

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Susan W. Miller entitled "Adolescent Sex Role Classification and Religious Orientation." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Guidance.

William A. Poppen
William A. Poppen, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Edwin Nelson
John R. Ray

Accepted for the Council:

L. Grant Bell
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

ADOLESCENT SEX ROLE CLASSIFICATION
AND RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Susan W. Miller

August 1981

3053629

Dedicated in loving memory of my nephew Danny
and my grandfather George

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. E. W. McClain and Dr. J. R. Ray for serving as members of my thesis committee. I am especially grateful to my major professor, Dr. W. A. Poppen, for his support and encouragement throughout my Master's program.

I also extend thanks to Sue and Lowell Brubaker, for their friendship as well as their valuable contributions to this research, and to Connie Akers, a very special friend with a great listening ear!

Extra special appreciation is extended to my husband, George. I wish to thank him for his faith in me and my chosen endeavor, for his encouragement and support—both emotionally and financially—and for his love; each of these contributed to the successful completion of my graduate program.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine adolescents' intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation across sex role classification and adolescents' masculinity and femininity across religious orientation. Subjects were 210 (109 males, 101 females) adolescents enrolled as seniors in two high schools in McMinn County, Tennessee. When subjects were categorized according to Bem's (1978) four sex role classifications, 58 were classified as androgynous, 53 as undifferentiated, 52 as masculine, and 47 as feminine. When subjects were categorized according to Allport's (1968) four religious orientations, 67 were extrinsically religious, 56 were intrinsically religious, 48 were indiscriminately proreligious, and 39 were nonreligious.

Data were analyzed separately for each null hypothesis using a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. For comparisons which yielded significant H values, a Mann-Whitney U test was used as a follow-up to determine where significant differences existed. The .05 level of significance was used to test each null hypothesis.

Of the twelve null hypotheses tested, five were rejected. A significant difference was found among the intrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine adolescents for total, male, and female samples. The direction of the scores for significant individual comparisons suggested that androgynous adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents for total, male, and female samples; androgynous adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine adolescents for total

and male samples; masculine adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents for the female sample; feminine adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents for total and male samples; and feminine adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine adolescents for the total sample.

A significant difference was also found among the feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious adolescents for total and male samples. The direction of the scores for significant individual comparisons suggested that intrinsically religious adolescents were more feminine than extrinsically religious adolescents for the total sample; intrinsically religious adolescents were more feminine than nonreligious adolescents for the male sample; indiscriminately proreligious adolescents were more feminine than extrinsically religious adolescents for total and male samples; and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents were more feminine than nonreligious adolescents for the male sample. No significant difference was found between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious females.

Results of Kruskal-Wallis one-way analyses of variance indicated there were no significant differences between the extrinsic scores of adolescents across sex role classifications nor between the masculine scores of adolescents across religious orientations.

Findings of the study are consistent with maturational theories which suggest intrinsically religious and androgynous persons are

psychologically healthier and more mature than undifferentiated persons. In addition, similarities among androgynous, feminine and intrinsically religious subjects lead to the conclusion that an individual's femininity may be a key concept in intrinsic religious orientation. Further research investigating personality characteristics and values of feminine, androgynous, and intrinsically religious persons is recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Hypotheses	2
Significance of Study	4
Definitions	5
Assumptions and Limitations	8
Organization for the Study	9
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
Sex Role Development	10
Correlates of Sex Role Development	16
Judeo-Christian Biblical Stereotypes	18
Religion—A Maturational Process	21
Androgyny	25
Summary—Review of the Literature	30
Inferences from the Literature	31
III. METHODOLOGY	33
Subjects and Setting	33
Statistical Design and Analysis	34
Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance	35
Mann-Whitney U Test	37
Instrumentation	38
Bem Sex Role Inventory	39
Religious Orientation Inventory	41
Procedures	43
Preliminary stages leading to test administration	43
Instrument administration	43
Summary	45
IV. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS	46
Description of Sample	47
Data Analysis and Interpretation	52
Summary of Findings	66
V. DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	69
Findings and Discussion	69
Hypothesis One	69
Hypothesis Two	71

CHAPTER	PAGE
Hypothesis Three	72
Hypothesis Four	74
Hypothesis Five	75
Hypothesis Six	76
Hypothesis Seven	76
Hypothesis Eight	78
Hypothesis Nine	78
Hypothesis Ten	79
Hypothesis Eleven	81
Hypothesis Twelve	81
Discussion of Results in Relation to Inferences from Literature	82
Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research	94
LIST OF REFERENCES	98
APPENDIX	105
VITA	112

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Sex Role Classifications (Total Sample)	48
2. Sex Role Classifications (Gender)	48
3. Religious Orientations (Total Sample)	50
4. Religious Orientations (Gender)	50
5. Sex Role Classifications and Religious Orientations (Total Sample)	51
6. Sex Role Classifications and Religious Orientations (Gender)	53
7. Kruskal-Wallis H Values among Four Sex Role Classifications Utilizing Intrinsic Scores	54
8. Mann-Whitney U Test Results of Individual Comparisons among Sex Role Classifications Utilizing Intrinsic Scores	55
9. Kruskal-Wallis H Values among Four Sex Role Classifications Utilizing Extrinsic Scores	59
10. Kruskal-Wallis H Values among Four Religious Orientations Utilizing Feminine Scores	61
11. Mann-Whitney U Test Results of Individual Comparisons among Religious Orientations Utilizing Feminine Scores	61
12. Kruskal-Wallis H Values among Four Religious Orientations Utilizing Masculine Scores	65

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION

Introduction

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. (Galatians 3:28, Holy Bible, p. 1101)

Altering the Biblical scripture to read, there is no more prejudice; there is no more sex role stereotyping; for ye are all one, in religion, brings the quotation up to the twentieth century. It appears the same issues addressing the world today were also present in early Christian society. After almost two thousand years, prejudice and sex role stereotyping still exist (Bem, 1975b; Chafetz, 1975; Mokros, Taylor, & O'Neill, 1977; Stuart, 1975). Yet, something else has managed to live through the centuries, something advocated, and in fact personified by the very individual mentioned in the opening quotation—religion.

These two interpretations of Galatians 3:28 appear to suggest that if one "gets" religion, he or she tends to lose stereotypic beliefs. Allport (1968) discovered that prejudice was often associated with an utilitarian religion. His research revealed persons who internalized religious beliefs displayed less prejudice than individuals who did not. Research by Rokeach (1960) and Ehrlich (1973) revealed religious and nonreligious persons with open belief systems, those not threatened by beliefs different from their own, were less prejudiced than persons with closed belief systems. Accepting these studies are

valid, men and women who internalize religious beliefs should lose sex role discrimination.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine adolescents' intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation across sex role classification and adolescents' masculinity and femininity across religious orientation. Subjects' religious orientation—intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, or nonreligious—was measured by the Religious Orientation Inventory—ROI (Allport, 1968). Subjects' sex role classification—androgynous, feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated—was measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory—BSRI (Bem, 1978).

Hypotheses

From the problem statement the following hypotheses, stated in null form, were derived:

1. There is no significant difference among average intrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine male and female adolescents.
2. There is no significant difference among average intrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine female adolescents.
3. There is no significant difference among average intrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine male adolescents.

4. There is no significant difference among average extrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine male and female adolescents.

5. There is no significant difference among average extrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine female adolescents.

6. There is no significant difference among average extrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine male adolescents.

7. There is no significant difference among average feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious male and female adolescents.

8. There is no significant difference among average feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious female adolescents.

9. There is no significant difference among average feminine scores of intrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, extrinsically religious, and nonreligious male adolescents.

10. There is no significant difference among average masculine scores of intrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, extrinsically religious, and nonreligious male and female adolescents.

11. There is no significant difference among average masculine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious female adolescents.

12. There is no significant difference among average masculine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious male adolescents.

Significance of Study

Research related to religious orientation (Allport, 1957; Stewart, 1967) and sex role classification (Block, 1973; Mischel, 1966; Pleck, 1975) yielded striking similarities. Block's (1973) discussion of stages leading toward androgyny parallel maturational processes associated with religious development (Allport, 1957; Stewart, 1967; Wagner, 1978). Initially, adolescents adhere to religious and sex role beliefs and practices observed in their parents. During early and mid-adolescence, adolescents' religious and sex role views tend to reflect beliefs accepted and practiced by peers. By late adolescence and early adulthood, some adolescents begin to internalize religious values and integrate conflicting sex role characteristics.

Allport (1968) identified persons functioning at the most enhancing level of religious development as intrinsically religious. Those endorsing less unifying religious concepts were labeled as extrinsically religious or indiscriminately proreligious. Bem (1975a) identified persons at the healthiest level of sex role development as androgynous. Others, those who restricted their response repertoires to characteristics attributed to masculine or feminine sex-types, were labeled as masculine or feminine, dependent upon which sex role characteristics were endorsed.

Research indicated persons who endorsed a utilitarian religion displayed less positive interpersonal and intrapersonal adjustment than those who had an integrated, life-fulfilling religion (Allport, 1968; Blum & Mann, 1960; Feagin, 1964; Photiadis & Biggar, 1962; Hamby, 1973). When compared to androgynous persons, those adhering to rigid sex role

expectations displayed a similar lack of adjustment (Chafetz, 1975; Marini, 1978; Sanders, 1973; Tree, 1967). High femininity in women resulted in low self-confidence and feelings of inadequacy and fear; whereas, high masculinity in males resulted in emotional and physical stress. Research concluded that androgynous and intrinsically religious persons exhibited more tolerance toward others and reported having positive self-concepts more often than extrinsically religious and sex-typed persons (Allport, 1968; Bem, 1975a; Bem & Lenney, 1976). These results suggest that intrinsically religious persons tend to be more androgynous than extrinsically religious persons who tend to be more sex-typed.

Definitions

Prejudice

Beliefs or judgements made without sufficient evidence and not easily changed by opposing facts or circumstances; preconceived feelings, opinions, or attitudes about a group; hostile and irrational attitudes about a person made without consideration of his or her own attributes. (Psychology Today, p. 735)

Discrimination:

Treating people differently on the basis of their ethnic group, class, and so on rather than on their relevant traits; acts of discrimination are typically premised upon prejudice. (Psychology Today, p. 724)

Stereotype:

A preconceived notion about some aspect of reality, particularly people or social groups; a set of over-simplified, rigid and biased generalizations about a group or category of people. (Psychology Today, p. 723)

Sex Role: Personality traits which are judged masculine and feminine by the BSRI; these traits represent socially assigned and

expected characteristics of males and females within society (Bem, 1978; McDonald, 1978).

Sex Role Identity: The degree to which an individual endorses, in numerical equivalents, masculine and feminine traits on the BSRI; these equivalents indicate the extent to which a person accepts and exhibits socially assigned and expected personality and behavior characteristics within society (Bem, 1978; McDonald, 1978). Sex role identity is better defined as the sex role component of one's identity (McClain, 1981).

Sex Role Classification: Four sex role categories of the BSRI—feminine, masculine, androgynous, and undifferentiated—which denote the extent to which a person has accepted or rejected masculine and/or feminine characteristics and behaviors (Bem, 1974, 1978).

Androgyny (A): A high score on the masculine and feminine scales of the BSRI; the androgynous person internalizes the positive characteristics of both masculine and feminine sex roles and is able to incorporate the correct characteristic for the given situation. The androgynous person has been described as, assertive and yielding, competent and sensitive, and independent and warm (Bem, 1974; Singer, 1976).

Feminine (F): A high score on the feminine scale and low score on the masculine scale of the BSRI; the feminine person endorses stereotypic feminine characteristics and rejects masculine characteristics and has been described as affectionate, sympathetic, and sensitive (Bem, 1974, 1978; Rosen & Aneshensel, 1976).

Masculine (M): A high score on the masculine scale and low score on the feminine scale of the BSRI; the masculine individual endorses

stereotypic masculine characteristics and rejects feminine characteristics and has been described as aggressive, competitive; independent, and analytical (Bem, 1974, 1978; Marini, 1978).

Undifferentiated (U): A low score on the masculine and feminine scales of the BSRI; the undifferentiated person does not endorse feminine or masculine stereotypic characteristics (Bem, 1974).

Religious Orientation: Four religious orientations of the ROI—intrinsic, extrinsic, indiscriminately proreligious, and non-religious—indicating the extent to which a person has accepted or rejected intrinsic and/or extrinsic characteristics or behaviors (Allport, 1968).

Intrinsically Religious (I): A low score on the intrinsic statements and low score on the extrinsic statements of the ROI; the intrinsically religious person has allowed religion to become an integral and unifying factor in his or her life; thus religion is lived rather than used. The intrinsically religious person tends to have a positive self-concept and has been described as intelligent, trusting, responsible, and in control of his or her impulses (Allport, 1957, 1968; Hamby, 1973).

Extrinsically Religious (E): A high score on the extrinsic statements and high score on the intrinsic statements of the ROI; the extrinsically religious person values religion for its utilitarian purposes; thus he or she relies on religion for comfort, status, self-confidence and uses religion as a defense against reality. The extrinsically religious person has been described as suspicious, irresponsible, competitive, and assertive (Allport, 1957, 1968; Hamby, 1973).

Indiscriminately Proreligious (IP): A low score on the intrinsic statements and high score on the extrinsic statements of the ROI; the indiscriminately proreligious person is torn between extrinsic and intrinsic religious involvement. He or she is unable to perceive differences in opposing issues and tends to over-generalize in stereotypic ways. The indiscriminately proreligious person has been described as people oriented but extremely immature and tends to be trusting, conforming, cooperative, and conscientious (Allport, 1968; Hamby, 1973).

Nonreligious (NR): A low score on the extrinsic statements and high score on the intrinsic statements of the ROI; the nonreligious person rejects all forms of religion and has been described as assertive, autonomous, and impulsive (Allport, 1968; Hamby, 1973).

Assumptions and Limitations

A major assumption of this study was that adolescents chosen to be participants were capable of giving valid self-reports under the conditions set forth for the study.

The following limitations were imposed upon this study:

1. Restricted involvement of subjects enrolled as seniors in two public high schools in McMinn County, Tennessee, limits the generalization of the results to those adolescents involved in the study.

2. The BSRI and ROI yield ordinal-level data; thus nonparametric tests were used to analyze results. Utilization of nonparametric tests, as opposed to parametric tests, tends to increase the probability of making Type II error—failure to reject a null hypothesis which is really false (Gay, 1976, p. 247).

Organization for the Study

Chapter I contains an introduction, statement of the problem, null hypotheses, significance of the study, definitions, assumptions and limitations. Chapter II presents a survey of the literature related to the research and inferences from this literature. Chapter III presents a description of the research setting and subjects, a design of the study, a review of the instruments and scoring procedures utilized, and procedures for collecting the data. An analysis and presentation of the data will be presented in Chapter IV followed by discussions, conclusions, and recommendations in Chapter V. References and an appendix will conclude the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature summarized in this chapter is grouped into the following areas: sex role development, correlates of sex role development, Judeo-Christian biblical stereotypes, religion as a maturational process and androgyny. Following a brief summary, inferences drawn from the literature review will conclude this section.

Sex Role Development

Research of theories of sex role development (Block, 1973; Freud, 1927/1976; Kaplan & Sedney, 1980; Kohlberg, 1966; Mischel, 1966) revealed several influencers of sex role development for children and adolescents. Among these, family (Grambs & Waetjen, 1975; Marini, 1978; Rosen & Aneshensel, 1976), educational environment (Campbell, 1976; Katz, 1979), peers (Collins, Kennedy, & Francis, 1976; Marini, 1978), mass media (Chafetz, 1975; Grambs & Waetjen, 1975) and biology (Muenchow, 1980) were found to be prime influencers of an individual's view of his or her sex role.

A review of literature revealed three traditional theories related to the development of sex roles: psychoanalytic theory (Freud, 1927/1976); social learning theory (Mischel, 1966); and cognitive developmental theory (Kohlberg, 1966). Although quite different in content, all three theories designate family members as important sources of an individual's sex role development and consequent behavior repertoire.

