International Journal of Social Science Research (IJSSR)
Volume- 3, Issue- 1 | January - February 2026 ISSN: 3048-9490

A Theoretical Comparison of Gender Role Strain and Gendered Life Course in Criminology

Pamela Brown[1*] & Jason Armstrong[2]
[1,2]Associate Professor, Albany State University, USA

Abstract

Background: Strain theories have long provided foundational explanations for deviant behavior, emphasizing how social structures create pressures toward nonconformity. Simultaneously, scholarship on the social construction of gender has demonstrated that gender roles, norms, and expectations fundamentally shape individuals' experiences and life trajectories. Despite shared theoretical commitments, two prominent frameworks addressing gender and crime, Gender Role Strain Paradigm and Gendered Life Course Theory have developed along largely separate scholarly tracks. **Purpose:** This paper compares these theoretical frameworks, examining their foundational assumptions, explanatory mechanisms, and applications to criminological inquiry. **Main Comparisons:** Both theories reject biological determinism and emphasize gender as socially constructed, yet they have focused on different populations: Gender Role Strain Paradigm predominantly theorizes men's experiences with masculinity and its dysfunctions, while Gendered Life Course Theory, informed by feminist criminology, centers women's pathways to crime shaped by victimization, cumulative disadvantage, and differential social control. **Key Findings:** This analysis demonstrates that these frameworks are fundamentally complementary. Together, they provide a more comprehensive gendered lens for understanding criminal behavior than offers independently. **Implications:** The authors call for theoretical integration that incorporates mechanisms from both traditions and advocate for gender-responsive policies and practices informed by understanding of distinct gendered pathways to crime. Directions for future empirical and theoretical research are proposed.

Keywords: gender role strain, gendered life course, feminist criminology, masculinities, social construction, gender-responsive policy.

Introduction

Strain theories represent some of the earliest explanations for the origins of deviant behavior. These theories focus on structural patterns within society that emerge as groups and individuals respond to societal changes over which they have limited control. As Merton articulated, "some social structures exert a definite pressure on certain persons in the society to engage in non-conforming conduct rather than conformist conduct" (1938, p. 672). Functionalists such as

*Corresponding Author Email: pamelapitmanbrownphd@gmail.com
Published: 3 January 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70558/IJSSR.2026.v3.i1.30756

Merton and Durkheim argued that society's organizational structure creates divisions based on social hierarchy, often determined by occupational roles, division of labor, or social class structures, thereby generating tension between individuals and groups.

Within gendered life course theory, the foundational concept of "doing gender" (West & Zimmerman, 1987) illuminates how socially constructed gender roles and norms shape our encounters and experiences with gender, creating differences that emerge as "an outcome of and rationale for social arrangements" and "a means of legitimating fundamental divisions of society" (p. 129). West and Zimmerman further noted that these divisions create differences between men and women that "essentialize sexual natures" (1987, p. 138). Building on this framework, West and Fenstermaker (1995) proposed reconceptualizing the social constructionist argument to include race and class as dimensions of "difference" (p. 9).

Spelman (1988) extends this analysis by distinguishing between sex and gender through Simone de Beauvoir's (1953) framework, explaining:

> It is one thing to be biologically female, and quite another to be shaped by one's culture into a "woman", not "men" do, someone who has the kinds of thoughts and feelings that make doing these things seems an easy expression of one's feminine nature (p. 124).

If race and class hold theoretical significance within criminology, then gendered constructs warrant equal consideration. Messerschmidt (2018) credits Edwin Sutherland and Albert Cohen with "perceiving the theoretical importance of the gendered nature of crime" and "placing masculinity on the criminal agenda" (p. 214). Theorists recognize that gender roles are contingent upon social structural positions and their associated expectations, regardless of biological sex (Parsons, 1951; Parsons & Bales, 1955). These gendered roles and statuses are "learned or enacted" (West & Fenstermaker, 1995, p. 18).

This paper examines the social construction of gender by comparing and contrasting two theoretical frameworks: the Gender Role Strain Paradigm and Gendered Life Course Theory. Additionally, this analysis explores the foundational assumptions of each theory and proposes applications for policy and practice in addressing crime and deviance.

Theoretical Foundations: Strain Theory

As previously established, strain theory provided foundational explanations for deviant behavior. Merton's (1938) strain theory remains the most prominent, positing that criminal or deviant behavior results from "disequilibrium." Clinard's (1964) early sociology of deviance textbook noted that anomie has been applied "not only to suicide, as by Durkheim, but also [by Merton] to crime, delinquency, mental disorders, alcoholism, and drug addiction" (p. 2).

