*Sex Roles, Vol. 27, Nos. 11/12, 1992*

# Men and Masculinities: Scales for Masculinity Ideology and Masculinity-Related Constructs

**Edward H. Thompson, Jr.**
*Holy Cross College*

**Joseph H. Pleck**
*Wellesley College*

**David L. Ferrera**[1]
*Holy Cross College*

*This review evaluates 11 masculinity ideology measures that examine attitudes toward men and masculinities and 6 instruments for other masculinity-related constructs. Four conclusions regarding the available measures and the future development of instrumentation in the area are drawn from the review. First, there is evidence that measures of gender orientation and measures of gender ideologies are independent, and have differential correlates. Instruments that attempt to determine gender orientation and masculinity ideology concurrently will have limited utility by virtue of not distinguishing between these two constructs. Second, there is also evidence that gender ideologies about men are distinct from, and have differential correlates than, gender ideologies about women and gender relations in general. Thus, measures intending to index attitudes toward masculinities should not include gender-comparative items. Third, measures of the gender-related conflicts or stresses of manhood are likely to predict males' behavior more directly than measures of masculinity ideology. Finally, a number of the existing instruments measuring either masculinity ideology or personal experiences with masculinity standards direct attention too narrowly toward a single definition of masculinity.*

[1]Currently a first-year law student at New York University.



0360-0025/92/1200-0573$06.50/0 

From their inception, the social sciences have predominantly concerned men and male experience. However, although traditional social scientific research emphasized males, it did not study men *as men.* Too often past research "treat[ed] men as if they had no gender" (Kimmel & Messner, 1989, p. 3). In much the same way that men were thought of as genderless, many schools of thought implicitly generalized from male experience and ignored female experience entirely. In recent years, however, a research interest in men, masculinity standards, and men's experiences has arisen. Two notable facts are apparent. This new approach explicitly investigates males as one of two genders whose life opportunities and social experience systematically differ from women's. Second, a number of important tests and measures have been developed to chart public attitudes toward men, and to systematically document how males experience their gender.

In this paper, we review 17 extant scales developed in the last two decades that measure masculinity-related constructs. Three of the measures were published in the late 1970s, and the remainder were developed in the 1980s. We limited the review to (1) attitude measures that tap ideologies about men and masculinities, and (2) inventories for other masculinity-related constructs that reveal how males might experience their gender. Among these, we included in the review only instrumentation that had been peer reviewed, was relatively recent in development, and was accessible. Thus, excluded from the review were the early generation of attitude measures, such as the Antifemininity in Men scale (Allen, 1954). Also excluded were the measures defining gender stereotypes such as the Sex Role Stereotype Questionnaire (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, & Broverman, 1968). Nor did we consider the widely used measures of gender orientation such as the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) and Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), or the lesser known measures of gender orientation such as the Boyhood Gender Conformity Scale (Hockenberry & Billingham, 1987) and the Masculine Behavior Scale (MBS; Snell, 1989). Instruments measuring gender orientation have been comprehensively reviewed elsewhere (Beere, 1979, 1990; Lenney, 1991), and critiqued on methodological (Deaux, 1984; Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979; Taylor & Hall, 1982) and conceptual grounds (Connell, 1987; Pleck, 1981; West & Zimmerman, 1987). This article is restricted to the relatively new instruments assessing masculinity ideologies and other masculinity-related constructs describing how men experience their gender. At the conclusion of the review, we suggest directions for the future development of instrumentation concerning men and masculinities.

Three theoretical concerns are basic to what follows. First is the distinction between gender ideology and gender orientation, a fundamental distinction underlying our classification of measures. Next, conscious of the

diversity of gender ideologies, we separate ideologies that focus on men from those that address women and those that address gender relations. Third, because the social meaning of masculinity varies and competing masculinities coexist, we distinguish between the measures that assume a single standard of masculinity and those that recognize more than one version of masculinity.

## BACKGROUND

### *Distinguishing Gender Ideology from Gender Orientation*

As a context for reviewing the measures that reveal one's beliefs and attitudes toward men and masculinity standards, several conceptual issues need to be addressed. First, the literature on masculinity is quite extensive. At the most general level, there have been two broad theoretical approaches to masculinity: (1) *trait* perspectives, exemplified by the "male sex role identity" model (Pleck, 1981) and conceptualizations of androgyny, theorize the sources and consequences of males acquiring the personality traits and behaviors culturally defined as masculine and/or feminine; and (2) *normative* perspectives, which view masculinity as an ideology rather than a psychologically (or biologically) based characteristic. To illustrate both perspectives, a "traditional" male, in trait terms, actually *has* culturally defined masculine characteristics. By contrast, the "traditional" male, viewed in the normative conception, is one who endorses the ideology that men *should* have these characteristics (and women should not).

Although they offer different interpretations and use different modes of assessment, both theoretical approaches assume that socially desirable "male roles" exist that are distinct from "female roles." The trait approach presumes normative masculinity is rooted in the actual differences between men and women, and primarily analyzes the personality (e.g., Spence and Helmreich's PAQ) and behavioral (e.g, Snell's MBS) correlates more often associated with men than women. Men who possess these personality attributes and behavioral tendencies are referred to as "masculine." (Janet Spence argues that the PAQ and the BSRI are measures of personality attributes that are not necessarily gender phenomena. The PAQ is a measure of instrumental and interpersonally expressive personality traits, which have been stereotypically associated with men and women, respectively. Sandra Bem, however, takes issue with this interpretation to argue that the BSRI does not measure the masculinity and femininity traits within an individual; rather it measures the cognitive constructs derived from gender roles that individuals use to organize their perceptions and social worlds.)

By contrast, the normative approach views "masculinity" as a socially constructed gender script, and examines the ideologies and institutions involved in maintaining different masculinity standards. Prior theoretical analyses of masculinity generally did not distinguish clearly between the trait and normative approaches, but blended elements of the two together (e.g., Brannon, 1976; Pleck, 1976).

The distinction we draw between trait-based approaches to gender orientation and normative approaches to gender ideology is not without debate (Archer, 1989, 1990; McCreary, 1990). However, we adopted this heuristic distinction as a basis for classifying masculinity-related assessment instruments. Instruments designed from a trait perspective to assess men's gender orientation were excluded from review. The first group of measures reviewed identify masculinity ideologies by tapping the beliefs and attitudes people maintain about men and their gender. Although the developers of the scales might not recognize their work under the rubric "masculinity ideologies," these scales index the extent to which individuals endorse the ideas and beliefs that serve to justify gender scripts and gender relations. The second group of attitudinal measures shift the focus to how men individually experience their gender. Some of the instruments index individuals' conformity with specific masculinity ideologies, and others index personal consequences arising from the press of masculinity standards. These measures, too, reflect the normative approach to understanding men. The content of the scales does not concern self-reported behaviors or characteristics to reveal the respondent's gender orientation (e.g., "I wear clothes that make me look physically tough" or "I am physically tough"). Instead, the items measure the respondent's attitudes toward and feelings about masculinities (e.g., "Men should be physically tough" or "I admire men who are physically tough"). We will point out later that by virtue of their construction, several scales inadvertently assess gender orientation and ideology simultaneously.

### *Distinguishing Among Gender Ideologies*

The array of beliefs and attitudes individuals hold about men, women, and gender relations do not make up a single tidy set. Gender-related attitude scales have a wide variety of subjects: for example, there are scales assessing attitudes toward "sex role" traditionality, attitudes toward gender relations, attitudes toward women, attitudes toward feminism, attitudes toward men, and attitudes toward masculinity. We conceptualize attitudes toward men and masculinities as distinct ideologies, which can differ from the attitudes someone holds toward women or gender relations in general.

Thompson and Pleck (1986) observed in their study of undergraduates' gender-related ideologies that endorsement of a masculinity ideology was correlated with, yet empirically distinct from, attitudes toward women and attitudes toward gender relations. This means that the various gender ideologies are certainly connected. Yet it also means that an individual can hold a progressive attitude toward women (e.g., believing that working mothers' employment is acceptable) while simultaneously hold a conservative attitude toward men (e.g., believing that compassionate touching among men is unacceptable).

Most gender-related ideology scales focus on women and their behavior, or on gender relations, or both (see Beere, 1990). The first 11 measures we review tap the respondent's attitudes toward the rights and responsibilities of men. The attitudes underlying these masculinity ideologies are most often assessed by agreement or disagreement with third-person statements. However, they may also be assessed with first-person statements (e.g., "I would be more comfortable with a male boss than a female boss"). In some instances, deciding whether a first-person item is better classified as assessing the respondent's gender orientation or masculinity ideology may be difficult. In these instances we have made decisions based on our judgment of the author's intent.

Assessment of attitudes toward masculinities can take two forms (Pleck, 1981). There are items assessing *prescriptive* statements (beliefs about what men *should* be like) and items assessing *descriptive* statements (beliefs about what men *actually* are like). Although the prescriptive component of attitudes about masculinities is probably more influential in shaping men's behavior, both categories of beliefs about men are important. In the review, we call attention to the types of items utilized.

An additional criterion used in classifying measures for this review was that the content of the items should concern masculinity expectations *without* making a comparison between men and women (e.g., "A young man should be physically tougher than his sister, even if he is not big"). The rationale for this criterion was that to understand public attitudes toward masculinities, ideally these ideologies would be assessed independently of someone's attitudes about women or attitudes toward men compared to women.

