

Chinese GRCS Short From Version of the Gender Role Conflict Scale

Contact Person Who Did the Translation If Known

Chunyu Zhang Southwest University, Chongqing, China

Related Publications

Zhang, C., Blashill, A.J., Wester, S.R., O'Neil, J.M, Vogel, D.L., Wei, J., & Zhang, J. (2014). Factor structure of the Gender Role conflict Scale-Short From in Chinese heterosexual and gay samples. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*. 16, 229-233.

RELEASE FORM FOR THE TRANSLATED GENDER ROLE CONFLICT SCALE

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP CODE _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

PHONE _____ (WORK)
_____ (HOME)

1. ____ Yes, I plan to use the Gender Role Conflict Scale translated into the cited language above in my research.
2. Please briefly describe your research project, if possible, including the nature of your sample and any other scales to be used. (Use reverse side if necessary)

3. How many subjects do you expect will complete the GRCS ? _____

4. If this research is a supervised undergraduate thesis, masters thesis or doctoral dissertation, who is supervising your research? Please give faculty member's name, address, and phone number.

Name _____

Email _____

Address _____

_____ Zip Code _____

Phone (If known) _____

I agree to send the results to the study to Dr. Jim O'Neil upon completion of research to be included on the Gender Role Conflict Research Program Web Page and in any future reviews of the literature on men's gender role conflict. This means sending me copies of the thesis, dissertation, convention presentation, and submitted or published journal articles that describe the research's rationale, methods, results, and discussion.

Signature _____ Date _____

Retain one copy of this release for your records and before the research is implemented return one to:

Dr. James M. O'Neil
E-MAIL: Jimoneil1@aol.com

OR

20 Vanderbilt Drive
Narragansett, R.I. 02882

BRIEF REPORT

Factor Structure of the Gender Role Conflict Scale-Short Form in Chinese Heterosexual and Gay Samples

Chunyu Zhang
Southwest University, Chongqing,
People's Republic of China

Aaron J. Blashill
Harvard Medical School and Massachusetts General Hospital

Stephen R. Wester
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

James M. O'Neil
University of Connecticut

David L. Vogel
Iowa State University

Jia Wei and Jinfu Zhang
Southwest University, Chongqing,
People's Republic of China

The current study examined the validity of Gender Role Conflict Scale-Short Form (GRCS-SF) among a sample of 256 Chinese heterosexual men and 250 Chinese gay men. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) supported the conclusion that a Chinese translated version of the GRCS-SF had acceptable structural validity. Specifically, the four-factor solution (i.e., Success, Power, Competition; Restricted Emotionality; Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men; Conflict Between Work and Family Relations) was confirmed with all items loading on their respective factors. Furthermore, the four-factor solution provided a better fit than either a single factor or a four-factor solution with a higher-order single factor. Cronbach's α reliabilities reached the acceptable criterion in both samples for the overall score as well as for the subscale scores. Measurement invariance also suggested that the GRCS-SF has a similar structure between heterosexual and gay Chinese men.

Keywords: gender role conflict, Chinese men, measurement invariance, gay men, heterosexual men

Because of increasing globalization, Western and Chinese cultures are becoming more intertwined. Therefore, Chinese men may also be constricted by the traditional Western masculine gender role norms. At the same time, because of the cultural demands unique to Chinese heritage, there may be additional gender-related factors specifically faced by Chinese men. Chinese culture values harmony and a balance of behavioral options (Louie, 2002) whereas Western culture socializes boys into a much more unidimensional masculinity (e.g.,

O'Neil, 2011; Wester & Vogel, 2012). The construct of male gender role conflict (GRC; e.g., O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986) might be uniquely poised to understand such tension (O'Neil, 2008), but it has been generally overlooked in Chinese psychological research. Previous studies suggest that GRC is applicable to the experiences of Chinese men (e.g., Liu & Iwamoto, 2006; Wester, Kuo, & Vogel, 2006; Xu, 2009). However, the participants in these studies were Chinese-American, Chinese-Canadian, and Chinese high-school students, respectively. To date, we are unaware of any published studies that have explored GRC among native Chinese adult men.

