

Progress in
**EXPERIMENTAL
PERSONALITY RESEARCH**

VOLUME 13

NORMAL PERSONALITY PROCESSES

ACADEMIC PRESS

Progress in

EXPERIMENTAL PERSONALITY RESEARCH

VOLUME 13

NORMAL PERSONALITY PROCESSES

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

FRANK ANDRASIK

JOHN G. ARENA

EDWARD B. BLANCHARD

DAVID M. BUSS

KENNETH H. CRAIK

NICHOLAS EMLER

JULIUS KUHL

JANET T. SPENCE

PROGRESS IN
Experimental
Personality Research

Edited by
Brendan A. Maher and Winifred B. Maher

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
AND SOCIAL RELATIONS
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

VOLUME 13

NORMAL PERSONALITY PROCESSES



1984

ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.

(Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers)

Orlando San Diego San Francisco

New York London Toronto Montreal Sydney Tokyo São Paulo

**COPYRIGHT © 1984, BY ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.**

**NO PART OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE REPRODUCED OR
TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC
OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPY, RECORDING, OR ANY
INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT
PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM THE PUBLISHER.**

**ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.
Orlando, Florida 32887**

United Kingdom Edition published by
**ACADEMIC PRESS, INC. (LONDON) LTD.
24/28 Oval Road, London NW1 7DX**

**LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 64-8034
ISBN 0-12-541413-7**

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

84 85 86 87 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS	vii
PREFACE	ix

Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender-Related Traits: A Conceptual Analysis and Critique of Current Research

JANET T. SPENCE

I. Introduction	2
II. Properties of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire and Bem Sex Role Inventory	4
III. Conceptions of Masculinity, Femininity, and Sex-Role Identification	16
IV. Androgyny and Its Vicissitudes	26
V. What Do the BSRI and PAQ Measure?	42
VI. Issues Related to Combining M and F Scores	54
VII. Androgyny as an Emergent Construct	65
VIII. Issues Related to Mental Health	70
IX. Masculinity and Femininity as Gender Identity	81
X. Summary and Conclusions	89
References	91

Volitional Aspects of Achievement Motivation and Learned Helplessness: Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Action Control

JULIUS KUHL

I. Introduction	100
II. Action Control and Achievement-Related Behavior	107
III. A General Framework for the Theory of Action Control	117
IV. The Problem of Volition in Various Subfields of Psychology	130
V. Two Modes of Control: Action and State Orientations	144
VI. Conclusion	163
References	164

Differential Involvement in Delinquency: Toward an Interpretation in Terms of Reputation Management

NICHOLAS EMLER

I. Introduction	174
II. Research Strategies	175
III. The Consistency of Delinquent Conduct	182
IV. Explanations of Delinquency	193
V. Delinquency and Reputation	206
VI. Delinquency as a Consequence of Knowledge Deficits	213
VII. Motivational Factors in Delinquency	218
VIII. Conclusions	228
References	230

Acts, Dispositions, and Personality

DAVID M. BUSS AND KENNETH H. CRAIK

I. From Acts to Dispositions	242
II. Act Frequency Research Methods	247
III. The Comparative Analysis of Dispositions	257
IV. Dispositions as Modal Human Tendencies	264
V. Analysis of Individual Differences in Dispositions	269
VI. Dispositions in the Idiographic Analysis of Persons	278
VII. From Dispositions to Personality	282
References	297

Personality and Chronic Headache

EDWARD B. BLANCHARD, FRANK ANDRASIK, AND JOHN G. ARENA

I. Introduction	303
II. Classification and Description of Headache	304
III. Review of the Clinical Observation Literature	306
IV. Review of Investigations Employing Standardized Psychological Tests	315
V. Studies on Personality and Headache from the SUNYA Headache Project	325
VI. Overall Discussion	358
References	359
INDEX	365
CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS VOLUMES	369

CONTRIBUTORS

Numbers in parentheses indicate the pages on which the authors' contributions begin.

FRANK ANDRASIK, *Center for Stress and Anxiety Disorders, Department of Psychology, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York 12222 (303)*

JOHN G. ARENA,¹ *Center for Stress and Anxiety Disorders, Department of Psychology, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York 12222 (303)*

EDWARD B. BLANCHARD, *Center for Stress and Anxiety Disorders, Department of Psychology, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York 12222 (303)*

DAVID M. BUSS, *Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 (241)*

KENNETH H. CRAIK, *Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720 (241)*

NICHOLAS EMLER, *Department of Psychology, The University of Dundee, Dundee DD1 4HN, Scotland (173)*

JULIUS KUHL,² *Max-Planck-Institute for Psychological Research, D-8000 Munich 40, Federal Republic of Germany (99)*

JANET T. SPENCE, *Department of Psychology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712 (1)*

¹ Present address: Psychology Service 116B, Veterans Administration Medical Center and Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Georgia 30910.

