



1980

## An Investigation Into the Dynamics Underlying Men's Attitudes Toward the Social Role of Women

Carl Robinson  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses)



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Robinson, Carl, "An Investigation Into the Dynamics Underlying Men's Attitudes Toward the Social Role of Women" (1980). *Master's Theses*. 3202.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/3202](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3202)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1980 Carl Robinson

200

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE DYNAMICS UNDERLYING  
MEN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SOCIAL ROLE OF WOMEN

by

Carl Robinson

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

April

1980

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the members of his thesis committee, Jeanne Foley, Ph.D., Thesis Director, and James Johnson, Ph.D., for their patience and valued advice. In addition, the author would like to thank CFS Continental Inc. for its cooperation in providing respondents for this research. Particular gratitude must go to James Bankard, Director of Employee Relations at CFS Continental, for his assistance in procuring volunteer subjects and in distributing and collecting testing materials.

This research was in part supported by a Small Research Grant (#333-37-226) awarded to James Johnson and Carl Robinson by Loyola University of Chicago.

## VITA

The author, Carl Robinson, is the son of Joseph Robinson and Florence (Beam) Robinson. He was born on November 25, 1953 in Chicago, Illinois.

His elementary education was obtained in the public schools of Winnetka, Illinois, and his secondary education at New Trier West High School, Northfield, Illinois, where he graduated in 1971.

In September of 1971 he entered the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, and in June, 1975 he graduated Magna Cum Laude with a B.A. in Psychology. While attending the University of Colorado, he became a member of Psi Chi, the National Honor Society in Psychology. In addition, he engaged in individual research on the topic of color perception and personality for which he authored two publications in 1975. After graduating college he taught in a Montessori School in Aspen, Colorado for one year.

In the Fall of 1976 he entered the Doctoral Program in Clinical Psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. He was awarded a USPH Fellowship in 1976 and he held Graduate Assistantships in 1977 and 1979. In the Fall of 1979 he completed a Clinical Psychology Internship at Chicago-Read Mental Health Center, Chicago, Illinois. He has served as a

Consulting Reader for Perceptual and Motor Skills and has chaired symposia and presented scientific papers at a number of Regional and National psychological association conventions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ii
VITA . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
CONTENT OF APPENDICES . . . . .	viii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Modern Thinking on Sex Roles . . . . .	7
Exploring the Feminist Personality . . . . .	16
Sex-Role Attitude Measures . . . . .	21
Demographic Relationships . . . . .	28
Personality Relationships . . . . .	34
Present Study and Hypotheses . . . . .	41
METHOD . . . . .	44
Subjects . . . . .	44
Materials . . . . .	46
Demographic Questionnaire . . . . .	47
Attitudes Toward Women Scale . . . . .	47
Tennessee Self Concept Scale . . . . .	49
Bem Sex-Role Inventory . . . . .	50
Adjective Check List . . . . .	52
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale . . . . .	54
Procedure . . . . .	56
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	58
Demographic Variables . . . . .	59
Sample Differences . . . . .	59
Age . . . . .	64
Religion . . . . .	65
Race . . . . .	66
Marital Status . . . . .	67
Personality Results . . . . .	69
Self Concept . . . . .	69
Dogmatism . . . . .	71
Personal Adjustment . . . . .	72
Needs for Aggression, Dominance and Autonomy . . . . .	72

Sex Roles . . . . .	75
CONCLUSION . . . . .	78
REFERENCES . . . . .	81
APPENDIX A . . . . .	88
APPENDIX B . . . . .	90
APPENDIX C . . . . .	95
APPENDIX D . . . . .	.103
APPENDIX E . . . . .	.106

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample . . . . .	60
2. Sample Characteristics - Personality Measures . .	61
3. ANOVA - Attitudes Toward Women by Demographic Variables . . . . .	62
4. Attitudes Toward Women Means for Demographic Variables . . . . .	63
5. Personality Variables Correlated with the Attitudes Toward Women Scale . . . . .	70
6. ANOVA - Attitudes Toward Women by Bem Sex-Role Categories and Attitudes Toward Women Means for Bem Sex-Role Categories . . . . .	76



CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	Page
A. Face Sheet . . . . .	88
B. Attitudes Toward Women Scale . . . . .	90
C. Tennessee Self Concept Scale . . . . .	95
D. Bem Sex-Role Inventory . . . . .	103
E. Rokeach Dogmatism Scale - Short Form . . . . .	106

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a growing interest within the field of psychology in understanding sex roles and sex-determined attitudes and beliefs. One need not look far in order to see why this phenomenon is occurring. Clearly it is in response to a changing social consciousness regarding women and their roles in society. This change has been brought about by a number of factors including the civil rights movement of the 1950s and '60s, a variable economic climate, population shifts, and most importantly, the women's liberation movement itself. The current situation reflects an increasing portion of women employed in all sectors of the labor force, smaller families in which mothers need be less burdened by their children, higher divorce rates, and in general a new found freedom that allows members of both sexes the opportunity to break away from traditional role constraints in ways never seen before.

Of course, there are many who have not greeted the changing zeitgeist with open arms. Although the women's movement is perhaps the largest, most diverse, and most effective social force seen in recent history, it is also most threatening to those who are invested in maintaining the status quo. Hence, it has met with considerable resistance.

Women's liberation has been seen as a serious threat to our moral character, potentially leading to the destruction of "family" as an institution. It has been labeled "unAmerican," and seen to go against the grain of the establishment both in religious and political terms. The ramifications of the resulting conflict which surrounds our traditional sex-based boundaries are too interesting and important to overlook. While in the past there was little reason to question the implications of "sex roles," the present situation demands careful attention. The women's movement of today is actively reassessing and challenging long-held attitudes and beliefs. This is an evolving and complex process, and its outcome remains unclear. However, psychology has clearly begun to act on its responsibility to address these issues with vigor and objectivity.

Recent research in the area of sex roles has focused on intangible and flexible attitudes. As a result, definitive conclusions and acceptable models have been hard to come by. Even the related terms are difficult to define. For the sake of the present discussion, the author accepts Block's (1973) broad description of sex role to mean the constellation of qualities an individual understands to characterize males and females within the context of his or her culture. Regarding these sex roles, two "truths" appear to have emerged: (a) there are reliably identifiable behavioral characteristics that are commonly and traditionally accepted to be descriptive of males or females respectively and (b) both men

and women tend to value masculine traits above feminine ones (Block, 1973; Kravetz, 1976; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968).

It is the apparent injustice of the second "truth" that has become the focal issue of the women's movement, and has in turn sparked much psychological research. Unfortunately, the attitude that the male role is superior to the female role pervades our society at all levels. The extent of this can be seen within our own profession. In a classic study conducted by Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970), psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers were asked to differentially describe an emotionally healthy and mature adult, as well as a man and woman. The authors found that the descriptions for a healthy adult paralleled those for a healthy man, while the healthy woman was seen as less mature, less actualized, less stable, and generally less healthy than the healthy adult. As recently as 1977, Aslin found that while feminist therapists viewed women within the context of "healthy adults," some 55 male therapists continued to perceive of mental health in male-valued terms.

The women's movement has long challenged the notion that women's roles need be less desirable (or indeed less healthy) than men's role in our society. Following this lead, psychologists have begun to contest the assumption that masculinity (M) and femininity (F) represent the polar ends of a single sex-role dimension. The established M-F scales

(MMPI, California Personality Inventory, Draw-a-Person, Adjective Checklist, etc.) have come under increasing criticism for reasons of their bipolar approach as well as for their poor construction and outdated item content (Constaninople, 1973; Wakefield, Sasek, Friedman, & Bowden, 1976). Instead, the conceptual advantage of assessing the independent development of masculine and feminine attributes has been advocated. This approach allows for the possibility that an individual may hold both desirable masculine and feminine characteristics and hence have an "androgynous" identity. With this in mind, a number of researchers have developed new scales that assess sex-role identity within the framework of current thinking (e.g., Bem, 1974; Berzins, Welling, & Wetter, 1978; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974).

With the advent of these new psychometric tools, researchers have begun to look anew at the dynamics associated with individual differences in M-F. While prior research had looked with equal interest at both men and women, most of the current studies have focused on women alone. This bias is understandable in that recent changes in sex-role identity have been brought about primarily by women, and on the surface it would seem that it is that role which has been most affected. Much of this research energy has been spent in attempting to understand how changing women's roles have affected women themselves. A frequent target of study has been the "feminist." Initially, research centered on comparing members of the women's liberation movement (who,

some speculated, held traditional masculine sex-role traits) with non-liberated women. Attempts were made to distinguish the feminist from the rest of womanhood. However, this distinction proved rather limited. As a result, a number of researchers devised feminism inventories (i.e., scales designed to measure attitudes toward women's liberation) in an attempt to increase sample size, strengthen the generalizability of findings, and further clarify the situation (Herman & Sedlacek, 1973; Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1972, to name a few).

As the feminist personality has become better understood, it seems reasonable that researchers would explore the other side of the coin; i.e., the "chauvinist" personality. Indeed, one might logically argue that understanding the male perspective would prove most valuable, as men continue to remain on top in our society, and hence put up much of the resistance to changing women's roles. Surprisingly, very little of this research has as of yet been done. Although the tools now exist to explore this domain, little is known about the dynamics that underlie and influence men's attitudes towards women. Indeed, what scant research that has occurred has relied almost exclusively on samples of college students. One can easily see that a young college man is a rather limited subject from which to generalize about all men's attitudes. This is particularly true in the present research area, as his attitudes have generally not yet been influenced by "adult" considerations

such as marriage, family, employment and the broader base of values and prejudices held by his non-student brothers.

The present study sought to help remedy this situation through its exploration of a wide range of personality and cultural factors within a fairly large and diverse male sample which were felt to underlie men's attitudes toward the social role of women. These personality variables included self-esteem, personal adjustment, degree of dogmatic thinking, the need for aggression, autonomy, and dominance, as well as individual sex-role identity. Cultural and demographic variables addressed were age, race, religion, marital status, and nature of employment. It was hypothesized that men's sex-role attitudes are a function of their individual sense of security and receptivity, and thus results were discussed and interpreted within this framework.

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### Modern Thinking on Sex Roles

In reviewing the literature relevant to man's attitudes towards women, a brief description of the current thinking on the topic of sex roles is a necessary starting point. As noted previously, our conception of this construct has changed considerably during the last few years. Traditional approaches concerned themselves primarily with masculine or feminine identification. This sex-role identification refers to the actual incorporation of the roles thought to be inherently male or female and the unconscious reactions of the individual characteristic of that role (Caligor, 1951; Lynn, 1959). This approach has a dynamic basis, stemming from the psychoanalytic theory espoused by Sigmund Freud (1924). It views masculinity (M) and femininity (F) as opposing ends of a single dimension (M-F). The phrase, "the opposite sex," fits well into this bipolar approach, as the stereotypical man is seen as the opposite of his female counterpart in M-F characteristics. The dynamic explanation for sex-role development stems from childhood identification with the same sex parent. Freud (1924) proposed that this process occurs in the successful resolution of the Oedipal (or Electra) complex. Depending on the modeling provided by



the parent, as well as the level of success achieved by the child in moving from one developmental stage to another, the adult finds himself falling somewhere on the M-F continuum (Mussen, 1962). The importance of one's ultimate sex-role identity has been of enduring theoretical significance. For example, Lynn (1959) has noted that most psychologists have long associated emotional disturbance with a lack of harmony among aspects of an individual's sense of masculinity or femininity.

As mentioned in the introduction, a host of psychometric tools were devised in the 1940s and '50s to assess M-F. They were inspired by the work of Terman and Miles (1936), who observed that the purpose of M-F scales is to enable the clinician to obtain a more meaningful, more objective measure of those aspects of personality in which the sexes tend to differ. More specifically, their purpose is to make possible a quantitative estimation of the amount and direction of a subject's deviation from the mean of his or her sex. The Femininity Scale of Gough (1952) follows this tradition in an exemplary fashion. It was derived from some 500 items thought to differentiate men from women. The final product contained the most reliable 58 items. One of the first applications of this test was a demonstration that homosexual men scored more similarly to females than to normal males. Support for this hypothesis was presented by Gough (1952) as an indication of the validity of his measure.

Little criticism of this general approach to sex roles

was heard until the late 1960s, when the social and political climate then began to change. Initial concern was expressed regarding the obviousness of the available M-F inventories themselves. It was repeatedly demonstrated that respondents' scores could easily be manipulated by response set and subject expectations (Bieliauskas, Miranda, & Lansky, 1968; Sappenfield, 1968), thus indicating the transparency and ineffectuality of these measures.

Constantinople (1973) criticized existing measures of M-F from another direction. She suggested that M-F is best not thought of as a single dimension, but as a multidimensional construct. If this were the case, then the bipolar nature of sex-role inventories would be necessarily limited. She argued that the theoretical explication that would tie sex differences to masculinity and femininity does not, in fact, exist and that empirical data actually point to the inadequacy of the bipolar approach. She observed that personality theorists, such as Erikson, Jung, and Maslow have long implied that an emotionally healthy adult incorporates characteristics of both sexes, and that the mature individual is somewhat androgynous in nature. She correctly pointed out that M-F scales fail to take this information into account and that they are defined only in terms of sex differences on item responses. She concluded her paper by suggesting that future work might be done in reevaluating the unidimensional M-F continuum.

In a similar vein, Block (1973) argued that traditional

thinking on masculinity and femininity as a single bipolar dimension is not only in grave theoretical error, but also itself a source of sexist ideology. Drawing on cross-national studies of self-definition as well as longitudinal assessment of sex-role attitudes in the United States, Block pointed out that evidence indicates our conception of M-F is consistent within our culture and times, but fails to hold constructural shape outside of this context. It is highly influenced by developmental socialization, and may best be thought of as a socialized value rather than a psychological dimension. She noted that individuals demonstrating the highest levels of ego functioning hold qualities traditionally thought of as masculine (e.g., independence and achievement orientation) as well as feminine (e.g., conscientiousness and sensitivity). These androgynous individuals claim the desirable and strong characteristics from both sexes. Block also suggested that it is easier for men to attain higher ego functioning in our culture because the individuation process for women involves greater conflict with prevailing norms. She concluded that a redefinition of sex roles and a revamping of socialization processes is necessary if our society wants to foster individuation and personal maturity for its young.

