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CHAPTER ONE
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

American society has been and continues to be involved in a process of reevaluating its former rigidly held notions about sex-roles and gender appropriate behavior. While new freedoms offer the opportunity for greater individual choice, there may be individual stress involved in making the personal transitions and in coping with conflicting messages of what is appropriate and expected. The construct of gender role conflict, defined by O'Neil (1981b) as "a psychological state in which gender roles have negative consequences or impacts on the person or others" (p. 203) has both practical and theoretical implication for psychology.

As practitioners, we are concerned about the ultimate outcomes of this conflict which O'Neil (1981b) describes as "the restriction of the person's ability to actualize their potential or the restriction of someone else's potential" (p. 203). Garnets and Pleck (1979) define sex role strain (Note: the terms gender/sex role conflict/strain are used interchangeably in the literature and in this paper) as an "intra psychic process associated with poor psychological..."
adjustment, specifically, low self-esteem" (p. 278). They assert that role strain is produced when "traditional sex role norms set standards which for a variety of reasons, many individuals of both sexes do not conform to, and as a result many of these individuals may come to devalue themselves" (Garnets & Pleck, 1979, p. 274).

Much research has supported the notion that restrictive sex roles have negative impacts for women and men in society. The literature is replete with studies indicating that adherence to the traditional female sex role has negative impacts for women in the areas of mental health (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz & Vogel, 1970; Chesler, 1972; Kaplan, 1983) and in the development of psychological difficulties such as eating disorders (Garner, Garfinkel, Schwartz, & Thompson, 1980). Kaplan (1983) asserts that the female sex role stereotype creates a Catch-22 for women,

to be considered an unhealthy adult, women must act as women are supposed to act (conform too much to the female sex role stereotype); to be considered an unhealthy woman, women must act as men are supposed to act (not conform enough to the female sex role stereotype) (Kaplan, 1983, p. 788).

Schaevitz (1984) describes women's experience as the "Superwoman syndrome" whereby women, trying to live up to sex role expectations (past and present) experience a tremendous role overload. This overload may lead to stress
and low self-esteem (Sanford & Donovan, 1984).

The exploration of gender role conflict in men has been spurred by men's feminist analyses of the negative impacts of the traditional male sex role. O'Neil (1981b) posits that men's socialization process engenders six patterns of gender role conflict and strain including:

a) restrictive emotionality; b) socialized control, power and competition issues; c) homophobia; d) restrictive sexual and affectionate behavior; e) obsession with achievement and success; and f) health care problems (O'Neil, 1981b, p.203).

O'Neil (1981a) and Pleck (1981) assert that men experience tremendous pressures in their sex role socialization, especially for what not to be. Many theorists have described how this oppressive sex role socialization limits men's potential to be fully functioning and whole human beings (David & Brannon, 1976; Komarovsky, 1976, O'Neil, 1981a, 1981b; Skovolt, Schauble & Davis, 1980; Solomon & Levy, 1982).

Psychologists have an important role to play in helping individuals to negotiate roles and lifestyles that enable them to fully actualize their potentials without restricting those around them. This requires a better understanding of the relationships between sex-role identity, gender role strain and the mechanism whereby they affect self-esteem and psychological well-being. While there has been a great deal of theoretical formulations regarding these constructs,
there has been a paucity of empirical investigations aimed at elucidating these constructs and their interrelationships. The empirical research that has been done in this area has generated confusing results which have failed to clearly elucidate the interrelationships of these constructs.

The bulk of the theoretical and empirical literature relating sex-role identity with self-esteem and psychological well-being has followed one of three models. Whiteley (1983, 1984) describes these three models as the congruence, androgyny and masculinity models. The congruence model is based on the assumption that masculinity and femininity are opposite ends of a unipolar dimension. Psychological well-being is thus assumed to be fostered only when one's sex role orientation is congruent with one's gender. That is, men ought to be masculine and women ought to be feminine.

Bem (1974, 1979) challenged the notion of unipolarity of sex role orientation suggesting that masculinity and femininity are two separate nonmutually exclusive dimensions. This led to the development of the second model to account for the relationship between sex role orientation and self-esteem - androgyny. According to the androgyny model an individual's psychological well-being is maximized when one adopts an androgynous orientation, that is, one which incorporates high levels of both masculine and
feminine traits. The hypothesis that androgynous individuals have greater adaptivity due to their ability to respond more flexibility than sex-typed individuals has received substantial empirical support.

Several studies (Antill & Cunningham, 1979; Kelly & Worell, 1977; Locksley & Colten, 1979) have questioned the validity of the positive relationship between androgyny and mental health. These empirical findings suggested that the previously found relationship may be accounted for primarily with the masculinity component of androgyny. Thus, the traits of masculinity are positively associated with psychological well-being and self-esteem while the contribution of femininity is negligible (Antill & Cunningham, 1979; Kelly & Worell, 1977; Locksley & Colten, 1979). Thus, the masculinity model suggests that one's psychological well-being is influenced to the extent that one possesses masculine, instrumental traits, regardless of one's gender.

Pleck (1981) asserted that all three of the above models proposed to account for the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being are shaped by what he termed the "male sex role identity paradigm (MSRI)". He suggests that while the androgyny model offers improvements over the earlier congruence model, it nonetheless "continues to impose a sex role standard that women and men should attain" (Pleck, 1981, p. 92) and is
Thus incorporated under the MSRI paradigm. Feminist scholars (Eichler, 1980; Rebecca, Hefner & Oleshansky, 1976) have similarly critiqued the androgyny model. Eicher (1980) notes that while androgyny was an attempt to overcome the limitations of sex roles, it has paradoxically served to cement their existence. She further asserts that:

in order to overcome the sexual double standard, we need to show that sex is an irrelevant basis on which to make those distinctions which today are still being made between the sexes, and from there let each person develop as he or she wishes to, without worrying whether this falls on the so-called masculine or so-called feminine side of some fictitious continuum (Eicher, 1980, p.70).

Pleck (1975, 1981) proposes that researchers and theorists must make a paradigmatic shift, to account for the relationship between the constructs of sex role orientation and psychological well-being. The alternative paradigm, which he terms the Sex Role Strain Paradigm (SRS) shifts from viewing sex role orientation with a trait approach to analyzing sex roles in a developmental stage perspective.

Pleck (1975) suggests a three stage model of development. In the first phase of sex role development, a child possesses an amorphous and unorganized sex role self concept. In the second phase, the individual learns the "rules" of sex role differentiation and is intolerant of deviations from sex role norms in themselves and others. In the third and final stage, an individual transcends the sex role norms and boundaries and "develops psychological
androgyny in accordance with their inner needs and temperments" (Pleck, 1975, p.172).

Rebecca, Hefner and Oleshansky (1976) developed and elaborated this model concluding that in the third stage, which they term sex role transcendence, an individual's choice of behavioral and emotional expression is not determined by rigid adherence to "appropriate" sex-related characteristics. An individual has thus "transcended" stereotypes and "assigned gender is irrelevant for decision making" (Rebecca, Hefner & Oleshansky, 1976, p. 205). They further note that while growth from stage I (undifferentiated sex roles) to stage II (polarized sex roles) is socially sanctioned and supported, the shift from stage II to stage III is only given minimal if any support.

Garnets and Pleck (1979) developed a theory of sex role strain analysis which they proposed would explain the relationship that had been found between sex roles and psychological adjustment from a SRS developmental paradigm rather than the androgyny trait approach. Specifically, they suggest that the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological adjustment is mediated by two variables: discrepancy between real-self and same-sex ideal self and sex role salience. The first variable, discrepancy between real-self and same-sex ideal self is based on Rogers (1951) client centered psychotherapy research but refers, in this case, to the self-concept in terms of sex role norms.
That is, for example, if a woman's real self (as measured on a sex role inventory) is androgynous but she believes that women ought to be feminine (same-sex ideal is sex-typed) she would be deemed to have high discrepancy between real-self and same-sex ideal.

The second variable, sex role salience, represents an operationalization of Rebecca, et al. (1976) and Pleck (1975) concept of transcendence. Salience is defined as the intrapsychic characteristic on which Rebecca et al.'s (1976) sex role transcendent individuals differ from non-transcendent individuals. It refers to the extent to which individuals do or do not experience and organize personality characteristics as parts of larger constructs of masculinity and femininity which they psychologically orient themselves to (Garnets & Pleck, 1979, p. 277).

For example, the degree of salience would distinguish between a man who engages in athletics for the enjoyment of the activity vs a man who does so to experience himself as masculine.

Based on interactions of these two variables, Garnets and Pleck (1979) propose five different outcomes of sex role strain. Levels of discrepancy and salience interact to create differing levels of gender role strain which is hypothesized to be "associated with poor psychological adjustment, specifically, low self-esteem" (p. 278). Accordingly, one would predict greater levels of psychological adjustment for individuals with low gender
role strain and low sex role salience—sex role transcendent individuals.

The Garnets and Pleck (1979) sex role strain analysis thus represents a theoretical model which operationalizes the sex role strain paradigm. The model is heuristic in terms of conceptualizing the relationship between sex roles and psychological well-being as well as offering a model for practitioners to conceptualize gender role strain.

Previous attempts to operationalize and empirically test the hypotheses derived from the theory have met with mixed results. Garnets (1978) provided the first empirical test of the model. She developed three means of operationalizing the sex role salience construct and assessed the power of salience and discrepancy in predicting levels of psychological adjustment as the theory would prescribe.

Rather than supporting a model of sex role transcendence and the sex role strain paradigm, her results generally supported an androgyny model of mental health. That is, contrary to hypotheses, individual's sex role orientation (androgynous or sex typed) was more predictive of psychological well-being and self-esteem than were the constructs of salience and discrepancy.

Several methodological and statistical flaws may have contributed to the failure to support the hypotheses. Specifically, the data were analyzed using a series of one-
way ANOVAs. This necessitated dichotomizing (artificially designating values of high/low) many of the variables which are actually continuous. Cohen and Cohen (1983) note that when one reduces a graduated many valued scale to a two-point scale, one is willfully throwing away information. This has immediate negative consequences to the amount of variance such a crippled variable can account for and concommitantly to the power of the statistical test of its contribution (Cohen & Cohen, 1983, p. 309).

Therefore, the variables of salience and discrepancy may actually have been significantly mediating the relationship between sex role orientation and self-esteem, yet the analyses did not accurately reflect it.

Another problem with the Garnets study is that there was no direct assessment of the construct of gender role strain. Therefore, levels of gender role strain were inferred to be existing based on levels of discrepancy and salience and these variables' hypothesized relationship to psychological adjustment. When the data failed to support the model, it is not possible to ascertain whether this is due to 1) the interaction between discrepancy and salience not resulting in the hypothesized levels of gender role strain or 2) levels of gender role strain not being related as predicted to psychological adjustment.

O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David and Wrightsman (1986) have recently developed the Gender Role Conflict Scale which has been validated for use with college males. Using this
measure, college males were found to manifest different amounts and types of gender role conflict related to their sex role type as measured by the PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

This study will thus link the theoretical paradigm presented by Garnets and Pleck (1979) and the new instrumentation (O'Neil et al., 1986) to operationalize and empirically test the theoretical model of gender role strain, sex role transcendence and psychological adjustment.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to further elucidate the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being through a sex role strain analysis model (Garnets and Pleck, 1979). To place this study in context, it is important to review the literature which has examined the relationship between sex roles and psychological well-being from other models. Furthermore, as the sex role strain model is comprised of various component constructs, such as discrepancy between real self and ideal self, sex role salience and gender role conflict, the literature relevant to these constructs is also examined.

Relationship between psychological adjustment and sex role orientation

Sex or gender roles, defined as "behaviors, expectations and role sets defined by society as masculine or feminine which are embodied in the behavior of the individual man or woman and culturally regarded as appropriate to males and females" (O'Neil, 1981b, p. 203) have been important constructs in personality research for the past five decades. The models and theories used to account for the
relationship between sex role orientation (organization of masculine and feminine traits) and an individual's psychological well-being are often reflective of cultural beliefs and standards set for men and women at the time. Whitely (1983, 1984) in two meta-analyses of the literature on sex role orientation and self-esteem and psychological well-being, posits three models for conceptualizing this relationships. He terms the models as follows: 1) the congruence model, 2) the androgyny model and 3) the masculinity model. Each model has a set of assumptions and has received differential support theoretically and empirically in the literature.

This study concerns itself with a fourth model for conceptualizing the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being—the sex role strain analysis model (Garnets and Pleck, 1979). As the literature from the previous models has been reviewed extensively elsewhere (Garnets, 1978, Pleck, 1981, Cook, 1985) this review will focus on the more salient works within each model with an emphasis on the empirical support for each as well as the paradigmatic shifts that have generated the subsequent models.

**Congruence model**

The congruence model, also known as the sex role identity model (Pleck, 1981, Garnets 1978) is founded on the assumption that better psychological adjustment is achieved
when one's sex role orientation is congruent with one's gender (Mussen, 1961). Simply stated, men ought to be masculine and women ought to be feminine. Kaplan and Bean (1976) describe this as the linear model of sex differentiation because it is presumes that psychological differences between men and women are the linear and logical manifestations of biological (genetic and physiological) sex differences. The assumption is that the "sexes must be as dichotomous psychologically as they appear physically" (Cook, 1985, p.6).

Pleck (1981) reviewed the tremendous volume of sex role identity literature that had been generated since the 1930's. Ironically, it was this critique of what Pleck labeled the Male Sex Role Identity (MSRI) paradigm that explicitly articulated the implicit assumptions underlying this body of research. One product of Pleck's review was the following eleven founding assumptions of the MSRI paradigm, each of which represent a particular line of research on sex roles:

1. Sex role identity is operationally defined by measures of psychological sex typing, conceptualized in terms of psychological masculinity and/or femininity dimensions.
2. Sex role identity derives from identification-modeling and, to a lesser extent, reinforcement and cognitive learning of sex-typed traits, especially among males.
3. The development of appropriate sex role identity is a risky, failure-prone process, especially for males.
4. Homosexuality reflects a disturbance of sex role identity.
5. Appropriate sex role identity is necessary for good psychological adjustment because of an inner psychological need for it.
6. Hypermasculinity in males (exaggerated masculinity, often with negative social consequences) indicates insecurity in their sex role identities.
7. Problems of sex role identity account for men's negative attitudes and behaviors toward women.
8. Problems of sex role identity account for boys' difficulties in school performance and adjustment.
9. Black males are particularly vulnerable to sex role identity problems.
10. Male adolescent initiation rites are a response to problems of sex role identity.
11. Historical changes in the character of work and the organization of the family have made it more difficult for men to develop and maintain their sex role identities (Pleck, 1981, p. 4-5).

One of the major areas of research within this literature focused on the acquisition, formation and development of appropriate sex role identity. The assumption being that there existed a "direct link between childhood learning and development in sex-role behavior and adult personality disturbance" (Brown, 1957). Thus the goal of understanding the mechanism whereby sex role identity was appropriately formed was to elucidate the antecedents of healthy vs pathological adult psychological adjustment.

Constantinople (1979) reviewed the three major theoretical perspectives which are represented in the sex role identity acquisition literature: psychoanalytic, social learning and cognitive developmental. The psychoanalytic perspective (Mussen, 1961) relied heavily on the constructs
of identification. Mussen (1961), for example, hypothesized that:

adolescent boys who are strongly identified with the male sex role are more likely to be more stable emotionally and better adjusted socially than boys who are low in masculinity" (Mussen, 1961, p. 22).

The social learning perspective (Mischel, 1966) posited that the acquisition and performance of sex-typed behavior could be described by the same learning principles used to analyze and describe any other aspect of individual behavior. Research from the social learning perspective thus examined the impact of constructs such as modeling in the development of appropriate sex role identity formation. The cognitive-developmental perspective (Kohlberg, 1966) applied Piagetian notion of cognitive schemata and object consistence to elucidate the development of stable gender identity. Gender identity was thus viewed as a "basic cognitive organizer of sex-role attitudes" (Kohlberg, 1966).

