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ABSTRACT

The present study was an attempt to investigate possible differences among college women of different sex-role orientations in levels of ego identity and intimacy. Subjects were 112 females from Introductory Psychology classes. The Bem Sex Role Inventory, The Ego Identity Scale, and the Intimacy Status Interview were used to assess sex-role orientation, identity achievement, and intimacy status. On the basis of previous theory and research, two hypotheses were made. The first hypothesis was that masculine and androgynous women would show higher levels of identity achievement, and this hypothesis was confirmed. The second hypothesis, that feminine women would show higher levels of intimacy, was not confirmed. On the contrary, masculine and androgynous women tended to show higher levels of intimacy as well as identity achievement. The significance of results found are discussed in the context of Erikson's theory of psychosocial development, and suggestions for further research are made.
Sex Roles, Ego Identity, and Intimacy in College Women
INTRODUCTION

The most important task facing the adolescent or young adult, according to Erikson (1959), is the development of a sense of ego identity. Fifth in Erikson's eight stages of psychosocial development, ego identity is "the inner capital accrued from all those experiences of each successive stage, when successful identification led to a successful alignment of the individual's basic drives with his endowment and his opportunities" (1959, p. 89). The development of a sense of ego identity thus bridges the gap between childhood stages and later stages involving various social roles with which the adolescent must deal.

The counterpart of ego identity is identity diffusion (or role confusion). The majority of adolescents falling in this state are characterized by an inability to make a decision concerning occupational roles. Successful resolution of the stage involves development of a sense of consistency between the self-image and how the adolescent appears to others and the ability to connect previously learned roles and skills with occupational models presently available.

When young adults enter the succeeding stage of psychosocial development, intimacy vs. isolation, the degree to which they will be willing to fuse their own identities with those of others depends upon strength acquired in the previous stage. Intimacy involves the capacity to commit oneself to strong friendships and partnerships and to
develop an ethical sense of loyalty to these commitments regardless of whatever sacrifices and/or comprises have to be made.

The counterpart of intimacy involves a fear of ego loss through involvement with others and may result in either a deep sense of isolation or, at best, involvement in either stereotyped, formalized relationships or relationships with improbable partners which are repeatedly attempted and failed. Thus, one who has not developed an adequate sense of identity will not be able to experience true intimacy: close friendships, mutual commitments, and sexual unions will be avoided.

Erikson's theory of psychosocial development was originally conceived in the context of male development. Erikson has some difficulty applying a theory of identity to females, especially with the ever-increasing changes in women's attitudes toward equality with men. As Erikson states: "Where dominant identities depend on being dominant it is hard to grant real equality to the dominated" (1968, p. 264). In other words, the male identity assumes a role as protector of the female species; and, therefore, the two genders cannot have equivalent identities.

Erikson's (1968) attitude toward the traditional woman involves the concept of inner space. History has shown that while men have emphasized "outer space" concerns of acting upon the world, women have exhibited "inner space" concerns of relating to the world. Erikson states that psychoanalytic theory accounts for these sex differences in social behavior by attributing them to different genital configurations: the intrusive male organ complements action-oriented behavior, whereas the receptive female organ complements communal behavior.
Adolescence allows the maturing woman a time to be less concerned with communal behavior and to experiment with activities more traditionally associated with males. However, Erikson believes that much of the average woman's identity is defined "in her kind of attractiveness and in the selective nature of her search for the man (or men) by whom she wishes to be sought" (1968, p. 283). Although she may postpone this phase while trying out roles as worker and citizen, "womanhood arrives when attractiveness and experience have succeeded in selecting what is to be admitted to the welcome of the inner space 'for keeps'" (1968, p. 283). A woman's long-range goals are those of wife and mother because these are her natural, biological predispositions. It would thus appear that the traditional woman described by Erikson may be primarily concerned with resolution of intimacy issues rather than identity because intimacy, in part, determines her identity.

Douvan and Adelson (1966) have suggested that most young women expect to combine some type of occupation with their role as wife and mother, but the occupational sphere is seen as a means of making them feel more competent rather than being a source of life meaning. Since their research, the number of women accepting this traditional view seems to have steadily declined. The increasing number of nontraditional women may indicate a general shift in the socialization process of women, which would consequently affect psychosocial development. Whether a woman accepts a traditional or nontraditional sex-role orientation would appear to affect which psychosocial stage is considered more important --- identity or intimacy.

The Eriksonian hypothesis that identity must precede intimacy has been supported to some degree by several studies with males (Kinsler,
Note 5; Constantinople, 1969; Orlofsky, Marcia, and Lesser, 1973) and one study using both males and females (Kacerguis and Adams, 1980). However, these studies have supported this hypothesis only to the extent of showing that higher levels of identity development were typically, but not always, associated with higher levels of intimacy. Thus, identity formation "may be a sufficient but not necessary prerequisite to the development of intimate relationships among adolescents and young adults" (Kacerguis and Adams, 1980, p. 124).

Hodgson (Note 4) has shown that men are more advanced in intrapersonal identity and that women are more advanced in interpersonal identity, as well as further along in the achievement of intimacy. This study might suggest that the psychosocial developmental sequence inherent in Erikson's theory is either reversed in females or not directly applicable to them.

Some researchers believe that the identity and intimacy stages are probably merged for women and that their identity thus develops at a deeper and less obvious level (Josselson, Greenberger, and McConochie, 1977). Marcia (in Adelson, 1980) believes that the identity formation process takes longer for women because of the social expectations related to marriage and childrearing. Again, the confounding factor appears to be whether the adolescent woman is ultimately interested in traditional issues of establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships or in nontraditional issues of occupation and politics. Interpersonal conflict associated with life decisions may interfere with traditional female concerns of maintaining relationships, which is important to their identities. O'Connell (1976), studying 30- to 58-year-old women, found that traditional women seemed to have undergone a moratorium in the development of personal identity.
during childrearing and only after childrearing did they begin to develop a personal identity. Nontraditional women showed a strong sense of identity throughout all portions of the life cycle, and all women showed an increase in identity during the first married stage.

