

Twinks, Jocks, and Bears, Oh My! Differing Body Ideals Among Gay Male Subcommunities

Samuel Fogarty and Dr. Catherine Walker

Union College

Abstract

Recent studies have focused on disordered eating psychopathology among gay men, particularly when oriented towards thinness or muscularity. Gay men are at increased risk of eating disorder symptoms when compared to heterosexual men and exhibit similar rates to women (Feldmen & Meyer, 2007; Frederick & Essayli, 2016; Siconolfi, Halkitis, Allomong, & Burton, 2009). However, the results remain muddled surrounding the topic of thinness- or muscularity-oriented eating psychopathology; the current study provides a potential response in subcultural gay appearance ideals. The present study examined the relationship between three gay subcultural appearance identities (twinks, jocks, and bears) and disordered eating attitudes and behaviors, such as dieting and muscularity-oriented eating. A total of 204 participants completed surveys assessing sexual orientation, gay subcultural identification, and eating psychopathology. Self-identified jocks reported significantly higher muscularity-oriented disordered eating than those who did not identify as jocks ($t=2.90, p=.004$). Participants who identified with a subcultural identity reported higher eating pathology than participants who did not ($t=2.04, p=.043$). Contrary to hypotheses, self-identified twinks did not report higher eating pathology than men who did not identify as twinks ($t=-.23, p=.821$). These results imply that gay subcultural identification may be a risk factor for disordered eating behaviors and attitudes among gay men. Furthermore, these findings may be especially relevant in clinical treatment of gay men who prescribe to such identities. Future research should explore specific types of behaviors associated with gay subcultural identification, as well as mediations such as gay hookup applications and LGBTQ community involvement.

Keywords: sexual minority men, gay men, eating disorder, twink, jock, bear

Introduction

While increasing amounts of research have recently focused on men with eating disorders, relatively little research has explored the relationships between sexual minority men and eating disorders. Furthermore, there has been a recent shift toward the increasing sociocultural appearance pressures on the male body—especially among the gay male community—in modern Western societies (Martins, Tiggemann, & Kirkbride, 2007). Mounting evidence has arisen supporting the assertion that gay men are particularly vulnerable to the development of eating disorders (Feldman & Meyer, 2007; Frederick & Essayli, 2016; Siconolfi, Halkitis, Allomong, & Burton, 2009). This can be due to a variety of risk factors, but media influence and societal pressures are perhaps the most researched (Carper, Negy, & Tantleff-Dunn, 2010; Duggan & McCreary, 2004). However, the extant research regarding this phenomenon does not account for the heterogeneity of the gay male population.

Research has firmly established heightened eating pathology and body image concerns among gay men (Strong, Williamson, Netemeyer & Geer, 2000; Siconolfi, Halkitis, Allomong & Burton, 2009; Siever, 1994; Frederick & Essayli, 2016). Thus, sexual orientation remains a relevant and important factor when investigating males with eating disorders. At the most elementary analysis, gay men are more likely to exhibit eating disorder symptoms and lower body satisfaction than heterosexual men (Frederick & Essayli, 2016; Feldman & Meyer, 2007; Strong et al., 2000). Research posits this to be due to the community placing considerable value on physical attractiveness, rather than other traits that may play a role in romantic or sexual attraction (Strong et al., 2000). Beyond such claims, the literature becomes more muddled. This is particularly evident in the research surrounding body ideals and body image concerns among

the gay male community, in which a variety of factors may be influential. Specifically, two body ideals are of particular interest: the thin ideal and the muscular ideal.

