



1984

Predicting Interpersonal Effectiveness: The Effects of Masculinity, Femininity and Intimacy Motivation

Anne Margaret Slocum McEneaney
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McEneaney, Anne Margaret Slocum, "Predicting Interpersonal Effectiveness: The Effects of Masculinity, Femininity and Intimacy Motivation" (1984). *Master's Theses*. 3369.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3369

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.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1984 Anne Margaret Slocum McEneaney

317

PREDICTING INTERPERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS:
THE EFFECTS OF MASCULINITY, FEMININITY,
AND INTIMACY MOTIVATION

by

Anne Margaret Slocum McEneaney

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

November

1984

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge the guidance provided by her committee, Dan McAdams, Ph.D and Patricia Rupert, Ph.D. Particular thanks go to Dan McAdams, as committee chair, who not only is the author of one of the measures used in this study, but who gave invaluable help in the writing of this thesis.

The author would also like to note the moral support given over the years by her sisters Sarah, Mary, Charlotte, and Lisa, and by her brother John, who never once questioned the fact that she was still in school.

Finally, she thanks the undergraduates who gave their time, without remuneration, to help score the several tests used in this study. Thanks to Ron Lotesto, Marie Dillie, and Edith Van Steen for their much-appreciated assistance.

VITA .

Anne Margaret Slocum McEneaney was born in Salzburg, Austria in March, 1956, the daughter of William Peter McEneaney and Elizabeth Truax Nichols.

She received her elementary education at the Ursuline School in New Rochelle, New York, graduating with honors in 1970. She attended the upper school at Ursuline beginning in September, 1970. She transferred to Harriton High School, in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, in October of 1973 and graduated in June, 1974.

Anne matriculated at Colgate University, in Hamilton, New York, in January of 1975. She left Colgate in August of that year, and served as a Head Start teacher-aide from March 1976 to June 1977. After a period of travel in Europe and the United States, she matriculated at the University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, in June, 1978. She was graduated magna cum laude in December of 1980, with a Bachelor of Arts in Child Psychology.

In August of 1981, Anne began the Doctoral program in Clinical Psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. She completed two years of clerkship training at the Charles Doyle Guidance Center in August of 1983. From September of 1983 through August of 1984 she was the recipient of a fellowship from the National Institute of Health. In September, 1984 she assumed a position as a psychology clerk at the Loyola Uni-

versity Counseling Center.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents,
Elizabeth Truax Nichols and William Peter McEneaney,
and to meine grosse-mutter Helene Bruning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	4
Introduction	4
Theoretical Considerations	4
Sex-roles and Interpersonal Effectiveness.	8
Intimacy Motivation and Interpersonal Effectiveness.	19
Interpersonal Effectiveness.	26
Summary and Hypotheses	28
III. METHODS.	34
Subjects	34
Materials.	34
Procedure	40
IV. RESULTS	42
Independent Variables: Descriptive Statistics.	42
Dependent Variables: Descriptive Statistics.	45
Hypotheses	50
Interpersonal Effectiveness and Productivity	53
Interpersonal Ineffectiveness.	57
V. DISCUSSION	59
Sex-roles, Intimacy Motivation, and Agentic Effectiveness.	59
Effectiveness and Productivity	65
Summary and Directions for the Future.	66
REFERENCES	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Independent Variables: Descriptive Statistics	43
2. Correlations between Independent Variables.	44
3. Cognitive Interpersonal Effectiveness	46
4. Behavioral Interpersonal Effectiveness.	48
5. Statistically Significant Predictors of Effectiveness	54
6. Productivity: Descriptive Statistics.	56
7. Interpersonal Ineffectiveness	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the concept of psychological androgyny was first proposed by Sandra Bem in 1974, there has been a great deal of dispute over the psychological and behavioral benefits (if any) that accrue to it. Early theorizers (Bem, 1975; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) held that androgyny allowed persons to be behaviorally flexible, to behave in either a masculine (assertive or instrumental) or feminine (expressive) way, depending on which would be more adaptive in the particular situation in which the person finds herself. The androgynous person, then, would benefit by being able to choose to behave in the manner that is most appropriate in any given situation. This, of course, gives him an advantage over sex-typed persons who will behave according to their sex-role's stereotypes, even if doing so is situationally maladaptive. While initial theorizing was based on logical and philosophical grounds (probably being, at least partially, an outgrowth of the feminist movement), a body of research has since been developed which explored the hypothesis of behavioral flexibility, and generally supported its conclusions.

A philosopher-psychologist whose work was often cited by these researchers (Bem, 1975; Kelly & Worell, 1977) is David Bakan. Bakan (1966) believes that the primary goal of life is to achieve a balance

between the two opposing life forces of agency and communion. As interpreted by Bem, agency, an active striving for mastery over the environment (including other persons), has been equated with masculinity, while communion, functioning which leads the person to join with the environment (including others), has been seen as manifest in femininity. Like Bakan's core concepts, sex-roles are seen as functioning optimally when high levels of each are present. This is the balanced 'androgynous' state.

Another personality variable which was originally conceived in terms of Bakan's concept of communion is intimacy motivation. Intimacy motivation is the recurrent desire to experience close interpersonal relationships. Its communal roots are evident in its definition as a passive waiting for intimacy, which leads the person to define himself in terms of his relationship to the environment. Intimacy motivation would seem to delineate another aspect of the spectrum of communal thought and behavior than does femininity. Together these measures ought to tell us more about this wide spectrum of thought and behavior than either alone.

The personality variables whose effect on behavioral flexibility will be examined in this study can all be conceptualized, then, in terms of one or the other of Bakan's core concepts. In Bakan's theory, optimal functioning in any sphere is defined in terms of a balance between agency and communion. This holds true in the sphere of interpersonal effectiveness. The balance here would be between reaching one's own goals in interpersonal interaction by mastering the environment

(agency), while maintaining an identity which defines the self by its relationship to the environment (communion).

It is believed that masculinity contributes to interpersonal effectiveness by increasing one's agentic functioning, while femininity and intimacy motivation do so by contributing to communal functioning. While the presence of each of these individually contributes to interpersonal effectiveness in either the agentic or communal sphere, it is only when these two spheres are balanced that optimal functioning occurs. For this reason, persons high in each of the variables masculinity, femininity, and intimacy motivation ought to be more interpersonally effective than any of their peers not high in all three.

This is the general hypothesis to be examined in this study. A review of the literature will provide the background from which hypotheses were drawn and an empirical study designed. Results of this study will then be outlined. Lastly, data will be interpreted, with emphasis given to their relation to the literature from which the thesis was originally derived.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Research in each of the previously unrelated fields of intimacy motivation and sex-roles has found evidence for a relationship to social effectiveness. This study will examine the relative contributions of intimacy motivation and sex-role to a measure of social effectiveness. Intimacy motivation was measured using the Thematic Apperception Test. Sex-role was derived from the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The measure of social effectiveness used was the Interpersonal Problem-Solving Assessment Technique (Getter & Nowinski, 1981). Before reviewing the literature relevant to these topics, some of the theoretical considerations that led to their combined use in this work will be examined.

Theoretical Considerations

The groundwork for this study can be found in the work of the philosopher-psychologist David Bakan. For Bakan, the two core characteristics of personality are agency and communion. Agency is functioning which leads the person to be separate from other people and from the environment. This leads also to the separation of parts of oneself from each other. To be an agent is to assert oneself regardless of one's environment and to thus be the master of the environment. In contrast,

communion is functioning which leads the person to merge or join with other people and with the inanimate environment. This leads to the integration of the various parts of the self. To be communal is to have an identity which is conferred on the individual by the context in terms of one's relation to that context. While agency signifies separation and mastery, then, communion is manifested by union, openness, and integration with other organisms. Bakan believes that the major task in life is to effect a compromise between the two opposing forces. The most constructive expression of the core tendency is simultaneous differentiation and integration. Yet, while healthy human adaptation is based on a dynamic tension between the two forces, individual differences can be partly understood in terms of varied balances of the two affecting behavior and experience differentially. This notion of different, even opposing, forces which function best when used simultaneously and when they are in balance with one another will be traced throughout this work. As we shall see, it will be of relevance to each of the concepts being investigated.

While Bakan's work provides background which is crucial in understanding the concepts to be studied, a paper by David McClelland has been of major importance in determining the method to be used. David McClelland (1980) has argued that at least three types of personality variables are necessary to account for variations in human behavior. The first of these, the motive, is a pervasive experiential preference which drives, directs and selects behavior. The schema variable is the report of a perception of the situation, it is thus the report of a cognition.

The third type of variable, the trait, is the report of an action frequently taken; it is the report of a behavior.

These three types of variables are most effectively investigated using different types of measures. Operant measures are those in which it is not possible to identify the exact stimulus which elicits the response. Essentially, McClelland uses this term as synonymous with 'projective', but prefers it because he sees these tests as measuring not projected wishes but samples of behavior or thought in standardized situations. Respondent measures are those which do specify the stimulus, the response, and the instructional set. The basic distinction between the two types of measures is in the degree of control the experimenter exercises in obtaining responses from the subject. This is illustrated by the contrast between a TAT and a self-evaluative questionnaire. Motives are most commonly, but not necessarily, assessed by operant measures. On the other hand, respondent measures have proven the most useful in examining schema and trait variables. Thus, to measure the three types of variables necessary to account for behavior, one would most probably use both respondent and operant measures.