Freud (1927/1976), when discussing biological and genetic determinants of sex role development, theorizes that children, after recognition of their genitals and resolution of an intense Oedipus Complex, in most instances eventually identify with the same-sexed parent. Mischel (1966) hypothesizes the child observes and mimics masculine and feminine models in his or her environment. Performance of the observed model behaviors leads to reinforcement and/or punishment which eventually contributes to the child's "appropriate" sex role. Kohlberg (1966) suggests children adopt sex-typed behaviors by identifying which masculine and feminine characteristics are in agreement with their gender.

A fourth model, the life span view (Kaplan & Sedney, 1980) advocated by Block (1973) and Pleck (1975) more closely resembles the concept of sex role development investigated for this thesis. Like the three traditional theories, the life span view recognizes the importance of both modeling and seeking societal approval in developing sex roles. Additionally, this view states an individual's learned behaviors can change as he or she progresses through life. As the person matures, he or she becomes aware of internal and personal masculine and feminine conflicts. A state of androgyny is reached when the individual is able to integrate the various discrepancies. Block (1973) reports characteristics of developmental stages leading toward androgyny parallel Loevinger's (1966, 1970) stages of ego development: distinguishing self from nonself, becoming impulse ridden, conforming with social patterns, becoming conscientious, becoming autonomous, resolving conflicts, and becoming integrated.

As each theory mentions, the family plays a crucial part in the development of the child's sex role. Research (Grambs & Waetjen, 1975; Sears, Rau, & Alpert, 1965) indicated a child's sex role originated from the time of birth. Parents soon modified their own behavior in accordance with the gender of their newborn. Female babies were greeted with pink blankets and much touching and pampering, whereas male babies received blue blankets and less physical contact. Sears et al. (1965) found that parents encouraged sons to participate in rambunctious and experimental activities but punished daughters for doing so. Due to societal norms, many parents encouraged sons to prepare for college and graduate school; daughters were induced to prefer clerical and domestic duties (Marini, 1978).

Rosen and Aneshensel (1976) discussed the presence of a "chameleon syndrome," defined as "an accommodative response to a social environment perceived as hostile to behavior that violates conventional sex role prescriptions" (p. 615), especially in female subjects. Analysis of data following the administration of the Chameleon Syndrome Index to 3200 adolescent males and females in New York state revealed overdominating, unyielding attempts by parents to appropriately "feminize" their daughters resulted in the latter's development of the chameleon syndrome. In contrast, androgynous parents, as reported in Block's longitudinal research (1973), stressed the importance of achievement, responsibility, and nurturance as positive attributes in both their sons and daughters.

On the average, children attend school for twelve years. Not surprisingly, the educational environment—with its presence of

teachers, administrators, and students—influences sex role behavior. Katz (1979) and Marini (1978) found although females made better grades in high school than males, more of the latter attended college. This phenomenon was attributed to females' gradual tendency to place marriage ahead of academic achievement. Sanders (1973) found that secondary guidance counselors suggested that adolescent girls take secretarial, home economics, and clerical coursework. In contrast, boys were encouraged to enroll in courses oriented toward the sciences, technical areas, or woodworking and shop.

The attitudes of both counselors and students may provide an explanation for results found in Campbell's study (1976) measuring adolescent IQs. Similar IQ tests were readministered to 471 high school seniors (290 girls, 181 boys) from two public and two private schools in New York state. When compared to the previous IQ scores obtained four to six years earlier, it was noticed that females' intelligence quotients declined; however, males' remained approximately the same. The few males who had declining IQ scores manifested less masculine stereotypic behavior than nondeclining males, but declining females exhibited more characteristic feminine attributes than nondeclining females.

In defense of male students, especially in their earlier years, Chafetz (1975) reported her belief that boys experience more anxiety in school. She supported her assumption by pointing out that behavior characteristics needed for success in school, being submissive to an authoritarian role model and sitting quietly in a desk, were diametrically opposed to masculine sex role attributes of autonomy and adventure.

Peer pressure, especially during adolescence, plays an important role in suggesting which masculine and feminine characteristics are accepted or rejected by youth. Katz (1979) reported in early adolescence, as parental influence waned, acceptance by the same sexed peer group became important. In later adolescence, expectations of the opposite sex begins to influence sex role adoption (Collins, Kennedy, & Francis, 1976; Katz, 1979; Marini, 1978).

Research on dating expectations (Collins et al., 1976), utilizing a sample of 472 male and female students ranging in age 17 to 30, revealed social expectations and beliefs strongly moderated dating practices. In interpersonal relationships, it appeared the female's desire to please and strengthen the relationship eventually allowed her to yield to the male's more pronounced need for sexual gratification. A similar concept was measured in a study (Wallin, 1960) at a western co-educational university. Data of 163 unmarried, undergraduate college women taken from self-report questionnaires and personal interviews revealed—although they viewed themselves as intellectual equals to men—women felt inferior in dating relationships. These women admitted to behaving in role expected ways to insure acceptance from their male escorts.

Grambs and Waetjen (1975) and Katz (1979) suggested the mass media—TV, books, movies—as another influencer of sex role acquisition. Chafetz (1974) investigated the mass media and its affects on adolescents in the early 70s. The era's rock music portrayed men as sexually aggressive, intellectual, and egotistical. Women, though rarely mentioned, appeared docile and sensitive. Sports articles

described male athletes as huge, great, tough, and courageous; women were represented as pretty, slim, and attractive. Male comic strip characters were characterized as being aggressive, nondomestic, intellectual, and responsible. Cartoons including women represented passive, domestic, emotional, and dependent types. An analysis of men's magazines found articles written for and about men, while women's magazines concentrated on ways to make oneself attractive to the opposite sex. The majority of television series' plots revolved around courageous leading men with attractive women playing supporting roles. Commercials represented men as practical and knowledgeable, while women were presented as sexually appealing. Of all the mass media reviewed, movies revealed a trend away from sex role stereotypes. More aggressive, single women and emotional, and occasionally submissive, men appeared in motion pictures.

In discussing sex differences between males and females, biological data cannot be ignored or de-emphasized. Muenchow (1980) presented an overview of studies suggesting biological bases for sex differences. The four major differences noted were in relation to reproduction: men impregnate; women menstruate, gestate, and lactate. The same hormones are present in both males and females but in different degrees. Tests suggested that a higher concentration of the male hormone androgen makes boys more aggressive than girls. After birth, boy babies remained awake longer, blinked and moved more than their female counterparts. Newborn female babies tended to smile and respond to other babies' cries more often than male infants. Investigators asserted that from gestation through the first year of life, boys' chances of survival were less than girls'. Boys were reported as walking and reaching maturity later than

girls. Through medical evidence, it was hypothesized that the speech-controlling left hemisphere of the female's brain developed earlier than the left hemisphere of the male's brain. In contrast, the right hemisphere of the male's brain (controlling visual-spatial abilities) developed earlier in males than females.

In conclusion, adolescents in contemporary American society are under the sway of several factors which theoretically influence sex role adaptation. Biology, family, educational environment, peers, and mass media are examples of important contributors to sex role development. Children and adolescents who "correctly" interpret conflicting sexual messages develop in a manner that society considers normal. Those who do not are, at best, harmed by emotional confusion and, at worst, the sad victims of emotional maladjustment.

Correlates of Sex Role Development

Block (1973), Grambs and Waetjen (1975), and Rosen and Aneshensel (1976) concluded sex role stereotypes encouraged females to be emotional, submissive, docile, concerned with personal appearance, and compliant. In contrast, men were influenced to be assertive, dominate and less emotional than women. Working women were viewed as being more successful in careers which utilized their domestic, home-oriented, and family care skills (Marini, 1978). Men were given the responsibility of handling more competitive, powerful, and intellectual tasks in their careers. Such career-oriented characteristics appeared to prepare males for employment but left females torn between their career aspirations and responsibilities as wives and mothers.

Mokros, Taylor and O'Neill (1977) studied the success predictions of 144 junior and senior high school students. Three occupations were represented: department head, nurse, and chief of staff at a local hospital. Adolescents were asked to rank the success of both males and females in each employment category. Results indicated the sample rated males as more successful than females. The male department head was rated to be most successful, while the male nurse was considered as least successful.

Fear was noted as a prime feeling among women when discussing their relationships with men (Tree, 1967). Although the women were successful, qualified, attractive, and outgoing, they still feared both rejection from men in interpersonal relationships and from society as a whole in relation to their career goals and aspirations.

Although a number of studies on male and female sex roles revealed male characteristics to be more highly valued than female sex role traits (Chafetz, 1975; Lynn, 1960; Sanders, 1973), other research showed an opposite trend (Parish & Bryant, 1978). Using two semantic differential attitude scales, one for boys and one for girls, as measuring devices, 60 males and 60 females in grades one through twelve were asked to rate male and female stereotypic adjectives ranging from positive to negative along a seven point continuum. Analysis revealed, although initially both genders rated their same sexed characteristics more positively, as grade levels increased, both males and females progressively rated male characteristics as less favorable than female characteristics.

Stringent sex role adoption has been suspected as a cause for both physiological and psychological illnesses in society. Chafetz

(1975) attributed heart attacks, strokes, high blood pressure and resultant premature death, significantly more characteristic of males than females, to the stereotypic male emphasis on competition and success. Using the Imaginal Process Inventory, Taylor, Fulcomer, and Taylor (1978) investigated ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade adolescents' reactions to daydreaming. Results indicated males reacted to their daydreams with feelings of guilt and hostility. These feelings did not occur among female subjects; thus emphasizing the negative pressures placed on men to react only in cognitive, socially acceptable ways.

In conclusion, as Sanders (1973) discussed in her article, both men and women suffer from being placed in rigid sex role classifications. Women are locked into roles which deprive them of independence, cognitive development and spontaneity. Likewise, males are penalized if they display nurturing, emotional, or compliant behaviors. As a result, men become more stressed as they struggle to maintain their image, and women become more angry and resentful due to feelings of inadequacy and inferiority.

Judeo-Christian Biblical Stereotypes

Most of the literature reviewed on biblical stereotypes related to women's inferior role. Several readings (Carmody, 1979; Daly, 1968; Micks, 1975) have been condensed to present an overview of male and female sex roles in Old and New Testament times. Patriarchal society was established with the concept of male superiority in mind and dates back to the moment God was called the Father, Jesus was called the Son, and Eve was created for Adam. In biblical times, females were inferior to males. In fact, females were owned by males—first by their fathers

then by their husbands. Women were responsible secondarily for domestic duties and primarily for producing male offspring believed to be a blessing from God. Females were denied education, legal rights, and freedom of choice. They were considered weak, stupid, and utilitarian. Even Jewish men recognized the inferior status of women—they thanked God each day for creating them as males instead of females.

The early Church Fathers, Tertullian, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Clement of Alexandria, Thomas Aquinas, and Jerome viewed women as having two natures, part evil and seductive and part virginal and good. Women and sex were both condemned as evils of society and something to be avoided if possible. Morris (1973) discussed the negative connotations associated with the woman's menstrual cycle. During this time, even more so than usual, women were considered impure and under a curse.

Several biblical texts reveal clearly the inferior status of women. In the Old Testament it is written:

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thine neighbors. (Exodus 20:17, Holy Bible, p. 72)

And if a woman have an issue, and the issue in her flesh be blood, she shall be put apart seven days: and whosoever toucheth her shall be unclean until the even. (Leviticus 15:19, Holy Bible, p. 111)

Furthermore, attitudes stayed the same in the New Testament:

Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. (I Corinthians 14:34, Holy Bible, p. 111)

But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. (I Timothy 3:12, Holy Bible, p. 1130)

Indications of how biblical stereotypes have survived through time were evidenced in the literature (Atkins, 1975; Hewitt & Hiatt, 1973; Stuart, 1975). Atkins (1975) contended Christ's earthly existence was spent as a male for the express purpose of establishing the importance of the male gender and its relevance to Christ's mission—not to conform to the tradition of the time. In addition, Atkins stressed Christ deliberately chose not to include women as part of the twelve disciples. Stuart (1975) condemned the present-day feminist movement toward equality as one of the many evils contributing to the downfall of America. He asserted women did not belong in the priesthood because they would be too sexually distracting to males in the congregation. Hewitt and Hiatt (1973) purported women would not be able to handle the situational problems confronting male priests—counseling men with sexual problems and making visits in unknown neighborhoods.

In contrast to the negative views of women presented in much of Christian literature, some researchers pointed out more androgynous views of God and spoke of the Lord's desire for all to be equal. Micks (1975) discussed a New Testament verse which stressed this point:

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. (Galatians 3:28, Holy Bible, p. 1101)

Micks (1975) also translated the Hebrew word "adham" in Genesis 2:3 (Holy Bible, p. 2) as the first of God's creation, man and woman.

Gibson (1970) revealed several anti-feminine traditions Jesus broke while on earth during His ministry. A woman touched Jesus while she was bleeding, but Jesus did not act as if He were defiled (Mark 5:21-34, Holy Bible, p. 931). Women traveled with Jesus (Luke 8:1-3, Holy

Bible, pp. 959-960). Jesus spoke with a woman about biblical truths (Matthew 5:27-32, Holy Bible, pp. 890-891). Gibson (1970) and Morris (1973) also pointed out women were the last to be with Christ when He died and the first to see Him when He returned after the resurrection. Jesus also gave women equal rights with men in marriage and divorce:

He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. (Matthew 19:8, Holy Bible, p. 908)

In summary, although a great deal of discrimination is evidenced in both the Old and New Testaments, it appears Jesus attempted to change some deeply set beliefs about male/female relationships. But—as can be witnessed even in present society—long standing traditions do not change "overnight" (Gibson, 1970; Hewitt & Hiatt, 1973; Micks, 1975; Morris, 1973; Stuart, 1975).

Religion—A Maturational Process

Allport (1957), Stewart (1967), and Wagner (1978), although using different terminology, all define the religious life as an ongoing maturational process. Immature childhood concepts of God are concrete and very realistic and only gradually evolve into more cognitive, spiritual representations. In early adolescence, the young person's religious view is closely associated with that of his or her parents. Around the onset of puberty, as the child moves away from the family and toward the peer group, a period of rejection of former teachings, among these biblical beliefs, ensues. Religion is often ignored, treated as nonexistent, or used strictly for utilitarian purposes. Questions abound in the adolescent's mind as he or she struggles with the image of a judgmental, damning God contrasted to a loving,

forgiving father. By late adolescence or early adulthood, some adolescents begin to grasp an intrinsic meaning associated with religion. Beliefs and values are internalized, but more important, they are lived. Yet, some never reach this all enhancing and integrating state. Instead, they flounder using the superficial benefits of belief without accepting the true meaning.

Stewart (1967) identified three adolescent religious types. The conventional or traditional adolescent exhibits a close attachment with the church and relies heavily on the pastor and parish members for strength and support—similar to Allport's extrinsic type (1968). The conformist adolescent accepts and practices the religious beliefs of his or her immediate social group. The beliefs of the conformist range from illogical commitments to everything which appears religious, to complete rejection of anything having to do with religion—similar to Allport's indiscriminately proreligious and nonreligious types respectively. The third type is the intrinsic adolescent; the youth who takes religion seriously and who struggles, and will continue to struggle, with the non-absolutes of faith, guilt, forgiveness, redemption, and commitment. This intrinsic type, similar to Allport's intrinsically religious orientation, transcends all others and is indicative of an integrated and healthy personality (Allport, 1968).

In an attempt to identify and separate religiously prejudiced individuals from religiously nonprejudiced persons, Allport developed the Religious Orientation Inventory—ROI (Allport, 1968). He contended some persons require both religion and prejudice and use each in an attempt to obtain security and self-esteem and reduce fear. These individuals resemble the Pharisees spoken of in a biblical parable

(Luke 18:9-14, Holy Bible, p. 974)—hypocritical, self-righteous persons. On the other hand, some church members exhibit a more pious view of God and religion. Acceptance of others is a key concept in this religious orientation.

Several studies appear to validate Allport's hypothesis concerning intrinsic and extrinsic religion and the degree of prejudice manifested by each. The results of a study (Blum & Mann, 1960) utilizing two groups—one religious and one nonreligious—of undergraduates at a New York university found religious group members more prejudiced against Jews than nonreligious group members. Photiadis and Biggar (1962) used the Bogardus Social Distribution Scale and F test to assess the prejudiced views of 300 Protestant men and women in South Dakota. Results revealed that extrinsic types were prejudiced due to their authoritarianism, conservatism, and concern about social status. A factor analytic study (Fagin, 1964) of 286 persons from churches in Oklahoma and Texas, using modified versions of the ROI and E scale, yielded results which again found extrinsic persons more prejudiced than intrinsic individuals. Allport (1968) used five measures of prejudice and the ROI to test 309 church attenders. Multifactorial analysis revealed extrinsic individuals were more prejudiced than intrinsic persons, and indiscriminately proreligious types were more prejudiced than both intrinsic and extrinsic types.

