

## “It’s Just a Guy Thing”: How Young Men Discursively Navigate Hegemonic Masculinity in Hookup Culture

Adam Whiteside

*This study draws upon 15 interviews with young men to explore how they discursively navigate hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. The findings revealed three discursive strategies: (a) reinforcing hegemonic masculinity through teasing peers, sexual boasting, and perpetuating sexual preference discourse; (b) reframing hegemonic masculinity by describing hookups as immature and highlighting health risks of hookups; and (c) resisting hegemonic masculinity by expressing desire for emotional connection and encouraging non-aggressive sexual communication. Taken together, these strategies suggest that while young men’s discursive constructions of masculinity are increasingly inclusive and productive, young men still reinforce hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture.*

*Keywords:* hegemonic masculinity, hookup, masculinity, hookup culture

### Introduction

Hooking up is often assumed to be a significant aspect of youth culture. This coincides with the proliferation of “hookup apps” like Tinder or Grindr among young people. To clarify, hookups are uncommitted sexual encounters between two strangers or acquaintances and can include many sex acts (e.g., kissing, sexual touching, oral sex, sexual intercourse, etc.; Fielder & Carey, 2010; Holman & Sillars, 2012; Reiber & Garcia, 2010). Relatedly, hookup culture describes a broader context that promotes sexual contact that is free from the binds of emotional intimacy or commitment (Bogle, 2008; Wade, 2017).

Despite some literature suggesting hookups are less common than previously thought (Menegatos et al., 2010; Wade, 2017), there has been much scholarly concern over the potential consequences of hookups. For instance, although many young people report positive feelings after hookups (Lewis et al., 2012; Owen & Fincham, 2011), hookups have also been associated with negative consequences for women and can perpetuate unequal power dynamics that privilege (heterosexual) men (Armstrong et al., 2014; Hess et al., 2015). Compared to men, women exhibit more depressive symptoms and regret after hookups (Campbell, 2008; Fisher et al., 2012), are judged more negatively after hookups (e.g., labeled a slut; Armstrong et al., 2014; Hamilton & Armstrong, 2009; Hess et al., 2015), are much more likely to experience sexual violence during hookups (Ford, 2017), and receive far less sexual pleasure than men during hookups (Armstrong et al., 2012; England et al., 2012).

This severe inequality stems from a hookup culture defined by hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinities are those often culturally exalted formulations of masculinity that perpetuate unequal gendered power dynamics (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Messerschmidt, 2018). Within hookup culture, discourses of hegemonic masculinity label women as “sluts” and men as “players,” thus rewarding young men’s sexual promiscuity while punishing women for the same behavior (Armstrong et al., 2014; Currier, 2013; Hess et al., 2015; Sweeney, 2014).

However, attitudes regarding hooking up have changed recently as more college programming targets toxic masculinity, sexual violence prevention, sex positivity, and gender norms (Orchowski et al., 2020). For example, programs like the Men’s Workshop (Gidycz et al., 2011) and RealConsent (Salazar et al., 2014) try to reduce sexual violence by encouraging men to intervene when they witness sexual violence, practice proper consent, and build empathy for survivors of sexual violence. These programs also urge men to be critical of hegemonic masculine norms (e.g., sexual aggression) and seek to dispel the misconception that the majority of men strictly adhere to these norms (Gidycz et al., 2011; Orchowski et al., 2020; Salazar et al., 2014). In fact, universities are also required by law to have comprehensive sexual assault awareness and prevention programs (The Department of Justice, 2018). Furthermore, some

scholars argue as feminist movements make greater strides in gender equality, men are less likely to value hegemonic masculine norms (Anderson, 2010; Thompson & Bennett, 2015). Specifically, current generational cohorts of men may resist discourses of hegemonic masculinity and push back on gender inequalities in the context of hooking up (Kalish, 2013; Lamont et al., 2018; Olmstead et al., 2013). To this end, this study answers calls to explore how diverse constructions of masculinity may impact the sexual decision making of young men within hookup culture (Kalish, 2013; Sweeney, 2014).

## **Literature Review**

### **Masculinity as a Discursive Construction**

This study approaches gender as a socio-cultural construct, an “organization of biology and social life into particular ways of doing, thinking, and experiencing the world” (Rakow, 1986, p. 23). That is, gender is something individuals do or perform based on certain socio-cultural expectations (Butler, 1990; West & Zimmerman, 1987). For example, young men are often expected to be highly interested in sex with women, have sexual prowess (i.e., be sexually skilled), be highly sexually active, and more sexually aggressive (e.g., initiate sex, be more sexually dominant; Kimmel, 2008; Platt & Krause, 2022; Wiederman, 2005). One primary way young men perform their masculinity is through casual sex with women (i.e., hooking up; Currier, 2013; Kalish, 2013; Kimmel, 2008).

Masculinity is a discursive construction (i.e., constituted in and through discourse; Connaughton, 2017) or how men position themselves through discursive practices (Mumby, 1998). Discourse can range from more interpersonal interactions (e.g., individual gender performances) to larger, more abstract cultural narratives (e.g., socio-cultural gendered expectations; Ashcraft & Mumby, 2003). Young men use various discursive practices to police and maintain hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. For example, young men were often found teasing male peers for lacking sexual prowess, while simultaneously boasting about their own sexual exploits (Currier, 2013; Kalish, 2013; Platt & Krause, 2022; Sweeney, 2014).

### **Masculinity Construction in Hookup Culture**

Peers greatly inform masculinity construction and performance within hookup culture as young men have frequently reported significant peer pressure to engage in heterosexual hookups (Kalish, 2013; Sweeney, 2014). After all, peer approval has been found to have a significant influence on sexual behavior and attitudes (Holman & Sillars, 2012; Menegatos et al., 2010). Some studies even found that young men categorized women with peers, deciding which were suitable for dating and which were only good for hookups (e.g., labeling women as sluts; Kalish, 2013; Sweeney, 2014). These practices helped establish masculine status with male peers, but simultaneously situated women as subordinate and gay or less sexually active heterosexual men as unmasculine. Furthermore, Lamont et al. (2018) found gay men also reinforced hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture through sexual preference discourse. That is, many gay men expressed exclusive sexual desire for men with hegemonic masculine body types (e.g., muscular, tall, hairy) and framed men with less masculine or more feminine bodies as undesirable (Lamont et al., 2018; Robinson, 2015). It is through discursive practices like these that prevailing cultural discourses of gender become intelligible and are reinforced (Butler, 1990).