It might be argued that even when item wording refers only to men living up to male standards, some degree of comparison to females is always implicit. This may be true to some degree. It is nonetheless desirable to use items that focus on men and masculinity standards to the greatest degree possible. Items explicitly comparing the sexes [e.g., "Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man," the first item in Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp's (1973) widely used Attitudes

toward Women Scale, (AWS) Short Form] are logically difficult to interpret as assessing the attitudes held toward one gender independently of attitude about the other. Conceptually, items making this simultaneous assessment are measuring *gender attitudes* in general. Thus, many scales labeled as assessing attitudes toward women or attitudes toward men may actually assess the broader construct of gender attitudes (e.g., of the 25 items in the short form of the AWS, 15 explicitly compare the sexes, and several others do so implicitly). When researchers developed these gender attitude scales, many believed the variance in gender ideology concerned only women's rights and roles, whereas men's rights and roles were assumed to be invariant, a fixed standard against which attitudes toward women could be compared.

### *Assessing a Single Norm for Male Standards?*

The third interpretive issue concerns whether the measures of masculinity ideology assume the existence of multiple types of masculinity. Critical voices have argued that although many in the gender field accept the idea of the male role and its complement the female role as generalized prescriptions for men and women, this assumption is problematic. First, studying the male role does not lend itself to an unambiguous understanding of men's gender. Unlike most roles, such as father, telephone lineman, and husband, the male role has no specific organizational context or location (West & Zimmerman, 1987). It is thought of as a synthesis of the multiple roles men perform (see Deaux, Winston, Crowley, & Lewis' 1985 study of the relative homogeneity of the male stereotype). Second, research informs us that few males fully comply with or endorse the standards presumed to define the male role (Baca-Zinn, 1984; Cazenave & Leon, 1987; Downs & Engleson, 1982; Franklin, 1988; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, in press —a; Thompson & Pleck, 1986). Finally, the image of a single standard of masculinity is apolitical and ignores the pervasive imbalance of power among different men or within gender relations (Connell, 1987; Morgan, 1990).

In our view, studies assessing the beliefs and attitudes about men, as well as investigations of men's gender-related stress and conflicts ought not assume that all social groups, cultures or subcultures, and periods have the same male standards. In recognition of the multiplicity of conceptions of masculinity, we occasionally use the term attitudes toward male *roles,* rather than role, or male *standards* rather than standard. Other scholars have also argued that the term *masculinities* needs be used rather than masculinity (Brod, 1987; Connell, 1987; Hearn & Morgan, 1990; Kimmel & Messner,

1989; Segal, 1990). Historically, Green (1946), Hacker (1957), and Komarovsky (1973) were perhaps the earliest to argue that multiple masculinities coexist and often conflict. We anticipate that the social forces affecting men's experiences will be differentially salient for men of different ages, cohorts, class, race, sexual preference, and region. We also assume that some expectations and social forces will be a common denominator in men's lives (cf. Gilmore, 1990).

Many of the attitudinal measures we review include multiple dimensions. One might argue that these scales therefore do not assume a single masculinity standard. Comparing different groups or cultures on their profiles of these multidimensional instruments would empirically document the extent to which different masculinity standards are endorsed to different degrees by these groups or cultures. Others might argue, however, that these scales still assume one monolithic male role, albeit with component dimensions. Throughout our review, we identify which masculinity ideology measures involve multiple subscales, and which measures assume single vs. multiple masculinities.

## MEASURES REVIEWED

The first group of masculinity-related measures reviewed are the instruments assessing beliefs and attitudes about men or masculinity standards in relatively pure form, i.e., with no or only a few items tapping gender orientation. The second group is comprised of 6 other masculinity-related instruments assessing first-person accounts of gender role conflict, stress, or conformity to a masculinity ideology.

The measures reviewed were identified in a computerized literature search of two data bases, *PsychInfo* since 1967 and *PsycLIT* since 1973. One unpublished scale not used in later published work (Falkenberg, Hindman, & Masey, 1983, cited in Beere, 1990, pp. 426–427) was not included in this review precisely because it has not been used by others, nor has the article presenting it been subjected to peer review. (Promising new work developed by Beth Willinger is also not included. Her work examines men's masculinity ideology across different cohorts of young men, and is based on a new scale she developed. She can be reached at the Newcomb Center for Research on Women, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA 70118.) The research studies employing the instruments reviewed here were located primarily using the *Social Science Citations Index* and by contacting scale authors.

## *Measures of Masculinity Ideology*

Table I lists 11 instruments for measuring masculinity ideologies. The scales are arranged chronologically. The scales focus on gender-related attitudes. They generally do not include items concerning gender orientation. However, many of these scales do include items comparing the sexes or concerning gender relations. Some scales also include items assessing attitudes and beliefs about women. Inclusion of these types of items is noted in the table. Three other general concerns served as guides to systematically evaluate the scales and are summarized in the table. We were interested in whether the authors took for granted the male role or one dominant form of masculinity. We were interested if subscales were identified, and in the psychometric properties of the scale and subscales.

*The Macho Scale.* Villemez and Touhey's (1977) Macho Scale (MS) is a 28-item self-report scale designed to measure individual differences in endorsement of sexist attitudes and discriminatory practices. The scale includes a number of items assessing attitudes toward men. However, 25% of the items compare the sexes to tap gender attitudes generally (e.g., "Parents usually maintain stricter control over their daughters than their sons, and they should"). For another 46% of the items, a female noun or pronoun is central, and thus the items measure attitudes about women. For example, one statement reads, "Women who try to be independent of their families are just hurting themselves." A 5-point (0–4) Likert-type format is used, with responses ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* (test–retest reliabilities average .91). Seven items were reverse scored. Basically, the MS presents declarative statements in both first and third person to index beliefs about the appropriate behavior for men *and* women (e.g., "A wife who becomes a mother has no more reason to give up her career than a husband who becomes a father" or "I would be more comfortable with a male boss than a female boss"). Given the content of the items, the MS is fundamentally a measure of antifemininity and patriarchal ideology, not strictly a masculinity ideology measure tapping only attitudes toward men and masculinity standards.

The MS has been used for more than a decade. Villemez and Touhey (1977) noted that it is not correlated with measures of manifest anxiety, achievement motivation, locus of control, or Machiavellianism. Brinkerhoff and MacKie's (1985) factor analysis found 18 of the items clustered together to account for 85% of the variance. Gayton, Sawyer, Baird, and Ozmon (1982) reported a moderate correlation ($r$ = .57) between MS scores and the anti-feminist attitudes indexed by the AWS (Spence & Helmreich, 1972), and they observed cross-cultural differences in Macho scores between Anglo- and Mexican-Americans. Anderson (1978) found

that MS scores varied with males' BSRI sex typing, but not females'; masculine-typed males had higher Macho scores. Anticipating a religiosity–sexism relationship, Barrish and Welch (1980) unexpectedly found no relationship between religiosity and maintaining sexist attitudes. However, Brinkerhoff and MacKie (1985) revealed religious variables were consistently and strongly related to sexist attitudes as defined by the 18-item general factor within the MS. Downs and Engleson (1982) concluded that the MS is limited to measuring the power dimension associated with gender relations. Mazer and Percival (1989) concur, finding that the more sexist subjects were, the more tolerant they were of sexual harassment. Even if limited to measuring a power dimension, Villemez and Touhey's (1977) 28-item scale, or the 18-item adaptation, makes a valuable contribution to the measurement of sexist attitudes by including items about men.

*Attitudes Toward the Male Role Scale.* Doyle and Moore (1978) developed the Attitudes Toward the Male Role (AMR) scale to index public attitudes toward the appropriate behavior for men. Their conceptual model implicitly assumed a universal model of masculinity. Rated on a 4-point disagree/agree format, 45 items cover five distinct factors: male dominance, vocational pursuits, sexuality, emotionality, and relations with women and other men. The items are declarative statements addressing stereotypic norms and values (e.g., "A man who cries in front of a woman is making a fool of himself"). All but one of the items in the AMR has a male noun leading the sentence (Gackenbach & Auerbach, 1985, p. 241). Ten items are reverse scored, so that agreement is the nontraditional response. The AMR includes both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes; nearly one-third of the items are descriptive stereotypes about men's lives, whereas the remainder are prescriptive "should" statements. However, one-third of the items also require comparing men to women (e.g., "Men are more decisive in crisis situations than women" or "Men are inclined by nature to be more truthful and direct than women"). With these items, the AMR taps attitudes toward men in comparison to women, and it is difficult to know if one type of attitude is being measured more than the other.

Derived from a much larger pool of 135 items, the AMR has high internal consistency (alphas in low .90s) and test–retest reliability over an eight-week interval of .89 for men and .85 for women. There is some evidence of construct and criterion validity. Secondary, college, and professional men held progressively more liberal attitudes, and women reported more liberal attitudes than men (Doyle & Moore, 1978). Whitley (1987) reported that attitudes toward homosexuality were predictably related to scores on a modified form of the AMR. Moderate correlations were also

**Table I.** Measures of Masculinity Ideology

| Authors/scale | Number of items | Some items compare sexes | Some items measure attitudes toward women | Some items measure gender orientation | Scale assumes one masculinity | Information on validity | Reliabilities | Sample size | Sub-scales[b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Villemez & Touhey (1977)<br>The Macho Scale | 28 | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | $\alpha$ = (na)<br>2-week = .91[c] | 347 — MF | None |
| Doyle & Moore (1978)<br>Attitudes Toward the Male Role | 45 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | $\alpha$ = .90<br>8-week = .87[c] | 1533 — M<br>1370 — F | None |
| Moreland & Van Tuinen (1978)<br>Attitude Toward Masculinity Transcendence Scale | 46 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | $\alpha$ = .94[c] | 236 — M<br>176 — F | 4 |
| Downs & Engleson (1982)<br>Attitudes Toward Men Scale | 34 | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | $\alpha$ = .87[c]<br>2-week = .92[c] | 245 — M<br>361 — F | None |
| Bunting & Reeves (1983)<br>Macho Scale | 15 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | $\alpha$ = (na) | 197 — M | None |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Iazzo (1983)<br>Attitudes Toward Men Scale | 32 | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | α = .79 | 104 — F | 4 |
| Brannon & Juni (1984)<br>Brannon Masculinity Scale | 110 | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | α = .95<br>4-week = .92 | 864 — MF | 7 |
| Thompson & Pleck (1986)<br>Male Role Norms Scale | 26 | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | α = .86 | 1510 — MF | 3 |
| Snell, Belk, & Hawkins (1986)<br>Stereotypes About Male Sexuality Scale | 60 | No | No | No | Yes | No | α = (na) | 27 — M<br>74 — F | 10 |
| Levant et al. (1992)<br>Male Role Norms Inventory | 58 | No | No | No | No | No | α = .93 | 287 — MF | 7 |
| Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku (in press)<br>Male Role Attitudes Scale | 8 | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | α = .56 | 1880 — M | None |

