

Psychology of Men & Masculinity

Measurement of Masculinity Ideologies: A (Critical) Review

Edward H. Thompson, Jr. and Kate M. Bennett

Online First Publication, February 2, 2015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038609>

CITATION

Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Bennett, K. M. (2015, February 2). Measurement of Masculinity Ideologies: A (Critical) Review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038609>

Measurement of Masculinity Ideologies: A (Critical) Review

Edward H. Thompson Jr.
College of the Holy Cross

Kate M. Bennett
University of Liverpool

Over the 20 years since Thompson and Pleck's review of masculinity measures, much has changed with respect to measurement of masculinity ideologies. In this review, we examine the theoretical foundations and psychometric properties of measures of masculinity ideologies. We frame the review with a brief discussion of the 2 distinct conceptualizations of masculinity ideologies, then provide a synopsis of the 16 measures that meet our selection criteria: have been used in empirical studies since 1995, were published in peer-reviewed psychology or gender-related journals, contain full presentation of psychometric properties, are not study-specific modifications of earlier scales, and focus directly or indirectly on masculinity ideologies. We show that there are now 2 generations of measures. The 1st focuses on the hegemonic, traditional masculinity ideologies in North America. The 2nd-generation theorizes local masculinities and explicitly recognizes that different groups of individuals hold different standards. These have begun to map the geography of masculinities for men of different birth cohorts, life stages, social classes, sexual orientations, cultures, and racial/ethnic communities. We conclude by suggesting that there is value for a 3rd generation of measures to capture the changing face of men's gendered lives.

Keywords: masculinity ideologies

It has been 20 years since Thompson and Pleck's (1995) review of the measurement of masculinity ideologies, and much has changed. Six of the 11 measures in the 1995 review are rarely or never used, and new measures have been developed. Since the journal's launch in 2000, an increasing number of the articles published in the *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* use one or more measures of masculinity ideology, including 26.5% of the 49 articles in 2013. As important as the utilization statistics, theorizing within psychology is moving away from the 1980s and 1990s discourse about the *male sex role* (for a review, see Smiler, 2004), which was the theoretical foundation for most of the pre-1995 measures. For these reasons, a new review of the measurement of masculinity ideologies is warranted.

This review begins with a discussion of the theorizing behind studies of masculinity ideology within the last 20 years. We then present a thorough summary of the available instrumentation on masculinity ideologies and point out areas in need of investigation. We end by suggesting that there are advantages to questioning which ideologies boys and men (might) adopt to promote greater equality across sexualities and genders.

Theorizing Masculinity Ideologies

Masculinity ideologies is the term Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera (1992; see also Thompson & Pleck, 1995) proposed to identify the

body of prescriptive and proscriptive social norms that sanction men and masculinity performances. At the time, the term was introduced to explicitly distinguish masculinities as social norms from the profoundly different construct of a gender orientation or identity.

The constructs gender orientation/identity and masculinity ideologies rest on two parallel but dissimilar conceptualizations of masculinity that have channeled psychological studies on men. To summarize: One perspective views masculinities as dispositions and traits; the other conceptualizes masculinities as culturally based (or normative) ideologies that promise men privileges and some men more privileges than others. The first perspective, which Thompson and Pleck (1995, p. 130) referred to as the *trait approach*, presents masculinity as a cluster of socially desirable attributes thought to differentiate males and females and is measured by assessing traits via self-concept ratings such as the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1981) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The trait approach presumes that what differs is the degree to which individuals exemplify idealized masculinity (and femininity).

The second perspective, referred to as the *normative approach*, emphasizes the social norms sanctioning men and recognizes that there is no single standard for masculinity or an unvarying masculinity ideology. Thompson and Pleck (1995) proposed that "normative perspectives . . . view masculinity as a culturally based ideology scripting gender relations, attitudes, and beliefs" (p. 130). Theorizing since Thompson and Pleck's (1995) review has located the societal-wide, regional, and local masculinity ideologies within both cultural traditions and social practices (cf. Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). From this perspective masculinity ideologies are properties of particular times, places, and groups, not individuals. They influence—although they do not wholly determine—how people think, feel, and behave in gender-salient matters. There may be

Edward H. Thompson Jr., Department of Sociology and Anthropology, College of the Holy Cross; Kate M. Bennett, Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Liverpool.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Edward H. Thompson Jr., Department of Sociology and Anthropology, College of the Holy Cross, 1 College Street, Worcester, MA 01610. E-mail: ethompson@holycross.edu

a dominant, societal-wide idealized blueprint (Brannon, 1976) for proper manhood, yet researchers have documented that the same masculinity ideology is not invariant across historical eras, social institutions, or groups of men. Rather, hegemonic masculinities are the most widely accepted forms of being a man as defined by the historical era, social institution, or community. In sum, the starting point for the normative approach is that masculinity ideologies are external cultural standards, and one is hegemonic at some point, for some men.

In addition, masculinity ideologies may overlap with ideologies about femininities and broader gender ideologies; however, they are empirically distinct. Studies have typically found that measures of masculinity ideologies share less than half their variance with either traditional feminine ideology or attitudes toward women (e.g., Levant, Richmond, Cook, House, & Aupont, 2007; Thompson & Pleck, 1986).

In this review, we define masculinity ideologies from the social constructionist tradition of sociologists and psychologists (e.g., Hacker, 1951, 1957; Hartley, 1959) who have explicitly discussed ideals of manhood and masculinity ideologies as *cultural things*—bodies of ideas, doctrines, myths, and expectations that reflect the gender constructions within and, sometimes, across groups, communities, and societies. This was also the starting point in the Thompson and Pleck (1995) review, which stated that “masculinity, viewed from a normative approach, is a socially constructed gender ideal for men and male roles” (p. 131). These historically and geographically rooted ideologies are now referred to as *masculinities* (cf. Connell, 1995; Hearn, 1996). There may be unique features when different masculinities are examined, but there are also commonalities across the history and geography of masculinities (cf. Kimmel, 1996, 2005).

For the last 20 years, there have been two conceptualizations of the construct masculinity ideologies—as cultural things and as individuals’ belief systems, neither of which is rooted in the trait approach. In addition, researchers working from close variants of social constructionism (e.g., the gender role strain paradigm; Pleck, 1981, 1995) have theorized that masculinity ideology resides within the individual. This model remains distinct from the trait approach to the gender orientation/identity construct. According to Pleck (1995), what individuals learn and internalize is a belief system about masculinity and appropriate gender relations. Thus, at the same time that Thompson and Pleck (1995) introduced masculinity ideologies as culturally, not individually, based, Pleck (1995) proposed that masculinity ideology can be thought of as the “individual’s endorsement and *internalization* [italics added] of cultural belief systems about masculinity and the male gender” (p. 19; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993a). In framing this review, we argue that conceptualizing masculinity ideology as if it were a belief system launches a different construct than the masculinity ideologies construct Thompson and colleagues (Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992; Thompson & Pleck, 1995) introduced. When individual-level belief systems about masculinities are studied, the target has shifted to the individual self. Consequently, we offer the following distinction: Masculinity ideologies remains the construct that identifies the cultural standards of manhood located in a society, a region, an ethnic community, or in social groups and institutions (cf. Connell, 1995; Thompson & Pleck, 1995), and *masculinity beliefs* refers to the set of norms that individuals have

internalized and “constitute[s] a belief system about masculinity” (Pleck, 1995, p. 19).

The next section explains the selection criteria for the masculinity ideology measures reviewed in this article, and then each measure is critically summarized.

Measures of Masculinity Ideologies

Consistent with Thompson and Pleck (1995), we exclude trait-based measures of gender orientation and review only the instrumentation that psychologists use to measure masculinity ideologies or the masculinity beliefs that reflect those ideologies. Whorley and Addis’s (2006) review of psychological research on men and masculinity in the United States between 1995 and 2004 found that psychologists had confined their use to just four of the 11 ideology measures identified by Thompson and Pleck (1995)¹ and two new instruments.² Subsequent to Whorley and Addis, our search of four databases (PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES, SocINDEX, and Google Scholar) for the terms *masculinity ideology*, *masculinity ideologies*, *traditional masculinity*, and *masculinities* showed that between 2005 and 2013, eight new instruments were developed³, and two other pre-1995 measures had also been used.⁴

In all, 16 measures directly or indirectly assess masculinity ideologies and have been integral to empirical studies of masculinities since 1995. All are self-report instruments, and almost all use Likert-type rating scales. They are individually discussed in chronological order of their development and are summarized in the Appendix. Our inclusion criteria were as follows:

1. have been used in empirical studies from 1995 onward,
2. were published in mainstream, peer-reviewed psychology or gender-related journals,
3. contain full presentation of psychometric properties,
4. are not a study-specific modification of earlier scales, and
5. focus on global, regional, or local masculinity ideologies or on masculinity beliefs that mirror masculinity ideologies.

¹ These were the Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson & Pleck, 1986), the Male Role Norms Inventory (Levant et al., 1992) and its revision (MRNI-R; Levant, Smalley, et al., 2007), the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon & Juni, 1984), and the Attitudes Toward Masculinity Transcendence Scale (Moreland & Van Tuinen, 1978).

² These were the Conformity to Masculinity Norms Inventory (Mahalik et al., 2003) and the Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale (Doss & Hopkins, 1998).

³ These were the Male Attitude Norms Inventory (Luyt & Foster, 2001) and its revision (Luyt, 2005), the Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (Chu, Porche, & Tolman, 2005), the Traditional Attitudes About Men measure (McCreary, Saucier, & Courtenay, 2005), the Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent (Levant, Graef, Smalley, Williams, & McMillan, 2008) and its revision (MRNI-A-r; Levant et al., 2012), the Machismo Measure (Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, & Tracey, 2008), the Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale (Oransky & Fisher, 2009), the Macho Scale (Anderson, 2012), the Russian Male Norms Inventory (Janey et al., 2013), and the Measure of Men’s Perceived Inexpressiveness Norms (Wong, Horn, Gomory, & Ramos, 2013).

⁴ These were the Male Role Attitudes Scale (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993a) and the Attitudes Toward Men Scale (Jazzo, 1983).

Restricting the review to measures directly or indirectly assessing masculinity ideologies excluded instrumentation designed to reveal men's gendered experiences (e.g., Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986; Wong et al., 2011) and specific matters such as body esteem, depression, muscle dysphoria, or (normative male) alexithymia (e.g., Avalos, Tylka, & Wood-Barcalow, 2005; Levant et al., 2006; Magovcevic & Addis, 2008; McCreary, Sasse, Saucier, & Dorsch, 2004). These instruments were constructed to determine individual differences in feelings, thoughts, and behaviors arising as men try to conform to competing masculinity ideologies and/or manage gender role strain. We, therefore, keep the focus on the ideologies.

One point of departure from Thompson and Pleck (1995) is that we distinguish between measures that were purposely designed to assess personal norms (or the internalization of perceived masculinity ideologies), such as much of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (Mahalik et al., 2003), and measures that were designed to assess people's (dis)agreement with the social norms scripting masculinities, such as the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon & Juni, 1984). In 1995, there were no measures purposely designed to ascertain the masculinity ideologies that people had adopted.

A second departure is that we distinguish between first- and second-generation measures of masculinity ideologies. First-generation measures chart the hegemonic, traditional masculinities theorized as applicable to all men within North America (and much of Europe). Second-generation measures direct attention to the geographies of traditional masculinities that are regional or local, to constructions scripting decision making and behavior for particular people (e.g., Mexican Americans), and/or to the local norms scripting specific traditional or nontraditional masculinity performances (e.g., a reference group's expectations about emotional control).

