

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

Sweta Chaubey^{1*}, Dr. Namita Srivastava²

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between selected masculinity norms like avoidance of femininity, restrictive emotionality, aggression and self-reliance and psychological distress (anxiety, stress, depression) among young adults males aged 18 to 30 years. A correlational research design was used on a sample of 100 participants recruited by convenience sampling. Masculinity norms were measured using selected subscales of the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI-58) namely are avoidance of femininity, aggression, self-reliance and restrictive emotionality and the assessment of the psychological distress was done using the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS-21). The results indicated that self-reliance did not show significant associations with anxiety, stress, or depression. Aggression was significantly associated with stress, but it did not show significant relationships with anxiety or depression. In contrast, restrictive emotionality did not demonstrate significant associations with any psychological distress indicators. Additionally, avoidance of femininity showed significant positive associations with stress and depression, indicating that higher endorsement of this norm is linked to greater psychological distress. Furthermore, stress, anxiety, and depression were found to be highly intercorrelated, reflecting overlapping dimensions of psychological distress. The findings suggest that specific dimensions of traditional masculine are associated with mental health outcomes among young adult men. The findings emphasised the need for culturally attuned, gender-responsive mental health interventions that address rigid or traditional masculine norms and promote emotional openness and adaptive coping strategies

Keywords: *Masculinity Norms, Psychological Distress, Self-Reliance, Avoidance of Femininity, Aggression, Depression, Anxiety, Young Adult Men*

Mental health has become significantly growing concern in contemporary world, shaped by social, cultural, and psychological factors influencing the overall well-being of an individual. Although substantial research has explored the mental health of women and children but comparatively limited attention has been given to men's mental health but this neglect is not merely accidental but it is deeply rooted in prevailing gender/masculinity that influence men's perception, expression and emotional regulation. In

¹Student, Amity Institute of Behavioural and Allied Sciences, Amity University Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow Campus, India.

²Assistant Professor, Amity Institute of Behavioural and Allied Sciences, Amity University Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow Campus, India.

*Corresponding Author

Received: April 04, 2026; Revision Received: April 14, 2026; Accepted: April 18, 2026

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

recent years, many researchers have noted that this neglect is not merely incidental but it is closely tied to prevailing gender norms that shape how men perceive, express and cope with psychological distress. A growing body of research highlights that masculinity norms play a pivotal role in shaping men's mental health outcomes, particularly during developmental stages such as adulthood.

Masculinity norms are socially constructed ideals, expectations and cultural standards that shape male behaviour. These norms often highlight traits that affect men's perception, expression, and regulation of emotions, such as aggressiveness, self-reliance, avoidance of femininity, and restricting emotionality. During young adulthood, a developmental stage characterized by identity development, social expectations, and increased vulnerability to mental health issues like stress, anxiety, and depression, these standards are specifically important. The increasing mental health problem among young males is sometimes assessed by combining these interconnected measures of psychological distress. These traditional masculinity norms have been shown to have a major influence on psychological outcomes in young adults.

Restrictive emotionality is characterized by avoiding vulnerability and suppressing emotional expression. Extensive research has linked restrictive emotionality with stress, anxiety, and depression. R Gados et al. (2023) the study examined young Filipino men adhere to traditional masculinity norms and how this impacts their emotional expressions. Findings suggest strong conformity to emotional restraint, independence and work-focused identity, with emotional expression characterized more by suppression than openness, suggesting the need for culturally sensitive interventions.

Aggression is often linked to risk-taking, toughness, and domination. Research indicates that it increases externalizing coping strategies and stress reactivity, which may indirectly exacerbate anxiety and depressive symptoms. Sileo and Kershaw (2020) the study analysed different masculine norms (status, toughness, and anti-femininity) affect depression and mental health service use among young men aged 18–25. Findings showed that valuing status was linked with fewer depressive symptoms and more help-seeking, while toughness and anti-femininity were related to higher substance use, hostility, and reduced engagement with mental health service use.

The notion that males should solve difficulties on their own, without seeking professional or emotional assistance, is reflected in self-reliance. Few researches suggest that conformity to self-reliance as a masculinity norm in men link to negative mental health outcomes. JN Kriby (2024) found that adherence to masculine norms is significantly associated with elevated level of depression and anxiety. These relationships were mediated through, reduce perception of social sadness, insecurity striving and fears of compassion particularly for self-reliance and emotional control.