While considerable debate existed among theorists as to the mechanism whereby sex role identity was acquired and developed, a generalization across the theories was the importance and centrality of developing a gender identity congruent with one's biological sex. A major vehicle for the elucidation of the constructs of masculinity and femininity in such research was sex-typing instruments or M-F scales (cited in Constantinople, 1973, e.g. Terman & Miles, 1936, MMPI M-F scale, Hathaway & McKinley, 1943).
M-F scales were all founded on the assumption that masculinity and femininity lie at opposite ends of a bipolar trait dimension. M-F scales thus posited a single bipolar continuum ranging from extreme femininity at one end to extreme masculinity at the other.

The basic strategy for constructing such instruments was the "known groups method". Accordingly, a large number of potential items were administered to groups already "known" to differ in the concept under scrutiny. The results were then analyzed to determine which items statistically discriminated between the responses of males and females. Items meeting a predetermined criterion were then included in the scale. Thus, for example, if significantly more women than men endorsed a liking of flower arranging then, answering yes to this item contributed to a femininity score and answering no contributed to a masculinity score. As M-F tests, in general, offered binary choice response options (yes/no, true/false), the notion of polarity was inherent in the instrument. That is, masculinity was negatively correlated with femininity. Once the scale was constructed, an individual's responses were compared to norms for their respective sex.

Pleck (1981) notes that while the scales are constructed based on sex differences, their application was generally targeted at understanding within sex variations.
Thus, these scales were used to investigate the "appropriateness" of one's gender identity by comparing one's traits and interests with those of one's sex. The assumption again being that "sex appropriate" (i.e. congruent) interests and traits were positively associated with psychological adjustment. Conversely, "deviations" from one's "sex appropriate" traits were viewed as indications of pathology.

Constantinople (1973) asserted that the M-F tests were based on three untested assumptions of M-F construct:

a) that it (M-F) is best defined in terms of sex differences in item responses; b) that it is a single bipolar dimension ranging from extreme masculinity at one end to extreme femininity at the other and c) that it is unidimensional in nature and can be adequately measured by a single score (Constantinople, 1973, p. 389).

In reviewing the construction and empirical findings of the major M-F tests (cited in Constantinople, 1973; Terman and Miles: Attitude-Interest Analysis Test, 1936; Strong M-F Scale of the Vocational Interest Blank, 1936; Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Hathaway & McKinley, 1943; The Femininity Scale, Gough, 1952; The Masculinity Scale, Guilford & Guilford, 1936) Constantinople concluded that these tests were essentially inadequate. The available data from factor analyses supported multidimensionality of the M-F construct as opposed to unidimensionality. The use of sex differences in responses as the sole criterion for an M-F indicator was also questioned.
In all probability, the length of the big toe would discriminate men and women, but does having a longer big toe than most women make a woman less "feminine", and can one have more confidence that she is less "feminine" because she scores deviantly on a number of items with similarly critical content? (Constantinople, 1973, p. 405).

In addition to the critique on the construction of the M-F instruments and the lack of evidence for the M-F construct itself, the empirical data was generally not supportive of the sex role identity paradigm. Research evidence challenged the assumption that sex-typed differences really do facilitate greater levels of psychological adjustment for males and females. (Garnets, 1978, Pleck, 1981). Contrary to theoretical assertions, high levels of femininity in females was generally found to be associated with high anxiety and low social acceptance, while high levels of masculinity in males was associated with poor adjustment for all phases of male development except adolescence (Garnets, 1978, Pleck, 1981, Whitley, 1983, 1984).

In summary, the congruence paradigm was psychology's first model for conceptualizing the relationship between sex role identity and psychological well-being. The model was heuristic in generating instrumentation and research for several decades and was generally reflective of the cultural standards for the behavior of men and women that existed during that era. However, with the advent of the Women's
Liberation Movement in the early 1970's, these beliefs were substantially challenged. The feminist emphasis on liberating individuals from gender based restrictions was inconsistent with the sex role identity model. This coupled with Constantinople's (1973) dismantling of the underlying assumptions on empirical grounds left an opening for a new view on the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being.

Androgyny

Bem (1974) first introduced and operationalized the model of androgyny for conceptualizing the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being. The foundation of the androgyny model grew from an alternative view of femininity and masculinity as representing complementary rather than antagonistic groups of psychological characteristics (Cook, 1985). Accordingly, individuals could theoretically be "both masculine and feminine, both instrumental and expressive, both agentic and communal, depending upon the situational appropriateness of these various modalities" (Bem, 1976, p. 48). Furthermore, Bem (1976) asserted that

for fully effective and healthy human functioning, masculinity and femininity must each be tempered by the other, and the two must be integrated into a more balanced, a more fully human, a truly androgynous personality (Bem, 1976, p. 48).
The androgyny model thus posited that androgynous individuals, individuals who combine high levels of both feminine and masculine characteristics would be better adjusted than their sex-typed counterparts (e.g. Bem, 1974; Berzins, Welling, & Wetter, 1978; Heilbrun, 1976; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975). Bem (1974) claims for the advantages of androgyny centered on the qualities of adaptability and flexibility. She wrote:

According to both Kagan (1964) and Kohlberg (1966), the highly sex-typed individual is motivated to keep his behavior consistent with an internalized sex-role standard, suppressing 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 (Bem, 1974, p. 155).

This superior adjustment would result from androgynous individuals' possession of a broader repertoire of behaviors from which to draw. They would thus be more resourceful and flexible in situation that call for cross-sexed behaviors.

Bem operationalized androgy theory with the development of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (1974) which was designed to assess "the extent to which the culture's definition of desirable female and male attributes are reflected in an individual's self-description" (p. 155). The instrument was developed by generating large numbers of
socially desirable adjectives which were then judged by undergraduate men and women to be significantly more desirable for men (masculinity scale) or for women (femininity scale).

The instrument is administered by having subjects rate how characteristic these adjectives are for themselves on a seven point scale (1 = never or almost never true to 7 = always or almost always true). Separate scores are thus generated for both the masculinity and femininity scales. When the BSRI was first designed, subjects were classified into sex-role groups using the t-ratio for the difference between the total points assigned to the femininity and masculinity scales. This technique was criticized because of its inability to distinguish between individuals who scored high on both femininity and masculinity and those who scored low on both. Spence, Helmreich & Stapp (1975) developed the median-split technique to correct this confusion. Accordingly, if an individual scores high (above the median) in masculinity and low in femininity, one is typed masculine. If an individual scores high in femininity and low in masculinity, one is typed feminine. If an individual scores low on both scales one is typed undifferentiated. If an individual is high on both scales, one is typed androgynous. Androgyny is thus defined operationalized as possessing high levels of both masculine and feminine traits. There are other methods of generating
a sex-role classification based on the interaction of masculinity and femininity scores. A review of the advantages and disadvantages of these various methods is provided in Bem (1981) and Cook (1985). Some researchers (Flaherty & Dusek, 1980; Kelly, Furman & Young, 1978) contend however that the very process of classifying subjects into categories is not warranted. They suggest that in the process of dichotomizing the masculinity and femininity scales, information is lost. They therefore recommended the use of multiple linear regression to analyze the information contained in the masculinity, femininity scales and their interaction.

The BSRI was employed in a series of validation studies (for review, Bem, 1976) to empirically test the hypotheses of androgyny theory as stated above. Bem and Lenney (1976) for example, examined whether sex-typed individuals were actually restricted in the performance of stereotypically cross-sex behaviors. That is, did masculine males avoid and/or experience discomfort in the performance of stereotypically feminine behaviors such as ironing. The results indicated that sex-typed subjects felt significantly worse than androgynous or sex-reversed subjects, who did not differ significantly from one another. Consistent with the hypotheses, they concluded that traditional sex roles did produce an "unnecessary and perhaps even dysfunctional pattern of avoidance for many people" (Bem, 1976, p.54).
Other studies found androgynous individuals to possess social poise (Berzins, Welling & Wetter, 1976), be characterized as outgoing, social, high in leadership, responsible, mature, socialized, high achieving, concerned about others (Baucom, 1980), attribute generally positive characteristics to themselves (Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1978), be highest on self-esteem (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975, O'Connor, Mann & Bardwick, 1978), be rated by others as most likeable and well-adjusted (Major, Carnevale, & Deaux, 1981). Androgynous women were found to be highest on adjustment measure (Silvern & Ryan, 1979), be more likely to prefer nontraditional careers (Clarey & Sanford, 1982) report feeling the least pressure to conform to others' expectations (Kleinke & Hinrichs, 1983), have greater satisfaction with their bodies and greater sexual satisfaction (Kimlicka, Cross & Tarnai, 1983). Androgynous males were found to endorse fewest undesirable adjectives as self-descriptors (Kelly, Caudill, Hathorn, & O'Brien, 1977), score highest on a measure of social cognition (Heilbrun, 1981), be more responsive to a baby than masculine men (Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1975).

Androgyny was thus enthusiastically viewed as a model of mental health which was "free from culturally imposed definitions of masculinity and femininity" (Bem, 1976). Apart from empirical support, androgyny had a philosophical appeal to practitioners who proposed its value as a
therapeutic treatment goal (Kenworthy, 1979, Knefelkamp, Widick & Stoad, 1976).

Research and theory of androgyny has undergone considerable critique and revision since its inception. Spence and her colleagues (Spence, 1983, Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975, Spence & Helmreich, 1980) disagree with Bem's assertion that the BSRI is a measurement of masculinity and femininity. They contend that the constructs measured by the BSRI as well as the PAQ (Spence, et. al.'s sex-role instrument) are better conceptualized as "instrumentality/agentic" (masculinity) while femininity was conceptualized as "expressive/communal". Spence & Helmreich (1980) examined the rationale and psychometric properties of the PAQ and the BSRI and suggested that the relationship between traits and attitudes measured on sex role inventories such as the BSRI and PAQ do NOT imply strong relationship between other sex role phenomena. They contend:

It is more appropriate to regard the PAQ, and to a large extent the BSRI, more narrowly as trait measures of socially desirable instrumental and expressive characteristics. In accounting for sex-role behaviors, many other variables, such as abilities, interest, attitudes, values, and external pressures must be taken into account. This complex network of variables, determines the individual's sex-role preferences and behaviors. (Spence & Helmreich, 1980, p. 157).

They thus object with Bem's hypothesis that behavioral flexibility is a necessary outcome of psychological
androgyny:

Once 'masculine' and 'feminine' personality characteristics have been equated with 'masculine' and 'feminine' roles, it is a small step to assume that, since all masculine and feminine phenomena (purportedly) covary, men and women who are androgynous in their instrumental and expressive traits (and thus 'flexible' in their capacities to meet situational demands for these dispositional capacities) are androgynous (and thus flexible) in all other domains. Similarly, those who are sex-typed in the total class of behaviors and attributes defining masculinity and femininity and thus behaviorally inflexible (Spence & Helmreich, 1980, p. 161).

Such criticism led researchers to look for situational moderating variables which might enhance the predictive power of androgyny. Rotheram & Weiner (1983) examined the relationship between androgyny and stress and satisfaction with work, home and personal life. The results indicated that being androgynous was associated with increased work stress, but simultaneously increased personal satisfaction. A significant interaction between androgyny and relationship status demonstrated that androgynous dual-career persons reported highest personal satisfaction; androgynous nondual-career persons reported highest work satisfaction. The authors noted the importance of considering each person's specific life situation when evaluating androgyny as a positive or negative attribute.

Another area of criticism was aimed at the item selection procedure used in the construction of the BSRI (Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979; Kelly, Caudill, Hathorn, &
O'Brien, 1977). Pedhazur & Tetenbaum (1979) were highly critical of the statistical methods employed in the construction of the instrument which involved Bem's use of 400 nonindependent t-tests. They also argued that a strictly empirical, atheoretical approach to scale development was inappropriate. Bem (1979) replied that the scale development procedures were in fact quite consistent with her theory and contended that the item selection procedure did not capitalize on chance. However, as a result of the criticism that the masculinity and femininity scale differed in social desirability (Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979, Kelly, Caudill, Hathorn, & O'Brien, 1977) Bem revised the original form of the BSRI and created a shortened version (Bem, 1979) which corrected many of these flaws.

In spite of such revisions, criticism of the BSRI items (Heerboth & Ramanaiah, 1985) and debate as to what exactly is being tapped by the instrument (Uleman & Weston, 1986) has persisted. Lubinski, Tellegen and Butcher (1981) suggested that:

...androgyny be viewed as only one example of a broader class of 'fulfillment' or 'self-actualization' concepts. All such concepts appear to imply the idea that a 'fully functioning' person integrates various and contrasting attributes in a synergistic manner, such that the whole is more than the sum of the parts (Lubinski, Tellegen and Butcher, 1981, p. 729).

The most difficult criticism that androgyny theory received however came from the repeated failures of the data
to support the theory that a blend of masculinity and femininity that actually leads to psychological well-being as opposed to just high levels of masculinity. These repeated failures led to the development of the third model for conceptualizing the relationship between sex-role orientation and psychological well-being: The masculinity model.

Masculinity model

From the earliest validation studies on androgyny theory, researchers (Bem, 1974, 1975, 1976; Bem & Lenney, 1976; Bem, Martyna & Watson, 1976) encountered difficulty empirically demonstrating the value of femininity. That is, while higher levels of masculinity, in both males and females, had positive correlations with measures of psychological well-being (Baucom, 1980; Erdwins, Small & Gross, 1980, Jones, Chernovetz & Hansson, 1978), high levels of femininity in both males and females did not correlate with measures of psychological well-being (Berzins, Welling, & Wetter, 1978; Jones, Chernovetz & Hansson, 1978). In reviewing the relationship between personality correlates such as self-esteem and sex role orientation, Kelly and Worell (1977) state:

It may be that masculine characteristics or items have higher social value for an individual and therefore lead to higher self-evaluation when present than do the same number of feminine items. It would also appear likely that the same behavior might lead to different social consequences.
depending on whether it was exhibited by a male or a female (Kelly & Worell, 1977, p.1108-1109).

Later reviews of androgyny research came to similar conclusions (Locksley & Colten, 1979; Taylor & Hall, 1982). Locksley and Colten (1979) found no proof that masculine and feminine sextyped persons were similarly disadvantaged. They asserted that masculinity allowed agency, effectiveness and elicited positive reaction from others, while benefits of femininity (if any) were more subtle and less socially valued. Taylor and Hall (1982) reviewed the theories, methods and conclusions within the psychological androgyny literature and concluded that:

the consistency and strength of the masculinity effects relative to the femininity effects suggest that masculinity rather than 'main effects' androgyny predicts psychological well-being (Taylor & Hall, 1982, p. 364).

The results of empirical studies linking sex role orientation to measures of psychological well-being indicated that either 1) masculine typed individuals were actually superior or not different from androgynous individuals (Long, 1986; Sethi & Bala, 1983; Baucom, 1983) or 2) when androgynous individuals did appear superior to sex-typed, the masculinity component of androgyny had much higher predictive power than did the femininity. That is the "goodness" of androgyny was actually accounted for by the masculinity component.
The methodology typically employed in such studies was to analyze masculinity and femininity scores separately with dependent variable scores representing a variety of characteristics (Cook, 1985). Masculinity was found to have greater predictive power in a number of areas: adjustment (Adams & Sherer, 1982; Jones, Chernovetz & Hansson, 1978; Sinnott, 1980; Turner & Sorell, 1986), identity development (Prager, 1983) and most notably self-esteem (Antill & Cunningham, 1979; Kimlicka et al., 1983; Prager, 1983; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975, Long, 1986), even in cross-cultural samples (Sethi & Bala, 1983).

