Masculinity Ideology in Russian Society: Factor Structure and Validity of the *Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale*

Bradley A. Janey **Natalia V. Janey**
Marywood University, Scranton, PA

Natasha Goncherova
Ulyanovsk State University
Ulyanovsk, Russia

Vladimir Savchenko
Belgorod State University
Belgorod, Russia

This study explores the factor structure and evaluates the validity of the *Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale* (Doss & Hopkins, 1998) using a sample of Russian students (N = 207) from two large public universities. Oblique rotation revealed four factors: achievement pose, emotional availability/stability, composed sexuality, and dedicated provider. Validity indicators were mixed, with achievement pose and dedicated provider demonstrating the strongest psychometric properties. Implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: masculinity ideology, Russian men, factor structure, validity, cross-cultural, etic, emic

---

The authors gratefully acknowledge Joel Stegall, Ph.D., of the Stegall Group for his help in facilitating this project. Special thanks are also extended to Ed O' Brien, Ph.D., of Marywood University, and John M. Robertson, Ph.D., in private practice in Manhattan, Kansas, for their editorial assistance and support.

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Bradley A. Janey, Marywood University, Graduate Department of Counseling and Psychology, 2300 Adams Avenue, Scranton, PA 18509. Electronic mail: janey@es.marywood.edu.

A research agenda exploring the experience of being a male in post-Soviet society is urgently needed. Many male issues investigated by Western researchers are of particular concern in Russia, such as substance abuse (Capraro, 2000; Pleck, Sonenstien, & Ku, 1993a), psychological distress (Good, Heppner, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & Wang, 1995; Good, Robertson, Fitzgerald, Stevens, & Bartels, 1996), potential for violence (Janey & Robertson, 2000; Thoreson, Shaughnessy, Cook, & More, 1993), and many forms of violence against women, including attitudes accepting of rape (Good et al., 1995; Turman, Tokar, & Fischer, 1996). For example, Russian men were significantly more likely to report more psychological violence than their American counterparts (O' Neil, Owen, Holmes, Dolgopolov, & Slastenin, 1994). In terms of overt behavior, 95% of victims of domestic violence in Russia are women, and virtually all perpetrators are men (Sillaste, 1997, as cited by Johnson, 2001). Findings of Gondolf and Shestakov (1997) further suggest that a Russian woman is two and half times more likely to be murdered by a male partner than an American woman.

Not only are Russian men a threat to the health of women, it appears they are also a threat to themselves and other men. Death due to homicide is now 20 times greater in Russia than in Western European nations (McKee & Shkolnikov, 2001) and the majority of those killed by males are males (Chervyakov, Shkolnikov, Pridemore, & McKee, 2002). According to Shkolnikov, McKee, and Leon (2001), there has been a slight moderation of the dramatic decline of life expectancy among Russian men, but death due to accidents and violence among males 15-24 years old remained 40% higher in 1998 than in 1991. According to reviews of Eberstadt (1999) and more recently McKee and Shkolnikov (2001), external causes of mortality remain three times higher among Russian men than in less developed countries such as Mexico and Venezuela.

Shkolnikov et al. (2001) argue that a substantial percentage of such deaths are the result of substance abuse. In a later study testing the relationship between alcohol consumption and sudden death due to cardiovascular disease, Skolnikov, McKee, Chervyakov, and Kyrianov (2002) found that more than half of men dying from external causes (i.e., accident or interpersonal violence) had medium or higher levels of intoxication. According to Chervykov et al. (2002), 80% of men convicted of murder were intoxicated, as were a large percentage of victims.

Alcohol may also play a role in the unusually high rate of suicide among Russian men. Though no studies in Russia have tested this relationship, findings in other countries suggest a relationship exists (see Foster, 2001). Such a finding is consistent with an unexpected drop in suicide during the anti-alcohol campaign introduced by Gorbachev in 1985 (Foster, 2001). Other evidence suggests that alcoholism is the strongest single predictor of completed suicide (Beck & Steer, 1989). When social scientists consider this body of research on Russian men in light of research on similar issues among males in the West and how this research has benefited counseling practice in the United States (Andronico, 1996; Brooks & Good, 2001; Scher, Stevens, Good, & Eichenfield, 1987), the need for masculinity research in Russia becomes clear.

