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ABSTRACT

This research studied the interaction between sex role identity, sexual preference and intrapersonal competence. The subjects were 46 homosexual and 30 heterosexual white, single women of the Central Florida area. Subjects were classified as Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous or Undifferentiated using the Bem Sex Role Inventory.

Intrapersonal Competence was measured using the Personal Adjustment, Self Confidence and Self Control scales of the Adjective Check List. A Two-way Analysis of Variance showed no significant main effects for sex role or sexual orientation. Post hoc analysis of the three Intrapersonal Competence subscales indicated that the Androgynous and Masculine women were higher in self confidence than the Feminine and Undifferentiated women.

When the two groups, Masculine-Androgynous and Feminine-Undifferentiated were analysed by homosexual and heterosexual groups using a 2 X 2 Chi-square procedure, a significant association was found between sex role categorization and sexual orientation. It is believed that future
studies would benefit from including the bisexual sexual preference, the effects of coupling, and a measure of the effects of active involvement in the feminist movement. It is the opinion of this writer that society is in flux on these issues and a longitudinal study is also needed for a fuller assessment.
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Introduction

Part I

Sex Roles

A major premise upon which the women's liberation movement is based is that culturally defined sex roles and the resultant sex role stereotypes are limiting and restrictive to the individual (Jones, Chernovetz, and Hanson, 1977). The existence of these socially prescribed sex roles is well documented (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp, 1975, Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, and Broverman, 1968). Williams and Bennett (1975) discovered that men and women are in close agreement as to the characteristics of male and female stereotypes, and others have suggested that these perceptions of sex role differences are basically correct (Rosenkrantz, et al, 1968, Spence, et al, 1975). Constantinople (1973) has defined masculinity and femininity as those traits, rooted in anatomy, physiology, and early experience which distinguish males from females in appearance, attitude and behavior. Other writers state that behavioral sex role differentiation is primarily cultural in nature, rather than psychological or biological (Myrh, 1976). This belief is given
credence by the finding that sex role structure varies by type of society (Carlson, 1971).

Sex role stereotypes have wide ranging and reciprocal impacts upon individuals and society. For instance, social assumptions about women affect their feelings about themselves, their behavior towards others, and, therefore, others' reactions to them. These interactions complete the cycle of inculturation and aid in determining where women fit on the masculine-feminine continuum. This continuum, in turn, may function as a component in women's mental health outlook or adjustment. This is especially likely to be the case if this inculturation not only encourages sex role choice but selectively reinforces some sex role positions as positive and others as negative.

In the initial stages of preparing the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), Bem (1974), using 50 male and 50 female undergraduate students, compiled a list of 20 masculine items, 20 feminine items, and 20 neutral items. These items describe character traits and were selected on the basis of social desirability rather than on differential endorsement.
by males and females. Judges were asked to rate such questions as, "In American society, how desirable is it for a man to be truthful?" A 7-point scale, ranging from "Not at all desirable", to "Extremely desirable", was used. The original list contained 400 such character items and each judge was asked to rate the desirability "For a man" or "For a woman". No judge was asked to rate both. An item qualified as masculine if it was independently judged by both males and females to be significantly more desirable for a man than for a woman. The same criteria were used to develop the list of 20 feminine items. A personality characteristic qualified as neutral if it was independently judged by both males and females to be no more desirable for one sex than for the other. Care was taken to ascertain that male and female judges did not differ significantly in their overall desirability judgments of a trait (See Table One for the BSRI items, Appendix B for the BSRI instrument itself).

Many masculine items such as "Acts as a Leader", "Ambitious", "Assertive", "Self-reliant", and "Strong personality", seem to reflect more socially valued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. Acts as a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Athletic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Defends own beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Forceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Has leadership abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Makes decisions easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-reliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Self-sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Strong personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Willing to take a stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Willing to take risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminine Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Affectionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Childlike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Does not use harsh language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Flatterable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Gentle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
47. Gullible
56. Loves children
17. Loyal
26. Sensitive to the needs of others
18. Shy
38. Soft spoken
23. Sympathetic
44. Tender
29. Understanding
41. Warm
2. Yielding

---

Neutral Items

51. Adaptable
36. Conceited
9. Conscientious
60. Conventional
45. Friendly
15. Happy
3. Helpful
48. Inefficient
24. Jealous
39. Likable
6. Moody
21. Reliable
30. Secretive
33. Sincere
42. Solemn
57. Tactful
12. Theatrical
27. Truthful
18. Unpredictable
54. Unsystematic

Note: The number preceding each item reflects the position of each adjective as it actually appears on the BSRI.

traits, or reflect characteristics which imply strength. Although some feminine items suggest
socially valued characteristics, for example, "Affectionate", "Cheerful", or "Understanding", others appear to reflect devalued traits, such as "Flatterable", "Gullible", "Shy", or weakness, such as "Yielding", "Tender", and "Childlike". However, to determine if this is actually the case, what is needed is a study in which both social desirability and sex role characteristics are actually measured. Rosenkrantz, et al, (1968) conducted such an investigation. They gained their initial list by asking undergraduate students to state items which they considered to differentiate men and women. Any item listed more than once was included. The items were then arranged on a 60-point, bipolar scale ranging from, for instance, "Not at all Aggressive", to "Very Aggressive". One hundred and fifty-four college students were asked to mark the extent to which they expected each item to characterize the adult male. Each judge repeated the process for adult female and then for self. Half answered for males first, and half for females first. "Self" was scored last for both groups. Although there was a high degree of agreement across the two samples
(Males and females responses on masculine traits correlated at .96, and males and females responses on feminine traits correlated at .95). Marking for one sex and then the other may have generated an "opposites" mental set in the mind of the judges. In Bem's study (1974) each judge rated only one sex, thus, it seems that Bem's method would be preferable. However, Rosenkrantz, et al, (1968) states, "These correlations indicated a very high degree of agreement between men and women as to what typical men and women are like". (p. 288)

Only items having a 75% or better agreement were selected as having sufficient consensus to indicate the presence of a sex role stereotype, and, further, items had to reach this same degree of agreement in both samples (males and females) to be included. Forty-one items were selected as stereotypic (Rosenkrantz, et al, 1968).

