

Initial Validation of the Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R)

RONALD F. LEVANT
The University of Akron

K. BRYANT SMALLEY **MARYSE AUPONT**
Nova Southeastern University

A. TANNER HOUSE **KATHERINE RICHMOND**
The University of Delaware *Muhlenberg College*

DELILAH NORONHA
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center

This article reports the results of the initial evaluation of the revised version of the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI-R). The MRNI-R assesses only traditional male role norms (thus dropping the Non-Traditional Attitudes subscale of the original MRNI), revises the labeling and content of the Self-Reliance subscale, drops the Achievement/Status subscale and substitutes the Dominance subscale, and updates the language throughout the instrument. The MRNI-R was administered to 170 undergraduate and graduate students (38 men and 132 women). One hundred and seven initial items were reduced to fifty-three items following iterative analyses of item-to-subscale correlations. Improved reliabilities were found for the MRNI-R and its subscales, with Cronbach alphas ranging from .73 to .96. Significant sex and racial/ethnic differences were found with respect to the endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology, providing support for its construct validity.

Keywords: traditional male role norms, Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI-R), instrument validation

Ronald F. Levant, Office of the Dean, Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, The University of Akron; K. Bryant Smalley, Center for Psychological Studies, Nova Southeastern University; Maryse Aupont, Center for Psychological Studies, Nova Southeastern University; A. Tanner House, Center for Counseling and Student Development, The University of Delaware; Katherine Richmond, Department of Psychology, Muhlenberg College; Delilah Noronha, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ronald F. Levant, Office of the Dean, Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-1901. Electronic mail: Levant@uakron.edu

The Journal of Men's Studies, Vol. 15, No. 1, Winter 2007, 83–100.

© 2007 by the Men's Studies Press, LLC. <http://www.mensstudies.com>. All rights reserved.
jms.1501.83/\$10.00 DOI: 10.3149/jms.1501.83

The new psychology of men has advanced our understanding of gender using the social constructionist Gender Role Strain Paradigm as a theoretical framework (Pleck, 1981, 1995). In this framework, the acquisition of gender roles is thought not to be an invariant process leading to the development of clusters of sex-typed personality traits that reside in individuals, as was the case in the older, essentialist, personality trait-oriented, Gender Role Identity Paradigm (Bohan, 1997; Pleck 1981, 1995). Rather, it is viewed as a variable process, informed by the prevailing gender ideologies, which themselves vary according to the social context. The prevailing ideologies, which define the social norms for male and female gender roles, serve to uphold gender-based power structures. For the most part, gender-based power structures in the U.S. are patriarchal, mitigated to varying degrees in different subcultures by the influence of feminism. These gender ideologies influence how parents, teachers, and peers socialize children, and how adults think, feel, and behave in regard to gender-salient matters (Levant, 1996; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku., 1994).

Although there are potentially many different masculinity ideologies, Pleck (1995) noted that there exists a common constellation of standards and expectations associated with the traditional male role in the Western world, referred to as traditional masculinity ideology. Connell (1995, p. 64) referred to this as “hegemonic masculinity,” to emphasize its role in upholding patriarchy.

Measuring Traditional Masculinity Ideology

David and Brannon (1976) defined four norms of traditional masculinity ideology: (1) “no sissy stuff”—men should avoid feminine things; (2) “the big wheel”—men should be successful and continually achieve; (3) “the sturdy oak”—men should not show signs of weakness; and (4) “give ’em hell”—men should seek adventure even at the risk of violence. Brannon used these norms to develop the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon & Juni, 1984). The Brannon Masculinity Scale is comprised of 110 normative statements, and was one of the first measures designed to assess traditional masculinity ideology. Levant et al. (1992) found redundancy between particular subscales within the measure and also suggested norms that might have been included to more fully measure masculinity ideology, including fear and hatred of homosexuals and non-relational attitudes toward sexuality.