According to Ashwin (2000), very little attention was paid to men as men during the Soviet Union era (circa 1919-1989). During this period, greater concern was shown for *zhenskii vopros* or the woman question (Kreig, Alyoshina, & Volovich, 1993). At issue was the undermining of pre-Revolutionary patriarchal social structure (Kukhterin, 2000) in order to consolidate the power of the new communist state (Ashwin, 2000). This was accomplished by offering women paid employment and government-supported childcare (Kukhterin, 2000), while men were granted privilege in the workplace that focused energies outside the family (Kiblitskaya, 2000). Thus, the male identity was formed in relation to the state rather than to the family (Meshcherkina, 2000) as they engaged in the task of building the new communist system. Meanwhile, "the state assumed responsibility for the fulfillment of the traditional masculine roles of father and provider" (Ashwin, 2000, p. 1). According to Kukhterin (2000), Soviet-era fathers and husbands were essentially marginalized: "the state forged an alliance with the mother and child unit which it 'protected,' leaving the individual man redundant on the edge of the family" (p. 73).

Since the collapse of communism and the breakup of the Soviet Union, Russian men have found themselves in the precarious position of suddenly being responsible for filling the void left by the governmental "universal and exclusive father" (Kukhterin, 2000, p. 71). This represents a formidable challenge for contemporary Russian men. They are confronted with greater demands for family participation in an economic climate that requires them to work twice as hard as men from previous generations (Kukhterin, 2000). Because of a social system that discouraged initiative and autonomy (Kiblitskaya, 2000; Meshcherkina, 2000) as well as involvement in family affairs (Ashwin, 2000; Kukhterin, 2000), it appears most Russian men have been poorly prepared to meet either challenge. Evidence suggests the emergence of a "new Russian man" who is able to navigate the complexities of the emerging market economy, yet even this minority seems no more inclined toward domestic duties than their fathers (Meshcherkina, 2000).

Much has been learned about the etic and emic components of traditional masculinity in Western cultures (Brannon, 1976; Levant et al., 1992) and the variations of sub-populations (Fischer & Good, 1998). The same cannot be said about Russian society, either before or after the collapse of the communist state. Most authors would agree that Russia has been and continues to be patriarchal, but potential etic or emic components of the Russian male role have not been articulated. Nonempirical literature hints at the "feminine side" of Russian men (Krieg, Alyoshina, & Volovich, 1993), and small-sample qualitative studies also imply hypermasculine tendencies manifest in male youth *rokery* (bikers) (Pilkington, 2000) in addition to the importance of *koremilets* (breadwinning) among both younger males (Meshcherkina, 2000) and men that came of age prior to the Soviet collapse (Kiblitskaya, 2000). What is missing is exploratory research using larger samples and quantitative methods. Results could promote a broader understanding of the male role in Russia and could constitute a first step in the process of model construction.

Masculinity ideology is defined as the "endorsement and internalization of cultural belief systems about masculinity and male gender, rooted in the structural relationship between the two sexes" (Pleck, Sonenstien, & Ku, 1993a, p. 88). This is the social constructionist perspective on masculinity and the male role, which assumes gender roles are social constructions that vary across societies and historical eras (Kimmel & Messner, 1989). Research testing this variability has proceeded on two fronts. One approach has used quantitative procedures to investigate possible differing structures of masculinity ideology. These studies have been limited to males in America (Fischer, Tokar, Good, & Snell, 1998; Doss & Hopkins, 1998), African Americans and Chileans (Doss & Hopkins, 1998), and men in South Korea (Janey & Lee, 2002). Few studies have been conducted that investigate potentially differing structural aspects of masculinity ideology in any of the former Soviet Republics, including Russia.

A second approach has involved attempts to place cultures on a continuum between liberal and traditional beliefs using instruments presumed to tap into universal etic components of the male role in patriarchal societies (Levant, Wu, & Fischer, 1996). This approach has been used on such diverse samples as African Americans (Levant & Majors, 1997), comparisons of dwellers of Northern regions and the American south (Levant, Majors, & Kelly, 1998), men and women in China (Levant, Wu, & Fischer, 1996), and more recently Russia (Levant et al., 2003). There is credible evidence suggesting a convergence of masculine ideals among male-dominated societies supporting this approach (see Gilmore, 1990). Yet Gibbons, Hamby, & Dennis (1997) suggest this procedure is less than ideal since it risks the imposition of pseudoetics, which might not in fact exist. Perhaps more problematic in cross-cultural research would be the omission of emic, culturally specific components of the male role that are presumed to exist in the culture being investigated (Kimmel & Messner, 1989).

