



Ulrich Klocke
(klocke@hu-berlin.de)
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

The Traditional-Antitraditional Gender-Role Attitudes Scale (TAGRAS): Development and Validation



Pia Lamberty
(pia.lamerty@uni-koeln.de)
University of Cologne

- Existing questionnaires usually measure gender role attitudes on a continuum between
 - traditional attitudes** (e.g. "It bothers me more to see a woman who is pushy than a man who is pushy", Kerr and Holden 1996) and
 - egalitarian attitudes** (e.g. "It is just as important to educate daughters as it is to educate sons", Larsen and Long 1988)
- We assume that nowadays **antitraditional attitudes** exist as well, i.e. a preference for women showing male-typed and men showing female-typed behavior.
 - E.g. 2013, 20% of a US sample would prefer a female boss (Riffkin, 2014).



Taxonomy of Questionnaires/Items Measuring Gender Role Attitudes

	Appropriateness for ...	Item examples	Also measures antitraditional gender role attitudes	Independent from general agentic and communal attitudes	Influenced by social desirability
1. Unipolar	1. One sex	"It is essential for a guy to get respect from others." (Pleck et al. 1994)	no	no	low-medium
	2. One sex compared to the other	"It bothers me more to see a woman who is pushy than a man who is pushy." (Kerr and Holden 1996)	no	yes	high
	3. Equality	"It is just as important to educate daughters as it is to educate sons." (Larsen and Long 1988)	no	yes	high
2. Bipolar	4. One sex compared to the other	"Be a leader." Appropriate ... (Chang, 1999) 1 2 3 4 More for men 0 1 2 3 4 Same 1 2 3 4 More for women	yes	yes	medium
	5. Men and women in separate items	"Wie finden Sie es, wenn eine Frau [ein Mann] Folgendes tut?" (TAGRAS, Klocke & Lamberty, 2015) "Sie [Er] wird von Beruf Friseurin [Friseur]. sehr schlecht (-2), eher schlecht (-1), teils teils (0), eher gut (+1), sehr gut (+2)"	yes	yes	low-medium

Methods

Item Development and Selection

- Categorization of 272 items of 11 existing questionnaires on gender role attitudes/identity into 29 categories (Bem, 1974; Chang, 1999; Kerr & Holden, 1996; King & King, 1997; Krampen, 1979; Larsen & Long, 1988; Pleck et al., 1994; Spence & Helmreich, 1997; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975; Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979; Thompson & Pleck, 1986)
- Development of items (behavior descriptions) from each category → 44 initial item pairs
- Based on Study 1: Selection of the 11 most appropriate item pairs

Presentation of the Items in the TAGRAS

- Two items per behavior, one with a man and one with a woman as target
- "Als Nächstes interessieren wir uns für Ihre Vorstellung einer idealen Frau [eines idealen Mannes]. Dabei geht es nicht um eine bestimmte Frau [einen bestimmten Mann], sondern darum, welches Verhalten Sie allgemein bei Frauen [Männern] gut finden. Wie finden Sie es, wenn eine Frau [ein Mann] Folgendes tut? Sie [Er] ..."

Study	N	Participants	Sex (% female)	Age: M (SD)
1	71	German pupils (89% Gymnasium) recruited by snowball sampling	57%	16.9 years (1.6 years)
2	481	Ninth and tenth graders in 25 classes of 10 schools in Berlin (representative for school types)	45%	15.2 years (1.0 years)
3	82	Acquaintances of students from FernUniversität Hagen	48%	35.4 years (12.5 years)

Results

Item Analyses

Role	German original items	Study 1		Study 2		Study 3		
		M♂	M♀	M♂	M♀	M♂	M♀	
♀	weint, wenn ihn/sie etwas sehr verletzt hat.	0.50 ***	1.11	-0.09 ***	0.96	0.43 *	0.66	-0.51
♀	unterbricht für ein Jahr seine/ihre Berufstätigkeit, um für sein/ihr Kind zu sorgen.	1.07	1.10	0.55 ***	1.15	1.09	1.11	-0.50
♀	wird von Beruf Friseur/in. ^a	-0.29 *	-0.03	-0.12 ***	0.33	-0.54	-0.48	-0.33
♀	übernimmt zu Hause das Putzen der Wohnung.	0.76 ***	0.17	0.05 ***	0.44	0.32 **	-0.13	-0.51
♂	gibt sich selbstbewusst, auch wenn er/sie verunsichert ist.	0.35	0.56	0.92	0.86	0.55	0.51	0.45
♂	wird Manager/in in einem großen Wirtschaftsunternehmen.	0.81	0.83	1.38 ***	1.08	0.59	0.59	0.62
♂	versorgt die Familie, während der/die Partner/in ^b für den Haushalt sorgt.	0.01	0.21	0.86 ***	0.10	0.46 *	0.13	0.52
♂	wird Automechaniker/in.	0.04	0.19	0.72 ***	-0.39	0.12	0.15	0.68
♂	spielt Fußball.	0.61	0.47	1.18 ***	0.04	0.49	0.52	0.66
♂	geht zur Bundeswehr und wird Berufssoldat/in.	-0.75	-0.81	0.66 ***	-0.52	-0.66	-0.84	0.78
♂	bezahlt bei einem Date die gemeinsame Rechnung.	1.15 ***	-0.12	1.42 ***	-0.79	0.88 ***	0.20	0.57