The Included 16 Scales

1. Attitudes Toward Men Scale

The Attitudes Toward Men Scale (AMS; Iazzo, 1983) was devised to survey women's attitudes about men, which have not been systematically studied. It examines four major aspects of adult men's lives—marriage and parenthood, sexuality, work, and physical and personal attributes. Subscales were constructed for each domain. Researchers using the measure report good⁵ internal consistencies for the overall scale and subscales (e.g., Maltby & Day, 2003; see the Appendix). All items are descriptive statements; all use a male noun as the anchor, yet several jointly tap attitudes about women (e.g., "Most husbands consider their wives to be weak and witless creatures"). The majority of items for marriage, parenthood, and sexuality are negatively worded (e.g., "Men consider marriage a trap"); however, Maltby and Day (2001) commented that even decades after the scale's development, the items remain relevant, psychometrically reliable, and discriminating. They affirmed the AMS's criterion validity and reexamined its component structure. The four-factor structure was confirmed in a sample of women; a five-factor structure best accounted for men's attitudes—the marriage and parenthood domains became independent. Men also more strongly agreed that work, marriage, sexuality, and a healthy body define manhood than did women. With the

exception of younger men's support for the importance of physical and personal attributes, age positively covaried with the perceived importance work, marriage, sexuality, and fatherhood to manhood. Further research is needed to examine Iazzo's premise that experience (or social practices) determines people's attitudes about manhood more than (dis)agreement with cultural ideologies; she noted that groups of women predicted to hold less favorable attitudes toward men—rape victims, battered wives—did indeed hold less favorable attitudes.

2. Brannon Masculinity Scale

The Brannon Masculinity Scale (BMS; Brannon & Juni, 1984) has its roots in early sex role theory and was developed to measure how "people actually feel about traditional American masculinity" (p. 110). It is based on Brannon's (1976) analysis of American culture's blueprint of what a man is supposed to be, want, and succeed in doing. Pivotal was the "no sissy stuff" standard, which was operationalized with two subscales: *avoiding femininity* and *concealing emotions*. The "big wheel" standard was also codified with two subscales: being *the breadwinner* and being *admired and respected*. Another pair of subscales represented the "sturdy oak" standard: *toughness* and *the male machine*. The final masculinity standard, the "give 'em hell" mandate, was operationalized in a single *violence and adventure* subscale. Scale items generally depict an adult man (e.g., "A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children") and include both prescriptive and descriptive declarations to represent mainstream masculinity values and norms. Having some items address a young man or boy varies the target's age. Scoring reflects endorsement of the traditional masculinity expectations. The short form of the BMS (BMS-SF) is highly correlated with the full scale, but the BMS-SF does not reliably reproduce the seven subscales. Thompson, Grisanti, and Pleck (1985) constructed reliable subscales for the four theorized standards (see the Appendix).

A major strength of the BMS is that its items address masculinities without comparison to women or men's sexualities. Because of the length of the BMS, in the past 20 years only the BMS-SF has been used (e.g., Brooks-Harris, Heesacker, & Mejia-Millan, 1996; Hogue, Yoder, & Singleton, 2007; Mahalik et al., 2003; Walker, Tokar, & Fischer, 2000; Weinstein, Smith & Wisenthal, 1995). The BMS has been critiqued for redundancy between subscales (Levant et al., 1992), its small number of operationalized masculinities (Levant et al., 1992; Mahalik, Talmadge, Locke, & Scott, 2005), and assessing a supposedly universal standard (Mahalik et al., 2003). The BMS provides no appraisal of the importance of sexuality or men's privilege.

3. Male Role Norms Scale

The Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986) was derived by reducing the length of the BMS-SF. On the basis

⁵ Interpretation of a Cronbach's α coefficient is based on number of items in a scale and sample size. Ponterotto and Ruckdeschel (2007, Table 3) provide the following rule of thumb for interpreting a coefficient, for example, when a scale has 7–11 items in a sample of <100: $\alpha > .80$ is excellent, $\alpha > .75$ is good, $\alpha > .70$ is moderate, and $\alpha > .65$ is fair. When a scale comprises fewer items (e.g., <7) and/or the sample size is larger, the rule of thumb changes (cf. Cortina, 1993).

of factor analysis, the MRNS identified three cultural standards that reproduce men's power and privilege: expectations for men to achieve status and others' respect (*status norms*), expectations to become self-reliant and be emotionally and physically tough (*toughness norms*), and expectations to avoid stereotypically feminine practices (*antifemininity norms*). McCreary, Newcomb and Sadava (1998) confirmed the MRNS's three-factor structure.

Variations of the MRNS have been developed. Gradman (1990), in his study of men's transition to retirement, and Thompson and Barnes' (2013) study of adult men reported a reliable and discriminating 12-item version based on the four items with the strongest factor loadings from each of the three original scales (see the Appendix). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses of the MRNS by Fischer, Tokar, Good, and Snell (1998; see also Fischer & Good, 1998) yielded a four-factor solution with good model-data fit (for model-fit criteria, see Hu & Bentler, 1999; McDonald & Ho, 2002). Fischer et al. suggested referring to their shorter version of the MRNS as the *Masculinity Ideology Scale-21* (MIS-21). Their subscales address the importance of being respected and thinking things out logically (*status/rationality*), the disavowal of anything perceived as feminine (*antifemininity*), the importance of portraying toughness and independence (*sturdy oak tough image*), and supporting the occurrence of fistfighting (*violent toughness*). When the MRNS was translated to Turkish, both the three-factor (MRNS) and four-factor (MIS-21) models had nearly equivalent fit index values in confirmatory factor analyses (Lease, Çiftçi, Demir, & Boyraz, 2009).

Convergent, discriminant, and predictive validities of the MRNS have been reported in a number of studies (see, e.g., Blazina, Eddins, Burrige, & Settle, 2007; Bruch, 2002, 2007; Dodson & Borders, 2006; Gordon, Hawes, Reid, et al., 2013; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002; Jakupcak, Tull, & Roemer, 2005; Janey, Janey, Goncherova, & Savchenko, 2006; Kilianski, 2003; Lease et al., 2013; Oransky & Fisher, 2009; Thompson & Cracco, 2008; Thompson & Whearty, 2004; Wilkinson, 2004). Two decades earlier, Thompson and Pleck (1995) commented that the MRNS's brevity, construct validity, and discriminant validity were its strengths; its limitations are no different than those of its parent (the BMS).

4. Male Role Norms Inventory

There are a number of versions of Levant and colleagues' Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI). Developed to assess norms rather than stereotypes, the MRNI was built and revised in line with the gender role strain paradigm (see Pleck, 1995). It also aimed to include aspects of the male role not found in the BMS, such as attitudes toward sex and heterosexism. In the measure's original form, the developers theorized seven standards underlying traditional masculinity and developed the MRNI to assess men's and women's endorsement of these norms (Levant et al., 1992). Confirmatory factor analysis could not reproduce the expected item clusters. The MRNI was amended (Levant & Fischer, 1998) to better operationalize the traditional masculinity standards thought to be representative of the United States and other Western societies prior to the second wave of feminism: *avoidance of femininity*, *restrictive emotionality*, *achievement/status*, *aggression*, *self-reliance*, *fear and hatred of homosexuals*, and *attitudes toward sex*. Also included was a 12-item nontraditional attitudes subscale.

Researchers have shown that endorsing nontraditional attitudes is related to health-conducive behavior (Wade, 2008), heterosexual men's relationship satisfaction (Wade & Donis, 2007), and resistance to racism and sexism (Liu, 2002; Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000).

The amended measure was revised into the MRNI-R (Levant et al., 2007) to address the lack of empirical support for the MRNI's theorized structure (for a brief history of this measure, see Levant & Richmond, 2007). In the MRNI-R, the nontraditional attitudes subscale was dropped, and new items were developed. Exploratory factor analysis (Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley, 2010) supported the hypothesized seven factors; however, it identified some ambiguous items to yield the shorter, robust 39-item MRNI-R-r (see Levant et al., 2010, Table 1). Some subscales were renamed (see the Appendix). Levant, Hall, and Rankin (2013) reported a confirmatory factor analysis for a shorter version (MRNI-SF) that affirms the seven-factor solution with good model-data fit in a sample of undergraduate men and women and in men- and women-only samples. The MRNI-SF uses the three highest loading items from the MRNI-R. Yielding another variation, Skolnick, Bascom, and Wilson (2013) excluded the *negativity toward sexual minorities* subscale, used the remaining 31 items, and developed a composite measure of traditional masculinity ideology by averaging the 18 items from the *restrictive emotionality*, *avoidance of femininity*, and *toughness* subscales.

By broadening the scope of measured masculinity norms to explicitly include the importance of sex, all versions of the MRNI distinguish themselves from the BMS and the MRNS. Having eight of the 39 MRNI-R-r items tap homophobia may make this version of the measure heavily weighted toward assessing overt heterosexism. Sexual prejudice is usually regarded as theoretical concomitant rather than a dimension of masculinity ideology (Herek, 2000). This matter is much less of an issue if the 21-item short form (MRNI-SF) of the MRNI-R-r is used; only three items address *negativity toward sexual minorities*.

In all its versions, the MRNI is one of the most commonly used measures of masculinity ideologies (Whorley & Addis, 2006). The seven types of norms assessed are empirically confirmed in the MRNI-R-r and MRNI-SF, and the original version can yield reliable subscales for traditional and progressive masculinities when total scores for the normative and nontraditional items are used.

5. Male Role Attitudes Scale

Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku (1993a, 1993b, 1994) developed the Male Role Attitudes Scale (MRAS) to map boys' attitudes toward societal masculinity norms, and the gender role strain model frames their research on masculinity ideologies. The authors selected items from each dimension in the MRNS and added an item concerning sexuality from the Stereotypes About Male Sexuality Scale (Snell, Belk, & Hawkins, 1986). Wording of items was modified to address "guys." Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku (1993a) reported a poor Cronbach's alpha coefficient ($\alpha = .56$), probably stemming from the scale's brevity, the intentional selection of items from each MRNS subscale leaving it multidimensional, and the large national sample's heterogeneity. However, Ojeda, Rosales, and Good (2008) found a stronger internal consistency reliability estimate ($\alpha = .70$) in a sample of Mexican American university students, and Poteat, Kimmel, and Wilchins (2011)

reported an alpha of .87 in a racially diverse sample of high school boys and girls in rural Illinois. The discriminant and convergent validity of the MRAS are pluses (see, e.g., Blazina, Cordova, Pisecco, & Settle, 2007; Chu et al., 2005; Epstein & Ward, 2011; Janey et al., 2006, 2013; Levant et al., 2008, 2010; Pleck & O'Donnell, 2001; Santana, Raj, Decker, La Marche, & Silverman, 2006; Smiler, 2008). A six-item version ($\alpha < .60$ for each of the different age groups) was used in waves of the National Survey of Adolescent Males (e.g., Marcell, Eftim, Sonenstein, & Pleck, 2011).

The MRAS shows good predictive ability among European American, African American, and Latino samples of adolescents. This suggests that the MRAS operationalizes a mainstream masculinity that is somewhat directive for all adolescent boys. But the evidence also reveals that, on average, boys differentially disagree with the mainstream norms.

6. Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale

The developers of the Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale (MMIS; Doss & Hopkins, 1998) initiated their work with the critique that existing measures of masculinity ideologies impose the universality of Anglo American conceptions of masculinities onto other cultures. The MMIS is one the new, second generation of measures of masculinity ideologies. It was designed with item wording to represent central tenants of masculinity ideologies in one or more cultures *and* to differentiate one cultural group from another. All but four items use a common male noun (“a guy”) to anchor the values and norms measured; the others direct attention to “a man” or “male friends.” On the basis of samples of Chilean, African American, and European American undergraduates, an exploratory factor analysis revealed *etic* (common) dimensions applicable to all three cultural groups and one to three *emic* (distinctive) components for each cultural group. The *etic hyper-masculine posturing* and *achievement* subscales have satisfactory internal consistency reliability as well as good discriminant and convergent validity. Doss and Hopkins detailed three *emic* subscales from the Chilean sample—an eight-item *toughness* subscale, a five-item *pose* subscale, and a five-item *responsibility* subscale (α s = .59, .58, and .49, respectively). They also detailed one *emic* subscale among the European Americans—a six-item *sensitivity* subscale ($\alpha = .70$)—and a single *emic* subscale in the African American sample—*sexual responsibility* ($\alpha = .43$).

Other cross-cultural use of the MMIS suggests that there is, in fact, evidence of a substantial variety of *emic* cultural masculinities as much as there are some *etic* (perhaps global) masculinities. Janey et al. (2006; see also Janey, Plitin, Muse-Burke, & Vovk, 2009) investigated the masculinity ideologies in post-Soviet society. Their two samples differed—ethnic Russian versus ethnic Ukrainian—and exploratory factor analyses of the MMIS were expected to identify both *etic* and *emic* dimensions in the two post-Soviet communities. They did. Common across Russian and Ukrainian men was their agreement with ideologies calling for men to be providers and responsible sexual partners. Unique *emic* subscales tapped Ukrainian men’s stoic protector and competitive perseverance as well as parallel, but distinctive, ideologies addressing Ukrainian’s men’s support for reserved sexuality and Russian men’s emphasis on composed sexuality in their intimate relationships with women. Roberts-Douglass and Curtis-Boles

(2013) found that young African American men reproduced the achievement and sexual responsibility components that Doss and Hopkins (1998) identified, and the two components include many of the same MMIS items in post-Soviet *dedicated provider* and *responsible sexual partner* components. LaPollo, Bond, and Lauby (2014) found that the *hypermasculinity* subscale was associated with Black but not White men having exchanged sex with women and men for money, food, or shelter. Researchers using the MMIS have demonstrated that a well-designed measure can yield important information about the meaningful ways that cultural masculinities are divergent, and sometimes similar, across societies and communities.

7. Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory

The developers of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al., 2003) broke away from the practice of only measuring “cognitive conformity,” or approval of mainstream masculinity ideologies. Their stated intention was to also codify personal accommodation—that is, behavioral and affective conformity—to mainstream masculinity ideologies. The CMNI includes some prescriptive statements that assess endorsement of, or cognitive conformity to, broad masculinity norms (e.g., “It is best to keep your emotions hidden”). However, most items examine behavioral and affective conformity and are written as self-reports about behaviors, feelings, and intentions (e.g., “I like to talk about my feelings” and “I am miserable when work occupies all my attention”). The focal point for these items is the respondent. The scale developers recognized that although people behave in ways that comply with certain masculinities, they feel cognitively or affectively uncomfortable with their own behavior.

Exploratory factor analysis supported the operationalized 11-factor structure (see the Appendix). Construct validity was supported at the outset for the CMNI and the discriminant validity of its subscales (Mahalik et al., 2003), and this has been reaffirmed in a number of studies since (see, e.g., Graef, Tokar, & Kaut, 2010; Hammer & Good, 2010; Iwamoto, Liao, & Liu, 2010; Levant et al., 2010; Levant, Wimer, & Williams, 2011; Smiler, 2006a, 2006b; Syzdek & Addis, 2010; Wong, Owen, & Shea, 2012).

Using confirmatory factor analysis on a sample of Canadian undergraduates, Parent and Moradi (2009) reexamined the structure of the CMNI on the basis of their view that the reliability and validity of the dominance subscale and the pursuit of status subscale were questionable (cf. Liu & Iwamoto, 2007; Smiler, 2006a; Tager & Good, 2005). The 11-factor structure was not reproduced with an acceptable data–model fit. Discarding the two questionable factors and items with the lowest loadings on their intended factor yielded a nine-factor CMNI-46 with good data–model fit. Its subscales are similar in length (four to six items). The psychometric properties of CMNI-46 have begun to be reported (Levant & Wimer, 2014; Parent & Smiler, 2013; see the Appendix). Hsu and Iwamoto (2014) suggested that the CMNI-46 is not invariant across ethnic groups.

One criticism of the original 94-item CMNI was its length, which has led to the use of selected subscales (e.g., Burns & Mahalik, 2008b; Tager, Good, & Brammer, 2010) and shorter versions. The CMNI-11 (Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007) is based on the highest loading items from each of the CMNI subscales, and it correlated strongly ($r_{SB} = .83$) with the original

version. The CMNI-22 (Smiler & Epstein, 2010) uses the two highest loading items for each of the 11 factors from the original CMNI and shows excellent concurrent validity ($r = .92$) with the original CMNI. This version has been used often (Hamilton & Mahalik, 2009; see also, Berger, Addis, Reilly, Syzdek, & Green, 2012; Burns & Mahalik, 2008a; Easton, Renner, & O'Leary, 2013; Gordon, Hawes, Perez-Cabello, et al., 2013; Hammer, Vogel, & Heimerdinger-Edwards, 2013; Iwamoto et al., 2012; Morrison, 2012; Rice, Fallon, Aucote, & Möller-Leimkühler, 2013; Rochlen, McKelley, Suizzo, & Scaringi, 2008). Finally, there also is the CMNI-55 (Owen, 2011) that supports the 11-factor structure and yields subscales of similar lengths and a global score (cf. Berger et al., 2012).

Researchers using the CMNI have demonstrated that whatever version is selected, it is an important measure in revealing people's own masculinity beliefs and reports of their behavioral, affective, and cognitive *conformity* with societal masculinities. But we are puzzled by why the developers of the many versions of the CMNI are keen to find (the) one version that can yield invariance across populations when masculinity ideologies vary by geography, history, and life-course experiences (cf. Hsu & Iwamoto, 2014).

8. Male Attitude Norms Inventory

Luyt and Foster (2001) introduced the Male Attitude Norms Inventory (MANI) to examine differing forms of masculine expression in South Africa. Grounded in the theoretical paradigm that gender is a negotiated social category reproduced through social practices (cf. Connell, 1987, 1995), the MANI aims to capture the extent to which gang members support traditional masculinities, including hypermasculinity. It extends mapping the geography of masculinities to South Africa. One-third of the items are from the MRNS and MRNI; some original items call attention to the subordination of women (e.g., "Women should do as men tell them to") or tap antigay attitudes. Exploratory factor analysis identified a three-factor—not the expected five-factor—underlying structure. A revision, MANI-II (Luyt, 2005), was introduced, with most items reworded or new and all presented as prescriptive statements (e.g., "Men *should* [italics added] remain focused in difficult situations"). Factor analysis also identified a three-factor structure and reliable subscales—public and private *toughness*; self-, social, and financial *control*; and antigay (hetero)*sexuality*. Although there has been limited research using the scale, it shows some evidence of convergent validity (Luyt, 2005; Reardon & Govender, 2013). Needed are studies outside of South Africa to determine how useful the MANI-II is in charting approval of traditional (hyper)masculinities.

9. Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale

The Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (AMIRS; Chu et al., 2005) is a second-generation measure that maps the extent to which boys align themselves with hegemonic masculinity within the contexts of their interpersonal relationships. Like Pleck et al. (1993a, 1994), the developers explicitly located their work in a normative perspective that conceptualizes masculinities as culturally constructed and then acquired through socialization. All scale items direct attention to "a guy" and are pre-

sented as either descriptive (e.g., "In a good dating relationship, the guy gets his way most of the time") or prescriptive statements (e.g., "I think it's important for a guy to go after what he wants, even if it means hurting other people's feelings"). Chu et al. reported factor analysis evidence of the scale being unidimensional, and there is evidence of the AMIRS's convergent validity with both the MRAS and subscales in Snell's (1989) Masculine Behavior Scale (see also Blazina, Cordova, et al., 2007). The mean score for this unidimensional scale is on the disagree side of the theoretical midpoint (cf. Morgan, Steiner, & Thompson, 2010).

The developers (Chu et al., 2005) proposed that the AMIRS measures "the extent to which adolescent boys *internalize* [italics added], in terms of resisting as well as conforming to, hegemonic masculinity, as evidence by their attitudes and beliefs about what constitutes appropriate behaviors" within relationships (p. 97). Consistent with the emphasis on resisting *and* conforming is the bidirectional finding that the AMIRS negatively covaried with boys' self-esteem—boys with greater self-esteem disagreed with the norms tapped by the scale, because they may have a capacity to resist the pressure of hegemonic masculinity, and boys with lower self-esteem take the effort to comply with impossible norms more seriously (Deborah Tolman, personal communication, February 9, 2014). This bidirectional observation warrants further study.

10. Traditional Attitudes About Men

McCreary et al. (2005) created a unidimensional scale to assess five "universal" expectations for men. Never directly named, but referred to throughout their article as *Traditional Attitudes About Men* (TAAM), the scale is unlike most masculinity scales in its strategy of directly measuring personal norms (see Questions b–e) rather than endorsement of statements representing societal-wide masculinity ideology (cf. Question a). The scale is based on five questions addressing aspects of conventional masculinity—risk taking, self-sufficiency, physical toughness, emotional restrictedness, and avoidance of femininity. The questions: (a) "Do you believe that taking risks that are sometimes dangerous is part of what it means to be a man and part of what distinguishes men from women?" (b) "As a man, how important is it for you to be self-sufficient and always to try to handle problems on your own?" (c) "As a man, how important is it for you to be physically strong and tough?" (d) "As a man, how important is it for you to control your emotions and never to reveal sadness or vulnerability?" (e) "As a man, how important is it for you to not engage in activities that you think others might consider feminine?" Rated on four-point scales (*not at all true, a little true, somewhat true, or very true* scale for the first question and *not at all important, a little important, somewhat important, or very important* for the remaining four), scoring averages responses into a single index.

McCreary et al. (2005) reported that the mean score ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 0.57$) fell slightly below the theoretical midpoint, which means that their sample of college men did not define their personal norms about what it takes to be a man in terms fully consistent with traditional masculinity ideologies in the TAAM. On average, the men rated being self-sufficient (Question b: $M = 2.87$) and physically tough and strong (Question c: $M = 2.76$) close to being *somewhat important*. Risk taking (Question a: $M = 1.61$), controlling emotions (Question d: $M = 2.19$), and avoiding

feminine activities (Question e: $M = 1.99$) were not viewed as salient to what defines being a man (Donald McCreary, personal communication, July 18, 2014). The TAAM is a succinct measure of the extent to which men embody traditional masculinities as personal norms, and its predictiveness of men's behaviors warrants further investigation. McCreary et al. (2005) reported no validity information.

11. Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent

The Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent (MNRI-A; Levant et al., 2008) was designed to be an age-appropriate measure of boys' attitudes toward traditional societal-wide masculinity norms for *antifemininity*, *self-reliance*, *aggression*, *achievement/status*, and *restrictive emotionality*. Even though it was designed to chart the masculinity norms for a specific life stage, it is a first-generation measure that operationalizes the ideal of boyhood in the United States. Some items from the adult MNRI (reviewed earlier) were reworded, and new items were created to address adolescent-related contexts such as sports. The developers discarded both the *fear and hatred of homosexuals* and *nonrelational attitudes toward sexuality* subscales from the adult MRNI as age inappropriate. All items except one call to attention "a boy," most items are prescriptive statements (e.g., "Boys should be allowed to kiss their fathers" [reverse coded]), and only a few items contrast boys with girls or focus on stereotypical femininity (e.g., "Chores like dusting and doing laundry are for girls"). On the basis of samples of American and Scottish boys (and girls), the MRNI-A was found to be internally consistent, but subscale reliabilities were not uniformly strong (see the Appendix); in addition, among boys the scale did not meet the developers' expectation for discriminant validity.

