INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

72-20,947

BURHENNE, Diane Pollack, 1943-
FEMALE AND MALE EVALUATIONS OF SEX-APPROPRIATE
AND SEX-INAPPROPRIATE SEX-ROLE STEREOTYPES.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1972
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

FEMALE AND MALE EVALUATIONS
OF SEX-APPROPRIATE AND SEX-INAPPROPRIATE
SEX-ROLE STEREOTYPES

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the
Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Diane Pollack Burhenne B.A., M.A.

The Ohio State University

1972

Approved by

Adviser
Department of Psychology

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Philip A. Marks, my adviser, for his helpful suggestions and to my reading committee, Dr. Herbert L. Mirels and especially to Dr. Saul M. Seigel for his continued support in the various aspects of my clinical training.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Steven J. Gross for his more than generous gifts and to Dr. Joseph Spitzner for his musical, statistical interventions.

My very deep gratitude is extended to Lynn P. Fisher, who throughout this study, gave time, support, and encouragement to both the research and the researcher. A special thank you to Doreen Seidler and to Carol Munzinger for knowing how to make chicken soup in the 11th hour.

A rainbow and a strong, silent 'thank you' for Richard Burhenne because he knew from the very beginning. . . .

This study is dedicated to those very remarkable women who have helped me "bust" some of my sex-role stereotypes and who have shown me not only that women could "do it" but "do it" superbly. For

Grayce M. Sills, Phima Engelstein, Anita Ross, Lillian Schwartz

and for

Ellyn, Mary Anne, Lila, Shayna, and Anne.

VITA

August 29, 1943 Born - Brooklyn, New York

1965. B.A., University of Florida,
Gainesville, Florida

1966. Psychometrician, University
Hospitals, The Ohio State
University, Columbus, Ohio

1967 - 1968 Psychology Internship,
Albert Einstein College of
Medicine, Yeshiva University,
Bronx, New York

1968 - 1969 Senior Staff Psychologist and
Ward Administrator, Bronx
State Hospital, Bronx, New
York

1969. M.A., The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

1969 - 1970 Teaching Associate, Department
of Psychology, The Ohio State
University, Columbus, Ohio

1970 - 1971 Behavior Modification Specialist,
Franklin County Program for the
Mentally Retarded, Columbus,
Ohio

1971 - 1972 Staff Psychologist, Columbus
Area Community Mental Health
Center, Columbus, Ohio

PUBLICATIONS

Burhenne, Diane P., Kaschak, Ellyn, and Schwebel, Andrew,
I. The effect of altering the administration
procedure on four WAIS subtests. Educational
and Psychological Measurement, (in press).

Burhenne, Diane and Mirels, Herbert, L. Self-disclosure
in self-descriptive essays. Journal of Consulting
and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 409-413.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Stability of Sex-Pole Stereotypes	3
Evaluations of Sex-Role Stereotypes	5
Some Consequences of Viewing the Sexes Stereotypically	8
Statement of Problem.	10
Hypotheses.	12
II. METHOD.	15
Part I.	15
Part II	17
Subjects.	17
Instruments	18
Procedure	20
III. RESULTS	22
Demographic Characteristics	22
Analysis of the Adjective Check List Data.	24
Analysis of Hypotheses.	26
Mental Health and Interpersonal Comfort	26
Likeability	29
Ability	32
Status.	34
IV. DISCUSSION.	35
Mental Health and Interpersonal Comfort	36
Likeability	38
Ability and Status.	40
Implications.	42

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	46
VI. APPENDICES.	49
A	51
B	57
C	58
D	59
E	60
F	62
VII. REFERENCES.	64

TABLES

Table

1. Percentage of Ss in Each Social Class Group in Part I and Part II of the Present Study	.23
2. Number of Endorsements of Adjectives in the "Most Typical of Males" Administration.	.24
3. Number of Endorsements of Adjectives in the "Most Typical of Females" Administration.	.25
4. Newman-Keuls Test on Ordered Treatment Means on the Dimension of Mental Health and Interpersonal Comfort for Feminine and Masculine Sex- Appropriate and Sex-Inappropriate Sex- Role Stereotypes.	.28
5. Newman-Keuls Test on Ordered Treatment Means on the Dimension of Likeability for Feminine and Masculine Sex-Appropriate and Sex-Inappropriate Sex-Role Stereotypes.	.31
6. Newman-Keuls Test on Ordered Treatment Means on the Dimension of Ability for Feminine and Masculine Sex-Appropriate and Sex-Inappropriate Sex-Role Stereotypes.	.33

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years behavioral scientists have given increasing attention to the nature of sex-roles and sex-role stereotypes in our society. Popular communications media area also increasingly focusing on the rapidly changing sex-roles of females and males. The media continues to note that attitudes and behaviors once associated with a particular sex are becoming less proscribed. Both females and males are described as holding attitudes and engaging in behaviors which were at one time considered as exclusively either feminine or masculine. However, while some females and males may very well be re-conceptualizing their sex-roles more flexibly, numerous sociological and psychological studies (Fernberger, 1948; Rosenkrantz, et al., 1969; Broverman, et al., 1970) indicate that changes in sex-role stereotypes are not occurring as rapidly as might be indicated by the media. Traditional sex-role stereotypes continue to exist among lay public (Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968) and professionals (Broverman, et al., 1970) alike.

Sex-role stereotypes are "consensual beliefs about different characteristics of men and women in our society" (Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968, p. 287). The crucial element with

regard to sex-role stereotypes is not whether perceived sex differences between females and males, in fact, do exist, but rather that there is consensual agreement in the belief of those differences. Traditional sex-role stereotypes frequently fall along a passive or submissive dimension for women and an active or aggressive dimension for men. That such sex-role stereotypes do exist has been well documented (McKee & Sherriffs, 1957, 1959; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957; Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968; Broverman, et al., 1970).

The reporting of changes in sex-roles by the popular communications media is a relatively recent phenomenon (e.g., Bowers, 1971). The frequency with which attention is paid to sex-roles by newspapers, magazines and television has highlighted not only the rapidity with which sex-roles are changing, but the importance of such changes for the entire society. For example, the growing Women's Liberation Movement continues to demonstrate that many women are attempting to re-define their sex-roles especially in the areas of occupational involvement and social activism.

In spite of the reported changes in sex-roles, psychological research on sex-role stereotypes for the last twenty years indicates that both the perception and evaluation of sex-role stereotypes is remarkably stable. The laboratory findings suggest that sex-role stereotypes are clearly defined and held in agreement by both females and males. On the one hand then, while the popular communications media indicates more flexibility

in sex-roles, laboratory research reports that sex-role stereotypes are narrow and inflexible. Additionally, research findings show that the favorability with which specific attributes of the respective sex-role stereotypes have been viewed, has remained unusually constant during the past twenty years.

Stability of Sex-Role Stereotypes

To date, there have been no more than approximately two dozen studies which have addressed themselves to exploring adult sex-role stereotypes. Since Fernberger's (1948) early work in the area, the majority of studies have continued to demonstrate empirically the stability of sex-role stereotypes.

Fernberger (1948) presented his undergraduate psychology classes with a lecture which stressed that many supposed behavioral and personality differences attributed to the sexes had not been experimentally demonstrated. Several days later he administered a questionnaire on these sex differences to 217 female and male students (and subsequently to 54 graduate students). He found that both female and male, undergraduate and graduate students, continued to view the sexes stereotypically. Female and male students agreed that males, when compared with females, were: (1) more intelligent, (2) more crude, (3) more dependent on the opposite sex, (4) possessed more all-around superiority. On the other hand, females were seen as: (1) the cause of trouble, (2) less passionate, (3) more sensitive, (4) not liking to fight, and (5) talking

too much. Fernberger (1948) concluded that it was extremely difficult to overcome stereotyped opinions regarding sex-roles.

Sherriffs and McKee (1957) employed Sarbin's Adjective Check List on which female and male college students were asked to indicate those words they believed to characterize females and males "in general." The findings indicate that males were considered "straight-forward," "intellectually rational," "competent," "bold," and "effective in dealing with the environment." The stereotype of females includes "emotional warmth," "involvement with social amenities," "irrationality," "unpleasant emotionality," and "snobbery."

