

2024

Taking the Red Pill: A Content Analysis of Ambivalent Sexism and Precarious Manhood in Alpha Male Podcasts

Madalen Lea Fields

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Fields, Madalen Lea, "Taking the Red Pill: A Content Analysis of Ambivalent Sexism and Precarious Manhood in Alpha Male Podcasts" (2024). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 12548. <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/12548>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Taking the Red Pill: A Content Analysis of Ambivalent Sexism and Precarious Manhood in Alpha Male Podcasts

Madalen Fields

Thesis submitted
to the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master's of Arts in
Communication Theory and Research

Daniel Totzkay, Ph.D., Chair
Elizabeth Cohen, Ph.D.
Christine Kunkle, Ph.D.

Department of Communication Studies

Morgantown, West Virginia
2024

Keywords: Alpha Male, Podcasts, Precarious Manhood, Ambivalent Sexism
Copyright 2024 Madalen Fields

ABSTRACT

Taking the Red Pill: A Content Analysis of Ambivalent Sexism and Precarious Manhood in Alpha Male Podcasts

Madalen Fields

Podcasts have become increasingly popular across various platforms (e.g., Spotify or Apple podcasts). A more recent trend is the emergence of “alpha male” podcasts. The goal of these podcasts is to instruct young men how to stop being “betas” and on achieving “alpha male” status. These podcasts are a subset of the manosphere, a term used to describe media focused especially on hegemonic masculinity, which is characterized by their promotion of misogynistic beliefs and sexist rhetoric. Drawing upon social science research, three forms of sexism (i.e., ambivalent sexism, precarious manhood and violence against women) serve as analytical frameworks for understanding alpha male podcasts. Thus, this thesis presents the first steps of a quantitative content analysis to explore the relationship between alpha male podcasts and the dimensions of sexism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Chapter 1 – Literature Review.....	1-7
Introduction.....	1
Sexism and Hegemonic Masculinity.....	3
Ambivalent Sexism.....	4
Precarious Manhood.....	6
Violence Against Women.....	7
Chapter 2 – Method.....	8
Sample and Data.....	8
Coding Scheme.....	9
Ambivalent Sexism.....	9
Precarious Manhood.....	9
Violence Against Women.....	10
Coding Procedure.....	10
Chapter 3 – Reliability.....	12
Chapter 4 – Discussion.....	13
Preliminary Findings.....	13
Coder Training Process and Reflection.....	15
Reliability Reflection.....	16
Next Steps.....	17
References.....	18-21
Appendix.....	22-25

List of Tables

Table 1. Intercoder Reliability Coefficients.....12

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank the Communication department and everyone within it for their kindness and support. Balancing the demands of this program while completing a thesis was extremely challenging, and the sense of community that you all created was invaluable to me. I am particularly grateful for my amazing cohort and friends who kept me sane. Without your support and encouragement, I don't think I would have made it this far in my academic journey. You all have my sincerest thanks.

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my committee members: Dr. Daniel Totzkay, Dr. Christine Kunke, and Dr. Elixabeth Cohen. Their insightful and constructive feedback has been crucial to the development of this project. Their thoughtful suggestions and encouragement kept me motivated and engaged throughout the entire process and were instrumental in continuing this project.

I would also like to acknowledge my family, for always checking on me and providing words of encouragement even though I am miles away from them. I am especially grateful to my sister for her love and support during my journey here in West Virginia. I also cannot forget about her dogs Nami and Keela, who also played a large part in keeping me sane for the year. I love you all.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The “manosphere” was a term originally used on a 2009 blog to describe men’s interests’ communities and was later popularized by Ian Ironwood in his book *The Manosphere: A New Hope for Masculinity* (2013). Since then, the manosphere has received much attention, especially for the extremely misogynistic views that are perpetuated. Of additional concern are the violent acts being committed such as mass shootings, college campus rape, death threats directed toward both female gamers and journalists along with abusive rhetoric (Ging, 2019).

Within the manosphere, there is an important term to take note of that is used across these groups: *the red pill*. This community’s use of the term, which is derived from the movie *The Matrix*, posits that men become enlightened to perceived misandry (i.e., contempt or prejudice toward men) and feminist “brainwashing.” The online community in the “manosphere” is described as seeking to make both men and women “great again” by rebuilding traditional gender roles and a focus on men’s “self-improvement.” Instances of the so-called manosphere and red pill communities can be observed on the blogging website *Reddit*, specifically in such subreddits such as *Men’s Rights*, *Men Going Their Own Way*, and *Red Pill Theory* (Kendrel, 2020). Each of the subreddits share core beliefs that are misogynistic and harmful to women, although there are a few differences in their beliefs.