Adams and Sherer (1985) examined the relationship between sex role orientation (as measured by the BSRI) and psychological adjustment (as measured by the MMPI, self-efficacy and assertiveness measures). Strong support was obtained for superior adjustment of masculine males and females. A factor analysis revealed that masculinity is related to assertiveness and self-efficacy rather than to the absence of maladjustment. Baucom (1983) examined the relationship between sex role orientation, self-esteem and depression through a learned helplessness manipulated experiment. Baucom (1983) found that women with high masculinity scores more often chose to "regain control" regardless of the helplessness manipulation. Feather (1985) similarly found a negative relationship between masculinity, self-esteem and depressive symptomatology.
In a more complex view of this same issue, Stoppard & Paisley (1987) examined the role of masculinity, femininity and life stress in the prediction of depressive symptomatology. While all three variables were found to be significant predictors of depression, life stress accounted for substantially greater proportion of the variance. The researchers note that

...exclusive focus on masculinity and femininity to the neglect of environmental influences in the investigation of gender-related factors in depression may lead to a tendency to overemphasize the importance of individual differences in sex role orientation (Stoppard & Paisley, 1987, p. 495).

The methodology of meta-analysis has been applied to the literature which examined the relationship between sex role orientation and self-esteem (Whitley, 1983) and psychological well-being (Bassoff & Glass, 1982; Whitley, 1984). Whitley (1983) found that while the strength of the observed relationship between sex role orientation and self-esteem varied as a function of both the sex role measure and the type of self-esteem instrument used. The results of the meta-analysis of 35 studies provided best support for the masculinity model.

Bassoff and Glass (1982) meta-analysis revealed that for both males and females, differences between high and low femininity are meager, but this was not true for differences between high and low masculinity (Bassoff & Glass, 1982, p. 109).
They suggested that femininity appeared to be a largely irrelevant component of androgyny, at least on measures of mental health. Whitley (1984) similarly found masculinity to have a moderately strong relationship to both high adjustment and lack of depression and femininity to have only a small relationship to adjustment and no relationship to depression. Whitley again concluded that the results of this meta-analysis of 32 studies which examined the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being (depression and general adjustment) provided the best support for the masculinity model.

Cook (1985) reviewed possible explanations of masculinity's more powerful impact in accounting for the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being. One area could be broadly termed as instrumentation effects. Specifically, the content of androgyny measures and self-esteem inventories, may make the positive relationship an artifact of measurement. Some contend that the construction of the BSRI and other sex role inventories (Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979) which have subjects indicate their degree of agreement with positively valued items is in essence quite similar to measures of self-esteem. Accordingly, it is not surprising to find that an individual who endorses items in a more positive direction on a self-esteem inventory, would be more likely to positively endorse socially-valued items on a sex-role
measure. Furthermore, the construct of masculinity is more socially-valued in our culture than is femininity. Cook (1985) termed this view the "masculine supremacy effect" (p. 94).

According to this view, the instrumentation itself is reflective of a masculine based notion of mental health and psychological well-being. Sampson (1977) noted that the "American ideal" of self-contained individualism makes masculine ways of behaving more highly valued. One would thus expect a person's general level of self-esteem to be related to the opportunity to perform these behaviors successfully. Kaplan (1983) furthered the argument that the construction of mental health is based on a more masculine model of psychological well-being. Bassoff and Glass (1982) offered the following thought with respect to the measurement of the construct of psychological well-being:

Consider the possibility that measures of mental health emphasize affective, anxiety and somatoform disorders, which may possibly be associated with femininity, rather than disorders of impulse control, which may be associated with masculinity (Bassoff & Glass, 1982, p. 110).

Not only was masculinity viewed as more highly valued in instrumentation but some felt that this was merely reflective of a male biased scientific methodology.

The scientific method itself assumes that instrumentality is the central process and primary goal of inquiry (e.g., prediction, control, manipulation). Expressivity, and its focus on interrelations among phenomena, has been seen as a
"soft" approach to "hard" topics. Usually, such an approach has been labeled as merely unscientific—not science at all. Thus it is not surprising to find that correlates of femininity and even femininity itself, have been excluded from theory and research concerning personality. (Turner & Sorell, 1986, p. 15-16).

In summary, it is not possible to determine conclusively at the present time whether the findings of masculinity’s superior predictive power is related to instrumentation effects, the nature of femininity or the "masculine supremacy effect". A recent shift in the research in this area which has included environmental variables into the equation (Stoppard & Paisley, 1987) may serve to further elucidate this issue in the future. In any case, the general conclusions from existing data currently lend overwhelming support to the masculinity model.

It is important to note, however, that the masculinity model is based upon data which is embedded in the androgyny paradigm. That is, while the data is in opposition to androgyny theory, the masculinity model is essentially a revision of androgyny theory rather than a theoretical paradigm in its own right. Harrison (1978) conceptualized the literature using Kuhn's (1962) conceptual scheme for scientific progression of traditional, transitional and transformation. The sex role identity model and all of the literature based upon it was thus viewed as the traditional paradigm. Androgyny theory was seen as a transitional
paradigm as it attempted to affirm the psychological and social equality of men and women but perpetuates the association of personality characteristics with sex linked differences between men and women (Harrison, 1978, p. 328).

The new paradigm, the sex role strain model, upon which this study is based is viewed as a transformation paradigm.

The remainder of this literature review addresses the theory and research relevant to the sex role strain analysis model (Garnets & Pleck, 1979). First, the sex role strain model as proposed by Garnets and Pleck (1979) and the theoretical underpinnings are presented. Then the research pertaining to the component constructs within the sex role strain model, gender role conflict, discrepancy and sex role salience, is reviewed. Finally, as this study is an empirical test of this model, previous attempts to operationalize the model are reviewed and critiqued.

Sex role transcendence and Sex role strain analysis

While androgyny was certainly viewed as an improvement over the previous model of sex role identity, some theorists contended that androgyny did not go far enough in separating masculinity and femininity from models of psychological well-being. Eichler (1980) believed that paradoxically, androgyny theory actually served to further cement their relationship. Pleck (1975) noted that the shift of models from sex role identity to androgyny, while positive, was
still embedded in a trait model. That is, a specified pattern of masculine and feminine traits were still being prescribed as ideals. Thus, although the prescription had indeed changed, a prescription still existed which he construed as potentially restrictive to individual's development. Pleck (1975) thus proposed that the field must make a paradigmatic shift, which Hefner, Rebecca and Oleshansky defined as:

reorganization of the same information into a different picture that asks different questions, interprets old results in new ways and suggest quite different directions for the next steps in the puzzle-solving process (Hefner, Rebecca, & Oleshansky, 1975, p. 150).

Drawing from the cognitive developmental literature (Kohlberg, 1966), as well as the language acquisition literature, Pleck (1975) suggested that the field shift from a trait perspective to a more developmental perspective. Accordingly, he proposed a three stage model of sex role development. Pleck outlined the stages as follows:

In the first phase of sex role development, the child has amorphous and unorganized sex role concepts, including confusion over the child's own gender. In the second phase, children learn the 'rules' of sex role differentiation and are motivated to make others and themselves conform to them. Such learning represents a great cognitive advance beyond the earlier stage, but in this intermediate stage persons are most rigid and intolerant of deviations from sex role norms in themselves and others. In the third and final stage of sex role development, individuals transcend these sex role norms and boundaries, and develop psychological androgyny in accordance with their inner needs and temperaments (Pleck, 1975, p. 173).
Others (Hefner, Rebecca, & Oleshansky, 1975; Rebecca, Hefner, & Oleshansky, 1976) furthered Pleck's (1975) model and labeled the three stages as 1) undifferentiated, 2) polarized and 3) transcendence. Transcendence was described as a stage where "choice of behavioral and emotional expression is not determined by rigid adherence to 'appropriate' sex-related characteristics" (Rebecca, Hefner, & Oleshansky, 1976, p. 204). Sex role transcendence or Stage III, was characterized as a dialectical orientation to life which was more dynamic than static. While conflicts as to how to behave arise in stage III, "assigned gender is irrelevant for decision-making for a transcendent person" (Rebecca, Hefner, & Oleshansky, 1975, p. 205). As opposed to previous trait models or even other stage models, the emphasis in such a dialectical model was on change.

Hefner, et al. (1975) differentiated the concept of sex role transcendence from the concept of androgyny in noting "Bem (1974) does stress situational flexibility; but, by defining androgyny as a psychological trait, she de-emphasizes intraindividual changes" (Hefner, et al., 1975, p. 153). The following example was provided to further elucidate this difference:

...a woman who is genuinely nurturant and expressive in her orientation (that is, not merely feminine because of her assigned gender, but in terms of her own internal desires and needs) moves into a situation that requires leadership and assertiveness. According to Bem, she is classified as androgynous if she situationally
adjusts, and shows 'masculine' traits in that setting (Bem, 1975). We would also regard such a person as being at stage III. However, we would additionally classify as transcendent an action on her part to change her supervisory relationship in terms of her internal needs (hopefully, also congruent with the needs of her supervisees) so that expressive, cooperative forms of interaction are functional in that setting. This flexible adaptation would be classified as 'inappropriately feminine', and not as androgynous by Bem. In this sense, then, sex-role transcendence encompasses all that is covered by androgyny, but includes other forms of flexibility as well (Hefner, et al., 1975, p. 154).

Although not often noted, Bem (1976) recognized this criticism of androgyny and endorsed the sex role transcendental perspective:

For if there is a moral to the concept of psychological androgyny, it is that behavior should have no gender. But there is an irony here, for the concept of androgyny contains an inner contradiction and hence the seeds of its own destruction. Thus, as the etymology of the word implies, the concept of androgyny necessarily presupposes that the concepts of masculinity and femininity themselves have distinct and substantive content. But to the extent that the androgynous message is absorbed by the culture, the concepts of masculinity and femininity will cease to have such content, and the distinctions to which they refer will blur into invisibility. Thus, when androgyny becomes a reality, the concept of androgyny will have been transcended (Bem, 1976, p. 59-60).

Proponents of sex role transcendence (Pleck, 1975; Rebecca, et al., 1976, Harrison, 1978) suggested that this stage allowed for greater flexibility and would thus be associated with greater psychological well-being. They (Rebecca, et al., 1976) noted however, that while the shift
from Stage I (undifferentiated) to Stage II (polarized) was socially sanctioned and supported, the shift from Stage II to Stage III (transcendant) was clearly not. Femininist theorists have noted that the prevalent sexism in our society is reflective of a cultural stage II development. It may thus be more difficult for individuals to transcend these cultural expectations.

Garnets and Pleck (1979) incorporated the concept of sex role transcendence in their development of the sex role strain analysis model. This new developmental paradigm was viewed as a means of conceptualizing the relationship between sex roles and psychological well-being. They asserted that a great deal of research had led to the conclusion that "traditional sex role norms set standards which, for a variety of reasons, many individuals of both sexes do not conform to, and as a result many of these individuals come to devalue themselves" (Garnets & Pleck, 1979, p. 274). The model attempted to better explain the discrepant findings from previous models (sex role identity and the androgyny) by introducing the developmental paradigm and the concept of sex role transcendence.

Sex role strain analysis proposed that the relationship between sex-typing and adjustment was moderated by two variables: discrepancy between an individual's real self concept and the individual's same sex ideal, and the degree of the individual's sex role salience. This first variable,
compared the qualities and characteristics which individuals thought members of their sex ought to possess with those characteristics which they believed they did possess. Garnets and Pleck (1979) noted that while the self-concept was composed of both sex role related and non-sex role related aspects, this analysis was only concerned with the former. In terms of their analysis, real self and same-sex ideal were categorized as either sex-typed or androgynous. The concept of discrepancy between real and ideal self was based upon Rogers' (1951) client-centered concept of congruence. Accordingly, Rogers (1951) suggested that lack of congruence (or high discrepancy) between an individual's real self and their ideal self created psychological conflicts. Garnets and Pleck (1979) extended this notion to the area of sex roles and proposed that if an man's real self (as measured by a sex role inventory) was androgynous but he believed that men should be masculine (sex-typed same-sex ideal), then he would have high discrepancy between real and ideal self, and would potentially manifest have greater conflicts.

The second variable, sex role salience, was viewed as...

...the intrapsychic characteristic on which Rebecca et al.'s (1976) sex role 'transcendent' individuals differ from non-transcendent individuals. It refers to the extent to which individuals do or do not experience and organize personality characteristics as parts of larger constructs of masculinity and femininity which they psychologically orient themselves to (Garnets & Pleck, 1979, p.277).
Based upon the interactions of discrepancy and sex role salience, Garnets and Pleck (1979) predicted five different outcomes of sex role strain as presented in Table 2.1. The basic relationship between the variables was that discrepancy between the real self and the same sex ideal led to high sex role strain, except when sex role salience was low. Sex role strain was further hypothesized to be associated with poor psychological adjustment, especially low self-esteem. Sex role strain was thus defined as "resulting from real-ideal discrepancies in sex role related characteristics with high salience" (Garnets & Pleck, 1979, p. 278).

Garnets and Pleck (1979) employed sex role strain analysis to provide alternative interpretations of previous findings regarding the relationship between sex-typing and psychological adjustment.

The relationship between having only sex-appropriate traits and good adjustment, predicted by sex role identity theorists, can be understood as holding true when the individuals' same sex ideals are sex-typed and sex role salience is high. Under these circumstances, having a sex-typed real self leads to low discrepancy and low strain, and therefore high self-esteem (outcome 1); while having an androgynous real self (i.e. including cross-sex characteristics) produces high discrepancy and high strain, and therefore low self-esteem (outcome 2). Conversely, androgyny theorists' prediction that androgyny is associated with good adjustment, while having only sex-typed traits leads to poor adjustment can be understood as holding true when the same-sex ideal is androgynous. That is, in this case, having an androgynous real self leads to low discrepancy and low strain, and therefore high self-esteem.
### Table 2.1

**Sex Role Strain Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex role strain (SRS) outcomes</th>
<th>Same-sex ideal- SSI (ST/ANDRO)</th>
<th>Real self-concept- RS (ST/ANDRO)</th>
<th>Discrepancy between SSI and RS</th>
<th>Sex-role Salience</th>
<th>Corresponding constructs in previous analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Low SRS w/ST ideal self</td>
<td>Sex-typed</td>
<td>Sex-typed</td>
<td>Low Discrepancy</td>
<td>High Salience</td>
<td>&quot;Adequate&quot; sex role identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High SRS w/ST ideal self</td>
<td>Sex-typed</td>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>High Discrepancy</td>
<td>High Salience</td>
<td>&quot;Inadequate&quot; sex role identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low SRS w/ANDRO ideal self</td>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>Low Discrepancy</td>
<td>High Salience</td>
<td>Androgynous personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High SRS w/ANDRO ideal self</td>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>Sex-typed</td>
<td>High Discrepancy</td>
<td>High Salience</td>
<td>Sex-typed personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Low SRS w/low sex role salience</td>
<td>Sex-typed or Androgynous</td>
<td>Sex-typed or Androgynous</td>
<td>Low or High Discrepancy</td>
<td>Low Salience</td>
<td>Sex role transcendence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(outcome 3), having a sex-typed real self-concept is associated with high discrepancy, high strain, and therefore low self-esteem (outcome 4) (Garnets & Pleck, 1979, p. 280).

In summary, the sex role strain analysis model (Garnets & Pleck, 1979) represented a paradigmatic shift in the conceptualization of the relationship between sex-type and psychological well-being. Rather than a prescribed trait or combination of traits being viewed as optimal, the sex role strain model emphasized examining the discrepancy between an individual's real and ideal self and the individual's degree of sex role salience which were hypothesized to generate sex role strain. Low levels of sex role strain were viewed as being associated with better psychological adjustment, while higher levels were hypothesized to create conflicts, poor psychological adjustment, specifically lower self-esteem.

Garnets (1978) attempted to operationalize and empirically test the sex role strain analysis model. The unrevised form of the BSRI was used to assess real self and same sex ideal. Subjects were placed in sex role categories using the median split procedure. Discrepancy was then operationally defined as having a different category placement for real self and same sex ideal. Garnets (1978) chose to only analyze subjects who were either sex-typed or androgynous. She additionally developed three methods of assessing sex role salience: a direct measure, a consistency measure, and an absolute difference measure, all of which
demonstrated reasonable reliability.