These important papers by Constantinople and Block led to the development of new psychometric tools. In 1974 Bem introduced the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. This is a 60-item measure designed to treat masculinity and femininity as

independent dimensions, thereby making it possible to categorize persons either as masculine or feminine in the traditional sense, or androgynous (i.e. individuals holding both masculine and feminine qualities). Not only is this inventory an improvement over other M-F scales in terms of item content and the reduction of social desirability confounds, but it also provides a means of validating the construct of androgyny, and hence the multidimensionality of sex-role identity. Indeed, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory became the first measure that did not automatically build an inverse relationship between masculinity and femininity. It should be noted that the scoring of the inventory was later modified (Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976) to allow the classification of subjects scoring low in both masculine and feminine qualities in an "undifferentiated" sex-role category.

The changing M-F construct also led Spece et al. (1974) to develop the Personality Attributes Questionnaire. This inventory is a measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity and femininity. It is a 55-item measure derived from the Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968) which treats masculinity and femininity as separate dimensions, both being characteristic of each sex. This questionnaire yields three scales: Masculinity (M), Femininity (F) and Androgyny (M-F). Items used for the M and F scales are considered desirable for both sexes (although they tend to be favored by one sex over the other), while items on the M-F scale vary in direct opposition in terms of

their desirability to each sex. This inventory provides still another means of defining and validating the multidimensionality of sex-role identity.

Several less significant scales have been developed which treat masculinity and femininity as independent variables. Berzins, et al. (1978) described the PRF-Androgyny Scale. It follows the same theoretical rationale that underlies the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, only it relies on the already established Personality Research Form for its items. This has two chief advantages: (a) because the inventory has been widely used in past research, post hoc inspection of data can provide a rich source of sex-role information, and (b), there is greater utility in using a measure which has established scales already available. The authors note that a correlation of .65 was found between the FFR-Androgyny Scale and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory.

A comparable line of reasoning led Heilbrun (1976) to extract masculinity and femininity subscales from an earlier bipolar composite index based on the Adjective Check List. Similarly, Wakefield et al. (1976) devised independent M-F scales using the MMPI. These authors developed their respective measures in a fashion that allowed "undifferentiated" individuals to emerge and as a result, made up for this deficiency in the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. However, as noted before, Bem and her colleagues adjusted their measure in 1976 to accomplish exactly this same function. As a result, most new M-F scales besides the Bem Sex-Role

Inventory and the Personality Attributes Questionnaire have not seen much use.

However, recent thinking on sex-role identity has generated a great deal of research during the last 5 years. Much of this has been in the direction of validating the androgyny construct, and by now this seems to be well established (Bem, 1977; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). More relevant to the present study, researchers have sought to explore the various correlates of and influences on sex-role identity. Much of this work has stemmed from Block's (1973) observation, noted previously, that individuals of highest ego development demonstrate an androgynous identity. In supporting this finding, psychologists are beginning to dispel the long-accepted notion that individuals of high emotional health and maturity necessarily hold strong stereotypical same-sex identity roles.

Using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, Bem (1975) found that androgynous individuals showed greater adaptability and more situationally effective behavior in an experimental laboratory situation than either high masculine or high feminine subjects. She concluded that this was due to their greater role flexibility and their broader repertoire of available skills. Wiggins and Holzmuller (1978) substantiated this finding. Using Bem's scale on some 178 college students, they found androgynous individuals to be more flexible in their interpersonal behavior than sex-typed individuals. In addition, the authors suggested that

androgynous men have greater flexibility than androgynous women.

In a similar direction, Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) administered the Bem scale and the Revised Bell Adjustment Inventory to 128 subjects. Androgynous men and women scored high in personal adjustment. However, masculine males also scored quite high on this measure, while feminine males and females scored low. The authors speculated that the acquisition of cross-sex qualities benefits women more than men, as the attainment of masculine traits by women may be more adjustive in the social context of a male dominated society.

Similar results were found by Orlofsky (1977), who tested the hypothesis that psychological androgyny should be associated with ego integrity. Sex-role orientation, ego identity status, and self-esteem were determined for 111 individuals. The author found that androgynous subjects had high levels of ego development and self-esteem, while undifferentiated subjects had low self-concept and a lack of personal integration (identity diffusion). However, as in Deutsch and Gilbert's (1976) study, Orlofsky found that masculine males also had high self-esteem. Yet these males demonstrated significantly poorer ego integration than androgynous subjects of both sexes.

The most extensive research on this topic has been done by Spence and her associates. In a series of experiments utilizing both the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and the Personality

Attributes Questionnaire (Helmreich & Spence, 1979; Spence et al., 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), these researchers not only demonstrated the validity of the androgyny construct, but also investigated a wide range of issues raised by this discovery. They presented data showing that a dualistic conception of M-F holds for a large number of groups varying widely in age, geographic location, socioeconomic status, and patterns of interest. Importantly, they demonstrated that androgynous individuals display higher self-esteem, social competence, and achievement orientation than individuals who are strong in either masculinity or femininity or strong in neither. The authors found some sex differences in these correlates. In self-esteem, for example, masculine males tended to score higher than feminine females. However, across both sexes, results indicated that androgynous individuals scored highest on all measures, with masculine subjects of both sexes scoring next highest, followed by feminine subjects of both sexes and finally the undifferentiated scoring lowest. Apparently any strong sense of sex-role identity is better than none. Equally apparent is the fact that in our male dominated culture, individuals holding masculine qualities fare better than those holding feminine ones.

The purpose of this brief review of the research on sex roles has been to set the stage for the more pertinent literature on men's attitude toward women. As pointed out in the introduction, the issues of sex-role identity and the attitudes regarding sex roles are linked both historically



and conceptually. It should now be clear to the reader that the last 10 years have witnessed major changes in our understanding of masculinity and femininity. In many respects, these changes have occurred in response to the general reevaluation of the traditionally accepted social roles of men and women in our culture, a reevaluation which is still in progress. The remainder of this literature review is concerned with the ways in which individuals have experienced the women's movement and the attitudes that have become associated with that process.

### Exploring the Feminist Personality

As the feminist movement gained momentum in the late 1960s, the stress and strain of social transformation was being felt in our society. A diverse group of women had seemingly banded together in order to effect the kind of changes which were initially viewed as both radical and potentially subversive. By the early 1970s, it became clear that members of the Women's Liberation Movement and associated groups were quite serious about their efforts. Although it was generally assumed that these women were mostly "masculine" in their sex-role identity, "lesbian" in their sexual preference, and "socialist men haters" in their political ideology, serious researchers had become interested in truly understanding the feminist personality. Initially, this was a question of differentiating feminists from

nonfeminists. Studies completed in this direction were primitive in methodology and primarily exploratory in nature. However, these attempts laid the groundwork for the subsequent increase in good research completed in the last half of the decade.

One of the earliest attempts to explore the feminist psyche was reported in an important study by Sanger and Alker (1972). Interested in investigating the possible similarities between the personality of black militants and feminists, these authors hypothesized that relative to control subjects, members of the Women's Liberation Movement would score more internal in their own lives, yet more external in their control ideologies as measured by an adjusted version of Rotter's I-E Scale. This hypothesis followed from an already established trend seen in black activists. Results confirmed the author's expectations. Feminists tended to blame "sexism" on socialization, laws, and cultural influences, while the controls saw sexism as inherent and internally controlled. In addition, the liberated members took a significantly more internal view regarding controlling their personal lives when compared to the nonfeminist sample. The authors concluded that a key distinction between these groups is that feminists identify sexism as a problem which can be overcome by collective social action, while nonactivist women either do not see a need for change or else feel the problem is insoluble.

This work inspired a number of studies in which members

of the women's movement were compared to nonfeminist controls. Generally this research has been haphazard and limited in focus. For example, Fowler and Van De Riet (1972) administered the Adjective Check List to 18 women attending a radical women's conference sponsored by a feminist organization, as well as to 45 other women with a wide range of backgrounds. Data analysis yielded interesting findings. The feminist sample scored significantly higher on autonomy, aggression, self-confidence, and dominance, and significantly lower on deference than did controls and normative samples. Results were interpreted in terms of both generational confounds and the "self actualization" values espoused by the Women's Liberation Movement.

Pawlicki and Almquist (1973) administered the California Fascism Scale and Rotter's I-E Scale to 31 members of a women's liberation group and to 44 female control subjects. The liberated group demonstrated lower levels of authoritarianism on the Fascism Scale as well as significantly higher levels of self-control on the I-E Scale. These findings add support to those reported by Sanger and Alker (1972), and suggest that the women's movement is composed of individuals who believe in their ability to effect the changes they seek. Bieliauskas (1974) suggested that this finding reflects a "masculine" orientation in feminists, one that is by nature achievement oriented and efficacy conscious. He presented data to substantiate this claim. Twenty-nine feminists and 29 nonfeminists were given

two bipolar measures of M-F (the Gough Femininity Scale and the Drawing Completion Test). On both measures feminists scored more masculine than control subjects. However, this difference was significantly more apparent on the Drawing Completion Test, and Bieliauskas speculated that this reflects a greater unconscious masculine identity than is willingly admitted by most feminists.

Some additional support for the accuracy of early thinking on the feminist personality is provided by Fowler, Fowler, and Van De Riet (1973). The Conservatism-Radicalism Opinionnaire was administered to 50 identified members of the women's movement and to 50 nonfeminist college females. A significant difference was found between these two samples, with the feminists scoring much more radical (liberal) in their political attitudes. The authors concluded their paper with the observation that feminism is an antecedent to political radicalism.

A number of studies, however, have suggested that the stereotypes surrounding women's liberation are quite inaccurate. Goldberg (1974), for example, found that 12 feminists did not score significantly more masculine on the Gough M-F Scale than did 19 control subjects. He did find, however, that feminists were less likely to conform to external pressure (as measured by the Conformity Instrument) than nonfeminists. Similarly, Oneil, Teague, Lushene, and Davenport (1975) reported that they found no evidence to support the imputations that feminists exhibit deviant

personality characteristics, nor was there any indication that these women are more maladjusted than other women. The authors computer scored some 26 scales of the MMPI which had been completed by 19 feminists and 34 nonfeminists. While the two groups differed significantly on seven of the scales, in general this reflected a variance of attitudes and values, not clinical deviancy. In all cases, the mean T scores for the liberated group were within normal limits.

Finally, in an important study, Jorden-Viola, Fassberg, and Viola (1976) administered the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory to a large sample of women (100 feminists and 380 nonfeminist women of various backgrounds). Rather than scoring in a masculine direction, feminists as a group tended to score androgynous (i.e. holding qualities thought of as both masculine and feminine). The authors suggested that prior studies evaluating M-F identity for members of the Women's Liberation Movement may have missed this important distinction. Feminists do not appear to be rejecting feminine qualities in favor of masculine ones. Rather they seem to value qualities seen as desirable in both sexes. In addition, the authors reported that the feminist sample scored no more anxious than other subjects. Indeed, they scored lower on the Taylor Score than did a sample of 100 college females. The authors had hypothesized quite the opposite and, as a result, one might infer that there is still a great deal more to be known about the feminist personality.

## Sex-Role Attitude Measures

It is noteworthy, then, that during the last 5 years research comparing members of feminist groups to nonfeminist women has decreased to the point of nonexistence. This has occurred even though many fundamental questions remain unanswered. However, this research trend is not surprising, since social scientists have been quick to realize that there are inherently limiting features to doing this type of investigation. Not only are usable women's movement subject samples difficult to obtain, but there are serious confounding factors which make these women poor candidates from which to generalize. The feminist personality is a complex entity that may well represent many women not actively involved in the women's movement. Clearly it reflects a continuum of attitudes, beliefs, and characteristics. Indeed, there is no reason to think that a member of a socialist women's art collective in Chicago necessarily has the same personality as a member of the moderate National Organization for Women in Washington, D.C. Some method of assessing individual differences is clearly essential.

As a result of these considerations, researchers have developed a number of attitude measures designed to objectively assess an individual's feelings regarding the changing social roles of women. In effect, these "feminism scales" have allowed research to proceed with greater

flexibility and rigor. In fact, they have opened the door for the expansion of study to include men's attitudes toward the women's movement. . . These inventories are generally bipolar, with feminist or progressive attitudes seen as falling on one side of a continuous dimension and traditional or sexist attitudes as falling on the other extreme.

The forerunner of the modern feminism scale is reported by Kirkpatrick (1936). He described the construction of a belief pattern scale for measuring Attitudes Toward Feminism. He devised items that assess acceptance of feminist beliefs rather than attitudes toward avowed feminists. Primarily these items represent a wide range of women's roles. However, the outdated nature of the items precludes the use of this measure for current research (Smith et al., 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1972).

The first modern feminism scale has turned out to have the greatest utility. Titled the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, this 55-item inventory was developed by Spence and Helmreich in 1972 as an updated version of Kirkpatrick's 1936 measure. The construction and validation of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale is described in the Methods Section of the present paper. However, it should be noted that the authors intended their inventory to be used as an objective measure of attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. They observed that prior to this measure researchers were forced to speculate on individual attitudes. Impressionistic assumptions about the beliefs

held by acknowledged members of the women's movement can hardly suffice when one can have a psychometrically sound assessment of an individual's attitudes, as made possible by the Spence scale. The dimensions covered by this inventory include vocational, educational, and intellectual roles, freedom and independence, dating and courtship relations, sexual behavior, drinking and related social behavior, as well as marital obligations. It should be pointed out that Doyle (1975) found a correlation of .87 ( $N = 103$ ) between the Spence and the Kirkpatrick measures. In addition, in 1973 a 25 item short form of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale was introduced by Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp. This measure has been found to correlate .95 to the full scale.

In 1973, Herman and Sedlacek devised their own attitudes toward feminism inventory, titled the Situational Attitude Scale for Women. This measure was designed to assess an individual's level of "sexism," which the authors defined as the reluctance to view both men and women outside the context of their traditional sex roles. In standardizing their measure, Herman and Sedlacek administered it to 110 college students. The inventory consists of 100 bipolar items reflecting personal and social situations relevant to male-female relations and sex roles. Although reliability is satisfactory, the authors reported difficulty in validating the measure. They concluded that sexism is more than a negative reaction to feminism, and is actually a stereotyped reaction to any change in the established sex roles.



Still another feminism measure is presented by Osmond and Martin (1975). Their Sex-Role Attitude Scale is a Likert-type 32-item inventory designed to measure attitudes in terms of familial roles, interpersonal roles, stereotypes of male/female behavior and social changes related to sex roles. They suggested that the scale reflects a single dimension with traditional attitudes falling on one side of the continuum and "modern" or progressive attitudes falling on the other. Reliability coefficients for the scale averaged .88. In terms of validation, men were found to be significantly more traditional in their attitudes than women. Items regarding familial roles yielded the greatest amount of sex differentiation and sex typing. The authors concluded that nonsexist or feminist individuals appear to transcend sex-role constraints and view social roles outside of the context of sex.