However, McClelland had noted as early as 1951 that operant and respondent measures tended not to correlate with one another. He believes that they provide independent estimates of different aspects of personality, even when they purport to be related to the same theme. For this reason, they are used most effectively together. They are not to be correlated to one another, but are seen as complementing one another in providing the best estimate of behavior. Used in this way,

operant measures indicate general trends in behavior and recurrent thought preferences, which are thought less amenable to conscious processing. Respondent measures, in contrast, define schemata, values, or attitudes which influence the choices made among alternatives, and thus are useful in predicting responses to particular situations.

McClelland (1980) cites one of the few examples in the literature in which operant and respondent measures were used in a complementary fashion. French and Lesser (1964) found that women high in need Achievement who were career oriented did better on an intellectual task when it was linked to career development than when it was linked to success as a wife and mother. Need Achievement is measured operantly, while "career orientation" was determined with a respondent measure. Conversely, women high in need Achievement who were traditionally oriented did better on a social skills task when it was linked to success as a wife and mother than when it was linked to career development. Therefore, women with the same high level of a motive (Achievement) behaved more congruently with that motive (they performed better) on tasks which were linked to values the women espoused. These values were measured respondently. Moreover, this was found to hold true in a variety of behavioral situations, ranging from intellectual to social skills tasks.

To get the fullest picture of personality, then, McClelland suggests that " the best type of personality study will employ operant measures of motives, respondent measures of schemata, and measures of habitual responses (traits) to predict behavior" (1980, p.37). It was hoped that by using the Thematic Apperception Test, an operant measure

of motives, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, a respondent measure of schemata, and the Interpersonal Problem Solving Technique, an operant measure of a trait-like concept, that this suggestion was heeded.

Sex-Roles and Interpersonal Effectiveness

A sex-role is defined as a person's beliefs about how the sexes differ from one another, or the degree of "gender polarity" to which a person ascribes. These differences in beliefs about the sexes, together with the sex-role which the person ascribes to himself, affect both the person's behavior and self-description. In addition, these affect one's interpretations of the behavior of others.

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) assigns persons to one of four sex-role categories. These are derived from a 2x2 model, which sees masculinity and femininity as orthogonal schemata, and derives a scaled score for each. Subjects are classified "high" or "low" on each of these measures on the basis of a median split. A subject who is high in both masculinity and femininity is scored Androgynous; someone low in both traits is considered Undifferentiated. A Masculine subject is one high in masculinity, and low in femininity, while the feminine subject is high in femininity and low in masculinity.

Individuals of these different sex-roles vary in their cognitive processing of gender-related information. Information related to gender and gender differences is thought to be more perceptually salient and cognitively available to highly sex-typed persons. People, then, are viewed as differing primarily not in terms of masculinity or femininity per se, but rather in the content of their beliefs about what the sexes

are like and in the salience and availability of the gender-related cognitive schemata by which they process incoming information.

Work on the analysis of sex-role characteristics supports the notion that persons high in androgyny may be more socially competent. The highly sex-typed person is thought to have a limited number of effective behavioral options in dealing with varied situations. This is evidenced in an inability to engage in cross-sex typed behaviors even when doing so would prove adaptive. For example, when asked to indicate which of a series of paired activities they would prefer to perform for pay while being photographed, sex-typed subjects were more likely than either androgynous or sex-reversed subjects to resist sex-inappropriate activity, even though such choices cost them money (Bem & Lenney, 1976). In contrast, the androgynous person showed a great deal of behavioral flexibility. This may reflect a larger capacity for using behaviors that lead to reinforcement, with masculine-typed behavior used for assertive purposes and feminine-typed behavior used for expressive purposes (Kelly & Worell, 1977)

The idea has been supported that this behavioral flexibility is a manifestation of "balance" in the terms given by Bakan. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory has been theorized to measure agentic, or instrumental, orientation on the masculinity scale and communal, or expressive, orientation on the femininity scale (Kelly & Worell, 1977; Wiggins & Holz-muller, 1981). Masculinity has been associated with a cognitive focus on problem solving, while femininity is associated with an emotional concern for the welfare of others and for group harmony (Bem, Martyna, &

Watson, 1976). The same theme can be noted in Brickman's conceptualization in "correspondence" terms (cited in Ickes & Barnes, 1978). This defines masculinity as an emphasis on external correspondence, or correspondence between one's behavior and its consequences. Femininity, on the other hand, is conceived as a correspondence between one's behavior and one's feelings, an internal correspondence. In all these conceptualizations, the two modes of behavior are seen as being complementary, and as functioning best when balanced. If, then, the BSRI's masculinity scale measures agentic traits while its femininity scale measures communal traits, psychological health, in Bakan's balance terms, should be positively related to androgyny, all other things being equal. The review of the literature on sex-roles will specifically examine the relationship between sex-role and behavioral flexibility in an effort to explore this "balance" hypothesis.

Bem cites Kagan (1964) and Kohlberg (1966) who propose that the highly sex-typed person becomes motivated, during the course of sex-role socialization, to keep behavior consistent with her internalized sex-role standard. This is accomplished by suppressing any behavior seen as inappropriate for one's sex-role. This applies to both sex-typed and sex-reversed (feminine males and masculine females) persons, although the developmental factors in the latter case are unclear. Androgynous people, on the other hand, "should be able to remain sensitive to the changing constraints of the situation and engage in whatever behavior seems most effective at the moment, regardless of its stereotype as appropriate for one sex or the other" (Bem, 1975, p.634-635).

This "adaptability hypothesis" was specifically investigated by Bem in 1975. Males and females of each of the four sex-roles were tested on tasks previously rated by other subjects as stereotypically masculine or feminine. The masculine task involved a conformity paradigm. Subjects were asked to rate the funniness of a cartoon, ostensibly serving as one of four subjects, the rest of whom could be heard but not seen. However, the three other "subjects" were simply pre-recorded voices. On certain trials, all three of these would give false responses, i.e. would say that an unfunny cartoon was funny. Conformity was induced on a total of 36 trials for each subject. As expected, masculine and androgynous subjects conformed on fewer trials than did feminine subjects. This comparison was significant for males, for females and for the two sexes combined. There were no significant differences between androgynous and masculine subjects in either the combined-sex or individual-sex groups. It would seem that androgynous and masculine subjects of either sex perform better on a stereotypically masculine task than do feminine subjects of either sex.

A second group of subjects was tested on a task previously judged as stereotypically feminine. After being recruited for an experiment on "mood," subjects were asked to perform a variety of tasks and to fill out a mood questionnaire after completing each task. The tasks were: building with plastic geometrical disks, playing with a kitten, and playing a game of manual skill called "Shoot the Moon." In addition to the period of "forced play" with the kitten, subjects were left alone for a period during which they were told they could do whatever they

liked. The kitten was in a playpen in the room and subjects were rated for the amount of time they spent spontaneously playing with the kitten, how much they touched the kitten, and how much they enjoyed playing with the kitten.

The pattern of results was markedly different for the two sexes. For males, results were as expected. That is, feminine and androgynous males demonstrated significantly greater overall involvement with the kitten than did masculine males. Also as predicted, feminine and androgynous males did not differ significantly from one another. It is interesting to note that during the period of "forced play" the feminine and androgynous males did not touch the kitten any more than did the masculine males. All the males seemed to interact with the kitten in essentially the same way during forced play. However, feminine and androgynous men reported that they enjoyed the play more, and did, during the later "spontaneous play" period, interact with the kitten significantly more than did the masculine males. Results were not as predicted for female subjects. Feminine subjects were found to show significantly less involvement with the kitten than androgynous females. Results for the masculine females found them to be midway between, and not significantly different from either, the feminine and androgynous females. Androgynous persons of both sexes did in fact demonstrate greater behavioral flexibility than their sex-typed or sex-reversed peers. The performance of the feminine females on the "female" task was not as predicted, however, and raised issues which were examined more fully by Bem, Martyna, and Watson in a later study (1976).

It was thought that a probable reason for the finding of low nurturance on the part of the feminine females in the 1975 study was the fact that an animal, rather than a human, had been used as the eliciting object. To control for this, two new situations were devised. In the first, subjects of both sexes and all four sex-roles were recruited for a study of social responsiveness in infants and observed surreptitiously when left with an infant for a period of ten minutes. Subjects were rated for amount of interaction with the infant and were also asked to self-report their feelings of nurturance toward the child. Results indicated that masculine subjects were significantly less nurturant toward the baby than were either feminine or androgynous subjects. In addition, the feminine and androgynous subjects did not differ from each other. Finally, there was a trend for the androgynous subjects to be more nurturant than the undifferentiated subjects. This indicates that the feminine woman's low level of nurturance in the 1975 study was situation-specific, and probably due to the fact that interaction with a non-human was examined.

Another possible factor was that feminine females were not assertive enough to act on their nurturant feelings in situations in which they would have to take the initiative in interacting. To look at this possibility, an experiment was designed in which subjects were set up with confederate peers for a study supposedly examining communication and feelings of closeness. In reality, the "true" subjects were placed in an interpersonal situation in which they would be able to act out any nurturant feelings without having to take responsibility for initiating

or sustaining the interaction. The experiment was designed to evoke sympathy and support from the subject without requiring an active role on his or her part. Confederates delivered scripts, in which they spoke of being lonely transfer students, to the subjects. Subjects served as listeners, who were instructed to comment or question, but not to shift the focus of the conversation. After this, the experimenter entered the room and asked the two "subjects" to fill out questionnaires. "Subjects" were also told that the experiment was now over, and were left alone while they filled out the questionnaires. When the forms had been completed, the confederate expressed his or her feeling better after talking to the subject and said it was too bad they hadn't had a chance to talk longer. After the subject responded to this statement, the experimenter entered the room and began debriefing.