Participants in the *Men’s Rights* community are activists who believe that men are disadvantaged in society and often argue that the idea of “rape culture” is made up by feminists, and that false rape allegations are an extremely common issue, perpetuating rape myths (Kendrel, 2020). *Men Going Their Own Way* is another subgroup within this larger community, are men who abstain from relationships with women and argue that men are stuck in their role as

breadwinners and that society is centered around women. Finally, *Red Pill Theory* consists of pick-up artists whose goal is to teach men how to get women to sleep with them but the language that they use is dehumanizing to women. While they have differences, the central beliefs of these groups do overlap. While the manosphere and the Red Pill community exist on multiple platforms, more recently there has been a rise of podcasts calling themselves “alpha male” podcasts that are a part of the manosphere (Bujalka et al., 2022).

Within the past few years, podcasts have become an extremely popular form of media, generally. More recently, there has been a pervasive rise of all-male hosted podcasts, often referred to as “alpha male” podcasts (Marsales, 2023). The language and rhetoric used in manosphere media, such as in these podcasts, perpetuate harmful beliefs about both men and women. Podcast hosts often use misogynistic rhetoric that they want to “teach” to younger men and adolescent boys so that they can achieve alpha male status (Marsales, 2023).

Popular alpha male podcasts include *Fresh and Fit* hosted by Myron Gaines and Walter Weekes and *Whatever* hosted by Brian Atlas. The hosts in these podcasts talk about what makes a man or woman “high” or “low value”; the hosts use terms of value to refer to the societal worth of individuals that they are criticizing. When describing a “high value man” this typically refers to a “perfect” man who is wealthy, has self-confidence and the ability to sleep with multiple women. Both “high value man” and “alpha male” appear to have similar meanings. “Low value” for example can be used in reference to women that they view to have low societal worth, such as a woman who has had multiple intimate partners.

Other common terms used in manosphere podcasts include referring to men as either “alpha” or “beta” (Marsales, 2023); both are pseudoscientific terms, with “alpha men” being at the top of the hierarchy and “beta men” being below them. “Beta” is a term used for men who are

not considered “alphas” and cannot “control” their partners. “Beta” men are also, at times, referred to as “sims”. Alpha male podcasts often advertise themselves as a way to help men, but instead they often use harmful rhetoric. The extent to which they use such rhetoric, nor the possible implications of using it, has not been examined.

Studies have examined various aspects of the manosphere, such as incels, Men’s Rights Activists, Men Going Their Own Way, and Red Pill Theory on platforms such as Reddit and Twitter. Halpin et al. (2023) examines the manosphere on Reddit and the misogynistic language that they use when talking about women; they found that people who join these communities self-select into them: they do not necessarily become misogynistic *because* they engage with red pill forums, rather they already held misogynistic views to begin with. While this has been explored in blog posts on Reddit and Twitter, it has not been fully explored in podcasts.

Most literature surrounding podcasts and content analysis vary widely in what they examine. Very few quantitative studies are performed to understand podcasts and their content—generally and specifically to manosphere-related podcasts—and therefore do not provide insight in how the content is covered on various beliefs and behaviors, or more specifically the various forms of sexism that alpha male podcasts contain. One of the benefits of performing a quantitative content analysis is that it creates a systematic and replicable examination of communication and an analysis of values using statistical methods to find relationships and describe the communication that is occurring (Riffe et al., 2019, Chapter 2). Therefore, the aim of this study is to perform a quantitative content analysis to examine the relationship between alpha male podcasts, and various dimensions of sexism.

Sexism and Hegemonic Masculinity

The manosphere itself is an echo chamber of sexism and misogynistic attitudes and

beliefs (Ging, 2019). Adherence to *hegemonic masculinity*—the enactment of gender in a particular way so that it legitimizes the patriarchy which then would lead to the dominance of man and women being subordinate to them (Connell, 2005)—is seen throughout the manosphere and alpha male podcasts are perpetuating it. Hegemonic masculinity is used to strongly promote adherence to traditional masculinity in response to perceived threats to one’s masculinity (Vallegra & Zubriggen, 2021).

Online manosphere communities that adhere to misogynistic beliefs are examples of sexism being openly expressed. It is also important to note that in some instances, members of the manosphere try to move past general sexist beliefs such as pushing away from benevolent sexism and are also more likely to believe in rape myths (Vallegra & Zubriggen, 2021). Three instances of sexism that have been studied in the social sciences that can provide an analytic framework for alpha male podcasts are ambivalent sexism, precarious manhood, and rape myth acceptance.