The most popular alternative to Spence and Helmreich's Attitudes Toward Women Scale is Smith, et al.'s (1975) Attitudes Toward Feminism Scale (Fem Scale). This 20-item Likert-type inventory has the singular advantage of being easy and quick to administer, as it requires only 5 minutes to complete. As with the Spence scale, the Fem Scale is a spinoff of Kirkpatrick's 1936 measure. As a result, the authors were more concerned with attitudes toward feminism than toward feminists when they selected their items. In keeping with other feminism scales, the authors view their construct as a single bipolar dimension. Reliability is

reported to be .91. Construct validation is reported by Singleton and Christiansen (1977) to be satisfactory. These writers approached validation from several directions using a large sample of men and women subjects. They found a correlation of .63 between the Fem Scale and a brief questionnaire designed to assess identification with the women's movement. Correlations of -.52 to -.47 were found between a measure of dogmatism and the Fem. Finally, using the known groups method, Singleton and Christiansen reported large and significant differences for scores on the Fem Scale between feminists ( $N = 88$ ) belonging to the National Organization for Women, college females ( $N = 149$ ) and antifeminists ( $N = 59$ ) belonging to an organization called "Fascinating Motherhood." As expected, feminists scored high while antifeminists scored low. These authors concluded that the inventory is a highly reliable and valid instrument for measuring attitudes toward feminism.

Criticism of feminism scales has generally concerned their susceptibility to social desirability influences. Bowman and Auerbach (1978) demonstrated that the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, for example, does not differentiate between "well meaning" subjects (those willing to endorse feminism in words but not in action) and "sincere" subjects (those who truly support the women's movement). Well meaning subjects ( $N = 16$ ) tended to demonstrate greater susceptibility to social pressure than the sincere ( $N = 19$ ) subjects. Both groups scored equally high (feminist) on the

Spence. The authors suggested that sex-role attitude scales should attempt to screen out the well meaning types so that a more honest picture can emerge. A similar line of thinking led Gilbert, Warner and Cable (1975) to develop the Cross-Examinative Attitude Scale, which attempts to appraise feminist beliefs without the influence of response bias. These researchers pointed out that other scales assess only conscious attitudes, while theirs, through the elicitation of latent nonverbal responses, assesses unconscious attitudes as well. However, no research has been reported to suggest that this approach is more reliable or valid than other efforts, and hence, one would be wise to continue using accepted measures such as the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, keeping in mind, of course, that it has its potential limitations. In the present study, this measure was chosen because of its demonstrated validity and its proven utility.

With the feminism inventories in hand, researchers have returned to the field to try to further unveil the dynamics underlying attitudes toward the changing sex roles. Clearly, the expanding perimeters of the Women's Movement have affected men and women of all ages, races and backgrounds. Yet, as noted before, research has tended to utilize university women as subjects. This limitation seems to have evolved from initial efforts at understanding the so-called "feminist personality."

Some of the studies incorporating the new inventories were simply offshoots of the known groups research (i.e.,

feminists vs. nonfeminists) described previously. These projects classified subjects based on their relative scores, and then sought to observe differences for individuals falling at the extremes. Pomerantz and House (1977), for example, sifted through a large number of females to find 64 who had extreme scores on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (32 "feminists" and 32 "antifeminists"). These women were then given a number of social skills tasks designed to assess locus of control. Results were consistent with previous findings, in that the liberated sample appeared less dependent on social skills for personal fulfillment and seemed to base their self-esteem to a greater extent on a sense of inner control than the traditional sample. In a similarly designed study, Tipan, Bailey, and Obenchain (1975) selected 36 women who scored high on the Spence scale (above 120) and 36 who scored low (below 95). These women were then placed into experimental conditions involving the introduction of a male or female confederate into a limited physical space. Traditional subjects remained more distant physically from the male confederate and afterward saw themselves as less potent and aggressive than feminist subjects did.

These group classification studies have added little to our understanding of sex-role attitudes because they fail to take into account the continuum of beliefs and values involved within this dimension, i.e., individuals who fall between the extremes. In addition, these studies are

conceptually confusing. Powers and Guess (1976), for example, criticize the Tipon et al. study for being guilty of nonrandom sampling techniques. In a repetition of this study, they found no significant differences between the high and low scoring groups.

Fortunately, many researchers using the new feminism scales have sensed a broader opportunity and have designed their studies in a way that encourages more meaningful results. These research efforts have utilized all-female samples as well as male and female samples. Studies intended strictly for the understanding of men's attitudes have been virtually nonexistent, and attempts to glean information on the male perspective have had to synthesize results from those projects using both sexes in their sample population. Primarily, research has gone in one of two directions: (a) many efforts have explored the demographic and cultural factors which might influence attitudes toward the sex-roles, and (b) other studies have examined personality correlates to these attitudes. Research from both of these directions is reviewed here.

### Demographic Relationships

One of the most consistent findings has been the observation of significant differences between men and women in their attitudes toward feminism. In a massive statistical evaluation of archival data, Joesting and Joesting (1973)

reported that women are much more liberated or progressive in their attitudes than men. The authors relied on norms calculated for 170,000 college freshmen in 1970, and found this difference existed even though their male and female samples did not differ in terms of age, racial makeup, or socioeconomic class. Tomeh (1978) evaluated several thousand college students in terms of their attitudes toward women's roles and also found that females produced a significantly more modern response than males. This finding has been substantiated in numerous other college samples where subjects have taken the Spence or Fem Scale measures (Etaugh & Gerson, 1974; Gackenbach, 1978; Schmid, 1975; Ullman, Freedland, & Warmsun, 1978). Equally important are reports that this finding generalizes to nonstudent populations as well. Schumacher-Finell (1977) administered a self-devised feminism measure to a diverse sample of 479 men and women. These subjects ranged in age from nine through 53 years. The author reported that at every age, females were more in favor of feminist ideology than males. Braun and Chao (1978) compared men and women between the ages of 30 and 55 on their Attitudes Toward Women Scale scores and found results consistent with those reported previously. Factor analysis indicated that women were significantly more liberal regarding vocational and educational roles as well as marital roles. And, in their initial sample validation data for the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, Spence and Helmreich (1972) indicated that mothers and their daughters both scored more

profeminist than fathers and sons. However, it should be noted that in a study completed by O'Connor, Mann and Bardwick (1978) which assessed the Spence scores of an adult sample, women appeared only slightly more profeminist than men. Yet, even in a sample of 154 male and female psychotherapists, Sherman, Koufacos, and Kenworthy (1978) found women to be significantly more supportive of the feminist movement than their male counterparts. The findings reported regarding sex differences have been generally interpreted as indicating that women perceive themselves as having more to gain in changing traditional sex roles than do men. This suggests that not only are these roles perceived as unequal by women, but that the feminine role is seen as less desirable than the masculine role.

Sex differences on attitudes toward feminism are one of the few consistently replicated findings. Less success has been found in demonstrating the influence of age. In the manual for the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, Spence and Helmreich (1972) reported that both sexes of the college sample scored in a more progressive direction than their parents, suggesting that the older one is, the more traditional will be his or her attitudes. Schumacher-Finell (1977) found similar results for her sample of 479 subjects. She noted that the relationship between age and attitudes toward feminism is a curvilinear one as feminism scores increase gradually until age 20, then decline steadily with increasing age. Etaugh and Bowen (1976), in a more limited

longitudinal study of 1102 university students, found that there is a shift to more liberal attitudes toward feminism over the college years. In the case of men, it was speculated that this change reflects a developmental maturation process. However, for women this effect may have been partially due to the high college drop-out rate of traditional thinking females. In conflict with these reports, Pleck (1978) found no correlation between age and attitudes toward women's roles for 616 males representing a diverse national sample (age range: 18 to 70). However he reported a mild but significant correlation ( $r = -.22$ ) between age and the recognition that women are discriminated against in our society.

Regarding cultural and socioeconomic factors related to sex-role attitudes, a number of interesting findings have emerged. Gackenbach (1978) administered the Spence scale to 206 black and white university subjects. She found that black women had significantly more traditional attitudes than white women. However, she observed no differences between black and white males. Ullman et al. (1978) gave both the Spence and the Fem scales to some 314 college students who identified themselves as either of Caucasian or Oriental ancestry. For both sexes, the white sample held more progressive attitudes than the Oriental sample. Braun and Chao (1978) administered the Spence to 74 Caucasian American subjects and to 84 Asian born Chinese Americans. Although the authors predicted that the Chinese would score more



liberal on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, this was not confirmed. Indeed, Chinese females were the most conservative group, behind Caucasian and Chinese males. The most progressive attitudes toward women were held by Caucasian females. The authors speculated that Asian born women are culturally socialized to accept only traditional and conservative roles to an extent not seen in American culture.

In assessing other cultural influences besides race, Etaugh and Gerson (1974) gave the Spence scale to 382 university students and found a small but significant correlation ( $r = -.09$ ) between sex-role attitudes and level of family income, suggesting that students of less wealthy families have more progressive attitudes. However, the opposite conclusion was drawn by Scott, Richards, and Wade (1977). These authors found more liberal attitudes toward women in students attending an affluent private university than in those attending a regional campus of a state university. These findings were interpreted in terms of the relative values held by wealthy as opposed to middle class families. In a less direct gauge of socioeconomic influence, Pleck (1978) found a significant relationship ( $r = .26$ ) between educational level and attitudes toward feminism, with more highly educated subjects demonstrating more accepting attitudes toward the women's movement. This is consistent with Etaugh and Bowen's (1976) finding that attitudes become more progressive regarding women's liberation as subjects

move through college. However, Schumacher-Finell (1977) failed to find differences on the Spence scale between subjects attending college and subjects of the same age not in school. Clearly, in these studies results may be confounded by generational and cultural influences. Better controlled research will be necessary before definitive conclusions can actually be drawn.

Beyond these related pieces of research, a number of interesting individual efforts have occurred which further contribute to an understanding of the factors related to sex-role attitudes. For example, Staines, Tavris, and Jayaratne (1973) found that married women hold more negative attitudes toward feminism than single women of the same age and economic class. The authors posited that traditional attitudes stem from successful adoption to the existing system of sex-role differentiation, as reflected by marriage. Schmid (1975) assessed the relation between religious faith and attitudes toward feminism for 289 men and women. She found that atheists held the most favorable attitudes toward feminism. This corresponded to the findings of Ellis and Bentler (1973). In addition, Schmid found that Jewish subjects held the next most progressive attitudes, followed by Catholics. The least progressive attitudes were expressed by Protestants. One final study of note is that reported by Leventhal (1977). She administered the Spence scale and the M-F Scale of the MMPI to 25 female criminals and to 25 noncriminals matched for age and background. The criminal



sample scored more masculine on the MMPI but also more traditional in their attitudes toward feminism. These results were interpreted to suggest that women offenders see themselves as outside the mainstream of society, and expect that if they had conformed more to the traditional feminine role, they might not have ended up in jail.

Generally, the results of demographic and cultural studies related to sex-role attitudes have raised as many questions as they have answered. Clearly, much more work needs to be done regarding the effects of age, race, religion, and economic status on attitudes toward women. In addition, nobody has yet explored the effects of marital, parental or occupational status on men's attitudes. What is required is additional research on this area with some importance given to sorting out the interaction effects of the various potential confounds.

### Personality Relationships

In studying the feminist personality, researchers began the process of identifying variables associated with an individual's attitudes or beliefs toward the changing sex roles. As noted, these attitudes make up a continuous bipolar dimension which reflects one's acceptance of or resistance to the idea of the social equality of men and women. The studies to be reviewed in the present section of this paper address the relationship between sex-role

attitudes and relevant personality characteristics.

One area of frequent research has been to compare sex-role identity with sex-role attitudes. Traditional lore has it that women who support feminism are probably masculine in their sex-role identity. Similar faulty reasoning might suggest that men who support women's liberation are likely feminine in their orientation. While early research lent credence to this thinking, subsequent findings indicated that such a relationship is hard to substantiate. Jordan-Viola et al. (1976), for example, demonstrated that feminist women seem to be more androgynous than masculine. However, research on male subjects has tended to yield ambiguous results.

Spence et al. (1975) administered the Personality Attributes Questionnaire and the Attitudes Toward Women Scale to some 530 subjects. Males who scored high on the masculinity dimension tended to score more conservatively in their attitudes toward feminism. Similarly, women who scored in a feminine direction also held more traditional sex-role attitudes. However, the authors noted that all relationships found were weak and nonsignificant. In a further discussion provided on the subject in 1978, Spence and Helmreich reported that they found virtually no relationship between men's femininity scores nor women's masculinity scores and their sex-role attitudes. Only one small but significant correlation ( $r = .21$ ) was found to suggest that androgyny was related to profeminist attitudes.

The authors concluded that any relationship between sex-role attitudes and the psychological attributes of masculinity and femininity is slight.

These findings have not been consistently replicated, however. Bem (1977) administered her sex-role measure and the Attitudes Toward Women Scale to 179 individuals. Males scoring as feminine were the most liberal in their attitudes toward women, while masculine respondents scored in the most conservative direction. Those males scoring as undifferentiated and androgynous fell in between the others in their attitudes toward women scores. For women, there were no significant differences between groups, thus corroborating Spence et al.'s (1975) female sample results. When Zeldow (1976) gave the Spence and the Bem scales to 100 college freshmen, he found that feminine males were significantly more conservative than other males. Interestingly, this was the only group that differed in their Spence scores. These authors speculated that the feminine male perceives the women's movement as a threat to his fragile self-image, and as a result he defensively clings to more conservative sex-role attitudes. However, when Minnigerode (1976) administered the Bem and the Spence scales to male and female subjects, he found no significant relationship between sex role identity and attitudes toward women for the men in his study. Yet he did report that feminist females tended to score as masculine on the Bem Scale. One final study worth noting is reported by O'Connor

et al. (1978). They replicated the 1975 Spence et al. study but used non-university student subjects. Substantiating the 1975 findings, these authors found no significant relationship between sex-role identity and attitudes toward women. Clearly, these studies shed some light by indicating that if any relationship does exist in this area, it is indeed weaker than might be expected. However, the apparently contradictory results reported suggest that there is still a need for further research.

