1980

Psychological Androgyny: Are Women Leaving Stereotypic Sex Roles More Quickly Than Men?

Charles Wolfson
Loyola University Chicago

PSYCHOLOGICAL ANDROGYNY: ARE WOMEN LEAVING STEREOTYPIC SEX ROLES MORE QUICKLY THAN MEN?

by

Charles Wolfson

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

July

1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr. Alan DeWolfe for his patience and time in planning the research design and statistical procedures, as well as in reading through several drafts of the manuscript. The author would also like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Dr. Jeanne Foley, whose strong interest in the topic of the research was a motivating factor, and whose close attention to the written product served to enhance its quality considerably.

VITA

The author, Charles Daniel Wolfson, is the son of Irving Norman Wolfson and Annabel (Kreider) Wolfson. He was born August 21, 1952, in Worcester, Massachusetts.

His elementary education was obtained in the public schools of Worcester, Massachusetts, and secondary education at North High School, in that city, where he graduated in June, 1970.

In September, 1970, he entered Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont. In September, 1971, he transferred to Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York, and in June, 1974, received the degree of Bachelor of Arts with a major in psychology. He was elected a member of Phi Beta Kappa in 1974.

In September, 1974, he entered the doctoral program in clinical psychology at Loyola University of Chicago, and was granted a traineeship in clinical psychology at Loyola University Guidance Center and Day School. In 1975 he became a student member of the American Psychological Association. In September, 1979, he entered an internship in clinical psychology at Chicago-Read Mental Health Center, Chicago, Illinois. In October, 1979, he became a student member of the Illinois Psychological Association.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The universality of sex-role stereotypes in American society has been well documented. Moreover, the male role is almost always seen as preferable to the female role. Men are often seen as mentally healthier than women. Men, however, tend to be more narrowly sex-typed than women, with fewer behavioral options open to them as a consequence. Recent studies indicate that sex typing, heretofore considered essential for proper psychological development, may actually diminish the ability of adults to cope with a variety of situations and may be associated with lower self-esteem than that of individuals who are not sex typed. Psychological androgyny, the simultaneous manifestation of masculine and feminine characteristics, appears to be associated with higher self-esteem and a greater range of potential behaviors.

In recent years, women have become more active in seeking to become androgynous in the sphere of work, and to share with men more of the duties at home. Men seem to be accepting these changes more slowly than women, and seem to be moving in the direction of androgyny for themselves more slowly also.

The present study explored the relationship between self-esteem and projected androgyny--that is, the ability to produce a profile of a more androgynous person when asked to describe a liberated person of the same sex. The study also explored differences in men and women in how androgynous they see themselves, how androgynous they would like themselves or the opposite sex to be, and how androgynous they think liberated men and women are. It is hypothesized that men are lagging behind women in the movement toward androgyny for both men and women.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Prevalence of Stereotypes

Sex-role stereotypes, or "consensual beliefs about the differing characteristics of men and women," (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972, p. 64) are prevalent in American society, as several investigators have conclusively shown over the past few decades.

Sherriffs and Jarrett (1953) administered a 58-item scale, consisting of 17 items judged characteristic of men, 17 items judged characteristic of women, and 24 items judged neutral, to a group of men and women. Half of the items in each category were favorable personality characteristics, while half were unfavorable. The subjects were instructed to indicate whether each item was more characteristic of men or of women. The researchers found a remarkable degree of agreement among men and women about which sex each item should be assigned to, concluding that "there are remarkably few behaviors and attributes which are not uniformly ascribed by both men and women to one or the other of the two sexes" (Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953, p. 167).

This universality of sex-role stereotypes was confirmed by Bieliauskas, Miranda, and Lansky (1968). These authors administered two tests of masculinity-femininity (MF) to a group of college men and women. The first was the Fe scale of Gough's California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957), a scale designed to differentiate appropriately sex-typed individuals from inappropriately sex-typed individuals. The second was Franck's Drawing Completion Test, a projective device designed to discriminate male and female sex typing. Subjects completed these tests under three sets of instructions: standard (as oneself), as a college man, and as a college woman. Under the latter two conditions, both men and women were able to produce very similar masculine and feminine sets of responses on the Fe scale. Furthermore, each gender's responses under opposite-sex instructions were more sex typed than under same-sex instructions, indicating that men and women view the opposite sex more stereotypically than their own. On the Drawing Completion Test, men were able to produce a feminine set of responses, but women were unable to produce a masculine set of responses. This study showed that men and women have clear ideas of what is considered masculine and what is considered feminine in our society.

Lunneborg (1970) administered the Edwards Personality Inventory to college men and women with instructions

to reply as most men or women would. The responses were compared to the responses of the normative college sample, and were found to be very consistent with the normative self-descriptions, regardless of the sex of the respondent. The stereotypic responses were more extreme than the self-descriptions, again indicating that American men and women hold strong, persistent sex-role stereotypes.

Valuation of Male and Female Roles

Not only do Americans hold these stereotypes, but there is much evidence to indicate that they value the masculine and feminine stereotypes differently. The literature indicates that the male stereotype is valued more highly than the female stereotype by both sexes. McKee and Sherriffs (1957) administered Sarbin's Adjective Check List to 100 college men and 100 college women. The subjects responded under four sets of instructions: as themselves, as they would ideally like to be, as the ideal member of the opposite sex, and as they thought the opposite sex would want the ideal person of their same sex to respond. The results indicated that women's ideal self is less sex-typed than men's, while women's real self is more sex-typed; women are further away from their ideal than men. The men reserved their highly valued masculine characteristics, such as action, vigor, and achievement, for themselves; they did not attribute them to women.

At the same time, the women thought that men's ideal woman was more sex-typed than the men's ideal woman actually was. The authors concluded that while men and women were egalitarian on the surface, both sexes still valued the male role more highly.

In a subsequent study, the same authors (McKee & Sherriffs, 1959) obtained virtually the same results. Men were thought of more highly than women, and men emphasized their own positive characteristics, while women emphasized their own negative characteristics. This indicates the low image women have of the feminine role, and the high image that men have of the masculine role. Osofsky and Osofsky (1972) and Broverman et al. (1972) both stated that the literature consistently shows that 5 to 12 times as many women as men have consciously wished at some time that they were of the opposite sex, again indicating the greater value attached to the male role. According to the latter authors, males are preferred to the extent that couples are more likely to have a third child if the first two children are girls than they are if they already have a male child.

Mental health professionals apparently share this preference for stereotypic male characteristics. Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970) asked a variety of mental health professionals to complete

a rating scale regarding a mentally healthy male, a mentally healthy female, and a mentally healthy adult (sex unspecified). The ratings for the mentally healthy male were quite similar to those for the mentally healthy adult, which were unlike those for the mentally healthy female. Thus, mentally healthy females do not behave like mentally healthy adults, according to this group of clinicians, while mentally healthy males do.

Johnson (1974) confirmed this male preference of mental health professionals. He administered a shortened version of the Stereotype Questionnaire to a group of psychiatrists, psychiatric social workers, psychologists, and counselors. The subjects completed the questionnaire under four sets of instructions: as a well-integrated male and female, and as a poorly-integrated male and female. Results indicated that the profiles of the well-integrated male and female both resembled the usual profile of the stereotypic male, while the profiles of the poorly-integrated male and female resembled that of the stereotypic female. In short, well-integrated behavior on the part of either sex was seen as masculine in nature, while stereotypic feminine behavior was defined by the clinicians as dysfunctional.

Broverman et al. (1972) summed up by stating that "these sex-role differences are considered desirable by

college students, healthy by mental health professionals, and are even seen as ideal by both men and women" (p. 61). In other words, a wide variety of groups sees sex roles as the norm, or even as the ideal way in which social relations should be set up. Furthermore, all of these groups place a greater value on men and masculine characteristics than on women and feminine characteristics.