Avoiding femininity entails shunning actions, characteristics, or expressions that are deemed feminine by society. Internal anguish and emotional repression are intimately associated with this norm. Avoidance of femininity was identified as to be a significant predictor of depressive symptoms by Sileo and Kershaw (2020).

Psychologically speaking, stringent adherence to conventional masculinity norms may impede adaptive coping and emotional expression. Excessive self-reliance and the suppression of vulnerability can exacerbate feelings of loneliness, reduce social support, and

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

cause internal conflict. This tension may eventually lead to maladaptive behavioural reactions, elevated stress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms. Wong, Wo, Wang & Miller (2017) examined a meta-analysis of 78 samples comprising 19,453 participants showed that adherence to masculine norms was linked with modestly negative mental health and reduced willingness of help-seeking support. Fisher et. al. (2022) this review explored anxiety symptoms among men and how masculinity influences them. It found that men often rely on self-reliance instead of seeking professional help. Masculine norms such as emotional restriction were associated with higher anxiety and stigma around mental health.

Through the use of a quantitative research design, the current study aims to investigate the relationship between young adult males between the ages of 18 and 30's levels of stress, anxiety, and depression and their restrictive emotionality, aggression, self-reliance, and avoidance of femininity. This study attempts to offer a more nuanced view of how different gender role expectations contribute to psychological distress by concentrating on particular aspects of masculinity norms rather than masculinity as a global concept. The results are anticipated to enable the development of focused, culturally aware interventions that foster emotional well-being while opposing detrimental masculine norms and add to the expanding body of research on men's mental health

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The term masculinity norms is a socially constructed set of ideals and expectations that shape how men behave in society. These norms influence how men perceive, express and regulate emotions and help-seeking behaviour. These norms particularly influence during young adulthood, a developmental stage related to identity formation, independence, social responsibility, and heightened vulnerability to psychological distress. These interrelated forms depression, anxiety and stress act as key indicators to studying the mental health difficulties, reflecting the cumulative psychological burden experienced in young men. This review integrates several studies on how masculinity norms affect mental health outcomes like depression, anxiety and stress.

Several studies have examined the conformity to traditional masculinity norms causes psychological distress among men. N. Kenig et al. (2020) demonstrated that conformity of hegemonic masculinity norms among young adults shows negative mental health outcomes, including depression, anxiety, emotional closure and health-threatening behaviour. The study was conducted on 310 Ethnic Macedonia men of 20 to 30 years old in 20 different cities. Similarly, Sileo & Kershaw et. al. (2020) the study followed cohort study on heterosexual men over 6 months which found that status, anti-femininity, and toughness affect depression and mental health service utilisation in men 18 to 25 years in the Northeast United States. Danielle Herreen et.al. (2022) examined the relationship between psychological inflexibility mediated by depression and conformity masculinity norms. The study was conducted on 326 men by using CMNI. The result indicates that psychological inflexibility may mediate the pathway between conformity to masculinity norms and depression. Gal Aharon et.al (2024) the study examined the relationship between psychological flexibility, alexithymia and conformality to masculine norms may lead to depressive and somatization symptoms using cross-sectional design on 119 Israeli men. The result indicates that masculinity norms contribute to depression when psychological flexibility was low in men. Iwamoto et.al (2018) the study was conducted on 332 men of their first year of college in Mid-Atlantic region of the United States using a longitudinal method demonstrated adherence to masculinity norms (self-reliance, playboy and violence contribute to depressive symptoms, while winning and power over women were less likely

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

to contribute to depressive symptoms. The existing body of research provides further support for empirical findings of Kaya et al. (2019), who examined the adherence of masculinity norms and gender role conflict on eudaimonic psychological well-being in young adults. This longitudinal study was conducted on 278 college-going men over six months. The findings indicate that masculine norms (power, playboy) and gender role conflict (restrictive emotionality) are associated with lower levels of well-being, while masculine norms (winning) is positively associated with well-being. Collectively these findings show a correlation between masculinity norms and psychological distress.