An alternative course of action would seem to be utilizing instruments validated using the population for which they were designed. When no such assessment tool exists, as is the case with Russian culture, we propose a workable compromise: employing an instrument that has proven itself to be a valid and reliable measure of masculinity ideology and demonstrates the capacity to identify unique emic components across more than one culture. The *Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale* (MMIS: Doss & Hopkins, 1998) would seem to fit this description. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to expand our understanding of masculinity ideology by exploring emic components of the former Soviet Republic of Russia and to take an opportunity to test construct validity of the MMIS when used with a sample of Russian men. To these ends, this study was guided by the following hypotheses: principle component analyses of the MMIS will reveal emic components of masculinity ideology that are unique to Russian society. In terms of demonstrating reliability and validity, it is hypothesized that derived factors will positively correlate with the *Male Role Attitudes Scale* (MRAS: Pleck et al., 1993a, 1993b), subscales of the *Male Role Norms Scale* (MRNS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986), while not demonstrating significant correlations to measures of social desirability.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics

Age (Mean)		20.22
Religion		
	% Russian Orthodox	70
	% Catholic	2
	% Protestant	1
	% Muslim	5.8
	% Jewish	15.9
	% Other	4.3
Marital status		
	% Single	86
	% Married	8.6
	% Divorced	3.1
	% Separated	2.3
Year in college		
	% First year	30
	% Second year	22.7
	% Third year	8.2
	% Forth year	30.4
	% Fifth year or greater	7.7
College major (*f*)		
	Technical	64
	Humanities	68
	Arts	16
	Business	18
	Engineering	14
	Other	25
Family of origin monthly income (Rubles)		
	% 1,200 or less	12
	% 1,200-2,500	22
	% 2,500-5,000	32
	% 5,000-10,000	29
	% 10,000 or more	5

METHOD

SAMPLE

Data were collected from two public universities located in Ulyanovsk ($n = 128$) and Belgorod ($n = 83$), Russia. Both cities have the notable advantages of being somewhat isolated from the social and political influences of the more cosmopolitan Moscow region and having populations that are predominately ethnic Russian.

The sample was composed of 211 male graduate and undergraduate students. All participants were volunteers and completed the study either as part of course requirements (Ulyanovsk) or for extra credit (Belgorod). The age of participants ranged from 17 to 50 (M = 20.22, SD = 3.75). Responses on the MMIS from both samples were compared and combined since no significant differences were found. Additional data describing the Russian sample are listed in Table 1.

Procedure

This study was briefly described by the second investigator to participants in classrooms with the following statement, spoken in Russian:

> Thank you very much for your help in conducting this study. We are exploring the roles that men are expected to play in Russian society, and we are very interested in your opinions. Please complete the questionnaire according to the instructions on the cover page. It is important that this survey remain anonymous, so please do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire. Again, we sincerely appreciate your cooperation.

The surveys were then sealed in envelopes and dropped by participants into a large box after completion to assure anonymity. Data were analyzed using SPSS v.11.0.

Measures

Survey materials contained the following scales, which were counterbalanced in four forms to control for order effects. In each form, demographic data were placed last.

Male Role Norms Scale. The *Male Role Norms Scale* is a widely used measure designed to assess the endorsement of masculinity-related norms. It is a 26-item scale that was derived from the *Brannon Masculinity Scale* (Brannon & Juni, 1984), which is theoretically based on Brannon's "Blueprint for Manhood" (Brannon, 1976). Principal-component solutions indicated a three-factor solution of toughness, antifemininity, and status (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). Reported internal reliability estimates ranged from .74 to .81. In the present study, alphas were somewhat lower, ranging from .67 for status to .55 and .49 for toughness and antifemininity, respectively. The MRNS was scored on a five-point Likert scale with 1 being anchored at "strongly disagree" and 5 at "strongly agree." Higher scores indicate higher levels of endorsement of traditional masculinity.

Male Role Attitudes Scale. The *Male Role Attitudes Scale* (Pleck et al., 1993a) is a global measure of masculinity ideology containing eight items. Scoring and interpretation procedures are identical to the MRAS. Previous research indicated an internal reliability estimate of .56, and the alpha coefficient found in the present study was .38.

Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale. The MMIS is a 35-item scale designed to assess masculinity in a manner comparable to the MRNS. The empirical and non-empirical masculinity literature from which items were derived included non-Anglo sources (for a complete review of sources, see Doss & Hopkins, 1998). Principal-component analysis from the original study used samples from Chilean, African-American, and Anglo-American cultures. Results revealed common etic components of hypermasculine posturing and achievement. Alpha coefficients for equal-*n* samples were .81 and .72, respectively. Emic components for the Chilean sample were toughness, (.59) pose (.58), and responsibility (.48). The only emic components in the African-American and Anglo-American samples were sexual responsibility (.43) and Sensitivity (.70), respectively.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. The 13-item, long form of the *Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale* (SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) was used to test for cultural differences in social desirability and to examine divergent validity of the MMIS. The original study used the six-item short form, but since alpha coefficients seemed low (.39 -.47), it was decided a more thorough test of this variable in this sample would be desirable. Internal reliability for this sample was .87.

