

Sex Typed Identification, Male Dominance and Attitudes Toward Social Equality for Women

Terrance Q. Percival
and
Elizabeth F. Percival

University of Prince Edward Island

The research reported in this paper focused on the relationship between sex-stereotyped (sex typed) masculine and feminine identity and attitudes toward male dominance versus social equality for women. We investigated attitudes toward the traditional male dominated culture in an attempt to identify some of the psychological factors and/or types of people that might either resist or promote change toward greater social equality for women. A brief description of the attitudes under consideration, the concept of sex typed identity, and our predictions about the relationship between the two is presented below before we consider our own studies in detail.

Male dominance was viewed not as an issue, but as a fact to be explained (see, for example, Stockard and Johnson, 1979). For instance, males continue to dominate the workplace

where women still do not have equal pay or equal opportunity for job appointment or promotion. Most professions continue to be predominantly populated by males, with procedures and objectives defined by males. Despite some changes in family law, males continue to be considered the head of the household, the financial decision makers and the owners of the greater share of family assets, while the value of the work women have traditionally done in the home has not received sufficient recognition. In the interpersonal realm, males have traditionally had the prerogative of initiating relationships and may assert demands directly, while females have had to resort to less direct strategies and gain power and status through their male partners. To assess attitudes in these domains specifically, we examined attitudes toward male dominance in the workplace, in the

family, in relations between the sexes and attitudes toward double morality.

Sex typed identity, viewed as an attitude towards oneself, can be thought of as having both a cognitive component and an affective component. In this case, the cognitive component is the belief structure about oneself, i.e. one's self-concept. The self concept is made up of both the attributes or characteristics used to describe the self and the roles which describe the self. The affective component is the value structure which includes both one's ego ideal (the value attached to attributes, ratings of the ideal self) and role preferences (the value attached to roles, roles that one would wish to have). In line with other approaches to attitude change (e.g. cognitive dissonance theory, Festinger, 1957), we would expect that there is a motive to maintain consistency, in this case, a motive to maintain a consistent identity.

The attributes of the self concept (cognitive component) may fit one of several identifiable prototypes. Two such prototypes will be considered in this paper: sex typed self concepts and androgynous self concepts. Specifically, a person would be said to have a sex typed self-concept to the extent that she/he reports possessing those characteristics manifested in the appropriate sex stereotype and not those of the opposite sex stereotype.¹ The prototypes here are the "feminine female"—a woman who describes herself in feminine stereotypic terms and the "masculine male"—a man who describes himself in masculine stereotypic terms. In contrast to such sex typed persons are those who do not describe themselves in stereotypic ways. One can argue that both females and males are capable of actualizing both masculine and feminine characteristics. Such persons would be capable of greater flexibility and could respond to situations in a manner they thought to be appropriate, regardless of whether the response would be considered masculine or feminine. A term used to

describe such an individual is psychological androgyny. The androgynous person has been defined as one whose self reports indicate a balance of masculinity and femininity (Bem, 1974) and as high on both masculinity and femininity (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1975; Bem, 1977). The prototype here, then, is the "androgynous female" and the "androgynous male".²

The Relationship Between Self Concept and Ego Ideal

Strong sex typed identification is evidenced, in part, when a person not only reports herself or himself to have sex typed attributes, but also values the possession of sex appropriate attributes and devalues the possession of sex inappropriate attributes, i.e. when there is congruence between the self concept and the ego ideal. Based on consistency theory, one might expect that both masculine males and feminine females would have sex typed identities. However, a complication may exist because of a cultural bias in favor of masculinity. Several studies are relevant to this issue of the relative value placed on masculine and feminine potentials. Jones, Chernovetz and Hansson (1978) found that subjects who rated themselves low on masculinity would strongly prefer to become more masculine, while subjects who rated themselves low on femininity did not show a strong preference to become more feminine. Gilbert, Deutsch and Strahan (1978) found that although males and females agreed on their masculinity ratings for an ideal man, females described the ideal woman to be as masculine as their ideal man, whereas males described her as significantly less masculine than their ideal man. Percival and Percival (1979) found that male subjects rated an ideal man and an ideal person to be quite similar while an ideal woman was considered to be different, i.e. the ideal woman was more loving, sensitive, sensuous and sub-

missive. Female subjects did not differentiate between an ideal man, woman and person. Similar results were reported by Brooks-Gunn and Fisch (1980) for ratings of a healthy adult man, healthy adult woman and a healthy adult, i.e. males rated a healthy man and a healthy adult as quite similar and a healthy woman as different. Females did not differentiate. Based on both consistency theory and these studies, then, we predicted that masculine males would tend to have masculine ego ideals, i.e. to value masculine attributes and devalue feminine attributes, thereby exhibiting consistent masculine identities.

The identities of feminine females were more difficult to predict. The Percival and Percival (1979) study would lead one to predict inconsistency for females since, from the males' perspective a woman cannot be both an ideal person and an ideal woman and from the females' perspective the ideal woman, man and person are very similar. More specifically, the Jones et al. (1978) study would lead one to predict androgynous ideals for females, therefore contradicting a consistency prediction for the identity of feminine females.

We predicted that androgynous subjects would value both masculine and feminine attributes, thus exhibiting consistent androgynous identities. This prediction is based on the fact that both masculine and feminine attributes are generally considered to be positive, and that androgynous subjects exhibit independence from sex typing in their self descriptions, reporting the possession of both masculine and feminine attributes.

