

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 346

CG 015 952

AUTHOR Minatoya, Lydia Y.; Sedlacek, William E.  
 TITLE The SASW: A Measure of Sexism among University Freshmen.  
 INSTITUTION Maryland, Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.  
 SPONS AGENCY Maryland Univ., College Park. Computer Science Center.  
 REPORT NO UM-RR-12-80  
 PUB DATE 81  
 NOTE 20p:

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Attitude Measures; Attribution Theory; College Freshmen; Conformity; Females; Higher Education; Nontraditional Occupations; \*Research Problems; \*Sex Bias; \*Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes; \*Social Influences; \*Test Format  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Situational Attitude Scale for Women

ABSTRACT

As it becomes socially less acceptable to appear prejudiced, the difficulty in obtaining unbiased measures of attitudes toward women increases. The Situational Attitude Scale-Women (SASW) was developed to overcome this methodological difficulty. The SASW consists of two parallel forms, one containing neutral situations involving "a person" and one containing situations involving "a woman." These two forms control for positive bias. The SASW was completed by 334 college freshmen. Results showed that 55 of the 100 items on the SASW elicited responses which were significantly different by form and 48 items elicited responses which differed significantly by sex of respondent. Interactions (N=32) between form and sex of respondent were found to be significant. While many of the attitudes toward women in various situations were positive, much of this positivity may be interpreted as attributable to sex stereotyping. (Author/NRB)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

ED217346

COUNSELING CENTER  
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND  
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

The SASW: A Measure of Sexism Among University Freshmen

Lydia Y. Minatoya and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 12-80

1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*William E. Sedlacek*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The computer time for this project was supported  
in full through the facilities of the Computer Science  
Center of the University of Maryland, College Park

CG 015952

During the past decade, women received considerable attention as an issue. On university campuses, efforts were begun to assess the needs of special populations of women, such as returning women students and women in traditionally male departments. Initially, concern for women was somewhat analogous to early attention given to some minority groups. That is, while there was recognition that barriers to these groups' access to many professional and social options existed, there also was an implicit assumption that many of these barriers existed within the group. Hence much consideration was given to the "problems" of traditionally outgroup members, such as negative self-concept, lack of role models, inadequate social skills.

Increasingly, there was recognition that social equity is not just a matter of assisting outgroup members to identify and rectify deficits which, if remediated, would make them more similar to the ingroup. Rather, social equity was more likely to be viewed as an interactive exchange requiring self-examination and adaptation from both the ingroup and outgroup. It therefore became important to examine attitudes toward social change.

As it became less socially desirable to appear prejudiced, respondents may have been more apt to fake responses in a positive direction on surveys of attitudes toward women (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1971). To compensate for this possible positive bias, Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) developed the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS), which was designed to measure the attitudes of whites toward Blacks. The Situational Attitude Scale Women (SASW) followed the format of the SAS. In the SASW, ten personal and social situations were presented (see appendix). The situations represented occasions where sex role stereotyping might be a variable in reacting. Ten bipolar semantic differential scales (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957) were constructed, with scale values of A-E (0-4), where 0 is a tolerant response and 4 is a

stereotyped response. The instrument, therefore, contains 100 items. To avoid the problem of positive bias, two parallel forms were developed, each containing the same situations and bipolar scales. However, Form A used neutral terms such as "a person," while form B used gender specific terms such as a "a woman." The positive pole of each item varied randomly from left to right to avoid response set.

Herman and Sedlacek (1973) administered the SASW to a random sample of 100 male college freshmen and found significant differences by form on 32 of the 100 items. Since only nine tests would have been expected to be significant due to chance (Sakoda, Cohen, & Beall, 1954), the differences were interpreted as evidence that the reference to gender caused subjects to respond differently to Form B than to Form A.

The present study sought to measure the attitudes of university students towards women in non-traditional roles, using the SASW. Herman and Sedlacek measured the attitudes of men toward women; the present study in part replicated their 1973 study by examining responses to situations by form. The present study also examined responses by sex of respondent, and interactions between form and sex of respondent.