Translation. All measures were first translated into Russian by a Russian graduate student in an English language graduate program. Back translation (Brislin, 1970) was performed by linguists fluent in both Russian and English. Difficult-to-translate items were translated with input from the principal investigators. The majority of items (72%) were either word-for-word translations or those with only slight differences in sentence structure. Thirty-one percent of items were different yet retained the same general meaning. Two items proved problematic and were without identical meaning in Russian. For example, "tough" in item #12 from the MMIS translated as "durable and stoic" in Russian. The expression "When the going gets tough, the tough get going" in item #11 in the MRNS is an English expression that lacks a direct Russian equivalent. It was translated as "only the strongest can succeed and prevail."

RESULTS

A total sample of 211 males was obtained. Data were screened for outliers and cases with missing data. Four were deleted with Mahalanobis distance, which exceeded the $p < .001$ with degrees of freedom equal to the number of variables (x^2 (35) = 66.58). Five other cases had isolated missing values that were replaced with means, leaving a total sample of 207. In terms of sample size required to conduct factor analysis, Kass & Tinsley (1979) suggest five-10 subjects per variable is appropriate. Since the *Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale* (MMIS) contains 35 variables, a sample of 175 would be indicated. Thus, a sample of 207 was judged sufficient.

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS

To estimate the number of components to retain for the MMIS, a principal-component analysis was performed. Principal-component analysis is favored over other

exploratory factor analysis procedures when, as in this case, the objective is an empirical summary of the data (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). Number of components to be retained for rotation was determined according to four criteria: (a) eigenvalues greater than 1.0, (b) percentage of total variance explained by each factor, (c) Cattell's (1966) scree test, and (d) interpretability of the solution. Scree plots indicated the presence of 10 components with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, with a marked discontinuity occurring after three. Therefore, solutions that were investigated ranged from two to 10.

Correlations between components for the MMIS were large, ranging from r (207) .06 to .32, which exceeds the Tabachnik & Fidell (1996) recommendations for orthogonal rotation; thus, oblique rotation was utilized for further extractions. Components were retained if they were interpretable as a masculinity construct and had four or more items loading at .40 or higher. Solutions from five to 10 resulted in components with three or fewer items loading at the specified limit. A three component solution resulted in a reproduced correlation matrix with nearly half (46%) of residuals with absolute values > .05, suggesting the presence of another component. A four-factor solution also appeared to be more interpretable and accounted for 35.7% of the variance. It also included 29 of the 35 MMIS items with loadings of ≥ .40 and no cross loadings ≤ .40. Thus all 29 items were included for interpretation. Table 2 presents the pattern matrix for the four-factor solution. Using the pattern matrix rather than the structure matrix is recommended by Tabachnik and Fidell after oblique rotation because the loadings exclude the variance contributed by other components.

Component 1 was composed of 11 items that accounted for 13.9% of variance. This component appeared to represent a goal-oriented air of confidence, persistence, and emotional reserve. Highest-loading items were #10 ("A man should be confident in everything he does"), #12 ("To be a man, you've got to be tough"), and #21 ("Men should not cry, even when something really bad happens"). This component was labeled *achievement pose*.

The second component accounted for 11.1% of the variance and contained eight items. Five out of the eight pertained to relations with women and sexuality (Items #18, 4, 1, 34, and 8). Two others— #5,"Men should not try to solve problems by fighting" (reverse scored), and #22, "A man doesn't have to be aggressive to get what he wants out of life"—demonstrated patterns of agreement/disagreement that suggested an unwillingness to behave aggressively. Because these loaded together with the aforementioned items regarding intimate relationships with women, it was labeled *composed sexuality*.

The third and forth components contained five items each and accounted for 5.3 and 5.2 percent of the variance, respectively. The third component was labeled *emotional availability/stability* because it contained items concerning attitudes with regard to the demonstration of affection and protecting other intimates as well as displays of anger: #15 ("A man should not show affection to those he loves"), #35 ("A man should be independent and not get too attached to others"), and #13 ("Strong anger is a natural emotion for a man to show"). Since means for each item in this component reflected an accommodating attitude in terms of displays of affection and avoidance of displays of anger (except for #13, all are reverse scored) this component was labeled *emotional availability/stability*.

