The Turkish Translation, Reliability and Validity Study of the Hypergender Ideology Scale

Utku Beyazıt[1], Ebru Çakıcı[2]

Department of Psychology, Near East University,
NORTH CYPRUS.

[1] proz2proz@yahoo.com, [2] ebru.cakici@neu.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study is to translate Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS) to Turkish and conduct reliability and validity studies. HGIS is a measure that assesses men's and women's adherence to extremely traditional gender roles and extremely gender stereotypical attitudes. The translation of HGIS from English to Turkish was conducted, initially. 180 students attending to Near East University, Psychology Department whose mean age was 21.47±2.39 participated in the study. A socio demographic form, HGIS, Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (ATLG), Gender Hostility (GHS) and Social Desirability Subscales (SDS) of Personal and Relationship Profile (PRP) were administered to the participants. According to the results, the internal consistency of the scale was 0.88. Item-total correlations ranged between 0.18 and 0.56. Test-retest reliability coefficient was 0.94 and split halves reliability coefficient was 0.88. In the factor analysis, 20 factors with eigenvalues equal or greater than 1 were found. According to the results, the Turkish form of HGIS is a reliable and a valid scale and can be used to assess the extremely traditional gender role adherence of women and men in Turkish society.

Keywords: Hypergender ideology, traditional gender roles, HGIS, reliability, validity.

INTRODUCTION

There are distinct definitions of gender and gender related concepts. The meaning of being masculine or feminine varies from one culture to another and from one historical period to another. In a cross cultural perspective, a remarkable variety was argued to exist in social meanings of gender and sexuality (Blackwood, 2000; Muehlenhard et al., 2003). Giddens (2005), defined gender as "social expectations about behavior regarded as appropriate for the members of each sex". According to Giddens, gender refers to socially formed traits of masculinity and femininity. Bilton et al. (1996) suggested that "the term gender often refers to the socially constructed categories of masculine and feminine that are differently defined in various cultures". Gender exist in our social world, shapes how we think about ourselves, guides our interactions with others and influence our work and family life and it shows the perception of sex constructed in social life (Çelik, 2008, Zeybeoğlu, 2009).

Chodorow (1995) suggested that gender cannot be entirely seen as a construction in culture, language or politics. Chodorow (1995) suggested that gender is both a cultural and a personal construction. Thus, the terms "male" and "female" are sexual categories whereas "masculinity" and "femininity" are social and psychological categories of gender (Macionis and Plummer, 1998). There are several concepts which are linked to the term "gender".

The term "gender identity" was defined as a psychological state in which a person says "I am a man" or "I am a woman" (Macionis and Plummer, 1998, Dökmen, 2004). Money (1995) argued that gender identity is the sameness, unity, persistence or ambivalence of one's

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

individuality as male or female. Money (1995) defined gender role as "everything a person says and does to indicate to others or to the self the degree in which one is male or female or ambivalent". Schaeffer and Lamm (1995) defined gender role as "expectations regarding the proper behavior, attitudes and activities of males and females".

Giddens (1995) defined masculinity as "the characteristic forms of behavior expected of men in any culture" and femininity as "the characteristic forms of behavior expected of women in any culture". Assuming that there is just one set of traits that characterizes men in general, which defines masculinity and one set of traits for women who defines femininity is a unitary model of sexual characters. This single, unitary model such as "just like a woman", "just like a man", "women have higher verbal ability" or "men are more aggressive" was proposed to be a part of sexual ideology (Connel, 1987; Kundakçı, 2007). "An individual's internalizations of cultural belief system regarding gender role norms" was defined as gender ideology. The adherence of such traditional gender role ideology is argued to be synonymous with sexism (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002).