A key component to understanding the relationship between sociocultural pressures and the gay male community is the muscular ideal, or the “buff agenda” (Siconolfi et al., 2009; Pope, Phillips, & Olivardia, 2000). Gay men exhibit significantly higher rates of dissatisfaction with muscle size and/or tone than heterosexual men (Frederick & Essayli, 2016; Siconolfi et al., 2009). Siconolfi et al. found that gay men not only reported higher body dissatisfaction than heterosexual men, but also that this was associated with an external motivation to work out, such as finding romantic partners. However, a number of studies have also established gay men to exhibit higher rates of drive for thinness than heterosexual men (Martins, Tiggemann, & Kirkbride, 2007; Hunt, Gonsalkorale, & Nosek, 2012; Smith, Hawkeswood, Bodell, & Joiner, 2011). These inconsistencies point to a heterogeneity of the gay male community which may distinguish between differing body ideals. Harvey and Robinson (2003) posit that this could be related to the AIDs epidemic of the 80’s, a disease associated with weight loss and muscle wasting. In order to establish oneself as healthy and youthful, one would prefer to appear muscular; however, the epidemic also created a norm of extremely slender and thin gay men in their communities. Thus, these differing body ideals may have a historical origin that remains evident.

Research has also stressed the role of media influence and mounting sociocultural pressure as crucial aspects to understanding body image and eating disorder phenomena. The figures depicted in media tend to be especially muscular and lean, with minimal body fat, directly contradicting the reality of most men’s bodies (Keel, 2017). As a result, men may feel dissatisfied with and conscious of their physical appearance. In fact, body fat dissatisfaction was

found to predict disordered eating and dietary restraint in both gay and heterosexual men (Smith et al., 2011). Duggan and McCreary (2004) explored how different media consumption may predict body dissatisfaction. Of special interest was the potential influence of fitness or muscle magazines and pornography in both gay and straight men. Researchers found that gay men consumed significantly more pornography, and were also more concerned with thinness, than their heterosexual counterparts. In gay men, increased exposure to pornography was positively correlated with social physique anxiety. While there was no significant difference in drive for muscularity between gay and straight men, this also does not dispute the fact that a large portion of gay men still may be driven towards muscularity, similar to heterosexual men.

Objectification theory provides a lens through which one can link media exposure and eating pathology or body image concerns among gay men. Martins, Tiggemann, and Kirkbride (2007) postulated objectification theory to be a driving principle for gay men, not just women. This theory posits that Western society gradually socializes people to adopt an observer's perspective of their physical self. Thus, men may feel increased pressure to conform to societal ideals of muscularity or thinness to avoid judgement and rejection. Researchers found, through both survey and experimental research, that there were significant interactions between sexual orientation and objectification, with gay men exhibiting higher body shame and dissatisfaction as well as more restricted eating behavior (Martins et al., 2007). This firmly established the expansion of objectification theory as a functional framework for the gay male community.

Objectification theory not only accounts for media exposure, but also pressure from community involvement. Hunt, Gonsalkorale, and Nosek (2012) examined the relationship between various psychosocial variables and body dissatisfaction in gay men. The sample included 64 self-identified gay men who completed surveys based on community involvement,

self-esteem, drives for muscularity and thinness, and other body dissatisfaction scales. While drive for thinness was negatively correlated with self-esteem, drive for muscularity was positively correlated with increased involvement in the gay community. This points to some third variable that may mediate these differing drives among gay men. Doyle and Engeln (2014) further detailed the nuanced relationship between body image concerns and community involvement. In their study, they found that identification within the gay community was associated with distinctive body image concerns for heavier versus thinner gay men. Heavier gay men who displayed high community identification reported less body dissatisfaction, whereas thinner gay men with high community identification reported greater body dissatisfaction. Thus, community identification was associated with positive outcomes among some men and negative outcomes for others, depending on their body mass index (BMI). Because of this, researchers called for future research to study the various body ideals and pressures among gay men.

One well-established example of a body ideal in the gay male community is the subcultural appearance identity of bears. The bear identity can be defined as a physically large and hairy gay man, oftentimes viewed as sexually attractive by other gay men (Gough & Flanders, 2009). Furthermore, bears often form close-knit groups or organizations, thus forming a subcommunity among the larger gay male community (Hennen, 2008; Gough & Flanders, 2009). Within this subcommunity, excessive weight is normalized and obesity is viewed as a positive attribute (Hennen, 2008). Gough and Flanders (2009) explored the bear subcommunity through qualitative interviews with ten self-identified bears. One key theme was the function of the bear community as a sanctuary from the greater gay male community, in which “fat abuse” was a frequent occurrence. Within the bear community, men reported finding acceptance, social support, and opportunities for sexual encounters. Bears also reported choosing to remain

overweight despite contrary medical advice. In this study, Gough and Flanders (2009) found that bears continued to distance themselves from the twink body ideal (slim, hairless gay men), viewing twinks as judgmental, dramatic, less happy, physically ill, and more feminine. Thus, in their celebration of larger, hairier bodies, bears pathologized those with thinner body types.