² Present address: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 202 Junipero Serra Avenue, Stanford, California 94305.

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

Personality research in recent years has seen a resurgence of interest in questions of theory and measurement on the one hand, and an extension of interest to a wider spectrum of applied problems on the other. This, the thirteenth volume in the series, reflects those trends.

Spence provides a detailed analysis of theoretical and conceptual aspects of gender research, together with a comprehensive review of the large body of research literature that has now accumulated on this topic. Gender differences have become matters of more than theoretical interest, bearing as they do on issues of social importance in the arena of public policy. We may expect this topic to continue to occupy a major niche in the landscape of personality research for a long time to come.

Buss and Craik present an act frequency approach to the study of personality dispositions. It represents a move toward a possible strategy for the resolution of the persistent question of trait-versus-situation that has plagued the formulation of adequate strategies for the investigation of personality for more than a decade.

Kuhl has developed a theoretical framework for the study of action control—or choice behavior—that encompasses a wide range of normal human action in addition to providing a schema in which the concept of “learned helplessness” might be handled. The problem of volition is an old one for the psychology of human conduct. Once regarded as available to consciousness only through the use of psychodynamic techniques of investigation, and later banished entirely by the radical behaviorists, it has returned again mainly through the revival of interest in cognition, and the development of concepts of self-control in behavior therapy. With the work of Kuhl we see this revival of concern becoming more articulated with the psychology of motivation and its integration with the psychology of personality.

One of the newer foci of application in personality psychology is the area of what has variously been called behavioral medicine, medical psychology, or, more recently, health psychology. Although some investigators currently at work in this field have come to it with a background in clinical psychology, it owes much to the study of normal personality processes, as well as to contributions from social psychology and sociology. Blanchard, Andrasik, and Arena report work on the personality correlates of chronic

headache, a model of the systematic investigation of a medical problem with the techniques and concepts of personality psychology.

Emler contributes a review and synthesis of data treating juvenile delinquency as a phenomenon of impression management. It opens up a new and fruitful perspective for the consideration of this important problem of applied personality psychology, one that we may confidently expect will affect the work of others in this problem area.

In this volume, as in earlier ones, we have tried to report work from various parts of the world, and to avoid the trap of parochialism that lies in wait for editors. Previous volumes have included contributions from England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, The Netherlands, and Israel. Even so, the list is narrow and we welcome reports of relevant research done in any part of the world. As always, we are grateful for suggestions for contributions from anywhere, and for any other comments upon the content and direction of the series.

BRENDAN A. MAHER
WINIFRED B. MAHER

Progress in

EXPERIMENTAL PERSONALITY RESEARCH

VOLUME 13

NORMAL PERSONALITY PROCESSES

This page intentionally left blank

MASCULINITY, FEMININITY, AND GENDER-RELATED TRAITS: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS AND CRITIQUE OF CURRENT RESEARCH¹

Janet T. Spence

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS

I. Introduction	2
II. Properties of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire and Bem Sex Role Inventory	4
A. Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ)	4
B. Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI).....	9
C. The BSRI and PAQ as "Sex-Role" Measures	12
D. Correlations between Instruments.....	15
III. Conceptions of Masculinity, Femininity, and Sex-Role Identification.....	16
A. Gender-Related Terms as Descriptive Labels versus Theoretical Concepts	16
B. Single-Factor Models	18
C. Two-Factor Models	22
D. Evidence for Multifactorial Conceptions.....	24
IV. Androgyny and Its Vicissitudes.....	26
A. Block's Theory	26
B. Outline of Bem's Theories	27
C. Detailed Analysis of Bem's Theories	35
V. What Do the BSRI and PAQ Measure?	42
A. The BSRI and PAQ as Trait Measures	42
B. The BSRI and PAQ as Measures of General Gender Constructs	43
C. Conclusions	49
VI. Issues Related to Combining M and F Scores	54
A. M and F Combination: The Central Issue	54
B. The Empirical Challenge	55
C. Criticisms and Misunderstandings of the Two-Way Method.....	59
VII. Androgyny as an Emergent Construct.....	65
A. Interactive Hypotheses	66

¹Preparation of this article was facilitated by NIMH Grant 32066 (Janet T. Spence and Robert L. Helmreich, Principal Investigators). Thanks are due to Lucia A. Gilbert and Robert L. Helmreich for their reading of the manuscript.

