women may also occur as a method of sexual domination (Lindsey, 2011).
When a man struggles to meet these gender norms, he may feel as though he is less of a man or may be subordinated by men that are within the hegemonic status (Lindsey, 2011). When these situations occur, the man may feel as though he has a masculinity deficit. If the male lacks the opportunities to make up this deficit, then he may turn to delinquent behavior or crime as a method of increasing his masculinity or “doing gender” (Messerschmidt, 1993).

The Cycle of Violence Hypothesis

The cycle of violence hypothesis, previously named the violence begets violence theory, was first conceptualized in the 1960’s and became fully formulated in 1989 by Cathy Widom. The cycle of violence hypothesis states that individuals who are victims of child abuse will grow up to perpetrate similar behavior as an adult (Widom, 1989). This process is often explained utilizing Bandura’s social learning theory which states that behavior is learned from role models, often parents or guardians, and then a choice is made to engage in similar behavior (Higgins & Marcum, 2016). Empirical studies have found support for this hypothesis over the past two decades (e.g., Heyman & Smith-Slep, 2002; Jennings, Zgoba, Maschi, & Reingle, 2014; Misheva, Webbink, & Martin, 2017; Reckdenwald, Mancini, & Beauregard, 2013).

More recently, research into the cycle of violence has attempted to discern whether the cycle of violence has a stronger impact on males and females. Thus far, studies have been fairly inconclusive as to whether there is a major difference between male and female populations. Early research into the subject found that females were more strongly impacted by the “cycle” (Hubbard & Pratt, 2002; Maxfield & Widom, 1996). Maxfield and Widom (1996) found that girls who faced childhood abuse were much more likely to engage in criminal behavior later in life than boys. Hubbard and Pratt (2002) found that both childhood physical and sexual abuse were strong indicators of adult antisocial behavior in female populations.
In 2012, Topitzes, Mersky, and Reynolds attempted to discern gendered differences in the cycle of violence by utilizing mixed-gender and gender-specific models, which looked at early childhood maltreatment and later violent behavior. The results of their study showed that male victims had a higher rate of juvenile delinquency than girls, but both males and females had increased levels of criminal behavior as adults if they were victims of childhood abuse (Topitzes, Mersky, & Reynolds, 2012).

While prior research has muddied the waters in regards to whether the cycle of violence affects males or females more, it has provided enough evidence to support a relationship between early childhood abuse and the perpetration of violent behavior as an adult. That being said, prior research has failed to account for the gendered differences between males and females, specifically in regards to the impact that masculinity and femininity has on decisions to engage in criminal behavior. It is possible that there is a spurious relationship within the cycle of violence and that masculine/feminine ideals are influencing the later life criminal behavior, rather than the childhood abuse, directly.

Masculinities and Crime

According to Messerschmidt’s 1993 text, *Masculinities and Crime*, men commit crime as a means of “doing gender.” “Doing gender” can be defined as the process or action that a male commits in an attempt to strengthen his masculinity when other opportunities for masculinity are not present (Messerschmidt, 1993). In the social world, a man’s masculinity is judged based on his behavior and appearance (Messerschmidt, 1993). When a man walks into a room, people may judge his masculinity based off of his physicality or the expensiveness of his clothing. When men are unable to accomplish their masculinities through clothing, sex appeal, or employment, they may turn to crime in an attempt to “do their gender.”
In addition to the importance of gender, identities associated with class, race, and age are important in understanding why criminal behavior occurs. In his studies, Messerschmidt found that boys of different race and class groups engage in different types of criminal behavior. Under the hegemonic masculinity ideal, white, middle-class boys are afforded more opportunity to “do their gender” in legal ways. Based off of the past success of their parents and other members of their race, they are more able to accomplish masculinity through sports and academic success. These boys often have strong parental figures that support their academic achievements and push them to strive for the highest grades possible. Thus they conform to school rules in an effort to best support their academic achievements (Messerschmidt, 1993).

Another such example of the race-class combination is the white, working-class boys (Messerschmidt, 1993). These boys see the school structure as emasculating, due to the fact they have a hard time succeeding with their studies. Because of this, they engage in delinquent acts such as truancy and vandalism in an attempt to “do their gender” by getting back at the emasculating authority. To this group, any attack against the emasculating institutions will increase their masculinity (Messerschmidt, 1993). If the boy is afforded an opportunity for employment, they may cease the disruptive behavior and “do their gender” through their occupation. This is due to the fact that they can find success, and therefore masculinity, through financial gain.

Finally, Messerschmidt describes the lower-working class and racial-minority boys (1993). These groups are afforded the least opportunity in society and do not see an opportunity to “do their gender” either inside school or through employment. Instead, these boys attempt to heighten their masculinity through acts on the street. According to Messerschmidt, these groups of boys are more likely to engage in violent behavior as a form of extreme opposition to the
emasculating authority (1993). These groups of boys feel marginalized by the emasculating authority. This ties back to the masculinity ideals of hegemonic masculinity as the authorities in the hegemonic role of masculinity are forcing the lower-working class boys into a marginalized masculinity.

Messerschmidt later expanded his theoretical ideas to include the interplay between masculinity and race, class, and sexuality (2016). He argues that the man’s race, class, or sexuality will oftentimes influence hegemonic masculine ideals. Hegemonic masculine norms (e.g., toughness, aggression, sexual prowess, etc.) are most frequently generated by the dominating class, typically white, middle-class, heterosexual males. When these norms are threatened, or an individual is unable to meet these norms, they may turn to criminal behavior (Messerschmidt, 2016). Utilizing historical records, Messerschmidt provides examples of how masculine ideals may lead to criminal behavior.

One such example of hegemonic masculinity occurred during the reconstruction era of the United States following the American Civil War (Messerschmidt, 2016). Following the end of the Civil War, there was a large increase in the number of lynchings committed against African Americans. Messerschmidt states that this increase in lynchings occurred due to the fact that African American males gaining more rights challenged the traditional hegemonic masculine norms (2016). White males would often band together and target African American males in an attempt to assert dominance over that group. Through lynching, white males were able to subordinate African American males through fear.

Messerschmidt ties this to political, economic, and sexual hegemonic spheres (2016). Following the Civil War, African American males were allowed more opportunity to pursue political and entrepreneurial roles. The influx of African American males into these spheres
challenged the traditional hegemonic ideals that both placed and kept white males in power (Messerschmidt, 2016). Threatening or lynching successful African American males helped to keep these arenas “white” and deterred many African Americans from pursuing these social roles out of fear.

Messerschmidt also asserts that many of the early white supremacy groups founded themselves off of the idea that they were protecting white women (2016). He ties this back to the “chivalric” or “protector” idea that often appears within heteronormative patriarchal societies. In other words, women are defenseless and it is a man’s duty to protect women from harm. In this instance it was rape by the African American male that women needed to be protected from. Often the accusation of rape by an African American man was enough evidence needed for these white supremacy groups to lynch the accused (Messerschmidt, 2016). One other interesting area of note is that white women were not exempt from scrutiny for interracial relations. In some instances, assuming they were given a fair trial, African American men would be found not guilty for a rape charge if the white woman had consented to sex with an African American man in the past. This is due to the fact that the woman was seen as worse than the man because she was shunning her protectors and going against the traditional hegemonic norms (Messerschmidt, 2016).

Moving forward to the late 1980’s, Messerschmidt analyzed how hegemonic masculinity played a role in the Challenger space shuttle tragedy (2016). In his analysis, Messerschmidt focused on the interplay between masculinity and job positions and how that dynamic affected the decision to launch the shuttle when there was clear evidence that indicated the dangers of a launch.
After a series of delays, the final decision to launch the Challenger shuttle came down to five managers at Morton Thiokol, Inc. (MTI), the company in charge of building the shuttle. During this meeting two engineers from MTI pleaded with the managers to delay the launch until an issue with an O-ring on the shuttle could be solved, otherwise there was a high likelihood of the shuttle exploding during launch. After repeatedly pleading their case, the engineers gave up once they realized that the managers would not change their minds. Ultimately, the five managers agreed to launch the shuttle, which led to the shuttle’s explosion on takeoff.

Messerschmidt asserts that masculinity played a major role in the managers’ decision to launch the shuttle (2016). He states that men within managerial positions showcase their masculinity by showing that they are in control and are willing to take risks (Messerschmidt, 2016). Delaying the launch in order to fix the issue would result in a loss of money to MTI and the federal government. In addition there was the possibility that MTI would lose their government contract if the launch was further delayed. These monetary losses would make the managers appear “weak”, which in turn would be a blow to their masculinity. This, Messerschmidt states, was the driving factor in the managers’ decision to launch the shuttle. If the shuttle launch was successful, even though evidence was strongly against it, the managers would be lauded for their risk-taking and successful protection of MTI and it’s contracts (Messerschmidt, 2016).