[a] See text for types of validity information.
[b] See text for list of subscales, number of items in each, and alpha coefficients when available.
[c] Reliability coefficient is an average of multiple samples.

found between the AMR and college students' scores on Villemez and Touhey's (1977) MS ($r$ = .72, Downs and Engleson, 1982), the Attitudes Toward Men Scale ($r$ = .67, Downs & Engleson, 1982; reviewed below), and Spence and Helmreich's AWS ($r$ = .64 for men and $r$ = .76 for women, Doyle & Moore, 1978; $r$ = .66, Gackenbach & Auerbach, 1985). As these correlations suggest, the AMR scale is a general-purpose measure of gender attitudes, not masculinity ideology. The scale highlights the expectations men face, and its comparative items tap attitudes toward gender relations and attitudes toward women.

*Attitude Toward Masculinity Transcendence Scale.* The Attitude Toward Masculinity Transcendence Scale (ATMTS), developed by Moreland and Van Tuinen (1978), is a general-purpose inventory of attitudes toward the changing societal norms and values defining masculinities. In the final version, the 46-item self-report ATMTS is based on comparing the gender "transcendent" male's behavior vs. a stereotypically masculine male (such as outlined by Brannon, 1976). Four aspects of the emerging norms for men and their gender relations were measured: dominance transcendence, homophobia transcendence, nontraditional activities, and acceptance of the new woman. The 5-point Likert format measures agreement and disagreement with masculinity norms and values. The scale includes both descriptive stereotypes (e.g., "A successful sex life in marriage depends mostly on the man") and prescriptive statements ("Male children should be discouraged from developing interest in traditionally feminine pursuits"). The scale also includes both first-person and third-person presentations of the norms and values. All but one of the items had the male pronoun leading or anchoring the statement. Yet 5 items (11%) measure masculinity attitudes indirectly because they contrast men to women (e.g., "Men should have less responsibility for child rearing than women").

The ATMTS was designed to measure attitudes toward competing masculinity standards within American culture. Unlike many other instruments, where rejection of the "traditional" masculinity script cannot necessarily be interpreted as endorsement of a "progressive" ideology, the ATMTS directly taps attitudes toward a nontraditional gender script. Moreland and Van Tuinen's factor analysis, however, failed to identify a factor structure that would correspond to the original conceptualization regarding dominance transcendence, homophobia transcendence, and tolerance of nontraditional activities. This outcome lead Moreland and Van Tuinen to suggest that the 46-item ATMTS is best considered as unidimensional, and they elected to not report reliability coefficients for the subscales. Alpha coefficients calculated by Moreland and Van Tuinen demonstrate the 46-item ATMTS has good reliability (.95 for men, .94 for women).

The nonconfirming factor structure of the 46-item version is not surprising since the wording of many items was changed after the initial administration. Using the earlier, larger 54-item version, which includes 8 items Moreland and Van Tuinen eventually dropped because of their poor item-total correlations, Buhrke (1988) found quite acceptable alpha coefficients for the four conceptual factors: .89 for dominance transcendence, .86 for homophobia transcendence, .81 for nontraditional activities, and .73 for attitudes toward the new woman.

Buhrke (1988) also noted that the 54-item version of the ATMTS was strongly correlated with the AWS ($r$ = .80). The shorter 46-item version of the ATMTS is somewhat less strongly correlated with the AWS ($r$ = .62; Harren, Kass, Tinsley, & Moreland, 1979). The ATMTS does not correlate with social desirability ($r$ = .05; Buhrke, 1988), nor is it correlated with the Masculinity (M) scale in the BSRI ($r$ = –.04; Harren et al., 1979).

There is some evidence of the ATMTS's concurrent validity. The 46-item scale was used by Burda and Vaux (1987) to show that endorsing traditional masculine norms was negatively related to both perceived and received social supports. In effect, those who go it alone endorse traditional masculinity standards. The masculinity norms and values tapped by the ATMTS were also predictive of decision-making style and satisfaction with career-related decisions (Harren et al., 1978, 1979).

*Attitudes Toward Men Scale.* Downs and Engleson (1982) developed the Attitudes Toward Men Scale (AMS) with undergraduates as well as elementary and secondary school teachers in master's degree programs. Like its complement, the AWS (Spence & Helmreich, 1972), the AMS was designed to measure public attitudes toward the roles and status of men. The scale appraises the male role as contrasted to the female role. This 34-item scale was derived empirically from a larger pool of items to index an individual's agreement with the common stereotypes about men and masculinity. Each item is worded as a declarative statement and scored on a 4-point Likert format (*agree strongly* to *disagree strongly*), and 5 are reverse scored. The descriptive and prescriptive statements included in the AMS address men's sexuality, occupational and recreational interests, domestic skills, relationships with women, power seeking, and emotionality.

Not all items assess attitudes toward men separately from attitudes toward women. For example, one item is "Women are more content than men," and another reads "Women are more comfortable with other women than men are with other men." Eight of the 34 items (24%) have a female noun leading the sentence, and many others examine attitudes toward men and masculinities comparatively. Only 16 items (47%) comment solely on men and masculinities (e.g., "Single fathers are competent to rear children"

and "It is ridiculous for men to stay home and keep house"). Thus, like the AWS, the AMS measures gender attitudes broadly, and does not directly tap an ideology that concerns men and masculinities.

A factor analysis by Downs and Engleson (1982) indicated that the AMS is multidimensional and involved seven interpretable factors. No specific subscales were presented. Assessments of the internal consistency of the scale reveal alphas of .89 for male subjects and .86 for female subjects, and test–retest reliabilities over a two-week interval of .94 for males and .90 for females.

Downs and Engleson also found that the AMS is not related to gender orientation as measured by Spence and Helmreich's (1978) PAQ. Construct validity is supported by the predicted differences in gender and age, and the correlations with Villemez and Touhey's (1977) MS ($r$ = .66), Doyle and Moore's (1978) AMR ($r$ = .67), and Spence and Helmreich's AWS ($r$ = .84 for men, .57 for women). Recently, Good, Dell, and Mintz (1989) found that traditional attitudes were critically important to explaining men's negative attitudes toward help seeking for psychological problems, yet the AMS did not predict help seeking for personal and academic/vocational problems. Although traditional attitudes on the AMS were also strongly correlated with O'Neil's (1981) "gender role conflict" (reviewed below), they were not correlated with depression, measured by the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (Good & Mintz, 1990).

*Macho Scale.* Some authors have viewed extreme forms of "masculine" behavior (or "hypermasculinity") as abnormal or pathological (e.g., Broude, 1990; Glass, 1984). Bunting and Reeves' (1983) 15-item self-report Macho scale aims to adapt this idea to the assessment of masculinities. The conceptualization of masculinity standards introduced by Brannon (1976) was used as a guide to operationalize a hypermasculinity ideology. The scale is intended for only male respondents. Most items assess the reaction of the respondent to gender violations (e.g., "It irritates me to see a man acting in a way to get sympathy"). The instrument includes both descriptive and prescriptive beliefs about males, as well as a mix of stereotyped beliefs about women (e.g., "There are some jobs that women should not have"). Four (27%) are self-descriptive (e.g., "I am usually able to express my innermost feelings to someone") and assess gender orientation. Because a female pronoun is the primary referent of 5 items (33%), the Macho Scale does not always assess attitudes toward men and masculinity separately from attitudes about appropriate gender relations or attitudes toward women. This mixing of different types of items limits the scale's usefulness. In many ways the Macho Scale simultaneously assesses masculinity beliefs, gender attitudes in general, and attitudes toward women.

Another limitation of the Macho Scale is that the wording of items best speak to the unmarried (e.g., "I try not to date a female that is taller than I"). Nonetheless, Bunting and Reeves (1983) found among male undergraduates that a "macho" ideology was predictably correlated with an attitudinal tolerance of rape.

*Attitudes Toward Men Scale.* The Attitudes Toward Men Scale (Iazzo, 1983) was developed to determine the attitudes that *women* have about men. Beginning with a larger item pool, Iazzo's 32-item scale encompasses four major domains: marriage and parenthood (13 items, e.g., "Most fathers want very much to be close to their children," alpha = .85); sexuality (7 items, e.g., "The male body is visually unappealing," alpha = .73); work (4 items, e.g., "It is important to a man that he provide for his family," alpha = .60); and physical and personality attributes (8 items, e.g., "A man's independence is to be admired," alpha = .69). A 4-point Likert-based agree/disagree format is employed, and almost half of the items are reverse scored to minimize response set. All items are descriptive statements, all have a male noun as the anchor, and no item directly compares men to women. Several items do assess attitudes toward women indirectly (e.g., "Most husbands consider their wives to be weak and witless creatures").