Subjects were rated on verbal and non-verbal responsiveness to the confederate's speech, as well as on their reaction to the confederate's implicit request for further contact. In addition, they were rated on their level of nurturance by others, and were asked to so rate their own feelings. Results were as predicted by the behavioral flexibility hypothesis. That is, masculine subjects were found to be significantly less nurturant than either feminine or androgynous subjects on all behavioral measures and on the rating of nurturance given by others. There were no significant differences between feminine and androgynous subjects on any of these variables. It is interesting to note that although there were no external differences found between the feminine and androgynous subjects, the feminine women reported themselves as

feeling significantly more nurturant than did the androgynous women. This may be related to the earlier noted belief that gender-related information is more perceptually salient and cognitively available to highly sex-typed persons.

Taken together, these two studies would seem to provide support for the hypothesis of behavioral flexibility. It was demonstrated that sex-typing restricts one's behavioral options in both instrumental and expressive situations, while, conversely, androgynous individuals of both sexes are capable of adaptive behavior in either situation.

Several other studies have demonstrated that sex-typing limits behavioral options, as androgyny expands them. It was found that sex-typed persons of both sexes will actively avoid behaviors they believe to be appropriate to the sex-role to which they do not ascribe, i.e. cross-sex behaviors. These behaviors will be avoided even in situations in which subjects are paid more to perform cross-sex behaviors than they are for sex-typed behavior. In addition, sex-typed persons experienced significantly more negative feelings about themselves when they performed cross-sex behaviors (Bem & Lenney, 1976). They reported feeling greater psychological discomfort, lower self-esteem, and either less masculine (if male) or less feminine (if female).

These results are based on within-sex analyses. This was indicated by preliminary findings that males were more likely than females to select highly-paid behaviors when no sex-role conflicts were involved, but were less likely to do so when sex-role conflict was present. This is consistent with literature suggesting that young boys are

discouraged from engaging in sex-inappropriate behavior to a greater extent than are young girls (cited in Bem & Lenney, 1976), and are thus less willing to perform them. This finding was also likely to have been influenced by the fact that stereotypically masculine tasks tend to be universally judged as possessing greater intrinsic worth than stereotypically feminine tasks (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970). For this reason, pairs of tasks were probably not matched on this variable of "intrinsic worth". This indicates the benefits to be accrued by examining data for males and females separately when studying sex-roles and behavioral flexibility.

Androgynous persons have also been shown to be more interpersonally effective in mixed-sex dyads interacting in unstructured situations. Ickes and Barnes (1982) found that mixed-sex dyads in which either or both members were androgynous experienced more interpersonal attraction and more positive affect and also did more talking, looking at each other and gesturing than did members of sex-typed dyads. In contrast to the notion that the masculine and feminine sex-typed roles are complementary, it was demonstrated that their interaction led to interpersonal stress in an unstructured situation. Further evidence for the interpersonal skill of androgynous persons was found by Campbell, Steffen and Langmeyer (1981). As self-reported, androgynous individuals were more skillful in interpersonal behavior, less anxious, and more socially active than sex-typed or undifferentiated peers in a variety of interpersonal situations. In another study using a self-report adjective scale, the hypothesis that androgynous persons would be more inter-

personally flexible was borne out for both male and female subjects. The interpersonal profiles of the sex-typed groups were significantly more variable than the profiles of androgynous individuals of either sex. There were no significant differences in the variability of profiles between sex-typed men and women, or between androgynous men and women.

A significant positive relationship has also been found, for both sexes, between masculinity and self-esteem and between femininity and self-esteem (Spence, et al. 1975) The authors believe that masculinity and femininity function additively to affect self-esteem and behavior and that "possession of a high degree of both masculinity and femininity may lead to the most socially desirable consequences, the absolute strengths of both components influencing attitudinal and behavioral outcomes for the individual" (p.35). Finally, androgynous people were also found to be consistently rated by others as being better adjusted and better liked than sex-typed or undifferentiated peers. Androgynous persons were seen as being as highly instrumental as masculine-typed persons, and as highly expressive as feminine-typed persons.

These studies together strongly support the hypothesis that androgyny implies a greater degree of behavioral flexibility than is found in sex-typed or undifferentiated persons. This has been observed in studies which directly measured behavior, as well as those in which persons were asked to rate themselves or others on behavior and/or personality characteristics, such as level of adjustment or self-esteem.

An issue in this field which has been at the center of a great

deal of disagreement recently is that concerning the relative roles of the interaction of male and female sex-roles, i.e. androgyny, and of the main effect of masculinity in contributing to increased social effectiveness. Many believe it is essential to separate the two. A review of the relevant literature demonstrated that even when balanced individuals (including both androgynous and undifferentiated) show greater psychological health¹ than sex-typed individuals, the difference between groups is much less than the difference favoring persons high in masculinity, with or without high femininity, over those low in masculinity (Taylor & Hall, 1982). These authors note that the dominance of masculinity effects may be due to the consistent disproportionately larger variability found in masculinity than in femininity, within samples of either sex. The feminine role may be more sharply delineated, with feminine traits being more uniformly claimed by women, and avoided by men. The latter statement is corroborated by the results of the study by Bem and Lenney, and lends further support to the idea of analyzing the results of female and male subjects separately when studying sex-roles and behavioral flexibility.

¹ This term was used as a rubric, in an extensive review of the literature on androgyny, which included, but was not limited to, interpersonal effectiveness/behavioral flexibility.

Intimacy Motivation and Interpersonal Effectiveness

We have seen how sex-roles have been shown in the literature to influence interpersonal effectiveness. This next section will examine the literature on intimacy motivation, looking specifically for its relation to interpersonal effectiveness. Before doing so, it will be helpful to define the construct more fully.

A social motive has been defined as "an affectively-toned cluster that energizes, directs and selects behavior and experience in certain situations" (McAdams, 1982, p.293). Intimacy motivation is the recurrent desire to experience warm, close, interpersonal relationships. Intimacy motivation implies a passivity, a receptivity in interpersonal relationships which embraces the "we" and relinquishes control over social situations in order to foster the expression of spontaneity. In conceptualizing intimacy motivation, McAdams has directly employed Bakan's concept of communion. Intimacy motivation implies that the person defines herself as an "individual organism embedded in a larger context, conceived by Bakan as a structured 'organism' in itself, and an identity (a definition or function) is conferred on the individual by the context in terms of relatedness (McAdams, 1982, p.135). Intimacy motivation implies an attentive waiting, not a striving, and interactions with others are ends themselves, not simply the means to another end.

Intimacy motivation is measured by the application of a special scoring system to stories given to selected cards of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). Six cards are generally used, and are chosen specifically to elicit interpersonal themes in varied situations. Each

story is scored for the presence or absence of each of ten categories of intimacy imagery. There are two predominant scoring categories: "relationship produces positive affect" and "dialogue". The presence of at least one of these two is a prerequisite for the scoring of any of the eight other categories. Scores for all cards are added to give an overall score of intimacy motivation for each subject.

Persons high in intimacy motivation are, by the definition of the construct, interpersonally oriented. They have also been shown, in a variety of studies, to be more interpersonally effective than their peers with low intimacy motivation. Those high in intimacy motivation have consistently been rated by others as being warmer, more natural, more sincere, and more loving than matched groups of low-intimacy peers. McAdams (1980) used results from control groups in two of his early validation studies to examine adjective x motive predictions. Controls who were high in intimacy motivation were rated by friends and acquaintances as being more natural, sincere, warm, appreciative, and loving and as less dominant, outspoken, and self-centered. Factor analysis yielded a factor of Interpersonal Warmth, which was very significantly related to intimacy motivation. No consistent sex differences were found.

In another experiment using college students as subjects, McAdams and Powers (1981) again found that subjects high in intimacy motivation were rated by their peers as being significantly more sincere, loving, likeable, and natural. They were also rated significantly less dominant. The subjects, however, did not rate themselves as being any more warm or less dominant than their peers who were not high in intimacy

motivation. Like the androgynous women in Bem, Martyna, and Watson's study of nurturance, who were high in behavioral nurturance but did not so rate themselves as highly as did the sex-typed women, these subjects high in intimacy did not seem to feel a need to "claim" these traits. This could relate to the relatively "flat" interpersonal profiles Wiggins and Holzmuller (1981) found for androgynous persons. Perhaps androgynous and high-intimate people tend to describe themselves in median terms, while sex-typed persons use the ends of the axes. Further support is given for this speculation by Bem's notion of gender polarity. That is, if sex-typed persons see more differences between the sexes and use these disparities in their cognitive processing of the world, they might tend to use more extreme terms to describe themselves and others, so as to delineate these differences.

McAdams and Powers also observed the behavior of subjects who were asked to structure a psychodrama, with others of the subjects serving as actors. Subjects high in intimacy motivation tended to fashion dramas which fostered a communal spirit in the group and physical proximity among its members. They often gave up a measure of control over the drama, by doing less organizing and making fewer commands, so that there was room for spontaneity and individual expression on the part of other group members.

Another study showed a rather more direct link between intimacy motivation and psychosocial adaptation. McAdams and Vaillant (1982) used archival data to do a longitudinal study of 57 men. Stories told to TAT pictures when subjects were thirty years old, when scored for

intimacy, were able to predict psychosocial adjustment at age 47. The latter measure was based on data gathered from interviews and questionnaires which looked at occupational success, interpersonal relations, and mental health. Subjects high in intimacy motivation at age 30 tended to be better adjusted at age 47. The highest correlation for individual items was between intimacy motivation and (a) enjoyment of job and (b) marital enjoyment. Intimacy motivation would seem to be linked to the quality of the emotion felt in work and family life.

