SELF-ESTEEM, SEX ROLES, AND FUNDAMENTALIST RELIGIOUS BELIEF

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

John Anthony Zervopoulos, B. A.
Denton, Texas

May, 1980

Zervopoulos, John Anthony, Self-Esteem, Sex Roles, and Fundamentalist Religious Belief. Master of Science (General-Experimental Psychology), May, 1980, 40 pp., 5 tables, references, 51 titles.

Recent sex role research suggested that androgynous subjects demonstrated better adjustment than sex-typed subjects. Fundamentalist religious belief, however, has strongly supported sex role differentiation.

This study hypothesized that the effect of appropriate sex role typing or androgyny on self-esteem would depend on religious belief. Although this hypothesis was not supported, a main effect on sex roles for females was obtained; androgynous females had a higher self-esteem level than feminine females. In addition, males in this study had a higher self-esteem level than females.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SELF-ESTEEM, SEX ROLES, AND FUNDAMENTALIST RELIGIOUS BELIEF

There has been significant interest in sex role behavior during the last 15 years, particularly in light of questions raised by the women's liberation movement. These questions focused on whether or not it was necessary to conceptualize psychological and behavioral differences between the sexes. Many women claimed that postulated differences discriminated against them because society valued masculine over feminine traits (Bem & Bem, 1971; McKee & Sheriffs, 1959; Rosencrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman & Broverman, 1968). Consequently, societal definitions of masculine and feminine characteristics were challenged, and many people began redefining traditional sex roles.

Psychologists studied sex role characteristics for many years, attempting to note their effects on individual and social behavior. In addition, developmental explanations of those characteristics were advanced from several theoretical viewpoints (Bronfenbrenner, 1960; Heilbrun, 1973; Kohlberg, 1966; Mischel, 1966). Despite this interest, however, some psychologists considered masculinity and femininity to be, theoretically and empirically, "among the muddiest concepts in their vocabulary" (Constantinople, 1973, p. 390). Many researchers confounded aspects of masculinity and femininity,

often combining gender identification, sex role preferences, and sex role adoption. Gender identification was the degree to which individuals were aware of and accepted their biological gender. Sex role preference was distinguished from sex role adoption on the basis of behaviors a person preferred to engage in versus those one actually manifested (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Recent research attempted to distinguish between these three factors, particularly focusing on the separation of gender-related aspects from sex role preferences and sex role adoptions. Males, then, were not assumed to possess or be required to exhibit masculine behaviors because they were male; females, likewise, were not assumed to possess or be required to exhibit feminine characteristics because they were female. Rather, sex role preference and adoption could be separated from gender in healthy, adaptive human behavior.

Other difficulties also plagued sex role research. Constantinople (1973) noted that masculinity-femininity test construction assumed that masculinity and femininity represented the negatively correlated ends of a unidimensional continuum. High masculinity implied low femininity; high femininity implied low masculinity. Individuals scoring outside the range of sex typed behavior for their gender were labeled as deviant and maladjusted, exemplifying sex role confusion. This conceptualization precluded the possibility of individuals' possessing both masculine and feminine characteristics. Instead

of viewing masculinity and femininity as endpoints of a single bipolar dimension, research since 1974 explored the use of two independent dimensions, one masculine and one feminine. Individuals could be characterized as both masculine and feminine (high scores on both dimensions) or sex typed in either direction (high masculine, low feminine; high feminine, low masculine) (Bem, 1974; Berzins, Wellings & Wetter, 1978; Heilbrun, 1976; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975).

Another problem in sex role research developed because the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, and psychology tended to stress different components (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Psychologists often did not take these differences into account. Anthropologists focused on the normative expectations that a given culture or subculture held about the position men and women should occupy. Position referred to the division of labor between the sexes and societal tasks assigned to each within a structured social setting. D'Andrade (1966) and Linton (1976) claimed that men and women not only tend to perform different activities in each culture, but that men tend to perform particular types of activities while women perform others. Maleness and femaleness were institutionalized as statuses in all cultures. These statuses encouraged the development of particular characteristics in males and females: self-reliance and achievement in males; obedience, nurturance, and responsibility in females. About 80% of known societies have followed this pattern (Barry,

Bacon, & Child, 1957). Despite these assertions, some investigators believed that changes in the economic system and the advancement of technology could be primary forces in erasing sex differentiation in work activities (Holter, 1971; Murphy & Murphy, 1976).

Sociologists viewed sex roles in the context of relationships and role-taking behaviors. These relationships, located in groups with varying structures, emphasized socialization (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Parsons and Bales (1955), from a sociological viewpoint, suggested that males and females have different roles in the family setting. Men, performing the instrumental role, were the family's representatives in the outside world and acted on its behalf. Independence, self-reliance, and assertiveness were among the necessary skills for performing these tasks. Women, performing the expressive role, were responsible for attending to family members' physical and emotional needs, and also maintaining harmonious interactions among them. These tasks required nurturant characteristics and interpersonal skills. Bakan (1966) developed ideas similar to Parsons and Bales, using agency and communion to describe orientations necessary for group functioning. Bakan characterized masculinity as a concern for oneself and one's goals (agentic) and femininity as a concern for self, but in relation to others (communal).

