

A Comparison of Androgynous/Non-Androgynous
Evaluations of Sex-Related Stories

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
Appalachian State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Carolyn Wallace Witcover

April 1978

LIBRARY
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina

403564

Archives
closed
LD
175
A406
TH
466

A Comparison of Androgynous/Non-Androgynous
Evaluations of Sex-Related Stories

by

Carolyn W. Witcover

Approved by

Joyce G. Louch
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

W. T. Moore
Professor of Psychology

Susan D. Moss
Assistant Professor of
Psychology

Joyce G. Louch
Chairperson, Department of
Psychology

Richard H. Rupp
Dean of the Graduate School

Table of Contents

Division	Page
Abstract	1
A Comparison of Androgynous/Non-Androgynous Evaluations of Sex-Related Stories	2
Method	13
Subjects	13
Procedures	13
Experimental Design	15
Results	16
Hypothesis 1	16
Hypothesis 2	16
Hypothesis 3	19
Discussion	27
References	33
Appendixes	
A. The Alligator River Story	38
B. The Alligator River Story	40
C. Jane and Ted	42
D. Jane and Ted	44
E. BSRI	46

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. ANOVA for AR Story	17
2. ANOVA for Jane/Ted Story	18
3. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Question 17 (Bruce/Sally) for Class	20
4. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Question 6 (Chastity) for Form	21
5. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Question 9 (Chastity) for Form	23
6. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Question 17 (Bruce/Sally) for Form	24
7. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test for Question 12 (Dominance) for Form	25
8. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test for Question 14 (Independence) for Form	26

Abstract

The present study was conducted to test the hypothesis that androgynous individuals have values which differ from those of masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated individuals. One hundred male and 100 female university students completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory and either a sex stereotypic form or a role reversal form of two stories, one involving sexual behavior and the other involving career advancement. Twenty-six key questions pertaining to different values were evaluated to assess the effects of sex classification and form received on responses. The results did not confirm the hypothesis that androgynous individuals held values different from other groups. However, it did show that all groups held sex stereotyped values.

A Comparison of Androgynous/Non-Androgynous
Evaluations of Sex-Related Stories

Apart from incidental research, the psychology of sex roles seems to have been derived from research directed toward the delineation of sex differences in intellectual factors, personality characteristics, and attitudes. These differences, which seem to be the result of a general norm for gender appropriate behavior, may not exist in all individuals. Such individuals, who have been referred to as androgynous, should not behave like the rest of the population, but few researchers have sought to confirm this. The present study will attempt to demonstrate that certain differences do exist between androgynous and non-androgynous individuals in the sphere of values. Since androgynous individuals have not been the target of much research, most of the literature is not directly related to the present study, but some studies do have indirect relevance.

Some research has shown significant differences between males and females. The sexes have been found to differ in the way they think (Maccoby, 1966), perceive (Bieri et al., 1958), aspire (Horner, 1968), experience anxiety (Sinick, 1956), daydream (Singer, 1968), and play competitive games (Uesigi and Vinachke, 1963). (Men tend to have an exploitative strategy, women an accommodative one, which does win

games.) The verbal ability (counting ability, and spatial tasks) of very young girls exceeds that of boys of the same age. However, sooner or later boys do better than girls on virtually every measure (Maccoby, 1966). These abilities are often linked to certain traits such as aggressiveness and competitiveness (Freeman, 1970). In return, these traits are related to masculinity and femininity. However, several studies do report that analytic thinking and general intelligence is related to cross-sex typing (Maccoby, 1966).

Theorists have attempted to explain these differences from hereditary and environmental viewpoints. Hormones (Broverman et al., 1968), chromosomes (Hartlage, 1970), and upbringing (Bing, 1963) have each been offered as the explanations for differences.

The researchers of biological determinants have grounded their research in animals, neonates, and hormone experiments (Rosenberg and Smith, 1972).

One study suggested a cultural explanation not only for sex differences, but for differences in female biology itself; the pain of menstrual cramps was significantly higher for Catholics and Jews than for Protestants (Paige, 1969). The environmentalist viewpoint is best represented by various learning theorists. According to Mischel, children learn early to discriminate between "girl things" and "boy things" and later generalize to other situations. On the other hand, Kohlberg believes that socialization stimulates basic modes of cognition relatively independently

of what parents say or do (Maccoby, 1966). These cognitive modes are based on how the child categorizes himself and which things he comes to value and relate to his perception of himself. McKee and Sheriffs (1956) also showed that, as they grow up, girls come to value boys more and girls less.

Not all researchers agree about the ramifications of stereotyping. James Nolan (1973) noted the growing numbers of young people with no stated sex preference. He saw this as a result of Gay Liberation and the Women's Movement. This third sex life style is a result of the loosening of rigid cultural attitudes. He also thinks that this "new androgyny" fits into a technocratic society in which there is no need for "Real Men" and "Real Women" and is the sexual component of "People Liberation."

Indeed, the effects of sex-role stereotyping are pervasive but subtle. Attempts have been made to assess these effects in the areas of mental health, child rearing, perceptions of ideal sex roles, self-concept, and attitudes toward work. Abstract notions such as "health" tend to be influenced by the greater social desirability of masculine characteristics.