From a theoretical perspective, the understanding of masculinity norms is grounded in (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity, which posits that dominant cultural ideals of masculinity are shaped by power relations and social hierarchies that privilege certain masculine traits over others. These ideals define what it means to be a "real man" and create pressure to conform to standards such as emotional restraint, toughness, and dominance. The gender role strain paradigm further explains that when men experience conflict between their personal emotional experiences and socially prescribed gender roles, psychological strain emerges. This strain may manifest as depression, anxiety, or chronic stress when men feel unable to meet these expectations or suppress authentic emotional expression. From a wider social standpoint, media representations, peer relationships, family socialisation, and institutional systems that discourage vulnerability and promote dominance and emotional control all serve to maintain masculinity standards. In addition to influencing individual behaviour, these social norms also have an impact on public perceptions of men's mental health, frequently stigmatising emotional expression and seeking help behaviour in young males may consequently internalise these norms, which could lead to delayed intervention and underreporting of distress.

Although substantial evidence linked masculinity norms to psychological distress, much of the existing research examines masculinity norms either as a global or single construct and focuses on isolated indicators of distress, primarily within western and mixed-age samples. There is limited research exploring specific dimensions of masculinity norms and their simultaneous association with depression, anxiety and stress within the Indian context on young adults. Addressing this gap is necessary for nuanced understanding of specific dimensions of masculinity norms and psychological distress.

Rationale of the study

The rationale for the present study emerges from the increasing recognition that mental health concerns among young adult men both prevalent and not properly addressed. Stress, anxiety and depression to remain as major psychological challenges during emerging adulthood, a developmental stage in a person's life that is marked by identity formation, academic and occupational pressures, and evolving interpersonal roles. In spite of experiencing tremendous distress, young men are less likely to seek professional help, usually due to internalised gender norms that consciously and subconsciously discourage expressions of emotions and of vulnerability. The importance of examining sociocultural factors that shape men's psychological experiences is highlighted by this pattern. One of the influential factors that has been identified is conformity to masculine norms. The most significant norms which may discourage help-seeking behaviour and restricted adaptive emotional processing are self-reliance, emotional control, toughness, and avoidance of femininity. Although certain aspects of masculinity, like orientation towards achievement or status striving, may enhance self-confidence, other conservative and rigid

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

norms are being continuously associated with higher levels of stress, anxiety and depressive symptoms, hostility and substance abuse. Although the research may point towards certain norms being responsible for mental distress, masculinity is still multi-dimensional construct, and existing research has produced mixed findings regarding whether specific norms function as protective or risk factors. Even though earlier studies have explored masculinity and mental health independently, fewer investigations have examined distinct masculine norm dimensions in relation to multiple indicators of psychological distress within young adult populations. There remains a need to better understanding of how conformity to specific traditional masculine norms relates simultaneously towards, anxiety, depression and stress during this critical stage of life. Addressing this gap could lead to a more detailed understanding of gendered pathways to mental health outcomes or consequences. Therefore, the present study seeks to examine the relationship between adherence to selected masculine norms and level of stress, anxiety and depression among young adult men aged between 18 to 30 years.

By examining the relationship, the study aims to contribute in nuanced understanding how different dimensions of masculinity influence psychological well-being, this research aim to inform gender sensitive prevention strategies and interventions approaches tailored to young men.

Objective of the study

1. To examine the relationship of avoidance of femininity (masculinity norms) with stress, anxiety and depression (psychological distress).
2. To examine the relationship of Restrictive emotionality (masculinity norms) with stress, anxiety and depression (psychological distress).
3. To examine the relationship of Aggression (masculinity norms) with stress, anxiety and depression (psychological distress).
4. To examine the relationship of Self-reliance (masculinity norms) with stress, anxiety and depression (psychological distress).

Hypotheses

- **H1:** Avoidance of femininity (masculinity norms) would be positively correlated with stress, anxiety and depression (psychological distress).
- **H2:** Restrictive emotionality (masculinity norms) would be positively correlated with stress, anxiety and depression (psychological distress).
- **H3:** Aggression (masculinity norms) would be positively correlated with stress, anxiety and depression (psychological distress).
- **H4:** Self-reliance (masculinity norms) would be positively correlated with stress, anxiety and depression (psychological distress).