Psychologists referred to the distinguishing characteristics of men and women when studying sex role behavior. These

characteristics included behavior, personality, abilities, and preferences (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Attempts to empirically investigate sex role differences in the past garnered confusion, but also some interesting findings. The lack of a definitive psychology of sex differences encouraged much confusion among psychologists when investigating sex roles (Lee, 1976). As recently as 1972, Rosenberg and Sutton-Smith concurred that masculinity and femininity represented extremely diverse phenomena, best viewed as a loose cluster of imprecisely defined behavioral correlates. Lee (1976) stated that Thorndike reached the same conclusion 50 years earlier. However, some research findings pointed to interesting trends suggesting different adjustment levels for individuals typed as either masculine or feminine, however they were measured.

Sex Roles and Adjustment: Past and Present

Sex role stereotypes have been defined as the sum of socially designated behaviors differentiating men and women, formed from specific expectations of how men and women should ideally behave. Researchers have found that a greater number of desirable stereotypic traits were attributed to men rather than women (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957, 1959). Positively valued masculine traits formed a cluster of behavior demonstrating competence, rationality, and assertion; positively valued feminine traits formed a cluster reflecting warmth

and expressiveness. However, since more feminine traits, in their studies, were negatively valued than were masculine traits, women tended to have more negative self-concepts than men. Other research also supported this conclusion, suggesting greater anxiety for individuals incorporating feminine traits (Cosentino & Heilbrun, 1964; Gall, 1969). Recely (1973) concluded that conformity to masculine stereotypes was more conducive to the maintenance of a high level of self-esteem, and vice versa, than was conformity to feminine stereotypes in both males and females.

Despite some consistent research findings on stereotypes and various measures of adjustment, critical objections about the masculinity-femininity construct were raised. The major objection was the conceptualization of masculinity and femininity as negatively correlated endpoints of a single bipolar dimension; a person had to be either masculine or feminine, but not both (Constantinople, 1973). Bem (1974) suggested that this sex role dichotomy obscured two plausible hypotheses: first, that many individuals might be androgynous (both masculine and feminine, depending on the situational appropriateness of these behaviors) and conversely, that strongly sex-typed individuals might be seriously limited in the range of behaviors as they move from situation to situation. In response, Bem constructed the Bem Sex Role Inventory, which contained independent masculine and feminine dimensions. Individuals scoring high on both were labeled androgynous;

those scoring high on one and low on the other were labeled sex typed; those scoring low on both were labeled undifferentiated. This last category was clarified after discussion by Spence et al. (1975).

Bem conducted four major studies on college populations to test her hypotheses. In two experiments involving sex typed behavioral tasks, she concluded that androgynous subjects displayed greater sex role adaptability across the tasks than did the nonandrogynous subjects. Feminine typed females demonstrated the greatest behavioral deficits. Two other studies suggested that cross-sex-typed behaviors (masculine typed behaviors for females, feminine typed behaviors for males) were motivationally problematic for appropriately sex typed individuals, and they actively avoided it as a result (Bem & Lenney, 1976; Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976).

Spence et al. (1975) constructed their own androgyny measure, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, and also utilized their Texas Social Behavior Inventory to assess the relationship of self-esteem and sex roles. The Texas Social Behavior Inventory focused on social confidence, social dominance, and social competence as components of self-esteem. Androgynous subjects obtained the highest level of self-esteem, followed by masculine-typed subjects, feminine subjects, and undifferentiated subjects. Spence and Helmreich (1978) recently replicated these results. Bem (1977) utilized the Texas Social Behavior Inventory to assess self-esteem, and the Bem Sex Role

Inventory to categorize sex roles. Bem's results were similar to those of Spence and her research group. Wetter (1975) used the Personality Research Form Andro Scale, a sex role inventory constructed from the Personality Research Form, and the Self-Esteem Questionnaire to assess the relationships of sex roles and self-esteem. Positive self-evaluation in four broad areas defined self-esteem: interpersonal relations, intellectual functioning, ethical and moral behavior, and overall self-regard. He obtained results similar to those of Spence's group and Bem.

In summary, these studies indicated that an androgynous sex role orientation facilitated behavioral flexibility. Androgyny was also associated with a greater amount of self-esteem as measured by the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (Spence et al., 1975) and the Self-Esteem Questionnaire (Wetter, 1975) than was a sex-typed orientation.

Difficulties with Current Sex Role Conceptualizations

Despite studies that demonstrated a positive relationship between psychological androgyny and various measures of adjustment, several criticisms and questions were raised. Kelly and Worell (1977) claimed that it was not clear whether the various sex role inventories measured the same characteristics. By virtue of being constructed differently, the Bem Sex Role Inventory, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, the Personality Research Form Andro Scale, and Heilbrun's (1976) inventory may not have comparably defined the sex role

categories. Each scale obtained its four sex role categories by performing median splits on the masculinity and femininity subscales. Although these scales shared a common variance, they were by no means interchangeable; in fact, some persons could have been categorized discrepantly by any pair of sex role scales (Kelly, Furman, & Young, 1978). These considerations suggested that much work was still necessary to define the androgyny construct, and generalizations concerning adjustment and psychological well-being needed to be confined to the particular sex role instrument used (Worell, 1978).