Zeldow (1976a) demonstrated some consequences of stereotypic thinking on the evaluations of patients. Female patients evaluated by male judges were viewed as more pathological if unconventional statements were attributed to them even though the statements were not inherently pathognomonic. No bias occurred when the judge was

female, nor did evaluations of male patients vary as a function of the statement. However, masculine characteristics such as independence and assertiveness are the clinical standard for mental health (Broverman et al., 1970). It is apparent that the notion of "health" tends to be influenced by the greater social desirability of masculine characteristics. If androgyny were the norm, such problems might not arise. The only solution presently seems to be that female patients should be conventional at the start of therapy and then let their therapists help them get well by instilling some masculine values.

It appears that from birth, parents and others begin to reinforce sex-role stereotypes. Rubin, Provenzano and Luria (1974) found that among newborn infants (24 hours old), females were viewed as cuter, smaller, and more like their mothers than were the male infants. The fathers thought in more stereotyped terms than did the mothers. Jacklin and Mischel (1973) found many incidents of sex-role stereotyping in children's readers. Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada and Ross (1972) found that for each female illustrated in a book, eleven males were illustrated. These characterizations reinforced the traditional sex-role stereotypes: boys as active, girls as passive; boys as leaders and rescuers; and girls as followers and servers. Adults are also stereotyped. The investigators were very distressed by their findings since books are one major way that children learn what is "appropriate" behavior.

However, some efforts have been made to change this by such organizations as Lollipop Power, which publishes non-sexist children's literature.

Most people have accepted sexist practices without many questions. Steinmann and Fox (1966) investigated male-female perceptions of the female role in the United States and found no significant differences between the males' ideal woman and the women's real self-perceptions. A study by Kaplan and Goldman (1973) added a dimension not shown in the Steinmann and Fox study. In an investigation of the attitudes of college students toward the average man's and woman's attitudes toward women, they found that males and females perceive male and female roles differently and that women perceive more dissimilarity between the sexes than do males. They attributed this to the women's greater awareness of their traditional roles and the present struggle among women to reduce differences. Similarly, Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) found more disparity between what women believe men's ideal woman to be and the men's reported ideal woman. This is in contrast to the high congruence between the male subjects' belief about the women's ideal man and the women's actual reported ideal man. They also found much conflict between the women's real and ideal self. Apparently, the women were trying to be feminine for the men and androgynous for themselves. This conflict was associated with poor adjustment as measured by the Revised Bell Adjustment Inventory (Bell, 1963).

The masculine subjects as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) were among the better adjusted subjects. Deutsch and Gilbert suggest that in our present society, masculinity is the norm for cultural socialization and is therefore, healthy. So masculine characteristics in either sex will be indicative of good adjustment.

It may be noted that even women have been found to be prejudiced against their own female characteristics (Goldberg, 1968). Some change has been brought about by political action, education, industrialization, and urbanization (Scott, 1971; Zuckerman et al., 1976; Mims et al., 1974). With increased exposure to differing philosophies, expressed attitudes towards women have been tempered. A similar finding was noted by O'Leary and Depner (1975), whose results showed no significant differences between men's and women's perceptions of their real capabilities. The males' ideal woman was significantly more adventuresome, competent, and independent than the females' actual ratings, the males' self-ratings, and the females' ratings of their ideal male. The males' ratings revealed a Wonderwoman profile. The authors commented that these men were apparently pleading not to be labeled as "male Chauvenist Pigs." The males were apparently willing to tip the scales in favor of the women since they perceive it to be socially desirable to espouse sexual equality.

A new area of research deals with the concept of psychological androgyny. Androgyny may be simply defined as the possession of both masculine and feminine characteristics and behaviors. Sandra Bem's research (1976) has been predicated on the assumption that it is possible in principle for an individual to be both masculine and feminine, both instrumental and expressive, both agentic and communal. An individual may even blend these complementary modalities into a single behavior. Although this is possible, traditional sex roles prevent this from becoming a reality for many individuals. However, demonstrating that traditional sex roles do restrict behavior is the concern of other researchers. Bem and her colleagues have been more concerned with collecting validating data for their hypotheses about androgyny.

Bem (1975) investigated the sex role adaptability of androgynous individuals. She used the Bem Sex Role Inventory or BSRI (1974) to measure androgyny. The BSRI treats masculinity and femininity as "two orthogonal dimensions rather than as two ends of a single dimension. Moreover, masculinity and femininity each represent positive domains of behavior" (p. 4). Specifically, she designed a pair of studies to investigate independence and nurturance in masculine, feminine, and androgynous subjects. Her hypothesis that non-androgynous subjects would only "do well" when the situation calls for behavior which is congruent with their self-definitions as masculine or feminine was confirmed.

That is, only androgynous subjects performed similarly to masculine subjects in a situation that was set up so that the subject was the only person who disagreed with the group about the funniness of a cartoon. Androgynous subjects also "performed" like feminine subjects on an activity monitoring how frequently the subject touched a kitten. Both male and female androgynous subjects displayed a high level of masculine independence and feminine nurturance.

In a second study, Bem (1976) attempted to determine whether or not masculine and feminine subjects restricted their behavior in accordance with sex-role stereotypes. Each subject was asked to choose between a masculine and feminine activity. Whichever activity they chose, the sex appropriate activity paid less. For example, female subjects were asked if they would rather "prepare a baby bottle by mixing powdered formula with milk" for two cents or "oil squeaky hinges on a metal box" for four cents. The results indicated that sex-typed subjects were significantly more stereotyped in their choices than the androgynous or sex-reversed individuals. Even though it cost them money, sex-typed subjects would choose the activity appropriate for their sex more often than the non sex-typed subjects.