Connel (1987) argued that the dominance of heterosexual men and standards of masculinity such as power, superiority, authority, aggression, subordination of women, being closely connected to marriage are common at the whole society. This construction was named as "hegemonic masculinity". Precedence, authority, intimate partner violence, fearlessness, and minimal emotions, natural manifestation of fear are argued to be the correlates of hegemonic masculinty (Il'inykh, 2013; Peralta and Tuttle, 2013; Reidy et. al., 2014). However, it was argued that there is no hegemonic form of femininity. But instead there is an "emphasized feminity" which is conceptualized as being oriented to compliance with desires of men (Connel, 1987). "An individual's internalization of cultural belief systems and attitudes toward masculinity and men's roles" was defined as masculine ideology (Levant and Richmond, 2007).

The measurement of masculinity was stated to be a focus of interest recently and involve different approaches which can be divided into three: The ones addressing gender role stress, the ones addressing conformity and the ones addressing endorsement of particular beliefs about masculinity (Lusher et al., 2007). Hyper masculinity was identified as a personality dimension by Mosher and Sirkin in 1984. It was conceptualized to define males with "macho" attitudes. "Macho" defines an adherence to an extremely stereotypic male gender role. Callous sex, considering violence as manly and danger as exciting were suggested to make up hyper masculinity. Hyper masculine males were argued to involve in aggressive actions, dominate others and inhibit emotions that are attributed to "weak" ones such as empathy, caring and expressing emotions (Mosher and Sirkin, 1984, cited in Ginter 2004; Sceff, 2006). Hyper masculinity Inventory (HMI) which was developed by Mosher and Sirkin, consist 30 items that assesses these three components of hyper masculinity. Scores from the HMI were significantly correlated with self-reported drug use, aggressive behavior, dangerous driving after alcohol consumption, and delinquent behaviors during the high school years and aggressive sexual behavior. A new version of Hyper masculinity Index was developed by Peters, Nason and Turner (2007) using a new response format.

After the construction and validation of HMI, Murnen and Byrne (1991) conducted a research to determine if there was a personality dimension in females, like hyper masculinity in males. They developed a scale to identify hyper feminine women who present an extreme version of traditional female gender role. Hyper femininity Scale (HFS) which is developed by Murnen and Byrne consist 26 items that assesses the three components of hyper femininity. Hyper feminine women were argued to blame the victim for the responsibility of sexual aggression and blamed themselves when they experienced it themselves. Hyper feminine women were

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

also argued to report more traditional family attitudes. For hyper feminine women, marriage was more important than a career but it was important for a potential spouse to have an economically successful. Job competitiveness and job concern was found to be negatively related to hyper femininity (Murnen and Byrne, 1991). McKelvie and Gold (1994) suggested that the hyper feminine woman was portrayed as someone who finds it important to maintain a relationship and will manipulate men. She will tolerate coercion, and even expect it, to stay in relationship with men.

Hyper masculinity and hyper femininity were defined as two distinct gender specific personality dimensions. Both of these measurements assess adherence to extremely traditional gender roles. Hamburger et al. (1996) developed a gender-neutral measure of adherence to extremely stereotypic gender beliefs which is applicable to both women and men. It was argued that hyper masculine and hyper feminine individuals have similar, complementary in some cases, beliefs and attitudes. Thus, it was argued to be reasonable to suggest a unifying constellation of attitudes which includes both hyper masculinity and hyper femininity. This constellation was called as hypergender ideology. Ginter (2004) defined hypergenderism as a relatively new construct and may contribute to the studies about gender identity. Hamburger et al. (1996) developed The Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS) to provide a gender-neutral format to assess adherence to extremely stereotypic gender beliefs.

METHOD OF THE STUDY

The Importance of the Study

Originally, HGIS is developed in the U.S. and to the best of our knowledge this is the first study to determine the psychometric properties of HGIS outside the U.S. Another considerable subject is that the Turkish form of HGIS is one of the few studies conducted for the reliability and validity study of a scale about gender issues in Turkey and in North Cyprus. HGIS has a predictive and increased ability as it offers an understanding of the causes and correlates of these behaviors, beliefs. In research, HGIS may help education, also intervention and prevention for clinical purposes, of the risky groups. A measure such as HGIS which can reliably detect such tendencies may enhance the ability to alter behaviors among groups that are seen to be at high risk.