	B. Empirical Evidence	66
	C. Back to Balance	67
VIII.	Issues Related to Mental Health	70
	A. Bem's Initial Propositions: Mirror Image Hypothesis	71
	B. Current Gender Parallel Hypotheses	71
	C. Implications of Trait Interpretation	76
	D. Who Is Healthiest?	79
	E. The PAQ and BSRI as Confounded with Psychological Adjustment	79
IX.	Masculinity and Femininity as Gender Identity	81
	A. Limitations of Current Conceptions.....	81
	B. The Concept of Gender Identity	83
	C. Gender Identification and Gender-Differentiating Attributes.....	84
X.	Summary and Conclusions	89
	References.....	91

I. Introduction

Until the resurgence of the feminist movement in the late 1960s, gender-related psychological research in the United States was conducted in a social climate that took for granted or actively defended the legitimacy of a sex-role system in which women had less power and access to political and economic resources than did men. Many investigators tacitly accepted the acquisition of socially prescribed masculine or feminine attributes and role behaviors as one of the goals of socialization. Others devised accounts of psychological masculinity and femininity that, whatever their intent, often served the purpose of justifying as well as explaining the establishment and maintenance of traditional sex-role divisions.

Liberalized sex-role attitudes and changes in conceptions of social justice in the larger society have been accompanied by challenges to several aspects of conventional psychological theories of masculinity and femininity. Alternative propositions have been put forward suggesting, most importantly, that masculinity and femininity are independent constructs and that individuals who are conventionally sex-typed in their attributes and behaviors are less rather than more personally effective than others.

A substantial volume of research has been generated by these more recent theoretical proposals, much of it bound to two similar self-report instruments, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), both of which are self-report measures primarily or exclusively composed of items describing socially desirable, gender-differentiating personality traits. Such theoretical concepts as masculinity, femininity, androgyny, sex-role identification or orientation, and, most recently, gender schemata (Bem, 1981a; Markus, Crane, Bernstein, & Siladi, 1982)

have been implicated in this research, the BSRI and PAQ typically being identified as measures of these constructs. In this article, a conceptual analysis and methodological critique will be undertaken of the research centered around these instruments and the theories that studies utilizing them have been typically designed to test.

The decision to confine the present article to an analysis of methodological and theoretical issues raised by research conducted with the PAQ and BSRI is primarily based on theoretical grounds that should be stated at the outset. Even among those who find such constructs as masculinity, femininity, androgyny, and sex-role identification useful, it is widely recognized that this general area of inquiry has been plagued by methodological controversies and conceptual confusions. Both friendly and unfriendly analyses and critiques of these constructs and the research generated by them, which include but go beyond the data obtained with the BSRI and PAQ, are beginning to appear (e.g., Baumrind, 1982; Ford, 1981; Locksley & Colten, 1979; Lott, 1981; Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1981; Sampson, 1977; Taylor & Hall, 1982; Worrel, 1978). In most of them, the fundamental validity of masculinity, femininity, sex-role identification, and other related constructs is taken for granted. It is typically assumed that self-concepts of masculinity and femininity, masculine and feminine attributes and behaviors, sex-role attitudes and preferences, and other gender-related phenomena are bound together in a relatively simple fashion and that these various components of psychological masculinity and femininity have a common etiology. These implicit assumptions have led the vast majority of investigators to accept a priori the BSRI, PAQ, and other similar instruments as measures of one or another of these broad gender concepts and to interpret the data obtained from these instruments only within this theoretical framework.

Consideration of the relevant empirical literature has led the present writer and her colleagues (e.g., Spence & Helmreich, 1978, 1979a; Spence & Sawin, 1984) to a more complex view of masculine and feminine phenomena. In common with several other investigators (e.g., Coffman & Levy, 1972; Constantinople, 1973; Deaux, 1982; Ford, 1981; Orlofsky, 1981), we have come to the conclusion that gender-related phenomena are multidimensional and have varying degrees and kinds of relationships with one another. We have further suggested that at the level of the individual these different kinds of gender-related attributes, attitudes, and behaviors do not necessarily have common developmental histories. Thus, such imperialistic constructs as masculinity, femininity, androgyny, and sex-role identification, as they have typically been conceived, are overly simplistic and of limited scientific utility. Behavior in any given situation, we have further argued, is determined by multiple properties of the person and the situation,

some of which on occasion may be gender-relevant; any theory of gender-related behavior must take this complexity into account.