Ambivalent sexism. Ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) posits that that power difference between genders and interdependence creates two forms of sexism: hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. *Hostile sexism* refers to the belief of women being manipulative competitors who want power over men (Bareket & Fiske, 2023). Those who endorse hostile sexism believe that women are incompetent and should not hold power. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996), the primary way ambivalent sexism beliefs are measured, include beliefs like “women fail to appreciate what men do for them” or even “women are too easily offended”. *Benevolent sexism*, on the other hand, refers to a belief that women are moral but weak and passive (Bareket & Fiske, 2023), including that women are restricted to domestic roles and are the weaker sex.

Although hostile and benevolent sexism are distinct, they are both used to justify the

structural power of men (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Examples of *benevolent sexism* from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory include: “A good woman should be set on a pedestal” or “Men should sacrifice for women”; benevolent sexism beliefs tend to focus on belittling sentiment toward women. It is also important to note that there are several individual factors that can influence and explain why some men have these beliefs, such as a social dominance orientation, a sense of entitlement, and right-wing authoritarianism (Renström, 2023). These personal attributes and orientations are connected to hegemonic masculinity, which is often connected to misogynistic beliefs.

Ambivalent sexism can also be seen in attitudes toward women across many contexts, such as in face-to-face interactions and media. Evidence from the literature suggests that hostile sexism promotes discrimination and prejudice against women (Bareket & Friske, 2023). Within the context of the podcasts, instances of ambivalent sexism could be when referring to women as “low value” or “high value,” or even how they refer to women. In studies such as Halpin et al. (2023), men existing in the manosphere use belittling language such as girl. Additionally, a “high value” woman is one that is considered feminine and virtuous (Marsales, 2023). On the other hand, a “low value” woman is one viewed as undesirable to these “alpha men” such as a woman having multiple intimate partners or even one that does not follow traditional gender roles and terms such as “whore” or “slut” are used against them. The use of this language could lead to promotion or normalization of these kinds of beliefs, so understanding their prevalence in this kind of media is necessary. Once understanding its prevalence, further intervention can proceed. Both hostile and benevolent sexism seem to appear in alpha male podcasts thus the following research question is asked:

RQ1: *How prevalent is a) hostile and b) benevolent sexism in alpha male podcasts?*

Precarious manhood. Another form of masculinity likely conveyed in these media is precarious manhood. *Precarious manhood* (Vandello & Bosson, 2013) posits that manhood is an elusive status that must be earned, can be taken away, and is confirmed by others—particularly other men—through public display. Because manhood needs to be earned and can be taken away, the idea of precarious manhood argues, men experience more anxiety over their gender status (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). Anxiety felt by the potential “loss” of their manhood can then motivate risky, avoidant, or aggressive behavior. Furthermore, femininity is viewed as bad, possibly a threat, or as having negative implications for one’s own manhood status.

Men motivated to be more masculine tend to value power, domination, and a higher status over others (Swami et al., 2013). When men are prompted to take action, they tend to respond more aggressively to the perceived threat (e.g., displays of femininity) as a way to establish their masculinity. Such actions can include harassment and abusive behaviors toward women and other men (Bogen et al., 2021). It was also found that when men think they are less masculine, they are more likely to harass others by adhering to traditional masculine norms (Rubin et al., 2020).

Beliefs regarding the precarity of manhood/masculinity can be seen in alpha male podcasts especially with the use of “low value” or “high value” man, or by describing men to be “alpha” or “beta” males. A “high value” or “alpha male is considered one who is a dominate, aggressive, has women flocking around them. On the other hand, a “low value” or “beta” male is one who has no control in their relationship and could be considered a loser for something as simple as not paying for dinner (Marsales, 2023). In these situations, if a man is not performing the expected way a “masculine” is supposed to then it makes them less of a man and therefore a “beta” male. This language can show them attacking other individuals’ masculinity, but perhaps

also showing their own insecurity. Thus, the following research question is asked:

RQ2: *What are the most frequent themes or characteristics associated with (precarious) masculinity in alpha male podcasts?*

Violence against women. Another manifestation of sexism and hegemonic masculinity explored here is violence against women and derogatory language used against women. Violence against women can take the shape in many forms. One of the more prevalent manifestations within alpha male podcasts is rape myths. Rape myths are false beliefs about sexual assault incidents and have a role in shaping rape culture (Thulin et al., 2024). Rape myths can include beliefs such as “well they went out looking like that (dressing a certain way), so they were asking for it [i.e., being sexually assaulted/raped].” Additionally, it can also appear as condoning abuse, violence or murder against women, by explaining why it was their fault it happened.