Another focus of research has concerned the hypothesis that favorable attitudes toward feminism is related to an individual's level of general openmindedness and personal security, i.e., the "receptivity hypothesis." Rozsnafszky and Hendel (1977), for example, found that in 56 women, attitudes toward feminism were significantly correlated .30 with ego development as measured by the Washington Sentence Completion Exam. Women who demonstrated a tendency to integrate multiple perspectives into their world view (indicating mature ego functioning) also had progressive attitudes toward feminism. Similarly, Greenberg and Zeldow (1977) found that male subjects who scored high on the Spence scale tended to be more spontaneous, individualistic, action oriented and unconventional as measured by the Adjective Checklist than low scorers. Additionally, liberal males scored lower in their needs for achievement and dominance. Noting that these findings bear some similarity to those reported for women, the authors suggested that liberated men

may be less threatened by women, and are hence more open to the idea of changing women's roles. This idea was initially proposed in theory by Unger (1976) and Pleck (1976). Ellis and Bentler (1973) found that for both males and female student subjects, disapproval of traditional sex determined role standards was significantly related ( $r = .28$ ) to an individual's political liberalism. The writers concluded that conservative attitudes seem to reflect a perceived threat inherent in change. They speculated that in "sexist" men, feminism is perceived as demasculinizing while in "liberated" men, feminism is seen as a welcome expansion of the sex-role boundaries. Final support for the receptivity hypothesis comes from Singleton and Christiansen's (1977) validation work with the Fem Scale. These authors found a correlation of  $-.50$  for 283 college students given the Fem Scale and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. These results suggest that a conventional or "closed" world view is reflected in conservative attitudes toward the social role of women, while openminded individuals favor expanded sex-roles. While there is some consistency within the findings of these studies, they have tended to utilize only student samples. Further work might explore the generalizability of the so-called receptivity hypothesis.

A number of recent studies have evaluated the influence of internal or external locus of control in relation to one's attitudes toward sex-roles. Findings have generally been consistent with the 1973 Pawlicki and Almquest study showing

a small but significant correlation between internality and profeminist attitudes for women. Minnigerode (1976) for example, assessed results obtained from the administration of Rotter's I-E Scale and the Attitude Toward Women Scale to 104 male and female respondents. He found a significant correlation in the expected direction ( $\underline{r} = .34, p < .05$ ) for women, but not for men ( $\underline{r} = .18$ ). The author speculated that a ceiling effect may have suppressed the correlation for the male sample. Yet, when Pleck (1978) evaluated locus of control for 616 men, he too found no significant relationship to attitudes toward women. However, Pleck's study did not use an established or reliable measure of internality, but rather a self-devised three item questionnaire. Finally, in a study published by Devine and Stillion (1978) using Rotter's I-E Scale and the Spence scale for 220 respondents, results were similar to those reported by Minnigerode. Weak but significant correlations were found between internality and profeminist attitudes for women. In this case internal males were found to be significantly more traditional than external males. While the work of Devine and Stillion suggested some relationship between I-E and sex-role attitudes for males, all studies indicate that any such relationship is weak at best. It appears that further research in this area would provide little additional reward.

One final research focus has been an exploration of the relationship between self-concept and sex-role attitudes. The rationale behind these studies stems from the hypothesis



that men and women who feel better about themselves will be less threatened by changing women's roles. Hence, one would expect a strong positive correlation between self-esteem and progressive sex-role attitudes. The first attempt to investigate this was made by Miller (1972). He administered the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and an unpublished feminism scale called the Women's Liberation Questionnaire to 171 males representing sex different university and non-university samples. For four of the groups, significant correlations (ranging from .31 to .49) were found between the measures in the expected direction. However, for two groups, nonsignificant negative correlations were reported. Although the author concluded that his findings generally support the hypothesis, he also noted that sample confounds may have interacted with individual findings. Gill (1975) used the Attitudes Toward Women Scale in her research on self esteem with 40 male respondents. She, too, found a significant relation between favorable attitudes toward feminism and positive self-concept. However, the Gill study relied on a 20-item self-esteem measure without demonstrated validity or reliability. Perhaps the best research on this topic has come from Spence et al. (1975). Using 530 college male and female students, the authors assessed the relationship between Attitudes Toward Women Scale scores and self-concept as measured by the respected and validated Texas Social Behavior Inventory. For these subjects, no correlation was found between the measures. Spence and Helmreich (1978)

reaffirmed these findings for another sample of 715 male and female college students. Hence, in reviewing the literature on self esteem, one is caught between contradictory reports. It is possible that the methodology used by Miller (1972) and Gill (1975) was inadequate, as reflected by their poor measures. Thus, their findings may be spurious. However, it is also possible that Spence et al.'s (1975, 1978) results reflect only the limited characteristics of a homogeneous single college population. Further research on this topic is clearly in order.

#### Present Study and Hypotheses

It is obvious from reviewing the literature relevant to sexual role attitudes that much of the work that has been done has been exploratory. Clearly, a few years ago there was little reason for researchers to concern themselves with assessing the impact of the women's movement. As a result, the field is still in its infancy and much work remains. Two serious deficiencies exist within the available research. The first concerns the relative lack of investigation into men's attitudes. For reasons noted previously, most prior work has focused on women. The second weakness concerns the limited sampling procedures used in most of these studies. There is a great need to explore sex-role attitudes across diverse subject groups, as one might imagine that college students do not adequately represent the general population.

It was the intention of the present project to contribute to the resolution of these deficiencies by investigating these attitudes in males holding white and blue collar jobs as well as in male students.

It appears that an implicit rationale underlying past research on men's attitudes toward feminism has been the feeling that these attitudes are a function of an individual's security and general receptivity. Men who are threatened for whatever reason by the women's movement are less likely to endorse feminism. Similarly, men who are open and secure are likely more willing to support changing women's roles. By following this reasoning and through reviewing past publications, a number of hypotheses were generated regarding the possible personality correlates of men's attitudes towards women.

- (1) Liberated men (men more favorable toward the women's movement) evidence significantly higher self-esteem than sexist men (men holding more traditional attitudes toward women's roles).
- (2) Liberated men are significantly less dogmatic and more openminded than sexist men.
- (3) Liberated men show significantly higher personal adjustment than sexist men.
- (4) Liberated men have significantly less need for aggression than sexist men.
- (5) Liberated men have significantly less need for dominance than sexist men.

- (6) Liberated men have a significantly higher need for autonomy than sexist men.
- (7) Regarding sex-role identity and attitudes toward feminism, the following hypotheses are ventured:
  - (a) Androgynous men demonstrate more liberated attitudes toward women than masculine men.
  - (b) Androgynous men demonstrate more liberated attitudes than feminine and undifferentiated men.
  - (c) Masculine men demonstrate more liberated attitudes than feminine and undifferentiated men.

Although it was expected that these hypotheses would hold true across diverse samples of men, it was equally reasonable to expect that cultural and demographic variables would play an important role in influencing men's sex-role attitudes. As a result, the present study explored several additional variables. As noted previously, very little is known of the role of age, race and religion on men's attitudes toward women. The same holds true regarding the influence of marital status, whether or not he has children, or whether he is employed in a white collar or blue collar position. Each of these factors was assessed in this study, although no specific hypotheses were proposed by the author.

## METHOD

### Subjects

Respondents for the present study initially consisted of 111 individuals. However six were eliminated from the sample due to methodological considerations, leaving a final total N of 105. All of these individuals were male and ranged in age from 18 to 65. These men were drawn from three distinct populations which will henceforth be referred to as the Student sample, the White Collar sample, and the Blue Collar sample. Normative demographic data for the total sample of 105 subjects as well as for each of the three subgroups is shown in Table 1 (refer to the Results and Discussion Section).

The Student sample consisted of 40 men attending a large midwestern Catholic university. Thirty of these were undergraduate students participating for research credit in fulfillment of subject pool requirements, and 10 were graduate students who volunteered their participation.

The White Collar sample was made up of 32 men employed by a large national corporation, CFS Continental Inc. This company is a leader in the food service industry, boasting some 3800 employees and total revenues in 1979 of nearly \$800 million. Subjects for this sample were selected from the

corporate staff headquartered in Chicago. Participants included salesmen, managers, consultants, executives and office personnel. The investigator worked with the Director of Employee Relations in exploring benefits to the company for their cooperation, as well as in developing the most effective means of selecting subjects, and distributing the research materials to them. It was agreed that the respondents would be recruited as volunteers, with the company taking responsibility for the collection of data under the direction of the investigator so as to facilitate subject participation.

The Blue Collar sample consisted of 33 men. These individuals were also employees of CFS Continental Inc. They were primarily employed as hourly workers in one of two facilities: a manufacturing plant in Chicago and a distribution plant in Rosemont, Illinois. Their jobs were traditional blue collar, i.e. assembly line workers, forklift operators, stockmen, and truck drivers. All were union members. They were induced to participate with the aid of a grant that allowed the experimenter to pay each blue collar participant \$5.00 for his time. Volunteers were recruited by foremen and supervisors in the plants where they, in turn, had been contacted by the Director of Employee Relations and asked to spread the word. It should be noted that no pressure was placed on these employees to participate, and it was generally agreed that the \$5.00 served as a major inducement for cooperation. Additionally, this sample was

the only one in which a fair number of subjects (seven) had to be eliminated from the final sample due to methodological considerations, such as apparent random response selection. This was seen as a reflection of a poor motivation for participation held by some members of this sample.

### Materials

Respondents were administered five personality and attitude inventories. In addition, demographic information was collected on each man. Factors influencing measure selection included validity and reliability, as well as the practical considerations of ease of administration, item clarity, and time required for completion. These later factors were of particular importance due to the samples used and the constraints imposed by the "in field" administration. The dependent variable, men's attitudes towards the social role of women, was measured by Spence and Helmreich's Attitudes Toward Women Scale (1972). Self-esteem was measured by Fitt's Tennessee Self Concept Scale (1965). Sex-role identification was assessed by means of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). Level of personal adjustment, as well as the needs for dominance, autonomy, and aggression were determined through responses on Gough and Heilbrun's Adjective Checklist (1965). Finally, closedmindedness was measured by a short form of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960; Troidahl & Powell, 1965).

Demographic Questionnaire. The face sheet (Appendix A) completed by each subject assured them of confidentiality and asked for information regarding their age, religion, ethnic or racial background, marital status, whether their wives worked, and whether they had any children. Questions regarding level of education completed were omitted at the request of CFS Continental.

Attitudes Toward Women Scale. The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Appendix B) was designed to objectively assess an individual's attitudes towards the rights and roles of women in contemporary society (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Vocational, educational, social, intellectual, sexual and marital roles are all examined by this inventory. The measure is a pencil and paper, self-administered, 55-item questionnaire which requires some 20 minutes to complete. Each item consists of a declarative statement for which there are four response alternatives: agree strongly, agree mildly, disagree mildly, disagree strongly. Each item is given a score from 0 to 3, with 0 representing the choice of an alternative reflecting the most traditional or conservative attitude, and 3 reflecting the most profeminist or progressive attitude. The total score is simple obtained by summing the item scores.

Normative data, provided by the authors, indicated that for some 1400 college students the mean male scored 89.26 with a standard deviation of 22.5 ( $N = 713$ ) and within a range of 37 to 156. Additional sample information was



provided on 500 parents of students. In this population, men's scores averaged 81.3 ( $SD = 17.3$ ,  $N = 232$ ). In both samples, women's scores were significantly higher than men's scores (averaging 10 points). This finding is consistently demonstrated elsewhere (Etaugh & Gerson, 1974; O'Connor et al., 1978; Schmid, 1975). Spence and Helmreich report acceptable reliability coefficients for their inventory and subsequent research has demonstrated its validity and utility. Ullman et al. (1978) found a correlation of .80 between the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and the Fem Scale (Smith et al., 1975), a measure designed to assess attitudes towards feminism. Baucom and Sanders (1977) reported a correlation of .70 between the Spence scale and Goldberg's (1976) Women's Liberation Scale, an instrument similar in purpose to the Fem Scale. Both papers suggested that the Attitudes Toward Women Scale is the more robust and effective measure. Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp (1975) demonstrated a significant relationship for both men and women between the Spence scale and subjects' self ratings for traditional or liberal values held. Spence and Helmreich (1978) provided additional evidence for the construct validity of their test in their massive study on masculinity and femininity. The authors noted that subjects from various groups consistently scored in the expected direction in their sex-role attitudes, and that the validity of the test has been effectively demonstrated over the years.

However, some criticism of the inventory has come from

Bowman and Auerbach (1978). While pointing out that the test remains the most valuable of the sexism measures, these authors suggested that the Spence scale is prone to social desirability influences. They found that subjects who were "well meaning" in words but "sexist" in action tended to score as high on this measure as sincerely progressive subjects. Yet they also noted that the clinical importance of this research is inconclusive.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was used to assess respondents' general level of self esteem (Appendix C). This self administered inventory contains 100 items. Each item is a self descriptive statement to which the subject responds on a five point scale as to how true the item is for him. The inventory is appropriate for subjects 12 years or older, and it takes the average adult some fifteen minutes to complete. Although many scales may be derived from the measure, in the present study only the Total Positive score was used. Fitts (1965) wrote that this is the most important single score on the test, reflecting "the overall level of self esteem." High scorers tend to have a strong sense of their self-value and worth while low scorers have little confidence and perceive themselves as inadequate and undesirable. Norms for the Fitts scale were derived from a diverse sample of 626 persons. The mean Total Positive score for that sample was 345.57 with a standard deviation of 30.70. Test re-test reliability for the scale was reported to be .92. Validity

data suggested that the inventory can successfully discriminate clinical groups from normal groups based on the Total Positive score alone. Cross validation results further confirmed its utility. Highly significant correlations between the Total Positive score and other measures of self-concept were reported, including .68 for Izard's Self-rating Positive Affect Scale and .67 for Hall's Inventory of Feelings. Comparing the measure with the MMPI, Fitts found an  $r = -.57$  with depression,  $r = -.62$  with psychasthenia, and  $r = -.58$  with schizophrenia. All of these relationships were in the expected direction. In addition, Fitts reported an  $r$  of .70 between the Total Positive score and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. These findings lend support to the validity of the scale as a good general measure of self-concept. The most serious difficulty with this inventory seems to be its cumbersome nature. The effects of this were demonstrated in the present research, as respondents consistently scored in a less positive direction on test items as they worked their way through the six pages of the inventory. One might speculate that they began the measure with an initial desire to appear "healthy and happy," but that this set influence wore off as they progressed through the pages of items. Regardless of the cause of this peculiar finding, it casts doubt on the immunity of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale from social desirability factors and bias.

Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory was used to assess respondents' sex-role identity (Appendix D).

This measure treats masculinity and femininity as two independent dimensions of personality. By using a median-split scoring system first proposed by Spence et al. (1975) and later adapted by Bem et al. (1976), subjects are categorized as either masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. The scale is a 60-item inventory which is self-administered and takes only 10 minutes to complete. Each item is an adjective found by Bem to be descriptive of a desirable male or female trait (20 adjectives for each). In addition, there are 20 adjectives which are neutral regarding sex role, and are used to assess social desirability. Subjects rate each item on a 7 point scale as to how true a given item is of them. One corresponds to "almost never true," while 7 reflects "almost always true." A separate masculinity and femininity score is obtained for each individual. Sex-role categorization is then made by dividing subjects according to the sample median for both masculinity (M) and femininity (F) scores. Individuals are classified as masculine if they have high M and low F, feminine if high F, low M, androgynous if both M and F are high, and undifferentiated if both M and F are low. Masculine persons are thought of as holding traditional male values and qualities at the exclusion of feminine ones (and vice versa for feminine individuals). Androgynous subjects hold both masculine and feminine traits, while those scoring undifferentiated hold few traits seen as desirable by either sex.

Bem reported reliability coefficients of .90 or higher for her measure. The median M score for her normative sample of male and female university students was 4.89, while the median F score was 4.76. For men alone, the mean M score was 4.97 and the F score was 4.57 (significantly different at the .0001 level). Some difficulty was initially reported in validating the scale. Only moderate correlations were reported by Bem (1974) between the measure and other M-F inventories (e.g., the California Personality Inventory M-F Scale, and the Gulford-Zimmerman Scale). This problem was made worse by an initial disregard for differentiating high M-F subjects from low M-F individuals. However, the current four-fold classification system used in the present study appears to have greater utility. Evidence is beginning to come in to suggest that the new scoring system yields higher construct validity for the measure (Bem et al., 1976; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The greatest strength of this inventory is its ability to treat masculinity and femininity as independent constructs rather than as polar ends of a single construct.

Adjective Check List. The Adjective Check List was used to measure subjects' levels of personal adjustment as well as their relative needs for aggression, dominance, and autonomy. This inventory consists of 300 descriptive adjectives. Subjects simply read through this list, checking those items which seem self-descriptive. The measure takes about 10 minutes to complete and is self-administered. The inventory

yields 24 scales and subscales as reported by the authors. Each scale reflects the sum of "indicative" adjectives minus the "counterindicative" adjectives checked. Different norms are provided for each scale depending on the total number of adjectives checked on the complete inventory.

For the purpose of the present study, the following four scales were selected. Personal Adjustment depicts a positive attitude toward life. High scorers are seen as optimistic, cheerful, adaptable, while low scorers are moody and dissatisfied. This scale was derived from an item analysis of responses made by subjects rated high and low on personal adjustment and emotional soundness. Three need scales, Aggression, Dominance and Autonomy, were also selected for use. Each represents a disposition within Murray's (1938) need-press system. The Aggression scale taps the need to engage in behaviors which attack or hurt others. High scorers are both competitive and aggressive, while low scorers are conformists, and both diligent and sincere in relationships. The Dominance scale reflects the need to seek and sustain leadership roles or to be influential and controlling in individual relationships. High scorers are forceful and persevering, while low scorers are passive and unsure of themselves. The Autonomy scale indicates the need to function independently from social norms and expectations. High scorers are assertive, independent, and individualistic. Low scorers are conservative and hesitant to break away from the dictates of others. These three need scales were derived

from items meeting three criteria: (a) each could be defined in terms of observable behavior; (b) each seemed relevant to the personality dynamics associated with that need trait; (c) each followed from the actual definition of the trait as described by Murray (1938).

Test-retest reliability coefficients for the four scales used range between .76 and .80. However, scale validity is less strongly established. Reasonable correlations were reported by Gough and Heilbrun (1965) between the four scales and comparable measures. An  $r$  of .31 to .48 was found between the four Adjective Check List scales and the same scales on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. An  $r$  of -.30 was reported between Personal Adjustment and the MMPI Welsch Anxiety Index. In addition to this, Personal Adjustment correlated negatively with eight of the 10 psychopathological dimensions of the MMPI. Dominance correlated .60 with Dominance on the California Personality Inventory. Autonomy correlated .33 with Dominance and -.32 with Self Control. Aggression also correlated -.44 with Self Control. However, these relationships are all less than satisfactory in supporting the validity of the Adjective Check List scales used. It should be noted that the major strength of the inventory is its simplicity and the ease with which it can be administered. These two factors were extremely important in its selection for the present study.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. A short form of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960) was used to assess each

subject's level of closedmindedness. This short form was designed by Troidahl and Powell (1965) in order to facilitate field research on dogmatism (Appendix E). It is composed of 20 items selected from Rokeach's 40 item inventory. Each item is a statement to which respondents are asked to rate on a seven point scale the degree that the sentiment expressed agrees with their own thinking. A rating of one corresponds to "disagree very much" and a rating of 7 indicates "agree very much." The individual's Dogmatism score is his total sum score for the 20 items. High scorers are seen as more dogmatic or closedminded than low scorers.

Troidahl and Powell reported a correlation of .95 ( $N = 227$ ) between their short form and the original scale. The short form has greater utility than the original scale because it requires only 10 minutes to complete. Rokeach introduced the Dogmatism Scale in 1960 as a means of assessing closed belief systems. He conceptualized dogmatism in terms of structure rather than the content of beliefs. Closedmindedness can be thought of as a reflection of an authoritarian outlook on life and an intolerance toward those with opposing beliefs. These people are threatened by change and see the world as a hostile and oppressive place. They are rigid and insecure by nature. The openminded individual is seen as flexible, tolerant, and personally secure. The more openminded one is, the greater strength he has to resist externally imposed rewards and the greater his ability to evaluate the world realistically and maturely.



Items on the Dogmatism Scale were selected in order to best reflect this theoretical continuum.

Reliability coefficients for this scale range between .68 and .93. Validity information provided by Rokeach is also acceptable. External judges were able to accurately differentiate high and low Dogmatism scorers based on their general attitude in interviews. Additionally, a significant relationship was found between the F scale of the California Personality Inventory (a scale designed to assess authoritarianism) and the Rokeach ( $r = .56$ ). Additional evidence of the measure's validity is supplied by Pedhauzer (1971), Rokeach (1956), and Rokeach and Fruchler (1956).

### Procedure

All respondents were given a materials packet in a large envelope containing the face sheet, directions, and the five inventories. The order of presentation of the personality measures was counterbalanced and alternated in a random fashion so as to minimize order effects. All inventories were prepared in such a manner as to allow the response to be written next to the given item for which it was intended. This was done to improve reliability and ease of inventory completion. Directions were provided for each measure and all inventories using Likert rating scales were arranged so that there was cross-measure consistency in the directional meaning of the ratings (e.g. agree strongly, most true, agree

very much, etc. always represented the high extreme in the rating scale).

The materials packets were completed individually. The average time required to finish this task was approximately 1 hour. Owing to the different circumstances encountered for each of the subject groups, different procedures were utilized. The experimenter distributed the packets to the Student sample personally. Materials were completed immediately in a nearby office and returned. The White Collar participants received their packets while at work. These were distributed by the Director of Employee Relations. Materials were completed at the convenience of the individual respondents with the one stipulation being that once work had begun on the packet it would be completed in one sitting. Packets were distributed and collected over a several week period. When all packets were accounted for, they were returned to the investigator. In the Blue Collar sample, packets were distributed by job foremen and supervisors. This was done immediately after the day's work was through. Participants were provided with a desk, and were asked to complete all materials before going home. Upon completion of the packet, they were each given \$5.00 as a token of appreciation for their cooperation. All Blue Collar respondents were volunteers, and the materials were administered to them in several phases spanning 2 weeks. When all packets were complete, they were returned to the Director of Employee Relations, who in turn gave them to the

investigator.

Student subjects were thoroughly debriefed by the investigator upon completion of the materials. For both the White Collar and Blue Collar participants, debriefing was completed by the Director of Employee Relations. General information was provided to each of these individuals to the effect that their attitudes and opinions were being assessed for the purpose of understanding what factors might influence men's attitudes toward the social role of women.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results were analyzed by paring the dependent variable, Attitudes Toward Women Scale scores, against both demographic and personality measures. Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated for each continuous independent variable. For those measures lending themselves to nonlinear categorization (race, for example), analysis of variance (ANOVA) was the statistic used to differentiate the groups. The presentation of results and subsequent discussion proceeds on a variable-by-variable basis. Demographic and cultural findings are presented first, followed by an examination of support found for the hypotheses proposed by the author regarding the personality variables and attitudes toward women.

### Demographic Variables

It should be noted that the first variable to be considered concerns the effects of the individual subject groups (Student, White Collar, and Blue Collar) on Spence scores. All subsequent variable analysis includes an effort at determining the extent of subject group interaction effects on results presented. Sample distributions including means, Ns, and standard deviations for the total group as well as for the three individual subject samples on all demographic and personality measures follow in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

Sample Differences. One way ANOVA indicated a significant subject group by Spence scale effect,  $F(2,102) = 5.08$ ,  $p < .01$  (Tables 3 and 4). White Collar respondents scored the highest on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale ( $\underline{M} = 105.7$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 23$ ) followed by the Student sample ( $\underline{M} = 98.7$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 22$ ) and the Blue Collar group ( $\underline{M} = 88.8$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 17$ ). A Newman-Keuls post hoc analysis indicated that White Collar means were significantly higher than those found for Blue Collar subjects ( $p < .01$ ). Other differences were statistically nonsignificant. These results indicate that men holding white collar jobs, i.e. management, sales, and office personnel, tended to be more progressive in their attitudes toward women's liberation than their blue collar counterparts, i.e. union factory employees. This finding lends corroboration to the work of Scott et al. (1977) and Pleck (1978), suggesting that males of higher socioeconomic class

Table 1

## Demographic Characteristics of Sample

	Total Sample	Students	White Collar	Blue Collar
Age	<u>M</u> = 30.60	<u>M</u> = 20.42	<u>M</u> = 38.25	<u>M</u> = 35.54
	<u>SD</u> = 11.7	<u>SD</u> = 2.9	<u>SD</u> = 9.9	<u>SD</u> = 11.1
Sample Size ( <u>N</u> )	105	40	32	33
Religion				
Catholic	50	27	15	18
Protestant	24	1	8	15
Jewish	9	2	7	0
Other	13	8	0	5
Atheist	7	2	2	3
Total	103	40	32	31
Race				
White	74	35	28	11
Black	26	2	4	20
Latino	4	3	0	1
Total	104	40	32	32
Marital Status				
Single	44	37	2	5
0-5 yrs.	18	3	6	9
5-15 yrs.	19	0	12	7
15 yrs.	19	0	9	10
Divorced	5	0	3	2
Total	105	40	32	33
Wives Work				
Yes	27	3	10	14
No	30	0	18	11
Total	57	3	28	25
Children				
Yes	53	0	25	28
No	11	3	5	3
Total	64	3	30	31

Table 2

## Sample Characteristics - Personality Measures

		Total Sample	Students	White Collar	Blue Collar
Attitudes Toward Women Scale	M	97.8	98.7	105.7	88.8
	$\bar{N}$	105	40	32	33
	$\underline{SD}$	22.33	22.8	23.6	17.0
Tennessee Self Concept Inventory	M	347.2	341.7	349.8	351.9
	$\bar{N}$	102	40	32	30
	$\underline{SD}$	35.4	35.8	34.5	36.2
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	M	75.3	74.5	65.1	86.4
	$\bar{N}$	104	40	32	32
	$\underline{SD}$	17.4	13.0	15.3	18.0
Adjective Check List Personal Adjustment	M	49.2	47.9	50.5	49.8
	$\bar{N}$	102	40	32	30
	$\underline{SD}$	9.9	8.8	12.7	7.9
Adjective Check List Aggression	M	48.1	50.6	48.6	44.1
	$\bar{N}$	102	40	32	30
	$\underline{SD}$	10.3	8.8	11.9	9.2
Adjective Check List Dominance	M	53.7	52.8	58.9	50.3
	$\bar{N}$	102	40	32	30
	$\underline{SD}$	10.3	9.9	10.5	9.0
Adjective Check List Autonomy	M	50.5	52.6	51.0	47.0
	$\bar{N}$	102	40	32	30
	$\underline{SD}$	9.5	9.4	10.4	7.8

Table 3  
 Analysis of Variance  
 Attitudes Toward Women by Demographic Variables

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Subject Group	2	2350.4	5.08	.008
Religion	4	1189.5	2.47	.05
Group Interaction	6	234.3	0.48	NS
Race	1	3511.1	7.52	.007
Group Interaction	2	125.6	0.26	NS
Marital Status	4	1280.4	3.07	.02
Group Interaction	5	507.6	1.21	NS
Wives Employed	1	29.4	0.07	NS
Group Interaction	1	0.6	0.00	NS
Children	1	1011.0	2.39	.12
Group Interaction	1	471.0	1.11	NS

Table 4

## Attitudes Toward Women Means for Demographic Variables

Variable	Total Sample		Students		White Collar		Blue Collar	
	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>
Religion								
Jewish	9	113.4	2	113.5	7	113.3	-	-
Atheist	7	101.2	2	110.0	2	95.3	3	99.2
Catholic	50	100.1	27	99.2	15	105.3	8	91.8
Other	13	92.2	8	97.0	-	-	5	88.0
Protestant	24	89.2	1	64.0	8	100.8	15	85.0
Race								
White	74	101.3	35	100.9	28	106.0	11	89.7
Minority	30	88.5	5	89.5	4	96.5	21	85.8
Marital Status								
Divorced	5	125.0	-	-	3	134.9	2	109.9
5-15 yrs.	19	101.5	-	-	12	109.5	7	87.7
1-5 yrs.	18	99.7	3	130.2	6	102.8	9	86.8
Single	44	94.9	37	96.2	2	87.5	5	88.6
Over 15 yrs.	19	91.6	-	-	9	96.2	9	85.2
Wives Employed								
Yes	27	98.5						
No	30	97.2						
Children								
No	11	107.7						
Yes	53	97.2						



(likely well educated and in positions of responsibility and power) are less threatened by and thus more supportive of changing women's roles than individuals of lower socioeconomic classes (likely less educated and holding jobs of less prestige). This finding suggests that there is a strong social and cultural influence on men's attitudes toward women. In addition, it is interesting to note that the White Collar sample scored an average of 7 points higher on the Spence scale than the Student sample. While this is not a statistically significant difference, it does suggest that student attitudes are not necessarily the most liberal, as is generally assumed (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Apparently, life experiences, such as employment and social responsibility play an important role in determining how supportive men are of women's liberation.