Cline and Richards (1965) also used a factor analytic approach in an attempt to establish the relationship between religiosity (measured by frequency of prayer, church attendance, and monetary donations) and Christian brotherhood. Data from a modified form of the

TAT and a self-report questionnaire revealed a near-zero relationship between the two factors. Rokeach (1970) found the majority of the 1000 adults who classified themselves as religious were egotistical, judgmental, and condemning of others.

In addition, research supported Allport's (1968) hypothesis concerning the emotional immaturity of extrinsic and proreligious church members. Hamby (1973) used the ROI to assess the relationship between religious orientation and emotional adjustment. The 275 students from an educational psychology class at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, were administered, along with the ROI, the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Thematic Apperception Test, and the Peck Sentence Completion Test. Those classified as intrinsically oriented, were more trusting, self-sufficient, positive, intelligent, and more interested in interpersonal relationships. Extrinsic persons displayed such characteristics as suspiciousness, irresponsibility, low self-esteem, and competitiveness. The indiscriminately proreligious group was trusting, conforming in behavior, conscientious, with low self-esteem. Similar to the extrinsic group, the nonreligious group was suspicious, aggressive, competitive, and irresponsible; additionally, these people were unconventional and showed a low regard for rules. Another factor analytic study (McClain, 1978) which utilized the ROI as a religious orientation measure and the EPPS, CPI, and 16PF as measures of interpersonal and intrapersonal adjustment yielded similar outcomes. Results suggested both intrinsically religious and nonreligious subjects were functioning at higher maturational levels than proreligious and extrinsic types.

An additional study by McClain (1979) measured the relationship between feminists and nonfeminists enrolled in a mental health class at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The SAI (The Sexes—An Attitude Inventory) was used to identify feminists from nonfeminists, the ROI determined the subject's religious orientation, and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, California Psychological Inventory and Edwards Personnel Preference Schedule were used to assess interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics. Combined results of the SAI and ROI classified feminists as nonreligious and nonfeminists as intrinsically religious. Scores on the other assessment measures revealed, in comparison with the feminists who scored higher in mistrust and liberalism, that nonfeminists scored higher in the areas of warmth, socialization, and need for other persons.

In conclusion, just as in the area of sex role development, it is evident that children accept, at least until puberty, the religion of their parents. Religion is presented as a maturational process which becomes more enhancing in proportion to the degree the individual is willing to commit his or her self. Lower levels of religious maturity are characterized by egotism, insecurity, and prejudice. A willingness to share, to trust, and having a greater degree of self-acceptance and acceptance of others; these traits correlate with higher levels of religious maturity.

Androgyny

Before discussing androgyny, a short review of two models, agentic/communal and instrumental/expressive, will be presented as necessary background information. Johnson (1963), Kaplan and Sydney

(1980), and White (1979) discussed the concepts of agency and communality in their research. Males appear to possess more agentic traits (related to self) such as the ability to control one's behavior, political awareness, and independence. The absence of these characteristics suggest a communal model (feminine) related to interpersonal characteristics evidenced by the desire to work with others and become emotionally involved. Another model, instrumental/expressive presented by Parsons and Bales (1955), was strikingly similar to the communality/agency representation. The male (instrumental) is defined as goal-oriented, cognitive, and driven toward accomplishment. The expressive female possesses qualities which include supportiveness and concern for others.

Kaplan and Sedney (1980) reported the shift to a two-dimensional view of masculinity and femininity which resulted in the new concept of androgyny. Prior to this shift, masculinity and femininity were placed at opposite ends of a single continuous dimension (Constantinople, 1973). To be considered healthy, a male had to possess low feminine traits and high masculine characteristics and females had to possess high feminine traits and low masculine characteristics. Individuals falling between the two extremes were labeled as sexually confused.

Singer (1976) defined androgyny as the "harmonious co-existence of masculinity and femininity within a single individual" (p. viii). Kaplan and Sedney (1980) defined the androgynous individual as having completely meshed both masculine and feminine characteristics. Bem (1975a) felt the androgynous person was much happier, healthier, and more emotionally stable than the sex-typed person who was restricted in

his or her response repertoire. Most researchers stressed the unique ability of the androgynous individual to act appropriately in situations requiring either/or a combination of both masculine and feminine behaviors.

Bem (1975a) stressed the importance of utilizing both masculine and feminine attributes and warned that American society's reinforcement of masculine characteristics at the exclusion of feminine behaviors could possibly lead to a society filled with male and female "masculine types" competing and trying to dominate one another. In a recent study designed to identify sex role strain (a state of being which results in low self-esteem and poor psychological adjustment) Garnets and Pleck (1979) reported sex role strain was not evidenced in females portraying masculine characteristics, but it could be noticed in androgynous men who displayed feminine traits—thus re-emphasizing the sense of urgency noted in Bem's previous statement.

Additional research using the BSRI has taken place in recent years. In their review of sex roles and androgyny, Kelly and Worell (1977) related their general findings that in most studies androgynous and masculine types held positive self-concepts. In contrast, feminine and undifferentiated subjects were less stable and more insecure about themselves. Falbo (1977) used the Bem Sex Role Inventory, self-reports, and peer evaluations to research the relationship between sex role classification and social influence. Course credit was given to the 150 (75 males, 75 females) Wake Forest University undergraduates for participating in the study. Results concluded masculine and androgynous types received more positive feedback from peers than feminine subjects.

Feminine ways of influencing others included crying and changing moods. Masculine types used assertive techniques more often than both androgynous and feminine types to influence others.

Kelly, Caudill, Hathorn, and O'Brien (1977) mixed 20 masculine and 20 feminine socially undesirable attributes with positive adjectives from the BSRI and asked 100 males and 100 female undergraduates to rate themselves on the modified measure. Results indicated that persons representing each sex role classification of the BSRI chose some negative attributes, with androgynous males choosing the least. Undifferentiated males chose fewer positive characteristics and more negative traits than did the other groups.

White (1979) assessed the communal and agency attributes of 166 female and four male nurses using a measure similar to the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Results revealed the category high agency/high communion (androgynous) included those students who were more responsible, dominant, dependable, caring, assertive, and inner directed. They appeared to be more competent than the other types in their nursing abilities and were well-liked by patients and co-workers.

Ridgeway and Jacobson (1979) researched personal confidence and its relevance to the feminine role ideology using 267 white (143 female, 124 male) and 160 black (188 female, 82 male) subjects. Responses to items about sex roles, educational interests, and personal confidence were factor analyzed. Results indicated males, and especially females, were beginning to associate positive self-confidence with an egalitarian (androgynous) emotional and behavioral repertoire.

Two of the studies reviewed did not find the androgynous individual to be the most mature or positively adjusted. A research

project (Smith, 1978) conducted at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, using 225 undergraduate students (110 men and 115 women) did not reveal androgynous individuals as the most self-actualized. Instead, women in the feminine category tended to report more self-actualized characteristics as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory. A study by Jones, Chernovetz, and Hansson (1978), which tested the adjustment levels of 1404 individuals on the basis of personality traits, resistance of helpless feelings, cognitive competence, and involvement of heterosexual relationships, only partially supported androgyny as the highest level of functioning. In fact, androgynous males drank more and were more introverted than masculine types. The female androgynous subject better supported the concept of androgyny. She had fewer drinking problems and more imaginative and creative interpersonal relationships than the other subjects. However, interpersonal relationships were measured in terms of numbers (quantity) instead of in-depth involvements (quality) which lowers the validity of the research results.

Hansson, Chernovetz, and Jones (1977) tested the relationship between maternal employment and the development of androgyny in feminine offspring. Using a sample of 268 female undergraduates, the BSRI was used to classify sex role orientation. A Chi square test suggested there existed a significant relationship between working mothers and androgynous daughters.

The three studies just noted (Hansson, Chernovetz, & Jones; Jones, Chernovetz, & Hansson; Smith, 1978) indicate the androgynous female relates more successfully within society than the androgynous male. This can be attributed again to the stringent sex role

stereotypes which presently exist within society. It is hoped that as individuals become increasingly more aware of the benefits of an integrated personality, stereotypes will cease to restrict the positive, growth enhancing values of androgyny.

Summary—Review of the Literature

A review of the related literature revealed some striking parallels between the intrinsically religious and androgynous individual. Many of the same adjectives were used to describe both types (higher self-confidence, inner directed, and caring). Likewise, the extrinsically religious individual appeared to have characteristics in common with the extreme sex-typed individual (low self-esteem, defensiveness, and prejudicial attitudes). Prejudice and discrimination play an important part in both sex role categorization and religious orientation. Prejudicial behavior possibly stems from feelings of insecurity and fear represented both in religious and cultural stereotypes.

At present, the androgynous female appears to be receiving the most reinforcement for her sex role classification. Women are beginning to function more successfully in society, especially in the career world. It is hoped that this is attributed to androgyny (both male and female characteristics) and not just to the masculine characteristics utilized. If the latter is so, more harm than good has resulted.

The parallels between Block's (1973) stages to androgyny and the development of an intrinsic point of view strikingly resemble one another. To reach and maintain states of androgyny and intrinsic religiosity, one has to exist in a continuous state of "becoming."

Both constructs can be reached through maturational processes. These two highest states of being represent "something" beyond the comprehension of rigid, inflexible, immature points of view.

Inferences from the Literature

A review of the literature reveals intrinsically religious persons tend to be more mature than extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious persons (Allport, 1957; Hamby, 1975; McClain, 1978). Likewise, androgynous persons tend to be more mature than masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated persons (Rosen & Aneshensel, 1976; Sanders, 1973). Characteristics shared by androgynous and intrinsically religious persons tend to be similar (Allport, 1957; Hamby, 1973; McClain, 1978; Ridgeway & Jacobson, 1979; White, 1979). Likewise, characteristics shared by extrinsically religious and sex-typed persons tend to be similar (Allport, 1957; Hamby, 1973; Rosen & Aneshensel, 1976; Sanders, 1973). In addition, McClain's research (1979), which found nonfeminists to be intrinsically religious and feminists to be nonreligious, suggests feminine qualities of warmth, socialization, and need for others are more representative of an intrinsic religious orientation than masculine qualities such as liberalism, independence, and dominance.

The following inferences have been developed from the literature review:

1. For all samples, androgynous adolescents will tend to be more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated, masculine, or feminine adolescents.

2. For all samples, feminine adolescents will tend to be more intrinsically religious than masculine and undifferentiated adolescents.

3. For all samples, masculine adolescents will tend to be more extrinsically religious than feminine and androgynous adolescents.

4. For all samples, undifferentiated adolescents will tend to be more extrinsically religious and less intrinsically religious than androgynous and feminine adolescents.

5. Androgynous and masculine female adolescents will tend to be less extrinsically religious than feminine female adolescents.

6. Androgynous and feminine male adolescents will tend to be less extrinsically religious than masculine male adolescents.

7. For all samples, extrinsically religious adolescents will tend to be more masculine than indiscriminately proreligious, non-religious, and intrinsically religious adolescents.

8. For all samples, indiscriminately proreligious adolescents will tend to be more feminine than intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, and nonreligious adolescents.

9. For all samples, nonreligious adolescents will tend to be more masculine and less feminine than intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents.

10. Intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious males will tend to be more feminine and less masculine than extrinsically religious males.

11. Intrinsically religious and extrinsically religious females will tend to be more masculine and less feminine than indiscriminately proreligious females.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is concerned with the methods and procedures used to conduct this study. These methods and procedures were designed to assess whether adolescents' degree of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation differed across sex role classification and whether adolescents' degree of masculinity and femininity differed across religious orientation. The chapter contains a description of the research setting and subjects, a design of the study, a review of the instruments and scoring procedures utilized, and procedures for collecting and analyzing the data. A short summary concludes the chapter.

Subjects and Setting

In January and February, 1981, data were collected from 210 students enrolled as seniors in two rural public high schools in McMinn County, Tennessee—McMinn Central and McMinn County. The 109 males and 101 females comprising the sample were primarily Caucasian and Black American and represented a cross section of socioeconomic status. McMinn Central and McMinn County were chosen because, as the only two high schools serving the county, the students who participated in the study were representative of all high school seniors enrolled in the McMinn County public school system during the 1980-81 academic year.

When subjects were categorized according to Bem's four sex role classifications, 58 were classified as androgynous, 53 as undifferentiated, 52 as masculine, and 47 as feminine. When subjects were categorized according to Allport's four religious orientations, 67 were extrinsically religious, 56 were intrinsically religious, 48 were indiscriminately proreligious, and 39 were nonreligious.

Statistical Design and Analysis

Subjects' religious orientation: intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, or nonreligious, was measured by the Religious Orientation Inventory (Allport, 1968). Subjects' sex role classification: androgynous, feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated, was measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1978).

To assess whether a difference existed between subjects' intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation and sex role classification, intrinsic and extrinsic scores from the ROI were compared across Bem's four sex role classifications. To assess whether a significant difference existed between subjects' masculinity and femininity and their religious orientation, masculine and feminine scores from the BSRI were compared across Allport's four religious orientations. Demographic information supplied on the surveys was used to make comparisons for total, male, and female samples.

Data were analyzed separately for each null hypothesis using a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (Champion, 1970; Siegel, 1956). For comparisons which yielded significant H values, a

Mann-Whitney U test was used as a follow-up to determine where significant differences existed (Champion, 1970; Siegel, 1956). The .05 level of significance was used to test each null hypothesis.

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance

The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance was used to test whether androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated adolescents differed with respect to degree of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation and to test whether intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious adolescents differed with respect to degree of masculinity and femininity. Twelve Kruskal-Wallis analyses of variance were performed: three tested the difference between the intrinsic scores of total, male and female samples across sex role orientations; three tested the difference between the extrinsic scores of total, male, and female samples across sex role classifications; three tested the difference between the feminine scores of total, male, and female samples across religious orientations; and three tested the difference between masculine scores of total, male, and female samples across religious orientations.

To test each hypothesis, individuals' scores (intrinsic, extrinsic; masculine, feminine) were ranked across samples (religious orientation and sex role classification) for total, male, and female samples. The smallest score in the combined group of scores was given a rank of one, the next smallest a rank of two, and so on. When ties occurred between two or more scores, each score was given the mean of the ranks for which it was tied. After the scores were ranked, the

following formula was applied to find the value of $\underline{H}$ corrected for ties:

$$\underline{H} = \frac{\frac{12}{N(N+1)} \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{R_j^2}{n_j} - 3(N+1)}{1 - \frac{\sum T}{N^3 - N}}$$

where

$T = t^3 - t$ (when t is the number of tied observations in a tied group of scores),

N = number of observations in all k samples together, that is,

$$N = \sum n_j,$$

$\sum T$ directs one to sum over all groups of ties,

k = number of samples,

n_j = number of cases in j th sample,

R_j = sum of ranks in j th sample (column)

$\sum_{j=1}^k$ directs one to sum over the k samples (columns).

Since each sample contained more than five elements, the chi-square distribution was approximated by $\underline{H}$. A chi-square table for a two-tailed test (Champion, 1970, p. 264) was entered at $k-1$ (3) degrees of freedom (k =number of samples). If the probability associated with the value of $\underline{H}$ was equal to or less than the previously set level of significance ($p < .05$), H_0 was rejected in favor of H_1 .

Mann-Whitney U Test

If a significant H value was found, the Mann-Whitney U test was used as a follow-up to evaluate the difference between each independent sample. Six Mann-Whitney U tests (comparing two samples each) were performed for each significant H value. Scores were combined for both groups and ranked. The rank of one was given to the lowest score in the combined group of scores, a rank of two to the next lowest score and so on. When ties occurred between two or more scores, each score was given the mean of the ranks for which it was tied. After ranking scores from each sample, the following formulas were applied:

$$\underline{U} = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_1(n_1+1)}{2} - R_1$$

or

$$\underline{U} = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_2(n_2+1)}{2} - R_2$$

where

n_1 = the number of cases in the smaller of the two independent groups,

n_2 = the number of cases in the larger of the two independent groups,

R_1 = sum of ranks assigned to groups whose sample size is n_1 ,

R_2 = sum of ranks assigned to groups whose sample size is n_2 .