The most comprehensive empirical method for studying Erikson's identity concepts was developed by Marcia (1966). On the basis of a semistructured interview, he denotes four separate classifications of the manner in which an adolescent deals with the issue of identity. These four statuses are defined in terms of the presence or absence of a crisis (decision-making period) and the degree of personal commitment. Individuals in the Identity Achievement status have experienced a decision-making period and are pursuing self-chosen occupational and ideological goals. Those in a Foreclosure status are committed to occupational and ideological goals which are parentally chosen and not arrived at through a decision-making period of their own. The Identity Diffusion status includes individuals who have not set goals, regardless of whether or not they are experiencing a decision-making period. The Moratorium status describes individuals currently struggling with occupational and/or ideological issues who are considered to be in an identity crisis.

Marcia's work, like Erikson's, was originally developed for use with males but was extended to include females. Interview questions originally concerned with occupation, religion, and politics were added by questions about premarital sex (Marcia and Friedman, 1970). Subsequent studies have shown the importance of the sexual area in women's identities (Schenkel and Marcia, 1972; Poppen, Note 8; Waterman and Nevid, 1977), as more females than males have experienced crises and made commitments in this area.
Several studies have shown that the pattern of identity achievement is different for males and females (Newman and Newman, 1978; Rothman, 1978; Orlofsky, 1978), and Matteson (1977) has shown that there is no clear evidence for a developmental progression through the statuses for female subjects as there is for male subjects. The above researchers have shown that patterns of status groupings for male and female subjects differ on certain personality variables: females in commitment-related statuses (foreclosure and identity achievement) and males in crisis-related statuses (moratorium and identity achievement) reflect more desirable personality traits. Thus, it appears that identity formation is different for males and females and that one cannot compare female identity to that of males using a measure designed primarily for the latter. Capasso (Note 1) has criticized Marcia's interview questions for this reason. Occupational questions are concerned solely with the choice of a major and career and do not explore the traditional roles of wife and mother. She also notes that while premarital intercourse may be of primary concern to women, it does not seem to tap the pronounced affiliative needs of women. It would thus appear that the identity status interview is appropriate only for women with nontraditional views which more closely approximate those of males.

Orlofsky, Marcia, and Lesser (1973) have developed the most comprehensive method of studying the Eriksonian concept of intimacy. Subjects are placed in an intimacy status on the basis of their responses to a semistructured interview assessing depth and mutuality of same- and opposite-sex interpersonal relationships. Also originally developed for use with males, the intimacy interview and statuses have been revised for use with females (Levitz, Note 6).
Female subjects are placed in one of seven intimacy statuses, which are grouped into four main statuses for the purpose of analysis. The Isolate individual has no close relationships with peers and is characterized by a marked constriction of life space. The Stereotyped Relationships individual has friends and dating relationships but is characterized by moderate constriction, shallowness, and paucity of self-awareness. The Pseudointimate has established a long-term heterosexual relationship which tends to be shallow and superficial and, for this reason, is considered to be a subgroup of the Stereotyped Relationships status. The Merger individual is characterized by high involvement to the point of enmeshment and dependency on others and is subdivided into Committed and Uncommitted statuses, depending on whether or not she has established a long-term heterosexual relationship. The Preintimate individual has one or more close friends but has not established an enduring heterosexual relationship and is characterized by a good deal of self-awareness and genuine interest in others. She is considered to be a subdivision of the Intimate status, which is further characterized by commitment to a long-term heterosexual relationship.

Research with women comparing relationships between identity and intimacy statuses is both limited and ambiguous. As stated previously, the Kacerguis and Adams (1980) study showed that high levels of identity are typically, but not always, associated with high levels of intimacy. Their study used both males and females. The only study found using solely women (Prager, Note 9) showed that intimacy was not related to any of the variables being investigated, one of which was identity.
The need for more research in this area is clearly indicated, and it appeared that studying the two issues of intimacy and identity within the context of a woman's sex-role orientation was one way of providing more information and perhaps clarifying things to some extent.

Using Marcia's category system, it has been found that women adopting a traditional feminine role are associated with a foreclosed identity status (Capasso, Note 1; Meissner, Zuitowski, and Waterman, Note 7; Fannin, Note 2). More nontraditional women have been represented in Identity Diffusion and Moratorium statuses in earlier research and in Moratorium and Identity Achievement statuses in more recent research (Capasso, Note 1; Greenhouse, Note 3; Prager, Note 9; Orlofsky, 1977). A question arises as to how adaptive the Foreclosure and Moratorium statuses are for women. Ambiguity of results found thus far for status groupings by sex roles might reflect a shift toward increasing stability associated with nontraditional roles, but the question of applicability of Marcia's categories to women probably precludes this explanation.

Matteson (1977) has discussed several limitations of Marcia's category system. Categories do not allow for a distinction between process and outcome of identity, have not been well-designed for analyses of sex differences, do not point out differences in content areas, and do not allow for measurement along a continuum. It would thus appear that while Marcia's system provides a more in-depth approach to identity formation, a measure of identity achievement which may be more appropriate for females would provide a continuous measure of the variable.

Several paper-and-pencil measures of identity achievement have
been developed as alternative measures for assessing ego identity (Marcia, 1966; Simmons, 1973; Rasmussen, 1964; Constantinople, 1969; Tan, Kendis, Fine, and Porac, 1977). Tan et al.'s Ego Identity Scale, unlike the other measures, does not confuse Foreclosures with Identity Achievements (because of their commitment) at the high end of the continuum.

The use of a measure of identity achievement other than Marcia's category system has yet to be examined in relationship to either intimacy or sex-role orientation. Using Marcia's category system of identity measurement, Orlofsky (1977) found a significant relationship between sex-role orientation and identity. Women with nontraditional sex-role orientations were associated with Identity Achievement and Moratorium statuses, and feminine women were associated with Foreclosure and Moratorium statuses. Women with no prominent sex-role orientation were associated with the Diffusion status.

Since the relationship between identity and intimacy is so ambiguous for women, it seems essential that they be examined together. The present study was designed to examine both concepts of identity and intimacy in college women within the context of their sex-role orientation.

Using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI, Bem, 1974), a traditional woman was defined as one who endorses a feminine sex-role orientation on the BSRI; and a nontraditional woman was defined as one who endorses either a masculine or androgynous sex-role orientation on the BSRI. A masculine individual has cross-sex-typed traits and an androgynous individual has both high masculine and feminine traits. An individual with no strong sex-role orientation, or low masculine and feminine traits, is classified as undifferentiated.
In terms of the BSRI's applicability to traditional and nontraditional women, a study by Harris and Schwab (1979) showed that certain personality traits on the California Personality Inventory correlated highly with sex-typed and androgynous scores on the BSRI. Sex-typed females showed personality traits associated with traditional sex-role stereotypes (e.g., well-being, socialization, and communality), and androgynous females showed both masculine and feminine traits.