Age. Perhaps the most ready explanation for the significant subject group differences is that they represent generational or age effects. However, results do not bear this out. No relationship was found between age and Attitudes Toward Women scores within the total male sample. This population ranged in age from 18 to 62 with a mean of 30.6 years. The distribution was somewhat skewed in a youthful direction due to the inclusion of the college sample. There was an absence of any meaningful or significant correlation between age and sex-role attitude within both the Blue Collar and White Collar samples. However, a correlation of .47 ( $N = 40$ ,  $p < .01$ ) was found in

the college student sample. Post hoc analysis of this finding indicated that most of this relationship can be accounted for by the liberal attitudes held by the 10 graduate students in this group as opposed by the more traditional attitudes held by the 30 college freshmen. In general, it is safe to conclude that these overall findings support the work of Pleck (1978) and contradict the conclusions drawn by Spence and Helmreich (1972). It appears that as a male sample approaches greater representation of the total population, the generational effects of age on attitudes toward women tend to fade out. Those studies reporting age differences may be overlooking other confounding influences including the possible artifact of comparing college students to non-college males.

Religion. Regarding the relation between religion and men's attitudes toward women (Tables 3 and 4), a 2-way analysis of variance indicates a significant main effect,  $F(4,102) = 2.47, p < .05$ . On this variable, Jewish subjects scored the highest on the Spence scale ( $M = 113.4$ ), followed by those men who described themselves as Atheists ( $M = 101.2$ ), Catholics ( $M = 100.1$ ), and subjects categorized as "Other"; i.e., Buddhists, Agnostics, etc. ( $M = 92.2$ ). The lowest scoring group was Protestant ( $M = 89.2$ ). Post hoc Newman-Keuls analysis indicated that the only statistically significant difference occurred between the high scoring Jewish group and the low scoring Protestant sample ( $p < .05$ ). The interaction effect of subject groups for these data was

not significant,  $F(6,102) < 1.0$ . This indicates that the significant religious differences found held across the three subject samples. These findings generally fall in the same pattern as results presented by Schmid (1975), except that she found atheists to be more liberal than Jewish subjects. Again, these findings suggest that the cultural influences of religion play an important part in formulating men's attitudes towards the social role of women.

Race. Concerning the variable of race (Tables 3 and 4), significant differences were also found. For purposes of statistical convenience, the 26 Black and four Latino subjects were combined to form a single "minority" sample. When this group was compared to "white" subjects, a 2-way ANOVA indicated a highly significant main effect for race,  $F(1,103) = 7.52$ ,  $p < .01$ , with the white sample scoring higher on the Spence scale ( $M = 101.3$ ) and the minority sample scoring lower ( $M = 88.5$ ). Again, no significant interaction effect for the subject groups was found to confound these racial differences,  $F(2,103) < 1.0$ .

These results are consistent with past findings suggesting that ethnic or minority samples generally have more traditional attitudes regarding the social role of women than the heterogeneous population of whites. Interestingly, Gackenbach (1978) found a significant difference between black and white women on the Spence scale, but not for men. However, when the black sample in the present study was compared to whites, they were found to have

significantly more conservative attitudes toward women,  $F(1,103) = 6.2, p < .01$ .

Marital Status. Men's marital status (Tables 3 and 4) also appears to be significantly associated with Attitudes Toward Women scores,  $F(4,104) = 3.07, p < .05$ . Respondents were categorized according to the length of their marriage and the following results were obtained: Divorced men scored highest on the Spence scale ( $\underline{M} = 125.0$ ), followed by men who reported having been married from 5 to 15 years ( $\underline{M} = 101.5$ ), men married less than 5 years ( $\underline{M} = 99.7$ ), and single men ( $\underline{M} = 94.9$ ). Interestingly, males married over 15 years scored the lowest on the Spence ( $\underline{M} = 91.6$ ). A post hoc Newman-Keuls analysis indicated that the divorced sample was significantly more progressive in their sex-role attitudes than any other group. However, sample sizes were not sufficiently high enough to yield additional significant differences. Interaction effects for the three subject groups proved nonsignificant,  $F(2,104) = 1.21$ .

These results suggest that divorced men have uniquely positive attitudes toward the women's movement. Perhaps due to their personal marital difficulties, they appreciate the importance of changing women's sex roles. One might speculate that they are particularly invested in seeing their ex-wives succeed in their new roles as single women. In looking at the pattern suggested by the data, it seems that single men and men married less than 15 years share similar sex-role attitudes. However, it also appears that men who

have been married for a long time (over 15 years) hold slightly more conservative attitudes. This may well reflect an acceptance of traditional sex-role values which has been encouraged by a successful long standing marriage. No other research has as of yet looked at the effects of marriage on men's attitudes, although Staines et al. (1973) found that married women hold more traditional sex-role attitudes than single women. One would hope that further efforts on this topic would be forthcoming.

Subsumed under the area of matrimony, married subjects were asked if their wives worked and also if they had any children (Tables 3 and 4). No relationship was found between Attitudes Toward Women scores and the employment status of subjects' wives,  $F(1,56) < 1.0$ , indicating that for married men, this variable held little importance on their sex-role attitudes. However there was a nonsignificant trend suggesting that having children may be associated with men's attitudes toward women,  $F(1,63) = 2.39$ ,  $p = .12$ . In this case, married or divorced subjects who had children scored more conservatively in their sex-role attitudes ( $\underline{M} = 97.1$ ) than those who did not ( $\underline{M} = 107.7$ ). No significant subject group interaction effects were found. These findings, while not significant, suggest that further study of this question is warranted. It may be that men who do not have children tend to be more supportive of the women's movement out of respect and compliance with the wishes of their wives for career or educational opportunity. Future research might

look at the effect of the child's sex on parents' attitudes as well as child's age. One might speculate, for example, that fathers with daughters would be more favorable toward feminism than fathers of sons, reflecting concern for the opportunity afforded to their children as they grow up. Additional investigation might explore the possible effect of the number of children on fathers' sex-role attitudes.

### Personality Results

Self Concept. Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated for the total sample as well as for each of the three subject groups between the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Table 5). Self-concept scores were essentially the same for all subject groups. No support was found for the hypothesis that men who hold more progressive sex-role attitudes demonstrate higher self-esteem. For the total sample as well as in the Student and Blue Collar groups, correlations were near zero. In the White Collar sample, a weak and nonsignificant correlation in the expected direction was found,  $r(30) = .23$ ,  $p = .20$ . However, clearly no evidence was found to suggest that any serious relationship exists between self-concept and sex-role attitudes. Although these results may be somewhat surprising, they do tend to corroborate the findings of Spence and her colleagues (1975; 1978). One might speculate that sex-role attitudes are formed independently of one's self-esteem.

Table 5  
 Personality Variables Correlated with  
 the Attitudes Toward Women Scale

	Correlations			
	Total Sample ( <u>N</u> = 102)	Students ( <u>N</u> = 40)	White Collar ( <u>N</u> = 32)	Blue Collar ( <u>N</u> = 30)
Tennessee Self Concept Scale	.03 NS	-.06 NS	-.23 NS	-.03 NS
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	-.58 <u>p</u> < .001	-.51 <u>p</u> < .001	-.58 <u>p</u> < .001	-.50 <u>p</u> < .005
Adjective Check List Personal Adjustment	-.02 NS	-.24 <u>p</u> = .12	.23 <u>p</u> = .20	-.23 NS
Adjective Check List Aggression	.06 NS	.24 <u>p</u> = .12	-.07 NS	-.20 NS
Adjective Check List Dominance	.03 NS	.00 NS	.13 NS	-.46 <u>p</u> < .01
Adjective Check List Autonomy	.05 NS	.02 NS	.06 NS	-.12 NS

However, it should be noted that the Tennessee Self Concept Scale measures only a consciously acknowledged picture of self-esteem, and does not necessarily reflect a subject's underlying level of adjustment, maturity, or emotional stability.

Dogmatism. A similar correlational analysis was performed between Attitudes Toward Women Scale scores and results for the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Table 5). In this case, the hypothesis that liberated men are less dogmatic than sexist men was clearly supported. The correlation for the total sample between the Spence scale and Rokeach scores was  $-.58$  ( $N = 105$ ,  $p < .001$ ). A relationship of this magnitude was found in each of the individual subject groups (ranging from  $-.50$  for Blue Collar subjects to  $-.58$  for Students). These results substantiate those found by Singleton and Christiansen (1977), and support the receptivity vs. threat hypothesis introduced by Unger (1976) and Pleck (1976). The implication is that open-minded men (i.e., those individuals who operate independently from external pressures and who take a receptive world view) are less threatened by the women's movement, and hence more supportive of its values and goals than closed-minded men (i.e., those who are dogmatic and view the world as generally threatening).

Interestingly, in a post hoc Discriminant Analysis done to assess differences between the subject samples, a significant Subject Group by Rokeach score main effect was found,  $F(2,104) = 11.35$ ,  $p < .001$ , indicating that White Collar



subjects were considerably less dogmatic on the Rokeach than Students and even less so when compared to the Blue Collar sample. The discriminant analysis indicated that some 65% of the subject group variance is accounted for by Rokeach differences. Clearly it is a significant confound that may help explain differences found between the subject groups on their mean Attitudes Toward Women scores reported previously.

Personal Adjustment. Correlational analysis for Adjective Check List Personal Adjustment scores and Attitudes Toward Women scores failed to support the hypothesis that the more liberated a man is in his sex-role attitudes, the higher is his personal adjustment. The total sample correlation was near zero, and in two of the subject groups (Student and Blue Collar), nonsignificant negative correlations were obtained,  $r(38) = -.24$  and  $r(28) = -.23$  respectively (Table 5). Clearly, personal adjustment as measured by the Adjective Check List bore no serious relationship to subject's sex role attitudes.

Needs for Aggression, Dominance and Autonomy. Findings for the relationship between Adjective Check List Aggression scores and Attitudes Toward Women Scale scores were also disappointing (Table 5). No support was found for the hypothesis that men with more liberated attitudes have less need for aggression. Indeed, the total sample correlation was a nonsignificant .06. For the individual subject samples, results were equally disheartening. While slight nonsignificant  $r$ s were found in the expected direction for

White Collar and Blue Collar subjects, the Student group demonstrated a modest correlation in the opposite direction,  $r(38) = .24$ ,  $p = .12$ . . However, none of these results suggests that the need for aggression, as measured by the Adjective Check List, bears any relationship to men's attitudes toward women.

Correlations calculated for Adjective Check List Dominance and Attitudes Toward Women scores (Table 5) generally failed to support the hypothesis that men with more liberated sex-role attitudes will show higher needs for dominance. The total sample correlation was a nonsignificant .03. Similar near zero correlations were found in both the Student and White Collar groups. However, in the Blue Collar sample, a significant relationship,  $r(28) = -.46$ ,  $p < .01$ , was found which was in the expected direction. For these subjects, higher needs for dominance (i.e., control and power) were associated with more traditional sex-role attitudes. For this one sample, findings support the conclusions drawn by Greenberg and Zedlow (1975). However, the overall absence of any meaningful relationship between scores for the bulk of men tested makes suspect any bold claims suggesting Dominance scores are highly related to men's attitudes toward women.

Finally, a correlational analysis of Adjective Check List Autonomy scores with Attitudes Toward Women scores indicated that there was no support for the hypothesis that men holding more liberated attitudes will have higher needs

for autonomy. Within the total sample as well as in the individual subject groups, no relationship of any kind was found between Autonomy scores and men's attitudes toward women.

In interpreting the nonsignificant results yielded by Attitudes Toward Women Scale correlations with the Adjective Check List scales of Personal Adjustment, Aggression, Dominance, and Autonomy some solace might be found in the inadequacy of the Adjective Check List itself. Clearly it is a measure which is open to the influence of social desirability bias and subject malingering. As noted previously, the measure has a poor track record in terms of scale validity. It was chosen in the present study primarily because of its simplicity and its ease of administration with subjects not used to psychological questionnaires. Although it was hoped that the measure would prove valuable in the context of this research, a post hoc analysis of subject group by Adjective Check List interaction effects suggests that perhaps a different test should have been used. For example, one might have speculated that respondents representing such diverse populations as students, white collar businessmen, and blue collar factory workers would differ significantly in their relative level of adjustment or on their needs for aggression, dominance, or autonomy. However, a post hoc discriminant analysis for the present results indicated that the subject groups differed significantly on only one of the variables; Dominance,

$F(2,104) = 5.44, p < .01$ . For this, White Collar subjects scored higher than the other two samples. Otherwise, there were absolutely no differences. One might interpret this surprising absence of findings as suggesting that the Adjective Check List is a questionable measure for assessing these traits. Of course, this is conjecture, but before one concludes that these four variables have no bearing on men's attitudes toward women, additional research utilizing better validated measures should be encouraged.

Sex Roles. Final statistical procedures involved the analysis of variance for Attitudes Toward Women scores across three categories of sex-role identity as determined by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. It should be noted that these categories included men scoring as androgynous, masculine, and feminine-undifferentiated. The latter group was collapsed for two reasons; (a) it was felt that feminine men and undifferentiated men would be equally unreceptive to changing women's roles (this was borne out in the present study), and (b) there were only seven respondents who scored as feminine, making an independent statistical analysis for this group impossible. In general, no support was found for the hypotheses that relative to each other, androgynous males hold the most progressive sex-role attitudes, while masculine subjects hold moderate attitudes, and feminine and undifferentiated men hold conservative attitudes toward women. Indeed, within the total sample, quite different results were obtained (Table 6). A trend was found,  $F(2,101)$

Table 6  
Analysis of Variance  
Attitudes Toward Women by Bem Sex Role Categories

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Sex-Role Categories	2	1047.2	2.29	.10
Subject Group Interaction	4	772.6	1.69	NS

Attitudes Toward Women Means for Bem Sex-Role Categories

Category	Total Sample		Students		White Collar		Blue Collar	
	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>
Androgynous	34	92.7	14	89.5	7	115.7	13	83.8
Masculine	36	103.6	13	108.0	17	104.6	6	91.2
Feminine- Undifferentiated	32	97.5	13	99.3	8	99.5	11	93.8

= 2.29,  $p = .10$ , indicating that the highest Spence scale scores were given by subjects categorized as masculine on the Bem measure ( $\bar{M} = 103.6$ ), followed by subjects categorized as feminine or undifferentiated ( $\bar{M} = 97.5$ ), while the lowest scores were provided by subjects describing themselves as androgynous on the Bem ( $\bar{M} = 92.7$ ). No significant group interaction was found to confound these results. Although these differences between sex-role categories are not significant, the hint of a counterintuitive trend is quite interesting. In looking at data for the individual subject groups, both Students and Blue Collar respondents followed the pattern seen in the overall sample. In these cases, androgynous men scored lower on the Spence scale than masculine subjects. However, in the White Collar sample, the pattern followed that predicted by the hypotheses, with androgynous subjects scoring highest on the Spence. While most past studies have indicated that relationships between sex-role identity and sex-role attitudes are weak, no report seen by the present author had suggested that masculine men would be more supportive of the women's movement than androgynous men. Clearly the peculiar results obtained through the Student and Blue Collar samples in this research indicate that further investigation of this topic is advisable.