A revision of the scale is available, the MRNI-A-r (Levant et al., 2012). Exploratory factor analysis of a pool of reworded and new items about gendered standards and expectations for "guys,"—no longer "boys"—did not support the hypothesized five-factor structure. However, a robust three-factor underlying structure emerged, isolating *emotionally detached dominance*, *toughness*, and *avoidance of femininity* (see the Appendix). Convergent validity for the MRNI-A-r was supported, and there is evidence of its discriminant validity. Levant et al. (2012) noted the similarities between the three constellations of masculinity norms in the MRNI-A-r and the MRNS (reviewed earlier).

12. Machismo Measure

Arciniega et al. (2008) joined others (e.g., Mirandé, 1997; Saez, Casado, & Wade, 2009) in challenging the history in psychological studies on men that concentrates on the negative characteristics of machismo among Mexican and Mexican American men (e.g., authoritarianism, chauvinism) and ignores the valued and desirable ideals of an honored protector, provider, and paternal figure. They developed a bidirectional Machismo Measure (MM) to reveal both *traditional machismo* (describing negative hypermasculine and chauvinistic behaviors and attitudes) and *caballerismo* (describing positive, family-centered, and nurturing behaviors and attitudes). The MM comprises two independent subscales supported by factor analysis with items such as "In the family, a father's wish is law" or "Real men never let down their guard" (traditional machismo) and "The family is more important than the individual" or "Men

should respect their elders" (caballerismo). The developers detail convergent and discriminant validity data.

It is noteworthy that Latino men (Arciniega et al., 2008) revealed marked disagreement with machismo masculinity norms but strong agreement with caballerismo masculinity norms, and men whose home language included Spanish were more supportive of the caballerismo norms than strictly English-speaking Latino men. What it means to be a man in Mexican American culture clearly emphasizes the values of being family centered (*familismo*), whereas the significance of (negative) machismo is negligible. Ojeda and Liang (2014) reported that caballerismo, not machismo, covaries with positive and active coping strategies among adolescent Mexican American men, and Ojeda and Piña-Watson, (2014) found caballerismo positively related to Mexican day laborers' self-esteem. The MM has become frequently used to assess Latino, especially Mexican American, men's distinctive masculinities (cf. Estrada, Rigali-Oiler, Arciniega, & Tracey, 2011; Glass & Owen, 2010; Liang, Salcedo, & Miller, 2011; Rivera-Ramos & Buki, 2011). The measure's predictiveness of men's positive as much as problematic behavior is encouraging.

13. Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale

Similar to the developers of the MRAS, the AMIRS, and the MNRI-A-r, the developers of the Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale (MAMS; Oransky & Fisher, 2009) recognized a need for a multidimensional measure of the masculinity norms that adolescents regard as legitimate. In the tradition of theorizing that boys internalize cultural ideologies as personal guides, the developers' role strain starting point reasoned that boys who model traditional masculinity norms may be at higher risk of maladaptive coping and troublesome behavior. Oransky and Fisher designed their scale to document adolescents' adherence to four traditional, age-appropriate masculinity norms for *constant effort* (e.g., "A guy should always seem as manly as other guys that he knows"), *emotional restriction* (e.g., "It is weird for a guy to talk about his feelings with other guys"), *heterosexism* (e.g., "It is embarrassing to have a lot of gay friends"), and *social teasing* (e.g., "A guy should be able to take teasing from his friends"). The MAMS is suitable for older adolescents; Steinfeldt, Vaughan, LaFollette, and Steinfeldt's (2012) confirmatory factor analysis supported the MAMS four-dimensional mapping in a sample of high school football players. In a sample of Norwegian adolescents, Slaatten, Anderssen, and Hetland (2014) found that the four normative standards were related to an increased likelihood of gay-related name-calling.

Oransky and Fisher (2009) established convergent validity of the MAMS. Needed is evidence of the MAMS's discriminant validity and which subscales best explain boys engaging in (or "doing") less conventional masculinities such as volunteering or nonsports extracurricular activities. Otherwise, the multidimensional character of the MAMS will remain invisible.

14. Macho Scale

Anderson (2012) introduced her Macho Scale (MS) to represent the pressures on Jamaican men to assert sexual dominance within a society that has between-groups disagreement on the legitimacy of this aspect of masculinity. It is a measure of heteronormative attitudes toward Jamaican men's sexual entitlement. Based on a

sample of fathers from four purposefully select, socioeconomically diverse communities (median age = ~40.5 years), the scale was designed to capture the concerns men have about establishing their (reproductive) status vis-à-vis other men. Developed through exploratory factor analysis of a pool of items, a two-component measure—*entitlement to sexual dominance* (e.g., “It is okay for a man to have outside children if he looks after them”) and a *felt need to produce children* (e.g., “If I did not have children, I would feel jealous of other men who have”)—is introduced. The scale has good internal consistency reliability (see the Appendix); omitting the one item addressing a woman not having the right to refuse to have sex with her partner would not alter the measure’s internal consistency reliability. There is some evidence of the scale’s predictive validity: Men from lower socioeconomic status communities more strongly supported the hypermasculine norms and reported a greater number of birth mothers of their children. More use of the measure is needed, especially among men from other cultures.

15. Russian Male Norms Inventory

Janey et al. (2013) argued that existing measures of masculinity ideologies developed in the West miss the capability to assess the norms of masculinity in non-European American cultures. Using a norm-based approach, they constructed the Russian Male Norms Inventory (RMNI) from an exploratory factor analysis of a pool of items developed from intensive conversations with Russian men, an examination of Russian research on men and masculinities, and iconic media portrays of manhood in Russia. Item content aimed to capture Russian culture; thus, some items may not be replicable in other cultures (e.g., “For a man, it is normal to ‘go to the left’” is a colloquialism about marital infidelity). Factor analysis identified a three-factor structure—men’s relational and family obligations from the perspective of men, including benevolent protection of others and agentic self-defense (*duty/reliability*); men’s privileges, chiefly within families (*privileges/pleasures*); and expectations of inexpressiveness in a variety of contexts (*inexpressive/impassive*). Janey et al. (2013) reported construct and discriminant validity information.

Given Janey et al.’s (2009) work revealing Russian and Ukrainian men’s differing masculinity values, it is important to determine whether aspects of the codified Russian masculinities in the RMNI are etic rather than emic and, thus, supported by men from different generations and other non-European cultures. This begs the question, do the views and behaviors of Russian men from different geographies or birth cohorts, who represent Soviet and post-Soviet culture, differ? We define the RMNI as a second-generation measure because it does examine regional (or White) Russian masculinities; however, we also need studies of whether Russian men from different geographies equally (dis)agree with the masculinities assessed.

16. Measure of Men’s Perceived Inexpressiveness Norms

The premise for the development of the Measure of Men’s Perceived Inexpressiveness Norms (M2PIN; Wong et al., 2013) was the conviction that existing measures of masculinity ideologies were not designed to chart the local norms scripting men’s

emotional control. Emotional control is a traditional masculinity expectation charted in other societal-wide measures, such as the MRNI and CMNI; however, studies have revealed that respondents typically disagree with the importance of emotional control, at least as measured. Wong et al. (2013) shifted their measure’s focus away from broad societal masculinity norms to men’s sense of the extant descriptive and injunctive social norms that their reference groups apply. Attending to men’s perceptions of what significant others expect regarding emotional (in)expressiveness kept attention on local, not personal, norms for masculinity performances. The M2PIN is based on social psychology theories that call attention to the importance of social norms as guides for or constraints on behavior.

Respondents are first asked to identify the group of men who had recently had the greatest influence on them, and the instructions provide examples of “male childhood friends, male sports team, male colleagues/classmates, [or] male members of the family” (Wong et al., 2013, p. 299). (College peers, family members, and colleagues emerged as the prevalent groups). Respondents next rate statements about the men in these groups. The M2PIN comprises five items assessing a group’s perceived descriptive norms (e.g., “Most men in this group bring up their feelings when talking with others” [reverse scored]) and another five items assessing perceived injunctive norms (e.g., “Most men in this group disapprove of men who show emotion on their faces when talking with others”). Confirmatory factor analysis revealed a good fit between data and the expected two-factor model. Evidence of convergent validity of the M2PIN and its two subscales was supported by positive correlations with (in)expressiveness scales within the CMNI the MRNI-R, thereby showing that scales founded on influential reference group norms covary with scales based on broad societal norms, though they share less than 25% common variance. The developers also suggest that whenever there is congruence between personal norms and external norms (regarding emotional inexpressiveness), men report positive psychosocial functioning. The M2PIN subscales proved to be differentially predictive—for example, perceived descriptive norms predicted intention to (not) seek counseling, and the perceived injunctive norms that discourage emotional expressiveness predicted self-reports of loneliness and less satisfaction with life.

The way the M2PIN is designed to assess specific group norms rather than broad societal norms distinguishes it from most other measures of masculinity ideologies. It might prompt new instrumentation tapping other group-level masculinity norms, such as ones that map how groups’ descriptive and injunctive norms regarding sexual aggression or bullying explain self-reports of bystander interventions among some men and party-related sexual aggression among other men or why younger and older widowers’ grieve differentially (cf. Bennett, 2007, 2010).

Discussion and Conclusions

The first generation of measures of masculinity ideologies, advanced 20–30 years ago (i.e., the AMS, BMS, MRNS, MRNI, and MRAS), were developed to assess respondents’ agreement with the prevailing cultural standards on what manhood is and ought to be. Since 1995, four additional measures (the CMNI, TAAM, MRNI-A, and MAMS) have extended psychologists capability to empirically assess ideologies about boyhood in the

United States as well as people's own masculinity ideologies and reports of conformity to traditional U.S. masculinities. The seven second-generation measures (the MMIS, MANI-II, AMIRS, MM, MS, RMNI, and M2PIN) introduce reliable instrumentation to begin mapping the geography of masculinities across nations and regions and to illustrate the salience of local masculinity ideologies. Even when the evidence is modest correlation coefficients gathered from surveys rather than longitudinal or experimentally designed studies, the large body of empirical work using these measures certainly has demonstrated that masculinity ideologies matter (see Levant, 2011; O'Neil, 2012). Which masculinities matter, how much they matter, for whom, and to what consequences remain largely uncharted questions and warrant research attention. One example: Straight-acting gay men are said to model their masculinity on working-class aesthetics (Clarkson, 2006), yet the masculinity ideologies guiding gay men's day-to-day lives remain uncertain.

Most measures of masculinity ideologies were empirically developed with college-age respondents and have not been put to use in samples of adult men, especially older men (cf. Whorley & Addis, 2006; Wong, Steinfeldt, Speight, & Hickman, 2010). This observation raises this question: Are these measures age invariant? If life stage matters and affects what men perceive as normative, and as gerontologists we know this is the case (cf. Meadows & Davidson, 2006), we do not know if the masculinity ideologies operationalized in most first- and second-generation measures are what middle-aged and older men perceive as normative or conform to.

The phrase "perceive as normative or conform to" raises an important distinction. It is the twofold way that masculinity ideologies have been incorporated into psychological studies—as recognizable cultural norms within and across populations and as individuals' own belief systems. Researchers could interpret respondents' scores on the same masculinity ideology measure as evidence of people's agreement that the cultural norms exist, as evidence that the norms are desirable, and/or as evidence that the norms are personal values. This begs the following question: Can individuals agree with the idea that the norms detailed in a measure of masculinity ideologies are present and practiced in the culture by men in general without personally approving of the same norms or having internalizing these cultural mandates? We cannot say that a respondent's disclosure of their opinions about the norms within a measure of traditional masculinity ideology also matches the person's internalization of such norms. But researchers working from the gender role strain paradigm typically propose that a measure charts internalized beliefs (cf. Sobiraji, Rigotti, Weseler, & Mohr, 2014). It might or might not.