Aim of the Study

The aim of the present study is to conduct the Turkish adaptation of Hyper gender Ideology Scale into Turkish, to explore whether it is a convenient and an applicable device to measure hyper gender ideologies in Turkish society.

Participants

The participants in this study were students of psychology department in Near East University which is located in the north of Cyprus. 180 students participated in this study. 78.9% (n=142) of the sample were females and 21% (n=38) were male. Participants' range of age was 18 to 34. 52.2% (n=94) of the participants were between 18 and 21 years old, 42.8% (n=77) between 22 and 25 years old, 3.9% (n=7) between 26 and 29 years old and 1.1% (n=2) 30 and above. The mean age of the participants was 21.57±2.32. 32.8% (n=59) of the participants were from the north of Cyprus (Turkish Cypriots), 64.4% (n=116) of them were from Turkey and 2.8% (n=5) of them were citizens of other countries.

Instruments

In this study, participants received the following battery of instruments: Turkish version of Hyper gender Ideology Scale, Turkish version of Bem Sex Role Inventory, Turkish version

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

of Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, Turkish version of Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale – The Revised Short Version #1 and Gender Hostility and Social Desirability subscales of Turkish version of Personal and Relationship Profile. Additionally, a demographic information form was used to obtain detailed information about subjects.

Hyper gender Ideology Scale (HGIS)

HGIS was developed by Hamburger et al. in 1996 as a measure to assess extreme gender role adherence in both men and women. It has been argued that HGIS provides a gender-neutral measure to the area of research. HGIS is described as a 57 item dispositional measure. Respondents answer each item on a 6-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree). Participants indicate their responses by writing the number, to the space on the left of each item (Davis et. al, 1998).

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)

BSRI was developed by Sandra Bem, in 1974 to measure sex role orientation. Bem Sex Role Inventory, consists of 60 personality characteristics on which respondents are asked to rate themselves using a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 to 7 of how well each of 60 characteristics describe them. 20 characteristics that constitute the Femininity scale are stereotypically feminine, and 20 traits that constitute the Masculinity scale are stereotypically masculine (Hoffman et al., 2005).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

ASI was developed by Glick and Fiske in 1996 as a measure of individual difference in ambivalent sexism. The inventory consisted of two components which are suggested to be positively correlated but at the same time represent distinctive sides of sexism: Hostile Sexism (HS) and Benevolent Sexism (BS). HS and BS participants rate each item on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) scale so that higher scores indicates more sexist attitudes. For an overall ASI score raw scores are added and divided into 22 in order to obtain an average score (Glick and Fiske, 1996).

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale – The Revised Short Version #1 (ATLG)

The original version of Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men was developed by Herek in 1984, for the assessment of attitudes toward lesbian and gay men. In the present study, The Revised Short Version #1 (Herek, 1998) of ATLG Scale, which has three other versions, was used. The scale consists of 10 items. Participants rate each item on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale.

Gender Hostility Subscale (GHS) and Social Desirability Subscale (SDS) of the Personal and Relationships Profile (PRP)

The Personal and Relationship Profile was developed by Straus et al. in 1999 and was intended for research on physical violence between dating, living together or married partners. SDS subscale of PRP, which has 22 items, was used in this study. The PRP consists of 187 items that the respondents are asked to rate themselves on a 4-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) (Straus and Mouradian, 1999).

The Translation of the Hypergender Ideology Scale

The adaptation study has commenced as with the required permissions taken from Dr. Matthew Hogben who is one of the authors of the scale. The translation of the scale into Turkish, which is originally in English, was made by two translators. Afterwards, these translations were back translated into English by two independent professionals. All these

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

English to Turkish to English translations were brought together to examine the meaning differences. In the meanwhile, two independent professionals who were occupied with English language teaching and one of whose native language is English, have been consulted particularly for meaning of the items that may be considered to content idioms or a slang language in order to form a wording as fitting as possible into Turkish.