The BSRI was one of the first sex-role inventories designed to measure masculinity and femininity as independent personality dimensions and androgyny as a combination of these traits. All items are considered positively-valued traits for both sexes. However, Puglisi (1980) found that the mean social desirability of the masculinity subscale was higher than that of the femininity subscale and eliminated this discrepancy by replacing three items on the femininity subscale with more socially desirable ones.

There are several other sex-role inventories available (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp, 1974; Berzins, Welling, and Wetter, 1978; Heilbrun, 1976), but the BSRI seems to be the predominant instrument used in current research. Correlations between these scales are relatively high in terms of scale scores (Spence and Helmreich, 1978; Wiggins and Holzmuller, 1978; Berzins et al., 1978), but there is less agreement among them in terms of categories (Kelly, Furman, and Young, 1978; Cayton, Havu, Ozmon, and Tavormina, 1977). Similarities are thus decreased when scale scores are reduced to the broad typologies of categories, and several researchers (Kelly and Worell, 1977; Bem, 1977; Strahan, 1975) therefore suggest that scale scores be used in analyzing results from these tests.
Since it is proposed that Marcia's categories may not be suitable for females, the present study investigated the relationship between sex-role orientation and identity using the BSRI and Tan's Ego Identity Scale. It was hypothesized that masculine and androgynous (nontraditional) women would score higher on identity achievement than feminine (traditional) women, because of the nature of their concerns. Nontraditional women should show similarities with males by being more concerned with intrapersonal identity; and traditional, feminine women should be more concerned with interpersonal issues and developing a sense of intimacy.

Some support for these hypotheses may be inferred from a study by Kendis and Tan (1978), which found that identity achievement in female college students was negatively correlated with evaluation of mothers and perception of mothers as democratic. Girls with high ego identity scores also evaluated their fathers more highly than their mothers and also perceived them as more democratic. This might suggest that identity achievement involves some degree of masculine identification and adoption of masculine sex-role traits.

The purpose of the present study was thus to examine the psycho-social concepts of identity and intimacy as they apply to traditional and nontraditional women. Using Tan et al.'s Ego Identity Scale and Orlofsky et al.'s Intimacy Status Interview, it was hypothesized that nontraditional (masculine and androgynous) women would show higher levels of identity achievement and traditional (feminine) women would show higher levels of intimacy.
METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 112 female undergraduates from Introductory Psychology classes who were given credit for their participation in the study. There were 63 Freshman, 29 Sophomores, 18 Juniors, and two Seniors who participated. All subjects were assigned a code number to ensure anonymity.

Measures

**Ego Identity.** Ego identity was assessed by Tan et al.'s (1977) Ego Identity Scale. The Ego Identity Scale consists of 12 forced-choice items dealing with psychosocial issues relevant to identity achievement (see Appendix A). The Ego Identity Scale has the advantages of being short, objective, and easily scored. Split-half reliability for the scale is .68, and construct validity for the scale has been established using other psychosocial variables (Tan et al., 1977).

**Intimacy Status.** Orlofsky, Marcia, and Lesser's (1973) Intimacy Status Interview, revised for females by Levitz (Note 6), was used to assess level of intimacy. Subjects were placed in one of seven intimacy statuses (Isolate, Stereotyped Relationships, Pseudointimate, Merger Uncommitted, Merger Committed, Preintimate, or Intimate) on the basis of their responses to semistructured interview questions about same-sex and opposite-sex relationships (see Appendix B). The intimacy statuses (described in Appendix C) were grouped into four main statuses for some of the analyses: Isolate, Stereotyped Relationships
(includes Pseudointimate), Merger (Uncommitted and Committed), and Intimate (includes Preintimate). Validity has been established for the male intimacy statuses using questionnaire measures (Orlofsky et al., 1973) and behavioral measures (Orlofsky, 1976).

**Sex-Role Orientation.** The Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) was used to assess sex-role orientation. The BSRI consists of 60 adjectives, each of which an individual rates on a scale from one to seven for purposes of self-description (see Appendix D). The BSRI yields masculine, feminine, androgynous, and neutral (social desirability) scores; and subjects can be categorized as masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated on the basis of these scores. Disagreements among researchers on scoring of the BSRI concern differences in determining categories and "cutoff" points for them (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp, 1975; Bem, 1977; Kelly and Worell, 1977). Use of the scaled scores does not present this problem. When categorization is necessary, however, the most suitable method for scoring the BSRI seems to be that used by Orlofsky, Aslin, and Ginsburg (1977), which involves a combination of procedures employed by previous researchers (namely, the difference score and the median split). Both scale scores and categories were used in the present study, and Orlofsky et al.'s method of scoring the BSRI was used because it has been proven to be more effective in determining sex-role orientation in females than Bem's (1974) original procedure (Orlofsky et al., 1977). Scale scores were derived for masculinity, femininity, androgyny, and social desirability. From these scale scores, sex role categories of masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated were derived. Subjects were categorized as: masculine if the difference between their masculinity and femininity scores
(multiplied by a constant of 2.332) was less than -1, feminine if the difference was greater than +1, and androgynous if the difference was within the ±1 range. Subjects in the androgynous range who had both masculinity and femininity scores below the median for each scale were categorized as undifferentiated.

Procedure

Subjects were told that the investigator was a graduate student conducting research on psychosocial development in women. They were informed that they would be completing two brief questionnaires and answering interview questions, pertaining to their friendships and relationships, which would be tape-recorded. They were also told that their data would remain anonymous. After signing a consent form, they were given the Ego Identity Scale, the Intimacy Status Interview, and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The order of presentation of stimulus materials was randomly counterbalanced across subjects. Subjects were tested individually, and each testing session lasted approximately 45 minutes. All data were assigned a code number to preserve anonymity. To reduce any effects that different interviewers might have had, the author was the only interviewer and was blind to the subjects' sex-role orientations and ego identity scores until the interviews had been rated. Each interview was tape-recorded and rated by the author according to criteria set forth by Orlofsky, Marcia, and Lesser (1973) and Levitz (Note 6). A random sample of ten interviews were blindly rated by two other male judges. Interrater reliability for the ten interviews judged was 100% for two out of three judges but only 20% for unanimous agreement. Percentage of agreement between raters in previous studies has been around 70% for unanimous agreement and about 90% for two out of three judges (Orlofsky et al., 1973; Orlofsky, 1976; Kacerguis and Adams, 1980).
RESULTS

To test hypothesized relationships between sex-role orientation, ego identity, and intimacy, several analyses were done. Although masculine and androgynous women are both considered nontraditional, the two groups were separated in preliminary analyses to check for differences. The two groups were collapsed when differences between sex-role groups were not significant alone.