The full scale shows evidence of good reliability (alpha coefficient = .79), and it is not correlated with the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability scale ($r$ = .02). The four conceptually derived content areas were confirmed in a factor analysis; however, this analysis used only 104 females and 52 items. Iazzo (1983) provided some information on the criterion validity of the Attitudes Toward Men Scale. Groups of women predicted to hold less favorable attitudes toward men, specifically rape victims, battered wives, and women active in the National Organization of Women, held less favorable attitudes than other women. This pattern suggests that women's attitudes toward men could be more a function of experience than belief in cultural scripts. What is needed is research that examines the construct and discriminant validity of the Attitudes Toward Men Scale.

*Brannon Masculinity Scale.* The Brannon Masculinity Scale (BMS) was developed by Brannon and Juni (1984; Brannon, 1985) to measure individuals' approval of the norms and values that define the male role. The 110-item self-report scale is based on Brannon's (1976) analysis of American culture's "blueprint" of what a man is supposed to be, to want, and to succeed in doing. This conceptualization presumes that masculinity centers on four themes. Most pivotal, the "No sissy stuff" standard contains two 16-item subscales: avoiding femininity (e.g., "It bothers me when a man does something that I consider 'feminine' ") and concealing emotions (e.g.,

"When a man is feeling a little pain he should try not to let it show very much"). The "Big wheel" standard is described with two subscales: being the breadwinner (15 items, e.g., "Success in his work has to be a man's central goal in this life"), and being admired and respected (16 items, e.g., "It's essential for a man to have the respect and admiration of everyone who knows him"). The "Sturdy Oak" standard is also represented by two 16-item subscales: toughness (e.g., "I like for a man to look somewhat tough") and the male machine ("A man should always try to project an air of confidence even if he doesn't really feel confident inside"). Brannon's last masculinity standard, "Give 'em Hell," is described in one violence and adventure subscale (15 items, e.g., "A real man enjoys a bit of danger now and then"). All seven subscales are internally consistent, with alphas ranging from .77 to .87.

Sixteen of the 110 items are reverse scored, and all items have a male noun anchoring the sentence. A few items concern gender relations, though they do not compare the sexes (e.g., "A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children"). The remainder address men fulfilling masculinity standards. The scale contains both prescriptive and descriptive statements, presented in first or third person to be rated on a 7-point *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* Likert format. Scoring reflects an individual's endorsement of traditional masculinity. The test–retest reliability coefficient for a sample of college students was .92 over a four-week interval (Brannon & Juni, 1984), and the BMS has high internal consistency, with an alpha of .95 (Brannon, Juni, & Grady, undated).

The more frequently used short form of the BMS contains 58 items (alpha = .90; Thompson, Grisanti, & Pleck, 1985) and is highly correlated with the full scale ($r$ = .89; Brannon & Juni, 1984). Brannon and Juni also report that the short form may provide an acceptable overall assessment of a traditional masculinity ideology, but it cannot provide separate subscale scores. The 58-item BMS was found uncorrelated with the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Good, Braverman, & O'Neil, 1991).

Validity studies using college students show moderately strong relationships between the BMS and self-reports of traditionally masculine behavior (Brannon & Juni, 1984), as well as with type A behavior, homophobic attitudes, sexist attitudes toward women, and men's asymmetrical power relationships with a female partner (Thompson et al., 1985). The BMS has a near-zero correlation with individuals' anxiety about intimacy or willingness to disclose personal information to male friends (Good et al., 1991; Thompson et al., 1985). Rieker, Edbril, and Garnick (1985) found that sexual impairment was prevalent among the subgroup of men who survived testis cancer and endorsed the concealing emotion

subscale. The men with high concealing emotional scores also had difficulty acknowledging feelings of vulnerability produced by the illness and treatment. Baruch and Barnett (1986; Barnett & Baruch, 1987) reported that fathers whose attitudes were less traditional on the short-form of the BMS were more involved in home chores (yet not child care). Mother's attitudes toward male roles proved to be critically important to father's involvement with children as well as the children's own gender role attitudes.

Major strengths of the approach taken by Brannon include the scope of the masculinity standards included, and the effort to assess attitudes toward the expectations men face without direct comparison to women. The latter is especially noteworthy, because the scale is based on a model of masculinity that defines the male role as distinct from the female role. As many components of masculinity ideology the BMS taps, using the BMS provides little information about attitudes toward male privilege, men's rights, or men's sexuality.

*Male Role Norms Scale.* The Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986) is founded on the masculinity ideology identified by Brannon (1976; Brannon & Juni, 1984). The Male Role Norms Scale was derived empirically by factor analyzing the 58-item Brannon Masculinity Scale. The MRNS reduces the number of basic dimensions underpinning the male role from four to three: status norms (11 items, alpha = .81); toughness norms (8 items, alpha = .74); and antifemininity norms (7 items, alpha = .76). Like the BMS, the MRNS measures masculinity ideology only, and is uncontaminated by items that measure attitudes toward women or toward gender attitudes in general. The 26-item self-report scale uses a 7-point *very strongly disagree* to *very strongly agree* format. Two of the 26 items are reverse scored. Combining multiple samples of college students ($N$ = 1510), the alpha for the scale's internal reliability is .86.

The MRNS was positively related ($r$ = .44 for undergraduate males; $r$ = .55 for undergraduate females; Thompson, 1990) to the 15-item AWS, which indirectly assesses attitudes toward men and toward gender relations. By contrast, Desnoyers (1988) found attitudes toward masculinity standards only moderately correlated with attitudes toward women, when measured by declarative belief statements such as "By nature women are happiest when they are making a home and caring for children" ($r$ = .27) or "It is insulting to women to have the 'obey' clause remain in marriage vows" ($r$ = –.18). Thompson and Pleck (1986) also noted that the three norm scales were differentially and only modestly correlated with two single-item measures of attitudes toward women: For example, opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment was not related to endorsing status norms, only to the

toughness ($r$ = .35) and antifemininity ($r$ = .25) norms. Construct validity of the MRNS has been examined and supported in studies of adolescent males, college students, and adult males near or in retirement. The MRNS held a near-zero correlation ($r$ = .07) with the M scale of the BSRI (Thompson, 1990). Riley (1990) used the antifemininity subscale to successfully predict which adult men seeking help for psychological problems would drop out of therapy sooner. In discriminate analysis, the MRNS predicted intimates' use of psychologically coercive behavior when their gender orientation and attitudes toward women were statistically controlled (Thompson, 1990). In another sample, endorsing the traditional masculinity ideology covaried with men's masculine gender role stress ($r$ = .43), as assessed by Eisler and Skidmore (1987).

Stark (1991) extracted 3 items from each subscale, and at one point compared the 9 with 8 other declarative statements measuring equality between men and women. He observed that men favored traditional standards more than women, and masculinity ideology more strongly predicted a lower level of same-sex intimacy and greater homophobia than attitudes about equality. Like Stark, Gradman (1990) modified the MRNS for his study of older men's transition to retirement by extracting the 3 items with the largest loadings from each subscale and modifying the wording of some statements to make them more acceptable to older men (for example, "sexual partner" was changed to "wife"). Gradman found that men who were retired vs. those still working did not differ in the endorsement of these masculinity standards, and that endorsement of a traditional masculinity ideology was unrelated to older men's gender orientation (the M scale of the PAQ), work ethic endorsement, and well-being. In effect, the MRNS offers a relatively short measure of attitudes toward three masculinity standards, and subscales scores can be used to generate profiles of different group's attitudes toward masculinity standards.

*Stereotypes About Male Sexuality Scale.* The Stereotypes About Male Sexuality Scale (SAMSS; Snell, Belk, & Hawkins, 1986b) is a self-report instrument designed to index attitudes toward ten stereotypes about male sexuality: (1) men should not have certain feelings, (2) sex equals performance, (3) men must orchestrate sex, (4) men are always ready for sex, (5) all physical contact leads to sex, (6) sex equals intercourse, (7) sex requires erection, (8) sex requires orgasm, (9) sex is spontaneous, and (10) men are sexually knowledgeable. Each stereotype is evaluated with 6 declarative statements about men (e.g., "Lack of an erection will always spoil sex for a man" or "Most men don't want to assume a passive role in sex"). The content of the statements consistently addresses attitudes toward men. The 60-item scale uses a 5-point Likert format, with anchors ranging from *agree* (+2) to *disagree* (–2). Only the alpha values for the 10 subscales were reported,

and they range from a low of .63 to a high of .93 with an average of .80 in a sample of 112 college students. Apparently the authors did not intend to use a summary score, because no alpha was reported for the full scale. Snell and his colleagues (1986b, 1988) provide some information on the SAMSS's construct validity. However, the gender-specific correlations were based on 25 to 27 college males and 69 to 74 college females. The strength of the SAMSS is that it broadens the scope of attitudes toward masculinity to include sexual behavior, an area omitted in many other scales. Construct validity, however, still needs to be established in larger, more diverse samples.

*Male Role Norms Inventory.* The Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI; Levant et al., 1992) is composed of 58 normative and nontraditional statements about the male role to which respondents agree/disagree on 7-point Likert scales. The authors theorized seven normative standards: avoidance of femininity (8 items, e.g., "Boys should prefer to play with trucks rather than dolls"), homophobia (5 items, e.g., "A man should be able to openly show affection to another man"), achievement/status (10 items, e.g., "It's not important for men to strive to reach the top"), attitudes toward sex (10 items, e.g., "A man doesn't need to have an erection in order to enjoy sex"), restrictive emotionality (10 items, e.g., "A man should never reveal worries to others"), self-reliance (7 items, e.g., "A man should never count on someone else to get the job done"), and aggression (8 items, e.g., "A man should not force the issue if another man takes his parking space"). Correlations among the seven theoretical factors are moderately high (median $r$ = .51). Alpha coefficients, which were reported by the authors in an earlier manuscript, suggest the seven subscales (with the exception of aggression and self-reliance) have adequate reliability (.70 to .80). The alpha for the complete scale was .93.

Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the MRNI consists of three rather than seven male role dimensions. These factors present masculinity norms that are being rejected and those that still regulate. The first factor consists of items from the avoiding femininity, homophobia, achievement/status, attitudes toward sex, and restrictive emotionality subscales (alpha = .93). The second factor matched the self-reliance subscale (alpha = .62), and the third matched the aggression subscale (alpha = .48). The content of the MRNI is largely prescriptive statements about appropriate behavior for men. There are several items in the Avoidance of Femininity subscale that some researchers might interpret as comparing the sexes (e.g., "Boys should not throw baseballs like girls"). These items appear to tap opinions about traditional masculinity standards that include comparisons between the sexes. The sample on which the measure was developed consisted of 287 university students. It is noteworthy that

the authors found evidence that age, marital status, and gender affect attitudes toward the masculinity norms.

Broadening the scope of the measured masculinity norms to explicitly include sexuality is a major strength of this approach. Although seven types of norms were not empirically confirmed in this sample, the instrument may provide reliable subscales. What is now needed is research that attests to the MRNI's construct and discriminant validities.

*Male Role Attitudes Scale.* Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku's 8-item Male Role Attitudes Scale (MRAS; in press — a, in press — b) extracted 7 items from the three factors defined in Thompson and Pleck's (1986) MRNS, and included an item concerning sexuality from Snell et al.'s (1986) Stereotypes about SAMSS. Item wording was simplified or otherwise modified for adolescent males (e.g., "A guy will lose respect if he talks about his problems"). Coefficient alpha for this measure is .56. Like the BMS and MRNS (on whose items it draws), the MRAS uses only items concerning the importance of men fulfilling masculinity standards. Detailed analyses to detect possible differential correlates of traditional masculinity attitudes among white, black, and Hispanic adolescent males have been conducted, and little evidence of differential relationships was found (Pleck et al., in press — b).

Pleck et al. (in press — a) observed that a traditional masculinity ideology was associated with school difficulties, alcohol and drug use, delinquency, and coercive sexual behavior in a national sample of adolescent males. Marsiglio (1991), using the same data, reported that endorsing the traditional masculinity ideology was associated with male pride in making a partner pregnant. Upholding a traditional masculinity ideology was also linked to a negative attitude toward male responsibility for contraception, less consistent use of condoms, more sexual partners, and a belief that relationships between men and women are inherently adversarial (Pleck et al., in press — b). The masculinity ideology indexed in the MRAS predicted condom use in analyses that statistically controlled for more global attitudes toward gender, and this suggests that the MRAS has discriminant validity.

The construct validity of the MRAS, and especially the evidence of its discriminant validity in relation to gender attitudes more generally, are its particular advantages. As noteworthy is the finding that the MRAS and its component items have similar correlates among male adolescents in diverse racial-ethnic groups. Finally, the small number of items in the scale makes it efficient to administer. Perhaps as a result, however, the MRAS's internal reliability is lower than any other scale reviewed here.

*Measures for Other Masculinity-Related Constructs*

Table II summarizes 6 other instruments for measuring masculinity-related constructs that are also conceptually distinct from measures of gender orientation. These scales were designed to reveal how men experience their own gender. We have ordered the scales in the table chronologically. The first 3 are first-person accounts of one's support of masculinity standards. Because these overall masculinity inventories include items assessing both support for a masculinity ideology and comfort with specific masculinity standards, the three scales come very close to measuring gender orientation. Yet as we show, they measure other masculinity-related constructs. The remaining 3 instruments assess the level of personal conflict or stress aroused by masculinity standards

*Traditional-Liberated Content Scale.* Fiebert published the 29-item Traditional-Liberated Content Scale (TLCS) in 1983. The scale indexes how men behave and feel in four key social relations: men's relationships with women, relationships with children, relationships with other men, and involvements at work. The TLCS was designed to identify men's gender traditionalism or liberalism, and is inappropriate for women. A 7-point Likert format is used, responses ranging from *very strongly agree* to *very strongly disagree.* Starting with a pool of 108 items and reduced by factor analysis, the TLCS is made up of two subscales that separately measure "liberated" or emerging views (15 items) and traditional views (14 items). Sixty percent of the "liberated" and 58% of the "traditional" items are first-person accounts that basically assess men's degree of comfort with masculinity standards (e.g., "I would be flattered if a woman asked me out for a date" or "I would not feel uncomfortable having a homosexual as a friend"). The remainder of the items are prescriptive attitudinal statements (e.g., "Lack of job success does not mean a man is a failure in life" or "Every boy should be tough enough to defend himself in a fight"). Two of the prescriptive items in each subscale, however, examine men's attitudes about women, rather than men.

It is noteworthy that the TLCS is based upon a study of 277 adult men completed in 1982 as a master's thesis by Patricia Biggs. Biggs and Fiebert published the results of this work in 1984. Their analysis demonstrated seven major factors within the 108 items: breaking the stereotype (27 items), the breadwinner/homemaker roles (14 items), loss of power (12 items), emotional control (8 items), appearance of masculinity (7 items), women at home (5 items), and toughness (5 items).

Test–retest reliability for the 29-item TLCS over a three-week interval was .85 for the traditional factor and .92 for the liberated factor (Fiebert & Vera, 1985). The scale's content validity was examined in a sample of

**Table II.** Measures for Other Masculinity-Related Constructs

| Authors/scale | Number of items | Some items compare sexes | Some items measure attitudes toward women | Some items measure gender orientation | Scale assumes one masculinity | Information on validity[a] | Reliabilities | Sample size | Sub-scales[b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fiebert (& Biggs; 1983) Traditional-Liberated Content Scale | 29 | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | α = (na) 3-week = .88[c] | 277—M | 2 |
| Mosher & Sirkin (1984) Hypermasculinity Inventory | 30 | No | Yes | Indirectly | Yes | Yes | α = .89 | 135—M | 3 |
| Snell (1986) Masculine Role Inventory | 30 | No | No | No | NO | Yes | α = (na)[d] 4-week = .79[c] | 729—MF | 4 |
| O'Neil et al. (1986) Gender-Role Conflict Scale-I | 37 | No | No | No | No | Yes | α = (na)[d] 4-week = .79[c] | 527—M | 4 |
| Gender-Role Conflict Scale-II | 16 | No | No | No | No | Yes | α = (na)[d] 4-week = .80[c] | 527—M | 4 |
| Eisler & Skidmore (1987) Masculine Gender-Role Stress | 40 | No | No | No | No | Yes | α = .90s 2-week = .93 | 150—M | 5 |

[a] See text for information on types of validity.
[b] See text for list of subscales, number of items in each, and alpha coefficients when available.
[c] Reliability coefficient is an average of multiple samples.
[d] Internal consistency estimate for full scale was not reported; however, alphas for subscales are summarized in text.

83 college males and received some support: the traditional and liberated scales of the TLCS were correlated moderately with the BMS ($r$ = .55 and .63, respectively; Vera & Fiebert, 1987). The TLCS offers a relatively short measure of individual differences in men's attitudes. A drawback, however, is that the nearly equal representation of self-representational and attitudinal items creates a problem of interpretation. Another concern is that its discriminant validity and other psychometric properties have not been well established.

*Hypermasculinity Inventory.* Mosher and Sirkin (1984; Mosher & Tomkins, 1988) argue that rigid conformity to masculinity standards or overcompensation to gender expectations can manifest itself in a "macho personality" characterized by socially callous attitudes, violence, and aggression. Drawing from psychoanalytic theory and a view of male roles as the antithesis of female roles, the authors' Hypermasculinity Inventory (HMI) measures three components of the "macho personality" construct: calloused sex attitudes, violence as manly, and danger as exciting. Ten items for each dimension make up this 30-item scale. Items are presented as "forced choices." Such a choice is believed to better mirror real life situations. Each pair consists of one "macho" alternative. Two examples read as follows:

a. Lesbians have chosen a particular life style and should be respected for it.
b. The only thing a lesbian needs is a good, stiff cock.

a. After I've gone through a really dangerous experience my knees feel weak and I shake all over.
b. After I've been through a really dangerous experience I feel high.

The instrument was refined from a larger pool of items and tested among male undergraduates. Alphas for the complete scale (.89) and the three 10-item subscales (.79, .71, .79, respectively) are quite satisfactory. The scale determines the "macho syndrome" by revealing the respondent's attitudes toward women as well as toward men. Several items would seem to approximate trait measures of gender orientation (e.g., "When I am bored I watch TV or read a book" vs. "When I am bored I look for excitement"). Factor analysis revealed the single, predominant, latent variable ("macho") was relatively homogeneous.

Numerous studies have used the HMI and provide support for its construct validity. Mosher and Sirkin (1984) and Exner (1985) observed that the macho personality pattern was significantly correlated with frequency of alcohol consumption and drug use, aggressive behavior, assaultiveness, violent behavior, contraceptive attitude and use, and sexual

experience. Mosher and Anderson (1986) reported the majority of college-aged men in their sample had used force or exploitation to "get" sex from dates. Hypermasculinity (and more specifically, espousing calloused sex attitudes) was correlated with a history of sexual aggression. Sullivan and Mosher (1990) and Smeaton and Byrne (1987) conclude that hypermasculinity was highly correlated with sexual coercion/aggression and tolerance of callous sex and rape. Mobayed (1990) found hypermasculinity predicted low self-disclosure in males. Archer and Rhodes (1989) examined the relationship of the HMI to the BSRI and the British version of the Attitudes Towards Women Scale (AWS-B). The HMI was fairly strongly and positively related to the M scale of the BSRI, negatively but less strongly related to the "femininity" traits, and strongly correlated with traditional attitudes toward women.