A second group of subjects rated the social desirability of each item. The instructions were to indicate which pole of each of the 41 items represented the more socially desirable behavior. Subjects were asked to consider social desirability
for the population at large, not for one sex or the other. Social desirability scores were computed for each item in the sample of men and in the sample of women. To ascertain whether masculinity is more valued than femininity, the mean social desirability score of the masculine pole on the 41 stereotypic items ($M = .65$) was tested against the proportion expected by chance ($M = .50$) and the difference was found to be significant.

Further examination of the social desirability scores indicated that 70% of the 41 stereotypic items were male valued; that is, the masculine pole was perceived as more desirable by the subjects than the feminine pole. Only 12 of the items were female valued. This difference produced a chi-square of 7.048 ($p < .001$). Similar chi-squares computed between male- versus female-valued items in the differentiating and nondifferentiating categories failed to achieve significance (Rosenkrantz, et al, 1968). These results suggest that stereotypically male characteristics tend to be perceived as socially desirable more often than stereotypically female characteristics.
Not only are male character traits seen as more socially desirable, they may also be viewed as reflecting greater psychological health. Braver, Braver, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970) found that clinical judgments parallel stereotypic sex role differentiations. Using 79 (46 men and 33 women) clinically trained psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers, it was found that behaviors and characteristics judged to reflect an ideal standard of adjustment for an adult, sex unspecified, resembled behaviors judged healthy for men but differed from behaviors judged healthy for females. They concluded:

On the face of it, the finding that clinicians tend to ascribe male-valued stereotypic traits more often to healthy men than to healthy women may seem trite. However, an examination of the content of these items suggests that this trite-seeming phenomenon conceals a powerful, negative assessment of women. For instance, among these items, clinicians are more likely to suggest that healthy women differ from healthy men by being more submissive, less independent, less adventurous, more easily influenced, less aggressive, less competitive, more excitable in minor crisis, having their feelings hurt more easily, being more emotional, more conceited about their appearance, less objective and disliking math and science. This constellation seems a most unusual way of describing any mature healthy individual. (p. 4)
The traditional view in American society that masculinity is the mark of the psychologically healthy male and femininity is the mark of the psychologically healthy female seems to be negated according to Bem (1975). Considering, on the one hand, the social pressure on women to conform to the "proper" feminine sex role and, on the other, the fact that this particular sex role is frequently devalued, it would be suspected that the greatest degree of cognitive dissonance, or lack of adjustment, would exist in the women who attempt to conform to this sex role. This appears to be the case with feminine women being seen as intropunitive, due to more rigid expectations for themselves to conform to society's stereotypes (Tucillo, 1977, Tinsley, Guest, and McGuire, 1979), expressing greater dissonance (Gobel and Harris, 1977), and holding a negative value of their own worth (Rosenkrantz, et al, 1968). Research also supports the reverse logic, that there is greater social and personal desirability for the masculine sex role for both sexes (Elman, 1976, Gobel and Harris, 1977, Jones, et al, 1977, and Broverman, et al, 1970). In a
society that prefers "masculine" traits such as Forcefulness, Competitiveness, Self-sufficiency and Dominance, to "feminine" traits of Compassion, Love of Children, Failure to Use Harsh Language, and Tenderness (Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968), it seems reasonable to conclude that individuals high in masculine tendencies will be more successful working within that value system. Further, they may be more self-confident due to a history of social reinforcement for this behavior (Jones, et al., 1977).

Until recently women were faced with the choice of conforming to social expectancies in the form of the feminine sex role at the expense of self and others' devaluation of that role, or to encounter censure by striving toward the more socially desirable masculine role. However, there is a third alternative.

Recent writers have indicated that male and female stereotypes impair the physical and mental health of both men and women (Bernard, 1974, Chesler, 1972, and Ramey, 1973) and it has been suggested that sex role flexibility, or androgyny, is most beneficial for all individuals (Elman, 1976,

Bem (1974) summarized the work of Kagan (1964) and Kohlberg (1966):

The highly sex-typed individual is motivated to keep his behavior consistent with an internalized sex-role standard, a goal that he presumably accomplishes by repressing any behavior that might be considered undesirable or inappropriate for his sex. Thus, whereas a narrowly masculine self-concept might inhibit behaviors that are stereotyped as feminine, and a narrowly feminine self-concept might inhibit behaviors that are stereotyped as masculine, a mixed, or androgynous self concept might allow an individual to freely engage in both 'masculine' and 'feminine' behaviors.

In 1975 Bem sought to evaluate the validity of the proposal that "sex role differentiation has long outlived its usefulness, and that it now serves only to prevent both men and women from developing as full and complete human beings" (p. 634). She hypothesized that non-androgynous sex roles can seriously restrict the range of behaviors available to an individual as he or she moves from situation to situation. Her experiment consisted of two parts; the first was designed to
to measure the ability of androgynous individuals of both sexes to function in a "typically masculine" setting and in a "typically feminine" setting.

Prior to the experimental manipulation, Bem had 42 subjects rate 12 activities as masculine or feminine on a seven point scale. Embedded in the list of activities were the two following activities of interest: "Playing with a six week-old baby kitten" and "Saying what you believe, even when you know those around you disagree". Both males and females rated independence, as described above, as significantly masculine and kitten playing as significantly feminine. Only one out of the 42 judges rated independence as even "slightly feminine" and no judge rated kitten playing as at all masculine.