To illustrate, men might agree that traditional masculinity ideologies reproduce gender inequality by normalizing gender inequality and women's lesser privileges (e.g., "The President of the United States should always be a man," "Men should be the leader of any group"). Yet these same men might not adhere to the inequality norms or enact them. They might prefer equal partnerships and normalize women in leadership positions. Thus, do the existing measures of traditional masculinity ideologies that were developed to chart the descriptive and/or injunctive normativeness of U.S. cultural standards—that is, chronicle what people perceive as normative—equally chart individuals' own masculinity ideologies? We are not confident that they do both. Needed is a set of

creatively designed research studies that use one of the measures of traditional masculinity ideologies (e.g., the MRNS, the MRNI) and resolve the extent to which the people sampled perceive the operationalized masculinity standards as normative and/or as their personal norms and then which of these latter two better explains people's self-reported or experimentally defined behavior. A reviewer suggested the value of mixed-method studies. One could administer a masculinity ideologies measure followed by interviews about experiences that involved the norms of interest. Or one could interview participants with high and low scores afterward about what thoughts and memories were evoked by the operationalized norms within a measure.

Most items within first-generation scales are worded as absolute statements, as if the rule applies equally across generations, contexts, and geographies (e.g., "One should not be able to tell how a man is feeling by looking at his face"). Any man who defines himself as conventional and endorses conventional masculinity ideologies might agree with this statement yet, in fact, vary his gendered performances. A man in a long-term marriage may not come right out and disclose his immediate worries, but he may well "allow" his wife to read his face and ask "What's wrong?" as their ritualized interpersonal strategy for him to disclose. He may profess traditional masculinity values supporting emotional non-disclosure but behave differently inside a personal relationship. Masculinity ideologies are not easily operationalized by simple spoken rules such as "One should not be able to tell how a man is feeling by looking at his face." The local and personal masculinity rules guiding men's everyday lives are more complex and nuanced, and they warrant attention (cf. Wong et al., 2013). Rephrased, is cognitive agreement with hegemonic traditional masculinity norms distinct from cognitive conformity with the actual local and personal norms that seem to direct men's lives (cf. Arciniega et al., 2008; Doss & Hopkins, 1998)?

Despite what was *theorized* as normative within measures of masculinity ideologies, the evidence is that respondents very often disagreed with the *operationalized* masculinity ideologies (cf. Levant, 1995; Smiler, 2004). Here is one example: Mean scores on the MRNS and its subscales can range 1 (disagree) to 7 (agree). Means for the *antifemininity* subscale (the importance of men avoiding activity and behavior perceived as feminine) were 3.57 ($SD = 1.08$) and 3.84 ($SD = 0.99$) in two samples of college men (Thompson & Cracco, 2008; Thompson & Pleck, 1986) and 3.63 ($SD = 0.89$) in a sample of older men (Thompson, Barnes, & Futterman, 2014). The older men, who grew up in the 1950s, and college-age men growing up in the 1980s or 2000s commonly disagreed with the principal that gender relations should strive to uphold a sexist, separate-spheres arrangement that resonates with patriarchal culture (Connell, 1987, 1995). What we conclude is that this subscale better charts respondents' disagreement with the cultural guidelines *as operationalized*. However, it is equally possible that respondents are disclosing their disagreement with how well the subscale charts their personal stance regarding the antifemininity standard. What is warranted are studies that compare men's views regarding hegemonic antifemininity standards with their nuanced personal norms.

In conclusion, it is our position that the study of masculinity ideologies needs to be broadened. Too few measures of masculinity ideologies have been developed outside the university setting, and too few studies using the measures have sought out the views

of nonuniversity young, middle-aged, and older men (and women). Most first- or second-generation measures were not designed to assess adult men's family-based masculinities beyond earning respect for being a breadwinner or head of the household. New measures are necessary to ascertain adult men's masculinity ideologies with regard to their work- and family-based lives, such as the significance of fatherhood, coparenting, marital negotiation, retirement, care work in later life, and recoupling after a wife's death. As the field of studying men goes forward, the nontraditional masculinity ideologies scripting adult men's lives certainly deserve attention. This recommendation is consistent with Wong et al.'s (2011) finding that even college men defined "a man" as centered on family and being responsible and accountable. New measures are also needed that no longer problematize gay men.

More important than continuing to determine whether an existing measure is invariant across different groups of men (and women) is the need to begin to distinguish common (etic) masculinities across various groups from the distinctive (emic) masculinities that uniquely channel people's lives in certain places and times. A decade ago, Smiler (2004) similarly observed that the study of masculinity ideologies would benefit from closer examination of within-group variability. Following the lead of Doss and Hopkins (1998), a third generation of measurement instruments on masculinity ideologies is needed to isolate the masculinities that result in men (and women) engaging in personally and/or socially healthy behaviors, such as the way Ojeda and Piña-Watson (2014) demonstrated that caballerismo protects Mexican day laborers' self-esteem and, likely, the men's families' self-assessed welfare. The question we urge is this: What ideologies channel men's lives such that they are satisfied, socially engaged, and resisting the reproduction of inequalities between men and women as well as among men? The (sub)scales within most existing measures of masculinity ideologies will not be sufficient to answer this question, because they target attitudes toward dominance, antifemininity, and other traditional masculinity values, which we know that participants often disagree with. The masculinities men live by have dramatically changed as both the hegemony of heteronormative social worlds fades and the legitimacy of sexist gender relations is questioned. Some of the newer generation of measures help initiate new avenues of scholarship to better understand why and how much masculinities matter.

References

- Anderson, P. (2012). Measuring masculinity in an Afro-Caribbean context. *Social and Economic Studies, 61*, 49–93.
- Arciniega, G. M., Anderson, T. C., Tovar-Blank, Z. G., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2008). Toward a fuller conception of machismo: Development of a traditional machismo and caballerismo scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*, 19–33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.19>
- Avalos, L., Tylka, T. L., & Wood-Barcalow, N. (2005). The Body Appreciation Scale: Development and psychometric evaluation. *Body Image, 2*, 285–297. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2005.06.002>
- Bem, S. L. (1981). *Bem Sex Role Inventory: Professional manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bennett, K. M. (2007). "No sissy stuff": Towards a theory of masculinity and emotional expression in older widowed men. *Journal of Aging Studies, 21*, 347–356. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2007.05.002>
- Bennett, K. M. (2010). How to achieve resilience as an older widower: Turning points or gradual change? *Ageing & Society, 30*, 369–382. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X09990572>
- Berger, J. L., Addis, M. E., Reilly, E. D., Syzdek, M. R., & Green, J. D. (2012). Effects of gender, diagnostic labels, and causal theories on willingness to report symptoms of depression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 31*, 439–457. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2012.31.5.439>
- Blazina, C., Cordova, M. A., Pisecco, S., & Settle, A. G. (2007). Gender Role Conflict Scale for Adolescents: Correlates with masculinity ideology. *Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies, 1*, 191–204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/thy.0102.191>
- Blazina, C., Eddins, R., Burrige, A., & Settle, A. G. (2007). The relationships between masculinity ideology, loneliness, and separation-individuation difficulties. *Journal of Men's Studies, 15*, 101–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1501.101>
- 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. 1–49). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. *Psychological Documents, 14*(1). (Document No. 2612)
- Brooks-Harris, J. E., Heesacker, M., & Mejia-Millan, C. (1996). Changing men's male gender-role attitudes by applying the elaboration likelihood model of attitude change. *Sex Roles, 35*, 563–580. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01548253>
- Bruch, M. A. (2002). Shyness and toughness: Unique and moderated relations with men's emotional expression. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 28–34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.49.1.28>
- Bruch, M. A. (2007). Cognitive bias in men's processing of negative social information: The role of social anxiety, toughness as a masculine role norm, and their interaction. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 31*, 273–289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10608-006-9001-5>
- Burns, S. M., & Mahalik, J. R. (2008a). Sexual functioning as a moderator of the relationship between masculinity and men's adjustment following treatment for prostate cancer. *American Journal of Men's Health, 2*, 6–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1557988307304325>
- Burns, S. M., & Mahalik, J. R. (2008b). Treatment type and emotional control as predictors of men's self-assessed physical well-being following treatment for prostate cancer. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 9*, 55–66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.9.2.55>
- Chu, J. Y., Porche, M. V., & Tolman, D. L. (2005). The Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale: Development and validation of a new measure for boys. *Men and Masculinities, 8*, 93–115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1097184X03257453>
- Clarkson, J. (2006). "Everyday Joe" versus "pissy, bitchy, queens": Gay masculinity on Straight Acting.com. *Journal of Men's Studies, 14*, 191–207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1402.191>
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19*, 829–859. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 98–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98>
- Dodson, T. A., & Borders, L. D. (2006). Men in traditional and nontraditional careers: Gender role attitudes, gender role conflict, and job satisfaction. *Career Development Quarterly, 54*, 283–296. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2006.tb00194.x>
- Doss, B. D., & Hopkins, J. R. (1998). The Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale: Validation from three cultural perspectives. *Sex Roles, 38*, 719–741. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018816929544>
- Easton, S. D., Renner, L. M., & O'Leary, P. (2013). Suicide attempts among men with histories of child sexual abuse: Examining abuse