An additional manifestation of violence against women is derogatory language. Derogatory language is any type of insinuation about members of a social group or individual that explicitly insults those people. This can include slurs, insults and swearing that is meant to be highly offensive. Examples of such language used against women include, “Bitch”, “whore”, “slut.” Men in the manosphere use rape myths and other forms of violence to reinforce gender hierarchies and as a way to punish women who do not conform to their gender role (Hopton & Langer, 2021). This rhetoric is often communicated towards other men, as the main goal of alpha male podcasts is to educate other men. However, in the podcasts it sometimes also communicated toward women if they have them as guests on their podcast. With this in mind, the following research question is asked:

RQ3: *To what extent do alpha male podcasts propagate violence against women?*

CHAPTER 2

Method

The purpose of this thesis was to conduct a content analysis of “Alpha Male” podcasts, conducting data collection, training of a coding team, and achieve intercoder reliability. Data were transcripts of individual podcast episodes that were randomly selected from a comprehensive list of “Alpha Male” podcast shows.

Sample and Data

Individual podcast shows’ name, description, and number of episodes were collected from the results of searching the term “Alpha Male” in Spotify and Apple podcasts, two of the most popular apps for podcasts (Morning Consult, 2022). Duplicates were removed, and shows were further screened for their relevance of teaching men “how to be a man” to provide a sample of 75 shows with 10,968 episodes in total. A random sample of 10% of all episodes was drawn ($n = 1,010$), selected so that episodes were selected proportionately to the number of episodes each show contained (i.e., shows with fewer episodes were more likely to be chosen and shows with more episodes were less likely to be chosen). The sample episodes used to train coders were identified by randomly selecting approximately 1% of the total episode sample ($n = 10$). These included episodes from *Alpha Male Strategies Show*, *Masculine Psychology*, and *Sigma Male Diaries*. Another 5% of the sample ($n = 50$) was identified to achieve intercoder reliability. These included episodes from *Master Teacher of Attraction*, *Beta to Alpha Human – Semen Retention*, *The Infamous*, *Alpha Male Giga Chad Alpha Dad Consulting*, *Zero Xcuses Podcast*, and *How to Talk to Girls*.

Episodes used for training and reliability were transcribed by recording full episodes to Zoom’s cloud storage, which provides transcription via artificial intelligence. Transcripts were

edited for formatting and recording errors in Microsoft Excel. Complete statements were split into separate rows to create manageable portions of text to review and code for study variables.

Coding Scheme

The variables in this content analysis are derived from existing scales measuring sets of beliefs. For this study, those scales are treated as coding categories and codes will capture if that sentiment, which the respective beliefs would resemble, is communicated in a given turn at talk within a podcast episode. Further inductive coding took place in which other terms, phrases, or statements that are similar within each category will be incorporated into the coding scheme and items will be re-reviewed to account for these. Each item was coded as being present as a self-expression (1), present as a critique of an expression (2), or not present (0). Coding categories can be found in the Appendix.

Ambivalent sexism. The preliminary codes for hostile and benevolent sexism are adapted from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996), which include *hostile sexism* statements like “feminists are seeking more power than men” and *benevolent sexism* comments like “Woman have a quality of purity that few men possess.” The scale is separated into six different categories: Women Complain (HS1), Women are Manipulative (HS2), Women Don’t Appreciate Men (HS3), Worshipping Women (BS1), Women have a moral superiority (BS2) and Men Need a Woman (BS3). These codes are meant to capture whether and to what extent manosphere podcasts express the sentiment that women are belittled or viewed to be manipulative by seeking to dominate men.

Precarious Manhood. The codes for precarious manhood are adopted from the Precarious Manhood Scale (Vandello et al., 2021), which includes statements like “Manhood is not assured it can be lost” and “Other people often question whether a man is a real man”. These codes

are meant to capture whether and to what extent manosphere podcasts contain sentiments that suggest that certainty of manhood is not guaranteed.

Violence against women. Violence against women is considered any statement that are rape myths or condone abuse and general violence against women. This can appear in statements such as “that’s why she gets beat by her partner” or even “she was asking for it, with how she was dressed”. An additional subset of violence against women that was added to the codebook after review is derogatory language. Derogatory language is any language used to show disrespect, demean, or insult women. This can manifest in statements like “She’s a fat bitch”, or “You can’t trust those whores”. The codes are divided into two categories: Violence Against Women (VAW) and Derogatory Language (DL).