Levant et al. (1992) developed the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) to measure both traditional and non-traditional masculinity ideology. The MRNI is a 57-item instrument comprised of normative statements about masculinity that do not compare males to females, to which respondents indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on 7-point, Likert-type scales. The MRNI measures seven theoretically derived traditional norms: Avoidance of Femininity, Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals, Self-Reliance, Aggression, Achievement/Status, Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality, and Restrictive Emotionality. It also includes a Non-traditional Attitudes toward Masculinity scale, in which items reflect violations of traditional male norms (e.g., “A man should be allowed to openly show affection for another man.”). Scoring of the MRNI

is performed by calculating the mean score for each subscale; thus, the range for each subscale score is from 1-7, with higher scores indicating higher levels of endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology on all of the subscales except Non-traditional Attitudes, where higher scores indicate greater endorsement of non-traditional views on masculinity. There is also a Total Traditional scale, which is the average score on the 45 traditional items.

Two studies assessed the reliability of each of the subscales, one with European American and African American male and female college students, and another with U.S. and Chinese male and female college students (Levant & Majors, 1997; Levant, Wu, & Fischer, 1996). The Cronbach alphas found in these studies are, respectively: Avoidance of Femininity (.77, .82), Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals (.54, .58), Self-Reliance (.54, .51), Aggression (.52, .65), Achievement/Status (.67, .69), Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality (.69, .81), Restrictive Emotionality (.75, .81), Nontraditional Attitudes toward Masculinity (.57, .56), and Total Traditional scale (.84, .88).

Discriminant validity was assessed by Levant and Fischer (1998) in a study comparing the MRNI to the short form of the Personal Attributes Scale (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), a theoretically disparate measure of gender attributes, which arises from the Gender Role Identity Paradigm. The MRNI total score was not correlated to the PAQ in their college sample ($r = .06$ for men and $r = .08$ for women). Convergent validity was assessed in the same study, in which the MRNI total score was found to be moderately correlated with two theoretically congruent measures of gender attributes, both arising from the Gender Role Strain Paradigm: The Gender Role Conflict Scale-I (GRCS-I; O'Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995) with an $r = .52$ and $p < .001$, and the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRSS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) with an $r = .52$, $p < .001$.

The MRNI and the Gender Role Strain Paradigm

The MRNI has been used to assess a central proposition of the gender role strain paradigm, one which sets it apart from the Gender Role Identity Paradigm and other essentialist perspectives—namely that gender norms vary depending on the social and cultural context. In studies of teenagers and college students, the endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology has been found to vary with a number of social contextual variables. Greater endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology (using the MRNI and similar instruments) was found to be associated with sex (being male), age (being younger), marital status (being single), education (an expectation of completing less education), religion (reporting greater church participation), sexuality (reporting greater sexual activity), race and ethnicity (African Americans endorse traditional masculinity ideology to a greater extent than do Latino/a Americans, who in turn endorse traditional masculinity ideology to a greater extent than do European Americans), geographic region (living in the South vs. the North), and nationality (Chinese and Russians endorse traditional masculinity ideology to a greater extent than do Americans) (Levant, Cuthbert, et al., 2003; Levant & Majors, 1997; Levant, Majors, & Kelly, 1998; Levant &

Richmond, 2006; Levant, Richmond, et al., 2003; Levant, Wu, & Fischer, 1996; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994; Thompson & Pleck, 1986; Wu, Levant, & Sellers, 2001).

Clinical Implications

The gender role strain paradigm also proposes that the socialization of children into, and the adherence of adults to, traditional gender role norms, have negative psychological consequences by creating gender role strain (Pleck, 1995). Factors found to be correlated with the endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology include: Low self-esteem (Davis, 1987), anxiety (Davis, 1987), alexithymia (Levant et al., 2003), depression (Good & Mintz, 1990), difficulties in intimacy (Maxton, 1994; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), and relationship violence (Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002). Hence, assessing male clients' endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology could be helpful in developing gender-aware treatment plans (Richmond & Levant; 2003).

Updating and Improving the MRNI

The original MRNI was created in the late 1980s and some of the language is quite dated (e.g., "It is too feminine for a man to use clear nail polish on his fingernails."). In addition we have found over the years that the original definitions of some of the male role norms were not completely clear or adequately conceptualized (in particular, the Self-Reliance and Achievement/Status subscales). Finally, the reliability of some of the MRNI subscales have been less than adequate in various studies, which resulted in these subscales not being used in those studies and the consequent loss of this data. The goal of this paper is to report on the development and initial validation of an updated and improved MRNI, the Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R).