Unique aspects of the HMI include its focus on hypermasculinity, the distinct content domains measured, and its forced choice format. A major strength of the HMI is its established construct validity, which links societal norms to individual behavior. One limitation, however, is that scale items define the macho personality in homophobic terms; thus, the scale might be limited to heterosexuals. Second, the scale also includes items that assess gender orientation indirectly and attitudes toward women directly. Last, hypermasculinity represents an extreme. It is a distal indicator of the possible effects of the social forces scripting men's behavior, and thus the scale may be relevant only to the extremes in male behavior.

*Masculine Role Inventory*. The Masculine Role Inventory (MRI; Snell, 1986) was designed to measure men's (and women's) compliance with three standards of masculinity. This self-report inventory initially included 30 statements for three hypothetical dimensions of the traditional male's experience: success preoccupation, restricted emotionality, and inhibited affection. Factor analyses reduced the number of items used to 25. Snell (1986, p. 447) reported that 5 items make up the success preoccupation subscale. Thirteen items defined the restrictive emotionality factor, and 7 items define the inhibited affection subscale. The items associated with each subscale, therefore, are empirically derived. The scale includes both first-person accounts of conformity to stereotypical norms (e.g., "I avoid discussing my feelings because others might think I am weak") and third-person endorsements of stereotypes (e.g., "People who cry will not get anywhere in the working world"). The descriptive stereotypes focus on masculinity standards without explicit comparison between genders. However, the nearly equal representation of self-representational and attitudinal items creates a problem of interpretation.

All available research with the MRI reports that respondents received the full 30-item scale; nonetheless, only subscale scores are used in analyses.

Perhaps, using the total score could mask different patterns of conformity. The response format is a 5-point Likert scale, from –2 (*strongly disagree*) to +2 (*strongly agree*), and one item is reverse scored. The subscales have adequate internal consistency, with alphas ranging from a low of .71 to a high of .88 across several college student samples. Construct validity has been partly established. Sex differences were found for the two emotionality subscales but not for success preoccupation. The subscales are differentially and predictably associated with gender orientation, elevated levels of negative life experiences, alcohol and drug use, self-disclosure, and use of avoidance strategies in intimate relationships (Belk & Snell, 1988; Snell, Belk, & Hawkins, 1986a, 1987). Newcomb (1990) selected 4 items with the largest factor loadings from each of the three subscales and interpreted them (with reverse scoring) as assessing "commitment to communality." Newcomb confirmed his construct with confirmatory factor analysis and found it associated with individuals' intimate/familial support network.

The MRI's greatest strength is its known associations with validating correlates. Unfortunately, no rationale was presented for respondents completing the 30-item inventory when only 25 items are used in the subscales. There is also some concern with the MRI including both attitudinal items and self-representational items that approximate measures of gender orientation. This blend of items requires being very cautious with interpretation.

*Gender-Role Conflict Scales.* O'Neil and his colleagues (O'Neil, 1981, 1982; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986) suggest a different approach to studying the traditional expectations men face. They introduce the construct "gender role conflict." This form of conflict is defined as a psychological state arising from the inherently contradictory and unrealistic messages within and across the standards of masculinity. Gender role conflict exists when masculinity standards result in personal restriction and devaluation. The Gender Role Conflict Scale — I (GRCS-I) was developed as an inventory of men's reactions to the gender expectations routinely faced. The GRCS-I is a 37-item, self-report scale that uses a 6-point Likert-type format with responses ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree.* The scale attends to men's concerns with success, power, and competition (13 items, alpha = .85; e.g., "Moving up the career ladder is important to me"); restrictive emotionality (10 items, alpha = .82; e.g., "Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me"); restrictive affectionate behavior between men (8 items, alpha = .83; e.g., "Hugging other men is difficult for me"); and the conflicts between work/family relations (6 items, alpha = .72; "My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like"). This four-factor structure was confirmed

in three other college student samples (Good et al., 1991). All items use the first person, all are worded to tap the individual's anxiety and distress, and most of the items imply gender role conflict rather than state it directly. Test–retest reliabilities over a four-week period ranged from .72 to .86 for each factor.

Validity was established for the GRCS-I and its subscales in a number of studies. The scale and subscales have near-zero correlations with social desirability (Good et al., 1991). In one study, the "success, power, and competition" factor was the only GRCS-I factor correlated with masculine orientation on Spence and Helmreich's PAQ. The other three GRCS-I factors predicted self-esteem, trait anxiety, and intimacy among men (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). In another study, the "success, power, and competition" factor and the "restrictive affectionate behavior between men" factor were more pronounced among men with a masculine orientation on the PAQ (O'Neil et al., 1986). Differential relationships among the subscales were also found with the BMS: only the subscale indexing conflicts between work and family relations failed to directly covary with endorsement of the traditional masculinity ideology (Good et al., 1991). Davis (1987) reported that gender role conflict correlated negatively with self-esteem and positively with anxiety. Good and Mintz (1990) and Sharpe and Heppner (1991) found GRCS-I factors correlated with depression. Sharpe and Heppner argued that traditional men face a "double-edged sword" — they are typically more depressed, but less likely to use counseling services. Stillson, O'Neil, and Owen (1991) provide some baseline information on how race and class might construct men's experience of the four patterns of gender role conflict. Similarly, Kim (1990) reported that the more acculturated Asian-American males of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean ethnicity experienced higher gender role conflict with success, power, and competition issues while exhibiting lower restricted emotionality than the less accultured males.

The gender role conflict construct provides an important link between societal norms scripting traditional masculinities and individuals' adaptation. Distinctive features of the approach taken by O'Neil and his colleagues for the GRCS-I include its implicit use of the appraisal model of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) and the establishment of construct validity in relation to indicators of psychological well-being. The GRCS-I readily complements masculinity ideology measures and could be used in conjunction with them. One limitation is the narrow range of types of gender role conflict in the GRCS-I; it excludes nontraditional masculinity standards such as men actively participating in family life or men engaging women as coequals and sharing power.

A second GRCS instrument, designated GRCS-II, measures men's degree of comfort and conflict in concrete situations that might entail gender role conflict (O'Neil et al., 1986). An example is as follows:

> There's a guy you've idolized since grade school. He's three years older than you are. In high school he was the star quarterback, valedictorian, and very active in the Young Methodist Fellowship. Last year he graduated from college. You have just learned he is a homosexual. How much conflict do you feel between your admiration for this person and the fact that he is a homosexual?

Responses are tabulated using a 4-point Likert format, ranging from *very much conflict/very uncomfortable* to *no conflict/very comfortable*.

Empirically derived from a larger pool, 16 situations like the example above are tapped by the GRCS-II. The 16 comprise four empirically distinct domains: success, power, and competition (6 situations, alpha = .79); homophobia (4 situations, alpha = .78); lack of emotional response (3 situations, alpha = .85); and public embarrassment from gender role deviance (3 situations, alpha = .83). Four-week test–retest reliabilities ranged from .79 to .85. Men with a masculine gender orientation (measured by the PAQ) had higher homophobia scores than other men (O'Neil et al., 1986). No other published research has used the GRCS-II, thus no additional information is available on its validity.

*Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale.* Drawing explicitly on the cognitive stress model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), Eisler and Skidmore's (1987) 40-item Masculine Gender Role Stress (MGRS) scale measures the way individuals appraise five types of situations that are common to men's lives and are hypothetically more stressful for men than for women: situations that demonstrate physical inadequacy (9 items; e.g., "Feeling that you are not in good physical condition"), express "tender" emotions (7 items; e.g., "Telling your spouse that you love her"), place men in subordination to women (9 items; e.g., "Being outperformed at work by a woman"), threaten a male's intellectual control (7 items; e.g., "Having to ask for directions when you are lost"), and reveal performance failures in work and sex (8 items; e.g., "Being unemployed"). The subscales and the number of items retained in each were derived by factor analysis. The MGRS scale measures individuals' appraisal of each situation on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from *not stressful at all* to *extremely stressful.* Recently, however, Lash, Eisler, and Schulman (1990) and Saurer and Eisler (1990) used the MGRS with a 6-point scale.

In samples of college students, the MGRS scale has demonstrated a high degree of internal consistency, with alpha coefficients reported in the low .90s (Eisler, Skidmore, & Ward, 1988; Thompson, 1991), and test–retest reliability over a two-week period for males ($r$ = .93, Skidmore, 1988). The MGRS has been used in different types of studies, which provide

evidence of the scale's construct validity. Men report greater masculine gender role stress than women (Eisler & Blalock, 1991; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987), and the experience of masculine role stress increases verbal and nonverbal inexpressiveness (Saurer & Eisler, 1990). It is also associated with higher levels of anger, state anxiety, cardiovascular reactivity in response to stress, and adverse health habits (Eisler et al., 1988; Lash et al., 1990; Lash, Gillespie, Eisler, & Southard, in press). Thompson (1991) found that endorsing a traditional masculinity ideology (high scores on the MRNS) was related to greater gender role stress; by contrast, the M and F scales of the BSRI were unrelated to gender role stress. The MGRS is also unrelated to Spence and Helmreich's PAQ M and F scales (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987).

Strengths of this measure include its explicit use of the stress-appraisal model and the scope of the gender-relevant situations in the scale. The observation that masculine gender role stress is independent of gender orientation (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Thompson, 1991) is also important.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This review suggests a number of conclusions regarding currently available masculinity-related measures and the future development of instrumentation in this area. First, the heuristic distinction underlying our classification of measures, as well as with Archer (1989, 1990), has been that gender orientation and gender ideology are separate constructs. The available evidence affirms this assumption. Whenever the relationship between the constructs was examined, measures of gender orientation and masculinity ideology were basically independent. The M and F scales of the BSRI or Spence and Helmreich's PAQ are found significantly correlated with gender ideology in only one empirical study (Villemez & Touhey, 1973). Gender orientation was unrelated to Moreland and Van Tuinen's ATMTS, Downs and Engleson's AMS, and Thompson and Pleck's MRNS. Both the ATMTS and the AMS tap global gender ideologies as much as masculinity ideology, and neither is correlated with gender orientation. By comparison, studies using the MNRS specifically document the independence of masculinity ideology and gender orientation.