The Relationship Between Self Concept and Attitudes Toward Social Equality

Males

Given consistency between self concepts and ego ideals, one would also expect consistent role preferences. For masculine males, this

would mean support for traditional sex roles based on male dominance. Power-dominance is, in fact, one important aspect of the masculine stereotype. Several lines of evidence point to the importance of such a dimension in masculinity. Spence et al. (1975) found the adjectives *aggressive* and *dominant* to be rated high for an ideal man but not for an ideal woman, while the majority of masculine items tested were rated as high for both the ideal man and the ideal woman. Lippa (1978) reported the results of an item analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (the BSRI is a device for measuring sex-typing and androgyny, Bem, 1974) in which the adjectives *dominant* and *assertive* correlated most strongly with masculinity. Factor analytic studies of the BSRI (Gaudreau, 1977; Whetton and Swindels, 1977; Feather, 1978; and Pedhazur and Tatembaum, 1979) found the highest loading items on the masculinity factor to indicate a theme of power-dominance and leadership. Thus, if masculine males identify with masculinity, one important aspect of this is identification with power and dominance. We therefore predicted that masculine males would support traditional attitudes toward a society dominated by males and would oppose social equality for women.

In contrast, if androgynous males value both masculine and feminine characteristics, it follows that they would be more receptive to changes in traditional role behaviors than would sex typed males.³

Females

Because of the problems associated with feminine identity already described, it was more difficult to predict females' attitudes toward male dominance versus social equality. As discussed above for males, we expected androgynous females to be more supportive of social equality than sex typed males. Regarding the sex typed females, two possibilities existed: (1) to the extent that they have an-

drogynous ideals, as predicted, we expected that they would endorse social equality more than their male sex typed counterparts, perhaps more like the androgynous females, but (2) if they maintain consistent identities by having feminine ideals, then, to maintain that consistency we expected that they would support traditional roles and would oppose social change, at least on some issues. For example, they might be willing to endorse the more general issue of equality in the workplace (which could benefit women without threatening their feminine identity), but be unwilling to endorse changes in relations between the sexes. No specific predictions were made in this regard.

The following report presents two studies. The first study focused on the issue of whether sex typed and androgynous subjects report sex typed or androgynous ideals. Some resolution of this question was important for the second study which (a) attempted to replicate the findings of the first and (b) focused on the relationship between sex typed identity and attitudes toward male dominance versus social equality for women. The second study differed from earlier attempts to correlate androgyny with traditional versus pro-feminist attitudes in that a double criterion (median split and difference score) method of sorting androgynous subjects was used, and a new attitude measure was developed which consisted of several subscales, each of which focused on a narrow attitude domain. The research strategy was to utilize a series of smaller studies across different samples. The pattern of results from each was taken as a hypothesis to be replicated by the next. This allowed a more complete exploration of the data while relying on replication as a rigorous standard for the reported results.

STUDY 1

Study 1 was a conceptual replication of some aspects of the Percival and Percival (1979) and

Brooks-Gunn and Fisch (1980) studies. It differed from these studies in the following ways: (a) a self report measure was included to classify subjects as sex typed or androgynous, adding an additional factor to the design, and (b) ideal self ratings were used rather than ratings of the ideal man or woman because the main purpose of the study was to assess sex typed identity rather than stereotyping. As in the Percival and Percival study, ideal person ratings were included.

Consistent identities were predicted for androgynous males and females and for sex typed males (i.e. that androgynous subjects would report androgynous ideals and masculine males would report masculine ideals). It was predicted that sex typed females would not have consistent identities (i.e. that feminine females would report androgynous ideals).

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 76 young adult volunteers aged 20 to 29 with equal numbers of married and unmarried males and females.⁴

Procedure

The subjects were administered the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence and Helmreich, 1978) for self ratings and were then given the same questionnaire with instructions to rate their ideal self and finally an ideal person.

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) contains scales for masculinity (M scale), femininity (F scale), and a bi-polar masculinity-femininity measure (MF scale). The M scale and F scale were reported by Spence et al. (1975) to be positively valued for both sexes, although valued more for the appropriate sex. Each pole of each MF scale item was reported to be valued differentially for

each sex, i.e. the mean ratings for an ideal man or ideal woman lay on different sides of the midpoint of the scale, suggesting that what was socially desirable for one sex was not socially desirable for the other.

The subjects were first sorted into sex typed and androgynous groups on the basis of self-ratings, using the method of median splits (Spence and Helmreich, 1978): sex typed males were high M, low F, sex typed females were high F, low M, and androgynous males and females were high M and high F. Undifferentiated males and females (low M and low F) and feminine males and masculine females were not included in the analysis ($n_s = 6, 6, 6, \text{ and } 1$, respectively). The selected sex typed and androgynous subjects were then required to pass a second, difference-score, criterion: large differences between M scale and F scale scores for sex typed subjects; small

The difference score criterion was added for two reasons: (1) to increase comparability with other studies using difference score sorts, as in Study 2 of this article, and (2) to control for difference scores in the self-reports. The latter was necessary because the self-reports might act as an anchor for the ideal self and ideal person ratings. This additional criterion eliminated only three sex typed males, one sex typed female, and no androgynous subjects.

Results and Discussion

The mean M, F, and MF scale ideal self and ideal person ratings for sex typed and androgynous males and females are presented in Table 1.

M and F scale data

The prediction that only sex typed males would tend toward sex typed identities could

Table 1
Mean Ideal Self and Ideal Person Ratings
by PAQ Groups on the M, F and MF Scales

PAQ Groups	Ideal Self			Ideal Person		
	M	F	MF	M	F	MF
Sex typed males	26.7	22.6	23.9	27.8	24.7	22.4
Androgynous males	24.7	26.3	18.6	25.2	27.4	19.1
Sex typed females	25.6	27.3	19.6	24.9	26.2	18.6
Androgynous females	27.2	26.8	18.8	24.8	26.9	19.7

PAQ Group $n_s = 9, 14, 18, 12$, respectively.

differences for androgynous subjects. With no precedent for PAQ difference score sorts, we defined a large difference score as greater than the median absolute difference score of four.

be tested by specific comparisons on the groups by scales interaction of the analysis of variance. Specifically, M scale minus F scale differences should be significant only for sex typed males.