Bennett and Cohen (1959) examined some of the perceived personality differences between females and males. Ss were 1300 females and males ranging from 15-64 years of age. The study employed 250 descriptive adjectives; Ss were asked to rate the adjectives according to how they best or least described (1) themselves, (2) how they would most like to be, (3) what a person should be like to be happy and satisfied, and (4) people in general. With respect to how Ss described themselves Bennett and Cohen (1959) found the major difference to be that women perceive themselves as being much richer in the qualities of social warmth and empathy (i.e., women see themselves as more understanding, tender, sympathetic, generous, affectionate, and loving than men see themselves) and that women see themselves as the "weaker" of the sexes (i.e., in comparison to men, women see themselves as more helpless, timid, and fearful).

Other studies (Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957, 1959; and Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968) continue to indicate that sex-role stereotypes are extremely stable and held in agreement by both college women and men.

Evaluations of Sex-Role Stereotypes

Investigators have found that evaluations (i.e., the relative desirability) of the respective sex-role stereotypes have also been stable over the last twenty years. For example, Sherriffs and Jarrett (1953) using a check list of 58 behaviors, asked Ss to indicate whether a behavior or attitude most appropriately characterized females or males and also to indicate the importance which they attached to each behavior or attitude. Consistent with previously cited research findings, Sherriffs and Jarrett (1953) found strong agreement between women and men with respect to the behavioral and attitudinal characteristics which they attributed to females and males. Moreover, they also reported marked agreement on the Ss' evaluation of these characteristics with both women and men Ss exhibiting a consistent preference for the attributes ascribed to males.

McKee and Sherriffs (1957) conducted the first of their series of three studies to determine whether Sherriffs and Jarrett's (1953) findings were attributable to a particular method or scale employed or if those findings were more general. They employed 3 different methods with several procedural variations; those included: (1) four different forms of a rating scale (6 and 7

point scales) where Ss noted their view of the over-all value or worth of women and men, (2) two different administrations of Sarbin's Adjective Check List (forced and unforced choice), and (3) an open ended procedure where Ss were asked to list 10 characteristics (McKee & Sherriffs do not specify as to type of characteristic) of females and 10 of males. Each of the three general methods and each of the procedural variations indicated that women and men Ss (undergraduate, introductory psychology students) regarded those characteristics ascribed to males more highly than the characteristics ascribed to females.

Of note, is the fact that McKee and Sherriffs' (1957) research was a methodological improvement in the study of sex-role stereotypes. They found that in spite of the type of scale employed, sex-role stereotypes and the evaluation of them remained relatively invariant. Furthermore, their results suggest that while open ended techniques tend to elicit somewhat egalitarian responses from Ss, forced choice procedures yielded pronounced partiality for the masculine sex-role stereotypic behaviors and personality characteristics.

In a second study, Sherriffs and McKee (1959) replicated their earlier findings; that is, Ss assigned more favorable adjectives to the masculine sex-role stereotype than to the feminine sex-role stereotype. MacBrayer (1960) reported similar results. Her findings reveal that among young, unmarried adults, females perceive masculine behaviors and personality characteristics significantly more favorably than males perceive female

behavior and personality characteristics. Eight years later, Rosenkrantz, et al. (1968) also found that both women and men agree that a greater number of the characteristics and behaviors stereotypically associated with masculinity are more socially desirable than those associated with femininity.

A methodological advance in studying sex-role stereotypes was offered by Rosenkrantz, et al. (1968) in their attempt to investigate differentially valued sex-role stereotypes. They constructed a 122 bipolar item questionnaire from lists of behaviors, attitudes and personality characteristics which Ss considered to differentiate women from men. Another sample of Ss judged which pole of each of the 122 bipolar items represented the more socially desirable behavior. The completed Sex-Role Questionnaire was then administered to college students with instructions to indicate what typical adult females and males were like. The findings indicate that both sexes agree that the attributes associated with the male sex-role stereotype are more socially desirable than those associated with the female sex-role stereotype.

In summary, studies examining the evaluation of sex-role stereotypes have found that Ss evaluate sex-role stereotypes differentially, that is, there is a consistent preference, by both females and males, for the behaviors, traits, and attitudes ascribed to males.

Some Consequences of Viewing the Sexes Stereotypically

During the last five years investigators have begun to systematically examine the evaluation of individuals engaging in behaviors or exhibiting attributes considered typical, (i.e., stereotypic) of the opposite sex. It may be assumed, from the previously described research, that a specific behavior and its consequences might be evaluated differentially, depending upon the sex of the individual who exhibited the behavior.

Goldberg (1968) tested the hypotheses that (1) even when the work is identical, women value the professional work of men more highly than that of women and (2) when the professional field happens to be one traditionally reserved for women, this tendency will be reversed, or at least diminished. In the study, women SS rated articles which, although they were the same, were labeled either as being the work of women or the work of men. Goldberg (1968) found that with regard to occupational fields (which were rated prior to the study as being either traditionally feminine or masculine) women were biased against women; that is, in both traditionally masculine and feminine fields, women rated the work of females as being inferior and less competent than the work of males.

Broverman, et al. (1970) employed the Sex-Role Questionnaire (Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968) with a population of mental health professionals. Broverman, et al. (1970) hypothesized that clinical

judgments about the traits characterizing healthy, mature individuals would differ as a function of the sex of the person judged. It was also expected that the differences in clinical judgments would parallel stereotypic sex-role differences and that behavioral attributes which were regarded as a standard of mental health, would resemble behaviors judged healthy for men, but would differ from behaviors judged mentally healthy for women.

Seventy-nine active clinicians (psychologists, social workers, and psychiatrists) were administered a 122 bipolar item sex-role Stereotype Questionnaire with one of three instructional sets: to describe a healthy, mature socially competent (a) adult, sex unspecified, (b) a man, or (c) a woman. The findings indicate a high agreement among both female and male clinicians as to the attributes characterizing healthy adult men, healthy adult women, and healthy adults, sex unspecified. Clinicians have different concepts of health for women and men and the differences paralleled the sex-role stereotypes in our society. That is, clinicians are more likely to suggest that healthy women differ from healthy men by being more submissive, less independent, less adventurous, more easily influenced, less aggressive, less competitive, more excitable in minor crises, having their feelings more easily hurt, being more emotional, more conceited about their appearance, less objective, and disliking math and science. They also found that the clinicians' conception of a healthy, mature man did not differ significantly from their conception of a healthy, mature adult; but their conception of a mature, healthy woman did differ signif-

ificantly from their conception of a healthy adult. Clinicians were significantly less likely to attribute traits which characterize healthy adults to women but were more likely to attribute these traits to men.

Horner (1970), investigating deviations from normative sex-role behaviors, asked female and male lawyers to describe a female and male lawyer who had: (1) become a partner in a large New York law firm and (2) been appointed Deputy Solicitor General. Although the data are still being analyzed, descriptions by women of the successful woman include: "unhappy," "aggressive," "unmarried," "peculiar," "frigid," and "terribly bright." Male descriptions of the successful female ranged from a "good for her" to "crazy," "stuffy," and "mannish." The attitudes expressed about the successful male (by both females and males) focused on his dull or boring personality and on his lack of social consciousness.

With respect to studying the evaluation of individuals who display attributes which are stereotypically ascribed to the opposite sex, Goldberg (1968) in his study tapped one evaluative dimension, professional competence; Broverman, et al. (1970) began to explore another, mental health; while Horner's (1970) study produced an array of descriptive data which will most probably be analyzed along numerous dimensions.

Statement of Problem

Much of the research in the area of sex-role stereotypes has confined itself to examining the behaviors, attitudes, and per-

sonality characteristics stereotypically attributed to females and males, and much of the data generated from these studies have been primarily descriptive in nature. Investigations which have explored evaluations of sex-role stereotypes have concentrated on such broad dimensions as social desirability or on a single dimension such as mental health.