Only 2 inventories in Table II were found to be correlated with measures of gender orientation, that is the M and F scales of the BSRI or Spence and Helmreich's PAQ. This occurred because these 2 masculinity inventories include items that measure gender orientation. Thus, a negative correlation between the F+ scale from the PAQ and both the restrictive emotionality and inhibited affection subscales of Snell's MRI (Snell et al.,

1987) is unsurprising. Similarly, given that hypermasculinity was conceptualized as a personality syndrome and the HMI includes items that indirectly tap gender orientation, finding a positive correlation between the M scale of the BSRI and the HMI (Archer & Rhodes, 1989) is also unsurprising. By not fully separating the MRI and HI from the way gender orientation is measured, both these scales may have limited utility.

Second, there is some evidence that masculinity ideologies that define standards for men *are* distinct from ideologies comprised of standards for women and gender relations in general. We believe this evidence signals the separateness of a masculinity ideology, even though it could be correlated with measures tapping ideologies about women. Studies that report high correlations between masculinity ideology measures and Spence and Helmreich's AWS (Archer & Rhodes, 1989; Buhrke, 1988; Downs & Engleson, 1982; Doyle & Moore, 1978; Gackenback & Auerbach, 1985; Gayton et al., 1982; Harren et al., 1979; Stark, 1991; Thompson, 1990) do not necessarily undermine our argument that masculinity ideologies are distinct from ideologies about women and gender relations in general. It should be recalled that the AWS is not a pure measure of attitudes toward women, since the majority of its items explicitly compare women and men in terms of gender-related characteristics, and many of the measures of masculinity ideology do the same. Studies that have investigated the relationship between masculinity ideology and measures specifically tapping attitudes toward women (e.g., Desnoyers, 1988; Thompson & Pleck, 1986) observe much lower correlations, averaging about .20.

Research investigating the correlates of masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs should now examine their discriminant validity, by determining whether attitudes toward women or gender relations in general have the same correlates, and whether any relationships found for the former persist when the latter are controlled. Several research studies have established the discriminant validity of a masculinity-related measure this way: Good and Mintz (1990) established the validity of the O'Neil et al.'s GRCS-I to predict depression in relation to Downs and Engleson's measure of gender attitudes; Thompson (1990) affirmed the validity of the MRNS in relation to the AWS in a study of courtship violence; and Pleck et al. (in press — b) established the discriminant validity of the MRAS in a national sample of adolescent males' sexual behavior. This type of analysis should become routine in future research.

Similarly, the general status of instrumentation for the constructs of attitudes toward women and gender relations (these terms are often used interchangeably) needs more attention. The constructs assessed by these measures currently have remarkably little theoretical interest. For example, our literature search revealed only one recent review article on this topic

(Del Boca, Ashmore, & McManus, 1986). There has been some interest in *gender stereotypes;* however, with few exceptions, this interest has been methodological in nature or focused on the degree of evaluative favorability–unfavorability of the female compared to the male stereotype, not on stereotypes as normative definitions of female or male behavior (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Wohlers, 1986; Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1991).

In sum, as much as attitudes toward men and attitudes toward women are conceptually independent, they will very likely be empirically correlated. When the two are highly correlated, then measures purporting to index masculinity ideology may be of limited research utility because they may not pass the test of discriminant validity. The content does not index attitudes toward men and masculinities only. In our judgment, measures intending to assess masculinity ideology and other masculinity-related constructs should include no gender-comparative items. Those that do (4 of the measures in Table I) cause problems in interpretation.

Third, O'Neil et al.'s GRCS-I and Eisler and Skidmore's MGRS suggest a promising new approach in masculinity-related measures. These instruments go beyond measuring respondents' endorsement of traditional masculinity standards (from which it may be inferred that male respondents would be motivated to fulfill these standards). They assess directly the extent to which males feel that violating traditional expectations is uncomfortable or stressful for them. The construct of men's masculinity conflicts and stresses (which O'Neil et al. call "gender-role conflict" and Eisler and Skidmore label "masculine gender role stress") is likely to be a more proximal predictor of males' behavior in some gendered situations than masculinity ideology. Which of the two constructs is most predictive of men's experiences and behavior is largely uncharted.

Finally, many existing instruments measuring attitudes toward men and masculinity standards direct attention too narrowly to a single masculinity script. This interpretation of masculinity is implicitly based on a conventional division of labor, contrasted to the female role, and presumed to be heterosexual. Subtly, then, we may very well have ignored (and misrepresented) the other masculinities that are found in the culture and in institutions. We are largely unfamiliar with how age, generation, sexual orientation, class, race, and ethnicity differentially structure the form and content of men's lives and the standards of masculinity to which they adhere. Needed are studies that try to identify the wide variety of footings that have yielded diversity in men's lives.

Many of the measures reviewed in this article could prove to be of considerable value. By comparing different men's responses to subscales or individual items, these existing measures can be used to identify how different

male populations view the masculinity standards that are measured. The "matrix of masculinities" (Kimmel & Messner, 1989) that we assume to exist needs to be mapped.

## REFERENCES


Allen, D. (1954). Anti-femininity in men. *American Sociological Review, 19,* 591-593.

Anderson, S. M. (1978). Sex-role typing as related to acceptance of self, acceptance of others, and discriminatory attitudes toward women. *Journal of Research in Personality, 12,* 410-415.

Archer, J. (1989). The relationship between gender-role measures: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 28,* 173-184.

Archer, J. (1990). Gender-stereotypic traits are derived from gender roles: A reply to McCreary. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 29,* 273-277.

Archer, J., & Rhodes, C. (1989). The relationship between gender-related traits and attitudes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 28,* 149-157.

Ashmore, R. D., Del Boca, F. K., & Wohlers, A. J. (1986). Gender stereotypes. In R. D. Ashmore & F. K Del Boca (Eds.), *The social psychology of female-male relations: A critical analysis of central concepts.* New York: Academic Press.

Baca-Zinn, M. (1984, Summer). Chicano men and masculinity. *Journal of Ethnic Studies, 10,* 29-44.

Barnett, R. C., & Baruch, G. K (1987). Determinants of fathers' participation in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49,* 29-40.

Barrish, G., & Welch, M. R. (1980). Student religiosity and discriminatory attitudes toward women. *Sociological Analysis, 41,* 66-73.

Baruch, G. K, & Barnett, R. C. (1986). Fathers' participation in family work and children's sex-role attitudes. *Child Development, 57,* 1210-1223.

Beere, C. A. (1979). *Women and women's issues: A handbook of tests and measures.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beere, C. A. (1990). *Gender roles: A handbook of tests and measures.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Belk, S. S., & Snell, W. E. (1988). Avoidance strategy use in intimate relationships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7,* 80-96.

Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42,* 165-174.

Biggs, P., & Fiebert, M. S. (1984). A factor-analytic study of American male attitudes. *Journal of Psychology, 116,* 113-116.

Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint for manhood, what it's done for us lately. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brannon, R. (1985). A scale for measuring attitudes toward masculinity. In A. Sargent (Ed.), *Beyond sex roles* (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes toward masculinity. *Psychological Documents, 14,* 6. (Ms. 2012.)

Brannon, R., Juni, S., & Grady, K (undated). *A scale for measuring attitudes toward masculinity.* Unpublished manuscript.

Brinkerhoff, M. D., & MacKie, M. (1985). Religion and gender: A comparison of Canadian and American student attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47,* 415-429.

Brod, H. (1987). *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies.* Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Broude, G. J. (1990). Protest masculinity: A further look at the cause and the concept. *Ethos, 18,* 103-122.

Buhrke, R. A. (1988). Factor dimensions across different measures of sex role ideology. *Sex Roles, 18,* 309-321.

Bunting, A. B., & Reeves, J. B. (1983). Perceived male sex orientation and beliefs about rape. *Deviant Behavior, 4,* 281-295.

Burda, P. C., & Vaux, A. C. (1987). The social support process in men: Overcoming sex-role obstacles. *Human Relations, 40,* 31-44.

Cazenave, N., & George, L. (1987). Men's work and family roles and characteristics: Race, gender and class perceptions of college students. In M. Kimmel (Ed.), *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power.* Stanford, CA: University of Stanford Press.

Davis, F. (1987). *Antecedents and consequents of gender role conflict: An empirical validation of sex role strain analysis.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decade's research on gender. *American Psychologist, 39,* 105-116.

Deaux, K., Winston, W., Crowley, M., & Lewis, L. L. (1985). Level of categorization and content of gender stereotypes. *Social Cognition, 3,* 145-167.

Del Boca, F. K, Ashmore, R. D., & McManus, M. A. (1986). Gender-related attitudes. In R. D. Ashmore & F. K. Del Boca (Eds.), *The social psychology of female-male relations: A critical analysis of central concepts.* New York: Academic Press.

Desnoyers, R. M. (1988). *The role of religiosity in male sex role attitudes.* Unpublished honor's thesis, Holy Cross College, Worcester, MA.

Downs, A. C., & Engleson, S. A. (1982). The attitudes toward men scale (AMS): An analysis of the role and status of men and masculinity. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 12,* 45. (Ms. 2502.)

Doyle, J. A., & Moore, R. J. (1978). Attitudes toward the male role scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes towards the male's sex role in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 8,* 35-36. (Ms. 1678,)

Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15,* 543-558.

Eagly, A. H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1991). Are women evaluated more favorably than men? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15,* 203-216.