The groups by scale interaction for the ideal self data was significant, $F(3,98) = 4.43$, $p < .01$. Specific comparisons for the M minus F scale difference was significant only for sex typed males, $t(98) = 2.71$, $p < .01$, one-tailed.

The groups by scale interaction for the ideal person data was also significant, though somewhat less so, $F(3,98) = 3.22$, $p < .05$. The M minus F scale difference was significant only for sex typed males, $t(98) = 1.87$, $p < .05$, one-tailed.

Recall that the M scale and F scale consisted of items that had been found to be rated as positive for both sexes. On this basis alone, one would expect high ratings on both scales for the ideal self and ideal person. Only sex typed males devalued feminine attributes for both the ideal self and ideal person. To the extent that there is a cultural bias toward valuing masculine over feminine attributes, it would seem to be supported only by sex typed males. The results were consistent with the Jones et al. (1978) finding that sex typed females would prefer to be more masculine.

MF scale data

To test the prediction on the MF scale, sex typed males were compared to the mean of the other groups. As predicted sex typed males reported more masculine ideal self and ideal person ratings, $t(49) = 3.28$ and 2.39 , $p < .01$ and $p < .025$, one-tailed.

As indicated previously, the MF scale consisted of items that had been found to be valued for one sex and not the other. At the masculine pole, the scale included power-dominance items, e.g. *dominant* and *aggressive*, and at the feminine pole, items suggesting emotional vulnerability e.g. *excitable in a crisis situation*. Sex

typed males predictably valued power dominance and rejected emotional vulnerability. However, sex typed females did not value emotional vulnerability and reject power dominance, and they could hardly be expected to do so. The results were consistent with our prediction that an orientation toward power and dominance would be an important aspect of male sex typed identity.

In summary, there was consistency between self concept and ideals for androgynous subjects and for sex typed males, but inconsistency for sex typed females, as predicted.

STUDY 2

The second study had two main objectives. The first was to replicate the results of Study 1 that sex typed males held sex typed ideals in contrast to sex typed females and androgynous subjects. The second objective was to investigate the relationship between sex typed identity and attitudes toward the traditional male dominated society versus the alternative of social equality for women.

In order to assess these attitudes, a new questionnaire was used. Although it drew heavily from the Spence and Helmreich (1972) Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS), it was different from that questionnaire in that it was composed of a variety of subscales. There were three major reasons for this variation. One was simply an interest in some issues not covered in the AWS. Another was that Spence and Helmreich reported that different content areas loaded on different factors suggesting that perhaps the scale is not unidimensional (for example, items pertaining to equal opportunity loaded on one factor while items referring to dating and courtship, traditional acts of courtesy and ladylike behavior loaded on another). And finally, along this same line,

Brannon (1978) had suggested the sort of approach adopted in this study. Noting that most existing questionnaires which measure attitudes toward women assume a broad general construct and measure a single dimension with items of heterogeneous content, he recommended the use of questionnaires composed of a set of smaller homogeneous subscales that may be used separately or in combination to provide an overall index. One advantage of such an approach is that it would enable one to discover qualitatively different patterns of interaction between the various subscales and other variables.

The main prediction of Study 2 was that sex typed males would endorse traditional attitudes toward the male dominated society and oppose social equality for women in contrast to all other groups. It follows from this prediction that sex typed males would be more traditional than androgynous males. Both androgynous females and males were predicted to support social equality for women.

Uncertain of the relationship between feminine sex typed identity and the attitude subscales, we regarded the comparisons between sex typed and androgynous females as exploratory. Because Spence and Helmreich (1972) reported females to be more liberal than males on the equal opportunity items, we would not expect females to be traditional in this area. However, we thought that sex typed females might be more traditional on some subscales. Of particular interest in this respect were the female initiative and double morality subscales. The former was based on attitudes toward women taking initiative in courtship and dating. The latter reflects attitudes toward the cultural expectation that females should "be nice" and avoid such behavior as drunkenness, heavy smoking or swearing, while these standards are not applied to males.

Method

Subjects and Procedure

Data are reported on two separate samples of subjects: (a) a high school sample of 48 male and 39 female grade eleven students who volunteered to participate in the project at a local high school, and (b) a university sample of 52 male and 77 female undergraduate students at the University of Prince Edward Island. These subjects were volunteers from classes in psychology, business administration and home economics.⁵

In each sample the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was administered first followed by the Sex Role Attitudes and Values Questionnaire (SRAVQ).

The Bem Sex Role Inventory

The high school sample was given the full BSRI (Bem, 1974) which consists of 20 masculine, 20 feminine and 20 neutral filler items. Subjects rate themselves on each item using a seven point Likert scale. Each subject's score on masculinity (M) and femininity (F) consisted of the mean rating across the 20 items.

The original Bem (1974) sorting method utilized M minus F difference score ranges to sort subjects into masculine, near masculine, androgynous, near feminine and feminine groups. Later, Bem (1977) proposed the median split technique (Spence et al., 1975) as a better alternative, though Bem also reported the two procedures produced similar results. Other research (Downing, 1979) did not report similar results and both Downing (1979) and Murray (1976) have recommended a hybrid sorting procedure.

To avoid this controversy, we sorted subjects both ways, thus producing a double criterion. First, the median split technique (defined in Study 1) was used to sort subjects into sex typed, androgynous and cross-sex

typed groups. The undifferentiated (low-low) group was not included in the analysis. The median split groups were further subdivided into difference score groups. This produced the possibility of a three median split groups by five difference score groups factorial design. However, the design was reduced to an incomplete factorial as only cells with a minimum of five subjects were included.