Peter Zeldow (1976b) examined the relationship between androgyny as measured by the BSRI and attitudes towards the rights and proper roles of women in contemporary society as measured by the Attitudes Towards Women Scale (Spence, 1972). He expected androgynous persons to have the most pro-feminist

attitudes, but this did not occur. The masculine men were no different in their attitudes from any of the female subjects. Only men with a preference for the feminine sex-role differed from any other group by taking a distinctly traditional stance.

It is obvious that most research has been concerned with traits and behaviors associated with masculinity and femininity, with a few devoted to the study of androgynous individuals. Some research has sought data to support the hypothesis that the androgynous individual is more functional than a single-gender oriented person. The experiments conducted to measure various aspects of personality tended to show that the effects of sex-role stereotyping influenced abstract notions such as self-concept, mental health, and values.

On the basis of these findings, it may be concluded that deviations in behavior and values exist depending upon orientation as feminine, masculine, or androgynous and that these deviations may influence situational evaluations. It may be deduced further that androgynous persons have values based upon functional rather than gender-oriented role evaluations.

Since some attributes are more central to sex-role stereotypes than others, one would expect those values related to dependence-independence, aggression-compliance, activity-passivity to be differentially evaluated by androgynous and non-androgynous persons. Although teachers are

increasingly using values clarification techniques, the relationship between values and androgyny has not been noted.

Since this is the case, techniques specifically designed to clarify sexist values are not available. However, a values clarification technique such as the Alligator River (AR) Story (see Appendix A) could be used to examine values by reversing the sex-denotation of the major characters in the story (see Appendix B). Since levels of aggression, initiative, chastity, dependency, independence, competitiveness, success, failure, and dominance are expected to be different for the sexes, stories which portray these characteristics should help determine the influence of sexism upon ratings of persons with these characteristics.

The present study was designed to determine if the sex designation of characters in a story would influence ratings of desirability. The following hypotheses are posited: (1) the ratings of characters and behaviors made by androgynous individuals will not differ significantly when male and female role assignments are made in a story, while those made by masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated individuals will differ significantly when male and female role assignments are made in a story, (2) androgynous subjects will not differ significantly from masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated subjects in their overall ratings, and (3) aggression, independence, competitiveness,

initiative, success, and dominance will be evaluated more positively in male characters than in female characters; chastity, dependence, and failure will be evaluated more positively in female characters than in male characters; and characters will be rated more positively when their behaviors conform to those generally accepted as sex appropriate.

Method

Subjects

One hundred male and one hundred female subjects were used in this study. Of these, all of the females and approximately two-thirds of the males were recruited from various psychology classes. The other males were obtained by canvassing one co-ed dormitory and obtaining volunteers. The mean age for males was 21 and for females 20; the age range was 18 to 25. The average student was a sophomore. Data from three males and six females were discarded because of incomplete forms, leaving 97 males and 94 females.

Procedures

All subjects received a packet containing the BSRI and two stories. The BSRI was used as a measure of sex-role attitudes. (See Appendix E.) This instrument consists of sixty items: twenty masculine personality characteristics, twenty feminine personality characteristics, and twenty neutral personality characteristics. It requires the subject to indicate on a scale from 1 (Never or almost never true) to 7 (Always or almost always true) how well that characteristic describes himself or herself. The degree of sex-role stereotyping in the person's self-concept was measured as follows. Subjects were divided at the median for both masculinity and femininity scales. They were then classified as masculine if they were high

masculine and low feminine, feminine if they were high feminine and low masculine, androgynous if they were high on both scales, and undifferentiated if they were low on both scales. Of these, 38 were typed as feminine, 58 as masculine, 59 as androgynous, and 36 as undifferentiated on the BSRI.

The two stories in the packet were the Alligator River story, a paragraph which tells about a person who tries to get across the river to his/her paramour and must use sex as a means, and the Jane/Ted story, an incident in which the central characters are competitors in the fashion world and are both trying to further their careers. The subjects received either form A (stereotyped) or B (reversed) of the Alligator River story followed by form C (reversed) or D (stereotyped) of the Jane/Ted Story. (See Appendices A-D.) After each story was a list of statements to which the subjects were asked to indicate their approval or disapproval based on a Likert scale with 1 being approval and 7 being disapproval. Not every question was considered, only the ones judged to relate to value categories stated in the hypotheses. The breakdown for the Alligator River story was: Aggression--#14; Initiative--#4; Chastity--#5, #6, #9, #10, #12; Dependency--#7, #13. The breakdown for the Jane/Ted story was: Competitiveness--#3; Success--#5; Failure--#7, #8; Dominance--#9, #12; Independence--#10, #13, #14. Also, the names of the characters were included in the ratings. (See Table 1,

page 17, and Table 2, page 18 for the questions themselves.

Experimental Design

Twenty-six 4x4 univariate between-subjects analyses of variance were performed with sex classification (masculine, feminine, androgynous, undifferentiated) and form (AC, BC, AD, BD) used as the independent variables. Although the standard $p < .05$ was used to test significance, the findings which fell between .05 and .10 were also discussed.