#### Method

The SASW, Forms A-1 and B-1, was administered to 353 incoming freshmen at the University of Maryland, College Park in the summer of 1979. Nineteen students did not complete the forms, leaving a sample of 334. This sample was 55% female and 45% male. All questionnaires were completed anonymously. Both a male and female experimenter administered the SASW to control for sex-of-experimenter effects. The forms were distributed randomly, so each student had an equal probability of receiving either Form A or Form B. One hundred sixty-one students completed Form A, and 173 completed Form B. Students were unaware of the existence of two forms.

### Analyses

The data were analyzed by means, standard deviations, frequencies, and two-way Analyses of Variance.

### Results and Discussion

As can be seen in Table 1, 55 of the 100 items elicited responses which differed to a significant degree by Form and 48 of the 100 items elicited responses which differed significantly by sex of the respondent. Thirty-two significant interactions between form and sex were found. In each of the ten separate situations described (see Appendix), at least seven of the 10 bipolar adjectives describing reactions to the situation were found to have some significant effect.

Results were similar to those reported by Herman and Sedlacek (1973), i.e., students in the present study felt more relaxed, receptive and generally positive when a magazine sales "woman" appeared at their door in the evening than when a sales "person" appeared. Women indicated greater wariness and fear than men regardless of the gender of the salesperson. When the sales person appearing at the door in the evening was a woman, men were significantly more apt than women to feel receptive, excited, pleased and friendly.

Women felt less calm, more afraid, more pleasant, more acceptive and more inferior than men when stopped by a police officer, regardless of the sex of the officer. When the officer was identified as a woman, both men and women more strongly endorsed adjectives such as calm, unfriendly, intolerant, bitter, belligerent, and superior than when the officer's sex was not specified but presumably male. This suggests that students felt more comfortable experiencing negative and hostile feelings when stopped by a woman officer than when the officer's gender was not specified.

Given a situation describing meeting their new physician, both men and women felt more confident, calm, jovial, and generally positive when the physician was a woman. When the physician's gender was unspecified, women respondents indicated stronger feelings of apprehension and nervousness than men. However, when the doctor was described as a woman, more female respondents than male respondents endorsed adjectives of confidence, calm, and joviality. When the physician was specified as a woman, men become more embarrassed and aroused and women become less embarrassed and aroused than when the gender of the physician was unspecified. These findings suggest that the students assume a physician is male unless otherwise specified. Additionally, while both men and women felt more at ease with a woman physician, female respondents were far more positive toward the idea of a woman for a doctor than were male students.

One of the ten situations presented concerned a man in a traditionally female role, i.e., a male nurse. When the nurse was specified as male, students found the situation elicited feelings of surprise, out of place, oddball, good and pleased more than when the gender of the nurse was unspecified. When presented with the neutral form of the situation, women endorsed the negative ends of the good-bad, and pleased-annoyed, bipolar adjectives more strongly than men. However, when given the situation of a male nurse, women endorse the positive poles of good and pleased more than did men.

Another situation described is going out for a drink with a friend who decides to pick up the check. In Form B the word "girlfriend" is inserted. Form B may be measuring two different situations for men and women. To women, the word "girlfriend" may connote a drink with a "pal," while to men the word may connote a drink with a person with whom they have an established romantic relationship. This makes interpretation of the results difficult. Perhaps



future revisions of the SASW could be rewritten so that the forms remain equivalent for respondents of both sexes.

In the situation which described being fired and having a coworker take over one's position, students endorsed the adjectives justified, pleased and acceptable more strongly when the coworker was a woman than when the coworker's sex was unspecified. In the neutral situation, men were less apt to indicate anger than women. When the coworker was a woman, men indicated more anger than women.

Students felt more positive about going to a tax consultant and a counselor when the helper was a woman than when the helper's gender was unspecified. Women students were more positive than male students about going to a counseling center whether or not the counselor's gender was specified.

When a service station attendant checked under their car hood, students responded more negatively when the attendant was a woman. Endorsement of adjectives such as anger, funny, silly, and improper increased when the attendant was female. Regardless of the gender of the attendant, in this situation women felt more apprehensive, pleased and less confident than did men.