While Gough and Flanders (2009) broadly studied the bear community through qualitative methods, Moskowitz, Turrubiates, Lozano, and Hajek (2013) took a quantitative approach to understanding this subcultural identity. In this study, researchers examined three different samples of gay men from different areas (online, pride events, and hook-up apps). Bears were found to be shorter, heavier, and hairier than the average gay man, as well as more likely to seek out hairier and heavier men as sexual partners. Furthermore, bears were found to have lower self-esteem and to be more sexually explorative than the greater gay male population. Researchers also found that there were many other subcultural identities, with the commonality being same-sex attraction. Even within the bear community, many men in their samples provided more specific identities such as “cubs.” Through the responses, researchers hypothesized cubs to be younger, slimmer—though still overweight—, and less hairy than bears, but included in the bear community. Thus, researchers called for further exploration into this myriad of subcultural identities which may have distinct physical qualities and psychosocial impacts.

While there is a dearth of scholarly research dedicated to such gay subcultural identities, Gardner (2016) explores definitions through popular culture. While this author is not a psychological researcher, his journalist perspective provides insight to the various body ideals presented among the queer community. More specifically, he attempted to define each “tribe” listed on the Grindr app, a common hook-up app catered to gay men. The self-identification—by defining yourself through a listed category—created a pressure to conform to a singular body

ideal, and a space for queer interaction online quickly became divisive. For example, a bear may be defined as a “husky, large man with a lot of body hair,” whereas a jock may be “a gay man with an athletic build who typically enjoys sports.” Finally, a twink may be defined as “a typically younger, thinner gay man with little or no body hair.” Each category was narrowly defined, thus creating a myriad of differing pressures that come along with each body type. Gardner hypothesized that such body ideals may drive division among the gay male community, rather than unity.

Lyons and Hosking (2014) studied potential health disparities among some of these subcultural appearance identities. As one of the only research studies that has examined this phenomenon, their research is especially relevant to the current study. Among 1,034 gay men, 458 (44%) reported a subcultural appearance identity; the most common identities were cubs and twinks. Those who did not identify with a subcultural identity (non-identified men) reported significantly lower amounts of psychological distress, as well as fewer sexual partners. However, researchers did not assess specific psychopathology, such as disordered eating concerns. Additionally, non-identified men were less likely to report any instances of discrimination. Meanwhile, twinks displayed higher rates of tobacco and alcohol consumption, and were also more likely to receive anal sex (colloquially known as bottoming) than those who did not identify as twinks. On the other hand, cubs reported lower self-rated physical health than those who did not identify as cubs. While Gardner (2016) hypothesized there might be an unhealthy pressure to conform to body ideals, Lyons and Hosking (2014) found that there were no differences in mental wellbeing between subcultural identities. However, this does not preclude the possibility that there are disparities in mental health within the gay male population. Lyons and Hosking (2019) were some of the only researchers to examine the phenomenon of gay

subcultural appearance identities, and did not study specific psychopathology such as disordered eating and body image concerns. With both a thin and muscular ideal reported among gay men, it remains unclear what drives these different pursuits.