This begs the question as to why the engineers would be against the launch. After all, the engineers were white, heterosexual men as well. Messerschmidt states that while these engineers were doing their gender through their career, their method of doing gender took a different form than the managers due to their job position (2016). The engineers prided themselves on overcoming technological issues and having completed the work that led to successful shuttle
launches. Risk-taking was not a part of their method of doing gender. If the engineers approved a launch when they knew that there was a significant chance of the loss of either money or life, then they would appear as failures because they did not properly do their jobs (Messerschmidt, 2016). Thus the engineers pleaded with the managers until they realized that it was a lost cause.

As evidenced, masculinity can play a major factor in a man’s decisions to engage in criminal activity. The influence of masculinity does not appear to be limited to just violent crimes or property crimes, as the managers at MTI committed a major white-collar crime. Whether it is on the streets, as shown by Elijah Anderson (1993), or in the conference room deciding the fate of the Challenger shuttle, masculinity is a driving factor in many criminal decisions.

General Strain Theory

Further expanding the interplay between masculinity and crime is Robert Agnew’s General Strain Theory (2006). Agnew’s theory focuses on how experienced strains influence an individual’s decision to commit crime. He defines “strains” as any event or condition that is generally disliked by an individual (Agnew, 2006). While every individual will face strains within their lifetime, Agnew asserts that there are three specific types of strains that are more conducive to criminal behavior.

The three types of strain most conducive to criminal behavior are: when an individual is treated in a negative manner by others, when an individual loses something that they value, or if an individual is unable to achieve their goals (Agnew, 2006). In particular, these strains are more likely to lead to criminal behavior if they are seen as high in magnitude, are viewed as unjust, associated with low social control, and create pressure or incentive for the individual to use crime as a coping mechanism (Agnew, 2006). It should be noted that strains may be
classified as either objective or subjective. Objective strains are conditions that generally anyone in society will dislike, such as poverty. Subjective strains, on the other hand, refer to conditions that an individual may find strenuous that others may not.

The works of Albert Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960) may be used to explain how class and a lack of legitimate opportunities can lead to delinquent behavior in juvenile populations. Both of these theories focus on delinquent subcultures that may be created when lower-class boys attempt to move up to the middle class. According to Cohen, boys who attempt to move from the lower class to the middle class may face social barriers when attempting to integrate into these groups (1955). This occurs due to the fact that these lower class boys may not have the education or upbringing that is accepted by the middle class boys. Due to this disregard by the middle class, the lower class boys will begin to associate with other boys who have been shunned by the middle class (Cohen, 1955). Often times this grouping of boys will rebel against the middle class and engage in delinquent behavior as a means of getting back at the middle class for their dismissal.

Shortly after Cohen’s work, Cloward and Ohlin utilized Robert Merton’s strain framework to explain juvenile delinquency. They assert that boys will engage in delinquent behavior when there is a lack of legitimate means within society for them to prove their success (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). For example, a boy may be a hard worker, yet there are simply not any jobs available to employ him. This lack of opportunity leads to frustration and in turn will cause him to act out. This strain then leads the boy to join one of three types of delinquent subcultures: criminal, conflict, or retreatist (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). The criminal subculture focused most heavily on organized crime where success was based upon monetary success through crime. Conflict subculture was often characterized by more violent crime, such as
assault and robbery. It is often the case that success within this group is measured by violence. Those within the retreatist subculture often heavily used alcohol and drugs. Boys within this group may be seen as the least “criminal” as they had failed at success both through legitimate and illegitimate means. The type of group that the boy joined was largely dependent upon which peers he associated with (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960).

The works of Agnew, Cohen, and Cloward and Ohlin showcase how strain can influence boy’s decisions to engage in criminal behavior. There is an inherent need for acceptance in male populations. As Cohen showcased, boys in the lower class felt the need to find acceptance. If they could not find this acceptance in the middle class, then they were likely to turn to a delinquent group that would accept them (Cohen, 1955). Cloward and Ohlin found that boys were likely to turn to illegitimate means to earn social acceptance if they could not find that acceptance through traditional means (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). While not yet tested, it seems logical that the findings of Messerschmidt’s work could inform these theories. Based off of Messerschmidt’s assertions, it seems logical that this need for social acceptance derives from the gendered need to prove success in male populations. This need comes directly from the socialized ideals of masculinity in western cultures (Messerschmidt, 1993, 2016).

Childhood abuse and neglect has been identified as one of the strains most likely to lead to criminal behavior as a coping mechanism (Agnew, 2006; Belknap & Holsinger; 2006; Bunch, Iratzoqui, & Watts, 2017; Iratzoqui, 2015; Watts & McNulty, 2013). Belknap and Holsinger (2006) found that childhood abuse was a major predictor of delinquent behavior, regardless of gender. While girls in their study reported higher rates of victimization, the abuse still seemed to have an impact on male juvenile delinquency. This is due to the fact that childhood abuse is often seen as unjust and high in magnitude to the victim (Iratzoqui, 2015). Because the victim is
a young age, they may lack the resources to cope with this strain in a legal manner. In order to reduce their victimization, the youth may choose to run away or engage in other delinquent behaviors (Iratzoqui, 2015).

Agnew states that general strain theory may be able to describe why men commit crime at a higher rate than women. The gender disparity is not due to the fact that men experience more strains, as prior research has indicated that women report experiencing strains at a rate either equal to or higher than men (Agnew, 2006). Instead the disparity is due to the fact that men experience gender-specific strains that are more conducive to crime than women. Often these strains relate directly to their masculinity.

Tying directly into Messerschmidt’s work, Agnew states that males are more likely to have trouble achieving goals that are conducive to crime (Agnew, 2006). Many of these goals are tied directly into masculine ideals such as monetary success and autonomy. The repeat failure to achieve these goals may lead the man/boy to feel as though he is failing to be a “man.” This continual strain may lead him to view crime as the only coping mechanism for their diminished masculinity. An excellent example of this may be found in the lower class and racial minority boys of Messerschmidt’s study. These boys engaged in criminal behavior since they were unable to succeed academically or obtain employment (Messerschmidt, 1993). The failure to succeed through academics or employment was a repeat attack on their masculinity, thus they engaged in criminal behavior to make up for their diminished masculinity.

Under a strain framework it seems logical that boys who are victims of childhood abuse will feel a diminished sense of their own masculinity. As Agnew explained, child abuse is a strain that is likely to influence the individual to commit crime. To the boy this abuse seems high in magnitude and extremely unjust (Agnew, 2006; Bunch, Iratzoqui, & Watts, 2017;
Iratzoqui, 2015). When combining this idea with the traditional gender norms it makes sense that the boy would feel a diminished sense of his own masculinity. The fact the he was unable to defend himself from the abuse means that he was not tough or aggressive enough to fend off the perpetrator. The magnitude of this abuse may increase if the boy is victimized by another male. This is due to the fact that his masculinity was directly impacted by another male. In other words, the perpetrator proved that he was the stronger male. I believe it is possible that the boy may continue to feel a diminished masculinity because of his victimization. Criminal behavior is viewed as inherently masculine (Messerschmidt, 2016) and may provide the boy an opportunity to heighten his masculinity.

The study of the gendered outcomes of child abuse under a strain framework is not uncommon, but studies fail to account for the impact of childhood abuse on masculinity. From an early age the traditional masculine norms are socialized into boys, but the question remains as to what impact victimization has on young boys. If from an early age boys feel as though they are failing to meet the masculine expectations due to their victimization, then they may continually feel the strain of failing to achieve these norms. It is this continual strain that may lead them to feel as though they must commit delinquent or criminal behavior to cope with their diminished masculinity.

Male Victimization

Research within victimology has primarily focused on experiences of women rather than men (Graham, 2006). More often than not, the man is discussed as the offender or aggressor rather than the victim of crime, especially in instances of sexual assault (Newburn & Stanko, 1995). This is problematic as research is lacking on an entire population of victims. Weiss (2010) found that 9% of victims of sexual assault were men. While this 9% is not the majority of
sexual assault victims, it is a sizeable body of the sexual assault victim population. It is possible that there may be an even larger population of men that have not reported their victimization due to society’s stigma of male victims (King & Woollett, 1997; Weiss, 2010). Based on this trend, it begs the question of how many unknown male victims there are in society.