### **Shifting Constructions of Masculinity**

These constructions of masculinity (e.g., high sexual interest, promiscuity, and aggression) are hegemonic because they perpetuate unequal power dynamics (Messerschmidt, 2018). Despite this, young men have also been found to resist or reframe hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. In fact, some studies found that many young men avoid hooking up as they finish college, instead communicating desires for monogamous romantic relationships (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013; Bogle, 2008;

Dalessandro, 2019). Furthermore, Dalessandro (2019) and Olmstead et al. (2013) found several young men preferred committed romantic relationships and emotional connection during sex over casual, emotionless sexual encounters. Moreover, some recent studies suggested young men are gradually placing less importance on sex as an indicator of masculinity (Iacoviello et al., 2022; Thompson & Bennett, 2015). This is underscored by recent data from the National Survey of Sexual Health and Behavior (NSSHB) that found a steep decline in sexual activity among young men (i.e., 18-24; Herbenick et al., 2022). Platt and Krause (2022) even found that some men were shamed by male peers for frequent hookups. These preferences conflicted with the hegemonic masculine discourse that young men are expected to be emotionally disconnected, prefer casual sex, and are rewarded for their sexual promiscuity (Kimmel, 2008; Wiederman, 2005). Lamont et al. (2018) also discovered that gay men often resisted discourses within hookup culture that promoted sexual aggression or slut shaming of sexual partners. Taken together, this literature complicates our understanding of how young men discursively construct masculinity and make sense of hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture.

## Summary

Male perspectives on hegemonic masculinity are limited within the hookup literature. Although recent research indicates masculinity construction in hookup culture is more nuanced than previously thought (Dalessandro, 2019; Lamont et al., 2018; Olmstead et al., 2013; Platt & Krause, 2022), it is still unclear exactly how young men navigate hegemonic masculine norms within hookup culture (Kalish, 2013; Sweeney, 2014). Additionally, there is a lack of research that explores how queer men experience hookup culture or how they respond to traditional gender norms within hookup culture (Kalish, 2013; Lamont et al., 2018; Pham, 2017; Sweeney, 2014). To this end, this study is guided by the following research question:

**RQ1:** How do young men discursively navigate hegemonic masculinity in hookup culture?

## Method

### Participants

Of the 15 young men who participated in this study, 10 identified as heterosexual, four were gay, and one was bisexual. The average age of participants was 23 (range: 21 to 26). Thirteen participants identified as White, one identified as Egyptian, and another identified as mixed (i.e., White and African American). Six participants were undergraduates, two were graduate students, six were recent college graduates, and one had not attended college. The majority of participants identified as coming from middle-class families and only one identified his family as lower class.

Participants were recruited via snowball and convenience sampling. These sampling techniques were utilized to optimize speed and lower cost of data collection (Tracy, 2019). Only individuals between the ages of 18 and 26 who identified as male were recruited. This included both heterosexual and queer men. Participants were primarily recruited with flyers and approached during communication courses (e.g., gender communication, quantitative methods, political communication, mass communication, communication theory). Communication courses were chosen because they were the most accessible and participation would be incentivized by extra credit. After each interview, participants were asked to share contact information of others who would be interested in participating.

### Procedures

The method employed in this study was semi-structured, in-depth interviews. This procedure was given approval by my university's institutional review board and all participants signed an informed consent form. Interviews ranged from 46 to 105 minutes ( $M = 73$  minutes) and probed (a) constructions

of masculinity and femininity (i.e., how they understand what it means to be a man and a woman); (b) constructions of hookups (i.e., how they define hookups or what constitutes a hookup); (c) constructions of masculinity within hookup culture (i.e., how they understand and enact masculinity within hookup culture). Interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed (422 double-spaced pages), double-checked to ensure accuracy, and participants were assigned pseudonyms for confidentiality.

### **Analysis**

With my research question in mind and guided by hegemonic masculinity as a conceptual framework, the analytic process for this study was informed by constant comparative method (Charmaz, 2014). Interview transcripts were examined line-by-line to generate open codes which included, for example, “teasing peers” and “sexual boasting.” Second-level coding noted that these were discursive strategies utilized to construct masculinity in hookup culture in a way that reinforced hegemonic masculinity. Given that data collection and analysis occur simultaneous within qualitative research, I engaged in memoing (i.e., systematic note-taking) after each interview and during the coding process (Charmaz, 2014; Tracy, 2019). This iterative process helped to illuminate codes and interrelationships within the data. After analysis and data collection concluded, I engaged in member reflections which involved gathering feedback from participants on findings to enhance the ethical quality and credibility of my results (Tracy, 2019). This process did not change, but merely confirmed the findings that this analysis revealed.

### **Results**

The research question that guided this study asked how young men discursively navigate hegemonic masculinity in hookup culture. This section describes the multiple, sometimes overlapping strategies in which young men discursively navigated hegemonic masculinity in hookup culture: (a) reinforcing hegemonic masculinity (b) reframing hegemonic masculinity (c) resisting hegemonic masculinity. Subsumed under each of these strategies are substrategies that articulate the precise method in which each larger strategy functions.

#### **Reinforcing Hegemonic Masculinity**

The first discursive strategy was reinforcing hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. Several men in this study repeated hegemonic masculine discourses. As Dave puts, “Just because it’s, you know, you’re a dude. You’re getting laid. That’s what you’re supposed to do.” This quote reinforced the discourse that men are expected to be sexually active. Other men like John also perpetuated the discourse that young men are expected to be highly sexually active, sexually skilled, and highly interested in sex with women (Kimmel, 2008; Wiederman, 2005; Sweeney, 2014). John added:

But I feel like the pressures of with others, with friends, and your surrounding of who you are with is a lot of friends and everything. And even girlfriends you’ll have. They put that pressure of being sexually active...I feel that girls expect guys to be more experienced in bed than how they are. They expect that because if they are teaching them then they feel like they’re not a true—in their eyes I don’t feel that they think that we’re truly manly then and know what we are doing. And that’s why I feel like it is more of a pressure thing of like how sexual activity is being manly.