Results

Twenty-six 4x4 univariate between-subjects analyses of variance were performed to assess the effects of class (masculine, feminine, androgynous, undifferentiated) and form (AC, BC, AD, BD) on responses to preselected questions. Table 1 (page 17) presents the results of the analysis for the Alligator River story and Table 2 (page 18) presents the results of the Jane/Ted story. When significant main effects were found, the new Duncan Multiple Range test was employed to determine which groups were significantly different. The findings are discussed by hypothesis for both tables to more clearly convey the findings.

Hypothesis 1

Analyses of variance resulted in no significant interaction effects, thereby failing to confirm the hypothesis that androgynous individuals as a class would give significantly different ratings from those made by the other groups when the sex of the character in the story was changed.

Hypothesis 2

The results partially confirmed the hypothesis that androgynous individuals would not differ significantly from masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated subjects in their overall ratings. In one case, on question 17 (Bruce/Sally

Table 1
ANOVA for AR Story

Question	Source	SS	df	MS	F	Significance
4. Abigail/Gregory asks Bruce/Sally to take her/him across the river.	Class	1,181	3	0,394	0,405	NS
	Form	7,465	3	2,488	2,558	,06
5. Bruce/Sally says he/she will take her/him across the river if she/he will sleep with him/her.	Class	16,918	3	5,634	1,579	NS
	Form	15,902	3	5,300	1,250	NS
6. Abigail/Gregory refuses Bruce's/Sally's offer.	Class	16,978	3	5,659	1,604	NS
	Form	27,719	3	9,240	2,610	,05
7. Abigail/Gregory goes to Jeff to explain her/his plight.	Class	5,669	3	1,890	0,544	NS
	Form	3,536	3	1,179	0,339	NS
9. Abigail/Gregory accepts Bruce's/Sally's terms.	Class	33,063	3	11,021	2,338	,07
	Form	83,292	3	27,764	5,890	,001
10. Bruce/Sally fulfills his/her part of the bargain.	Class	2,025	3	0,675	0,136	NS
	Form	29,456	3	9,819	1,974	NS
12. Gregory/Abigail casts her/him aside with disdain.	Class	14,30	3	4,767	0,885	NS
	Form	0,772	3	0,257	0,048	NS
13. Abigail/Gregory tells Mike her/his tale of woe.	Class	16,718	3	5,573	1,437	NS
	Form	17,491	3	5,830	1,503	NS
14. Mike beats up Gregory/Abigail.	Class	7,320	3	2,440	0,573	NS
	Form	15,938	3	5,313	1,249	NS
16. Gregory(A)/Abigail(B).	Class	5,641	3	1,880	0,423	NS
	Form	9,156	3	3,052	0,686	NS
17. Bruce(A)/Sally(B).	Class	43,074	3	14,358	4,247	,007
	Form	79,755	3	26,585	7,864	,001
18. Jeff.	Class	15,622	3	5,207	1,219	NS
	Form	24,511	3	8,170	1,913	NS
19. Mike.	Class	5,957	3	1,986	0,548	NS
	Form	17,232	3	5,744	1,586	NS

Table 2

ANOVA for Jane/Ted Story

Question	Source	SS	df	MS	F	Significance
3. Competitiveness attracted one to the other.	Class	10.464	3	3.488	0.974	NS
	Form	8.682	3	2.894	0.808	NS
5. Geneva/Sam raised Jane/Ted to chief buyer.	Class	10.472	3	3.491	1.906	NS
	Form	0.700	3	0.233	0.127	NS
7. Sam/Geneva said, "Don't be nervous; let her/him have her/his title; it's only in women's/men's fashions.	Class	4.192	3	1.397	0.305	NS
	Form	5.263	3	1.754	0.383	NS
8. Ted/Jane became depressed.	Class	15.881	3	5.294	1.278	NS
	Form	14.929	3	4.976	1.201	NS
9. Ted/Jane told Jane/Ted, "Let's go to Chicago; I have an offer there as chief buyer."	Class	28.975	3	9.658	2.046	NS
	Form	26.384	3	8.795	1.863	NS
10. Jane/Ted replied that her/his career was doing well in New York.	Class	16.032	3	5.344	2.301	,08
	Form	15.595	3	5.198	2.238	,08
12. Finally, Ted/Jane said, "We go to Chicago or we split."	Class	16.236	3	5.412	1.228	NS
	Form	35.423	3	11.808	2.679	,05
13. Jane/Ted packed and moved out.	Class	18.179	3	6.060	1.052	NS
	Form	19.052	3	6.351	1.103	NS
14. Ted/Jane went to Chicago.	Class	9.508	3	3.169	0.568	NS
	Form	55.913	3	18.637	3.338	,02
15. Jane(C)/Ted(D).	Class	7.959	3	2.653	0.778	NS
	Form	22.389	3	7.463	2.189	,09
16. Ted(C)/Jane(D).	Class	16.868	3	5.623	1.559	NS
	Form	5.003	3	1.668	0.462	NS
17. Geneva(C)/Sam(D).	Class	9.824	3	3.275	1.389	NS
	Form	12.578	3	4.193	1.778	NS
18. Sam(C)/Geneva(D).	Class	1.152	3	0.384	0.115	NS
	Form	6.927	3	2.309	0.691	NS

role), the F value was significant ($p = .007$). As can be seen in Table 3 (page 20), masculine subjects were significantly more disapproving of a person who required sexual favors in return for services than the feminine subjects, regardless of the sex of the character. (\bar{X} for masculine subjects, 5.879; \bar{X} for feminine subjects, 4.789, with 7 being most disapproving.)