A modification of the z test was utilized since each sample exceeded 20. The larger of the two U's (U') was then used to find z. To correct for ties, the following formula for z was applied:

$$\underline{z} = \frac{u - \frac{n_1 n_2}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_2}{N(N-1)} \left(\frac{N^3 - N}{12} - \Sigma T \right)}}$$

where

n_1 = the number of cases in the smaller of the two independent groups,

n_2 = the number of cases in the larger of the two independent groups,

$N = n_1 + n_2$,

$T = \frac{t^3 - t}{12}$ (where t is the number of observations tied for a given rank),

ΣT is found by summing the T 's over all groups of tied observations.

A table of probabilities for values of $\underline{U}$ as extreme as observed values of $\underline{z}$ in the normal distribution (Siegel, 1956, p. 247) was entered to find the probability. Since a two-tailed test was utilized, the p shown in the table was doubled. If the observed value of $\underline{U}$ had an associated probability equal to or less than .05, H_0 was rejected in favor of H_1 .

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1978) and the Religious Orientation Inventory (Allport, 1968).

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Bem (1972, 1974, 1975b) developed the BSRI as a measure of androgyny. Unlike previous instruments (Constantinople, 1964) which treat masculinity and femininity as two ends of a single, bipolar dimension, the BSRI classifies masculinity and femininity as two orthogonal dimensions (Bem, 1974). The purpose of the BSRI is to differentiate androgynous individuals from those who are sex-typed (masculine or feminine) or undifferentiated. The BSRI is a self-report instrument which uses positively valued, socially desirable characteristics in describing masculinity and femininity. The 60 adjectives comprising the inventory were chosen by judges—20 feminine characteristics (significantly more desirable for a female than a male); 20 masculine characteristics (significantly more desirable for a male than a female); and 20 neutral characteristics (no more desirable for one sex than the other). The neutral characteristics were included to determine the social desirability of the subjects' choices.

For each of the 60 characteristics, the subject is asked to indicate how well the adjective describes himself or herself. The individual rates the item on a scale ranging from one through seven—1 ("never or almost never true"); 2 ("usually not true"); 3 ("sometimes but infrequently true"); 4 ("occasionally true"); 5 ("often true"); 6 ("usually true"); and 7 ("always or almost always true") (Bem, 1978). In scoring the BSRI (Bem, 1976) the subject's masculinity (mean of the ratings of the masculine adjectives) and femininity (mean of the ratings of the feminine adjectives) scores are calculated. To aid in scoring, masculine, feminine and neutral characteristics are placed on the BSRI such that the first adjective and every third one thereafter is

masculine, the second adjective and every third one thereafter is feminine, and the third adjective and every third one thereafter is neutral. Next the median masculinity and femininity (2 numbers) scores are calculated for the entire sample. Following this, the subjects are classified in one of four categories as follows: masculine (above or on the masculinity median and below the femininity median), feminine (above or on the femininity median and below the masculinity median); androgynous (above or on both medians), and undifferentiated (below both medians).

Bem (1974) found the BSRI to be internally consistent using two samples: masculinity, .86, .86; femininity, .80, .82; and social desirability, .75, .70. Masculinity and femininity scores were found to be independent of one another in both samples: $r = -.11$, and $-.02$ for males and $r = -.14$ and $-.07$ for females, thus validating Bem's claim masculinity and femininity are two dimensions. The masculinity and femininity scores did not correlate with an individual's tendency to describe himself or herself in a socially desirable direction (average, $r = -.06$). Product moment correlations of masculinity, $r = -.90$; femininity, $r = .90$; and social desirability, $r = .89$ revealed test-retest reliability over a four-week interval.

Bem conducted additional studies to determine whether individuals would exhibit behaviors characteristic of their masculine, feminine, or androgynous type as indicated on the BSRI (Bem, 1975b; Bem and Lenny, 1976; Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976). Results from these laboratory experiments indicated that sex-typed individuals (masculine, feminine) were more likely than androgynous persons to participate in activities

socially accepted by their own sex and reject activities stereotypically designated for the opposite sex (Bem & Lenny, 1976). In a study using cartoons and a kitten (Bem, 1975b), androgynous subjects were found to be both independent and nurturant; masculine subjects were independent and less nurturant than androgynous subjects; and feminine subjects were less independent than androgynous and masculine subjects and less responsive to the kitten than masculine and androgynous individuals. Repeat studies (Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976), using a real baby in place of the kitten and a mock counseling interview, differed from the previous study in that feminine and androgynous subjects were both significantly more nurturant than masculine subjects. These studies revealed, when using laboratory samples, the BSRI was successful in measuring that which it purported to measure.

Religious Orientation Inventory

The ROI was developed by Allport (1968) in an attempt to differentiate within religious groups those individuals who were prejudiced from those who were nonprejudiced. The ROI is comprised of 20 statements, 9 of which portray intrinsic (integral, unifying) religious involvement and 11 which represent extrinsic (instrumental) religious involvement. For each of the 20 statements, the subject is asked to indicate, from four choices (ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement), the one which best describes his or her reaction to the statement. Each response statement has an assigned score ranging from one to five; one indicates the most intrinsic response; two a less intrinsic response, five the most extrinsic response; four

a less extrinsic response, and three is assigned to items which have been omitted. Next the median intrinsic and extrinsic scores are calculated for the entire sample, and each individual is assigned to one of four religious categories.

The individual whose scores fall below the medians of both subscales—thus agreeing with the intrinsic statements and disagreeing with the extrinsic statements—is classified as intrinsically religious. The scores of the extrinsically religious individual fall above or on the medians of both subscales, thus agreeing with the extrinsic and disagreeing with the intrinsic statements. Scores which fall below the intrinsic median and on or above the extrinsic median represent an indiscriminately proreligious individual who agrees with both extrinsic and intrinsic religious statements. The nonreligious individual's scores fall on or above the median for the intrinsic scale and below the median for the extrinsic scale, thus disagreeing with both intrinsic and extrinsic statements.

Correlations of each item (statement) with the total subscale score resulted in item reliabilities of: extrinsic scale; .49, .47, .51, .39, .31, .44, .32, .33, 1.8, and .50; intrinsic scale; .39, .44, .50, .30, .47, .49, .28, .41, and .58.

Using the Illness Ideology Scale, the Social Problems Questionnaire, and the Religious Orientation Inventory, Allport (1968) studied the relationship between prejudice and religious orientation (intrinsic, extrinsic, and indiscriminately proreligious). The subjects were 309 church attenders of six different denominations. The five measures of prejudice were analyzed using a six (religious groups) by three (religious type) analysis of variance. The resulting multivariate

analysis of variance revealed a significant difference ($p < .0005$) between the three religious orientations (F ratio=5.96) and the six subsamples (F ratio=3.19). Mean examination revealed the extrinsic group (means=33.0, 24.6, 23.3, 8.7, 11.8) to be more prejudiced than the intrinsic group (means=28.7, 22.6, 20.4, 7.9, 10.2) and the indiscriminately proreligious (means=36.0, 28.9, 26.1, 9.6, 13.4) more prejudiced than the other two orientations. The results of this study support Allport's hypothesis that extrinsic individuals use their religion while intrinsic persons live their religion.

Procedures

Preliminary Stages Leading to Test Administration

1. In the fall of 1980, arrangements were made with the McMinn County Board of Education for the specific purpose of identifying the subjects to be represented in the research project and dates for administering the instruments.
2. Subjects were contacted and asked to have parents or guardians complete and return written permission for involvement in the study.
3. Arrangements were made with teachers and school administrators of each school to identify the actual setting for test administration (large classroom, multiple small classrooms, auditorium).
4. Actual administration of the research instruments took place during January and February, 1981.

Instrument Administration

1. On the date of administration, those seniors not choosing to participate in the research project or without written permission from parents or guardians were excused.

2. A brief statement as to the purpose of the research was presented to the subjects.

3. Directions for taking both the Religious Orientation Inventory and the Bem Sex Role Inventory were given and questions related to administration were answered.

4. Subjects were encouraged to respond honestly without fear of unfavorable ramifications. Each subject received a number (beginning with one and progressing through the actual number of participants). Subjects were asked to place this number and their gender (M=male, F=female) in the name section of their instruments, thus ensuring anonymity.

5. Folders containing the instruments were distributed in the following manner:

- a. Odd numbered folders, containing a copy of the BSRI, were distributed such that the first and every other person thereafter received an odd numbered folder.
- b. Even numbered folders, containing a copy of the ROI and answer sheet, were distributed such that the second and every other person thereafter received an even numbered folder.

6. Subjects were instructed to complete the instruments.

7. Sufficient time was allowed for the subjects to complete the instruments.

8. Individual clarification to questions was provided.

9. Upon completing the instrument, the subject was instructed to return the materials to the folder and wait for the researcher to collect.

10. When the first folder was completed and returned, the second group of folders was handed out in the following manner:
 - a. Even numbered folders, containing a copy of the ROI and answer sheet, was distributed such that the first and every other person thereafter received an even numbered folder.
 - b. Odd numbered folders, containing a copy of the BSRI, was distributed such that every second and every other person thereafter received an odd numbered folder.
11. Subjects were instructed to complete the instruments.
12. Sufficient time was allowed for the subjects to complete the instruments, and individual clarification to questions was provided.
13. When all subjects had completed and returned the second packet, the group was dismissed.

Summary

In summary, data collected from 210 male and female adolescents in senior high school was analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis analyses of variance and Mann-Whitney U tests. The instruments used in the study to collect data were the Religious Orientation Inventory (Allport, 1968) and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1978).

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine adolescents' intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation across sex role classification, and adolescents' masculinity and femininity across religious orientation. Subjects were assigned to one of four sex role classifications and one of four religious orientations according to their responses on the BSRI and ROI respectively. For hypotheses one, two, three, four, five, and six, intrinsic and extrinsic scores from the ROI for total, male, and female samples were compared across androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine sex role classifications to determine the religious orientation of subjects in each sex role category. For hypotheses seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, and twelve, masculine and feminine scores from the BSRI for total, male, and female samples were compared across intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, non-religious, and indiscriminately proreligious religious orientations to determine the sex role classification of subjects in each religious category. The gender of each subject was assigned according to the demographic information supplied on the surveys. Data collected were analyzed separately for each null hypothesis. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance and Mann-Whitney U test were used to test each null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

This chapter is divided into two major sections: a description of the sample followed by data analysis and interpretation. A summary

of the findings concludes this section. A discussion of the results is contained in Chapter V.

Description of Sample

Results of the BSRI were used to assign each of the 210 subjects to one of four sex role categories. Scores on the masculine subscale of the BSRI ranged from 2.7 to 6.6 with a median score of 4.8. Scores on the feminine subscale ranged from 2.9 to 6.4 with a median score of 4.95.

Table 1 presents percentages of total subjects assigned to the four sex role categories. The largest percentage of adolescents were assigned an androgynous sex role classification, followed by undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine sex role classifications respectively. A breakdown of the total population into male and female samples is presented in Table 2. The highest percentage of males were assigned to the masculine sex role category, followed by undifferentiated, androgynous, and feminine categories respectively. The highest percentage of females were assigned to the feminine sex role category, followed by androgynous, undifferentiated, and masculine categories respectively. Comparisons of percentages between males and females indicated more females were classified as androgynous and feminine; whereas more males were classified as undifferentiated and masculine.

Data presented in Table 2 also show that 41.28 percent of the male subjects and 39.60 percent of the female subjects were sex-typed. These data indicate for this population, a high percentage of males and females displayed characteristics traditionally accepted as appropriate

TABLE 1. Sex Role Classifications (Total Sample).

Group ^a	<u>N</u>	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent
A	58	27.62	27.62
U	53	25.24	52.86
F	47	22.38	75.24
M	52	24.76	100.00
TOTAL	210	100.00	

^aA=androgynous, U=undifferentiated, F=feminine, M=masculine.

TABLE 2. Sex Role Classifications (Gender).

Group ^a	Male			Female ^b		
	<u>N</u>	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent	<u>N</u>	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent
A	24	22.02	22.02	34	36.66	33.66
U	33	52.03	52.03	20	19.80	53.45
F	7	58.72	58.72	40	39.60	93.06
M	45	100.00	100.00	7	6.93	99.99
TOTAL	109			101	99.99	

^aA=androgynous, U=undifferentiated, F=feminine, M=masculine.

^b.01 lost when rounding to nearest .00.

for their sex. In contrast, 6.42 percent of the men and 6.93 percent of the women were sex-reversed. These data indicate these adolescents displayed characteristics traditionally accepted as inappropriate for their sex.

Results from the ROI were used to assign each of the 210 adolescents to one of four religious orientations. Scores on the intrinsic subscale of the ROI ranged from 9 to 45 with a median score of 23. Scores on the extrinsic subscale ranged from 13 to 41 with a median score of 30.

Table 3 presents percentages of total subjects assigned to four religious categories. The largest percentage of adolescents were assigned an extrinsically religious orientation followed by intrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious orientations respectively. A breakdown of the total population into male and female samples is presented in Table 4. The highest percentage of males were assigned an extrinsically religious orientation, followed by indiscriminately proreligious, intrinsically religious, and nonreligious orientations respectively. The highest percentage of females were assigned an intrinsically religious orientation followed by extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious orientations respectively. Comparisons of percentages between males and females indicated more males were extrinsically religious; whereas more females were intrinsically religious. Percentages of nonreligious and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents were similar for both samples.

Table 5 presents sex role classifications and religious orientations for each of the 210 subjects. The highest percentage of

TABLE 3. Religious Orientations (Total Sample).

Group ^a	N	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent
I	56	26.67	26.67
E	67	31.90	58.57
NR	39	18.57	77.14
IP	48	22.86	100.00
TOTAL	210	100.00	

^aI=intrinsic, E=extrinsic, NR=nonreligious, IP=indiscriminately proreligious.

TABLE 4. Religious Orientations (Gender).

Group ^a	Male			Female ^b		
	N	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent	N	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent
I	22	20.18	20.18	34	33.66	33.66
E	41	37.62	57.80	26	25.74	59.40
NR	20	18.35	76.15	19	18.81	78.21
IP	26	23.85	100.00	22	21.78	99.99
TOTAL	109	100.00		101	99.99	

^aI=intrinsic, E=extrinsic, NR=nonreligious, IP=indiscriminately proreligious.

^b.01 lost when rounding to nearest .00.

TABLE 5. Sex Role Classifications and Religious Orientations (Total Sample).

Groups ^a	N	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent
I/A	18	8.57	8.57
I/U	8	3.81	12.38
I/F	16	7.62	20.00
I/M	14	6.67	26.67
E/A	11	5.24	31.91
E/U	17	8.10	40.01
E/F	15	7.14	47.15
E/M	24	11.43	58.58
NR/A	10	4.76	63.34
NR/U	16	7.62	70.96
NR/F	6	2.86	73.82
NR/M	7	3.33	77.15
IP/A	19	9.05	86.20
IP/U	12	5.71	91.91
IP/F	10	4.76	96.67
IP/M	7	3.33	100.00
TOTAL	210	100.00	

^aI/A=intrinsic and androgynous, I/U=intrinsic and undifferentiated, I/F=intrinsic and feminine, I/M=intrinsic and masculine, E/A=extrinsic and androgynous, E/U=extrinsic and undifferentiated, E/F=extrinsic and feminine, E/M=extrinsic and masculine, NR/A=nonreligious and androgynous, NR/U=nonreligious and undifferentiated, NR/F=nonreligious and feminine, NR/M=nonreligious and masculine, IP/A=indiscriminately proreligious and androgynous, IP/U=indiscriminately proreligious and undifferentiated, IP/F=indiscriminately proreligious and feminine, IP/M=indiscriminately proreligious and masculine.

adolescents were extrinsically religious and masculine; the lowest percentage nonreligious and feminine.

