

**Psychological Gender Inventories: Constructing the Concept of  
Gender through Measuring.**

By

Elena Kosterina

*Submitted to*

*Central European University*

*Department of Gender Studies*

*In partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Arts in Gender Studies*

Supervisor: Professor Anna Loutfi

Budapest, Hungary

2009

## ***Abstract.***

In my work I analyze and criticize the phenomenon of gender-measuring inventories and practice of measuring gender-related concepts in psychometrics. I incorporate several approaches to this phenomenon – social theories of M. Foucault, T. de Lauretis and J. Butler, feminist psychological theories of N. Chodorow, C. Gilligan and S. Bem, and data and literature from authors working in the field of psychometrics. This interdisciplinary approach allows analyzing the phenomenon of gender-measuring inventories both from psychological and gendering perspective.

In my work I focus on two of the most widely-used gender-measuring inventories in psychometrics – MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) (1930) Masculinity-Femininity scale and BSRI (Bem Sex Role Inventory) (1974) and organize my analysis chronologically, starting from analysis of MMPI Mf as one of the most traditional inventories and proceeding to BSRI as one that was created by a feminist psychologist Sandra Bem.

Through my work I provide evidence for the fact that gender is perceived in psychometrics as one of the core personality dimensions that has to be theorized. I also argue that gender-measuring inventories can be seen as a part of regulatory mechanisms in the society because they function to control gendered behavior in individuals through imposing gender roles embedded in the content of the inventories. This finding is supported by the evidence provided by the interviews I conducted with 11 respondents; the data from the analysis of interviews showed that the statement of identity provided by the inventories can influence individuals' perception of gendered self.

In my work I conclude that psychometric approach to gender as a quantitatively measurable core personality characteristic is linked to the view on gender in psychology as a whole, and this approach affects view on gender in psychological science and in society as well, because according to the evidence I provide psychology is seen as an authority in the social discourse on sex and gender.

## ***Acknowledgments.***

I would like to thank Professor Anna Loutfi for patient help through my work on the thesis, for extraordinary approaches to theory and for encouragement.

I would like also to thank Professor Elissa Helms for guiding me to come to the idea of this thesis.

## ***Table of Contents.***

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Method.....	8
3. Theoretical framing. Gender-measuring inventories through the theory of Michele Foucault.	12
4. Critique of psychological gender-measuring inventories in the context of psychometric approach to gender. ....	16
4.1. Analysis of Masculinity-femininity scale of MMPI.....	17
4.2. Analysis and critique of gender inventories.....	19
4.2.1. The philosophy of measuring. ....	19
4.2.2. What is measured by gender-measuring inventories? .....	24
4.2.3. Critique of techniques of development and content. ....	27
4.3. Overview of the concept of gender in psychology.....	30
4.3.1. Psychological approach to gender identity. ....	30
4.3.2. Gender variable in applied psychological research and psychometrics. ....	33
5. Work of Bem and her BSRI in the context of feminist psychological approach to gender. ....	37
5.1. Sandra Bem's Sex Role Inventory as a feminist psychological attempt to reconceptualize approach to gender measurement in psychology. ....	38
5.1.1. Looking closely on BSRI. ....	39
5.1.2. "Gender polarization" and independency of Masculinity and Femininity in BSRI. ....	41
5.1.3. Questioning revolutionary nature of the concept of androgyny in BSRI. ....	43
5.2. Concept of gender in feminist psychology. ....	48
5.2.1. Material body in work of Susan Bordo and Judith Butler. ....	49
5.2.2. Gender identity and gender differences in theories of feminist psychologists. Carol Gilligan and Nancy Chodorow. ....	51
5.2.3. 'Biological reductionalism' in the theory of Sandra Bem. ....	53
6. Function of gender measuring inventories in construction and perception of gender identity. ....	58
6.1. Examining responses to psychological gender testing. ....	59
6.2. Theorizing the process of gender identity construction and perception.....	67
7. Conclusion. ....	70
Appendix I. Bem Sex Role Inventory with answer sheet.....	73
Appendix II. MMPI Masculinity-Femininity Scale with keys. ....	75
Appendix III. Interview schedule. ....	80
Bibliography. ....	82

# 1. Introduction.

One of the important fields of study in psychology is *psychometrics* – a field development and theorizing of measurements of different psychological constructs such as intelligence, abilities or personality characteristics, and concerned with development of standard psychometric instruments or *psychological inventories* designed to assess the psychological traits<sup>1</sup>. This field appeared in the late 19 century with the works of Francis Galton (1822-1911), who theorized measurement of different anthropological characteristics and psychological traits, including intelligence<sup>2</sup>. Psychometrics today is a field of study and research that is regulated by “The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing” published by American Psychiatric Association in 1994<sup>3</sup>.

Among many types of inventories developed and being developed in psychometrics, a significant percentage of inventories are proposed to measure such constructs as masculinity-femininity, sex-role, gender-role, sex-role behavior, gender identity and others<sup>4</sup>. In this study I will refer to all of these inventories as *gender-measuring inventories*, because, as I will explain it in my analysis, all of these inventories perceive masculinity-femininity and traditional masculine or feminine roles to be the core constructs they measure, and *gender-measuring inventories* can be used as an overarching term for them.

In connection to this, I need to say that gender in psychology is usually defined as “fundamental, existential sense of one’s maleness or femaleness, an acceptance of one’s gender as a social-psychological construction that parallels acceptance of one’s biological sex”<sup>5</sup>. In analysis of psychological view on gender in my work I will use the term ‘gender’ in the connotation expressed

---

<sup>1</sup> Definition of the term can be retrieved from <http://knowledgerush.com/kr/encyclopedia/Psychometrics/>.

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.gap-system.org/~history/Biographies/Galton.html>.

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.apa.org/science/standards.html>.

<sup>4</sup> See Beere, C.A. (1990) *Gender roles. A Handbook on tests and measures*.

<sup>5</sup> Deux, K and Major, B. A Social-Psychological Model of Gender. From *The Gendered Society Reader* by M.Kimmel and A.Aronson (Eds.) p.84

by this definition, because my study is aimed at analysis and critique of the view on gender in psychometrics and psychology, expressed in the gender-measuring inventories. I will show in my work that this definition does not reflect the perception of the term ‘gender’ as it is implied in gender inventories. I argue that in contrast to this definition, the definition on gender assumed by the creators of gender inventories rather expresses a set of psychological traits that have biological basis, and are different from males and females, and can be assessed quantitatively. The evidence for my conclusion and the critique of such understanding of gender in psychometrics and psychology as a whole I will provide later in my work.

The history of gender-measuring inventories started in 1930 with invention of the first inventory – “Attitude-Interest Analysis Survey (AIAS)” by Lewis Terman and Catherine Miles in 1936, which consists of statement that require yes/no answers to a list of statements and was named in this way with the aim to conceal the purpose of the measurement. This inventory was created to measure ‘masculinity-femininity’ and “was intended to identify incongruities between one’s biological sex and one’s ‘psychological’ sex”<sup>6</sup>. The test was stated to be useful in “predicting problems in marital adjustment by identifying ‘feminine’ and ‘masculine’ minds”<sup>7</sup>. As it will be explored later in my work, this inventory became the basis for many other tests, which were using the same logic of construction and content item-selection, although it is known that there were no theoretical basis for Terman and Miles test, no definitions were provided for gender identity and masculinity and femininity. Basic assumption of this inventory is that masculinity and femininity are best identified “in terms of sex differences in response”<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Hoffman, R. M. (2001). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: historical perspective and implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 79 (4). Retrieved 02.20.2009 from [http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\\_0286-27173315\\_ITM](http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-27173315_ITM)

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

After the inventory of Terman and Miles a lot of different gender-measuring inventories were invented. A lot of them are used in different types of academic research and clinical practice, and several of them are widely known and used in most of gender-related research in psychology<sup>9</sup>. The most popular inventories, used as examples in my work, are “Masculinity-Femininity Scale (Mf)” of “Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory” (MMPI Mf) which was developed in late 1930s and “Bem Sex Role Inventory” (BSRI), developed in 1974. The content of both of these inventories will be described in detail in methodology section, where I explain why I focus on these two in particular. Both of these tests are widely used in clinical assessment and in psychological research in spite of being rather old, they have many versions and adaptations to many languages and cultures.

These two inventories, as well as others are used for two main purposes. First of all, it is important to say that the purpose of their administration in clinical treatment was formulated as revealing homosexual traits in patients from the beginning of development of gender inventories. Currently, the same purpose is assumed in clinical usage of the tests, although the formulation of the purpose is softened to be “revealing the extent of identification of the patient with the role of male or female assigned by the society”<sup>10</sup>.

In contemporary practice the same gender inventories are mostly used in cases of family and interpersonal relations therapy to assess level of masculinity and/or femininity of an individual, although the content of the inventories remains unchanged in all the inventories from the moment of their construction. Usage of gender inventories in such cases is explained by the fact that particular levels of masculinity and femininity help an individual to better adapt in social life, and

---

<sup>9</sup> Beere, C. (1990) “Gender Roles: A handbook of tests and measures”.

<sup>10</sup> The citation is taken from the manual for MMPI inventory by Sobchik, L.N. (2005), which was downloaded from [http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob\\_01.shtml](http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob_01.shtml) Translation from Russian is mine.

thus these characteristics should be measured to reveal potential or present problems of adaptation<sup>11</sup>.

One more area of usage of the inventories, more popular one in contemporary science, is gender-related research in psychology. Typical examples of studies that are conducted with the use of gender-measuring inventories, specifically with MMPI Mf and BSRI are correlation research which studies correlations of levels of masculinity and femininity with psychiatric symptoms; with educational level; with level of cognitive moral development; with tendency to take care for elderly parents; with tendency to risky driving; with level of sexual attraction; with level of working mother feeling of guilt; with creative styles; with number of sexual partners during lifespan; correlation between femininity of mothers and medical conditions of newborns and many other types of correlation studied that are published within different fields of psychological science and can be found in many academic psychological journals and electronic databases as well. In case of BSRI alone, in different research this test has been offered to very different groups of people: homosexuals and transsexuals, athletes, physicians, nurses, parents of newborns, parents-to-be, married couples, women awaiting trial, women awaiting abortion, infertile couples, teachers, homosexual fathers, psychiatric inpatients, prostitutes, clinical psychologists, and many others<sup>12</sup>. There is lack of information about why BSRI was administered to these particular groups of people, and along with that the groups that got this inventory seem to be very randomly selected in relation to each other. According to Morawski<sup>13</sup>, the main area where creators of the gender-measuring inventories and other authors have always prognosticated their effective usage is “ameliorating

<sup>11</sup> The fact is taken from the manual for MMPI inventory by Sobchik, L.N. (2005), which was downloaded from [http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob\\_01.shtml](http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob_01.shtml)

<sup>12</sup> Beere, C.A. (1990) “Gender Roles: A handbook of tests and measures”. p.74

<sup>13</sup> Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality*, 53 (2) p.462



familial and marital maladjustments”<sup>14</sup>, where they are actually frequently used within the field of psychological treatment. But in the case of both provided examples, the inventories are seemed to be used mostly for the research in the field of gender psychology.

As it is evident, there are a lot of groups of people who can be offered a gender-measuring inventory due to many reasons, but still direct usage of the inventories is limited, and not every person in every society can have experience of filling out one of these inventories. But nevertheless, I argue, gender-measuring inventories are a social mechanism that intensively influences individuals’ and social construction and perception of gender identity, because, except for clinical assessment and psychological research, the statements of the inventories along with results of many psychological research using these inventories are extensively reiterated in different academic works and journals in different disciplines, mainly psychology and sociology, textbooks for different disciplines and other research.

Along with extensive usage of gender-measuring inventories in different spheres, there is a lot of critique of these inventories both within the discipline of psychology and outside of it. The critique focuses on different aspects of usage, creation and conceptualization of gender inventories and as a phenomenon. But with all existing critique and problems listed for the gender inventories, they are still very extensively used in different areas of psychological science. This very fact is the practical basis for my research. In the frame of this problem I will analyze in my work the phenomenon of gender measuring in psychology and particularly in psychometrics. The questions that guide my research are the following: What function do gender tests have in construction and forming perception of gender identities by society and individuals that take gender-measuring inventories? Why is gender important to be measured for psychometrics and what is understood by process of measurement in case of gender measuring inventories? What are the social mechanisms that make

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid p.462

gender inventories acceptable in society and taken as authoritative measure of gender and related constructs, why are the inventories extensively replicated and used despite the critique of psychologists and non-psychologists? How do gender-measuring inventories influence the self-perception of gender identity in individuals who take these inventories, how do they correspond to self-defined gender identity?