A potential solution to this question is the exploration of gay male subcultural appearance identities which focus on differing body ideals, such as twinks, jocks, and bears. The current study aims to understand the relationship between gay subcultural appearance identities and eating and body image pathology. The research has firmly established that gay men are especially vulnerable to the development of eating disorders, whether that be through media consumption or social pressures (Carper, Negy, & Tantleff-Dunn, 2010; Doyle & Engeln, 2014; Duggan & McCreary, 2004; Foster-Gimbel & Engeln, 2016; Frederick & Essayli, 2016). However, previous research in eating pathology and body ideals among gay men fails to account for the heterogeneity of this population. The findings on muscular and thin ideals among gay men continue to be contradictory and vague, thus leaving researchers perplexed. The current study asserts the answer to lie partly in subcultural appearance identities (such as jocks, twinks, and bears), in which appearance ideals drive certain eating pathology in gay men. Each distinct subcultural identity holds a different appearance ideal: twinks are young and slender, bears are large and hirsute, and jocks are lean and muscular. Thus, the current study hypothesizes that:

- I. Twinks will demonstrate greater thinness-oriented disordered eating than those who do not identify as twinks as seen by higher scores on the EAT-26 dieting subscale.
- II. Jocks will demonstrate greater muscularity-oriented disordered eating than those who do not identify as jocks as seen by higher scores on the MOET.
- III. Gay men who identify with a subcultural appearance identity will demonstrate greater disordered eating than those who do not as seen by higher scores on the EAT-26.

Method

Participants

A total of 247 participants were recruited for the present study. Participants were recruited via Amazon MTurk ($N = 204$), as well as Facebook, college campuses, Reddit, LGBTQ organizations, and snowball sampling through participants who had already completed the study ($N = 43$). However, this sample was restricted to those who reported a sexual orientation of “exclusively homosexual,” “predominantly homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual,” or “predominantly homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual.” Additionally, participants who self-identified as a feminine gender identity (cisgender and transgender women) were excluded, resulting in the final sample of $N = 167$. Participants were 167 men ranging in age from 18 to 70 ($M=35.53$, $SD=10.66$), ranging in self-reported BMI from 12.25 to 40.44 kg/m² ($M=19.41$, $SD=4.43$). Additional demographic information is provided in Table 1.

Measures

Eating Attitudes Test-26 (EAT-26; Garner & Garfinkel, 1982) The EAT-26 is a widely used, standardized assessment of eating disorder symptoms and attitudes. The EAT-26 has three distinct subscales: Dieting, Bulimia and Food Preoccupation, and Oral Control. Moreover, the EAT-26 was strongly correlated with the original EAT-40 ($r=0.98$; Garner et al., 1982). This 26-item scale is a Likert-type scale, with response choices ranging from 1 (*always*) to 6 (*never*). Examples of items are “I am terrified of being overweight,” “I give too much time and thought to eating food,” and “I like my stomach to be empty.” In a study of homosexual men, the Cronbach’s alpha for the EAT-26 was .89, suggesting the measure to be valid and reliable in this

population (Russell & Keel, 2002). In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha for the EAT-26 was .907.

Kinsey Heterosexual Homosexual Rating Scale (Kinsey Scale; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1975) This measure is used to describe sexual orientation based on the participant's response at that given time. The Kinsey Scale is a single-item Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (*exclusively heterosexual*) to 6 (*exclusively homosexual*). Meanwhile, a score of 3 is "*equally heterosexual and homosexual*." This scale allows sexuality to be measured on a spectrum rather than a categorical measure.

Muscularity-Oriented Eating Test (MOET; Murray, Brown, Blashill, Compte, Lavender, Mitchison, & Nagata, 2019) The MOET assesses muscularity concerns and muscularity-related eating pathology. The MOET was significantly positively correlated with traditional measures of eating disorder symptoms as well as muscularity concerns (Murray et al., 2019). This measure is a 15-item Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (*never true*) to 4 (*always true*). Examples of items are "I have felt anxious when I run out of protein-based supplements," "other people do not seem to understand how important my food choices are to me," and "I have recorded the macro-nutritional values of everything that I ate." Cronbach's alpha of the MOET was .921 in the present study.

Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (OBCS; McKinley & Hyde, 1996) This measure assesses negative body experience through various behaviors and attitudes which may contribute to such an experience. This standardized measure is a 24-item Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). This measure includes three subscales: Body Surveillance, Body Shame, and Control Beliefs. Examples items include: "During the day, I think about how I look many times" and "I would be ashamed for people to know what I really

weigh.” A previous study found the OBCS had a Cronbach alpha of .79 (Body Surveillance), .73 (Body Shame), and .64 (Control Beliefs) among a sample of undergraduate college men, despite its feminist foundations, suggesting it to be a valid measure in male samples (McKinley, 1998). In the present study, the Cronbach’s alpha for the OBCS was .861.