Table 6 presents sex role classifications and religious orientations for each of the 210 subjects with respect to gender. The highest percentage of males were extrinsically religious and masculine; the lowest percentage nonreligious and feminine. The highest percentage of females were androgynous and intrinsically religious; the lowest percentage extrinsically religious and masculine. These results indicate females were classified as intrinsically religious and androgynous; intrinsically religious and feminine, extrinsically religious and feminine; androgynous and nonreligious; feminine and nonreligious and feminine and indiscriminately proreligious more often than males. Males were classified as intrinsically religious and masculine; extrinsically religious and masculine; nonreligious and undifferentiated; masculine and undifferentiated; androgynous and indiscriminately proreligious; undifferentiated and indiscriminately proreligious; and masculine and indiscriminately proreligious more often than females.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Null hypotheses one, two, and three predicted there would be no significant difference among the average intrinsic scores of androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated adolescent males and females; of androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated adolescent males; and of androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated adolescent females.

To test for differences within the three samples with respect to intrinsic religious orientation, a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance

TABLE 6. Sex Role Classifications and Religious Orientations (Gender).

Groups ^a	Male ^b			Female ^c		
	N	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent	N	Percent of Total	Cumulative Percent
I/A	4	3.67	3.67	14	13.86	13.86
I/U	4	3.67	7.34	4	3.96	17.82
I/F	4	3.67	11.01	12	11.88	29.70
I/M	10	9.17	20.18	4	3.96	33.66
E/A	6	5.50	25.68	5	4.95	38.61
E/U	9	8.26	33.94	8	7.92	46.53
E/F	2	1.83	35.77	13	12.87	59.40
E/M	24	22.02	57.79	0	0	59.40
NR/A	2	1.83	59.62	8	7.92	67.32
NR/U	12	11.01	70.63	4	3.96	71.28
NR/F	0	0	70.63	6	5.94	77.22
NR/M	6	5.50	76.13	1	.99	78.21
IP/A	12	11.01	87.14	7	6.93	85.14
IP/U	8	7.34	94.48	4	3.96	89.10
IP/F	1	.92	95.40	9	8.91	98.01
IP/M	5	4.59	99.99	2	1.98	99.99
TOTAL	109	99.99		101	99.99	

^aI/A=intrinsic and androgynous, I/U=intrinsic and undifferentiated, I/F=intrinsic and feminine, I/M=intrinsic and masculine, E/A=extrinsic and androgynous, E/U=extrinsic and undifferentiated, E/F=extrinsic and feminine, E/M=extrinsic and masculine, NR/A=nonreligious and androgynous, NR/U=nonreligious and undifferentiated, NR/F=nonreligious and feminine, NR/M=nonreligious and masculine, IP/A=indiscriminately proreligious and androgynous, IP/U=indiscriminately proreligious and undifferentiated, IP/F=indiscriminately proreligious and feminine, IP/M=indiscriminately proreligious and masculine.

^b.01 lost when rounding to nearest .00.

^c.01 lost when rounding to nearest .00.

was performed for each sample. Comparisons were made between subjects classified as androgynous (male=24, female=34), masculine (male=45, female=7), feminine (male=7, female=20), and undifferentiated (male=33, female=20). Table 7 presents $\underline{H}$ values resulting from a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance for each sample.

TABLE 7. Kruskal-Wallis $\underline{H}$ Values among Four Sex Role Classifications Utilizing Intrinsic Scores.

Sample	$\underline{H}$	$\underline{H}_0$
Total	27.58	27.64*
Female	10.36	10.39*
Male	12.90	12.93*

^aValues of $\underline{H}$ corrected for ties in ranks.

* $p < .05$ ($df=3$).

$\underline{H}$ values of 27.64 (total sample); 10.39 (female sample); and 12.93 (male sample) indicated a significant difference ($p < .05$) existed somewhere between the intrinsic scores of androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated adolescents for all samples analyzed; thus the first three null hypotheses were rejected.

Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ tests were administered to investigate where significant differences existed within each sample. Table 8 presents $\underline{z}$ scores which resulted from the Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ comparisons.

Values of $\underline{z}$ indicated a significant difference ($p < .05$) existed between the intrinsic scores of androgynous ($\underline{N}=58$, $\underline{R}=2530$) and undifferentiated ($\underline{N}=53$, $\underline{R}=3686$) male and female adolescents; between androgynous ($\underline{N}=24$, $\underline{R}=517.5$) and undifferentiated ($\underline{N}=33$, $\underline{R}=1135.5$) male adolescents;

TABLE 8. Mann-Whitney U Test Results of Individual Comparisons among Sex Role Classifications Utilizing Intrinsic Scores.

Comparison	Sample	z^a
Androgynous vs. Undifferentiated	Total	4.24*
	Male	2.89*
	Female	2.79*
Androgynous vs. Masculine	Total	3.55*
	Male	2.84*
	Female	.40
Androgynous vs. Feminine	Total	1.59
	Male	.31
	Female	1.84
Undifferentiated vs. Masculine	Total	.55
	Male	.32
	Female	2.41*
Undifferentiated vs. Feminine	Total	2.64*
	Male	2.03*
	Female	1.20
Masculine vs. Feminine	Total	2.00*
	Male	1.92
	Female	1.60

^aValues of z corrected for ties in ranks; since the larger N is greater than 20 in all comparisons, U is distributed approximately normally (Siegel, 1956, pp. 120-121).

* $p < .05$.

and between androgynous ($N=34$, $R=779.5$) and undifferentiated ($N=20$, $R=705.5$) female adolescents. The direction of the scores indicated that androgynous male and female adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated male and female adolescents; that androgynous female adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated female adolescents, and that androgynous male adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated male adolescents.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between androgynous and masculine adolescents resulted in significant ($p < .05$) scores for adolescent male and female comparisons ($A/N=58$, $R=2626.5$; $M/N=52$, $R=3478.5$) and for adolescent male comparisons ($A/N=24$, $R=615$; $M/N=45$, $R=1800$) but not for adolescent female comparisons ($A/N=34$, $R=725.5$; $M/N=7$, $R=135.5$). The direction of total sample scores suggested that androgynous male and female adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine male and female adolescents. In addition, the direction of male sample intrinsic scores suggested androgynous male adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine male adolescents.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between androgynous and feminine adolescents for all three samples indicated there were no significant differences between the intrinsic scores of adolescent males and females ($A/N=58$, $R=2827$; $F/N=47$, $R=2738$), adolescent males ($A/N=24$, $R=390.5$; $F/N=7$, $R=105.5$), nor adolescent females ($A/N=34$, $R=1105.5$; $F/N=40$, $R=1669.5$). Although not significant, comparisons of median intrinsic scores for total ($p < .1118$) and female ($p < .0658$) samples resulted in higher feminine scores for androgynous adolescents than feminine adolescents.

Mann-Whitney U results for undifferentiated versus masculine subjects were not significant for total ($U/N=53$, $\underline{R}=2895$; $M/N=52$, $\underline{R}=2670$) and male samples ($U/N=33$, $\underline{R}=1335.5$; $M/N=45$, $\underline{R}=1745$). However, there was a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the intrinsic scores of undifferentiated ($N=20$, $\underline{R}=323.5$) and masculine ($N=7$, $\underline{R}=54.5$) female subjects. The direction of the scores suggested that masculine female adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated female adolescents.

Comparisons of undifferentiated and feminine adolescents using the Mann-Whitney U test indicated a significant difference ($p < .05$) existed between the intrinsic scores of male and female adolescents ($U/N=53$, $\underline{R}=3057.5$; $F/N=47$, $\underline{R}=1992.5$) and between the intrinsic scores of male adolescents ($U/N=33$, $\underline{R}=733.5$; $F/N=7$, $\underline{R}=86.5$). The direction of the scores indicated that feminine male and female adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated male and female adolescents. Also, feminine male adolescents tended to be more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated male adolescents. Although not significant ($p < .2320$), the median intrinsic score of feminine females was higher than the median intrinsic score of undifferentiated females.

The final Mann-Whitney U comparison indicated a significant difference ($p < .05$) existed between intrinsic scores of masculine ($N=52$, $\underline{R}=2884.5$) and feminine ($N=47$, $\underline{R}=2065.5$) male and female adolescents. The direction of the scores indicated that feminine adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine adolescents. Separate comparisons indicated there were no significant differences

between the intrinsic scores of feminine ($N=7$, $R=114$) and masculine ($N=45$, $R=1264$) males as well as feminine ($N=40$, $R=1013.5$) and masculine ($N=7$, $R=114.5$) females. Although not significant, the median intrinsic score of feminine males was higher than the median intrinsic score of masculine males ($p < .0548$). In contrast, the median intrinsic score for masculine female adolescents was higher than the median intrinsic score of feminine female adolescents ($p < .1096$).

Null hypotheses four, five, and six predicted there would be no significant difference among the average extrinsic scores of androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated adolescent males and females; of androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated adolescent males; and of androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated adolescent females.

To test for differences within the three samples with respect to extrinsic religious orientation, a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance was performed for each sample. Comparisons were made between subjects classified as androgynous (male=24, female=34), masculine (male=45, female=7), feminine (male=7, female=20), and undifferentiated (male=33, female=20). Table 9 presents H values resulting from a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance for each sample.

H values of 1.31 (total sample), 5.66 (female sample), and 1.07 (male sample) indicated no significant difference ($p < .05$) existed between the extrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, feminine and masculine adolescents for all samples analyzed; thus the null hypotheses (four, five, and six) were not rejected.

Although the extrinsic scores of females, when compared across sex role classification samples, were not significantly different at the

TABLE 9. Kruskal-Wallis H Values among Four Sex Role Classifications Utilizing Extrinsic Scores.

Sample	H	H_0^a
Total	1.31	1.31
Female	5.64	5.66
Male	1.07	1.07

^aValues of H corrected for ties in ranks.

* $p < .05$ ($df=3$).

.05 level, the H value of the female sample differed substantially from H values of the total and male sample comparisons. A Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to investigate this difference.

Mann-Whitney U test results revealed a significant difference at the .05 level between undifferentiated ($N=20$, $R=315.5$) and masculine ($N=7$, $R=62.5$) female adolescents. The direction of the extrinsic scores indicated undifferentiated females tended to be more extrinsically religious than masculine females. Although not significant, comparisons of median extrinsic scores resulted in higher extrinsic scores for undifferentiated females than androgynous females ($p < .1310$), for feminine females than masculine females ($p < .0628$), and for feminine females than androgynous females ($p < .1528$).

Null hypotheses seven, eight, and nine predicted there would be no significant difference among the average feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious male and female adolescents; of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious male adolescents; and of intrinsically

religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious female adolescents.

To test for significant differences within samples with respect to degree of femininity, across sample comparisons were made between subjects classified as intrinsically religious (male=22, female=34), extrinsically religious (male=41, female=26), nonreligious (male=20, female=19), and indiscriminately proreligious (male=26, female=22) using feminine scores from the BSRI. Table 10 presents H values resulting from a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance for each sample. H values of 11.99 (total sample) and 14.79 (male sample) indicated significance at the .05 level. There was a significant difference between the feminine scores of males and females classified as intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious. There was also a significant difference between the feminine scores of males compared across like samples. There was no significant difference between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious females. Significant results allowed for the rejection of null hypotheses seven and nine but did not allow for the rejection of null hypothesis eight.

To determine where the difference existed between the feminine scores of females and males compared across religious samples and males compared across religious samples, Mann-Whitney U tests were administered. Table 11 presents a summary of the results of Mann-Whitney U tests for total and male sample comparisons utilizing feminine scores from the BSRI.

TABLE 10. Kruskal-Wallis H Values among Four Religious Orientations Utilizing Feminine Scores.

Sample	H	H_0^a
Total	11.94	11.99*
Female	3.19	3.21
Male	14.79	14.89*

^aValues of H corrected for ties in ranks.

* $p < .05$ ($df=3$).

TABLE 11. Mann-Whitney U Test Results of Individual Comparisons among Religious Orientations Utilizing Feminine Scores.

Comparison	Sample	z^a
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	Total	2.75*
	Male	1.19
Intrinsic vs. Nonreligious	Total	1.69
	Male	2.83*
Intrinsic vs. Proreligious	Total	.07
	Male	1.08
Extrinsic vs. Nonreligious	Total	.26
	Male	1.90
Extrinsic vs. Proreligious	Total	2.47*
	Male	2.25*
Nonreligious vs. Proreligious	Total	1.44
	Male	3.52*

^aValues of z corrected for ties in ranks; since the larger N is greater than 20 in all comparisons, U is distributed approximately normally (Siegel, 1956, pp. 120-121).

* $p < .05$.

Mann-Whitney U test results indicated there was a significant difference between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious ($N=56$, $R=4011.5$) and extrinsically religious ($N=67$, $R=3514.5$) male and female adolescents. The direction of the scores indicated that intrinsically religious adolescents were more feminine than extrinsically religious adolescents. In contrast, no significant difference was found when feminine scores of intrinsically religious and extrinsically religious males were compared. Although not significant ($p < .1340$), the median feminine score of intrinsically religious males ($N=22$, $R=786.5$) was higher than the median feminine score of extrinsically religious males ($N=41$, $R=1229.5$).

Mann-Whitney U test results between intrinsically religious ($N=56$, $R=2911$) and nonreligious ($N=39$, $R=1649$) male and female adolescents indicated there was no significant difference between the feminine scores of male and female adolescents ($p < .0910$). Although not significant, a comparison of median feminine scores resulted in a higher score for intrinsically religious adolescents than nonreligious adolescents. A significant z score was obtained from a comparison of feminine scores of intrinsically religious ($N=22$, $R=585$) and nonreligious ($N=20$, $R=318$) males. The direction of the scores indicated that intrinsically religious males were more feminine than nonreligious males.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between male and female intrinsically religious adolescents ($N=56$, $R=2951$) and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents ($N=48$, $R=2509$) indicated there was no significant difference between the feminine scores of male and female adolescents. Likewise, there was no significant difference between intrinsically religious

($\underline{N}=22$, $\underline{R}=487$) and indiscriminately proreligious ($\underline{N}=26$, $\underline{R}=689$) male adolescents. Although not significant ($\underline{p} < .2082$), a comparison of median feminine scores resulted in a higher feminine score for indiscriminately proreligious males than intrinsically religious males.

Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ comparisons between extrinsically religious ($\underline{N}=67$, $\underline{R}=3544.5$) and nonreligious ($\underline{N}=39$, $\underline{R}=2126.5$) adolescent males and females indicated there was no significant difference between the feminine scores of the total sample. Similarly there was no significant difference at the .05 level ($\underline{p} < .0574$) between extrinsically religious ($\underline{N}=41$, $\underline{R}=1393.5$) and nonreligious ($\underline{N}=20$, $\underline{R}=497.5$) males. However, a comparison of median feminine scores resulted in a higher score for extrinsically religious males than nonreligious males.

Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ test results indicated there were significant ($\underline{p} < .05$) differences between the scores of extrinsically religious ($\underline{N}=67$, $\underline{R}=3452$) versus indiscriminately proreligious ($\underline{N}=48$, $\underline{R}=3218$) male and female adolescents and between extrinsically religious ($\underline{N}=41$, $\underline{R}=1219.5$) and indistriminately proreligious ($\underline{N}=26$, $\underline{R}=1058.5$) male adolescents. Directions of the scores indicated indiscriminately proreligious subjects were more feminine than extrinsically religious subjects for both total and male samples.

A Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ comparison between the feminine scores of nonreligious ($\underline{N}=39$, $\underline{R}=1548$) and indiscriminately proreligious males and females indicated no significant difference existed at the .05 level ($\underline{p} < .1498$). However, a comparison of median feminine scores resulted in a higher score for indiscriminately proreligious adolescents than nonreligious adolescents. In contrast, a comparison between male samples indicated there was a significant difference between nonreligious

($N=20$, $R=311.5$) and indiscriminately proreligious ($N=26$, $R=769.5$) males. The direction of the scores suggested that indiscriminately proreligious males were more feminine than nonreligious males.

Null hypotheses ten, eleven, and twelve predicted there would be no significant difference among the average masculine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious male and female adolescents; of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious male adolescents; and of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious female adolescents.

To test for significant differences within samples with respect to degree of masculinity, across sample comparisons were made between subjects classified as intrinsically religious (male=22, female=34), extrinsically religious (male=41, female=26), nonreligious (male=20, female=19), and indiscriminately proreligious (male=26, female=22) using masculine scores from the BSRI. Table 12 presents H values resulting from a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance for each population. H values of 6.84 (total sample), 6.50 (female sample), and 2.51 (male sample) indicated, for all samples, no significant differences existed between the masculine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents.