To conduct such an investigation, one must first have culturally valid measurement tools. Without such tools, it is unknown how applicable the results of any particular cross-cultural study would be because the results could be due to either the constructs of interest or measurement error that is based on changes in the psychometric properties. For example, in the Wiley *Handbook of Counseling Psychology*, Miller and Sheu (2008) suggested that researchers must examine measures using diverse samples of participants to determine which aspects of the measures have universal utility. In response, Wester, Vogel, O'Neil, and Danforth (2012) developed a short form of the

Chunyu Zhang, Faculty of Psychology, Southwest University, Chongqing, People's Republic of China; Aaron J. Blashill, Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School/Massachusetts General Hospital; Stephen R. Wester, Educational Psychology, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee; James M. O'Neil, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Connecticut; David L. Vogel, Department of Psychology, Iowa State University; Jia Wei and Jinfu Zhang, Faculty of Psychology, Southwest University, Chongqing, People's Republic of China.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jinfu Zhang, Faculty of Psychology, Southwest University, No.2 Tiansheng Road, Beibei District, Chongqing 400715, People's Republic of China. E-mail: zhangjf@swu.edu.cn

Table 1
Items and Loadings of the GRCS-SF Subscales

	Loading	
	Heterosexual	Gay
RABBM		
(1) Affection with other men makes me tense.	.75	.64
(4) Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.	.63	.70
(7) Hugging other men is difficult for me.	.63	.60
(13) Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.	.59	.63
RE		
(2) Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.	.69	.66
(3) I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.	.76	.62
(6) I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.	.51	.69
(11) I do not like to show my emotions to other people.	.62	.66
CBWFR		
(5) Finding time to relax is difficult for me.	.67	.51
(9) My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.	.69	.68
(12) My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, health, leisure, etc).	.72	.64
(15) Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.	.54	.69
SPC		
(8) Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.	.68	.61
(10) I strive to be more successful than others.	.67	.65
(14) Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.	.71	.74
(16) I like to feel superior to other people.	.72	.77

Note. n for heterosexual sample = 256; n for gay sample = 250.

However, it has been suggested that changes in CFI criteria (i.e., $\Delta\text{CFI} \leq .01$; see Cheung & Rensvold, 2002) best reflect across-group invariance given that such changes are less vulnerable to variations in number of items or sample size than χ^2 changes (see also Chen, 2007).

Configural invariance was the first step in the analysis process. Configural invariance is present to examine whether the overall pattern of factor loadings are similar across different samples. Table 3 presents the results of model fit and model comparisons. The results showed an acceptable fit to the data and support the configural invariance, suggesting the overall construct provided an acceptable fit to the samples. Next, to examine the metric invariance, we compared a fully invariant model, in which each model factor path was set to be equal across the two groups, to the previous configural model, in which all of the paths were allowed to freely estimate across the different groups. Metric invariance is present when the specific factor loadings are similar across groups.

The results showed that the heterosexual was fully invariant with the gay Chinese sample ($\Delta\text{S-B}\chi^2 = 9.16$, $\Delta\text{df} = 12$, $p = .69$; $\Delta\text{CFI} < .01$).

The third step was to examine if scalar invariance was supported. We compared a fully invariant model, in which each item intercept (full invariance) was set to be equal across models, to the previous nested metric models. Scalar invariance is present when a sufficient number of item intercepts are similar across groups. Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998) have suggested that at least two invariant items per factor (i.e., partial invariance) are needed for meaningful mean comparisons to be made. The results showed that the full metric invariance was not supported ($\Delta\text{CFI} > .01$ and $\Delta\text{S-B}\chi^2 = 193.73$, $\Delta\text{df} = 12$, $p < .001$). To examine if partial metric variance was supported, we relaxed the constraints in the models in which the modification indices (MIs) and expected parameter changes (EPCs) were substantial in a sequential fashion (see MacCallum, Roznowski, & Necowitz, 1992). This led to a

Table 2
Summary of χ^2 and Fit Indices for the Competing Models of the 16-Item GRCS-SF