McAdams (1982) in two studies examined the relationship of intimacy motivation to the recollection of life experiences. He was looking at the ways in which this particular social motive might, as sex-role has been hypothesized to do, influence cognitive processing. The first study asked subjects to recall a "peak experience" and a "great learning experience", these both being assumed to be highly salient and meaningful experiences. Results showed intimacy motive scores (as measured by a previously given TAT) were highly correlated with intimacy content in each of the autobiographical recollections. No sex differences were found. The second study looked at the relationship between intimacy motivation and the recollection of life experiences of different levels of meaningfulness to the subject. Experiences were classified as peak, satisfying, neutral, and unpleasant. As had been hypothesized, intimacy motivation was positively related to intimacy themes in peak experiences, but not in unpleasant and neutral experiences. The correlation for peak experiences was highly significant, while that for satisfying was marginally significant. McAdams interprets these results as indi-

cating that intimacy motive may relate to the content of highly salient and meaningful autobiographical memories. Thus, "the intimacy motive appears to confer upon particular classes of experience a special meaning or salience that facilitates the relatively efficient processing and ready retrieval of such information in a setting in which the subject is asked to recall a particularly meaningful event" (1982, p.300). This is not, of course, a one-way relationship. Rather, it is thought that there exists a two-way interaction in which motive shapes and is shaped by past and present experience.

Other studies have supported the relationship between intimacy motivation and perceptual/cognitive processing. One showed that people high in intimacy motivation are more sensitive to facial nuance. Of 53 college students, those high in intimacy motivation were more likely to perceive small changes in facial configurations, and therefore to use a greater variety of adjectives to describe those faces (McAdams, 1982). In an unpublished work by McAdams and McClelland (cited in McAdams, 1982), a highly significant correlation was found between intimacy scores and recall of a story high in intimacy themes, while no relationship was found between intimacy motive and recall of a neutral story. Another study by McClelland and McAdams (cited in McAdams, 1982) indicated that when subjects were read a long story containing intimacy, power, and neutral facts, those persons high in intimacy motivation remembered significantly more facts having to do with warmth, closeness, and the communication of the characters in the story.

A relationship has also been noted between intimacy motivation and

the patterns of friendship that subjects report. McAdams, Healy, and Krause (in press) assessed intimacy motivation of male and female undergraduates and asked them to describe ten friendship episodes which had occurred in the previous two weeks. Subjects of both sexes who were high in intimacy motivation reported more dyadic friendship episodes, as opposed to group episodes, than did other subjects. They also reported more self-disclosure among friends, more listening and more concern for the well-being of their friends than did their peers low in intimacy motivation.

McAdams and Jackson (1983) carried out a study in which college females were interviewed individually by female experimenters. Interviews were either one-way, in which only the subject described personal life experiences, or reciprocal, in which both subject and experimenter shared life experiences. Subjects high in intimacy motivation engaged in significantly more nonverbal displays of behavior indicative of intimacy. These included laughter, smiling, and eye contact. Moreover, the reciprocal condition seemed to stimulate, in high intimacy women, the very highest levels of laughter and eye contact. McAdams and Jackson interpret this as indicating a preference on the part of high-intimate women for reciprocal interaction over one-way interaction.

This study, in conjunction with that done by Ickes and Barnes (1978) mentioned previously, provide examples of intimacy and androgyny each individually contributing to greater interpersonal skill. While the Ickes and Barnes study was done with mixed-sex dyads, and the McAdams and Jackson study with same-sex dyads, this does not negate any

connection between the two. It will be remembered that Ickes and Barnes designed their study to examine the mitigating effects of androgyny on the interpersonal stress they hypothesized to be associated with interaction between the not-necessarily complementary sex-roles traditionally associated with the two sexes. They assumed that same-sex interaction would be less prone to stress than mixed-sex interaction. Taken together, these studies may indicate that such factors as intimacy motivation (for which no consistent sex differences have been found) may have more of an effect on, or be easier to discriminate in, interpersonal effectiveness in same-sex pairs, while sex-role may have a stronger effect on mixed-sex interaction.

Lastly, while it is true that no consistent sex differences have been found in studies of intimacy motivation, some studies have shown that females "score significantly higher than males on intimacy motivation, especially in environmental contexts in which traditional sex-roles prevail" (McAdams, Healy, & Krause, 1983, p.19). That "environment" was that of Midwestern colleges quite similar to that from which the subject pool used in this study was drawn. A similar effect is possible. This is yet another reason for which the results of the two sexes will be examined separately.

Intimacy motivation has been shown, then, to be linked to interpersonal effectiveness as measured behaviorally in the short-term as well as longitudinally. Other studies, moreover, have demonstrated greater interpersonal effectiveness in high-intimate persons as measured by self-reports and the reports of others. Persons high in intimacy

would seem to be oriented toward interpersonal interaction. Given the opportunity to structure a situation, they opt to give up control in the interests of fostering interpersonal communion, and are seen by others as being more effective in interpersonal interaction than are low-intimate people. Finally, intimacy motivation was shown, like sex-roles, to influence the ways in which persons cognitively process their experience. By all these means, a strong link would seem to have been forged between intimacy motivation and social effectiveness.

Interpersonal Effectiveness

A wide variety of definitions of "interpersonal effectiveness" have, at one time or another, been used in the psychological literature. At its broadest, this term includes any action on the part of a person that in any way impinges on another person. This is, of course, a construct too broad to be measured effectively. For this reason, most studies attempting to measure interpersonal effectiveness have limited its scope to something more manageable. This study was no exception. Interpersonal effectiveness was defined in this study in behavioral terms, as the ability to deal effectively with interpersonal conflict in a variety of difficult social situations. "Effectively" was defined as referring "to goal attainment through socially appropriate means as reflected in current definitions of assertiveness" (Getter & Nowinski, 1981, p.302). This definition is based on the parameters established by the authors of the measure used to assess interpersonal effectiveness. Before examining this measure more fully, it should be noted that, because it was based on a limited definition of interpersonal effective-

ness, it has not been purported to measure every aspect of effective interpersonal behavior but, rather, only those aspects as meet the criteria outlined above.

As stated in the introductory section of this literature review, the measure to be used to assess social competence is the Interpersonal Problem-Solving Assessment Technique (IPSAT). It yields patterns of self-reported behaviors in six classes of problematic social situations.

Types of situations covered are:

1. Authority situations, which involve interactions with persons having perceived power over the respondent.
2. Socially distant situations, in which interactions occur with persons perceived by the respondent as markedly different from him/her in one or more significant social dimensions.
3. Peer situations, which involve nonsexual interactions with people of similar social status
4. Personal request situations, in which the aim is getting help from others
5. Sexual situations, whose aim is sexual/romantic contact
6. Contractual situations, which represent interactions with persons bearing perceived obligations toward the respondent, i.e. a waiter.

Because of the importance of "assertiveness" in the definition of interpersonal effectiveness used, the IPSAT may, in Bakan's terms, tap a more "agentic" than "communal" mode of interaction. However, Bakan's

dialectical model may be applicable to the IPSAT because of these six subscales into which it can be divided. It is believed that peer situations, sexual situations, and socially distant situations may elicit more communal responses, while authority situations, personal request situations, and contractual situations should elicit more agentic solutions. In addition, the IPSAT also asks subjects to generate as many alternative responses as possible, and thus gives a measure of productivity. The ability to generate large numbers of alternative behaviors has, in the past, been associated with psychological adjustment (Platt & Spivak, 1972 cited in Getter & Nowinski, 1981). It is also, of course, directly related to the type of behavioral flexibility which has been examined in this review of the literature. Initial validation studies found scores not to be materially affected by sex differences. Nor was any evidence found that scores were subject to the undue influence of social desirability response sets. Finally, scores were noted as being independent of subjects' verbal ability.

Summary and Hypotheses

A review of the literature of each of the previously unrelated fields of sex-roles and intimacy motivation has revealed, for each, a relationship with interpersonal effectiveness. Androgyny, or the availability of both the masculine and feminine sex-roles, has been shown to have a positive relationship to behavioral flexibility. This has been demonstrated in studies which directly measured behavior, as well as others in which subjects were asked to rate themselves or others on either behavioral attributes, such as nurturance, or personality charac-

teristics, such as level of adjustment or self-esteem.

Theoretically, the flexibility of the androgynous person is seen as representing an example of 'balance' in terms of Bakan's core characteristics. The masculine sex-role is seen as a manifestation of agency, while the feminine sex-role is one of communion. The optimal mix of these two is a balanced state, in which each contributes equally to the person's behavior and cognition. By this theory, the presence of both characteristics is essential for optimal functioning. Applying this theory to the measurement of sex-roles, androgyny is seen as the optimal manifestation of these characteristics, the 'balance' state in which people function most effectively.

Intimacy motivation, too, was demonstrated to have an effect on level of interpersonal effectiveness. This was true when measured behaviorally in the short-term, as in the study involving psychodrama, or longitudinally, as in McAdams and Vaillant (1982). Other work has demonstrated greater interpersonal effectiveness in high-intimate persons when this is measured by self-report or the reports of others. In line with the construct's original definition, persons high in intimacy motivation do seem to be more oriented toward interpersonal interaction than are their low-intimate peers. Moreover, they seem to be more successful in carrying out such interaction.

In contrast to androgyny, which is thought to encompass both the core characteristics, intimacy motivation is seen as being related only to the characteristic of communion. The desire for interpersonal unity is a passive waiting, an openness to others, in which the interaction is

an end in itself, and not simply the means to some other end. As evidenced by the literature, intimacy motivation has been an effective measure of levels of orientation to interpersonal interaction. As such, it effectively provides an estimate of at least this aspect of Bakan's communion.