Some research findings suggested that the androgyny and adjustment relationship discussed earlier might not be valid for all individuals. Jones, Chernovetz, and Hansson (1978) compared androgynous with sex typed and opposite sex typed persons (Bem Sex Role Inventory categories) along several attitudinal, personality, and behavioral dimensions. Contrary to their expectations, flexibility and adjustment were generally associated with masculinity rather than androgyny, for both males and females. Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) used Bem Sex Role Inventory categories and the Revised Bell Adjustment Inventory to measure personal adjustment, finding that masculinity was more adjustive than androgyny for males, but androgyny was more adjustive than femininity for females. These results and Bem's results suggested that feminine behaviors were still less socially valued than masculine typed behaviors. Masculine, instrumental behaviors had a greater

impact on high adjustment level than feminine, expressive characteristics. Therefore, the androgyny and adjustment relationship may have been more a function of how high an androgynous person's masculinity level was rather than how high his or her masculinity and femininity levels were.

Another difficulty with current sex role conceptualization was the value judgment that androgyny was most adaptive, a judgment made on the basis of empirical research conducted mostly on college students. Bem (1976) stated that the best sex role identity was no sex role identity. Research discussed earlier suggested this might not be true for everyone (Deutsch & Gilbert, 1976; Jones et al., 1978). Phares and Lamiell (1977) added that while it hardly seemed reasonable to dispute that individuals may vary reliably in behavioral flexibility, how one has regarded such individuals may be heavily entangled with person and social values.

In a stimulating theoretical paper, Sampson (1977) suggested that instead of being a more fundamentally desirable quality, androgyny only reflected the current cultural value of individualism rather than that of interdependence within a group. Syntheses of opposing characteristics (masculinity-femininity) were located within the person (androgyny) instead of shared within a group. In light of Sampson's assertion, an important contextual factor for considering sex roles and adjustment was whether the person had assimilated characteristics most highly valued by his or her society or subculture (Jones et al., 1978).

Religion and Roles

Ellis and Bentler (1973) reported that individuals perceiving large differences in the characteristics of the sexes had more traditional sex role attitudes than persons perceiving similarity between the sexes. Traditional attitudes emphasized different role behaviors for men and women, each contributing to the overall functioning of the group--in particular, the family or society. Men involved themselves in instrumental activities; women focused on expressive activities (Parsons & Bales, 1955; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Despite research suggesting that these traditional attitudes may promote a lower self-esteem for feminine typed women, other findings asserted that traditional and contemporary sex role viewpoints lead to two distinct life patterns, with women in each pattern having similar self-esteem profiles (Lipman-Blumen, 1972).

Research has demonstrated that religious belief may be a significant predictor for attitudes towards women's roles. Tavris (1971) concluded that for both sexes, predictors for support of feminism were political radicalism, religious liberalism or atheism, and the belief that all sex differences in personality traits were culturally determined. Spence and Helmreich (1978) used their Attitudes Toward Women Scale to measure attitudes toward the rights, roles, and privileges women ought to have or be permitted. They found that high school students expressing no religious preference reported the most pro-feminist attitudes, followed in order by Jewish,

Protestant, and Catholic students. McFarlin (1974), also using the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, assessed the relationship of fundamentalist religious belief upon attitudes toward women's roles. She found that (a) persons high in fundamentalist religious belief had more traditional attitudes than persons low in fundamentalist religious belief, (b) atheists, agnostics, Unitarians, and others held more liberal attitudes than Protestants or Catholics, and (c) persons who frequently attended church services held more conservative attitudes toward women's roles than persons attending infrequently. Holcomb (1975) studied differences in the role concepts of women as related to their level of self-esteem. She examined these differences in churches that were judged to vary in doctrinairism (traditionalism) with regard to women's roles. Differences between these groups were significant; the nondoctrinaire group had more liberal conceptions of women's roles than the doctrinaire groups. In addition, there were no significant differences in levels of self-esteem between the groups.

Fundamentalist Religious Belief and Sex Roles

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of fundamentalist religious belief to sex roles and adjustment. Fundamentalist religious belief was defined as belief in particular relgious doctrines. There have been varying degrees of belief in these Christian doctrines, ranging from literal belief and acceptance to liberal interpretations, to total rejection of those doctrines. In this study, as in McFarlin (1974), high-fundamentalist believers are persons accepting Christian

doctrines to a higher degree, as specified in the Inventory of Religious Behavior (Brown & Lowe, 1951); low-fundamentalist believers were those who either accepted those doctrines to a low degree or rejected them. One basic doctrine uniformly accepted by high-fundamentalist believers has been the complete reliability and authority of the Bible as it is literally interpreted (Quebedeaux, 1974). Teaching from the Bible has been used to define roles for men and women. Women were to be submissive, remain at home, and be obedient to their husbands. Conversely, men were to exhibit leadership in the home and church. Ryrie (1958, 1974), a theologian in a fundamentalist seminary, claimed that the early Church (prior to 100 A.D.) clearly considered subordination of the wife in domestic relations the normal and fixed status; the primary and honored place of the Christian women was in her home. Knight (1975) stated that this role relationship is still recognized as normative among fundamentalists.

The fundamentalist subculture has emphasized and reinforced traditional attitudes toward sex roles, sharply differentiating male and female behaviors (Knight, 1975; McFarlin, 1974). If the important issue in sex roles and adjustment was the extent to which a person assimilated the tendencies most valued by his or her subculture (Jones et al., 1978: Kelly & Worell, 1977), then the relationship between sex roles and adjustment in a fundamentalist subculture may not have been that androgyny equalled adjustment. Rather,

sex types might have equalled adjustment, because that was reinforced, particularly for fundamentalist women. The hypothesis proposed in this study, then, was that the effect of appropriate sex typing (masculine males and feminine females) or androgyny on self-esteem level depended on religious belief, measured as high-fundamentalist belief or low-fundamentalist belief.