For the first experiment, Bem selected nine masculine, nine feminine, and nine androgynous students of each sex (N = 54) on the basis of scores on the BSRI. They were told that they were participating in an experiment on humor and run in same-sex groups of four. However, each subject was immediately placed in a sound proof booth. Cartoons
which had been pretested for degree of funniness by a separate set of subjects, were flashed on a screen. The subject vocally rated each cartoon, responding into a microphone, on a 7-point scale from "very funny" to "very unfunny". The subject heard what was believed to be the vocal responses of the other three students in the group. However, the other three voices were prerecorded tapes and controlled by the experimenter. The order of "participation" varied. In order to attempt to induce conformity the tape included a number of trials during which all three voices gave false responses. That is, all agreed that a particular cartoon was funny when it was not or that it was not funny when it was. Of the 92 trials, 36 were "critical" that is, trials on which false consensus was presented to the subject. The results showed that masculine and androgynous subjects conformed on fewer trials than feminine subjects. This comparison was significant for males, $t = 2.62$, $p < .02$, approached significance for females, $t = 1.95$, $p < .06$, and was highly significant for the two sexes combined, $t = 3.27$, $p < .01$. These
results suggest that masculine and androgynous subjects remain independent from social pressure and do well at stereotypically masculine behavior ("Masculine independence").

Part two of Bem's experiment was designed to test the hypothesis that females are more likely than males to cuddle tiny babies, puppies, and kittens. Sixty-six students, half male, half female, served as subjects. As in the first study, one third of the subjects of each sex were masculine, one third feminine, and one third androgynous. Subjects were solicited for an experiment on mood. The experimenters were blind as to the sex role orientation of subjects and each experimenter ran an approximately equal number of feminine, masculine, and androgynous subjects. Subjects were given a box of 60 plastic geometrical discs and were asked to build something with them. The discs varied in color and shape and could be attached to on another in a variety of ways. This activity lasted 8 minutes and served to equalize mood across subjects. The subjects then filled out a mood questionnaire. A kitten was brought into the room
and the subjects were explicitly instructed to interact with the kitten in anyway they wished. This "forced play" period lasted 5 minutes.

Following the "forced play" activity, subjects were given five minutes to engage in a somewhat challenging game of skill requiring the player to place a metal ball between two metal rods and, by opening and closing the rods, to roll the ball as far away as possible without letting it drop between the two rods. After this, the kitten was again placed in the room and put in its playpen. The subjects were told that they could do anything that they liked. The room also held a number of other things to do, including various magazines, puzzles and games. This "spontaneous play" period lasted ten minutes. One of four female raters sampled the subjects interaction with the kitten every ten seconds from behind a mirrored window. The coders were blind as to sex role and rated an approximately equal number of each type. Rating was done simultaneously and the results indicated a very high interrater reliability (over 95% agreement) for all ten behaviors sampled, e.g.,
looking at kitten, touching kitten. The results supported Bem's primary hypothesis. Thus, for males in the study, feminine and androgynous males demonstrated significantly greater overall involvement with the kitten than did the masculine males, \( t(30) = 3.38, p < .002 \). Furthermore, they indicated on a mood questionnaire that they enjoyed playing with the kitten significantly more than did the masculine males. For the female group, contrary to Bem's prediction, feminine females were found to show less overall involvement with the kitten than did the androgynous females, \( t(30) = 2.08, p < .05 \). While this confirmed her hypothesis for androgynous females, she found the results for the feminine females most surprising. "It is true that, as predicted, the feminine females failed to display masculine independence in the face of pressure to conform, but it is also true that they failed to display feminine playfulness when given the opportunity to interact with a tiny kitten. Thus across the two experimental situations, the feminine females can be said to have 'flunked' both critical tasks, and consequently, it is they who
seem to have the most serious behavioral deficit" (p. 644).

Bem concluded, on the basis of these two experiments that, "Androgynous subjects of both sexes displayed a high level of masculine independence when under pressure to conform and they displayed a high level of feminine playfulness when given the opportunity to interact with a tiny kitten" (p. 642).

Bem's early work did not include the Undifferentiated category. The standard scoring for the BSRI developed by La France and Carmen in 1980 allowed the subject to fall within the Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated ranges. The Androgynous personality contains a significant amount of both masculinity and femininity, while the Undifferentiated personality contains a significant lack of either. That is, the Undifferentiated individual does not function particularly well within a masculine or a feminine framework.
Introduction

Part II

Sexual Orientation

Much of the pre-1970's investigations centered on the treatment of homosexuality (Capiro, 1954, Freund, 1960, Ovesay and Gaylin, 1965, Feldman and MacGulloch, 1964, and, Kraft, 1965) or its etiology (Ellis, 1965, and Marmor, 1965). There were few studies related directly to the specific adjustment, personality or behavior of homosexual individuals. Many recent studies have used non-representative samples such as prison inmates (David, 1964, Climet, 1977, and, Miller, 1966), or clinical subjects (Aaronson and Grumpelt, 1961, Singer, 1972, and Kaye, Berl, Clare, Eleston, Gershwin, Gershwin, Kogan, and Torda; 1977). Others have used non-patient samples but failed to include control groups (Dank, 1971). Further, several writers indicate that the majority of serious investigations into this area have been aimed at the male homosexual (Saghir and Robins, 1969, Kaye, et al, 1967, Cotton, 1975, Hooker, 1957, Adelman, 1977, and Chang and Block, 1960) and that research of non-
clinical, non-prison lesbians is rare (Chafetz, Sampson, Beck, and West, 1974). Additionally, the traditional psychiatric belief that homosexual women are emotionally unstable (Caprio, 1954, Fenichel, 1945, and Wilber, 1965) has been challenged by Armon (1960), Freedman (1968), Hopkins (1969), and Siegelman (1972). The contention that such women are neurotic has typically been voiced by clinicians reporting on their own therapy patients (Caprio, 1954, Fenichel, 1945, and Socarides, 1968). One exception is a psychometric investigation by Kenyon (1968) who studied a non-clinical group of English homosexual women and concluded that they were higher in neuroticism when measured on the Maudsley Personality Inventory and the Cornell Medical Index Health Questionnaire than a comparison group of heterosexual women. The control group was made up of married and, therefore, "presumed" heterosexual women. It is not known whether the neuroticism was a function of sexual orientation or marital status, or whether the members of the control group were, in fact, heterosexual women.
Many researchers of the recent decade suggest that homosexuality may properly be considered an alternative life style as opposed to a nosological entity (Clingman and Fowler, 1976, Thompson, McCandles and Strickland, 1971 and Saghir and Robins, 1969). Therefore, especially considering the American Psychiatric Association's removal of homosexuality from its nomenclature of disease entities (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, III, 1980), it would seem more useful for personality researchers to focus upon the non-pathological dimensions of homosexuality (Fowler and Epting, 1975).