This discursive strategy addresses how young men reinforced hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. Within the purview of this strategy are three substrategies that involved young men teasing peers, sexual boasting, and perpetuating sexual preference discourse.

### **Teasing Peers**

The first substrategy involves young men teasing their peers to reinforce hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. This discursive strategy was often employed when participants' peers failed to enact hegemonic masculinity (e.g., failing to hookup with women). John explained, "I still have a friend that's 22 and a virgin. It sucks because I would understand what he means because we all rag on him about it because, you know, it's just a guy thing."

Here John admitted to teasing his friend for being a virgin, dismissing it as an innocent behavior that guys just do. The assumption is that this is a common discursive practice among men. Jack also described a situation in which he virgin shamed, constructing it in a similarly playful and dismissive way as John. He declared, "I was hounding my little brother. Because he didn't lose his virginity until he was 18. Which was crazy! I was like, 'Time's a ticking there, buddy' [laughs]." Owen offered another example of teasing when he used to live with a group of guys who would laugh at men who failed at hooking up with women. He said:

...that person would, they would come downstairs and tell us it [sex] didn't happen, the girl didn't-didn't want to, or she fell asleep or it just didn't work out. So we would just laugh, you know. Just laugh.

He later assured me it was in good fun and not mean-spirited. Regardless of perceived intent, their communication served to police masculinity by reminding their peers of the heteronormative sexual expectations within hookup culture. After all, vaginal intercourse is constitutive of masculinity for young men (Richardson, 2010), so a failure of achieving this signifies a failure of achieving hegemonic masculinity. David reiterated this when he stated:

The heteronormative way, you know. You get girls and that's key. If you're not doing that you're screwing up. You can have, in the classic masculine sense, you can have the job, the money, success, whatever. But if you suck at talking to girls, guys are gonna make fun of you for it for sure.

### **Sexual Boasting**

The second discursive substrategy utilized to reinforce hegemonic masculinity was boasting about sexual exploits and prowess. For example, John expressed, "I am definitely, out of all my friends, definitely the most sexually active." John frequently mentioned that he was highly sexually active and experienced. He often asserted his high social status at one point even saying his friends considered him "the king of the group." Dave, Jack, and Don told similar stories highlighting their sexual prowess and expertise. Jack recited to me lyrics from a rap song he wrote outlining one such story. He sang:

I crashed out, woke up in her basement. I don't fuck with her, because she basic. Only hit her up when I'm wasted. Then she got me all on her playlist. All she do is take dick. Say shit. Say I'm never going to make it. I crashed out, woke up in her basement.

Jack reaffirmed his masculinity as this story establishes that he is sexually active and that he sexually objectifies women. Similarly, Dave excitedly shared an unprompted story about one sexual encounter he had saying, "She worked at a car dealership. And she cleaned it out after it closed. Yeah, we went up there and fucked on one of the dude's desks in the middle of her work shift." Sexual boasting seemed to be commonplace among male peers as Joseph elaborated:

But when it's just guys, it's usually the topic of conversation. Even if it's not very wide open and saying, "Oh, I fucked this girl and she's a 10," it's more... Obviously, it's not as obvious as that, but it's almost a way for a guy to assert their status as a man and as an alpha male within the

group to say, "Yeah, I was talking to this super hot girl the other day and she came over to my place."

### ***Sexual Preference Discourse***

The third substrategy articulates how young men in this study, specifically gay men, reinforced the ideal hegemonic masculine body through sexual preference discourse. With some men, there was a clear preference of more hegemonically masculine hookup partners or those with emphasized gender presentations. Alec noted:

...when it comes to just sex, to the nitty gritty of it, I think that it is inherently just so masculine and manly to me, and that is kind of within my sexuality. I'm looking for somebody that is as much of a man as I can get because if a person has more effeminate or feminine qualities, I think it reads as just more girly as more feminine to me, and that's not within my sexuality, if that makes sense.

Alec stated at one point that he was open to dating more feminine presenting men. However, he also clarified that he is more sexually attracted to men with more normative masculine physical characteristics. He then described these more "masculine" physical characteristics:

If I'm looking for someone more masculine, then I do look for those features that I mentioned before. Somebody who has got facial hair, someone who's a maybe got a stronger body type or physique, a deep voice. Kind of all those qualities that we that contribute more to being masculine.

Philip expressed similar sexual interest in men with more "masculine" physical characteristics. He added, "... in terms of sexual attraction, I definitely like the masculine characteristics. I like men with scruff. I like men who are taller than me. I like muscles." Phillip later elaborated what exactly he is attracted to and how his attraction has changed over time. He clarified:

...speaking of masculinity, something I've learned more as I've gotten older and what I'm attracted to, I've dated trans women or trans men who transitioned from being a woman and they're trans men. I found that even if someone biologically is a woman, but they have more masculine traits and present as masculine and male, I've been finding myself, I'm much more open and attracted to that as I've gotten older. That's just something I thought about. Another thing I've learned about myself and what I'm attracted to, I'm learning that I'm more attracted to masculinity than a man per se.

Phillip divorced biological sex from masculinity in describing his sexual attraction, but still reinforced the hegemonic masculine body. This sexual desire for a "masculine" body, in turn suggests that feminine or less fit bodies are far less desirable as Dillon articulated:

Being feminine, in of course gay culture, is a lot of times negative. If you are more femme, that's less. It's lesser, I guess. For a lot of people, being femme is negative. A lot of times it can be derogatory. If you're using masc on the other hand, it can be something good, it can be positive. It depends on who you are and what your preference is, I guess. There is a lot of culture that's gay culture, I guess in my aspect, that is definitely. Less desirable, I guess, if that makes sense.