Spearman correlation coefficients were obtained for the following variables: ego identity; intimacy; masculinity, femininity, androgynous, and neutral scores; and class. Significant correlations found were: ego identity with intimacy ($r = .20$, $p < .02$), ego identity with masculinity ($r = .48$, $p < .001$), ego identity with androgyny ($r = -.36$, $p < .001$), ego identity with social desirability ($r = .28$, $p < .002$), intimacy with masculinity ($r = .18$, $p < .03$), femininity with social desirability ($r = .36$, $p < .001$), and androgyny with social desirability ($r = .16$, $p < .05$). Since the absolute values of the androgyny scores were not used in computing the correlations, negative masculine scores affected the correlations. The negative androgynous scores of masculine individuals would account for the negative correlation between ego identity and androgyny and should therefore be viewed as a positive correlation instead. Table 1 represents the correlations obtained.

In order to assess the effects of sex-role orientation on levels of identity and intimacy, two one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were done using sex-role orientation (masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated) as an independent variable and identity and
Table 1
Correlation Coefficients for Ego Identity, Intimacy, BSRI Scores, and Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EI (^a) with INT (^b)</th>
<th>EI with M (^c)</th>
<th>EI with Pd</th>
<th>EI with A (^e)</th>
<th>EI with SD</th>
<th>EI with Class</th>
<th>INT with M</th>
<th>INT with F</th>
<th>INT with A</th>
<th>INT with SD</th>
<th>INT with Class</th>
<th>M with SD</th>
<th>M with Class</th>
<th>P with SD</th>
<th>P with Class</th>
<th>A with SD</th>
<th>A with Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.20(^*)</td>
<td>.48(^{**})</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.36(^{***})</td>
<td>.28(^{**})</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18(^*)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.36(^{***})</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.16(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) EI = ego identity.
\(^{b}\) INT = intimacy.
\(^{c}\) M = masculinity.
\(^{d}\) P = femininity.
\(^{e}\) A = androgyny.
\(^{f}\) SD = social desirability.

\(^\star\) \(P < .05\).
\(^{\star\star}\) \(P < .01\).
\(^{\star\star\star}\) \(P < .001\).
intimacy as dependent variables. Intimacy statuses were given a value from one to seven: Isolate = 1, Stereotyped Relationships = 2, Pseudo-intimate = 3, Merger Uncommitted = 4, Merger Committed = 5, Preintimate = 6, and Intimate = 7. Orlofsky et al. (1973) have shown the intimacy statuses to vary in degree of intimacy from isolate to intimate, and Kacerguis and Adams (1980) analyzed their data on the intimacy statuses in this manner. These studies did not, however, include the Merger statuses, which were added in the revised manual for females (Levitz, Note 6). Post-hoc analyses for comparisons among means, using Duncan's Multiple Range Test, revealed that androgynous and masculine women were significantly higher in ego identity than feminine or undifferentiated women ($F = 6.64, df = 3/108, p < .0004$). There were no differences among the sex-role groups on level of intimacy ($F = 1.27, df = 3/108, p < .29$). An analysis of variance was also done to determine differences among the sex-role groups on social desirability. Androgynous individuals were significantly higher in social desirability than the other groups ($F = 3.43, df = 3/108, p < .02$). An analysis of covariance was therefore done for the four sex-role groups on the ego identity variable, using social desirability as the covariate, and the significance of the differences was not altered. Mean scores for the four sex-role groups on identity, intimacy, and social desirability variables are included in Tables 2 - 4.

Using sex-role orientation as a type of moderator variable for identity and intimacy variables, nonparametric Spearman correlations were computed for each sex-role group. For masculine individuals, the correlation between identity and intimacy was not significant ($r = .20, p < .22$). Feminine individuals also did not exhibit a significant relationship ($r = .14, p < .14$). Androgynous individuals exhibited a
Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Sex Role Groups on Ego Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Sex Role Groups on Intimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Sex Role Groups on Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relationship which approached significance ($r = .32, p < .06$). Since androgynous and masculine individuals showed similar levels of identity, they were combined in the same type of analysis, yielding a significant correlation ($r = .27, p < .03$). These correlations and the sample sizes of each group are included in Table 5.

Chi-square values were computed among combinations of high and low levels of identity and intimacy in order to determine if there were differences not evident in the above correlations. These tables were also designed to examine the possibility of co-existing levels of high intimacy and low identity. In order to establish high and low levels of identity, a median split was done: all individuals with a median score of 8 ($n = 25$) on the identity scale were excluded from the analysis. Chi-square values were computed using the four major intimacy statuses: Isolate, Stereotyped Relationships, Merger, and Intimate. An attempt was made to compute coefficients using only high and low levels of intimacy as well. The latter analysis required using a median split and excluding individuals in the Merger statuses ($n = 32$), since they composed the group with the median value of 4.5. This yielded cell sizes which were too small for computing chi-square values, with the exception of the feminine sex-role group. Since chi-square tables were done for each sex-role group, cell sizes were still extremely small in most cases, and none of the results were significant. For the masculine individuals, $\chi^2 = 4.74, df = 3, p < .19$. For feminine individuals, $\chi^2 = 4.69, df = 3, p < .19$. For feminine individuals in high and low levels of intimacy, $\chi^2 = 2.22, df = 1, p < .14$. For androgynous individuals, $\chi^2 = 2.27, df = 2, p < .32$. There were not enough subjects in the undifferentiated group to compute a chi-square
Table 5

Spearman Correlation Coefficients:
Ego Identity with Intimacy for Sex Role Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine &amp; Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
value (n = 8). Again, masculine and androgynous individuals were analyzed together, yielding a value which approached significance ($\chi^2 = 6.37, df = 3, p < .09$). Tables 6 - 10 exhibit the above frequencies.
Table 6