To answer these questions, I will analyze theoretical assumptions and logic of gender measuring using examples of two most popular gender inventories in psychometrics – MMPI Mf and BSRI, as it was mentioned above. Because MMPI Mf is one of the early scales measuring gender and BSRI is the latest and most popular one in contemporary psychometrics, such design of analysis will allow to trace historically and chronologically the theorization of gender identity in psychology and development of gender inventories as well. While MMPI Mf scale was created as a clinical psychological instrument for gender assessment, BSRI is an instrument developed by Sandra Bem, a feminist psychologist who claimed her inventory to be challenging the basic assumptions of gender measurement in psychometrics. In my work I contextualize the work of Bem as a feminist psychologist. The history of this field of study is represented by such authors as Karen Horney in psychoanalysis, Melanie Klein in object-relations theory, and more recent works of Carol Gilligan, Nancy Chodorow, Sandra Bem and others. Feminist psychology as a field of knowledge is representing interdisciplinary approach to gender identity theorization and its construction and at the same time have a specific hybrid vision of sex/gender distinction. On the one hand, approach of feminist psychology to gender as a concept and identity formation as a process is incorporating both traditional psychological and feminist insights, and attempting to subvert major dogmatic assumptions of traditional psychology about process of gender identity construction and purpose of gender differentiation in the society. But at the same time, feminist psychologists such as Bem, Gilligan and Chodorow have very specific for feminist theory approach to theorizing gender in their

work, because of their reluctance to give up the vision of sex as psychological foundation for gender identity development, while claiming that they incorporate feminist approach to gender and challenge traditional psychological one.

In connection to this, I argue that that the BSRI as an attempt of Bem to challenge mainstream assumptions of gender measuring is unsuccessful because it demonstrates the same practical problems and theoretical false assumptions as previous gender inventories had, although Bem argues that the theoretical basis behind the BSRI incorporates feminist insights about gender inequality and “androcentrism”<sup>15</sup> in the society. In addition to this analysis I will provide the findings based on interviews, which I conducted after asking respondents to fill out gender inventories and where I will focus on respondents’ feedback about the procedure of taking the inventories and their feedback on the statements about their gender identity provided by the inventories.

The phenomenon of psychological inventories that measure gender-related constructs has been addressed in different disciplines, mainly in psychology and psychometrics, and in feminist psychology by Sandra Bem, but there is lack of analysis of this topic outside of the field of psychology, while I see it to be an important social phenomenon to theorize. I perceive my work to be answering more general questions about this topic and in more radical way than they are usually addressed by authors in the field of psychometrics. In my work I apply social theories of gender, first of all ones by M. Foucault and T. de Lauretis to contextualize the phenomenon of gender-measuring inventories in a broader scope of social practices concerning regulation of gendered behavior in the society.

I perceive my work to be interdisciplinary because in my analysis I incorporate different theoretical approaches from different perspectives: mainstream psychological and psychometric theories about gender identity and its development, feminist psychological view on gender identity

---

<sup>15</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender*.

and its critique of understanding of concept of gender in mainstream psychology, Foucauldian theory of sexuality, and theory of gender by Judith Butler. All the approaches which I use together help to understand the position of psychometrics on gender identity and process of gender measurement, and dynamics of social mechanisms that make gender-measuring inventories acceptable as authoritative technique of stating individuals' gender identity.

Through my work, I will first provide a critique of the view on gender in psychometrics and psychology as a whole, illustrating it with the example of MMPI Mf in the chapter four. Brining the argument further, I will provide analysis and critique of BSRI and conceptualize it in the work of feminist psychologists. And in the chapter six I will discuss the data from the interviews. Details of the procedure of interviewing I will discuss in method section.

I am intended to provide an extended critique of the phenomenon of gender-measuring inventories and argue that all the evidence I provide prove this phenomenon to be part of the regulatory practices of control over the gendered behavior in the society, while stating the aim of gender measuring to be maintaining psychological health of the population.

## **2. Method.**

In my study I combine two types of analysis. First of all, I provide theoretical analysis of phenomenon of gender-measuring inventories in psychology, incorporating social theories working with the concept of discipline and power (by M. Foucault and T. de Lauretis), psychology, psychometrics, and feminist psychology. Along with that, I use interview as important part of my method. While theoretical critique of gender inventories provide analysis of construction, content and usage of the inventories, interviews provide answer to the question how exactly gender-measuring inventories can influence individuals' perception of own gender identity.

Materials that I use for conducting interviews in my study are the following: two gender-measuring inventories – MMPI Mf scale (Masculinity-Femininity Scale (Mf) of Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) and BSRI (Bem Sex Role Inventory) with answer sheets and interpretation materials<sup>16</sup>; and the interview schedule I comprised myself of the basis of issues I intended to discuss with the respondents<sup>17</sup>.

The MMPI Mf scale was created in late 1930 as part of Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory developed by Starke R. Hathaway and J. C. McKinley. This inventory one of major psychological clinical inventories and it is designed to provide a complex analysis of personality traits according to 10 scales measuring [Hypochondriasis](#), Depression, Hysteria, Psychopathic Deviation, Masculinity-Femininity, Paranoia, Psychasthenia, Schizophrenia, Hypomania, Social Introversion. Since its development, the inventory was revised two times, last time in 1989, but the content of masculinity-femininity scale has not been changed since 1943<sup>18</sup>. This scale, full version of which can be found in Appendix I, consists of 60 statements with ‘yes’ and ‘no’ answer options, and has male and female versions that differ in one question: “I have never been sorry that I am a girl” in female answer sheet and “I have often wished I were girl” in male answer sheet. The results for the inventory are counted as number of matches with the key, which presumes certain answers for males and females. If more that a half of answers coincide, the person is considered to be ‘above the

---

<sup>16</sup> I downloaded MMPI Mf scale from Torrent database, but this test is not distributed via internet usually, since it is considered to be used only by qualified professionals. The BSRI was retrieved from <http://www.neiu.edu/~tschuepf/bsri.html>. For interpretation of MMPI Mf I used materials from manual for MMPI by Sobchik, L.N. (2005), which was downloaded from [http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob\\_01.shtmlln](http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob_01.shtmlln). This manual was in Russian I translated from the manual when reporting the results to the respondents. I didn’t manage to find the same manual in English. I used the original interpretation of BSRI from the works of Sandra Bem.

Both inventories with answer sheets can be found in Appendix I and II.

<sup>17</sup> The interview schedule can be found in the Appendix III.

<sup>18</sup> Hoffman, R. M. (2001). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: historical perspective and implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 79 (4). Retrieved 02.20.2009 from [http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\\_0286-27173315\\_ITM](http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-27173315_ITM)

mean', which means that she or he has more characteristics of 'the opposite sex' than of one's own, which is considered to be deviant from the norm.

The second inventory used for my research is Bem's Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), which was created by Sandra Bem, a feminist psychologist, in 1974. This inventory, which is provided in Appendix II, consists from 60 adjectives and consists of 3 scales: Masculinity, Femininity and Social Desirability. A respondent is asked to rate herself/himself from one to seven on every adjective. If a person is rated high on femininity scale and low on masculinity scale, s/he is stated to be feminine, if a person is rated high on masculine scale and low on feminine one, s/he is stated to be masculine, if a person a rated high on both scales, s/he is stated to be androgynous, which means that a person equally incorporates high level of masculine and feminine characteristics (the concept of androgyny will be discussed in detail in chapter 4), and if a person is rated low on both scales, s/he is stated to be undifferentiated, which means that person incorporates low levels of both masculinity and femininity. The Social Desirability scale is claimed to be designed to analyze if a person tends to give only socially desirable answers<sup>19</sup>. This inventory will be analyzed in detail in the theoretical part of my work in the context of feminist psychological approach to gender measuring.

I use these two inventories for the research, because they are the most widely used inventories in psychometrics, and also their exemplify the development of gender measuring in psychology: MMPI Mf is a conceptualized as an example of early an inventory that in based on traditional psychological assumptions about gender and its measurement, and BSRI is usually seen as a challenging attempt of feminist approach within psychology to reconceptualize gender measuring and deconstruct traditional understanding of masculinity and femininity in psychology. So, my work provides chronological analysis of development of gender-measuring inventories on the examples of these two tests. I will argue in my work that the assumptions about gender identities and function of the

---

<sup>19</sup> Theoretical problems of having this scale in the inventory will be analyzed in chapter five.

inventories in construction and perception of gender do not change through development of the inventories, despite of seemingly different approaches behind the tests.

Within the scope of my study, I conducted interviews with eleven respondents. Five of them were males and six were females. All of the respondents were Hungarians, although some of them were citizens of other countries. Part of them were students of Central European University; part of them were people whom I found with the help of the people I had already interviewed. The age of the respondents varied from 20 to 30. In my practical chapter I will refer to my respondents as M1, M2, M3, M4, M5 for males and F1, F2, F3, F4, F5 and F6 for females, because I do not dedicate much space for the practical chapter in my thesis in comparison to other chapters, and using anonymous names would only distract attention of the reader to the feedback of the respondents.

The procedure of the interview consisted from several sections. First, as you can see from the interview schedule in Appendix III, I asked a respondent about her/his general opinion about gender identities, differences between males and females, possibilities of measuring gender identity and gender differences. These questions are justified by the assumption implied in every inventory that gender identities are better described in terms of differences between males and females – the assumption that I will critique in the body of my work. Then the inventories were offered to a respondent, first BSRI and after it MMPI Mf, because BSRI appear to be more neutral in representation of gender characteristics and doesn't influence the perception of the second inventory to be gender measuring one, while MMPI Mf has many statements that are gender loaded, like "I never been sorry that I am a girl" or "I would like to be a florist (or nurse)", and this fact could influence perception of the BSRI as one that assesses masculinity-femininity by analogy with the MMPI Mf. This approach is important because after filling out the inventories the respondents were asked to explain what these inventories measure, according to their opinion. Along with that, the respondents were asked to provide their feedback on the feelings and confusions they had while

filling out the tests. Later, after the scores were counted in front of the respondents and reported to them, I asked for their opinion about the procedure of counting and their feeling and opinion about me personally when I was counting the scores. After being reported the scores, the respondents were asked to explain how they felt about the identity that was stated by the both tests.

The most important part of interview was the last one, where the reaction of the respondents could be analyzed together with their feedback on the procedure and statements of the tests, and respondents were asked to speak of any problems and thoughts that appeared to them while they were filling out the inventories.

The main aim of conducting the interview for my study, as it was mentioned in the introduction, was receiving the feedback from the respondents about the statements of gender identity defined by the inventories for them, levels of masculinity and femininity the inventories stated, and also the whole procedure of answering the questions and seeing the results of the tests calculated by me.

In connection to this, I acknowledge that my study has particular methodological limitations. First of all, my sample is very small and homogeneous in terms of nationality and age group. Also, translation of some of my materials from Russian and translation of some of my interviews from Hungarian can distort the data from the interviews. Nevertheless, I still perceive it to be possible to draw certain conclusions, important for my work, from the opinions of my respondents.

### **3. Theoretical framing. Gender-measuring inventories through the theory of Michele Foucault.**

In “History of Sexuality” Michele Foucault speaks about “science of sexuality”, that he sees as a “guarantee under which moral obstacles, economic or political options, and traditional fears can be recast in a scientific-sounding vocabulary”<sup>20</sup>. For Foucault, this term includes many dimensions of science social institutional activity, and I argue that psychology is one part of this science. Not only

---

<sup>20</sup> Foucault, M. (1998) “History of Sexuality. Volume 1: Introduction”. p.55



psychiatric clinics as social institutions of which Foucault speaks directly, but also psychology as a discipline is one of “institutions”<sup>21</sup> that produce discourse about gender and sex, and give authority for experts within this field – psychologists – to speak about gender identities and gender characteristics, within the whole discourse about sex, of which Foucault speaks . Foucault speaks mainly about psychiatry, and that’s why I consider it to be important to theorize psychology and gender tests development in psychology as part of the argument that Foucault implies under term of psychiatry but doesn’t state explicitly.