Dillon pointed out that more "femme" gay men are typically lower within the hierarchy of sexual desirability whereas "masc" gay men are highly valued. He alluded to "mascing" which is the practice in which gay men, "reinforce their own masculinity, while also maintaining masculine norms by seeking out masculine partners" (Rodriguez et al., 2016, p. 260).

## **Reframing Hegemonic Masculinity**

This discursive strategy considers how young men reframed hegemonic masculinity. Reframing involves restructuring one's viewpoint or how one perceives something (Robson Jr & Troutman-Jordan, 2014). This discursive strategy was identified when participants reevaluated and changed their viewpoints of masculinity in hookup culture through their communication. Participants utilized this discursive strategy by shifting opinions of hooking up from positive to negative without critiquing hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. Under the purview of this strategy are the substrategies of reframing hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture through describing hookups as immature and highlighting the health risks of hookups.

### ***Describing Hookups as Immature***

The first substrategy, describing hookups as immature, explores how participants describe how they have shifted away from the hegemonic masculine values within hookup culture as they have gotten older and matured. For example, Steve explained:

Going back to saying how my worldview kind of evolved going into college, I would say that they're coming from a different worldview still where they still have that mentality of like, Oh, you've got to be good at sex. You've got to have sex. You, be sort of aggressive and macho to be a man.

Jack also expressed, "...I used to think you needed to get all the girls and have sex with a bunch of women, but honestly, I don't think that is important anymore." These men felt as though sexual activity, sexual prowess, and sexual aggression used to be important in defining their masculinity. Several men in this study admitted to engaging in hookups, but the majority of participants, other than two, stated that they currently preferred dating to hookups. Many of them provided similar reasons to that of Dillon who said:

I've never gone out and think, oh yeah, I just want to hookup with a lot of people. It's more like relationship is bigger, and the older I get, the hooking up is shrinking. It's still there, and not that I've shifted to only wanting a relationship, it's that the older I get, the bigger that grows and the more I think I want a relationship. You're slowly closing yourself off to hooking up. You're looking for more serious connections.

Even though Dillon never actively sought out hookups, as he gets older, he more actively seeks out romantic relationships. Even those participants who were more actively engaged in hookup culture like John also admitted, "I've hooked up for a while. You know, for the past three, four years. And I am more on the lines of like I've done so much of that to where now I just want to settle down." Owen also expressed similar sentiments, detailing how he used to engage in hookup culture, but no longer desires hooking up as time has passed. He added:

I'm over that whole like come home with me tonight. Completely over. I stopped even having that much interest in going to bars. I can. I'll feel good for a couple of shots and hang out with one of my friends and talk, watch a game. But I just, the whole like go to the bars, look around for girls, look around for groups of girls that are not with guys. I don't know. It's just over for me. But I used to and it was like that. If you'd have asked me that same question two years ago I would have 100% just said hooking up.

He later went on to tell me that actively seeking out hookups was something that he "grew out of." Hooking up is presented as just a phase he and others went through. By expressing how much time has

passed since they valued or engaged in these hegemonic masculine practices, participants create distance from their past selves. They reframe the once valued hegemonic masculinity as immature and frame their distance from it as a sign of maturity or self-growth.

### ***Highlighting Health Risks of Hookups***

The second substrategy involves men reframing hegemonic masculinity in hookup culture through highlighting the health risks of hookups. This substrategy describes how young men have come to understand hookups as unhealthy behavior or they discuss how hookups can negatively impact one's health in various ways. For instance, when I asked Jack if he considered sexual activity important when assessing manliness, he responded:

I used to feel like that, but honestly not anymore. That doesn't really matter. Honestly, I feel like that's just more so like a self-control problem. Like if you're someone who needs to have sex all the time, I feel like that's kind of just a self-control problem.

Jack went on to say that he felt it is necessary for people to masturbate and be sexually active. He also felt too much casual sex might indicate a sex addiction or lack of sexual control. Similarly, Owen also expressed that he no longer values frequent casual sex. Although he went on to discuss how frequent hookups can have a negative impact on one's back and knees.

However, the primary health concern was STDs. Tim used to think frequent casual sex with women was masculine, but when discussing hookups he warned, "you don't know the person, you don't know their background, or you don't know anything that they could potentially give you in terms of diseases." Similarly, Michael also stated, "...if you're having sex a lot with multiple different people, hooking up with different people, there's a higher chance of getting an STD, STI, things like that." Even Don, a proponent for hookups, stated, "You don't want to go sleep around too much or you're going to get an STD."

Sexually transmitted diseases like HIV or AIDS were particularly concerning for gay participants. Philip elaborated, "Especially for me being gay, there's the extra worry in the gay community about AIDS, HIV, all that stuff." Alec echoed this concern:

I feel more apprehensive when my gay friends are going out and having sex, then when my straight friends are going out and having sex. I feel more apprehensive and nervous for them. Because I just know being within the community that there are so many guys that want unprotected sex that aren't tested."

Reframing hookups as health hazards legitimizes nonparticipation in hookup culture without necessarily calling into question participant's masculine status or the hegemonic masculine discourses within hookup culture.

### **Resisting Hegemonic Masculinity**

This strategy deals with how young men resisted hegemonic masculinity. Resisting was distinct from reframing in that discursive reframing was not necessarily counterhegemonic (Abbott & Geraths, 2021; Messerschmidt, 2018). That is, these strategies did not "critique, challenge, or actually dismantle hegemonic masculinities" (p. 142) or promote more "more egalitarian gender relations" (Messerschmidt, 2018, p. 158). Young men who discursively resisted hegemonic masculinity in hookup culture critiqued common hegemonic masculine norms, expressed desires that oppose hegemonic masculine norms, or promoted more egalitarian sexual practices. Under the purview of this strategy are the substrategies of encouraging non-aggressive sexual communication and expressing desires for emotional connection.