Model	S-B χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA
Heterosexual						
One factor	478.479	104	.639	.583	.102	.119 (CI: .108, .129)
Four factor	155.783	98	.944	.932	.053	.048 (CI: .033, .062)
Second-order factor	162.343	100	.940	.928	.057	.049 (CI: .035, .063)
Gay						
One factor	516.219	104	.557	.488	.115	.126 (CI: .115, .137)
Four factor	145.091	98	.949	.938	.051	.044 (CI: .028, .058)
Second-order factor	164.414	100	.931	.917	.069	.051 (CI: .036, .064)

Note. n for heterosexual sample = 256; n for gay sample = 250. CI = 90% confidence interval.

This is the Chinese version of the Gender Role Conflict Scale.

1. 年龄: _____

2. 教育程度: (选择最高程度)

____ 高中毕业 ____ 大一 ____ 大二 ____ 大三 ____ 大四

____ 硕士研究生 ____ 博士研究生 ____ 其他

3. 当前婚姻状况: ____ 已婚 ____ 单身 ____ 离异 ____ 离异后再婚

4. 种族: ____ 白人 ____ 黑人 ____ 拉丁裔 ____ 亚洲裔 (this category is not fit to Chinese)

指导语: 以下是一些陈述, 请根据您对陈述的同意或不同意的程度填写最适合的数字, 回答没有对错之分, 请根据您的实际情况进行填写。

非常 同意						非常 不同意
6	5	4	3	2		1

1. ____ 职业晋升对我来说很重要.

2. ____ 我不善于表达对他人的关心.

3. ____ 我难以用言语向其他男性表达我的爱.

4. ____ 我感觉自己被繁忙的工作和个人健康之间的矛盾所折磨.

5. ____ 赚钱是衡量成功人士的一个标准.

6. ____ 我难以体会强烈的情绪.

7. ____ 对其他男性的情感使我感到紧张不安.

8. ____ 我有时会用我的职业成就来定义个人价值.

9. ____ 我觉得, 表露感情会给他人提供攻击自己的机会.

10. ____ 向其他男性表达我的情感是有风险的.

11. ____ 我的事业、工作或学校学习影响我的休闲或家庭生活质量.

12. ____ 我以他人成就的高低来评价他们的价值.

-
- | 非常
同意 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 非常
不同意 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|
-
13. ___我难以在性行为中谈论自己的感受.
 14. ___我担心失败, 担心它会影响我成为一个合格的男人.
 15. ___我难以向我的伴侣表达情感需要.
 16. ___男人之间的身体接触使我感到不舒服.
 17. ___我难得有时间去放松一下.
 18. ___任何时候都表现出色, 这对我来说很重要.
 19. ___我难以表露自己的亲切和善.
 20. ___我很难去拥抱其他男性.
 21. ___我常觉得我需要掌控周围的一切.
 22. ___在我的性行为中, 不包括把我的强烈感受告诉对方.
 23. ___与他人竞争是成功的最好方法.
 24. ___胜利是评价我个人价值的一个标准.
 25. ___我经常找不到合适的词汇来表达自己的感受.
 26. ___碍于他人可能对我的看法, 我有时会犹豫是否要向其他男性表露自己的情感.
 27. ___我对工作或学习的需求过多地妨碍了我的家庭或休闲生活.
 28. ___我努力使自己比他人更成功.
 29. ___我不喜欢向他人展现自己的情绪.
 30. ___我难以在性行为中向伴侣表达我对他/她的感受.

非常
同意
6

5

4

3

2

非常
不同意
1

31. ___ 我的工作或学校学习常扰乱我生活的其他方面（如家庭、健康、休闲）。
32. ___ 我常常在意他人对我工作和学习表现的评价。
33. ___ 与其他男性产生非常私人的关系会使我感到不舒服。
34. ___ 对我来说，比其他男人更聪明或更强壮是重要的。
35. ___ 对我表现得过于友好的男性会让我怀疑他们的性取向。
36. ___ 为了在工作或学习上有所成就，引起了我的过度工作和压力，这影响了我的生活。
37. ___ 我喜欢比他人优秀的感觉。