Starting his analysis of psychiatry and psychology from psychoanalysis, Foucault accuses this approach of being a first signal within psychology to shift from repression to regulation, although psychoanalysis “gave itself a task of alleviation of repression” in the very beginning in discourse of sexuality. Creating first psychological gender tests was not part of implication of psychoanalytic theory but this theory gave a path for seeing gender identity as a personality trait that can be and should be conceptualized, analyzed, regulated, and thus measured by means of tests. And in addition to this, psychoanalysis as the first major theoretical approach in psychology opened the path to see gender identity as the core of personality, and that’s why the most important concept for psychological theory to analyze. Psychoanalysis, thus, can be seen as a part of “technology of life”<sup>22</sup> or “technology of sex”, which Foucault sees as a means of regulating population. Medicalization together with psychological approach to sex made it legitimate to conduct medical and psychological examinations, and, what is the most important for understanding function of gender tests, it “gave rise to comprehensive measure and statistical assessment”<sup>23</sup>, creating the need for mechanisms and technologies for such measurement. I argue that gender tests are mechanisms that appeared as a result of legitimization of statistical assessment of gender related constructs.

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid p.55.

<sup>22</sup> Foucault, M. (1998). *History of Sexuality. Volume 1: Introduction.* p.145

<sup>23</sup> Ibid p.145.

In the functioning of gender tests, the most important principle is described with Foucauldian term “confession”<sup>24</sup>, which Foucault sees as the basis for making people speak about their sexuality. Foucauldian way of presentation the “science of sexuality” as “a confessional science”<sup>25</sup> is fully applied to psychology in situation of gender inventories. The mechanism of confession, I argue, is used in all gender-measuring inventories, and the tradition to use confession in the institution of religion, as Foucault refers to it, as a mechanism of regulation of population seems to be transported to psychological discipline to be manifested in gender tests.

Taking this argument further, I see gender tests in psychology as part of “technology of gender”<sup>26</sup>, the term that Teresa de Lauretis uses in connection to Foucauldian “technology of sex”. As Foucault emphasizes importance of analysis of the authoritative institutions that speak about sex, their viewpoint and especially “institutions which *prompt* people to speak about it”<sup>27</sup>, similarly Lauretis develops this argument to say that the “theory” constructed by certain “domain of knowledge” or “discipline” is a type of “technology of gender”, which has “power of control over the field of social meaning”<sup>28</sup> and constructs gender. I see “theory” in terms of Lauretis as specific theories behind gender tests and certainly “domain of knowledge” as psychological theory and its understanding of gender construction.

One part of my analysis of gender inventories in my work is the argument that these inventories function to construct perception of individual’s own gender identity, and in connection to this, influence person’s perception of own gendered self. This argument will be developed by means of analysis of data from interviews in chapter VI.

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid p.145.

<sup>25</sup> Foucault, M. (1998) *History of Sexuality. Volume 1: Introduction*. p.145

<sup>26</sup> Lauretis, T. (1987). *Technologies of gender: Essays on theory, film and fiction*.

<sup>27</sup> Foucault, M. (1998) “History of Sexuality. Volume 1: Introduction”. p.11 (Emphasis mine).

<sup>28</sup> Lauretis, T. (1987). *Technologies of gender: Essays on theory, film and fiction*.

In analysis of influence of gender inventories on perception of person's gender identity, I perceive the concept of Judith Butler "regulatory practices" to be one that explains the role and function of gender inventories in society. The concept of "regulatory practices" is close to the concept of "technology of sex/gender" of Foucault and T. de Lauretis. Butler states that these practices are aimed to create "true identity", but for Butler "true identity" doesn't exist, but instead there exists gender identity as a "regulatory fiction", because gender identity is artificially constructed as a "normative ideal rather than a descriptive feature of experience"<sup>29</sup>. Concept of "regulatory fiction" I see to be a metaphor of what is constructed by gender tests through the process of measuring gender. This "fiction" is the scope of *norms* of the society that are *internalized* by an individual and begin to be perceived as a natural and essential part of one's personality. Gender inventories are one of the mechanisms of "regulatory practices" that create gender norms and make internalization of these norms possible because of authoritative position of psychology behind them.

As following from above, gender inventories, as a part of "regulatory practices", can be instruments for measuring in a person appropriateness of "performativity" assumed for certain gender identity, in other words to measure how well practices assigned to person of specific gender identity are internalized by the person. And by making individuals internalize gender norms produced by inventories, the inventories can be seen as constructing gender identities, gender-related concepts such as gender roles, sex differences and others, and forming certain perception of gender identity in the society and by an individual.

To summarize everything that has been said, I argue that gender inventories are part of "technology of sex", according to Foucault, or "technology of gender", according to T. de Lauretis. As a technology of sex/gender, they function to construct certain gender identities in society using mechanism of "confession", in the form theorized by Foucault. They also form the perception of

---

<sup>29</sup> Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*.p.16

gender identity and behavior attached to particular identity by measuring (and through this regulating) the level of internalization of social norms attached to certain gender identity. The possibility to function in this way is possible due to role of gender inventories as a part of authoritative institution of psychology.

In my analysis of phenomenon of gender inventories I will analyze the approach to gender identity in mainstream and feminist psychology, which will provide understanding of major problematic assumptions in the field that are reflected in the gender-measuring inventories developed in these fields. Using the example of feminist psychological approach to gender identity I will argue that biological sex differences and innate characteristics are taken in all approaches within psychology as unquestionable basis for developing two gender identities – male and female. To analyze the approach to gender identity in feminist psychology, I use the framework of Judith Butler and Susan Bordo debates on the ‘materiality of the body’. I argue that despite the fact that Butler and Bordo see body differently in context of gender identity development and perceive that in the end, the body “matters” and it should be localized in time and space, psychological approach radically differs from the view of these two authors. Psychological and feminist psychological approach to gender insist in the fact of biological innate sex differences as the basis of development of two gender identities, and this fact is reflected in construction of gender inventories as well. This argument will be explored in chapter IV and more detailed analysis will be provided.

#### **4. Critique of psychological gender-measuring inventories in the context of psychometric approach to gender.**

In this chapter I will provide the analysis and critique of gender measuring inventories in psychological science from Foucauldian perspective, incorporating mainly his concepts of “technology of sex” and “regulatory practices” to analyze the function of gender-measuring

inventories in construction of gender identities and to position the phenomenon of gender inventories in the context of mainstream psychological view on gender as a concept and development of gender identity in a person.

I will take Masculinity-Femininity scale of MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) (1943) as an example for my analysis. As it was described in detail in previous chapters, this inventory appears to be one of the few most popular gender-measuring inventories in psychometrics and is reflecting general approach to gender measurement in psychometrics and in psychology in general. One more reason why I take this inventory for my analysis is the fact that Mf scale from MMPI was developed early in 20<sup>th</sup> century but is still widely used and considered to be reliable and not in need of revision.

I will provide analysis of Mf scale in the context of general critique of gender-measuring inventories, and later in the chapter I will contextualize my analysis of gender inventories in a more generalized critique of mainstream psychological view on gender as a concept and gender identity development.

#### ***4.1. Analysis of Masculinity-femininity scale of MMPI.***

As it was described in the introduction, MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) is the biggest clinical psychometric instrument that consists from 10 scales and many subscales, and one of the scales is masculinity-femininity scale (will be called here Mf as it is usually referred in psychological literature).

General logic of the construction of this scale can be said to be a typical one, one that will be discussed also in the next part of this chapter in general terms about construction of all gender-measuring inventories. Here I will focus on main characteristics of the MMPI Mf scale, which are important for my analysis.

First of all, speaking about MMPI as a whole, the inventory is said to have “no theoretical basis”<sup>30</sup> at all, which is explained in the literature on the instrument to be due to the fact that the inventory was created using ‘clinical data’ from many patients with different diagnosed disorders that was later compared with response data from ‘healthy people’. While it is not mentioned anywhere how many people were actually used as a sample to normalize the whole MMPI inventory, it is stated that it has 75% credibility to define different psychopathological conditions.

In connection to this, it is important to mention that Mf scale was added to the inventory specifically to define abnormality, in particular “sexual perversion in males”<sup>31</sup>. Taking into consideration the fact that Mf scale is said to measure ‘femininity’ and it was normalized on male homosexuals (only 13 people were the sample) to define the items that could diagnose homosexuality in males, a conclusion can be drawn that Mf scale as an instrument that represents psychological understanding of homosexuality as pathology that can be diagnosed and maybe potentially cured. In addition to that, the very fact of conceptualizing femininity as pathological characteristic for males points to the ‘habit’ in psychology (as Gilligan would put it) of seeing male characteristics as norm. The fact of taking male behavior as normal in gender measuring inventories is also proved by the fact that the authors state that “effort to establish a relationship to inversion in women [using this scale] met with no success”<sup>32</sup>, but no investigation has been conducted to find out why to use the same scale for both males and females, if it was normalized on males. It is important that now the descriptions of the scale are saying that it measures “identification of the respondent with the role of male or female, assigned by the society”<sup>33</sup>, although the test has not been changed since its development in 1940.

---

<sup>30</sup> The citation is taken from the manual for MMPI inventory by Sobchik, L.N. (2005), which was downloaded from [http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob\\_01.shtml](http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob_01.shtml) Translation from Russian is mine.

<sup>31</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005) Masculinity-Femininity: an Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*. 15(4) p.391

<sup>32</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005) Masculinity-Femininity: an Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*. 15(4) p.392

<sup>33</sup> The citation is taken from the manual for MMPI inventory by Sobchik, L.N. (2005), which was downloaded from [http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob\\_01.shtml](http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer4/sob_01.shtml) Translation from Russian is mine.

Speaking about the content of the scale itself, majority of the items – 37 out of 60 – were taken from Terman and Miles test – the first one in the history of gender measuring inventories (1936), described in introduction chapter of my work. This fact means that MF was largely based on the inventory that was created even earlier and was named as problematic even by its creators. As for the items of Mf MMPI, the content of the items doesn't explicitly correlate with the 'construct' it is said to measure: such statements as "I think I would like the work of a librarian" or "I believe in a life hereafter" seem to have no value to define gender identity in a respondent or define any gender-related characteristics that are universally demonstrated by either males or females.

In the following part I will analyze gender-measuring inventories. I argue that all the general critique of gender inventories that can be and is actually provided in the next part of the chapter can be attributed to the analysis of Mf scale of MMPI.

## ***4.2. Analysis and critique of gender inventories.***

### **4.2.1. The philosophy of measuring.**

In the critique of construction and usage of gender inventories, the most important question for me is rather general – why to measure some construct, why to conceptualize it in numbers and relative definitions, and, more specifically – why to measure gender or masculinity and femininity? Why analyzing the works of main authors writing about gender measuring inventories in the field of traditional and feminist psychology, I came to conclusion that these questions are not really addressed in a full manner, which would include exact explanation of the purpose of measuring psychological constructs proposed by the theory and impact that this practice can have on respondents, psychology as a science and the society. In the work of different authors, only indirect references can be found to the psychological understanding to the purposes of measuring.

First of all, as Anne Constantinople formulates it, there is an "axiom in psychological measurement: 'Everything that exists, exists in some quantity, and if it exists in some quantity, it can

be measured’ ”<sup>34</sup>. This hypothetical statement of traditional psychometrics points to many assumptions used in gender tests, for example what it means to ‘exist in quantity’ or the fact that if something ‘*can* be measured’ it practically *must* be measured.

Speaking about the purposes of measuring, it appears that measurement as a practice is closely associated by psychologists with the social responsibilities of the psychological science, illustrated further. It is typical for psychological science to point to the importance of understanding and predicting the behavior, which becomes the main purpose of measuring, when psychologists insist that they are “hard pressed *as scientists* to *come up* with any clear definition of the concept or indeed any unexceptionable criteria for its measurement”<sup>35</sup>. ‘Coming up’ with definitions of masculinity and femininity seems to be unresolved problem in psychometrics, as it will be shown later, since nobody from the most prominent authors gives these definitions. As well, it is very important to my analysis that there is no origin of pressure mentioned for psychologists that would make them provide mentioned definitions and measurements. Instead, many authors (Morawski) point to a general aim of psychology usually described as a regulatory and controlling function:

Scientists in general showed escalated concern about *human ignorance* and about the *scientists’ leadership responsibilities* [ ] For instance Edward Thorndike<sup>36</sup> (1920) suggested that the *average* citizen, the “half-educated man”, should relinquish decision making to the *experts*. [ ] Psychologists became more vocal about their role in brining *social problems* under *control*. [ ] *control* became a fundamental component of the definition of psychology<sup>37</sup>.