### ***Encouraging Non-aggressive Sexual Communication Practices***

The first substrategy outlines how young men resisted hegemonic masculinity in hookup culture by encouraging non-aggressive sexual communication. Sexual aggression is often a hegemonic masculine norm among young men (Kimmel, 2008; Wiederman, 2005). That is, young men are often expected to actively seek out casual sex, initiate sex, be sexually dominant, and more sexually coercive. As Steve explained, "You've got to have sex to be sort of aggressive and macho to be a man." John reiterated:

The whole of masculinity and pressure and everything. It all comes from that basis of that the guy is always told that he has to do everything. And that's what the girl, the woman wants to see. And that's with anything. With hooking up and being a man.

John further specified, "Yeah you are initiating all the contact. You initiate the hooking up. You initiate being the man." Alec echoed this sentiment when he explained how this hegemonic masculine norm impacted his early sexual experiences. He added:

So when I was younger, I definitely associated sexual activity with something that is kind of male initiated. So that's what I thought I had to do. So when I was first going on dates, I never went in for the kiss. I never did any of those things. I always thought that it had to be initiated by somebody else.

Alec felt as though he was more feminine than masculine, therefore he believed he needed to maintain more of a gatekeeping role or employ more passive behaviors often associated with femininity in sexual situations (Wiederman, 2005). Although he went on to say:

As I got to college, I started to meet other people who were gay, or girls that were not following that train of thought, because they didn't have to. And kind of hearing from gay men too this idea of, "Oh, no, you don't have to do that. That's like straight people stuff..." I didn't have to follow those rules anymore. And I was kissing guys on first dates, or I was the one texting first, or I was the one initiating stuff. And I was like, "This is amazing!" I just never associated it from then on out as who's being the man and who was initiating it.

Relatedly, Matt also described some specific sexually aggressive behaviors of many heterosexual men and how he avoids them. He declared:

I think verbal consent and verbal reassurance of interest is the most important thing...I feel a lot of guys think, Oh, she was giving me signs so I might grab her ass or something, just see how it goes. That's the kind of stuff that you should not be doing.

Several other men also described avoiding sexually aggressive practices and highlighted the importance of consent. For instance, Michael stated:

I definitely check in [chuckles], I feel a lot. Especially if I'm getting to know them like, "Is this okay?" like, "Are you okay with that?" Stuff like that. And obviously consent is incredibly important. You're getting to know somebody and how they kind of do things and operate when you're having sex. You just need to ask and have those check-ins.

However, previous scholarship has found that while many young people, particularly young men, express the importance of verbal consent during casual sex, they often rely heavily on nonverbal communication in practice (Klinger, 2016; Lamont et al., 2018). Therefore, it is hard to know the extent to which these men actually engage in verbal communication during hookups.

***Expressing Desire for Emotional Connection***

The second substrategy details how young men expressed their desire for emotional connection during sex and, in turn resisted hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. Several men in this study constructed hookups as lacking emotions or emotional connection. For example, Dillon explained, "...hooking up is not a lot of emotional, not having emotion I guess. Like, oh that was just a hookup, it's like being disconnected." In discussing his concern for hookup partner's pleasure, Don suggested that there is even less of an emotional connection for men when he said, "I guess it's easier to please someone you don't know, because there's no emotional connection for you as a guy." Within this quote are two assumptions. One being that because he is a man, there is no emotional connection when he hooks up with someone. The second being that it is easier to please a sexual partner if there are no emotions involved. This reflects the hegemonic masculine discourse in which young men are expected to be more emotionally disconnected during sex (Kimmel, 2008; Wiederman, 2005).

Although Don implied that a lack of emotional connection in hookups was positive, several other men viewed it negatively. It was, at times, cited as the key reason why some men chose to opt out of hookup culture as Tim said, "I never have been the kind of hooking up guy... I have hooked up before, but it doesn't feel as gratifying as being with somebody you actually care about...the emotional connection is more important to me." Some young men in this study believed hookups were defined by emotional detachment as Brendan further elaborated:

The way that I defined hooking up, I've never just hooked up with somebody. It's not for me, but I don't view it negatively as long as both people are consenting. Any sexual interaction for me is really hard to detach from the emotional aspects. In order to have that you kind of have to have a relationship of some sort with that person. That's not to say that I could never see myself hooking up or that would always be less desirable than being in a relationship. I've just never been in a situation where that has looked appealing to me.

Brendan does not hookup because it is hard for him to detach from the emotional aspect of sexual activity. While he did not directly state that hookups are void of emotion, it is certainly implied in this statement.

Michael and Matt went further to imply that hookups lead to greater emotional detachment over time. Michael declared, "If I hookup enough, I'm training myself to have sex, but to not actually be connected with people." Michael perceived hookups as lacking in emotion connection, therefore he felt frequent hookups will naturally condition someone to be less emotionally connected during sex. Similarly, Matt expressed:

I think hooking up a lot and hookup culture in general sort of creates this situation where relationships are often less emotionally intimate and they're more just about the physical side of things. I think somebody might have sex with people a lot and feel like physically fulfilled, but on an emotional and mental level, they might not really be getting the care and attention that they need that they might get from being in a long-term relationship.

Once again, the assumption is hookups are detached from emotion; therefore, engaging in hookup culture will negatively impact one's ability to form future emotional connections or healthy romantic relationships. This perception of emotional detachment during hookups is not uncommon as one normative hookup and sexual discourse is that individuals, particularly men, are supposed to be emotionally detached (Epstein et al., 2009; Kimmel, 2008; Wade, 2017; Wiederman, 2005). Michael reiterated this expectation when he said, "...if you're too emotional, that's not very masculine."