Early writers commonly saw female homosexuals as sick and as leading "cold, empty, futile lives" (Romm, 1965). And while not all investigators would agree, e.g., Hassel and Smith, 1975, Myreck, 1974, the reverse is often seen today. For instance, lesbians have been shown in some research reports to be psychologically healthier than both male homosexuals and female heterosexuals. Kaye, et al, (1967) found that the number of female homosexual patients who remain in therapy for an extended
period is fewer than the number of males who do so. This is a reversal of the usually larger ratio of females to males in psychoanalytic treatment. Studies using the MMPI have found basically only non-clinical differences, with heterosexual women scoring higher on scales such as Hypochondriasis (Hs), Hysteria (Hy), and Psychasthenia (Pt), though both groups remained in the normal ranges (Ohlson and Wilson, 1974). Adelman (1977) also compared lesbians to heterosexual women on the MMPI with findings similar to those above: "With the exception of the Sc scale, no differences were found on the clinical scales. The lesbian group achieved a significantly higher elevation than the non-lesbian group on the Mf and Sc scales. Further analysis of the data on the Sc subscales indicated no differences on the pathological part of the scale, but rather a difference in the degree of social alienation" (p. 193). Similar studies by Riess, Safe, and Yotive (1974) and Oberstone (1975) likewise found no more psychopathology among female homosexuals than among female heterosexuals. Not only have these reports suggested the essential
normalcy of homosexuals but, in some cases, have used such terms as "supernormalcy" (Laner, 1977). Freedman (1975) also found that homosexual social-sexual arrangements often lead to a high degree of interpersonal honesty because gays do not have to feign emotions such as love or marital interest. And, due to the masks of heterosexuality that many gay people feel forced to wear, Freedman believes that many homosexuals become more sophisticated about "masks", that is, about the relationship between identity and role. Thus, "Many gays have a fairly complex understanding of self-disclosure, both in themselves and in others. More over, they are often more candid and open than non-gays" (1975, p. 32). Freedman found that his lesbian subjects told fewer lies than did his heterosexual controls and that they were more candid and less defensive. Freedman's finding that homosexual women seem to function better when compared to a group of heterosexual controls affirms the previous conclusions of Hopkins (1969) and Siegelman (1972) Lesbian women also appear to be highly stable in their emotional attachments. Saghir and Robins
(1968) found that the vast majority (93%) of the homosexual women in their sample had established relatively long term relationships, and of those, eighty-four per cent were faithful. This is echoed in research by Cotton (1975) contrasting lesbians to homosexual men. It was found that the lesbians were less promiscuous, more affectionate, with longer lasting relationships characterized by a high degree of fidelity.

Positive images of homosexuals are likewise found in relationship to their work and careers. Neumeyer (1977) discovered a significantly higher proportion of gays in steady employment and holding a higher portion of at least middle class jobs when compared to nongays. Saghir and Robins (1969) describe their lesbian sample as having "higher educational and training characteristics" and suggested that the homosexual woman is well able to produce and achieve. Siegelman (1972) studied a group of 84 lesbians. Forty-six had been solicited from a New York homophile organization and the remaining 38 women responded to a notice in a bookstore window asking for volunteers. "The
occupational status for the majority of homosexuals could be classified as professional, in addition to 11 teachers from all educational levels, and 13 graduate and undergraduate college students, there were registered nurses, social workers, editors, a statistician, a librarian, a psychiatrist, a psychologist, etc." (p. 477).

Harper (1969) in a nonempirical theoretical discussion believes that the lesbian might be a better worker because of her homosexuality, rather than in spite of it. Harper suggest that knowing her career will not be interrupted by motherhood or marriage, and rejecting the idea of a male providing financial support affects the lesbian's attitude towards her career in a positive manner. As insurance companies do not recognize a homosexual marriage any more than the law does, each partner is left with the knowledge that at any time, due to sickness, accident, or death, she could become the sole provider for the family. This adds to the weight of economic responsibility. Homosexual women are often asked to take on extra duties such as staying late because it is assumed that
they have no family. This, no doubt, increases their own and their employer's value of their dependability. Harper (1969) goes on to discuss the convenience of vacation planning for employees who do not require summers off because of children as well as lessened time spent on the job flirting, romancing, talking on the phone to boyfriends, and primping. Lesbians, by social necessity, must severely restrict even phone conversations with each other.

There seem to be many ways in which homosexuality itself contributes to the lesbian's well-being. For instance, Hammersmith and Weinberg (1973), in a study using non-clinical male homosexuals in three western countries (U.S., Netherlands, Denmark) suggested that with increases of commitment to a socially meaningful role-category, for instance, "homosexual", the more "settled" the question of identity will be. They concluded that this leads to a more stable self-concept for homosexuals.

Freedman (1975) states that "Many gay people have responded to social pressures against homosexuality by 'centering', by discovering and living by their own values" (p. 32).
Introduction

Part III

Sex Roles, Sexual Orientation, and Intrapersonal Competence

The present investigation is an attempt to determine what differences exist between homosexual and heterosexual women with respect to several specific personality variables. The first of these is sex role stereotype. This has been measured and defined according to the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) as Masculinity; Femininity; the combination of the two, Androgyny; and the significant lack of either, called Undifferentiated. The second major concern of this paper is adjustment or intrapersonal competence. While many writers, previously discussed, have reported a positive relationship between androgyny and adjustment (Elam, 1976, Bedeian and Hyder, 1977, Bem 1975, Babladelis, 1978, Gobel and Harris, 1977, Nevil, 1975, and Jones, et al, 1977), and others have investigated adjustment and sexual orientation (Van Cleave, 1977, Hammersmith and Weinberg, 1973, Kaye, et al, 1967, Climent, 1977, and Nash, 1976), no study, to date, has investigated the inter-
relationship between sexual orientation, sex role identity, and adjustment.