Androgyny

In recent years, the desirability of sex-role stereotypes and the preference for masculinity have been challenged. Bem (1972) stated that traditional masculine behavior is instrumental, emphasizing traits like assertiveness, perseverance, self-confidence, and independence. Traditional feminine behavior, on the other hand, requires expressive, nurturant behaviors like tenderness, nurturance, sensitivity, and the ability easily to express emotions. Bakan (1966) characterized the two orientations as "agency" for men and "communion" for women. Both authors pointed out that it has been assumed in the past that each set of behaviors is appropriate for one sex, whereas it may actually be the case that each set of behaviors is appropriate for particular types of situations. From this speculation emerges the concept of androgyny: "having the characteristics of both sexes: being at once both male and female" (Webster's third new international

dictionary of the English language, 1971).

Many studies have indicated that traditional sex typing may not be the best avenue to adjustment and adaptability as an adult; these studies suggest that androgyny is associated with better adjustment and adaptability. Vincent (1966) administered the California Psychological Inventory to a group of male and female high school students. He found that females who scored less feminine and males who scored less masculine on the Fe scale also tended to do better on the other scales measuring such attributes as poise, ascendancy, self-assurance, socialization, maturity, responsibility, achievement potential, and intellectual efficiency.

Harford, Willis, and Deabler (1967) administered a battery of tests which measured sex-role stereotyping to a group of normal male volunteers. Men who were not highly sex typed had better mental capacity and better verbal skills than men who were highly sex typed, while the latter tended to experience emotional distress, guilt proneness, and neurotic tendencies.

Androgyny and Self-Esteem

Androgyny appears to be related to self-esteem in addition to psychological adjustment. Block (1973) found that less sex-typed individuals (those who endorsed more adjectives usually endorsed by the opposite sex) tend to

show greater maturity, as measured by Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Test, than more sex-typed individuals. Miller (1974) administered a self-esteem measure and a scale of attitudes toward women's liberation to a group of college students at five different Northeastern United States institutions, as well as to a noncollege population. Men who accepted the women's liberation movement tended to have higher self-esteem than men who did not accept this movement. This was especially true at the most conservative of the colleges. Doyle (1975), using a sample of 50 male subjects, found a significant positive correlation between self-actualization, as measured by Shostrow's Personal Orientation Inventory, and favorable attitudes toward feminism, as measured by Kirkpatrick's Feminism-Anti-feminism Belief-Pattern Scale.

Similarly, Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) administered the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (a self-esteem measure), the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire to a large group of males and females. Androgynous subjects, as measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, had significantly higher self-esteem than all others. Next in self-esteem came masculine subjects, then feminine subjects, followed by undifferentiated individuals, who endorsed neither masculine nor feminine attributes.

Androgyny and Adaptability

Not only do androgynous individuals appear to have higher self-esteem than sex-typed individuals, but they also appear to be more adaptable in a wider variety of situations. Kanner (1976) compared sex typing in creative male architects and uncreative male architects. He found that the creative architects were androgynous, while the uncreative architects were not, with the former no lower in masculinity than the latter.

Strodtbeck, Beydek, and Goldhamer (1970) studied men's responses to a hypothetical community problem, which was presented by a speaker as serious or unserious, and solvable or unsolvable. After hearing the presentation of the problem, the subjects were asked how much they would be willing to try to do to solve the problem. The results indicated that masculine men were much more likely to attempt to solve the problem only if they perceived it as solvable, whereas less masculine men responded to the personal effects of the problem rather than to its perceived solvability. Masculine men apparently find it a waste of time to expand energy on problems which they are not reasonably sure they can solve.

Bem (1975) placed college students in two situations, one calling for masculine, independent behavior (rating a funny cartoon as funny when confederates of the

experimenter all said that it was not funny) and the other calling for feminine, nurturant behavior (spontaneous play with a kitten). Masculine males (as measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory) were able to perform only the former task, feminine females were able to perform neither task, and androgynous subjects were able to perform both tasks. The discrepant finding about the feminine females led the author to speculate that the task required too much assertiveness for that group of subjects.

Bem and Lenney (1976) asked 24 sex-typed, 24 sex-reversed, and 24 androgynous college students of each sex to choose between a cross-sex or same-sex activity. They were always paid more, and they were aware they would be paid more, if they chose a cross-sex activity. The sex-typed individuals chose the same-sex activity significantly more often than the sex-reversed or androgynous individuals, who did not differ from each other. In other words, sex-typed individuals were unable to choose a cross-sex activity as often as androgynous individuals, even though their decision cost them money. In addition, after all the subjects had been forced to perform three cross-sex activities (as well as three same-sex activities and three neutral activities), sex-typed subjects felt worse about themselves and more negatively about the tasks than either androgynous or sex-reversed individuals. Thus,

sex-typed individuals are reluctant to perform cross-sex activities, and are disturbed when they do so.

Bem, Martyna, and Watson (1976) placed 84 college students, equally divided into groups of masculine, feminine, and androgynous, into two situations calling for feminine behavior. The situations involved being left in a room with a baby who was neutrally dressed and alternately introduced as David or Lisa, and talking to a lonely student (who was actually the experimenters' confederate). In both cases, feminine and androgynous individuals showed the same amount of nurturance, which was significantly higher than that shown by masculine individuals.

Some research has not borne out the relationship between androgyny and self-esteem outlined above. For example, Gill (1976) classified college women as high, moderate, or low in femininity, according to scores on the Fe scale of the California Psychological Inventory. Self-actualization of the subjects was based on the Personal Orientation Inventory and attitude toward the feminine role was measured by the Fand Role Inventory. There were no significant differences in self-actualization among the women in the three levels of strength of sex-typing. Romano (1976) measured self-esteem (using an identity confusion inventory) and sex-role perception (using an

inventory of feminine values) in freshman college women. He found no correlation between self-esteem and attitude toward the feminine role, but cautioned against generalization of the findings because of the limited sample of subjects (all were freshman women in the first co-ed class of a college) and the exclusive use of inventories.

Despite these disparate findings, most research indicates a strong positive correlation between androgyny and self-esteem, and most research indicates that sex-typed individuals have lower self-esteem than androgynous individuals.

Narrow Sex Typing of Men

In general, little research has been undertaken on changing sex roles for men, according to authors who have reviewed the literature (Hochschild, 1973; Mednick & Weissman, 1975). Many studies have indicated, however, that boys are more narrowly sex typed than girls; that is, the range of activities in which boys are expected to engage is narrower than that for girls. Hartup, Moore, and Sage (1963) presented males and females between the ages of 3 and 8 with a choice between attractive, sex-inappropriate toys (e.g., doll, purse, football, bulldozer) and unattractive, neutral toys (e.g., pegboard, puzzle with a piece missing). Even with the blatant unattractiveness of the neutral toys, all of the children were reluctant to

play with the sex-inappropriate toys. The boys in particular tended to avoid the cross-sex toys when an experimenter was in the room.

Lynn (1964) claimed that over the past 60 years, boys have shown a lowered preference for feminine games; she pointed out that boys are consistently taught not to engage in feminine behavior. Lansky (1967) administered a questionnaire to the parents of 98 upper-middle-class children at a private preschool. They were asked how they would react to their child's preference for a sex-inappropriate activity, in dichotomies such as gun vs. doll, shaving vs. playing with cosmetics, and building vs. cooking. Parents were consistently less happy when boys chose a sex-inappropriate behavior than when girls did; this was especially true of fathers.