Coding Procedure

Coders ($n = 3$) were recruited to assist with coding. Several rounds of training took place. The first round consisted of going over the Codebook (see appendix) and discussing all the variables and examples of what they could look like in the transcripts. Then one transcript was coded together, applying the codebook. After the initial coding session, two transcripts were given to code independently. Another training session was held once independent coding was completed. Once all coders completed coding, there was a total of 19 disagreements (2.5% disagreement). All disagreements were discussed and settled, by going through the codebook and discussing the disagreements. This was done by going through each transcript and finding all of the disagreements that occurred. Once they were found, they were compared to the codebook, then discussed why the lines counted as a variable or not.

Once disagreements were resolved, an additional training session was planned where 3 additional transcripts were given to code alone. During the meeting, all findings were discussed

and a total of 5 disagreements (0.84% disagreement) was found. All disagreements were examined and discussed using the codebook. During this process, one of the categories was taken out due to confusion and an additional category was added for “derogatory language.” Following training, coders applied the final codebook to each reliability transcript to generate the data to be used to calculate intercoder reliability.

CHAPTER 3

Reliability

Intercoder reliability was evaluated with percent agreement, as well as Krippendorff's Alpha and Cohen's Kappa which both use a criterion of 0.80 for adequate coding reliability. These values were computed using Dr. Deen Freelon's ReCal resource (<https://dfreelon.org/utills/re-calfront/recal2/>). The overall reliability according to Krippendorff's Alpha was 0.45 and 0.447 for Cohen's Kappa. It was otherwise below the .80 cutoff across each coding category (see Table 1 reliability of each study variable). While both Alpha and Kappa values are low, coders had high levels of agreement for all variables. There is a documented paradox where Alpha and Kappa values are low despite coders having nearly 100% agreement (Riffe et al., 2019) which is caused by Krippendorff's Alpha and Cohen's Kappa not counting 0s when computing reliability (i.e., correctly reporting the absence of a variable does not get "counted" as agreement). There is another reliability coefficient that does count 0s (i.e., coding something as *not* being present) as agreement, called Gwet's AC1 (Gwet, 2008). This coefficient is interpreted as "Very Good" between the values of 0.80 and 1.00. As seen in Table 1, all variables had an AC1 value of nearly 1.00.

Table 1.*Intercoder reliability coefficients.*

Variable	Gwet's AC1	Total % Agreement	Krippendorff's Alpha	Cohen's Kappa
Overall Reliability <u>Hostile Sexism</u>	0.998	99.51%	0.453	0.447

HS1	0.998	99.75%	0.285	0.317
HS2	0.990	98.94%	0.533	0.533
HS3	0.997	99.63%	0.165	0.198
<u>Benevolent Sexism</u>				
BS1	0.996	99.61%	0.199	0.210
BS2	0.996	99.70%	0.427	0.373
BS3	0.996	99.64%	0.146	0.179
PM	0.990	98.99%	0.365	0.351
VAM	0.998	99.95%	0.600	0.666
DL	0.995	99.26%	0.639	0.621

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

The Manosphere can be a problematic community that promotes ideals that are harmful to both men and women. Within the Manosphere, there are alpha male podcasts that specifically are meant to provide dating advice and teach men “how to be real men” (Marsales, 2023). Despite the popularity and potential impact of this form of media, very little research has analyzed them and especially in terms of various forms of sexism. Three main areas of sexism that were explored in this paper were ambivalent sexism, precarious manhood and violence against women. The purpose of this thesis was to conduct the beginning of a content analysis of “Alpha Male” podcasts by conducting data collection, training of a coding team, and achieve intercoder reliability. Following this, organization and coding of a sample of the total population of content will take place for a full, publishable study.

Preliminary Findings

Examining the data in the reliability sample, so far, it reveals that *hostile sexism* seems to be more prevalent than *benevolent sexism*. An example of hostile sexism that occurred in one of the episodes of the podcast *Alpha Male Giga Chad* is “It doesn't mean you invented something right? It's Abby that's it's this blatant, blatant plagiarism, disgusting. Just well, you know. And

this is the way of the woman they just they cheat at life, right? You don't get to steal everything from men. Yeah.” This was coded as an example of women being manipulative (HS2).

While benevolent has fewer occurrences, many of them ended up being *critiques* of benevolent sexism attitudes such as in an episode of *The Infamous*: “Listen, guys, you can never expect to be treated well as a beta male, because as a beta male, your value is based on what you can provide. Not you. So, you're essentially saying that the woman is on a pedestal, and I'm lucky to be with you so let me provide for you, my queen.” This example was coded as a critique of worshipping women (BS1), they are instead saying that men should not be putting women on a pedestal.