The university subjects did both self and ideal self ratings. That is, after filling out the BSRI using standard instructions, they were given another copy and asked to rate their ideal selves, "the person you would wish to be." This sample was given a short form of the BSRI which consisted of the 10 masculine and 10 feminine items with the highest loadings on the masculinity and femininity factors, based on the previously cited BSRI factor analytic studies. Ten filler items were also included. The short form had greater factorial purity and such a short form was recommended by Bem (1979).

The scoring was essentially the same as that used for the high school sample except that an adjustment was necessary for the short form. While the long form of the BSRI has approximately equal measures of central tendency on the M and F scales, the short form had a higher median F score. This occurred because several low rated masculine items, e.g., *dominant*, *forceful* and *aggressive*, loaded high on the masculinity factor and thus were included in the short form, while low rated feminine items, e.g. *gullible*, *flatterable* and *shy*, did not load on the femininity factor and were not included. Using the respective medians as a measure of equivalent points on each scale, a difference score equal to the difference between the medians would be equivalent to no difference. The M scale median minus F scale median was 1.0, and thus, M minus F scale difference scores were adjusted by adding a constant of 1.0 to each score. The subjects were

then sorted, using adjusted difference scores and following the same procedure as for the high school sample.

The Sex Role Attitudes and Values Questionnaire (SRAVQ)

As previously mentioned, the SRAVQ was developed as an alternative to existing questionnaires, most of which assume a broad unidimensional construct. In contrast to unidimensional scales with heterogeneous content, short subscales with items of highly similar content were used to assess narrow attitudinal domains. The approach relied heavily on face validity and internal consistency. What was measured was essentially the endorsement or non-endorsement of the item content. However, should the questionnaire measure more general construct dimensions, this would be evident in the clustering or factoring of subscales and by qualitatively similar patterns of interaction between these subscales and other variables. Should a theoretical construct be proposed, research could be initiated to test its validity, e.g. the validation of the sex typed identification subscale in this article.

The high school sample was given a five subscale version of the questionnaire. The subscales were: equal opportunity, female initiative, double morality, androgynous value and sex typed identification. The first three were based heavily on Spence and Helmreich's (1972) Attitudes Toward Women Scale.⁶ Based on results from a pilot sample of 93 introductory psychology students, all items selected for each subscale correlated greater than .50 with the total subscale score.⁷

The university sample was administered a new form of the questionnaire consisting of the best 5 items from the equal opportunity, double morality and androgynous value subscales, revised five item female initiative and sex typed identification subscales, and five new

subscales which were included for exploratory work. Of the new subscales, two were considered worthy of reporting in this article based on reliability and on substantial relationships with other variables: stereotypic belief and male dominance versus family equality. The content for this latest form of each subscale is presented in Appendix I.

An item format was adopted that was a hybrid between forced choice and Likert scaling. This enabled a forced choice between alternatives which were not exact contradictions for some subscales, whereas the same format would be similar to a single item Likert format if the item was paired with its obverse. The forced choice format controlled for an acquiescence response set and the direction of paired alternatives within a subscale was alternated randomly to control for a right-left response set. The reliability of the latest form (university sample) was indicated by the high Cronbach's alpha coefficients (a measure of in-

ternal consistency) presented in the diagonal of Table 2. Additionally, an indirect indication of reliability was the substantial correlation between subscales also presented in Table 2. These correlations between subscales indicated the possibility of grouping the subscales into more general dimensions. However, we considered this a future research objective.

Results and Discussion

The results will be reported in two parts. In Part I we present data on the ideal self reports of sex typed and androgynous subjects as a replication of Study 1. Additionally, two independent measures from the SRAVQ are presented: the sex typed identification subscale and the sex typed versus androgynous ideals subscale. The first could be validated against the BSRI sorts and the second provided an opportunity to replicate Study 1 with a new measure. Having established the sex typed identity of the subjects in Part I, in Part II we

Table 2
Intercorrelations Between SRAVQ Subscales
(University Sample)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Sex typed identity	(.71) ^a	-.39	-.40	-.27	.44	-.40	.30
2. Androgynous value		(.79)	.63	.69	-.43	.33	-.60
3. Equal opportunity			(.75)	.56	-.41	.26	-.56
4. Family equality				(.63)	-.45	.29	-.54
5. Double morality					(.71)	-.37	.42
6. Female initiative						(.82)	-.21
7. Stereotypic belief							(.65)

^aCronbach's alpha coefficients

investigate the relationship between sex typed identity and traditional attitudes toward the male dominated society.

The data for each dependent variable were analyzed using a one way analysis of variance across the cells of the incomplete factorial design, and planned comparisons were carried out to test for differences between cell means as outlined in Table 3. Sex typed versus androgynous comparisons were used for both the median split sorts and for double criterion sorts i.e., those subjects who would be selected as sex typed or androgynous by both the median split and the difference score sorts. A third comparison contrasted sex typed males (double criterion sort) with all other cells. This was a direct test of our hypothesis that only sex typed males would maintain sex typed ideals and oppose social equality for women.

Part I. Sex Typed Versus Androgynous Ideals

One index of sex typed and androgynous ideals was the BSRI ideal self ratings. In the first study, sex typed males reported sex typed ideal self ratings. As indicated in Table 4, sex typed males again rejected feminine characteristics for the ideal self, replicating the findings of Study 1. The mean ideal self rating on the F scale was low for sex typed males in comparison to the other subjects. Both the median split and double criterion sex typed versus androgynous comparisons on the F scale were highly significant for males. The comparison between sex typed males and all other cells on the F scale was also highly significant, $t(88) = 4.29 < .001$. Additionally, sex typed males were significantly higher than the other cells on the M scale ideal self ratings, $t(88) = 2.14$ $p < .05$, one-tailed, although the differences were much smaller than those on the F scale. In summary, sex typed males again maintained sex typed ideal self ratings with

significantly higher M scale scores and significantly lower F scale scores than other subjects.