Table 2

MMIS Items and Pattern Matrix Loadings for Four-Factor Solution with Oblique Rotation

					Mean	SD
Factor 1–Achievement Pose (α = .77)						
10. A man should be confident in everything he does.	**.71**	.15	-.02	.00	4.03	.95
12. To be a man, you've got to be tough.	**.66**	.22	.13	.03	4.05	.8
21. Men should not cry even when something really bad happens.	**.60**	-.05	-.19	-.01	3.6	1.01
33. A man should take risks to reach his goal.	**.57**	.02	-.02	-.14	3.66	.82
28. Even when things get really difficult, a man should keep trying.	**.55**	.19	.24	.00	4.12	.87
9. Men should have a positive attitude towards life and not let things get them down.	**.49**	.29	.08	.06	4.05	.87
14. A man should have long-term goals for his life. (R)	**.48**	.15	-.11	.25	3.95	.91
7. Male friends should not show affection for each other.	**.42**	-.03	-.07	.21	3.5	.98
26. Men should be competitive.	**.41**	-.06	-.11	.29	3.09	.98
20. A man should always have a woman that he is dating.	**.40**	-.22	-.18	-.04	2.96	1.04
31. A man should have sexual intercourse as early as he can in life.	**.40**	-.28	-.28	-.05	2.6	.92
Factor 2–Composed Sexuality (α = .47)						
18. Being a virgin should not be an embarrassment to a man.	.13	**.70**	-.08	.05	3.33	.95
5. Men should not try to solve problems by fighting. (R)	-.10	**.68**	.26	.07	2.5	.99
4. A man should prove his masculinity by having sex with a lot of people.	.03	**.64**	.01	.00	3.64	.97
1. Men should always be courteous to women.	.18	**.49**	.09	.29	3.9	.86
34. For a man sexual intercourse should not be the goal of making out.	.08	**.47**	.08	.24	3.47	.9
8. A man should look for a date who has a good personality rather than one who is really good looking.	-.02	**.44**	-.08	.25	3.08	.94
22. A man doesn't have to be aggressive to get what he wants out of life.	.26	**.43**	0.11	.05	3.6	1.01
32. Showing emotion is a sign of weakness for a man. (R)	.22	**.42**	.24	-.31	3.7	.96

Table 2
MMIS Items and Pattern Matrix Loadings for Four-Factor Solution with Oblique Rotation (continued)

					Mean	SD
Factor 3–Emotional Availability/Stability (α = .41)						
15. A man should not show affection to those he loves (R).	.18	.06	**.59**	-.19	4.05	.89
35. A man should be independent and not get too attached to others. (R)	-.24	-.05	**.55**	.25	3.02	1.05
13. Strong anger is a natural emotion for a man to show.	.05	.04	**-.53**	-.06	2.64	1.09
17. Courage should not be a necessary part of being a man. (R)	.27	-.28	**.53**	.03	3.57	.98
24. A man should not always have to protect his family. (R)	.00	-.08	**.44**	.00	4.23	1.05
Factor 4–Dedicated Provider (α = .51)						
25. The best way a man can care for his family is to get the highest-paying job he can.	-.05	-.02	-.06	**.61**	2.98	1.06
27. A man should have sexual intercourse only in emotionally committed relationships.	-.13	.21	.15	**.58**	2.72	1.03
6. Providing for his family should be a man's main goal in life.	-.02	.10	.05	**.53**	3.56	.99
30. Being athletic or good at a sport should be important for a man.	.22	-.13	.19	**.44**	3.38	.98
19. Even if a man is not rich, he should try to look that way.	.13	-.3	-.03	**.40**	2.52	.92

Note. R indicates reverse scoring.

The items loading highest on the fourth component were #25 ("The best way a man can care for his family is to find the highest-paying job he can"), #27 ("A man should have sexual intercourse only in emotionally committed relationships"), and #6 ("Providing for his family should be a man's main goal in life"). Since these questions reflect commitment and a responsive attitude with regard to supplying economic resources, this component was called *dedicated provider*.

Reliability and Validity

Internal consistency estimates were .77 for *achievement pose,* .47 for *aggressive sexuality,* .41 for *emotional availability/stability, and* .51 for *dedicated provider*. Test-retest reliability measures conducted with a subset of the sample from Belgorod (n = 41) were .92 for *achievement pose,* .86 for *composed sexuality,* .73 for *emotional*

availability/stability, and .81 for *dedicated provider*. Construct validity of the MMIS was tested using the *Male Role Norms Scale* (MRNS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986) and the *Male Role Attitudes Scale* (MRAS; Pleck, Sonenstien, & Ku, 1993a). Correlations of all variables are presented in Table 3. As expected, *achievement pose* demonstrated strong positive correlations with all three components of the MRNS with values ranging from r (207) = .75 for the antifemininity scale, to r = .53 for status. *Composed sexuality* correlated moderately only with the antifemininity subscale (r = .33).