Although the aim of psychology is formulated first of all as monitoring “psychological well being”<sup>38</sup> on the level of individual and on the level of population, the concept of control is incorporated in the definition of the aim of this science described by many authors. As it is seen

<sup>34</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005) Masculinity-Femininity: an Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*. 15(4) p.385

<sup>35</sup> Constantinople, A. (1973) “Constantinople, A. (2005) Masculinity-Femininity: an Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*. 15(4) p.386 (Emphasis mine if not otherwise specified).

<sup>36</sup> Edward Thorndike (1874 - 1949) is American psychologist famous for his works in behavioral psychology, particularly learning theory.

<sup>37</sup> Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality*, 53 (2) p.459

<sup>38</sup> Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality*, 53 (2) p.462



here in the explanation of Morawski, psychologists posit themselves as authorities, “experts” who are the only ones to have legitimate opinion about person’s psychological state, and also about gender identity development, gender differences, and simply to produce inventories. Control is defined here through the authority of psychologists who have “scientists’ responsibilities” towards “half-educated”, “average citizen” who is unable of self-control herself/himself. “Decision making” in situations that first of all, as Morawski explains, involved, from the very beginning of discourse on sex and gender in psychology, family life and relationship, was denied to individuals and delegated to “experts”, which means that every behavior had to be first of all understood in order to be controlled. This premise allows appearance of different measuring instruments to define and describe behavior prior to controlling it, and gender-measuring inventories are one category of such instruments.

The precise function of a gender inventory in psychology can be analyzed for its socially regulatory dimensions, as a disciplinary means of producing coherent and stable gender identity. Michele Foucault in his “Society Must Be Defended” argues that:

... *regulatory mechanisms* must be established to establish an equilibrium, maintain an *average*,... and compensate for variations within this general population... . In a word, *security mechanisms* have to be installed around the *random element* inherent in a population of living being so as to *optimize* a state of life. <sup>39</sup>

One *element*, ... which will make it possible to *control* both the disciplinary order of the body and the aleatory events that occur in the biological multiplicity. The element that circulates between two is *the norm*. <sup>40</sup>

Understanding of Foucault is compatible with the explanation of the aim of psychology presented in the previous citation from Morawski: in each case individual and population as a whole are seen as incompetent in decision making and regulating themselves; “average citizen” in the eyes of psychologist is a “random element” in the population, according to Foucault, that has to be regulated in order to “optimize a state of life”; and gender-measuring inventories are one type of

<sup>39</sup> Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended : lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*. p.246

<sup>40</sup> Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended : lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*. p.252

“security mechanisms” that make it possible to establish what is “average” and ‘normal’ and what is “random” and thus ‘deviant’ and has to be controlled. But there is a contrast between two positions presented here because when psychology authors position the aim of control over behavior and norm in population as a positive one – maintaining psychological health of the population, - Foucault describes the aim of regulatory institutions as granting absolute authority to certain “experts” (psychologists in this case) and denying for individuals any possibility for deviation from the authoritatively established norm, any possibility for individuality and right making choices concerning one’s own behavior.

Following from what has been said, the concept of the psychological norm becomes a key one to explain how measurement is important for gaining control. Control over people in society can be achieved only if there is definition of what is ‘right’ and what is ‘wrong’ in the society. For psychology of gender, it is important to establish what is normal and abnormal regarding sexual practices and, as following, definition of and characteristics that constitute certain gender identities. According to Jennifer Terry, psychological “scientific sexual researchers of 1920s turned their attention to the question of what exactly constituted ‘normal’ sexual behavior”<sup>41</sup>, which became the beginning of ongoing search for definition of masculinity and femininity in order to define boundaries of its normality, the search that was marked by constant development of new gender measuring inventories. As Terry explains, ‘normal family’, consisting of ‘feminine’ woman and ‘masculine’ man complementing each other, was the aim of psychological research and the object to control by psychology of gender.

As for psychological science in general, norm in terms of gender identity is seen as congruence of sex, gender identity, gender role, gendered behavior, gender sexual practices and many other possible psychological constructs related to behaviors that differentiate between males and females. This norm is bounded with the “conception of psychological well being, a model equating mental

---

<sup>41</sup> Terry, J. (1999). *An American obsession: science, medicine, and homosexuality in modern society* p.121

health with definitive correspondence between psychological and biological sex ascriptions”<sup>42</sup>. By means of this, norm is defined as very limited, and variation for pathology becomes wide, so is the opportunity and perceived need for control.

It is important that norm is defined statistically, drawn from quantitative majority of all random responses in the population and statistically processed to define borders of the norm. So, population has been an important target of sex research from 1920s, raising importance of concept of “prevalence” in psychology. According to many authors, “epidemiologic approach to the human population”<sup>43</sup> appears to be mainstream one in contemporary psychological research. As for diagnosis, DSM-IV-TR<sup>44</sup> (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders), prevalence data should be considered for every disorder and condition in population, and is defined as “systematic epidemiological data regarding the prevalence of the various (sexual) disorders in the population”. If we turn here to Foucault, he defined “endemics” as close to prevalence: “the form, nature, extension, duration, and intensity of the illnesses prevalent in a population”<sup>45</sup>, and pointed to the fact that endemics is important in recording not only disorders and illnesses but all the data regarding sexual behavior of the population, because of population being perceived as a lively entity that must be controlled in its reproductive behavior, and that’s why in sexual behavior. Just as Foucault points that “public hygiene” became the aim of the medicine, Terry points that “marital hygiene” became once aim of gender psychology and due to this all the constructs concerning sex and gender-related behavior became an object to be controlled.

Concept of normality as the basis for controlling deviations from the norm is possible only in the context of authoritative position of psychology. Ongoing evaluation of all research in psychology

---

<sup>42</sup> Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality*, 53 (2) p.462

<sup>43</sup> Ghosh, S., & Walker, L. Sexuality: Gender Identity. Retrieved from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>.

<sup>44</sup> Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR). Published by American Psychiatric Association in 1994. Retrieved last from <http://books.google.com/books?id=3SQrtpnHb9MC&printsec=frontcover#PPA581,M1>

<sup>45</sup> Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended : lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*.p.243

in terms of ‘scientificity’ (borrowing the term from Connell) is generally seen in the works of majority of the authors. Obsession of making or seeing psychology as “true science”<sup>46</sup>, that practically means proposing objectivist, positivist and quantitative approach, leads to assurance that ‘everything that exists can be measured’, as it was cited before, and that psychological tests in particular are proper instruments to make this measurement. The case of thinking the other way around: “if something cannot be measured, it doesn’t exist”, as Constantinople proposes it, seems not to be considered by most authors, because despite a lot of problems that are accounted in the tests usage and creation, the problem is seen to be rooted not in conceptualization of gender identity in psychological science, but in some defects of measurement. To solve this problem all authors state that ‘further research’ should be conducted in gender psychology to obtain “pure measure”<sup>47</sup> of masculinity and femininity.

#### 4.2.2. What is measured by gender-measuring inventories?

While having some vague understanding of why to measure gender-related constructs at all, psychometric research and critique of gender inventories agree on that they don’t have definition of what inventories are actually measuring. Practically, researchers and authors come up with a conclusion that ‘empirical studies should help in defining gender identity’ although there is no any definition prior to conducting these studies, meaning that *results of implementation of psychological inventories will show what is there that was measured*. Such a strange assumption looks like ‘putting cart before the horse’, since it seems to be strange to create inventories without having any theory behind them. Psychological analysts admit that very often different scale that state to measure the same construct do not even correlate statistically and do not give the same results in scores (Beere, 1979).

<sup>46</sup> Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality*, 53 (2) p.457

<sup>47</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4) p.401

In the works of many authors that I analyzed, I found no clear definition of gender identity, masculinity and femininity, or what in fact the tests are measuring in general. As Hoffman points out, although gender measuring inventories are widely used, the question of what they are in fact measuring is paradoxically not paid much attention to (Hoffman, 2001). The only “generalized” definition of masculinity and femininity is given by Constantinople:

... relatively enduring traits which are more or less rooted in anatomy, physiology and early experience, and which generally serve to distinguish males from females in appearance, attitude and behavior.<sup>48</sup>

As it is implied by Constantinople, items used in tests are usually “intuitively” chosen by the authors to fit some “abstract concepts that seem to summarize some dimension of *reality*”<sup>49</sup>. The concept of “*reality* of masculinity and femininity”<sup>50</sup> that is proposed to be measured, is a contradictory one, since on one hand it is attempted to be assessed in some quantitative terms, but on the other hand it is referred to as a personal perception of own masculinity and femininity. Indeed, later authors (Hoffman, 2001) proposed that “there should be allowances made for personal interpretations of what it means to be female or male”<sup>51</sup>. Although some authors differentiate between *gender identity* that is a “self-label” and *gender role* that is “given by society because of behavior and appearance”<sup>52</sup>, such suggestions to see gender identity as part of self-concept or self-image, and thus be part of subjective perception of the self, seem to be left unattended in psychometrics.

---

<sup>48</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4)p.387

<sup>49</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4) p.386

<sup>50</sup> Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality*, 53 (2) p.462

<sup>51</sup> Hoffman, R.M. The Measurement of Masculinity and Femininity: Historical Perspective and Implications for Counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 79 (4). Retrieved from [http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\\_0286-27173315\\_ITM](http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-27173315_ITM).

<sup>52</sup> Ghosh, S., & Walker, L. Sexuality: Gender Identity. Retrieved from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>.

Although there is no definition for gender identity, however, the debate is in progress about the dimensionality of masculinity and femininity. Perceived unidimensionality and polarization or bipolarity of ‘continuum’ of masculinity and femininity are often seen as the major problem of the conceptualization of gender identity and construction of tests (Constantinople 1973, Bem 1993). Bipolarity is defined by Constantinople as “a single continuum ranging from one extreme through zero point to the other” while “behaviors defining one end point are opposite to those at the other and thus should be negatively correlated”<sup>53</sup>. Actually, this understanding of masculinity-femininity is evident in all existing gender inventories. As Constantinople points out, multidimensionality is now considered to be the basic characteristic of masculinity and femininity, meaning that both concepts consist from many traits of behavior, but this vision of the concepts again are not providing solution to vagueness of gender identity conceptualization, because multidimensionality in a way suggests that by gender identities measured by inventories authors mean some set of characteristics, so it means that inventories are measuring these *sets of characteristics*, but not *masculinity* or *femininity* that these characteristics are said to constitute. For example, many authors agree on the fact that Bem’s Sex Role Inventory is actually measuring ‘instrumentality’ and ‘expressiveness’ and is calling them ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’ respectively. Although ‘instrumentality’ and ‘expressiveness’ are not less vague terms, still this remark shows how conceptualization of gender identity measured by inventories is dependent on subjective and stereotypical understanding of the concepts by the researcher.

As for bipolarity mentioned to be one of the major problems of gender inventories, this drawback in perception of gender identities in psychology is not challenged by any inventory, even by those who propose to do that, for example Bem’s Sex Role Inventory, as it will be showed in the next chapter.

Despite the vagueness of definitions of gender identity and M-F, it is interesting to mention that femininity is by default conceptualized in contrast to masculinity and not vice versa. Femininity from

---

<sup>53</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4) p.389

the early gender inventories was constructed as reversal of masculinity, marked usually with “— ” (‘minus’) sign, conceptualized as abnormality in contrast to masculinity, because first gender inventories (Terman and Miles AIAS inventory as described in introduction) were usually normalized on males, for whom femininity was considered to be the sign of homosexuality. In addition to that, as Constantinople describes, even statistical “correlation between ‘most masculine’ and ‘most feminine’ person was positive” and “between ‘least feminine’ and ‘most masculine’ and vice versa were negative”<sup>54</sup>, which proves that obviously masculinity and femininity are not just reverse representations of each other.

#### 4.2.3. Critique of techniques of development and content.

As for the actual techniques of construction and usage of the tests, there are several major points of critique of gender inventories which concern with the assumptions and statistical drawbacks evident in inventories creation.

First of all, selection of the items for the inventories and the way respondents are expected to answer them is unsystematic and biased. As Constantinople argues, items selected for measurement of masculinity and femininity are making these concept “the muddiest”<sup>55</sup> ones in psychology, since “anything that discriminates men and women, usually at a particular point in time in a particular culture, is taken as an indicator of M-F”<sup>56</sup> and ‘difference in item response’ has always been considered the basis for differentiating between males and females since the first early gender inventory – Terman and Miles’ “Attitude-Interest Analysis Survey” which was developed in 1936, and item from which were used in many later inventories, including MMPI Mf scale, described earlier. The basis for the technique used in these inventories is assumption that males and females

---

<sup>54</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4) p.399

<sup>55</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4) p.387

<sup>56</sup> Ibid p.387

generally have different attitudes and interests that can be assessed by means of psychological testing.