The MRNI-R assesses only traditional male role norms (thus dropping the Non-traditional Attitudes subscale), revises the labeling and content of the Self-Reliance subscale, drops the Achievement/Status subscale and substitutes the Dominance subscale, updates the language throughout the instrument, and aims at achieving greater reliability of the subscales. To assess construct validity we predicted that there will be significant sex and racial/ethnic differences in the scoring patterns, with males and ethnic minorities endorsing more traditional views of masculinity than females and European Americans, as has been found with the original MRNI.

Methods

Participants

Participants were 170 undergraduate and graduate students (38 men and 132 women) at a large private university in the Southeast. Participants were recruited on a voluntary basis in their courses. The participants mean age was 27.4 years, reflecting the fact that this University emphasizes graduate and professional education, and whose

undergraduates are often adult learners. Just over half (50.6%) were European American, 27.1 percent were African American, 6.5 percent were Asian American, and 15.8 percent identified themselves as belonging to other racial/ethnic groups, reflecting the cultural diversity of the student body of this University. Most participants (64.1%) were single, 17.1 percent were married, 1.2 percent separated, 7.6 percent divorced, and 10.0 percent reported living with a non-married significant other, reflecting the older age of the student body of this University. When considering income, 22.3 percent identified as lower class, 72.3 percent identified as middle class, and 5.4 percent identified as upper class.

Procedure

In accordance with the requirements for research on human participants, informed consent was obtained. The MRNI-R (107-item version) was administered to the participants, along with a brief demographic questionnaire. Participants were reminded that the results would be kept confidential.

Measure

Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R). One hundred and seven items were generated for the revised version of the MRNI, which included 49 items from the original MRNI. Following the recommendations of Pleck (1981), the items were written as normative statements about how men should or should not behave, and did not compare the behavior of men and women. Participants indicated their level of agreement or disagreement with items on 7-point Likert-type scales, with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology.

To develop the inventory, we used the same theoretically-informed, deductive process that was used in the development of the original MRNI (Levant et al., 1992). Seven traditional norms were conceptualized, and then items were written (or selected from the original MRNI) by the investigators (faculty and doctoral students at Nova Southeastern University) to reflect these norms. This resulted in seven traditional subscales: Avoidance of Femininity, Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals, Extreme Self-Reliance, Aggression, Dominance, Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality, and Restrictive Emotionality. Five bear the same names as the original scales but have new items, and two were re-conceptualized. Over the years we had found that the original Self-Reliance subscale did not capture the extreme degree of self-reliance that is normative for men (e.g., “A man should be able to perform his job even if he is physically ill or hurt.”). Thus we wrote more items of this type and changed the title of this subscale to “Extreme Self-Reliance.” We also had found that the “Achievement/Status” subscale did not focus sufficiently on the central element of the status aspect of this norm, namely “Dominance” (e.g., “A man should always be the boss.”).

The scale was reduced to 53 items by iteratively analyzing item-to-subscale correlations and eliminating items that did not correlate highly with their respective sub-

scale. The final scale includes 22 of the original MRNI items. The scale, scoring, and notation of items from the original MRNI are included in the Appendix.

Results

In order to assess the reliability of the scale and subscales, Cronbach's alphas were computed. Improved internal consistency was found, with alphas ranging from .73 for women's scores on Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality to .96 for the Total Scale for both sexes. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Cronbach's Alphas for the Male Role Norms Inventory Scale, Revised

| | Men | Women | Total Sample |
|--------------------------------|-----|-------|--------------|
| <i>N</i> | 38 | 132 | 170 |
| Scale | | | |
| Avoidance of Femininity | .85 | .80 | .85 |
| Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals | .91 | .91 | .91 |
| Extreme Self-Reliance | .75 | .78 | .78 |
| Aggression | .82 | .77 | .80 |
| Dominance | .80 | .81 | .84 |
| Non-relational Sexuality | .79 | .73 | .79 |
| Restrictive Emotionality | .87 | .81 | .86 |
| MRNI-R Total Scale | .95 | .94 | .96 |

Correlations of the subscales with each other and with the total scale are shown in Table 2. All of the subscales correlate more strongly with the total scale ($r = .70$ to $.87$) than they do with each other ($r = .38$ to $.72$). This pattern of results suggests that the subscales measure somewhat different aspects of the same broad construct.