Although the null hypotheses were not rejected for the masculine scores of the BSRI for all samples at the .05 level of significance, H values were significant at the .10 level for both total and female samples. Mann-Whitney U comparisons were made to investigate where the differences were located.

TABLE 12. Kruskal-Wallis H Values among Four Religious Orientations Utilizing Masculine Scores.

Sample	H	H_0^a
Total	6.82	6.84
Female	6.47	6.50
Male	2.50	2.51

^aValues of H corrected for ties in ranks.

* $p < .05$ ($df=3$).

Mann-Whitney U test results revealed a significant difference at the .05 level between masculine scores of intrinsically religious ($N=34$, $R=1218.5$) and extrinsically religious ($N=26$, $R=611.5$) females. The direction of the scores indicated that intrinsically religious females were more masculine than extrinsically religious females. Although not significant, comparisons of median masculine scores resulted in higher masculine scores for intrinsically religious females when compared with nonreligious ($I/N=34$, $R=983$; $NR/N=19$, $R=448$; $p < .2262$) and indiscriminately proreligious ($I/N=34$, $R=1057.5$; $IP/N=22$, $R=538$; $p < .1362$) females.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between male and female samples revealed no significant differences at the .05 level between intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious adolescents with regard to degree of masculinity. Only one comparison of median scores differed substantially ($p < .0872$). A comparison of median masculine scores resulted in a higher score for intrinsically religious male and female adolescents ($N=56$, $R=2914$) than nonreligious ($N=39$, $R=1646$) male and female adolescents.

Summary of Findings

Subjects were 210 (male=109, female=101) adolescents enrolled as seniors in two high schools in McMinn County. When the subjects were categorized according to Bem's four sex role classifications, 58 were classified as androgynous, 53 as undifferentiated, 52 as masculine, and 47 as feminine. When the subjects were categorized according to Allport's four religious orientations, 67 were extrinsically religious, 56 were intrinsically religious, 48 were indiscriminately proreligious, and 39 were nonreligious.

Of the twelve null hypotheses tested, five were rejected. A significant difference was found between the intrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine adolescents for total, male, and female samples. Individual comparisons among sex role classifications utilizing intrinsic scores revealed significant differences between androgynous versus undifferentiated adolescents for total, male, and female samples; between androgynous versus masculine adolescents for total and male samples; between undifferentiated versus masculine adolescents for the female sample, between undifferentiated versus feminine adolescents for total and male samples; and between masculine versus feminine adolescents for the total sample. The direction of the scores suggested androgynous adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents for total, male, and female samples; androgynous adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine adolescents for total and male samples; masculine adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents for the female sample; feminine adolescents were

more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents for total and male samples; and feminine adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine adolescents for the total sample.

A significant difference was also found between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious adolescents for total and male samples. Individual comparisons among religious orientations utilizing feminine scores revealed significant differences between intrinsically religious versus extrinsically religious adolescents for the total sample; between intrinsically religious versus nonreligious adolescents for the male sample; between extrinsically religious versus indiscriminately proreligious adolescents for total and male samples; and between nonreligious versus indiscriminately proreligious adolescents for the male sample. The direction of the scores suggested intrinsically religious adolescents were more feminine than extrinsically religious adolescents for the total sample; intrinsically religious adolescents were more feminine than nonreligious adolescents for the male sample; indiscriminately proreligious adolescents were more feminine than extrinsically religious adolescents for total and male samples, and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents were more feminine than nonreligious adolescents for the male samples. No significant difference was found between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious females.

Results of Kruskal-Wallis one-way analyses of variance indicated there were no significant differences between the extrinsic scores of

adolescents across sex role classifications nor between the masculine scores of adolescents across religious orientations.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is comprised of a discussion of the research findings detailed in Chapter IV, conclusions, and recommendations for further research. The chapter is divided into the following sections: findings and discussion, discussion of the results in relation to inferences from the literature, and conclusions and suggestions for further research.

Findings and Discussion

The twelve null hypotheses of this study are presented and discussed as follows:

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one indicated there would be no significant difference among average intrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine male and female adolescents. This hypothesis was rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which yielded a significant H value at the .05 level of significance. Mann-Whitney U test results yielded significant differences between intrinsic scores of androgynous versus undifferentiated; androgynous versus masculine, undifferentiated versus feminine; and masculine versus feminine male and female adolescents. Intrinsic scores among significant samples indicated androgynous and feminine male and

female adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine and undifferentiated male and female adolescents.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between intrinsic scores of androgynous versus feminine and undifferentiated versus masculine male and female adolescents neglected to yield significant z scores. However, a comparison of median intrinsic scores resulted in a higher intrinsic score for androgynous male and female adolescents than feminine male and female adolescents.

These findings support previous expectations that androgynous adolescents would be more intrinsically religious than masculine and undifferentiated adolescents. However, feminine adolescents were more intrinsically religious and less indiscriminately proreligious than originally anticipated. Likewise, masculine and undifferentiated adolescents were more similar with respect to intrinsic religious orientation than expected.

Similarities between androgynous and feminine adolescents with respect to intrinsic religious orientation may be attributed to feminine traits such as supportiveness and concern for others which are characteristic of androgynous as well as feminine adolescents and are also represented in intrinsically religious adolescents (Hamby, 1973; Parsons & Bales, 1955; Singer, 1976). Masculine and undifferentiated adolescents also share similar and less integrating personality traits, such as lack of security and instability, which are not characteristic of intrinsically religious types (Hamby, 1973; Worrell, 1977).

Findings among androgynous and feminine adolescents tend to support the research of Jones, Chernovetz, and Hannson (1978) which

found androgynous females more consistent with the concept of androgyny than androgynous males.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two indicated there would be no significant difference among average intrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine female adolescents. This hypothesis was rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which yielded a significant H value at the .05 level of significance. Mann-Whitney U test results yielded significant differences between the average intrinsic scores of androgynous versus undifferentiated and undifferentiated versus masculine female adolescents. Intrinsic scores among significant samples indicated that androgynous and masculine females were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated females.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between androgynous versus masculine, androgynous versus feminine, undifferentiated versus feminine, and masculine versus feminine females failed to yield significant results. However, median intrinsic scores were higher for androgynous females than feminine females; for undifferentiated females than feminine females; and for masculine females than feminine females.

Consistent with findings of the total sample, androgynous female adolescents tended to be more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated female adolescents. Significant differences between masculine and undifferentiated intrinsic scores of female adolescents suggest that masculine females have more integrating personality characteristics than undifferentiated females thus are more intrinsically religious. Likewise, similar intrinsic scores between androgynous and masculine females

suggest that females who have incorporated masculine traits tend to have more integrated personalities characteristic of intrinsically religious adolescents, and similar to androgynous adolescents, who have incorporated both masculine and feminine traits.

Nonsignificant differences between feminine versus androgynous and feminine versus undifferentiated females suggest that feminine females share characteristics similar to androgynous and more intrinsically religious females as well as characteristics similar to undifferentiated and less intrinsically religious females. It is hypothesized that feminine qualities such as supportiveness and concern for others tend to be characteristic of feminine females who are more intrinsically religious; whereas feminine characteristics such as insecurity and over-dependency tend to be more representative of feminine females who are less intrinsically religious.

A nonsignificant difference between the intrinsic scores of feminine and masculine female adolescents appear to indicate that each group has characteristics representative of intrinsically religious adolescents. It is hypothesized that intrinsically religious adolescents incorporate positive and integrative characteristics from both masculine (intellectual, responsible) and feminine (supportive, expressive) sex roles.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three indicated there would be no significant difference among average intrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine male adolescents. This hypothesis was rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which

yielded a significant H value at the .05 level of significance. Mann-Whitney U test results yielded significant differences between the intrinsic scores of androgynous versus undifferentiated; androgynous versus masculine; and undifferentiated versus feminine male adolescents. Intrinsic scores among significant samples indicated that androgynous males were more intrinsically religious than masculine and undifferentiated males, and feminine males were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated males.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between androgynous versus feminine, undifferentiated versus masculine, and masculine versus feminine male adolescents failed to yield significant z scores. However, a comparison of median intrinsic scores resulted in a higher intrinsic score for feminine males than masculine males.

Findings across the male sample were consistent with findings across female and total samples—androgynous males were more intrinsically religious than masculine and undifferentiated males, feminine males were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated males, and intrinsic scores between androgynous versus feminine male adolescents were not significantly different.

As with the female sample, a nonsignificant difference between the intrinsic scores of feminine and masculine male adolescents suggests that each group has characteristics representative of intrinsically religious adolescents. As well as having characteristics in common with intrinsically religious adolescents, results indicate feminine females, as well as masculine males, lack integrative characteristics common to intrinsically religious adolescents. Incorporating the

positive attributes of opposing sex-types would tend to allow for a more integrated religious orientation as well as sex role classification.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four indicated there would be no significant difference among average extrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine male and female adolescents. This hypothesis could not be rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which failed to yield a significant H value at the .05 level of significance.

Results indicate although adolescents differ with respect to intrinsic religious orientation, they do not differ with respect to extrinsic religious orientation across sex role classifications. Two conclusions can be formulated from this data. A difference in intrinsic scores of male and female adolescents across sex role classifications does not automatically result in a difference in extrinsic scores for the same sample across sex role classifications. In addition, for male and female adolescents combined, an adolescent's sex role classification appears unrelated to his or extrinsic religious orientation.

These conclusions suggest, although adolescents begin to differ with respect to degree of intrinsic religious orientation by the time they are seniors in high school, more religious maturation is required before differences in extrinsic religious orientation among adolescent samples can be determined. Regardless of sex role orientation, adolescents tend to exhibit characteristics associated with extrinsically religious persons. Adolescents in both groups tend to evade

responsibility, have low self-concepts, are competitive, and have difficulty in interpersonal relationships (Stone & Church, 1973; Hamby, 1975).

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five indicated there would be no significant difference among average extrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine female adolescents. This hypothesis could not be rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which failed to yield a significant H value at the .05 level of significance.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between female samples revealed a significant difference at the .05 level between the extrinsic scores of masculine and undifferentiated female adolescents. The direction of the extrinsic scores indicated undifferentiated females were more extrinsically religious than masculine females. For nonsignificant comparisons, median extrinsic scores were higher for undifferentiated females than androgynous females; for feminine females than masculine females, and for feminine females than androgynous females.

The direction of intrinsic and extrinsic scores of females across sex role classifications resulted in four similar tendencies. Masculine females tended to be more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated females, and undifferentiated females tended to be more extrinsically religious than masculine females. Androgynous females tended to be more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated females, and the extrinsic median was higher for undifferentiated females than androgynous females. Comparisons of median intrinsic and

extrinsic scores resulted in a higher intrinsic score for masculine females than feminine females and a higher extrinsic score for feminine females than masculine females. Comparisons of median intrinsic and extrinsic scores resulted in a higher intrinsic score for androgynous females than feminine females and a higher extrinsic score for feminine females than androgynous females.

As with total and male samples, extrinsic scores for females did not differ significantly across sex role classification. It can be concluded, for adolescent females, extrinsic religious orientation appears unrelated to sex role classification.

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six indicated there would be no significant difference among average extrinsic scores of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine male adolescents. This hypothesis could not be rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which failed to yield a significant H value at the .05 level of significance.

As with total and female samples, an adolescent male's extrinsic religious orientation does not differ among androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine sex role classifications. Therefore, for adolescent males, extrinsic religious orientation appears unrelated to sex role classification.

Hypothesis Seven

Hypothesis seven indicated there would be no significant difference among average feminine scores of intrinsically religious,

extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious male and female adolescents. This hypothesis was rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which yielded a significant H value at the .05 level of significance. Mann-Whitney U comparisons revealed there was a significant difference between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious versus extrinsically religious, and extrinsically religious versus indiscriminately proreligious male and female adolescents. Intrinsic scores among significant samples indicated intrinsically religious adolescents were more feminine than extrinsically religious adolescents, and that indiscriminately proreligious adolescents were more feminine than extrinsically religious adolescents. For nonsignificant comparisons, median feminine scores were higher for intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents than nonreligious adolescents.

As expected, both intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious males and females were more feminine than extrinsically religious males and females. This may be attributed to feminine characteristics, such as willingness to make commitments, to trust, and to conform; which tend to be shared by intrinsically religious and proreligious adolescents but are rejected by extrinsically religious adolescents. In contrast, extrinsically religious and nonreligious adolescents tend to exhibit characteristics more related to masculine sex-typed persons—a tendency to be aggressive, competitive, nonconventional, and nonsupportive (Hamby, 1974; Marini, 1978).

Hypothesis Eight

Hypothesis eight indicated there would be no significant difference among average feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious female adolescents. This hypothesis was not rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which failed to yield a significant H value at the .05 level of significance.

Although no significant differences could be found between feminine scores of female adolescents across religious orientations ($I/N=34$, $R=1753$; $E/N=26$, $R=1130.5$; $NR/N=19$, $R=1122.5$; $IP/N=22$, $R=1145$), median feminine scores were less for extrinsically religious females than intrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious females.

From these results it can be concluded that an adolescent female's degree of femininity does not differ across religious orientations; therefore, for female adolescents, degree of femininity does not appear to be related to religious orientation. Feminine attributes shared by all female adolescents, regardless of sex role classification or religious orientation, may be partially responsible for the inability to determine differences in femininity among religious categories.

Hypothesis Nine

Hypothesis nine indicated there would be no significant difference among average feminine scores of intrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, extrinsically religious, and nonreligious male adolescents. This hypothesis was rejected based on the results of

a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which yielded a significant H value at the .05 level of significance.

Mann-Whitney U analyses revealed significant differences between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious versus nonreligious, extrinsically religious versus indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious versus indiscriminately proreligious male adolescents. The direction of the scores indicated that intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious males were more feminine than nonreligious males. In addition, extrinsically religious males tended to be less feminine than indiscriminately proreligious males. Median feminine scores for nonsignificant comparisons were higher for intrinsically religious males than extrinsically religious males, for indiscriminately proreligious males than intrinsically religious males, and for extrinsically religious males than nonreligious males.

Similar to the total sample, indiscriminately proreligious males were more feminine than nonreligious males. Although nonsignificant for both samples, a higher feminine median score for intrinsically religious males than nonreligious males was consistent with findings of the total sample.

Hypothesis Ten

Hypothesis ten indicated there would be no significant difference among average masculine scores of intrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, extrinsically religious, and nonreligious male and female adolescents. This hypothesis was not rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which failed to yield a significant H value at the .05 level of significance.

Mann-Whitney U comparisons between male and female samples revealed no significant differences at the .05 level between the masculine scores of intrinsically religious, indiscriminately pro-religious, extrinsically religious, and nonreligious male and female adolescents. Results utilizing masculine scores to test for differences across religious orientations with respect to sex role classification tend to reflect results utilizing extrinsic scores to test for differences across sex role classifications with respect to religious orientations. Comparisons for all samples across both categories failed to yield significant H values when tested using Kruskal-Wallis analyses of variance. These results tend to indicate extrinsic religious orientation and masculine sex role classification share common characteristics.

Conclusions similar to those formulated for hypothesis four can be drawn for hypothesis ten. A difference in feminine scores of male and female adolescents across religious orientations does not automatically result in a difference in masculine scores for the same population across the same sample. Unlike femininity, an adolescent's masculinity does not appear to be related to his or her religious orientation.

These conclusions suggest, regardless of religious orientation, adolescents, in general, tend to exhibit characteristics associated with masculine persons. Adolescents, in general, and masculine sex-typed persons tend to evade responsibility, have low self-concepts, are competitive, and have difficulty in interpersonal relationships (Stone & Church, 1973; Marini, 1978).

Hypothesis Eleven

Hypothesis eleven indicated there would be no significant difference among average masculine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious female adolescents. This hypothesis was not rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which failed to yield a significant H value at the .05 level of significance.

Mann-Whitney U test results revealed a significant difference at the .05 level between masculine scores of intrinsically religious and extrinsically religious females. The direction of the scores suggested that intrinsically religious females tended to be more masculine than extrinsically religious females. Nonsignificant masculine score comparisons revealed median masculine scores were higher for intrinsically religious females than nonreligious and indiscriminately proreligious females.