The results indicated that contrary to predictions of sex role strain analysis, discrepancy and salience did not moderate the relationship between sex-typing and adjustment. The data tended to support the masculinity model of androgyny theory, in that, the masculinity aspect of the real self-concept showed a stronger relationship to adjustment than did femininity. Low sex role salient individuals did not show better adjustment or higher self-esteem than individuals in the high salience groups.

Several methodological and statistical decisions may have contributed to the failure to support the hypotheses. Specifically, Garnets (1978) employed a series of one-way ANOVA's in the data analysis which forced many of the continuous variables to be artificially dichotomized. Cohen and Cohen (1983) suggested that such dichotomization decreases the amount of variance that variables can account for. Another limitation of Garnets (1978) was the inability to directly assess the construct of gender role conflict. It was therefore not possible to ascertain from the failure to support the hypotheses whether discrepancy and salience do not create gender role conflict or whether gender role conflict was not actually related to self-esteem.

While no other study has attempted to test the entire model of sex role strain analysis, each of the component constructs: discrepancy, salience, and gender role conflict have received attention empirically and theoretically.
Discrepancy

The Garnets and Pleck (1979) sex role strain analysis proposed that the discrepancy between an individual's real self and an individual's same sex ideal was negatively related to an individual's psychological adjustment. That is, higher levels of discrepancy led to poorer adjustment. Literature that is pertinent to this issue came from two sources. First, there are several studies which examined cultural sex role stereotypes (i.e. what was typical, desirable, ideal for men or women in our culture). Some of these studies also examined how differences in sex types were related to perceptions of ideals for males and females. Such cultural assessments can provide information about societal presses for gender related behavior.

Early research in the area of sex role stereotypes (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman & Broverman, 1968; Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972) found that more stereotypically masculine traits were rated as socially desirable by college students and mental health professionals. Using the same 21 item bipolar sex role questionnaire used by Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman & Broverman, (1968), O'Leary & Depner (1975) had male and female college students rate themselves and their opposite sex ideal. The results indicated that males rated themselves as more aggressive, independent, dominant,
stronger and tougher than females rated themselves. No significant differences were found between male and female self ratings of competence, competitiveness, successfulness and rationality. They characterized male's ideal female as "wonder woman". She was rated as more competent, independent and adventuresome than females self-ratings, males self-ratings or females rating of the ideal male.

Freeman (1975) had college men and women rank the 15 needs of the Edwards Personal Preference Survey for either 1) the average female, 2) the average male, 3) the ideal female, 4) the ideal male and 5) for themselves. Numerous differences were found between ratings for average female and male but very few were found between ideal female and male. Freeman further noted that the self-concepts of the male and female subjects were highly similar.

Gilbert, Deutsch and Strahan (1978) used the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) to assess males' and females' typical, desirable and ideal woman and man. They found that traditional views of men and women were "alive and well" (p. 767). Specifically, they found that female subjects described an androgynous ideal for a woman, but a sex-typed one for a man. Male subjects described sex typed ideals for both sexes. It was thus still typical and desirable for a man to be more masculine than a woman and for a woman to be more feminine than a man.
Kimlicka, Wakefield and Goad (1982) also assessed college males' and females' perception of the opposite sex ideal using the BSRI. They noted significant differences depending on the sex type of the rater. Specifically, androgynous, feminine and masculine males described a feminine typed ideal for women. Undifferentiated males described an undifferentiated ideal female. Androgynous and feminine women described androgynous or masculine ideal for males, while feminine women described a more masculine ideal. Masculine women overwhelmingly preferred masculine males, while undifferentiated women's ideals were masculine or undifferentiated. The researchers noted:

...females allow for more variation in the ideal sex-role behaviors of males than males allow in the ideal sex roles of females. Some women prefer A, M, and U men, while men choose only F or U women for their ideals. The effect of women's approval of androgynous behavior for men is to increase the range of ideal sex-role behavior for men. On the other hand, the males' lack of approval of androgynous behavior for women gives the females a smaller range of ideal sex-role behavior. In fact, androgyny is ideal for males only (Kimlicka, Wakefield & Goad, 1982, p. 521).

Silvern and Ryan (1983) again used the BSRI to reexamine Broverman, et. al's (1972) findings. Male and female subjects rated the ideal male, ideal female, ideal person and themselves using the BSRI. The design of this study permitted exploration of whether sex type of the rater affected perception of what is ideal. Silvern and Ryan's (1983) results diverged from the earlier study's findings in
that, "both men and women characterized the ideal person as significantly more feminine than masculine" (p. 1241).

Regarding differences between males and females of different sex role categories they found:

Androgynous women were found to value masculinity, regardless of the target, as much as highly masculine men; and androgynous women expressed no conflict between masculine ideals for their own gender and for the person. In contrast, for men, androgyny means incorporating into the self-concept traits about which they manifest such a conflict (Silvern & Ryan, 1983, p. 1244).

Moore and Nuttall (1981) focused on males' and females' perception of what was typical and ideal for males. Male and female subjects rated the BSRI for either typical or ideal male. Male subjects rated their real self, ideal self or perceptions of women's ideal man. The study was limited by the between subjects design and a relatively small N (only 15 subjects per group). In contrast to predictions, they found that men saw ideal males as more expressive than women saw ideal males. The researchers concluded:

...males are indeed confronted by contradictory demands and expectations, but not in the manner proposed by the role strain proponents. Rather than inexpressive, males already see themselves and their ideal selves as expressive, even more expressive than women's perceptions of the ideal man. Women's ideal man and men's ideal man are, however, more instrumental or traditional than men's self-perceptions. To be consistent with both their ideal and with women's ideal male, men must become more instrumental, not more expressive. The male dilemma may not come from the failure to be expressive, but from the failure to be instrumental, that is, traditional (Moore & Nuttall, 1981, p. 324).
Scher (1984) had subjects rate themselves, "their personal ideal woman", and "their personal ideal man" on the BSRI. In contrast with other studies, Scher employed a repeated measures within subjects design and staggered the administration of the instruments. The results indicated that females described an androgynous model for themselves and for their ideal. Males described an androgynous model for their self-portrayal, but sex-typed portrayals for their ideal male and ideal female. Scher suggested that the results indicated a conflict for males as they recognized traits such as loyalty and childhood in themselves, but did not view such traits as ideal. Thus, Scher (1984) concluded, "males may have a personal dilemma in which they recognize sex-typed traits in themselves which they do not highly value" (p. 655). The finding that female's ideal male was similar to the male's self-portrayal is similar to Kimlicka, Wakefield & Goad's (1982), view that female subjects have a personal model that is not in conflict with men's reality. Scher (1984) noted that this same congruence was not found for men's view of the ideal woman as females saw themselves as androgynous, while males endorsed a feminine typed ideal.

The female subjects, thus, have a personal model that is in conflict with the males' view of the ideal female. A dilemma is suggested in which males have neither self-acceptance nor a female model that is acceptable to women. It appears that currently males have more difficulty than females in adopting sex-role models that are both
consistent and personally acceptable (Scher, 1984, p. 655).

In summary, these studies have attempted, using various methods and instruments, to examine the men's and women's stereotypes regarding same and opposite sex ideals. A variety of contradictory and mixed conclusions were drawn from these studies. One difficulty in comparing the studies was the differences in methodology of the study (design and instrumentation), as often the same construct was operationalize quite differently. Another potential confounding variable in drawing conclusions from this research is that stereotypes and ideals may have changed during the fifteen year span over which the studies were conducted. While understanding the cultural climate within which individual's attitudes are shaped is important, the more important question for this study is the construct of intrapersonal discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal and its relation to psychological well-being. Two studies (Deutsch & Gilbert, 1976; Dorgan, Goebel, & House, 1983) addressed this issue more directly.

Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) asked college women and men to complete the BSRI to describe their concepts of real self, ideal self, ideal other sex, and belief about the other sex's ideal other. Personal adjustment was measured by the Revised Bell Adjustment Inventory. The results indicated that the relationship between discrepancy and
adjustment was different for males and females. Specifically, females' perceptions of the other sex's ideal were inaccurate and sex typing for females was associated with poor adjustment. Contrary to predictions, sex typing in males was associated with good adjustment. The results indicated that women's sex role concepts regarding their real self, their ideal self, and their belief of what the other sex desires were highly dissimilar, whereas those of men were found to be highly similar. The relationship between discrepancy and poor adjustment was described as follows:

These findings suggest sources of Rogerian conflict that exist for women but not for men. The average college undergraduate woman sees herself as slightly feminine, wants to be more androgynous, but believes she is more desirable to men if she is extremely feminine. She is pulled toward opposing goals, a situation ripe for conflict. College males, on the other hand, do not appear to have this conflict between their role perceptions (belief) and personal values (real self and ideal self). Further discrepancy among females was found in the disparity between what they believe men's ideal woman to be and the men's reported ideal woman. This is in contrast to the high congruence between male subjects' belief about women's ideal man and the women's actual reported ideal man (Deutsch & Gilbert, 1976, p. 377).

Extrapolation to the Garnets and Pleck (1979) notion of discrepancy was limited by the method in which discrepancy was assessed. Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) calculated the relationship between adjustment and sex typing in two ways: by calculating the correlations between adjustment scores
and BSRI real self absolute value t scores and by directly comparing adjustment scores for androgynous and sex-typed groups. Thus, their analysis still did not specifically test the predictive power of discrepancy in relation to adjustment.

Dorgan, Goebel and House (1983) also used the BSRI and had subjects respond according to their perceived selves (real self) and how they would ideally rate themselves. A discrepancy was then calculated for each subject corresponding to the difference between ideal and perceived self. While not identical, this came closer to the notion of discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal as proposed by Garnets and Pleck (1979). Dorgan, Goebel and House (1983) also had subjects respond to a measure of salience which was simply a question "How important is sex role to your self-esteem?" to which subject responded on a seven point scale. Measures of self-esteem were the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI) and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI). Stepwise multiple regression was used to analyze the predictive capacity of gender, discrepancy, salience and the interaction between salience and discrepancy in predicting each of the self-esteem measures. Results were found to differ depending on which inventory was used. Neither discrepancy, salience nor their interaction was significant in predicting self-esteem as measured by the SEI. However, perceived masculinity, the
interaction of feminine discrepancy and salience and gender were found to be significant in predicting self-esteem as measured on the TSBI. Thus, while Dorgan, Goebel and House (1983) were not attempting to operationalize the sex role strain analysis model, their results did offer some support for the model.

Neither Dorgan, Goebel and House (1983) nor Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) directly examined the relationship of discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal and psychological adjustment. In this entire body of literature on discrepancy, another important issue which has not been raised was the relative importance males and females may ascribe to conforming to the opposite sex ideal. That is, although it is not possible to conclusively answer "What do men and women want?", it is also not known what variability might exist in how interested men and women are in conforming to opposite sex ideals.

This factor may be more related to the previously described construct of sex role salience. Several theorists have expressed the need to examine the role of the individual's level of importance that is attached to gender identity within one's self concept (Sherif, 1982). Bem (1979) noted "...despite the universal recognition of the gender dichotomy,... there are wide individual differences in the functional importance attached to it" (p. 1051). The following section examines the literature on this construct.
Sex Role Salience/Gender Schematic Processing

As discussed previously, Garnets and Pleck (1979) viewed sex role salience as "...the extent to which individuals do or do not experience and organize personality characteristics as parts of larger constructs of masculinity and femininity..." (Garnets & Pleck, 1979, p. 277). They further speculated that sex role salience "can be assessed only indirectly, i.e., by observing phenomena interpreted as resulting from its presence" (Garnets & Pleck, 1979, p. 277). Although very little has been done to directly operationalize and test this construct as it relates to sex role strain analysis, an emerging area within the sex role literature, gender schematic processing (Bem, 1981), seems to be describing a very similar construct.

Extending constructs from cognitive processing research, Bem (1981) postulated the existence of gender schematic processing. Bem (1981) defined schema and schematic processing as follows:

A schema is a cognitive structure, a network of associations that organizes and guides an individual's perception. A schema functions as an anticipatory structure, a readiness to search for and to assimilate incoming information in schema relevant terms. Schematic processing is thus highly selective and enables the individual to impose structure and meaning onto the vast array of incoming stimuli. Schema theory-if it can be called a theory-construes perception as a
constructive process wherein what is perceived is a product of the interaction between the incoming information and the perceiver's pre-existing schema (Bem, 1981, p. 355).

Applying these concepts to the realm of sex roles, Bem (1981) hypothesized the existence of gender-based schematic processing which she asserted was "a generalized readiness to process information on the basis of the sex-linked associations that constitute the gender schema" (p. 354). The following hypotheses were thus derived:

...individuals who have a generalized readiness to process information in terms of a particular schema should be able to encode schema-consistent information quickly, they should organize information in schema-relevant categories; they should make highly differentiated judgements along schema-relevant dimension; and when given a choice, they would spontaneously choose to make discriminations along those same dimensions (Bem, 1981, p. 355).

Bem (1981) further suggested that sex-typing resulted from the fact that the "self-concept itself was assimilated to the gender schema" (p. 354). Bem (1981) presented two studies which supported the hypotheses stated above. She found, for example, that sex-typed individuals (masculine males and feminine females) were faster than non-sex typed individuals when they made schema-consistent judgments. That is, they more quickly responded to sex-congruent attributes being self-descriptive or that sex-incongruent attributes were not. She additionally found that sex-typed individuals showed a higher percentage of gender clustering
in free recall of items.

Markus, Crane, Bernstein, and Siladi (1982) also provided two studies which examined the "information processing consequences of self-schemas about gender" (p. 38). In contrast to Bem (1981) who grouped all sex-typed individuals as gender schematic, Markus et al. (1982) differentiated between masculine and feminine schematics. Markus et al. (1982) found that:

feminine schematics remembered more feminine than masculine attributes, endorsed more feminine qualities, required shorter processing times for 'me' judgments to these attributes than to other types of attributes, and were more confident of their judgements. These individuals were able to supply relatively more examples of past feminine behavior than masculine behavior. A parallel pattern of results was found for those individuals identified as masculine schematics. In contrast, those subjects identified as androgynous recalled as many masculine attributes as feminine attributes and did not differentiate between masculine and feminine attributes with respect to latency or confidence (Markus et al., p. 38).

While these findings were consistent with Bem's (1981), Markus et al. (1982) diverged with respect to androgynous subjects. Markus et al. (1982) differentiated between what they termed low and high androgynous (in Bem's terms, undifferentiated and androgynous). While Bem (1981) believed the androgynous subjects to be aschematic, Markus et al. (1982) found only the undifferentiated subjects to be aschematic. The high androgynous subjects, they suggested, had multiple gender self-schemas and were thus sensitive to
and importantly concerned with both masculine and feminine aspects of their self-concepts.

Bem (1982) and Crane and Markus (1982) disagreed as to the interpretation of these findings. Bem (1982) contended that the major differences in amount of schematic processing was between sex-typed and non sex-typed individuals. Thus, she stated:

...all gender schema theory claims is that androgynous and undifferentiated individuals may both describe themselves as, say dominant or nurturant without implicating the concepts of masculinity or femininity. When sex-typed individuals so describe themselves, however, it is precisely the gender connotations of the attributes or behaviors that are presumed to be salient for them (Bem, 1982, p. 1194).

Signorella (1984) connected the concepts of gender role schema and sex role salience and provided further evidence of cognitive processing differences between subjects for whom a gender identity was low or high as a self-concern ("less or more involved"). Heilbrun (1986) additionally examined this constructs with respect to androgynous attitudes and behaviors. Differences were found in effects of gender schema between males and females. No gender-schema effects of any kind were found for males. Feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated females were found to have higher gender-schema scores than their male counterparts.