To assess construct validity by examining variations in the endorsement patterns by sex and race/ethnicity, we first generated a correlation matrix of the three demographic variables that are not independent variables (age, years of education, and socioeconomic status) with the MRNI-R subscales and with the MRNI-R Total Scale. Results are shown in Table 2. It can be seen that years of education and age, but not SES, were significantly correlated with the MRNI-R subscales, and education was significantly correlated with the MRNI-R Total Scale.

Data were next analyzed using a 4 (race/ethnicity) \times 2 (sex) factorial multivariate analysis of covariance, with the seven MRNI-R subscales as dependent variables and the two demographic variables that were correlated with the MRNI-R subscales (age and years of education) as covariates, using Pillai's Trace (the most conservative esti-

Table 2
Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Demographic Variables and MRNI-R Subscales and Total Scale

| Variable | EDUC | Age | SES | AVFEM | HOMO | SELF | AGGR | DOM | ATTSEX | RESTEM |
|--------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Age | -.04 | | | | | | | | | |
| SES | .05 | -.15 | | | | | | | | |
| AVFEM | -.03 | -.04 | .05 | | | | | | | |
| HOMO | -.33** | -.21** | -.02 | .56** | | | | | | |
| SELF | -.09 | -.01 | -.01 | .59** | .38** | | | | | |
| AGGR | -.12 | -.02 | .07 | .72** | .54** | .67** | | | | |
| DOM | -.26** | -.07 | .04 | .51** | .66** | .48** | .63** | | | |
| ATTSEX | -.25** | -.01 | .09 | .53** | .48** | .48** | .65** | .71** | | |
| RESTEM | -.21** | -.08 | .06 | .62** | .51** | .47** | .68** | .66** | .63** | |
| MRNI-R Total Scale | -.27** | .05 | .02 | .83** | .79** | .70** | .87** | .82** | .77** | .80** |

Note. EDUC = years of education; SES = socioeconomic status; AVFEM = Avoidance of Femininity; HOMO = Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals; SELF = Extreme Self-Reliance; AGGR = Aggression; DOM = Dominance; ATTSEX = Non-relational Attitudes Toward Sexuality; RESTEM = Restrictive Emotionality.

mator) to determine significance of the multi-nominal variable of race/ethnicity. To reduce the likelihood of alpha inflation, we set an alpha criterion of .01 for the multivariate analysis of covariance. The two main effects were significant, [race/ethnicity: $F(21, 390) = 2.69, p < .01$; sex: $F(7, 128) = 5.73, p < .01$], as was the interaction of race/ethnicity x sex [$F(21, 390) = 2.59, p < .01$]. This was followed by a series of univariate analyses of covariance for all subscales (with age and years of education as covariates) first by sex, then by race/ethnicity, and then by the sex by race/ethnicity interaction, using an alpha criterion of .05. Finally, post-hoc analyses using Bonferroni's technique were conducted. The results are shown in Table 3, which also displays the means and standard deviations for all of the subscales categorized by sex within each racial/ethnic group, and provides the probability values for the pairwise comparison of means across racial/ethnic groups.

Significant differences were found between the sexes on all of the subscales except Extreme Self-Reliance through univariate analyses of covariance by sex, with males endorsing a more traditional view of masculinity than females.

We also found significant differences between the four racial/ethnic groups on all subscales except Extreme Self-Reliance through univariate analyses of covariance by race/ethnicity on all of the subscales. Through post-hoc analyses using Bonferroni's technique, the largest number of significant differences was found in the comparisons between European Americans and African Americans, who differed on all subscales except Extreme Self-Reliance, with African Americans endorsing a more traditional view of masculinity than European Americans. Significant differences on the Dominance, Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality, and Restrictive Emotionality subscales were found in the comparisons between European Americans and Asian Americans, with Asian Americans endorsing a more traditional view of masculinity than European Americans. No significant differences on any of the subscales were found between Asian Americans and African Americans, Asian Americans and Others, and African Americans and Others, and European Americans and Others.