While the responses to women in several situations appeared positive, the findings support the interpretation of Herman and Sedlacek (1973) that this positivity may be based on stereotypes. For example, women in the nurturant roles of counselor and doctor and the helpful role of tax consultant were seen positively. Women in roles requiring mechanical ability (service station attendant) and disciplinary authority (police officer), and men in the nurturant role (nurse) elicited less positive reactions than did neutral actors. The positivity of students toward women doctors, counselors, and also tax consultants may have been influenced by a new assumption. That is,

students may have assumed that to succeed in a non-traditional field, a woman must be more qualified than a male colleague.

The study of environmental sexism requires measurement of complex and suitable variables. The SASW may be a useful tool for assessing reactions to persons in non-traditional roles. Chapman (1974) found that the SASW was useful in raising the issues of sexism and changing the attitudes of workshop participants. Sedlacek & Brooks (1976) consider the measurement of sexist attitudes through the use of the SASW just one of six stages which must be worked through to eliminate sexism. Thus the continued development and improvement of the measurement of sexist attitudes could be an important part of reducing or eliminating the problems and consequences of sexism in our educational system and in our society.



## References

- Chapman, T.H. Simulation game effects on attitudes regarding racism and sexism. Cultural Study Center Research Report # 8-74, University of Maryland, College Park, 1978.
- Herman, M.H. and Sedlacek, W.E. Sexist attitudes among male university students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 11, 544-548.
- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J. and Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Sakoda, J.H., Cohen, B.H. and Beall, G. Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51, 172-175.
- Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. Social acceptability in the measurement of racial attitudes. Psychological Reports, 1971, 29, 17-18.
- Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) Manual. Chicago: Natresources, Inc., 1972.
- Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. Racism in American education: A model for change. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Appendix

The S.A.S.W.

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous, so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date.

happy ' A ' B ' C ' D ' E ' sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you will feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPERATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

FORM A

FORM B

- I. It is evening and a person appears at your door selling magazines.
- II. You are stopped for speeding by a police officer.
- III. You have just met your new doctor.
- IV. You have just learned that you have been fired and a coworker takes over your job.
- V. You meet the person who will complete your income tax return.
- VI. You pull into a service station and the attendant looks under the car hood.
- VII. You are in a hospital and the nurse comes in to give you an injection.
- VIII. You go out for a drink with a friend who decides to pick up the check.
- IX. You are a personnel officer and have just interviewed an applicant who appears to be aggressive and bright.
- X. You come to the Counseling Center and meet you counselor for the first time.

- I. It is evening and a woman appears at your door selling magazines.
- II. You are stopped for speeding by a policewoman.
- III. You have just met your new woman doctor.
- IV. You have just learned that you have been fired and a female coworker takes over your job.
- V. You meet the woman who will complete your income tax return.
- VI. You pull into a service station and the female attendant looks under the car hood.
- VII. You are in a hospital and the male nurse comes in to give you an injection.
- VIII. You go out for a drink with a girlfriend who decides to pick up the check.
- IX. You are a personnel officer and have just interviewed a woman applicant appears to be aggressive and bright.
- X. You come to the Counseling Center and meet your female counselor for the first time.