In summary, although a relatively recent development, some support has been provided for the existence of gender
schema having cognitive processing consequences which differ for individuals of different sex type. Sex role strain analysis would assert that the existence of gender schema processing is indicative of high levels of sex role salience. Furthermore, although this has not been tested using the gender schema methodology, the sex role strain analysis model would assert that rather than being related to categories of sex role orientation, it is an independent variable which exerts its influence in mediating the relationship between sex typing and psychological well-being. One of the major impediments to testing this hypothesis has been the lack of reliable and valid instrumentation to assess the construct of sex role salience. While the gender schema literature has provided several different operationalizations of this construct, a great deal of debate and conflict exists as to what is actually being assessed (Spence & Helmreich, 1981, Bem 1981).

**Gender Role Conflict**

Garnets and Pleck's (1979) sex role strain analysis proposed that gender role conflict (what they called sex role strain) was caused by discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal and sex role salience. They further asserted that gender role conflict would be associated with poor adjustment, especially low self-esteem. Since their initial proposal, the construct has been further defined
(O'Neil, 1981, 1982) and operationalized (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986).

While Garnets and Pleck (1979) asserted that gender role conflict affected both men and women, the majority of work in this area has come from the reevaluation of the negative impacts of men's gender role socialization. O'Neil (1981) defined gender role conflict as "a psychological state in which gender roles have negative consequences or impact on the person or others" (p. 203). O'Neil (1982) reviewed over 100 articles and books from popular literature, as well as theoretical and empirical research which addressed the area of gender role conflict for men. He suggested that "unresolved gender role conflict can potentially inhibit human maturity, affect overall emotional and physical health, and reduce happiness in life" (O'Neil, 1982, p. 9).

O'Neil (1982) suggested that gender role conflict and strain has emerged for three reasons: 1) the assumption that biologic sex affects gender development in many more ways than has been scientifically documented, 2) rigid socialization processes that have inhibited individuals from developing both the masculine and feminine aspects of their personality, and 3) social, political and technological changes that have affected all realms of people's lives.

A review of the literature on men's sex role socialization, led O'Neil (1982) to posit the existence of
the "Masculine Mystique" (p. 16). The following fifteen assumptions summarized the major tenets of this conceptualization:

1. Men are biologically superior to women, and therefore men have greater human potential than women.
2. Masculinity, rather than femininity, is the superior, dominant, more valued form of gender identity.
3. Men's power, dominance, competition, and control are essential to proving one's masculinity.
4. Vulnerabilities, feelings, and emotions in men are signs of femininity (weakness) and to be avoided.
5. Masculine control of self, others, and environment are essential for men to feel safe, secure, and comfortable.
6. Men seeking help and support from others show signs of weakness, vulnerability, and potential incompetence.
7. Masculine thinking, including rational and logical thought, is always the superior form of intelligence to understand life.
8. Interpersonal communications that emphasize human emotions, feelings, intuitions, and physical contact are considered feminine and should be avoided.
9. Men's success in relationships with women is contingent on subordinating females by using power, dominance, and words to control interactions.
10. Sexuality is a primary means of proving one's masculinity. Sensuality and intimacy are considered feminine and should be avoided.
11. Vulnerability and intimacy with other men are to be avoided because (a) being vulnerable with another male competitor may cause him to take advantage; (b) being intimate with other men may imply homosexuality or effeminacy.
12. Men's work and career success are measures of their masculinity.
13. Self-definition, self-respect, and personal worth are primarily established through achievement, success, and competence on the job.
14. Male power, control, and competition are the primary means to becoming a success and ensuring personal respect, economic security, and
happiness.
15. Men are vastly different and superior to women in career abilities; therefore men's primary role is that of breadwinner or economic provider; women's primary role is that of caretaker of home, children, and men (O'Neil, 1982, p. 16).

Other researchers and theorists (David & Brannon, 1976; Goldberg, 1979; Komarovsky, 1976; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; O'Leary & Donoghue, 1978; Pleck, 1981) have supported the notion that boys are more intensely socialized to conform to a sex role standard than are girls and that men who fail to conform to the standards of the Masculine Mystique are subject to punishment by being labeled immature, unmasculine and effeminate. O'Neil (1981, 1982) posited that the product of this socialization was men's fear of femininity. Fear of femininity was hypothesized to cause six patterns of gender role conflict and strain including:

1) restrictive emotionality, 2) homophobia, 3) socialized control, power, and competition issues, 4) restricted sexual and affectionate behaviors, 5) obsession with achievement and success, 6) health care problems (O'Neil, 1982, p.23).

O'Neil (1981, 1982) defined and discussed these areas as well as their implications for counseling and psychotherapy with men.

While instruments existed to measure men's attitude toward masculinity (Moreland & VanTuinen, 1978), instrumentation aimed at operationalizing the construct of gender role conflict has recently been developed. O'Neil, et al. (1986) published the Gender Role Conflict Scales I &
II (GRCS). GRCS-I was designed to assess men's gender-role attitudes, behaviors, and conflicts, while GRCS-II was designed to assess men's gender-role conflicts in specific situations. Preliminary validation data indicated that the significant gender-role conflict differences existed across four PAQ categories.

Snell (1986) recently published the Masculine Role Inventory (MRI) which while not specifically tied to O'Neil's theory, also seems to assess the construct of gender-role conflict. Snell (1986) reported data on the MRI which indicated that women scored significantly lower than men on scales of restrictive emotionality and inhibited affection. No sex differences were found on the success preoccupation subscale.

Summary

The literature analyzing the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being has led to mixed and confusing results. The current androgyny paradigm has not been empirically supported as the masculinity component accounts for the majority of variance in psychological well-being while the contribution from femininity is negligible (Whitley, 1983, 1984). The sex role strain analysis model has been proposed (Garnets & Pleck, 1979) as a paradigmatic shift in conceptualizing the relationship between sex role orientation and psychological well-being. Only one study has explicitly attempted to
operationalize and empirically test the sex role strain analysis theory. This previous attempt (Garnets, 1978) was limited both by methodological flaws as well as a lack a direct measure for gender role conflict. As measures have recently been developed for directly assessing gender role conflict (O'Neil et al., 1986), this study will empirically test the assertions of the sex role strain analysis as a means of further elucidating the relationship sex role orientation and psychological well-being.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to empirically investigate the sex role strain analysis model. The constructs of sex role salience and discrepancy were measured by various means and their relationship to gender role conflict, self-esteem and anxiety were assessed.

Research Participants

Subjects were obtained from a pool of undergraduate students enrolled in Psychology 100, the introductory psychology course at The Ohio State University in the fall of 1986. The students participated in research on a volunteer sign-up basis as a component of their course requirements. The final sample consisted of 304 males and 203 females. The average age of the subjects was approximately 19 years of age. Table 3.1 presents the grade distribution of the sample and shows that the majority of the subjects were freshmen (75.0).
Table 3.1
Grade distribution of sample by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures

A paper and pencil test battery of self-report instruments was employed to assess the constructs relevant to this study. The format for the data collection was a group administration which lasted approximately one and one-half hours. As a fixed order of instruments was used to facilitate computer scoring, the instruments were ordered in the battery such that the more central components were presented earlier in the battery and that similar instruments were separated as much as possible to avoid fatigue. The battery presented the instruments in the following order: a demographic data sheet, Salience-Adjective (part 1), Bem Sex Role Inventory-Real Self, Jackson Personality Inventory- Self-Esteem and Anxiety Scale, Bem Sex Role Inventory-Same Sex Ideal, Salience-Direct, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory, Bem Sex Role Inventory- Opposite Sex Ideal, Texas Social Behavior Scale, Salience-Adjective (part 2), Gender Role Conflict Scale (male subjects only). The two forms of the battery are presented in Appendix A (male subjects) and Appendix B (female subjects).

To insure confidentiality and subject anonymity, subjects responded on answer sheets which were coded with an identification number. Subjects were informed as to the purpose of the study following completion of the battery and were asked not to discuss the study with other students.
Instrumentation

The measures employed in this study are discussed in the following order: 1) Independent variables, 2) Dependent variables. For each instrument, a general description, the scoring procedure and psychometric properties is discussed. As several of the constructs in this study are derived from the core measures, method of derivation is discussed following the discussion of the individual measures.

Many of the instruments used in this study represent modifications of those developed by Garnets (1978) in a previous study of sex role strain analysis. As significant modifications of the instruments, their scoring and analyses have been done, direct extrapolation from the reported psychometric data is not possible. For each instrument, then, descriptions of both the original and the modification for this study will be discussed.

Independent variables

Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (BSRI).

The BSRI (Bem, 1974) was the first sex role inventory which was developed to identify sex typed individuals on the basis of their self-concepts or self-ratings of their personal attributes. The instrument was developed to "assess the extent to which the culture's definition of desirable female and male attributes are reflected in an individual's self-description" (Bem, 1979, p. 1048). The instrument was developed by generating large numbers of
socially desirable adjectives which were then judged by undergraduate men and women to be significantly more desirable for men (masculinity scale) or for women (femininity scale). Despite some theoretical and methodological criticism (Pedhauzer & Tetenbaum, 1979), the BSRI is one of the most widely used measures of sex role orientation.

The Original BSRI contained 60 items, with twenty adjectives for each of three scales: masculinity, femininity and neutral. Individuals rate themselves on each characteristic using a 7-point scale (1 = "never or almost never true" to 7 = "always or almost always true"). Based on various scoring procedures, individuals are typed as either androgynous, sex-typed (masculine or feminine), or undifferentiated. The most recent form, Short BSRI, was revised in 1979 and contains 30 items (ten adjectives for each scale). The revision omitted items that correlated highly with sex and some femininity scale items which were low in social desirability. This study used the revised, short form of the instrument.

**Scoring.** Separate sums are calculated for the masculinity scale (M Scale) and femininity scale (F scale). Each are divided by 10 (the number of items per scale) to yield scale means. There are thus two separate scale means: the M scale reflecting the extent of self-described masculinity and the F scale reflecting the extent of self-
described femininity.

Bem (1981) discusses the various methods for deriving type from the scale means. In this study when sex-typing was employed, the median split technique was used. In the interest of validity, reliability and consistency with other research, Bem's (1981) published medians (F scale = 5.5, M scale = 4.80) were used to divide the sample. Individuals scoring above the median on both scales, are typed androgynous. Individuals scoring below the median on both scales, are typed undifferentiated. Individuals scoring above the median on the M scale while scoring below the median on the F scale, are typed masculine. Individuals scoring above the median on the F scale while scoring below the median on the M scale, are typed feminine. The masculine and feminine typed individuals may be considered either sex-typed, if the type is congruent with one's gender (i.e. masculine-typed male or feminine-typed female) or cross-typed, if the type is not congruent with one's gender (i.e. feminine-typed male or masculine-typed female).

Psychometric properties. Estimates of the internal consistency reliability of the scale content for the BSRI have been acceptably high. Psychometric data for the Short BSRI are actually reformulated from data (Bem, 1973, 1978) from the Original BSRI. Bem (1981) reports coefficients for females (.84 for the F scale and .87 for the M scale), and for males (.84 for the F scale and .85 for the M scale).
Test-retest reliability, over a four week interval was reported for females (.85 for the F scale and .91 for the M scale) and males (.91 for the F scale and .76 for the M scale).

Bem (1978) assessed the empirical independence of the M and F scales in a study of 2,000 undergraduates at Stamford. Intercorrelation between the M and F scales for male subjects was reported as -.11. For female subjects the intercorrelation was .14. The scales were additionally found to be uncorrelated with a social desirability response set (correlations ranged from .02 to .24 for females and from .08 to .16 for males).

Convergent validity has been assessed in many studies by comparing subjects on the BSRI and other measures of sex typing. Cook (1985) reports that the BSRI correlations with other scales have been replicated with a number of different samples and have been shown to be significantly correlated with other sex typing measures. Spence and Helmreich (1975) report BSRI correlations with the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) to be generally high (M scale: .75 for males, .73 for females; F scale .57 for males, .59 for females). Berzins, Welling, and Wetter (1978) found correlations with the PRF ANDRO to be for the M scale: .60 for males, .65 for females; for the F scale .52 for males, .50 for females.
Much research has addressed the issues of construct validity through a series of behavioral studies (Bem 1975, 1976). These experiments were aimed at demonstrating that masculine and feminine traits are each functionally adaptive in different situations and that androgynous individuals show greater behavioral flexibility across situations than sex-typed individuals. Based on these validation studies, Bem concluded that the BSRI was indeed predictive of subjects' choices of sex stereotyped activities (e.g. sex-typed individuals avoided cross-sex behavior whereas androgynous individuals were more willing to engage in a variety of simple tasks, irrespective of the sex-stereotyped nature of the activities). She further found that masculine-typed subjects were more independent and resistant to conformity demands.

**Procedures.** Subjects completed the short BSRI under three sets of instructions: Real self, same sex ideal and other sex ideal. These measures were used independently as well as together to derive other constructs. As the instructional set given to subjects may have influenced the psychometric properties of the instrument, data available for these variations on the BSRI is presented. It is important to note however throughout all of the measures of the BSRI and its derivatives, Garnets (1978) used the unrevised version of the BSRI whereas this study used the revised short BSRI which has been deemed psychometrically
superior.

**Same-sex Ideal Concept**

The same sex ideal concept (qualities and characteristics which individuals think that members of their sex ought to possess) was assessed using the BSRI format with a different instructional set. Subjects were asked to rate the BSRI items in terms of how they think members of their own sex ought to be. Females thus rated the items in terms of how they believe women ought to be, while males rated the items in terms of how they believe men ought to be.

**Scoring.** The same scoring procedure described for the real self rating was used to score the same sex ideal concept rating.

**Psychometric properties.** As this measure is a derivative of the BSRI developed by Garnets (1978), analyses of its psychometric properties are provided and compared with the original form. Garnets (1978) found internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) for the "women ought to be" version was .90 for males and .89 for females (on the M scale) and .87 for males and .84 for females (on the F scale). The "men ought to be" version had the following Cronbach's alphas: .90 for males and .86 for females (on the M scale) and .86 for males and .76 for females (on the F scale). When the M and F scales of the "women ought to be" scales were combined, the alpha
coefficients were found to be .42 for males and .41 for females. When the M and F scales of the "men ought to be" scale were combined, the coefficients were rated at .50 for males and .45 for females.

Garnets (1978) additionally assessed the independence of the M and F scales. Intercorrelations between the M and F scales on the "women ought to be" measure were .28 (p < .01) for males and .01 for females. Intercorrelations between the M and F scales on the "men ought to be" measure were .33 (p < .01) for males and .30 for females. Garnets noted that the positive correlations contradict the theoretical assumptions of empirical independence between the M and F scales reported by Bem (1974).

**Discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal.** This measurement is a derivative of the BSRI real self rating and same sex ideal ratings. Discrepancy between the real self (rs) and the same sex ideal (ssi) for the M and F scales was tabulated and summed to yield an overall continuous discrepancy measure in the following manner:

\[
\text{discrepancy BSRI-M} = |\text{BSRI-M (rs)} - \text{BSRI-M (ssi)}|
\]
\[
\text{discrepancy BSRI-F} = |\text{BSRI-F (rs)} - \text{BSRI-F (ssi)}|
\]
\[
\text{Discrepancy} = \text{discrepancy BSRI-M} + \text{discrepancy BSRI-F}.
\]

As this method of calculating discrepancy has not been used in previous research, there are no psychometric data
available. This method was chosen to generate a continuous discrepancy variable which was deemed preferable to categorical comparisons. That is, due to the nature of categorization schemes, there may be individuals placed in the same category who are in fact more discrepant than individuals placed in different categories. Several researchers (Flaherty and Dusek, 1980) have additionally objected to the use of categorical classification schemes because of the information that is lost. Finally, a continuous discrepancy variable permitted the use of multiple linear regression which permits the full variance of the construct to be analyzed.

**Sex Role Salience**

Garnets (1978) developed and assessed the psychometric properties of three different methods of measuring the construct of sex role salience. While this study employed two of these methods, several modifications were made.