According to many authors (Hoffman, Morawski, Connell), items and sets of characteristics do not differ from one test to another. Masculine is traditionally defined everywhere as “powerful, active, steady, strong...” and so on, and feminine as “sensitive, compassionate, timid, sentimental...” and alike.

One more characteristic of majority of the tests is that they are giving quite limited number of standard answers for any questions or statements, the most popular option in inventories is binary answers ‘yes’ and ‘no’.

Connell genuinely pointed that ‘item response’ is felt and perceived differently by a respondent and a psychologist:

What a person thinks she is saying to the researcher is set aside. The tick or cross is treated not as an answer to the question, but as a ‘response’ providing a clue for an underlying entity.

Such treatment of responses as ‘keys’ that provide information about one’s masculinity and femininity is very problematic, because the same item or question can be understood very differently by different people, and researcher’s view can differ from that of a respondent as well. In addition to that, if some answers of the respondent are contradictory to other ones, what happens is that total score is lowered, and nothing is done usually to investigate why there appears such ambivalence in answers.

Another following concern about tests construction is the process of ‘normalization’ of inventories, where some sample of respondents is used to assess what items of the tests are relevant to the concept measured. The famous problem is using students as such sample, who can be considered as at least not representative sample for the whole population, being of approximately the same age, social status, and in the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century in USA, when the first test was



constructed, of the same race. Usage of such sample is usually referred to as “<sup>57</sup>judges rating”, which itself sounds very striking.

And the last but important point of critique is intention of all researchers to “mask”<sup>58</sup> the real purpose of the test. First of all, as it has been mentioned, answer to every item can mean different things to researcher and to respondent, but in addition to that, an inventory is considered to be a good one if it is impossible to understand what it is measuring and following form that impossible to ‘fake’ the results. For example, such question as from Terman and Miles test as “Do you like to have people tell you their troubles?” is designed to indicate masculinity if answer is positive. This fact is quite difficult to explain, because it seems that Constantinople was right when stating that everything that intuitively seems to distinguish between genders is used as items for the tests.

Here to provide conclusion to this part of my work, I will summarize the major gaps of psychological critique of gender tests and suggest explanation of problem of measuring gender identity, discussed in this chapter.

First of all, the whole body of critique of gender inventories from psychological perspective discussed here doesn’t answer the question why to measure gender identity at all, but instead focuses on methodological and statistical problems of inventories. As Connell answers to this, the problem is not in methods of measuring, but of terms and concepts used and the very obsession of measuring gender.

Second, referring to widely discussed fact that people tend to ‘recognize’ themselves or agree with the statements of inventories: it can be explained that because of the fear of “otherness”, as Connell mentions, and because of ability to find in themselves characteristics described by the

---

<sup>57</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4) p.398

<sup>58</sup> Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality*, 53 (2) p.461

inventory and thus adapt to them, people tend to adapt to test description, but not challenge it in the first place<sup>59</sup>.

And, the most important, psychological gender inventories are working to “reify” concepts of femininity and masculinity, which means to turn abstract terms like these into solid object that can be measured. What is paradoxical about this fact is that the theories behind the inventories do not define rigidly gender identities, but “reification” of femininity and masculinity seems to be achieved by the very fact of using gender inventories to state person’s gender identity.

### **4.3. Overview of the concept of gender in psychology.**

Gender in psychology is conceptualized in contrast with but at the same time on the basis of the concept of sex. While in general authors differentiate between terms sex and gender, in official diagnostic psychological literature like DSM-IV-TR<sup>60</sup> (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders by American Psychiatric Association) the terms *sex* and not *gender* is used to differentiate between males and females.

In this part of the chapter I will focus on the way gender is conceptualized in traditional psychology and how it influences practical psychometric approach to measuring gender.

#### **4.3.1. Psychological approach to gender identity.**

Conceptualization of gender identity construction and perception appears to be a difficult issue in psychology due to several reasons presented in this part. Usually term *gender* is explained by authors in psychology to account for socially constructed differences between males and females, while the term sex “implies that differences are *caused directly* by biological sex”<sup>61</sup>. But in research and literature on gender differences the slippage usually occurs towards biologically determined

<sup>59</sup> This dimension of the argument will be discussed in chapter 6.

<sup>60</sup> Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR). Published by American Psychiatric Association in 1994. Retrieved last from <http://books.google.com/books?id=3SQrtpnHb9MC&printsec=frontcover#PPA581,M1>

<sup>61</sup> Burn, S.M. (1996). *The social Psychology of Gender*. p.XIX

differences as main differences between males and females, for example saying that one of the differences between genders is difference between reproductive functions. I would actually argue that it seems that psychological research in gender is aimed at determining biologically rooted differences, because only those can be conceptualized as ‘true’ ones. In connection to this, the term *gender* appears to be a nominal term used to show awareness of existence of socially constructed differences between males and females, while there is still an assumption that there exist differences between *sexes* that can be found and theorized. The latter is the only aim of psychological research regarding gender.

It is evident that many terms and concepts related to sex and gender are conceptualized separately and are not usually presented in connection and interrelation with each other, the accent is usually made on their independence from each other, and it is said that “just as gender and sex are not interchangeable terms, neither are gender development and sexual development interchangeable”<sup>62</sup>.

But at the same time, as it was mentioned before, all gender differences discussed in psychological studies are usually conceptualized in terms of sexual differences, because gender identity is paradoxically seen to be rooted in sex, even if terms are emphasized to have different meaning. Moreover, gender identity is claimed by developmental psychologists to be rooted in “intrauterine stage”<sup>63</sup>, meaning prenatal foundation for development of gender identity. This statement openly conceptualizes gender to have biological basis at least to some extent. Developmental psychology speaks of “core gender identity”<sup>64</sup> that is suggested to exist in the “incomplete stage” at birth that then develops. In connection to this, there appears the concept of “gender stability” of the child that means understanding that “gender identity remains constant over time”, and the concept of “gender consistency” that stands for the “knowledge that gender is

---

<sup>62</sup> Ghosh, S., & Walker, L. Sexuality: Gender Identity. Retrieved from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>.

<sup>63</sup> Ghosh, S., & Walker, L. Sexuality: Gender Identity. Retrieved from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>.

<sup>64</sup> Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106. Retrieved from <http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/Bandura1999PR.pdf>

invariant” despite some differences between people, and “gender constancy”, which is child’s “ability to differentiate between genders”<sup>65</sup>.

Existence of all these concepts differentiated in psychology leads not to the possibility for variations as it seems to do, but, on the contrary, to the possibility of defining gender normality more accurately. Passage of every mentioned stage by a child and congruence of sex, gender identity and gender role can be pathologized due to the possibility of “confusion or incongruence of gender identity”<sup>66</sup> if there is any deviation from established norm for any stage of gender identity development or incongruence between elements of developing identity. So, it becomes evident that detailed conceptualization of everything related to gender in psychology gives more opportunities for defining norm and pathology. Also, this leads to medicalization of gender- and sex-related issues, since for many authors incongruence between sex and gender immediately becomes a question between physician and patient or psychologist and patient<sup>67</sup>. Although gender variance is stated to be normal, many cases of incongruence biological sex/gender identity/gender role mentioned above are theorized as “Gender Identity Disorder”, which is usually described as “gender dysphoria or gender incongruence”<sup>68</sup> that is manifested in “strong and persistent preference for the status and gender role of the other sex”<sup>69</sup> and “clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational or other important areas of functioning”<sup>70</sup>. Since there is no clear definition of ‘impairment’ and ‘incongruence’ and many conditions are said to be able to appear under this category, it seems that conceptualizing development and components of gender identity is in fact broadening the opportunity for pathologization of gender-related behavior.

---

<sup>65</sup> Ghosh, S., & Walker, L. Sexuality: Gender Identity. Retrieved from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> Ghosh, S., & Walker, L. Sexuality: Gender Identity. Retrieved from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>.

<sup>68</sup> Ghosh, S., & Walker, L. Sexuality: Gender Identity. Retrieved from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR). Published by American Psychiatric Association 1994. Retrieved last from <http://books.google.com/books?id=3SQrtpnHb9MC&printsec=frontcover#PPA581,M1>

Certainly, there are different perspectives in psychology, and they have somewhat different view on gender identity development. The two extremes are evolutionary psychology and social psychology. While evolutionary psychology is more radical and states that gender differences are determined by “ancestral mating strategies”, social psychology of gender, in contrast, sees gender identity to be determined by social interactions, but this approach also perceives some biological shared characteristics of sexes as the basis for that construction. In this chapter, I described the approach of cognitive-developmental psychology, because this approach occupies somewhat middle position and appears to be the mainstream in psychological science today. But still the main shared overarching characteristic of all the approaches, to a different extent, appears to be biological essentialisms – seeing sex to be basis for gender identity development, and seeing normality in connection to gender identity to be based on congruence of certain sex and gender identity.

#### **4.3.2. Gender variable in applied psychological research and psychometrics.**

Gender identity and all the concepts related to it are nowadays attracting more and more attention, even though they have always been important variables and subjects of psychological research and psychometrics.

As it was mentioned already before in this chapter, gender-measuring inventories lack theoretical basis behind them, and the general assumptions exists in psychometrics that the implementation of the inventories will give empirical data to base the theory on.

While there exist some theories of gender identity development, the main conclusion of all those theories appears to be that too many facts about gender identity still “remain unspecified”, “remain unclear”<sup>71</sup>, and that it “has not yet been determined” if gender identity is a truly inborn characteristic

---

<sup>71</sup> Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106. Retrieved from <http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/Bandura1999PR.pdf>

and if it changes over lifespan, and the concluding remark often appears to be that “current state of knowledge remains somewhat incomplete”<sup>72</sup>.

One common conclusion which is made by majority of authors is that there should be improved research conducted and new better inventories created to theorize the concept of gender and differences between males and females. Anne Anastasi, one of the best known authors and researchers in psychometrics writes, argues that “masculinity and femininity ... are highly meaningful and significant concepts to most individuals and ... attempts to dismiss them as useless are *premature*”<sup>73</sup>. She claims that masculinity and femininity are not studied properly so far and more research is needed to explore them better and explain gender differences basing on that. When criticizing existing gender inventories in psychology, Anastasi points only to their methodological drawbacks and proposes to find some new approach to gender measurement because, according to her, there exist some core constructs of masculinity and femininity, but a proper research is needed to conceptualize them and measure them properly.

This view is shared by Alice Eagly, who states that it is impossible and contrary to theoretical approach to try to get rid of categories of masculinity and femininity, but instead, psychologists and gender theorists should enhance research on gender “comparisons” (actually meaning *studying gender differences*), because “more data would produce a richer and more differentiated picture of gendered behavior”<sup>74</sup>. Eagly states that although it is important to account for contextual settings, it is still possible to make “generalizations about gender”<sup>75</sup>, which is perceived by her as the process of producing the theory of gender in psychology. While it seems to be evident that creators of gender inventories have some ‘theoretical’ assumptions about the construct they are measuring, but the data gathered from the implementation of the inventories and the theory awaiting to be produced from this data are never linked with the assumptions that the researchers have when creating an inventory.

---

<sup>72</sup> Ghosh, S., & Walker, L. Sexuality: Gender Identity. Retrieved from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>.

<sup>73</sup> Sonderegger, T. B., & Anastasi, A. (1985). *Psychology and Gender*. University of Nebraska Press. p.64

<sup>74</sup> Eagly, A. H. (1994). On comparing women and men. *Feminism & Psychology*, 4 p.163

<sup>75</sup> Ibid p.163.

This fact points to the possibility of producing the theory of gender exactly according to already existing assumptions of the researchers who develop the gender inventories.

What is important about the position of actually all authors discussed in this chapter, they propose producing new inventories and conducting new research using them in order to produce relevant gender theory in psychology or more gender theorization, and in their suggestions to base psychological theory of gender on the basis of data from gender-measuring inventories, these authors completely ignore the question of the purpose or aim of measurement in general, together with the purpose and aim of theorizing of any gender-related constructs.

Psychometrics and applied research in psychology, represented by the authors discussed in this chapter are insisting on continuous research and developing of inventories to obtain eventually ‘successful’, ‘relevant’ and ‘proper’ criteria for distinguishing between males and females, but never answer would ‘successful’ measuring of this category mean for psychology and society. As I have already argued before in this chapter, measuring gender-related constructs and producing the theory on the basis of that has the aim of maintaining control over the gender-related characteristics and behavior in individuals and population.