Durkheim's Anomie

Durkheim introduced the concept of anomie in his seminal work on suicide (1897/2005), describing how anomic suicide results directly from the breakdown of social standards when societal behavior loses regulatory mechanisms. During periods of anomie, previously established values and meanings become obsolete without new ones to replace them, as society

has not yet developed alternative frameworks. This normative vacuum proves problematic both socially and individually. When traditional expectations, such as those surrounding careers or occupational roles, become unclear because old norms no longer apply, deviance rates increase. According to Durkheim, increased deviance typically occurs during periods of rapid social change and shifts in the division of labor. During such transitions, individuals cannot progress forward; without societal regulation of expectations and definitions of success, a sense of purpose dissipates. Durkheim prioritized moral order over economic order in explaining societal decline, arguing that the division of labor contributed to strained social relationships and economic disparities so severe that state intervention became necessary to maintain social cohesion (Clinard, 1964).

Merton's Adaptation

While Merton agreed with Durkheim that anomie emerges when society overemphasizes economic success, he diverged by rejecting sudden social change as the primary catalyst (Lilly et al., 1989). Merton (1938) conceptualized strain as the rupture between "culturally defined goals, purposes, and interests" (p. 672) and access to "the acceptable modes of achieving these goals" (p. 673). In later work, Merton (1968) described anomic stress as creating "a literal demoralization, e.g., a de-institutionalization of the means" (p. 190) resulting from "the acute pressure created by the discrepancy between culturally-induced goals and socially structured opportunities" (p. 232). Essentially, Merton argued that society imposes uniform success goals on all individuals while failing to provide equal means for achievement. Henry and Lanier (2018) identified these goals in the United States as centered on the "American Dream" material success measured by money" (p. 154). Americans continue pursuing this Dream vigorously, believing that hard work guarantees upward mobility and success within a meritocratic system.

However, when access to the Dream becomes blocked, individuals may experience "frustration, depression, and anger, emotions that can convert to illegal behavior" either as alternative means to achieve success or as retaliation against the system (Henry & Lanier, 2018, p. 154). Featherstone and Deflem (2003) reinforced this perspective, emphasizing that blocked opportunities stem not only from financial constraints but also from unequal access to social resources and opportunities "hoarded" by others competing for success (Tilly, 1999). Research demonstrates that affluent families benefit disproportionately from income inequality, with the upper middle class maintaining significantly greater resource access than the broader U.S. population (Reardon & Bischoff, 2011; Reeves, 2017).

Gender Role Strain Paradigm (GRSP)

The Gender Role Strain Paradigm (Levant, 2011; Pleck, 1981, 1995) incorporates the principle that gender is socially constructed while acknowledging that socially constructed masculinities vary across race, ethnicity, culture, and geographic regions. According to Levant (2011), within GRSP, "gender roles and gendered behavior are thus thought to be the result of social cognition and social influence processes, instructed by gender ideologies" (p. 766). Rather than employing hegemonic masculinity as a singular construct, GRSP researchers use "masculinities" (plural) to denote the multiplicity of gendered constructions. Substantial empirical research supports this differentiated perspective. Levant and Richmond's (2007)

comprehensive review examined 15 years of masculinity ideological research, while additional studies document ideological variations across age (Pleck et al., 1994; Young, 1996), ethnicity (Liu, 2002), nationality (Levant et al., 2003), geographic region (Levant et al., 1998), sexual orientation (Campbell, 2000; Grant, 2002), condom attitudes (Brown, 2012; Brown & Ewen, 2010; Smith, 1996), and intersectional factors (Levant et al., 2003; Rogers et al., 2015).

Mechanisms of Gender Role Strain Paradigm (GRSP)

According to GRSP, individuals experience strain at both individual and societal levels, manifesting as diminished self-esteem or social policing by others, when deviating from dominant masculine ideology (Levant, 2011; Fontaine, 2019). Contemporary research identifies traditional masculine ideology as encompassing the following normative expectations: avoidance of femininity, negativity toward sexual minorities, self-reliance through mechanical skills, toughness, dominance, the prioritization of sex, and restrictive emotionality (Levant et al., 2013, p. 228).

