

Very masculine, not very feminine: social variations of gender

Mathieu Trachman, French Institute for Demographic Studies

Population & Societies, 605. <https://doi.org/10.3917/popsoc.605.0001>

Available at: <https://www.ined.fr/en/publications/editions/population-and-societies/>

Appendix: Methods and Results

Method

Tables 3 and 4 compare the gender positionings of heterosexual men and women with a partner at the time of the survey in relation to certain events in their sex life over the previous 12 months. The odds ratios measure the risks for men of saying they are ‘not very masculine’ or ‘very masculine’ rather than ‘quite masculine’ and for women of saying they are ‘not very feminine’ or ‘very feminine’ rather than ‘quite feminine’ according to whether or not they have experienced these events. ‘Quite masculine’ and ‘quite feminine’ are the reference categories. Non-responses are excluded. The odds ratios are obtained using a regression model to compare positionings after controlling for the differential effects of certain variables (age, corpulence, educational level, and occupation) across the groups.

Results

Table 3. Probability for partnered heterosexual men of saying they are ‘very masculine’ or ‘not very masculine’ rather than ‘quite masculine’, by sexual events experienced over the previous 12 months (odds ratios)		
	Not very masculine	Very masculine
Arguments about sexuality with partner	1.9 ** [1.3, 3.0]	1.1 (n.s.) [0.9, 1.3]
Consent to intercourse without really wanting it	2.3 *** [1.5, 3.7]	1.2 * [1.0, 1.4]
Refusal to have intercourse with partner	1.4 (n.s.) [0.9, 2.3]	1.1 (n.s.) [1.0, 1.3]

Interpretation: The probability of reporting as ‘not very masculine’ rather than ‘quite masculine’ is 1.9 times higher for heterosexual men who had sometimes or often had arguments about sexuality with their partner in the previous 12 months.

Method: Multinomial logistic regression. The reference category is ‘quite masculine’. The adjustment variables are age, corpulence, educational level, and occupation.

Statistical significance: *** $p < .001$. ** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$. $p > .05$ = non-significant (n.s.).

Coverage: All men identifying as heterosexual, with a partner at the time of the survey ($n = 7,897$).

Source: VIRAGE GP survey, INED, 2015.

Table 4. Probability for partnered heterosexual women of saying they are ‘very feminine’ or ‘not very feminine’ rather than ‘quite feminine’, by sexual events experienced over the previous 12 months (odds ratios)

	Not very feminine	Very feminine
Arguments about sexuality with partner	1.3 ** [1.0, 1.6]	0.8 * [0.7, 1.0]
Consent to intercourse without really wanting it	1.3 ** [1.1, 1.6]	1.0 (n.s.) [0.9, 1.1]
Refusal to have sexual intercourse with partner	1.4 *** [1.2, 1.7]	0.7 *** [0.6, 0.8]

Interpretation: The probability of reporting as ‘not very feminine’ rather than ‘quite feminine’ is 1.4 times higher for heterosexual women who had sometimes or often refused to have sexual intercourse with their partner in the previous 12 months.

Method: Multinomial logistic regression. The reference category is ‘quite feminine’. The adjustment variables are age, corpulence, educational level, and occupation.

Statistical significance: *** $p < .001$. ** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$. $p > .05$ = non-significant (n.s.).

Coverage: All women identifying as heterosexual, with a partner at the time of the survey ($n = 9,983$).

Source: VIRAGE GP survey, INED, 2015.