Univariate analyses of covariance by the race/ethnicity and sex interaction of all of the subscales identified only one significant difference, and that was on the Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality subscale. We found, through post-hoc analyses using Bonferroni's technique, that the difference between African American men and women on this subscale differed significantly from the difference found between Asian American men and women, with African Americans having a larger difference between the sexes than Asian Americans. The direction was the same (men had higher scores than women in both groups).

Second, to replicate these analyses using the Total Scale, we performed a 4 (race/ethnicity) x 2 (sex) factorial analysis of covariance, with the MRNI-R Total Scale as the dependent variable and the demographic variable that was correlated with the MRNI-R Total Scale (years of education) serving as the covariate. The main effects of race/ethnicity and sex were both significant, $F(3,134) = 7.05, p < .01$ and $F(1,134) = 21.32, p < .01$, respectively; however, the interaction of sex x race/ethnicity was not significant, $F(3,134) = .983, p = .441$. This was followed by two univariate analyses of co-

Table 3
MRNI-R Means and Standard Deviations for the MRNI Subscales and the MRNI-R Total Scale by Race/Ethnicity and Sex

| Scale ^a | Asian American | | | | | | European American | | | Other | | | ANCOVA (p-values) | | | Pairwise Comparisons ^c | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|------|------|------|------|-------------------|------|---|-------|---|---|-------------------|-------|------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | M ^b | F ^b | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | Sex | Race | SxR | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 |
| AVFEM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 4.33 | 2.83 | 4.59 | 3.05 | 3.84 | 2.38 | 3.04 | 3.11 | | | | | <.000 | .029 | .170 | 1.000 | .126 | 1.000 | .012 | 1.000 | .759 |
| <i>SD</i> | 0.30 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.12 | 1.04 | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HOMO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 2.96 | 2.32 | 4.16 | 3.13 | 2.55 | 1.79 | 4.00 | 2.32 | | | | | .001 | .003 | .700 | .484 | .633 | 1.000 | <.000 | .071 | .284 |
| <i>SD</i> | 0.35 | 0.52 | 0.46 | 0.26 | 0.28 | 0.12 | 1.59 | 0.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SELF | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 4.14 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.80 | 4.03 | 3.15 | 3.38 | 3.86 | | | | | .617 | .493 | .100 | 1.000 | .150 | 1.000 | .097 | 1.000 | .097 |
| <i>SD</i> | 0.30 | 0.55 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.29 | 0.13 | 0.42 | 0.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AGGR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 4.43 | 3.64 | 5.00 | 3.78 | 3.81 | 2.90 | 4.67 | 3.62 | | | | | .001 | .003 | .965 | 1.000 | .078 | 1.000 | <.000 | 1.000 | .083 |
| <i>SD</i> | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0.30 | 0.18 | 0.30 | 0.13 | 0.92 | 0.22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 3.06 | 2.88 | 4.20 | 2.34 | 2.50 | 1.53 | 3.33 | 1.97 | | | | | <.000 | <.000 | .111 | 1.000 | <.000 | .064 | <.000 | .074 | .378 |
| <i>SD</i> | 0.27 | 0.41 | 0.48 | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 0.50 | 0.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ATTSEX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 3.73 | 3.17 | 4.58 | 2.21 | 2.73 | 1.89 | 2.72 | 2.62 | | | | | <.000 | <.000 | .001 | .093 | <.000 | .093 | .004 | 1.000 | .060 |
| <i>SD</i> | 0.27 | 0.59 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.39 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RESTEM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 2.70 | 2.71 | 3.70 | 2.19 | 2.69 | 1.67 | 3.04 | 2.06 | | | | | <.000 | .032 | .278 | 1.000 | .038 | .639 | .006 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| <i>SD</i> | 0.63 | 0.25 | 0.33 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 0.10 | 0.99 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Scale | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 3.58 | 3.04 | 4.31 | 2.94 | 3.14 | 2.17 | 3.48 | 2.76 | | | | | <.000 | <.000 | N/A | 1.000 | .002 | .730 | <.000 | .396 | .063 |
| <i>SD</i> | 0.13 | 0.36 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.81 | 0.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(see footnotes on page 92)

Footnotes by Table 3 of page 91:

^a AVFEM = Avoidance of Femininity; HOMO = Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals; SELF = Extreme Self-Reliance; AGGR = Aggression; DOM = Dominance; ATTSEX = Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality; RESTEM = Restrictive Emotionality.