Hypothesis 3

The results partially confirmed the hypothesis that aggression, independence, competitiveness, initiative, success, and dominance would be evaluated more positively in male characters than in female characters; chastity, dependence, and failure would be evaluated more positively in female characters than in male characters; and characters would be rated more positively when their behaviors conform to those generally accepted as sex appropriate. Significant differences between forms were found on the analyses of variance for five questions. Three were related to chastity, one to dominance, and one to independence. As can be seen in Table 4 (page 21) for question 6 (Abigail/Gregory refuses Bruce's/Sally's offer--chastity), forms BC and BD were significantly more disapproving than form AD. In other words, there was more approval of Abigail (form A) for refusing Bruce's offer than for Gregory for refusing Sally's offer (form B). (\bar{X} for BD, 2.391; \bar{X} for BC, 2.250; \bar{X} for AD, 1.486.)

Table 3
 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test
 of Question 17 (Bruce/Sally)
 for Class

	(F) 4.789	(U) 5.194	(A) 5.458	(M) 5.879	LSR
(F) 4.789		.405	.669	1.090*	R ₂ = .7567
(U) 5.194			.264	.685	R ₃ = .7967
(A) 5.458				.421	R ₄ = .8236

*p < .05

F = Feminine

U = Undifferentiated

A = Androgynous

M = Masculine

Table 4
 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test
 of Question 6 (Chastity)
 for Form

	(AD) 1.480	(AC) 1.830	(BC) 2.250	(BD) 2.381	LSR
(AD) 1.486		.350	.770*	.911*	$R_2 = .7540$
(AC) 1.830			.420	.561	$R_3 = .7937$
(BC) 2.250				.141	$R_4 = .8209$

*p < .05

On question 9 ("Abigail/Gregory accepts Bruce's/Sally's terms"--chastity) (see Table 5, page 23), form AC met with more disapproval than forms BC and BD. Also, form AD was more disapproved of than form BC. In other words, all the subjects disapproved more of the female (form A) than the male (form B) for accepting a sexual bargain. (\bar{X} for AC, 5.447; \bar{X} for BC, 4.021; \bar{X} for BD, 4.435, \bar{X} for AD, 5.340.)

On question 17 (Bruce/Sally role), forms AC and AD met with more disapproval than forms BC and BD. Bruce's role (form A) was more disapproved of than Sally's role (form B) in the same story. (See Table 6, page 24.) As this role revolved around chastity issues, it was included in the discussion as such. (\bar{X} for AD, 5.980; \bar{X} for AC, 5.936; \bar{X} for BC, 4.604; \bar{X} for BD, 5.065.)

On question 12, form B/D ("Finally, Ted/Jane said, 'We go to Chicago or we split.'"--dominance), the responses to form AD were significantly more disapproving than the responses to form BC. (See Table 7, page 25.) In other words, the female (form D) was significantly more disapproved of than the male (form C) for making the same demand. (\bar{X} for AD, 6.280; \bar{X} for BC, 5.229.)

On question 14 ("Ted/Jane went to Chicago."--independence), form AD met with more disapproval than forms AC or BC. (See Table 8, page 26.) A female leaving her husband to further her career (form D) was more disapproved of than a male doing the same thing (form C). (\bar{X} for AD, 5.140; \bar{X} for AC, 3.702; \bar{X} for BC, 3.729.)

Table 5
 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test
 of Question 9 (Chastity)
 for Form

	(BC) 4.021	(BD) 4.435	(AD) 5.340	(AC) 5.447	LSR
(BC) 4.021		.414	1.319*	1.426*	$R_2 = .8721$
(BD) 4.435			.905	1.012*	$R_3 = .9180$
(AD) 5.340				.107	$R_4 = .9491$

*p < .05

Table 6
 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test
 of Question 17 (Bruce/Sally)
 for Form

	(BC) 4.604	(BD) 5.065	(AC) 5.936	(AD) 5.980	LSR
(BC) 4.604		.461	1.332*	1.376*	$R_2 = .7373$
(BD) 5.065			.871*	.915*	$R_3 = .5847$
(AC) 5.936				.044	$R_4 = .8025$

*p < .05

Table 7
 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test
 for Question 12 (Dominance)
 for Form

	(BC) 5.229	(BD) 5.565	(AC) 5.596	(AD) 6.280	LSR
(BC) 5.229		.336	.367	1.051*	$R_2 = .8432$
(BD) 5.565			.031	.715	$R_3 = .8877$
(AC) 5.596				.684	$R_4 = .9178$

$p < .05$

Table 8
 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test
 for Question 14 (Independence)
 for Form

	(AC) 3.702	(BC) 3.729	(BD) 4.326	(AD) 5.140	LSR
(AC) 3.702		.027	.624	1.438*	$R_2 = .9480$
(BC) 3.729			.597	1.411*	$R_3 = .9980$
(BD) 4.326				.814	$R_4 = 1.032$

*p < .05

Discussion

Results from the present study failed to support the hypothesis that the ratings of characters and behaviors made by androgynous individuals would not differ significantly when male and female role assignments were made in a story, while those made by masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated individuals would differ significantly when male and female role assignments were made in a story.