Pleck (1995) identified three distinct types of gender role strain experienced by men. First, gender role discrepancy strain, or incongruity (p. 12), occurs when individuals perceive themselves as failing to meet their internalized masculinity ideals. Pleck noted that many men cannot fulfill male role expectations, referencing Goffman's (1963) classic description of masculinity and its attendant negative self-judgments:

> *there is only one complete unblushing male in America: a young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight, and height, and a recent record in sports. Every American male tends to look out upon the world from this perspective, this constituting one sense in which one can speak of a common value system in America. Any male who fails to qualify in any one of these ways is likely to view himself during moments at least as unworthy, incomplete, and inferior (p. 128).*

The second type is gender role dysfunction strain (Pleck, 1995, p. 12), which occurs when individuals, in adhering to or successfully fulfilling male role expectations, experience negative side effects for themselves or others. Pleck discusses how attempting to meet societal standards is "inherently dysfunctional" (p. 17) with negative consequences. Research using the Hypermasculinity Inventory (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) demonstrates that excessive drinking, drinking and driving, delinquent behavior, drug use, and aggressiveness relate to the dysfunctionality of gender-role adherence (Pleck, 1995, p. 18). Other research links traditional masculinity to adverse health outcomes, including Helgeson's (1990) work on Type A behavior, heart disease, social network impairment, and physician relationships. Males communicate better with female physicians and provide twice as much information, supporting the observation that "real men are lousy patients, particularly when their doctors are also men" (cited in Winslow, 1993).

The final type is gender role trauma strain (Pleck, 1995, p. 12). Even when role expectations are successfully fulfilled, "the socialization process is traumatic, or the fulfillment itself is traumatic," potentially leading to negative consequences with long-term impacts (Pleck, 1995,

p. 12). This occurs when gender role strain becomes so severe that it traumatizes the individual—consider gay male experiences in heterosexist environments or the inability to spend time with family due to work demands for financial support. Pleck also discusses how the "hidden curriculum" within elementary schools contributes to trauma, where any behavior by boys deemed "feminine" is immediately stigmatized by peers through slurs such as "fag," "queer," or "gay" (Best, 1983, p. 82; Fontaine, 2019).

Life Course and Gendered Criminology Theories

Life Course Theory (LCT)

Life-course theory initially identified seven key principles (Elder, 1998): process, time, context, agency, linked lives, meaning, and diversity. These were later consolidated into five principles: life-span development, agency, time and place, timing, and linked lives (Elder, Johnson, & Crosnoe, 2003). The principle of lifespan development indicates a lifelong, highly individualized process (Elder, 2001). Childhood experiences affect life trajectories and health outcomes, either favorably or adversely (Brown, Niles-Yokum, & Baker, 2021, p. 83), with adult situations shaped by childhood experiences (Marshall & Mueller, 2003). The principle of agency, rooted in sociology, refers to individuals' capacity to act freely and construct their own life course "through the choices and actions they take within the opportunities and constraints of history and social circumstance" (Elder, Johnson, & Crosnoe, 2003, p. 11). Agency operates within boundaries imposed by social circumstances (e.g., insufficient education) or historical constraints (e.g., pandemics or wars). The principle of time and place refers to socio-historical time and cultural or geographic location (Brown, Niles-Yokum, & Baker, 2021, p. 84). Socio-historical time encompasses changes in cultural ideologies (e.g., patriarchy), economic shifts (e.g., recessions), political or religious transformations, and technological innovations—all of which interact with individuals and affect their choices, decisions, or opportunities. The principle of timing encompasses individual time (chronological age), generational time (family rank-ordered position), cohort time (group position shared with historical peers), and historical time (Price, McKenry, & Murphy, 2000). The principle of linked lives addresses how social relationships shape interpretations of life events (Marshall & Mueller, 2003; Giele & Elder, 1998).

Life Course Criminology Theory

Similar to LCT in aging and sociology, life course theory in criminology examines behavioral patterns within each life stage to understand individuals' involvement in criminal or deviant behavior (Newsome, 2014). Sampson and Laub (1990) originally introduced the concept of using LCT to explain deviance and criminal behavior. They argued that incarceration alone was too narrow for reducing recidivism and sought to explain the impact of social institutions: family, education, employment, housing, and geographic location (Sampson & Laub, 1993). As Laub stated, "What I have argued here is that criminology should argue for life-course criminology as its paradigm for the causes and dynamics of crime and that this paradigm should be the 'soul' and 'core' of criminology around which all of the facts, research agendas, and theories of the entire field can be organized" (2006, p. 250). Lilly, Cullen, and Ball (2002) view criminality as interrelated across the life course from childhood to adulthood. Life-course

criminology offers a framework for understanding crime fluctuations, various crime types, and career criminals due to the theory's cumulative nature (Van Gundy, 2014). A key benefit of life course theory is that crime cannot be viewed in isolation; each aspect of an individual's life represents a piece of the puzzle.

Gendered Life Course

Moen (2001) opens her chapter with the assertion that "gender matters" (p. 179), illustrating how gender matters in men's and women's roles and how these gender roles may disadvantage individuals, particularly as they age. Since LCT emphasizes the socialization process across the life course, examining gender socialization becomes essential, necessitating assessment of gender-based risk predictors of crime. Van Gundy (2014) documents how females and males experience social control differently within families and social institutions, noting that girls face more stringent social control for participating in the same activities as boys. She emphasizes how control and power relationships influence women's future decisions and relationships, with subordination structures and status "impact[ing] their life course trajectories in relation to expectations, limitations, and goal achievement—all key components of criminological theory" (Van Gundy, 2014).