^b M=male, F=female.

^c *p*-values for pairwise comparison of mean for both men and women: *P*1 = comparison of Asian American to African American; *P*2 = comparison of Asian American to European American; *P*3 = comparison of Asian American to Other; *P*4 = comparison of African American to European American; *P*5 = comparison of African American to Other; *P*6 = comparison of European American to Other

variance for the Total Scale, first by sex and second by race/ethnicity. Finally, post-hoc analyses using Bonferroni's technique were conducted. The results are also displayed in Table 3.

Significant differences between the sexes on the MRNI-R Total Scale were found through univariate analyses of covariance by sex, with males endorsing a more traditional view of masculinity than females.

We also found significant differences between the four racial/ethnic groups on the MRNI-R Total Scale, through univariate analysis of covariance by race/ethnicity on the MRNI-R Total Scale. We found, through post-hoc analyses using Bonferroni's technique, significant differences on the MRNI-R Total Scale between African Americans and European Americans, and between Asian American and European Americans, with both African Americans and Asian Americans endorsing more traditional views of masculinity than European Americans. No significant differences were found between African Americans and Asian Americans, Asian Americans and Others, African Americans and Others, and European Americans and Others.

Sex and race/ethnicity had identical effect sizes. Using the Total Scale, the partial eta squared (portion of the variance of the Total score accounted for by the specific independent variable) for both sex and race/ethnicity was .125, which is a small effect size.

Discussion

Results suggest that the subscales of the revised 53-item MRNI-R are more reliable than those in the original MRNI. Correlations of the subscales with each other and with the total scale suggest that the subscales measure different aspects of the same broad construct.

As expected, significant sex differences were found on the Total Scale and all but one of the subscales (Self-Reliance). With the exception of this scale, males endorsed traditional masculinity ideology to a greater degree than did females. This is consistent with previous findings that U.S. women of different races and ethnicities are less traditional than men of the same races and ethnicities in how they view the male role (Levant & Richmond, 2006).

With regard to race/ethnicity, we found that African Americans, in comparison to European Americans, more strongly endorsed all of the MRNI subscales (except Self-

Reliance), and the MRNI-R Total Scale. These findings are also consistent with prior research, in which African Americans have been found to endorse traditional masculinity ideology to a greater extent than European Americans (Levant & Majors, 1997; Levant, Majors, & Kelly, 1998; Levant et al., 2003).

Asian Americans, in comparison to European Americans, more strongly endorsed the traditional male role norms of achievement/status, non-relational sexuality, restrictive emotionality, and the MRNI-R Total Scale. With regard to this finding, this appears to be the first study that has directly compared European Americans and Asian Americans. Levant and colleagues compared mainland Chinese and American college students and found that the Chinese students endorsed traditional masculinity ideology to a greater extent than their American counterparts (Levant, Wu, & Fischer, 1996; Wu, Levant, & Sellers, 2001). Although Liu (2002) compared seven different groups of Asian American men (Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, South Asian, Southeast Asian, and biracial/biethnic) on their endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology using the MRNI, he did not compare any of these groups with European Americans. Two other studies investigated masculinity in European American and Asian American samples, but did not directly compare them on masculinity ideology (Chua & Fujino, 1999; Wang, 2000).

Several factors may be contributing to these racial/ethnic differences. Masculinity appears to be more complex in non European American subcultures. Ethnic minorities are faced with the task of negotiating masculinity requirements of their own culture as well as the dominant culture's, which can result in significant conflict (Lazur & Majors, 1995). Those belonging to ethnic minority groups can be caught in a bind, in that conforming to the dominant culture can result in rejection from one's own culture, while conforming to one's own culture can result in rejection from the dominant culture (Lazur & Majors, 1995). "Cool Pose" is an example of how young urban African American males attempt to negotiate masculinity (Majors & Billson, 1992). It is a way to adapt to the environment and offset the frustration that accompanies racism, discrimination, and the lack of opportunities to obtain what is valued by the dominant culture (e.g., power and money). It is also a way of expressing the bitterness and anger that results from their social situation. Other ethnic minorities are required to negotiate masculinity in a manner similar to that of African American males, attempting to live up to the standards of their culture, while integrating the dominant culture's view on what it means to be a man.