According to different authors and in psychometrics in general, successful measurement of gender-related constructs is dependent on proper usage of statistics. Quantitative methodology appears to be the reason for hope all mentioned authors for possibility of better conceptualization of category of gender and gender differences. Especially meta-analysis – “statistical technique where information from many studies is combined in order to arrive at an overall estimate of the differences between groups”<sup>76</sup>, which is celebrated by many authors such as Anastasi, Eagly, and Jacklin, is considered to be the remedy to many ineffective studies and false conclusions, because it compares results of many studies to draw independent conclusions. Thinking of this method, it is interesting to consider that multiplying amount of the data doesn’t guarantee new approach to the quality of gathering the data primarily. Although I am not positioning myself to be against

---

<sup>76</sup> Burn, S.M. (1996). *The social Psychology of Gender*. p.XIX p.34

quantitative methodology, I argue that quantitative research in gender is usually conducted using gender measuring inventories, which brings misleading generalizations and conclusions about the results of these research.

Carol Jacklin effectively criticizes quantitative methods used in psychometrics and psychological research, pointing to several common problems of conducted research and development of inventories, which are very important for my study.

First of all, according to Jacklin, the very conceptualization of the *difference* between males and females is problematic because “the characteristics usually do not distinguish most of the members of one group from most of the members of the comparison group”<sup>77</sup>, and every tiny variation perceived in the study can be theorized as difference. In connection to this, the size of the difference is not paid much attention to, according to Jackline, as long as there is any difference found in general.

Another point of Jacklin very important for the present analysis of gender tests is that positivism as main characteristic of psychological science and research. As she explains, there exists bias toward publishing and reprinting only research with positive findings, no matter how big the statistical significance of the findings is. In psychological research, as Jacklin states, “highlighting a nondifference or null finding is contrary to the traditional approach to science”<sup>78</sup>. Referring to the previously discussed obsession in the literature with ‘scientificity’ of psychology and aspiring to the standard of ‘true science’, positivism becomes a characteristic that pushes psychology to exaggerate the findings of any research and, following my previous argumentation, to produce the theory on the basis of a selected amount of findings and limited data. Keeping in mind that the findings can be guided by the assumptions of a creator of the inventory, positivism and objectivity as characteristics of psychology can lead to tendency to reify and keep unquestioned any findings and theories of

---

<sup>77</sup> Jacklin, C. N. (1981). Methodological issues in the study of sex-related differences. *Developmental Review*, 1p.48

<sup>78</sup> Jacklin, C. N. (1981). Methodological issues in the study of sex-related differences. *Developmental Review*, 1 p.50



gender already claimed to be proved; and along with that, any methods, such as gender inventories, that were used to obtain the findings and produce the theory are left unchanged and unquestioned.

## **5. Work of Bem and her BSRI in the context of feminist psychological approach to gender.**

In this chapter I will continue the analysis of gender-measuring inventories in psychology on the example of BSRI (Bem Sex Role Inventory) developed in 1974 by Sandra Bem. Analysis is the inventory itself I will frame by the analysis of work of Sandra Bem and her understanding of the concept of gender and gender measurement. I will criticize the way in which Bem sees her inventory to be a revolutionary instrument in psychometrics that challenges traditional assumptions of gender measurement existing in the field.

I will frame the analysis of the work of Bem and development of BSRI by the analysis of feminist psychological view on the concept of gender, because I argue that the main problems of the theory of Bem that I critique can be traced to general assumptions in feminist psychology. I will also argue in this chapter that the understanding of gender and related concepts in the feminist psychology is similar in its basis to the mainstream view on gender in psychology as a whole.

To critique the BSRI and the theory of Bem in the context of feminist psychology I will use the analysis of the debate between Judith Butler and Susan Bordo on the concept of 'material body', that was mentioned in the theoretical framework. This frame for my analysis will allow theorizing the major problematic assumptions about gender in feminist psychology and in work of Bem in particular and show that these assumptions are based in perceiving sex and material body to be the basis for construction of gender identity.

### **5.1. Sandra Bem's Sex Role Inventory as a feminist psychological attempt to reconceptualize approach to gender measurement in psychology.**

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), as described in previous chapters, is an instrument used in psychological research and therapy to assess to what extent a person taking the test perceives herself/himself in terms of feminine and/or masculine characteristics according to social traditional stereotypes of sex roles. But, although Bem explicitly states that her test is created to reveal stereotypically constructed gender identities in people, I argue that the test is used in psychological science to assess sex roles in absolute terms and it still assumes masculinity and femininity to be measurable solid constructs. I perceive this fact to be both due to traditional psychological vision of gender identity or sex role as being biologically determined and thus adapting usage of BSRI to this vision, and due to numerous problems related to the development of BSRI itself.

From psychological point of view, BSRI can be seen as an attempt of Bem as a feminist psychologist to challenge the traditional psychometric approach to gender identity assessment. Her inventory is the most popular contemporary one in psychometrics to assess gender. But this very fact is revealing the paradox, because the test is using traditional methodology in psychological gender assessment but at the same time Bem claims it to be breakthrough in the field.

I argue that the test doesn't challenge basic problems with gender measuring inventories in psychology discussed in previous chapters. These main problematic assumptions, stated by Constantinople<sup>79</sup>, can be summarized as following: seeing "sex differences in item response" as the basis for defining masculinity and femininity; assuming a single bipolar dimension with extreme femininity and masculinity at its ends; perceiving unidimensionality of M-F that can be measured by a single score. Taking into consideration this definition, I argue that BSRI doesn't subvert any of these problems except for challenging abstract unidimensionality of M-F. First of all, the test uses

---

<sup>79</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4)

the assumption that differences between genders can be assessed by differences in item response and uses it as the basic method of assessment. It also sees it possible to measure masculinity and femininity by a single score, although separately from each other.

The only reason the test is so popular in psychometrics and is conceptualized by Bem as a new word in psychometrics is that it is seen to challenge traditional psychological approach to seeing masculinity and femininity as independent separate dimensions, which, as I am arguing in this chapter, is not true. On the contrary, BSRI as a phenomenon and Bem's theory behind the test are working to reiterate and solidify traditional concepts of masculinity and femininity, which will be demonstrated further through the analysis of Bem's theory of gender.

### 5.1.1. Looking closely on BSRI.

Speaking about practical side of creation of BSRI, Sandra Bem states that her inventory "directly challenges three problematic assumptions" which were summarized earlier with the reference to the work of Constantinople, but at the same time Bem paradoxically agrees that her inventory is a "standard measure of masculinity-femininity"<sup>80</sup>.

Analyzing the course of development of the inventory itself, the techniques used by author appear to be problematic, particularly in the extent to which they do not accord with main stated purposes of the inventory and "moral of androgyny" proposed to be reflected in the way of usage the inventory.

First of all, items for masculinity and femininity scales for the test were chosen explicitly as stereotypes of masculine and feminine characteristics. According to Williams and Best, so-called "sex trait stereotypes" are "psychological characteristics and behavioral traits that are *believed* to characterize men with much greater (or lesser) frequency than women"<sup>81</sup>. As for BSRI, it was based

<sup>80</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.119

<sup>81</sup> Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multinational study*. p.16

on 200 masculine and 200 feminine characteristics that “*seemed* to the author and *several* students to be positive” and describing either feminine personality traits. Final versions of masculinity and femininity scales were derived in their turn from these characteristics by “judges”, who are referred by Bem as “native informants” of the culture and were to assess “how desirable they thought it would be in American society in general for either man or woman”<sup>82</sup> and to choose 20 characteristics for each scale as they appear in the inventory. As for “judges” themselves, they were 100 undergraduate students, half of them male and half female.

In terms of quantity, it is evident that number of characteristics used for the inventory is hardly enough to express the pool of even stereotypical male and female characteristics in the society. In addition to that, the sample of “judges” doesn’t seem to be representative of American population at all, especially taking into account their homogeneous age, occupation and no detailed information about their race and class in Bem’s description.

One more interesting contradiction in Bem’s description of BSRI is that she emphasizes that answers to Social Desirability Scale of the inventory do not depend on answers on masculinity and femininity scales. According to her, it is important that general conformity to stereotypes, that is measures by Social Desirability Scale doesn’t measure the same as masculinity and femininity scales, although she in general agrees that latter scales are stated to measure personal tendency to describe herself/himself in stereotypical socially imposed characteristics of male and female.

According to Constantinople<sup>83</sup>, different studies at least in psychology have proved that sex role stereotypes exist and they influence the constructs that gender tests are measuring, for example M-F. Although Bem states that she is not intended to measure exactly M-F, she anyway uses stereotypical characteristics to prove that some people tend to conform to socially imposed characteristics of

---

<sup>82</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.119

<sup>83</sup> Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4) 401

masculinity and femininity. If such, it is difficult to see the answer why Bem in her work describing BSRI celebrates the fact that her Social Desirability scale has nothing to do with masculinity-femininity image and construction at all. Contrary to Bem's position, Williams and Best state that women and men tend to describe themselves in more masculine terms<sup>84</sup>, thus seeing them to be more socially desirable, so at least one set of stereotypes – masculine ones – tends to reflect desire to be socially accepted.

One of possible explanations is that masculinity-femininity are not fully presented set of stereotypic characteristics, as it was examined above, and, in addition to that, Social Desirability Scale is also represented by 20 items that were “independently judged by both male and female judged to be more desirable for one sex than the other”<sup>85</sup>. The constructs stated by Bem are not fully represented even stereotypically and quantitatively, that's why statistically there is no correlation found between being sex-typed, according to Bem's understanding, and being socially conform.

### **5.1.2. “Gender polarization” and independency of Masculinity and Femininity in BSRI.**

Bem sees the only problem of traditional psychometrics to be “gender polarization”. In her theory, she states that polarization of masculinity and femininity leads to “homogenization” within each sex, “dichotomization of the ways of relating to the world” into feminine and masculine, but the most important problem for Bem is the reduction of maleness and femaleness to biological sex, saying that “real” gender differences are “having primary to do with the biology of reproduction”<sup>86</sup>. Here, as it was discussed earlier, Bem states that all the differences between sexes being based in biology, but she neglects the fact that biology is never just taken as it is. Biology is always interpreted

<sup>84</sup> Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study*. p.297

<sup>85</sup> Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2) p.157

<sup>86</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.192

by the society and that's why differences between sexes are not result of biology of reproduction as such, but rather of "imaginary morphology"<sup>87</sup> as Butler calls it. Moreover, according to Bem, creation of categories of masculinity and femininity as opposite ones is "largely as a result of historical accident"<sup>88</sup>, and these accidental categories are actively incorporated by individuals.

This fact of seeing M-F polarization in psychology and society as accidental allows Bem perceiving it to be an easy solution to separate the masculinity and femininity scales of her inventory. According to Bem, the basic novelty in her inventory is introduction of "two independent scales of culturally defined masculinity and culturally defined femininity"<sup>89</sup>, and the fact that "each respondent receives both a masculinity and a femininity score"<sup>90</sup>. She perceives the best way of challenging the gender polarization and inequality based on it to be separation of these two scales that have always been perceived as unidimensional continuum in traditional psychometrics. I perceive that seeing gender polarization as the only problem for gender hierarchy and stereotypical division of masculinity and femininity pushes Bem to several overgeneralizations and makes her to jump to conclusions.

Bem neglects that fact that stereotypical images of masculinity and femininity in the society are not constructed independently from each other, they are constructed always already in contradiction or opposition to each other, based on stereotypical and mutually exclusive characteristics. As Gatens states, "each gender is at once the antithesis of, and the complement to, the other"<sup>91</sup>. Every characteristic prescribed for males has an opposite one prescribed for females. That's why it's theoretically impossible to follow Bem's suggestion to see masculinity and femininity as

---

<sup>87</sup> Butler 'bodies that matter'

<sup>88</sup> Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2) p.192

<sup>89</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.119

<sup>90</sup> Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2) p. 192

<sup>91</sup> Gatens, M. (1995). *Imaginary bodies: Ethics, power, and corporeality*. p.36

independently present scales in each person, because it's impossible to think of mutually exclusive characteristics of extreme femininity and masculinity present in a person at the same time.