Frequencies of High/Low Ego Identity by Intimacy: Masculine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego Identity Level</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Stereotyped</th>
<th>Merger</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Frequencies of High/Low Ego Identity
by Intimacy: Feminine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego Identity Level</th>
<th>Intimacy Level</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Stereotyped</th>
<th>Merger</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Frequencies of High/Low Ego Identity by High/Low Intimacy: Feminine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego Identity Level</th>
<th>Intimacy Level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Frequencies of High/Low Ego Identity by Intimacy: Androgynous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego Identity Level</th>
<th>Intimacy Level</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Stereotyped</th>
<th>Merger</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Frequencies of High/Low Ego Identity by Intimacy: Androgynous & Masculine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intimacy Level</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Stereotyped</th>
<th>Merger</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Results of the present study supported the hypothesis that masculine and androgynous women would show higher levels of identity achievement. An analysis of variance and comparison among means revealed that masculine and androgynous women were significantly higher in identity achievement than feminine or undifferentiated women. This result replicated the findings of Orlofsky (1977), who used Marcia's category system of identity assessment and also found that masculine and androgynous women were representative of higher levels of identity achievement.

A possible explanation for this finding is the idea that females must make "cross-sex" identifications to achieve a sense of autonomy and independence. Tan and Kendis' (1978) study showed that female identity achievers had positive views of their fathers and negative views of their mothers. On the other hand, it can also be argued that identity achievement is a concept which is traditionally masculine in nature and does not take into account issues important to the traditional female. Therefore, one might only find masculine traits in individuals who ascribe to a role similar to that of males.

Since nontraditional sex roles are becoming increasingly more acceptable, it might be suspected that these roles would be more socially desirable. An analysis of variance and comparison among means for the sex role groups on social desirability did indeed show that androgynous women were higher in social desirability than the other
groups. However, an analysis of covariance, using social desirability as a covariate, showed that ego identity was not affected by social desirability.

A question arises as to what the social desirability scale of the BSRI is actually measuring. In ascribing to positively-valued traits, one may simply be giving an earnest self-evaluation. One facet of identity achievement itself is positive self-value and high self-esteem. One would expect that individuals with high identity achievement do feel positive about their self-images. In fact, Orlofsky's (1977) study also showed that masculine and androgynous women were higher in self-esteem than their traditional peers. This might also explain the correlation between ego identity and social desirability. Again, individuals with high identity achievement scores would seem more likely to have high social desirability scores simply because they view themselves in a highly positive light. The fact that differences among the sex-role groups were not affected by social desirability may provide more weight to this explanation.

Regarding the correlation between ego identity and social desirability, caution should be used in interpreting all significant correlations in the present study. With a large sample (n = 112), one would expect a certain percentage of significant correlations by chance; and most of the correlation sizes are small in spite of their significance.

None of the analyses supported the hypothesis that feminine women would show higher levels of intimacy. On the contrary, some of the analyses suggested that masculine and/or androgynous women were more intimate. This appears to be the case primarily when intimacy is examined with identity. There were no differences among the groups on intimacy
alone. When intimacy was examined in relationship to identity, however, the relationship in nontraditional women was significant and that of traditional women was not. This is reflected in the analysis in which sex-role orientation was used as a moderator variable for correlations between identity and intimacy.

In offering explanations for these findings, it is necessary to review the rationale for why feminine women would be expected to show higher levels of intimacy. Previous research and theory has shown that traditional women are more concerned with interpersonal relationships and caretaking than nontraditional women. In other words, they find these issues more important than nontraditional issues of occupation and politics. However, the quality of their relationships may not be such that it can be termed "true intimacy" in Erikson's sense of the word. Traditional women may be more involved in interpersonal issues and/or find them more important than nontraditional women; but without an adequate level of identity achievement, they may not be able to "give" of themselves as truly intimate people. The quality of their relationships may therefore be either superficial and/or highly dependent.

When these results are applied to Erikson's theory of psychosocial development, it does appear that identity achievement is important for obtaining a sense of intimacy. The relationship seen between identity and intimacy for nontraditional women may suggest a "fusion" of these two issues such that these women tend to work on developing a sense of identity and a sense of intimacy at the same time. One might then question the value of the traditional female role. If identity and intimacy achievement are connected with nontraditional roles, one
might assume that these roles are more "healthy" ones to possess, in terms of psychosocial development. Again, however, one must keep in mind that these are theoretical concepts which are traditionally masculine in nature.

An examination of the chi-square tables shows that nontraditional women were more likely to exhibit high levels of ego identity and intimacy simultaneously. It is also possible, however, to possess a high level of intimacy and a low level of identity. This was especially true for feminine individuals (see Tables 6 - 10). This might place some degree of doubt on the applicability of the sequential invariance of Erikson's psychosocial stages to traditional women.

Another factor which might have influenced the results obtained was the nature of the sample. College students are of the age where they are expected to begin developing a sense of intimacy. Although there were quite a few Preintimate individuals in the present study, there were only a few subjects who were actually rated as Intimate. Of the students who participated in the study, approximately 80% were underclassmen. One might find that, over time, there would be differences in the identity-intimacy relationship such that traditional women would indeed exhibit higher levels of intimacy. It is therefore suggested that further research be done in this area using a population of women in their early to mid-twenties, which is the age range which Erikson applies to the intimacy stage.

In terms of objectively examining the issue of intimacy, it should be noted that it was especially difficult to categorize individuals in an intimacy status. In spite of high interrater reliability for two out of three judges (100%), the rate of unanimous agreement
among judges was quite low (20%). Since most females are relationship-oriented to begin with, it is probably much more difficult to make distinctions between degrees of intimacy than it is for males. Again, the issue of applying concepts developed in the context of males to female development arises.

Regardless of the relevance of applicability of a male theory to females, there does appear to be a distinct difference in the way traditional and nontraditional women approach identity and intimacy issues. If one considers nontraditional women to be more "healthy" in terms of psychosocial development, it is important to investigate the relationship between sex roles and later psychosocial stages. One might expect differential effects of sex roles on these stages, such that a traditional role would facilitate resolution of the generativity issue and a nontraditional role would facilitate ego integrity.
Appendix A

Ego Identity Scale

Adapted from Tan et al. (1977)
BElOW ARE some pairs of statements. Please circle the letter of the statement in each pair that you agree with more. Please respond to every question.