The first hypothesis considers the relationship of sex role to Intrapersonal Competence in women. Intrapersonal Competence was operationally defined as the subjects scores on the following three scales of the Adjective Check List (ACL): Adjustment, Self-Confidence and Self Control. These scales were selected on an a priori basis as having a face validity relationship to the construct Intrapersonal Competence. No other scales of the ACL were scored or utilized in the analysis. The work of Rosenkrantz, et al, 1968, Broverman, et al, 1970, Tucillo, 1977, Tinsley, Guest and McGuire, 1979, Gobel and Harris, 1977, Bernard, 1974, Chesler, 1972, Ramey, 1973, Elman, 1976, Babladelis, 1978, Spence, et al, 1975, Wakefield, et al, 1976, Weis, 1977, and Bem, 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977, previously discussed, prompted the following hypothesis. It was expected that the highest scores on the Intrapersonal Competence cluster, the Adjustment, Self Confidence, and Self Control subscales on the ACL, would be achieved by the Androgynous women, next highest
scores were expected for the Masculine women, then the Feminine group, which in Bem's (1975) study, reported on page 11, were said to have "flunked" both the masculine independence and the feminine playfulness tasks. Lastly, the lowest scores were expected to be obtained by the Undifferentiated group of women as they have been previously defined as lacking both masculine and feminine qualities, interests, and abilities.

The second major hypothesis of this work is that the female homosexual group would receive significantly higher scores on Intrapersonal Competence than the heterosexual female group. Evidence has been presented that suggests that homosexual women, compared to heterosexual women, show equal or greater psychological health, demonstrate stability in interpersonal relationships, show commitment to identity, and function well in all levels of career choices (Kaye, et al., 1967, Ohlson and Wilson, 1974, Adelman, 1977, Lainer, 1977, Freedman, 1975, Saghir and Robins, 1968, Cotton, 1975, and Neumeyer, 1978).

A third hypothesis of this paper was that
female homosexuals would produce a more androgynous profile than the female heterosexuals on the Bem Sex Role Inventory and that the homosexual women would also be more masculine than the heterosexual group on this measure. It will be remembered that increased masculinity in women has also been previously reported (Larson, 1977), to relate to better psychological adjustment and higher self-esteem.

Recent writers have clearly demonstrated a positive correlation between androgyny and homosexuality in women. In 1977, Nachbahr compared sixteen homosexual and sixteen heterosexual women. The BSRI and the Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI) were used, among other measures. "On the BSRI transexual women typically scored in the masculine range, homosexual women in the androgynous range, and heterosexual women in the near-feminine range (emphasis this author). On the DSFI, transexual women scored high on masculinity, and low on femininity, heterosexual women scored
high on femininity and low on masculinity, and homosexual women scored high on masculinity as well as high on femininity" (p. 1412). In the same year Van Cleave tested 75 lesbians on the BSRI as well as other measures, and concluded that, "Data obtained from the subject's scores on the BSRI indicated statistically significant support for the hypothesis that more women with same-sex sexual preference would identify themselves as androgynous (A), than either sex-typed (ST), or sex-reversed (SR)" (p. 5933)

While no other clearly quantitative conclusions can be drawn from the literature correlating androgyny with lesbianism, certain general assumptions can be made which tend to point in the direction of androgyny as a component of the lesbian personality. The entire concept of androgyny relates directly to social sex roles. And while there are only a few studies which actually quantify lesbians as being more androgynous, there are many indications that they do tend to reject the notion of prescribed sex-roles (Chafetz, et al, 1974, Minningerode, 1976). Saghir and Robins (1968)
reported that only a minority of the lesbians in their sample adopted sex roles and that they tended to assume both active and passive roles. This finding very nearly parallels the definition of androgyny as "freedom from rigid sex roles" (Wakefield, et al, 1976, p.766). Freedman (1975) also states that many gays are able to demonstrate a wider range of emotional expression because they are not confined by standard roles. This has logical as well as empirical referents. When two women live together as a couple they quickly discover the limitations of prescribed sex roles. Upon what will they base decisions as to whom will cook, call the plumber, maintain the finances, or care for the children? It is assumed that chores and other life space requirements and personal functions (including psychological) usually dictated by sex will give way to considerations of abilities, preferences and democratic trade-offs. This would result in these women, by necessity, being involved in a larger number of traditionally "masculine" endeavors. Although it is evident that only a minority of lesbian couples struggle
to mimic and preserve the heterosexual sex role dichotomies (e.g. butch-femme relationships), even so, this role playing is less frequent than that of heterosexual women who are naturally considered to be the "femme" (Myron and Bunch, 1975). Overall, then, women in a lesbian relationship should tend to move toward a masculine role more often than women in a heterosexual relationship.

This seems to be the case. Larson, in his 1977 study of both male and female homosexuals found that the homosexuals had greater orientation to the sex roles typical of the opposite sex and that this related to a more positive self concept for the lesbians (but not for the male homosexuals). Larson contended that masculine sex role behavior is related to a more positive self-concept due to our society being "male dominated". A more masculine sex role identity was also discovered for female homosexuals, as contrasting bisexual and heterosexual women, by Nash (1976). This evidence lends credence to the third hypothesis of this study, that lesbians score higher on the masculine scales and lower on the feminine scales of the BSRI than the female
heterosexual group.

Although recent quantitative data are slightly in favor of a relationship between androgyny and lesbianism, a large bulk of findings suggest masculinity as a primary sex role trait of gay women. The theoretical controversy as to whether this masculine component of the lesbian personality reflects a move toward androgyny or simply a rejection of femininity remains unresolved.
Method

Subjects

The subjects included in this study were 44 homosexual and 30 heterosexual female residents of the Central Florida area. The age range for the homosexual group was 19 to 43 years with the mean age being 26.97 years. The heterosexual women ranged in age from age 15 to 52 years with a mean of 25.3 years. There was no significant differences between the groups in age, \( t(74) = 1.25, p > .005 \).