Actually Bem opposes to such critique saying that in the tests only “positive” social characteristics of both genders are used, in order to avoid effect of negative stereotyping on the participants. This fact suggests that stereotypical categories of masculinity and femininity are simply not fully presented in the test. If “independency” as a male characteristic, for example, requires “dependency” as a complementary female characteristic, as Gatens sees that, then there seems to be quite a big theoretical flaw in Bem’s inventory and in her concept of androgyny, because omitting “dependency” as a negative characteristic reduces the traditional scope of gender stereotypes used in the inventory.

Thus, Bem’s vision of the problem of gender polarization to be centered on unidimensionality of M-F is problematic, because this view doesn’t allow seeing the problem in the very existence of categories and, further, scales of masculinity and femininity. Even these dimensions being theoretically separate, nothing prevents one dimension to be socially associated with biological femininity and the other with biological masculinity.

### **5.1.3. Questioning revolutionary nature of the concept of androgyny in BSRI.**

Androgyny is the concept that is said by Bem to be new to psychometrics, and thus challenging traditional vision of masculinity and femininity to be separate polarized categories. Bem defines androgyny mainly as a ‘sex role’ that “represents the equal endorsement of both masculinity and femininity”<sup>92</sup> as culturally constructed definitions. Androgyn, according to Bem, is “less likely” to regulate behavior on the basis of these cultural definitions.

---

<sup>92</sup> Bem androgyny Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and*

The most obvious problem widely discussed in connection to androgyny as a concept, with which Bem herself agrees in part, is that androgyny assumes that there exist two separate “palpable” characteristics of masculinity and femininity. But while Bem agrees that androgyny is problematic because the categories of masculinity and femininity are not conceptualized in psychometrics yet, she negates the fact that androgyny is actually based on two mutually exclusive sets of categories, as it was argued before.

As for the measurement of androgyny in BSRI, originally androgyny was measured as difference of scores on masculinity and femininity scale – Femininity-Minus-Masculinity-Difference Score, and the smaller the difference between scales, the more androgyn an individual was considered to be<sup>93</sup>. Because of the perceived problem of androgyny being too wide concept that includes people who have both high femininity and high masculinity and also people who score low on both scales, Bem developed this concept and added one more sex role to be measured by her inventory – “undifferentiated”; androgyny was decided to signify presence of high scores on both scales and role of undifferentiated type – low scores on both scales. But actually both concepts (“androgynous” and “undifferentiated”) can be seen as very vague and overlapping at the same time, first of all because they are similar theoretically – incorporating both M and F scales of the inventory, and at the same time androgyny defined in this way is privileged over undifferentiated type, and this fact is not adequately explained by Bem herself. It is obvious that even psychometrically defined masculinity and femininity are not present as either high or low, but can manifest many combinations, which point to the fact that androgyny alone can comprise many different types of sex roles because of different characteristics present in different sex roles, and I perceive undifferentiated as just one of them. In connection to that, it is evident here how problematic it is to theorize gender in

---

*Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2) p.159

<sup>93</sup> Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2). p.158



quantitative categories, and not in qualitative ones, especially when perceiving gender as a social construct.

As it was discussed earlier, in addition to androgynous and undifferentiated types of sex roles, BSRI claims to identify two more – “sex-typed” and “cross-sex-typed” ones, defining sex-typed as sex role that is consistent with individual’s biological sex and cross-sex-typed as sex role ‘opposite’ to one’s biological sex . As Bem states, contrary to previous inventories, which contrasted sex-typed sex role to cross-sex-typed one and saw the latter as a pathological role, BSRI contrasts both sex-types and cross-sex typed role to androgynous (and undifferentiated) type, thus presenting androgyny as a kind of ‘perfect’ sex role in comparison to others defined by the inventory. For Bem, sex-types and cross-sex-typed roles are not that different from one another, because they equally perceive reality through “gender schema” or “lenses of gender”. “Gender schema” is defined by Bem as “network of associations that organize and guide individual’s perception”<sup>94</sup>. But while sex-typed sex role of individuals, according to Bem, is constructed by means of applying gender schema to self-concept of an individual, Bem doesn’t give adequate explanation of how sex roles of cross-sex-typed and androgynous individuals are constructed. Instead, Bem just states that cross-sex-typed individuals, like sex-typed ones, tend to sort incoming information about the world in terms of gender differences, but since they at the same time “rate the sex-incongruent set [of categories] as more self-descriptive”, that’s why “no clear prediction can be made about gender-schematicity of this group”<sup>95</sup>. Bem, in connection to conceptualizing cross-sex-typed sex role fails to analyze and even to mention differences that are obviously present between cross-sex-typed males and females. As Gatens points to that, there is “a qualitative difference between the kind of femininity ‘lived’ by

<sup>94</sup> Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender Schema Theory: A Cognitive Account of Sex Typing. *Psychological Review*, 88 (4) p. 355

<sup>95</sup> Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2) p.195

women and that ‘lived’ by man”<sup>96</sup>. Thus, it seems that sex-typed role is the only concept clearly defined by Bem in her theory and explanation of BSRI. Even androgyny is not that clearly defined and conceptualized, although it’s stated to be the main concept of the whole theory of Bem and the main purpose of creation of her inventory.

To oppose the critique of androgyny of other authors, Bem in her latest work “The Lenses of Gender” opposes “the concept of androgyny” to “the moral of androgyny”<sup>97</sup>. While she agrees with the critique that androgyny as a concept is problematic because it, as it has been mentioned, assumes masculinity and femininity to have “an independent and palpable reality”, she states that the main function of androgyny in her theory is its “moral” component, the mission of androgyny as a concept to challenge psychological traditional understanding of gender identity. But the main description of androgyny as “moral” that Bem provides is that personal “behavior should have no gender”<sup>98</sup> and it can be “freely chosen”<sup>99</sup>, and this view of her has several shortcomings mainly because she perceives that a person can choose to have or not have gender identity, as it is elaborated below.

First of all, androgyny becomes a contradictory concept as a “moral” when Bem introduces it as an idea based in free choice of behavior. She explicitly states in her theory the fact of accidental gender categorization in society and stresses that “sex-typed individuals will conform to whatever definitions of masculinity and femininity the culture happens to provide”<sup>100</sup>. Because of her view of gender polarization as accidental and, in addition, perceiving individual conformity as an act of free will, Bem proposes androgyny as a moral decision to the moral problem of both gender polarization and andocentrism combined in the society. Bem sees androgyny to be able to challenge gender

<sup>96</sup> Gatens, M. (1995). *Imaginary bodies: Ethics, power, and corporeality*. p.9

<sup>97</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.175

<sup>98</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.175.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid p.123

<sup>100</sup> Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2) p.194

polarization because of its ability to eradicate andocentrism<sup>101</sup>. Major moral function of androgyny, for Bem, is its ability to destroy gendered hierarchy of values in the culture, where masculine values are perceived as superior. In this argument, Bem mistakenly assumes that existing values are positioned outside social construction of gender, and are not tied to dichotomization of masculinity and femininity. She perceives existing values as being imposed, rather than produced, by hierarchical relations. As Christine Delphy concisely opposes this assumption, “it is [] not possible to imagine the values of a future egalitarian society as being a sum, or a combination, of existing masculine and feminine values, for these values were created in and by hierarchy”<sup>102</sup>. So, neither behavior nor values produced by gender polarization can be challenged by challenging andocentrism by means of androgyny, because the society cannot imagine what this hierarchy would look like if we imagine *gyno*-centrism to be possible.

One more additional reason why it’s difficult to see androgyny as a moral idea challenging gender polarization and androcentrism, is that, as Bem herself agrees<sup>103</sup>, though the history, the word itself signifies not merging of two identities and elimination of differences genders, but proposes a perfection of man, in whom male characteristics are supplemented by only several female ones, like emotionality. As for females, in Western philosophy they were never expected to become androgynous. Surprisingly, this historical fact is not just a philosophic critique of the word itself, but it is also reflected by the findings of other authors and even by Bem herself in her studies of androgyny where BSRI was used.

In one of these studies, Bem makes conclusion that androgyny correlates more with masculinity than with femininity in traditional understanding of successful qualities such as independence of opinion and individualism (or “low conformity”). By this conclusion Bem supports bias of

<sup>101</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.195

<sup>102</sup> Delphy, C. (2002). Rethinking sex and gender. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.) *Gender: A sociological reader*. p.57

<sup>103</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.123

traditional psychometrics perceiving “more similarity between ‘healthy adult’ and ‘healthy man’ than between ‘healthy adult’ and ‘healthy woman’ ”<sup>104</sup>. According to studies of sex-related stereotypes<sup>105</sup>, men and women tend to present their “ideal self” more masculine and less feminine than they actually perceive themselves to be. All of these speak about androgyny being a concept loaded with masculine characteristics.

To sum up everything that has been said, androgyny as a concept appears to be not adequately defined in the theory of Bem in comparison to sex-typed individual. Androgyny is seen by Bem to be as accidental as masculinity and femininity are in the society, that’s why its theorized in her work as being simply comprised in the basis of already existent M and F scales, which makes the concept to be a combination of stereotypical masculine and feminine characteristics. The fact that androgyny is defined only as a combination of high masculinity and high femininity scores, and all other combinations of these scales are neglected and casted away as undifferentiated in half of the cases, makes it a very problematic concept to challenge gender polarization and androcentrism in the society and in psychometrics in particular, as Bem proposes it.

## **5.2. Concept of gender in feminist psychology.**

Having provided the major points of my critique of BSRI and theory of Bem related to the development of this inventory in the previous subchapter, in this part I will position the work of Bem in the context of feminist psychology.

First I will summarize the debate between Judith Butler and Susan Bordo on materiality of body, that will help to make sense of the critique I provide for feminist psychology, then I will analyze view on gender in feminist psychology, taking as the representative work the theories of Nancy

<sup>104</sup> Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study*. p.296

<sup>105</sup> Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study*. .p.283

Chodorow and Carol Gilligan. And in the final part I will argue that Bem represents the same position on the view on gender as feminist psychologists and as psychologists in general, which means that she sees biological differences to be the basis for psychological and social gender differences.

### 5.2.1. Material body in work of Susan Bordo and Judith Butler.

Materiality of the body in the theories of Bordo and Butler is the basis for their understanding of the role of the body in different dimensions of feminist theory and specifically of the place of the body in gender identity construction.

Butler, as a postmodern gender theorist, sees the body or “sex”<sup>106</sup>, as Butler prefers to refer to biologic basis for gender identity assumed in society, not to be essentially material, not prior to construction of gender on the basis of it, but to be “forcibly materialized through time”<sup>107</sup> by the “regulatory practices”<sup>108</sup> of the society. Butler sees “performativity”<sup>109</sup> as the main mechanism of these practices for production of material body, and understands it as the “reiterative and citational practice”<sup>110</sup> by means of which the norms for sexual practices and differences and gender identity characteristics based on those differences are constructed in the society. So, “performativity” in Butlerian sense is practice that makes individuals internalize and “cite”<sup>111</sup> the “regulatory norms of sex” and gender. And materiality of the body cannot be understood outside of the regulatory practices that constitute it through this “citation”<sup>112</sup>. Materiality or “matter of body [is] indissociable from the regulatory norms”<sup>113</sup>, by which it is created.

---

<sup>106</sup> Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. p. 71

<sup>107</sup> Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. p.71

<sup>108</sup> Ibid p.71

<sup>109</sup> Ibid p.78

<sup>110</sup> Ibid p.78

<sup>111</sup> Ibid p.79

<sup>112</sup> Ibid p.79

<sup>113</sup> Ibid p.72

And in connection to the process of materialization of the body, gender identity or gendered “I” is constructed, according to Butler, through this very process of materialization. Subject doesn’t exist before taking on the bodily norm ascribed by the culture or society. Subject identifies herself/himself with the sex norm in the moment of materializing of the body and starts to reiterate the norms assumed for that subject, thus creating gender of the subject, giving the place for conclusion that for Butler there is no material body as the basis for gender identity construction, but there exists only the process of “materialization” that creates body as the illusion of biological material basis for gender identity.

In a very different way materiality of the body is understood by Susan Bordo. First of all, Bordo agrees with Butler on the fact that neither body itself, nor the theories of body, are outside of discursive construction and are free from “conceptual frameworks”<sup>114</sup>. Bordo takes account of the language as discursive framework and sees the bodies to be “embedded in language”<sup>115</sup>. But it’s important that Bordo also sees the same body to be limited with physiology of their materiality.

