DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 271   CS 506 137

AUTHOR   Aitken, Joan E.
TITLE   Stephenson's Q Methodology: A Unique Tool for
                Research and Instruction.
PUB DATE   Jun 88
NOTE   35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                Canadian Communication Association (Windsor, Ontario,
                Canada, June 1988). Appendix containing descending
                array of Z-scores may not reproduce clearly.
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information
                Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility
                (142)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Communication Research; Computer Software; Data
                Analysis; Higher Education; Instructional
                Effectiveness; *Personality Assessment; Personality
                Measures; *Q Methodology; *Research Methodology;
                Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS   Intrapersonal Communication; Music Videos; Research
                Curriculum; Research Trends; Stephenson Q
                Methodology

ABSTRACT
        Q methodology, a theory-based research technique
begun by William Stephenson, permits a scientific approach to the
study of subjective ideas, and proves useful in studying
intrapersonal communication processes in a variety of contexts. The
Q-sort, which incorporates Q methodology into a measure, allows
respondents to sort statements (pictures or other materials)
according to an agree--disagree (pleasure--unpleasure) continuum.
Using this method, researchers can construct a theoretically based
measure in which the respondents restructure information to reflect
their interpretations. A study on music videos effectively
illustrates the use of Q-sort statements as a research tool. Q
methodology can also be used as an instructional tool, as
demonstrated by a sophomore level interpersonal communication course
structured around the design and completion of three Q-sorts. Course
evaluations indicated that the use of Q methodology was an effective
teaching strategy. (A list of resources is provided, including
articles and manuscripts by Stephenson, a Q research journal, and
computer programs analyzing Q data. Appendixes include: (1) music
video Q-sort; (2) gender communication Q-sort; (3) gender Q-sort; and
(4) student analysis of gender study results. Descending arrays of
Z-scores and item descriptions for types 1, 2, and 3, and 37
references are appended.) (MM)

Stephenson's Q Methodology: A Unique Tool for Research and

Instruction

Joan E. Aitken

University of Missouri--Kansas City

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian
Communication Association, Windsor, Ontario, June, 1988.

Abstract: Q methodology is a research technique begun by
William Stephenson.   Over 1500 studies using the method have
been completed, many of which reflect applications in the
field of communication.   As a research tool, Q methodology
and Q technique permit a scientific approach to the study of
subjective ideas and prove particularly useful in studying
intrapersonal communication processes in a variety of
contexts.   As a teaching tool, Q can be used to structure
student thinking on various issues and to teach students a
method for solving problems.
     The purpose of this paper is to provide basic
information on Q methodology through the examples of a
research study on music videos and instruction in an
undergraduate interpersonal communication course.

2

Stephenson's Q Methodology: A Unique Tool for Research and
Instruction

The strength of Q methodology (Stephenson, 1953) has
been shown through more than 1500 studies over the past
fifty years (Brown, 1986, p. 72). Recent applications in
communication (e. g. Cragan and Shields, 1981; Barchak,
1984; Stephen, 1985; Barbato, 1986; Murray, 1986; Nitcavic
& Aitken, 1988) demonstrate the use of Q methodology in the
communication discipline. The method has been proven
effective in analyzing the "phenomenological world of the
individual (or of small numbers of individuals) without
sacrificing the power of statistical analysis" (Stephen,
1985, p. 193), and in analyzing the intrapersonal processes
of large numbers of subjects (Cataldo et al, 1970). Q has
been used to study human subjectivity, thus making it
viable in the study of intrapersonal communication
processes. Because of Stephenson's training in both the
physical and behavioral sciences--a Ph.D. in physics and a
Ph.D. in psychology--he has developed a method that can
serve as the science of subjectivity.

Introduction to Q Methodology

"In a nutshell," Q methodology is a set of procedures
that can be used in developing theory-based research.
Whether the researcher incorporates theory into a measure
(Q-sort) or allows the data to suggest a theoretical
explanation, the researcher obtains person-types or thinking
patterns of people through principles of factor analysis.
The Q-sort is different from most paper-and-pencil
measures, in that the respondent sorts statements (pictures
or other material) according to an agree--disagree
(pleasure--unpleasure) continuum. Instead of responding
with one's agreement to each statement, the respondent sorts
each statement to be placed on an agree-disagree continuum
that shows the relationship between statements.

Q Applicability

Q has several important characteristics. (a) Q's
heuristic ability provides fundamental research, (b) Q's
theory-building ability can provide a framework for further
study, (c) Q's analysis of the individual's intrapersonal
communication processes gives a scientific approach to the
study of subjectivity, (d) Q draws statements and structure
from the culture, and (e) by using a structured Q-sort, the
individual respondents' conceptual processes will transcend
the researcher's theory. In communication research--which
has been criticized by some for inadequate theoretical
development--Q's greatest strength lies in its potential for
shaping theory. Q methodology also has proven effective in

specific types of problem solving, such as in analysis of
decision-making processes (Brown, 1980), and comparison of
the real and ideal (Bem & Funder, 1978; Nitcavic, 1979).

One major advantage of Q method is that the researcher
can construct a theoretically based measure, but the
respondents will restructure that information so that it
represents their interpretations. According to Stephenson
(1980):

Q sorts are operations of "focalizing attention" under
given conditions of instruction, in which measurement
is for a person's feeling and belief with
self-reference....The individual, in Q sorting, may of
course use judgment, reason, and comprehension, all of
which we call conscious. But the underpinning is
"affectability," and quantification is with respect to
feeling, belief, and self reference. The outcome for
any individual is operant factor structure, subject to
various laws..., a structure that is indicative of
objective properties of communicability of which the
person is quite unaware. (p. 884)

The logic of Q is based on communication processes in
that the Q statements represent language common to the
people involved., After completing a Q sort by this author,
a colleague commented that it was the most understandable
survey he had ever seen from the standpoint of the language
used in each statement. Perhaps the understandability was
because the language of each statement came from the people
interviewed, not the jargon of the researcher.

One might wonder why investigators simply cannot
interview subjects regarding their feelings on an issue
instead of using Q methodology. Research shows that people
are unable to define their intrapersonal communication
processes. As Brown (1986) explained, a person's "viewpoint
[will] remain implicit (that is, present but undetected)
unless provided with some instrumental medium, such as a Q
sort, for transforming it into a manifestation" (Brown,
1986, p. 73). Regarding their understanding of cognitive
processes, people may be unaware of their intrapersonal
processes, and the existence and influence of stimuli
(Nisbett & Wilson, 1977, p. 231). Thus, the Q method can
enable the researcher to discover feelings and patterns he
or she cannot discover in other ways.

Issues of Q Methodology

Among those who have analyzed the value of Q
methodology, Kerlinger (1986) cautioned users regarding
inappropriate applications. Although the method has proven
its heuristic value and ability to uncover new relationships
and conceptualizations, it remains controversial (personal
conversation, Stephenson, January, 1987). To effectively
use Q methodology, one must consider certain issues.

In the field of communication--which sometimes
generates controversy over the values of empirical versus
critical research--some researchers (e.g. Murray, 1986)
think Q offers the ability to provide theoretically grounded
research with elements of subjective and objective analysis.
Cragan (personal conversation, November, 1986) suggested
that the use of Q may put the researcher in a middle area in
which he or she finds difficulty being accepted by either
colleagues doing quantitative research or colleagues doing
qualitative research. The subjective nature of Q
methodology makes the quantitative researcher suspicious and
the "number crunching" of the factor analysis makes the
qualitative researcher suspicious. Although he has
published successfully in many prestigious sources,
Stephenson has found difficulty in publishing Q studies and
has encountered theorists and statisticians who have been
unable or unwilling to understand Q methodology (personal
conversation, January, 1987).

Q methodology links theory and statistics. In essence,
the statistics provide the theory for the method. An
understanding of the statistical basis is helpful to the
researcher using Q methodology. One might ask whether Q
method is simply the inverted R matrix. There is,
obviously, a relationship between Q and R factor analysis.
Q determines person factors while R determines concept
factors. In one's data analysis, the researcher should make
a decision regarding the Q-R use of horizontal matrices and
whether or not the centroid method should be used in rotated
solutions.

Several computer programs and program versions are now
available for Q data analysis. Some researchers believe
that the most recent are not necessarily the best, but there
are advantages and disadvantages to each program. Certainly
the differences between programs can somewhat shape the data
analysis (VanTurbergen, 1975; Nesterenko & Wilson, 1980).

Some researchers use a template in the administration
of a Q-sort. A template grid with pockets in which the
respondent can place each Q statement is one method of
effectively administering the Q-sort. This author used a
grid on paper, which is another commonly used technique (see
Appendix 2). Barchak provides a pamphlet of instruction for
respondents doing Q-sorting, which includes photographs
(personal conversation, February, 1988).

Sample size of people and sample size of statements
have been an area of differences in opinions. Although some
Q studies use large numbers of subjects, most rarely use
more than approximately 50 subjects. Stephenson basically
has argued for 40 to 60; Kerlinger has suggested 60 to 80.
For validity, one does not need more than that in most
cases, and in addition, with large numbers one is likely to
find a severe regression to the mean (resulting in a one

factor solution) with large persons samples. This author
disagrees with Kerlinger (1986) on the issue of sample size
and other issues about which Kerlinger appears less than
up-to-date. Regarding sample size of people, there is
adequate evidence that the method can be used successfully
for a sample of one person up to thousands of persons. For
example, one application of Q would be to have a single
individual sort statements under different conditions. One
person might sort statements about communication
apprehension, for example, first under the condition of
speaking in a dyad, second under the condition of speaking
in public, and so on. Because of certain computer program
capacities, a factoring of factors may be useful with large
numbers.