**Direct Measure of Sex Role Salience (Salience-Direct)**

This instrument was developed by Garnets (1978) to rate the extent to which subjects think various activities and behaviors are related to sex roles. High ratings on this instrument are viewed as a direct measure of sex role salience. The instrument consists of thirty one different kinds of leisure and work activities to which subjects indicate, on a four point scale (not related, slightly related, moderately related and strongly related) the degree
to which they believe the activity is related to sex roles. The leisure activities items were selected from a list developed by Converse and Robinson (1973). The work/career items were selected from career interest items cited in Johansson (1975). Garnets developed the scale items to reflect activities which are reported to be sex-typed in our culture. Garnets reported some problems with the instructions given to subjects. Specifically, subjects were confused as to whether item answers were to be formulated in terms of personal conceptions of sex roles or in terms of cultural sex role stereotypes. The instruction were modified to more clearly inform subjects to respond in terms of their personal conceptions.

**Scoring.** The sum of the thirty-one items served as the summary score for this measure. Garnets (1978) used the mean score and classified subjects into high and low salience groups using a .80 cutoff point to distinguish the groups. This dichotomization of the salience variable was necessary in Garnets study as she used ANOVA to analyze her data. The procedure is not only unnecessary when using multiple linear regression, but further, to do so results in a loss of information about the variable and in statistical power. Therefore, while the same measure was employed in this study, the measure was analyzed as a continuous variable. The range of possible scores was 0-93, with higher scores indicating greater sex role salience.
Psychometric properties. Data available on the Salience-Direct are based on Garnets' (1978) version of scoring and dichotomization as described above. Regarding internal consistency reliability, Salience-D was found to have a Cronbach's alpha of .93 for males and .95 for females. The split-half reliability was found to range between .91 and .93 in three different samples. Item-scale correlations were high, ranging from .40 to .86 for female subjects and .22 to .90 for male subjects.

Consistency Measure of Sex Role Salience (Salience-Consistency)

This measure of sex role salience is defined by Garnets (1978) as an indirect measure of the construct. Salience is operationally defined by this measure as the degree of internal consistency within the masculine items and within the feminine items in the same-sex ideal and other sex ideal ratings of the BSRI. This is based on the conceptualization of salience as the "degree to which the individual cognitively organized culturally sex-typed traits consensually, i.e., the way most people in the culture do" (Garnets, 1978, p. 70). Procedurally, the data was generated by subjects completing the BSRI-R under the instructional sets for same sex ideal and other sex ideal.

Scoring. The scoring procedure used was a variation on the method proposed by Garnets (1978). A within subjects standard deviation score was computed on the ten adjectives
classified as masculine and on the ten adjectives classified as feminine on both the same sex ideal ratings and the other sex ideal ratings. This yielded four separate standard deviation scores, which were summed to yield an overall salience score. Whereas Garnets (1978) then divided the sample into high and low groups at the eighteenth percentile, this study analyzed the impact of this measure as a continuous variable for reasons explained above.

**Psychometric properties.** The only psychometric data available for this measure are those reported by Garnets (1978) which involve the artificial dichotomization of the data. Cronbach's alpha for the two measures combined were .75 for males and .75 for females. High internal reliability among the four scales was deemed justification for their combination into a single summary score.

**Adjective Measure of Sex Role Salience (Salience-Adjective)**

This measure of sex role salience was developed and assessed as a part of this study. The Salience-Adjective measure is based on the assumption that sex role salience will be reflected in the extent to which one organizes one's personality in terms of traits which they define as masculine and feminine. The instrument itself involves a two part process. In the first phase, subjects selected adjectives which were self-descriptive from a checklist of adjectives. In the second phase, subjects rated these self-descriptive adjectives as either a) more typical of females
than males, b) more typical of males than females or c) equally descriptive of both sexes. The second phase of this instrument is a modification of Ravinder's (in press) rating system which was developed to assess sex role salience following a different procedure for generating self-descriptive adjectives.

Procedures. In the beginning of the test battery, subjects were given a checklist of ninety-nine adjectives. This list is a modified version of a checklist that has been used as a therapeutic device in the practicum clinic to help clients identify and label their feelings.

Subjects were instructed to look over the list and check 15 items that they "feel are generally descriptive of how you see yourself". Subjects then transcribed these fifteen items to the bottom of the sheet. At the end of the test battery, subjects were instructed to return to this sheet and rate each of the fifteen self-descriptive adjectives as either a) more typical of females that males, b) more typical of males than females or c) equally descriptive of both sexes.

Scoring. Salience-Adjective was scored by tabulating the number of items to which the subject rated "c" (equally descriptive of both sexes) subtracting that from the total number of items (15) and dividing by the total number of items (15). (Total # of items - # of items answered "c"/Total # of items). A ratio was thus created of the number of
items answered either a or b divided by the total number of items. As the responses a and b are presumed to be indicative of greater sex role salience, higher values for the ratio indicate greater levels of the sex role salience, and vice versa. The instrument thus yields a score ranging between 0 (all items marked "c", lowest salience) to 1 (all items marked either "a" or "b", highest salience).

**Psychometric properties.** As this instrument was developed for this study, there are no available data relevant to psychometric properties. The instrument was compared to the other measures of sex role salience to assess construct validity.

**Summary of Sex Role Salience Measures**

It is important to note that Garnets (1978) provided the Salience-Direct and Salience-Consistency methods to operationalize the construct of sex role salience. While internal consistency reliability was reported to be reasonably sound, there was some question regarding the intercorrelations among these measures which are presumed to be assessing the same construct. Garnets (1978) found the measures to be uncorrelated with the exception of a few low significant correlations between some of the measures with certain samples. This poses serious questions regarding the construct validity of the measures.

Garnets concluded that the measures were relatively independent and presumed that each measure tapped a
different aspect of sex role salience. As the scoring and analyses were based on dichotomization of the variables and series of one-way ANOVAs, it is difficult to reach firm conclusions regarding the viability of the measures. Additionally, all measures involving the BSRI used the unrevised, longer form of the instrument.

**Dependent Variables**

**Gender Role Conflict**

The construct of gender role conflict will be measured by O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David & Wrightsman (1986) Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). The instrument was constructed to assess men's pattern of gender role conflict as described by O'Neil (1981a, 1981b). The GRCS assesses men's personal gender role attitudes, behaviors and conflicts. It was developed and normed on college age males.

**Scoring.** The GRCS consists of 37 statements to which subjects indicate their degree of agreement using a 6 point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A summary score was derived from the sum of the 37 items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of gender role conflict.

In a factor analysis of the items (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David & Wrightman, 1986), the following four factors were found: 1) success, power and competition, 2) restrictive emotionality, 3) restrictive affectionate behavior between men, 4) conflict between work and family
relations. The summary scores of these four subscales will also be used in some analyses as measures of these aspects of gender role conflict.

Self-Esteem

Three different instruments will be used to measure the construct of self-esteem. The first two instruments were employed by Garnets (1978) in an empirical test of a theoretical model of sex role strain analysis (Garnets & Pleck, 1979).

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES, Rosenberg, 1965)

This inventory is designed to assess the self-acceptance aspect of self-esteem, i.e. the individual's self-evaluation of his or her own worth. The instrument consists of ten items, to which subjects respond on a four-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Scoring. As the instrument alternates between positively and negatively worked items, the negative items were reversed in the scoring. The sum of the ten items served as the summary score for the instrument. Higher scores will indicate greater levels of self-esteem, with the range of scores being 0-30.

Psychometric properties. A normative sample of 5,024 high school juniors and seniors from ten randomly selected New York City schools served as the basis of Rosenberg's analyses. The scale has since been widely accepted and used
in a wide variety of samples.

Rosenberg (1965) found the scale to have a Guttman reproducibility coefficient of .92 for the normative sample. Silber and Tippett (1965) report a two-week test-retest reliability coefficient of .85 for 28 college students.

Convergent validity of the instrument was examined by Silber and Tippett (1965). Intercorrelations with three other measures of self-esteem are reported as follows: Kelly Repertory Test ($r = .67$), Heath Self-Image Questionnaire ($r = .83$), and Interviewer's ratings of self-esteem ($r = .56$). Crandally (1973) found the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale correlated ($r = .59$) with the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory.

Rosenberg (1965) assessed the external validity of the inventory and reported the following results: low self-esteem was significantly associated with a number of psychosomatic symptoms, with being touchy, shy and depressed. In contrast, high self-esteem was significantly associated with self-reported participation in extracurricular activities, club memberships, elected positions, and discussions.

Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI, Helmreich, Stapp and Ervin, 1974).

The TSBI assesses the interpersonal and social competence aspects of self-esteem. The inventory consists of 16 self-descriptive statements. Ten items are positively
worded (e.g. "I feel confident in my appearance") and 6 of the items are negatively worded (e.g. "When in a group of people, I have trouble thinking of the right things to say"). Subjects responded to the items on a four-point scale ranging from "not characteristic of me" to "very characteristic of me".

**Scoring.** The negatively worded items were reversed in their scoring. The summary score was then derived by summing the sixteen items. Higher scores indicate greater levels of self-esteem, with the range of scores being 0 to 48.

**Psychometric properties.** The short form of the TSBI will be used in the present study. Helmreich and Stapp (1974) used a normative sample of 238 male and 262 female undergraduates to compare two short forms of the TSBI with the original 32 item form. The short form used in this study correlated .973 for males and .974 for females with the long version of the TSBI. A factor analysis of this form revealed a similar structure to those obtained with the original instrument.

The psychometric properties of the long form were assessed with a normative sample of 506 undergraduates at the University of Texas at Austin. All item-whole correlations were significant with a range of .32 to .76 for the sexes combined and a mean correlation of .53 for males and .55 for females. Test-retest reliability was .94 for.
males and .93 for females.

Convergent validity of the instrument was assessed by examining intercorrelation with other measures of self-esteem. The long form was found to be significantly correlated with the self-esteem scale of the California Personality Inventory (.50 for males and .52 for females), and to not be significantly related to scholastic aptitude as measured by the SAT (.12 for males and .05 for females).

Jackson Personality Inventory—Self-Esteem scale (JPI-SE, Jackson, 1976).

The JPI was developed to provide a set of measures of personality reflecting a variety of interpersonal, cognitive and value orientations likely to have important implications for a person's functioning. It is deemed to be most appropriate for assessing the functioning of normal populations, particularly college and high school students.

Each of the sixteen scales contains twenty items, ten of which are scored if false and ten of which are scored if true. The self-esteem scale is designed to focus upon the interpersonal aspects of self-confidence, rather than the more generalized aspects of self-esteem. High scorers are described as "confident in dealing with others, not easily embarrassed or influenced by others, showing presence in interpersonal situations, possessing aplomb", while low scorers are described as "feeling awkward among people, especially strangers, ill at ease socially, preferring to
remain unnoticed at social events, having low opinion of self as a group member; lacking self confidence; easily embarrassed" (Jackson, 1976, p. 10).

Scoring. One point was scored for each of the twenty items that was answered consistently with the scale construction (i.e. answered true when that item is scored for true and vice versa). Higher scores are indicative of greater levels of self-esteem.

Psychometric properties. The scales of the JPI were constructed using empirical item selection procedures. Specifically, the goal of the item analyses were four-fold: a) to enhance internal consistency reliability of the scales; b) to suppress desirability response bias; c) to maximize discrimination among scales; and d) to identify items yielding scales with normal distributions with a mean at the center of the scale. Thus, many of the psychometric qualities have been developed into the instrument in its scale construction. Detailed description of the scale construction is available in the test manual (Jackson, 1976).

Regarding the self-esteem scale per se, convergent validity was reported as .73 with the Adjective Checklist, .77 with self-rating of self-esteem and .30 with peer ratings of self-esteem. The scale correlated .36 with measures of desirability taken from the Personality Research Form. The scale was also found to negatively correlate with
the following Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory scales: -.42 with Depression, -.48 with Psychasthenia, and -.60 with Social Introversion.

**Anxiety**

**Jackson Personality Inventory—Anxiety scale (JPI-ANX)**

A general description of the JPI is provided above. The JPI-ANX scale consists of twenty true-false items which are designed to tap the tendency to worry over inconsequential matters. High scorers may be described as worried, tense, nervous, preoccupied, anxious, edgy, distressed, agitated, and fearful. Conversely, low scorers may be described as being easy-going, patient, calm, serene, tranquil, relaxed, contented, placid and imperturbable.

**Scoring.** One point was scored for each of the twenty items that was answered consistently with the scale construction (i.e. answered true when that item is scored for true and vice versa). Higher scores are indicative of lower levels of anxiety.

**Psychometric properties.** Convergent validity between the Anxiety scale and other instruments was reported as follows: .71 with the Adjective Checklist, .58 with self-ratings of anxiety and .43 with peer ratings of anxiety. The scale correlated .29 with measures of desirability taken from the Personality Research Form.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses regarding the relationship among the variables of discrepancy, sex role salience, gender role conflict, self-esteem and anxiety are derived from the theory of sex role strain analysis proposed by Garnets and Pleck (1978). The first set of hypotheses were tested for both male and female subjects. As the GRCS is only intended for use with males, all hypotheses involving the GRCS were tested for male subjects.

1) Discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal will correlate negatively with measures of self-esteem and anxiety.

2) All measures of sex-role salience will correlate negatively with measures of self-esteem and anxiety.

3) The interaction between sex-role salience and discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal will be significant in predicting self-esteem and anxiety.

For male subjects only:

4) Discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal will be significantly positively correlated with gender role conflict.

5) Sex role salience will be significantly positively correlated with gender role conflict.

6) The interaction between sex-role salience and
discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal will be significant in predicting gender role conflict.

7) Gender role conflict will be significantly negatively correlated with measures of self-esteem and anxiety.

Analyses

All scoring was done on IBM computer sheets. Statistical calculations were computed with Statistical Analysis System, Version 5 (1985).

Descriptive statistics for all variables will be presented and when possible (i.e. significantly highly correlated variables) a composite score will be created to best represent the construct (e.g. sex role salience, self-esteem).

The hypotheses were tested by examining zero order correlations among variables and/or composite constructs as well as multiple linear regression to assess the amount and significance of the variance accounted for by the variables and their interactions. Due to the large number of subjects and analyses that were done, a .01 alpha level was used to minimize experiment wise error.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

In this study of sex role strain analysis, the variables may be divided into four sets. First are demographic measures, such as age and grade. Second are measures of sex role orientation, which in this study are three different trials of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), for the real self, for the same sex ideal and for the opposite sex ideal. Discrepancy between the real self and the same sex ideal are derived from the first two trials. A third set of variables are the measures of sex role salience. There are three measures of sex role salience, Salience-Direct, Salience-Consistency and Salience-Adjective. The fourth set of variables are the dependent measures of psychological well-being. These include three measures of self-esteem and one measure of anxiety. Male subjects only responded to a measure of gender role conflict.

Descriptive statistics for each of the sets are presented in the first section. The following sections present the results of the analyses that tested the hypotheses outlined in the previous chapter.
**Descriptive Statistics**

Means and standard deviations of the demographic variables, sex role salience and dependent measures are presented in Table 4.1. The only significant sex difference was found on the anxiety measure. Female subjects (7.03) were found to be significantly more anxious than the male subjects (8.89) on the Jackson Anxiety Scale ($\chi^2 = 40.303, df=21, p=.007$).

Table 4.2 presents means, medians and standard deviations for the variables involving the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Significant differences between males and females were not found on the BSRI masculinity scale but were found for the femininity scale. Comparing this sample with the normative sample reported by Bem (1981), this sample's males (5.1) and females (4.9) mean masculinity scores were higher than Bem (1981) reported for males (4.88) and females (4.78), (males: $t = 4.01, p < .01$; females: $t = 1.97, p < .05$). Although no significant differences were found between samples for male's femininity scores; the females in the current sample had a mean femininity score (5.8) which was significantly higher ($t = 3.46, p < .01$) than those in the normative sample (5.57). Female subjects (.92) also experienced significantly greater discrepancy between their real self-masculinity scores and same sex ideal masculinity scores than did the male subjects (.62).
Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics for Demographic and Dependent Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Males M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Females M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience-Adjective</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience-Direct</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>27.38</td>
<td>17.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience-Z</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience-Consistency</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem-RSES</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem-TSBI</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem-JPI</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem-Z</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety*</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role Conflict</td>
<td>114.14</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; TSEI = Texas Social Behavior Inventory; JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory-SE Scale; Anxiety = Jackson Personality Inventory-Anxiety Scale; Salience-Z = standardized Salience-Direct + standardized Salience-Adjective. Self-Esteem-Z = standardized RSES + standardized TSEI + standardized JPI-SE.