In order to explore whether the translated items could be understood clearly and exercise the applicability of the Turkish form, a pre-pilot study was carried out by applying the scale to 12 clinical psychology master degree students. After the last corrections, the Turkish form of Hyper gender Ideology Scale was obtained with translations of the original items that were agreed on.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

The study was presented to the participants as the Turkish adaptation study of Hypergender Ideology Scale. All the students completed a battery of self-report scales which all included independent but some related variables. The ethical concerns have been adjusted and anonymity was assured. The participants were also explained that they were free to admit or decline participating or free to withdraw whenever they want even after starting to respond the measurements, in addition to, they could omit the items that disturb or bother them. The scores obtained were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

RESULTS

Reliability Study

Internal Consistency

In regards with the internal consistency, Cronbach Alpha coefficient was computed. The Cronbach Alpha based on standardized items was found as $\alpha = .88$ for the overall sample. Cronbach Alpha was also computed for both genders separately which was $\alpha = .85$ for females and $\alpha = .90$ for males. This result suggests that the Turkish form of Hypergender Ideology Scale is internally consistent for both genders. In addition to Cronbach Alpha, an item total analysis was conducted to study the relationship between each individual item and the entire scale. The correlations and the significance level of each item that constitutes the scale and the total score of the scale are given below:

Table 1. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients and Significance Levels between Item and Item-Total Scores of the Turkish Form of HGIS

Item	*r*	*p*	*Item*	*r*	*p*
1	0.221	0.003*	29	0.438	0.000**
2	0.257	0.001*	30	0.138	0.065
3	0.402	0.000**	31	0.436	0.000**
4	0.228	0.002*	32	0.475	0.000**
5	0.203	0.006*	33	0.294	0.000**
6	0.447	0.000**	34	0.492	0.000**
7	0.214	0.004*	35	0.536	0.000**
8	0.258	0.000**	36	0.356	0.000**
9	0.400	0.000**	37	0.346	0.000**
10	0.491	0.000**	38	0.350	0.000**
11	0.336	0.000**	39	0.475	0.000**
12	0.359	0.000**	40	0.411	0.000**
13	0.268	0.000**	41	0.427	0.000**

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

Item	r	p	Item	r	p
14	0.403	0.000**	42	0.480	0.000**
15	0.322	0.000**	43	0.251	0.001*
16	0.274	0.000**	44	0.446	0.000**
17	0.353	0.000**	45	0.067	0.374
18	0.380	0.000**	46	0.216	0.004*
19	0.412	0.000**	47	0.427	0.000*
20	0.318	0.000**	48	0.336	0.000**
21	0.376	0.000**	49	0.396	0.000**
22	0.203	0.007*	50	0.323	0.000**
23	0.434	0.000**	51	0.343	0.000**
24	0.369	0.000**	52	0.563	0.000**
25	0.313	0.000**	53	0.373	0.000**
26	0.186	0.013*	54	0.387	0.000**
27	0.247	0.001*	55	0.314	0.000**
28	0.376	0.000**	56	0.372	0.000**
29	0.438	0.000**	57	0.218	0.003*

p‹ 0.05 * p‹ 0.001 **

The item and item-total score correlations ranged from .18 to .56. The relationship is significant for the item 26 (p ‹ 0.01) and highly significant (p ‹ 0.001) for the rest of the items except for 45 and 30. The correlations between these two items and the total score of the scale are not found to be statistically significant.

Test-Retest and Split Halves Reliability Coefficients

A test-retest procedure was performed by administering the scale to same sample twice within a certain time interval. In addition to test-retest, another reliability model to assess the reliability of the scale was conducted. The split halves method was performed by dividing the scale into two parts according to the odd and even items. The correlations between relevant set of scores, significance levels and the Cronbach Alpha coefficients are shown below.