The interpersonal measure used in this study was chosen specifically to be a test of the "behavioral flexibility hypothesis". As such, it was chosen to measure how flexibly, i.e. with what number of alternatives, and how well, i.e. with what level of effectiveness, subjects could respond to a variety of interpersonal problem situations. This test, then, in conjunction with the BSRI to measure sex-role and the TAT to measure intimacy motivation, should provide an estimate of interpersonal effectiveness to which the contributions of each of the other tests can be determined by statistical analysis. In terms of Bakan's conceptualizations, it will be remembered that while the IPSAT's "assertive" orientation may make it more sensitive to agentic than communal aspects of interpersonal effectiveness, the six subscales into which it can be divided are thought to differ in the degrees of each characteristic they measure. It is believed, therefore, that some of these subscales will, in fact, provide measures of behavior best conceptualized in communal terms. These are the Peer, Sexual, and Socially Distant subscales.

There were differences between this thesis and the literature thus far reviewed. This work heeded the warning of the literature on androgyny and look at masculine and feminine sex-roles as distinct from one

another, i.e. as separate traits rather than a single bipolar one. They were also examined separately from the sex of the subjects. The main effects of each of these, and of their interactions were examined in relation to level of intimacy motivation. Moreover, as mentioned, the measure of interpersonal effectiveness was broken down into subscales to clarify conceptualizations in terms of degree of agentic or communal orientation.

It was thought that the separation of sex from sex-role and the dissection of an overall measure of social effectiveness into subscales would elucidate the various relationships between intimacy motive and social effectiveness, and between sex-role and social effectiveness. In addition, the relationships between the three factors, and of each with the sex of the subject were examined in hopes of shedding some light on these complex issues.

Specific hypotheses were as follows:

1. High scores on both intimacy motivation and psychological androgyny will predict high scores of interpersonal effectiveness in both the cognitive and behavioral dimensions, higher scores than would be predicted by high scores on either measure alone. In addition to the demonstrated effect of each individually on interpersonal effectiveness, it is expected that they will function additively when used together to predict social effectiveness. This is based on McClelland's argument that operant measures, such as the TAT, and respondent measures, such as the BSRI, can more

effectively predict behavior when used together, than can either used separately. This is true even though such operant and respondent measures do not generally correlate with one another even when they purport to measure the same theme. However, they measure parallel aspects of behavior patterns and can therefore bolster one another's utility when used together.

2. The relationship described in (1) may be different for the two sexes. It will be recalled that some research has indicated that it may be the main effect of masculinity, rather than androgyny per se, may be responsible for a large proportion of social effectiveness. If this is so, it should first become evident in analysis due to the fact that data from the two sexes will be examined separately. Secondly, if the main effect of masculinity is found to have a large effect on social effectiveness, what looks like an androgyny effect in women may not be, while no androgyny effect will be found for men.
3. It is expected that high interpersonal subscores on the Peer, Sexual, and Socially Distant scales will be predicted by high intimacy scores and/or high feminine sex-role scores. This hypothesis is based on the fact that each of these five measures is conceptualized as being a manifestation of Bakan's core characteristic of communion. Therefore, these operant (intimacy) and respondent (sex-role)

measures together should provide the best measure of communally oriented behavior.

4. Similarly, it is hypothesized that subscores for the Personal Request, Authority, and Contractual Situations should be more strongly influenced by masculine sex-role scores, these four measures being conceptualized as measuring agentic aspects of self-reported behavior.
5. Finally, it will be recalled that the Ickes and Barnes (1978) and McAdams and Jackson (1983) studies of mixed-sex and same-sex, respectively, dyadic interaction were interpreted, together, as indicating that different factors may be operating to influence social effectiveness in these two situations. It is thought that intimacy motivation may have more of an effect on, or be easier to discriminate in, interpersonal effectiveness in same-sex pairs, while sex-role should have more of an effect on mixed-sex interaction. It is hypothesized that this will be reflected in a stronger effect of intimacy motivation in contributing to interpersonal effectiveness on the Peer subscale, and in a stronger effect of androgyny on the Sexual subscale of the interpersonal measure.



CHAPTER III

METHODS

Subjects

Subjects were undergraduates in Introductory Psychology classes at Loyola University of Chicago who volunteered to participate in partial fulfillment of class requirements. Both male and female subjects were used, without regard to race or religion. The final group included 46 women and 53 men.

Materials

Intimacy Motivation. The measurement of intimacy motivation involved the use of paper and pencil, a projector, and six slides drawn from the Thematic Apperception Test (as outlined by McAdams, 1980). Subjects are shown each slide for 30 seconds. After each slide has been shown, subjects are given exactly five minutes to write a story in response to the picture. These slides consisted of drawings and photographs chosen to elicit interpersonal themes. These included (in the order in which they were presented):

1. A couple sitting on a bench next to a river
2. A man at a desk, on which is a photograph of a woman and two children
3. A ship's captain, his liner in the background, talking to another man

4. A man and woman on the trapeze
5. Two female scientists in the laboratory
6. A man and woman walking through a field with a dog and two horses.

The manual for the intimacy motive scoring system contains a detailed explication of the system. Subjects may receive, at the maximum, a score of 10 for each story, 60 for the entire test. This represents the presence or absence of each of the ten scoring categories of intimacy motivation in each of the six stories. The manual also contains a series of sample stories, previously scored by an expert, which are rescored by novice raters to establish inter-rater reliability. The undergraduate who scored the TAT in the present study was asked to familiarize himself thoroughly with the manual and the intimacy motive scoring system before establishing his reliability by scoring the sample stories provided. The inter-rater reliability established for this rater and the expert scoring given in the manual was .92.

Evidence for the construct validity of the intimacy motive scoring system has been provided by a series of studies previously outlined in Chapter Two (McAdams, 1982). To summarize, peer ratings and behavioral studies (e.g. the psychodrama study) have both found evidence for persons high in intimacy motivation being warmer, less dominant, and more interpersonally oriented than their low-intimate peers. In addition, persons high in intimacy motivation have been found to have a propensity to certain types of perceptual/cognitive processing. That is, they are more sensitive to facial nuance, and tend to remember facts concerned

with closeness to others more readily than they do neutral or power-oriented facts. In addition, a longitudinal study found intimacy motivation to be positively related to psychosocial adaptation, especially as related to marital enjoyment and enjoyment of job.

Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Sex-role was measured using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). This self-report test involves rating oneself, on a scale of 1 to 7, on each of sixty adjectives. In initial validation studies, twenty of these adjectives have been rated as stereotypically masculine, twenty as stereotypically feminine, and twenty as neutral in this dimension. A mean is derived for self-reported scores on all masculine items and then converted into a standard score. The same procedure is followed for the feminine items. Standard scores are based on large samples of Stanford undergraduates, an appropriate norm group for the subjects in this study. Using the standard scores, subjects are classified high or low on each dimension, on the basis of a median split. This gives the four 'types' previously mentioned: masculine (high masculine, low feminine), feminine (high feminine, low masculine), androgynous (high feminine, high masculine), and undifferentiated (low feminine, low masculine).

Test-retest reliability for the BSRI has proven high, ranging from a low of .76 to a high of .94 (BSRI manual, 1974). Empirical research has generated quite a bit of support for the notion that the BSRI does, in fact, discriminate between those who restrict their behavior in accordance with sex stereotypes and those who do not. Again, these studies were reviewed in Chapter Two. In brief, it has been shown that

sex-typed persons resist performing cross-sex typed behavior to a greater degree than do androgynous persons, and also experience greater psychological discomfort if required to so engage themselves. Additional support for the validity of the BSRI is given by studies showing that androgynous persons consistently displayed high levels of behavior in both the expressive and instrumental domains of behavior while nonandrogynous people were often low in one or the other of these domains (Bem, Martyna, and Watson, 1976).

Interpersonal Problem-Solving Assessment Technique. Interpersonal effectiveness was assessed using the complete (forms CS1 and CS2) college form of the Interpersonal Problem-Solving Assessment Technique (Getter & Nowinski, 1981). This paper-and-pencil test poses 42 interpersonal problem situations and asks subjects to generate as many solutions as they can. It also requires that they star (*) that solution which they think they would actually perform in the situation.

Solutions generated and solutions chosen represent, respectively, the Cognitive and Behavioral dimensions of interpersonal effectiveness as tapped by the IPSAT. Each response is scored either effective, avoidant, inappropriate, dependent or unscorable. Subjects receive separate 'effective,' 'avoidant,' 'inappropriate,' 'dependent' and 'unscorable' scores in each of the two dimensions, based on the number of responses so scored in that dimension. Subscale scores are also derived for different categories of interpersonal situation. These are: peer situations, sexual situations, socially distant situations, personal request situations, authority situations, and contractual situations. Again,

separate scores are derived in each of the scoring categories for each subscale. For example, a 'dependent' score would be only one of five scores in the subscale 'Authority situation'. In addition, the number and length of solutions are taken together to score subjects' Productivity.

The authors of the IPSAT initially gathered reliability data using four scorers, all advanced undergraduates (Getter & Nowinski, 1981). Subjects were asked to familiarize themselves with the IPSAT manual before beginning to score. At all times, each scorer was blind to the scorings of the others. Correlations between each of two sets of scorers were averaged to yield reliability coefficients. Average reliability among the four scorers was .93 for the Effective scoring category, .97 for the Avoidant, .86 for the Dependent, and .82 for the Unscorable responses (Getter & Nowinski, 1981). It was hypothesized that the low reliabilities for the latter two categories may be due to their low frequency of occurrence.