1. a. I enjoy being active in clubs and youth groups.
   b. I prefer to focus on hobbies which I can do on my own time, at my own pace.

2. a. When I daydream, it is primarily about my past experiences.
   b. When I daydream, it is primarily about the future and what it has in store for me.

3. a. No matter how well I do a job, I always end up thinking that I could have done better.
   b. Whenever I complete a job that I have seriously worked on, I usually do not have doubts as to its quality.

4. a. I will generally voice an opinion, even if I appear to be the only one in a group with that point of view.
   b. If I appear to be the only one in a group with a certain opinion, I try to keep quiet in order to avoid feeling self-conscious.

5. a. Generally speaking, a person can keep much better control of himself and of situations if he maintains an emotional distance from others.
   b. A person need not fear loss of control, of himself and of situations, simply because he becomes intimately involved with another person.

6. a. I have doubts as to the kind of person my abilities will enable me to become.
   b. I try to formulate ideas now which will help me achieve my future goals.

7. a. My evaluation of self-worth depends on the success or failure of my behavior in a given situation.
   b. My self-evaluation, while flexible, remains about the same in most situations.

8. a. While there may be disadvantages to competition, I agree that it is sometimes necessary and even good.
   b. I do not enjoy competition, and often do not see the need for it.

9. a. There are times when I don't know what is expected of me.
   b. I have a clear vision of how my life will unfold ahead of me.

10. a. What I demand of myself and what others demand of me are often in conflict.
    b. Most of the time, I don't mind doing what others demand of me because they are things I would probably have done anyway.

11. a. When confronted with a task that I do not particularly enjoy, I find that I usually can discipline myself enough to perform it.
    b. Often, when confronted with a task, I find myself expending my energies on other interesting but unrelated activities instead of concentrating on completing the task.

12. a. Because of my philosophy of life, I have faith in myself, and in society in general.
    b. Because of the uncertain nature of the individual and society, it is natural for me not to have a basic trust in society, in others, or even in myself.
Appendix B

Intimacy Status Interview Questions

Adapted from Lewitz (Note 6)
The following is a list of recommended questions concerning S's relationships with her friends and boyfriends, as well as some general, abstract questions concerning friendship. The list is by no means exhaustive. Nor should the interviewer feel constrained to use all of the questions. The idea is to ask open-ended questions as much as possible, moving to the more specific questions as necessary.

**Intimacy Interview**

I'd like to ask you some questions about your relationships with other people. While I have some specific questions, at any time please feel free to bring up whatever you feel is significant about the kinds of relationships you have with others, important or meaningful incidences which you have experienced in relationships and particular patterns that you have observed in yourself. While I am tape-recording our interview, it is for data analyzing purposes only. Whatever you say here will be kept strictly confidential, so please feel free to express how you feel.

Are you married, engaged or seriously involved with one guy? What is your living situation now? (e.g. with parents, friends, husband etc.?). How is that working out for you?

A.

Are there any friends with whom you're pretty close to now?

If no-

Would you like to have close friends now?

Have you ever been close with friends? If yes - when? Can you tell me about these friendships? Why not close anymore?

What do you think stands in the way of your having close friends?

If yes-

Would you tell me about this (these) relationship(s)? (try to encourage spontaneous descriptions - then as necessary, ask specific questions)

How long have you been close with her (them)?

How often do you get together or contact one another?

How close would you say you are with her (them)?

Describe some of the close experiences you've had (ask for examples).

What kinds of things do you talk about?

Do you ever talk about personal matters (exs)?

Do you discuss your problems with each other? Why or why not? If yes, what do you get from it? (exs.)

Are there any matters that you wouldn't discuss or would be very difficult for you to discuss with them? Why?

Do you do things for each other? Do you go out of your way to help one another? (exs).
The friend you spend the most time with: what in particular do you like or admire about her (What drew you towards her? What is she like? What kind of a person is she?)
What do you dislike about her?
Even good friends can have disagreements or conflicts and get mad at each other. Has this ever happened between you and your friends? If so, what was it about and how was it dealt with? If not, has this happened with previous friends?
Do you consider yourself much of a social person? Do you generally prefer to be with friends or by yourself?
  Do you generally prefer to pursue activities and interests with or apart from friends? (ask for examples of both- e.g., what do you do with friends and what do you do individually?)
  How do you usually spend your evenings, free time?

What does friendship mean to you? What do you value in your friendships?
Do you feel satisfied with your friendships?
What does closeness mean to you? Do you feel you are as close to friends as you would like to be?
Are there any conflicts or concerns or difficulties you experience which keep you from enjoying relationships as much as you would like to which perhaps have not been mentioned yet?

If S is married or otherwise seriously involved with a guy, go to section C - if not continue with section B.

B.
Do you date much?
If no-
Have you ever dated? Have you ever dated one guy exclusively for a period of time?
Would you like to date more?
Are there any particular reasons why you haven't dated much up to now? (What has gotten in the way?)

Now dating or has dated one guy exclusively -
Have you ever dated or spent time with one person exclusively?
  If yes, inquire into this relationship as follows:
  What was this relationship like (encourage a spontaneous description and ask specific questions as necessary).
    How long were you seeing him?
    What was he like - what did you like, dislike about him?
    What caused the relationship to end? Did you experience any specific conflicts or difficulties around this relationship?
    How did you experience the breakup?
  Do you generally prefer to see several different people, or would you rather have a steady relationship with one guy? Why?
  Would you like to establish an enduring relationship with one person in the near future? Why or why not? Do you feel ready for such a commitment? Why or why not?
  Have you ever met a man with whom you would like to establish an enduring relationship? What was he like? What happened?
If appropriate—
For how long a period of time do you usually date a person?
What do you usually do on a date? (e.g., movies, parties, sit and talk?)
What kinds of things do you like to talk about?
Would you say that you date more for the excitement or the companionship? Which is more important to you at this point?

Some people feel comfortable discussing sexual issues and others don't. Although I don't need to know specific details about your sexual life, I would like to ask some general questions about your attitudes towards sexual involvement.
What are your feelings about sexual involvement before marriage? (e.g. Is there a conflict? How have you resolved the issue?) Would you say you are a physically affectionate kind of person? Do you like expressing your feelings in physical or sexual ways? Do you like others to do so?
How important a part does sex occupy in your relationships with guys?
Do you usually feel satisfied from sexual involvement? What do you feel you get from it?