There have been only two studies (Goldberg, 1968; Horner, 1970) which have directly investigated the evaluations of females and males who deviate from existing sex-role stereotypes.

This research, in part, attempted to explore the evaluation of individuals who exhibit characteristics appropriate to their sex-role stereotype and individuals who display characteristics inappropriate to their sex-role stereotype. For the purpose of this study, stereotypic behaviors and characteristics consensually attributed by both sexes, to one sex, are defined as sex-appropriate if employed to describe that sex. For example, if both females and males agree that 'domestic' were a characteristic of females and if 'domestic' were employed to describe a female, the application of that characteristic would be sex-appropriate. On the other hand, stereotypic behaviors and characteristics consensually attributed by both sexes, to one sex, but employed to describe a member of the other sex are defined as sex-inappropriate. For example, if 'domestic', a consensually agreed upon female sex-role stereotype characteristic, were employed in the description of a male, the application would be sex-inappropriate.

This study also attempted to investigate whether the stability

of evaluative judgments of the respective sex-role stereotypes may be attributed in part to the fact that researchers have collapsed various evaluative dimensions under such labels as 'social desirability' or 'favorability.' To examine this, the present study employed four dimensions: "mental health and interpersonal comfort," "ability," "status," (Harrison, undated paper) and "likeability."

In summary, the present research attempted to study how females and males evaluate sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes employing four different dimensions.

Hypotheses

The first two hypotheses concern Ss' evaluations on the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort.

H-1 Evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort will not differ with respect to the appropriateness of the sex-role stereotype being judged.

H-2 Evaluations of the sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort will not differ with respect to the sex of the stereotype being judged.

The next two hypotheses concern Ss' evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of likeability.

H-3 Evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of likeability will not differ with respect to the appropriateness of the stereotype being judged.

H-4 Evaluations of the sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of likeability will not differ with respect to the sex of the stereotype being judged.

The next 6 hypotheses were stated in such a manner as to reflect the anticipated interaction between the sex and the appropriateness of the sex-role stereotype.

The following three hypotheses deal with Ss' evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of ability.

H-5 Evaluations of the sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of ability will not differ with respect to the sex of the stereotype being judged.

H-6 Evaluations of the feminine sex-role stereotype on the dimension of ability will not differ with respect to the appropriateness of the stereotype being judged.

H-7 Evaluations of the masculine sex-role stereotype on the dimension of ability will not differ with respect to the appropriateness of the stereotype being judged.

The last three hypotheses concern Ss' evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of status.

H-8 Evaluations of the sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of status will not differ with respect to the sex of the stereotype being judged.

H-9 Evaluations of the feminine sex-role stereotype on the dimension of status will not differ with respect to the appropriateness of the stereotype being judged.

H-10 Evaluations of the masculine sex-role stereotype on the dimension of status will not differ with respect to the appropriateness of the stereotype being judged.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

PART I

Development of items reflecting sex-role stereotypes

One-hundred-eighty-six unmarried, undergraduate students (82 females and 104 males) at The Ohio State University participated in a preliminary investigation to develop sex-role stereotypes. Ss were drawn from an introductory psychology course, where participation in a psychology experiment was partial fulfillment of the course requirements. Ss were invited by means of a sign-up sheet to participate in a study of "college students' attitudes and opinions." Ss were run in groups of approximately 10 per session during Summer Quarter, 1971. Ss were administered the Adjective Check List (ACL; Gough and Heilbrun, 1965) with instructions to endorse the adjectives considered to be most typical of females and most typical of males.

The ACL (see Appendix A), developed to describe and study human behavior, is a set of 300 descriptive terms designed to be "(a) meaningful, (b) sufficiently complex in scope to cover the ordinary range of behavior observed and (c) susceptible of systematic analysis" (Gough, 1960, p. 107). The ACL was originally

constructed from lists of trait names and words referring to personal behavior developed by Allport and Odbert (1936). The 1958 revision of the ACL (Gough and Heilbrun) includes 24 scales based on Murray's need-trait system.

Typically, the instrument is presented with standard instructions for Ss to check each adjective which they feel to be self-descriptive. For the purposes of this investigation, the ACL was administered with instructions requesting Ss to check adjectives which they believed to be "most typical" of females and "most typical" of males. The administrations were counter-balanced so that half the Ss received "most typical of females" instructions first and half the Ss received the "most typical of males" instructions first.

Instructions to Ss were:

This is a study of college students' attitudes and opinions. On the cover sheet before you there are a number of questions. Please answer them as quickly as possible.

On the attached IBM sheet, fill in your sex and birth date; you do not need to fill in any other information.

The attached booklet contains a list of 300 adjectives. Each of the 300 adjectives has a number under it. Please read each adjective as quickly as possible and put a mark on the IBM sheet, in the "true" column, next to the appropriate corresponding number of only those adjectives which you consider to be the most typical of females (males). For example, if one of the adjectives were considered typical of females (males) you would darken in the number on the IBM sheet, in the "true" column. You will never need to use the "false" column. Remember, darken in, on the IBM sheet, in the "true" column, the appropriate, corresponding number of only those adjectives which you consider to be the most typical of females (males). Please work as quickly as possible so that we can go on to the other parts of the study.

The ACL data were analyzed for females and males separately; each group first being divided in half. The data analysis, then, was conducted for each administration (most typical of females and most typical of males) on four groups (two female and two male). An adjective was included on the sex-role stereotype list if endorsement of the item by each of the four groups exceeded twice the standard error of endorsement of all items for that group in the administration under analysis. The criterion for selection was stringent but was employed, nevertheless, in an attempt to assure the most discriminating adjectives on the sex-role stereotype list.

For the purpose of the study it was necessary to compile what was considered an adequate number of adjectives for Ss to react to and also to maintain an equal number of words for the female and male sex-role stereotype lists. On this basis, and given the stringency of the selection criterion, it was decided to include additional adjectives which did not meet the initial requirements. The additional words were selected in accordance with two criteria: (1) that at least twice the standard error of endorsement was met in three of the four groups, and (2) in no case did the selected word meet the criterion as being typical of the opposite sex.

PART II

Subjects

A second sample of 200 unmarried, undergraduate students (100 females and 100 males) at The Ohio State University partici-

pated in Part II of the study. The sample, which was similar to the first, was drawn from an introductory psychology class, where participation in a psychology experiment was partial fulfillment of the course requirements. Ss were invited, by means of a sign-up sheet, to participate in a study of "college students' impressions." Twenty-five female and twenty-five male Ss were randomly assigned to each of four treatment conditions: female sex-appropriate, female sex-inappropriate, male sex-appropriate, male sex-inappropriate. Ss were run in groups of approximately 20 during Autumn Quarter, 1971.

Instruments

Development of the Personality Questionnaire

Two sets of sex-role stereotype adjectives (see Appendices B - E) developed from Part I of the study, were prepared in the following manner: feminine sex-role stereotype adjectives were placed on two sheets, one indicating that the words were chosen by a female (Carol T.) to describe herself (sex-appropriate condition); the other indicating that the words were chosen by a male (Robert T.) to describe himself (sex-inappropriate condition). The masculine sex-role stereotype adjectives were prepared similarly. One sheet indicated that the words were selected by a male (Robert T.) to describe himself (sex-appropriate condition); the other indicated that the words were selected by a female (Carol T.) to describe herself (sex-inappropriate condition). The sheets were presented to Ss as a Personality

Questionnaire.

Person Description Instrument

The Person Description Instrument (PDI) was developed by Harrison (undated paper) to measure objectively which concepts individuals employ to describe others. In a series of studies, Harrison had Ss describe others (sex unspecified). He then selected a number of bi-polar traits which were factor analyzed to yield six interpersonal and four other dimensions.

For the purposes of the present study, the following dimensions with their bi-polar traits were selected.