Of the homosexual group, one (2%) did not complete high school, ten (22%) graduated from high school, fourteen (30%) had some college, eleven (24%) had a college degree and ten (22%) had graduate training. Of the heterosexual group, two (7%) failed to finish high school, seven (23%) received a high school diploma, twelve (40%) had some college, seven (23%) had a college degree, and two (7%) had done post graduate work. There was no significant difference between the groups on the mean number of years of education completed, \( t(74) = 1.24, p > .05 \).

As can be seen by Table 2, the differences
between the homosexual women who profess Catholicism, Judaism, or "other" religious affiliation is not great compared to the differences between these groups when we look at the women who indicate either profession in the Protestant faith or as having No Religion. Far more homosexuals than heterosexuals have no religion, while 60% of the heterosexuals compared to only 39.1% of the homosexuals are Protestant. Possible interpretations and implications of these data are discussed in the concluding section of this paper.

Table 2
Homosexuals vs Heterosexuals
According to Religious Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Homosexuals</th>
<th>Heterosexuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All subjects were caucasian. While all of the women in the study were single (a function of selection), forty-six (61%) of the total sample considered themselves as part of a couple, while the remaining 30 did not. There was no definition of "couple" offered, as any traditional definition (i.e. engaged, married) would not be descriptive of pairing within the lesbian group. Subjects were solicited through word of mouth (Bell and Weinberg, 1978). That is, several acquaintances of the writer, thought to be homosexual were contacted by telephone. They were asked if they would be willing to take part in a study on "women's views and attitudes", they were also asked if they knew of anyone who would also participate. These people were then called and the process repeated. An identical procedure was used to generate names for the heterosexual group. The word of mouth or "friendship pyramiding" technique has been successfully used to reach the gay population by Weis, (1977), Saghir and Robins, (1968), Van Cleave, (1977), and Chafetz, et al, (1974).
Materials

Each subject included in this study received a packet containing:

1. Release Form
2. Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)
3. Adjective Check List (ACL)
4. Demographic Questionnaire including the Kinsey Scale

The release form (see Appendix A) described this study in general terms, as a paper on "women's views and attitudes". On this form anonymity was assured and the research sponsors identified. Information was given as to how the completed work could be viewed should the subject desire feedback.

The Bem Sex Role Inventory, (see Appendix B) was included as a measure of the four major sex roles; Masculinity, Femininity, Androgyny, and the Undifferentiated role. Research has supported the validity of the separate scales (Wakefield, et al., 1976) and test-retest reliability on the instrument has proven highly reliable (Masculinity Scale, \( r = .90 \); Femininity Scale, \( r = .90 \), Androgyny Scale,
r = .93). This test-retest study was carried out by Bem (1974); the Product moment correlations for the Undifferentiated types were not done at that time. Bem found, also, that the internal consistency of the scales was highly reliable. Coefficient alpha was computed separately for the Masculinity and Femininity scales and was found, in one group to be: Masculinity, \( \alpha = .86 \); Femininity, \( \alpha = .82 \).

The Adjective Check List, (see Appendix C), is comprised of 300 commonly used adjectives which appear to arouse little resistance or anxiety in subjects. The present investigation focused on the Personal Adjustment subscale (8), the Self Confidence subscale (5), and the Self Control subscale (6), as having a face validity relationship to the construct Intrapersonal Competence.

The Personal Adjustment subscale was derived from an item analysis of assessment subjects rated higher and lower on personal adjustment and personal soundness. Representative items include alert, calm, fair-minded, loyal, organized, practical, trusting, versatile, and warm. Contra-indicative adjectives included affected, arrogant, conceited,
dissatisfied, intolerant, moody, and weak, among others. The high scoring subject is seen as dependable, peaceable, friendly, practical, loyal, and wholesome. She fits in well, asks for little, treats others with courtesy and works enterprisingly toward her own goals. She possess's the capacity to "work and love". This subscale was found to correlate negatively with eight of the ten psychopathological dimensions on the MMPI.

The Self Confidence subscale corresponds to the "poise and self assurance" cluster of scales on the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). This scale was constructed by contrasting self descriptions of men and women rated as higher and lower on such traits as poise, self confidence, self assurance, and the like. The indicative list includes such adjectives as aggressive, clear-thinking, confident, dominant, enterprising, high-strung, independent, and strong. Illustrative of contra-indicative adjectives are anxious, cautious, inhibited, and patient.

The Self Control subscale was also developed empirically and is intended to parallel the responsibility-socialization cluster of scales on
the CPI. Indicative adjectives for Self Control include conscientious, dependable, good-natured, industrious, pleasant, stable, and others. Contraindicative adjectives are argumentative, adventurous, disorderly, hasty, rebellious, spendthrift, and etc. High scorers tend to be serious, sober individuals, interested in and responsive to their obligations. They are seen as diligent, practical and loyal workers. At the same time there may be an element of over control, too much emphasis on the proper means for attaining the ends in social living (Gough, 1952).

These three scales were selected as having a face validity relationship to Intrapersonal Competence. None of the other subscales of the ACL were scored or compared.

The Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix D) was used to match homosexual and heterosexual groups, as well as to appraise sexual orientation. Saghir and Robbins (1969) suggested that the use of the Kinsey scale or overt experience alone is insufficient criterion for sexual orientation classification.
and recommended a combination of both, along with inquiries of psychological responses (i.e. cognitive rehearsals). Therefore, each subject in this study was assessed in these three spheres to qualify for sexual orientation classification. The first was the Kinsey scale, the second was the subject's acknowledgement of sexual activity, and the third, questions eliciting information regarding cognitive rehearsals (e.g., emotional attachment, erotic fantasies, and sexual arousal).
Procedure

A packet containing all of the materials was mailed or given to each person who responded to requests for subjects. The items in each packet were in a random order, except that the Release Form was placed first (on top). One hundred and fifty-eight packets were distributed, one hundred and eight were returned. This 68% return rate appears to be within the ranges obtained by other researchers using similar methods (i.e., Weis, 1977 53.8%; Kenyon 1968, 82%; Seigleman, 1972, 61%; Nash, 1976, 62%). Thirty-two could not be used because respondents were either married (6), bisexual (3), did not satisfy criterion established by Saghir and Robins (1969) for sexual orientation classification (33) or returned incomplete questionnaires (8).