Qualitative questions on subcultural identities. These questions are included to obtain qualitative data regarding participants’ subcultural appearance-based identification. The first multiple choice question (“Some gay and bisexual men identify with a subcultural community or “tribe” based on physical appearance. Click the response below you most identify with.”), assessed subcultural identity, such as jock, bear, or twink. Two open-ended response questions were asked: “If you identify with a subcultural community or ‘tribe’, define that community below in your own words. Please be as specific as possible.” And “If you identify with a subcultural community or ‘tribe’, do you ever feel pressured to conform to a body ideal? Please explain.”

Procedure

All participants read and agreed to an informed consent form prior to participation. After providing informed consent, participants completed an online questionnaire. This included demographic questions, qualitative questions on subcultural appearance identification, the OBCS, the Kinsey Scale, the EAT-26, and the MOET. All participants were debriefed upon completion of the questionnaire. Participation in this study took approximately 25 minutes. The study received approval from the college’s institutional review board. Participation was voluntary, and participants received compensation for the completion of the survey. Participants recruited through Amazon MTurk received their regular pay quota (\$0.75), whereas participants recruited via the snowballing technique were given the option to enter a \$50 cash prize raffle.

Statistical Analyses

The data were analyzed using SPSS-25. Independent *t*-test analyses were used to determine relationships between variables. For hypothesis I, the difference between twink-identified participants and non twink-identified participants on the EAT-26 Dieting Subscale was assessed. For hypothesis II, the difference between jock-identified and non jock-identified participants on the MOET was assessed. For hypothesis III, the difference between participants who identified with a subcultural appearance ideal and participants who did not on the EAT-26 global score was assessed.

Results

Hypothesis I. In contrast to hypothesis I, EAT-26 dieting subscale scores were not different between self-identified twinks and participants who did not identify as twinks (see Table 2).

Hypothesis II. In support of hypothesis II, jocks had significantly higher scores on the MOET compared to participants who did not identify as jocks (see Table 2).

Hypothesis III. In support of hypothesis III, sexual minority men who identified as a subcultural identity had significantly higher scores on the EAT-26 global scale than participants who did not identify as a subcultural identity (see Table 2).

Discussion

The current study is among the first known quantitative analyses of gay subcultural identities and psychological wellbeing, specifically examining their relationship with disordered eating attitudes and behaviors. Previous research has established that gay men are especially vulnerable to the development of eating disorders (Feldmen & Meyer, 2007; Frederick &

Essayli, 2016; Siconolfi, Halkitis, Allomong, & Burton, 2009). However, little research has accounted for the heterogeneity within the gay male population, particularly midst muscular versus thin ideals. The present study sought to fill this critical gap in our knowledge of gay male body ideals by examining men with differing gay subcultural identities. Particularly, the current study assessed whether these gay men would experience greater eating disordered behaviors and attitudes and whether those behaviors and attitudes differ among those subcultural identities.

Through qualitative responses in the current study, twinks described themselves as gay men “who are relatively young, smooth, and slender.” Thus, the current study hypothesized that those who identify as twinks would display greater thinness-oriented eating disorder symptoms than those who did not identify as twinks. While the data did not support this assertion (see Table 2), previous research has found that gay men are more likely than their heterosexual counterparts to exhibit thinness-oriented disordered eating (Martins, Tiggemann, & Kirkbride, 2007; Hunt, Gonsalkorale, & Nosek, 2012; Smith, Hawkeswood, Bodell, & Joiner, 2011). The current study sample precluded our ability to test this hypothesis; however, the study aim did further question *which* gay men, if any, are more likely to exhibit a drive for thinness, based on their identification as twinks.