The results of this study are consistent with previous studies finding that the endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology varies by sex and race/ethnicity, thus supporting the construct validity of the MRNI-R.

The limitations of this study include the use of a self-report instrument with a convenience sample of college students, a relatively low N, particularly of males. Further research should expand the sample size, use community samples, and evaluate the discriminant and convergent validity.

Finally, since the subscales of the MRNI-R have better reliability than the original MRNI, we recommend that it be used in future research, rather than the original MRNI.

The MRNI-R may also be useful in clinical work to assess client's endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology, because of its associations with lower self-esteem, anxiety, alexithymia, depression, difficulties in intimacy, and relationship violence (Levant & Richmond, 2006).

References

- Bohan, J. S. (1997). Regarding gender: Essentialism, constructionism, and feminist psychology. In M. Gergen & S. N. Davis (Eds.), *Toward a new psychology of gender* (pp. 31-47). New York: Routledge.
- Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. *Psychological Documents*, 14(1). (University Microfilms No. 2612).
- Chua, P., & Fujino, D. C. (1999). Negotiating new Asian-American masculinities: Attitudes and gender expectations. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 7, 391-413.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- David, D., & Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint for manhood, and what it's done for us lately. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role* (pp. 1-48). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Davis, F. (1987). Antecedents and consequents of gender role conflict: An empirical test of sex role strain analysis (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48(11), 3443.
- 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.
- Good, G. E., & Mintz L. B. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence for compounded risk. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 17-21.
- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3, 97-106.
- Lazur, R. F., & Majors, R. (1995). Men of color: Ethnocultural variations of male gender role strain. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Levant, R. (1996). The new psychology of men. *Professional Psychology*, 27, 259-265.
- Levant, R. F., Cuthbert, A. C., Richmond, K., Sellers, A., Matveev, A., Matina, O., et al. (2003). Masculinity ideology among Russian and U.S. young men and women and its relationship to unhealthy lifestyle habits among young Russian men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 4, 26-36.
- Levant, R. F., & Fischer, J. (1998). The Male Role Norms Inventory. In C. M. Davis, W. H. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Sexuality-related measures: A compendium* (2nd. ed., pp. 469-472). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L., Celentano, E., Cozza, T., Hill, S., MacEachern, M., et al. (1992). The male role: An investigation of norms and stereotypes. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 14, 325-337.
- Levant, R., & Majors, R. (1997). An investigation into variations in the construction of the male gender role among young Asian American and European American women and men. *Journal of Gender, Culture and Health*, 2, 33-43.
- Levant, R., Majors, R., & Kelley, M. (1998). Masculinity ideology among young Asian American and European American women and men in different regions of the United States. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, 4, 227-236.
- Levant, R. F., & Richmond, K. (in press). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the Male Role Norms Inventory. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 15(2).
- Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Majors, R. G., Inclan, J. E., Rossello, J. M., Heesacker, et al. (2003). A multicultural investigation of masculinity ideology and alexithymia. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 4, 91-99.
- Levant, R. F., Wu, R., & Fischer, J. (1996). Masculinity ideology: A comparison between U. S. and Chinese young men and women. *Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health*, 1, 217-220.
- Liu, W. (2002). Exploring the lives of Asian American men: Racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3, 107-118.
- Majors, R. G., & Billson, J. M. (1992). *Cool pose: The dilemmas of Black manhood in America*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Maxton, R. A. (1994). How do men in mid-life conceptualize masculinity, and how do these conceptualizations relate to intimacy? (Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54, B4432.
- O'Neil, J. M., Good G. E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New paradigms for empirical research. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 164-206). New York: Basic Books.
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1994). Attitudes toward male roles: A discriminate validity analysis. *Sex Roles*, 30, 481-501.
- Richmond, K., & Levant, R. (2003). Clinical application of the gender role strain paradigm: Group treatment for adolescent boys. *Journal of Clinical Psychology/ In Session*, 59(11), 1-9.
- 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.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male norms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29, 531-543.