        Long Q-sorts can be time consuming and confusing. The
52 statement Q-sort in this study took college students
between 10 and 45 minutes to complete. Although most people
find the unique nature of Q-sorting fun to do, a long Q-sort
can become tedious. The ability to discriminate levels of
agreement accurately with large numbers of statements also
raises certain questions. Investigators must determine the
exact size--of people and statements--based on the pilot
study and needs of the specific research (Stephenson, 1967,
p. 17-20), and determine for themselves whether they
consider the method appropriate for large surveys (Cataldo,
Johnson, Kellstedt, & Mildrath, 1970).

Design and Construction of a Q-Sort
        Three methods are commonly used in initiating
statements for a Q-sort: the literature, interviews, and
focus groups. In this case, relatively few statements were
made regarding the industry promotion aspect of music
videos, so additional statements were taken from the
literature and added to this category. The key to using
such statements is to word them in commonly used language
rather than professional jargon. This author has found
success in other studies using in-depth interviews of adults
and focus groups of children to generate statements.
Stephenson has developed Q-sorts that use color swatches and
pictures. Anything one can sort according to a continuum
appears appropriate.

        When one considers the unique nature of Q-sorts, one
can understand the administrative problems they present.
Each Q-sort is copied on paper or cardboard stock, the cut
up into a stack of statements (papers or cards). Those
statements may be bound by a rubber band or placed in an
envelope, for example. The actual process of cutting the
statements and preparing each Q-sort is a time consuming one
that may take several people hours. If the researcher uses
small numbers or several small groups, considerable time can
be saved in the preparation of the Q-sorts. Each stack of

statements should be shuffled between uses, however, so that
the arrangement of one respondent does not influence the
arrangement of the next respondent who uses that Q-sort
stack. Administration to a large group instead of several
small groups also raises the cost of making the Q-sort
because so many more copies of the Q-sort are needed.

This author has found it easiest to put all Q-sort
statements on a couple pages, make copies, then separate and
cut out each page. This procedure works better than an
assembly-line procedure because it goes faster and there is
less apt to be a mistake in adding or omitting a statement.

Respondents have difficulty finding their own errors in
a Q-sort because of the time required to go back and check
each statements. The researcher or person entering the data
needs to double-check for respondent mistakes. One problem
this author experienced in using a computer printed Q-sort
was that the appearance of number "36" and "38" were so
similar that some respondents recorded "36" twice instead of
both numbers. The researcher can generally correct such
problems by looking at the content of statements to
determine where the statements would most logically go.
Another way of handling such problems is to put missing
statements in the neutral-middle area. An occasional
respondent mistake will not significantly alter the data.

Another respondent problem that occurs in research is
the person who does not follow directions because he or she
lacks the ability or desire to do so. The responses of such
individuals probably will fail to load on factors with other
respondents. A researcher should pay attention to loadings
with only a few respondents because they represent a
unique--although less common--person-type. The respondents
who fail to load on any type probably represent persons who
did not respond accurately on their Q-sort. In study using
children (Nitcavic & Aitken, 1988), this author has found
the technique ineffective with mentally retarded students.
Apparently they cannot handle the complexity of the
Q-sorting procedure.

Anyone using a Q-sort should consider the various
discussions about the advantages and statistical soundness
of using a structured Q. One concern in using a
forced-choice grid is whether or not people who apply their
responses to a grid structure (see Brown, 1971), will be
"made the same" artificially. Instructing respondents to
work from the two extremes toward the neutral-middle area,
however, seems to solve that problem. Although people may
differ in their intensity of feelings about the statements
and their agree-disagree balance, this procedure should
allow a viable method for each respondent.

To determine Q-sort validity, one can have a small
number of respondents sort the statements according to the
categories employed in the structure (theoretical and

positive-negative categories). One method of establishing reliability is to have some respondents re-sort the statements and then to compare the first and second sort. After an initial administration of a Q-sort, the researcher may chose to modify statements, particularly by omitting (or substituting) statements that generate the same response by all respondents. Some researchers use Q to develop measures and then convert them to a normative form using a Likert-type scale. Although Stephenson does not approve of this procedure (personal conversation, January, 1987), it may be appropriate depending upon the researcher's objectives.

To provide an example of a research application, this paper shows the procedures used to design a study using Q methodology for development of a theory about music video use. With their introduction to the public a few years ago, music videos have been an area of recent communication research. Content analysis of videos, for example, has revealed dominant themes and techniques (Baxter De Riemer, Landini, Leslie, & Singletary, 1985). Relatively little research exists on the effects of music videos, however, particularly in regard to the viewers' feelings. A survey of the literature showed three areas of current study and analysis about music videos: industry promotion, social behavior, and content. Consideration of interpersonal communication was added as an additional category of analysis. These areas formed the theoretical basis for the Q-sort.

To provide an example of an instructional application, this paper also shows the procedures used to teach an undergraduate course in interpersonal communication by the use of four Q sorts. Thus, the purpose of this paper is twofold: (a) to demonstrate how one can design and administer a theoretically-based measure (Q-sort) to solve research problems, and (b) to demonstrate how one can teach communication by using Q methodology.

Q As A Research Tool: A Music Video Study

Not all studies using Q techniques actually use Q methodology, in that Stephenson's Q methodology employs theoretically-based construction. Two key aspects in the development of a study using Q methodology are (a) to structure a measure that is theoretically based and (b) to use language common to the respondents. Thus, the content of the measure can be designed to include key elements that the researcher wants to test. In this case, a survey of the literature indicated three key aspects to music videos: industry promotion, social behavior, and content. The concept of interpersonal communication was added because this author wanted to see the relationship between music

video viewing and one's interpersonal interaction. To
provide language that would be most capable of evoking
meaning, the statements were gathered from essays about
music videos. Using statements from the public allows the
statements to have the same meaning, not in the sense that
they are normative, but in the sense that the common
language evokes meaning in any respondent. The purpose of
the study was to determine whether the four categories
related to music videos--industry promotion, social
behavior, music video content, and interpersonal
communication--provide a viable explanation for different
types of music video viewers.

Method
       The Q sort was generated from 98 college students in
two communication classes. One class was shown five music
videos, and given time in between each to write about their
feelings. The other class was told to think about a music
video they liked and one they disliked and write about them
based on the following categories: visual
abstraction-animation, sex, relationships, dance, violence,
celebration, friendship, isolation, and character (Baxter,
et al, 1985). The researcher originally considered the
Baxter categories as a basis for theory development.
Student responses, however, showed a much broader range of
feelings. Because a researcher may choose to use Q to test
the theories of others, the ideas of various researchers
were built into this Q-sort.
       This author considers structuring the most appropriate
use of a Q-sort because it provides a way the researcher to
build theory into the measure. Stephenson has, however,
given mixed reactions to structuring (paper rebuttal,
November, 1987). A structured Q sort was designed in this
case to determine if the Q factors would support current
literature on music videos. The Q-sort included 13
statements in each of four categories: (a) industry
promotion, (b) social behavior, (c) music video content, and
(d) interpersonal communication. If the theory is sound,
the four factors should emerge after the data analysis.
More likely, however, the data will transcend the theory by
allowing a new form to emerge.
       In the case of the Music Video Q-sort, this author
categorized the statements according to their positive,
mixed-or neutral, or negative tone either toward music
videos or toward socially-accepted behaviors. The Q sort
included 24 statements that were positive or neutral in
nature and 28 statements that were negative in nature (see
Appendix 1 for categorization of statements). Researchers
should mix Q-sort statement numbering so as to avoid
responder bias because of the categorization. This author
prefers to include positive and negative statements,

although some researchers have found that the use of
negative statements in disagree columns causes a double
negative that is confusing and disadvantageous.

To better understand the basis for the Q-sort structure
in this case, a selected review of literature is included
below. The current research seemed to fall into three main
categories: industry promotion, social behavior, and
content. A fourth category--interpersonal
communication--was added to the Q sort to provide further
explanation for viewer response to music videos.

Industry Promotion. A variety of researchers have
discussed the role of industry promotion in music videos,
some of whom consider promotion as the main purpose for
their existence (Peterson-Lewis & Chennault, 1986; Sun &
Lull, 1986; Dominick & Sherman, 1986; Hoberman, 1983;
Zeichner, 1983). Music Television (MTV) began in 1981.
Within three years, 25 percent of American households had 24
hour access to the music videos of the MTV channel, while
virtually all households had access to some music videos on
television (Brown & Campbell, 1986).

One major influence of music videos is that they
decrease the need for performers to make expensive tours
(Peterson-Lewis & Chennault, 1986). As Music Television
(MTV) has grown in popularity, it has helped the music
industry to increase record sales. MTV has become a new
form of advertising, thus increasing video sales and record
sales by influencing consumer purchasing of records, tapes,
compact discs, and other products advertised on the channel
(Sun & Lull, 1986). MTV was the first 24-hour
all-music-video station. Viewers of Music Television buy
more records than people without the music channel, and when
buying records, viewers are more influenced by MTV than by
radio, concerts, or commercial television (Hoberman, 1983).
Music Television has been credited with driving the industry
out of a buying slump by increasing sales (Zeichner, 1983).