Partial support was found for the hypothesis that androgynous individuals would not differ significantly from masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated subjects in their overall value ratings. In only one case did androgynous individuals approach ($p < .10$) being significantly less disapproving than undifferentiated subjects, no matter what form they received. In other words, androgynous individuals performed similarly to the non-androgynous individuals in their overall value ratings. This finding lends support to the hypothesis that androgynous individuals are not different from other people in their values about sex-related characteristics and behaviors. The only class that differed significantly from the other classes was masculine individuals. This group was significantly more disapproving than feminine subjects of a person who required sexual favors in return for services, regardless of the gender of the character. Also, masculine subjects

approached being significantly more disapproving than undifferentiated subjects of a person for giving sexual favors in return for services ($p < .10$). It appears from this that masculine individuals have the strictest prescriptions for gender appropriate behavior.

Partial support was found for the hypothesis that aggression, independence, competitiveness, initiative, success, and dominance would be evaluated more positively in male characters than in female characters; chastity, dependence, and failure would be evaluated more positively in female characters than in male characters; and characters would be rated more positively when their behaviors conformed to those generally accepted as sex appropriate. Areas of chastity, dominance, and independence were evaluated differently in males and females and in a stereotyped direction. All of the subjects indicated more disapproval of a female for entering a sexual bargain, delivering an ultimatum, and leaving her husband; each of these are disapproved of when the behavior differs from the stereotype. Also, the subjects approved more of a female for refusing a male's offer for services in return for sexual favors than of a male for refusing a female's offer for services in return for sexual favors. Perhaps, the subjects thought it was more important for a female to refuse services in return for sexual favors than for a male to refuse. At this point, it is noteworthy that for three other questions, the F values were less than .10 and, in each case, more

disapproval of a character, male or female, was shown for acting in a manner different from stereotypic norms. The subjects tended to disapprove of a male for seeking assistance and of a female for resisting her husband's suggestion that they move.

Also, there was a difference in the ratings of Jane's role that seemed dependent on the first story received by the subject. If the first story followed stereotypic norms, the subjects tended to indicate more disapproval of non-stereotypic behavior. On the other hand, if the first story was non-stereotypic, the subjects tended to indicate more approval for non-stereotypic behavior. Apparently, the first story established some kind of norm against which the second story was evaluated. The subjects were less likely to respond differently from the "norm" they discerned in the first story. This suggests the possibility that the ratings of the second stories may have been contaminated by the first story. Nonetheless, the results from the first story would not have been affected. Repeatedly, the subjects valued similar behavior differentially in males and females. In general, behavior at variance with stereotypic values met with the most disapproval. One seeming exception was the rating of a person who required sexual favors in return for services. All of the subjects disapproved more of a male requiring sexual favors than a female requiring sexual favors. Perhaps, the subjects believed it was worse for a male to take advantage of a

female than vice versa or that it is not possible for a female to take advantage of a male sexually.

It is important to note that some of the questions were not strongly relevant to some of the value categories. Areas such as dependency, aggression, competitiveness, success, and failure may not have been effectively tapped by this study in this particular group of subjects. There may have been agreement between all the subjects on these questions, which may have been interpreted as neutral. Nonetheless, certain questions did seem to tap sex-role bias in these subjects in that certain restrictions for males were not as stringent.

From this, it is difficult to conclude that androgynous individuals are devoid of gender based values. Throughout this study, all the subjects gave similar ratings. Sandra Bem (1976) concluded from her research that androgynous individuals are more functional and less constricted by their gender than other individuals. This study does not contradict her findings; however, the data suggest that her definition and measure of androgyny is limited to cross-role behavior and not cross-role values. An androgynous individual may have greater freedom of choice in situations and experience less anxiety in cross-role behavior, but that does not mean that he/she believes that this should hold true for others. Peter Zeldow (1976) also noted a similar result when he compared androgyny as measured by the BSRI and attitudes toward femininism as

measured by the Attitudes Towards Women Scale (Spence, 1972). In his study, the androgynous individuals did not have the most pro-feminist attitudes, nor did their performance differ significantly from masculine men.

In summary, this study showed that androgynous individuals are not clearly differentiated from other individuals about certain values and that at times, gender does indeed make a difference in approval-disapproval of a particular behavior.

Future research based on the present study might be directed toward investigating more thoroughly whether or not androgynous individuals have gender based values. Perhaps, having only one story with a larger sample would clarify the results, or a within subjects design with androgynous individuals using non-related activities or materials which would eliminate demand characteristics would be more to the point. Another important investigation would attempt to create a new inventory to assess psychological androgyny, one which would measure characteristics other than functional behavior which the BSRI appears to do rather well.

One must note the limitations of the BSRI in its present form, but with some alterations, it too might eventually measure true psychological androgyny as opposed to behavioral androgyny. Finally, it would be interesting to compare androgynous and undifferentiated subjects in different areas such as self-concept or

emotional adjustment. Better definitions of androgyny, or androgynies, need to be established before the concept of androgyny can provide significant insights into problems or attitudes in our society.

References

- Bem, Sandra. The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1974, 42(2), 135-162.
- Bem, Sandra. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Clinical Psychology*, 1975, 31(4), 634-643.
- Bem, Sandra. Sex-typing and the avoidance of cross-role behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1976, 33, 48-54.
- Bieri, J. Sex differences in perceptual behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 1958, 26(1), 1-12.
- Bing, Elizabeth. Effect of childbearing practices on development of differential cognitive abilities. *Child Development*, 1963, 34, 631-648.
- Broverman, J. K. et al. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 1970, 34, 1-7.
- Broverman, D. et al. Roles on activation and inhibition in sex differences in cognitive abilities. *Psychological Review*, 1968, 74(1), 23-50.
- Deutsch, Connie & Gilbert, Lucia. Sex-role stereotypes: Effect on perceptions of self and others and on personal adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1976, 23(4), 373-379.