Stein, Pohly, and Mueller (1971) found that sixth-grade boys focused on masculine-labeled tasks more than girls focused on feminine-labeled tasks when both were presented with masculine, feminine, and neutral tasks. Also, actual achievement on the tasks varied according to the sex-typed labels for the boys, but not for the girls. The authors suggested that boys experience greater pressure for sex-appropriate behavior from parents and society than do girls.

Fling and Manosevitz (1972), in a study of nursery

school children, found a nonsignificant trend for boys to show more sex-role orientation, preference, and adoption. They also observed that boys experienced more pressure to behave according to sex roles than girls.

Seyfried and Hendrick (1973) had male and female college students rate their attraction for males and females who had supposedly filled out a sex-role questionnaire resulting in either a sex-appropriate or sex-inappropriate profile. The female subjects preferred the masculine male to the feminine male, while the male subjects did not differ in their preference for the feminine female or the masculine female. Furthermore, ". . . the feminine male was disliked [by males] significantly more than any other stranger" (Seyfried & Hendrick, 1973, p. 19). These results indicate both the greater latitude of behavior permitted to females and the greater stigma attached to the male who crosses sex roles.

In a study similar to that of Hartup et al. (1963), Bem and Lenney (1976) paid college students more money to engage in a cross-sex activity than a same-sex activity. The subjects were sex typed, sex reversed, and androgynous individuals of each sex. Examples of activities were preparing formula (feminine) and oiling metal (masculine). The study revealed that the males were less likely to prefer to perform cross-sex activities, even though this

stance cost them money and even though they had tried previously to maximize their earnings when engaging in neutral activities. This clearly indicates the great difficulty that males have in behaviorally overcoming the restricted roles which they have been taught.

Not all researchers agree that men have more trouble incorporating both the masculine and feminine roles. Block, Von der Lippe, and Block (1973) studied a group of males and females between the ages of 30 and 40 who had been administered the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1964) as part of a larger study. The subjects were grouped into sex-role and socialization groups according to their scores on the femininity (Fe) Scale and the Socialization (So) Scale of this inventory. All the subjects were then interviewed and described by a clinical psychologist. Their findings were that highly socialized men incorporate the positive aspects of the masculine sex role (for highly masculine men) or of the feminine sex role (for less masculine men). This group of researchers concluded that ". . . for men, socialization appears to expand the personal options available" (Block et al., 1973, p. 337). They found, further, that highly socialized women, whether highly feminine or less feminine, were more constricted in their behavior. The low socialization/low feminine group of women was more likely to manifest androgynous behavior

than any other group. Block et al. concluded that socialization expands the behavioral options for men, while it constricts options for women because they are forced to renounce autonomy. Other interpretations of the data of Block et al., more consistent with the findings cited earlier, seem possible: the occupational classes of the two highly socialized male groups and the two highly socialized female groups appear to be either traditional (for the highly sex-typed individuals) or fairly neutral (for the less sex-typed individuals). Furthermore, it appears to this reader that the occupational choices of the high feminine/high socialization women are less traditional than those of the high socialization/high masculine men, which would support the hypothesis of more narrow sex typing in the socialization of men.

Faster Sex-Role Changes in Women

In general, women seem to be more liberal in regard to changing sex roles than men. Bayer (1975), in a study of 188,000 college freshmen in 1972, found that 41 percent of the males and 19 percent of the females felt that a married women should confine her activities to her home and her family. There was a steady decline in these percentages since 1970, yet the women consistently had a much lower percentage endorsing this notion than the men.

Tavris (1973) gave a survey on sex roles to a large sample of readers of Psychology Today, a presumably liberal sample. She found that women were more liberated than men in terms of personal issues: for example, women were happier if the housework in their home was distributed in a more egalitarian fashion between themselves and their husbands while men were less happy if the housework was so distributed. Tavris found that while 73 percent of the men surveyed approved of equality in housekeeping and child care, only 15 percent of them actually shared in these activities. While most of the men approved of working wives, Tavris found that most of them would not be influenced by their wives' unhappiness in making a career decision (such as a geographic relocation). Furthermore, most of the men believed that men are unconscious sexists, yet 25 percent of them did not find an intellectual female attractive. In short, this liberal sample of women was translating its nonsexist beliefs into action while the men's behavior fell far short of their stated nonsexist attitudes. Tavris concluded that there were very few truly liberated men in her sample.

Komarovsky (1973) surveyed 62 male college seniors from an Ivy League all-male college. The respondents were interviewed for six hours each, and they completed several questionnaires. The author, who was investigating this

assumed liberal sample's reactions to changing sex roles for women, found that about one-third of the respondents felt uncomfortable with a woman who was their intellectual equal. Almost half of the men felt that men's reasoning ability was superior to that of women. Most of the men were not feminists. They favored a pattern for their future wives in which the latter would work, withdraw from work to engage in child rearing, then work again. They felt that there is no substitute for a mother for young children. While they were willing to help their future wives, they often excluded tasks like diapering and laundry from their offers. Most of the subjects felt that the man should be the superior achiever in a couple. Most of the men thought that housewives are boring, but most wanted their wives to stay home. Komarovsky (1973) summarized the findings thus:

> In sum, the right of an able women to a career of her choice, the admiration for women who measure up in terms of the dominant values of society, the lure but also the threat that such women present, the low status attached to housewifery but the conviction that there is no substitute for the mother's care of young children, the deeply internalized norm of male occupational superiority pitted against the principle of equal opportunity irrespective of sex--these are some of the revealed inconsistencies (p. 881).

Most of the men, when confronted with these inconsistencies, did not report any feelings of stress; Komarovsky pointed out that the issues do not affect the men as directly as they affect women.

Hoffman (1977) pointed out that the new, more androgynous roles are not as strange for women as they are for men, because the work arena has become more and more interpersonally oriented, drawing on women's traditional interpersonal skills acquired through socialization. The fact that androgynous roles are stranger to men might help account for their slower adoption of these new roles.

Epstein and Bronzaft (1972) administered the College Student Questionnaire to over 1,000 women entering a 4-year liberal arts college under a new open admissions policy. The sample was thus predominantly from the lower-middle and working classes. The researchers were interested in the respondents' future projected roles as women. A full 48 percent wished to become married career women with children, while 28 percent wished to become housewives with one or more children. The respective figures in 1965 were 42 percent and 35 percent, indicating a trend for women even of lower-class backgrounds to reject the traditional female role.

Doyle (1975) administered the Feminist-Antifeminist Belief Pattern Scale and the Attitudes Toward Women Scale to a group of men and women. Measuring self-acceptance using the Personal Orientation Inventory, Doyle found that men who accept themselves have more profeminist attitudes than men who are not self-accepting. He

theorized that men's narrow sex typing leads to a lack of self-acceptance which in turn leads to antifeminist attitudes.

Broverman et al. (1972), as previously mentioned, pointed out that many more women than men have expressed a desire to be a person of the opposite sex. This could be interpreted to mean that women have a greater desire to change their sex roles than men, while men are more comfortable with the roles for which they have been socialized.

Stanford (1975) administered the Attitudes Toward Women Scale to men and women, and found that males who were brought up traditionally as far as sex roles were concerned were more sexist than women who were reared in this fashion. This would support the notion that men's socialization disposes them toward more conservatism in regard to sex roles later on.

Some authors contradict this general finding that women's roles and attitudes are changing more rapidly than men's. Hochschild (1973), for example, concluded that women are in fact usually quite willing to let a man's work assume more importance than their own, thus putting the men in the traditional dominant position. Dorn (1970) administered a questionnaire to 70 juniors and seniors in college. He found that more men than women felt that more

egalitarian relationships were occurring; this could be interpreted to mean, however, that men perceived women's roles changing faster than their own while women did not feel this was the case.