Meanwhile, self-identified jocks commonly defined themselves as gay men focused on gaining muscle in the current study. One participant wrote: “Jocks are mainly focused on having a nice physique...I feel like I am never satisfied with my muscles and I need to get bigger to look better.” Our results supported the hypothesis that men who identified as jocks displayed greater muscularity-oriented eating disorder symptoms than those who did not identify as jocks (see Table 2). These findings are in line with those of previous research, which established that gay men experienced elevated risks of muscularity-oriented disordered eating psychopathology

(Frederick & Essayli, 2016; Siconolfi et al., 2009). Furthermore, elevated muscularity-oriented concerns among the self-identified jocks in our sample fit with data from a recent study that found that sexual minority men endorsed a higher drive for muscularity and were more likely to intend to use anabolic-androgenic steroids and compulsive exercise to achieve this ideal, compared to heterosexual men (Brewster et al., 2017). The relationship between drive for muscularity and steroid-use and between drive for muscularity and compulsive exercise were partially mediated by internalized standards of attractiveness, which may be especially perpetuated within the jock community. Future studies should examine whether gay men who identify as jocks are more likely to use anabolic-androgenic steroids and compulsive exercise, rather than only muscularity-oriented eating, to control their physiques.

In the current study, those who did not identify with a subcultural identity reported less eating disorder symptomatology than those who identified with a subcultural identity (see Table 2). This is in line with research showing that those who did not identify with a subcultural identity reported lower amounts of general psychological distress than those who identified with a subcultural identity (Lyons & Hosking, 2014). Whereas Lyons and Hosking (2014) focused on disparities in physical health, the current study built upon their research by examining whether eating disorder pathology was elevated among gay men with subcultural appearance ideals, such as jocks, twinks, and bears. While twinks did not demonstrate greater thinness-oriented psychopathology, jocks demonstrated greater muscularity-oriented psychopathology and gay men who had a subcultural appearance ideal had greater global eating disorder pathology than those without a subcultural appearance ideal.

Limitations

The present study has several limitations, especially due to its status as one of the first studies examining gay subcultural identities. Participants were recruited exclusively on-line, precluding participation from those without internet access. Thus, the present study cannot be generalized to populations who may not have regular access to internet. The current study also had relatively homogenous racial participation, with 82% of participants identifying as White. This could be due to subcultural identities being a phenomenon mostly among the White gay male community (Gardner, 2016), however we do not have sufficient data to explore this question. Future research on subcultural appearance identities among gay men should aim to recruit a racially and ethnically diverse sample in order to assess this question. Furthermore, the present study has limited participation from those who identify with gay subcultural identities, especially among twinks ($n=11$); this may be resolved via savvy recruitment locations frequented by gay men (such as gyms, beaches, clubs, bars, etc.). Lastly, the present study also relied on self-reported sexual orientation via the Kinsey Scale, which does not take into account behavioral or romantic histories. A more nuanced and thorough investigation of sexual orientation might better assess each participant's sexual identity.

Directions for Future Research

Though our findings begin to examine the role of gay subcultural identities in psychological wellbeing, specifically disordered eating pathology, there are a number of important future directions among this population. First, the potential mediations between gay subcultural appearance ideals and psychopathology should be determined. Specifically, previous research has identified internalized heterosexism, self-objectification, and sociocultural attitudes as mediators between subcultural identities and body dissatisfaction and disordered eating in gay

men. The present study simply identified gay subcultural identities as a potential risk factor; however, when working in a therapeutic realm, such information would be valuable to clinicians. When a gay male client identifies as a subcultural identity, the clinician may be aware of heightened eating disorder psychopathology. Second, the relationship between gay subcultural identities and aging among gay men could provide additional content in relation to each identity. For example, twinks may be younger than other identities, and bears may be older than others, implying a shift in subcultural identification with age. Additionally, as gay men age, their endorsement of such ideals may shift, or endorsement of youthful ideals may influence their psychological wellbeing. For example, gay men who self-identify as twinks may feel pressure to remain a slender and youthful appearance as they age. Additionally, as jocks age, they may feel pressure to build muscle mass or maintain a lean physique. These complex, longitudinal interactions could provide insight to how such identities persist as risk factors throughout a gay man's life.