- Freeman, J. Growing up girlish. *Trans-action*, 1970, (Nov.-Dec.), 36-43.
- Goldberg, Philip. Are women prejudiced against women? *Trans-action*, 1968, (April), 28-30.
- Hartlage, L. Sex-linked inheritance of spatial ability. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1970, 31, 610.
- Horner, Matina. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, 30(1-B), 407.
- Jacklin, Carol & Mischel, Harriet. As the twig is bent: Sex-role stereotyping in early readers. *School Psychology Digest*, 1973, Summer, 2(3), 30-38.
- Kaplan, Robert & Goldman, Roy. Stereotypes of college students' attitudes toward the average man's and average woman's attitudes toward women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1973, 20(5), 459-462.
- Maccoby, Eleanor, ed. *The Development of Sex Differences*. Palo Alto, Calif.: University of Stanford Press, 1966.
- McKee, J. & Sheriffs, A. The differential evaluation of males and females. *Journal of Personality*, 1956, 25(2), 357-371.
- Mims, Fern, Yeaworth, Rosalea, & Hornstein, Stephen. Effectiveness of an interdisciplinary course in human sexuality. *Nursing Research*, 1974, 23(3), 248-253.

- Nolan, James. The third sex. *Ramparts*, 1973, 12(5), 21-26.
- O'Leary, Virginia & Depner, Charlene. College males' ideal female: Change in sex-role stereotypes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1975, 95, 139-148.
- Paige, K. The effects of oral contraceptives on affective fluctuation associated with the menstrual cycle. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1970, Nov., Vol. 31(5-B), 2963.
- Rosenberg, B. G. & Smith, Brian S. *Sex and Identity*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972.
- Rubin, Jeffery, Provenzano, Frank, & Luria, Zella. The eyes of the beholder: Parent's views on sex of newborns. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1974, 44, 512-519.
- Scott, Ann F., ed. *The American woman: Who was she?* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Singer, Jerome. The importance of daydreaming. *Psychology Today*, 1968, 1(April), 18-27.
- Sinick, D. Two anxiety scales correlated and examined for sex differences. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1956, 12(4), 394-395.
- Steinmann, Anne & Fox, David. Male-female perceptions of the female role in the United States. *Journal of Psychology*, 1966, 64, 265-276.
- Uesigi, T. K. & Vinachke, W. E. Strategy in a feminine game. *Sociometry*, 1963, 26(1), 75-88.

- Weitzmann, Leonore et al. Sex-role socialization in picture books for pre-school children. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1971, 77(May), 1125-1150.
- Zeldow, Peter. Effects of nonpathological sex-role stereotypes on student evaluations of psychiatric patients. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 1976(a), 44(2), 304.
- Zeldow, Peter. Psychological androgyny and attitudes toward feminism. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1976(b), 44(1), 150.
- Zuckerman, Marvin, Tushup, Richard, & Finner, Steven. Sexual attitudes and experiences: Attitude and personality correlates and changes produced by a course in sexuality. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 1976, 44(1), 7-19.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The Alligator River Story

Once upon a time, there was a woman named Abigail who was in love with a man named Gregory. Gregory lived on the shore of a river. Abigail lived on the opposite side of the river. The river which separated the two lovers was teeming with alligators. Abigail wanted to cross the river to be with Gregory. Unfortunately, the bridge was washed out. So, she went to ask Bruce, a river boat captain, to take her across. He said he would be glad to help if she would consent to go to bed with him preceding the voyage. She promptly refused and went to a friend named Jeff to explain her plight. Jeff did not want to be involved at all with the situation. Abigail, then, felt her only alternative was to accept Bruce's terms. Bruce fulfilled his promise to Abigail and delivered her into the arms of Gregory.

When Abigail told Gregory about her amorous escapade in order to cross the river, Gregory cast her aside with disdain. Heartsick and dejected, Abigail turned to Mike, an old friend, with her tale of woe. Mike, feeling compassion for Abigail, sought out Gregory and beat him up.

Now please turn the page and answer the questions.

On a scale from 1 (approval) to 7 (disapproval), please respond to the following statements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 approval _____ disapproval

1. ___ Abigail is in love with Gregory.
2. ___ Abigail lives on the opposite side of the river.
3. ___ Abigail wants to cross the river to be with Gregory.
4. ___ Abigail asks Bruce to take her across the river.
5. ___ Bruce says he will take her across if she will sleep with him.
6. ___ Abigail refuses Bruce's offer.
7. ___ Abigail goes to Jeff to explain her plight.
8. ___ Jeff does not want to be involved.
9. ___ Abigail accepts Bruce's terms.
10. ___ Bruce fulfills his part of the bargain.
11. ___ Abigail tells Gregory about her escapade.
12. ___ Gregory casts her aside with disdain.
13. ___ Abigail tells Mike her tale of woe.
14. ___ Mike beats up Gregory.
15. ___ Abigail
16. ___ Gregory
17. ___ Bruce
18. ___ Jeff
19. ___ Mike

Appendix B

The Alligator River Story

Once upon a time, there was a man named Gregory who was in love with a woman named Abigail. Abigail lived on the shore of a river. Gregory lived on the opposite side of the river. The river which separated the two lovers was teeming with alligators. Gregory wanted to cross the river to be with Abigail. Unfortunately, the bridge was washed out. So he went to ask Sally, a river boat captain, to take him across. She said she would be glad to help if he would consent to go to bed with her preceding the voyage. He promptly refused and went to a friend named Jeff to explain his plight. Jeff did not want to be involved at all with the situation. Gregory, then, felt his only alternative was to accept Sally's terms. Sally fulfilled her promise to Gregory and delivered him into the arms of Abigail.