Method

Subjects

There were 250 undergraduate psychology students (100 males and 150 females) in various psychology classes who served as subjects in this study. Research credit points were given to 120 of the subjects in exchange for their participation. The subjects' ages ranged from 18 to 53, and their mean age was 22.24.

Apparatus

Inventory of Religious Belief. The Inventory of Religious Belief, consisting of 15 items, was used to assess fundamentalist religious belief. Brown and Lowe (1951) stated that the principal aim in constructing this inventory was to select items differentiating persons who believed in Christian dogma and those who rejected it. The Inventory of Religious Behavior was initially administered to 35 Bible college students and to 21 students at a liberal theological seminary. Differences between these two groups were significant, and no scores overlapped. In addition, the scores were compared with replies given

on a personal data form. A high positive relationship was found between strong belief and practices such as Bible reading, church attendance, prayer, and contributing to the church. This inventory also had face validity in that items dealing with the virgin birth of Christ, the personal return of Christ, and Biblical inerrancy were subscribed to by fundamentalist denominations but not by liberal churches.

Reliability of the Inventory of Religious Behavior was determined by correlating one chance-half against the other chance-half on the scores of 100 students selected randomly from the first 300 to whom the scale was administered. The obtained reliability coefficient was 0.77 ± 0.04. Using the Spearman-Brown formula, the entire inventory's reliability was 0.87.

Interpersonal Disposition Inventory. The Interpersonal Disposition Inventory, containing 85 items, combined the Personality Research Form Andro Scale and Self-Esteem Scale (Wetter, 1975). The Personality Research Form Andro Scale was derived from the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1967) with two subscales: masculinity (29 items) and femininity (27 items). The theoretical definitions of the masculine and feminine constructs evolved from the Bem Sex Role Inventory. The masculine construct reflects dominant-instrumental themes of social-intellectual ascendancy, autonomy, and orientation toward risk; the feminine construct refers to expressive

themes of nurturance, affiliative-expressive concerns, and self-subordination (Berzins, Welling, & Wetter, 1977).

The masculine and feminine subscales were essentially orthogonal. In two large college samples, correlations between the two subscales were -0.05 and -0.11 for men, and -0.16 and -.024 for women (Berzins et al., 1978). This was consonant with the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire conceptions of masculinity and femininity. In a recent study, Personality Research Form Andro correlations with the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire were 0.70 and 0.66 for the masculine scales respectively, and 0.62 and 0.59 for the feminine scales respectively (Kelly et al., 1978). Despite these modest correlations, item content of the Personality Research Form Andro Scale was more heavily loaded with descriptions of role behavior, as opposed to personality traits, than either the Bem Sex Role Inventory or the Personal Attributes Questionnaires (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

The subjects of Berzins et al. (1978) were classified into one of four sex role categories, after taking the Personality Research Form Andro Scale, on the basis of their positions on the masculine and feminine dimensions. Median splits were performed in each dimension on the scores of all subjects taking the inventory. Subjects scoring above the median on both subscales were androgynous; subjects scoring

high on one dimension but below the median on the other were sex typed (masculine or feminine); subjects scoring below the median on both subscales were undifferentiated. On the average, one of every two persons was appropriately sex typed (masculine males or feminine females), one in five was androgynous, one in five was undifferentiated, and only one in ten was cross-typed (feminine males or masculine females).

The Self-Esteem Scale (Wetter, 1975) was constructed to assess independently the relation of sex roles to self-esteem, when it was noticed that scores on the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (Spence et al., 1975) were too closely related in content to the masculine scale of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. The Self-Esteem Scale contained 20 items assessing general self-esteem in emotional, sexual, and interpersonal areas. Alpha coefficients for this scale have ranged from 0.79 to 0.84, with the median equalling 0.82.

Procedure

Subjects were given instructions about taking the inventories and were assured of the anonymity of their answers. Following completion of a personal data sheet, subjects were asked to complete the Interpersonal Disposition Inventory (see Appendix A) and the Inventory of Religious Behavior (see Appendix B), in that order, to prevent responses from the latter measure from biasing the former measure. Results of the Inventory of Religious Behavior were split at the median for both sexes combined. Males and females scoring above the median were classified as high-fundamentalist believers;

males and females scoring below the median were classified as low-fundamentalist believers. This procedure was similar to that employed by McFarlin (1974).

Median splits were also performed on the masculine and feminine subscales of the Interpersonal Disposition Inventory. All subjects were then classified into one of four sex role categories--androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated.

Results

Data for the hypothesis was analyzed by a two-way (2 X 2) analysis of variance for each sex. One factor was sex role (appropriately sex typed and androgynous) and the other was religious belief (high- and low-fundamentalist believers). The dependent variable was self-esteem, as measured by the Self-Esteem Scale of the Interpersonal Disposition Inventory.