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The present study employed a correlational research design to examine the relationship between masculinity norms and psychological distress among young adult males. This design was appropriate for assessing the strength and direction of associations without manipulating variables. The sample comprised 100 males aged 18–30 years, predominantly undergraduate students, with a smaller proportion pursuing or having completed postgraduate studies. Participants were recruited through convenience sampling and voluntarily provided informed consent prior to participation. The sample size was

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

considered sufficient for conducting Pearson's correlation analysis, in line with methodological recommendations for examining relationship.

Inclusion Criteria

- Male individuals belonging to the age group 18-30 years
- Participants who provided informed consent.
- Participants who completed all questionnaire items.

Exclusion Criteria

- Female participants.
- Individuals outside the specified age group.
- Incomplete or improperly filled questionnaire responses.

Measures

Considering the research objectives, validated instruments were adopted from established literature sources to assess masculinity norms and psychological distress among young adult men.

- 1. Male Role Norms Inventory–58 (MRNI-58):** Masculinity norms were measured using selected subscales from the Male Role Norms Inventory–58 (MRNI-58) developed by (Levant et al., 2010). For the present study, four core dimensions of traditional masculine ideology were included: restrictive emotionality, self-reliance, aggression, and avoidance of femininity. A total of 30 items corresponding to these four dimensions were adopted from the original inventory. Responses were recorded on a Likert-type scale, with higher scores indicating stronger endorsement of traditional masculine norms. The original instrument has demonstrated satisfactory reliability and construct validity across diverse populations.
- 2. Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21):** Psychological distress was assessed using the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales–21 (DASS-21) developed by Sydney H. Lovibond and Peter F. Lovibond (1995), which consists of 21 items divided into three subscales measuring depression, anxiety, and stress, with seven items in each subscale. Responses were recorded on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 3, with higher scores reflecting greater levels of psychological distress. Both instruments have been widely used in psychological research and have demonstrated strong psychometric properties in previous studies.

RESULTS

The result for masculinity norms and psychological distress are presented in Table 1. The mean scores indicate moderate levels of restrictive emotionality ($M = 41.36$, $SD = 9.01$), aggression ($M = 34.96$, $SD = 6.84$), and self-reliance ($M = 34.96$, $SD = 10.84$). Avoidance of femininity showed a mean of 28.89 ($SD = 7.36$). Stress, anxiety, and depression scores were relatively lower but demonstrated greater variability (SDs ranging from 10.20 to 12.31).

Table 1 Mean scores for Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress Variables (N = 100)

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation
Avoidance of Femininity (F)	28.89	7.36
Restrictive Emotionality (RE)	41.36	9.01
Aggression (A)	34.96	6.84

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation
Self-Reliance (SR)	34.96	8.48
Stress (S)	17.10	10.40
Anxiety (AN)	17.66	10.98
Depression (D)	18.96	12.30

Source: Researcher's own work

Table 2 The correlation table for male young adults (N = 100) shows how masculinity norms are associated with stress, anxiety, and depression.

	Stress (S)	Anxiety (AN)	Depression (D)
F (Avoid Femininity)	.206*	.097	.247*
	(.040)	(.337)	(.013)
RE (Restrictive Emotionality)	.122	.060	.050
	(.228)	(.553)	(.618)
A (Aggression)	.245*	.093	-.014
	(.014)	(.355)	(.891)
SR (Self-Reliance)	.084	-.007	.036
	(.406)	(.948)	(.725)

*p < .05

** p < .01

Source: Researcher's own work

The correlations between Avoidance of Femininity (F) and stress show a significant positive association ($r = .206$, $p = .040$), indicating that higher avoidance of femininity is associated with higher stress levels among male adults. Similarly, Avoidance of Femininity and depression demonstrate a significant positive correlation ($r = .247$, $p = .013$), suggesting that greater avoidance of femininity is linked to higher depression scores. However, the relationship between Avoidance of Femininity and anxiety is non-significant ($r = .097$, $p = .337$), indicating no association with anxiety. Therefore, Hypothesis H1 is partially supported.