Correlations with the MRAS were somewhat lower (*achievement pose*, r = .45, *composed sexuality*, r = .01, *emotional availability/stability*, r = .27, *dedicated provider*, r = .21), with only three of the four significant. Correlations with *composed sexuality* were not significant (r = .01). Divergent validity was established using the long form of the *Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale*. Correlations with all four components (r = .00 - .12) were not significant. Thus, none of the components were significantly affected by tendencies to respond in socially desirable ways.

Table 3
Factor Score Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. SDS									
2. MRAS	.02								
3. Status	-.04	.44*							
4. Toughness	-.05	.42*	.57*						
5. Antifem.	-.07	.72*	.55*	.52*					
6. Ach. Pose	.10	.45*	.53*	.55*	.75*				
7. Comp. Sexuality	.12	.01	.12	-.01	.33*	.26			
8. Emotional A/S	-.09	.27*	.13	.04	.12	.06	.07		
9. Dedicated Provider	.00	.21*	.42*	.33*	.34*	.28*	.32*	.16*	

Note. * = < .01

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis stated that a principle component analysis of the MMIS would reveal emic components of masculinity ideology unique to Russian society. This hypothesis was supported since four components meeting the specified criteria were obtained: *achievement pose, composed sexuality, emotional availability/stability,* and *dedicated provider*. Internal consistency ratings were acceptably high for *achievement pose* but somewhat lower for the remaining three components. The second hypothesis pertaining to validity and reliability received mixed support. Test-retest measures for a portion of the sample were acceptable for all four components. Discriminate validity in terms of social desirability was also established for all four components. However, convincing evidence of convergent validity was exhibited for only two out of the four. *Achievement pose* and *dedicated provider* significantly correlated in expected directions with the MRAS, subscales of the MRNS, and the corresponding behavioral items for the MMIS. *Composed sexuality* was only weakly

correlated with the MRAS. Except for a moderate relationship to the antifemininity subscale of the MRNS, *emotional availability/stability* was unrelated to the MRAS and the other two subscales of the MRNS.

LIMITATIONS

Before interpreting the components obtained, it is necessary to discuss several limitations. The first is that it is not possible to come to any firm conclusions about the male role in Russian society using a single instrument. As is the case with any quantitative research design, results are confined to the assessments used and the questions they contain. Had other masculinity tools been used, they may have revealed components of the male role in Russian society that could differ substantially from those reported here. Also, all instruments were back translated with due care, yet there were some items that did not translate directly. It is not known how this may have influenced the interpretations and responses of the participants. In addition, these results cannot be generalized beyond young Russian men attending an urban university. This is of particular relevance for two reasons. One is prior research that indicates older men from the United States are not as rigid as their younger counterparts in their attitudes concerning the male role (Levant et al., 1992). Another is the unique distinctions drawn between rural and city dwellers in Russian society (Krieg et al., 1993).

CONCLUSIONS

With these limitations in mind, it is possible to come to some tentative conclusions about masculinity ideology themes among younger men in Russian society. Perhaps the most striking results are the *achievement pose* and *dedicated provider* components. The first seems to represent a global masculinity construct, containing items suggestive of all four of Brannon's (1976) themes. Two other items pertaining to relations with women also loaded at the specified limit, suggestive of the impregnator theme found by Gilmore (1990). More consistent with Gilmore is *dedicated provider*. Items from both components also loaded highly on the etic components found by Doss & Hopkins (1998) and the *masculine pose* and *achievement* components found in a sample of Korean men (Janey & Lee, 2002).

Because of the similarities to masculine themes from other research, it could be argued that *achievement pose* and *dedicated provider* are etic components that exist across male-dominated cultures. The long history of a patriarchal social structure in Russia would support this conclusion. However, it is also plausible that these seemingly common threads are indications of increased globalization and the spread of Western ideas about gender roles. Because of the wide variety of media available in Russia coming from the United States and other Western European nations and participants' probable access to it, this possibility cannot be discounted.

Discussion of the *composed sexuality* and *emotional availability/stability* components must be more cautious because of lower internal reliability estimates and dubious correlations with convergent validity measures. It is possible that demonstrated weak correlations with other masculinity measures are an indication of their uniqueness as emic components. It is also possible they reveal a wide gap between

what is and is not known about expectations for the male role in Russian society. However, because of the interpretability of the components, high test-retest reliability, and the exploratory nature of this study, further comment seems warranted. Taken together, both components imply masculinity in Russia means a willingness to be responsible and responsive to the physical and emotional safety needs of potential partners. Yet, because of the seemingly contradictory high loading of item #4 ("A man should prove his masculinity by having sex with a lot of people") in *composed sexuality*, the responsiveness of men from this sample appears not to include exclusivity. Considering the mean age of the participants and their largely single status, this may not be as contradictory as it first appears. This also highlights a need for future research. According to Shiraev (1999), prior to marriage, men take the active role and strive to win the affection of the female. It may be that *emotional availability/stability* and *composed sexuality* represent attitude sets that potential partners would likely view as positive, possibly facilitating successful courtship. Krieg et al. (1993) propose there is an emotional distancing and retreat into the work role that takes place after marriage and after the birth of the first child when the male is confronted with the "realities of family life," for which he has not been well prepared.