Social Behavior. Perhaps the most important aspect of
music videos is their relationship to social behavior
because social behavior includes the social effects of music
video viewing. According to Aufderfeide (1986), for
example, "music videos have animated and set to music a
tension basic to American youth culture: That feeling of
instability which fuels the search to buy and belong" (p.
57). MTV has become a socializing agent which is almost
mandatory to a happy adolescent's life (Sun & Lull, 1986).

Major concerns are the portrayal of race, violence, and
gender in videos. Brown and Campbell (1986) found: "Blacks
were much more likely than whites to be shown in optimistic
scenarios as helpful and caring individual, but almost
exclusively in videos on a black channel; women and blacks
remain minorities on MTV" (p. 94). According to Sherman and
Dominick (1986), as far as visual content, "women, older

adults, and nonwhites are all more likely to be the
aggressors than the victims" (p. 79). Caplan (1985) said
about music videos: "Violence, victimization, gender
portrayal and subservience are all played out in a bizarre,
seemingly unrelated fashion" (p. 145). In their content
analysis of music videos, Sherman and Dominick found "music
videos are violent, male-oriented, and laden with sexual
content" (p. 92). Lewis (1987) analyzed form and female
authorship of music videos as aspects that "negotiate gender
inequalities."

Music Video Content. A final area of music video
research has been content. Because Music Television has
creative potential aesthetic video and film effects have
become an important part of some videos (Caplan, 1985). The
techniques behind images have emerged as an art form of its
own. As Baxter and other explained (1985), music videos
have become "a contemporary hybrid of rock music and film
imagery" (p. 333). They continued: "Producers rely heavily
on special camera techniques, film imagery, and special
effects in creating music videos" (p. 336). One might
consider some music videos simply "bubble gum for the eyes,"
thus able to keep the attention of youth who have short
attention spans. Providing a different analysis of the
content, Wollen (1986) analyzed music videos according to
cultural traits: "(1) the fine arts/avant-garde tradition,
(2) the mass media, (3) vernacular culture (or
sub-cultures), (4) the new technologies (mainly electronic)
associated with the 'communications explosion' and the
'information revolution'" (p. 167).

Many music videos are characterized by their lack of
fluidity. Gehr (1983) wrote: "If any one troupe sums up
the rhetoric of rock video, it's that of discontinuity and
disjunction" (p. 39). The videos have a dream-like quality
that differs from reality (Kinder, 1984). Rubin, Rubin,
Perse, Armstrong, McHugh, and Faix (1986) found that the
same music have different meanings, depending upon whether
they were in music-video or music-audio forms (p. 353).

Sun and Lull (1987) found that the purpose behind music
video viewing for many adolescents is "to find out what
popular songs 'mean'" (p. 115). One problem may be that too
many different kinds of music are presented back-to-back on
television. As Peterson-Lewis and Chennault (1986)
explained: "Artists may attempt to broaden their appeal to
include audiences with which they traditionally have not
been popular, blurring the distinctions between various
types of music as a result" (p. 114).

Music Television has changed the relationship between
records and radio (Gehr, 1983). After watching a video, the
image tends to stays in one's mind so that the image returns
when the song is heard later. The listener then remembers
the music video's visual elements rather than focusing on

the lyrics to the song. Even when the visuals are abstract
or unrelated to the song, they can still enter one's
intrapersonal processes at least momentarily. As Kinder
(1984) wrote: "One of the most compelling aspects of rock
video is its power to evoke specific visual images in the
mind of the spectator every time one hears the music with
which they have been juxtaposed on television" (p. 3).

Interpersonal Communication. The influence of music
videos on interpersonal interaction appears to be largely
ignored in current music video research. Many of the
respondents' statements, however, included aspects of
interpersonal interaction that were caused by the viewing of
music videos. Because of this author's desire to emphasize
the communication relationship in music videos, the Q-sort
included statements related to interpersonal communication.
Thus, this fourth area was included to determine if certain
person-types watch music videos primarily for interpersonal
communication reasons.

Once completed, the Q-sort was administered to a group
of over 127 college students enrolled in a large section
basic communication course. Each computer program that can
be used to analyze Q data has its own characteristics. In
this case, QUANAL was used.

The maximum number of variables (people, in Q) that
QUANAL can handle is 109, although one sometimes can analyze
more if the number of statements is small (e.g. less than
40) or the number of points on the scale is small (e.g. a
7-point scale). Because of the number of subjects in the
music video study, the computer could not process the full
127 variables at once. First, the sample was split into two
parts (one with 60 subjects and the other with 67) and run
as two separate studies. Both worked. Of 127 subjects, 100
loaded on factor one, 12 loaded on factor two (10
negatively), four loaded on factor three (three negatively),
and 11 subjects failed to correlate significantly. The
three factor solution accounted for 57% of the total
variance.

Because of the large group (N = 127) trial-and-error
runs were made to see how many sorts could run at once. One
run included 107 variables (people). On each run, the three
solutions turned out to be virtually identical in factor
structure. Had they not, then one could have proceeded to
"factor the factors" in the split-halves approach. Instead,
variable that was either confounded or non-significant were
eliminated. There were about 11 such cases--an unusually
small number out of a sample of 107. The high consistency
in this case suggests that college students know how they
feel about music videos.

To prepare a final run, the nonsignificant cases were
replaced from the "left over" cases. All this had to be
handled with care to make sure that subject ID numbers

matched the subject numbers on the computer printout. These
procedures are quite defensible and, even, commonplace. For
interest sake, the data was run in a split-halves approach.
Again, the results were most consistent. The results in
this case provide strong evidence for the validity of Q
methodology.

The correlation for factor loadings was set at .415
because it indicates a .01 level of significance.

Music Video Study Results

The best solution in this study seemed to be a three
factor solution, with most people loading on the first
factor. Considerations in determining solutions include the
number of persons loading on factors, the communality
between factors, reflected factors, and the percentage of
negative factors. One can determine the nature of each
factor from studying the statement array (agree-disagree)
for each factor, which represents people's thinking pattern
or structured response to the Q-sort. The correlation gives
the degree to which individuals are like the person-types.
Most researchers give each person-type a label that typified
the factor--allowing easy conceptualization--and a brief
description. Having used eight different
communication-related Q sorts over the years, this author
found that most people have loaded on the first factor,
which reflects healthy communication behaviors. The same
held true in this case. Below are the three types found in
this study.

Type 1:   The Video Viewer. Type 1 has a positive
attitude toward music videos. They like music videos that
show friendship and relationships, have plot and meaning,
and bring back memories. They enjoy watching videos that
have a message, and consider videos artistic and creative.
Music videos make them want to sing. They recognize the
importance of MTV to the music industry, and they generally
enjoy videos. Content and industry characteristics were
most important to these viewers.

Type 2:   The Listener: Type 2 would rather listen to
music than watch videos, and--in fact--they seldom watch
videos. They have a more negative and cautious attitude
toward videos, showing little enthusiasm for the medium.
Interpersonal communication and social interaction were most
important to this type.

Type 3:   The People Viewer. Type 3 was similar to type
one, although less interested in videos and more interested
in people. They like videos that make a statement, and
generally enjoy watching them. Music videos are important
in leading trends in clothing, behavior, and culture. This
person prefers people to media, and would rather listen to
music than watch videos. Music videos make them feel very
energetic. Content is most important to this type.

13

The sample here was young college students, a prime audience for music videos. If people of other ages had completed the Q sort, the factors may have been different, resulting in more inconsistency in the data. In this case, however, the characteristics of the music video audience--not a general population--was sought.

Theoretical Basis

To determine the value of the Q sort's theoretical basis, the factors then were analyzed regarding the ten most agree and ten most disagree statements, and the categories to which those statements related. By using a Chi-square test for independence, no significant difference was found between factors (Chi-square 6.81, contingency coefficient .32, Cramer's phi prime .24), thus indicating that respondents on all factors considered statements from all four categories important in describing their feelings about music videos. Thus, one may conclude that viewers recognize the influence of music videos on the music industry, they feel that music videos affect social behavior, they consider content important in their response to music videos, and their interpersonal communication is influenced by their music video viewing. The study supports these four categories--industry promotion, social behavior, music video content, and interpersonal communication--as basis for a viable explanation of viewer response to music videos.

Q As An Instructional Tool

Over the years, this author has used Q methodology in a variety of contexts. In the case of the music video study, data was collected from a large section basic course. The main reason for using so many subjects was because large numbers of students volunteered to complete the Q sort. One unexpected result, however, was that in the course evaluation, students frequently mentioned the Q sort on music videos in response to an evaluation about "the most interesting" and the "most thought provoking" part of the course. This author had taught graduate students about Q in research courses and collected data on students, but had never considered Q's potential value as a learning tool. Discussions at the Q conference suggested that Q methodology may be viable for providing the structure for a course.

Therefore, Q methodology was used as the basis for teaching an undergraduate course in interpersonal communication. The sophomore level course was structured around the design and completion of three Q sorts, one for each major unit of the course. The students were given a Q-sort from a previous study as an example for discussion of the objectives and basic techniques of Q methodology and used the lecture-discussion format for teaching about Q.

Objectives

The following educational objectives in using Q methodology were provided to the students:

1. To allow students to contribute to the advancement of knowledge, which includes testing theories found in the literature. [Students were encouraged to ask questions relevant to research findings on the particular issue being discussed.]

2. To encourage students to study areas of interpersonal communication in which they are interested. [The class as a group decided on the specific area within the unit to be studied through each Q sort.]

3. To teach interviewing techniques. [After providing instruction on interviewing, the students interviewed people of their choice in order to collect statements for a Q concourse.]

4. To stimulate interpersonal discussion with another person(s) of importance to the student. [The interviews themselves and the process of collecting data caused the students to talk with friends and family members about interpersonal communication issues.]