Table 1

Means\*, Standard Deviations and Results of Analysis of Variance

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A				FORM B				Diff. Sign.*** at .05				
		Total N=161 Mean	S.D.	Male N=75 Mean	Female N=86 Mean	Total N=173 Mean	S.D.	Male N=75 Mean	Female N=98 Mean					
I PERSON SELLING MAGAZINES														
1	relaxed - startled	1.91	1.05	1.79	1.03	2.02	1.06	1.69	.99	1.65	1.10	1.71	.91	F
2	receptive - cautious	2.80	1.01	2.64	1.05	2.93	.97	2.17	1.11	1.68	1.08	2.54	.98	F, S, FS
3	excited - unexcited	2.97	1.03	2.85	1.01	3.07	1.04	2.76	1.13	2.25	1.15	3.15	.96	S, FS
4	glad-angered	2.27	.59	2.21	.62	2.31	.56	2.03	.77	1.81	.85	2.19	.65	F, S
5	pleased- annoyed	2.47	.77	2.40	.84	2.52	.70	2.32	.89	1.97	.91	2.59	.77	S, FS
6	indifferent-suspicious	1.94	1.30	1.79	1.26	2.08	1.32	1.76	1.19	1.81	1.15	1.72	1.23	
7	tolerable-intolerable	1.50	1.01	1.69	.99	1.51	1.03	1.40	1.02	1.16	.93	1.59	1.05	FS
8	afraid-secure	2.27	1.07	2.53	.98	2.02	1.10	2.68	1.07	3.09	.96	2.36	1.04	F, S
9	friend-enemy	1.97	.77	2.00	.77	1.94	.77	1.68	.76	1.40	.81	1.89	.66	F, S, FS
0	unprotected-protected	2.34	1.08	2.65	1.06	2.07	1.04	2.73	1.06	3.12	.97	2.43	1.03	F, S
II STOPPED BY POLICE OFFICER														
1	calm-nervous	3.29	.99	3.04	1.01	3.51	.93	2.90	1.29	2.87	1.28	2.93	1.30	F, S
2	trusting-suspicious	1.93	1.10	2.00	1.15	1.86	1.05	1.82	1.16	1.96	1.27	1.70	1.06	
3	afraid-safe	1.53	1.24	1.75	1.25	1.35	1.20	1.68	1.35	1.81	1.40	1.57	1.30	S
4	friendly-unfriendly	1.26	1.12	1.32	1.14	1.21	1.11	1.53	1.22	1.69	1.34	1.41	1.12	F
5	tolerant-intolerant	1.12	1.14	1.29	1.16	.98	1.11	1.43	1.19	1.59	1.26	1.31	1.13	F, S
6	bitter-pleasant	2.22	1.30	1.99	1.28	2.42	1.29	1.82	1.24	1.60	1.34	1.98	1.15	F, S
7	cooperative-uncooperative	.47	.80	.51	.78	.44	.82	.63	.98	.61	.97	.64	.99	
8	acceptive-belligerent	.97	.90	1.09	.92	.86	.87	1.40	1.04	1.67	1.13	1.19	.93	F, S
9	inferior-superior	1.38	.92	1.53	.81	1.24	.99	1.61	1.04	1.75	1.14	1.50	.94	F, S
0	serious-humorous	.73	.95	.71	.88	.74	1.01	.85	1.05	.73	1.03	.94	1.05	

\*Scale A to E, numerical equivalent 0 to 4

\*\*See Appendix for complete situations

\*\*\*F=significant by Form

S=significant by Sex

FS Significant by Form and Sex

Table 1 (continued)