Although not significant for all comparisons, results of masculine score comparisons for females across religious orientations support inferences that a more integrated sex role tends to represent an intrinsic religious orientation. A significant difference between the degree of masculinity of intrinsically religious and extrinsically religious females indicates extrinsically religious females tend to have a feminine sex-type.

Hypothesis Twelve

Hypothesis twelve indicated there would be no significant difference between average masculine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, indiscriminately proreligious, and nonreligious

male adolescents. This hypothesis was not rejected based on the results of a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance which failed to yield a significant H value at the .05 level of significance.

From these results it can be concluded for adolescent males, degree of masculinity does not differ significantly across religious orientation categories; therefore, for male adolescents, degree of masculinity is not related to religious orientation.

Masculine attributes shared by all male adolescents, regardless of sex role classification or religious orientation, may be partially responsible for the inability to determine differences in degree of masculinity among religious samples.

Discussion of Results in Relation to

Inferences from Literature

Chapter II concluded with several inferences from the literature. Each inference is discussed in this section as it relates to the findings of the study.

The first inference suggested, for all samples, androgynous adolescents would tend to be more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated, masculine, or feminine adolescents. In comparisons across androgynous and undifferentiated sex role classifications, results indicated that androgynous adolescents tended to be more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents for all samples investigated. In comparisons across androgynous and masculine sex role classifications, androgynous adolescents comprising total and male samples tended to be more intrinsically religious than masculine subjects of the same samples.

However, androgynous female adolescents did not tend to be more intrinsically religious than masculine female adolescents. For comparisons across androgynous and feminine sex role classifications, androgynous and feminine adolescents did not differ significantly in degree of intrinsic religious orientation for all samples compared. However, androgynous adolescents comprising total and female samples had higher median scores than feminine adolescents of the same samples.

Results from this study, which indicate androgynous adolescents across total, male, and female samples tend to be more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents, lend support to the contention that androgynous and intrinsically religious adolescents tend to be more mature and have integrated positive personality characteristics of masculine and feminine sex-types to a greater degree than undifferentiated adolescents.

Similar intrinsic scores between androgynous and feminine samples suggest androgynous and feminine adolescents tend to share characteristics in common with intrinsically religious adolescents. Adolescents in all three groups tend to become emotionally involved, and care for and are sensitive to the feelings of others (Hamby, 1975; Johnson, 1963).

Results for the female sample—which indicated intrinsic scores of androgynous adolescents were not significantly different from intrinsic scores of masculine adolescents—lend support to the contention that incorporating positive sex role characteristics of the opposite sex tends to lead to a more mature and stable personality (Singer, 1963; Bem, 1975a).

The second inference drawn from the literature review suggested, for all samples, feminine adolescents would tend to be more intrinsically religious than masculine and undifferentiated adolescents. Significant differences between the intrinsic scores of adolescents in the total sample suggested that feminine male and female adolescents were more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated and masculine adolescents. This inference also tended to be true for feminine male adolescents who were found to be significantly more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated male adolescents. Although a significant difference was not found, the median intrinsic score of feminine female adolescents was higher than the median intrinsic score of undifferentiated female adolescents. Similarly, feminine male adolescents had a higher median intrinsic score than masculine male adolescents.

This second inference suggests that feminine adolescents tend to have more personality characteristics in common with intrinsically religious adolescents than either masculine or undifferentiated adolescents. Results appear to partially support this contention. Similarities between intrinsically religious and feminine adolescent scores may be attributed to shared characteristics between feminine and intrinsically religious adolescents; such as concern and regard for others, sensitivity, and a desire to become emotionally involved; which are not representative of masculine and undifferentiated adolescents (Hamby, 1975; Johnson, 1963).

One comparison was in the direction opposite that inferred. Although not a significant difference, masculine female adolescents had a higher median intrinsic score than feminine female adolescents. This

difference may be attributed to the contention discussed in relation to inference one—incorporating positive sex role characteristics of the opposite sex tends to lead to a more mature and stable personality (Bem, 1975a; Singer, 1963).

The third inference suggested, for all samples, masculine adolescents would tend to be more extrinsically religious than feminine and androgynous adolescents. For all samples, no significant differences were found between the extrinsic scores of masculine, feminine, and androgynous adolescents. These results suggest an adolescent's extrinsic religious orientation is not related to his or her sex role classification. Characteristics of persons classified as extrinsically religious include: reliance on others (Stewart, 1967), desire to obtain security, self-esteem and reduce fear (Allport, 1968), and concern about social status (Photiadis & Biggar, 1962). These characteristics are often "typical" of senior high school adolescents who tend to be concerned and confused about present and future relationships and endeavors. Feelings of fear and insecurity are often characteristic of adolescents as they struggle toward adulthood (Stone & Church, 1973). Characteristics shared by adolescents as they mature and extrinsically religious persons may suggest reasons for the similarities between the extrinsic scores of adolescents across sex role classifications.

The fourth inference suggested, for all samples, undifferentiated adolescents would tend to be more extrinsically religious and less intrinsically religious than androgynous and feminine adolescents. For all samples, there was a significant difference between the intrinsic scores of androgynous and undifferentiated adolescents. The direction

of the average intrinsic scores suggested that undifferentiated adolescents tended to be less intrinsically religious than androgynous adolescents.

Significant results obtained from comparisons between feminine and undifferentiated male adolescents indicated undifferentiated males tended to be less intrinsically religious than feminine males. Although nonsignificant, median score comparisons for total and female samples resulted in lower median intrinsic scores for undifferentiated male and female adolescents than feminine adolescents and for undifferentiated female adolescents when compared to feminine female adolescents.

No significant differences were found between the extrinsic scores of androgynous, feminine, and undifferentiated adolescents for all populations. However, for the female sample, the median extrinsic score of undifferentiated females was higher than the median score of androgynous females.

As discussed in reference to the first inference, results appear to support the contention that undifferentiated adolescents tend to be less mature—and therefore less intrinsically religious—than androgynous adolescents, because they have failed to integrate positive characteristics of either masculine or feminine sex-types. In addition, undifferentiated adolescents' failure to endorse feminine sex role characteristics tends to make them less intrinsically religious than females who have endorsed feminine sex role characteristics (Bem, 1975a; Singer, 1963).

Similarities between the extrinsic scores of total, male, and female samples across sex role classifications, as discussed in reference to the third inference, suggest extrinsically religious

persons and adolescents in general share common personality characteristics (Hamby, 1975; Johnson, 1963).

The fifth inference suggested androgynous and masculine female adolescents would tend to be less extrinsically religious than feminine female adolescents. As stated in discussions of inferences three and four, no significant differences were found across sex role classifications for all samples researched. However, for female adolescents, median extrinsic scores were higher for feminine females than androgynous and masculine females.

As discussed in reference to inference one, by definition (Kaplan & Sedney, 1980; Singer, 1976) androgynous female adolescents endorse both male and female sex role characteristics. Similar to androgynous females, masculine females have endorsed sex role characteristics attributed to the opposite sex. Results of this research suggest, because of their ability to endorse masculine sex role characteristics, androgynous and masculine females tend to be more mature and integrated, and thus less extrinsically religious, than feminine female adolescents who tend to endorse only feminine sex role characteristics.

Results related to inferences one, two, and five appear to refute earlier research (McClain, 1979) which found feminists to be nonreligious and nonfeminists to be intrinsically religious. An erroneous conclusion would be to assume that all masculine females are feminists; therefore, they are nonreligious. This assumption does not take into consideration specific masculine sex role characteristics endorsed by females. Females endorsing masculine characteristics as assertiveness, willingness to defend one's beliefs, and independence (Bem, 1978) would tend to have

more mature and integrated personalities than females endorsing only feminine sex role characteristics. In contrast, females endorsing masculine characteristics of forcefulness, aggressiveness, and excessive dominance (Bem, 1978) would tend to have more immature and less integrated personalities. From these results it can be inferred that extreme feminists endorse negative masculine characteristics which are not representative of an intrinsically religious orientation; whereas, intrinsically religious masculine females tend to endorse positive masculine and feminine characteristics.

The sixth inference suggested androgynous and feminine male adolescents would tend to be more intrinsically religious and less extrinsically religious than masculine male adolescents. Comparisons between androgynous and masculine male adolescents resulted in a significant difference between intrinsic scores. The direction of the scores indicated androgynous male adolescents were more intrinsically religious than masculine male adolescents. Although not significant, the median intrinsic score of feminine males was higher than the median score of masculine males. Comparisons between extrinsic scores of androgynous, feminine, and masculine males failed to yield significant differences.

Just as androgynous and masculine female adolescents tend to endorse masculine sex role characteristics, androgynous and feminine male adolescents tend to endorse feminine sex role characteristics (Kaplan & Sedney, 1980; Singer, 1976). Consistent with the inference made for female adolescents, it is inferred that male adolescents who endorse feminine sex role characteristics tend to be more mature and

integrated, thus more intrinsically religious, than male adolescents who endorse only masculine sex role characteristics.

The seventh inference suggested, for all samples, extrinsically religious adolescents would tend to be more masculine than indiscriminately proreligious, nonreligious, and intrinsically religious adolescents. Although comparisons of masculine scores across religious orientations failed to yield significant differences, variance between masculine scores was evident in individual comparisons between religious orientations for total and female samples. Although not significant, the median masculine score for the total sample was higher for extrinsically religious adolescents than nonreligious adolescents. For the female sample, a significant difference was found between the intrinsic scores of intrinsically religious and extrinsically religious female adolescents. The direction of the scores indicated intrinsically religious females tended to be more masculine than extrinsically religious females.

Degree of masculinity did not differ significantly between religious orientations, just as degree of extrinsic religious orientation did not differ significantly among sex role classifications. Personality traits characteristic of persons classified as extrinsically religious—authoritarian, conservative, and concerned about social status (Photiadis & Biggar, 1962)—are similar to characteristics of persons classified as masculine—dominant, competitive, and noncompliant (Block, 1973; Sanders, 1973). Results of this study suggest both male and female adolescents, regardless of sex role classification or religious orientation, tend to endorse characteristics similar to those of

extrinsically religious and masculine persons. As mentioned in the discussion of inference three, this may be associated with an adolescent's maturational process (Stewart, 1967; Stone & Church, 1973).

The eighth inference suggested, for all samples, indiscriminately proreligious adolescents would tend to be more feminine than intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, and nonreligious adolescents. For the total sample, there was no significant difference between the feminine scores of indiscriminately proreligious versus intrinsically religious adolescents nor between indiscriminately proreligious versus nonreligious adolescents. However, there was a difference between the feminine scores of extrinsically religious versus indiscriminately proreligious adolescents. The direction of the scores indicated indiscriminately proreligious adolescents tended to be more feminine than extrinsically religious adolescents.

For the female sample, there were no significant differences between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, nonreligious, and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents.

For the male sample, there was a significant difference between the scores of extrinsically religious versus indiscriminately proreligious and nonreligious versus indiscriminately proreligious male adolescents. The direction of the feminine scores indicated indiscriminately proreligious males were more feminine than extrinsically religious and nonreligious males. Though not significant, a comparison of median feminine scores resulted in a higher feminine score for indiscriminately proreligious males than intrinsically religious males.

Results of this study only partially supported inference eight. The direction of the feminine scores suggested that indiscriminately

proreligious males were more feminine than extrinsically religious and nonreligious males. However, among female religious orientations, no significant differences in femininity existed. Results between female comparisons suggest feminine adolescents, regardless of religious orientation, tend to share similar feminine characteristics. Unlike females, for males degree of femininity differs across religious orientations. Findings suggest indiscriminately proreligious males are most feminine followed by intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, and nonreligious males respectively.

Inference nine suggested, for all samples, nonreligious adolescents would tend to be more masculine and less feminine than intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious adolescents. For the total samples, no significant differences were found between the feminine scores of intrinsically religious versus nonreligious adolescents and nonreligious versus indiscriminately proreligious adolescents. However, comparisons of median feminine scores resulted in lower feminine scores for nonreligious adolescents than indiscriminately proreligious and intrinsically religious adolescents. There was no significant difference between the masculine scores of nonreligious versus indiscriminately proreligious and intrinsically religious versus nonreligious adolescents. A comparison of median masculine scores resulted in a higher masculine score for intrinsically religious adolescents than nonreligious adolescents.

For the female sample, no differences were found between nonreligious versus intrinsically religious adolescents nor between nonreligious versus indiscriminately proreligious adolescents. There

was also no significant difference between the masculine scores of intrinsically religious versus nonreligious adolescents. Although not significant, a comparison of median masculine scores resulted in a higher masculine score for intrinsically religious females than nonreligious females.

For the male sample, no significant differences could be found between masculine scores of nonreligious versus intrinsically religious and nonreligious versus indiscriminately proreligious male adolescents. Feminine scores indicated significant differences existed between the femininity of nonreligious versus intrinsically religious males and between nonreligious versus proreligious males. Directions of the scores suggested that intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious males were more feminine than nonreligious males.

Results for feminine scores of total and male samples were in the direction indicated in inference nine. However, nonsignificant results for masculine scores of total and female samples were in the opposite direction of that suggested in inference nine. For adolescents in the female population, this contradiction can be attributed to intrinsically religious females' tendency to endorse masculine sex role characteristics as explained in inferences one and three.

It can be concluded that for male, female, and total adolescent samples, degree of masculinity does not differ significantly among nonreligious, indiscriminately proreligious, and intrinsic religious orientations. In addition, for total and female samples, degree of femininity does not differ significantly among nonreligious, indiscriminately proreligious, and intrinsic religious orientations.

The tenth inference suggested that intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious males would tend to be more feminine and less masculine than extrinsically religious males. A significant difference between the feminine scores of extrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious male adolescents suggested that indiscriminately proreligious males were more feminine than extrinsically religious males. Although not significant, the median feminine score of intrinsically religious males was higher than the median score of extrinsically religious males. No significant differences were found between masculine scores of intrinsically religious versus extrinsically religious nor indiscriminately proreligious versus extrinsically religious males.

As mentioned in discussions of previous inferences, adolescent males, in general, tend to be similar with regard to degree of masculinity, thus it is difficult to access differences in masculine scores across religious orientations. In contrast, degree of femininity among male adolescents tends to indicate religious orientation. Results suggest feminine males tend to belong to religious categories which have characteristics in common with feminine sex-types and are less likely to belong to religious categories which have characteristics in common with masculine sex types.

Inference eleven suggested that intrinsically religious and extrinsically religious females would tend to be more masculine and less feminine than indiscriminately proreligious females. Masculine score comparisons between intrinsically religious versus indiscriminately proreligious females failed to yield significant results. However, a

comparison of median masculine scores resulted in a higher masculine score for intrinsically religious females than indiscriminately proreligious females.

Feminine scores between indiscriminately proreligious versus intrinsically religious and indiscriminately proreligious versus extrinsically religious female adolescents were not significantly different. Feminine scores across religious orientations indicated there was little difference in the degree of femininity between intrinsically religious, extrinsically religious, and indiscriminately proreligious females. These results suggest, in general, female adolescents display characteristics associated with "traditional" feminine sex roles. Masculinity scores among female religious orientations were not significantly different which suggests females, as a whole, share similar masculine sex role characteristics regardless of religious orientation.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

For adolescents participating in this study, the clearest difference in intrinsic religious orientation was between androgynous and undifferentiated adolescents for all samples. Results from this study, which indicate androgynous adolescents are more intrinsically religious than undifferentiated adolescents, are consistent with maturational theories which suggest intrinsically religious (Allport, 1957; Stewart, 1976) and androgynous (Bem, 1974; Block 1973) persons are psychologically healthier and more mature than undifferentiated

persons. Previous research indicates that persons who are intrinsically religious and androgynous should be able to internalize religious values as well as integrate conflicting sex role characteristics; therefore, a suggestion for further research would be to compare personality characteristics and religious values between intrinsically religious and androgynous persons to determine if similarities exist.

Kohlberg (1964) has found that males at the highest level of moral reasoning (post conventional) endorse, along with masculine adjectives, feminine adjectives such as sympathetic, responsive and idealistic. Similarly, females endorse, along with feminine adjectives, masculine adjectives such as impulsive and restless. Kohlberg's post conventional persons appear to resemble intrinsically religious and androgynous persons. Another research proposal would be to investigate similarities between androgynous, intrinsically religious, and post conventional individuals.