Considering Restrictive Emotionality (RE), the correlations with stress ($r = .122$, $p = .228$), anxiety ($r = .060$, $p = .553$), and depression ($r = .050$, $p = .618$) are all non-significant. This indicates that restrictive emotionality is not significantly associated with psychological distress variables in the present study. Hence, Hypothesis H2 is not supported.

For Aggression (A), the correlation with stress shows a significant positive association ($r = .245$, $p = .014$), suggesting that higher aggression is associated with higher stress levels. However, aggression does not show significant relationships with anxiety ($r = .093$, $p = .355$) or depression ($r = -.014$, $p = .891$), indicating no association with these variables. Therefore, Hypothesis H3 is partially supported.

Finally, Self-Reliance (SR) does not demonstrate significant associations with mental health outcomes. The correlations with stress ($r = .084$, $p = .406$), anxiety ($r = -.007$, $p = .948$), and depression ($r = .036$, $p = .725$) are all non-significant. This indicates that self-reliance is not significantly associated with psychological distress among male adults. Therefore, Hypothesis H4 is not supported.

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the relationship between masculinity norms restrictive emotionality, aggression, self-reliance, and avoidance of femininity and psychological distress indicators (stress, anxiety, and depression) among young adult males aged 18–30 years. The results revealed both expected and unexpected associations, offering important insights into the role of gender norms in shaping mental health outcomes.

Avoidance of Femininity

Hypothesis H1 proposed that avoidance of femininity would show a significant positive correlation with stress, anxiety, and depression. The findings partially supported this hypothesis, as avoidance of femininity was significantly and positively correlated with stress ($r = .206, p = .040$) and depression ($r = .247, p = .013$), leading to the acceptance of H1 for these variables. However, the relationship with anxiety was not significant ($r = .097, p = .337$), resulting in the partial rejection of the hypothesis. These findings suggest that individuals who strongly reject traits associated with femininity, such as emotional expression and vulnerability, may experience higher levels of internalized distress, particularly stress and depression. This may be due to restricted emotional processing and limited coping flexibility. The non-significant association with anxiety may indicate that anxiety is influenced more by cognitive and physiological factors rather than gender role beliefs. These results are consistent with previous research (Sileo & Kershaw, 2020), which found that anti-femininity norms are more strongly linked with internalized distress outcomes.

Restrictive Emotionality

Hypothesis H2 proposed that restrictive emotionality would be positively correlated with stress, anxiety, and depression. However, the findings did not support this hypothesis, as no significant associations were found with stress ($r = .122, p = .228$), anxiety ($r = .060, p = .553$), or depression ($r = .050, p = .618$), leading to the rejection of H2. This lack of significant association may be explained through multiple perspectives. Culturally, emotional restraint is often normalized among men, particularly within the Indian context, where it is viewed as a sign of strength and maturity. As a result, individuals may not perceive emotional suppression as distressing in the short term. Additionally, it is possible that restrictive emotionality affects psychological distress indirectly through mediating variables such as social support or coping styles, rather than showing a direct relationship. Measurement limitations and the relatively homogeneous sample (young adult students) may also have reduced variability in emotional expression. This finding diverges from some prior studies (Sileo & Kershaw, 2020; Herreen et al., 2022), suggesting that the impact of restrictive emotionality may depend on contextual and methodological factors.

Aggression

Hypothesis H3 proposed that aggression would be positively correlated with stress, anxiety, and depression. The findings partially supported this hypothesis, as aggression was significantly associated with stress ($r = .245, p = .014$), leading to the acceptance of H3 for stress. However, no significant associations were found with anxiety ($r = .093, p = .355$) or depression ($r = -.014, p = .891$), resulting in partial rejection of the hypothesis. These findings suggest that aggression may function as an externalizing response to stress, where individuals express psychological tension through outward behaviours such as irritability or conflict. While this may be associated with increased stress levels, it does not necessarily translate into internalized forms of distress such as anxiety or depression. It is also possible that aggression may mask underlying emotional difficulties rather than

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

eliminate them, thereby weakening its observable association with internal distress variables. This interpretation aligns with previous research (Iwamoto et al., 2018), which indicates that certain masculine norms are more strongly linked to externalizing behaviors.