Sex-Role Expectations

While women's roles appear to be changing more rapidly than men's, some researchers have undertaken more direct studies of what men and women really expect from themselves and each other as far as sex roles are concerned. Steinmann and Fox (1966) administered the Inventory of Feminine Values to about 800 women and 400 men, including persons from a wide range of backgrounds and occupations. The women were instructed to respond as themselves, as their ideal woman would respond, and as they thought men's ideal woman would respond. The men were instructed to respond as their ideal woman would respond. In essence, the results showed that women saw themselves as balanced, their ideal woman as somewhat more active, and men's ideal woman as passive and family-oriented. However, men's ideal woman was much closer to the balanced self-perceptions of the women, suggesting a lack of communication between men and women regarding how men want women to be. Of particular significance was the finding that men's ideal woman would raise children to believe in the equality of the sexes. However, in examining men's ideal woman more

closely, the authors found contradictions similar to those mentioned in other studies. While men want women to fulfill themselves outside the family, they do not feel that a woman's self-realization should ever be the most important aspect of her life. Thus, while espousing a generally liberal position, men become more conservative when it comes to women actually acting out the new position. Apparently men's ideal woman is liberated as long as her liberation does not affect the man personally.

Fay (1970), in a cross-cultural study, found that ideal ratings of males and females among both male and female Americans tended to converge, with the ideal male becoming slightly more feminine than the typical male, and the ideal female becoming somewhat more masculine than the typical female.

Ellis and Bentler (1973) administered a sex-stereotype questionnaire and a personality questionnaire to a group of 152 male and female college students. They found, like Fay, that the ideal males and females had both male and female characteristics, rather than the stereotyped ones. Furthermore, each sex thought that the opposite sex's ideal of them was more traditional than it actually was, again indicating a lack of communication.

McKee and Sherriffs (1959) administered the Serbin Adjective Check List to 100 unmarried college men and 100

unmarried college women. They were instructed to respond as themselves, as they would like to be, as they would like the opposite sex to be, and as they thought the opposite sex would like them to be. The most significant finding was that while women's ideal man had as many favorable feminine characteristics as it did favorable masculine characteristics, men's ideal woman had considerably fewer favorable masculine characteristics than favorable feminine characteristics. This appears to indicate that while women desire androgynous men, men still desire basically feminine women. These researchers also found that women's ideal self was less sex typed than men's ideal self, meaning that women desire androgyny for themselves more than men do. Curiously, these authors predicted that since men have higher status in society, they would sooner be able to express overt sex-role change; the present writer, on the other hand, predicts just the opposite, because men appear to have more to lose by showing overt sex-role change.

Stericker (1976) administered the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) to 124 female and 107 male introductory psychology students at the same university at which the present research was conducted. She found that males described themselves as more masculine than females, females described themselves as more feminine than males, and neither sex was more androgynous than the other.

In short, the literature suggests that while men and women are still respectively masculine and feminine, the gap is closing. It appears that women want men to become more androgynous than men want women to become.

Measures of Masculinity-Femininity

Sex-role researchers have used a variety of scales in obtaining measures of masculinity and femininity. Chief among these is the Fe Scale of the California Psychological Inventory. Bieliauskas, Miranda, and Lansky (1968) administered the Fe scale to a group of college males and females with instructions to respond as typical college men and college women would. The scores were respectively masculine and feminine. The authors felt that these results indicated that the Fe scale was obvious to both men and women, and they questioned its utility. Furthermore, the stereotypes of the opposite sex were found to be stronger than those of the same sex, largely because the opposite-sex instructions were more stereotyped than the standard same-sex instructions.

Constantinople (1973) reviewed the following MF scales: the Terman and Miles Attitude-Interest Analysis Test, the MF scale of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the MF scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Fe scale of the California Psychological

Inventory, and the Guilford Masculinity Scale. She pointed out that the item selection for all of these instruments is based on the items' ability to discriminate males from females. This method assumes that "masculinity" and "femininity" are bipolar traits; that is, they represent opposite extremes, which cannot exist concurrently in the same person. These scales also assume the unidimensionality of masculinity-femininity, measuring it by one score only. Constantinople pointed out that correlational and factor analytic studies have shown that MF is multidimensional, rendering inadequate all the commonly used MF scales.

Pleck (1975) discussed the concepts of masculinity and femininity and the assumptions upon which they are based; his conclusions were similar to those of Constantinople. Pleck pointed out that there is a low correlation among various MF scales that are popularly used. Furthermore, most MF scales are unidimensional (as previously mentioned) while MF is multi-dimensional, including empirically unrelated components, such as emotionality, interests, and abilities. The available MF scales do not show convergent validity. Furthermore, Pleck pointed out, MF scales generally comprise a limited number of secondary, rather than central, personality traits, which limits their utility.

Bem (1974), responding to these criticisms of most MF scales, produced the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, which treats masculinity and femininity as separate dimensions rather than as opposites on a continuum. Bem pointed out that masculinity and femininity are logically as well as empirically independent, necessitating this treatment. The scale contains 20 masculine adjectives, 20 feminine adjectives, and 20 neutral adjectives, chosen on the basis of sex-typed social desirability as decided by a group of judges, rather than on the basis of differential endorsement by males and females. Thus, the subject is not forced to choose between masculine and feminine characteristics; the subject can score high on masculinity, high on femininity, high on both masculinity and femininity (which puts him or her in the "androgynous" category), or low on both masculinity and femininity (which puts her or him in the "undifferentiated" category). Because the Bem scale solves many of the problems associated with other MF scales (particularly the problems of bipolarity and unidimensionality), it has become popular in sex-role research, and is the focal instrument of the present study.

Hypotheses

The research reviewed above suggests several hypotheses regarding the changing sex roles for men and women

in our society. Those that were addressed by the present study follow. Hypothesis A states that women are less sex typed (more androgynous) than men. Given previous research indicating the more narrow sex typing experienced by males during development, as well as greater acceptance of equality by females, it seems that women would present themselves as more androgynous than men.

Hypothesis B states that higher self-esteem is positively correlated with greater ability to describe an androgynous person of the same sex. Previous research has indicated a positive correlation between androgyny and self-esteem. It seems to the author that individuals who can more readily describe an androgynous person of the same sex would probably be nearer to becoming androgynous themselves than individuals who can less readily describe such a person. Therefore, the former individuals would also be expected to have higher self-esteem.

Hypothesis C states that individuals of both sexes view liberated females as more androgynous than liberated males. In addition to the finding that girls are less narrowly sex-typed, it seems that both sexes are exposed in their development and in the media to liberated women who incorporate both masculine and feminine characteristics, while there is very little exposure to liberated men. In fact, the term "liberated man" is one that most people seen never to have heard of.

Hypothesis D states that women describe a liberated male in more androgynous terms than do men. Presumably, women, who are engaged in the process of becoming free of stereotypic sex roles, are more aware than men of what a male who is also free of stereotypic sex roles is like.

Hypothesis E states that women describe the ideal male in more androgynous terms than do men. Again, it seems that as women change, they would like to see men change also, while men's desire to become androgynous seems limited.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 71 male and 71 female college students enrolled in either an introductory psychology course or in an introductory course in research methods in psychology. The introductory psychology students (49 males and 53 females) were members of the "subject pool," and participated in the study as partial fulfillment of a departmental requirement. The research students (22 males and 18 females) participated at the request of their instructor. Data were actually collected on 77 females and 71 males; 6 females were randomly eliminated to ensure equal *N*s in the male and female groups. The mean age for the 71 males was 19.3 years; for the 71 females it was 19.2 years. This difference was not statistically significant, $t(140) = .28$, n.s.