Chesney-Lind (1989) articulated that girls respond to family conflict through gendered strategies such as running away from home, with status offenses and minor delinquencies representing enforcement of gender double standards. Chesney-Lind argues that girls' status is key to their survival responses and that vast differences exist in girls' and boys' childhood and adolescent experiences, with children inhabiting different worlds with different choices (1989; Chesney-Lind & Morash, 2013). Daly (1998) discussed gendered lives and gendered pathways as two approaches through which criminology constructs gender/crime theories from both feminist and non-feminist perspectives (pp. 94-99, cited in Daly, 2018, p. 211). Both gendered lives and gendered pathways can be incorporated within LCT's boundaries and principles.

Theoretical Comparison

Both theories fall within the functionalist tradition while focusing significantly on social construction and the interaction of social institutions with gender, gender roles, norms, and role-related stressors. Gender Role Strain Paradigm conceptualizes these pressures as strains, while Gendered Life Course Theory examines how stress contributes to acting out or delinquent behavior, including status offenses among girls and young women. Notably, while GRSP has focused primarily on men and masculinities, it is informed by feminist academic tradition, employing masculinity as a social identity rather than biological category. Sampson and Laub's (1993) LCT work indirectly addresses gender in crime and delinquent behavior across the life course, noting social processes contributing to crime and delinquency in relation to gender socialization differences. Moreover, their 1990 article on life course criminology emphasizes that institutional social control in childhood and adolescence is crucial to understanding criminal behavior, yet focuses predominantly on boys rather than girls, again demonstrating that gender matters.

Practical Implications for Policy and Practice

Both Gendered Life Course Theory and Gender Role Strain Paradigm establish crucial links between childhood experiences and criminal behavior in youth and adults, creating opportunities for preventative public policies and intervention strategies (Van Gundy, 2014). Understanding these theoretical frameworks allows for more comprehensive and effective responses across multiple domains of policy and practice.

Prevention and Early Intervention

Prevention programs are often overlooked due to their expensive nature. However, targeting children and families early would likely cost far less than incarceration. Strengthening the family unit, increasing investment in education, self-esteem development, and family stability would be key priorities, alongside strengthening social bonds, embodying the principle that "it takes a village to raise a child." Early childhood interventions that address gender socialization patterns, challenge rigid gender norms, and provide support for children experiencing trauma can interrupt pathways to criminal behavior before they become entrenched.

School-based programs represent another critical intervention point. Addressing the "hidden curriculum" that enforces traditional gender norms and stigmatizes non-conforming behavior can reduce gender role trauma. Programs that promote emotional literacy for boys, challenge toxic masculinity, and support girls in developing agency and self-determination can reshape the gendered pathways identified by both theoretical frameworks.

Life Course Transitions and Adult Interventions

Intervention during adulthood should focus more intensively on life transitions such as education, job training, employment, and marriage and family bonds. As Van Gundy (2014) states, "prosocial transitions may provide the individual... a turning point within the individual's criminal trajectory." Programs that facilitate successful navigation of these transitions while accounting for gendered experiences and expectations can serve as powerful intervention points.

For male offenders, interventions that address gender role strain, helping men develop identities not dependent on hyper-masculine norms, teaching emotional expression and help-seeking behaviors, and creating pathways to meaningful employment that provide alternative sources of masculine identity, which can reduce recidivism. For female offenders, prevention-focused approaches are particularly crucial (Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2011), given that girls and women face unique life circumstances including sexual assault, intimate partner violence, pregnancy, and motherhood. Programs must address these gendered experiences, and the cumulative disadvantages women face across the life course.

Criminal Justice System Responses

These theoretical frameworks suggest important considerations for criminal justice system responses. Understanding how gender role strain and gendered life course pathways contribute to offending behavior can inform more effective and humane responses. Recognition of how traditional masculinity norms contribute to aggression, risk-taking, and resistance to help-

seeking among male offenders can guide treatment and rehabilitation strategies. Similarly, acknowledging how gender socialization and cumulative disadvantage shape pathways to crime for female offenders is essential for effective intervention.

Both theories highlight how trauma, whether from gender role expectations or adverse life course experiences, contributes to criminal behavior, suggesting the need for trauma-informed approaches throughout the criminal justice system, from initial contact through sentencing and rehabilitation. Life course theory's emphasis on turning points suggests that diversion programs, particularly for youth and first-time offenders, can interrupt criminal trajectories. Gender-specific programming that addresses distinct needs and pathways is supported by both frameworks.