## CONCLUSION

An attempt was made by the author to come to a better understanding of the factors that influence an individual's attitudes toward the changing sex roles. A review of the relevant literature indicated that two deficiencies existed which might be fruitfully addressed. The first had to do with the relative lack of research directly concerned with the male perspective on women. The second centered on the rather limited sampling procedures seen in most previous studies, which have utilized primarily college students as subjects. Hence, the present effort sought to remedy this situation by investigating both the cultural and psychological dynamics which might underlie men's attitudes toward the social role of women, within the context of a more diverse sample which included students, white collar businessmen, and blue collar factory workers. Sex-role attitudes were assessed by means of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, while personality qualities were gathered through several established measures including the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, the Adjective Check List, and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory.

Research literature indicates that men's sex-role attitudes are a result of many complex factors, including

cultural and social forces. In the present study, significant relationships were found between men's attitudes toward women and race (with whites holding more progressive attitudes than minority respondents), religion (with Jewish individuals holding more progressive attitudes than Protestants), and marital status (with divorced men scoring in a more progressive direction than single and married men). A trend was also found suggesting that married subjects without children have more progressive sex-role attitudes than those who are parents. Although these results did not arise from particular experimental hypotheses, they did contribute to an exploratory effort made by the author to further understand the components of men's attitudes toward women. The implications of these findings for future research are discussed, with particular attention paid to the ways in which they did or did not corroborate prior research results.

From a psychological point of view, it was generally hypothesized that men's sex-role attitudes are a reflection of personal security and receptivity. It was felt that an individual who is closedminded and who perceives the world as threatening may well regard the women's liberation movement as demasculating and destructive, while the individual who is open and who takes a confident and assured world view may see the women's movement as role-expanding and positive. With this theoretical framework in mind, a number of specific hypotheses were put forward for confirmation in the present



research. They predicted a relationship between men's attitudes toward women and various personality measures thought to be related to one's level of social receptivity. Generally, these hypotheses were not supported. No significant relation was found between men's sex-role attitudes and self-esteem, sex-role identity, personal adjustment, or the needs for aggression, dominance, or autonomy. However, a strong relationship,  $r(102) = -.58$ ,  $p < .001$ , was discovered between men's attitudes and open vs. closedmindedness. Although this finding did support the general receptivity hypothesis, the remaining nonsignificant results were interpreted in terms of the possible inadequacy of the independent measures themselves. It was felt that before one concludes that there is no relationship between the personality components mentioned and men's attitudes toward women, further research should be done assessing these hypotheses through more valid and reliable measures.

## REFERENCES

- Aslin, A. L. Feminist and community mental health center psychotherapists' expectations of mental health for women. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 32-40.
- Baucom, D. H. and Sanders, B. S. Masculinity and femininity as factors in feminism. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1978, 42, 378-385.
- 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. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 196-205.
- Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., and Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.
- Berzins, J. I., Welling, M. A., and Wetter, R. E. A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the personality research form. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 126-138.
- Bieliauskas, V. J. A new look at masculine protest. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1974, 30, 92-97.
- Bieliauskas, V. J., Miranda, S. B., and Lansky, L. M. The obviousness of two masculinity-femininity tests. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 314-318.
- Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.
- Bowman, P. C. and Auerbach, S. M. Measuring sex-role attitudes: the problem of the well meaning liberal male. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1978, 4, 265-271.
- Braun, J. S. and Chao, H. M. Attitudes toward women: a comparison of asian-born chinese and american caucasians. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1978, 2, 195-201.

- Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P., and Vogel, S. R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.
- Caligor, L. The determination of the individual's unconscious conception of his own masculinity-femininity identification. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1951, 15, 494-509.
- Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: an exception to a famous dictum. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.
- Deutsch, C. J. and Gilbert, L. A. Sex-role stereotypes: effect on perceptions of self and others on personal adjustment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 373-379.
- Devine, R. C. and Stillion, J. M. An examination of locus of control on traditional or liberal sex-role orientation. Journal of Psychology, 1978, 98, 75-79.
- Doyle, J. A. Comparison of Kirkpatrick's and Spence and Helmreich's attitudes toward women scale. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 878.
- Ellis, L. J. and Bentler, P. M. Traditional sex determined role standards and sex stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 28-34.
- Etaugh, C. and Bowen, L. Attitudes toward women: comparison of enrolled and nonenrolled college students. Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 229-230.
- Etaugh, C. and Gerson, A. Attitudes toward women: some biographical correlates. Psychological Reports, 1974, 35, 701-702.
- Fitts, W. H. Tennessee self concept scale manual. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Fowler, M. G. and Van De Riet, H. Women, today and yesterday, an examination of the feminist personality. Journal of Psychology, 1972, 82, 269-276.
- Fowler, M. G., Fowler, R., and Van De Riet, H. Feminism and political radicalism. Journal of Psychology, 1973, 83, 237-242.
- Freud, S. A general introduction to psychoanalysis. New York: Washington Square Press, 1924, pp. 333-347.

- Gackenbach, J. The effect of race, sex, and career goal differences on sex role attitudes. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1978, 12, 93-101.
- Gilbert, A. R., Warner, J. R., and Cable, D. G. Probing into the face value of women's liberation attitudes. Psychological Reports, 1975, 17, 519-526.
- Gill, M. J. Self-esteem and males' receptiveness to persuasion toward women's liberation ideology. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36B, 886-887.
- Goldberg, C. Sex-roles, task competence, and conformity. Journal of Psychology, 1974, 86, 157-164.
- Gough, H. G. and Heilbrun, A. B. The adjective check list manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1965.
- Greenberg, R. P. and Zedlow, P. B. Personality characteristics of men with liberal sex-role attitudes. Journal of Psychology, 1977, 97, 187-190.
- Heilbrun, A. B. Measurement of masculine and feminine sex-role identities as independent dimensions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 183-190.
- Helmreich, R. L. and Spence, J. T. The work and family orientation scale (WOFOS). JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1979.
- Herman, M. H. and Sedlacek, W. E. Measuring sexist attitudes of males. Proceedings, 81st Annual Convention, APA, 1973, 341-342.
- Joesting, J. and Joesting, R. Sex differences among entering freshman - fall, 1970. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 911-914.
- Jordan-Viola, E., Fassberg, S., and Viola, M. T. Feminism, androgyny, and anxiety. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 870-871.
- Kirkpatrick, C. The construction of a belief-pattern scale for measuring attitudes toward feminism. Journal of Social Psychology, 1936, 7, 421-437.
- Kravetz, D. F. Sex role concepts of women. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 437-443.
- Leventhal, G. Female criminality: is "women's lib" to blame. Psychological Reports, 1977, 41, 1179-1182.

- Lynn, D. B. A note on sex differences in the development of masculine and feminine identification. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 126-135.
- Miller, T. W. Male attitudes toward women's rights as a function of their level of self esteem. Paper Presentation, American Psychological Association Convention, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1972.
- Minnigerode, F. A. Attitudes toward women, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control. Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 1301-1302.
- Murray, H. A. Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Mussen, P. H. Long term consequents of masculinity of interests in adolescence. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 435-440.
- O'Connor, K., Mann, D. W., and Bardwick, J. M. Androgyny and self-esteem in the upper middle class. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1168-1169.
- O'Neil, F., Teague, M., Lushene, R. E., and Davenport, S. Personality characteristics of women's liberation activists as measured by the MMPI. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 355-361.
- Orlofsky, J. L. Sex-role orientation, identity formation, and self esteem in college men and women. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 561-575.
- Osmond, M. W. and Martin, P. Y. Sex and sexism. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 744-757.
- Pawlicki, R. E. and Almqest, C. Authoritarianism, locus of control, and tolerance of ambiguity as reflected in membership and non-membership in a women's liberation group. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 1331-1337.
- Pedhauzer, M. Factor structure of the dogmatism scale. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 735- 737.
- Pleck, J. H. Male threat from female competence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 608-613.
- Pleck, J. H. Men's traditional perceptions and attitudes about women's correlates of adjustment or maladjustment. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 975-983.

- Pomerantz, S. and House, W. C. Liberated versus traditional women's performance satisfaction and perceptions of ability. Journal of Psychology, 1977, 95, 205-211.
- Powers, W. G. and Guess, D. Research note on "invasion of males' personal space by feminists and non-feminists." Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 1300.
- Rokeach, M. Political and religious dogmatism. Psychological Monographs, 1956, 70, 224-250.
- Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1960.
- Rokeach, M. and Fruchler, B. A factorial study of dogmatism and related concepts. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 356-360.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., and Broverman, D. M. Sex-role stereotypes and self concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.
- Rozsnafszky, M. and Hendel. Relationship between ego development and attitudes toward women. Psychological Reports, 1977, 41, 161-162.
- Sanger, S. P. and Alker, H. A. Dimensions of internal-external locus of control and the women's liberation movement. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 115-127.
- Sappenfield, B. R. The revised CMM as a test of perceived masculinity-femininity and of self report. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1968, 32, 92-95.
- Schmid, M. Feminist attitudes: dimensions and distribution by gender, religion and class. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 6826.
- Schumacher-Finell, J. The relationship between attitudes toward feminism and the sex, age, and background factors of the residents in a small town setting. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 882.
- Scott, R., Richards, A. and Wade, M. Women's studies as change agent. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 1, 377-379.
- Sherman, J., Koufacos, C., and Kenworthy, J. Therapists: their attitudes and information about women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1978, 2, 299-313.

- Singleton, R. and Christiansen, J. B. The construct validation of a short form attitudes toward feminism scale. Sociology and Social Research, 1977, 61, 294-303.
- Smith, E., Ferree, M., and Miller, F. D. A short scale of attitudes toward feminism. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1975, 6, 51-56.
- Spence, J. T. and Helmreich, R. Attitudes Toward Women Scale, Journal Supplement Abstract Service, 1972, 2, No. 66.
- Spence, J. T. and Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity and Femininity. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. A short version of the attitudes toward women scale. Psychonomic Bulletin, 1973, 2, 219-220.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. The personality attributes questionnaires: a measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 43-44.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relationship to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.
- Staines, G., Tavris, C. and Jayaratne, T. E. The queen bee syndrome. In C. Tavris (Ed.), The Female Experience. Del Mar, CRM Books, 1973. Pp. 63-66.
- Terman, L. M. and Miles, C. C. Sex and personality: Studies in masculinity and femininity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.
- Tipton, R. M., Bailey, K. G., and Obenham, J. P. Invasion of males' personal space by feminists and non-feminists. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 99-102.
- Tomeh, A. K. Sex-role orientation: an analysis of structural and attitudinal predictors. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 40, 341-354.
- Troldahl, V. C. and Powell, F. A. A short-form dogmatism scale for use in field studies. Social Forces, 1965, 44, 211-214.

- Ullman, L. P., Freedland, K. E. and Warmsun, C. H. Sex and ethnic group effects on attitudes toward women. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1978, 11, 179-180.
- Unger, R. K. Male is greater than female: the socialization of status inequality. The Counseling Psychologist, 1976, 6, 2-7.
- Wakefield, J. A., Sasek, J., Friedman, A., and Bowden, J. D. Androgyny and other measures of masculinity-femininity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 766-770.
- Wiggins, J. S. and Holzmuller, A. Psychological androgyny and interpersonal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 40-52.
- Zeldow, P. B. Psychological androgyny and attitudes toward feminism. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 150.



APPENDIX A

## FACE SHEET

YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY IS GUARANTEED WHEN YOU PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. NO NAMES WILL BE USED, AS WE ARE NOT INTERESTED IN INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES BUT IN OVER-ALL ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF PEOPLE.

IN ORDER TO ENABLE US TO GENERALIZE OUR FINDINGS AND MAKE SENSE OF RESULTS, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BEFORE YOU BEGIN COMPLETING THE ATTACHED QUESTIONNAIRES:

YOUR AGE? \_\_\_\_\_

YOUR RELIGION? \_\_\_\_\_

YOUR ETHNIC OR RACIAL BACKGROUND? \_\_\_\_\_

ARE YOU MARRIED? \_\_\_\_\_

IF YES, FOR HOW LONG? \_\_\_\_\_

DOES YOUR WIFE WORK? \_\_\_\_\_

DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN? \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX B**

## ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE

THE STATEMENTS LISTED BELOW DESCRIBE ATTITUDES DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE TOWARD THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS, ONLY OPINIONS. YOU ARE ASKED TO EXPRESS YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT EACH STATEMENT BY INDICATING WHETHER YOU (1) DISAGREE STRONGLY WITH IT, (2) DISAGREE MILDLY WITH IT, (3) AGREE MILDLY WITH IT, OR (4) AGREE STRONGLY WITH IT. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR OPINION FOR EACH STATEMENT BY MARKING OR CIRCLING THE ALTERNATIVE WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR PERSONAL ATTITUDE. PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY ITEM.