Research into male victimization has brought forward relationships between victimization and changes in the victim’s beliefs of their own masculinity (Andersen, 2011; Dunn, 2012; Weiss, 2010). Weiss (2010) found that some men would refuse to report their sexual assaults to the police because the abuse made them doubt their masculinity and that it could be threatened further if they reported their incident to the police. In addition she found that men would play up the more masculine activities related to their assault, such as heavy drinking, in an effort to make them sound more masculine and less like a victim. In Andersen’s (2011) study, he found that some males believed that they were a failure as a man if they were unable to fend off their aggressor. In the case of gay men, a study found that men who had been victimized due to their sexuality felt that they had a diminished masculinity unless they were able to reconstruct a non-victim identity (Dunn, 2012). This non-victim identity allowed the victim to become a subordinated masculinity where they did not reap the benefits of being part of the hegemonic class, but were able to feel safer in the male hierarchy.

A study by Wood (2004) found that men who committed interpersonal violence were in fact victims of interpersonal violence by their spouses. Often this would take the form of verbal assaults by their wife, but in some instances would take the form of a physical attack. A common narrative among her sample group was that the man’s spouse “disrespected them as a man” (Wood, 2004). This implies that the men engaged in interpersonal violence to compensate for their diminished masculinity. When looking at the findings of this study through the
theoretical lens provided by Messerschmidt and Agnew, it appears that the men acted aggressively due to the strain placed on them by their partner emasculating them.

Heber (2017) found through qualitative interviews that men were uncomfortable in sharing information related to their prior victimization. Participants would often attempt to leave the interview or change the subject to focus on their prior usage of violence against other men (Heber, 2017). This behavior ties into the aforementioned gender norms in multiple ways. The men are being victimized and thus their masculinity is questioned as they may be seen to lack toughness or aggression. By focusing on their prior usage of violence, the participants are attempting to heighten their masculinity and appear as less of a victim (Heber, 2017). The findings of this study should not go ignored, as they show that the man is attempting to shun the potential feminine stigma that may be placed on him.

These studies have shown that victimization does have an impact on a man’s masculine identity. When looked at through the hegemonic masculinity lens, it is apparent that a man may be subordinated out of hegemonic status by their victimization. This subordination may come from the physical dominance of another man as well as the traditional theme of women being victims (Lindsey, 2011). Male gender norms play a role here as being a victim is seen as feminine and the hegemonic status attempts to avoid femininity. Men may be victimizing other men in order to subordinate them and move towards the hegemonic status. This idea of crime as a method to “do gender” is showcased in Messerschmidt’s work.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Current Study

Based off of the prior literature, there is compelling evidence that a boy/man’s masculinity can be diminished due to victimization. Under the concept of hegemonic masculinity, male victims may feel as though they are no longer at a state of hegemonic masculinity and instead feel that they are now a part of a subordinated or marginalized masculinity. Prior literature has not successfully linked diminished feelings of masculinity after victimization with the process of “doing gender” through crime.

The overall goal of this research study is to explain male criminality by assessing the impact that early victimization has on a man’s masculinity and how that diminished masculinity influences their decision to engage in criminal behavior. The research questions and hypotheses for the current study are as follows:

Research Question 1: Do men who experience physical victimization have a lower adherence to masculinity norms?

Research Question 2: Do men who experience neglect have a lower adherence to masculinity norms?

Research Question 3: Do men who experience sexual victimization have a lower adherence to masculinity norms?

Hypothesis 1: Men with lower ideals of their own masculinity will engage in criminal behavior at an increased rate.

Hypothesis 2: Victimization decreases a man’s belief in his own masculinity, which leads him to engage in criminal behavior in an effort to “do gender.”
The framework for these hypotheses and research questions are outlined in the following model.
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**Figure 2.** Theoretical Framework

For the purposes of this study, victimization will be categorized as three separate independent variables: physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect. Physical victimization will be defined as any instance in which physical harm was inflicted on the participant as a child. Sexual victimization is any instance in which the participant experiences sexual violence. Neglect will be defined as any instance in which the participant experienced being left home alone at a young age or failed to have their needs met. Masculinity, the other independent variable, will be conceptualized as the traditional ideals of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005). Finally, criminal behavior, the dependent variable, will be conceptualized as any criminal/delinquent act committed by the individual.

The unit of analysis for this study will be college males. College males are not far from adolescence, which is a time where gender becomes very important to a male. This is the time of puberty and the age in which boys truly begin to come into their gender and attempt to follow the masculine norms (Galambos, Almeida, & Petersen, 1990; Levant, 2011; Wilczak, 2017).
SAMPLING

Data for the current study was collected at the large Southwestern University over a six-month period. Data was collected utilizing a convenience sample of undergraduate students currently attending university. Some undergraduate programs at the university in which the study took place, require students to participate in a research study in order to obtain full credit for their introductory course. This research requirement fulfills two of their three credits for the course. Due to the nature of study, students were given the opportunity to complete a research paper instead of participating in the study. Since the content of the survey may lead to distress, students were given a debriefing after participation in the study that provided them with contact information for mental health services offered on campus.

There were multiple reasons that a college student population was chosen for the current study. First, the research requirement in the undergraduate program allowed for a simple recruitment process. The current study did not have to utilize any recruitment methods to gather the sample group. Second, the current study asks respondents about extremely sensitive information (e.g. childhood victimization and criminal behavior). Having participants complete the study in the laboratory setting allowed the research team to visibly check for signs of distress. The research assistants were trained to intervene if any participants appeared distressed. Should this occur, the research assistants were trained to immediately end the current survey and refer the participant to psychological services offered on the college campus. While national services could be offered to participants in the general public taking this study online, there could be no guarantee that they would have emotional support available should they feel distressed. Finally, while college students may engage in criminal behavior at a lower rate, studies have shown that this group does engage in criminal behavior. Sexual assault on campus is known to be
perpetrated by men enrolled in college (Abbey and McAuslan, 2004; Voller and Long, 2010).

Alcohol and drug related crime is also prevalent on college campuses (Runyan, Pierce, Shankar, and Bangdiwala, 2013). In addition, prior research has shown that college students engage in minor crimes, such as shoplifting, in addition to more serious crimes (Blanco, Grant, Petry, Simpson, Alegria, Liu, and Hasen, 2008; Farmer and Dawson, 2017).

A total of 357 participants chose this research study option during the study period. Of these responses, 220 identified as female (58.9%), 135 as male (36.5%), and two as transsexual female-to-male (.5%). The remainder did not provide a response as to their gender and were removed from the analyses. For the purpose of the current study, only male responses were analyzed. All further information provided pertains specifically to the male population.

The race of respondents was also asked. Race was self-reported with the options African American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, Caucasian/White, and Other as choices. The race of respondents was diverse and is presented in Figure 3. The age of the participants ranged from 18 years old to 56 years old. The average age of participants was 19 years old.

**Figure 3. Race Demographics of Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROCEDURES

The Trauma and Masculinity Survey (See Appendix) was created by Dr. M. Alexis Kennedy and Shon Reed. The current study was conducted in a research laboratory located within the University. IRB for the survey was granted during the summer of 2017 (protocol number 1045509-3). While students were required to show up in person to the lab for participation, the survey was administered online through SurveyMonkey.com.

MEASURES

The current study utilized an online survey methodology. Due to the large amount of content being measured (e.g. childhood victimization, masculinity beliefs, criminal/delinquent behavior, etc.) it was most feasible to utilize an online survey as participants could take the study at their own pace. The strict timeline for the current study did not allow enough time for qualitative methodology (e.g. face-to-face interviews or focus groups). In addition, online survey methodology offers a level of anonymity and confidentiality that would not be available if the survey was administered face-to-face. While students did have to take the survey within a laboratory setting, responses were not tied to the participants in any way. This anonymity is beneficial in this situation, as the survey was asking about personal information. Utilizing an online methodology also allows for data to be easily exported. The researcher did not have to manually enter data, which helped to ensure that there were fewer errors in the data set.

The Trauma and Masculinity survey consisted of 60 questions that gathered respondents’ histories of trauma, criminal behavior, and masculinity beliefs. While further questions asked respondents about self-esteem and beliefs on prostitution, only the questions pertaining to trauma, criminal behavior, and masculinity beliefs were utilized in this study. To measure masculinity beliefs, this survey utilized three measures: the Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in
Relationships Scale (AMIRS) (Chu, Porche, & Tolman, 2005), the Male Role Attitudes Scale (MRAS) (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994), and the Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-revised (MRNI-A-r) (Levant, McDermott, Hewitt, Alto, & Harris, 2016). These measures are outlined briefly below.