When Gregory told Abigail about his amorous escapade in order to cross the river, Abigail cast him aside with disdain. Heartsick and dejected, Gregory turned to Mike, an old friend, with his tale of woe. Mike, feeling compassion for Gregory, sought out Abigail and beat her up.

Now, please turn the page and answer the questions.

Appendix C

Jane and Ted

Jane and Ted were buyers of high fashion in competing New York department stores. When they met at a fashion show, from the start it was, "What Macy's has, Gimbel's has better." Perhaps it was this competitiveness that attracted one to the other. And so they were married.

Continuing their respective careers after marriage was fine until Geneva, Jane's boss, raised her to chief buyer. When Ted went to Sam, his boss, and sought a promotion, Sam said, "Don't be nervous, let her have her title; it's only in women's fashions."

Faced with indifference from his boss and seeing increasing confidence and self-awareness or what he called independence in Jane, Ted became emotionally depressed. One day, he came home and told Jane, "Let's go to Chicago; I have an offer there as chief buyer." Jane replied that her career was doing fine in New York and there was no opportunity for her in Chicago. Ted's rejoinder was, "Well, you've always been able to find a good job fairly easily; this time shouldn't be any different." Bad led to worse and finally Ted said, "We go to Chicago and further my career or we split." Faced with this choice, Jane packed bag and baggage, moved out, and Ted went to Chicago.

Now, please turn the page and answer the questions.

Appendix D

Jane and Ted

Ted and Jane were buyers of high fashion in competing New York department stores. When they met at a fashion show, from the start it was, "What Macy's has, Gimbel's has better." Perhaps it was this competitiveness that attracted one to the other. And so they were married.

Continuing their respective careers after marriage was fine until Sam, Ted's boss, raised him to chief buyer. When Jane went to her boss, Geneva, and sought a promotion, Geneva said, "Don't be nervous; let him have his title; it's only in men's fashions."

Faced with indifference from her boss and seeing increasing confidence and self-awareness or what she called independence in Ted, Jane became emotionally depressed. One day she came home and told Ted, "Let's go to Chicago; I have an offer there as chief buyer." Ted replied that his career was doing fine in New York and there was no opportunity for him in Chicago. Jane's rejoinder was, "Well, you've always been able to find a good job fairly easily; this time shouldn't be any different." Bad led to worse and finally Jane said, "We go to Chicago and further my career or we split." Faced with this choice, Ted packed bag and baggage, moved out, and Jane went to Chicago.

Now, please turn the page and answer the questions.

On a scale from 1 (approval) to 7 (disapproval), please respond to the following statements.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
approval				disapproval		

1. ___ Jane and Ted were buyers of high fashion in competing stores.
2. ___ They met at a fashion show.
3. ___ Competitiveness attracted one to the other.
4. ___ They were married.
5. ___ Sam raised Ted to chief buyer.
6. ___ Jane sought a promotion.
7. ___ Geneva said, "Don't be nervous; let him have his title; it's only in men's fashions."
8. ___ Jane became depressed.
9. ___ Jane told Ted, "Let's go to Chicago; I have an offer there as chief buyer."
10. ___ Ted replied that his career was doing well in New York.
11. ___ Jane said, "You've always been able to find a good job easily."
12. ___ Finally, Jane said, "We go to Chicago or we split."
13. ___ Ted packed and moved out.
14. ___ Jane went to Chicago.
15. ___ Ted
16. ___ Jane
17. ___ Sam
18. ___ Geneva

Appendix E

BSRI

Sex _____ Age _____ Year _____

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

Example: sly

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sly	3	Irresponsible	7
Malicious	1	Carefree	5

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

Self reliant	
Yielding	
Helpful	
Defends own beliefs	
Cheerful	
Moody	
Independent	
Shy	
Conscientious	
Athletic	
Affectionate	
Theatrical	
Assertive	
Flatterable	
Happy	
Strong personality	
Loyal	
Unpredictable	
Forceful	
Feminine	

Reliable	
Analytical	
Sympathetic	
Jealous	
Has leadership abilities	
Sensitive to the needs of others	
Truthful	
Willing to take risks	
Understanding	
Secretive	
Makes decisions easily	
Compassionate	
Sincere	
Self-sufficient	
Eager to soothe hurt feelings	
Conceited	
Dominant	
Soft-spoken	
Likable	
Masculine	

Warm	
Solemn	
Willing to take a stand	
Tender	
Friendly	
Aggressive	
Gullible	
Inefficient	
Acts as a leader	
Childlike	
Adaptable	
Individualistic	
Does not use harsh language	
Unsystematic	
Competitive	
Loves children	
Tactful	
Ambitious	
Gentle	
Conventional	