1. Mental health and interpersonal comfort
 - a. comfortable with others, uncomfortable with others
 - b. relaxed, tense
 - c. well adjusted, maladjusted
 - d. unworried, anxious
2. Ability
 - a. high ability, low ability
 - b. intelligent, dull
 - c. competent, incompetent
 - d. informed, uninformed
3. Status
 - a. influential, uninfluential
 - b. low status, high status
 - c. low prestige, high prestige
 - d. has much authority, has little authority

In the present study, the bi-polar traits were randomly ordered for both dimension and pole and presented as a series of 7 point scales. Together with an additional 7 point "likeability" scale (likeable, unlikeable) the 13 scales were presented to Ss as the "Impressions Scale" (see Appendix F).

Scores on all scales comprising a single dimension were added to yield a total score for each of the four dimensions for a single S. Ss' total score for each dimension were then analyzed using a 2X2X2 analysis of variance.

Procedure

Evaluation of the Sex-Role Stereotypes

Ss were first asked to complete a form calling for demographic data. They were then presented with one of the four Personality Questionnaires, asked to form an impression of the person described, and then to rate that individual on the "Impressions Scale." Instructions to Ss were:

As you know from the sign-up sheet, this is a study of college students' impressions. Before you there are a number of questions. Please answer them as quickly as possible. In a previous portion of this study, students were asked to write a list of words which they believe best describe themselves. You will be asked to read one such list and to form an impression of that person. On the following page are instructions for using the Impressions Scale. Please read them along with me [see Appendix F]. On the next page there is a Xerox copy of the words which Carol T. (Robert T.) believes to best describe herself (himself). Please read the list and try to gain an impression of what kind of person you believe Carol T. (Robert T.) to be. After you have gained an impression, turn to the following

page, and according to the instructions, note your impressions of Carol T. (Robert T.) on the Impressions Scale.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics of Subjects

Demographic data were collected for all Ss. The mean age of the 82 females participating in Part I of the study was 19.33 years (S.D. = 2.16) and the mean age of the 100 females in Part II of the study was 18.38 years (S.D. = .87). A t-test between these means did reveal a difference (t = 3.72, p < .01). The mean age of the 104 males participating in Part I of the study was 20.31 years (S.D. = 1.90) and the mean age of the 100 males in Part II of the study was 19.45 years (S.D. = 1.75). A t-test between these means also revealed a difference (t = 3.37, p < .01). Of note is the fact that Ss participating in Part I of the study were sampled from a population of students enrolled at The Ohio State University during the Summer Quarter while Ss participating in Part II of the study were enrolled during Autumn Quarter. Ninety-three percent of the females in Part I and 92% of the females in Part II of the study reside in the Mid-West. Ninety-five percent of the males in Part I and 92% of the males in Part II of the study reside in the Mid-West.

The socio-economic classes of Ss were established according

to Hollingshead's (1957) two factor index of social position. The classes are arranged hierarchically so that I represents the Upper, III the Middle, and V the Lower socio-economic class. The socio-economic class data were analyzed using a 4 x 5 (sex for Part I and Part II of the study X socio-economic class) χ^2 contingency table. The χ^2 was not significant. Socio-economic class was not differentially related to sex in Part I or Part II of the study.

As noted in Table I, an inspection of the socio-economic

TABLE I

Percentage of Ss in Each Socio-Economic Class Group in Part I and Part II of the Present Study

Studies	Social Class				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Part I					
Females	21.9	13.4	41.5	15.9	7.3
Males	20.1	12.5	36.5	18.2	12.5
Part II					
Females	15.0	11.0	36.0	34.0	4.0
Males	20.0	17.0	30.0	29.0	4.0

class of Ss reveals that they are more concentrated in classes I and III and less concentrated in classes IV and V.

Analysis of the Adjective
Check List Data

As indicated by Table 2, four adjectives met the criterion

TABLE 2

Number of Endorsements of Adjectives in the "Most Typical of Males" Administration

Adjective	Males		Females	
	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
	Total N=52	Total N=52	Total N=41	Total N=41
Active	39	44	38	35
Adventurous	41	46	34	33
Aggressive	41	48	35	35
Ambitious	33	43	29	31
Boastful	32	38	30	27*
Dominant	29*	40	28	30
Independent	36	36*	26	33

Note - Critical values are: Males, Group A=30, Group B=38;
Females, Group A=26, Group B=29.

*These scores fall below twice the standard error of endorsement for all items.

of twice the standard error endorsement as "most typical of males":

active, adventurous, aggressive, and ambitious. As also shown in Table 2, 3 adjectives which did not meet the initial criterion but did meet the second criterion were added: boastful, dominant and independent.

Table 3 indicates that six adjectives reached the criterion of twice the standard error of endorsement as "most typical of females": affectionate, appreciative, changeable, emotional,

TABLE 3

Number of Endorsements of Adjectives in the "Most Typical of Females" Administration

Adjective	Males		Females	
	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
	Total N=52	Total N=52	Total N=41	Total N=41
Affectionate	39	43	35	38
Appreciative	35	40	36	34
Attractive	43	49	27*	32
Changeable	33	37	34	33
Emotional	43	45	37	34
Sensitive	34	39	31	31
Sentimental	33	36	32	33

Note - Critical values are: Males, Group A=28, Group B=35;
Females, Group A=28, Group B=31.

*This score falls below twice the standard error of endorsement for all items.

sensitive, and sentimental; one adjective, 'attractive,' which did not reach the initial criterion but did meet the second criterion was added.

ANALYSIS OF HYPOTHESES

Mental Health and Interpersonal Comfort

Hypothesis 1 stated that evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes, on the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort, would not differ significantly with respect to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the sex-role stereotype being judged. The results indicate a significant difference ($F = 5.18$, $p < .05$) between evaluations of the sex-appropriate ($\bar{X} = 21.27$) and sex-inappropriate ($\bar{X} = 20.12$) stereotypes. Both female and male Ss rated sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes as being somewhat more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes. This finding suggests that Ss perceive sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes significantly different on the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort.

Hypothesis 2 specified that evaluations of the sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes, on the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort, would not differ significantly with respect to the sex of the stereotype being evaluated. The results indicate that ratings of the feminine sex-appropriate stereotype ($\bar{X} = 20.30$) and the masculine sex-appropriate stereotype ($\bar{X} = 22.34$) are significantly different ($t = 3.84$; $p < .001$).

That is, female and male Ss evaluated the masculine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype as being more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than the feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype.

A further analysis of the data on the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort for feminine and masculine sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes was carried out using the Newman-Keuls Test (Winer, 1962). This test is employed in examining the difference between all pairs of means following a significant over-all F. The test takes into account the fact that the larger the number of means intervening between a pair of means in an ordered set, the larger the difference between them must be before this difference exceeds its critical value (Winer, 1962). As noted in Table 4, masculine sex-appropriate stereotypes were judged significantly more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than masculine sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes ($q_r = 3.88, p < .01$); feminine sex-inappropriate significantly more than masculine sex-inappropriate ($q_r = 3.52, p < .01$); feminine sex-inappropriate more than feminine sex-appropriate ($q_r = 1.58, p < .05$), and masculine sex-appropriate significantly more than feminine sex-appropriate ($q_r = 1.94, p < .05$). In the above mentioned cases, when feminine stereotypic adjectives were compared with masculine stereotypic adjectives, masculine stereotypic adjectives were evaluated as significantly more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than were feminine stereotypic adjectives. In the comparison

TABLE 4

Newman-Keuls Test on Ordered Treatment Means on the Dimension of Mental Health and Interpersonal Comfort for Feminine and Masculine Sex-Appropriate and Sex-Inappropriate Sex-Role Stereotypes

ORDER:	1	2	3	4
TREATMENT:	MAS SI	FEM SA	FEM SI	MAS SA
MEAN:	18.36	20.30	21.88	22.24
<hr/>				
TRUNCATED RANGE		2	3	4
q _{.95} (r,192)		2.77	3.31	3.63
q _{.95} (r,192) $\sqrt{\frac{MS_{error}}{n}}$		1.05	1.67	1.83
<hr/>				
q _{.99} (r,192)		3.64	4.12	4.40
q _{.99} (r,192) $\sqrt{\frac{MS_{error}}{n}}$		1.84	2.08	2.22
<hr/>				
DIFFERENCES				
	MAS SI	FEM SA	FEM SI	MAS SA
MAS SI	=	1.94*	3.52**	3.88**
FEM SA		-	1.58*	1.94*
FEM SI			-	NS
MAS SA				-

*p < .05
 **p < .01

of means where both sets of adjectives were stereotypic masculine (i.e., feminine sex-inappropriate and masculine sex-appropriate) there was no significant difference. When the sets of adjectives were both feminine (i.e., feminine sex-appropriate and masculine sex-inappropriate) the sex-appropriate stereotype was evaluated as more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable ($q_r = 1.94$, $p < .05$).