*Difference between males and females significant ($\chi^2$ = 40.3 df = 21 p = .007).
Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics for Bem Sex Role Inventory Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity-Real Self</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity-Real Self*</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity-Same Sex Ideal</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity-Same Sex Ideal*</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity-Opposite Sex Ideal*</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity-Opposite Sex Ideal</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy-Masculinity*</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy-Femininity</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy Masculinity+ Femininity</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Masculinity and Femininity scales from Bem Sex Role Inventory; Discrepancy = Real self - Same Sex Ideal.

*Difference between males and females significant (p < .05).
Subjects were classified into one of four sex-type categories using the median split method. In the interest of consistency with other research using the BSRI, Bem's (1981) sample medians for masculinity (5.50) and femininity (4.80) were used to divide this sample. Table 4.3 presents the distribution of sex-type classification in this sample in comparison with the normative sample (Bem, 1981). A z statistic was calculated to assess the significance of the differences in category percentages between these two samples (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p.325). Compared to the females of the normative sample, a higher percentage of females (42.7 %) were classified as androgynous (z = 4.62, p < .01) in the current sample and a lower percentage (15.2 %) were classified as undifferentiated (z = 2.33, p < .01). Compared with the distribution of males in Bem's (1981) sample, a higher percentage of males (46.2 %) were classified as sex-typed (masculine) (z = 3.82, p < .01). Comparing percentage of sex-typed individuals between samples, the current sample had a significantly higher percentage (z = 3.84, p < .01) of sex-typed individuals (39.1 %) than the normative sample (28.9 %) from Stamford.

Sex Role Salience

One aspect of this study was to empirically explore the construct of sex role salience. Subjects responded to three different measures of sex role salience, a direct measure and a consistency measure which were developed by Garnets
Table 4.3
Comparison of BSRI Sex-type Classification in current and a normative sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
<th>Undifferentiated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bem</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>46.2*</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bem</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Females and Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>33.2*</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bem</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Samples are significantly different percentage (p < .01).
and a new adjective checklist method which was developed for this study (Salience-Adjective). The intercorrelation of these three measures of sex-role salience for both sexes combined is presented in Table 4.4. Salience-adjective is significantly positively correlated ($r = .34$) with Salience-direct.

The consistency measure of salience was found to be unrelated to either the adjective ($r = -.06$) or the direct measures of salience ($r = -.07$). It appears that the consistency measure of salience is assessing a different construct or may be tapping into a different aspect of sex role salience than direct and adjective measures are. As the construct of sex role salience is still exploratory in nature, this lack of convergent validity was dealt with as follows. As the Salience-Adjective and Salience-Direct measures were significantly positively correlated, a composite measure of sex role salience (Salience-Z) was created by summing standard scores of each measure. The means and standard deviation for this new composite variable, Salience-Z are presented in Table 4.1 and the correlations with other variables are presented in Table 4.4. For some analyses, the Salience-Consistency measure was retained and was analyzed as a separate variable.
Table 4.4
Correlation matrix (N = 507)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Salience-Direct</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Salience-Adjective</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Salience-Z</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Salience-Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Self-Esteem-RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Self-Esteem-TSBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.91*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Self-Esteem-JPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Self-esteem-Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; TSEI = Texas Social Behavior Inventory; JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory-Self-Esteem Scale; Anxiety = Jackson Personality Inventory-Anxiety Scale; Salience-Z = standardized Salience-Direct + standardized Salience-Adjective. Self-Esteem-Z = standardized RSES + standardized TSEI + standardized JPI-SE.

* p < .01.
Table 4.5
Correlation matrix (by sex)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Salience-Direct</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Salience-Adjective</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Salience-Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Salience-Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Self-Esteem-RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Self-Esteem-TSBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Self-Esteem-JPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Self-esteem-Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; TSBI = Texas Social Behavior Inventory; JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory-Self-Esteem Scale; Anxiety = Jackson Personality Inventory-Anxiety Scale; Salience-Z = standardized Salience-Direct + standardized Salience-Adjective. Self-Esteem-Z = standardized RSES + standardized TSBI + standardized JPI-SE.

Note: In all cells, the value for females (N = 200) is on the top row and the value for the males (N = 300) is on the bottom row.

* p < .01.
Dependent Measures of Psychological Well-Being

The intercorrelation of the four measures of psychological well-being: Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI), Jackson Personality Inventory-Self-Esteem Scale (JPI-SE) and Jackson Personality Inventory-Anxiety Scale (JPI-Anxiety) are presented in Table 4.4. All of these measures of psychological well-being are positively and significantly correlated. It is important to note that all measures of psychological well-being were scored such that higher levels were indicative of greater adjustment. Thus, higher anxiety scores actually indicate lower levels of anxiety (better adjustment). The three self esteem measures were standardized and summed to yield a composite measure of self-esteem which was in further analyses. The means and standard deviation for this new composite variable, Self-Esteem-Z, are presented in Table 4.1 and the correlations with other variables are presented in Table 4.4.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1—It was hypothesized that discrepancy between real-self and same-sex ideal would correlate negatively with measures of psychological well-being. As can be seen in Table 4.4, the zero-order correlations between discrepancy and all measures of self-esteem are significant and in the predicted direction. Table 4.5 presents the correlation matrix of all variables with the
sample separated by sex. Fisher's $Z$ transformations were calculated to test for sex differences in these correlation (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 311). Significant sex difference were not found in the relationship between discrepancy and any of the measures of self-esteem or anxiety. While a significant sex difference in the correlation between discrepancy and anxiety was not found, discrepancy was significantly related to anxiety for males ($r = -0.16$) but was not significantly related for the female subjects ($r = -0.07$).

Although the correlations suggested that discrepancy was significantly related to self-esteem and anxiety, it is important to assess whether the discrepancy construct lends further predictive power than merely knowing an individuals' sex-type. Thus further regression analyses were conducted to assess what discrepancy adds to the prediction of self-esteem and anxiety above and beyond variance accounted for by the BSRI variables. Table 4.6 presents the standardized and unstandardized regression coefficients, and the squared semi-partial correlations (the unique contribution of BSRI-type and discrepancy) in predicting self-esteem and anxiety. Results of this partitioning of variance are given for the total sample as well as for females and males, separately.
Table 4.6

Standard Multiple Regression of Sex-Type and Discrepancy on Self-Esteem and Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Total (N = 500)</th>
<th>Self-Esteem-Z</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSRI-Type</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R = .26*</td>
<td>R = .51*</td>
<td>R = .03*</td>
<td>R = .17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept = 2.81</td>
<td>Intercept = 9.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (N = 200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSRI-Type</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R = .29*</td>
<td>R = .53*</td>
<td>R = .01</td>
<td>R = .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept = 2.81</td>
<td>Intercept = 7.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (N = 300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSRI-Type</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R = .24*</td>
<td>R = .49*</td>
<td>R = .04*</td>
<td>R = .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept = 2.80</td>
<td>Intercept = 10.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Squared semipartial correlations (sr) represent the unique contribution of each independent variable to R. * p < .01.
As can be seen in Table 4.6, when BSRI-type and discrepancy are entered in the regression equation, a significant amount of the variance is accounted for in self-esteem (total $R^2 = .26$, females $R^2 = .29$, males $R^2 = .24$). In predicting anxiety, however, only the total sample ($R^2 = .03$) and male sample ($R^2 = .04$) are statistically significant. Given the relatively large sample size, such correlations are not practically significant. As shown by the squared semi-partial correlations, the unique contributions of both BSRI-type and discrepancy are statistically significant in predicting self-esteem, although again, the practical significance of the discrepancy variable is minimal. In predicting anxiety, none of the squared semi-partial correlations are significant.

**Hypothesis 2**—It was hypothesized that sex role salience would be significantly negatively correlated with measures of psychological well-being. This hypothesis is examined for both measures of sex role salience, the Consistency measure and the composite measure of Salience-Direct and Salience-Adjective, Salience-Z.

As can be seen in Table 4.4, the zero-order correlations between Salience-Z are not significantly related to any measures of psychological well-being. Table 4.5 does show that Salience-Z is significantly negatively correlated with self-esteem as measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for female subjects only.
Contrary to the hypothesis, Salience-Consistency was significantly positively correlated to all measures of self-esteem for both males and females. The composite self-esteem measure correlated significantly for both females ($r = .23$) and males ($r = .20$). Anxiety was found to be significantly positively correlated for males ($r = .22$) but not for females ($r = .07$).

The hypothesis that sex role salience would be significantly negatively correlated with measures of psychological well-being was not supported with either measure of sex role salience.

**Hypothesis 3**—It was hypothesized that the interaction of sex role salience and discrepancy would be significant in predicting psychological well-being. Analyses were run separately for the composite measure of sex role salience, Salience-Z and Salience-Consistency. As indicated in Table 4.7, the interaction between Salience-Z and discrepancy was not significant in predicting either self-esteem or anxiety. The interaction between Salience-Consistency and discrepancy was found to be significant in predicting self-esteem for the total sample ($R = .22$) females ($R = .33$) and for males ($R = .15$). Neither interaction predicted a significant amount of variance in anxiety.
Table 4.7

Regression of Interaction between Sex Role Salience and Discrepancy on Measures of Psychological Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem-Z</th>
<th></th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience-Z X Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience-C X Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>24.28*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>21.99*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>6.21*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Esteem-Z = standardized Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory + standardized Texas Social Behavior Inventory + standardized Jackson Personality Inventory Self-Esteem Scale.

* p < .01.
As the measure for gender role conflict is only valid and was thus only administered to males, the following hypotheses, involving variables' relationships to gender role conflict were tested for only males subjects.

**Hypothesis 4 and 5** - It was hypothesized that Gender Role Conflict would be significantly positively correlated with both discrepancy and sex-role salience.

As can be seen in Table 4.4, discrepancy was not found to be significantly correlated with gender role conflict ($r = .05$). Sex role salience as measured by the composite of Salience-Direct and Salience-Adjective, Salience-Z was found, consistent to the hypothesis, to be significantly positively correlated ($r = .21$) with gender role conflict. Salience-Consistency was found to be significantly negatively related to gender role conflict ($r = -.13$).

**Hypothesis 6** It was hypothesized that the interaction between discrepancy and salience would be significant in predicting gender role conflict. The results of the regression analyses testing the interactions of salience and discrepancy are presented in Table 4.8. The interaction between discrepancy and Salience-Z was found to be significant ($R = .15$) while the interaction between discrepancy and Salience-C was not significant ($R = .00$).
Table 4.8

Results of Regression of Discrepancy and Sex Role Salience on Gender Role Conflict (Male Ss Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variance</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy* Salience-Z</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>6.06*</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy* Salience-C</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .01$. 
Hypothesis 7- It was hypothesized that gender role conflict would be negatively correlated with measures of psychological well-being. As shown in Table 4.4, gender role conflict was found to be significantly negatively correlated with self-esteem ($r = -0.25$) and anxiety ($r = -0.21$).

Correlations between the four subscales of the GRCS and measures of psychological well-being are presented in Table 4.9. It is interesting to note that self-esteem was not negatively correlated ($r = 0.04$) with subscale 1, which assesses desire for success, power and competition. In fact, although non significant, the relationship was in a positive direction. However, the success, power and competition subscale was significantly negatively correlated with anxiety. The second subscale, which assesses restrictive emotionality, was found to be significantly negatively correlated with all measures of psychological well-being. Restrictive emotionality was highly correlated with measures of self-esteem ($r = -0.41$) but only moderately correlated with anxiety ($r = -0.12$). The third subscale, which assesses restrictive affectionate behavior between men, was significantly negatively related to all measures of psychological well-being except for the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory. Finally, the fourth subscale, which assesses conflict between work and family relations, was found to be significantly negatively correlated with all
Table 4.9

Correlation matrix for Gender Role Conflict Scales with Dependent Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Self-Esteem-RSES</th>
<th>Self-Esteem-TSBI</th>
<th>Self-Esteem-JPI</th>
<th>Self-Esteem-Z Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRCS-1 (Success, power, competition)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCS-2 (Restrictive emotionality)</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCS-3 (Restrictive affectionate behavior between men)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCS-4 (Conflict between work and family relations)</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; TSEI = Texas Social Behavior Inventory; JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory-Self-Esteem Scale; Anxiety = Jackson Personality Inventory-Anxiety Scale; Self-Esteem-Z = standardized RSES + standardized TSEI + standardized JPI-SE.

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
measures of psychological well-being, especially the anxiety measure \( r = -0.30 \).

**Additional analyses**

Path analyses were done on the sex role strain analysis model using a series of multiple linear regression equations. While the results of the path analyses are not substantially different from previous analyses, they present an overview of the interrelationships among the variables. Another advantage of path analysis is that the paths show the effect of one variable on another while the effects of others are taken into account.

The first path analysis (Figure 1) shows the relationship among discrepancy, salience, gender role conflict and self-esteem. The overall model accounts for a significant amount of variance in self-esteem (11%) \( F = 10.21, p < .01 \). As shown in Figure 1, when the effects of sex role salience and gender role conflict are controlled for, discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal has a strong independent effect on self-esteem \(-.21\). When discrepancy and gender role conflict are controlled for, there is no relationship between sex role salience and self-esteem. When discrepancy and sex role salience are controlled for, gender role conflict has a strong independent effect on self-esteem.

Sex role salience has a strong independent effect on gender role conflict when the effect of discrepancy is
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Figure 4.1. Linear model of sex role strain analysis: Relationship between discrepancy, salience, gender role conflict and self-esteem.
Figure 4.2. Linear model of sex role strain analysis: Relationship between discrepancy, salience, gender role conflict and anxiety.
controlled for. Conversely, discrepancy has no relationship to gender role conflict when the effect of sex role salience is controlled.

The relationships among discrepancy, salience and gender role conflict in predicting anxiety are shown in Figure 2. The overall model accounted for 7% of the variance in anxiety as measured by the Jackson Personality Inventory-Anxiety Scale. When the effects of sex role salience and gender role conflict are controlled for, discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal has a negative independent effect on anxiety (−.12). When discrepancy and gender role conflict are controlled for, there is a small positive relationship between sex role salience and anxiety. When discrepancy and sex role salience are controlled for, gender role conflict has a strong independent effect on anxiety.

The results of the path analyses indicate that the relationship of discrepancy and self-esteem is not mediated through gender role conflict as the theory would predict. Rather the relationship is significant but independent. Consistent with theory, sex role salience has a positive relationship with gender role conflict when the effects of discrepancy are controlled for. Thus, the influence of sex role salience on self-esteem and anxiety does seemed to be mediated through gender role conflict. Also consistent with the sex role strain analysis theory is the negative relationship between gender role conflict and self-esteem.
Summary of Results

Overall, the data provided partial support for the sex role strain analysis model. The theory predicted that there would be a negative relationship between discrepancy and psychological well-being. The data supported this hypothesis for self-esteem, but the relationship was only significant in predicting anxiety for males. Also, when the variance from sex type was controlled for, the contribution of discrepancy is still statistically significant in predicting self-esteem but not practically significant. There was no relationship between discrepancy and anxiety when sex type was controlled. There was thus, partial support for this hypothesis.

The theory also predicted that there would be a negative relationship between sex role salience and psychological well-being. The results indicated that Salience-Z was not significantly related, furthermore, contrary to hypotheses, Salience-C was positively related to measures of adjustment. This hypothesis was thus not supported.

It was hypothesized that the interaction between sex role salience and discrepancy would be significant in predicting psychological well-being. This was not generally supported by the data.