AMIRS was developed to determine young adult males’ beliefs of masculinity in relationships (Chu, Porche, & Tolman, 2005). This scale consists of 12 items measuring traditional masculine ideals such as toughness, emotional vulnerability, and heterosexual dominance (Chu et al., 2005). These items are measured on a 4-point Likert scale (I disagree a lot – I agree a lot) and are tied directly into the concepts of hegemonic masculinity. Initial testing of the scale showed a Chronbach’s Alpha of .70 (Chu, et al., 2005). Formal tests of the instrument have shown that it is high in construct validity when compared to similar scales (Chu, et al., 2005).

The MRAS was created to determine young adults’ acceptance of traditional male roles (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994). This instrument utilizes eight items that measure acceptance of these roles on a four-point Likert scale (I disagree a lot – I agree a lot). Initial testing of the MRAS showed a Chronbach’s Alpha score of .56 (Pleck, et al., 1994). The MRAS has been found to be high in construct validity, as its measures focus on traditional male norms such as, dominant attitudes towards female roles, traditional ideas of gender roles, homophobic beliefs, and sexual prowess (Pleck, et al., 1994).

The MRNI-A-r is a 29-item instrument that measures the respondent’s beliefs of how males should think and behave (Levant, et al., 2016). These beliefs are measured on a 7-point Likert scale (Strongly disagree – Strongly agree) that measures emotionally detached dominance, toughness, and avoidance of femininity (Levant, et al., 2016). This instrument has been found to
have high levels of convergent validity with AMIRS and is valid for both face validity and content validity (Levant, et al., 2016). Each of these scales utilizes a composite score to determine the respondent’s masculinity beliefs. The higher the total score, the more accepting the individual is of traditional masculine norms.

Each of these scales is limited in their methodology. As is the issue with survey methodology in general, there may be issues with self-reporting beliefs. Participants may not feel comfortable sharing their true beliefs on gender norms, or may simply provide an answer that does not reflect their true beliefs. Also, the current scales are based off of traditionally Western ideals of masculinity. While that is not an issue for the current study, as the current study focuses on Western ideals of masculinity, these scales may not accurately measure the ideals of participants whom do not proscribe to Western ideals of masculinity.

Childhood victimization was measured utilizing a revised version of the childhood victimization questions utilized in the Add Health research design (Harris, Halpern, Whitsel, Hussey, Tabor, Entzel, & Udry, 2009). This section consists of four different questions measuring sexual, physical, and emotional abuse, as well as neglect. The questions are designed to measure the frequency of victimization by allowing participants to choose from six different answer choices ranging from “Never” to “More than 10 times.” The Add Health study prefaces the questions by asking about childhood victimization occurrences prior to the age of 18, but for the purposes of this study the questions were introduced with, “By the time you started 6th grade, how often did your parents or other adult caregivers…” This was done in an attempt to determine instances of victimization at an early age. While limiting the experiences of victimization to such an early age could limit the number of reported traumatic experiences, the scope of the current study focuses specifically on early childhood victimization.
The dependent variable for the current study is “criminal behavior.” Criminal behavior was conceptualized as any criminal act committed by the individual. Criminal behavior was measured using 18 questions that were created specifically for the purpose of this study. Participants were asked about their histories of perpetrating both violent and property crimes. The violent crimes section included questions related to physical assault, sexual assault and robbery. Property crimes that were measured include burglary, arson, motor vehicle theft, shoplifting, and vandalism. These crimes were chosen, as they are the listed index crimes put forth by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) (Uniform Crime Report, 2016). Respondents were given the options: “No”, “Yes, before age 13”, “Yes, between age 13 and 18”, “Yes, after 18”, and “This has happened to someone I know.” Respondents were able to choose multiple responses if the behavior had been perpetrated at multiple times in their life.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

A series of univariate analyses were utilized to determine the rate of victimization, masculinity beliefs, and perpetration of criminal behavior. Bivariate and multivariate analyses were conducted to assess the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The results of these analyses are summarized below.

Childhood Victimization Rates

Frequency distributions indicate relatively low rates of childhood abuse in the sample population. The results of these frequency distributions can be seen in Figure 4. Overall, being left home alone prior to sixth grade had the highest frequency (n=63, 47%). Physical abuse was the second most frequent form of abuse (n=37, 24%). Neglect and sexual abuse rates were relatively low in the current sample with 7% of the population having been neglected (n=9) and 2% having been sexually abused (n=2). The “Neglect” and “Home Alone” variables were then combined to create a “Neglect Composite” variable. Once combined, frequency distributions indicated that 49% of respondents (n=66) had experienced neglect. Due to the low rate of sexual abuse within the population, the sexual abuse variable was excluded from further analyses. Victimization did not vary significantly by ethnicity in correlation analyses.
Figure 4. Experience of Childhood Victimization

![Experience of Childhood Victimization (n=135)](image)

Masculinity Scores

Figure 5 consists of the frequency distributions in regards to the masculinity scores. Descriptive statistics indicate that the majority of participants had a high level of adherence to masculine norms. All scales were recoded dichotomously to high or low based off of the mean. Those whose scores were higher than the mean were coded as “HIGH,” while those who whose scores placed lower than the mean were coded “LOW.” The scales were dichotomized to assess how many participants placed high or low on the scales for analysis purposes. In addition, chi-square analyses require the variables being utilized in the analysis to be categorized. While the chi-square analyses utilized a dichotomous version of the masculinity variables, all other analyses utilized the continuous version of the variables.

The mean score for the MRAS (Male Role Attitude Scale) was 17.82 (SD=3.96), while the range was 8-29. 55% of respondents placed above the mean (18 or above; n=72). Reliability
testing of the MRAS showed a Chronbach’s Alpha score of .77. In regards to AMIRS (Adolescent Masculinity in Relationships Scale), the mean score was 26.50 (SD=5.32) with the range being 17-42. 53% of respondents placed above the mean on this scale (27 or above; n=70). Chronbach’s Alpha for AMIRS in the current study was .82. Scores for the MRNI-A-r (Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-revised) were lower than the other two scales. Mean score for the MRNI-A-r was 70.58 (SD = 24.6) with a range from 29-125. 45% of respondents scored above the mean (71 or higher; n=59). The Chronbach’s Alpha score for the MRNI-A-r in the current study was .95.

As will be shown at the multivariate level, utilizing the MRAS to showcase masculinity led a statistically significant relationship between SES and the perpetration of criminal behavior. Because of this finding, it merits discussing the comparison of the MRAS scores found in this study with the initial testing of the measure. Overall means for each item in the MRAS were lower in the current study than in the original study (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994). Item number four (A guy will lose respect if he talks about his problems) had a mean equal to that of the original study 1.76 (SD=.72).

Overall, univariate analyses of the three masculinity scales indicated that there were nearly equal levels of participants who placed high and low on the measures. The majority of respondents scored above the mean for both the MRAS and AMIRS. There was a slightly higher level of participants who scored below the mean in the MRNI-A-r.
Rates of Criminal/Delinquent Behavior

Rates of criminal behavior were analyzed in two separate categories: violent and non-violent crime. Frequency distributions show low rates of violent crime perpetrated by this sample population. Responses to the “Assault” (e.g., I have purposely hit someone with my fist or an object to inflict pain) and “PhysKick” (e.g., I have purposely kicked someone to inflict pain) questions were relatively high. The majority (55%) of the sample (n=74) indicated that they had utilized their fist or another object to harm another person. Over a third (36%) of the sample (n=49) stated that they had kicked another person in order to harm them. In regards to other types of violent crime, two individuals (2%) responded that they had forced someone to hand over their money or valuables. Four respondents (3%) stated that they had forcibly taken money or valuables from another person. One respondent (1%) reported that they had committed rape.
Overall rates of violent crime were relatively low in this sample. While one participant indicated that they had committed sexual assault, the rates of sexual assault were not nearly as previous studies have shown (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; Voller & Long, 2010).

**Figure 6. Violent Crime Rates**

As shown in Figure 7, the perpetration of non-violent crimes was much higher. The most common form of non-violent crime was shoplifting. This finding coincides with prior literature, which found that college students do engage in shoplifting at relatively high rates (Blanco, et al, 2008; Farmer & Dawson, 2017). 31% of respondents (n=42) stated that they had shoppedlifted at some point in their life. The second highest non-violent crime was damaging private property (16%, n=22), followed by damaging public property (10%, n=13) and drug dealing (9%, n=12). The findings of property crimes are equitable to a prior study, which found that roughly 18% of college students had engaged in property crimes (Runyan, Pierce, Shankar, & Bangdiwala, 2013). The rates of the remaining non-violent crimes were low.
Following the analysis of individual crime perpetration, a scale (CrimeRangeTrue) was created to determine how many participants had engaged in criminal behavior. This scale combined all criminal behavior variables into one composite scale. The higher the respondent’s score, the more criminal/delinquent behavior they had engaged in. The range for this scale was 0-10. 60% of participants had not engaged in any criminal behavior (n=74), while one participant had engaged in 10 different acts of criminal behavior. The mean score for this scale was .87.