In the present study, two of these scorers were also advanced undergraduates who were familiar with the IPSAT manual before they began to score. The third scorer was the author. All three raters scored 24 of the 99 CS1 forms of the IPSAT that had been administered. Reliability coefficients were calculated for each of the undergraduates with the author's scores. These were averaged to yield reliabilities of .92 for the Effective scoring category, .98 for the Avoidant, .93 for the Inappropriate, .98 for the Dependent, and .74 for the Unscorable responses. Again, the low reliability for the latter may be due to its low fre-

quency of occurrence, while the reliability for the Dependent responses is, in this case, well within acceptable limits.

Validity of the IPSAT was measured by its authors (Getter & Nowinski, 1981) by examining correlations between scores on the IPSAT and on the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (EPPS), the Psychological Screening Inventory (PSI), and the College Self-Expression Scale (CSES). Using the latter measure, effective choices were found to correlate positively with self-reported assertiveness, while avoidant solutions correlated negatively with assertiveness. With the EPPS, number of effective solutions correlated positively with self-reported aggression, and negatively with succorance. Avoidant solutions correlated positively with deference, and negatively with exhibition, autonomy, and dominance. Inappropriate solutions correlated negatively with nurturance and positively with exhibition. Dependent solutions correlated positively with Succorance. Finally, using the PSI, alienation was found to be positively related to the number of avoidant solutions, and negatively related to the number of effective solutions.

In a second study reported by Getter and Nowinski (1981), clinical and normal populations of college students yielded patterns of IPSAT means which were significantly different in clinically meaningful ways. Normal subjects reported more effective solutions, while subjects accepted for psychotherapy reported more avoidance, and less effectiveness in interpersonal situations. It should be noted that, contrary to expectation, the two groups did not differ on the inappropriate or dependent scoring categories. There were also no significant differ-

ences in the number of solutions generated by the two groups, the Productivity dimension.

Procedure

Subjects were tested in small groups, ranging in size from three to nine persons. All groups were run by the author. At the beginning of the testing session, each subject was handed a packet of materials. This included, in order from the top to the bottom of the packet, a single-page consent form, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, blank lined paper on which responses to the Thematic Apperception Test were to be written, and forms CS1 and CS2 of the Interpersonal Problem-Solving Assessment Technique.

Subjects were first asked to read and sign the consent form, which was then collected by the experimenter. Directions for the BSRI were then read aloud by the experimenter, as subjects read along on the face sheet of the test. Subjects then filled out this test, and it was collected after all had completed it.

Following this, the TAT was administered. A slide projector was used to show each of the six slides for thirty seconds. Immediately after a slide had been shown, subjects were given exactly five minutes to write a story. Using the instructions standardly given by McAdams and his associates, subjects were asked to write a story with these four elements:

1. Who are the people and what are they doing?
2. What events led up to what is happening now in the story?
3. What are the people thinking and feeling?

4. What will happen in the future?

After all six slides had been shown, and six stories written, papers were collected by the experimenter.

Finally, instructions for the IPSAT were read aloud by the experimenter as subjects read along. Subjects were told to fill out both forms of the IPSAT, and were told that they could leave the testing session when these had been handed in to the experimenter, who remained in the room throughout the session. The entire testing session generally took about two hours, although individual times ranged from one hour forty minutes to two and one-half hours.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Independent Variables: Descriptive Statistics

The independent variables used to test the hypotheses on which this study was based were intimacy motivation, as measured by the TAT and the scoring system developed by McAdams (1980), and femininity and masculinity, as measured by the Bem Sex- Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). As can be seen in Table 1, means, standard deviations and ranges were computed for each independent variable on all subjects and on the male and female subgroups. It can also be seen that significantly different scores on each of the three variables were found for the two sexes. Females had higher scores on intimacy motivation, $t= 3.37$, $p <.01$, and femininity, $t= 4.83$, $p <.01$, than did males. Males had higher scores on masculinity, $t= 3.53$, $p <.01$, than did females.

Correlations between the three independent variables were also generated. These are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 1

Independent Variables: Descriptive Statistics

Independent Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
<u>Intimacy Motivation</u>			
Males	5.9	3.6	16.0
Females	8.2*	4.5	19.0
All	6.9	4.2	20.0
<u>Masculinity</u>			
Males	52.4*	10.5	56.0
Females	43.6	13.7	54.0
All	48.3	12.9	61.0
<u>Femininity</u>			
Males	46.2	9.3	43.0
Females	54.8*	8.4	38.0
All	50.2	9.9	48.0

*Mean value for sex subsample significantly higher ($p < .01$) than mean value for alternate sex subsample.

TABLE 2

Correlations between Independent Variables

	<u>Intimacy Motivation</u>	<u>Masculinity</u>	<u>Femininity</u>
Intimacy Motivation			
Masculinity	-.05		
Femininity	.13	-.03	

Dependent Variables: Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations and ranges are given for the variables derived from the Interpersonal Problem-Solving Assessment Technique (Getter & Nowinski, 1981) in Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 specifies results, tabulated for all subjects and separately by sex, of Cognitive measures of interpersonal effectiveness. The Cognitive measures are the total number of responses that subjects are able to generate in response to each of the interpersonal problem situations posed. Any effective response is scored 1, any other response (avoidant, inappropriate, dependent, or unscorable) is scored 0. There are six types of situations in which interpersonal effectiveness is measured. These are Authority, Socially Distant, Contractual, Peer, Sexual, and Personal Request situations. An overall Cognitive score, which is the sum of the six subscales, is also derived.

Table 4 gives data, again tabulated for all subjects and separately by sex, on Behavioral measures of interpersonal effectiveness. As with the cognitive measures, scores are determined for overall behavioral effectiveness and for behavioral effectiveness in each of the six types of situations defined by the subscales. These data are based only on those responses which subjects starred in response to the IPSAT's directions to mark the response they would actually perform in the given situation. As with the Cognitive measures, any effective marked solution would receive a score of 1; any other type of solution would be scored 0.

TABLE 3

Cognitive Interpersonal Effectiveness

Situation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Authority			
Males	3.1	1.4	5.0
Females	4.1	1.6	9.0
All	4.1	1.5	9.0
Socially Distant			
Males	6.6	1.7	8.0
Females	6.4	2.2	10.0
All	6.5	2.0	10.0
Personal Request			
Males	8.9	2.0	9.0
Females	9.4	2.2	11.0
All	9.1	2.1	11.0
Peer			
Males	11.0	2.5	13.0
Females	11.5	2.7	13.0
All	11.2	2.6	14.0
Sexual			
Males	11.9	3.2	13.0
Females	12.5	3.7	17.0

All	12.2	3.4	18.0
Contractual			
Males	7.5	1.6	7.0
Females	7.8	1.8	10.0
All	7.6	1.7	10.0
Overall			
Males	50.1	8.4	38.0
Females	52.3	11.1	54.0
All	51.1	9.8	54.0

TABLE 4

Behavioral Interpersonal Effectiveness

Situation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Authority			
Males	2.5	1.1	4.0
Females	2.4	1.1	4.0
All	2.4	1.1	4.0
Socially Distant			
Males	3.6	1.5	7.0
Females	3.2	1.4	5.0
All	3.4	1.4	7.0
Personal Request			
Males	4.9	1.7	7.0
Females	4.7	1.6	8.0
All	4.8	1.6	8.0
Peer			
Males	5.9	1.7	7.0
Females	5.8	1.9	7.0
All	5.8	1.8	8.0
Sexual			
Males	5.3	1.7	7.0
Females	5.3	1.9	9.0

All	5.3	1.8	9.0
Contractual			
Males	4.8	1.4	6.0
Females	5.1	1.2	5.0
All	5.0	1.3	6.0
Overall			
Males	50.1	8.4	38.0
Females	52.3	11.1	54.0
All	51.5	9.8	54.0

It should be noted that, in contrast to the independent variables previously discussed, an analysis of data on the dependent variables found no significant differences attributable to sex. This was determined by means of a step-wise multiple regression which entered sex as a dummy variable in the first step of the regression. None of the resultant F values were significant.

Hypotheses

Interpersonal Effectiveness: Overall measures. The first hypothesis of this study was that high scores on interpersonal effectiveness would be predicted by high scores on each of the independent variables masculinity, femininity, and intimacy motivation. It was hypothesized that these measures together would predict a greater percentage of the variance in the measure of interpersonal effectiveness than would any of the measures alone. It was thought that this relationship would hold true in both the Cognitive and Behavioral dimensions of interpersonal effectiveness as measured by the IPSAT.

The statistical method used to test these hypotheses was step-wise multiple regression. This method was chosen because it allows the experimenter to determine how much of the variance in a continuous dependent variable is accounted for by each of several continuous independent variables. This was suited to this study of the effects of masculinity, femininity, and intimacy motivation (all continuous variables), on continuous measures of interpersonal effectiveness. Sex was entered

into the equation first, followed by masculinity, femininity, and intimacy motivation. This procedure was followed for each of the IPSAT scores that was used as a dependent variable.

A regression was done with each of the following as dependent variable: overall cognitive effectiveness, and cognitive effectiveness in each of the six situations subscaled by the IPSAT, overall behavioral effectiveness, and behavioral effectiveness in each of the six situations. In addition, regression equations were run with various aspects of interpersonal ineffectiveness as the dependent variable. These were: measures of cognitive avoidance, inappropriateness, and dependence and of behavioral avoidance, inappropriateness, and dependence.

The primary hypothesis was not fully supported. Rather masculinity was found to be a significant predictor in a number of the analyses. Contrary to hypotheses, neither femininity (with one exception) nor intimacy motivation was found to be a significant predictor of interpersonal effectiveness.

For all subjects, masculinity had a significant ($p < .01$) and positive effect on overall behavioral effectiveness. No main effect was obtained for masculinity predicting cognitive effectiveness.