All subjects were classified into one of two religious classifications on the basis of their scores on the Inventory of Religious Behavior. The distribution of scores was split at the median. By this procedure, the high-fundamentalist believers were indicated by scores of 55 and greater; the low-fundamentalist believers were indicated by scores of 54 and less. As a result, 127 subjects, 45 males and 82 females, were assigned to the high-fundamentalist believers group ($M = 66.70$, $SD = 6.23$); 123 subjects, 55 males and 68 females, were assigned to the low-fundamentalist believers group ($M = 41.42$, $SD = 9.08$).

In addition to their assignment to a religious belief group, subjects were also placed in one of four sex role

categories on the basis of scores on the masculine and feminine subscales of the Interpersonal Disposition Inventory. Median splits were performed on each subscale on the scores of all subjects taking the inventory. The medians for the masculine and feminine subscales were 16.0 and 16.1, respectively. The number of subjects assigned to each sex role category and religious belief group is reported in Table 1.

Table 1

Subjects Assigned to Each Sex Role Category and Religious Belief Group

	High Fundamentalists		Low Fundamentalists	
Sex Roles	Males	Females	Males	Females
Androgynous	14	31	9	14
Masculine	16	13	25	13
Feminine	12	24	10	27
Undifferentiated	3	14	11	14
Total	45	82	55	68

The hypothesis that the effect of appropriate sex typing (masculine males and feminine females) or androgyny on self-esteem level would depend on religious belief required the obtaining of an interaction effect in the 2 X 2 analysis of variance. Before this statistical procedure was chosen, a _t_ test was undertaken to assess possible differences between males and females in self-esteem level; the _t_ test indicated

a significantly higher self-esteem level for males than for females, t (158) = 4.06, $p < .001$. Consequently, male and female self-esteem scores were not pooled, and a separate 2 X 2 analysis of variance was conducted for each sex.

The hypothesized significant interaction effect was not obtained by the males, F (1,60) = 0.05, $p > .05$. A summary of the analysis of variance for males is reported in Table 2.

Table 2

The Effect of Sex Role and Religious Belief on Self-Esteem for Males

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Sex Role	5.57	1	5.57	0.68
Religious Belief	0.43	1	0.43	0.05
Interaction	0.43	1	0.43	0.05
Within	492.40	60	8.21	
Total	498.83	63		

The hypothesis was also rejected in the female sample, F (1,92) = 0.55, $p > .05$. Religion was not a factor in self-esteem level for either sex in this study. However, a significant main effect for sex role was obtained in the female sample, indicating a significantly higher self-esteem level for androgynous females than for feminine females, F (1,92) = 6.51, $p < .05$. The analysis of variance summary for females is reported in Table 3.

Table 3

The Effect of Sex Role and Religious Belief on Self-Esteem for Females

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Sex Role	113.32	1	113.32	6.51*
Religious Belief	1.56	1	1.56	.09
Interaction	9.55	1	9.55	.55
Within	1602.82	92	17.42	
Total	1727.25	95		

* $p < .05$

Discussion

The hypothesis was not supported that the effect of appropriate sex typing (masculine males and feminine females) or androgyny on self-esteem level would depend on religious belief for both sexes. However, a significant main effect for sex roles was obtained by the females, indicating that androgynous females in this sample had a significantly higher self-esteem level than feminine females.

Several possibilities may have contributed to the lack of support for the hypothesis in this study. First of all, the mean score on the Inventory of Religious Behavior for the high-fundamentalist believers in this study was significantly lower than the mean of believers in a university sample (M = 69.20) in the Brown and Lowe (1951) standardization study. Consequently, the definition of high-fundamentalist belief

in this study was not comparable to Brown and Lowe's definition of strong belief in a university setting.

Secondly, Brown and Lowe's (1951) results on the Inventory of Religious Behavior showed a standard error of measurement of approximately 4.5, indicating the possibility that each subject's score could vary that much on either side of his or her observed score. Because a median split on the Inventory of Religious Behavior distribution was used to define the religious groups in this study, up to 30 subjects whose scores fell within 5 points on either side of the median could have been classified as either above or below the median, as a result of chance factors. These possible fluctuations may have prevented real differences between the religious groups from emerging in the statistical analyses.

Thirdly, the definition of high-fundamentalist belief versus low-fundamentalist belief may have been a limitation in this study. Brown and Lowe (1951) indicated that Catholics and Protestants of different denominations obtained different mean scores on the Inventory of Religious Behavior. Conservative religious groups are apparently not homogeneous in their degree of assent to certain Christian doctrines. In addition, strong assent to certain Christian doctrines may not be the only criterion for fundamentalist belief. A more comprehensive definition, including doctrinal assent, commitment to a fundamentalist church group, and the meaning of religious beliefs in a person's life (Allport & Ross, 1967) may more accurately define a fundamentalist believer.

Finally, the exclusive use of college students as subjects may have contributed to the lack of support for the hypothesis in this study. Spence and Helmreich (1978) observed in college students that the correlation was slight between attitudes toward appropriate role behaviors and psychological attributes of masculinity and femininity. For example, a college woman might endorse traditional sex role attitudes, yet be classified as androgynous rather than feminine typed. Because the college environment emphasizes achievement, effort, competitiveness, and job concerns, the student must conform to these behaviors to succeed. However, persons holding traditional sex role attitudes and assuming roles as husbands and wives outside a college setting may find their attitudes affecting their behaviors more than if they were in college. A family environment might be more conducive than college to adopting behaviors in accordance with traditional sex roles. The criterion for adjustment, then, might differ, depending on whether the person holding traditional sex role attitudes is in primarily a family or a college-student setting. Research with noncollege subjects in family situations may clarify this issue.