Likeability

Hypothesis 3 stated that evaluations of sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of likeability would not differ significantly with respect to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the stereotype being rated. The findings indicate a significant difference ($F = 9.39$; $p < .01$) between evaluations of the sex-appropriate ($\bar{X} = 5.34$) and sex-inappropriate ($\bar{X} = 4.74$) sex-role stereotypes. Ss rated sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes as being significantly more likeable than sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes. These findings indicate that Ss 'like' sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes more than the sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes.

Hypothesis 4 specified that evaluations of sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes, on the dimension of likeability, would not differ significantly with respect to the sex of the stereotype being judged. The results indicate a significant difference ($t = 2.93$; $p < .01$) between means for evaluations of the feminine sex-appropriate ($\bar{X} = 6.24$) and the masculine sex-appropriate

($\bar{X} = 4.44$) sex-role stereotypes. Female and male Ss evaluated feminine sex-appropriate stereotypes as being more likeable than masculine sex-appropriate stereotypes.

As noted in Table 5, a further analysis of the data, using the Newman-Keuls Test (Winer, 1962) indicates that the feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype was evaluated as significantly more likeable than the feminine sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotype ($q_r = 2.34, p < .01$); the masculine sex-inappropriate significantly more than the masculine sex-appropriate ($q_r = 1.44, p < .01$); the feminine sex-appropriate significantly more than the masculine sex-appropriate ($q_r = 1.80, p < .01$). In each of these cases, the feminine stereotypic adjectives were judged as significantly more likeable than the masculine stereotypic adjectives. When a comparison was made between sets of adjectives which were both masculine stereotypic (i.e., feminine sex-inappropriate and masculine sex-appropriate) there was no significant difference. When both sets of adjectives were feminine stereotypic (i.e., feminine sex-appropriate and masculine sex-inappropriate) the feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype was evaluated as significantly more likeable ($q_r = .66, p < .05$).

TABLE 5

Newman-Keuls Test on Ordered Treatment Means on the Dimension of Likeability for Feminine and Masculine Sex-Appropriate and Sex-Inappropriate Sex-Role Stereotypes

ORDER:	1	2	3	4
TREATMENT:	FEM SI	MAS SA	MAS SI	FEM SA
MEAN:	3.90	4.44	5.58	6.24
<hr/>				
TRUNCATED RANGE		2	3	4
q _{.95} (r,192)		2.77	3.31	3.63
q _{.95} (r,192) $\sqrt{\frac{MS_{error}}{n}}$		.54	.65	.71
<hr/>				
q _{.99} (r,192)		3.64	4.12	4.40
q _{.99} (r,192) $\sqrt{\frac{MS_{error}}{n}}$		.71	.81	.86
<hr/>				
DIFFERENCES				
	FEM SI	MAS SA	MAS SI	FEM SA
FEM SI	-	NS	1.68**	2.34**
MAS SA		-	1.44**	1.80**
MAS SI			-	.66*
FEM SA				-

*p < .05
 **p < .01

Ability

Hypothesis 5 specified that evaluations of the sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes, on the dimension of ability, would not differ significantly with respect to the sex of the stereotype being judged. A significant difference ($t = 3.88$, $p < .001$) was found between the feminine sex-appropriate ($\bar{X} = 19.42$) and the masculine sex-appropriate ($\bar{X} = 16.60$) stereotypes. The feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype was rated as having more ability than the sex-appropriate masculine sex-role stereotype.

Hypothesis 6 specified that on the dimension of ability evaluations of the feminine sex-role stereotypes would not differ significantly with respect to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the stereotype. The results indicate a significant difference ($t = 4.21$; $p < .001$) between evaluations of the feminine sex-appropriate ($\bar{X} = 19.42$) and the feminine sex-inappropriate ($\bar{X} = 16.36$) sex-role stereotypes. Ss rated the feminine sex-appropriate stereotype as having more ability than the feminine sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotype.

Hypothesis 7 stated that evaluations of the masculine sex-role stereotypes, on the dimension of ability, would not differ significantly with respect to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the stereotype. The difference between these means was not significant.

As noted in Table 6, a further analysis of these data indicates that the feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype was evaluated as having significantly more ability than the

TABLE 6

Newman-Keuls Test on Ordered Treatment Means on the Dimension of Ability for Feminine and Masculine Sex-Appropriate and Sex-Inappropriate Sex-Role Stereotypes

ORDER:	1	2	3	4
TREATMENT:	FEM SI	MAS SA	MAS SI	FEM SA
MEAN:	16.36	16.60	17.88	19.42
TRUNCATED RANGE		2	3	4
$q_{.95}(r,192)$		2.77	3.31	3.63
$q_{.95}(r,192) \sqrt{\frac{MS_{error}}{n}}$		2.01	2.41	2.23
DIFFERENCES				
	FEM SI	MAS SA	MAS SI	FEM SA
FEM SI	-	NS	NS	3.06*
MAS SA		-	NS	2.82*
MAS SI			-	NS
FEM SA				-

* $p < .05$

feminine sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotype ($q_r = 3.06$, $p < .05$); and the feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype as having significantly more ability than the masculine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype ($q_r = 2.82$, $p < .05$). In these instances, feminine stereotypic words were evaluated as having

more ability than masculine stereotypic adjectives.

Status

Hypothesis 8 stated that on the dimension of status Ss evaluations of sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes would not differ significantly with respect to the sex of the stereotype being rated. The findings reveal no significant difference between means. Ss did not rate the feminine sex-appropriate and masculine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes as significantly different in terms of status.

Hypothesis 9 stated that evaluations of the feminine sex-role stereotype, on the dimension of status, would not differ significantly with respect to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the stereotype being evaluated. The findings indicate that the mean difference was not significant.

Hypothesis 10 specified that evaluations of the masculine sex-role stereotype, on the dimension of status, would not differ significantly with respect to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the stereotype. Differences between means were not found to be significant.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The popular communications media continue to publicize radical changes in sex-roles while data from the research laboratory continues to indicate stability in sex-role stereotypes. This study lends support to the fact that sex-role stereotypes are remarkably impervious to the changes in sex-roles during the past 20 years. This finding is in accord with previous psychological research (Fernberger, 1948; Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957, 1959; Rosenkrantz, et al., 1970) which indicates that there has been minimal change in the personality characteristics and behaviors stereotypically attributed to the respective sexes over the last 24 years.

Previous research also indicates that there is marked stability in the evaluations of sex-role stereotypes by both females and males. Consistent with other findings in the area (Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968; Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957, 1959; MacBroyer, 1960; Goldberg, 1960) is the finding of the present study that female and male college students both define and evaluate sex-role stereotypes similarly. There were no significant main or second order interaction effects

indicating that female and male Ss evaluated the sex-role stereotypes differently on the four dimensions under study.

Mental Health and Interpersonal Comfort

With regard to the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort the results of the present study replicate the findings of Broverman, et al. (1970). That is, masculine, sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes are evaluated as more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than feminine, sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes. This along with the finding that, in general, sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes are evaluated as more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes holds implications for the attribution of pathology to individuals who deviate from culturally normative sex-role stereotypes, in particular for women who deviate from established sex-role patterns. Broverman, et al. (1970) found that practicing clinicians made evaluations of the mental health of individuals in a manner which was consistent with their sex-role stereotypes. That is, clinicians are more likely to suggest that healthy women differ from healthy men by being more submissive, more emotional, less independent, less aggressive, less adventurous, and less competitive. Broverman, et al. (1970) did not explore whether (and the extent to which) clinicians evaluate clients who deviate from culturally sanctioned sex-role behaviors. For instance, would a female who is viewed as "aggressive" and "active" and a male who is viewed as "sensitive"

and "sentimental" be evaluated by clinicians as being "less" mentally healthy?