Measures

Self-esteem was measured by Short Form A of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). This is a 16-item, 5-point, self-report scale which correlates highly with its parent scale, the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI), a widely used measure of self-

esteem. Each response is assigned a score from 1 to 5, with 1 standing for the response associated with lower self-esteem and 5 standing for the response associated with higher self-esteem. Each subject thus receives a mean self-esteem score between 1 and 5. See Appendix A for a copy of this measure.

Androgyny was measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974), which was described above. Since the author was interested in the degree of androgyny in various groups rather than in classifying individuals in terms of their sex roles, Bem's sex-role categories (e.g., masculine, feminine, androgynous) were not used. Furthermore, since the focus was on the degree of androgyny, Bem's androgyny difference score (each subject's mean femininity score minus his or her mean masculinity score), which indicates to what degree a subject's sex role is in one direction or another, was not employed. Rather, the author used the absolute value of the androgyny difference score, which indicates the degree of androgyny, but not the direction (masculine or feminine) of the sex role. Because of what it measures, and for the sake of brevity, the absolute value of the androgyny difference score will hereafter be referred to as ANDRO; when a group of such scores is averaged for a group of subjects, the average score will be referred to as MEAN-ANDRO.

Procedure

Subjects were given a packet of materials, which included the following: a face sheet for personal data, Short Form A of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory, and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory with five different sets of instructions (describe yourself, an ideal college male, an ideal college female, a truly liberated college male, and a truly liberated college female). See Appendix A for copies of all the materials that the subjects completed. The order of presentation was as above, except that the two "ideal" response sheets were counterbalanced within each sex of respondent, and the two "liberated" response sheets were counterbalanced within each sex of respondent. Subjects completed the packets in a quiet classroom with other subjects present. There was no time limit; most subjects completed the packets in about a half hour.

A variety of statistical procedures was employed. For Hypothesis A, the MEAN-ANDRO scores for males and females, when describing themselves on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, were compared using a *t*-test. For Hypothesis B, the MEAN-ANDRO scores for subjects describing a truly liberated college student of the same sex on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory were correlated with the same subjects'

self-esteem scores on Short Form A of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory, using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. For Hypothesis C, for both males and females, each sex's MEAN-ANDRO score when describing a truly liberated college female was compared to its MEAN-ANDRO score when describing a truly liberated college male, using Sandler's A for correlated samples (Runyon & Haber, 1971, p. 210). For Hypothesis D, the two sexes' MEAN-ANDRO scores when describing a truly liberated college male on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory were compared using a t-test. For Hypothesis E, the two sexes' MEAN-ANDRO scores when describing the ideal college male on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory were compared using a t-test.

For all of the hypotheses, the subject pool group and the research class group were compared within each sex (because males and females were always analyzed separately within hypotheses), using a t-test, to rule out differences by class. The two groups were analyzed together, except in one case.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In only one case (the male subjects' description of a liberated male) did the subject pool subjects differ significantly from the research class subjects. In this case, the MEAN-ANDRO score for subject pool males was 1.64 (*SD* = .82), while the MEAN-ANDRO score for research class males was 1.02 (*SD* = .72), $t(69) = 3.02$, $p < .01$ (see Table 1). Separate analyses for the two classes of males were therefore performed for Hypotheses C and D, both of which involved the comparison of another measure with the males' liberated-male ratings.

Hypothesis A

Contrary to the prediction, there was no significant difference in androgyny between male and female subjects; their MEAN-ANDRO scores were identical when rounded to the first decimal place (MEAN-ANDRO for males = .89, *SD* = .58; MEAN-ANDRO for females = .90, *SD* = .61). Each sex tended to respond in the direction of its sex-role stereotype: males were more masculine and females were more feminine. Both the males' and the females' mean androgyny difference scores approximated those obtained by Bem (1974; see Table 2). Her subjects and those in the

Table 1

Summary of Comparisons Between Subject Pool Group and Research Class Group for MEAN-ANDRO Scores

	Subject Pool		Research Class		
	M	(*SD*)	*M*	(*SD*)	*t*
Females					
Yourself	.85	(.53)	1.03	(.82)	1.06
Ideal Male	1.11	(.72)	1.03	(.83)	.69
Liberated Male	1.83	(.97)	1.53	(.97)	1.12
Liberated Female	1.44	(1.01)	1.45	(.83)	.04
Males					
Yourself	.91	(.56)	.85	(.62)	.40
Ideal Male	1.29	(.75)	1.06	(.69)	1.20
Liberated Male	1.64	(.82)	1.02	(.72)	3.02*
Liberated Female	1.35	(.90)	.87	(.65)	1.77

* $p < .01$

Table 2

Summary of Comparisons Between Bem's (1974) College Subjects and the Present Subjects for Androgyny Difference Scores ("Yourself" Instructions)

	Bem		Present Study			
	M	(*SD*)	*M*	(*SD*)	*t*	*df*
Stanford University						
Males	-.53	(.82)	-.68	(.82)	1.43	513
Females	.43	(.93)	.58	(.92)	1.22	348
Foothill Junior College						
Males	-.34	(.97)	-.68	(.82)	2.56*	186
Females	.53	(.97)	.58	(.92)	.32	146

* $p < .02$

present study are therefore similar in degree of androgyny. The lone exception is in the comparison between Bem's Foothill Junior College males (M = -.34, SD = .97) and the males in the present study (M = -.68, SD = .82). The latter group was significantly less androgynous than the former, $t(186) = 2.56$, $p < .02$.

There were no undifferentiated (i.e., neither masculine, feminine, nor androgynous) subjects in the present group, as defined by having both the masculinity and femininity means on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory falling at least one standard deviation below the means for Bem's (1974) Stanford University sample. Apparently the cultural forces experienced by this population during both earlier and current development have not, at least as yet, differentially affected the two sexes as far as a balance between masculine and feminine characteristics is concerned. Whether both the males and the females in the present group have both been affected by these cultural and developmental forces, and have moved closer to androgyny than individuals of similar social and cultural backgrounds were ten years ago, is not known. We do know, however, that the present group, several years after the study of Bem's group, is not more androgynous than her group was, and, at least for some of the subjects, is in fact less androgynous. It may be that current students at Stanford

University and Foothill Junior College have become more androgynous than they were when Bem first studied them. If this is true, they would probably be considerably more androgynous than the present subjects. It may be noted that the present subjects all attend a rather traditional, conservative, Roman Catholic, midwestern college, which may in part account for the fact that they are not more androgynous even than Bem's groups of several years ago.

Hypothesis B

Contrary to the prediction, for male subjects, higher self-esteem was not correlated with a more androgynous profile under the liberated college male instructions. In fact, there was a significant correlation in the opposite direction, r (69) = -.29, p < .02. One of the possible conclusions that one can draw from this result is that males who are aware enough of their feminine characteristics to attribute them to a liberated male have a lower self-concept than those who are not as aware of their feminine characteristics. This finding could be explained by the narrow sex typing that males experience, which teaches them that it is shameful and unmanly for them ever to cross sex-role boundaries.

On the other hand, this finding could be an artifact of the self-esteem measure employed in the study: the Texas Social Behavior Inventory has many statements

about assertiveness in social situations that contribute heavily to the subject's self-esteem score. It may be that men who are more in touch with their feminine aspects are simply less assertive than men who cannot readily admit their feminine aspects; the former may not, in fact, have lower self-esteem. Moreover, these men may simply admit their faults and self-doubts more readily than men who are less aware of their feminine aspects. In other words, the lower self-esteem scores obtained by the men who described a liberated college male in more androgynous terms may be an artifact of their being less assertive, or of their being more willing to admit doubts about themselves, rather than of their actually having lower self-esteem.