In contrast to the results of Study 1, sex typed females had significantly lower M scale ideal self ratings than androgynous subjects on both the median split and double criterion comparisons. Sex typed females also tended to be lower on the F scale ideal self ratings, although they were significantly lower on the median split comparison only. However, the F scale ratings for double criterion sex typed females were significantly higher than their M scale ratings even after an adjustment for the overall differences in scale (i.e., the overall mean difference was subtracted from the tested difference, the same correction procedure as was described for self ratings in the Method section), $t(34) = 3.59$, $p < .01$, one-tailed. The findings of Study 1 that sex typed females tend toward androgynous ideals was not replicated.

SRAVQ Sex Typed Identity and Androgynous Value Subscales

The sex typed identity and androgynous value subscales from the SRAVQ provided independent measures of similar dimensions to those of the BSRI and provided the opportunity for validating these subscales against the BSRI.

The means for both subscales across BSRI groups are reported in Table 5. We predicted that subjects classified as sex typed on the BSRI would score higher on the sex typed identification subscale of the SRAVQ. The results were quite consistent with this prediction. In the high school sample, both the median split and double criterion sex typed versus androgynous comparisons were significant for both sexes. In the university sample, the difference was most evident for the double criterion comparison, but reached significance only for females. The double criterion com-

Table 3
Alternate Sorting Methods,
Numbers of Subjects
and Planned Comparisons

Sex of Subjects	Males				Females			
	Sex Typed		Androgynous		Sex Typed		Androgynous	
Median Split Sort	Masc	Near Masc	Near Masc	Andro	Fem	Near Fem	Near Fem	Andro
Difference Score Sort	Masc	Near Masc	Near Masc	Andro	Fem	Near Fem	Near Fem	Andro
Column Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Number of Subjects ^a								
High School Sample	12	7	5	9	8	5	1	11
University Sample	9	9	2	9	18	14	5	14
Comparisons ^b								
Sex Typed vs. Androgynous								
Median Split Comparison:	Males, columns (1,2) vs. (3,4) Females, columns (5,6) vs. (7,8)							
Double Criterion Comparison:	Males, column 1 vs. 4 Females, column 5 vs. 8							
Sex Typed Males vs. All others:	column 1 vs. all others							

^aMeans are not reported in subsequent tables for cells with fewer than five subjects. All other subjects were undifferentiated on the basis of median splits: 12 males and 11 females, high school sample; 14 males and 16 females, university sample.

^bAlso included in the analysis of variance and used in the error mean square for the comparisons were feminine males ($n = 3$ and 9 for the high school and university sample, respectively) and masculine females ($n = 3$ and 10 for the high school and university sample, respectively).

Table 4
Sex Typed versus Androgynous
Comparisons on Means
for Ideal Self Ratings
(University Sample)

	Males		Females	
	Sex Typed	Andro- gynous	Sex Typed	Andro- gynous
M Scale				
Median Split	5.75	5.62	5.17	5.49 *
Double Criterion	5.89	5.62	4.99	5.42 *
F Scale				
Median Split	5.09	6.38 ***	6.08	6.77 *
Double Criterion	4.77	6.38 ***	6.59	6.76

* $p < .05$, one-tailed

** $p < .01$, one-tailed

*** $p < .001$, one-tailed

parison for university males was in the predicted direction; in fact, 67% of the sex typed males had scores above the median while only 11% of the androgynous subjects were above the median. A chi square test of this difference was significant $X^2(1) = 5.84$, $p < .02$. The results were thus replicated for the double criterion only.

That the SRAVQ androgynous value subscale was not simply the opposite of the sex typed identification subscale was apparent from the correlational data; the correlation was significant, $r(119) = -.39$, $p < .001$, but moderate. The hypothesis carried over from the first study was that sex typed males would maintain sex typed ideals while androgynous males and all females would tend towards androgynous ideals. The means of Table 5 correspond

closely to this prediction. The sex typed males versus others comparison was significant for both samples: high school, $t(50) = 3.51$, $p < .001$, and university, $t(88) = 2.30$, $p < .02$, one-tailed. In contrast, the sex typed versus androgynous comparison was not significant for females as females generally tended towards higher androgynous value.

The pattern of results for sex typed males was clear. They reported sex typed ideals and strong sex typed identification. These results for sex typed males were quite consistent from study to study and sample to sample. On the other hand, no such clear picture emerged for female sex typed identity. Sex typed females scored high on the sex typed identification subscale, but also scored high on the androgynous value subscale. While sex typed females tended

Table 5
Sex Typed versus Androgynous
Comparisons on Means
for Sex Typed Identification
and Androgynous Value Subscales

	Males		Females	
	Sex Typed	Andro- gynous	Sex Typed	Andro- gynous
Sex Typed Identification				
Median Split				
High School Sample	1.68	.54 ***	.43	-.72 **
University Sample	.83	.63	.90	-.17
Double Criterion				
High School Sample	1.74	.65 **	.68	-.72 **
University Sample	1.07	.63	1.09	.19 **
Androgynous Value				
Median Split				
High School Sample	-.57	.37 **	.98	1.21
University Sample	.82	1.61 *	2.25	2.07
Double Criterion				
High School Sample	-.47	.43 *	1.29	1.21
University Sample	.72	1.61	1.53	2.07 *

* $p < .05$, one-tailed

** $p < .01$, one-tailed

*** $p < .001$, one-tailed

toward androgynous ideal self descriptions in Study 1, this result was not replicated in Study 2.