## Discussion

This study explored how young men discursively navigate masculinity in hookup culture revealing several discursive strategies and substrategies in the process. This study's first theoretical contribution was providing specific strategies for how young men discursively navigate hegemonic masculine discourses within hookup culture. This research revealed three different discursive strategies and seven different substrategies that young men utilize. First, some participants reinforced hegemonic masculinity with hookup culture through teasing peers, sexual boasting, and perpetuating sexual preference discourse. This study supports previous hookup and masculinity literature that suggests young men often boast about sexual exploits and tease peers about sexual failures to police masculinity and reaffirm masculine status (Currier, 2013; Kalish, 2013; Platt & Krause, 2022; Sweeney, 2014). Additionally, this study also coincides with extant literature that has found when it comes to hookups, young men are more concerned with maintaining social status, rather than sexual exploration or their hookup partner's enjoyment (Currier, 2013; Kalish, 2013). This finding is concerning as hookups motivated by elevating social status have been linked to rape myth acceptance (Reling et al., 2018). Although gay participants largely resisted hegemonic and heteronormative discourses, they also engaged in "personal preference discourse" (Robinson, 2015, p. 318). This third discursive substrategy is used to mask how choice of sexual partner can perpetuate stereotypes, create boundaries between groups, and ultimately reinforce inequality. That is, this desire for "masculine" bodies (e.g., muscular, facial hair, taller) in turn places more "feminine" or less physically fit bodies into the lower echelons of the gay body hierarchy (Robinson, 2015; Slevin & Linneman, 2010; Whitesel, 2014). Viewing the male body as constitutive of masculinity is essential in reinforcing hegemonic masculinity which maintains unequal gendered power dynamics (Connell, 2005). These discursive strategies illuminate the persistence and omnipresence of hegemonic masculinity (Messerschmidt, 2018).

This study also contributes to the hookup literature by illuminating several discursive strategies and substrategies that young men utilize as they abandon or avoid hegemonic masculinity in hookup culture. Hooking up is so normalized among young people that even those who do not endorse or engage in hookups must confront hookup culture at some point (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013; Bogle 2008; Kimmel 2008; Wade 2017). Despite this, not much is known about how or why young men choose to not participate in hookup culture (Olmstead et al., 2013; Pham, 2017; Wade, 2017). The second strategy, reframing hegemonic masculinity, depicts how young men avoid or abandon hookup culture through describing hookups as immature and highlighting health risks of hookups. In describing hookups as immature participants explain how they have "grown out" of hookup culture. Age could be a factor as most participants were upperclassmen in college or recent college graduates. Extant hookup scholarship has found students near the end or after college mostly abandon hookup culture to focus on formal dating and monogamous relationships (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013; Bogle, 2008; Dalessandro, 2019). Furthermore, masculinity constructions change with maturity, growth, and as context changes (Connell, 2005; Kimmel, 2008). Dalessandro (2019) found that young men often conflated monogamous relationships with maturity and hookups with immaturity. Although this reframing of hegemonic masculinity might be perceived as personal growth, this discursive framing could be a means to dissociate or excuse previous sexual behavior. This framing also reflects the male privilege of being able to participate and abandon hookup culture without consequence; a privilege women in hookup culture rarely possess (Dalessandro, 2019; Hamilton & Armstrong, 2009; Sweeney, 2014).

Additionally, participants reframed hooking up as unhealthy by highlighting many potential health risks related to hookups. Several men indicated STDs as a primary concern. This conflicts with previous studies that suggest young people, particularly men, often do not perceive STDs as a serious implication of casual sex and frequently do not use condoms (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger, 2009; Fielder & Carey, 2010; Maas et al., 2015). In fact, many young men perceive condom use as a greater threat because condoms can hinder sexual performance which threatens masculine status (Davis, et al., 2014; Fleming et al., 2016). This fear of STDs could be explained by the age of my participants. After all, men have been found to increasingly value their health and devalue sexual prowess as they age (Kimmel,

2008; Springer & Mouzon, 2011). These strategies support previous theorizing that masculinity constructions shift as men age (Connell, 2005; Kimmel, 2008).

The third discursive substrategy involved young men resisting hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture through expressing desire for emotional connection and encouraging non-aggressive sexual communication practices. These substrategies can be partially explained by research on hookups and gendered sexual discourses. One implicit rule within hookup culture is that hookups should be emotionally detached (Epstein et al., 2009; Wade, 2017, 2021). Additionally, young men are often expected to be more sexually aggressive and emotionally callous in sexual situations (Kimmel, 2008; Wiederman, 2005). However, Wade (2021) points out, young adults “do” sexual casualness within hookup culture; therefore, sexual casualness can also be undone. Despite this, Wade (2021) notes many negative social repercussions can come from a failure to follow the implicit rules of hookup culture. This could explain why participants chose not to participate in hookup culture, rather than expressing emotions within hookup culture.

Regardless, these substrategies highlight ways that young men discursively resist and even potentially undo gendered sexual scripts. This adds to the growing body of masculinity and hookup literature that suggests young men are increasing resisting hegemonic masculine expectations (i.e., sexual aggression and emotional callousness; Anderson, 2010; Dalessandro, 2019; Epstein et al., 2009; Harris & Harper, 2014; Lamont et al., 2018; Olmstead et al., 2013). This study builds on more recent masculinity theorizing by finding further evidence for masculinities shifting to be more “productive” and “inclusive” (Anderson, 2010; Harris & Harper, 2014). In doing so, this study helps articulate the subtle changes in masculinity construction and performance.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

Although this study provided meaningful contributions to the masculinity and hookup literature, it also had some limitations. First, this study lacked diversity along race and class lines. These findings do not capture the experiences of those who do not have race and class privileges. Additionally, the experiences of trans men were not captured. These factors play a profound role in how young men conceptualize and, in turn, enact masculinity (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013; Lamont et al., 2018; Ray & Rosow, 2010). These young men are underrepresented within the hookup literature and future research should adopt more intersectional and inclusive approaches to capture their experiences. Second, the use of interviews could have also been a limitation. Masculinity is performative and shifts based on the audience and nature of the interaction (Iacoviello et al., 2022; Montemurro & Riehman-Murphy, 2019; Sweeney, 2014). Young men express more private masculinities in intimate settings where they are less likely to be policed by peers (Montemurro & Riehman-Murphy, 2019). How participants enact masculinity in a naturalistic social setting is likely different than how they would during an interview. To capture this, there is a need for future work to employ more observational methods to understand masculinity within hookup culture.