Table 2. The Test-Retest Reliability Coefficient and Significance Level of Turkish Form of HGIS

HGIS	r	p	α
Test-Retest Scores	0.887	0.000**	0.94
Split-Halves Scores	0.784	0.000**	0.88

p ‹ 0.001 **

The relationship between test and retest scores of HGIS that was computed by using Pearson correlation coefficient suggested a highly significant (p = 0.000), strongly and positively correlation (r = 0.89). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was computed as α = .94 for the overall sample, α = .93 for females and α = .94 for males. As with the split halves scores, the relationship between the odd and even items of HGIS that was computed by using Pearson correlation coefficient suggested a highly significant (p = 0.000), strongly and positively correlation (r = 0.78). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient based on standardized items was computed as α = .88 for the overall sample.

Validity Study

Criterion Related Validity

In order to validate the Turkish form of HGIS, the participants were administered ASI, ATLG and GHS, SDS subscales of PRP which were suggested to be associated with HGIS, in

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

addition to BSRI which was suggested not to be significantly associated with HGIS. The relationships between all of these measures and HGIS were studied by using Pearson correlation coefficient. The correlations between measures used are shown below.

Table 3. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients and Significance Levels of the Turkish Form of HGIS and Criterion Related Scales

HGIS	*BEM-M*	*BEM-F*	*BEM-M*	*BEM-F*	*BEM-M*	*BEM-F*	*BEM-M*
r	0.84	-0.028	0.622	0.416	0.313	0.215	-0.163
p	0.265	0.713	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.005*	0.032*

p ‹ 0.05 *, p ‹ 0.001 **

These results indicate that the association between the Turkish form of HGIS and the expected correlates are statistically significant. A significant relationship appeared between HGIS and HS (r = .62, p = .000). The relationship between HGIS and BS indicated a moderate correlation which was statistically meaningful (r = .41, p = .000). The relationship between HGIS and ATLG also indicated a similar result (r = .31, p = .000) . The relationship between HGIS and GHS was weak but statistically meaningful (r = .21, p = .005).

Construct Validity

For the construct validity of the Turkish form of HGIS, factor analysis was carried out. In this respect, a principle component analysis was carried out without any rotation of the factors. According to the results, there are 20 components with eigenvalues equal or greater than 1 which reveals 20 factors accounting for 68 % of the variance for the overall sample. When one component was extracted by principal component analysis to investigate the unrotated factor loadings of the HGIS items on this first factor, it was seen that 38 items had factor loadings of .30 or higher whereas 19 items were lower.

Table 4. The Rotated Factor Loadings of HGIS Items on 5 Factors

Items	*Factor 1*	*Items*	*Factor 2*	*Items*	*Factor 3*	*Items*	*Factor 4*	*Items*	*Factor 5*
33	.598	24	.633	6	.664	1	.775	17	.610
41	.581	25	.629	53	.651	5	.709	57	.567
54	.561	9	.529	50	.557	7	.665	18	.436
19	.553	42	.528	36	.530	2	.637	48	.434
28	.545	15	.499	22	.509	4	.558	37	.411
56	.499	34	.498	38	.490	13	.365	43	-.392
20	.471	47	.495	27	.469			3	.392
40	.436	11	.471	44	.454				
35	.428	52	.460	26	.357				
31	.426	14	.410						
29	.386	21	.397						
45	-.368	39	.376						
30	-.349	23	.373						
16	.338	10	.355						
8	.337	32	.324						
12	.303	49	.315						
46	.295	51	.298						
55	.282								

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

In second step, result of a screen test, a principle component analysis forcing five factors has been performed. The factor loading of the items after this analysis is given in above table 4.

In this five factor model, the total variance explained was 33%. The factor loadings of 57 items varied between .775 and - .392. Items with negative loadings are marked as (-). As one of the aim of the factor analysis was to determine the factors that are meaningful in the sense that they indicate sets of related variables, a rotation was made for an easier interpretation. This result came out consistent with the factor analysis of the original HGIS.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In regards with the reliability analysis of the study, the findings were significant. Also, the relationship between each individual item and the entire scale was explored by an item total analysis. The correlations were highly significant except the item 30 (men shouldn't measure their self-worth by their sexual conquests) and 45 (all women, even feminists, are worthy of respect). The possible reason for this might be that, the term feminism is quite unfamiliar for most Turkish people. It may be difficult to imagine a role model which would represent Turkish feminist women. In the daily language the meaning of the word is mostly misused and ascribed to women who are "hostile to men".

