ABSTRACT
        Traditionally, "masculine" males and "feminine"
females are seen as being the most mentally healthy individuals.
Recently this view has been challenged by Sandra Bem and other
researchers in the area of sex role identity. Bem (1975) maintains
that those individuals whose behavioral and emotional repertoires
incorporate aspects of both masculine and feminine behaviors are more
likely to display adaptive behaviors across a variety of situations.
However, Block (1973) has posited that sex role development proceeds
in an invariant sequence through the stages of gender identity and
self-enhancement, to stages of conformity to external sex role
standards and eventually internalized sex role standards, through
stages of sex role differentation and, finally, androgyny. One's sex
role orientation would be one aspect of one's general personality
development. If this is so, it should be possible to predict an
individual's sex role orientation from his or her general personality
development. To test this hypothesis, 21 subjects (15 females and six
males) were administered the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) and
Loevinger's sentence completion test. Subsequently, all subjects were
individually administered Kohlberg interviews of moral development.
Since there were not enough subjects to allow the use of sample
medians in order to assign subjects to sex role orientation, scores
on the masculine and feminine scales as the dependent variables were
utilized. No significant results were obtained, probably due to the
serious problems surrounding the androgyny instrumentation.
Preliminary evidence from a related study also brings into question
the validity of self-reports obtained with this instrument. It thus
appears premature to dismiss a developmental hypothesis of sex role
development. With the resolution of instrumentation issues in this
area it is hoped that the development of sex role orientation can be
more fully studied from a developmental perspective. (Author/CKJ)

Androgyny and Moral and Ego Development

Dov Liberman
John P. Gaa

University of Houston

Running Head: Androgyny, Moral and Ego Development

Androgyny and Moral and Ego Development

Traditionally the well-adjusted person has been viewed as one who has attained a sex appropriate sex role. "Masculine" males and "feminine" females were seen as being the most mentally healthy individuals. Recently this view has been challenged by Sandra Bem and other researchers in the area of sex role identity. Bem (1975) has maintained that those individuals whose behavioral and emotional repetoires incorporate aspects of both masculine and feminine behaviors (Bem labels this an androjynous sex role orien- tation) are more ikely to display adaptive behaviors across a variety of situations.

In addition to arguing for the desirability of an androgynous sex role orientation, Bem main...ins that all behavioral and emotional differences between the sexes are the result of learning, influenced by differing socialization patterns (Bem, 1976). Indeed, she implies that bisexuality is "natural" and that exclusive sexual preference for members of one sex or the other is the result of societal pressure.

However, there have been those who have advocated a different approach to viewing sex role development. Block (1973) has pointed out that sex role development could be usefully examined as a part of ego development, as conceptualized by Loevinger (Loevinger and Wessler, 1970). She has posited the development of sex role through a series of stages, with each stage being an extrapolation from one of Loevinger's stages of ego development. According to this explana- tion, sex role development would proceed in an invariant sequence

through the stages of: gender identity and self-enhancement
(paralleling ego levels I-2 and Delta), to stages of conformity
to external sex role standards and eventually internalized sex
role standards (paralleling ego levels I-3 and I-4), through
stages of sex role differentation and, finally, androgyny (paral-
leling ego levels I-5 and I-6).

This development from pre-conformist levels through conformist
levels, and finally to a post-conformist level of functioning
has also been noted by Kohlberg (1969) in his description of moral
development.

It can be seen that viewing an androgynous sex role orientation
as the outcome of a developmental sequence provides a very differ-
ent perspective from that proposed by Bem. A developmental per-
spective would maintain that individuals must go through a period
of sex role stereotypy as a necessary prerequisite to developing
an androgynous sex role orientation. Furthermore, one's sex role
orientation would be seen as being an aspect of one's general
personality development. If this latter point were true, it should
be prossible to predict an individual's sex role orientation from
his or her general personality development. This study was under-
taken in order to examine that hypothesis.

Method

In order to test this hypothesis, 21 subjects (15 females
and six males) were administered the Bem Sex role Inventory (BSRI)
and Loevinger's sentence completion test. Instrument order was
varied randomly in order to avoid position effect. Subsequently,
all subjects were individually adminstered Kohlberg interviews

of moral development. The two developmental measures were scored
by independent raters. The ego development protocols, scored by
a rater trained by Loevinger, categorized subjects with regard to
ego level. The moral development interviews, scored by a rater
trained by Kohlberg, assigned each subject a level of moral develop-
ment. Additionally, in accordance with a new scoring procedure
developed by Kohlberg, each protocol was assigned a numeric value,
which was used in the analysis.