Several instances of precarious manhood occurred. One such instance was in *Beta to Alpha Human*, stating “One obeying women like a little simp. The thing is, you truly are a little simp if you obey women in every single thing.” This statement is implying that a man who chooses to do what a woman wants is not a real man. A simp refers to a man who shows too much attention to a woman that can be one sided. It is meant as an attack on a man’s masculinity.

Derogatory language has also appeared quite a bit. An example of this occurring is in *Master Teaching of Attraction*: “That woman, she's fat now looking like a Yeti, that Yeti that's supposed to be running around in Alaska. Yeah, the big bitch looking like her.” On the other hand, there were very few instances of violence against women occurring. One agreed upon example is from *Alpha Male Giga Chad*: “You're a dumb whore! That's right. That's your stupid bitch. That's why your husband left you. That's right. Well, that's why your husband beats you right. That, too. You deserve it obviously not enough, cause you're still opening your mouth.” While these findings do start to give us an understanding of what is going on these preliminary findings are not representative of the whole sample and especially not the full population. Once

the analytic sample is complete, it will reveal more information about the different categories and allow for a more nuanced exploration of “Alpha Male” content.

Coder Training Process and Reflection

The podcast shows and episodes were collected from Spotify and Apple Podcasts. Data collection took place once the search string was decided on (“Alpha Male”). This was searched for in quotation and out of quotation to collect as many podcasts as possible. This had led to a total of 388 podcasts collected from Spotify and 154 podcasts from Apple. The initial screening removed podcasts for, not being in English, relevancy (not relationship oriented or geared towards men) and if they had less than one episode. Once screened the podcasts from Apple Podcasts and Spotify were compiled together and screened for duplicates. A final screening took place after this that excluded podcasts that had less than 30 minutes of content and were older than 2023. This process was fairly simple, but just tedious in organizing all of the collected podcasts into the excel sheet.

For training, the codebook was first created and just accounted for whether or not the variables were present (1) or absent (0). As the codebook was used in training and the transcripts were closely examined, we had noticed that the current codebook was not accounting for variables we were interested in. More specifically, there were times when hosts would talk about something like benevolent sexism (e.g. putting women on a pedestal) in a critical way. It was then decided to include a coding value that was a critique of an expression (2). Two coders were recruited, and meetings were planned based on availability. For the first training session, it was planned to code one together to have the coders develop a better understanding of the codebook. The coders were then given a few transcripts to code by themselves, and then we came back to discuss the findings.

Overall, there were not many disagreements found, when they did occur, we went back and forth with the codebook until agreement was reached. However, there was one code where consistent issues were occurring. Originally it was labeled as BS4 and included statements of what men thought women ought to be. However, since we were also looking for critiques of the view (2), this category became redundant and was confusing the coders, so it was removed. Additionally, after some discussion on the “violence against women” category, it was also decided to add another category for “derogatory language.” This was due to there being a significant amount of violent language (e.g. name calling, slurs etc.), but not in terms of talking about being violent (i.e. condoning abuse). Once finished with that, coding the reliability sample began.

Reliability Reflection

Results of reliability reports showed adequate agreement, but there is still room for improvement. Typical reliability estimates were mixed, but accounting for more appropriate reliability measures showed reasonable agreement. However, closer analysis of where disagreements took place suggested said room for improvement.

One of the main issues was that one coder was in consistent disagreement with the other two. That coder had issues overthinking the codes, due to having more experience with the content and the variables. This issue had also appeared in training but had improved with the second training session. This still appeared to be a slight issue.

Moving forward, there are several steps that could be taken to improve reliability. The first would be refining the codebook and providing additional examples taken from the podcasts themselves to gain a more accurate understanding of what the variables would look like within the transcripts. Additionally, the approach that was taken did affect reliability by creating arbitrary units. Within the transcripts, if there are two or more speakers, they will be highlighted to

help differentiate between them. For future coding, it may also be more beneficial to recruit coders who are not as familiar with the content, so they would be less likely to overthink when reading through the transcripts and they will be required to listen to the podcast episodes.

Next Steps

Due to the arbitrary units created with the initial reliability sample, we will now look at it at an episode level (i.e., looking for the number of instances across the episode). A new reliability sample will be selected, and coders will then code at the episode level. After reliability is achieved, the coding team will code additional transcripts from sampled podcast episodes ($n = 899$) that will be used for analysis. Additional podcast shows will be collected by searching for other relevant terms in Apple and Spotify podcasts. These terms will include “high value man/men” and “Sigma male”, both of which are also used to describe alpha males. The same procedure reported here will be followed, where show titles across search terms will be combined, having duplicates reviewed, and then again screening for relevance. Any unique shows identified through these other search terms will be combined with the total list of “Alpha Male” podcasts. Longer-term, transcripts of every podcast in the total, final “Alpha Male” podcast lists. The total dataset will then be available for unique projects that sample from this population of podcasts.