Previous research findings indicate that authoritarianism and traditional gender roles are negatively associated with feminism and positively associated with sexist attitudes (Peterson, Zurbriggen, 2010). It is also argued that many men feel defensive in response to feminism. They feel they are being blamed or perhaps they feel they are to blame. Dominance of men has troubles in engaging the concept of feminism (Crowe, 2011). The possible reason of the 30th item not having a significant item total correlation might be that, the word "conquest" may have not been meaningful for Turkish people.

In order to investigate the consistency among different sets of HGIS scores, test-retest and split halves models were performed. The test-retest reliability coefficient was highly significant ($r = 0.89$, $p = 0.000$). For split halves method, the relationship between the odd and even items of HGIS was highly significant ($r = 0.78$, $p = 0.000$). Consequently, reliability coefficients suggested that the Turkish form of Hyper gender Ideology Scale is a reliable measure.

For the validity analysis, criterion related validity and construct validity were explored. ASI, ATLG, GH and SD subscales of the PRP were administered as convergent validity scales. The relationship between HGIS and convergent scales were found to be significant as expected. BSRI was administered as the discriminant validity scale and a statistically significant relationship with HGIS was not found as proposed. The scores on HGIS were unrelated with the socially desirable masculine and feminine traits of BSRI. It was suggested that masculinity and hyper masculinity, femininity and hyper femininity might be different personality traits (Murnen and Byrne, 1991; Murnen et al., 2002; Ginter, 2004). Consistently with the prior research (Hamburger et al. 1996), hyper gender ideology was found to be negatively correlated with social desirability. The Turkish form of the HGIS was negatively correlated with SD subscale of PRP ($r=-.163$, $p=.032$). Hamburger et al. (1996) argued that the relationship between HGIS and social desirability might be due to the female sample rather than the male. In the previous studies, hyper femininity was found to be negatively correlated with social desirability (Murnen and Byrne, 1991; McKelvie and Gold, 1994; Maybach and Gold, 1994).

A factor analysis was conducted to study the construct validty of the Turkish form of HGIS. According to the results of factor analysis, HGIS was considered as a uni-dimensional scale and use of a single score was employed. When taken all together, the factorial structure of the

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

Turkish form of HGIS was not the same however fairly similar to its original. Consequently, the findings of validity analysis suggested that the Turkish form of HGIS is a valid measure.

The primary aim of the study was to provide a reliable and a valid measurement by adapting HGIS to Turkish. It may be argued that the Turkish culture is more traditional and conservative than American culture. Thus, establishing the psychometric properties of HGIS in Turkish society may contribute to an overall understanding of adherence to extreme gender roles. Also, the Turkish form of this scale may provide an opportunity for researches to conduct a cross-cultural comparison. Further studies should be conducted with diverse populations and different socio demographic backgrounds such as diverse age, ethnical, education status and marital status groups.

REFERENCES

[1] Blackwood, E. (2000). Culture and Women's Sexualities. *Journal of Social Issues*, *56*(2), 223-238.

[2] Chodorow, N. J. (1995). Gender as a Personal and Cultural Construction. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *20*(3), 516-544.

[3] Connel, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

[4] Crowe, J. (2011). Men and Feminism: Some challenges and A Partial Response. *Social Alternatives*, *30*(1), 49-53.

[5] Çelik, Ö. (2008). Ataerkil Sistem Bağlamında Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerinin Benimsenmesi. *Master Thesis*. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Hacettepe Üniversitesi.

[6] Dökmen, Z. Y. (2004). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Sosyal Psikolojik Açıklamalar*. İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

[7] Giddens, A. (1995). *Politics, Sociology and Social Theory: Encounters with Classical and Contemporary Social Thought* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

[8] Ginter, B. (2004). Hypergenderism: Relationship Satisfaction in Substance Dependent Men. *Master Thesis*. Trinity Western University.