Each subject was assessed in three separate areas for the purposes of experimental group membership classification. The first was the Kinsey scale, see Figure I. Those checking 0, 1, or 2 (Entirely or Largely Heterosexual) were assigned, pedente lite, to the heterosexual category. For final assignment to this group the subject had to
claim actual sexual experience with the opposite sex, as well as give heterosexual responses to the three questions designed to reflect psychological responses. These questions involved emotional attachment, sexual arousal and erotic thoughts and fantasies about the other sex. A reversal of the criterion was used to establish homosexual group membership. That is, checking 4, 5, or, 6 (Largely or Entirely Homosexual) on the Kinsey scale and with same-sex overt sexual activity, emotional attachment, erotic fantasies and sexual arousal. Overt sexual activity was measured by asking each subject to indicate the number of persons of the opposite sex and the same sex with whom she had engaged in sexual activity. In order to be included in either group a subject had to list two or more persons from that group (either homosexual or heterosexual) and no persons from the other group. For instance, to be considered heterosexual at this point, an individual would have to mark 1, 2, or 3 on the Kinsey scale and indicate two or more contacts with the other sex and none with the same sex, as revealed in response to the sexual history first item.
The second pair of questions on the sexual history portion of the questionnaire asked if the subject had ever felt strong emotional attachment for a member of the same or opposite sex. The subject was required to answer in the affirmative for group inclusion. That is, for inclusion in the heterosexual group the subject would have to acknowledge past feelings of love for a member of the opposite sex whether she also had felt such attachment for the same sex or not. That is, past emotional attachment for a member of either sex did not disqualify a volunteer for group inclusion. The third pair of questions asked about erotic fantasies or thoughts. One question signified same sex direction and the other indicated opposite sex direction. These could be answered "Rarely", "Occasionally", or "Often". Only "Occasionally" or "Often" were acceptable for group membership. Again, an individual could also indicate such thoughts about members of the group to which she was not assigned, but she must have experienced such thoughts at least occasionally about her own group (i.e. either homosexual or heterosexual).
This same criterion applied to the final pair of questions, "Have you ever experienced sexual arousal with a member of the opposite (same) sex?" There was room to indicate "yes" or "no". Again the subject was required to answer in the affirmative for her own group regardless of her answer regarding the other group. Those failing to achieve criterion, for instance, bisexuals, were not included.

The BSRI asked that the subjects use the list of 60 personality characteristics to describe themselves, and to indicate on a scale from one to seven, how true of themselves each of the characteristics were. The BSRI was scored in the prescribed manner, using the formula recommended by La France and Carmen (1980).
Results

A two-way Analysis of Variance was performed using the Intrapersonal Competence Score (composed of a linear combination of the three ACL subscales; Adjustment, Self Confidence, and Self Control), with the four BSRI sex role types (Androgynous, Feminine, Masculine, and Undifferentiated, and by group (Homosexual and Heterosexual). There were no significant main effects for sex role or sexual orientation, \( F' s < 1.50, p' s > .20 \). The sex role by sex orientation interaction effect approached significance \( F (3,68) = 2.27, p < .09 \). See Table 3

Table 3
Mean Total Intrapersonal Competence and Subscale Scores for Sex Role and Homosexual-Heterosexual Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Undifferentiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>151.53</td>
<td>132.17</td>
<td>145.88</td>
<td>152.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>46.07</td>
<td>41.17</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>46.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Control</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>38.63</td>
<td>53.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>65.25</td>
<td>52.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>141.00</td>
<td>139.70</td>
<td>157.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>44.60</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td>35.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>37.90</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>39.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Control</td>
<td>58.50</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>45.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similiar two-way Analyses of Variance were performed on the three separate ACL subscales which comprised the Intrapersonal Competence Scores. There were no significant main effects or interaction effects on the Self Control, \( F(3,72) = .84, p > .05 \), or Adjustment scores, \( F(3, 72) = .428, p > .05 \). However, there was a strong main effect difference in Self Confidence scores across the BSRI sex role types, \( F(3,72) = 9.78, p < .001 \). A Student-Newman-Keuls procedure was performed. This post-hoc analysis indicated that the Androgynous (\( M = 61.49 \)), and the Masculine (\( M = 64.57 \)) groups were significantly higher in Self Confidence than the Feminine (\( M = 52.00 \)) and the Undifferentiated women (\( M = 49.22 \)). Androgynous and Masculine groups were not significantly different from each other, nor were the Feminine and Undifferentiated groups.

A 2 X 2 Chi-square Analysis was performed on the frequency distribution for women categorized as homosexual or heterosexual and as Masculine/Androgynous, or Feminine/Undifferentiated. This analysis revealed a significant association between sex role categorization and sexual orientation.
categorization and sexual orientation, $X^2 (1) = 4.54, p < .05$. See Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Homosexual</th>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BSRI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous/ Masculine</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated/ Feminine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 (1) = 4.54, p < .05$
Discussion