Are there any conflicts or issues about dating, commitment or sexual involvement which you are dealing with which have not been discussed here?

What is a meaningful or good relationship as you see it? What does it consist of?
How much of that do you feel you've attained?
What kinds of changes would you like to see in the way you relate to others (friends, boyfriends). What kinds of changes would you like to see in the way they relate to you?

C.
You mentioned earlier that you are married (seriously involved with a guy)-
How long have you known him? How long have you been married (involved)?
Have either of you during the period you've been involved dated other people? What were the circumstances? What was the outcome?
Can you describe your relationship? (try to encourage spontaneous description—then as necessary, ask specific questions).
How would you describe your feelings for him? Would you say you are in love with him? How do you think he feels about you?
How close would you say the two of you are? Can you describe some of the experiences in which you've felt closest?
What kinds of things do the two of you talk about?
Do you share your worries and problems with him (ask for examples)? Are you open with him? Do you feel he is open with you?
Is there anything that you couldn't or wouldn't share with him?
What kind of a person is he? What do you like or admire about him? In what ways is he a special person to you?
People sometimes get on each other's nerves in some way or another. Is there anything about him which you dislike or would like to see changed? Do you discuss it with him? Do you ever fight? Is it about particular themes? How does it usually get resolved? (ask for examples)

Is one of you more involved in the relationship or consider the relationship more important than the other? If yes - Is that a source of difficulty? How are you working it out?

Finding one's identity is a big concern for young people now and some people feel concerned about becoming too dependent or too involved in a relationship. Is this a concern for you? (ask S to elaborate). Is jealousy, possessiveness or wanting freedom in the relationship an issue for you or your partner? Do you see these issues getting resolved? How?

What do you see as the major problems or conflicts you two have to work out as a couple?

How do you spend your time together? Do you have mutual friends? Do you pursue interests or friendships separately from your partner? (ask for examples).

Are you happy in this relationship? How does it compare to other relationships you have had?

Where do you want this relationship to go in the future? Have you discussed future plans?

How critical is this relationship to your present and future happiness? What do you think life would be like if you were no longer with your partner? How do you think your partner would handle it?

Some people feel comfortable discussing sexual issues and others don't. Although I don't need to know specific details about your sexual life, I would like to ask some general questions about your attitudes towards sexual involvement.

What are your feelings about sexual involvement before marriage? (e.g. Is (was) there a conflict? How have (had) you resolved the issue?)

Would you say you are a physically affectionate kind of person? Do you like expressing your feelings in physical or sexual ways? Do you like your partner to do so?

How important a part does sex occupy in your relationship? Do you generally feel satisfied with the sexual aspect of your relationship? If not, why not? Have you discussed it with him?

Are there any conflicts or issues about commitment or sexual involvement which you are dealing with which have not been discussed here?

What is a meaningful or good relationship as you see it? What does it consist of?

How much of that do you feel you've attained?

What kinds of changes would you like to see in the way you relate to others (friends, boyfriend or spouse?) What kinds of changes would you like to see in the way they relate to you?
Appendix C

Intimacy Status Descriptions

Adapted from Levitz (Note 6)
Instructions for rating

The following is a description of the way in which these criteria are combined to yield an intimacy status. (Note: When the two ratings are different, the "relationships with boyfriends" rating is weighted more heavily. Otherwise, the overall feeling of the interview is used).

1. Isolate
   a. This individual has no close relationships with peers, her acquaintances tend to be formal and stereotyped.

   This individual may see some peers at school, work or church, but rarely does she talk with them at length or attempt to initiate social contacts. She rarely dates and it is unlikely that she will date the same guy for more than a few times. She may rationalize her lack of dating as a desire to avoid being tied down or as a result of her being too busy. Otherwise she may want to date more but is too uncomfortable on dates or sees herself as too unattractive or otherwise unacceptable for others to be interested in her.

   The isolate tends to be withdrawn and lacking in social skills. She may appear insecure and self-depreciating; or smug, self-satisfied and defensive, living in a world of "splendid isolation" and denying any need or desire to be close to others.

2. Stereotyped Relationships
   a. This individual has friends and dating relationships but has not established a long-term heterosexual commitment.

   b. Her relationships lack openness or deep involvement and communication is at a low level.

   This individual may have several friends whom she sees frequently and enjoys being with. She may describe these relationships as
close. However, there appears to be little real closeness between them. She rarely discusses personal matters or problems with friends; that would be overstepping the implicit bounds of the relationship. To the limited extent that she does share concerns with others, it is only to "gather other viewpoints" or "feel better". She generally prefers to keep conversations on a superficial, impersonal level. Friendships typically mean having a good time or partying with the crowd.

The stereotype individual may date frequently, but rarely does she see the same person for more than a few months. She prefers to play the field, not get too involved and date several people at the same time. Dates are often formal-- parties, movies, sporting events. Seldom are dates spent talking and getting to know one another. The stereotype individual may be sexually inhibited and immature or promiscuous, going from one partner to the other and experiencing sexuality in terms of conquest or excitement. The emphasis in her relationships is on what can be obtained from others rather than on mutuality. The idea of genuine closeness and mutuality appear somewhat foreign to her.

In general, the stereotype individual is characterized by moderate constriction, shallowness and a paucity of self-awareness.

3. Pseudointimate
   a. This individual has established a long-term heterosexual relationship.
   b. This and other relationships lack open communication and deep emotional involvement.

   Like the stereotype individual, the pseudointimate forms
relationships which tend to be superficial. Rarely does she share her personal concerns or innermost feelings with others. Her sense of responsibility to friends and partner are limited. Generally she tells others only what is convenient and is available to hear the other's concerns, feelings and problems only when it is convenient for her. This individual approaches relationships as conveniences in which others are treated as objects which provide status, respectability, material or other external gains. When asked why she married or became engaged, she may reply that others expected it or "it was about time". She appears to live her life in parallel to others, never really meeting or experiencing them. She is limited in her ability to perceive her friends or partner as unique individuals. When asked to describe her man, she may be able to say very little about him or else do so in terms of external characteristics or degree of fun he provides. She may or may not have a satisfactory sexual relationship.

The pseudointimate is generally characterized by shallowness and a lack of self-awareness. She does not appear to value open, honest relationships or is unaware of such a possibility.