Risk assessment tools should account for gendered pathways to crime, recognizing that risk and protective factors may operate differently based on gender socialization and life course experiences. Traditional risk assessment instruments that fail to account for these differences may systematically over- or under-predict risk for certain populations.

Social Institutions and Structural Interventions

Social institutions should be viewed as major players in both theoretical perspectives. Passas and Passas (2015) highlight social institutions' relationship to crime from a strain theory perspective. Passas's theory of global anomie (2000, 2006) demonstrates how global economic trade has threatened or eliminated safety nets while promoting deviant responses (Passas & Passas, 2015). Policy interventions must therefore address not only individual-level factors but also the structural conditions that create strain and limit legitimate opportunities, particularly for those experiencing gender-based disadvantage across the life course.

Discussion

This comparative analysis reveals that Gender Role Strain Paradigm and Gendered Life Course Theory, while emerging from distinct scholarly traditions, share fundamental assumptions about the social construction of gender and its relationship to criminal behavior. More significantly, this examination demonstrates that these frameworks have developed along parallel but separate tracks. GRSP predominantly theorizing men's experiences with masculinity and its dysfunctions, and Gendered Life Course Theory, particularly through feminist criminological contributions, centering women's pathways to crime. This disciplinary division represents both a limitation and an opportunity. Taken together, these theories offer a more comprehensive gendered lens for criminology than either provides independently.

Complementary Theoretical Contributions

The complementary nature of these frameworks becomes apparent when examining their respective strengths. Gender Role Strain Paradigm provides robust mechanisms for understanding how masculine socialization contributes to criminal behavior among men. Pleck's (1995) typology of discrepancy, dysfunction, and trauma strain offers precise conceptual tools for identifying the psychological and social processes through which rigid gender expectations produce harmful outcomes. The extensive empirical literature supporting GRSP, documenting variations in masculine ideology across age, ethnicity, sexuality, and

geography, demonstrates the theory's capacity to account for diversity within masculinity while maintaining explanatory coherence.

Gendered Life Course Theory contributes what GRSP largely lacks: sustained attention to women's experiences and the cumulative, trajectory-based nature of gendered pathways to crime. Chesney-Lind's (1989) work on girls' responses to family conflict, status offenses as enforcement of gender double standards, and the distinct worlds that boys and girls inhabit provides essential theoretical grounding for understanding female offending. The life course framework's emphasis on transitions, turning points, and linked lives captures the processual nature of how gender shapes criminal trajectories over time in ways that strain theory's more static conceptualization does not fully address.

The integration of these perspectives yields a more complete theoretical picture. GRSP explains why men, particularly those who internalize traditional masculine ideology, may engage in aggression, risk-taking, substance abuse, and violence as expressions of or compensations for masculinity. Gendered Life Course Theory explains how women's pathways to crime are shaped by victimization, economic marginalization, relational disruptions, and constrained agency across the life span. Together, they illuminate how gender operates as a fundamental organizing principle of criminal behavior for all individuals, not merely as a demographic variable or control factor.

Challenging Traditional Criminology

This theoretical comparison challenges criminology's historical tendency to treat gender as peripheral or to universalize male experiences as the norm. As Messerschmidt (2018) observed, while Sutherland and Cohen recognized the gendered nature of crime, mainstream criminology has often failed to develop this insight systematically. Traditional strain theories, including Merton's foundational work, implicitly centered male experiences of blocked opportunities without examining how gender itself structures both goals and means. The American Dream, as typically conceptualized, reflects masculine achievement ideology; women's relationships to this cultural mandate have historically been mediated through family roles and economic dependence on men.

Both GRSP and Gendered Life Course Theory foreground what traditional approaches obscure: that gender is not simply a variable to be controlled but a constitutive feature of social life that shapes the very phenomena criminology seeks to explain. The social construction of gender creates distinct pressures, pathways, and responses for men and women. Recognizing this fundamentally reorients criminological inquiry from asking why women commit less crime than men to examining how gendered social arrangements produce distinct patterns of conformity and deviance across the gender spectrum.

Furthermore, both theories challenge the individual-level focus that characterizes much criminological thought. While attending to psychological processes and individual experiences, each framework locates the origins of criminal behavior in social structures, cultural ideologies, and institutional arrangements. Gender role strain is not an individual pathology but a predictable outcome of socialization into contradictory and impossible standards. Gendered life course pathways are not expressions of essential female nature but products of cumulative

disadvantage, constrained choices, and differential social control. This structural orientation suggests that effective responses to crime must address not only individual offenders but the gendered social order that produces offending.