Note. Five-point scales from -2 (very bad) to +2 (very good). The asterisks indicate significant differences between the evaluations of men and evaluations of women: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.
^a The nouns with a slash (e.g. "Friseur/in") were exchanged by the female form (e.g. "Friseurin") when asking for expectations of women and the male form (e.g. "Friseur") when asking for expectations of men (for an exception, see note ^b in item 6).
^b In the German version, the male form ("der Partner") was used when asking for expectations of women and the female form ("die Partnerin") when asking for expectations of men.

Reliabilities and Correlations

	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3
Cronbach's α TAGRAS	.89	.78	.77
Retest-Reliability 9 months TAGRAS		.62 ***	
Male (vs. female) sex	.34 **	.28 ***	.28 *
Age	-.09	.06	-.10
Educational level		-.32 ***	-.25 *
Economic situation		-.04	
Social dominance orientation		.38 ***	
Religiosity		.13 **	
Religious fundamentalism		.27 ***	
Religious reflexivity		-.05	
Right (vs. left) wing political attitudes			.39 **
Acceptance of gender-fair language			-.49 **
Motivation to act without prejudice			-.41 **

Predictive Validity: Multi-level Analyses with Z-Standardized Predictors (Study 2)

Dependent variables ↓	Female (vs. male) sex	Economic situation	Education level	TAGRAS
Discriminatory behavior towards lesbians, gays, and gender-nonconform. indiv. (peer reports)	-.21 ***	.08	.08	.14 *
Supportive behavior towards lesbians and gays (peer reports)	.13 *	.00	.16 **	-.02
Explicit attitudes towards lesbians and gays	.20 ***	.07	.08	-.33 *** *
Implicit attitudes towards lesbians and gays (Affect misattribution procedure)	-.09	-.01	.12 #	-.28 ***
Implicit attitudes towards heterosexuals (Affect misattribution procedure)	.00	.02	-.11	-.05

Note. # Effect is also significant ($\beta = -.11, p < .05$) for a prediction of attitudes at Time 2 by predictors at Time 1, controlling for attitudes at Time 1.

Further Results and Discussion

- Antitraditional gender role attitudes exist (scores below the egalitarian midpoint of the scale: Study 1: 44%, Study 2: 13%, Study 3: 39%).
- Even though, on average, some behaviors were evaluated traditionally, some egalitarian, and some antitraditionally, in a factor analysis, all behaviors' difference scores loaded highly on the same factor.
- Reliability:** Acceptable internal consistency and retest reliability
- Convergent validity:** Expected correlations with sex, education level, right-wing political attitudes, social dominance orientation, religious fundamentalism, acceptance of gender-fair language, and motivation to act without prejudice.
- Predictive validity:** Prediction of explicit and implicit attitudes to lesbians and gays as well as (peer-reported) discriminatory behavior towards lesbians, gays, and gender non-conforming individuals.

Advantages of the TAGRAS

- Includes a broader range/variance of gender role attitudes → less prone to bottom effects → might be better able to predict other attitudes and behavior
- Includes gender-role specific behaviors from different domains (not limited to work and home)
- Measures gender role attitudes independently of agentic and communal attitudes (a general preference for attributes associated with masculinity or femininity)
- Contemporary wording
- Suitable for adolescents and adults

Manuscript with TAGRAS:



References
 Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162. doi: 10.1037/00362115
 Chang, L. (1999). Gender Role Egalitarian Attitudes in Beijing, Hong Kong, Florida, and Michigan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 722. doi: 10.1177/0022022199030006004
 Kerr, P. S., & Holden, R. R. (1996). Development of the Gender Role Beliefs Scale (GRBS). *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 11, 3-16.
 King, L., & King, D. (1987). Sex-role egalitarianism scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 71-87. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb01010.x
 Krampen, G. (1979). Eine Skala zur Messung der normativen Geschlechterrollenorientierung. [A scale to measure the normative gender role orientation]. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 8, 254-266.
 Larsen, K. S., & Long, E. (1988). Attitudes toward sex-roles: Traditional or egalitarian? *Sex Roles*, 19, 1-12. doi: 10.1007/bf00292459
 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. doi: 10.1007/bf01420798
 Riffkin, R. (2014). Americans Still Prefer a Male Boss to a Female Boss. Women are more likely than men to prefer a female boss. *GALLUP ECONOMY*.
 http://www.gallup.com/poll/175484/americans-prefer-male-boss-female-boss.aspx
 Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, E. D. (1997). The Attitudes toward women scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 17.
 Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 29-39. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.32.1.29
 Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1673-1682. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.37.10.1673
 Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29, 531-543. doi: 10.1177/000276488629005003