5. To structure the student's thinking on specific interpersonal communication issues. [One of the strengths of doing a Q sort is the thinking process required. The individual must sort through ideas, compare them with his or her own ideas, determine degrees of agreement, and structure his or her thinking. Q sorting is a somewhat complicated, but an interesting and enlightening process.]

6. To compare each student (and their "significant other") to classmates in order to provide insight into their feelings and the feelings of those students around them. [Each student was required to turn in two completed Q sorts for each assignment, one done by a "significant other." The students coded their response sheets so their answers could be anonymous.]

7. To teach students a scientific method for investigating and solving problems. [Two students subsequently used adaptations of the technique.]

Instructional Technique

The class decided to do an additional fourth Q sort during the semester because they were interested in investigating another topic, so a Q-sort was developed on each of the following topics: (a) initial contact in meeting new people, (b) communication differences caused by gender, particularly relating to opposite-sex platonic friends, (c) negotiation and risk in interpersonal

relationships, and (d) termination or ending of
relationships (see examples from gender study in
appendices).

The quality of statements students obtained increased
in sophistication as they progressed, reflecting greater
depth of feelings. As Barchak encouraged, people can be
poetic with the right kind of probing questions. The
increased number and depth of responses indicated that the
students improved their interviewing techniques during the
semester. The entire process included the following steps
for each of the four studies:

1. The students selected a topic to be studied in
   depth, then read about the topic and discussed the
   topic in class.
2. Each student interviewed at least one significant
   other about the topic and obtained statements for
   the sort.
3. To save time, the teacher selected statements for
   the Q sort and typed up the statements and answer
   sheet.
4. Each student completed the Q sort and gave the Q
   sort to a significant other.
5. The teacher converted the data for computer
   analysis, determined the relevant factors, student
   loadings, and made copies of the results for the
   students.
6. Each student analyzed the factor statement arrays,
   then wrote a summary of each factor.
7. The teacher wrote a description of each factor
   based on the students' analyses and gave it to each
   student.
8. Student discussed the results with their
   significant others.
9. Each student evaluated the process and learning on
   his or her final examination.

Instructional Results. The task of compiling,
printing, inputing data, and analyzing four Q sorts turned
out to be enormous. If help had not hired, the projects
would not have been completed on time. It is difficult to
collect and analyze data under deadlines, especially when
the students want immediate feedback. The same process
using only one or two studies and allowing more than a week
at the end of the semester for discussion of the projects
would have been more realistic.

Instructional Results

During a mid-semester and final evaluation of the
process, the students indicated that they considered the use
of Q to be a valuable and interesting learning tool. With
"10" representing the learning techniques used in the best
class and "1" representing techniques of the poorest class

they have had in college, the mean student response rating
of Q methodology was "7." Some example student comments
included: "It produced a sense of accomplishment because
the whole study--from start to finish--was our own
doing....It is a chance to sort out one's thoughts....I
really could relate to the factors that I fell into....It
makes you really dig deep....I'll never forget these Q
studies because they forced me to sit down and take some
time to evaluate who I am and what I believe....Made me
think about my values....I felt overwhelmed by all the
information....The Q studies made me feel better about those
around me as well as myself....Very interesting and
fun ..They really did make me think....I was involved in
the process."

The students appeared to learn the basic principles of
Q methodology in addition to interpersonal communication,
and did so in an interested and involved manner. The use of
Q methodology seemed more creative and applied than more
traditional teaching methods. Personally, this author found
the approach to be a way to experiment with Q methodology,
learn more about the technique, and keep motivated.

Resources for Users of Q Methodology

Q methodology is unique, interesting, and
extraordinarily successful for certain kinds of problems.
In this paper, this author has tried to provide sufficient
detail to enable a newcomer to tackle a problem by using Q
methodology. Perhaps the best way to conclude is to provide
some additional resources. This author has never met a
kinder, more generous, more open-minded group of people than
the researchers who use Q methodology. Perhaps using the
technique makes the researcher more likely to question
traditional forms of research, to respect the varied
intrapersonal processes of people, and be more inclined to
use new and creative approaches.

William Stephenson has several articles and eleven
book-length manuscripts in progress, as he continues to work
from his home: 2111 Rock Quarry Rd., Columbia, Missouri,
U.S.A., 65201. Probably the two most important works on Q
methodology are Stephenson's (1953) The Study of Behavior
and Brown's (1980) Political Subjectivity: Applications of
Q methodology in Political Science. Steve Brown is also
quite approachable to people seeking help with Q
methodology, and can be reached at: The Political Science
Department, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, U.S.A., 44242
(area code 216-672-2060). Brown edits Operant
Subjectivity--an inexpensive journal that deals exclusively
with Q research--which is worth reading. He also has
compiled the most extensive bibliography on Q and heads the
annual Q conference that meets each Fall in Columbia,

17

Missouri, U.S.A.   Len Barchak continues his work in
communication at the Communication and Theatre Dept.,
McNeese State University, Lake Charles, Louisiana, U.S.A.
70609.

There are several computer programs available to
analyze Q data: PCQ by Strickland; CENSORT for mainframes
from the University of Iowa; Stephenson's ROSETTA; Hanley's
PC program, Vantubergen's QUANAL for mainframes; Brown's
JINNI for mainframes, and Barchak's statement program
(personal conversation, S. Brown, November 17, 1987).   For
those who prefer to pay to have someone else run the data
before investing in a program, they can find help from
Donald J. Brenner, Director, The William Stephenson Research
Center, School of Journalism, University of Missouri,
Columbia, Missouri, U.S.A., 65205.

References

Aufderheide, P. (1986, Winter). Music videos: The look of the sound. Journal of Communication, 36(1), 57-78.

Barbato, C. A. (1986). Uses of interpersonal communication. Paper presented at Speech Communication Association, Chicago.

Barchak, L. J. (1984, July). Discovering communication paradigms with Q Methodology: Ferment or sour grapes? Operant Subjectivity, 7, 115-130.

Baxter, R. L., DeRiemer, C., Landini, A., Leslie, L., & Singletary, M. W. (1985, Summer). A content analysis of music videos. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 29(3), 333-340.

Bem, D. J., & Funder, D. C. (1978, November). Predicting more of the people more of the time: Assessing the personality of situations. Psychological Review, 85(6).

Berg, C. (1984, November). Visual music the archaeology of music-video. Paper presented at the 70th annual Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

Brown, J. D., & Campbell, K. (1986). Race and gender in music videos: The same beat but a different drummer. Journal of Communication, 36(1), 94-106.

Brown, S. R. (1971). The forced-free distinction in Q technique. The Journal of Educational Measurement, 8, 283-287.

Brown, S. R. (1980). Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brown, S. R. (1986). Q technique and method: Principles and procedures. In W. D. Berry & M. S. Lewis-Beck (Ed.) New tools for social scientists: Advances and applications in research methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Caplan, R. E. (1985, Spring). Violent program content in music video. Journalism Quarterly, 62(1), 144-147.

Cataldo, E., Johnson, R., Kellstedt, L, & Mildrath, L. (1970). Card sorting as a technique for survey interviewing. Public Opinion Quarterly, 34, 202-215.

Corliss, R. (1983). The medium is the maximum. Film Comment, 19(4), 34.

Cragan, J. F., & Shields, D. C. (Eds.) (1981). Applied communication research. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Ehrenstein, D. (1983). Pre-MTV. Film Comment, 19(4), 41-42.

Gehr, R. (1983). The MTV aesthetic. Film Comment, 19(4), 35-36.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. (3rd ed). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kinder, M. (1984). Music video and the spectator: Television ideology and dream. Film Quarterly, 38(1), 2-15.

Lewis, L. A. (1987), Form and female authorship in music video. Communication, 9, 355-377.

Lull, J., & Sun, S. W. (1986). The adolescent audience for music videos and why they watch. Journal of Communication, 36(1), 115-124.

Murray, E. (1986). Quantifying qualitative data: The Q-sort as an aid to interpretive rigor. Paper presented at Speech Communication Association in Chicago.

Nesterenko, A., & Wilson, S. A. (1980, October). CONCOURSE: Computer program for the Q methodologist. Operant Subjectivity, 4, 17-22.

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977, May). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes Psychological Review, 84(3), 231-259.

Nitcavic, R. G. (1979). A descriptive study of input and output variables in a multiple-approach basic speech course. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Nitcavic, R. G., and Aitken, J. E. (1988). Inclusion expectancies of the adolescent handicapped as they interact with teachers and peers. Paper presented at the national meeting of the Central States Speech Association in Chicago.

Peterson-Lewis, S., & Chennault, S. A. (1986). Black artists' music videos: Three success strategies. Journal of Communication, 36(1), 107-114.

Rubin, R. B., Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., Armstrong, C., McHugh, M., & Faix, N. (1986, Summer). Media use and the meaning of music video, 63(2), 353-359.

Sherman, B. L., & Dominick, J. R. (1986). Violence and sex in music videos: TV and rock 'n' roll. Journal of Communication, 36(1), 79-93.

Stephen, T. D. (1985, Summer). Q methodology in communication science: An introduction. Communication Quarterly, 33, 193-208.

Stephenson, W. (1953). The study of behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephenson, W. (1967). The play theory of mass communication. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Stephenson, W. (1980). Newton's fifth rule and Q-Methodology: Application to educational psychology. American Psychologist, 35(10), 882-889.