Eisler, R. M., & Blalock, J. A. (1991). Masculine gender role stress: Implications for the assessment of men. *Clinical Psychology Review, 11,* 45-60.

Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification, 11,* 123-136.

Eisler. R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine gender-role stress: Predictor of anger, anxiety, and health-risk behaviors. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52,* 133-141.

Exner, T. (1985). *Hypermasculinity and male contraceptive attitude and behavior.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Falkenberg, S. D., Hindman, C. D., & Masey, D. (1983). *Measuring attitudes toward males in society.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 287.)

Fiebert, M. S. (1983). Measuring traditional and liberal males' attitudes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 56,* 83-86.

Fiebert, M. S., & Vera, W. (1985). Test-retest reliability of a male sex-role attitude survey: The traditional-liberated content scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 60,* 66.

Franklin, C. W. (1988). *Men and society.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Gackenbach, J. I., & Auerbach, S. M. (1985). Sex-role attitudes and perceptual learning. *Journal of Social Psychology, 125,* 233-243.

Gayton, W. F., Sawyer, B. L., Baird J. G., & Ozmon, K. L. (1982). Further validation of a new measure of machismo. *Psychological Reports, 51,* 820-822.

Gilmore, D. L. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity.* New Haven, CT. Yale University Press.

Glass, L. L. (1984). Man's man/ladies' man: Motifs of hypermasculinity. *Psychiatry, 47,* 260-278.

Good, G. E., & Mintz, L. B. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence from compounded risk. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69,* 17-20.

Good, G. E., Braverman, D., & O'Neil, J. M. (1991). *Gender role conflict scale: Construct validity and reliability.* Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

Good, G. E., Dell, D. M., & Mintz, L. B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36,* 295-300.

Gradman, T. J. (1990). *Does work make the man: Masculine identity and work identity during the transition to retirement.* Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

Green, A. (1946). The male middle class child and neurosis. *American Sociological Review, 11,* 31-41.

Hacker H. (1957). The new burdens of masculinity. *Marriage and Family Living, 19,* 227-233.

Harren, V. A., Kass, R. A., Tinsley, H. E. A., & Moreland, J. R. (1978). Influence of sex role attitudes and cognitive styles on career decision making. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25,* 390-398.

Harren, V. A., Kass, R. A., Tinsley, H. E. A., & Moreland, J. R. (1979). Influence of gender, sex role attitudes, and cognitive complexity on gender-dominant career choices. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26,* 227-234.

Hearn, J., & Morgan, D. (1990). *Men, masculinities, and social theory.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Hockenberry, S. L., & Billingham, R. E. (1987). Sexual orientation and boyhood gender conformity: Development of the boyhood gender conformity scale (BGCS). *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 16,* 475-492.

Iazzo, A. (1983). The construction and validation of Attitudes Toward Men Scale. *Psychological Record, 33,* 371-378.

Kim, E. J. (1990). *Asian American men: Gender role conflict and acculturation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Kimmel, M. S., & Messner, M. A. (1989). Introduction. In M. Kimmel & M. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives.* New York: Macmillan.

Komarovsky, M. (1973). Cultural contradictions and sex roles: The masculine case. *American Journal of Sociology, 78,* 873-884.

Lash, S. J., Eisler, R. M., & Schulman, R. S. (1990). Cardiovascular reactivity to stress in men: Effects of masculine gender role stress appraisal and masculine performance challenge. *Behavior Modification, 14,* 3-20.

Lash, S. J., Gillespie, B. L., Eisler, R. M., & Southard, D. R. (in press). Sex differences in cardiovascular reactivity: Effects of the gender relevance of the stressor. *Health Psychology.*

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. 1984. *Stress, appraisal, and coping.* New York: Springer.

Lenney, E. (1991). Sex roles: The measurement of masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes.* New York: Academic Press.

Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L., Celentano, E., Cozza, T., Hill, S., MacEachern, M., Marty, N., & Schnedeker, J. (1992). The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14,* 325-337.

Marsiglio, W. (1991). *Adolescent males' orientation toward the reproductive realm: Paternity, contraception, and pregnancy resolution.* Unpublished paper, Sociology Department, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Mazer, D. B., & Percival, E. F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationships among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students. *Sex Roles, 20,* 135-147.

McCreary, D. R. (1990). Multidimensionality and the measurement of gender role attributes: A comment on Archer. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 29,* 265-272

Mobayed, C. P. (1990). *Hypermasculinity as a predictor of self-disclosure in males: A sequential analysis.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Moreland, J., & Van Tuinen, M. (1978). *The attitude toward masculinity transcendence scale.* Paper presented at the Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Morgan, D. H. J. (1990). Issues of critical sociological theory: Men in families. In J. Sprey (Ed.), *Fashioning family theory: New approaches.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mosher, D. L., & Anderson, R. D. (1986). Macho personality, sexual aggression, and reactions to guided imagery of realistic rape. *Journal of Research in Personality, 20,* 77-94.

Mosher, D. L., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 18,* 150-163.

Mosher, D. L., & Tomkins, S. S. (1988). Scripting the macho man: Hypermasculine socialization and enculturation. *Journal of Sex Research, 25,* 60-84.

Newcomb, M. D. (1990). Social support by many other names: Towards a unified conceptualization. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7,* 479-494.

O'Neil, J. (1981). Patterns of gender-role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60,* 203-210.

O'Neil, J. (1982). Gender-role conflict and strain in men's lives. In K. Solomon & N. Levy (Eds.), *Men in transition.* New York: Plenum.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K, David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14,* 335-350.

Pedhazur, E. J., & Tetenbaum, T. J. (1979). Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 996-1016.

Pleck, J. H. (1976). The male sex role: Definitions, problems, and sources of change. *Journal of Social Issues, 32,* 155-164.

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

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (in press — a). Problem behaviors and masculinity ideology in adolescent males. In R. Ketterlinus & M. Lamb (Eds.), *Adolescent problem behaviors.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (in press — b). Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues.*

Rieker, P. P., Edbril, S. D., & Garnick, M. B. (1985). Curative testis cancer therapy: Psychosocial sequelae. *Journal of Clinical Oncology, 3,* 1117-1126.

Riley, D. P. (1990). *Men's endorsement of male sex-role norms and time spent in psychotherapeutic treatment.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts among college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32,* 287-295.

Saurer. M. K.. & Eisler, R. M. (1990). The role of masculine gender role stress in expressivity and social support network factors. *Sex Roles, 23,* 261-271.

Segal, L. (1990). *Slow motion. Changing masculinities, changing men.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Sharpe, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). Gender role, gender role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38,* 323-330.

Skidmore, J. R. (1987). *Cardiovascular reactivity in men as a function of masculine gender role stress, type A behavior, and hostility.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Smeaton, G., & Byrne, D. (1987). The effects of R-rated violence and erotica, individual differences, and victim characteristics on acquaintance rape proclivity. *Journal of Research in Personality, 21,* 171-184.

Snell, W. E. (1986). The masculine role inventory: Components and correlates. *Sex Roles, 15,* 443-455.

Snell, W. E. (1989). Development and validation of the masculine behavior scale: A measure of behaviors stereotypically attributed to males and females. *Sex Roles, 21,* 749-767.

Snell, W. E., Belk, S. S., & Hawkins, R. C. (1986a). The stereotypes about male sexuality scale (SAMSS): Components, correlates, antecedents, consequences and counselor bias. *Social and Behavioral Sciences Documents, 16,* 9. (Ms. 2746.)

Snell, W. E., Belk, S. S., & Hawkins, R. C. (1986b). The masculine role as a moderator of stress–distress relationships. *Sex Roles, 15,* 359-366.

Snell, W. E., Belk, S. S., & Hawkins, R. C. (1987). Alcohol and drug use in stressful times: The influence of the masculine role and sex-related personality attributes. *Sex Roles, 16,* 359-373.

Snell, W. E., Hawkins, R. C., & Belk, S. S. (1988). Stereotypes about male sexuality and the use of social influence strategies in intimate relationships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7,* 42-48.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). The Attitudes toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology 2,* 66. (Ms. 153.)

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (*1973).* A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2,* 219-220.

Stark, L. P. (1991). Traditional gender role beliefs and individual outcomes: An exploratory analysis. *Sex Roles, 24,* 639-650.

Stillson, R. W., O'Neil, J. M., & Owen, S. V. (1991). Predictors of adult men's gender-role conflict: Race, class, unemployment, age, instrumentality-expressiveness, and personal strain. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38,* 458-464.

Sullivan, J. P., & Mosher, D. L. (1990). Acceptance of guided imagery of marital rape as a function of macho personality. *Violence and Victims, 5,* 275-286.

Taylor, M. C., & Hall, J. A. (1982). Psychological androgyny: Theories, methods, and conclusions. *Psychological Bulletin, 92,* 347-366.

Thompson, E. H. (1990). Courtship violence and the male role. *Men's Studies Review, 7,* 4-13.

Thompson, E. H. (1991). *Men's gender role conflicts and strain: The dilemma of traditional men.* Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Cincinnati, OH.

Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29,* 531-543.

Thompson, E. H., Grisanti, C., & Pleck, J. H. (1985). Attitudes toward the male role and their correlates. *Sex Roles, 13,* 413-427.

Vera, W., & Fiebert, M. S. (1987). Validity of an instrument measuring male attitudes: The traditional-liberated content scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 65,* 437-438.

Villemez, W. J., & Touhey, J. C. (1977). A measure of individual differences in sex stereotyping and sex discrimination: The "macho" scale. *Psychological Reports, 41,* 411-415.

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

Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1987). The relationship of sex-role orientation to heterosexuals' attitudes toward homosexuals. *Sex Roles, 17,* 103-113.