4. **Merger (Committed)**
   a. This individual has established a long-term heterosexual relationship.

   b. Her relationships are characterized by high involvement to the point of enmeshment, dependency and unrealistic perceptions of others.

   The committed merger is intensely involved with her partner. In some cases, she is similarly involved with one or two close
friends; in other cases, she has abandoned such relationships for exclusive involvement with her partner. The individual in this status differs from the intimate in that she attempts to gain a sense of self through these relationships. She has difficulty discussing herself or pursuing interests and activities separate from her partner or friends. She is highly dependent on her partner emotionally as well as practically. She tends to look to him to make decisions for her and them. In some cases, she is the more dominant one and attains her sense of self through domination of him. In either case, the individual in this status lacks respect for the autonomy and integrity of the self and others. Satisfaction from the relationship is largely derived by achieving a sense of security, wholeness or direction, feeling taken care of and avoiding feeling alone and empty. While not necessarily happy in the relationship or in love with her partner, she would find its termination intolerable.

The committed merger may unrealistically idealize her partner, whom she is eager to please. Or else she may devalue him as weak, passive, dependent, possessive, insecure etc. An alternation between these two positions may also be evidenced. The committed merger has difficulty absorbing frustrations in the relationship and working out conflicts in an equitable way.

The individual in this status appears quite needful and may have low self-esteem. While she may be somewhat self-aware and eager to communicate her internal world, she is self-involved and sees others in relation to herself.
5. **Merger (Uncommitted)**
   
a. This individual has not established a long-term heterosexual relationship.

   b. Her relationships are characterized by high involvement, dependency and unrealistic perceptions of others.

   The uncommitted merger experiences her relationships as extensions of herself. She continually seeks out intensely close encounters through which she can define and experience herself. Her friends may be unrealistically idealized when they meet her expectations and devalued when they disappoint her. For this reason, her relationships may be transient -- i.e. quickly formed and abandoned.

   This individual tends to dwell over such issues or conflicts pertaining to dependency, security, autonomy, entrapment, domination, jealousy, possessiveness and loyalty when discussing her relationships. She may have difficulty with a third party (e.g. a friend's boyfriend) "intruding" on her closeness with her friend.

   Any loss of a close or needed relationship is also described with a great deal of intensity. A friend moving out of town or a breakup with a boyfriend, for example, is extremely painful for the uncommitted merger as she has few internal resources to deal with the loss. The uncommitted merger has trouble enjoying herself or pursuing interests apart from close friends.

   The individual in this status may use her sexuality freely as a means to obtain affection and gratify her needs to be held and cared for. Or else she is fearful of her sexuality and threatened by men who arouse such feelings in her. The merger is still most comfortable in relationships which parallel mother-child mirroring or early adolescent closeness.
Like the committed merger, the individual in this status appears quite needful. She is generally sensitive, communicative and somewhat insightful; yet perceives herself in relation to other people.

6. Preintimate
   a. This individual has one or more close friends, but has not established an enduring heterosexual relationship.
   b. Her relationships are characterized by open communication, affection, caring and respect.

   The preintimate has close friends whom she enjoys being with and sees regularly. She discusses personal concerns with them and is open and sympathetic to their concerns. She values openness and generally wants to know others and be known by them on a deep emotional level.

   The preintimate may or may not date much. Generally, her dating relationships are characterized by the same kind of openness and honesty as her friendships are. She is generally somewhat experienced sexually but has some conflicts in this area. However, her sexual encounters are not primarily conquest or approval seeking. The preintimate is generally somewhat conflicted about commitment, desiring a close sexual relationship, yet feeling not quite ready to form such an attachment. The preintimate has a deep respect for the integrity of others, perceives them in a realistic manner and is on guard against using them for her own gain.

   The preintimate individual has a good deal of self-awareness and a genuine interest in others. She gives the impression of being capable of engaging in an enduring love relationship and being likely to do so at some future time.
7. **Intimate**
   a. This individual has established a long-term heterosexual relationship and made a commitment to the continuation of the relationship.

   b. This relationship and the individual's relationships with friends are characterized by openness of communication, mutual affection and caring, sharing of responsibility and respect for the integrity of the self and others.

   The intimate individual works at developing mutual personal relationships. She shares private worries and problems with her partner and friends and is able to express both angry and affectionate feelings with them. She is open to the other's feelings and problems as well. She has a strong commitment to her partner and works to overcome problems and resolve differences in an equitable way. She perceives her partner and friends as unique individuals and views their limitations and strengths in a realistic way. She enjoys interests and activities with others; however, she also has interests and activities apart from them and respects their individual needs as well. She is not overly dependent on, nor jealous or manipulative of others.

   The intimate individual is characterized by a good deal of self-awareness, genuine interest in others and the absence of significant defensiveness.
Appendix D

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Adapted from Bem (1974)
Below are a number of personality characteristics. Please use these characteristics to describe yourself as you see yourself. Indicate on a scale from 1 to 7 how true each of these characteristics is of you. Please don't leave any of the characteristics unmarked.

Example: Sly

Mark a 1 if it is never or almost never true that you are sly.
Mark a 2 if it is usually not true that you are sly.
Mark a 3 if it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are sly.
Mark a 4 if it is occasionally true that you are sly.
Mark a 5 if it is often true that you are sly.
Mark a 6 if it is usually true that you are sly.
Mark a 7 if it is always or almost always true that you are sly.

Thus, if you feel it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are sly, never or almost never true that you are malicious, always or almost always true that you are responsible, and often true that you are carefree, then you would rate these characteristics as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE</td>
<td>USUALLY NOT TRUE</td>
<td>SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE</td>
<td>OCCASIONALLY TRUE</td>
<td>USUALLY TRUE</td>
<td>OFTEN TRUE</td>
<td>ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sly</td>
<td>Malicious</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Carefree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self reliant</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
<th>Warm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Solemn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Willing to take a stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend own beliefs</td>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td>Tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>Have leadership abilities</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td>Graceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracious</td>
<td>Willing to take risks</td>
<td>Inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Act as a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>Secretive</td>
<td>Charming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td>Make decisions easily</td>
<td>Adaptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatrical</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Do not use harsh language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatterable</td>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>Unsystematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong personality</td>
<td>Conceited</td>
<td>Love children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td>Soft-spoken</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference Notes
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