### **Conclusion**

Overall, this study discovered that young men employ various, at times conflicting, strategies when discursively navigating hegemonic masculinity within hookup culture. While this study found increasing evidence for more productive and inclusive masculinities, it also found hegemonic masculinity is still persistent within hookup culture. Gender unequal power dynamics still persist within hookup culture making gender research within this context increasingly vital. By exposing the masculinity constructions that help to perpetuate these unequal power dynamics, this research can help guide what issues educational programming should focus on. Furthermore, men often misperceive the extent to which other men actually endorse or enact hegemonic masculine norms (Iacoviello et al., 2022; Munsch et al., 2018). Research shows men are more likely to endorse and enact masculinity constructions that they perceive to be consistent with their peers (Currier, 2013; Kalish, 2013; Sweeney, 2014) or the

social norms of the given context (Iacoviello et al., 2022; Munsch et al., 2018). By highlighting how hegemonic masculinity is steadily becoming less of the social norm amongst their peers, this work could help inspire young men to reevaluate their ideas of masculinity and potentially shift away from construction of masculinity that perpetuate unequal power dynamics.

## References

- Abbott, J. Y., & Geraths, C. (2021). Modern masculinities: Resistance to hegemonic masculinity in *Modern Family*. *Journal of Contemporary Rhetoric*, 11(1/2), 36–56.
- Anderson, E. (2010). *Inclusive masculinity: The changing nature of masculinities*. Routledge.
- Armstrong, E. A., England, P., & Fogarty, A. C. (2012). Accounting for women's orgasm and sexual enjoyment in college hookups and relationships. *American Sociological Review*, 77(3), 435–462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412445802>
- Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L. T., Armstrong, E. M., & Seeley, J. L. (2014). “Good Girls” gender, social class, and slut discourse on campus. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 77(2), 100–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272514521220>
- Ashcraft, K., & Mumby, D. K. (2003). *Reworking gender: A feminist communicology of organization*. Sage Publications.
- Bogle, K. A. (2008). *Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus*. New York University Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- Campbell, A. (2008). The morning after the night before: Affective reactions to one-night stands among mated and unmated women and men. *Human Nature*, 19(2), 157–173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-008-9036-2>
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.
- Connaughton, S. L., Linabary, J. R., & Yakova, L. (2017). Discursive construction. *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc063>
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Currier, D. M. (2013). Strategic ambiguity: Protecting emphasized femininity and hegemonic masculinity in the hookup culture. *Gender & Society*, 27(5), 704–727. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243213493960>
- Davis, K. C., Schraufnagel, T. J., Kajumulo, K. F., Gilmore, A. K., Norris, J., & George, W. H. (2014). A qualitative examination of men's condom use attitudes and resistance: “It's just part of the game”. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43(3), 631–643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0150-9>
- Dalessandro, C. (2019). Manifesting maturity: Gendered sexual intimacy and becoming an adult. *Sexualities*, 22(1-2), 165–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1363460717699779>
- Downing-Matibag, T. M., & Geisinger, B. (2009). Hooking up and sexual risk taking among college students: A health belief model perspective. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(9), 1196–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1049732309344206>
- England, P., Shafer, E. F., & Fogarty, A. C. K. (2012). Hooking up and forming romantic relationships on today's college campuses. In M. Kimmel, & A. Aronson (Eds.), *The Gendered Society Reader* (5th ed., pp. 559–572). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Epstein, M., Calzo, J. P., Smiler, A. P., & Ward, L. M. (2009). “Anything from making out to having sex”: Men's negotiation of hooking up and friends with benefits scripts. *Journal of Sex Research*, 46, 414–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490902775801>
- Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual hookups among first-semester female college students. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 36(4), 346–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2010.488118>
- Fisher, M. L., Worth, K., Garcia, J. R., & Meredith, T. (2012). Feelings of regret following uncommitted sexual encounters in Canadian university students. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 14(1), 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2011.619579>
- Fleming, P. J., DiClemente, R. J., & Barrington, C. (2016). Masculinity and HIV: Dimensions of masculine norms that contribute to men's HIV-related sexual behaviors. *AIDS and Behavior*, 20(4), 788–798. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10461-015-1264-y>

- Ford, J. V. (2017). Sexual assault on college hookups: The role of alcohol and acquaintances. *Sociological Forum*, 32(2) 381–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12335>
- Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), 720–742. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211409727>
- Hamilton, L., & Armstrong, E. A. (2009). Gendered sexuality in young adulthood: Double binds and flawed options. *Gender & Society*, 23(5), 589–616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243209345829>
- Harris III, F., & Harper, S. R. (2014). Beyond bad behaving brothers: Productive performances of masculinities among college fraternity men. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(6), 703–723. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2014.901577>
- Herbenick, D., Rosenberg, M., Goltzari-Arroyo, L., Fortenberry, J. D., & Fu, T. C. (2022). Changes in penile-vaginal intercourse frequency and sexual repertoire from 2009 to 2018: Findings from the national survey of sexual health and behavior. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 51(3), 1419–1433. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02125-2>
- Hess, A., Menegatos, L., & Savage, M. W. (2015). Shaming Jane: A feminist Foucauldian analysis of how college students employ the sexual double standard in peer interventions. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 38(4), 462–485. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2015.1085476>
- Holman, A., & Sillars, A. (2012). Talk about “hooking up”: The influence of college student social networks on nonrelationship sex. *Health Communication*, 27(2), 205–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2011.575540>
- Iacoviello, V., Valsecchi, G., Berent, J., Borinca, I., & Falomir-Pichastor, J. M. (2022). Is traditional masculinity still valued? Men’s perceptions of how different reference groups value traditional masculinity norms. *The Journal of Men’s Studies*, 30(1), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10608265211018803>
- Kalish, R. (2013). Masculinities and hooking up: Sexual decision-making at college. *Culture, Society and Masculinities*, 5(2), 147–165. <https://doi.org/10.3149/CSM.0502.147>
- Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. Harper & Brothers.
- Klinger, L. (2016). Hookup culture on college campuses: Centering college women, communication barriers, and negative outcomes. *College Student Affairs Leadership*, 3(2). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/csai/vol3/iss2/5>
- Kuperberg, A., & Padgett, J. E. (2016). The role of culture in explaining college students’ selection into hookups, dates, and long-term romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33(8), 1070–1096. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407515616876>
- Lamont, E., Roach, T., & Kahn, S. (2018). Navigating campus hookup culture: LGBTQ students and college hookups. *Sociological Forum*, 33(4), 1000–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12458>
- Lewis, M. A., Granato, H., Blayney, J. A., Lostutter, T. W., & Kilmer, J. R. (2012). Predictors of hooking up sexual behaviors and emotional reactions among US college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(5), 1219–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-011-9817-2>
- Maas, M. K., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2015). Sexual esteem in emerging adulthood: Associations with sexual behavior, contraception use, and romantic relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 52(7), 795–806. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2014.945112>
- Menegatos, L., Lederman, L., & Hess, A. (2010). Friends Don’t Let Jane Hook Up Drunk: A Qualitative Analysis of Participation in a Simulation of College Drinking-Related Decisions. *Communication Education*, 59(3), 374–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634521003628909>
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (2018). *Hegemonic masculinity: Formulation, reformulation, and amplification*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Montemurro, B., & Riehm-Murphy, C. (2019). Ready and waiting: Heterosexual men’s decision-making narratives in initiation of sexual intimacy. *Men and Masculinities*, 22(5), 872–892. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077184X17753040>
- Mumby, D. K. (1998). Organizing men: Power, discourse, and the social construction of masculinity (s) in the workplace. *Communication Theory*, 8(2), 164–183.