In order to test the prediction that an orientation to power and dominance would be an important aspect of male sex typed identity and with the hope of clarifying some of the inconsistencies in the female data, an exploratory item analysis of the BSRI self-report and ideal self data was carried out. Essentially, the same

analyses were applied to each item as were applied to the whole scale. Unless otherwise specified, the following summaries are based on the double criterion comparisons (the median split comparisons were not contradictory, although they were not always significant).

Sex typed males were compared with androgynous males on each masculine item of the BSRI. In the high school sample self-report

data, large significant differences were found for the items *dominant*, *forceful*, *masculine*, *athletic*, *acts as a leader* and *has leadership ability*. The results for the items *dominant* and *forceful* were replicated in the university sample, while the items *masculine* and *athletic* were not included in the BSRI short form, and the leadership items did not reach significance. In the university sample ideal self data, sex typed males placed greater value on the items *dominant*, *competitive*, *acts as a leader* and *has leadership ability* though the *t*-tests were marginally significant at $p < .05$. The results for the item *forceful* were not significant as all groups tended toward low ratings. For further exploration within the university male sample, each masculine item was correlated with the sex typed identification subscale. Highest correlations were for *dominant* and *assertive*, $r's(48) = .21$ ($p < .07$) and $.24$ ($p < .05$) respectively, one-tailed. The correlations for the items *forceful* and *has leadership ability* also tended to be positive, $r's(48) = .17$ and $.17$, respectively.

In contrast to males, sex typed females were not higher than androgynous females on any of the F scale items. However, interesting results occurred for the M scale ideal self data on which sex typed females had been found to be significantly lower than androgynous females. Despite the significant effect for the whole scale, the only significant differences on individual items occurred for the items *dominant*, *acts as a leader* and *forceful* (the latter two on median split comparisons only). The same items had differentiated sex typed and androgynous males. The items *dominant*, *forceful*, *aggressive* and *assertive* received low mean ratings overall for the ideal self ($M_s = 4.49, 3.74, 4.62, \text{ and } 4.88$, respectively). The prediction that sex typed females would endorse androgynous ideals was based on the assumption that the masculine attributes would be positively valued. This prediction would, therefore, not necessarily hold for these less valued items. With respect to the positively

valued M scale items, the sex typed females were not, in fact, significantly different from the androgynous females.

Because a large number of non-independent statistical tests were carried out, some of the reported findings could have occurred by chance. However, the probability that the same items would be significant by chance across different samples and different measures was very low. The results for the item *dominant* were significant on all tests. Sex typed males reported that they were more *dominant* and *forceful* than androgynous males and they placed more value on being *dominant*. Other items such as *athletic*, *assertive*, *has leadership ability*, *acts as a leader* and, of course, *masculine* did not have the strength of consistent replication, but were thematically consistent with a strength, power and dominance orientation. The sex typed identification already demonstrated for sex typed males would thus seem to be strongly oriented toward being dominant and one would expect these subjects to support the traditional attitudes toward a male dominated society and oppose social equality for women.

Part II. Male Dominance versus Social Equality for Women

The results for the various BSRI subject groups on the appropriate SRAVQ subscales are presented in Tables 6 and 7. The most direct test of the hypothesis was on the male dominance versus equal opportunity and male dominance versus family equality subscales (Table 6). It was mainly sex typed males who opposed equal opportunity and family equality. The sex typed males versus all other cells comparisons were highly significant: equal opportunity, high school, $t(50) = 5.01$, $p < .001$, university, $t(88) = 4.36$, $p < .001$, and family equality, university sample, $t(88) = 2.82$, $p < .01$. As indicated in Table 6, the sex typed versus androgynous comparisons were all significant for males and, with one ex-

Table 6
Sex Typed versus Androgynous
Comparisons on Means
for Equal Opportunity
and Family Equality Subscales

	Males		Females	
	Sex Typed	Andro- gynous	Sex Typed	Andro- gynous
Equal Opportunity				
Median Split				
High School Sample	-.35	1.27 ***	1.79	1.70
University Sample	.08	.86 *	1.00	1.98 **
Double Criterion				
High School Sample	-.31	1.16 ***	2.03	1.70
University Sample	-.50	.86 **	1.42	1.49
Family Equality				
Median Split				
University Sample	.87	1.61 *	1.51	1.79
Double Criterion				
University Sample	.54	1.61 **	1.74	1.91

* $p < .05$, one-tailed

** $p < .01$, one-tailed

*** $p < .001$, one-tailed

ception, not significant for females. The exception was the median split comparison on the university sample for equal opportunity. In summary, sex typed males opposed social equality for women while androgynous males and all female groups endorsed social equality.

On the double morality and female initiative subscales, we thought that the sex typed versus androgynous comparisons for females might be significant. As indicated in Table 7, the differences on these subscales were quite weak. There were no significant differences in the

female comparisons; the only significant results were for the sex typed versus androgynous comparisons for males on the double morality subscale. Sex typed males, of course, tended to support a double standard of morality.