The significantly higher self-esteem scores for males than for females in this study may be explained by reference to findings that masculine traits are more positively valued than feminine traits in a college setting (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968). Conformity to masculine characteristics in a college

that demands mastery and competitiveness for success is more conducive to the maintenance of a high level of self-esteem than is conformity to feminine traits in both males and females (Recely, 1973). Explaining the main effect for sex roles in the female sample may follow the same line of thought. Many women, then, emphasizing characteristic feminine traits to the exclusion of masculine traits, may have a lower measured self-esteem level than androgynous women, utilizing masculine traits, or men in general (Bem & Lenney, 1976; Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976; Cosentino & Heilbrun, 1964; Deutsch & Gilbert, 1976; Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

In summary, the hypothesis that the effect of appropriate sex typing or androgyny on self-esteem level would depend on religious belief for both sexes was not supported. However, results indicated that androgynous females had a significantly higher self-esteem level than feminine females, and that males had a significantly higher self-esteem score than did females.

An implication for counseling may be ventured from these results. Therapists might help women with self-esteem conflicts to explore the relationship between how they see themselves performing and how they would like to perform in a college environment that emphasizes masculine-oriented pursuits. Following such an investigation, appropriate assessment may suggest the need for vocational exploration, assertiveness training, or social skills training, to help the client more effectively deal with her college environment. In addition, the client

could be assured that she does not have to sacrifice her feminine role orientation, but rather, may add additional behaviors to her repertoire to allow more effective overall behavior.

Only a small amount of research has examined the relationships of religious belief, sex roles, and adjustment with the recently constructed sex role measures. Research with noncollege populations is necessary to assess these relationships, particularly with persons who value strong injunctions from religious teaching for sex role differentiation. Results may further our understanding of personal adjustment and sex roles from a broader psychosocial perspective.

Appendix A

Interpersonal Disposition Inventory

Instructions

On the following pages you will find a series of statements that a person might use to describe himself/herself. Read each statement and decide whether or not it describes you. Then indicate your answer on the separate answer sheet.

If you agree with the statement or decide that it does describe you, answer True. If you disagree with the statement or feel that it is not descriptive of you, answer False.

Indicate your answers to the items by placing a heavy black mark that fills the circle completely in the T or F column beside the appropriate item number on the separate answer sheet. Be sure the item number on the answer sheet matches the item number on the test. Answer every statement either true or false, even if you are not completely sure of your answer.

---

1. Self-control is not a big problem for me.
2. I like to be with people who assume a protective attitude toward me.
3. I try to control others rather than permit them to control me.
4. Surfboard riding would be too dangerous for me.
5. Often I don't trust my emotions.
6. If I have a problem, I like to work it out alone.