Intersectionality Considerations

Both theoretical frameworks acknowledge, to varying degrees, the intersection of gender with other dimensions of social stratification. GRSP researchers have documented variations in masculine ideology across racial and ethnic groups, recognizing that masculinity is not monolithic but shaped by cultural context and social position. West and Fenstermaker's (1995) extension of "doing gender" to include race and class as simultaneous accomplishments provides theoretical grounding for understanding how gender intersects with other systems of inequality.

Life course theory's principles of time, place, and historical context similarly create space for examining how gender operates differently across social locations. Women's pathways to crime are shaped not only by gender but by race, class, immigration status, and other factors that structure opportunities, constraints, and responses to adversity. The cumulative disadvantage that characterizes many women's trajectories toward criminal involvement reflects intersecting oppressions rather than gender alone.

Limitations

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment. This analysis is theoretical and conceptual rather than empirical; the proposed integration of GRSP and Gendered Life Course Theory requires empirical testing to establish its utility for explaining criminal behavior across diverse populations and offense types. Additionally, while both frameworks address gender as socially constructed, neither fully theorizes experiences of transgender and gender non-conforming individuals, whose relationships to gender norms, strain, and life course trajectories may differ substantially from cisgender men and women.

The present analysis also focuses primarily on American contexts, reflecting the empirical base of both theoretical traditions. The applicability of these frameworks to other cultural settings, where gender ideologies and life course structures may differ significantly, requires further examination. Finally, this comparison necessarily simplifies complex theoretical traditions; both GRSP and Gendered Life Course Theory encompass diverse perspectives and ongoing debates that a single article cannot fully represent.

Future Research Directions

The call for theoretical integration suggested by this analysis points toward several productive research directions. First, scholars should develop integrated theoretical models that explicitly incorporate mechanisms from both frameworks, examining how masculine and feminine role strain operates across the life course and how gendered life course transitions create or alleviate strain. Such models would enable more comprehensive explanations of criminal behavior that account for both the content of gender socialization and its temporal, developmental dimensions.

Second, empirical research should test propositions derived from integrated theory across diverse samples. Comparative studies examining how GRSP mechanisms operate for women, and how life course processes shape men's trajectories, would illuminate the frameworks' broader applicability. Research designs that follow individuals over time while measuring gender ideology, role strain, and life course transitions would provide particularly valuable tests of integrated theoretical propositions.

Third, intervention research should examine whether programs informed by integrated theory produce better outcomes than those drawing on single frameworks. Gender-responsive programming for justice-involved populations might be enhanced by attending to both strain mechanisms and life course processes, tailoring interventions to address the specific gendered pathways that characterize different populations.

Finally, theoretical work should continue refining our understanding of how gender intersects with other dimensions of inequality to shape criminal behavior. While this analysis has not prioritized intersectionality as a central focus, the theoretical frameworks examined here provide foundations for more fully intersectional criminological theory that accounts for the simultaneous operation of multiple systems of oppression across the life course.

Conclusion

This comparative analysis of Gender Role Strain Paradigm and Gendered Life Course Theory reveals two theoretical frameworks that, despite emerging from distinct scholarly traditions, share a fundamental commitment to understanding gender as socially constructed and consequential for criminal behavior. Both theories reject biological determinism in favor of examining how cultural ideologies, social institutions, and structural arrangements produce gendered patterns of conformity and deviance. Both locate the origins of criminal behavior not in individual pathology but in the tensions between social expectations and lived experience.

The central contribution of this analysis lies in demonstrating the complementary nature of these frameworks. Gender Role Strain Paradigm, with its sustained attention to masculinities and the mechanisms through which masculine socialization produces dysfunction and trauma, provides essential tools for understanding male pathways to crime. Gendered Life Course Theory, particularly as developed through feminist criminological scholarship, illuminates women's distinct experiences, the cumulative disadvantages, constrained choices, victimization histories, and differential social control that shape female offending. Neither framework alone captures the full complexity of gender's relationship to crime. Together, they offer criminology a more comprehensive gendered lens than either provides independently.

This theoretical integration carries significant implications for both scholarship and practice. For researchers, it suggests the value of developing models that incorporate mechanisms from both traditions, examining how gender role strain operates across the life course and how life course transitions create or alleviate gendered pressures. For practitioners and policymakers, it underscores the necessity of gender-responsive approaches that address the distinct pathways through which men and women come into contact with the criminal justice system. Prevention efforts must attend to gender socialization patterns in childhood; intervention programs must recognize how gender shapes the meaning and impact of life course transitions; and system

responses must account for the different experiences and needs of justice-involved men and women.

More broadly, this comparison challenges criminology to move beyond treating gender as a demographic variable or statistical control. The theoretical traditions examined here demonstrate that gender is not peripheral to criminal behavior but constitutive of it. The social construction of masculinity and femininity creates the very pressures, pathways, and responses that criminological theory seeks to explain. Criminology that fails to center gender in its explanatory frameworks will necessarily produce incomplete accounts of the phenomena it studies.