In scoring the BSRI, subjects were not assigned sex role cate-
gories based on obtained scores on the nasucline and feminine
scales of the BSRI. This decision was made because scores obtained
on the BSRI were higher than those reported by Bem. In fact,
scoring the protocols in accordance with the most recent procedures
advocated by Bem (Bem, 1976), and using norms which she obtained
with her subjects, would have resulted in virtually all subjects
being classified as androgynous. Since there were not enough
subjects in our sample to allow the use of sample medians in order
to assign subjects to sex role orientation, it was decied to use
scores on the masculine and feminine scales as the dependent variables.
Since it is necessary to attain high scores on both scales in order
to be classified as androgynous, it was hypothesized that those
individuals who had obtained the highest scores on the developmental
measures would also obtain the high scores on the two BSRI scales.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was employed, in
which scores on the two developmental measures were used to predict
scores on the BSRI. In accordance with Bem's original scoring
procedure for the BSRI, the difference between scores on the
masculine and feminine scales were also calculated and used as
an additional dependent variable in the regression equation. For
the sake of completeness, an additional regression analyis was
performed in which the sex of the subject was also employed as a
predictor variable.

Results and Conclusion

   The inter-correlation matrix of the variables of interest is
presented in Table 1. As can be seen, there is a high correlation

----
         Insert Table 1 About Here
----

between the ego development and moral development measures (.73).
This finding is theoretically consistent and lends some confidence
to the reliability of the two measures. The Multiple R, for both
partial and full models, was not significant in all cases. Thus,
in no case were scores on the independent variables able to signi-
ficantly predict scores on the dependent variable.

   When examining these findings, one can turn to eith r theoreti-
cal or instrumentation considerations in order to explain the failure
to obtain significant results. As pointed out by other reports
delivered at this symposium (Gaa and Liberman, 1978; Edwards,
Gaa and Liberman, 1978) there seem to be serious problems surrounding
the androgyny instrumentation. Factor analysis of the BSRI often

yields factors which include items from more than one of the sub-scales. In addition the median scores obtained on the masculine and feminine scales appear to vary considerably from sample to sample (As pointed out above, for the sample used in this experiment, median scores were higher than those obtained by Bem), making a person's sex role categorization at least partially dependent upon the other individuals with whom he or she is being tested. Furthermore, preliminary evidence from a related study indicates the possibility of a response bias operating in relation to the BSRI, and thei by brings in to question the validity of self-reports obtained with this insturment.

Because of these concerns, it would appear to be premature to dismiss a developmental hypothesis of sex role development. Indeed, the description by Bem of the functioning of an androgynous person and Loevinger's descriptions of individuals functioning at the higher levels of ego development are similar enough to warrant further investigation into this line of inquiry. With the resolution of instrumentation issues in this area it is hoped that the development of sex role orientation can be more fully studied from a developmental perspective.

References

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny,
The Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 19
42, No. 2, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psycho-
logical androgyny, Journal of Personality and Social Psy-
chology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S. L. Probing the promise of androgyny, In Beyond Sex Role
Stereotypes: Readings Toward a Psychology of Androgyny,
Kaplan, A. G. and Bean, J. P. (eds.), Little Brown, Boston,
1976.

Bem, S. L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing
psychological androgyny, Journal of Consulting and Clinical
Psychology, 1977, 45, No. 2, 196-205.

Block, J. H. Conception of sex role: Some cross-cultural and
longitudinal perspective, American Psychologist, 1973, 512-526.

Edwards, T. A., Gaa, J. P., and Liberman, D. A factor analysis of
the BSRI and the PAQ. Paper presented at the annual meeting
of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario,
Canada, August, 1978.

Gaa, J. P. and Liberman, D. Comparison of categorical assignments
of the BSRI and the PAQ. Paper presented at the annual meeting
of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario,
Canada, August, 1978.

Konlberg, L. Stages in the Developmental of Moral Thought and
Action. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1969.

Leovinger, J. and Wessler, R. Measuring Ego Development,
Vol. 1, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1970.

Table I

Inter-Correlation Matrix
of Variables

	Sex	Masc	Fem	Diff	Kohl	Loev
Sex	1.00000	-0.39473	0.18287	-0.23585	-0.01429	-0.08758
Masculinity	-0.39473	1.00000	0.01970	-0.28837	0.05935	0.02885
Femininity	0.18287	0.01970	1.00000	0.61968	0.23047	0.29109
Difference	-0.23585	-0.28837	0.61968	1.00000	0.24499	0.39646
Kohlberg	-0.01429	0.05935	0.23047	0.24499	1.00000	0.73150
Loevinger	-0.08758	0.02885	0.29109	0.39646	0.73150	1.00000