Though not the main thrust of the study, the SRAVQ for the university sample contained a measure of stereotypic belief regarding sex differences. The stereotypic belief subscale correlated highly with equal opportunity, family equality and androgynous value (see

Table 7
Sex Typed versus Androgynous
Comparisons on Means
for Double Morality
and Female Initiative Subscales

	Males		Females	
	Sex Typed	Andro- gynous	Sex Typed	Andro- gynous
Double Morality				
Median Split				
High School Sample	.59	-.28 *	.24	-.12
University Sample	.06	-.79 *	-.35	-.24
Double Criterion				
High School Sample	.22	-.67 *	-.21	-.12
University Sample	.39	-.79 *	.03	-.10
Female Initiative				
Median Split				
High School Sample	.37	.69	-.04	.73
University Sample	.82	.88	1.34	.60
Double Criterion				
High School Sample	.69	.65	-.35	.73
University Sample	.54	.88	.51	.61

* $p < .05$, one-tailed

** $p < .01$, one-tailed

*** $p < .001$, one-tailed

Table 2). The relationship with the BSRI revealed a familiar pattern. Sex typed males endorsed stereotypic belief, double criterion, $M = .30$, median split, $M = .12$, in contrast to androgynous males, $M = -.83$, and all female groups, overall $M = -1.28$. The sex typed males versus all other cells comparison was highly significant, $t(88) = 3.80$, $p < .001$. The sex typed versus androgynous comparisons were significant only for males,

median split, $t(88) = 2.53$, $p < .01$, one-tailed and double criterion, $t(88) = 2.59$, $p < .01$, one-tailed.

The reader may wonder about the results for feminine males and masculine females, the means for which were not included in the tables (for purposes of clarity and because no specific predictions were made about them). On all reported SRAVQ subscales, the means

for these subjects fell somewhere in between the means for the sex typed and androgynous cells for the respective sex. They tended to be less traditional than sex typed subjects but more traditional than androgynous subjects.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We conclude with a brief discussion of (1) the methodological issue of alternate sorting procedures for classifying subjects, and the major findings for (2) androgynous subjects, (3) sex typed females and (4) sex typed males.

The incomplete factorial design in Study 2 enabled a comparison of the median split and double criterion sorting methods. The main difference between the sorts was that the median split sex typed and androgynous categories contained subjects in the near masculine or near feminine difference score range. While there was a remarkable consistency of results across the high school and university sample for the double criterion sorts, there was a lack of consistency in the near masculine and near feminine categories. In the high school sample, the near masculine and near feminine subjects who would be selected as sex typed on the basis of the median split sort were very similar to the appropriate double criterion sex typed group on most variables. In the university sample, the near masculine males and near feminine females scored in between the sex typed and androgynous groups on most variables. However, researchers must weigh the advantages gained by the double criterion sort against the subject loss. The incomplete factorial worked well for the present research and might be an acceptable alternative, at least until a better method is discovered.

The findings for androgynous subjects of both sexes were as predicted. They had androgynous ideals and were generally supportive of social equality for women. For the

males overall, we consistently found significant differences between sex typed males and androgynous males (and all female groups). Androgynous females, however, were not significantly different from sex typed females on most measures. It is important to note, however, that this occurred not because the androgynous females were more traditional than expected but, rather, because the sex typed females appeared to have less traditional attitudes and values very similar to the androgynous females.

A summary of the findings for sex typed females is difficult; the pattern of results did not present a clear and consistent picture. They were strong in their endorsement of androgynous ideals and social equality and yet indicated that it was important for them to be feminine in response to the sex typed identification subscale. One wonders how this femininity is defined? Is it a deeper gender based identity or a superficial role identity of "being nice" and "proper?" Is their femininity defined through their relationship to dominant males? The present research provides more questions than answers. Sex typed females seemed to be defined not so much by the characteristics they possessed as by what they were missing and by the wish to gain valued masculine characteristics and high status masculine roles. The short form of the BSRI contained only the positive feminine items, and this could have been a mistake. A female prototype for future study might be the complimentary counterpart of the dominating male. If, as this research suggests, such males devalue femininity, the male defined woman would not only be characterized by the absence of the valued masculine characteristics but also by the presence of devalued, subordinate and diminutive feminine characteristics. Such a prototype, in contrast to one using only positive characteristics, might better represent the plight of many women in a male dominated society.

A summary of findings for sex typed males is more straightforward; the results were clear and consistent. They were high on sex typed identification, low on androgynous value, high on stereotypic belief, high on double morality and opposed to social equality for women. They reported themselves to be higher on power-dominance items, e.g., *dominant*, and *forceful*, than did androgynous males and they placed greater value on power-dominance items. This overall pattern of results suggests a strong orientation toward male dominance for those males not shared by androgynous males or any of the female groups. In conclusion, it would seem to be an identifiable subset of males which most strongly opposes social change. More research aimed at a better understanding of the origins and dynamics of male dominance is needed.

NOTES

This research was funded by a grant from the Senate Research Committee of the University of Prince Edward Island.

1. Where the terms "masculine and "feminine" are used, they should be understood to refer to the traditional sex stereotypes. No assumption is made that they are "real" except as they exist in individual and cultural assumptions about the nature of women and men. The feminine stereotype includes such traits as: *sympathetic, loves children, understanding, eager to soothe hurt feelings, compassionate, sensitive to the needs of others, gentle, warm, affectionate and tender*. The masculine stereotype includes: *aggressive, strong personality, has leadership abilities, dominant, competitive, acts as a leader, willing to take a stand, forceful, makes decisions easily and assertive*.
2. Other possibilities include persons who are cross-sex typed, i.e. "masculine females" and "feminine males", and those who do not describe themselves as high on either masculine or feminine characteristics, commonly referred to as "undifferentiated" subjects. We do not specifically discuss people in these categories for two reasons: (1) the numbers are typically fairly small and (2) there are no clear theoretical reasons for making predictions about them.
3. This hypothesis has not received a great deal of support. Several studies have found only weak or non-significant relationships between measures of androgyny and pro-feminist attitudes (Zedlow, 1976; Spence and Helmreich, 1978; and Jones et al., 1978). One problem may be that researchers have not been able to agree on the best method to sort androgynous subjects. A second problem may be that pro-feminist attitudes may not fall on a single dimension, thus, androgyny might relate to some issues and not others.