The present study extends the work of Broverman, et al. (1970) by examining evaluations of the mental health and interpersonal comfort dimension based solely on the appropriateness of (i.e., conformity to or deviance from) culturally established sex-role stereotypes. Although unlike Broverman's et al. (1970) population, the present study employed a population of college students, the findings, nevertheless, suggest that individuals who deviate from their designated sex-role stereotypes are likely to be evaluated as less mentally healthy.

The results of this study indicate that Ss evaluated sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes as more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes and masculine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes as more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes. Although the latter finding is consistent with the results reported by Broverman, et al. (1970), the current data suggests that evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of mental health and interpersonal comfort are not as clear-cut as previously assumed. In all cases, masculine sex-role stereotype adjectives (regardless of the appropriateness or sex to which they were attributed) when compared with feminine sex-role stereotype adjectives were evaluated as significantly more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable. It may be that Ss were reacting to the composite of

adjectives which comprised the respective stereotypes rather than to the sex of the stereotype.

Likeability

On the dimension of likeability, Ss evaluated the sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes as more likeable than the sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes. Generally, then, not only do Ss evaluate the socially sanctioned sex-role stereotypes as more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable but they also state that they "like" them better than sex-role stereotypes which deviate from cultural norms.

Interestingly, although Ss rated the masculine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype as significantly more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than the feminine sex-appropriate stereotype, the findings were reversed on the ratings of likeability. On this dimension both female and male Ss evaluated the feminine, sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype as significantly more likeable than the masculine sex-appropriate stereotype. These findings are not consistent with previous research in the area, all of which indicates that on such dimensions as "favorability" and "social desirability" female and male Ss both show preferences for the masculine sex-role stereotype. A further analysis of these data indicates that in all cases when feminine sex-role stereotype adjectives (regardless of appropriateness or sex to which they were attributed) were compared with the masculine stereotypic adjectives, the feminine adjectives were evaluated

as significantly more likeable. These findings also suggest that Ss may not have been responding to the "label" female and male but possibly to the composite of adjectives which comprised the respective sex-role stereotypes.

While Ss evaluated the masculine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype as more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable, they evaluated the feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype as more likeable. Examining the sex-role stereotype adjectives in terms of these findings suggests that they may be, for the purposes of explanation, roughly dichotomized as representing two different approaches to interacting with the world; the masculine sex-role stereotype adjectives (e.g., aggressive and dominant) characterizing a "mechanistic" orientation and the feminine sex-role stereotype adjective (e.g., sensitive and emotional) characterizing a "humanistic" orientation. It may be that although Ss in this study tend to agree that to be 'well adjusted' in this technological society calls for personality characteristics such as articulated by the masculine sex-role stereotypic words (i.e., the "mechanistic" approach) they may, nevertheless, subjectively dislike individuals who display those characteristics. As seems prevalent with so many college students today, the Ss in the present study respond more favorably to individuals who exhibit the highly valued "humanistic" qualities such as sensitivity and emotionality.

Ability and Status

With respect to the dimension of ability, when compared with both the masculine sex-appropriate and the feminine sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes, Ss evaluated the feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype as having significantly more ability. This finding along with the fact that there were no significant differences on the dimension of status is somewhat puzzling. It is also not consistent with previous research which tends to suggest that when compared with females, males are perceived as having more ability and status. There may be several possible explanations for these findings. First, the dimensions of ability and status, as measured by the PDI may be too global for Ss to respond to; that is, the questions which comprise the dimensions ask Ss to evaluate ability and status "in general" without reference to specific areas or kinds of ability and status. The questions Ss may have had to ask themselves during ratings are "Ability to do what?" and "Status in terms of who and what?" Perhaps the dimensions of ability and status need to be defined more concretely with respect to specified tasks. Ss may have perceived, for example, the feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotype as having more ability in terms of dealing with "feelings" or "interpersonal interactions," and evaluated on that account. If the dimensions were more explicitly defined with respect to specific areas of endeavor, female and male sex-role stereotypes might yield differential abilities depending upon the task requirements.

McKee and Sherriffs (1957) in their study employing several methodological procedures for exploring sex-role stereotypes found, generally, that forced choice questions elicited more significant differences in the evaluations of female and male sex-role stereotypes than did open-ended ones. They suggest that ". . . most Ss will, if given a chance, deny partiality for either sex. We have interpreted this to mean that our college Ss have a veneer or equalitarianism overlying their more fundamental established beliefs (p. 379)." This phenomenon may also apply to the college students in the present study. McKee and Sherriffs' (1957) suggestion provides a plausible explanation for understanding both the lack of clear-cut results on the dimensions of ability and status and also the relatively small absolute differences on the dimensions of mental health/interpersonal comfort and likeability.

Fourthly, an analysis of the demographic data revealed a difference in age between females in Part I and Part II of the study and between the males in Part I and Part II of the study. Ss participating in Part I of the study were enrolled in school during Summer Quarter while Ss in Part II were enrolled during Autumn Quarter. It may be that the composition of the student population varies with the Summer and Autumn Quarters. Ss in Part I may have chosen adjectives which for them comprised what was 'typical' (i.e., stereotypic) of females and males yet Ss in Part II (who were approximately 1 year younger) may not have responded to the adjectives as stereotypic.

Furthermore, the present study employed a population of college students who reside, for the most part, in the Mid-West and come from upper and middle socio-economic families, while previous studies employed populations of college students from the East or West coasts. Although previous studies failed to offer demographic data, it may be that certain demographic characteristics, such as urban-rural, effect the evaluation of sex-role stereotypes.

ii Finally, a further explanation for the current findings is that evaluations of sex-role stereotypes may be undergoing some change, so that Ss no longer perceive that status and ability differences exist between feminine and masculine sex-role stereotypes. This explanation is plausible in light of the changes in sex-roles as reported by the popular communications media. Most of the previous research findings on the stability of evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes are now somewhat dated. With the reported rapid changes in sex-roles, it is likely that the laboratory data and the lag in the reporting of studies might not accurately reflect current attitudes toward sex-role stereotypes; particularly, as reflected by the dimensions of likeability, ability, and status.

Implications

The results of this study have various implications.

They suggest:

1. Global ratings of the social desirability or favora-

bility of the various sex-role stereotype characteristics need to be studied in relation to specific tasks. What is socially desirable for (or likeable about) a male in the business world may not be so for a male in the world of art. Future research on the evaluation of sex-role stereotypes might be more elucidating if the evaluative dimensions were clearly defined and tied to specified stimulus situations.

2. Additional research needs to explore possible differential evaluations of Ss to female and male sex-role stereotypes as opposed to women and men themselves. For example, in this study Ss were asked to endorse adjectives they believed 'typical' of females and of males. Those adjectives were then attributed to an 'individual' female or male. It is possible that Ss may evaluate the same adjectives differently depending upon whether the adjectives are attributed to the entire female or male sex or to an 'individual' female or male.