Self-Reliance

Hypothesis H4 proposed that self-reliance would be positively correlated with stress, anxiety, and depression. However, the findings did not support this hypothesis, as self-reliance was not significantly associated with stress ($r = .084$, $p = .406$), anxiety ($r = -.007$, $p = .948$), or depression ($r = .036$, $p = .725$), leading to the rejection of H4. This suggests that self-reliance may not function as a direct predictor of psychological distress in this sample. While high self-reliance is often associated with reduced help-seeking behavior, it may also reflect adaptive qualities such as independence, resilience, and effective problem-solving. Therefore, its impact on mental health may vary depending on contextual and individual differences. It is also possible that self-reliance becomes maladaptive only when it reaches extreme levels or is combined with social isolation, which may not have been captured in the present study. This finding contrasts with earlier research (Iwamoto et al., 2018), indicating that the relationship between self-reliance and distress may not be consistent across populations.

Taken together, the findings indicate that masculinity norms are multidimensional and exert differential effects on psychological distress. Avoidance of femininity was found to be positively associated with stress and depression, while aggression showed a limited positive association with stress. However, restrictive emotionality and self-reliance did not demonstrate significant relationships with psychological distress variables. Overall, the hypotheses received partial support, highlighting that certain dimensions of masculinity norms may be more strongly linked to psychological distress than others. These findings emphasize the importance of adopting culturally sensitive and multidimensional approaches to understanding masculinity, as well as promoting adaptive coping strategies to support the mental health of young adult males.

Implications

The findings of the present study have important practical and theoretical implications, as specific dimensions of masculinity norms, particularly avoidance of femininity and, to a lesser extent, aggression, show significant associations with psychological distress. These findings highlight the need for gender-sensitive mental health interventions that address these rigid norms. Counsellors and psychologists can incorporate strategies that encourage emotional expression and help-seeking behaviour among young men. Additionally, the study underscores the importance of awareness programs in educational institutions to challenge harmful societal expectations related to masculinity, as promoting healthier and more flexible gender norms may help reduce stigma around mental health. Overall, the findings contribute to a broader understanding of male mental health, suggesting that addressing cultural norms surrounding masculinity can play a crucial role in preventing psychological distress and enhancing overall well-being.

Limitations

The present study is subject to several limitations that require careful attention. First, the correlational design restricts the ability to infer causality; although relationship between masculinity norms and psychological distress were observed, the direction of influence cannot be determined. Second, data were collected using self-report questionnaires, which introduces possibility of social desirability bias, particularly given the sensitive nature of

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

masculinity norms and emotional distress. Third, the sample composed primarily of urban, educated young adult men, limiting the applicability of findings to rural populations, older adults, or individuals from different socioeconomic or cultural backgrounds. Additionally, since data were collected at a single point in time, the study does not capture changes in masculinity norms or psychological distress across developmental stages. Another limitation is that mediating variables such as coping strategies, psychological flexibility, or social support were not examined, even though they may explain how masculinity norms influence psychological distress. Finally, only four dimensions of masculinity norms restrictive emotionality, aggression, self-reliance, and avoidance of femininity were included, while other potentially relevant dimensions such as dominance or achievement orientation were not assessed.

Future Research Directions

- Expand to more diverse populations, including rural and non-student samples, to capture broader sociocultural influences.
- Employ longitudinal designs to clarify causal pathways between masculinity norms and psychological distress.
- Investigate mediating and moderating variables (e.g., social support, coping strategies, cultural values) to explain indirect effects.
- Conduct intervention-based studies to test the effectiveness of gender-sensitive counselling strategies in reducing distress among young men.

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to the literature on masculinity norms and mental health by showing that avoidance of femininity and aggression have selective associations with psychological distress among young adult males, while restrictive emotionality and self-reliance do not show significant direct relationships. Avoidance of femininity was significantly related to stress and depression, indicating that rejecting emotional openness may be associated with increased internal conflict and reduced coping. Aggression was associated with stress, suggesting its role as an externalizing response rather than a contributor to anxiety or depression.