As might be anticipated from this series of contentions, we have also proposed that the BSRI and PAQ cannot usefully be regarded as measures of such general constructs as masculinity and femininity or sex-role identification and therefore should not be given such labels. Rather, these instruments are little more than measures of two specific constellations of gender-differentiating personality traits, and data obtained with them should be interpreted from this limited perspective. It follows from these assertions that it is inadvisable to mix the findings from studies of the BSRI and PAQ with those from studies employing instruments that also happen to be identified as measures of the masculinity and femininity constructs but which have more diverse or dissimilar empirical content.

No attempt will be made here to review exhaustively the extensive BSRI and PAQ literature or to include a complete analysis of the multiple ways in which such terms as masculinity, femininity, and androgyny have been defined. Rather, the focus will be on analysis and evaluation of the major theories that have been implicated in research with the BSRI and PAQ and on methodological problems that have frequently been encountered in this research.

Before these theoretical and methodological issues can be introduced, it is necessary to set the stage by describing the psychometric properties of the two measures and their theoretical rationales (Section II). Next, several general theoretical concepts and their underlying assumptions are evaluated (Section III). In the following two sections (IV and V), Bem's highly influential theories and concept of androgyny, as they are tied to the BSRI and PAQ, are described; a critique of these theories is offered, and an alternative interpretation of what the BSRI and PAQ measure is presented. These discussions are followed by sections devoted to methodological and conceptual issues related to the scoring of the PAQ and BSRI (Section VI) and to androgyny as an emergent, interactive construct (Section VII). In Section VIII, issues related to the study of androgyny and mental health are considered. In Section IX, a theory of gender identity is outlined that better fits the available data than do current conceptions of masculinity, femininity, and sex-role identification.

II. Properties of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire and Bem Sex Role Inventory

A. PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES QUESTIONNAIRE (PAQ)

Although the BSRI (Bem, 1974) and the PAQ (Spence *et al.*, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) were developed independently and have

quite different theoretical rationales, they share important empirical similarities. Because its content is more straightforward, the PAQ will be described first.

1. Description of the Scales

In its present form, the PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) contains two major scales, here labeled M and F, each containing eight descriptors of general personality traits set up on a five-point bipolar rating scale.² For theoretical reasons to be explicated at a later point, the M scale items have been confined to self-assertive, goal-oriented traits (e.g., independent, decisive) that had been judged to be more characteristic of males than females but socially desirable to some degree in both sexes. Similarly, the F scale items have been confined to socially desirable, interpersonally oriented nurturant traits (e.g., kind, aware of others' feelings) that had been judged to be more characteristic of females.

These two trait clusters can be given various descriptive labels for mnemonic convenience. Personality theorists (e.g., Lubinski *et al.*, 1981; Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1983; Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1978) use such labels as dominance and warmth. When gender phenomena are the focus of investigation, they are typically labeled instrumental and expressive (terms borrowed from Parsons' 1955 analysis of male and female roles) or agentic and communal (terms taken from Bakan, 1966). In subsequent discussion, I will describe these two trait clusters as self-assertiveness and interpersonal orientation, choosing these terms because they seem descriptively accurate and because they are less likely (than such gender-linked terms as instrumental and expressive) to invite unintended and unwarranted surplus meaning to be read into them. However, when referring more particularly to the PAQ scales (and the parallel BSRI scales), I will usually use the labels M and F to identify the self-assertive and interpersonal clusters, respectively.

2. Psychometric Properties

Expected gender differences in self-reports have consistently been found on the M and F scales in unselected groups of males and females varying

²The PAQ also contains a third scale, labeled M-F, composed of traits that not only stereotypically differentiate the sexes but which are considered to be differentially desirable for men and women (e.g., the ideal female is judged to be somewhat submissive and the ideal male to be somewhat dominant). Although the M and F scales are essentially uncorrelated in both sexes, the M-F scale (scored in a "masculine" direction) correlates positively with M ($r > .5$) and negatively with F ($r > .3$), suggesting its bipolar nature. The data indicate that the relationships of the M-F scale with criterion variables are sometimes different from those obtained with either M or F. Perhaps because of its bipolar properties, investigators have had difficulty assimilating this scale into their conceptual models and seldom include it in their empirical studies. For this reason, little further mention will be made of the M-F scale in this article.

widely in age and socioeconomic backgrounds³ (e.g., O'Connor, Mann, & Bardwick, 1978; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), although it should be noted that these differences are minor in comparison to the variability within each sex. Psychometric analyses indicate that, within each sex, M and F scores are essentially uncorrelated. Confirmatory factor analyses of the M and F items have further demonstrated that each of the two scales is unifactorial (Helmreich, Spence, & Wilhelm, 1981).