Means\*, Standard Deviations and Results of Analysis of Variance

SITUATIONS**	FORM A				FORM B				Diff. 'Sign.*** at .05				
	Total N=161	Male N=75	Female N=86	Total N=173	Male N=75	Female N=98							
BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSIONS	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
III MEET YOUR NEW DOCTOR													
1 apprehensive-confident	1.28	1.12	1.44	1.02	1.14	1.20	2.20	1.38	1.53	1.15	2.70	1.33	F, S, FS
2 nervous-calm	1.42	1.13	1.77	1.02	1.10	1.14	2.11	1.30	1.69	1.21	2.43	1.29	F, FS
3 angry-jovial	2.42	.76	2.44	.72	2.41	.79	2.62	.90	2.41	.82	2.78	.94	F, FS
4 unsure-sure	1.63	1.05	1.81	.97	1.48	1.10	2.32	1.28	1.84	1.20	2.69	1.22	F, S, FS
5 slighted-understanding	2.60	.90	2.57	.87	2.62	.93	2.83	1.11	2.47	1.13	3.11	1.00	F, S, FS
6 embarrassed-not embarrassed	2.07	1.29	2.39	1.16	1.79	1.35	2.39	1.39	1.91	1.33	2.77	1.33	F, FS
7 confident-not confident	1.77	.93	1.72	.88	1.81	.98	1.27	1.08	1.65	.99	.97	1.05	F, S, FS
8 aroused-passive	2.35	.87	2.36	.91	2.34	.83	2.37	1.23	1.64	1.08	2.93	1.02	S, FS
9 disappointed-elated	2.05	.52	2.00	.43	2.09	.59	2.36	.81	2.27	.88	2.43	.75	F
0 threatened-neutral	2.93	1.11	3.00	1.01	2.86	1.19	3.29	1.03	2.97	1.00	3.53	.83	F, FS
IV CO-WORKER TAKES JOB													
1 resentful-tolerant	.82	1.02	.83	1.07	.81	.99	1.14	1.27	1.11	1.18	1.17	1.34	F
2 unjustified-justified	.95	1.02	.95	1.09	.95	.96	1.42	1.27	1.29	1.18	1.52	1.33	F
3 disgusted-pleased	.65	.78	.68	.79	.62	.77	.92	.97	.76	.93	1.05	.99	F
4 incensed-cautious	1.72	1.00	1.53	.99	1.88	1.00	1.69	1.05	1.64	1.11	1.73	1.00	
5 angry-calm	.91	1.04	.97	1.05	.85	1.03	.99	1.08	.80	.97	1.14	1.14	FS
6 unreasonable-reasonable	1.81	1.15	1.67	1.20	1.94	1.10	1.73	1.26	1.51	1.29	1.91	1.21	S
7 going too far-fair	1.53	1.30	1.48	1.12	1.57	1.14	1.71	1.18	1.53	1.26	1.84	1.11	
8 acceptable-objectionable	2.76	1.08	2.77	1.03	2.74	1.13	2.51	1.18	2.68	1.20	2.38	1.16	F
9 furious-accepting	1.43	1.06	1.43	1.08	1.43	1.05	1.53	1.19	1.44	1.27	1.60	1.13	
0 wrong-right	1.54	1.20	1.52	1.23	1.56	1.18	1.72	1.08	1.52	1.12	1.87	1.02	

\*Scale A to E, numerical equivalent 0 to 4

\*\*See Appendix for complete situations

\*\*\*F=significant by Form

S=significant by Sex

FS=significant by Form and Sex

Table 1 (continued)

Means\*, Standard Deviations and Results of Analysis of Variance

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS**	FORM A				FORM B				Diff. Sign.*** at .05				
		Total N=161		Male N=75		Female N=86		Total N=173			Male N=75		Female N=98	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
V. MEET INCOME TAX PERSON														
41	irritated-calm	2.86	1.03	2.75	.97	2.97	1.08	2.96	1.06	2.72	1.07	3.14	1.03	S
42	skeptical-assured	2.16	1.13	2.07	1.07	2.23	1.17	2.71	1.13	2.56	1.08	2.82	1.19	F
43	incredible-credible	2.48	.86	2.48	.94	2.49	.79	2.86	.94	2.80	.90	2.91	.96	F
44	useful-useless	1.26	1.12	1.59	1.08	.98	1.07	1.14	1.00	1.20	.96	1.09	1.04	S, FS
45	competent-incompetent	1.39	1.10	1.60	1.08	1.20	1.09	.97	1.01	1.09	.99	.87	1.02	F, S
46	ridiculous-expected	2.48	.92	2.25	.87	2.67	.93	2.55	.91	2.44	.95	2.63	.88	S
47	cheated-fulfilled	2.42	.95	2.29	.96	2.53	.93	2.52	.97	2.43	.99	2.59	.96	
48	trusting-lack of trust	1.40	1.03	1.61	1.06	1.21	.97	1.07	.96	1.23	1.03	.95	.89	F, S
49	inadequate-adequate	2.59	1.02	2.32	1.03	2.83	.96	2.81	1.01	2.69	1.00	2.90	1.02	F, S
50	humorous-serious	2.74	1.11	2.69	1.16	2.78	1.07	2.52	1.16	2.31	1.17	2.68	1.13	
VI. SERVICE STATION ATTENDANT														
51	furious-pleased	2.93	1.15	2.71	1.6	3.12	1.12	2.66	.91	2.47	.89	2.81	.90	F, S
52	apprehensive-confident	2.33	1.27	2.03	1.19	2.59	1.29	2.21	1.20	1.88	1.22	2.46	1.12	S
53	surprised-expected	1.47	1.25	1.53	1.26	1.42	1.24	1.26	1.13	1.21	1.04	1.30	1.20	
54	funny-not funny	2.45	.99	2.47	.83	2.44	1.12	1.97	1.12	1.87	1.17	2.04	1.08	F
55	confidence-lack of confidence	1.56	1.16	1.75	1.18	1.40	1.13	1.62	1.18	1.89	1.21	1.42	1.11	S
56	silly-proper	2.93	.97	2.89	.98	2.95	.97	2.24	1.04	2.08	.98	2.36	1.08	F
57	superior-inferior	1.83	.88	1.87	.92	1.79	.86	1.83	.82	1.67	.86	1.95	.78	
58	excited-not excited	2.37	.98	2.29	.88	2.43	1.06	2.34	1.08	2.09	1.10	2.53	1.03	S
59	improper-proper	2.76	.99	2.60	1.04	2.91	.93	2.30	1.08	2.23	1.03	2.36	1.12	F
60	feminine-masculine	2.04	1.40	2.93	1.07	1.26	1.18	2.10	1.17	2.47	1.04	1.82	1.19	S, FS