Those who had reported engaging in any criminal behavior were coded as “1.” The decision was made to omit the “Assault” and “PhysKick” measures from this scale, as it is possible that those physical acts were done in self-defense. Figure 8 displays the rate of criminal behavior perpetration after the removal of those two items. In sum, 40% of respondents (n= 49)
had committed some form of criminal behavior. The remaining 60% of respondents (n=74) did not report having committed any form of criminal behavior.

**Figure 8. Criminal Behavior Perpetration**
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**Bivariate Analyses**

Bivariate analyses were conducted to assess the correlation between the dependent and independent variables. Figure 9 outlines the findings of the bivariate correlation analyses. Continuous versions of each of the variables were utilized for this analysis in order to increase variance within the model.

The correlation between masculinity beliefs and the perpetration of criminal behavior was not found to be statistically significant. Neglect and physical abuse did not correlate with masculinity either. Strong correlations were found between each of the masculinity measures at the .01 level. The MRAS correlated highly with the MRNI (r=.699, p<.01) and AMIRS (r=.620, p<.01). The MRNI had a strong correlation with AMIRS (r=.815, p<.01).
While no correlation was found between the masculinity measures and criminal behavior, a strong correlation was found between physical abuse and the perpetration of criminal behavior ($r=0.282$, $p<0.01$). No statistically significant correlation was found between neglect and crime perpetration. A statistically significant correlation was found between neglect and physical abuse ($r=0.329$, $p<0.01$). This indicates that those who had experienced physical abuse had also experienced neglect.

In this sample there does not appear to be a correlation between masculinity beliefs and the perpetration of criminal behavior. There does appear to be some correlation between childhood physical abuse and criminal behavior. The fact that all masculinity scales correlate with each other is a significant finding, as it appears that all masculinity scales are measuring both high and low levels of masculinity properly.
**Figure 9** Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MRAS SCORE</th>
<th>MRNI-A-r TOTAL</th>
<th>AMIRS TOTAL</th>
<th>CRIME RANGE TRUE</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRAS SCORE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNI-A-r TOTAL</td>
<td>.699**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMIRS TOTAL</td>
<td>.620**</td>
<td>815**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIME RANGE TRUE</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLECT COMPOSITE</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL ABUSE</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note: MRAS is the Male Role Attitudes Scale, MRNI-A-r is the Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-revised, AMIRS is the Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale.

Following the bivariate correlation, chi-square analyses were conducted to analyze the association between victimization and masculinity as well as masculinity and the perpetration of criminal behavior. Crosstabulation offers a clearer visual inspection of the association of the variables. For these analyses, dichotomous versions of the victimization, masculinity, and criminal behavior variables were utilized.

Chi-Square analysis of neglect and masculinity when utilizing the MRAS has no significant statistical relationship ($X^2 = 1.245, \text{NS}$). As shown in Figure 10, crosstabulation indicates that there are equal levels of high and low masculinity in the neglect population.
Similar to the chi-square analysis of the MRAS, no statistically significant relationship was found between neglect and masculinity when utilizing the MRNI-A-r ($X^2 = 1.700, \text{NS}$).

Figure 11 shows the crosstabulation analysis. This analysis shows nearly equal levels of high and low masculinity scores in the abuse population.

Chi-square analysis of physical abuse and MRAS scores indicates that there is no statistically significant relationship between the two variables ($X^2 = 0.009, \text{NS}$).
shows the crosstabulation analysis, which states that there are similar rates of high and low masculinity scores in the physical abuse population.

**Figure 13. Crosstabulation between physical abuse and the MRAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>MRAS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the findings of the chi-square analysis utilizing the MRAS, no statistically significant relationship was found between physical abuse and low masculinity rates when utilizing the MRNI-A-r ($X^2 = 0.087$, NS). As shown in Figure 14, crosstabulation indicates that there were nearly equal levels of participants in the high and low masculinity columns who had experienced physical abuse.

**Figure 14. Crosstabulation between physical abuse and the MRNI-A-r**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>MRNI-A-r</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No statistically significant relationship was found between physical abuse and low masculinity scores when using AMIRS ($X^2 = 0.014$, NS). The results of the crosstabulation analysis are shown in Figure 15. This analysis shows that there were nearly equal levels of participants in the high and low categories who had experienced physical abuse.
Figure 15. Crosstabulation between physical abuse and the AMIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>AMIRS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square analysis did not indicate any statistically significant relationship between the perpetration of criminal behavior and masculinity when utilizing the MRAS to measure masculinity ($X^2 = 0.192, \text{NS}$). Crosstabulation, shown in Figure 16, indicates equal levels of criminal behavior between respondents with low and high levels of masculinity.

Figure 16. Crosstabulation between the MRAS and the perpetration of criminal behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRAS Score</th>
<th>Criminal Behavior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square analysis does not indicate any statistically significant relationship between the perpetration of criminal behavior and low levels of masculinity when utilizing the MRNI-A-r ($X^2 = 0.532, \text{NS}$). Figure 17 shows the results for the crosstabulation analysis. This model shows a slightly elevated level of criminal behavior in the low masculinity population.

Figure 17. Crosstabulation between the MRNI-A-r and the perpetration of criminal behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRNI-A-r Score</th>
<th>Criminal Behavior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar to the analysis of the other two measures, no statistically significant relationship was found between the perpetration of criminal behavior and low masculinity when utilizing AMIRS ($X^2 = 0.273$, NS). Figure 18 show similar results to the previous analyses, as there was no relationship between low masculinity and the perpetration of criminal behavior.

**Figure 18.** Crosstabulation between AMIRS and the perpetration of criminal behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMIRS Score</th>
<th>Criminal Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate Analyses**

Multivariate analyses were conducted to explore the relationship between masculinity and the perpetration of criminal behavior when controlling for multiple variables (e.g. ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and religiosity). Linear regression was utilized for each masculinity scale. These models utilized continuous versions of the masculinity and criminal behavior variables. The remaining variables (e.g. race, socioeconomic status, and religiosity) were dichotomized in this analysis. The results of each of these models are summarized below.

**Male Role Attitude Scale**

Figure 19 presents the findings for the linear regression model measuring the impact of the Male Role Attitudes Scale on the perpetration of criminal behavior. Findings of this analysis indicate that there is no significant relationship between masculinity and the perpetration of criminal behavior when utilizing the Male Role Attitude Scale as the measurement of masculinity ($B=0.026$, NS). Further analysis of the independent variables indicates that low
socioeconomic status has a statistically significant impact on the perpetration of criminal behavior (B=0.598, p<0.05).

**Figure 19.** Regression model using the Male Role Attitudes Scale as a predictor for criminal behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRAS Score</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level.

**Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-revised**

The linear regression model measuring the impact of the Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-revised did not work with the overall ANOVA, not meeting significance (F = 0.808, NS) for predicting perpetration of criminal behavior.

**Adolescent Masculinity in Relationships Scale**

Linear regression analysis of the impact of the Adolescent Masculinity in Relationships Scale held similar findings to the MRNI-A-r. The linear regression model measuring the impact of the Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale did not work with the overall ANOVA, not meeting significance (F = 0.692, NS) for predicting perpetration of criminal behavior.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings of this study did not reveal a relationship between childhood victimization and subsequent masculinity beliefs. Prior research has found that men who are victimized may feel a diminished sense of their masculinity (Andersen, 2011; Dunn, 2012; Heber, 2017; Wood, 2004). Yet this relationship was not found in the current study when focusing specifically on childhood victimization. Criminological research has indicated that boys and men may engage in criminal activity as a means of “doing gender,” when they are unable to achieve their gender through legitimate means (Messerschmidt, 1993, 2016). The primary difference between previous research and the current study is the focus on victimization. Messerschmidt’s research focuses on diminished masculinity when boys are unable to accomplish their gender through educational or occupational means. While education and occupation may have a strong effect on masculinity and the perpetration of criminal behavior, it is possible that victimization does not have the same effect.

The purpose of this study was to bridge the gap between criminology and victimology and analyze the relationship between childhood abuse, masculinity beliefs, and their subsequent effect on the decisions to engage in criminal behavior as a means of “doing gender.” Utilizing a sample of 135 male undergraduate students, the current study attempted to provide answers to three research questions and two hypotheses. Various bivariate and multivariate analyses were conducted to provide answers to these questions. The findings in regards to these questions and hypotheses are detailed below.