Garnets and Pleck (1979) discussed the theory of sex role transcendence in their research. An androgynous person is able to integrate or combine masculine and feminine sex role characteristics; the transcendent person goes beyond this androgynous state. Masculine and feminine sex traits are no longer recognized or endorsed, because sex-typed thoughts have been "transcended." At the time of Garnets and Plecks' research, a measurement of psychological "transcendence" had not been developed—nor is one available at this writing. Future research would benefit if such an instrument were devised. From the present research it might be inferred that persons having transcended sex role stereotypes, more than androgynous persons, would be characteristics of intrinsically religious persons.

Findings which indicate similarities between androgynous, feminine, and intrinsically religious subjects lead one to conclude that degree of femininity may be a key concept in intrinsic religious orientation. Findings of this study support results of Cline's research (1965) which investigated differences between religious commitments of males and females. Cline found women who reported having deep religious beliefs and convictions exhibited behaviors consistent with their religious values. Although males prayed, attended church frequently and held church offices, when compared to females, they were more unsure of their religious beliefs. Males reported having more guilt feelings and inner conflicts than females. In addition, men rejected initial religious beliefs more often than women. Findings of this study also support McClain's (1979) research which found feminists to be nonreligious and nonfeminists to be intrinsically religious. It can be concluded that feminine characteristics; such as supportiveness, concern and regard for others, sensitivity, warmth and trust; are evident in androgynous and intrinsically religious persons but are less apparent in extrinsically religious, nonreligious, masculine and undifferentiated persons (Allport, 1957; Bem, 1974; Hamby, 1973).

American society's tendency to reinforce and value masculine characteristics over feminine traits (Chafetz, 1975; Lynn, 1960; Sanders, 1973) may be inhibiting sex role as well as religious maturation. Additional research should be conducted to investigate possible detrimental effects of society's movement away from traditional feminine sex roles. Questions relating to sex roles, such as whether men are incorporating feminine characteristics at the same rate that women are endorsing masculine characteristics, need to be answered. In addition,

there is need for research that focuses on feminine attributes in relation to women and men.

Adolescents' incomplete identity formation (Stone & Church, 1973) may be partially responsible for the similarities between extrinsic and masculine scores among adolescent groups. Extrinsic characteristics—such as reliance on others, desire to obtain security, self-esteem and reduce fear, and concern about social status (Allport, 1968; Photiadis & Biggar, 1962; Stewart, 1967)—and masculine characteristics—such as irresponsibility, competitiveness, and having difficulty establishing interpersonal relationships (Bem, 1974; Marini, 1978) are often representative of senior high school adolescents who tend to be concerned and confused about present and future relationships and endeavors. Since degree of maturation is related to a person's religious orientation (Allport, 1957; Stewart, 1967; Wagner, 1978) and sex role classification (Kaplan & Sedney, 1980; Singer, 1976), further research using older, more mature subjects may result in increased differences among extrinsic and masculine scores.

Although the sample used in this study was relatively large ($N=210$), generalization of the results to other adolescent samples is limited, because the subjects were all seniors in high schools located in a rural East Tennessee county. A suggestion for further study would be to include urban and suburban as well as rural adolescents in the sample investigated. In addition, increasing sample size, especially for males classified as nonreligious and feminine and females classified as extrinsically religious and masculine, should tend to increase the validity of the research.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. The individual and his religion. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- Allport, G. W. The person in psychology. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Atkins, S. The theological case against women's ordination. In M. P. Hamilton & N. S. Montgomery (Eds.), The ordination of women pro and con. New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1975.
- Bem, S. L. Psychology looks at sex roles. Paper presented at the UCLA Symposium on Women, Los Angeles, CA, May 1972.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. Beyond androgyny: Some presumptuous prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. Key note address for APA-NIMH conference on the Research Needs of Women, Madison, Wisconsin, May 1975. (a)
- Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643. (b)
- Bem, S. L. Bem sex role inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1978.
- Bem, S. L., & Lenney, E. Sex typing and the avoidance of cross sexed 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.
- Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-516.
- Blum, B., & Mann, J. H. The effect of religious membership on religious prejudice. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 52, 97-101.
- Campbell, P. B. Adolescent intellectual decline. Adolescence, 1976, 11 (44), 629-635.
- Carmody, D. L. Women and religion: Where mystery comes to center stage. In E. C. Snyder (Ed.), The study of women enlarging prospectives of social reality. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.

- Chafetz, J. S. Masculine/feminine or human: An overview of the sociology of sex roles. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock, 1975.
- Champion, D. J. Basic statistics for social research. US: Chandler, 1970.
- Cline, V. B., & Richards, J. M. A factor-analytic study of religious belief and behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 569-578.
- Collins, J. K., Kennedy, J. R., & Francis, R. D. Insights into a dating partner's expectations of how behavior should ensue during the courtship process. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38(2), 373-377.
- Constantinople, A. Masculinity: Femininity: An exception to the famous dictum. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.
- Daly, M. The church and the second sex. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Ehrlich, H. J. The social psychology of prejudice. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
- Falbo, T. Relationships between sex, sex role, and social influence. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 2(1), 62-72.
- Feagin, J. R. Prejudice and religious types: A focused study of southern fundamentalism. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1964, 4(1), 3-13.
- Freud, S. [Some psychological consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes.] In P. C. Lee & R. S. Stewart (Eds.), Sex differences: Cultural and developmental dimensions. New York: Urizen Books, 1976. (Reprinted from International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1927, 8, 133-142.)
- Garnets, L., & Pleck, J. H. Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex role strain analysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 3(3), 270-283.
- Gay, L. R. Educational research. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1976.
- Gibson, E. When the minister is a woman. Canada: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- Grambs, J. D., & Waetjen, W. B. Sex: Does it make a difference? Sex roles in the modern world. North Scituate, MS: Duxbury Press, 1975.

- Hamby, J. Some personality correlates of four religious orientations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1973.
- Hansson, R. O., Chernovetz, M. E., & Jones, W. H. Maternal employment and androgyny. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977 2(1), 76-78.
- Hewitt, E. C., & Hiatt, S. R. Women priests, yes or no. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.
- Holy Bible. The Open Bible Edition. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1975.
- Johnson, M. W. Sex role learning in the nuclear family. Child Development, 1963, 34, 319-333.
- 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.
- Kaplan, A. G., & Sedney, M. A. An androgynous perspective. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1980.
- Katz, P. A. The development of female identity. Sex Roles, A Journal of Research, 1979, 5(2), 155-178.
- Kelly, J. A., Caudill, M. S., Hathorn, S., & O'Brien, C. G. Socially undesirable sex-correlated characteristics: Implications for androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45(6), 1185-1186.
- Kelly, J. A., & Worell, J. New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45(6), 1101-1115.
- Kohlberg, L. Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M. Hoffman & L. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research, Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Kohlberg, L. A cognitive-development analysis of children's sex role concepts and attitudes. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- Lovinger, J. The meaning and measurement of ego development. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 195-206.
- Lovinger, J., & Wessler, R. Measuring ego development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.
- Lynn, D. B. A note on sex differences in the development of masculine and feminine identification. In J. M. Seidman (Ed.), The adolescent: A book of readings. Canada: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.

- Marini, M. S. Sex differences in the determination of adolescent aspirations: A review of research. Sex Roles, 1978, 4(5), 723-753.
- McClain, E. W. Personality differences between intrinsically religious and nonreligious students: A factor analytic study. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1978, 42(2), 159-166.
- McClain, E. W. Religious orientation: The key to psychodynamic differences between feminists. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1979, 18(1), 40-45.
- McClain, E. W. Personal communication, July 1981.
- McDonald, G. W. A reconsideration of the concept of sex role identification in adolescent and family research. Adolescence, 1978, 13(50), 215-219.
- Micks, M. H. The theological case for women's ordination. In M. P. Hamilton & N. S. Montgomery (Eds.), The ordination of women pro and con. New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1975.
- Mischel, W. A social-learning view of sex differences in behavior. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- Mokros, J. R., Taylor, R. M., & O'Neill, M. K. Adolescents' perceptions of the causes and consequences of success in sex-linked occupations. Sex Roles, 1977, 3(4), 353-364.
- Morris, J. The lady was a bishop. New York: Macmillan, 1973.
- Muenchow, S. The truth about sex differences. Parents, February 1980, 51-56.
- Parish, T. S., & Bryant, W. T. Mapping sex group stereotypes of elementary and high school students. Sex Roles, 1978, 4(1), 135-140.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. E. Family socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1955.
- Photiadis, J. D., & Biggar, J. Religiosity, education, and ethnic distance. American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 67(6), 666-672.
- Pleck, J. H. Masculinity-femininity: Current and alternate paradigms. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 161-178.
- Psychology Today: An introduction (2 ed.). Delmar, CA: Communications Research Machines, Inc., 1972.

- Ridgeway, C. L. & Jacobson, C. K. The development of female role ideology, impact of personal confidence during adolescence. Youth and Society, 1979, 10(3), 297-315.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rokeach, M. Faith, hope, and bigotry. Psychology Today, 1970, 3, 33-37 & 58.
- Rosen, B. C., & Aneshensel, C. C. The chameleon syndrome: A social psychological dimension of the female sex role. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38(4), 605-617.
- Sanders, E. B. What do young women want? In D. Gottlieb (Ed.), Youth in contemporary society. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1973.
- Sears, R. A., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. Identification and child rearing. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1965.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Singer, J. Androgyny. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1976.
- Smith, H. R. The relationship between androgyny and self actualization in college men and women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1978.
- Stuart, D. R. My objections to ordaining women. In M. P. Hamilton and N. S. Montgomery (Eds.), The ordination of women pro and con. New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1975.
- Stewart, C. W. Adolescent religion. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1967.
- Stone, L. J. & Church, J. Childhood and adolescence. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Taylor, L. L., Fulcomer, M., & Taylor, F. Z. Daydreaming in the adolescent years: Instrument development, factor analysis, and sex differences. Adolescence, 1978, 13(52), 735-750.
- Tree, M. The dimensions of citizenship: Demands of political leadership. In The education of women for social and political leadership: A symposium at Southern Methodist University in honor of its semi-centennial year 1915-1965. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1967.
- Wagner, H. The adolescent and his religion. Adolescence, 1978, 13(50), 349-364.

- Wallin, P. Cultural contradictions and sex roles: A repeat study.
In V. M. Seidman (Ed.), The adolescent: A book of readings.
Canada: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1960.
- White, M. S. Measuring androgyny in adults. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 3(3), 293-307.

APPENDIX

Religious Orientation

The following items deal with various types of religious ideas. Please indicate the response you prefer, or most closely agree with, by printing the CAPITAL LETTER corresponding to your choice by the appropriate number of the answer sheet.

If none of the choices expresses exactly how you feel, then indicate the one closest to your own views. If no choice is possible, you may omit the item.

1. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.
 - A. I definitely disagree
 - B. I tend to disagree
 - C. I tend to agree
 - D. I definitely agree
2. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.
 - A. I definitely agree
 - B. I tend to disagree
 - C. I tend to agree
 - D. I definitely agree
3. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.
 - A. definitely not true
 - B. tends not to be true
 - C. tends to be true
 - D. definitely true
4. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.
 - A. definitely not true
 - B. tends not to be true
 - C. tends to be true
 - D. definitely true
5. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.
 - A. I definitely disagree
 - B. I tend to disagree
 - C. I tend to agree
 - D. I definitely agree

6. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.
 - A. this is definitely not so
 - B. probably not so
 - C. probably so
 - D. definitely so
7. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.
 - A. I definitely disagree
 - B. I tend to disagree
 - C. I tend to agree
 - D. I definitely agree
8. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.
 - A. almost never
 - B. sometimes
 - C. usually
 - D. almost always
9. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
 - A. definitely not true of me
 - B. tends not to be true
 - C. tends to be true
 - D. clearly true in my case
10. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church.
 - A. more than once a week
 - B. about once a week
 - C. two or three times a month
 - D. less than once a month
11. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.
 - A. I definitely disagree
 - B. I tend to disagree
 - C. I tend to agree
 - D. I definitely agree

12. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join (1) a Bible Study group or (2) a social fellowship.
- A. I would prefer to join (1)
 - B. I probably would prefer (1)
 - C. I probably would prefer (2)
 - D. I would prefer to join (2)
13. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life.
- A. I definitely disagree
 - B. I tend to disagree
 - C. I tend to agree
 - D. I definitely agree
14. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.
- A. definitely disagree
 - B. tend to disagree
 - C. tend to agree
 - D. definitely agree
15. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.
- A. definitely true of me
 - B. tends to be true
 - C. tends not to be true
 - D. definitely not true of me
16. I read literature about my faith (or church).
- A. frequently
 - B. occasionally
 - C. rarely
 - D. never
17. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.
- A. definitely not true of me
 - B. tends not to be true
 - C. tends to be true
 - D. definitely true of me
18. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.
- A. frequently true
 - B. occasionally true
 - C. rarely true
 - D. never true

19. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.
- A. definitely disagree
 - B. tend to disagree
 - C. tend to agree
 - D. definitely agree
20. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.
- A. I definitely agree
 - B. I tend to agree
 - C. I tend to disagree
 - D. I definitely disagree

Letter Requesting Participant Consent

Dear Student:

This letter is to request your permission to become involved in a research project in connection with a graduate program at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The survey will be conducted at both McMinn County and McMinn Central high schools. All seniors enrolled in the McMinn County public school system are being requested to participate. The county supervisor/administrator and principals have approved the initiation of the study.

The purpose of the research is to determine how much school seniors' ideas about religion relate to their masculinity or femininity. You will be asked to complete two opinion surveys related to these topics. Actual administration of the instruments will require about fifty minutes of classroom time. Research procedures will ensure complete privacy of all your responses. Whether you choose to participate will not affect your grades or school standing. You may withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

If you have further questions or would like additional information about this project or its procedures, please contact the project director, Susan Miller, at 745-3221 or the faculty director of the project, Dr. William Poppen, Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, The University of Tennessee, at 1-974-5131.

If you agree to participate in this research, please sign the form below and return it to your classroom teacher. If you do agree to participate and later decide to withdraw your participation, you may do so by contacting the project director.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Susan W. Miller
Candidate for the M.S. Degree
Project Director
The University of Tennessee

Dr. William A. Poppen
Faculty Director of the Project
The University of Tennessee

I give my permission to become involved in the project outlined above.

(Signature of Student)

Letter Requesting Parental Consent

Dear Parents:

This letter is to request permission for your son/daughter to participate in a research project in connection with a graduate program at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The survey will be conducted at both McMinn County and McMinn Central high schools. All seniors enrolled in the McMinn County public school system have been requested to participate. The county supervisor/administrator and principals have approved the initiation of the study.

The purpose of the research is to determine how adolescents' ideas about religion relate to their masculinity or femininity. Each participant will be asked to complete two opinion surveys related to these topics. Actual administration of the instruments will require approximately fifty minutes of classroom time. Research procedures will ensure complete privacy of all responses. Whether a student participates will not affect his/her grades or school standing. Any student may withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

If you have further questions or would like additional information about this project or its procedures, please contact the project director, Susan Miller, at 745-3221 or the faculty director of the project, Dr. William A. Poppen, Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, The University of Tennessee, at 1-974-5131.

If you agree to allow your son/daughter to participate in this research, please sign the form below and ask your son/daughter to return it to his/her classroom teacher. If you do agree for your son/daughter to participate and later decide to withdraw his/her participation, you may do so by contacting the project director.

Sincerely,

Dr. William A. Poppen
Faculty Director of the Project
The University of Tennessee

Susan W. Miller
Candidate for the M.S. Degree
Project Director
The University of Tennessee

I give permission for _____
(name of son/daughter) to participate in the project outlined above.

(Signature of Parent or Guardian)

VITA

Susan Lynn Wilson Miller was born in Detroit, Michigan, on July 21, 1954. She attended elementary and secondary school in Fairfax, Virginia, and was graduated from W. T. Woodson High School in 1972. During December 1976, she received her Bachelor of Science degree in Elementary Education and Education for the Emotionally Disturbed from James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia. Upon graduation from college, she taught learning disabled children in Woodbridge, Virginia. Following her marriage to George P. Miller, III on August 27, 1977, she relocated to Maryville, Tennessee, where she was employed for two years as a resident director at Maryville, College.

In January 1980, soon after moving to Athens, Tennessee, she entered the Graduate School at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. She received the Master of Science degree with a major in Guidance in August 1981.