References

- (2022) *National tracking poll: Crosstabulation results* (Report No. 2210197). Morning Consult.
https://assets.morningconsult.com/wp-uploads/2023/01/10153744/2210197_cross-tabs_MC_SPORTS_PODCAST_PREFERENCES_Adults.pdf
- Bareket, O., & Fiske, S. T. (2023). A systematic review of the ambivalent sexism literature: Hostile sexism protects men's power; benevolent sexism guards traditional gender roles. *Psychological Bulletin*, 149(11–12), 637–698. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000400>
- Bogen, K. W., Williams, S. L., Reidy, D. E., & Orchowski, L. M. (2021). We (want to) believe in the best of men: A qualitative analysis of reactions to #Gillette on Twitter. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 22(1), 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000308>
- Bosson, J. K., Jurek, P., Vandello, J. A., Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Olech, M., Besta, T., ... & Van Laar, C. (2021). Psychometric properties and correlates of precarious manhood beliefs in 62 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 52(3), 231-258.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022121997997>
- Bujalka, E., Rich, T., & Bender, S. (2022). The Manosphere as an Online Protection Racket: How the Red Pill Monetizes Male Need for Security in Modern Society. *Fast Capitalism*, 19(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.32855/fcapital.202201.001>
- Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Elmore, K. C., Scull, T. M., Malik, C. V., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (2020). Rape Myth Acceptance Reflects Perceptions of Media Portrayals as Similar to Others, but Not the Self. *Violence against Women*, 27(3-4), 107780122090833. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220908335>

- Ging, D. (2019). Alphas, Betas, and Incels: Theorizing the Masculinities of the Manosphere. *Men and Masculinities*, 22(4), 638–657.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X17706401>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Gwet, K. L. (2008). Computing inter-rater reliability and its variance in the presence of high agreement. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 61, 29-48.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/000711006X126600>
- Halpin, M., Richard, N., Preston, K., Gosse, M., & Maguire, F. (2023). Men who hate women: The misogyny of involuntarily celibate men. *New Media & Society*, 146144482311767-146144482311767. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231176777>
- Hedrick, A. (2021). A Meta-analysis of Media Consumption and Rape Myth Acceptance. *Journal of Health Communication*, 26(9), 645–656.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2021.1986609>
- Kahlor, L., & Eastin, M. (2011). Television’s Role in the Culture of Violence Toward Women: A Study of Television Viewing and the Cultivation of Rape Myth Acceptance in the United States. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 55(2), 215–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2011.566085>
- Krendel, A. (2020). The men and women, guys and girls of the “manosphere”: A corpus-assisted discourse approach. *Discourse & Society*, 31(6), 607–630.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926520939690>

Marsales, E. (2023). Join the brotherhood!: How “alpha male” podcasts are targeting men. *The Ethnograph: Journal of Anthropological Studies*, 5(1), 6-13.

<https://doi.org/10.14288/ejas.v7i1.198299>

Murumaa-Mengel, M., & Muuli, L. M. (2021). Misogynist content exposé pages on Instagram: Five types of shamings, moderators and audience members. *Participations: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies*, 18(2), 100-123.

Nomamiukor, F. O., & Wisco, B. E. (2023). Social Media’s Impact on Rape Myth Acceptance and Negative Affect in College Women: Examining the #MeToo and #HimToo Movement. *Violence Against Women*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012231181045>

Renström, E. A. (2023). Exploring the role of entitlement, Social Dominance Orientation, Right-Wing authoritarianism, and the moderating role of being single on misogynistic attitudes. *Nordic Psychology*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19012276.2023.2186816>

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., Fico, F., & Watson, B. (2019). *Analyzing Media Messages: Using Quantitative Content Analysis in Research* (4th ed.). Routledge.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429464287>

Rubin, J. D., Blackwell, L., & Conley, T. D. (2020). Fragile masculinity: Men, gender, and online harassment. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376645>

Stubbs-Richardson, M., Rader, N. E., & Cosby, A. G. (2018). Tweeting rape culture: Examining portrayals of victim blaming in discussions of sexual assault cases on Twitter. *Feminism & Psychology*, 28(1), 90–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353517715874>

- Thulin, E. J., Florimbio, A. R., Philyaw-Kotov, M. L., Walton, M. A., & Bonar, E. E. (2024). Measuring Electronically Shared Rape Myths: Scale Creation and Correlates. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 39*(1/2), 369–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605231197140>
- Vallerga, M., & Zurbriggen, E. L. (2022). Hegemonic Masculinities in the “Manosphere”: a Thematic Analysis of Beliefs about Men and Women on the Red Pill and Incel. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 22*(2), 602–625. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12308>
- Vandello, J. A., & Bosson, J. K. (2013). Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*(2), 101–113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029826>
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1325–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012453>

Appendix

Codebook

Instructions

Below are variables adapted from ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996), Precarious Manhood (Vandello et al., 2008), violence against women and derogatory language. These include the original scale items, and examples of how they could occur in the transcript.