Stephenson, W. (1986). Interbehaviorism in a subjective framework: An objective psychology for subjectivity. Columbia, MO: The William Stephenson Research Center, University of Missouri.

Sun, S. W., & Lull, J. (1986). The adolescent audience for music videos and why they watch. Journal of Communication, 36(1), 115-125.

Van Tubergen, N. (1975). QUANAL user's guide (Computer program manual). Lexington, KY: Dept. of Communication, University of Kentucky.

Wollen, P. (1986). Ways of thinking about music video (and post-modernism). Critical Quarterly, 28, 167-170.

Zeichner, A. (1983). Video auteurs. Film Comment, 19(4), 42-44.

Appendix 1:   Music Video Q-Sort

(4) Industry Promotion (Positive)

23.   I enjoy watching music videos.

25.   Music Television (MTV) has given musicians the broad public exposure necessary to make hit records.

31.   Music Television (MTV) leads trends in clothing, behavior, and culture too.

39.   I'd rather watch music videos on television than listen to music on the radio.

(3) Industry Promotion (Neutral/Mixed)

32.   When I see a music video I really like, I go out and buy a record, disc, or tape.

34.   I'm in love with some of the music video performers.

41.   I buy more records and tapes when I see a lot of music videos I enjoy.

(6) Industry Promotion (Negative)

30.   The music video industry is fcr kids.

37.   Music videos are just advertisements for the music industry.

38.   I seldom watch music videos.

42.   I prefer listening to my favorite music rather than a bunch of music videos on television.

43.   Music videos end my need for attending concerts.

44.   I pity the people caught up in this music video nonsense.

(2) Social Behavior and Response (Positive)

9.   Music videos make me feel very energetic.

50.   Music videos make me want to sing.

(1) Social Behavior and Response (Mixed/neutral)

51. Music videos make me want to smoke and drink because
they remind me of a bar.

(10) Social Behavior and Response (Negative)

12. I don't think young children should be allowed to watch
music videos.

13. Music videos make me feel sexually deprived.

14. Music videos make me feel like raising hell!

15. Music videos are selling sex: they are too suggestive.

17. Music videos often use women as sex objects.

18. For the most part, I am bored or disgusted with music
videos.

20. I don't feel anything when I watch music videos. They
make me numb.

21. Some music videos make me want to kill soft furry
things.

40. Some music videos make me want to take a bathroom break
during the video and come back for the commercials.

48. Some performers are sick. I wish they would die!

(3) Music Video Content (Positive)

19. I enjoy watching videos which make statements, have a
message with the music and visual effects.

22. I like videos with plot and meaning.

27. Music videos are very artistic and creative.

(2) Music Video Content (Neutral/Mixed)

26. I like the ones that simply show the performers
singing, without a lot of visual effects.

28. The quality of the music and lyrics are the most
important part of a music video.

(8) Music Video Content (Negative)

3. Music videos turn me off because they give music a bad
name.

6. I like the music videos involved in satanic activities.

1Ø. I like the music videos with violence.

16. Music videos have no meaning.

29. After seeing the video, that's all I see when I hear the song.

35. I hate the music videos in black and white.

36. I like the music videos with leather, sadomasochism, and sex.

52. Half naked, beautiful girls are almost always a must in today's videos.

(6) Interpersonal Communication (Positive)

1. Music videos really bring back memories about people I like to be with.

2. I like to watch music videos with other people. Actually, if I am not already with someone else, music video viewing often makes me call or visit a friend.

11. Music videos make me want togetherness.

45. I like music videos that show friendship and relationships.

46. Music videos make me want to dance with someone.

47. Music videos remind me of going with friends.

(3) Interpersonal Communication (Mixed/neutral)

4. Music videos are great when you want to party.

24. Music videos kill time when I'm alone.

48. Music videos make me ache to be with the person I love.

(4) Interpersonal Communication (Negative)

5. Music videos are a waste of time.

7. I'd rather be doing just about anything other than watching music videos.

8. I prefer people to media.

33.   I like to watch music videos alone.   In fact, they make
      me want to be alone.

Appendix 2: <u>Gender Communication Q Sort</u>

<u>INSTRUCTIONS</u>: You have been given a stack of 52 statements. These statements relate to communication patterns among men and women. Think about your communication with people with whom you have relationships. Please sort these statements according to your first impression, how you feel today.

   <u>Step 1</u>. Begin by reading the statements and placing them in 3 piles: (1) those you agree with, (2) those you disagree with, and (3) those you feel neutral or undecided about.

   <u>Step 2</u>. Then take your "agree" pile and select from it the 2 statements with which you agree most strongly. Record the numbers on those statements in the 2 squares in the far-right ("+5") column of the figure below. From the remaining "agree" statements choose the 3 with which you agree next most strongly and record their numbers in the column with a "+4" over it. Repeat this procedure until there are no remaining statements in your "agree" pile.

   <u>Step 3</u>. Next, take your "disagree" pile and follow the same procedure, except begin with the far-left ("-5") column for your "most disagree" statements. Continue to work toward the middle until you have recorded the numbers of all your "disagree" statements. You probably will not have equal numbers of agree and disagree statements, which is fine.

   <u>Step 4</u>. Finally, take your "undecided" pile and arrange these statements in the middle. If you agree slightly with the statement, place its number toward the right and if you disagree slightly, place its number toward the left of the neutral area. Remember, it doesn't matter whether the agree-disagree balance is exact. Simply work from the extremes toward the middle, and your answers will be recorded correctly.

   <u>Be sure to put a number in every box. Use each number only once. (THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT)</u>. When you are finished, return this sheet and the stack of statements. Remember to complete the information items at the bottom of the page.

MOST DISAGREE   NEUTRAL AREA   MOST AGREE

-5   -4   -3   -2   -1   0   +1   +2   +3   +4   +5

(2)   (2)
      (3)   (3)
            (5)   (5)
                  (6)   (6)   (6)   (6)
                              (8)

                                    26

Name (optional):_____ Age:____ Sex: F___ M___ Date:____

se double check to make sure you have recorded a number in every
and recorded each number only once. Thank you.

Appendix 3:   Gender Q Sort
Developed by Undergraduate Interpersonal Class

1. Some of my closest platonic friends are members of the opposite sex.

2. I can open up more to someone of the opposite sex.

3. A platonic relationship is in itself a rare form of love.

4. I share everything with my friends, except sex.

5. Women are not as loyal as men in their relationships.

6. Women friends are more competitive with each other than men are competitive with each other.

7. It makes me angry when other people think there is something romantic going on between us (opposite sex platonic friends).

8. Because I am involved in team sports, I find myself showing male mannerisms toward women.

9. You can have best friend relations between opposite sexes before you are married, but after that, husband and wife should be best friends.

10. Some mother and son relationships make it hard for the son to relate to other women.

11. Women are more open with their friends, while men are more secretive.

12. I would rather have a platonic relationship than any other kind.

13. I get jealous when my partner has friends of the opposite sex.

14. Men may show that they are angry by throwing something or yelling, but I cannot remember a male ever confiding that he is upset or depressed.

15. Male and female gender is not what makes communication different, it is the individual.

16. It is easier to have a deep conversation with a friend of the opposite sex than one of my own gender.

17. Touching and hugging is too intimate for a platonic relationship.

18. It is easier to "tell off" someone of the opposite sex than someone of my own gender.

19. Women get more emotional support from other women than men get from men.

20. Platonic relationships are generally longer lasting than those with romantic and sexual involvement.

21. In woman to woman relationships, if there are children, friendships get harder.

22. I have never come close to a member of the opposite sex without first being lovers.

23. I think my best friend will be there forever for me. The only thing that might end our relationship would be a spouse who could not accept our love.

24. My closet friend lives far away. I imagine talks to discuss problems in my life.

25. Males hold grudges longer than females.

26. Most of my friends are of the opposite sex.

27. When I tell a man confidential information, I can trust him more than I could if I told a woman.

28. I'd rather work or study with a female friend because they're more focused and serious than the guys--they know what needs to be done and they do it.

29. I avoid opposite sex plutonic relationships because of what "people may think."

30. If my intimate partner has time to do something with a plutonic friend, s/he should have the time to do something with me first.

31. I hate the way people spread rumors about a purely plutonic male-female relationship.

32. Women's best friends change as they go through life. Men keep the same friends throughout life.

33. Women are easier to talk to than men.

34. Men have more casual close relationships than women, who always need to know all the deep dark secrets.

35. I sometimes have sexual fantasies about a platonic friend.

36. I want my partner to be friends with my friends.

37. Having a friend of the opposite sex helps open my eyes to the basic feelings of the opposite sex.

38. At a party, it is easier to start talking to someone of the opposite sex than someone of my own sex.

39. I am intimidated more by someone of my same gender than one of my opposite gender.

40. A person of the opposite sex who is unattractive or unappealing to me is easier to become friends with. The expectations and inhibitions involved with romantic attraction are not present.

41. It is easier for me to manipulate people of the opposite sex.

42. Females are better listeners and helpers than males are.

43. My male friends are friends for life.

44. I would more often entrust a member of my own sex with an intimate secret about my past.

45. I maintain more active friendships than most people do.

46. Women talk to me about intimate things more than men do.

47. Platonic relationships are easier to maintain with someone I have known since childhood. I could never think of these kinds of friends in a sexual sense.

48. In developing a relationship between sexes, the males I know need more time to develop trust than the women I know.

49. Long term close friends don't have to worry about trust. That aspect of the relationship was worked out years ago.

50. I find females to be more open-minded and jolly. Males
     scare me with some of their attitudes.

51. Usually the people who give a male and female (who are
     just friends) trouble about being "just friends" are
     jealous because they don't share such a unique
     relationship with anyone.