3. Median Split Method for Combining M and F Scores

Statistical procedures for determining the joint contribution of the scale scores to criterion variables will be discussed in detail in Section VI. Briefly, the writer and her colleagues (Spence *et al.*, 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1979b; Spence, 1983) have advocated that the relationships with criterion measures be examined for each scale separately, followed by an empirical determination of the manner in which the scales are jointly related to the criterion. Although more elegant methods are currently available and should be employed when unselected groups are tested (Lubinski *et al.*, 1983; Spence & Helmreich, 1979b), we suggested in our initial PAQ article (Spence *et al.*, 1975) that male and female respondents could each be assigned to four groups on the basis of their scores, above and below the median of a normative group, on the M and F scales. This median split procedure serves as a heuristic device for describing and comparing the frequency of various combinations of M and F scores across groups and for examining the joint contribution of M and F scores to criterion variables. The score combinations represented by each of these groups and the identifying verbal labels we gave them are as follows: high M, high F (androgynous); high M, low F (masculine); low M, high F (feminine); and low M, low F (undifferentiated) (see Table IIB). High and low, it is important to note, do not refer to a set of absolute cutoff points on each scale but indicate an individual's relative position above or below the median in some normative group of men and women.

These verbal labels have been regarded by many investigators as being constructs of some sort, and as such have had considerable surplus meaning read into them. However, they can also be treated as purely nominal designations. The reader should be warned, in advance of later discussions,

³The data reported in this article are confined to studies conducted in the United States and other English-speaking countries. Although conclusions drawn from these investigations should not be generalized to other nationalities and cultures, it is interesting to note that PAQ data obtained from samples in several other countries (e.g., Federal Republic of Germany, Mexico, France) have essentially replicated United States results with respect to sex differences and psychometric properties of the scales (e.g., Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Runge *et al.*, 1981; Diaz-Loving *et al.*, 1981).

that according to our theoretical views they not only can but should be limited to this type of atheoretical usage. Thus, we use the terms we coined to identify the four categorical groups merely to describe score combinations (e.g., androgyny is a substitute for above-the-median scores on both M and F); they are not intended to have explanatory significance or to represent theoretical constructs.⁴

The distinction between nominal and theoretical meanings is crucial to emphasize. Despite our repeated statements to this effect, and our explicit rejection of such constructs as masculinity, femininity, and androgyny and the PAQ as measures of them (e.g., Spence & Helmreich, 1978, 1979a; Spence, 1982), statements are frequently found in the literature describing us as advocates of these constructs, often within the context of critical analyses of them (e.g., Baumrind, 1982; Locksley & Colten, 1979; Meyers & Gonda, 1982; Taylor & Hall, 1982).

As these remarks imply, the procedures we suggested for assigning a person to a group in no way represents a theoretical model. More particularly, the classification system was never intended to suggest the existence of a true or quasi-typology, that is, sets of persons differing qualitatively in their properties.

4. *Theoretical Rationale*

The development of the PAQ as a measure of gender-related self-assertive and interpersonal/nurturant characteristics was simulated by the prominence of these trait constellations in both popular and scientific descriptions of the natures of men and women. Studies of both descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotypes have consistently found that the typical and the ideal male and female are believed to differ on a number of self-assertive and interpersonally oriented traits (e.g., Broverman, Vogel, Brov-

⁴This seems to be the appropriate place to acknowledge that in our initial article (Spence *et al.*, 1975) we rather mindlessly used the terms "masculinity" and "femininity" to identify the two major PAQ scales and informally described the questionnaire as a "sex-role" measure. The labels used to identify the four groups produced by the median split method were assigned in the same spirit. However, the nature of the evidence quickly led us to renounce the equation between the scales and such general constructs as masculinity, femininity, and sex-role identification, as well as to question the utility of the concepts themselves. According to our current views, described in this article, the adjectives masculine and feminine used to describe the PAQ scales can be justified only as descriptive, atheoretical terms that call attention to the fact that males and females differ stereotypically and in self-report. Although we have adopted the more neutral M and F labels to identify the scales on the PAQ and BSRI in an attempt to avoid surplus meaning being read into them, the terms we devised to identify the four score combinations are so firmly established in the literature that we ourselves must continue to use them.