It is possible that the attitudes illustrated by these themes represent transitory intent and may go through substantial changes as the demands of family life and work increase and conflict. Cross-sectional studies testing the potential change in attitudes of Russian men from different generations would do much to speak to this question, as it has in American samples (Levant et al., 1992). Investigating generational variability would also help clarify the influence Western culture has had on the male gender role in Russian society. Testing this variability could be accomplished using the *Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale*, though further development may be required. Another potential instrument may be the *Gender Role Journey* scale designed by O'Neil, Egan, Owen, and McBride-Murry (1993), provided appropriate care is taken in translation.

Future researchers may also wish to employ the *achievement pose* component as a global measure to investigate the role that masculinity ideology plays in critical issues that Russian men and their families are facing. These might include behavioral correlates such as various forms of violence against children and women, substance abuse, and various types of emotional distress including depression and anxiety. Of particular importance may be issues relating to sexuality. According to Kon (1993), the collapse of communism led to accelerated and unchecked sexual development that has increased the risk of sexual assault and may be contributing to the looming HIV/AIDS crisis in Russia and the former Soviet republics. Considering the findings of Pleck, Sonenstien, and Ku (1993b), which suggested a link between traditional attitudes about masculinity and less condom use, similar research could shed light on gender-role attitudes that could be placing Russian men and their partners at greater risk for sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancies.

References

Andronico, M.P. (1996). *Men in groups: Insights, interventions and psychoeducational work.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ashwin, S. (2000). Gender, state and society in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. In S. Ashwin (Ed.), *Gender, state and society in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia* (pp. 1-29). London: Routledge.

Beck, A.T., & Steer, R.A. (1989). Clinical predictors of eventual suicide: A 5 to 10 year prospective study of suicide attempters. *Journal of Affect Discord, 17,* 203-209.

Bodrova, V.V. (1997). Work or family: What is more important for the contemporary woman? *Materials of the first Russian summer school on women's and gender studies, Valdai-96* (pp. 97-100). Moscow: MCGS.

Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint for manhood and what it's done for us lately. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role* (pp. 1-48). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. *Psychological Documents, 14,* 6-7.

Brislin, R. (1970). Back translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal for Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1, 185-216.*

Brooks, G.R., & Good, G.E. (2001). *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men: A comprehensive guide to settings, problems, and treatment approaches.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Capraro, R.L. (2000). Why college men drink: Alcohol, adventure, and the paradox of masculinity. *Journal of American College Health, 48(9),* 307-315.

Cattell, R.B. (1966). The scree test for number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1,* 245-276.

Chervyakov, V.V., Shkolnikov, V.M., Pridemore, W.A., & McKee, M. (2002). The changing nature of murder in Russia. *Social Science and Medicine, 55(10),* 1713-1725.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale for social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24,* 349-354.

Doss, B.D., & Hopkins, J.R. (1998). The multicultural masculinity ideology scale: Validation from three cultural perspectives. *Sex Roles, 38*(9/10), 719-741.

Eberstadt, N. (1999). Russia: Too sick to matter? *Policy Review, 95,* 3-25.

Fischer, A.R., & Good, G.E. (1998). New directions for the study of gender role attitudes: A cluster analytic investigation of masculinity ideologies. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22,* 371-384.

Fischer, A.R., Tokar, D.M., Good, G.E., & Snell, A.F. (1998). More on the structure of male role norms: Exploratory and multiple sample confirmatory analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22,* 135-155.

Foster, T. (2001). Dying for a drink. *British Medical Journal, 323*(7317), 817-819.

Gibbons, J.L., Hamby, B.A., & Dennis, W.D. (1997). Researching gender-role ideologies internationally and cross-culturally. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21,* 151-170.

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

Gondolf, E.W., & Shestakov, D. (1997). Spousal homicide in Russia versus the United States: Preliminary findings and implications. *Journal of Family Violence, 12*(1), 63-74.

Good, G.E., Heppner, M.J., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T., & Wang, L. (1995). Sexual and psychological violence: An exploratory study of predictors in college men. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 4,* 59-71.

Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., O'Neil, J.M, Fitzgerald, L.F., DeBord, K.A., Stevens, M., et al. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric properties and relations to distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42,* 3-10.

Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., & Bartels, K.M. (1996). The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 75,* 44-49.

Janey, B.A., & Robertson, J.M. (2000). Masculinity ideology as a correlate of self-reported aggression in preadolescent boys. *Journal of the Pennsylvania Counseling Association, 3*(1), 25-32.

Janey, B.A., & Lee, H.Y. (2002). Masculinity ideology in Korean society: Structure and validity using the multicultural masculinity ideology scale. *The Korean Journal of Woman Psychology, 7*(1), 83.83.

Johnson, J.E. (2001). Privatizing pain: The problem of woman battery in Russia. *NWSA Journal, 13*(3), 153-168.

Kass, R.A., & Tinsley, H.E.A. (1979). Factor analysis. *Journal of Leisure Research, 11,* 120-138.

Kiblitskaya, M. (2000). Once we were kings: Male experiences of loss of status at work in post-communist Russia. In S. Ashwin (Ed.), *Gender, state and society in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia* (pp. 90-104). London: Routledge.

Kimmel, M.S., & Messner, M.A. (1989). Introduction. In M Kimmel & M. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (pp. 1-13). New York: Macmillan.

Kreig, P.K., Alyoshina, Y.Y., & Volovich, A.S. (1993). Gender role socialization in contemporary Russia: Implications for cross-cultural research. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 17,* 389-408.

Kon, I.S. (1993). Sexuality and culture. In I. Kon & J. Riordan (Eds.), *Sex and Russian society* (pp. 15-44). London: Pleito Press.

Kukhterin, S. (2000). Fathers and patriarchs in communist and post-communist Russia. In S. Ashwin (Ed.), *Gender, state and society in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia* (pp. 71-89). London: Routledge.

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

Levant, R.F., Wu, R., & Fischer, J. (1996). Masculinity ideology: A comparison between U.S. and Chinese young men and women. *Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health, 1*(3), 207-220.

Levant, R.F., & Majors, R. (1997). An investigation into variations in the construction of the male gender role among young African American and European American women and men. *Journal of Gender, Culture and Health, 2,* 33-43.

Levant, R.F., Majors, R., & Kelly, M. (1998). Masculinity ideology among young African American and European American women and men in different regions of the United States. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health, 4,* 227-236.

Levant, R.F., Cuthbert, A., Richmond, K., Sellers, A., Matveev, A., Mitina, O., et al. (2003). Masculinity ideology among Russian and U.S. young men and women and its relationship to unhealthy lifestyle habits among young Russian men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4*(1), 26-36.

McKee, M., & Shkolnikov, V.M. (2001). Understanding the toll of premature death among men in Eastern Europe. *British Medical Journal, 323*(7320), 1051-1056.

Meshcherkina, E. (2000) "New Russian Men: Masculinity Regained?" In S. Ashwin (Ed.), *Gender, state and society in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia* (pp. 105-117), London: Routledge.

O'Neil, J.M., Egan, J., Owen, S.V., & McBride-Murry, V. (1993). The *Gender Role Journey* measure: Scale development and psychometric evaluation. *Sex Roles, 28*(3/4), 167-185.

O'Neil, J.M., Owen, S.V., Holmes, S., Dolgopolov, N., & Slastenin, V.A. (1994). Russian-American violence toward women: Cross cultural differences. Paper presented at the 102nd annual American Psychological Association convention, Los Angeles, CA.

Pleck, J.H., Sonenstien, 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., Sonenstien, F.L., & Ku, L.C. (1993b). Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 40,* 11-29.

Scher, M., Stevens, M., Good, G.E., & Eichenfield, G.A.(1987). *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with men.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Shiraev, E. (1999). Gender roles and political transformations. In B. Glad & E. Shiraev (Eds.), *The Russian transformation* (pp. 199-212). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Shkolnikov, V.M., McKee, M., & Leon, D.A. (2001). Changes in life expectancy in Russia in the mid 1990s. *Lancet, 357*(9260), 917-922.

Skolnikov, V.M., McKee, M., Chervyakov, V.V., & Kyrianov, N.A. (2002). Is the link between alcohol and cardiovascular disease among young Russian men attributable to misclassification of acute alcohol intoxication? Evidence from the city of Izhevsk. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 56*(3), 171-174.

Tabachnik, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Thompson, E.H., & Pleck, J.H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29*(5), 531-543.

Thoreson, R.W., Shaughnessy, P., Cook, S.W., & Moore, D. (1993). Behavioral and attitudinal correlates of masculinity: A national survey of male counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71,* 337-342.

Truman, D.M., Tokar, D.M., & Fischer, A.R. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: Relations to date rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating situations. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74,* 555-562.