In contrast, restrictive emotionality and self-reliance were not significantly related to distress, implying that their effects may be indirect or context-dependent. These findings highlight the importance of addressing specific harmful masculine norms, particularly avoidance of femininity, while promoting adaptive coping and emotional openness. Overall, the study emphasizes that masculinity norms are not uniform, and their impact, and certain dimensions may be more strongly related to mental health outcomes than others.

Furthermore, these findings have practical implications for mental health interventions targeting young men. Programs should focus on reducing rigid gender norms and encouraging emotional expression and help-seeking behaviours. Addressing avoidance of femininity in particular may help reduce stress and depressive symptoms. Such approaches can contribute to more effective and culturally sensitive mental health support for young adult males.

REFERENCES

Aharon G, Aisenberg-Shafran D, Levi-Belz Y. Adherence to Masculinity Norms and Depression Symptoms Among Israeli Men: The Moderating Role of Psychological

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

- Flexibility. *American Journal of Men's Health*. 2024;18(3). doi:10.1177/15579883241253820
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Depression Anxiety Stress Scales – 21-item version (DASS-21) Lovibond, S. H., & Lovibond, P. F. (1995). Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (2nd ed.). Sydney, Australia: Psychology Foundation Australia.
- Fisher, K., Seidler, Z. E., King, K., Oliffe, J. L., Robertson, S., & Rice, S. M. (2022). Men's anxiety, why it matters, and what is needed to limit its risk for male suicide. *Discover Psychology*, 2(1), 18. Men's anxiety, why it matters, and what is needed to limit its risk for male suicide | Discover Psychology | Springer Nature Link
- Gados, R. (2023). Exploring the Adherence to Masculine Norms and Emotional Expression of Male College Students. *Masculinities & Social Change*, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.17583/mcs.18215>
- Herreen, D., Rice, S., & Zajac, I. (2022). Psychological inflexibility mediates the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and depression: Preliminary support for a transdiagnostic approach to working therapeutically with men. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 26, 210-216. Psychological inflexibility mediates the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and depression: Preliminary support for a transdiagnostic approach to working therapeutically with men – Science Direct
- Iwamoto DK, Brady J, Kaya A, Park A. Masculinity and Depression: A Longitudinal Investigation of Multidimensional Masculine Norms Among College Men. *American Journal of Men's Health*. 2018;12(6):1873-1881. doi:10.1177/1557988318785549
- Kenig, N. (2020). Conformity to Masculine Norms and Its Effects on Men's Well-Being. *Annual of the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje*, 73(1), 157-182. <https://doi.org/10.37510/godzbo2073171k>
- Kirby, J. N., Day, J., & Gilbert, P. (2024). Social rank and compassion: How insecure striving, social safeness and fears of compassion mediate the relationship between masculinity, depression and anxiety. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 97(2), 339-353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/papt.12520>
- Male Role Norms Inventory – 58-item version (MRNI-58) Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L. S., Celentano, E., & Cozza, T. M. (1992). The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 14(3), 325–337.
- Psychology of Men & Masculinities Kaya, A., Iwamoto, D. K., Brady, J., Clinton, L., & Grivel, M. (2019). The role of masculine norms and gender role conflict on prospective well-being among men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 20(1), 142. psycnet.apa.org APA PsycNet Buy Page
- Ronald F. Levant, Rankin, T. J., Williams, C. M., Hasan, N. T., & Smalley, K. B. (2010). Evaluation of the factor structure and construct validity of the Male Role Norms Inventory–Revised (MRNI-R). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11(1), 25–37.
- Sileo KM, Kershaw TS. Dimensions of Masculine Norms, Depression, and Mental Health Service Utilization: Results from a Prospective Cohort Study Among Emerging Adult Men in the United States. *American Journal of Men's Health*. 2020;14(1). doi:10.1177/1557988320906980
- Wong, Y. J., Ho, M.-H. R., Wang, S.-Y., & Miller, I. S. K. (2017). Meta-analyses of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and mental health-related outcomes. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 64(1), 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000176>

Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Chaubey, S. & Srivastava, N. (2026). Masculinity Norms and Psychological Distress: A Correlational Study. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 14(2), 001-012. DIP:18.01.S51.20261402, DOI:10.25215/1402.S51