[9] Glick, P. T., & Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Peronality and Social Psychology*, *70*(2), 2491-512.

[10] Hamburger et al., (1996). Assessing Hypergender Ideologies: Development and Initial Validation of a Gender-Neutral Measure Adherence to Extreme Gender-Role Beliefs. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *30*(0011), 175-178.

[11] Herek, G. M. (1998). Heterosexuals' Attitudes Towards Lesbians adn Gay Men: Correlates and Gender Differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, (25)*4*, 451-477.

[12] Hoffman, R. M. et al., (2005). Personal Definitions of Masculinity and Femininity as an Aspect of Gender Self-Concept. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling Education and Development, 44,* 66-83.

[13] Il'ilynkh, S. A. (2013). Multiple Masculinity. *Russian Social Science Review*, *54*(1), 62–78.

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553

[14] Kundakçı, F. S. (2007). İktidar, Ataerkillik ve Erkeklik: Ankara örneğinde erkek akademisyenler üzerinde bir çalışma. *Master Thesis*. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Hacettepe Üniversitesi.

[15] Levant, R. F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A Review of Research on Masculinity Ideologies Using the Male Role Norms Inventory. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, (15)*2*, 130-146.

[16] Lusher, D. et al. (2007). The Masculine Attitudes Index (MAI). *Working Paper.* University of Melbourne, Australia.

[17] Macionis, J. J., & Plummer, K. (1998). *Sociology: A Global Introduction*. Harlow: Prentice Hall Inc.

[18] McKelvie, M. & Gold, .R S. (1994). Hyperfemininity: Further Definition of the Construct. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *31*(3), 219-228.

[19] Money, J. (1995). *Gender Gap*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

[20] Muehlenhard, Z. D.et al. (2003). Gender and Sexuality: An Introduction to the Special Issue. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *40*(1), 1-3.

[21] Murnen, S. K., & Byrne, D (1991). Hyperfemininity: Measurement and Initial Validation of the Construct. *The Journal of Sex Research*. *28*(3), 479-489.

[22] Murnen, S. K. et al., (2002). If "Boys will be boys," Then Girls will be Victims? A Meta-Analytic Review of the Research that Relates Masculine Ideology to Sexual Aggression. *Sex Roles*, 4*6*(1/12), 359-375.

[23] Perelta, R. L., & Tuttle, L. A. (2013). Male Perpetrators of Heterosexual-Partner-Violence: The Role of Threats to Masculinity. *The Journal of Men's Studies*. *21*(3), 255-276.

[24] Peters, J. et al. (2007). Development and Testing of a New Version of the Hypermasculinity Index. *Social Work Research*, 31(3), 171-182.

[25] Peterson, B. E., & Eileen, Z. L. (2010). Gender, Sexuality, and the Authoritarian Personality. *Journal of Personality. 78*(6), 1801-1826.

[26] Reidy, D. et al., (2014). Man Enough? Masculine Discrepancy Stress and Intimate Partner Violence. *Personality and Individual Difference,*. 68, 160–164.

[27] Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2003). Cinsiyetçilik: Kadınlara ve Erkeklere İlişkin Tutumlar ve Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *6* (11-12): 1-20.

[28] Scheff, T. J. (2006). Hypermasculinity and Violence as a Social System. *Universitas*, *2* (2).

[29] Schaefer, R. T., & Lamm, R. P. (1995). *Sociology* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

[30] Straus, M. A., & Mouradian, V. E. (1999). *Preliminary Psychometric Data for the Personal and Relationships Profile (PRP): A Multi-Scale Tool for Clinical Screening and Research on Partner Violence.* University of New Hampshire. Durham. NH.

[31] Zeybekoğlu, Ö. (2009). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet Bağlamında Erkeklik Olgusu.* Master Thesis. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Akdeniz Üniversitesi.

ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553