The purpose of the first research question was to explore whether there was a correlation between experiencing physical abuse in childhood and the adherence to traditional masculine
norms. Findings of this study do not indicate that there is a relationship between childhood physical abuse and diminished masculinity. Chi-square analysis did not find any statistically significant relationships between childhood physical abuse and lower levels of masculinity when utilizing any of the three masculinity measures. In addition to the chi-square analyses, a bivariate correlation was conducted in an effort to determine correlation between the variables. Again, no statistically significant relationship was found between childhood physical victimization and lower levels of masculinity.

Analysis of the bivariate correlation did indicate that childhood physical abuse correlated with the perpetration of criminal behavior ($r=.282, p<.01$). Childhood physical abuse also correlated highly with childhood neglect ($r=.329, p<.01$). Based off of the findings of this correlation, it is possible that the participants in the physical abuse population may have also experienced neglect in their youth.

The second research question utilized similar analyses to determine if there was a correlation between childhood neglect and adherence to masculinity norms. Similar to the findings in research question one, no statistically significant relationships were found between neglect and masculinity. Chi-square analyses did not indicate that there were any statistically significant relationships between the two variables. Analysis of the bivariate correlation did not indicate any correlation between neglect and any of the variables other than physical abuse.

Research question three could not be answered in the current study. Descriptive statistics indicated a low rate of sexual victimization in the sample population ($n=2$). Due to the extremely low rate of sexual victimization in the sample group, the decision was made to omit the sexual abuse variable from further analyses. This decision was made due to the fact that there would not be enough statistical power to conduct analyses.
Hypothesis one stated that men with lower ideals of their own masculinity will engage in criminal behavior at an increased rate. The findings of the current study do not support this hypothesis. At the bivariate level, no support was found for the hypothesis. Chi-square analysis did not indicate any statistically significant relationships between lower levels of masculinity and the perpetration of criminal behavior. Alternatively, it did not indicate any significant relationships between high levels of masculinity and the perpetration of criminal behavior. This finding held true in the analysis of all three masculinity scales. Bivariate correlation did not indicate any statistically significant correlations between the masculinity scales and the perpetration of criminal behavior. It is possible that the low levels of criminal behavior reported by the sample population restricted these analyses.

Linear regression analyses found no statistically significant relationship between masculinity and the perpetration of criminal behavior when controlling for race, socioeconomic status, and religiosity. These findings stayed consistent across all three masculinity measures.

The second hypothesis stated that victimization decreases a man’s belief of his own masculinity, which leads him to engage in criminal behavior in an effort to “do gender.” The findings of this study do not support hypothesis two. Statistical analyses did not indicate any relationship between childhood victimization and masculinity or that low masculinity influenced decisions to engage in criminal behavior. Bivariate analyses did indicate that some victimized males did have lower levels of masculinity. Due to the methodology of the current study, it is not possible to analyze whether low masculinity was the deciding factor in their perpetration of criminal behavior.

In the linear regression models, it was found that low socioeconomic status was a statistically significant predictor of criminal/delinquent behavior (B=0.598, p<0.05). This
finding may provide evidence of both Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin’s theoretical ideas. Both of
their theories assert that the need to prove success at an early age can drive delinquent or
criminal behavior. It is possible that having a low socioeconomic status at an early age led the
participants of this study to engage in this behavior, as they were unable to find success or
acceptance through legitimate means.

Limitations

While the current study may not have been able to provide evidence for the proposed
questions and hypotheses, it is an important first step towards building a discussion around male
victimization. Due to the fact that this study focuses on understudied relationships, there are
multiple limitations to the current methodology and sampling. The current study utilized revised
versions of the childhood victimizations questions used in the Add Health research design
(Harris, et al., 2009). While these questions assess the general categories of childhood abuse
(e.g. sexual, physical, and neglect) there is the possibility that their wording omits certain
instances of childhood abuse. More robust measures, such as the Child Abuse and Trauma Scale
(CAT) (Sanders & Becker-Lausen, 1995), may provide more accurate rates of childhood
victimization. Perhaps utilizing a more robust measure may have increased the number of
reported childhood victimizations. For example, only two participants stated that they had been
sexually abused. A different measure, such as the CAT scale, may have led to a higher amount
of reported instances of sexual abuse.

In addition to the limitations in regards to the Add Health questions, revising the preface
of the questions to focus only on victimization prior to sixth grade may have reduced the number
of responses. This decision was made due to the fact that literature regarding the effects of early
childhood victimization on masculinity is nearly non-existent. That being said, expanding the
frame of the victimization questions may have led to a much higher response rate to these measures. In addition, the current study did not measure for participants’ experiences with dating violence or other types of victimization that may occur during adolescence. Future research should expand the age range of victimization being measured.

Multiple limitations are also found within the sample group. The sample size for this study was relatively low (N=135). Within this small sample size, even fewer participants had histories of childhood abuse or had engaged in criminal behavior. The low numbers of victimization and criminal behavior, in conjunction with the overall small sample size, led to a lack of power in statistical analysis. A much larger sample size, that includes higher levels of the independent variables, may have led to different statistically significant relationships.

Utilizing college males as the unit of analysis may not have been the most appropriate unit to test the theoretical concepts of the study. While participants did in fact indicate that they had experienced victimization and had engaged in criminal behavior, attending college may have been their means of “doing gender.” As Messerschmidt asserts, men will engage in criminal behavior if they have no legitimate means in which to “do their gender” (Messerschmidt, 1993, 2016). It is possible that those who had engaged in criminal behavior ceased to continue to offend due to the fact that they were able to accomplish their gender through education.

The current study was unable to provide solid evidence of Agnew’s general strain theory. Respondents reported low rates of both victimization and criminal behavior. The correlation between physical abuse and the perpetration of criminal behavior may hint at a strain-based correlation between the two variables, but cannot be proven in the scope of the current study.

The low amount of strain shown in the current study is due in part to the small amount of strains measured within the survey. This survey only included strains related to childhood abuse
and socioeconomic status. Future studies may expand upon this survey and include measures of employment, abusive relationships, and other negative experiences. It is possible that these other strains could have a direct influence on masculinity or the perpetration of criminal behavior.

It should also be noted that the current sample frame omits men within the general public who are not attending university, as well as boys and men who are currently incarcerated in juvenile or adult correctional facilities. Sampling boys and men within these two groups may lead to more accurate testing of the presented hypotheses and research questions. Future research studies should replicate the current study utilizing a sample frame that is inclusive of these two groups.

**Implications**

While the current study was unable to provide clear evidence to support the proposed hypotheses, frequencies indicate that there was still a moderate rate of victimization within the sample population. These findings alone support the argument for increased awareness and services around the child abuse issue. Bivariate analysis did indicate a strong statistical correlation between childhood physical abuse and the perpetration of criminal behavior. This finding does coincide with Belknap and Holsinger’s study (2006), which found that physical abuse was a predictor for criminal/delinquent behavior. This finding should not go ignored, as it is possible that failing to provide adequate supportive services to these young men after their abuse may actually be perpetuating the crime issue. Future research should further investigate the relationship between childhood abuse and criminal behavior.

Prior criminological research has hinted at the relationship between masculinity and its impact on criminal behavior (Anderson, 1993; Messerschmidt, 1993, 2016). Second-wave feminist scholars, such as James Messerschmidt, have focused on the various characteristics that
influence masculinity (e.g. race and class), but have failed to examine the impact that early abuse has on a boy’s masculine identity. The impact that victimization has on masculine identity should not be overlooked. Studies on adult criminal offenders have indicated that victimization does impact masculine identity (Heber, 2017; Weiss, 2010; Wood, 2004), but no such studies have been conducted to examine the long-term effects of childhood victimization and trauma on masculine identity through a criminological lens.

Qualitative methodologies may be able to more clearly detail the relationship between childhood abuse, masculinity, and criminal behavior. Quantitative methodologies only allow for a statistical interpretation of the phenomenon and do not provide a narrative as to why an individual is engaging in criminal behavior. In-depth interviews or focus groups with male victims of abuse may allow a clearer picture of the gendered actions of criminal or delinquent offenders. In addition to providing clearer narratives, qualitative methodologies may highlight other aspects of an individual’s social identity that is influencing them to engage in criminal behavior or is being directly affected by their childhood victimization.

Conclusion

This study suggests that masculinity may not be directly impacted by childhood victimization. While the proposed relationships between victimization and criminal behavior may not be apparent due to the restricted range of behavior seen among college students, the correlations suggest that further exploration is warranted. Looking at victimization as an explanation for delinquency behavior among male youth could provide important insight in stopping the over incarceration of young men. Qualitative or mixed-methods strategies may be able to highlight the effect that childhood abuse has on a man’s masculinity. These
methodologies may also be able to expand upon the role that masculinity plays on the decision to engage in criminal behavior.
APPENDIX

Trauma and Masculinity Survey

Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT
Department of Criminal Justice

TITLE OF STUDY: Trauma and Masculinity
INVESTIGATOR: Dr. Alexis Kennedy
CONTACT PHONE NUMBER: (702) 895-5122

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to gain knowledge about student's past experiences with trauma, beliefs of gender norms, and behavior.