For females, on the other hand, the correlation between self-esteem and a greater degree of androgyny as a liberated college female was in the expected direction, $r(69) = .20$, $p < .02$. Thus, college women who perceive their liberated peers as more androgynous have higher self-esteem (or, perhaps, are more assertive) than those who perceive their liberated peers as more masculine (as the vast majority of females did). The fact that perception of the liberated female as masculine was associated with lower self-esteem seems to indicate that higher self-esteem is necessary for a female even to consider integrating the masculine and feminine sides of her personality. It seems

that if her self-esteem is not high enough, she is more likely to dismiss liberated women as masculine, not androgynous.

All of these conclusions can be questioned when one looks at the task that the subjects encountered: to describe a truly liberated college male or female. Both sexes of subjects, when looked at overall, described the liberated person of the same sex and of the opposite sex in masculine terms; in fact, these descriptions are more masculine than those of almost all the other individuals they were asked to describe. Although the author understands "liberated" to mean "free from stereotypic sex roles," i.e., androgynous, apparently these subjects view the concept as meaning "more masculine." This is understandable, in light of the fact that most of the exposure they have had to liberated individuals has been to liberated women seeking to gain recognition in previously masculine activities. There has been little or no exposure to the concept of the liberated man, so apparently the subjects concluded that this individual is also someone exhibiting masculine characteristics. Further research is needed to clarify how male and female subjects define liberated men and women, on whether the subjects differ in their definitions according to their own sex, and on whether the definitions differ according to the sex of the liberated person being defined.

Hypothesis C

For this hypothesis, since the MEAN-ANDRO scores differed significantly for the subject pool and the research class males, their data were analyzed separately.

For the subject pool males, the liberated female (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.35, SD = .89) was, as predicted, described as more androgynous than the liberated male (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.64, SD = .82), Sandler's A(48) = .222, $p < .05$. For the research class males, there was no significant difference between their liberated female (MEAN-ANDRO = .87, SD = .66) and their liberated male (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.02, SD = .72), A(21) = 1.267. These differing results for the two classes suggest that the more experienced (at least in terms of education in psychology) group of males was thinking more in terms of androgyny for both sexes, while the less experienced group had a more difficult time imagining androgynous men. The former group may on the whole be more open to new ideas than the latter. The results for the subject pool group do seem to indicate that it is easier for male subjects to imagine an androgynous female than an androgynous male.

For the female subjects, the liberated female (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.44, SD = .97) was more androgynous than the liberated male (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.75, SD = .99), A(70) = .102,

$p < .01$. The women presumably have been exposed to many more models of androgynous women than models of androgynous men. Thus, while they viewed both liberated women and liberated men as masculine (as noted by inspection of the mean masculinity and femininity scores, the former of which is higher in each case), they viewed liberated men as even more masculine (less androgynous). Apparently, they see liberated women as crossing sex-role boundaries, while liberated men do so less. It is easier to describe a woman who integrates both sex roles than it is to describe a man who does so. On the other hand, the problem of how the subjects are defining "liberated" may be confounding these results: if liberated means more masculine, it may be that the female subjects saw the liberated woman as much more masculine than they saw themselves, while the liberated man was seen as simply more masculine than men in general were thought to be. In this interpretation, liberated women are not really seen as more androgynous: they are just seen as less masculine than liberated men, but much more masculine than women see themselves. In this sample, in fact, women did describe the liberated woman as much more masculine than they described themselves, $A(69) = .021$, $p < .001$.

Hypothesis D

Since this hypothesis again involved androgyny

scores for liberated males, the data for the two classes of male subjects were analyzed separately.

There was no significant difference between the subject pool males (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.64, SD = .82) and all of the females (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.75, SD = .99) in the degree of androgyny ascribed to liberated males, $t(118) = .66$. Both groups described these liberated males as quite masculine.

The hypothesis was also not confirmed when the research class males (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.02, SD = .72) were compared with the females in their descriptions of the liberated male. In fact, a significant result in the opposite direction was found, $t(91) = 3.70$, $p < .001$. In this case, then, the females rated liberated males as more masculine, rather than as more androgynous, then the males rated them. This fits with the earlier finding that the research class males seemed to view a liberated male as about equal in degree of androgyny to a liberated female. Apparently, these more experienced males did not view the liberated male in terms as masculine as those of the female subjects. Perhaps the female subjects are so accustomed to men putting up a front of masculinity that they could not even imagine men beginning to cross sex-role boundaries, while the more experienced men, perhaps aware of this front, were more able to picture men who might begin to show less

masculine sides of their personalities. Furthermore, it is possible that the females, who are beginning to become free of stereotypic sex roles themselves, perceive changing men as a threat to them, and thus would rather that men not move toward androgyny at the same time that they themselves are doing so.

Hypothesis E

The females' ideal male (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.09, SD = .76), contrary to the prediction, did not have a significantly more androgynous profile than the male subjects' ideal male (MEAN-ANDRO = 1.22, SD = .74), $t(140) = 1.03$. At least for this sample, the ideal male for women was no more androgynous than he was for men. One could speculate either that the men in this sample want to be just as androgynous as the women want them to be, or that the women do not really want the men to be androgynous. This is consistent with the findings on Hypothesis D, in which the women seem neither to be hoping for nor imagining men who deviate from their masculine sex typing. Despite protestations to the contrary, the women may find security in masculine men while they themselves are changing. Another factor may be the age of these women; they are still in late adolescence, and thus have not formed a solid sense of identity. To want men to assume some of the traditional

characteristics of women may be too threatening to their beginning sense of identity as women. It may be that older female subjects, more secure in their own identities, wish more strongly than these subjects for men to move toward androgyny along with them.

Conclusions

The results of the study did not, as a whole, support the main conceptual hypothesis that women are moving toward sex-role change more quickly than men, at least within a fairly conservative college population that is at the beginning of its college career. Nor did the women in this group seem to think of either a liberated male or an ideal male in more androgynous terms than the men, which leads the author to speculate that this female population is no more ready for androgynous men than the males. In fact, the males in this group who were members of a more advanced class seemed to perceive liberated males in more androgynous terms than the females perceived them, suggesting that, as males become more experienced, they are more able to imagine themselves functioning in a less stereotypically sex-typed manner.

The interpretation of the relationship between projected androgyny (androgyny in a same-sexed liberated person) and self-esteem was hampered by two factors: the nature of the self-esteem measure that was employed and

the expectation that the subjects would understand the word "liberated" in the same manner as the author. The self-esteem measure, the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (Short Form A), is heavily loaded with measures of dominance and social competence which may or may not reflect respondents' self-concept. Furthermore, the measure seems to have a rather significant capacity for being faked, so that subjects who wish to appear self-confident may receive higher scores than those who are more honest about themselves. There also seems to be a strong cultural emphasis on assertiveness, and assertive responses are given higher self-esteem scores. Further research, using a different measure of self-esteem, could begin to answer this question.

One of the more difficult problems in the present research was the subjects' interpretation, or misinterpretation, of the word "liberated." This is a word that has come into common parlance in regard to women, but that has hardly been heard in regard to men. The author knows of no research investigating the meaning of this word to people when it is applied to men or to women; it would seem necessary to conduct such research in future studies, in order to avoid the problems encountered in the present investigation.

Most of the subjects in the present study were in their first two years of college, which is often a time

of turmoil in terms of identity formation. While these males and females did not differ in their current level of androgyny or movement toward androgyny, it may be that older, more experienced individuals would differ in this regard. Future studies might use college seniors or other adults to investigate differences in degree of androgyny within different age groups. Another kind of study, which might help to clarify the issue of differential degrees of androgyny in males and females, would be a longitudinal study of the degree of androgyny in people over a time span of several years, particularly during young adulthood when many attitudes are forming. These kinds of studies could give a clearer picture of how different in degree of androgyny males and females are at different ages, and of how they change differentially in degree of androgyny as they get older.