\*Scale A to E, numerical equivalent 0 to 4

\*\*See Appendix for complete situations

\*\*\*F=Significant by Form

S=Significant by Sex

FS=Significant by Form and Sex

Table 1 (continued)

Means\*, Standard Deviations and Results of Analysis of Variance

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSIONS	FORM A				FORM B				Diff. Sign.*** at .05				
		Total N=161		Male N=75		Female N=86		Total N=173			Male N=75		Female N=98	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
VII. NURSE GIVES YOU INJECTION														
61	surprised-expected	2.24	1.37	2.15	1.41	2.31	1.34	1.23	1.27	1.17	1.33	1.27	1.12	F
62	feminine-masculine	1.88	1.28	2.72	1.12	1.15	.90	1.87	1.22	2.28	1.12	1.56	1.21	S, FS
63	slow-quick	2.34	1.14	2.45	1.11	2.24	1.16	2.15	1.05	2.20	1.10	2.11	1.00	
64	dumb-smart	2.29	1.03	2.40	1.05	2.19	1.00	2.23	1.08	2.13	1.14	2.30	1.03	
65	out-of-place-in place	2.14	1.22	1.99	1.24	2.27	1.30	1.83	1.25	1.67	1.24	1.96	1.24	F, S
66	oddball-normal	2.74	1.19	2.57	1.16	2.88	1.20	2.22	1.30	1.85	1.32	2.50	1.22	F, S
67	distasteful-tasteful	1.88	1.06	2.03	1.01	1.76	1.09	2.17	1.07	2.11	1.19	2.21	.97	F
68	proper-improper	1.37	1.08	1.40	1.01	1.35	1.14	1.64	1.19	1.89	1.24	1.45	1.11	F, S
69	good-bad	2.02	1.25	1.83	1.17	2.19	1.30	1.64	1.09	1.85	1.10	1.48	1.06	F, FS
70	annoyed-pleased	1.58	1.08	1.73	1.04	1.44	1.09	2.09	1.10	1.73	1.12	2.37	1.00	F, FS
VIII. FRIEND PICKS UP CHECK														
71	embarrassed-relaxed	2.69	1.29	2.73	1.32	2.65	1.26	2.47	1.42	2.12	1.54	2.73	1.26	FS
72	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.74	1.30	2.87	1.27	2.64	1.32	2.55	1.37	2.31	1.44	2.74	1.28	FS
73	unsure-confident	2.61	1.27	2.72	1.20	2.52	1.32	2.56	1.31	2.32	1.34	2.74	1.26	FS
74	unexpected-expected	1.43	1.18	1.45	1.18	1.42	1.18	1.65	1.22	1.25	1.12	1.95	1.21	S, FS
75	put down-not put down	3.15	1.05	3.07	1.07	3.22	1.03	2.92	1.18	2.75	1.28	3.06	1.07	
76	hurt-not hurt	3.19	1.10	3.00	1.20	3.36	.99	2.92	1.24	2.64	1.40	3.13	1.05	F, S
77	annoyed-pleased	3.09	1.00	3.16	1.03	3.02	.97	2.68	1.15	2.44	1.24	2.86	1.05	F, FS
78	disappointed-satisfied	2.95	1.05	3.05	1.01	2.86	1.08	2.64	1.11	2.44	1.18	2.79	1.03	F, FS
79	distasteful-tasteful	2.93	.96	3.01	.88	2.86	1.03	2.64	1.08	2.41	1.16	2.81	.99	F, FS
80	feminine-masculine	1.94	1.42	2.87	1.09	1.13	1.16	1.63	1.19	2.20	1.23	1.19	.96	F, S, FS