- severity, mental health, and masculine norms. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37, 380–387. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.11.007>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/01454455870112001>
- Epstein, M., & Ward, L. M. (2011). Exploring parent–adolescent communication about gender: Results from adolescent and emerging adult samples. *Sex Roles*, 65, 108–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-9975-7>
- Estrada, F., Rigali-Oiler, M., Arciniega, G. M., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2011). Machismo and Mexican American men: An empirical understanding using a gay sample. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58, 358–367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023122>
- Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1998). New directions for the study of gender role attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 371–384. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00163.x>
- Fischer, A. R., Tokar, D. M., Good, G. E., & Snell, A. F. (1998). More on the structure of male role norms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 135–155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00147.x>
- Glass, J., & Owen, J. (2010). Latino father: The relationship among machismo, acculturation, ethnic identity, and paternal involvement. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11, 251–261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021477>
- Gordon, D. M., Hawes, S. W., Perez-Cabello, M. A., Brabham-Hollis, T., Lanza, A. S., & Dyson, W. J. (2013). Examining masculine norms and peer support within a sample of incarcerated African-American males. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14, 59–64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028780>
- Gordon, D. M., Hawes, S. W., Reid, A. E., Callands, T. A., Magriples, U., Divney, A., . . . Kershaw, T. (2013). The many faces of manhood: Examining masculine norms and health behaviors of young fathers across race. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 7, 394–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1557988313476540>
- Gradman, T. J. (1990). *Does work make the man: Masculine identity and work identity during the transition to retirement*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Graef, S. T., Tokar, D. M., & Kaut, K. P. (2010). Relations of masculinity ideology, conformity to masculine role norms, and masculine gender role conflict to men's attitudes toward and willingness to seek career counseling. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11, 319–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019383>
- Hacker, H. M. (1951). Women as a minority group. *Social Forces*, 30, 60–69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2571742>
- Hacker, H. M. (1957). The new burdens of masculinity. *Marriage and Family Living*, 19, 227–233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/348873>
- Hamilton, C. J., & Mahalik, J. R. (2009). Minority stress, masculinity, and social norms predicting gay men's health risk behaviors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56, 132–141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014440>
- Hammer, J. H., & Good, G. E. (2010). Positive psychology: An empirical examination of beneficial aspects of endorsement of masculine norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11, 303–318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019056>
- Hammer, J. H., Vogel, D. L., & Heimerdinger-Edwards, S. R. (2013). Men's help seeking: Examination of differences across community size, education, and income. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14, 65–75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026813>
- Hartley, R. L. (1959). Sex-role pressures and the socialization of the male child. *Psychological Reports*, 5, 457–468. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1959.5.h.457>
- Hearn, J. (1996). Is masculinity dead? A critical account of the concepts of masculinity and masculinities. In M. Mac an Ghail (Ed.), *Understanding masculinities: Social relations and cultural arenas* (pp. 202–207). Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Herek, G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 19–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00051>
- Hogue, M., Yoder, J. D., & Singleton, S. B. (2007). The gender wage gap: An explanation of men's elevated wage entitlement. *Sex Roles*, 56, 573–579. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9199-z>
- Hsu, K., & Iwamoto, D. K. (2014). Testing for measurement invariance in the Conformity to Masculine Norms-46 across White and Asian American college men: Development and validity of the CMNI-29. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15, 397–406. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0034548>
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Iazzo, A. (1983). The construction and validation of Attitudes Toward Men Scale. *Psychological Record*, 33, 371–378.
- Iwamoto, D. K., Gordon, D., Oliveros, A., Perez-Cabello, A., Brabham, T., Lanza, S., & Dyson, W. (2012). The role of masculine norms and informal support on mental health in incarcerated men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13, 283–293. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025522>
- Iwamoto, D. K., Liao, L., & Liu, W. M. (2010). Masculine norms, avoidant coping, Asian values, and depression among Asian American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11, 15–24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017874>
- 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 & Masculinity*, 3, 97–106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.97>
- Jakupcak, M., Tull, M. T., & Roemer, L. (2005). Masculinity, shame, and fear of emotions as predictors of men's expressions of anger and hostility. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6, 275–284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.6.4.275>
- Janey, B. A., Janey, N. V., Goncherova, N., & Savchenko, V. (2006). Masculinity ideology in Russian society: Factor structure and validity using the Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 14, 93–108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1401.93>
- Janey, B. A., Kim, T., Jampolskaja, T., Khuda, A., Larionov, A., Maksimenko, A., . . . Shipilova, A. (2013). Development of the Russian Male Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14, 138–147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028159>
- Janey, B. A., Plitin, S., Muse-Burke, J. L., & Vovk, V. M. (2009). Masculinity in post-Soviet Ukraine: An exploratory factor analysis. *Culture, Society & Masculinities*, 1, 137–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/csm.0102.137>
- Kilianski, S. E. (2003). Explaining heterosexual men's attitudes toward women and gay men: The theory of exclusively masculine identity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4, 37–56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.37>
- Kimmel, M. S. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. New York: Free Press.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2003). Globalization and its mal(e)contents: The gendered moral and political economy of terrorism. *International Sociology*, 18, 603–620. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/02685809030183008>
- LaPollo, A. B., Bond, L., & Lauby, J. L. (2014). Hypermasculinity and sexual risk among Black and White men who have sex with men and women. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 8, 362–372. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1557988313512861>
- Lease, S. H., Çiftçi, A., Demir, A., & Boyraz, G. (2009). Structural validity of Turkish version of the Gender Role Conflict Scale and Male Role

- Norms Scale. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10, 273–287. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017044>
- Lease, S. H., Montes, S. H., Baggett, L. R., Sawyer, R. J., Fleming-Norwood, K. M., Hampton, A. B., . . . Boyraz, G. (2013). A cross-cultural exploration of masculinity and relationships in men from Turkey, Norway, and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44, 84–105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022111432293>
- Levant, R. F. (1995). Toward the reconstruction of masculinity. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 229–251). New York: Basic Books.
- Levant, R. F. (2011). Research in the psychology of men and masculinity using the gender role strain paradigm as a framework. *American Psychologist*, 66, 765–776. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025034>
- Levant, R. F., & 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). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Levant, R. F., Good, G. E., Cook, S. W., O'Neil, J. M., Smalley, K. B., Owen, K., & Richmond, K. (2006). The Normative Male Alexithymia Scale: Measurement of a gender-linked syndrome. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 7, 212–224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.7.4.212>
- Levant, R. F., Graef, S. T., Smalley, K. B., Williams, C., & McMillan, N. (2008). The evaluation of the psychometric properties of the Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent (MRNI-A). *Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies*, 2, 46–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/thy.0201.46>
- Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., & Rankin, T. J. (2013). Male Role Norms Inventory–Short Form (MRNI-SF): Development, confirmatory factor analytic investigation of structure, and measurement invariance across gender. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60, 228–238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031545>
- Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L. S., Celentano, E., Cozza, T. M., Hill, S., MacEachern, M., . . . Schmedeker, J. (1992). The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 14, 325–337.
- Levant, R. F., & Majors, R. G. (1997). An investigation into variations of the construction of the male role among young African American and European American women and men. *Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health*, 2, 33–43.
- Levant, R. F., Rankin, T. J., Williams, C., Hasan, N. T., & Smalley, K. B. (2010). Evaluation of the factor structure and construct validity of scores on the Male Role Norms Inventory—Revised (MRNI-R). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11, 25–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017637>
- Levant, R. F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the Male Role Norms Inventory. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 15, 130–146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1502.130>
- Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Cook, S., House, A. T., & Aupont, M. (2007). The Femininity Ideology Scale: Factor structure, reliability, convergent and discriminant validity, and social contextual variation. *Sex Roles*, 57, 373–383. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9258-5>
- Levant, R. F., Rogers, B. K., Cruickshank, B., Rankin, T. J., Kurtz, B. A., Rummell, C. M., . . . Colbow, A. (2012). Exploratory factor analysis and construct validity of the Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-revised (MRNI-A-r). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13, 354–366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029102>
- Levant, R. F., Smalley, K. B., Aupont, M., House, A., Richmond, K., & Noronha, D. (2007). Initial validation of the Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R). *Journal of Men's Studies*, 15, 83–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1501.83>
- Levant, R. F., & Wimer, D. J. (2014). Masculinity constructs as protective buffers and risk factors for men's health. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 8, 110–120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1557988313494408>
- Levant, R. F., Wimer, D. J., & Williams, C. M. (2011). An evaluation of the Health Behavior Inventory-20 (HBI-20) and its relationships to masculinity and attitudes toward seeking psychological help among college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 12, 26–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021014>
- Liang, C. T. H., Salcedo, J., & Miller, H. A. (2011). Perceived racism, masculinity ideologies, and gender role conflict among Latino men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 12, 201–215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020479>
- Liu, W. M. (2002). Exploring the lives of Asian American men: Racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 3, 107–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.107>
- Liu, W. M., & Iwamoto, D. K. (2007). Conformity to masculine norms, Asian values, coping strategies, peer group influences and substance use among Asian American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 8, 25–39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.8.1.25>
- Luyt, R. (2005). The Male Attitude Norms Inventory-II: A measure of masculinity ideology in South Africa. *Men and Masculinities*, 8, 208–229. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1097184X04264631>
- Luyt, R., & Foster, D. (2001). Hegemonic masculine conceptualization in gang culture. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 31(3), 1–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/008124630103100301>
- Magovcevic, M., & Addis, M. E. (2008). The Masculine Depression Scale: Development and psychometric evaluation. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9, 117–132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.9.3.117>
- Mahalik, J. R., Burns, S. M., & Syzdek, M. (2007). Masculinity and perceived normative health behaviors as predictors of men's health behaviors. *Social Science & Medicine*, 64, 2201–2209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.02.035>
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4, 3–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3>
- Mahalik, J. R., Talmadge, W. T., Locke, B. D., & Scott, R. P. J. (2005). Using the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory to work with men in a clinical setting. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 61, 661–674. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20101>
- Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2001). Psychological correlates of attitudes toward men. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 135, 335–351. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223980109603703>
- Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2003). Applying a social identity paradigm to examine the relationship between men's self-esteem and their attitudes toward men and women. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143, 111–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224540309598434>
- Marcell, A. V., Eftim, S. E., Sonenstein, F. L., & Pleck, J. H. (2011). Associations of family and peer experiences with masculinity attitude trajectories at the individual and group level in adolescent and young adult males. *Men and Masculinities*, 14, 565–587. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1097184X11409363>
- McCreary, D. R., Newcomb, M. D., & Sadava, S. W. (1998). Dimensions of the male gender role: A confirmatory analysis in men and women. *Sex Roles*, 39, 81–95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018829800295>
- McCreary, D. R., Sasse, D. K., Saucier, D. M., & Dorsch, K. D. (2004). Measuring the drive for muscularity: Factorial validity of the Drive for Muscularity Scale in men and women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5, 49–58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.5.1.49>
- McCreary, D. R., Saucier, D. M., & Courtenay, W. H. (2005). The drive for muscularity and masculinity: Testing the associations among gender-role traits, behaviors, attitudes, and conflict. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6, 83–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.6.2.83>
- McDonald, R. P., & Ho, M. H. (2002). Principles and practice in reporting structural equation analyses. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 64–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.64>
- Meadows, R., & Davidson, K. (2006). Maintaining manliness in later life:

- Hegemonic masculinities and emphasized femininities. In T. M. Calasanti & K. F. Slevin (Eds.), *Age matters: Realigning feminist thinking* (pp. 295–312). New York: Routledge.
- Mirandé, A. (1997). *Hombres y machos: Masculinity and Latino culture*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Moreland, J., & Van Tuinen, M. (1978, July). *The Attitudes Toward Masculinity Transcendence Scale*. Paper presented at the Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Morgan, E. M., Steiner, M. G., & Thompson, E. M. (2010). Processes of sexual orientation questioning among heterosexual men. *Men and Masculinities, 12*, 425–443. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1097184X08322630>
- Morrison, J. A. (2012). Masculinity moderates the relationships between symptoms of PTSD and cardiac-related health behaviors in male veterans. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*, 158–165. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024186>
- Ojeda, L., & Liang, C. T. H. (2014). Ethnocultural and gendered determinants of coping among Mexican American adolescent men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*, 296–304. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033293>
- Ojeda, L., & Piña-Watson, B. (2014). Caballerismo may protect against the role of machismo on Mexican day laborers' self-esteem. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*, 288–295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033450>
- Ojeda, L., Rosales, R., & Good, G. E. (2008). Socioeconomic status and cultural predictors of male role attitudes among Mexican American men: ¿Son más machos? *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 9*, 133–138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.9.3.133>
- O'Neil, J. M. (2012). The psychology of men. In E. Altmaier & J. Hansen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 375–408). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Oransky, M., & Fisher, C. (2009). The development and validation of the Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*, 57–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013612>
- Owen, J. (2011). Assessing the factor structures of the 55- and 22-item versions of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *American Journal of Men's Health, 5*, 118–128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1557988310363817>
- Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2009). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory and development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*, 175–189. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015481>
- Parent, M. C., & Smiler, A. P. (2013). Metric invariance of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 among women and men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*, 324–328. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027642>
- 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., & O'Donnell, L. N. (2001). Gender attitudes and health risk behaviors in urban African American and Latino early adolescents. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 5*, 265–272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1013084923217>
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993a). Masculinity ideology and its correlates. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in social psychology* (pp. 85–110). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993b). Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*(3), 11–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01166.x>
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1994). Attitudes toward male roles among adolescent males: A discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles, 30*, 481–501. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01420798>
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Ruckdeschel, D. E. (2007). An overview of coefficient alpha and a reliability matrix for estimating adequacy of internal consistency coefficients with psychological research measures. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 105*, 997–1014.
- Poteat, V. P., Kimmel, M. S., & Wilchins, R. (2011). The moderating effects of support for violence beliefs on masculine norms, aggression, and homophobic behavior during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*, 434–447. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00682.x>
- Reardon, C. A., & Govender, K. (2013). Masculinities, cultural worldviews and risk perceptions among South African adolescent learners. *Journal of Risk Research, 16*, 753–770. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2012.737823>
- Rice, S. M., Fallon, B. J., Aucote, H. M., & Möller-Leimkühler, A. M. (2013). Development and preliminary validation of the Male Depression Risk Scale: Furthering the assessment of depression in men. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 151*, 950–958. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.08.013>
- Rivera-Ramos, Z. A., & Buki, L. P. (2011). I will no longer be a man! Manliness and prostate cancer screenings among Latino men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*, 13–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020624>
- Roberts-Douglass, K., & Curtis-Boles, H. (2013). Exploring positive masculinity development in African American men: A retrospective study. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*, 7–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029662>
- Rochlen, A. B., McKelley, R. A., Suizzo, M., & Scaringi, V. (2008). Predictors of relationship satisfaction, psychological well-being, and life satisfaction among stay-at-home fathers. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 9*, 17–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.9.1.17>
- Saez, P. A., Casado, A., & Wade, J. C. (2009). Factors influencing masculinity ideology among Latino men. *Journal of Men's Studies, 17*, 116–128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1702.116>
- Santana, M. C., Raj, A., Decker, M. R., La Marche, A., & Silverman, J. G. (2006). Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate partner violence perpetration among young adult men. *Journal of Urban Health, 83*, 575–585. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11524-006-9061-6>
- Skolnick, A. J., Bascom, K. L., & Wilson, D. T. (2013). Gender role expectations of disgust: Men are low and women are high. *Sex Roles, 69*, 72–88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0279-y>
- Slaatten, H., Anderssen, N., & Hetland, J. (2014). Endorsement of male role norms and gay-related name-calling. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*, 335–345. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033734>
- Smiler, A. P. (2004). Thirty years after the discovery of gender: Psychological concepts and measures of masculinity. *Sex Roles, 50*, 15–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000011069.02279.4c>
- Smiler, A. P. (2006a). Conforming to masculinity norms: Evidence for validity among adult men and women. *Sex Roles, 54*, 767–775. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9045-8>
- Smiler, A. P. (2006b). Living the image: A quantitative approach to delineating masculinities. *Sex Roles, 55*, 621–632. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9118-8>
- Smiler, A. P. (2008). "I wanted to get to know her better": Adolescent boys' dating motives, masculinity ideology, and sexual behavior. *Journal of Adolescence, 31*, 17–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.03.006>
- Smiler, A. P., & Epstein, M. (2010). Measuring gender: Options and issues. In J. C. Chrisler & D. R. McCreary (Eds.), *Handbook of gender research in psychology: Gender research in general and experimental psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 133–157). New York: Springer Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1465-1_7
- Snell, W. E., Jr. (1989). Development and validation of the Masculine Behavior Scale: A measure of behaviors stereotypically attributed to

- males and females. *Sex Roles*, 21, 749–767. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00289806>
- Snell, W. E., Jr., Belk, S. S., & Hawkins, R. C. (1986). The Stereotypes About Male Sexuality Scale (SAMSS): Components, correlates, antecedents, consequences and counselor bias. *Social and Behavioral Sciences Documents*, 16(10). (Manuscript No. 2746)
- Sobiraji, S., Rigotti, T., Weseler, D., & Mohr, G. (2014). Masculinity ideology and psychological strain: Considering men's social stressors in female-dominated occupations. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035706>
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Steinfeldt, J. A., Vaughan, E. L., LaFollette, J. R., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2012). Bullying among adolescent football players: Role of masculinity and moral atmosphere. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13, 340–353. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026645>
- Syzdek, M. R., & Addis, M. E. (2010). Adherence to masculine norms and attributional processes predict depressive symptoms in recent unemployed men. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 34, 533–543. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10608-009-9290-6>
- Tager, D., & Good, G. E. (2005). Italian and American masculinities: A comparison of masculine gender role norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6, 264–274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.6.4.264>
- Tager, D., Good, G. E., & Brammer, S. (2010). "Walking over 'em": An exploration of relations between emotional dysregulation, masculine norms, and intimate partner abuse in a clinical sample of men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11, 233–239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017636>
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Barnes, K. (2013). Meaning of sexual performance among men with and without erectile dysfunction. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14, 271–280. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029104>
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., Barnes, K., & Futterman, A. (2014, November). *The Older Men Masculinity Ideology Scale: Factor structure, reliability, and construct validity*. Paper presented at the annual scientific meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, Washington, DC.
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Cracco, E. J. (2008). Sexual aggression in bars: What college men can normalize. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 16, 82–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1601.82>
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., Grisanti, C., & Pleck, J. H. (1985). Attitudes toward the male role and their correlates. *Sex Roles*, 13, 413–427. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00287952>
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male norms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29, 531–543. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000276486029005003>
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Pleck, J. H. (1995). Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 129–163). New York: Basic Books.
- Thompson E. H., Jr., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles*, 27, 573–607. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02651094>
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Whearty, P. M. (2004). Older men's social participation: The importance of masculinity ideology. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 13, 5–24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1301.5>
- Wade, J. C. (2008). Masculinity ideology, male reference group identity dependence, and African American men's health related attitudes and behaviors. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9, 5–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.9.1.5>
- Wade, J. C., & Brittan-Powell, C. S. (2000). Male reference group identity dependence: Support for construct validity. *Sex Roles*, 43, 323–340. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1026695209399>
- Wade, J. C., & Donis, E. (2007). Masculinity ideology, male identity, and romantic relationship quality among heterosexual and gay men. *Sex Roles*, 57, 775–786. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9303-4>
- Walker, D. F., Tokar, D. M., & Fischer, A. R. (2000). What are eight popular masculinity-related instruments measuring? Underlying dimensions and their relations to sociosexuality. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 1, 98–108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.1.2.98>
- Weinstein, M. D., Smith, M. D., & Wiesenhal, D. L. (1995). Masculinity and hockey violence. *Sex Roles*, 33, 831–847. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01544782>
- Whorley, M. R., & Addis, M. E. (2006). Ten years of psychological research on men and masculinity in the United States: Dominant methodological trends. *Sex Roles*, 55, 649–658. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9120-1>
- Wilkinson, W. W. (2004). Authoritarian hegemony, dimensions of masculinity, and male antigay attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5, 121–131.
- Wong, Y. J., Horn, A. J., Gomory, M. G., & Ramos, E. (2013). Measure of Men's Perceived Inexpressiveness Norms (M2PIN): Scale development and psychometric properties. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14, 288–299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029244>
- Wong, Y. J., Owen, J., & Shea, M. (2012). A latent class regression analysis of men's conformity to masculine norms and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59, 176–183. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026206>
- Wong, Y. J., Shea, M., LaFollette, J. R., Hickman, S. J., Cruz, N., & Boghokian, T. (2011). The Inventory of Subjective Masculinity Experiences: Development and psychometric properties. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 19, 236–255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1903.236>
- Wong, Y. J., Steinfeldt, J. A., Speight, Q. L., & Hickman, S. J. (2010). Content analysis of *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* (2000–2008). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11, 170–181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019133>

(Appendix follows)

Appendix
Description of Masculinity Ideology Measures

Scale/author(s)	Target population	Number of items	Items may focus on women	Type	Focus and generation	M (SD)	Range	Reliability ^a	Subscales
1. Attitudes Toward Men Scale (Iazzo, 1983)	Adults	32	Yes	Likert 4-point: <i>Disagree strongly to agree strongly</i>	Domains of men's lives; 1st generation	89.92 (9.56)	46–230	$\alpha = .79$	4
Subscales									
Marriage and parenthood		13				37.62 (6.55)	13–52 ^b	$\alpha = .74^b$	
Work		4				7.57 (1.62)	4–16	$\alpha = .81$	
Sexuality		7				22.48 (3.67)	7–28	$\alpha = .76$	
Physical and personal attributes		8				22.62 (3.74)	8–32	$\alpha = .72$	
2. Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon & Juni, 1984)	Adults	110	No	Likert 7-point: <i>Strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>	Masculinity properties and guidelines; 1st generation	—	—	$\alpha = .95$	7
Subscales									
Avoiding femininity		16						$\alpha = .87$	
Concealing emotions		16						$\alpha = .84$	
The breadwinner		15						$\alpha = .77$	
Admired and respected		16						$\alpha = .81$	
Toughness		16						$\alpha = .79$	
The male machine		16						$\alpha = .77$	
Violence and adventure		15						$\alpha = .79$	
2a. BMS Short Form (Brannon & Juni, 1984; Thompson, Grisanti, & Pleck, 1985)	Adults	58	No	Likert 7-point	Masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	3.94 (0.66) ^c	1–7	$\alpha = .90$	4
Subscales									
No sissy stuff		17				3.88 (0.86) ^c	1–7	$\alpha = .81^c$	
Big wheel		17				3.82 (0.75)	1–7	$\alpha = .74$	
Study oak		16				4.09 (0.83)	1–7	$\alpha = .80$	
Give 'em hell		8				4.29 (1.03)	1–7	$\alpha = .67$	
3. Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson & Pleck, 1986)	Adults	26	No	Likert 7-point: <i>Strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>	Masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	3.99 (0.73)	1–7	$\alpha = .86$	3
Subscales									
Status		11				3.90 (0.99)	1–7	$\alpha = .81$	
Toughness		8				4.29 (1.09)	1–7	$\alpha = .74$	
Antifemininity		7				3.57 (1.08)	1–7	$\alpha = .76$	
3a. Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson & Barnes, 2013)	Adults	12	No	Likert 7-point	Masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	3.72 (0.76)	1–7	$\alpha = .76$	0
3b. Masculinity Ideology Scale-21 (Fischer & Good, 1998; Fischer, Tokar, Good, & Snell, 1998)	Adults	21	No	Likert 7-point	Masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	—	—	$\alpha = .86$	4

(Appendix continues)

Appendix (continued)