In this analysis, as in all the others to follow, results were also computed within each sex. This was done despite the fact that no significant sex differences were found on the dependent variables. For women, masculinity was found to be a significant ($p < .01$) predictor of overall behavioral effectiveness. For men, masculinity was a signifi-

cant ($p < .01$) predictor of overall cognitive effectiveness. On the other hand, no significant effects were found for men in the behavioral dimension; conversely, no significant effects were found for women in the cognitive dimension.

Peer, Sexual, and Socially Distant Situations. We shall now look at analyses of behavioral and cognitive effectiveness within specific types of interpersonal situations. A hypothesis stated that high scores on the peer, sexual, and socially distant subscales should be predicted by high intimacy motivation and by high femininity scores. This was based on the conceptualization of all of these measures as 'communal,' in Bakan's sense of the word. This hypothesis was generally supported, the only exception was an effect within the male sample on the sexual subscale. In this case, femininity ($p < .01$) and masculinity ($p < .01$) each were significant predictors of scores on behavioral effectiveness. Masculinity had a positive effect on effectiveness, but femininity's effect was negative in sexual situations for men.

Contrary to expectation, results for all subjects indicated a significant effect for masculinity on the Behavioral dimension of both the Socially Distant ($p < .01$) and Peer ($p < .01$) subscales. Masculinity accounted for, respectively, 12 and 10 percent of the variance of the dependent variables. These relationships also held for the within-sex analysis of women. Masculinity had an effect at the .05 level of significance for the Behavioral dimension of the Socially Distant subscale and at the .01 level of significance for the Peer subscale, Behavioral

dimension. For men, in addition to the previously noted relationship between masculinity, femininity, and Behavioral effectiveness on the Sexual subscale, a significant effect ($p < .05$) was noted for masculinity alone on the Cognitive dimension of the Peer subscale. It will be noted that no support was found for the hypothesis that intimacy motivation should have a strong effect on interpersonal effectiveness as measured by the Peer subscale.

Personal Request, Authority, and Contractual Situations. It was hypothesized that subscores for the Personal Request, Authority, and Contractual situations would be more strongly influenced by masculinity, as all four measures were conceptualized as targeting agentic aspects (again, in Bakan's terms) of self-reported behavior. This hypothesis was not confirmed. There were no significant results, for all subjects, or within either sex, on any of these subscales.

Significant results regarding interpersonal effectiveness and the variables femininity, masculinity, and intimacy motivation are summarized in Table 5.

Interpersonal Effectiveness and Productivity

The authors of the IPSAT (Getter & Nowinski, 1981) initially hypothesized that the total number of responses generated (TR) and the total length in number of words (TL) of all Behavioral responses could be taken together as a measure of a subjects' Productivity, which should contribute to interpersonal effectiveness. Although their results

TABLE 5

Statistically Significant Predictors of Effectiveness

Situation	Statistically Significant Predictors		
	Males	Females	All
Overall			
Cognitive	M*		
Behavioral		M**	M**
Peer			
Cognitive	M*		
Behavioral		M**	M**
Sexual			
Cognitive			
Behavioral	M** F**@		
Socially Distant			
Cognitive			
Behavioral		M*	M**

Note: M= Masculinity; F= Femininity; I= Intimacy Motivation.

Authority, Contractual, and Personal Request situations are not included in the table because no significant predictors of effectiveness were found for these three situations.

@This is a significant negative effect.

* p <.05

** p <.01

(1981) did not confirm this hypothesis, the results of this study do. These results are presented in this section. Descriptive statistics for measures of Productivity (TR and TL) are given for all subjects, for males, and for females in Table 6. No significant sex differences were found by comparing group means.

Multiple regressions in which sex, TR, and TL were entered as independent variables, and overall cognitive effectiveness was entered as the dependent variable found that TR made a significant ($p < .01$) contribution to cognitive effectiveness. When the same analysis was done with behavioral effectiveness as the dependent variable, both TR ($p < .01$) and TL ($p < .01$) were significant predictors of behavioral effectiveness.

Although no significant sex differences were found in the regression equation, different patterns of results emerged in within-sex analyses. For women, TR ($p < .01$) and TL ($p < .05$) each contributed to cognitive effectiveness when they were entered in a regression. On behavioral effectiveness for women, both TR ($p < .01$) and TL ($p < .01$) were significant.

For men, only TR had an effect ($p < .01$ in both cases) on cognitive effectiveness. There were no significant results at all for men on the behavioral dimension of interpersonal effectiveness.

TABLE 6

Productivity: Descriptive Statistics

		All subjects	Females	Males
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total Responses (TR)	Mean	132.5	132.8	132.1
	SD	27.6	29.1	26.5
	Range	171.0	171.0	149.0
Total Length (TL)	Mean	424.6	451.0	401.6
	SD	149.9	168.2	129.2
	Range	812.0	759.0	661.0

Interpersonal Ineffectiveness

In addition to giving scores of interpersonal effectiveness, the IPSAT gives scores in various "ineffective" categories. These include Avoidant, Inappropriate, and Dependent. Scores are given in both the Cognitive and Behavioral dimensions. Interesting results were found in regression analyses of both the Avoidant and Dependent categories of response. Descriptive statistics for these categories are given in Table 7. There were no significant differences between the group means of the two sexes in either dimension of either category of interpersonal ineffectiveness.

Results for all subjects indicated that masculinity accounted for 23 percent of the variance in Behavioral Avoidance ($p < .01$), with an additional 2.5 percent accounted for by the other two independent variables (not statistically significant). However, masculinity received a negative beta weight in the regression equation. In other words, the higher the level of masculinity, the fewer the number of avoidant responses the subjects makes. Within-sex analyses supported these results for both sexes. For women, masculinity (with a negative weight) accounted for 36 percent of the variance in Avoidant behavior ($p < .01$). Though significant, this effect was not as strong for the men. Masculinity accounted for only 11 percent of the variance in avoidant behavior ($p < .01$) among males.

Finally, masculinity also had a significant negative effect ($p < .05$) on Dependent behavior in the male sample only.

TABLE 7
Interpersonal Ineffectiveness

Situation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Avoidant Cognitive			
Males	43.3	12.0	62.0
Females	44.1	12.0	65.0
All	43.7	12.0	73.0
Avoidant Behavioral			
Males	8.5	4.6	19.0
Females	9.4	5.2	21.0
All	8.9	4.9	21.0
Dependent Cognitive			
Males	5.5	3.4	16.0
Females	6.2	3.0	12.0
All	5.9	3.2	16.0
Dependent Behavioral			
Males	1.9	1.6	6.0
Females	2.0	2.2	11.0
All	2.0	1.5	11.0

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Sex-Roles, Intimacy Motivation and Agentic Effectiveness

Reviewing the descriptive statistics of the variables examined in this study indicates that while there were no sex differences on any of the dependent variables (all of which were drawn from the Interpersonal Problem-Solving Assessment Technique), there were significant sex differences on each of the three independent variables: masculinity and femininity, as measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, and intimacy motivation, as measured using the Thematic Apperception Test. In addition, there were significant sex differences in the manner in which one of the independent variables contributed to performance on the IPSAT. This independent variable was masculinity.

It will be recalled that this study was originally conceived in terms of Bakan's concepts of agency and communion. Masculinity was thought of as tapping primarily agentic forms of cognition and behavior, while femininity and intimacy motivation measured communal aspects of the same. It was hoped that the IPSAT, despite the strongly 'assertive' nature of its definition of interpersonal effectiveness, would provide some measure of communal functioning because of the six subscales into which it can be divided. It was hypothesized that certain of the subscales (Peer, Sexual, and Socially Distant) would be communally ori-

ented, and that the IPSAT could thus be used as a measure of behavioral flexibility, in Bakan's balance terms. Results of this study would seem to indicate that this is not the case, and that the 'assertive' nature of the IPSAT precludes its providing a sensitive measure of communal cognition or behavior. This idea will now be developed more fully.

The IPSAT defines effective interpersonal behavior as "goal attainment through socially appropriate means as reflected in current definitions of assertiveness" (Getter & Nowinski, 1981, p.302). While it was hoped that the Peer, Sexual and Socially Distant subscales would provide a measure of communal interpersonal effectiveness, results of this work indicate instead that they measure agentic aspects of what only might be communal situations. Contrary to expectation, results of this study support the idea that the concepts of femininity and intimacy motivation are, by definition, ineffective as it is defined by the IPSAT. That is, femininity has been conceived as being an emotional concern for the feelings of others (Bem, et al.1976), and as a striving for correspondence between one's feelings and one's behavior (Ickes & Barnes, 1978). Neither of these places any emphasis on attainment of external goals or on assertiveness; each leaves the way open to behavior that might, but would not necessarily, be classified as Avoidant, Dependent or Inappropriate by the IPSAT. Intimacy motivation, too, by its emphasis on passive waiting for close interpersonal relationship, goes against any notions of assertiveness in interaction. As has been shown, no relationships (with the exception of a negative relationship between

femininity and effective behavior in sexual situations to be discussed later in this chapter) were found between these two independent variables and the IPSAT, reinforcing the notion that femininity and intimacy motivation are defined in opposition to the definition of interpersonal effectiveness put forth by the IPSAT.

Masculinity, on the other hand, has been defined in congruence with 'assertive goal attainment' as a cognitive focus on problem solving (Bem, et al.1976) and as a correspondence between one's behavior and its consequences (Ickes & Barnes, 1978). These conceptualizations are supported to some extent by the results of this study, which found many relationships between masculinity and interpersonal effectiveness as measured by the IPSAT.