Third, research surrounding the sexual activity of each gay subcultural identity would help clinicians to better understand their clients' physical and mental health. For example, men who receive anal sex may regulate their eating habits to ensure cleanliness during sexual intercourse. These men may restrict eating for several hours before sexual encounters or focus on diets full of fiber to keep their anal cavity clean. Other men may regularly douche, which has serious negative physical health impacts. Finally, other aspects associated with gay subcultural identification should be explored, especially gay community involvement and gay hookup applications, to determine their role in the endorsement of such appearance ideals. Men who are more involved in their community and frequently use gay hookup apps may feel a greater pressure to adhere to one of the subcultural appearance ideals in order to be accepted (Breslow et

al., 2020). Overall, there is a dearth of research examining the physical and psychological impetus and impacts of subcultural appearance ideals. The current study suggests that jocks are at increased risk for muscularity-related pathology and gay men who endorse any subcultural appearance ideal are at greater risk of eating disorder psychopathology. Further research is needed in order to better understand the risks and potential protective factors among gay men who endorse subcultural appearance identities to better inform community and clinical work with sexual minority men.

References

- Breslow, A. S., Sandil, R., Brewster, M. E., Parent, M. C., Chan, A., Yucel, A., Bensmiller, N., & Glaeser, E. (2020). Adonis on the apps: Online objectification, self-esteem, and sexual minority men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 21(1), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000202>
- Brewster, M., Sandil, R., Deblaere, C., Breslow, A., & Eklund, A. (2017). “Do You Even Lift, Bro?” Objectification, Minority Stress, and Body Image Concerns for Sexual Minority Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 18(2), 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000043>
- Carper, T. L., Negy, C., & Tantleff-Dunn, S. (2010). Relations among media influence, body image, eating concerns, and sexual orientation in men: A preliminary investigation. *Body Image*, 7(4), 301-309.
- Doyle, D. M., & Engeln, R. (2014). Body size moderates the association between gay community identification and body image disturbance. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1(3), 279-284.
- Duggan, S., & McCreary, D. (2004). Body image, eating disorders, and the drive for muscularity in gay and heterosexual Men: The Influence of Media Images. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 47(3-4), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v47n03_03.
- Feldman, M., & Meyer, I. (2007). Eating disorders in diverse lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 40(3), 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.20360>.

- Foster-Gimbel, O., & Engeln, R. (2016). Fat chance! Experiences and expectations of antifat bias in the gay male community. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 3(1), 63-70.
- Frederick, D., & Essayli, J. (2016). Male body image: The roles of sexual orientation and body mass index across five national U.S. studies. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 17 (4), 336-351.
- Gardner, L. (2016). Identity crisis on grindr. Retrieved from <https://www.wussymag.com/all/2016/8/2/identity-crisis-on-grindr>.
- Garner, D. & Garfinkel, P. (1982) The Eating Attitudes Test: Psychometric Features and Clinical Correlates. *Psychological Medicine*, 871-878.
- Gough, B., & Flanders, G. (2009). Celebrating “obese” bodies: Gay “bears” talk about weight, body image, and health. *International Journal of Men’s Health*, 8, 235–253. doi:10.3149/jmh.0803.235
- Harvey, J., & Robinson, J. (2003). Eating Disorders in Men: Current Considerations. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*, 10(4), 297–306.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026357505747>
- Hennen, P. (2008). Bear bodies, bear masculinity: Recuperation, resistance, or retreat? In J. Z. Spade, & C. G. Valentine (Eds.), *2nd ed.; the kaleidoscope of gender: Prisms, patterns, and possibilities (2nd ed.)* (2nd ed. ed., pp. 287-300, Chapter xxii, 581 Pages) Pine Forge Press/Sage Publications Co, Thousand Oaks, CA. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.union.edu/docview/621966895?accountid=14637>
- Hunt, C., Gonsalkorale, K., & Nosek, B. (2012). Links between psychosocial variables and body dissatisfaction in homosexual men: differential relations with the drive for muscularity