52. If I were to be unfaithful to my partner, it would
     probab-y be because of one of my partner's best
     friends.

Appendix 4:   Student Analysis of Gender Study Results

The data suggests a four factor solution (N=39). Significant factor loadings (.4125 level) were as follows: factor 1, 24 positive; factor 2, 1 positive, 2 negative; factor 3, 2 positive, 1 negative; nine not significant or confounded loadings. Each student turned in a paragraph description of each factor-type. The responses were compiled, omitting information that was very similar. The teacher omitted analysis that portrayed any factor in very negative terms. Below is a compilation of student descriptions of factors (note that sexist language and analysis that conflicts between students is included). The descending array of z-scores and item descriptions for the three types follow the student analysis.

Type 1
    This person finds platonic relationships to be unique and fulfilling to the extent of what is put into the relationship is what is received out of it. Friendly, supportive and open-minded are a few of their qualities.
    This person will be your friend through thick and thin.
    S/he has more women friends than men friends, and s/he feels that women are easier to talk to. Their platonic friendships with the opposite sex are exactly that and nothing more.
    This type puts a lot of emphasis on their friends, and they are open with their relationships. They also have realistic and modern views about relationships.
    Someone in touch with their feelings. S/he is only concerned with him/herself. Not afraid to have opposite sex friends.
    Very open person.
    The friendly social person. It seems to me that this type wants to be friends with everyone. They also want everyone to be friends with each other. This kind reminds me of the question-answer period in the Miss American Pageant-runway speech. They want to say something that pleases everyone.
    Friendly with males and females, but not many close platonic friends of the opposite sex. Strong identity with women friends--more trusting of females than males.
    Trying not to be sexist. They want to be judged as an individual, not part of a group.
    This person feels more secure and confident around people of his or her own sex. Though she isn't afraid of male companionship--due to the obvious acceptance of plutonic relationships, she feels able to share more with a female friend.
    This person realized that society treats males and females differently, especially in a personal realm. They

know that men and women have roles that are unique to each
gender. This person also realizes by communicating with
others of the opposite sex and looking for insight, they
will be able to communicate with more insight and
sensitivity.

Type 2   [Some student responses directly contradict in this
case.]
     This individual seeks approval from men. She confides
in them, prefers men as her closest friend, and she finds
men easier to talk with. Because of her confidence with the
opposite sex, she views herself as being outgoing and able
to handle deep conversations with the opposite sex. She has
had poor experiences with women, finding that they hold
grudges, and she feel more able to tell them off.
     I think that this would be a young person. It would be
the opposite of the first person. They are more towards
that of a man's tendency.
     They tend to be more positive towards a man and as it
goes down, the evidence supports that they don't support
women's actions.
     He has a lot of friends and knows a lot of people.
     This person will have more of a tendency to want more
out of a plutonic relationship.
     This person thinks men are a little easier to talk to.
     They are active and interact well.
     This personality is outgoing, extroverted, enjoys life
and the presence of others.
     This person, if a man, is one who has been raised with
sisters or is married because he expresses favorable
attitudes toward women.

Type 3
     An observer, quite introverted.
     This person appears insecure and needs others to
reassure them. They seemed to notice people's actions and
appearances, are watchful of others.
     They tend to talk about friends in the long-term.
     Confident with a variety of people, she is more of a
realist and accepts life. More mature.
     Does not have close friends. They have had
unsuccessful romantic encounters and would prefer to have
platonic relationships.
     Seems to have had many relationships, platonic or
intimate that have fallen through. Seems untrusting of
their partner's platonic relationships or female-female
relationships. Believes that gender isn't as important as
the individual.
Women are shallow in this type's view. They seem to be
identifying with a traditional male attitude.

No.	Item	Z-Score
15..	MALE AND FEMALE GENDER IS NOT WHAT MAKES COMMUNICATION DIFFERENT, IT IS THE INDIVIDUAL.	2.08
36..	I WANT MY PARTNER TO BE FRIENDS WITH MY FRIENDS.	2.06
37..	HAVING A FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX HELPS OPEN MY EYES TO THE BASIC FEELINGS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	1.77
3..	A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP IS IN ITSELF A RARE FORM OF LOVE.	1.62
19..	WOMEN GET MORE EMOTIONAL SUPPORT FROM OTHER WOMEN THAN MEN GET FROM MEN.	1.36
46..	WOMEN TALK TO ME ABOUT INTIMATE THINGS MORE THAN MEN DO.	1.19
44..	I WOULD MORE OFTEN ENTRUST A MEMBER OF MY OWN SEX WITH AN INTIMTE SECRET ABOUT MY PAST.	0.94
35..	I SOMETIMES HAVE SEXUAL FANTASIES ABOUT A PLATONIC FRIEND.	0.93
18..	IT IS EASIER TO "TELL OFF" SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN SOMEONE OF MY OWN GENDER.	0.90
42..	FEMALES ARE BETTER LISTENERS AND HELPERS THAN MALES ARE.	0.85
51..	USUALLY THE PEOPLE WHO GIVE A MALE AND FEMALE (WHO ARE JUST FRIENDS) TROUBLE ABOUT BEING "JUST FRIENDS" ARE JEALOUS BECAUSE THEY DON'T SHARE SUCH A UNIQUE RELATIONSHIP WITH ANYONE.	0.83
7..	IT MAKES ME ANGRY WHEN OTHER PEOPLE THINK THERE IS SOMETHING ROMANTIC GOING ON BETWEEN USE (OPPOSITE SEX PLATONIC FRIENDS).	0.74
34..	MEN HAVE MORE CASUAL CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS THAN WOMEN, WHO ALWAYS NEED TO KNOW ALL THE DEEP DARK SECRETS.	0.69
41..	IT IS EASIER FOR ME TO MANIPULATE PEOPLE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	0.66
39..	I AM INTIMIDATED MORE BY SOMEONE OF MY SAME GENDER THAN ONE OF MY OPPOSITE GENDER.	0.61
1..	SOME OF MY CLOSEST PLATONIC FRIENDS ARE MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	0.61
10..	SOME MOTHER AND SON RELATIONSHIPS MAKE IT HARD FOR THE SON TO RELATE TO OTHER WOMEN.	0.60
20..	PLATONIC RELATIONSHIPS ARE GENERALLY LONGER LASTING THAN THOSE WITH ROMANTIC AND SEXUAL INVOLVEMENT.	0.55
33..	WOMEN ARE EASIER TO TALK TO THAN MEN.	0.54
31..	I HATE THE WAY PEOPLE SPREAD RUMORS ABOUT A PURELY PLUTONIC MALE-FEMALE RELATIONSHIP.	0.44
11..	WOMEN ARE MORE OPEN WITH THEIR FRIENDS, WHILE MEN ARE MORE SECRETIVE.	0.42
49..	LONG TERM CLOSE FRIENDS DON'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT TRUST. THAT ASPECT OF THE RALTIONSHIP WAS WORKED OUT YEARS AGO.	0.41
9..	YOU CAN HAVE BEST FRIEND RELATIONS BETWEEN OPPOSITE SEXES BEFORE YOU ARE MARRIED, BUT AFTER THAT, HUSBAND AND WIFE SHOULD BE BEST FRIENDS.	0.39
38..	AT A PARTY, IT IS EASIER TO START TALKING TO SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN SOMEONE OF MY OWN SEX.	0.33
30..	IF MY INTIMATE PARTNER HAS TIME TO DO SOMETHING WITH A PLUTONIC FRIEND, S/HE SHOULD HAVE THE TIME TO DO SOMETHING WITH ME FIRST.	0.13
24..	MY CLOSEST FRIEND LIVES FAR AWAY. I IMAGINE TALKS TO DISCUSS PROBLEMS IN MY LIFE.	0.06
50..	I FIND FEMALES TO BE MORE OPEN-MINDED AND JOLLY. MALES SCARE ME WITH SOME OF THEIR ATTITUDES.	-0.03
48..	IN DEVELOPING A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEXES, MALES I KNOW NEED MORE TIME TO DEVELOP TRUST THAN THE WOMEN I KNOW.	-0.10
47..	PLATONIC RELATIONSHIPS ARE EASIER TO MAINTAIN WITH SOMEONE I HAVE KNOWN SINCE CHILDHOOD. I COULD NEVER THINK OF THESE KINDS OF FRIENDS IN A SEXUAL SENSE.	-0.13
40..	A PERSON OF THE OPPOSITE SEX WHO IS UNATTRACTIVE OR UNAPPEALI TO ME IS EASIER TO BECOME FRIENDS WITH. THE EXPECTATIONS AND INHIBITIONS INVOLVED WITH ROMANTIC ATTRACTION ARE NOT PRESENT.	-0.16
13..	I GET JEALOUS WHEN MY PARTNER HAS FRIENDS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	-0.28
27..	WHEN I TELL A MAN CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, I CAN TRUST HIM MORE THAN I COULD IF I TOLD A WOMAN.	-0.43
43..	MY MALE FRIENDS ARE FRIENDS FOR LIFE.	-0.51
28..	I'D RATHER WORK OR STUDY WITH A FEMALE FRIEND BECAUSE THEY'RE MORE FOCUED AND SERIOUS THAN THE GUYS—THEY KNOW WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE AND THEY DO IT.	-0.51
45..	I MAINTAIN MORE ACTIVE FRIENDSHIPS THAN MOST PEOPLE DO.	-0.53
23..	I THINK MY BEST FRIEND WILL BE THERE FOREVER FOR ME. THE ONLY THING THAT MIGHT END OUR RELATIONSHIP WOULD BE A SPOUSE WHO COULD NOT ACCEPT OUR LOVE.	-0.55
21..	IN WOMAN TO WOMAN RELATIONSHIPS, IF THERE ARE CHILDREN, FRIENDSHIPS GET HARDER.	-0.69
12..	I WOULD RATHER HAVE A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP THAN ANY OTHER KIND.	-0.70
2..	I CAN OPEN UP MORE TO SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	-0.75
26..	MOST OF MY FRIENDS ARE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	-0.83
6..	WOMEN FRIENDS ARE MORE COMPETITIVE WITH EACH OTHER THAN MEN ARE COMPETITIVE WITH EACH OTHER.	-0.91
8..	BECAUSE I AM INVOLVED IN TEAM SPOTS, I FIND MYSELF SHOWING MALE MANNERISMS TOWARD WOMEN.	-0.92
29..	I AVOID OPPOSITE SEX PLUTONIC RELATIONSHIPS BECAUSE OF WHAT PEOPLE MAY THINK.	-1.01
14..	MEN MAY SHOW THAT THEY ARE ANGRY BY THROWING SOMETHING OR YELLING, BUT I CANNOT REMEMBER A MALE EVER CONFIDING THAT HE IS UPSET OR DEPRESSED.	-1.03
32..	WOMEN'S BEST FRIENDS CHANGE AS THEY GO THROUGH LIFE. MEN KEEP THE SAME FRIENDS THROUGHOUT LIFE.	-1.03
16..	IT IS EASIER TO HAVE A DEEP CONVERSATION WITH A FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN ONE OF MY OWN GENDER.	-1.05
4..	I SHARE EVERYTHING WITH MY FIRENDS, EXCEPT SEX.	-1.05
25..	MALES HOLD DRUDGES LONGER THAN FEMALES.	-1.19
52..	IF I WERE TO BE UNFAITHFUL TO MY PARTNER, IT WOULD PROBABLY BE BECAUSE OF ONE OF MY PARTNER'S BEST FRIENDS.	-1.21
5..	WOMEN ARE NOT AS LOYAL AS MEN IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS.	-1.58
22..	I HAVE NEVER COME CLOSE TO A MEMBER OF THE OPPOSITE SEX WITHOUT FIRST BEING LOVERS.	-2.03
17..	TOUCHING AND HUGGING IS TOO INTIMATE FOR A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP.	-2.51