4. Data were collected by students in the second author's Social Psychology class (1978). Each student recruited four volunteers: two males (one married, one single) and two females (one married, one single) to fill out the questionnaires. The married/single factor is omitted from the data presented as no significant differences were found on this dimension for the variables and issues addressed in this paper.
5. Results are not reported for the different subject area classes since the number of subjects in each group was too small for separate analysis.
6. Those subscales which were based on the AWS were grouped by their factor loadings as reported by Spence and Helmreich (1972). Items for the equal opportunity subscale (AWS 9, 19, 24, 47, 49) loaded on a factor appropriately labelled equal opportunity, while items for female initiative (AWS 20, 42, 16) and the double standard (AWS 2, 11, 15) tended to load on a factor reflecting beliefs about "social-sexual relationships between men and women and what constitutes lady like behavior" (Spence and Helmreich, 1972, p. 11).
We wish to thank Tina Maden for her work on the development of the double morality subscale.
7. The subscales administered to the high school sample contained 8, 3, 7, 10 and 4 items respectively. An attempt to include female initiative items as part of a more general female assertiveness dimension was not successful, hence only data for the original 3 items from the AWS were included in the analysis.

Appendix 1

Content and Format of the Sex Role Attitudes and Values Questionnaire

Item Format	
A	B
The husband should be the head of the family.	The husband and wife should be equal partners in all respects.
Agree more with A	Agree more with B
_____	_____
Strongly Moderately Slightly	Slightly Moderately Strongly

Subscale Content

Sex Typed Identification. Each item asks the subjects if it is important that they be masculine or feminine, that they behave appropriately to their sex, that the differences between the sexes be maintained, etc.

Sample Item:

- A. It is very important to me that my behavior be considered appropriate to my sex.
- B. It is not very important to me that my behavior be considered appropriate to my sex.

Androgynous Value. The prescription of stereotypic characteristics, "a man should be _____, a woman _____" versus the prescription of androgyny, "it is equally important for both men and women to be both _____ and _____."

Sample Item:

- A. In relationships between the sexes, the man should be more dominant than the woman.
- B. It is equally important for both men and women to be both dominant and yielding.

Male Dominance Versus Equal Opportunity. Preferential treatment for males in job appointment and promotion, job opportunities in business and the professions, apprenticeships in the trades, and admission to vocational and professional schools versus equal opportunity for women.

Sample Item:

- A. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.
- B. In some cases men should be given preference over women in job appointment and promotion.

Male Dominance Versus Family Equality. The husband should be the head of the family, the financial decision maker, the owner of business investments and family property and has little responsibility for work done in the home versus equal participation by women and shared ownership.

Sample Item:

- A. The husband and wife ought to share

equally in making financial decisions.

- B. While the husband may wish to consult other family members, the final decision in financial matters is up to him.

Double Standard of Morality. A more severe, conventional moral standard applied to women with respect to swearing and obscenity, intoxication, loud behavior, telling dirty jokes, and cigarette smoking.

Sample Item:

- A. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
- B. Intoxication among women is no worse than intoxication among men.

Male Versus Female Initiative. Male versus female initiative in establishing relationships, dating, marriage, and intimacy.

Sample Item:

- A. The initiative in dating should come from the man.
- B. A woman has the same right as a man to take the initiative in dating.

Stereotypic Belief. The belief that men and women "have" or "are" the stereotypic characteristics versus the belief that men and women have the ability or potential to be both.

Sample Item:

- A. Both men and women have equal ability to be compassionate and to soothe hurt feelings.
- B. Compared to men, women are more able to be compassionate and to soothe hurt feelings.

REFERENCES

- Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1974, 42, 155-162.

- Bem, S.L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1977, 45, 196-205.
- Bem, S.L. Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhazur-Tatenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1979, 37, 1047-1054.
- Brannon, R. Measuring attitudes toward women (and other-wise): A methodological critique. In J. Sherman and F. Denmark (Eds.), *The Psychology of Women: Future Directions in Research*. New York: Psychological Dimensions, 1978, 645-731.
- Brooks-Gunn, J. and Fisch, M. Psychological androgyny and college students' judgments of mental health. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 1980, 6, 575-580.
- Downing, N.E. Theoretical and operational conceptualizations of psychological androgyny: Implications for measurement. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 1979, 3, 284-292.
- Feather, N.T. Factor structure of the Bem Sex Role Inventory Implications for the study of masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 1978, 30, 241-254.
- Festinger, L. *Theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Gaudreau, P. Factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1977, 45, 299-302.
- Gilbert, L.A., Deutsch, C.J., and Strahan, R.F. Feminine and masculine dimensions of the typical, desirable and ideal woman and man. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 1978, 4, 767-778.
- Jones, W.H., Chernovetz, M.E.O.C. and Hansson, R.O. The enigma of androgyny: Differential implications for males and females? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1978, 46, 298-313.
- Lippa, R. The naive perception of masculinity-femininity on the basis of expressive cues. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 1978, 12, 1-14.
- Murray, B.O. Androgyny and sex-role stereotypes: Women's real and ideal self-perceptions and perceptions of psychological health in others (Doctoral Dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, 1976). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 1976, 37, 114B (University Microfilms No. 76-19, 645).
- Pedhazur, E.G. and Tatenbaum, T.J. Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1979, 37, 996-1016.
- Percival, E. and Percival, T. Is a woman a person? Sex differences in stereotyping. *Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal*, 1979, 4, 71-77.
- Spence, J.T. and Helmreich, R. The attitudes toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 1972, 2, 66.
- Spence, J.T. and Helmreich, R.L. *Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.
- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R. and Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1975, 32, 29-39.
- Stockard, J. and Johnson, M.M. The social origins of male dominance. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 1979, 5, 199-218.
- Whetton, C. and Swindels, T. A factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1977, 33, 150-153.
- Zedlow, P.B. Psychological androgyny and attitudes toward feminism. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1976, 44, 150.