Scale/author(s)	Target population	Number of items	Items may focus on women	Type	Focus and generation	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Range	Reliability ^a	Subscales
Subscales									
Status/rationality		6				4.00 (1.14)	1-7	$\alpha = .75$	
Antifemininity		7				3.60 (1.09)	1-7	$\alpha = .78$	
Tough image		5				3.66 (1.12)	1-7	$\alpha = .73$	
Violent toughness		3				3.85 (1.33)	1-7	$\alpha = .71$	
4. Male Role Norms Inventory (Levant & Fischer, 1998; Levant et al., 1992)	Adults	57	Yes	Likert 7-point: <i>Strongly disagree</i> to <i>strongly agree</i>	Cultural script and masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	—	—	$\alpha = .84^d$	8
Subscales									
Avoidance of femininity		7				—	—	$\alpha = .77^d$	
Restricted emotionality		7				—	—	$\alpha = .75$	
Achievement/status		7				—	—	$\alpha = .67$	
Aggression		5				—	—	$\alpha = .52$	
Self-reliance		7				—	—	$\alpha = .54$	
Rejection of homosexuals		4				—	—	$\alpha = .54$	
Attitudes toward sex		8				—	—	$\alpha = .69$	
Nontraditional		12				—	—	$\alpha = .57$	
4a. MRNI-Revised-revised (Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley, 2010; Levant, Smalley, et al., 2007)	Adults	39	No	Likert 7-point	Cultural script and masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	3.88 (1.07) ^e	1-7	$\alpha = .96^e$	7
Subscales									
Restricted emotionality		7				3.19 (1.18) ^e	1-7	$\alpha = .88^e$	
Self-reliance through mechanical skills		3				4.76 (1.34)	1-7	$\alpha = .85$	
Negativity toward sexual minorities		8				3.64 (1.57)	1-7	$\alpha = .92$	
Avoidance of femininity		7				4.17 (1.32)	1-7	$\alpha = .89$	
Importance of sex		3				3.80 (1.56)	1-7	$\alpha = .84$	
Toughness		4				4.92 (1.14)	1-7	$\alpha = .75$	
Dominance		7				3.44 (1.28)	1-7	$\alpha = .88$	
4b. MRNI-Short Form (Levant, Hall, & Rankin, 2013)	Adults	21	No	Likert 7-point	Cultural script and masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	3.74 (1.05) ^e	1-7	$\alpha = .92^e$	7
Subscales									
Restricted emotionality		3				2.92 (1.22) ^e	1-7	$\alpha = .83^e$	
Self-reliance through mechanical skills		3				4.52 (1.36)	1-7	$\alpha = .86$	
Negativity toward sexual minorities		3				3.18 (1.57)	1-7	$\alpha = .88$	
Avoidance of femininity		3				4.24 (1.52)	1-7	$\alpha = .90$	
Importance of sex		3				3.76 (1.51)	1-7	$\alpha = .83$	
Toughness		3				4.68 (1.23)	1-7	$\alpha = .79$	
Dominance		3				3.05 (1.39)	1-7	$\alpha = .87$	
5. Male Role Attitudes Scale (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993a, 1994)	Adolescents	8	No	Likert 4-point: <i>Agree a lot</i> to <i>disagree a lot</i>	Masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	2.80 (0.44)	1-4	$\alpha = .56$	0

(Appendix continues)

Appendix (continued)

Scale/author(s)	Target population	Number of items	Items may focus on women	Type	Focus and generation	M (SD)	Range	Reliability ^a	Subscales
6. Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale (Doss & Hopkins, 1998)	Adults	35	No	Likert 5-point: <i>Strongly disagree</i> to <i>strongly agree</i>	Masculinity properties and guidelines; 2nd generation	Not applicable			2
Subscales (etic—common)									
Hypermasculine posturing		13				2.52 (0.59)	1–5	$\alpha = .81$	
Achievement		8				4.09 (0.54)	1–5	$\alpha = .72$	
7. Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (Mahalik et al., 2003)	Adults	94	No	Likert 4-point: <i>Strongly disagree</i> (0) to <i>strongly agree</i> (3)	Personal norms; 1st generation	134.45 (24.64) ^e	0–282	$\alpha = .94$	11
Subscales									
Winning		10				16.91 (5.10) ^e	0–30	$\alpha = .88$	
Emotional control		11				14.89 (5.66)	0–33	$\alpha = .91$	
Risk taking		10				16.58 (3.61)	0–30	$\alpha = .82$	
Violence		8				12.38 (3.96)	0–24	$\alpha = .84$	
Power over women		9				10.59 (4.46)	0–27	$\alpha = .87$	
Dominance		4				5.84 (1.88)	0–12	$\alpha = .73$	
Playboy		12				12.06 (6.05)	0–36	$\alpha = .88$	
Self-reliance		6				6.63 (2.81)	0–18	$\alpha = .85$	
Primacy of work		8				8.97 (3.28)	0–24	$\alpha = .76$	
Disdain for homosexuality		10				17.74 (6.65)	0–30	$\alpha = .90$	
Pursuit of status		6				11.85 (2.43)	0–18	$\alpha = .72$	
7a. CMNI-46 (Parent & Moradi, 2009)	Adults	46	No	Likert 4-point	Personal norms; 1st generation	66.55 (12.81)	0–138	$\alpha = .88$	9
Emotional control		6				8.65 (3.06)	0–18	$\alpha = .91$	
Winning		6				9.99 (2.98)	0–18	$\alpha = .88$	
Playboy		4				5.06 (2.86)	0–12	$\alpha = .88$	
Violence		6				10.14 (3.41)	0–18	$\alpha = .84$	
Self-reliance		5				6.19 (2.65)	0–15	$\alpha = .85$	
Risk taking		5				7.44 (2.36)	0–15	$\alpha = .82$	
Power over women		4				3.77 (1.95)	0–12	$\alpha = .87$	
Primacy of work		4				4.26 (2.04)	0–12	$\alpha = .76$	
Disdain for homosexuality		6				11.05 (4.28)	0–24	$\alpha = .90$	
7b. CMNI-11 (Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007)	Adults	11	No	Likert 4-point	Personal norms; 1st generation	12.92 (3.65)	0–33	$\theta = .64$	0
7c. CMNI-22 (Burns & Mahalik, 2008a)	Adults	22	No	Likert 4-point	Personal norms 1st generation	25.56 (5.27)	0–66	$\alpha = .70$	0
7d. CMNI-55 (Owen, 2011)	Adults	55	No	Likert 4-point	Personal norms; 1st generation	1.28 (0.26) ^e	0–3	$\alpha = .86^e$	11
Subscales									
Winning		10				1.52 (0.53) ^e	0–3	$\alpha = .82$	
Emotional control		11				1.22 (0.68)	0–3	$\alpha = .88$	
Risk taking		10				1.57 (0.56)	0–3	$\alpha = .84$	
Violence		8				1.32 (0.64)	0–3	$\alpha = .82$	
Power over women		9				0.63 (0.41)	0–3	$\alpha = .73$	
Dominance		4				1.26 (0.46)	0–3	$\alpha = .73$	
Playboy		12				1.06 (0.64)	0–3	$\alpha = .83$	
Self-reliance		6				1.21 (0.58)	0–3	$\alpha = .84$	
Primacy of work		8				1.03 (0.69)	0–3	$\alpha = .89$	

(Appendix continues)

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers. This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

Appendix (continued)

Scale/author(s)	Target population	Number of items	Items may focus on women	Type	Focus and generation	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Range	Reliability ^a	Subscales
Disdain for homosexuality		10				1.99 (0.40)	0–3	$\alpha = .70$	
Pursuit of status		6				1.26 (0.50)	0–3	$\alpha = .78$	
8. Male Attitude Norms Inventory-II (Luyt, 2005)	Adults	40	No	Likert 5-point: <i>Strongly disagree</i> to <i>strongly agree</i>	Masculinity guidelines; 2nd generation	89.07 (15.96)	40–120	$\alpha = .90$	3
Subscales									
Toughness		9				21.06 (6.15)	9–45	$\alpha = .81$	
Control		12				46.53 (6.38)	12–60	$\alpha = .82$	
Sexuality		8				21.48 (6.78)	8–45	$\alpha = .85$	
9. Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (Chu, Porche, & Tolman, 2005)	Adolescents	12	No	Likert 4-point: <i>Disagree a lot</i> to <i>agree a lot</i>	Personal norms; 2nd generation	2.05 23.98 (5.96) ^f	1–4 12–48 ^f	$\alpha = .70$	0
10. Traditional Attitudes About Men (McCreary, Saucier, & Courtenay, 2005)	Adults	5	No	4-point: See text	Personal norms; 1st generation	2.28 (0.57)	1–4	$\alpha = .75$	0
11. Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent (Levant, Graef, Smalley, Williams, & McMillan, 2008)	Adolescents	43	Yes	Likert 7-point: <i>Strongly disagree</i> to <i>strongly agree</i>	Masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	4.44 (0.76) ^e	1–7	$\alpha = .93^e$	5
Subscales									
Avoidance of femininity		8				4.70 (1.27) ^e	1–7	$\alpha = .78^e$	
Self-reliance		8				4.32 (0.74)	1–7	$\alpha = .46$	
Aggression		8				4.77 (0.97)	1–7	$\alpha = .68$	
Achievement/status		8				4.55 (0.88)	1–7	$\alpha = .60$	
Restricted emotionality		11				4.12 (0.95)	1–7	$\alpha = .72$	
11a. MRNI-A-revised (Levant et al., 2012)	Adolescents	29	No	Likert 7-point	Masculinity guidelines; 1st generation	3.99 (0.91) ^e	1–7	$\alpha = .88^e$	3
Subscales									
Emotionally detached dominance		16				3.36 (1.07) ^e	1–7	$\alpha = .87^e$	
Toughness		7				4.56 (1.07)	1–7	$\alpha = .71$	
Avoidance of femininity		6				5.00 (1.39)	1–7	$\alpha = .74$	
12. Machismo Measure (Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, & Tracey, 2008)	Adults	20	No	Likert 7-point: <i>Strongly disagree</i> to <i>strongly agree</i>	Masculinity guidelines; 2nd generation	—	—	$\alpha = .82$	2
Subscales									
Traditional machismo		10				3.2 (0.8)	1–7	$\alpha = .85$	
Caballerismo		10				6.1 (1.2)	1–7	$\alpha = .80$	

(Appendix continues)

Appendix (continued)

Scale/author(s)	Target population	Number of items	Items may focus on women	Type	Focus and generation	M (SD)	Range	Reliability ^a	Subscales
13. Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale (Oransky & Fisher, 2009)	Adolescent	27	No	Likert 4-point: <i>Strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>	Cultural script; 1st generation	Not available	27–108	$\alpha = .80$	4
Subscales									
Constant effort		7				17.95 (2.98) ^g	7–28	$\alpha = .79$	
Emotional restriction		7				16.15 (3.21)	7–28	$\alpha = .80$	
Heterosexism		8				23.79 (4.06)	8–32	$\alpha = .80$	
Social teasing		5				13.97 (2.16)	5–20	$\alpha = .61$	
14. Macho Scale (Anderson, 2012)	Adults	13	Yes	Likert 5-point: <i>Agree strongly to disagree strongly</i>	Masculinity guidelines; 2nd generation	35.99 (8.20)	13–80	$\alpha = .82$	2
Subscales									
Entitlement to sexual dominance		8				19.44 (5.38)	8–40	$\alpha = .75$	
Felt need to produce children		5				16.56 (3.95)	5–25	$\alpha = .72$	
15. Russian Male Norms Inventory (Janey et al., 2013)	Adults	36	No	Likert 4-point: <i>Completely disagree to completely agree</i>	Masculinity guidelines; 2nd generation	—	—	$\alpha = .72$	3
Subscales									
Duty/reliability		23				—	—	$\alpha = .92$	
Privileges/pleasures		9				—	—	$\alpha = .76$	
Inexpressive/impassive		4				—	—	$\alpha = .61$	
16. Measure of Men's Perceived Inexpressiveness Norms (Wong, Horn, Gomory, & Ramos, 2013)	Adults	10	No	Likert 4-point: <i>Strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>	Group norms about masculinities; 2nd generation	2.30 (0.50)	1–4	$\alpha = .89$	2
Subscales									
Descriptive norms		7				2.53 (0.60)	1–4	$\alpha = .89$	
Injunctive norms		7				2.10 (0.53)	1–4	$\alpha = .85$	

Note. Dashes in cells indicate that data were not available. BMS = Brannon Masculinity Scale; MRNI = Male Role Norms Inventory; CMNI = Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory.

^a See text for validity information. ^b Mean scores and standard deviations are from Iazzo (1983); alpha coefficients from Maltby and Day (2001). ^c Means, standard deviations, and alpha coefficients are from Thompson et al. (1985). ^d Alpha coefficients are from Levant and Fischer (1998). ^e Mean scores, standard deviations, and alpha coefficients are for men (or U.S. boys). ^f Mean score and standard deviation are from Blazina, Cordova, Pisecco, and Settle (2007). ^g Mean scores are from Steinfeldt, Vaughan, LaFollette, and Steinfeldt (2012).

Received March 5, 2014
 Revision received November 11, 2014
 Accepted November 20, 2014 ■