In addition to the effects of masculinity that were found to hold for all subjects, there were some differences in its effects for the two sexes. It seems likely, based on the results of this work, that masculinity may function differently for men and women in contributing to agentic interpersonal effectiveness. In order to expand on this idea, results will be interpreted first for all subjects, and then by comparing results for the two sexes, in relation to the overall results.

For all subjects, masculinity was found to have a positive effect on effective behavior. This held true in the overall measure of effective behavior, and in two specific types of situation (Peer and Socially Distant). Moreover, a negative relationship was found between masculinity and avoidant behavior. Masculinity seems to contribute to people's ability to behave assertively, although it did not have a significant

impact on the cognitive aspect of assertiveness measured by the IPSAT. While masculinity may have an effect on one's choosing to behave effectively (or at least saying that one would do so), it does not seem to effect one's ability to generate possible responses to interpersonal problem situations. The same holds true negatively for avoidant behavior. Masculinity increases the likelihood that one will choose not to behave avoidantly, although one will be able to generate as many avoidant solutions as persons low in masculinity.

Why the effect of masculinity on effective behavior should be stronger in two subscales originally thought (by the author) to be more communally oriented is unclear. One hypothesis, however, is that all persons, regardless of level of masculinity, tend to act assertively in such 'agentic' situations as those put forth in the Authority, Contractual, and Personal Request subscales. Individual differences on the basis of masculinity would thus tend to be 'wiped out' in analysis (as happened in this study). By contrast, situations that are less cut-and-dry in calling for assertiveness would tend to show any effect that masculinity might have, making it more likely that subjects high in masculinity would act so as to achieve a goal, rather than to, for example, experience closeness passively with another person.

These are results as derived and interpreted for all subjects. It was determined from the outset of this work, however, that because of the nature of the results of previous studies examining sex, sex-roles, and interpersonal effectiveness, data should also be examined separately for each sex. Results indicate this to have been a fortuitous decision,

as significant results within each sex differed in systematic ways. Following are within-sex analyses.

Results for women on measures of overall agentic effectiveness replicated those of all subjects. That is, masculinity had a significant effect on behavioral effectiveness, without impacting on cognitive effectiveness. The opposite was true of male subjects. Masculinity had a significant effect, for men, on cognitive effectiveness, without impacting behavioral effectiveness. It would seem that while masculinity encourages agentic behavior in women, without leading them to generate any more agentic solutions, it does contribute to men's generating more agentic solutions than low-masculine males, without encouraging high-masculine men to engage in any more agentic behavior than their low-masculine peers. Moreover, this relationship held within the subscales for which significant results were found. While women showed a masculinity effect on the behavioral dimensions of the Peer and Socially Distant subscales, men showed an effect on the cognitive dimension of the Peer subscale.

Of course, results from male subjects were figured into the 'all subjects' results, and it can therefore be said that masculinity affects agentic behavior, as well as cognition, to some extent in males as well as females. This extent, however, is too small to be significant when men are studied as a distinct group, and especially pales by comparison with the female subgroup, where masculinity's effects on effective behavior were generally stronger than they were for 'all subjects.' This relationship also held for the negative correlation between agentic

effectiveness and avoidant behavior, with women displaying this effect more, and men less, strongly than 'all subjects.' In fact, although masculinity alone as a independent variable demonstrated this effect for men, the addition of femininity and intimacy motivation as independent variables wiped out this effect in men, indicating that this 'effect' of masculinity is tenuous at best.

There were two relationships to be found concerning interpersonal behavior in men. The first of these involved behavior as called for on the Sexual subscale. Here masculinity and femininity together showed a significant effect on behavioral effectiveness, while neither alone showed such an effect. This might seem like an androgyny effect, but while masculinity made a positive contribution to this effectiveness, femininity had a negative impact on it. It would seem that for men the agentic nature of the IPSAT is such that femininity detracts from effective agentic behavior in the sexual domain. This, of course, is contrary to the author's expectation as it is to the results reported by Ickes and Barnes (1978).

The second relationship found for men concerning behavior was that of a significant negative relationship between masculinity and dependent behavior. This relationship became more powerful when masculinity was entered as a single independent variable, again perhaps indicating that the discrepancies between the definitions of femininity, intimacy motivation, and interpersonal effectiveness as defined by the IPSAT are such as to preclude any positive contribution of the former two to the latter. In contrast, masculinity seems to demonstrate a great deal of con-

gruence with this type of effectiveness, which is not surprising given the fact that 'assertive' is one of the adjectives which makes up the masculinity scale of the BSRI.

Effectiveness and Productivity

In initial validation studies of the IPSAT (Getter & Nowinski, 1981) it had been hypothesized that a positive relationship would be found between effectiveness and productivity. The latter was determined by a combination of the total number of responses given and by the total number of words which made up the behavioral responses. Getter and Nowinski's results did not confirm this hypothesis. Data from this study, however, do. This relationship held for all subjects, and for women only, on both dimensions of agentic effectiveness. For men only, this relationship held only in the cognitive dimension. While this is in line with other results for the male subgroup, the author is at a loss in attempting to explain why being able to produce more and longer responses should contribute to females' being able to think of and choose to perform more effective responses, while it contributes only to the cognitive dimension in men. Moreover in attempting to interpret these results, it is important to remember that while masculinity makes different contributions to agentic effectiveness within each of the two sexes, there are no significant differences between the two groups in absolute levels of effective interpersonal behavior. This, of course, implies that masculinity and agentic effectiveness are not synonymous, despite the relationship this study has found to exist between them.

Summary and Directions for the Future

In general, the hypotheses which this study was designed to test have not been supported. The author believes that this is due not to the fact that the 'behavioral flexibility hypothesis' is without value but rather to the inability of the test of interpersonal effectiveness used in this study to provide a measure of behavior and cognition flexible enough to encompass both agentic and communal interpersonal behavior. The IPSAT does seem to provide a good measure of agentic effectiveness, and the relationship of this to the masculine sex-role would seem to be strong and interestingly discrepant between the two sexes.

Directions for the future point in two major directions. The first would involve the replication of this study with a measure of interpersonal effectiveness which truly did encompass both agentic and communal cognition and behavior. While no such measure is at present available (to the best of the author's knowledge), it is believed that the use of such a measure in a replication of this study would confirm many of the hypotheses put forth in this work.

Secondly, this study has pointed out some intriguing discrepancies between the ways in which the masculine sex-role effects agentic effectiveness in men and in women. In light of the debate in the literature over the relative contributions of masculinity and androgyny to interpersonal effectiveness, a new dimension would seem to have been added by the indications given in this study that masculinity may function differently for men and women in contributing to agentic interpersonal effectiveness. As this is in contrast to most of the literature on

androgyny, further comparison of the sexes in terms of this relationship could prove very instructive in understanding the ways in which sex-roles contribute to effective interpersonal behavior.

REFERENCES

- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162
- Bem, S. (1975). Sex-role adaptability: one consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 634-643
- Bem, S. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45 196-205
- Bem, S. (1979). Theory and measurement of androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1047- 1054
- Bem, S. and Lenney, E. (1976). Sex-typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 48-54
- Bem, S. Martyna, W. and Watson, C. (1976). Sex-typing and androgyny: further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 1016-1023
- Broverman, I. Broverman, D. Clarkson, F. Rosenkrantz, P. and Vogel, S. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 1-7
- Campbell, M. Steffen, J. and Langmeyer, D. (1981). Psychological androgyny and social competence. Psychological Reports, 48, 611-614
- Gaudreau, P. (1977). Factor analysis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 299-302
- Getter, H. and Nowinski, J. (1981). A free response test of interpersonal effectiveness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 45, 301-308
- Ickes, W. and Barnes, R. (1978). Boys and girls together- and alienated: on enacting stereotyped sex-roles in mixed-sex dyads. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 669-683
- Kelly, J. and Worell, J. (1977). New formulations of sex-roles and androgyny: a critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 1101-1115

- Maddi, S.(1968). Personality theories. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.
- Major, B. Carnevale, P. and Deaux, K.(1981). A different perspective on androgyny: evaluations of masculine personality characteristics. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 988-1001
- McAdams, D.(1980). A thematic coding system for the intimacy motive. Journal of Research in Personality, 14, 413-432
- McAdams, D.(1982). Experiences of intimacy and power: relationships between social motives and autobiographical memory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 292-302
- McAdams, D.(1982). Intimacy motivation. In Stewart, A. (Ed.), Motivation and society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 133-171.
- McAdams, D. and Powers, J.(1981). Themes of intimacy in behavior and thought. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 573-587
- McAdams, D. and Vaillant, G.(1982). Intimacy motivation and psychosocial adjustment: a longitudinal study. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 586-593
- McAdams, D. Healy, S. and Krause, S.(in press). Social motives and patterns of friendship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.
- McAdams, D. and Jackson, R.J.(1983). Intimacy motivation, reciprocity, and nonverbal behavior in college women. Paper presented at Midwestern Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois.
- McClelland, D.(1980) Motive dispositions. In Wheeler, L. (Ed.), Review of Personality and Social Psychology:1 Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Spence, J. Helmreich, R. and Stapp, J.(1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 29-39
- Taylor, M. and Hall, J.(1982). Psychological androgyny: theories, methods, and conclusions. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 347-366
- Wiggins, J. and Holzmuller, A.(1981). Further evidence on androgyny and interpersonal flexibility. Journal of Research in Personality, 15, 67-80

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Anne McEaney has been read and approved by the following Committee:

Dr. Dan McAdams, Director
Assistant Professor, Psychology, Loyola University

Dr. Patricia Rupert
Associate Professor, Psychology, Loyola University

The final copies have been examined by the Director of this thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact 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.

11/26/84

Date

Dan T. McAdams

Director's Signature