Another question not answered in the present study is the degree of androgyny desired in themselves and in the opposite sex by both males and females. While the literature suggests that women desire less stereotypic sex-typed behavior on the part of men than men desire for themselves, the present study did not confirm this. Discrepancies between men and women in the desire for androgyny in themselves and/or in the opposite sex would be worthy of further investigation; if there are significant dis-

crepancies, increased lack of meeting of expectations of each other would result.

There seems to be a general public consensus that women have changed rather significantly over the past decade in terms of their attitudes about their stereotypic sex role. Very little is empirically known in this regard, however; even less is known about any corresponding changes in men, and the public does not seem nearly as interested in the men's side of sex-role change. The present study attempted to contribute to compensating for this deficiency, and the author, believing androgyny to be a growing aspect of life for both men and women, hopes that other investigators will continue to perform research on androgyny and its correlates in both sexes.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Different sex roles for men and women have long been an accepted part of our culture, and psychological theorists and practitioners have long considered appropriate sex-role identification (masculine or feminine) essential for psychologically healthy development and functioning. Recent cultural developments, as well as recent empirical investigations, have thrown into question the need for and the efficacy of these traditional roles. A new model for psychological and behavioral functioning, androgyny, has emerged as an alternative to different and stereotypic roles for the two sexes. Several studies have linked the presence of androgyny in individuals with higher self-esteem; other have suggested that androgyny is becoming more prevalent in women than in men.

The present study explored further the relationship between androgyny and self-esteem, differential degrees of androgyny in men and women and in people's conceptions of liberated men and women, and differential desires in men and women for sex-role change in men. The results were mixed: there was no difference in present degree of androgyny in the men and women in the sample, nor was there

a difference in their desire for androgyny in men. Liberated men and women were both described as quite masculine by both men and women (although liberated women were generally seen as less masculine than liberated men), suggesting that the subjects interpreted the word "liberated" as indicating a movement toward a greater amount of stereotypic masculine characteristics, increased self-determination, and/or perhaps the freedom and power associated with the male role. The relationship between self-esteem and the description of a same-sexed liberated person was unclear: there was a positive relationship only for women.

Further research was suggested to clarify the issues that were explored. The author believes that different degrees of androgyny, or different rates of movement toward androgyny, in men and women could have a strong influence on how the two sexes relate to each other. The relationship between androgyny and self-esteem also needs clarification: research in this area could have profound effects on theories of child development, on parenting methods, and on conceptions of mental health.

REFERENCES

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Bayer, A. E. Sexist students in American colleges: A descriptive note. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37, 391-397.

Bem, S. L. Psychology looks at sex roles: Where have all the androgynous people gone? Paper presented at UCLA Symposium on Women, May, 1972.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S. L. & Lenney, E. Sex typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 48-54.

Bem, S. L., Martyna, W. & Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.

Bieliauskas, V. J., Miranda, S. B., & Lansky, L. M. Obviousness of two masculinity-femininity tests. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 314-318.

Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.

Block, J., Von Der Lippe, A., & Block, J. H. Sex-role and socialization patterns: Some personality concomitants and environmental antecedents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41, 321-341.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., & Vogel, S. R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Dorn, D. S. Idealized sex roles among young people. Journal of Human Relations, 1970, 18, 789-797.

Doyle, J. A. Self-actualization and attitudes toward women. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 899-902.

Ellis, L. J. & Bentler, P. M. Traditional sex-determined role standards and sex stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 28-34.

Epstein, G. F. & Bronzaft, A. L. Female freshmen view their roles as women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 671-672.

Fay, T. L. Culture and sex differences in concepts of sex role and self. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1970.

Fling, S. & Manosevitz, M. Sex typing in nursery school children's play interests. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7, 146-152.

Gill, M. K. Psychological femininity of college females as it relates to self-actualization, feminine role attitudes, and selected background variables. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, (11-A), 7206.

Gough, H. G. Manual for the California Psychological Inventory. (Revised Edition). Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologist Press, 1964.

Harford, T. C., Willis, C. H. & Deabler, H. L. Personality correlates of M-F. Psychological Reports, 1967, 21, 882-884.

Hartup, W. W., Moore, S. G. & Sager, G. Avoidance of inappropriate sex-typing by young children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 467-473.

Helmreich, R. & Stapp, J. Short forms of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI), an objective measure of self-esteem. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1974, 4 (5A), 473-475.

Hochschild, A. R. A review of sex roles research. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 1011-1029.

Hoffman, M. L. Personality and social development. Annual Review of Psychology, 1977, 28, 295-321.

Johnson, P. I. The relationships between sex-role stereotypes and concepts of mental health. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34 (10-B), 5195.

Kanner, A. D. Femininity and masculinity: Their relationships to creativity in male architects and their independence from each other. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 802-805.

Komarovsky, M. Cultural contradictions and sex roles: The masculine case. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 873-884.

Lansky, L. M. The family structure also affects the model: Sex role attitudes in parents of preschool children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13, 139-150.

Lunneborg, P. W. Stereotypic aspect in masculinity-femininity measurement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 113-118.

Lynn, D. B. Divergent feedback and sex-role identification in boys and men. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 17-24.

McKee, J. P. & Sherriffs, A. C. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 356-371.

McKee, J. P. & Sherriffs, A. C. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals and self-concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 356-363.

Mednick, M. T. S. & Weissman, H. J. The psychology of women--selected topics. Annual Review of Psychology, 1975, 26, 1-18.

Miller, T. W. Male attitudes toward women's rights as a function of their level of self-esteem. In F. Denmark (Ed.), Who discriminates against women? Beverly Hills: Sage, 1974.

Osofsky, J. D. & Osofsky, H. J. Androgyny as a life style. The Family Coordinator, 1972, 21, 411-418.

Pleck, J. H. Masculinity-femininity: Current and alternative paradigms. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 161-178.

Romano, N. C. Relationships among identity confusion and resolution, self-esteem, and sexrole perceptions in freshman women at Rutgers University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36 (10-A), 6487.

Runyon, R. P. & Haber, A. Fundamentals of behavioral statistics (2nd ed.). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1971.

Seyfried, B. A. & Hendrick, C. When do opposites attract? When they are opposite in sex and sex-role attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 15-20.

Sherriffs, A. C. & Jarrett, R. F. Sex differences in attitudes about sex differences. Journal of Psychology, 1953, 35, 161-168.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. 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, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Stanford, S. M. Attitudes toward women; Critical background predictors and the effect of a managerial development and feminist awareness seminar. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1975.

Stein, A. H., Pohly, S. R., & Mueller, E. The influence of masculine, feminine, and neutral tasks on children's achievement behavior, expectancies of success, and attainment values. Child Development, 1971, 42, 195-207.

Steinmann, A. & Fox, D. J. Male-female perceptions of the female role in the U.S. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 64, 265-276.

Steriker, A. B. Fear-of-success in male and female college students: Sex-role identification and self-esteem as factors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36 (11-B), 5819.

Strodtbeck, F. L., Beydek, W. & Goldhamer, D. Male sex-role and response to a community problem. Sociological Quarterly, 1970, 11, 291-306.

Tavris, C. Who likes women's liberation--and why: The case of the unliberated liberals. Journal of Social Issues, 1973, 29, 175-198.

Vincent, C. E. Implications of changes in male-female role expectations for interpreting M-F scores. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 196-199.

Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language (Unabridged). Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1971.

APPENDIX A

PERSONAL DATA

Please note that this information is being collected anonymously, and will be treated completely confidentially.