36..	I WANT MY PARTNER TO BE FRIENDS WITH MY FRIENDS.	1.80
1..	SOME OF MY CLOSEST PLATONIC FRIENDS ARE MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	1.74
2..	I CAN OPEN UP MORE TO SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	1.65
3..	A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP IS IN ITSELF A RARE FORM OF LOVE.	1.60
41..	IT IS EASIER FOR ME TO MANIPULATE PEOPLE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	1.52
45..	I MAINTAIN MORE ACTIVE FRIENDSHIPS THAN MOST PEOPLE DO.	1.28
37..	HAVING A FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX HELPS OPEN MY EYES TO THE BASIC FEELINGS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	1.17
13..	I GET JEALOUS WHEN MY PARTNER HAS FRIENDS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	1.01
38..	AT A PARTY, IT IS EASIER TO START TALKING TO SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN SOMEONE OF MY OWN SEX.	0.95
26..	MOST OF MY FRIENDS ARE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	0.94
49..	LONG TERM CLOSE FRIENDS DON'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT TRUST. THAT ASPECT OF THE RELATIONSHIP WAS WORKED OUT YEARS AGO.	0.86
35..	I SOMETIMES HAVE SEXUAL FANTASIES ABOUT A PLATONIC FRIEND.	0.81
4..	I SHARE EVERYTHING WITH MY FRIENDS, EXCEPT SEX.	0.80
15..	MALE AND FEMALE GENDER IS NOT WHAT MAKES COMMUNICATION DIFFERENT, IT IS THE INDIVIDUAL.	0.68
39..	I AM INTIMIDATED MORE BY SOMEONE OF MY SAME GENDER THAN ONE OF MY OPPOSITE GENDER.	0.55
31..	I HATE THE WAY PEOPLE SPREAD RUMORS ABOUT A PURELY PLUTONIC MALE-FEMALE RELATIONSHIP.	0.54
7..	IT MAKES ME ANGRY WHEN OTHER PEOPLE THINK THERE IS SOMETHING ROMANTIC GOING ON BETWEEN USE (OPPOSITE SEX PLATONIC FRIENDS).	0.52
44..	I WOULD MORE OFTEN ENTRUST A MEMBER OF MY OWN SEX WITH AN INTIMTE SECRET ABOUT MY PAST.	0.47
27..	WHEN I TELL A MAN CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, I CAN TRUST HIM MORE THAN I COULD IF I TOLD A WOMAN.	0.45
51..	USUALLY THE PEOPLE WHO GIVE A MALE AND FEMALE (WHO ARE JUST FRIENDS) TROUBLE ABOUT BEING "JUST FRIENDS" ARE JEALOUS BECAUSE THEY DON'T SHARE SUCH A UNIQUE RELATIONSHIP WITH ANYONE.	0.43
32..	WOMEN'S BEST FRIENDS CHANGE AS THEY GO THROUGH LIFE. MEN KEEP THE SAME FRIENDS THROUGHOUT LIFE.	0.42
19..	WOMEN GET MORE EMOTIONAL SUPPORT FROM OTHER WOMEN THAN MEN GET FROM MEN.	0.37
46..	WOMEN TALK TO ME ABOUT INTIMATE THINGS MORE THAN MEN DO.	0.35
9..	YOU CAN HAVE BEST FRIEND RELATIONS BETWEEN OPPOSITE SEXES BEFORE YOU ARE MARRIED, BUT AFTER THAT, HUSBAND AND WIFE SHOULD BE BEST FRIENDS.	0.33
20..	PLATONIC RELATIONSHIPS ARE GENERALLY LONGER LASTING THAN THOSE WITH ROMANTIC AND SEXUAL INVOLVEMENT.	0.31
16..	IT IS EASIER TO HAVE A DEEP CONVERSATION WITH A FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN ONE OF MY OWN GENDER.	0.20
24..	MY CLOSEST FRIEND LIVES FAR AWAY. I IMAGINE TALKS TO DISCUSS PROBLEMS IN MY LIFE.	0.03
52..	IF I WERE TO BE UNFAITHFUL TO MY PARTNER, IT WOULD PROBABLY BE BECAUSE OF ONE OF MY PARTNER'S BEST FRIENDS.	0.02
43..	MY MALE FRIENDS ARE FRIENDS FOR LIFE.	-0.03
6..	WOMEN FRIENDS ARE MORE COMPETITIVE WITH EACH OTHER THAN MEN ARE COMPETITIVE WITH EACH OTHER.	-0.14
5..	WOMEN ARE NOT AS LOYAL AS MEN IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS.	-0.41
40..	A PERSON OF THE OPPOSITE SEX WHO IS UNATTRACTIVE OR UNAPPEALI TO ME IS EASIER TO BECOME FRIENDS WITH. THE EXPECTATIONS AND INHIBITIONS INVOLVED WITH ROMANTIC ATTRACTION ARE NOT PRESENT.	-0.42
23..	I THINK MY BEST FRIEND WILL BE THERE FOREVER FOR ME. THE ONLY THING THAT MIGHT END OUR RELATIONSHIP WOULD BE A SPOUSE WHO COULD NOT ACCEPT OUR LOVE.	-0.46
34..	MEN HAVE MORE CASUAL CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS THAN WOMEN, WHO ALWAYS NEED TO KNOW ALL THE DEEP DARK SECRETS.	-0.52
33..	WOMEN ARE EASIER TO TALK TO THAN MEN.	-0.52
11..	WOMEN ARE MORE OPEN WITH THEIR FRIENDS, WHILE MEN ARE MORE SECRETIVE.	-0.52
8..	BECAUSE I AM INVOLVED IN TEAM SPORTS, I FIND MYSELF SHOWING MALE MANNERISMS TOWARD WOMEN.	-0.56
47..	PLATONIC RELATIONSHIPS ARE EASIER TO MAINTAIN WITH SOMEONE I HAVE KNOWN SINCE CHILDHOOD. I COULD NEVER THINK OF THESE KINDS OF FRIENDS IN A SEXUAL SENSE.	-0.64
30..	IF MY INTIMATE PARTNER HAS TIME TO DO SOMETHING WITH A PLUTONIC FRIEND, S/HE SHOULD HAVE THE TIME TO DO SOMETHING WITH ME FIRST.	-0.64
42..	FEMALES ARE BETTER LISTENERS AND HELPERS THAN MALES ARE.	-0.69
10..	SOME MOTHER AND SON RELATIONSHIPS MAKE IT HARD FOR THE SON TO RELATE TO OTHER WOMEN.	-0.72
21..	IN WOMAN-TO-WOMAN RELATIONSHIPS, IF THERE ARE CHILDREN FRIENDSHIPS GET HARDER.	-0.73
48..	IN DEVELOPING A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEXES, MALES I KNOW NEED MORE TIME TO DEVELOP TRUST THAN THE WOMEN I KNOW.	-0.88
18..	IT IS EASIER TO "TELL OFF" SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN SOMEONE OF MY OWN GENDER.	-0.90
50..	I FIND FEMALES TO BE MORE OPEN-MINDED AND JOLLY. MALES SCARE ME WITH SOME OF THEIR ATTITUDES.	-1.29
28..	I'D RATHER WORK OR STUDY WITH A FEMALE FRIEND BECAUSE THEY'RE MORE FOCUSED AND SERIOUS THAN THE GUYS-THEY KNOW WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE AND THEY DO IT.	-1.31
14..	MEN MAY SHOW THAT THEY ARE ANGRY BY THROWING SOMETHING OR YELLING, BUT I CANNOT REMEMBER A MALE EVER CONFIDING THAT HE IS UPSET OR DEPRESSED.	-1.34
25..	MALES HOLD GRUDGES LONGER THAN FEMALES.	-1.38
17..	TOUCHING AND HUGGING IS TOO INTIMATE FOR A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP.	-1.87
12..	I WOULD RATHER HAVE A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP THAN ANY OTHER KIND.	-1.93
29..	I AVOID OPPOSITE SEX PLUTONIC RELATIONSHIPS BECAUSE OF WHAT "PEOPLE MAY THINK."	-1.94
22..	I HAVE NEVER COME CLOSE TO A MEMBER OF THE OPPOSITE SEX WITHOUT FIRST BEING LOVERS.	-2.01

Q for Research and Instruction 36.