3. Work needs to be carried out to provide alternative conceptual frameworks for understanding both the nature of sex-role stereotypes and the evaluation of them. For example, typically, the sex-role stereotype of males has been viewed as falling along a predominantly "active" dimension; the sex-role stereotype of females has been viewed as falling along a predominantly "passive" dimension. In the present study as in previous studies these dimensions may be employed in examining the sex-role stereotypes. However, it is suggested that the application of an alternative framework may prove more useful

in understanding the feminine and masculine sex-role stereotypes. For example, the adjectives comprising the feminine sex-role stereotype may also be viewed as oriented toward "internal psychological phenomena" (e.g., emotions) and those comprising the masculine sex-role stereotype as focused toward "external environmental phenomena" (e.g., mastery of the environment). Traditionally, females have been viewed, stereotypically, as "passive" in comparison with the stereotypic view of males as "active." The dimensions of "active" and "passive" in and of themselves, carry certain stereotypic associations which when applied to individuals may lead to erroneous conclusions about their functioning. For example, females, stereotypically viewed as "passive" may also be seen as unable to adequately take charge of their lives, unable to go aggressively about meeting their needs, and unable to actively compete both academically and in the job market. To date, the association between "dealing with feelings" and "passivity" has not been empirically examined. The two activities are currently viewed synonymously with respect to sex-role stereotyping when perhaps they are not. It may be that a critical distinction between feminine and masculine sex-role stereotypes is "locus of attention"; that is, females are perceived as directing their attention toward internal processes while males are viewed as directing attention toward the environment.

4. Furthermore, different populations of Ss may evaluate sex-role stereotypes differentially. For example, the population

of Mid-Western college students from upper and middle socioeconomic families, employed in this study may evaluate the sex-role stereotypes differently than the populations of East and West coast college students employed in other research. Moreover, evaluations of sex-role stereotypes might vary as a function of age, year in school, and mother's occupation. Future researchers need to carefully define the demographic parameters of their populations. In fact, the demographic characteristics of both raters and ratees might be studied in an attempt to isolate some of the variables which might influence evaluations of sex-role stereotypes.

5. Additional research might be carried out in an attempt to explore the attribution of pathology to both females and males who deviate from expected societal sex-role stereotypes.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The study investigated female and male evaluations of sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes on four dimensions: mental health and interpersonal comfort, likeability, status, and ability.

In Part I of the study 186 (82 females and 104 males) ss indicated on the Adjective Check List which adjectives they considered to be "most typical" of females and "most typical" of males. Two sets (one feminine and one masculine) of 7 sex-role stereotype adjectives, each were selected from Part I of the study. The two sets of adjectives were prepared in the following manner: feminine sex-role stereotype adjectives were placed on one sheet which indicated they were selected by a female to describe herself (feminine, sex-appropriate) and on another sheet which indicated they were chosen by a male to describe himself (masculine, sex-inappropriate). The masculine sex-role stereotype adjectives were listed on a sheet which indicated they were chosen by a male to describe himself (masculine, sex-appropriate) and on another which indicated they were chosen by a female to describe herself (feminine, sex-inappropriate).

In Part II of the study, a second sample of 200 (100 female and 100 male) unmarried, undergraduate, introductory psychology students were randomly assigned (25 females and 25 males per condition) to 1 of 4 treatment conditions: feminine sex-appropriate, feminine sex-inappropriate, masculine sex-appropriate, masculine sex-inappropriate. Using the Person Description Instrument (presented to Ss as the Impressions Scale), Ss were asked to rate the 'individual' described by 1 of the 4 treatment conditions. The ratings were made on 4 dimensions: mental health and interpersonal comfort, likeability, ability, and status. The results were analyzed using a 2X2X2 analysis of variance.

The findings support the following conclusions:

1. Sex-role stereotypes do exist and are consistent with the stereotypes found in other studies.
2. On the 4 dimensions under study, females and males evaluated the sex-role stereotypes similarly.
3. Ss view sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes as more mentally healthy/interpersonally comfortable and more likeable than sex-inappropriate sex-role stereotypes.
4. Masculine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes are perceived as more mentally healthy and interpersonally comfortable than feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes.
5. Feminine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes are viewed as more likeable than masculine sex-appropriate sex-role stereotypes.
6. On both the dimensions of mental health/interpersonal

comfort and likeability Ss may have been responding to the adjectives which comprised the feminine and masculine stereotypes (regardless of which sex to which they were applied) rather than to the genders 'female' and 'male;.'

7. The conclusion of no difference between feminine and masculine sex-role stereotypes on the dimension of status and the lack of clear-cut results on the dimension of ability may be understood in terms of lack of specificity of the dimensions, the equalitarianism of college students, the demographic characteristics of the population, and the possible changes, over time, in college students attitudes toward sex-role stereotypes.

Implications of this study are seen in terms of: (1) tying evaluations of the sex-role stereotypes to specified stimulus situations; (2) exploring differential evaluations of the feminine and the masculine sex-role stereotypes as opposed to evaluations of women and men themselves; (3) providing alternative frameworks for understanding both the nature and evaluations of sex-role stereotypes; (4) studying the effects of demographic characteristics on the evaluation of the sex-role stereotypes and (5) exploring the attribution of pathology to individuals who deviate from expected sex-role stereotypes.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
THE ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

THE ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

☐ 1	absent-minded	☐ 23	boastful	☐ 45	considerate
☒ 2	active	☐ 24	bossy	☐ 46	contented
☐ 3	adaptable	☐ 25	calm	☐ 47	conventional
☒ 4	adventurous	☐ 26	capable	☐ 48	cool
☐ 5	affected	☐ 27	careless	☐ 49	cooperative
☐ 6	affectionate	☐ 28	cautious	☐ 50	courageous
☐ 7	aggressive	☐ 29	changeable	☐ 51	cowardly
☐ 8	alert	☐ 30	charming	☐ 52	cruel
☐ 9	aloof	☐ 31	cheerful	☐ 53	curious
☐ 10	ambitious	☐ 32	civilized	☐ 54	cynical
☐ 11	anxious	☐ 33	clear-thinking	☐ 55	daring
☐ 12	apathetic	☐ 34	clever	☐ 56	deceitful
☐ 13	appreciative	☐ 35	coarse	☐ 57	defensive
☐ 14	argumentative	☐ 36	cold	☐ 58	deliberate
☐ 15	arrogant	☐ 37	commonplace	☐ 59	demanding
☐ 16	artistic	☐ 38	complaining	☐ 60	dependable
☐ 17	assertive	☐ 39	complicated	☐ 61	dependent
☐ 18	attractive	☐ 40	conceited	☐ 62	despondent
☐ 19	autocratic	☐ 41	confident	☐ 63	determined
☐ 20	awkward	☐ 42	confused	☐ 64	dignified
☐ 21	bitter	☐ 43	conscientious	☐ 65	discreet
☐ 22	blustery	☐ 44	conservative	☐ 66	disorderly

() 67	dissatisfied	() 92	forgetful	() 117	idealistic
() 68	distractible	() 93	forgiving	() 118	imaginative
() 69	distrustful	() 94	formal	() 119	immature
() 70	dominant	() 95	frank	() 120	impatient
() 71	dreamy	() 96	friendly	() 121	impulsive
() 72	dull	() 97	frivolous	() 122	independent
() 73	easy going	() 98	fussy	() 123	indifferent
() 74	effeminate	() 99	generous	() 124	individualistic
() 75	efficient	() 100	gentle	() 125	industrious
() 75	egotistical	() 101	gloomy	() 126	infantile
() 77	emotional	() 102	good-looking	() 127	informal
() 78	energetic	() 103	good-natured	() 128	ingenious
() 79	enterprising	() 104	greedy	() 129	inhibited
() 80	enthusiastic	() 105	handsome	() 130	initiative
() 81	evasive	() 106	hard-headed	() 131	insightful
() 82	excitable	() 107	hard-hearted	() 132	intelligent
() 83	fair-minded	() 108	hasty	() 133	interests narrow
() 84	fault-finding	() 109	headstrong	() 134	interests wide
() 85	fearful	() 110	healthy	() 135	intolerant
() 86	feminine	() 111	helpful	() 136	inventive
() 87	fickle	() 112	high-strung	() 137	irresponsible
() 88	flirtatious	() 113	honest	() 138	irritable
() 89	foolish	() 114	hostile	() 139	jolly
() 90	forceful	() 115	humorous	() 140	kind
() 91	foresighted	() 116	hurried	() 141	lazy