One hypothesis of this research predicted a positive relationship between Androgyny and Intrapersonal Competence in women. Thus, it was expected that the Androgynous and then the Masculine women (pooling the Homosexual and Heterosexual groups) would produce a higher Intrapersonal Competence score than the Feminine or Undifferentiated women. It was expected that the Androgynous group would score highest due to greater personal flexibility; that is, meaning the ability to function in either a masculine or a feminine role depending upon the demands of the situation. It was further predicted that the masculine women, because they are thought to be assuming a self and society-valued role, would score next highest in adjustment. Feminine women, because of the low social and self-value placed on that role, were expected to score below both the Androgynous and the Masculine women, with the Undifferentiated women, who, Presumably are not able to function well in either role, scoring the lowest. This hypothesis was not supported for the Intrapersonal Competence cluster. However, when the individual ACL subscales which made up
the cluster were analysed, some differences were discovered. Although there were no differences in the Self Control or Adjustment scores, a strong difference was noted on the Self Confidence scale. The scores on this scale divided the four BSRI groups into two distinct poles. The Masculine and Androgynous women scored significantly high, while the Feminine and Undifferentiated women scored low. While no specific predictions were made for the various subscales, this relationship was consistent with what was predicted for the overall Intrapersonal Competence. It may be that the hypothesis that Androgynous and Masculine women are better adjusted is true for only certain components of their personality. Further research, using all of the scales of the ACL or a similar measure is therefore needed. If there are personality spheres in which Androgynous and Masculine women show superior adjustment, investigation is needed to determine which these are, how they differ from other personality variables, and, most importantly, why this is so. In this regard it is interesting to note that in the present study, Masculinity-Androginity
tended to be over represented among the Homosexual sample. This seems reasonable. Lesbianism, in addition to being a sexual preference, is a feminist issue, a social stance, and has sex role consciousness as an integral component. The lesbian is a breaker of tradition. It is difficult, on the other hand, for the heterosexual woman to escape the constant, though perhaps subtle, bombardment of information regarding "appropriate" (feminine) sex role behavior. There are, for instance undeniable social and affective associations with the word "wife". The heterosexual woman must, at some level, deal with this label. The lesbian usually does not. It may be that it is easier, for this reason, for the homosexual woman to avoid internalizing socially expected roles, thereby allowing her to move freely among all of the roles.

A second hypothesis predicted higher overall adjustment or Intrapersonal Competence scores for the homosexual women than the heterosexual women. This was not supported. While new evidence has indicated that homosexual women may show greater psychological health than their heterosexual
sisters (Kaye, et al, 1967, Ohlson and Wilson, 1974, Adelman, 1977, Lainer, 1977, Freedman, 1975, Saghir and Robins, 1968, Cotton, 1975, Neumeyer, 1978), this was not reflected in the current data. However, it should be noted that much of this evidence has been presented in the form of suggestion equal or greater emotional health for the homosexual woman. There are also a great number of investigations, as reported, finding that it is impossible to distinguish between lesbian and non-lesbian women on psychological tests, especially the MMPI. Although this was not a specific hypothesis of this study, the finding of no significant personal adjustment related differences between homosexual versus heterosexual female groups was supported by the present data.

It is the opinion of this writer that there may be other moderator variables which have contributed to the results and which deserve further investigation. One such consideration is the norming of the BSRI. This currently popular instrument was normed on undergraduate females only. This is an age when many young women are still
dependent upon their parents or are struggling with issues of independence. Many of the 40 or 50 year old women in the present study were engaged in or had completed successful careers. It may be that they had a stronger sense of sex role identity than the younger women upon whom the BSRI was normed. It is this writer's belief that a re-norming of the BSRI would produce a more valid and socially comprehensive instrument.

Another, and possible the most important omitted consideration is feminism. How does active involvement in the women's liberation movement affect the issues in this study? Does a move toward sexual equality imply a move toward Androgyny? And, if feminism affects sex roles, does it affect the lesbian and the non-lesbian woman in the same way? Answers to these questions would provide invaluable dimensions in a future consideration of the topics of this study.

Finally, are women becoming more "liberated", more adjusted, or more androgynous over time? For instance, although the difference in scores did not reach significance, the feminine women scored lowest
APPENDIX A
You are being asked to complete the enclosed questionnaires and checklists. This will become part of a study of women's views and attitudes that will be part of a Master's Thesis at the University of Central Florida.

You will remain anonymous and will not be identified in any way in this study.

Should you desire feedback, the results, when completed, will be available at the University of Central Florida Library, listed in the author catalog under the name of the undersigned.

By signing below, you signify that you have been advised of these facts and that you agree to let those results become part of the study.

India Aditi

Signature

John M. McGuire, Ph. D

Date
APPENDIX B
On the following page, you will be shown a large number of personality characteristics. Please use these characteristics in order to describe yourself. That is, indicate on the scale from 1 to 7, how true of you each of these characteristics are. Do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

Example: Shy

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

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

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

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are shy

Mark a 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE that you are shy

Mark a 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE that you are shy

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

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

Shy 3  Irresponsible 7
Malicious 1  Carefree 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Trait</th>
<th>Descriptive Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>Makes decisions easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defends own beliefs</td>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>Conceited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>Soft spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td>Solemn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatrical</td>
<td>Willing to take a stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatterable</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong personality</td>
<td>Gullible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td>Acts as leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>Childlike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Adaptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Does not use harsh language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Unsystematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has leadership abilities</td>
<td>Loves children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
<td>Tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take risks</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
The Adjective Check List

by
HARRISON G. GOUGH, Ph.D.
University of California (Berkeley)

Name ........................................... Age .................. Sex ..............
Date ........................................... Other ........................................

DIRECTIONS: This booklet contains a list of adjectives. Please read them quickly and put an X in the box beside each one you would consider to be self-descriptive. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be frank, and check those adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.
QUESTIONNAIRE

Age  Race  Education

Religion

Martial Status

Coupledom: Do you consider yourself part of a couple?  Is your partner the same sex as yourself?  Are you living together?  If yes, how long?

Sexual Orientation: Please place a check before the statement which best describes you.

- Entirely heterosexual

- Largely heterosexual but with incidental homosexual history (infrequent)

- Largely heterosexual but with distinct homosexual history (more than incidental but heterosexual element predominates).

- Equally homosexual and heterosexual (bisexual)

- Largely homosexual but with distinct heterosexual history (prefer homosexual contact but fair amount of heterosexual behavior).

- Largely homosexual but with incidental homosexual history

- Entirely homosexual (no reaction to opposite sex in erotic sense). Includes individuals who may be psychologically committed but with no overt homosexual contacts

Sexual History: Approximate number of persons of the opposite sex with whom I have engaged in sexual activity

Approximate number of persons of the same sex with whom I have engaged in sexual activity

Have you ever felt strong emotional attachment for a member of the opposite sex?

Have you ever felt strong emotional attachment for a member of the same sex?

Do you have erotic fantasies or thoughts about a member of the opposite sex? Rarely

Occasionally  Often

Do you have erotic fantasies or thoughts about a member of the same sex? Rarely

Occasionally  Often
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