Each transcript will be transcribed onto an excel sheet, organized by line number, line, and the variables. Be sure to read the transcript before you begin coding. You will go through each line of the transcript and look for each variable (i.e., **HS1, HS2, HS3, BS1, BS2, BS3, PM, VAW, DL**).

If a variable is absent record as 0. If the variable is present as a self-expression (i.e., the speaker's own beliefs) record as 1. If the variable is present as a critique of an expressed view (e.g., women should not be placed on a pedestal) record it as 2. Keep in mind that multiple variables can appear in the same cell, be sure to mark them all.

Codes: 0 (absent), 1 (present, self-expression), 2 (present, critique of view)

Ambivalent Sexism theory (Glick & Fiske 1996)

Ambivalent Sexism: Gendered differences and mutual interdependences create two sexist ideologies: hostile and benevolent sexism.

- Hostile Sexism: The view that women are manipulative and seek to gain power over men.

Women Complain (HS1):

Women exaggerate problems.

Women are too easily offended.

Most women interpret innocent remarks as sexist.

When women lose fairly, they claim discrimination.

These can be expressed in instances such as:

- “Women complain too much.”
- “Women get too offended by harmless jokes”
- “Women, just love to exaggerate, claiming that I harassed them when giving them a compliment.”

Women are Manipulative (HS2):

Women seek special favors

Feminists are not making reasonable demands

Women seek power by gaining control over men.
 Women tease men sexually
 Women become controlling once, men commit to the relationship

These can be expressed in instances such as:

- “Women only want men for their money”
- “Women will threaten to claim rape, to get what they want”
- “She’ll use their children to get a paycheck”

Women don’t appreciate men (HS3):

Women fail to appreciate all men do for them

This can be expressed in instances such as:

- “Modern women are disrespectful towards their partner.”
- “ I do all these things for a woman, pay for her date etc., but she still disrespects me”
- Benevolent Sexism: Viewing women as more pure, but weak and passive – therefore needing the protection of men, as long as they conform.

Worshipping Women (BS1)

A good woman should be set on a pedestal
 Women should be cherished and protected by men
 Men should sacrifice to provide for women
 In a disaster, women need to be rescued first

These can be expressed in instances such as:

- “It’s instinctual for men to want to protect and provide for women.”
- “A man should work to provide for women”
- “A man is a leader and the provider for his partner”

Women have moral superiority (BS2)

Women have a superior moral sensibility
 Women have a quality of purity that few men possess
 Women have a more refined sense of culture, taste

These can be expressed in instances such as:

- “Women are more sensitive than men”
- “Women are more nurturing.”
- “Women are accommodating, submissive and cooperative toward their husbands.”

Men need a Woman (BS3)

Every man ought to have a woman he adores

Men are not complete without women

Despite accomplishment, men are incomplete without women

These can be expressed in instances such as:

- “A man’s not fulfilled without a strong and dependable woman by his side”
- “Behind every successful man, is a woman.”
- “I feel like I deserve a woman.”

Precarious Manhood (Vandello et al., 2008)

- This is the belief that the status of one’s manhood is elusive and can be easily lost. However, one’s manhood/ masculinity can be confirmed (particularly by other men) through public displays.

Precarious Manhood (PM)

People often question other’s status as a man

Some boys will never become men

It’s easy to lose status as man

Manhood is not assured

These can be expressed in instances such as:

- “A man who gives into a woman’s whims is a beta male/simp.”
- “A man should not beg for a woman’s attention, if he does, he’s a beta.”
- “A low value man begs for a woman’s attention.”
- If he does simp/beta behavior, then he is not a real man

Violence in General and Against Women (VAW)

Statements that mention/condone violence against women (rape myths, abuse etc.)

- “Women deserve what happens to them, if they try to manipulate a man.”
- “If she’s dressed like that, she deserves it.”
- “That’s why she probably gets beat.”

Derogatory Language (DL)

Any language used to show disrespect, demean, or insult. This can include name calling, slurs etc.

- “Bitch”
- “Whore”
- “Slut”
- “She looks like a pig.”