() 142 leisurely	() 167 outgoing	() 192 quitting
() 143 logical	() 168 outspoken	() 193 rational
() 144 loud	() 169 painstaking	() 194 rattlebrained
() 145 loyal	() 170 patient	() 195 realistic
() 146 mannerly	() 171 peaceable	() 196 reasonable
() 147 masculine	() 172 peculiar	() 197 rebellious
() 148 mature	() 173 persevering	() 198 reckless
() 149 meek	() 174 persistent	() 199 reflective
() 150 methodical	() 175 pessimistic	() 200 relaxed
() 151 mild	() 176 planful	() 201 reliable
() 152 mischievous	() 177 pleasant	() 202 resentful
() 153 moderate	() 178 pleasure-seeking	() 203 reserved
() 154 modest	() 179 poised	() 204 resourceful
() 155 moody	() 180 polished	() 205 responsible
() 156 nagging	() 181 practical	() 206 restless
() 157 natural	() 182 praising	() 207 retiring
() 158 nervous	() 183 precise	() 208 rigid
() 159 noisy	() 184 prejudiced	() 209 robust
() 160 obliging	() 185 preoccupied	() 210 rude
() 161 obnoxious	() 186 progressive	() 211 sarcastic
() 162 opinionated	() 187 prudish	() 212 self-centered
() 163 opportunistic	() 188 quarrelsome	() 213 self-confident
() 164 optimistic	() 189 queer	() 214 self-controlled
() 165 organized	() 190 quick	() 215 self-denying
() 166 original	() 191 quiet	() 216 self-pitying

() 217 self-punishing	() 242 spendthrift	() 267 thrifty
() 218 self-seeking	() 243 spineless	() 268 timid
() 219 selfish	() 244 spontaneous	() 269 tolerant
() 220 sensitive	() 245 spunky	() 270 touchy
() 221 sentimental	() 246 stable	() 271 tough
() 222 serious	() 247 steady	() 272 trusting
() 223 severe	() 248 stern	() 273 unaffected
() 224 sexy	() 249 stingy	() 274 unambitious
() 225 shallow	() 250 stolid	() 275 unassuming
() 226 sharp-witted	() 251 strong	() 276 unconventional
() 227 shiftless	() 252 stubborn	() 277 undependable
() 228 show-off	() 253 submissive	() 278 understanding
() 229 shrewd	() 254 suggestible	() 279 unemotional
() 230 shy	() 255 sulky	() 280 unexcitable
() 231 silent	() 256 superstitious	() 281 unfriendly
() 232 simple	() 257 suspicious	() 282 uninhibited
() 233 sincere	() 258 sympathetic	() 283 unintelligent
() 234 slipshod	() 259 tactful	() 284 unkind
() 235 slow	() 260 tactless	() 285 unrealistic
() 236 sly	() 261 talkative	() 286 unscrupulous
() 237 smug	() 262 temperamental	() 287 unselfish
() 238 snobbish	() 263 tense	() 288 unstable
() 239 sociable	() 264 thankless	() 289 vindictive
() 240 soft-hearted	() 265 thorough	() 290 versatile
() 241 sophisticated	() 266 thoughtful	() 291 warm

- () 292 wary
- () 293 weak
- () 294 whiny
- () 295 wholesome
- () 296 wise
- () 297 withdrawn
- () 298 witty
- () 299 worrying
- () 300 zany

APPENDICES B-E
PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRES

PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name CAROL THOMPSON

Fill in the blanks with words which best describe you.

1. SENTIMENTAL
2. SENSITIVE
3. AFFECTIONATE
4. ATTRACTIVE
5. APPRECIATIVE
6. EMOTIONAL
7. CHANGEABLE

PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name CAROL T. [REDACTED]

Fill in the blanks with words which best describe you.

1. ADVENTUROUS
2. BOASTFUL
3. AMBITIOUS
4. INDEPENDENT
5. DOMINANT
6. ACTIVE
7. AGGRESSIVE

PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ROBERT T. [REDACTED]

Fill in the blanks with words which best describe you.

1. ADVENTUROUS
2. BOASTFUL
3. AMBITIOUS
4. INDEPENDENT
5. DOMINANT
6. ACTIVE
7. AGGRESSIVE

PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ROBERT T. [REDACTED]

Fill in the blanks with words which best describe you.

1. SENTIMENTAL
2. SENSITIVE
3. AFFECTIONATE
4. ATTRACTIVE
5. APPRECIATIVE
6. EMOTIONAL
7. CHANGEABLE

APPENDIX F
IMPRESSIONS SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING

If, after reading Carol T.'s description of herself, it is your impression that she is very similar to one or the other end of the scale you should place your check-mark as follows:

sincere X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : insincere

or

sincere ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : X : insincere

If it is your impression that she is quite similar to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

happy ____ : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : sad

or

happy ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : sad

If it is your impression that she is only slightly similar to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

slow ____ : ____ : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : quick

or

slow ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : ____ : quick

The direction toward which you check depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems most characteristic of Carol T. If you consider Carol T. to be neutral on the scale or if both sides of the scale are equally similar to Carol T. then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

messy ____ : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : neat

- REMEMBER: (1) DO NOT SKIP ANY SCALES.
- (2) PLACE YOUR CHECK-MARK IN THE MIDDLE OF SPACES,
NOT ON THE BOUNDARIES.
- (3) NEVER PUT MORE THAN ONE CHECK-MARK ON A SINGLE SCALE.

IMPRESSIONS SCALE

influential _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____uninfluential

has little authority ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ has much authority

relaxed : : : : : : **tense**

high prestige _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ low prestige

unworried : : : : : : **anxious**

comfortable with others _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ uncomfortable with others

intelligent _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **dull**

uninformed _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ informed

well adjusted _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____maladjusted

low ability _____ high ability

unlikable _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ likable

incompetent : : : : : : **competent**

low status ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ high status

REFERENCES

1. Angrist, S. S. The study of sex roles. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 215-231.
2. Bennett, E. M., and Cohen, L. R. Men and women: Personality patterns and contrasts. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1959, 59, 101-155.
3. Biddle, B. J., and Thomas, E. J. Role theory: Concepts and research. New York: Wiley, 1966.
4. Bowers, F. The sexes: Getting it all together. Saturday Review, January 9, 1971, 16-19.
5. Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., and Vogel, S. R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.
6. Fernberger, S. W. Persistence of stereotypes concerning sex differences. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1948, 43, 97-101.
7. Freud, S. Some psychological consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes (1925). Collected papers, Volume 5. London: Hogarth, 1952.
8. Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? In D.L. Schaeffer (Ed.) Sex differences in personality: Readings. Belmont, California: Brooke-Cole, 1971, Pp. 62-66.
9. Gough, H. G. The adjective check list as a personality assessment research technique. Psychological Reports, 1960, 6, 107-122.
10. Gough, H. G., and Heilbrun, A. B. The adjective check list manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1965.
11. Harrison, R. The structure and measurement of person perception. Unpublished and undated manuscript, Yale University. NIMH Grant #1-G466A.

12. Hartley, R. E. A developmental view of female sex-role identification. In B. J. Biddle and E. J. Thomas (Eds.) Role theory: Concepts and research. New York: Wiley, 1966. Pp. 354-361.
13. Hollingshead, A. B. Two factor index of social position. New Haven: Author, 1957.
14. Hollingshead, A. B., and Redlich, F. Social class and mental illness. New Haven: Wiley, 1958.
15. Horner, M. S. Follow up studies on the motive to avoid success in women. Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Miami, Florida, September, 1970.
16. MacBrayer, C. T. Differences in perception of the opposite sex by males and females. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 52, 309-314.
17. McKee, J. P., and Sherriffs, A. C. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals, and self concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 356-363.
18. McKee, J. P., and Sherriffs, A. C. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 356-371.
19. Rosenkrantz, P. S., Vogel, S. R., Bee, H., Broverman, I. K., and Broverman, D. I. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.
20. Schaeffer, D. L. (Ed.) Sex differences in personality: Readings. Belmont, California: Brooks-Cole, 1971.
21. Sherriffs, A. C., and Jarrett, R. F. Sex differences in attitudes about sex differences. Journal of Psychology, 1953, 35, 161-168.
22. Sherriffs, A. C., and McKee, J. D. Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 251-264.
23. Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.