(1) Disagree strongly (2) Disagree mildly (3) Agree mildly (4) Agree strongly

CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR PERSONAL OPINION:

- 1) Women have an obligation to be faithful to their husbands...1 2 3 4
- 2) Swearing and obscenity is more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.....1 2 3 4
- 3) The satisfaction of her husband's sexual desires is a fundamental obligation of every wife.....1 2 3 4
- 4) Divorced men should help support their children but should not be required to pay alimony if their wives are capable of working.....1 2 3 4
- 5) Under ordinary circumstances, men should be expected to pay all the expenses while they're out on a date.....1 2 3 4
- 6) Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day..1 2 3 4
- 7) It is all right for wives to have an occasional casual extramarital affair.....1 2 3 4
- 8) Special attentions like standing up for a woman who comes into a room or giving her a seat on a crowded bus are outmoded and should be discontinued.....1 2 3 4
- 9) Vocational and professional schools should admit the best qualified students--regardless of their sex.....1 2 3 4
- 10) Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.....1 2 3 4
- 11) Men should really be the only ones to tell dirty jokes.....1 2 3 4
- 12) Husbands and wives should be equal partners in planning the family budget.....1 2 3 4
- 13) Men should continue to show courtesies to women such as holding open the door or helping them with their coats.....1 2 3 4

(1) Disagree strongly (2) Disagree mildly (3) Agree mildly (4) Agree strongly

- 32) Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage--even their fiances.....1 2 3 4
- 33) Women should demand money for household and personal expenses as a right rather than as a gift from their husbands.....1 2 3 4
- 34) The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.....1 2 3 4
- 35) Wifely submission is an outworn virtue.....1 2 3 4
- 36) There are some professions and types of businesses that are more suitable for men than women.....1 2 3 4
- 37) Women should be concerned with their duties of childrearing and housetending, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.....1 2 3 4
- 38) The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.....1 2 3 4
- 39) A wife should make every effort to minimize irritation and inconvenience to the male head of the family.....1 2 3 4
- 40) There should be no greater barrier to an unmarried woman having sex with a casual acquaintance than having dinner with him.....1 2 3 4
- 41) Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set by men.....1 2 3 4
- 42) Women should take the passive role in courtship.....1 2 3 4
- 43) On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contribution to economic production than are men.....1 2 3 4
- 44) The intellectual equality of woman with man is perfectly obvious.....1 2 3 4
- 45) Women should have full control of their bodies and be free to give or withhold sex intimacy as they choose.....1 2 3 4
- 46) The husband has in general no obligation to inform his wife of his financial plans.....1 2 3 4
- 47) There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.....1 2 3 4
- 48) Women with children should not work outside the home if they don't financially need to.....1 2 3 4
- 49) Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.....1 2 3 4

(1) Disagree strongly (2) Disagree mildly (3) Agree mildly (4) Agree strongly

- 50) The relative amounts of time and energy to be devoted to household duties on the one hand and to a career on the other should be determined by personal desires and interests rather than by sex.....1 2 3 4
- 51) As head of the household, the husband should have more responsibility for the family's financial plans than his wife.1 2 3 4
- 52) If both husband and wife agree that sexual fidelity isn't important, there's no reason why both shouldn't have extramarital affairs if they want to.....1 2 3 4
- 53) The husband should be regarded as the legal representative of the family group in all matters of law.....1 2 3 4
- 54) The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.....1 2 3 4
- 55) Most women need and want the kind of protection and support that men have traditionally given them.....1 2 3 4

APPENDIX C

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

THE STATEMENTS IN THIS BOOKLET ARE TO HELP YOU DESCRIBE YOURSELF AS YOU SEE YOURSELF. PLEASE RESPOND TO THEM AS IF YOU WERE DESCRIBING YOURSELF TO YOURSELF. DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEM! READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY; THEN SELECT ONE OF THE FIVE RESPONSES LISTED BELOW. TO THE RIGHT OF EACH STATEMENT, PUT A CIRCLE AROUND THE RESPONSE YOU CHOSE. IF YOU WANT TO CHANGE AN ANSWER AFTER YOU HAVE CIRCLED IT, DO NOT ERASE IT BUT PUT AN X MARK THROUGH THE RESPONSE AND THEN CIRCLE THE RESPONSE YOU WANT. REMEMBER, PUT A CIRCLE AROUND THE RESPONSE NUMBER YOU HAVE CHOSEN FOR EACH STATEMENT.

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
_____	1	2	3	4	5



Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5
1) I have a healthy body.....	1	2	3	4	5
2) I am an attractive person.....	1	2	3	4	5
3) I consider myself a sloppy person.....	1	2	3	4	5
4) I am a decent sort of person.....	1	2	3	4	5
5) I am an honest person.....	1	2	3	4	5
6) I am a bad person.....	1	2	3	4	5
7) I am a cheerful person.....	1	2	3	4	5
8) <u>I</u> am a calm and easy going person.....	1	2	3	4	5
9) I am a nobody.....	1	2	3	4	5
10) I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble	1	2	3	4	5
11) I am a member of a happy family.....	1	2	3	4	5
12) My friends have no confidence in me.....	1	2	3	4	5
13) I am a friendly person.....	1	2	3	4	5
14) I am popular with men.....	1	2	3	4	5
15) I am not interested in what other people do.....	1	2	3	4	5
16) I do not always tell the truth.....	1	2	3	4	5
17) I got angry sometimes.....	1	2	3	4	5

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5
18) I like to look nice and neat all the time.....	1	2	3	4	5
19) I am full of aches and pains.....	1	2	3	4	5
20) I am a sick person.....	1	2	3	4	5
21) I am a religious person.....	1	2	3	4	5
22) I am a moral failure.....	1	2	3	4	5
23) I am a morally weak person.....	1	2	3	4	5
24) I have a lot of self-control.....	1	2	3	4	5
25) I am a hateful person.....	1	2	3	4	5
26) I am losing my mind.....	1	2	3	4	5
27) I am an important person to my friends and family.....	1	2	3	4	5
28) I am not loved by my family.....	1	2	3	4	5
29) I feel that my family doesn't trust me.....	1	2	3	4	5
30) I am popular with women.....	1	2	3	4	5
31) I am mad at the whole world.....	1	2	3	4	5
32) I am hard to be friendly with.....	1	2	3	4	5
33) Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about....	1	2	3	4	5
34) Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.....	1	2	3	4	5

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5
35) I am neither too fat nor too thin.....	1	2	3	4	5
36) I like my looks just the way they are.....	1	2	3	4	5
37) I would like to change some parts of my body.....	1	2	3	4	5
38) I am satisfied with my moral behavior.....	1	2	3	4	5
39) I am satisfied with my relationship to God.....	1	2	3	4	5
40) I ought to go to church more.....	1	2	3	4	5
41) I am satisfied to be just what I am.....	1	2	3	4	5
42) I am just as nice as I should be.....	1	2	3	4	5
43) I despise myself.....	1	2	3	4	5
44) I am satisfied with my family relationships.....	1	2	3	4	5
45) I understand my family as well as I should.....	1	2	3	4	5
46) I should trust my family more.....	1	2	3	4	5
47) I am as sociable as I want to be.....	1	2	3	4	5
48) I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.....	1	2	3	4	5
49) I am no good at all from a social standpoint.....	1	2	3	4	5
50) I do not like everyone I know.....	1	2	3	4	5
51) Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.....	1	2	3	4	5

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5
52) I am neither too tall nor too short.....	1	2	3	4	5
53) I don't feel as well as I should.....	1	2	3	4	5
54) I should have more sex appeal.....	1	2	3	4	5
55) I am as religious as I want to be.....	1	2	3	4	5
56) I wish I could be more trustworthy.....	1	2	3	4	5
57) I shouldn't tell so many lies.....	1	2	3	4	5
58) I am as smart as I want to be.....	1	2	3	4	5
59) I am not the person I would like to be.....	1	2	3	4	5
60) I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.....	1	2	3	4	5
61) I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living).....	1	2	3	4	5
62) I am too sensitive to things my family say.....	1	2	3	4	5
63) I should love my family more.....	1	2	3	4	5
64) I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
65) I should be more polite to others.....	1	2	3	4	5
66) I ought to get along better with other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
67) I gossip a little at times.....	1	2	3	4	5
68) At times I feel like swearing.....	1	2	3	4	5

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5
69) I take good care of myself physically.....	1	2	3	4	5
70) I try to be careful about my appearance.....	1	2	3	4	5
71) I often act like I am "all thumbs".....	1	2	3	4	5
72) I am true to my religion in my everyday life.....	1	2	3	4	5
73) I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
74) I sometimes do very bad things.....	1	2	3	4	5
75) I can always take care of myself in any situation.....	1	2	3	4	5
76) I take the blame for things without getting mad.....	1	2	3	4	5
77) I do things without thinking about them first.....	1	2	3	4	5
78) I try to play fair with my friends and family.....	1	2	3	4	5
79) I take a real interest in my family.....	1	2	3	4	5
80) I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living).....	1	2	3	4	5
81) I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.....	1	2	3	4	5
82) I get along well with other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
83) I do not forgive others easily.....	1	2	3	4	5
84) I would rather win than lose in a game.....	1	2	3	4	5

Responses-	Complotely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5
85) I feel good most of the time.....	1	2	3	4	5
86) I do poorly in sports and games.....	1	2	3	4	5
87) I am a poor sleeper.....	1	2	3	4	5
88) I do what is right most of the time.....	1	2	3	4	5
89) I somotimes use unfair means to get ahead.....	1	2	3	4	5
90) I have trouble doing the things that are right.....	1	2	3	4	5
91) I solve my problems quite easily.....	1	2	3	4	5
92) I change my mind a lot.....	1	2	3	4	5
93) I try to run away from my problems.....	1	2	3	4	5
94) I do my share of work at home.....	1	2	3	4	5
95) I quarrel with my family.....	1	2	3	4	5
96) I do not act like my family thinks I should.....	1	2	3	4	5
97) I see good points in all the people I meet.....	1	2	3	4	5
98) I do not feel at ease with other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
99) I find it hard to talk with strangers.....	1	2	3	4	5
100) Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

## BEM SEX ROLE INVENTORY

ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WE ARE INTERESTED IN THE VARIOUS WAYS PEOPLE SEE THEMSELVES. ON THE FOLLOWING TWO PAGES THERE IS A LIST OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS. SOME

OF THESE WILL FIT YOU AND OTHERS WON'T. 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 CHARACTERISTIC UNMARKED. CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT CORRESPONDS TO THE DEGREE TO WHICH YOU FEEL YOU HAVE THE QUALITY IN QUESTION.

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOURSELF ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

1 NEVER TRUE	2 USUALLY NOT TRUE	3 SOMETIMES TRUE	4 TRUE HALF THE TIME	5 OFTEN TRUE	6 USUALLY TRUE	7 ALWAYS TRUE
SELF RELIANT.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					RELIABLE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
YIELDING.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					ANALYTICAL.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
HELPFUL.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					SYMPATHETIC.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
DEFEND MY BELIEFS..	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					JEALOUS.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
CHEERFUL.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					A LEADER.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
MOODY.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					SENSITIVE TO OTHERS1 2 3 4 5 6 7
INDEPENDENT.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					TRUTHFUL.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
SHY.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					WILLING TO TAKE RISKS.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
CONSCIENTIOUS.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					UNDERSTANDING.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
ATHLETIC.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					SECRETIVE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
AFFECTIONATE.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					MAKE DECISIONS EASILY.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
THEATRICAL.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					COMPASSIONATE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
ASSERTIVE.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					SINCERE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
FLATTERABLE.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					SELF SUFFICIENT....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
HAPPY.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					SOOTHE HURT FEELINGS.1 2 3 4 5 6 7
STRONG PERSONALITY.1	2 3 4 5 6 7					CONCEITED.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
LOYAL.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					DOMINANT.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
UNPREDICTABLE.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					SOFT SPOKEN.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
FORCEFUL.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					LIKABLE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
FEMININE.....	1 2 3 4 5 6 7					MASCULINE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7



1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES TRUE	TRUE HALF THE TIME	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

WARM.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 SOLEMN.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 WILLING TO TAKE A STAND..1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 TENDER.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 FRIENDLY.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 AGGRESSIVE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 GULLIBLE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 INEFFICIENT.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 ACT AS A LEADER.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 CHILDLIKE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 ADAPTABLE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 INDIVIDUALISTIC.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 I DO NOT USE HARSH  
 LANGUAGE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 UNSYSTEMATIC.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 COMPETITIVE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 I LOVE CHILDREN.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 TACTFUL.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 AMBITIOUS.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 GENTLE.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 CONVENTIONAL.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**APPENDIX E**

ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE

THE FOLLOWING 20 STATEMENTS REPRESENT OPINIONS THAT SOME PEOPLE HAVE EXPRESSED ON A NUMBER OF TOPICS. YOU MAY FIND YOURSELF AGREEING STRONGLY WITH SOME OF THE STATEMENTS, WHILE DISAGREEING WITH OR REMAINING UNCERTAIN ABOUT OTHERS. WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH ANY STATEMENT, YOU CAN BE SURE THAT MANY PEOPLE FEEL THE SAME WAY AS YOU DO.

WE WANT YOUR PERSONAL OPINION ON EACH STATEMENT. PLEASE RATE, ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 7, YOUR FEELINGS REGARDING THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
DISAGREE VERY MUCH	DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE	DISAGREE A LITTLE	UNCERTAIN	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE ON THE WHOLE	AGREE VERY MUCH
CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT						

YOUR OPINION:

- 1) In this complicated world of ours, the only way we can know what is going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 2) My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit that he is wrong..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 3) There are two kinds of people in this world; those who are for the truth and those who are against it.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 4) Most people just don't know what is good for them.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 5) Of all the different philosophies which exist in the world, there is probably only one which is correct.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 6) The highest form of government is a democracy, and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 7) The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 8) I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 9) Most of the ideas which got printed now-a-days aren't worth the paper they are printed on.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 10) Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 11) It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 12) Most people just don't give a damn about other people.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 13) To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side..1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 14) It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what is going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
DISAGREE VERY MUCH	DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE	DISAGREE A LITTLE	UNCERTAIN	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE ON THE WHOLE	AGREE VERY MUCH

- 15) The present is all too often full of unhappyness, so  
it is the future that really counts.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 16) The United States and Russia have just about nothing  
in common with each other.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 17) In a discussion, I often find it necessary to repeat  
myself several times to make sure I'm being understood.1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 18) While I don't often like to admit it even to myself,  
my secret ambition is to become a great man, like  
Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 19) Even though freedom of speach for all groups is a  
worthwhile goal, it is unfortunatoly necessary to  
restrict this freedom for certain political groups at  
certain times.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 20) It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Carl Robinson has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Jeanne Foley, Director  
Chairperson, Department of Psychology, Loyola

Dr. James Johnson  
Professor, Department of Psychology, Loyola

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.

June 27, 1980  
Date

Jeanne Foley  
Director's Signature