\*Scale A to E, numerical equivalent 0 to 4

\*\*See Appendix for complete situations

\*\*\*F = Significant by Form

S = Significant by Sex

SF = Significant by Form and Sex

Table 1 (continued)

Means\*, Standard Deviations and Analysis of Variance

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS**	Total		FORM A		Female		Total		FORM B		Female		Diff. Sign.** at .05
		Mean	S.D.	Male N=75	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Male N=75	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
IX. PERSONNEL OFFICER														
81	good-bad	.58	.99	.69	1.05	.48	.92	.50	.78	.56	.78	.45	.79	
82	surprised-not surprised	2.11	1.15	1.83	1.11	2.36	1.14	2.72	1.20	2.51	1.25	2.89	1.15	F, S
83	threatening-non-threatening	2.71	1.10	2.77	.97	2.66	1.20	2.87	1.12	2.76	1.04	2.96	1.17	
84	unpleasant-pleasant	2.98	1.13	2.75	1.21	3.17	1.02	3.06	.98	2.91	1.04	3.18	.91	S
85	provocative-undesirable	1.58	1.00	1.60	1.04	1.56	.98	1.73	1.02	1.49	.99	1.91	1.01	FS
86	unattractive-attractive	2.58	1.00	2.56	1.00	2.60	1.00	2.51	1.07	2.61	1.10	2.44	1.05	
87	domineering-outgoing	2.60	1.09	2.55	1.06	2.65	1.12	2.55	1.18	2.25	1.22	2.78	1.10	S
88	problem-asset	2.81	1.14	2.76	1.17	2.86	1.12	3.03	.95	2.97	.93	3.08	.96	
89	masculine-feminine	1.93	1.25	1.29	1.04	2.48	1.16	2.34	1.32	1.75	1.30	2.79	1.15	F, S
90	exciting-unexciting	1.37	.97	1.41	.93	1.31	1.00	1.65	1.01	1.45	.83	1.81	1.11	F, FS
X. MEET NEW COUNSELOR														
91	mothered-independent	2.26	1.23	1.97	1.19	2.51	1.22	2.19	1.27	1.99	1.26	2.35	1.26	S
92	gypped-good deal	2.78	.96	2.72	.91	2.83	1.00	2.68	1.03	2.45	1.07	2.86	.96	S
93	uncomfortable-comfortable	1.99	1.20	1.85	1.10	2.12	1.27	2.77	1.13	2.49	1.17	2.98	1.06	F, S
94	aroused-unaroused	1.81	1.03	1.80	1.05	1.81	1.01	2.51	1.15	2.12	1.09	2.82	1.12	F, S, FS
95	nervous-calm	1.63	1.26	1.80	1.25	1.49	1.26	2.34	1.29	2.20	1.22	2.44	1.33	F, FS
96	disappointed-elated	2.32	.82	2.35	.76	2.30	.87	2.28	.91	2.12	.97	2.41	.84	
97	guarded-open	2.17	1.17	2.19	1.14	2.15	1.21	2.52	1.11	2.36	1.17	2.64	1.06	F
98	humorous-serious	2.37	1.09	2.33	1.09	2.41	1.09	2.36	1.05	2.36	1.07	2.37	1.04	
99	out of place-in place	2.13	1.94	2.09	1.64	2.16	1.23	2.74	1.09	2.53	1.18	2.90	.99	F
100	masculine-feminine	1.97	1.27	1.25	1.12	2.59	1.06	2.43	1.30	1.76	1.32	2.95	1.03	F, S

\*Scale A to E, numerical equivalent 0 to 4

\*\*See Appendix for complete situations

\*\*\* F=Significant by Form

S=Significant by Sex

FS=Significant by Form and Sex