The limitations of this conceptual analysis point toward necessary future work. Empirical testing of integrated theoretical propositions, extension of these frameworks to transgender and gender non-conforming populations, and examination of their applicability across diverse cultural contexts represent productive directions for continued scholarship. The theoretical foundations laid by GRSP and Gendered Life Course Theory provide solid ground for this ongoing work.

Ultimately, this analysis affirms what feminist criminologists have long argued: gender matters. It matters for understanding why individuals engage in criminal behavior, how social institutions respond to that behavior, and what interventions might effectively address it. The integration of Gender Role Strain Paradigm and Gendered Life Course Theory represents one path toward a criminology that takes this insight seriously, producing scholarship and practice adequate to the gendered realities of crime and justice.

References

Best, R. (1983). *We've all got scars: What boys and girls learn in elementary school.* Indiana University Press.

Brown, P. (2012). *Relationship power and control among single heterosexual women at midlife: Correlates of condom use and traditional gender role ideology* [Doctoral dissertation, Miami University]. OhioLINK Electronic Theses and Dissertations Center.

Brown, P., & Ewen, H. (2010, September). *Gender-role attitudes and control in sexual spheres: Egalitarianism vs. traditionalism in U.S. married and cohabitating couples* [Paper presentation]. 10th Congress of the European Federation of Sexology, Porto, Portugal.

Brown, P., Niles-Yokum, K., & Baker, H. (2021). *Social theories of aging: A brief synopsis*. Cognella.

Campbell, K. M. (2000). *Relationship characteristics, social support, masculine ideologies, and psychological functioning of gay men in couples* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. California School of Professional Psychology, Alameda.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1989). Girls' crime and woman's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency*, 34(1), 5–29.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Morash, M. (2013). Transformative feminist criminology: A critical re-thinking of a discipline. *Critical Criminology*, 21, 287–304.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (2011). *The female offender: Girls, women, and crime* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Clinard, M. B. (1964). The theoretical implications of anomie and deviant behavior. In M. B. Clinard (Ed.), *Anomie and deviant behavior* (pp. 1–56). The Free Press.

Daly, K. (1998). Gender, crime and criminology. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *The handbook of crime and punishment* (pp. 85–108). Oxford University Press.

Daly, K. (2018). Feminist thinking about crime. In S. Henry & M. M. Lanier (Eds.), *The essential criminology reader* (pp. 205–213). Routledge.

de Beauvoir, S. (1953). The second sex (H. M. Parshley, Trans.). Jonathan Cape. (Original work published 1949)

Durkheim, E. (2005). *Suicide: A study in sociology* (J. A. Spaulding & G. Simpson, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1897)

Elder, G. H., Jr. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development*, 69(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.2307/1132065

Elder, G. H., Jr. (2001). Life course. In G. L. Maddox (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of aging* (3rd ed., pp. 593–596). Springer Publishing.

Elder, G. H., Jr., & Giele, J. Z. (2009). Life course studies: An evolving field. In G. H. Elder, Jr. & J. Z. Giele (Eds.), *The craft of life course research* (pp. 1–24). Guilford Press.

Elder, G. H., Jr., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Handbook of the life course* (pp. 3–19). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-306-48247-2_1

Featherstone, R., & Deflem, M. (2003). Anomie and strain: Context and consequences of Merton's two theories. *Sociological Inquiry*, 73(4), 471–489.

Fontaine, A. L. C. (2019). Integrating general strain theory and the gender role strain paradigm: Initial considerations. *Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology*, 11(3), 159–186.

Giele, J. Z., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (Eds.). (1998). *Methods of life course research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Sage Publications.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Prentice-Hall.

Grant, J. E. (2002). *Single gay and heterosexual men's involvement with friends and family.* Dissertation Abstracts International, 63(5), 2650B.

Helgeson, V. S. (1990). The role of masculinity in a prognostic predictor of heart attack severity. *Sex Roles*, 22(11/12), 755–776.

Henry, S., & Lanier, M. M. (Eds.). (2018). *The essential criminology reader*. Routledge. (Original work published 2006)

Jang, S. J., & Johnson, B. R. (2003). Strain, negative emotions, and deviant coping among African Americans: A test of general strain theory. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19(1), 79–105.

Kornrich, S., & Furstenberg, F. (2013). Investing in children: Changes in parental spending on children, 1972–2007. *Demography*, 50, 1–23.

Laub, J. H. (2006). Edwin H. Sutherland and the Michael-Adler report: Searching for the soul of criminology seventy years later. *Criminology*, 44, 235–258.