7. I seldom go out of my way to do something just to make others happy.

8. Adventures where I am on my own are a little frightening to me.

9. I usually know what to say to people.

10. I feel confident when directing the activities of others.

11. I will keep working on a problem after others have given up.

12. I would not like to be married to a protective person.

13. There are many things I would change about myself if I could.

14. I usually try to share my problems with someone who can help me.

15. I don't care if my clothes are unstylish, as long as I like them.

16. When I see a new invention, I attempt to find out how it works.

17. I can make up my mind and stick to it.

18. People like to tell me their troubles because they know I will do everything I can to help them.

19. Sometimes I let people push me around so they can feel important.

20. I am only very rarely in a position where I feel a need to actively argue for a point of view I hold.

21. I am usually disorganized.

22. I dislike people who are always asking me for advice.

23. I seek out positions of authority.

24. I believe in giving friends lots of help and advice.

25. I am poised most of the time.

26. If someone finds fault with me I either listen quietly or just ignore the whole thing.

27. I get little satisfaction from serving others.

28. I make certain that I speak softly when I am in a public place.

29. I am afraid of what other people think about me.

30. I am usually the first to offer a helping hand when it is needed.

31. When I see someone I know from a distance, I don't go out of my way to say "Hello."

32. I would prefer to care for a sick child myself rather than hire a nurse.

33. I am in control of what happens to me in my life.

34. I prefer not being dependent on anyone for assistance.

35. When I am with someone else I do most of the decision making.

36. I try to get at least some sleep every night.

37. I don't mind being conspicuous.

38. I am afraid of a full-fledged disagreement with a person.

39. I would never pass up something that sounded like fun just because it was a little hazardous.

40. I get a kick out of seeing someone I dislike appear foolish in front of others.

41. When someone opposes me on an issue, I usually find myself taking an even stronger stand than I did at first.

42. I feel adequate more often than not.

43. When two persons are arguing, I often settle the arguement for them.

44. I will not go out of my way to behave in an approved way.

45. I am quite independent of the people I know.

46. I frequently doubt my sexual attractiveness.

47. I make all my clothes and shoes.

48. If I were in politics, I would probably be seen as one of the forceful leaders of my party.

49. I prefer a quiet, secure life to an adventurous one.

50. I prefer to face my problems by myself.

51. I'm pretty sure of myself.

52. I try to get others to notice the way I dress.

53. When I see someone who looks confused, I usually ask if I can be of any assistance.

54. It is unrealistic for me to insist on becoming the best in my field of work all of the time.

55. I often kick myself for the things I do.

56. The good opinion of one's friends is one of the chief rewards for living a good life.

57. If I get tired while playing a game, I generally stop playing.

58. I could easily count from one to twenty-five.

59. When I see a baby, I often ask to hold him.

60. I have a good deal of initiative.

61. I am quite good at keeping others in line.

62. I feel uncomfortable when people are paying attention to me.

63. I am quite soft-spoken.

64. I usually have the feeling that I am just not facing things.

65. I think it would be best to marry someone who is more mature and less dependent than I.

66. I would resist anyone who tried to bully me.

67. I don't want to be away from my family too much.

68. I am sexually attractive.

69. I can run a mile in less than four minutes.

70. Once in a while I enjoy acting as if I were tipsy.

71. I feel incapable of handling many situations.

72. I delight in feeling unattached.

73. I often feel inferior.

74. I would make a poor judge because I dislike telling others what to do.

75. Seeing an old or helpless person makes me feel that I would like to take care of him.

76. I usually make decisions without consulting others.

77. I feel emotionally mature.

78. It doesn't affect me one way or another to see a child being spanked.

79. My goal is to do at least a little bit more than anyone else has done before.

80. I usually wear something warm when I go outside on a cold day.

81. To love and be loved is of greatest importance to me.

82. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

83. I avoid some hobbies and sports because of their dangerous nature.

84. One of the things which spurs me on to do the best is the realization that I will be praised for my work.

85. People's tears tend to irritate me more than to arouse my sympathy.

Scoring

The Interpersonal Disposition Inventory scoring key is reported in Table 4. This inventory includes the Femininity (Fem) subscale, the Masculinity (Mas) subscale, and the Self-Esteem (SE) Scale. The Interpersonal Disposition

Inventory is invalid if the Infrequency score (Infr) is two or greater.

Table 4

Interpersonal Disposition Inventory Scoring Key

Item	Scale	Key	Item	Scale	Key	Item	Scale	Key
1.	SE	T	29.	SE	F	57.	Mas	F
2.	Fem	T	30.	Fem	T	58.	Infr	F
3.	Mas	T	31.	Fem	F	59.	Fem	T
4.	Mas	F	32.	Fem	T	60.	SE	T
5.	SE	F	33.	SE	T	61.	Mas	T
6.	Mas	T	34.	Fem	F	62.	filler	
7.	Fem	F	35.	Mas	T	63.	filler	
8.	Mas	F	36.	Infr	F	64.	SE	F
9.	SE	T	37.	Mas	T	65.	Fem	T
10.	Mas	T	38.	SE	F	66.	filler	
11.	Mas	T	39.	Mas	T	67.	Fem	T
12.	Fem	F	40.	Fem	F	68.	SE	T
13.	SE	F	41.	Mas	T	69.	Infr	T
14.	Mas	F	42.	SE	T	70.	Fem	T
15.	Mas	T	43.	Mas	T	71.	Mas	F
16.	Mas	T	44.	Mas	T	72.	Mas	T
17.	SE	T	45.	Fem	F	73.	SE	F
18.	Fem	T	46.	SE	F	74.	Mas	F
19.	Fem	T	47.	Infr	T	75.	Fem	T
20.	Mas	F	48.	Mas	T	76.	Mas	T
21.	SE	F	49.	Mas	F	77.	SE	T
22.	Fem	F	50.	Mas	T	78.	Fem	F
23.	Mas	T	51.	SE	T	79.	Mas	T
24.	Fem	T	52.	Fem	T	80.	Infr	F
25.	SE	T	53.	Fem	T	81.	Fem	T
26.	filler		54.	Mas	F	82.	SE	T
27.	Fem	F	55.	SE	F	83.	Mas	F
28.	Fem	T	56.	Fem	T	84.	Fem	T
						85.	Fem	F

Appendix B

Inventory of Religious Behavior

This is a study of religious belief. Below are 15 items which are to be answered on your answer sheet in the following manner:

- -Fill in the circle under AA if you Strongly Agree with the statement.
- -Fill in the circle under A if you Agree with the statement.
- -Fill in the circle under NS if you are Not Sure whether you agree or disagree with the statement.
- -Fill in the circle under D if you Disagree with the statement.
- -Fill in the circle under DD if you Strongly Disagree with the statement.

Remember to read each statement carefully and mark only one answer for each statement. People differ widely in their beliefs. Please indicate your own in the manner described.

---

1. It makes no difference whether one is a Christian or not as long as one has good will for others.
2. I believe the Bible is the inspired Word of God.
3. God created man separate and distinct from animals.
4. The idea of God is unnecessary in our enlightened age.
5. There is no life after death.
6. I believe Jesus was born of a Virgin.
7. God exists as: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.
8. The Bible is full of errors, misconceptions, and contradictions.
9. The Gospel of Christ is the only way for man to be saved.
10. I think there have been many men in history just as great as Jesus.
11. I believe there is a heaven and a hell.
12. Eternal life is the gift of God only to those who believe in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.