Participants
You are being asked to participate in the study because previous research has shown that college level students share similar attitudes with other adults in the community at large.

Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following: complete an anonymous self-report survey consisting of questions about past traumatic experiences, ideals of gender norms, ideals of self-worth, and previous criminal behavior. You will be asked to provide some demographic information (e.g., age, sex, and ethnic background). Your name will not be associated with or linked to the data in any way.

Benefits of Participation
There may be a direct benefit to you as a participant in this study. You may benefit from gaining direct knowledge about the process by which psychological data is collected in a university setting. We hope to learn more about the effectiveness of measuring traumatic experiences and their impact.

Risks of Participation
There are risks involved in all research studies. This study may include only minimal risks. You might be uncomfortable answering some of the questions asked. You may choose not to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable. Participation is completely voluntary and you have the right to refuse to participate and withdraw from the study without jeopardizing your course grade. If you exercise your right to withdraw from the study before it is completed, you will still receive your full research credit points. Your answers are being collected in Survey Monkey and will not be linked to the Criminal Justice scheduling system to protect confidentiality.

Some of the questions in this study are personal and may be unsettling to you. If you would like to discuss any issues following the study you may reach out to UNLV's Student Counseling and Psychological Services at (702) 895-3627.

Cost/Compensation
There will not be financial cost to you to participate in this study. The study will take approximately 60 minutes of your time. You will not be compensated financially for your time. You will receive two (2) extra credit research points for CRJ 104 for your participation.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact Dr. Kennedy at (702) 895-5122. For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office of Research Integrity – Human Subjects at 702-895-2794.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the survey.


Participant Consent:
I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I am at least 18 years of age. A copy of this form has been provided to me.

PLEASE CLICK THE "NEXT" BUTTON TO GO TO THE SURVEY. BY CLICKING ON THIS ICON, YOU INDICATE THAT YOU HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE ABOVE CONDITIONS, AND GIVE YOUR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

IF YOU DO NOT CONSENT TO THE SURVEY, PLEASE CLICK EXIT THE SURVEY AT THE TOP RIGHT-HAND CORNER OF THE SCREEN.
1. Please indicate how much each statement describes your situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Rarely true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>True nearly all of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to adapt to change</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can deal with whatever comes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to see the humorous side of problems</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel coping with stress strengthens me</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to bounce back after illness or hardship</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I can achieve my goals</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under pressure, I am able to focus and think clearly</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not easily discouraged by failure</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think of myself as a strong person</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can handle unpleasant feelings</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The following items relate to your opinions of yourself and your personal characteristics. Please extent to which you agree or disagree with each one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have friends that will back me up</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can be myself around my friends</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make friends easily</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at keeping friendships going</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use laughter to help me deal with stress</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stand up for what I believe is right</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to help others</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I control my own life</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look for the “lighter side” of tough situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t give up when something bad happens to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t let anything stop me from reaching a goal I set for myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I come up with different ways to let out my feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can change my surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use my sense of humor to deal with tough situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can change my behavior to match the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know when I am good at something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know it’s OK if some people don’t like me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can tell if it was my fault when something goes wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know it’s OK if I don’t see things the way other people do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Provide at least 5 nouns to describe yourself.

4. Has anyone ever told you that you were bad, a troublemaker, or going to end up in prison?

Yes [ ] No [ ]
5. How many times did you witness family violence (ex. saw or heard your parents fight) growing up?

- Never
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3-5 times
- 6-10 times
- More than 10 times

6. If yes, did you experience intense fear, helplessness, or horror when it happened?

- No
- Yes
- Not applicable

7. If yes, were you seriously wounded or injured?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

8. How many times did you experience unwanted sexual contact before age 18?

- Never
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3-5 times
- 6-10 times
- More than 10 times

9. If yes, did you experience intense fear, helplessness, or horror when it happened?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

10. If yes, Were you seriously wounded or injured?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

11. How many times have you been physically hurt by a ROMANTIC partner?

- Never
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3-5 times
- 6-10 times
- More than 10 times

12. If yes, did you experience intense fear, helplessness, or horror when it happened?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

13. If yes, were you seriously wounded or injured?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

14. How many times have you been physically assaulted or threatened with death by a stranger?

- Never
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3-5 times
- 6-10 times
- More than 10 times

15. If yes, did you experience intense fear, helplessness, or horror when it happened?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
16. If yes, were you seriously wounded or injured?
   ○ Yes ○ No ○ Not applicable

17. How many times have you been robbed by gunpoint or any other weapon?
   ○ Never ○ 1 time ○ 2 times ○ 3-5 times ○ 6-10 times ○ More than 10 times

18. If yes, did you experience intense fear, helplessness, or horror when it happened?
   ○ Yes ○ No ○ Not applicable

19. If yes, were you seriously wounded or injured?
   ○ Yes ○ No ○ Not applicable

20. How many times have you suddenly or tragically lost a close friend or loved one?
   ○ Never ○ 1 time ○ 2 times ○ 3-5 times ○ 6-10 times ○ More than 10 times

21. If yes, did you experience intense fear, helplessness, or horror when it happened?
   ○ Yes ○ No ○ Not applicable

22. How many times have you been diagnosed with a life threatening illness (ex. cancer, HIV/AIDS)?
   ○ Never ○ 1 time ○ 2 times ○ 3-5 times ○ 6-10 times ○ More than 10 times

23. If yes, did you experience intense fear, helplessness, or horror when it happened?
   ○ Yes ○ No ○ Not applicable

24. How many times have you lost custody of your child or children?
   ○ Never ○ 1 time ○ 2 times ○ 3-5 times ○ 6-10 times ○ More than 10 times ○ Not Applicable

25. If yes, did you experience intense fear, helplessness, or horror when it happened?
   ○ Yes ○ No ○ Not applicable

26. Below is a list of problems and complaints that individuals sometimes have in response to stressful life experiences. Please read each one carefully, and select the option that indicates how much you have been bothered by the problem in in the last month.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeated, disturbing memories, thoughts, or images of a stressful experience from the past?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated, disturbing dreams of a stressful experience from the past?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suddenly acting or feeling as if a stressful experience were happening again (as if you were reliving it)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling very upset when something reminded you of a stressful experience from the past?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having physical reactions (e.g., heart pounding, trouble breathing, or sweating) when something reminded you of a stressful experience from the past?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid thinking about or talking about a stressful experience from the past or avoid having feelings related to it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid activities or situations because they remind you of a stressful experience from the past?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble remembering important parts of a stressful experience from the past?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of interest in things that you used to enjoy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling distant or cut off from other people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling emotionally numb or being unable to have loving feelings for those close to you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling as if your future will somehow be cut short?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble falling or staying asleep?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling irritable or having angry outbursts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics

27. What is your current age (years)?

28. What is your Race/Ethnicity (check all that apply):

- Caucasian (not Latino/Hispanic) / White
- Latino/Hispanic
- African American/Black
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- American Indian
- Other (please specify)

29. What city were you born in?

30. If you were not born in Las Vegas, how many years have you lived in the Las Vegas area?

Not at all A little bit Moderately Quite a bit Extremely Frequently

Having difficulty concentrating?

Being "super alert" or watchful on guard?

Feeling jumpy or easily alerted?
31. What is the combined yearly income of your parents (or guardians)?

- $0 - 10,000
- $10,001 - 30,000
- $30,001 - 50,000
- $50,001 - 70,000
- $70,001 - 100,000
- $100,001 - 150,000
- Over $150,000

32. Do you consider yourself to be a spiritual person?

- Not at all
- A little
- Somewhat
- Quite a bit
- Very much so

33. What political party would you say you agree with the most?

- Republican
- Democrat
- Libertarian
- Other
- Prefer not to say

34. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Trans: Male-to-Female
- Trans: Female-to-Male
- Other (please specify)

35. What is your sexual orientation?

- Hetero/Straight
- Lesbian/Gay
- Bisexual/Bi
- Other (please specify)
36. What is your current relationship status?
☐ Single ☐ With a romantic partner ☐ Legally married ☐ Separated ☐ Widowed ☐ Divorced
☐ Other (please specify)

37. How many children do you have, if any? Please indicate by number

38. How old were you the first time you were arrested (if applicable)? If not applicable please type N/A

39. What was the offense of your first arrest (if applicable)? If not applicable please type N/A

40. Where have you lived for the past 90 days? (Check all that apply)
☐ Alone in own home ☐ Incarceration/Jail ☐ Living w/ Family or Friends ☐ Drug/Mental Health Facility ☐ Homeless
☐ Shelter/Hallway House
☐ Other (please specify)

41. Were you ever homeless (ex. slept in a place not meant for sleeping, did not have a regular residence) for a week or longer as an adult (18 or older)?
☐ No ☐ Yes

42. Have you ever stayed in a homeless shelter?
☐ No ☐ Yes
43. Were you ever 'kicked out' of your parents'/caregivers' house before the age of 18?