Levant, R. F. (2011). Research in the psychology of men and masculinity using the gender role strain paradigm as a framework. *American Psychologist*, 66, 765–776. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025034

Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., & Rankin, T. J. (2013). Male Role Norms Inventory-Short Form (MRNI-SF): Development, confirmatory factor analytic investigation of structure, and measurement invariance across gender. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(2), 228–238. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031545

Levant, R. F., Majors, R. G., & Kelley, M. L. (1998). Masculinity ideology among young African American and European American women and men in different regions of the United States. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, 4, 227–236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.4.3.227

Levant, R. F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the Male Role Norms Inventory. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 15(2), 130–146.

Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Sellers, A., Cuthbert, A., Matveev, A., Mitina, O., Sokolovsky, M., & Heesacker, M. (2003). Masculinity ideology among Russian and U.S. young men and women and its relationship to unhealthy lifestyle habits among young Russian men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4(1), 26–36. https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.26

Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Sellers, A., Majors, R., Inclan, J., Rossello, J., Heesacker, M., & Rowan, G. (2003). A multicultural investigation of masculinity ideology and alexithymia. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4(2), 91–99. https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.4.2.91

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (1989). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences.* Sage Publications.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2002). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Liu, W. (2002). Exploring the lives of Asian American men: Racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 3(2), 107–118. https://doi.org/10.1037//1524-9220.3.2.107

Marshall, V. W., & Mueller, M. M. (2003). Theoretical roots of the life-course perspective. In W. R. Heinz & V. W. Marshall (Eds.), *Social dynamics of the life course* (pp. 3–32). Aldine de Gruyter.

Merton, R. K. (1938). *Social structure and anomie*. American Sociological Review, 3, 672–682.

Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. Free Press.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2018). Masculinities and theoretical criminology. In S. Henry & M. M. Lanier (Eds.), *The essential criminology reader* (pp. 214–220). Routledge.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2019). The salience of "hegemonic masculinity." *Men and Masculinities*, 22(1), 85–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X18805555

Moen, P. (2001). The gendered life course. In R. H. Binstock & L. K. George (Eds.), *Handbook of aging and the social sciences* (5th ed., pp. 179–196). Academic Press.

Mosher, D., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 18, 150–162.

Newsome, J. (2014). Life course and development theories of crime. In J. S. Albanese (Ed.), *Wiley series of encyclopedias in criminology and criminal justice: The encyclopedia of criminology and criminal justice*. Wiley.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Free Press.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Free Press.

Passas, N. (2000). Global anomie, dysnomie, and economic crime: Hidden consequences of neoliberalism and globalization in Russia and around the world. *Social Justice*, 27(2), 16–44.

Passas, N. (2006). Demystifying hawala: A look into its social organization and mechanics. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 7(1), 46–62.

Passas, N., & Passas, N. (2015). The sick society anomie, strain, and subcultural theory. In M. M. Lanier & S. Henry (Eds.), *Essential criminology* (4th ed.). Westview Press.

Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. MIT Press.

Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11–32). Basic Books.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1994). Attitudes toward male roles: A discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles*, 30, 481–501.

Price, S. J., McKenry, P. C., & Murphy, M. J. (2000). Families across time: A life course perspective. In S. J. Price, P. C. McKenry, & M. J. Murphy (Eds.), *Families across time: A life course perspective* (pp. 2–22). Roxbury.

Reardon, S., & Bischoff, K. (2011). Income inequality and income segregation. *American Journal of Sociol*ogy, 116, 1092–1153.

Reeves, R. (2017). *Dream hoarders: How the American upper middle class is leaving everyone else in the dust, why that is a problem, and what to do about it.* Brookings Institute Press.

Rogers, B. K., Sperry, H. A., & Levant, R. F. (2015). Masculinities among African American men: An intersectional perspective. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 16(4), 416–425. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039082

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55(5), 609–627.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life.* Harvard University Press.

Smith, J. A. I. (1996). *Assessment of gender variables in heterosexual condom use* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of North Dakota.

Spelman, E. V. (1988). *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought*. Beacon Press.

Tilly, C. (1999). *Durable inequality*. University of California Press.

Van Gundy, A. (2014). *Feminist theory, crime, and social justice*. Taylor & Francis.

Walters, M. A. (2011). A general theories of hate crime? Strain, doing difference and self control. *Critical Criminology*, 19(4), 313–330.

West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender & Society*, 9, 8–37.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1, 125–151.

Winslow, R. (1993, July 9). Male patients suffer for being taciturn. *Wall Street Journal*, p. B1.

Young, P. A. (1996). A transgenerational study of sex role norms and development in adult men. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(11), 6413B.

Zembroski, D. (2011). Sociological theories of crime and delinquency. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 21, 240–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2011.564553