13. I think a person can be happy and enjoy life without believing in God.

14. In many ways the Bible has held back and retarded human progress.

15. I believe in the personal, visible return of Christ to the earth.

Scoring

The answer to each statement that most strongly reflects fundamentalist beliefs is given a score of five; the answer to each statement most antithetical to fundamentalist beliefs is given a score of one. The range of points for each statement is one to five points. With 15 statements, the range of total scores is 15-75 points. Answers for each statement most strongly reflecting fundamentalist belief are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Fundamentalist Answers in the Inventory of Religious Behavior

Item	Answer	Item	Answer	Item	Answer
1.	DD	6.	AA	11.	AA
2.	AA	7.	AA	12.	AA
3.	AA	8.	DD	13.	DD
4.	DD	9.	AA	14.	DD
5.	DD	10.	DD	15.	AA

References

Allport, G. W. & Ross, J. M. Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 432-443.

Barry, H., Bacon, M. K., & Child, I. L. A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 327-332.

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

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

Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptibility: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

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. & Lenney, E. Sex typing and the avoidance of cross sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 48-54.

Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.

Bem, S. L. & Bem, D. J. Training the woman to know her place: The power of unconscious ideology. In M. Garskoff (Ed.), Roles women play: Readings toward women's liberation. Belmont, Ca.: Brooks-Cole Publishing Co., 1971.

Berzins, J. I., Welling, M. A., & Wetter, R. E. The Personality research form andro scale user's manual. University of Kentucky, 1977.

Berzins, J. I., Welling, M. A., & Wetter, R. E. A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the Personality Research Form. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 126-137.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Freudian theories of identification and their derivatives. Child Development, 1960, 31, 15-40.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F., & Rosenkrantz, P. Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Brown, D. G. & Lowe, W. L. Religious beliefs and personality characteristics of college students. Journal of Social Psychology, 1951, 33, 103-129.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Cosentino, F. & Heilbrun, A. B. Anxiety correlates of sex role identity in college students. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 729-730.

D'Andrade, R. G. Sex differences and cultural institutions. In E. Maccoby (Ed.) The development of sex differences. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Deutsch, C. J. & Gilbert, L. A. Sex role stereotypes: Effects on perceptions of self and others and on personal adjustment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 373-379.

Ellis, L. & Bentler, P. Traditional sex-determined role standards and sex stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 28-34.

Gall, M. D. The relationship between masculinity-femininity and manifest anxiety. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 294-295.

Heilbrun, A. B. Parent identification and filial sex role behavior: The importance of biological context. In J. K. Cole & R. Dienstbier (Eds.), Nebraska symposium on motivation (Vol. 21). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973.

Heilbrun, A. B. Measurement of masculine and feminine sex role identities as independent dimensions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 183-190.

Holcomb, L. H. Role concepts and self-esteem in church women with implications for pastoral counseling. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 1975, 3, 119-126.

Holter, H. Sex roles and social change. Acta Sociologica, 1971, 14, 2-12.

Jackson, D. N. Personality research form manual. Goshen, N.Y.: Research Psychologists Press, 1967.

Jones, W. H., Chernovetz, M. E., & Hansson, R. O. The enigma of androgyny: Differential implications for males and females? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 298-313.

Kelly, J. A., Furman, W., & Young, V. Problems associated with typological measurement of sex roles and androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1574-1576.

Kelly, J. A. & Worell, J. New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 1101-1115.

Knight, G. W. The New Testament teaching of the role relationship of male and female with special reference to the teaching and ruling functions in the church. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 1975, 3, 216-225.

Kohlberg, L. A. A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex role concepts and attitudes. In E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Lee, P. Psychology and sex differences. In P. Lee & S. Stewart (Eds.), Sex differences: Cultural and developmental dimensions. New York: Urizen Books, 1976.

Linton, R. Selections from the study of man. In P. Lee & S. Stewart (Eds.), Sex differences: Cultural and developmental dimensions. New York: Urizen Books, 1976.

Lipman-Blumen, J. How ideology shapes women's lives. Scientific American, 1972, 226, 34-42.

McFarlin, D. A. The effect of fundamental religious beliefs upon males' and females' attitudes toward women's role in society. Unpublished master's thesis, North Texas State University, 1974.

McKee, J. & Sheriffs, A. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 356-371.

McKee, J. & Sheriffs, A. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals, and self-concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 356-363.

Mischel, W. Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Murphy, Y. & Murphy, R. Women and men. In P. Lee & S. Stewart (Eds.), Sex differences: Cultural and developmental dimensions. New York: Urizen Books, 1976.

Parsons, T. & Bales, R. F. Family, socialization, and interaction process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955.

Phares, E. J. & Lamiell, J. T. Personality. In M. Rosenzweig & L. Porter (Eds.). Annual review of psychology. Palo Alto, Ca.: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1977.

Quebedeaux, R. The young evangelicals. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Recely, N. L. Level of self-esteem and conformity to sex role stereotypes. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973 (Oct.), 34(4-B), 1757-1758.

Rosencrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. Sex role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.

Ryrie, C. C. The role of women in the church. Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.

Ryrie, C. C. You mean the Bible teaches that. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.

Sampson, E. E. Psychology and the American ideal. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 767-782.

Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity and femininity. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & 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.

Tavris, C. A. The unliberated liberals: Attitudes toward the issue of women's liberation. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971 No. 72-15, 013.

Wetter, R. E. Levels of self-esteem associated with four sex roles. Paper presented at the 83rd Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois, August 30, 1975.

Worell, J. Sex roles and psychological well being. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 777-791.