- No
- Yes, how many times?

44. If yes, where did you go?

- Your parent's home
- Another person's home
- Your own home
- A place not meant for living
- Shelter
- Other (please specify)

45. Did you ever run away from your parents'/caregivers' home before the age of 18?

- No
- Yes, how many times?

46. By the time you started 6th grade, how often did your parents or other adult caregivers...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>3-5 times</th>
<th>6-10 times</th>
<th>More than 10 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave you home alone when an adult should have been with you?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to take care of your basic needs (ex. keep you clean, provide food, clothing)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slap, hit, kick or otherwise physically hurt you?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch you sexually, force you to touch them sexually or forced you to have sex?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. How satisfied are you with your life as a whole?

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
48. In the past month, have you experienced any of the following? (Check all that apply)

- Feeling hopeless
- Feeling of anxious or nervous
- Having suicidal thoughts/ideations
- Suicidal attempts or gestures
- Violent or homicidal thoughts
- Delusions or hallucinations

49. In your lifetime, have you ever received MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT or services?

- No
- Yes

50. In your lifetime, have you ever received DRUG or ALCOHOL treatment or services?

- No
- Yes

51. Do you regularly use any drugs or alcohol?

- No
- Yes

52. If yes, have you ever...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>felt like you should cut down on your drinking and/or drug use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been annoyed by others who criticize your drinking and/or drug use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt bad or guilty about your drinking and/or drug use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drank/use drugs immediately upon waking to steady your nerves/get rid of a hangover?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. In your lifetime, have you ever had an experience that was so frightening, horrible, or upsetting that you...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had nightmares about it or thought about it when you did not want to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to not think about it or went out of your way to avoid situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that reminded you of it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were constantly on guard, watchful, or easily started?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt numb or detached from others, activities, or your surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Please answer the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>I disagree a lot</th>
<th>I disagree</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I agree a lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is essential for a guy to get respect from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man deserves the respect of his wife and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I admire a guy who is totally sure of himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guy will lose respect if he talks about his problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A young man should be physically tough, even if he's not big</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It bothers me when a guy acts like a girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't think a husband should have to do housework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are always ready for sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. Please answer the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I disagree a lot</th>
<th>I disagree</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I agree a lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It's important for a guy to act like nothing is wrong, even when something is bothering him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a good dating relationship, the guy gets his way most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can respect a guy who backs down from a fight (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's ok for a guy to say no to sex (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys should not let it show when their feelings are hurt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guy never needs to hit another guy to get respect (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a guy tells people his worries, he will look weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it's important for a guy to go after what he wants, even if it means hurting other people's feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is important for a guy to act like he is sexually active even if he is not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be friends with a guy who is gay (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's embarrassing for a guy when he needs to ask for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it's important for a guy to talk about his feelings, even if people might laugh at him (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. Please answer the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Kind of Disagree</th>
<th>Kind of Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If needed, a guy should stop being friends with someone to be more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys should do whatever it takes to be cool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guy should prefer football to sewing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guy should never depend on someone else to help him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys shouldn't cry, especially in front of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When in a group of guys and girls, guys should always make the final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not ok for a guy to ask for help fixing a flat tire on his bike.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys should never tell others if they're worried or afraid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guy should win at any game he plays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys shouldn't ever show their feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guy who can't make up his mind will not be respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys should not be allowed to wear skirts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a group of guys and girls, it is up to the guys to get things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organized and moving ahead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is too girlish for a guy to wear make-up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports like softball should not be played by guys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Kind of Disagree</td>
<td>Kind of Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone else starts it, a guy should be allowed to use violence to defend himself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the going gets tough, guys get tough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chores like doing the laundry or cooking aren’t for guys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s important for a guy to be able to play it cool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys should not tell their friends they care about them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys should play with trucks rather than dolls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s important to have the newest video game system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys shouldn’t carry purses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys shouldn’t show fear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they’re sad or upset, guys should just “suck it up” and get over it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys should not throw baseballs “like a girl.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a guy is in pain, it’s better for him to keep it to himself rather than to let people know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guy with no interest in adventure is not very cool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s important for guys to try hard to be the best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions relate to your past history of traumatic experiences. Please remember that you do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to.
57. Please answer the following based off of your past experiences and select all that apply...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes, before age 13</th>
<th>Yes, between age 13 and 18</th>
<th>Yes, after 18</th>
<th>This has happened to someone I know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone tried to take something directly from you by using force or the threat of force?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone attempted to rob you or actually robbed you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone attempted to or succeeded in breaking into your home when you were not there?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone attempted to or succeeded in breaking into your home when you were there?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a serious accident at work, in a car, or somewhere else?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced a &quot;man-made&quot; natural disaster (e.g. Bank robbery, fire, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been in any other situation in which you were seriously injured?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been in any other situation where you feared you might be killed or seriously injured?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen someone seriously injured or killed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen dead bodies (other than at a funeral) or had to handle dead bodies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a close friend or family member murdered or killed by a drunk driver?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a spouse, romantic partner, or child die?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, before age 13</td>
<td>Yes, between age 13 and 18</td>
<td>Yes, after 18</td>
<td>This has happened to someone I know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had to engage in combat while in military service in an official or unofficial war zone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone has made you have intercourse, oral, or anal sex against your will?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone has touched private parts of your body, or made you touch theirs, under force or threat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have there been any other situations where another person tried to force you to have unwanted sex?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone, including friends and family, ever attacked you with a weapon?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone, including friends and family, ever attacked you without a weapon and injured you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you experienced any other extraordinarily stressful situations not mentioned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. Please answer the following...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes, before age 13</th>
<th>Yes, between ages 13 and 18</th>
<th>Yes, after 18</th>
<th>I know someone who has done this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have purposefully hit someone with my fist or an object to inflict pain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have purposefully kicked someone to inflict pain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, before age 13</td>
<td>Yes, between ages 13 and 18</td>
<td>Yes, after 18</td>
<td>I know someone who has done this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sexual experiences with someone when they did not want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sexual interactions (Oral/Anal sex) with someone when they did not want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have forced someone to give me their money or valuables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have forcibly taken someone's money or valuables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have broken into someone's house to take their valuables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have broken into a store to steal merchandise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have purposefully started a fire in order to damage something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have purposefully started a fire to harm someone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have taken a car or other motor vehicle without permission from the owner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have taken merchandise from a store without paying for it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have purposefully damaged someone's property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have purposefully broken someone's window.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have purposefully spray painted public property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have purposefully spray painted private property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59. Please answer the following...  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution is acceptable as long as no one gets hurt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal brothels deserve special discretion from public attention because they provide sexual services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worry that brothels may attract illegal activities to Las Vegas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel embarrassed if a friend or family member worked at a brothel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who live in Las Vegas don't need to be concerned with legal brothels, because legal brothels are in different counties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60. Please answer the following...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men are likely to assault women if they aren’t provided a sexual outlet,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as prostitutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the brothels ever went out of business or were shut down, I would be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid that I or someone I know would be at a higher risk of sexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assaults.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women would be safer if we legalized prostitution in every county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothels have no effect on sexual assault rates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural areas with legal brothels in Nevada will likely have lower rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rates than Las Vegas or Reno.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
61. Please answer the following...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal brothels should be able to advertise in Clark County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The criminal status of prostitution needs to remain a county decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulating the brothels should be up to the State of Nevada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal prostitution weakens the nation’s stance on human trafficking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal brothels are a better alternative to independent sex work in cities like Las Vegas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothels should be kept away from urban areas because they impact the health and well-being of neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to hear the state legislature to discuss the future status of legal brothels in Nevada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. Please answer the following...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensed sex workers should give half of their earnings to the owner of their brothel.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees should be free to leave the grounds of their place of employment whenever they choose.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes should have the right to say “no” to a customer.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A licensed sex worker who is contractually forced to serve a customer despite her objections has been sexually assaulted.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The nuisance resulting from the operation of a house of prostitution is aggravated by its location within 400 yards of a school or church.” Cunningham v. Washoe County, 66 Nev. 60, 66 (Nev. 1949)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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