Age_____ Sex: Male Female Year in College_____

Marital Status: Single Married Other

Religious background: Catholic Protestant Jewish Other None

Current religion: Catholic Protestant Jewish Other None

Do you practice this religion? Yes No Sometimes

Father's educational level_____

Mother's educational level_____

Mother's occupation_____

Father's occupation_____

Major_____

Please circle the letter corresponding to the description that best suits yourself, according to the following scale.

a	b	c	d	e
Not at all characteristic of me	Not very characteristic of me	Slightly characteristic of me	Fairly characteristic of me	Very much characteristic of me

1. I am not likely to speak to people until they speak to me.
   a b c d e

2. I would describe myself as self-confident.
   a b c d e

3. I feel confident of my appearance.
   a b c d e

4. I am a good mixer.
   a b c d e

5. When in a group of people, I have trouble thinking of the right things to say.
   a b c d e

6. When in a group of people, I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions.
   a b c d e

7. When I am in disagreement with other people, my opinion usually prevails.
   a b c d e

8. I would describe myself as one who attempts to master situations.
   a b c d e

9. Other people look up to me.
   a b c d e

10. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.
    a b c d e

11. I make a point of looking other people in the eye.
    a b c d e

12. I cannot seem to get others to notice me.
    a b c d e

13. I would rather not have very much responsiblility for other people.
    a b c d e

14. I feel comfortable being approached by someone in a position of authority.
    a b c d e

15. I would describe myself as indecisive.
    a b c d e

16. I have no doubts about my social competence.
    a b c d e

On the following page, you will be shown a large number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics in order to describe yourself. That is, we would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you these various characteristics are. Please do not leave any characteristics unmarked.

Example: sly

Mark a 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE that you are sly.

Thus, if you feel it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are "sly," never or almost never true that you are "malicious," always or almost always true that you are "irresponsible," and often true that you are "carefree," then you would rate these characteristics as follows:

Sly	3
Malicious	1

Irresponsible	7
Carefree	5

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE	OCCASIONALLY TRUE	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

YOURSELF

Self reliant		Reliable		Warm	
Yielding		Analytical		Solemn	
Helpful		Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand	
Defends own beliefs		Jealous		Tender	
Cheerful		Has leadership abilities		Friendly	
Moody		Sensitive to the needs of others		Aggressive	
Independent		Truthful		Gullible	
Shy		Willing to take risks		Inefficient	
Conscientious		Understanding		Acts as a leader	
Athletic		Secretive		Childlike	
Affectionate		Makes decisions easily		Adaptable	
Theatrical		Compassionate		Individualistic	
Assertive		Sincere		Does not use harsh language	
Flatterable		Self-sufficient		Unsystematic	
Happy		Eager to soothe hurt feelings		Competitive	
Strong personality		Conceited		Loves children	
Loyal		Dominant		Tactful	
Unpredictable		Soft-spoken		Ambitious	
Forceful		Likable		Gentle	
Feminine		Masculine		Conventional	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE	OCCASIONALLY TRUE	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

On this page you will find the same set of personality characteristics, only this time you are to describe the IDEAL COLLEGE MALE. Indicate by your ratings what you think he is like.

IDEAL COLLEGE MALE

Self reliant		Reliable		Warm	
Yielding		Analytical		Solemn	
Helpful		Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand	
Defends own beliefs		Jealous		Tender	
Cheerful		Has leadership abilities		Friendly	
Moody		Sensitive to the needs of others		Aggressive	
Independent		Truthful		Gullible	
Shy		Willing to take risks		Inefficient	
Conscientious		Understanding		Acts as a leader	
Athletic		Secretive		Childlike	
Affectionate		Makes decisions easily		Adaptable	
Theatrical		Compassionate		Individualistic	
Assertive		Sincere		Does not use harsh language	
Flatterable		Self-sufficient		Unsystematic	
Happy		Eager to soothe hurt feelings		Competitive	
Strong personality				Loves children	
Loyal		Conceited		Tactful	
Unpredictable		Dominant		Ambitious	
Forceful		Soft-spoken		Gentle	
Feminine		Likable		Conventional	
		Masculine			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE	OCCASIONALLY TRUE	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

On this page you will find the same set of personality characteristics, only this time you are to describe the IDEAL COLLEGE FEMALE. Indicate by your ratings what you think she is like.

IDEAL COLLEGE FEMALE

Self reliant		Reliable		Warm	
Yielding		Analytical		Solemn	
Helpful		Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand	
Defends own beliefs		Jealous		Tender	
Cheerful		Has leadership abilities		Friendly	
Moody		Sensitive to the needs of others		Aggressive	
Independent		Truthful		Gullible	
Shy		Willing to take risks		Inefficient	
Conscientious		Understanding		Acts as a leader	
Athletic		Secretive		Childlike	
Affectionate		Makes decisions easily		Adaptable	
Theatrical		Compassionate		Individualistic	
Assertive		Sincere		Does not use harsh language	
Flatterable		Self-sufficient		Unsystematic	
Happy		Eager to soothe hurt feelings		Competitive	
Strong personality		Conceited		Loves children	
Loyal		Dominant		Tactful	
Unpredictable		Soft-spoken		Ambitious	
Forceful		Likable		Gentle	
Feminine		Masculine		Conventional	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE	OCCASIONALLY TRUE	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

On this page you will find the same set of personality characteristics, only this time you are to describe the TRULY LIBERATED COLLEGE MALE. Indicate by your ratings what you think he is like.

TRULY LIBERATED COLLEGE MALE

Self reliant		Reliable		Warm	
Yielding		Analytical		Solemn	
Helpful		Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand	
Defends own beliefs		Jealous		Tender	
Cheerful		Has leadership abilities		Friendly	
Moody		Sensitive to the needs of others		Aggressive	
Independent		Truthful		Gullible	
Shy		Willing to take risks		Inefficient	
Conscientious		Understanding		Acts as a leader	
Athletic		Secretive		Childlike	
Affectionate		Makes decisions easily		Adaptable	
Theatrical		Compassionate		Individualistic	
Assertive		Sincere		Does not use harsh language	
Flatterable		Self-sufficient		Unsystematic	
Happy		Eager to soothe hurt feelings		Competitive	
Strong personality		Conceited		Loves children	
Loyal		Dominant		Tactful	
Unpredictable		Soft-spoken		Ambitious	
Forceful		Likable		Gentle	
Feminine		Masculine		Conventional	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE	OCCASIONALLY TRUE	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

On this page you will find the same set of personality characteristics, only this time you are to describe the TRULY LIBERATED COLLEGE FEMALE. Indicate by your ratings what you think she is like.

TRULY LIBERATED COLLEGE FEMALE

Self reliant		Reliable		Warm	
Yielding		Analytical		Solemn	
Helpful		Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand	
Defends own beliefs		Jealous		Tender	
Cheerful		Has leadership abilities		Friendly	
Moody		Sensitive to the needs of others		Aggressive	
Independent		Truthful		Gullible	
Shy		Willing to take risks		Inefficient	
Conscientious		Understanding		Acts as a leader	
Athletic		Secretive		Childlike	
Affectionate		Makes decisions easily		Adaptable	
Theatrical		Compassionate		Individualistic	
Assertive		Sincere		Does not use harsh language	
Flatterable		Self-sufficient		Unsystematic	
Happy		Eager to soothe hurt feelings		Competitive	
Strong personality		Conceited		Loves children	
Loyal		Dominant		Tactful	
Unpredictable		Soft-spoken		Ambitious	
Forceful		Likable		Gentle	
Feminine		Masculine		Conventional	

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Charles D. Wolfson has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Alan S. DeWolfe, Director
Professor, Psychology, Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Jeanne M. Foley
Professor, Psychology, Loyola University of Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

7/28/81
Date

Alan S. DeWolfe
Director's Signature