- Munsch, C. L., Weaver, J. R., Bosson, J. K., & O'Connor, L. T. (2018). Everybody but me: Pluralistic ignorance and the masculinity contest. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(3), 551–578. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12282>
- Olmstead, S. B., Billen, R. M., Conrad, K. A., Pasley, K., & Fincham, F. D. (2013). Sex, commitment, and casual sex relationships among college men: A mixed-methods analysis. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 42*(4), 561–571. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-0047-z>
- Orchowski, L. M., Edwards, K. M., Hollander, J. A., Banyard, V. L., Senn, C. Y., & Gidycz, C. A. (2020). Integrating sexual assault resistance, bystander, and men's social norms strategies to prevent sexual violence on college campuses: A call to action. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 21*(4), 811–827. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1524838018789153>
- Owen, J., & Fincham, F. D. (2011). Young adults' emotional reactions after hooking up encounters. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 40*(2), 321–330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-010-9652-x>
- Pham, J. M. (2017). Beyond hookup culture: Current trends in the study of college student sex and where to next. *Sociology Compass, 11*(8), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12499>
- Platt, C. A., & Krause, J. A. (2022). Discursive constructions of women's sexuality in college hookup culture. *Women & Language, 45*(2), 103–132. <https://doi-org/10.34036/WL.2022.014>
- Rakow, L. F. (1986). Rethinking gender research in communication. *Journal of Communication, 36*(4), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1986.tb01447.x>
- Ray, R., & Rosow, J. A. (2010). Getting off and getting intimate: How normative institutional arrangements structure black and white fraternity men's approaches toward women. *Men and Masculinities, 12*(5), 523–546. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1097184X09331750>
- Reiber, C., & Garcia, J. R. (2010). Hooking up: Gender differences, evolution, and pluralistic ignorance. *Evolutionary Psychology, 8*(3), 390–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F147470491000800307>
- Reling, T. T., Barton, M. S., Becker, S., & Valasik, M. A. (2018). Rape myths and hookup culture: An exploratory study of US college students' perceptions. *Sex Roles, 78*(7-8), 501–514. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0813-4>
- Richardson, D. (2010). Youth masculinities: compelling male heterosexuality. *The British Journal of Sociology, 61*(4), 737–756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01339.x>
- Robinson, B. A. (2015). “Personal preference” as the new racism: Gay desire and racial cleansing in cyberspace. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 1*(2), 317–330. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2332649214546870>
- Robson Jr., J. P., & Troutman-Jordan, M. (2014). A concept analysis of cognitive reframing. *Journal of Theory Construction & Testing, 18*(2), 55–59.
- Rodriguez, N. S., Huemmer, J., & Blumell, L. E. (2016). Mobile masculinities: An investigation of networked masculinities in gay dating apps. *Masculinities & Social Change, 5*(3), 241–267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17583/mcs.2016.2047>
- Salazar, L. F., Vivolo-Kantor, A., Hardin, J., & Berkowitz, A. (2014). A web-based sexual violence bystander intervention for male college students: Randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 16*(9), e203. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.3426>
- Slevin, K. F., & Linneman, T. J. (2010). Old gay men's bodies and masculinities. *Men and Masculinities, 12*(4), 483–507. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1097184X08325225>
- Springer, K. W., & Mouzon, D. M. (2011). “Macho men” and preventive health care: Implications for older men in different social classes. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 52*(2), 212–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022146510393972>
- Sweeney, B. N. (2014). Masculine status, sexual performance, and the sexual stigmatization of women. *Symbolic Interaction, 37*(3), 369–390. <https://doi.org/10.1002/symb>
- Thompson Jr, E. H., & Bennett, K. M. (2015). Measurement of masculinity ideologies: A (critical) review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(2), 115–133. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038609>



- Tracy, S. J. (2019). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wade, L. (2017). *American hookup: The new culture of sex on campus*. Norton & Co.
- Wade, L. (2021). Doing casual sex: A sexual fields approach to the emotional force of hookup culture. *Social Problems*, 68(1), 185–201. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spz054>
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0891243287001002002>
- Department of Justice. (2018, November 5). Protecting students from sexual assault. <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/protecting-students-sexual-assault>
- Whitesel, J. (2014). *Fat gay men: Girth, mirth, and the politics of stigma*. NYU Press.
- Wiederman, M. W. (2005). The gendered nature of sexual scripts. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 13, 496–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480705278729>