- Wang, A. (2000). Asian and white boys' competing discourses about masculinity: Implications for secondary education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 25, 113-125.
- Wu, R., Levant, R. F., & Sellers, A. (2001) The influence of sex and social development on masculinity ideology of Chinese undergraduate students. *Psychological Science* (published by the *Chinese Psychological Society*, 24, 365-366).

Appendix: MRNI-R

Please complete the questionnaire by circling the number which indicates your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. Give only one answer for each statement.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | No Opinion | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1. | Homosexuals should never marry. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. | The President of the US should always be a man. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. | Men should be the leader in any group. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. | A man should be able to perform his job even if he is physically ill or hurt. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | Men should not talk with a lisp because this is a sign of being gay. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. | Men should not wear make-up, cover-up or bronzer. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | Men should watch football games instead of soap operas. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | All homosexual bars should be closed down. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. | Men should not be interested in talk shows such as Oprah. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | Men should excel at contact sports. | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

11. Boys should play with action figures not dolls.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Men should not borrow money from friends or family members.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Men should have home improvement skills.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Men should be able to fix most things around the house.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. A man should prefer watching action movies to reading romantic novels.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. Men should always like to have sex.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Homosexuals should not be allowed to serve in the military.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Men should never compliment or flirt with another male.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Boys should prefer to play with trucks rather than dolls.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. A man should not turn down sex.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. A man should always be the boss.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. A man should provide the discipline in the family.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. Men should never hold hands or show affection toward another.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. It is ok for a man to use any and all means to “convince” a woman to have sex.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. Homosexuals should never kiss in public.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. A man should avoid holding his wife’s purse at all times.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. A man must be able to make his own way in the world.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. Men should always take the initiative when it comes to sex.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. A man should never count on someone else to get the job done.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. Boys should not throw baseballs like girls.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. A man should not react when other people cry.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. A man should not continue a friendship with another man if he finds out that the other man is homosexual.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. Being a little down in the dumps is not a good reason for a man to act depressed.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. If another man flirts with the women accompanying a man, this is a serious provocation and the man should respond with aggression.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. Boys should be encouraged to find a means of demonstrating physical prowess.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. A man should know how to repair his car if it should break down.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. Homosexuals should be barred from the teaching profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. A man should never admit when others hurt his feelings.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
39. Men should get up to investigate if there is a strange noise in the house at night.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
40. A man shouldn't bother with sex unless he can achieve an orgasm.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
41. Men should be detached in emotionally charged situations.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42. It is important for a man to take risks, even if he might get hurt.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
43. A man should always be ready for sex.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
44. A man should always be the major provider in his family.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
45. When the going gets tough, men should get tough.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
46. I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love story.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
47. Fathers should teach their sons to mask fear.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
48. I think a young man should try to be physically tough, even if he's not big.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
49. In a group, it is up to the men to get things organized and moving ahead.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
50. One should not be able to tell how a man is feeling by looking at his face.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
51. Men should make the final decision involving money.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
52. It is disappointing to learn that a famous athlete is gay.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
53. Men should not be too quick to tell others that they care about them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Scoring subscales and total score

To obtain subscale scores compute the means of the items for that scale. These are designated below by the number as they appear on the instrument.

Avoidance of Femininity = (6+7+9+11+15+19+26+30)/8

Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals = (1+5+8+17+18+23+25+32+37+52)/10

Extreme Self-Reliance = (4+12+13+14+27+29+36)/7

Aggression = (10+34+35+39+42+45+48)/7

$$\text{Dominance} = (2+3+21+22+44+49+51)/7$$

$$\text{Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality} = (16+20+24+28+40+43)/6$$

$$\text{Restrictive Emotionality} = (31+33+38+41+46+47+50+53)/8$$

To obtain Total Scale, take the mean of all of the items.

Items used from the original MRNI: 19, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53.

Copyright of *Journal of Men's Studies* is the property of Men's Studies Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.