- and the drive for thinness. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 11(2), 127–136.
<https://doi.org/10.3149/jmh.1102.127>
- Keel, P. K. (2017). *Eating disorders* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C. (1975). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Indiana University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt173znh5>.
- Lyons, A., & Hosking, W. (2014). Health disparities among common subcultural identities of young gay men: Physical, mental, and sexual health. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43(8), 1621-1635. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.union.edu/10.1007/s10508-014-0315-1>.
- Martins, Y., Tiggemann, M., & Kirkbride, A. (2007). Those speedos become them: the tole of self-objectification in gay and heterosexual men's body image. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(5), 634–647. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206297403>
- McKinley, N. M. (1998). Gender differences in undergraduates' body esteem: The mediating effect of objectified body consciousness and actual/ideal weight discrepancy. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 39(1-2), 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018834001203>
- McKinley, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (1996). The Objectified Body Consciousness Scale: Development and Validation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20(2), 181–215.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00467.x>
- Moskowitz, D., Turrubiates, J., Lozano, H., & Hajek, C. (2013). Physical, behavioral, and psychological traits of gay men identifying as bears. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42(5), 775–784. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0095-z>.
- Murray, S. B., Brown, T. A., Blashill, A. J., Compte, E. J., Lavender, J. M., Mitchison, D., Nagata, J. M. (2019). The development and validation of the muscularity-oriented eating

- test: A novel measure of muscularity-oriented disordered eating. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*. doi: 10.1002/eat.23144
- Pope, H., Phillips, K., & Olivardia, R. (2000). *The Adonis complex : the secret crisis of male body obsession* . New York: Free Press.
- Russell, C., & Keel, P. (2002). Homosexuality as a specific risk factor for eating disorders in men. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 31(3), 300–306.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.10036>
- Siconolfi, D., Halkitis, P., Allomong, T., & Burton, C. (2009). Body dissatisfaction and eating disorders in a sample of gay and bisexual men. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 8(3), 254–264. <https://doi.org/10.3149/jmh.0803.254>
- Siever, M. (1994). Sexual orientation and gender as factors in socioculturally acquired vulnerability to body dissatisfaction and eating disorders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62(2), 252–260. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.62.2.252>
- Smith, A., Hawkeswood, S., Bodell, L., & Joiner, T. (2011). Muscularity versus leanness: An examination of body ideals and predictors of disordered eating in heterosexual and gay college students. *Body Image*, 8(3), 232–236.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2011.03.005>
- Strong, S., Williamson, D., Netemeyer, R., & Geer, J. (2000). Eating disorder symptoms and concerns about body differ as a function of gender and sexual orientation. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19(2), 240–255.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2000.19.2.240>

Tables & Figures:

Table 1

Demographic Information of Sample

Demographic	Variable	%	<i>n</i>
Subcultural Identity	Twink	6.6	11
	Jock	9.0	15
	Bear	17.4	29
	Other Identity	7.2	12
	No Identification	59.9	100
Kinsey Scale	Mostly homosexual	8.4	14
	Predominantly homosexual	15.6	26
	Exclusively homosexual	76.0	127
Education Level	Less than HS degree	1.2	2
	HS degree or equivalent	7.8	13
	Some college	21.6	36
	Associate's degree	13.2	22
	Bachelor's degree	41.3	69
	Graduate degree	15.0	25
Race	White	82.0	137
	Black/African-American	9.0	15
	Asian	3.6	6
	Multiracial	5.4	9

Note. HS=High School.

Table 2

Comparisons of Subcultural Communities Across Disordered Eating Habits

Measure	Sample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> -value
EAT-26-Dieting	Twinks	6.64	6.95	-.23	.821
	Non-Twink Identification	7.13	6.97		
MOET	Jocks	1.58	0.78	2.90	.004**
	Non-Jock Identification	0.99	0.76		
EAT-26 Global	Subcultural Identification	13.66	12.69	2.04	.043*
	No subcultural identification	10.00	10.36		

Note: EAT-26 = Eating Attitudes Test-26; EAT-26-Dieting = EAT-26 dieting subscale; MOET = Muscularity-Oriented Eating Test. *= <0.05 , **= <0.01