Gender role conflict was predicted to be correlated positively with discrepancy and sex role salience. The relationship between gender role conflict and discrepancy
was not found among the data. Consistent with the prediction, sex role salience, as measured by salience-Z accounted for a small percentage of the variance in gender role conflict. The interaction between salience-Z and discrepancy was also found to be significant in predicting gender role conflict which was consistent with the hypotheses.

Finally, gender role conflict was hypothesized to be negatively correlated with measures of psychological well-being. This relationship was supported for both self-esteem and anxiety.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to further elucidate the relationship between among the variables in the sex role strain analysis model (Garnets and Pleck, 1979). The model was proposed as an alternative paradigm to account for the relationship between sex type and psychological well-being. The previous models (sex role identity, androgyne and masculinity) had asserted that a specific combination of traits was associated with psychological adjustment. The sex role strain model proposed that two variables, discrepancy between one's real self and same sex ideal and sex role salience created gender role conflict which was associated with poorer adjustment, e.g. lower self esteem. This study operationalized these constructs and tested the hypothesized relationships among the variables.

One way to conceptualize the sex role strain analysis model is as a set of predictions regarding the antecedents and consequents of gender role conflict. Accordingly, the model suggests that discrepancy and sex role salience create gender role conflict (antecedents) and that gender role conflict is associated with poorer adjustment (consequent).
The intent of this chapter is to focus upon the results of this study and to discuss possible interpretations and implications of these results for this model. Finally, limitations of the findings will be discussed as well as future directions for research in this area.

Relationship of the data to the hypotheses

Overall, the data provided mixed support for the sex role strain analysis model for conceptualizing the relationship between sex type and psychological well-being. The theory implies a model for the interrelationships among the variables and each hypothesis focuses on one set of relationships. Each hypothesis is reviewed separately, followed by a review of the entire model.

It was hypothesized that discrepancy between real-self and same-sex ideal would correlate negatively with measures of psychological well-being. The results of the zero-order correlations between discrepancy and all measures of self-esteem were found to be significant and in the predicted direction. Discrepancy was additionally significantly related to anxiety for male subjects but was not significantly related for the female subjects.

Although the correlations suggested that discrepancy was significantly related to self-esteem and anxiety, it is important to note that when the unique contribution was assessed above variance accounted for by sex-type, the practical significance of the discrepancy variable was
minimal. Thus, only partial support was provided for this hypothesis.

Sex role salience was hypothesized to be significantly negatively correlated with measures of psychological well-being. This hypothesis was examined separately for the Salience-Consistency measure and the composite measure of Salience-Direct and Salience-Adjective, Salience-Z, as these measures did not demonstrate convergent validity.

Salience-Z was not found to be significantly related to any measures of psychological well-being, except for self-esteem as measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for female subjects only. Contrary to the hypothesis, Salience-Consistency was significantly positively correlated to all measures of self-esteem for both males and females and with anxiety for males. Thus, the hypothesis that sex role salience would be significantly negatively correlated with measures of psychological well-being was not generally supported with either measure.

It was hypothesized that the interaction of sex role salience and discrepancy would be significant in predicting psychological well-being. The interaction between Salience-Z and discrepancy was not significant in predicting either self-esteem or anxiety. The interaction between Salience-Consistency and discrepancy was found to be significant in predicting self-esteem. Neither interaction predicted a significant amount of variance in anxiety.
The following results that explore hypotheses regarding variables' interrelationship with gender role conflict are based on data for male subjects only. Generalizations and conclusions regarding the entire model can thus only be made for males.

Sex role strain analysis predicted that gender role conflict would be significantly positively correlated with both discrepancy and sex-role salience and that the interaction between discrepancy and salience would be significant in predicting gender role conflict. Contrary to the hypothesis, discrepancy was not found to be significantly correlated with gender role conflict. Sex role salience as measured by the composite of Salience-Direct and Salience-Adjective, Salience-Z was found, consistent to the hypothesis, to be significantly positively correlated with gender role conflict. Salience-Consistency was found to be significantly negatively related to gender role conflict. The interaction between discrepancy and Salience-Z was found to be significant while the interaction between discrepancy and Salience-C was not significant.

Finally, it was hypothesized that gender role conflict would be negatively correlated with measures of psychological well-being. Consistent with the hypothesis, gender role conflict was found to be significantly negatively correlated with self-esteem and anxiety. Correlations between the four subscales of the Gender Role
Conflict Scale (O'Neil, et al., 1986) and measures of psychological well-being yielded interesting results. Subscale 1, which assesses desire for success, power and competition was not found to be negatively correlated with psychological well-being. In fact, although non significant, the relationship was in a positive direction. However, the success, power and competition subscale was significantly negatively correlated with anxiety. Thus, greater conflict regarding success, power and competition may be related to problems of anxiety but does not seem to be related to issues of self-esteem. The second subscale, which assesses restrictive emotionality, was found to be significantly negatively correlated with all measures of psychological well-being. Restrictive emotionality was highly correlated with measures of self-esteem but only moderately correlated with anxiety. The third subscale, which assesses restrictive affectionate behavior between men, was significantly negatively related to all measures of psychological well-being except for the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory. Finally, the fourth subscale, which assesses conflict between work and family relations, was found to be significantly negatively correlated with all measures of psychological well-being, especially the anxiety measure.

Path analyses were also done as follow-up analyses which presented an overview of the interrelationships among
the variables. The path analyses were done separately for predicting self-esteem and anxiety. In predicting self-esteem, the overall model accounted for a significant amount of variance (11%). When the effects of sex role salience and gender role conflict were controlled for, discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal had a strong independent effect on self-esteem. When discrepancy and gender role conflict were controlled for, there was no relationship between sex role salience and self-esteem. When discrepancy and sex role salience were controlled for, gender role conflict had a strong independent effect on self-esteem.

Sex role salience had a strong independent effect on gender role conflict when the effect of discrepancy was controlled. Conversely, discrepancy had no relationship to gender role conflict when the effect of sex role salience was controlled.

Regarding the relationships among discrepancy, salience and gender role conflict in predicting anxiety, the overall model accounted for 7% of the variance. When the effects of sex role salience and gender role conflict were controlled, discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal had a negative independent effect on anxiety. When discrepancy and gender role conflict were controlled, there was a small positive relationship between sex role salience and anxiety. When discrepancy and sex role salience were controlled,
gender role conflict had a strong independent effect on anxiety.

Discussion and Interpretations of the Findings

Regarding the predicted antecedents of gender role conflict, discrepancy and salience as measured in this study did not provide much support for the theory. Taken together the results of analyses that tested the hypotheses and the results of the path analyses indicated that the relationship of discrepancy and self-esteem was not mediated through gender role conflict as the theory would predict. Rather the path analyses found that the relationship between discrepancy and psychological well-being was significant but independent of gender role conflict. Furthermore, when the influence of sex type was accounted for, the unique contribution of discrepancy was minimal. This raises questions as to the validity of using discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal as a measure or definition of gender role conflict, at least as it is measured by the O'Neil et al. (1986) instrument.

Although sex role salience, as measured by Salience-Z was not found to have a significant relationship to psychological well-being directly, it was found consistent with theory, to have positive relationship with gender role conflict. Thus, the influence of sex role salience on self-esteem and anxiety seemed to be mediated through gender role conflict. If indeed, low levels of sex role salience can be
viewed as a operational definition of sex role transcendent individual, the present data supported the notion that they would have less gender role conflict.

Regarding the negative consequences of gender role conflict, the present data provided stronger support for the sex role strain analysis theory. That is, greater levels of gender role conflict were found to be significantly related to both lower self-esteem and greater anxiety.

**Implications**

Many implications of the findings have been touched upon in discussing possible interpretations of the results. The present findings do have additional theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, the present study sheds some light on the findings of the previous attempt to operationalize the sex role strain analysis model (Garnets, 1978) and on the definition and assessment of both gender role conflict and sex role salience constructs. Practical implications involve the finding of potential negative consequences of gender role conflict.

As the previous attempt to operationalize the sex role strain analysis model (Garnets, 1978) was not able to directly assess the gender role conflict construct, it was not possible to determine whether the lack of relationship that was found between discrepancy, salience and psychological well-being was a) due to discrepancy and salience not being related to gender role conflict or b)
whether gender role conflict was not associated with psychological well-being. The present findings that gender role conflict was significantly related to psychological well-being indicate that the sex role strain analysis model was on target regarding the negative consequences of gender role conflict, but was less predictive regarding the antecedents. Thus, the present findings would explain Garnets (1978) lack of support for the sex role strain analysis model as reflective of problems with either the theoretical formulation of the antecedents of gender role conflict (Garnets & Pleck, 1979) or assessment of these constructs (i.e., salience and discrepancy).

While there are still questions to be addressed regarding the sex role strain analysis model, the present methodology represents an improvement over Garnets (1978) in the use of Multiple Linear Regression as opposed to ANOVA and the inclusion of all sex-type categories as opposed to just androgynous and sex-typed individuals.

While higher levels of discrepancy were related to poorer adjustment, there was no support for the relationship between discrepancy and gender role conflict. Some theorists (O'Neil, 1981) have even conceptualized gender role conflict as a discrepancy between real self and same sex ideal. While this conceptualization may have some merits theoretically, the present data did not find empirical support. The lack of relationship between the
GRCS and discrepancy leads to questions regarding the construct validity of the instrument. As a new measure of gender role conflict (MRI, Snell, 1986) has recently been developed, future research could explore the relationship between these instruments and among the constructs. Another advantage of the MRI is that the model could be tested for female subjects as well. It is important to note however that while the MRI proports to be valid for females as well as males, it still appears to be assessing conflicts regarding the masculine role. While several theorists have discussed problems with subscription to the traditional female role, little is known empirically regarding gender role conflict, per se in women.

Another aspect of this study was further empirical exploration of the sex role salience construct. Subjects responded to three different measures of sex role salience, a direct measure and a consistency measure which were developed by Garnets (1978), and a new adjective checklist method which was developed for this study (Salience-Adjective). The results of the present study provided further elucidation of this construct. The instrument developed for this study, Salience-adjective was found to be significantly positively correlated (r = .34) with Salience-Direct. When these separate measures were standardized and summed to yield the composite measure of sex role salience, Salience-Z, the resultant measure was found to be
significantly related to gender role conflict as predicted by the theory.

The consistency measure of salience was found to be unrelated to either the adjective ($r = -.06$) or the direct measures of salience ($r = -.07$). It appears that the consistency measure of salience was assessing a different construct or was tapping into a different aspect of sex role salience than the direct and adjective measures were. In addition to a lack of convergent validity, Salience-Consistency did not relate to any other variables in a manner consistent with the theory.

Further research is needed in developing a reliable and valid measure of sex role salience. While the Salience-Adjective and Salience-Direct measures provide some promise, integration with gender role schema research (Bem, 1981) may provide further elucidation of this construct.

Finally, the current study provided some support for the clinical issue of gender role conflict's potential negative effects on psychological well-being. While theorists have contended that the male sex role has potential negative impacts on adjustment, there has been little empirical data to support these claims. The present data revealed that gender role conflict was related both to lower self-esteem and greater levels of anxiety in males.
Limitations of the Investigation

Several limitations that are both inherent in this type of research and that are specific to this particular study must be considered in interpreting the results.

The first major limitation is that the entire model could only be tested for male subjects. While the GRCS is only a valid measure of gender role conflict in males, the generalizations regarding the sex role strain analysis model can only be made for males. Future research with either the MRI (Snell, 1986) or other instruments that assess female gender role conflict may provide different results for this model.

A second limitation is that the subject sample consisted primarily of freshmen and sophomore students; accordingly the results may only be generalized to students in the early stages of college. While the instruments used have been validated on college populations, there is good reason to believe that there would be few, if any sex role transcendent individuals in their early years of college. As the sex role strain model is developmental in nature, the limited age range of the sample prohibits generalizations to older adults or assessment of age related changes.

Finally, there are several limitation related to the instrumentation. All data was generated from paper and pencil, self-report measures. It is thus difficult to assess what impact social desirability may have had on
subjects' responses. Also, given the length and repetitive nature of the battery, fatigue may have contributed to subjects performance. Some of the instruments used in this study have limited reliability and validity data available so it is important not to generalize these results beyond the power of these instruments. The construct validity of the sex role salience measures needs further exploration to have a clearer sense of exactly what is being measured. Other measures of sex role, especially one that assesses negative as well as positive aspects of sex role orientation may provide different results. The gender role conflict measure (GRCS, O'Neil et al., 1986) is also recently validated and needs further exploration especially some of the subscales which have relatively few items.

**Summary**

Overall, the data provided partial support for the sex role strain analysis model. The theory predicted that there would be a negative relationship between discrepancy and psychological well-being. The data supported this hypothesis for self-esteem, but the relationship was only significant in predicting anxiety for males. Also, when the variance from sex type was controlled for, the contribution of discrepancy was still statistically significant in predicting self-esteem but not practically significant. There was no relationship between discrepancy and anxiety when sex type was controlled. There was thus, partial
support for this hypothesis.

The theory also predicted that there would be a negative relationship between sex role salience and psychological well-being. The results indicated that Salience-Z was not significantly related, furthermore, contrary to hypotheses, Salience-C was positively related to measures of adjustment. This hypothesis was thus not supported.

It was hypothesized that the interaction between sex role salience and discrepancy would be significant in predicting psychological well-being. This was not generally supported by the data.

Gender role conflict was predicted to correlate positively with discrepancy and sex role salience. The relationship between gender role conflict and discrepancy was not found among the data. Consistent with the prediction, sex role salience, as measured by salience-Z accounted for a small percentage of the variance in gender role conflict. The interaction between salience-Z and discrepancy was also found to be significant in predicting gender role conflict which was consistent with the hypotheses.

Finally, gender role conflict was hypothesized to be negatively correlated with measures of psychological well-being. This relationship was supported for both self-esteem and anxiety.
Appendix A

Instructions and Questionnaire

for Male Subjects
INSTRUCTIONS

Check to be sure that you have a questionnaire packet, a green sheet, and two computer answer sheets. Since these will be machine scored, it is very important that you put your answers in the correct space! Your experiment card will not be signed until I have scanned your answer sheet to make sure that it is filled in correctly.

Look at the computer answer sheets. In the space marked "IDENTIFICATION NUMBER", you will see that you have been given a number so that your two answer sheets will stay together. The numbers in spaces ABC are your identification number. In the space marked D, is either a number 1 or 2 which indicates the first and second page. It is crucial that you begin answering on page 1!!!! Use only #2 pencil and be sure to make your marks very dark. If you need to erase, make sure you erase completely and that there are no stray marks on the sheets. If you do not have a #2 pencil- PLEASE ASK FOR ONE !!!!

On the first answer sheet (with a 1 in space D), fill in the following information.

Identification number & special codes-
Fill in the numbers spaces for A-D that correspond to the number written on the answer sheet. Now go to the second answer sheet and fill in the identification number for your second page. It will be the same three numbers in spaces A, B, and C but will have a number 2 in the space D.

Name- LEAVE BLANK !

Sex
M = male
F = female

Grade
1= freshman
2= sophomore
3= junior
4= senior
5= other

Birthday
Month, day, year
ex: September 5, 1965= sep-05-65

GO TO THE GREEN SHEET and place your identification number in the spaces at the top of that page. Follow the directions for completing that sheet and when you have finished it, turn this page and finish reading the directions.
The following is a set of questions aimed at understanding a variety of everyday behaviors. Please answer each item as quickly as possible. Do not skip any items. Some questions may appear similar. It is important that you answer each item as honestly as possible rather than trying to be consistent with other answers you may have given. Please do not refer back to any sections of the questionnaire packet once you have completed them.

Before you begin to answer the questionnaire, make sure that you begin answering on the sheet that has a 1 in the space for D, which is the first page. When you have completed the answers 1 to 120, go to the second answer sheet. PLEASE FILL IN EVERY ITEM ON THE COMPUTER SHEET PROVIDED. DO NOT WRITE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE PACKET. If you have any questions feel free to ask me at any time.
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.
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