#	Item	Score
15..	MALE AND FEMALE GENDER IS NOT WHAT MAKES COMMUNICATION DIFFERENT, IT IS THE INDIVIDUAL.	2.05
36..	I WANT MY PARTNER TO BE FRIENDS WITH MY FRIENDS.	2.02
49..	LONG TERM CLOSE FRIENDS DON'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT TRUST. THAT ASPECT OF THE RALTIONSHIP WAS WORKED OUT YEARS AGO.	1.54
34..	MEN HAVE MORE CASUAL CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS THAN WOMEN, WHO ALWAYS NEED TO KNOW ALL THE DEEP DARK SECRETS.	1.49
47..	PLATONIC RELATIONSHIPS ARE EASIER TO MAINTAIN WITH SOMEONE I HAVE KNOWN SINCE CHILDHOOD. I COULD NEVER THINK OF THESE KINDS OF FRIENDS IN A SEXUAL SENSE.	1.45
37..	HAVING A FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX HELPS OPEN MY EYES TO THE BASIC FEELINGS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	1.27
13..	I GET JEALOUS WHEN MY PARTNER HAS FRIENDS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	1.18
30..	IF MY INTIMATE PARTNER HAS TIME TO DO SOMETHING WITH A PLUTONIC FRIEND, S/HE SHOULD HAVE THE TIME TO DO SOMETHING WITH ME FIRST.	1.17
31..	I HATE THE WAY PEOPLE SPREAD RUMORS ABOUT A PURELY PLUTONIC MALE-FEMALE RELATIONSHIP.	1.16
32..	WOMEN'S BEST FRIENDS CHANGE AS THEY GO THROUGH LIFE. MEN KEEP THE SAME FRIENDS THROUGHOUT LIFE.	1.01
44..	I WOULD MORE OFTEN ENTRUST A MEMBER OF MY OWN SEX WITH AN INTIMATE SECRET ABOUT MY PAST.	0.98
46..	WOMEN TALK TO ME ABOUT INTIMATE THINGS MORE THAN MEN DO.	0.80
3..	A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP IS IN ITSELF A RARE FORM OF LOVE.	0.76
20..	PLATONIC RELATIONSHIPS ARE GENERALLY LONGER LASTING THAN THOSE WITH ROMANTIC AND SEXUAL INVOLVEMENT.	0.68
45..	I MAINTAIN MORE ACTIVE FRIENDSHIPS THAN MOST PEOPLE DO.	0.50
7..	IT MAKES ME ANGRY WHEN OTHER PEOPLE THINK THERE IS SOMETHING ROMANTIC GOING ON BETWEEN USE (OPPOSITE SEX PLATONIC FRIENDS).	0.48
27..	WHEN I TELL A MAN CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, I CAN TRUST HIM MORE THAN I COULD IF I TOLD A WOMAN.	0.41
17..	TOUCHING AND HUGGING IS TOO INTIMATE FOR A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP.	0.40
48..	IN DEVELOPING A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEXES, MALES I KNOW NEED MORE TIME TO DEVELOP TRUST THAN THE WOMEN I KNOW.	0.38
19..	WOMEN GET MORE EMOTIONAL SUPPORT FROM OTHER WOMEN THAN MEN GET FROM MEN.	0.38
33..	WOMEN ARE EASIER TO TALK TO THAN MEN.	0.29
6..	WOMEN FIRENDS ARE MORE COMPETITIVE WITH EACH OTHER THAN MEN ARE COMPETITIVE WITH EACH OTHER.	0.28
21..	IN WOMAN-TO-WOMAN RELATIONSHIPS, IF THERE ARE CHILDREN, FRIENDSHIPS GET HARDER.	0.17
11..	WOMEN ARE MORE OPEN WITH THEIR FRIENDS, WHILE MEN ARE MORE SECRETIVE.	0.17
39..	I AM INTIMIDATED MORE BY SOMEONE OF MY SAME GENDER THAN ONE OF MY OPPOSITE GENDER.	0.12
51..	USUALLY THE PEOPLE WHO GIVE A MALE AND FEMALE (WHO ARE JUST FRIENDS) TROUBLE ABOUT BEING "JUST FRIENDS" ARE JEALOUS BECAUSE THEY DON'T SHARE SUCH A UNIQUE RELATIONSHIP WITH ANYONE.	0.11
28..	I'D RATHER WORK OR STUDY WITH A FEMALE FRIEND BECAUSE THEY'RE MORE FOCUED AND SERIOUS THAN THE GUYS—THEY KNOW WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE AND THEY DO IT.	0.04
9..	YOU CAN HAVE BEST FRIEND RELATIONS BETWEEN OPPOSITE SEXES BEFORE YOU ARE MARRIED, BUT AFTER THAT, HUSBAND AND WIFE SHOULD BE BEST FRIENDS.	-0.05
5..	WOMEN ARE NOT AS LOYAL AS MEN IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS.	-0.10
1..	SOME OF MY CLOSEST PLATONIC FRIENDS ARE MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	-0.20
42..	FEMALES ARE BETTER LISTENERS AND HELPERS THAN MALES ARE.	-0.24
2..	I CAN OPEN UP MORE TO SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	-0.28
18..	IT IS EASIER TO "TELL OFF" SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN SOMEONE OF MY OWN GENDER.	-0.39
38..	AT A PARTY, IT IS EASIER TO START TALKING TO SOMEONE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN SOMEONE OF MY OWN SEX.	-0.41
43..	MY MALE FRIENDS ARE FRIENDS FOR LIFE.	-0.43
10..	SOME MOTHER AND SON RELATIONSHIPS MAKE IT HARD FOR THE SON TO RELATE TO OTHER WOMEN.	-0.49
26..	MOST OF MY FRIENDS ARE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	-0.51
50..	I FIND FEMALES OT BE MORE OPEN-MIND D AND JOLLY. MALES SCARE ME WITH SOME OF THEIR ATTITUDES.	-0.53
8..	BECAUSE I AM INVOLVED IN TEAM SPOTS, I FIND MYSELF SHOWING MALE MANNERISMS TOWARD WOMEN.	-0.69
16..	IT IS EASIER TO HAVE A DEEP CONVERSATION WITH A FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX THAN ONE OF MY OWN GENDER.	-0.70
14..	MEN MAY SHOW THAT THEY ARE ANGRY BY THROWING SOMETHING OR YELLING, BUT I CANNOT REMEMBER A MALE EVER CONFIDING THAT HE IS UPSET OR DEPRESSED.	-0.94
29..	I AVOID OPPOSITE SEX PLUTONIC RELATIONSHIPS BECAUSE OF WHAT PEOPLE MAY THINK.	-1.07
24..	MY CLOSEST FRIEND LIVES FAR AWAY. I IMAGINE TALKS TO DISCUSS PROBLEMS IN MY LIFE.	-1.09
25..	MALES HOLD DRUDGES LONGER THAN FEMALES.	-1.10
41..	IT IS EASIER FOR ME TO MANIPULATE PEOPLE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.	-1.14
4..	I SHARE EVERYTHING WITH MY FIRENDS, EXCEPT SEX.	-1.17
23..	I THINK MY BEST FRIEND WILL BE THERE FOREVER FOR ME. THE ONLY THING THAT MIGHT END OUR RELATIONSHIP WOULD BE A SPOUSE WHO COULD NOT ACCEPT OUR LOVE.	-1.19
12..	I WOULD RATHER HAVE A PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP THAN ANY OTHER KIND.	-1.22
40..	A PERSON OF THE OPPOSITE SEX WHO IS UNATTRACTIVE OR UNAPPEALI TO ME IS EASIER TO BECOME FRIENDS WITH. THE EXPECTATIONS AND INHIBITIONS INVOLVED WITH ROMANTIC ATTRACTION ARE NOT PRESENT.	-1.52
35..	I SOMETIMES HAVE SEXUAL FANTASIES ABOUT A PLATONIC FRIEND.	-1.89
52..	IF I WERE TO BE UNFAITHFUL TO MY PARTNER, IT WOULD PROBABLY BE BECAUSE OF ONE OF MY PARTNER'S BEST FRIENDS.	-2.00
22..	I HAVE NEVER COME CLOSE TO A MEMBER OF THE OPPOSITE SEX WITHOUT FIRST BEING LOVERS.	-2.02