Bordo stipulates that matter of body for her is not something “natural”<sup>116</sup> or essential about the body that can be contrasted or positioned before discursive. Rather, while taking into consideration the discursively constructed body, it is very important to take into consideration that Bordo speaks about materiality as a “metaphor” that “signifies finitude [] and physical locatedness in time and space, in history and culture”. Materiality in this terms helps to see, in addition to Butlerian understanding of constructed body, that the body at least is not constructed nowhere, in the space with no history and specific cultural traditions and norms. In contrast to Bordo’s body which is

---

<sup>114</sup> Bordo, S. (1998). Brining body to theory. In D. Welton (Ed.) *Body and Flesh: A Philosophical Reader*. p.89

<sup>115</sup> Ibid p.89.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid p.89.

suffering in a context and living in a gendered world, Butlerian body is a universal illusion of materialization of cultural norms of sex and gender.

### **5.2.2. Gender identity and gender differences in theories of feminist psychologists. Carol Gilligan and Nancy Chodorow.**

As Susan Bordo refers to work of Carol Gilligan and Nancy Chodorow, their theories

“cleared a space, described a new territory, that radically altered the male-normative terms of discussion about reality and experience; they forced recognition of the difference gender makes”<sup>117</sup>.

But along with that she acknowledges that these theories are very problematic in their totalizing and universalizing vision of development of gendered individual. Work of both of these authors is based on conceptions of some innate “essential ‘gender reality’ ”<sup>118</sup>.

Gilligan in her book “In a Different Voice” insists on the fact of existence of radical difference between men and women that is manifested in their moral judgments. The main argument she makes is that the differences between males and females that become evident in psychological research are always interpreted by psychologists in a way that benefits men, and women characteristics are taken as deviation from the norm. Gilligan sees that the differences accounted in psychological research and measurement have only biological basis, and sees women to be excluded and oppressed on the basis of invalid interpretation of those differences in the psychological science and further perception of male characteristics to be superior to female ones in the society.

Gilligan bases her argumentation on the opinion of Chodorow, who in her book “The Reproduction of Mothering” explained that boys and girls undergo the process of identity construction differently: while boys to become males had to undergo separation from the mother to become masculine according to social norms, girls have to identify with their mother personally and

---

<sup>117</sup> Bordo, S. (1993). *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture and the Body*. p.219

<sup>118</sup> Bordo, S. (1993). *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture and the Body*. p.220

with the role of mothering as well. According to the vision of Chodorow, boys and girl are *essentially different* and that is the reason for their different ‘socialization’ process (although she doesn’t use this expression). Perception of masculinity as a benefit that has to be achieved causes a boy to separate from mother and reject femininity in him, and causes him for the first time to see world as hierarchical relations and individuality as separateness, when at the same time girl sees the world as relations between people and describes herself in terms of her relationships with others.

This view of Chodorow on children development is applied by Gilligan to support her vision of biologically and psychologically based differences between men and women. Gilligan argues that model of boy’s development is mistakenly taken as the norm of development and because of that the differences between men and women are given wrong theoretical interpretation in psychological science. According to Gilligan, there are basic psychological and biological differences between males and females, such as differences in perception of relationships with other people – boys see them hierarchically and girls in form of network, according to Gilligan – and these differences are the basis of gender identity construction for her. Gender identities, in opinion of Gilligan are constructed to show women as inferior only because of ‘wrongful’ interpretation of biological and following developmental differences between sexes ).

Gilligan speaks about “different languages”<sup>119</sup> that men and women use, she insists that women have “different voice” because they “perceive and construe social reality differently”<sup>120</sup>. In saying so, Gilligan sees that to change the way how genders are constructed and perceived in society it is necessary to challenge the norm in psychological understanding from male norm to female one, to write the psychology of women in “women’s own terms”<sup>121</sup>.

---

<sup>119</sup> Gilligan, C. (1982). *In A Different Voice*. p.173

<sup>120</sup> Ibid p.173.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid p.173.



In constructing her argumentation, Gilligan insists on differences in development of men and women that effect their gender roles and positions as adults, but she doesn't see development in terms of different socialization processes for girls and boys that can be based on social stereotypes of gender differences. Following her logic, the problem of unequal social positions of men and women is rooted in accepting male model as a norm for successful development. At the same time Gilligan doesn't engage in discussing behavior as being constructed, according to Butler, and segregated games and activities for boys and girls that are designed on the basis of cultural images of male and female roles in the society.

Call of feminist psychologists such as Chodorow and Gilligan for "women psychology" or psychology in women's terms that would be based on shifting psychological norm from male model to female one is a solution that is trying to 'bring women in' and not engage in discussion on how the norms and identities of both men and women are constructed in the society. In addition to that, the perception of gender differences by these authors to be rooted in biological and psychological ones, allows making a conclusion that they see gender identity to be constructed 'wrongfully' on the basis of 'stable' biologically based bodily differences between sexes that are either wrongfully interpreted or neglected in case of women; and that they perceive it possible for gender identities to be reconstructed in a different way using different approach to interpretation and accounting for these stable biologically rooted differences.

### **5.2.3. 'Biological reductionalism' in the theory of Sandra Bem.**

Sandra Bem, as the author of Bem Sex Role Inventory in psychological science, occupies a somewhat contradictory position as a feminist psychologist who positions herself as working to reconceptualize approaches to seeing gender measurement in psychology and, at the same time, who is the author of one of the gender measuring inventories in psychology and new concepts that

follow the creation of this inventory. To better analyze her work and role of her inventory in practice of gender measuring, I will first analyze her understanding of body as the biological foundation for gender identity construction. It is important to do so because Bem, as well as Gilligan and Chodorow, perceives body as a source of biological differences between sexes to be the basis for psychological differences between genders.

In her article “Androgyny and Gender Schema Theory”, Bem states that she believes there are “biologically based sex differences in behavior”<sup>122</sup> and sees the aim of feminist psychology to “let the distribution of activities and roles across males and females reflect nothing but biology”<sup>123</sup>. She expresses assurance that biologically determined sexual differences would be not as huge and incompatible as those that exist in our society today.

Bem’s view appears to be contradictory to that of Susan Bordo, who states, that biology should be taken seriously and not rejected as “fantasy” or “fiction”<sup>124</sup>. For her, biology is a framework for understanding the body, for locating the body in historical and cultural context of existence. For Bordo, biology cannot be rejected for the same reasons for which “materiality” cannot be rejected as concept that grants our individual locatedness. Although Bordo acknowledges that “science of biology is mediated by historically located, conceptual frameworks”<sup>125</sup>, she states that historical and cultural locatedness cannot be perceived without biology.

But for Bordo, at the same time, it is a problem to understand differences between males and females purely in terms of biology: “I am [] still suspicious of the arguments about biological basis of differences between men and women”<sup>126</sup>. She rejects this assumption primarily because the differences that are given biological basis in the society, for her, are produced by discursive practices

---

<sup>122</sup> Bem, S. L. (1985). Androgyny and Gender Schema Theory: A Conceptual and Empirical Integration. [Nebraska Symposium on Motivation.] p.180.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid p.180.

<sup>124</sup> Bordo, S. (1998). Brining body to theory. In D. Welton (Ed.) *Body and Flesh: A Philosophical Reader*. p.89

<sup>125</sup> Ibid. p.89

<sup>126</sup> Ibid. p.90

and are inscribed on the body. So, contrary to Bem's position, Bordo sees biology as a possible explanatory theory of the body that has to be anyway historically and discursively framed, but not explanatory basis for any sexual differences, as Bem does.

Biology serves as the basis for construction of self for Bem. She speaks about self as a "constructed self"<sup>127</sup>, and emphasizes that both the role of individual and the society in its construction. First of all, under the "self" Bem perceives an individual, but she doesn't speak about a gender of an individual, instead of that she sees "a gendered personality" and "a gendered body" to be several parts that constitute a constructed self.

In connection to this, I argue that Bem perceives individual's psyche or psychological processes to be independent sustainable system of production of subjective reality. Contrary to this view, Foucault<sup>128</sup>, sees all psychological processes as the effects of "psyche", "soul" or "personality" to be produced as "human interiority" of a subject by the relations of power. While for Foucault there doesn't exist subjective psychological reality outside of discursive construction, and psyche is a socially constructed reality rather than an active producer of reality, Bem expresses traditional psychological view, perceiving an individual to be psychologically active in constructing her/his personal reality. Moreover, Foucault emphasizes that the power acts through the body to produce the "interiority" that Bem would see as psyche, while Bem, on the contrary, sees "gendered body" to be constructed by "gendered psyche". "Gendered body" for Bem is a part of psychological reality produced by active individual's psyche, while for Foucault it is psyche that is produced by power relations that operate through the body. In this comparison it is seen that for Bem body itself precedes construction of gender, meaning that gender identity has biological basis, but at the same time, body becomes 'more gendered than it was' after acceptance of gender identity.

---

<sup>127</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.152

<sup>128</sup> McLaren, M. A. (2002). *Feminism, Foucault, and embodied subjectivity*. p.84

As it was mentioned earlier, contrary to Bem's point of view, Butler sees personality, self or "I" as formed at the moment of materialization of "assumed sex" or body by regulatory practices, and this moment is not separable from the process of constructing gender:

...the "I" neither precedes nor follows the process of this gendering, but emerges only within and at the matrix of gender relations themselves.

So, for Butler there is only one process of gendering, not separate construction of gendered body and gendered personality. But in Bem's vision, "gendered personality" and "gendered body" are separated and are produced or "gendered" separately from each other, but it is done actively, by means of each other and not through power relations. Moreover, for Bem there exists "gendered self", consisting from both "gendered personality" and "gendered body" that are mutually influencing and both have some 'reality', but both are constructed actively by individual and not social relations of power.

As for the concept of body as basis for gender differences, for Bem there are two possible positions of body for theoretical account – one is characterized by autonomous psychological functioning, location and ability to "move around the space" and have "sexual desires"<sup>129</sup>, and the other is constructed by "gendered personality" as a part of self. Bem sees body as primarily physical, "material" as Bordo would say, but contrary to Bordo, who utilizes concept of materiality to show historical and contextual locatedness of bodies, Bem doesn't account for historicity of body, but only speaks about "biological sexual differences"<sup>130</sup>. Body for Bem is changed as an effect of personality being "gendered", but this body is just shaped to look "more male or female in appearance" than it already appears to be due to its biological characteristics, body is not constructed by the discursive practices of the society at all as Butler and Bordo would both agree.

<sup>129</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.159

<sup>130</sup> Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. p.160

This is a crucial difference in positions of understanding body between feminist psychologists, and Bem especially, and feminist body theorists of Butlerian perspective. What Bem sees as the irreducible basis for sexual differences, Butler names “imaginary morphology” that is not presymbolic but “is orchestrated through regulatory schemas” and makes it possible to interpret and construct the body through social norms and classifications for bodies. While Bem sees it accidental that males and females are prescribed to manifest different sets of behavior patterns, Gatens claims for such differences being not accidental at all, but instead being rooted in anatomy itself:

Masculinity and femininity as forms of sex-appropriate behaviors are manifestation of historically based, *culturally shared phantasy about male and female biologies*, and as such *sex and gender are not arbitrarily connected*.

That’s why Bem in her suggestion to reduce all the differences to ‘merely’ biological ones is blind to the fact that all the gender differences seem not to have emerged from nowhere, but are rooted in biology of reproduction itself. To refer to biology and “material” body in order to challenge androcentrism and gender polarization is ineffective solution, since, as Butler argues, materiality or biology is tied to “signification”<sup>131</sup> of the matter, and thus sex or biological differences that Bem brings about cannot be discussed outside of “gender matrix”, to borrow from Butler.

Connecting everything that has been argued in this chapter to the analysis of gender-measuring inventories in the previous chapter, I argue that BSRI is not challenging any assumptions of gender measurement in psychometrics, because the theory of Sandra Bem doesn’t differ in its fundamental assumptions from basic view on gender in psychology. ‘Biological essentialism’ of Bem is an illustration of feminist psychological view on gender identity, as it has been shown in this chapter in the analysis of feminist psychological approach to gender.

---

<sup>131</sup> Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. p.31

The phenomenon of gender measuring is not perceived by Bem, as a feminist expert in psychometrics, differently from the approach to measuring gender in psychometrics existing before appearance of BSRI. This fact proves that using gender-measuring inventories as phenomenon in the society doesn't depend on the origins of the theory behind them, but is explained by the aim of regulation and maintaining control over the society by authoritative institution of psychology, as it has been argued in the previous chapter as a general critique of gender-measuring inventories.

## **6. Function of gender measuring inventories in construction and perception of gender identity.**

In this last chapter I will show what impact gender-measuring inventories have on people that take them, why they can be perceived as part of the “technology of gender”, according to T. de Lauretis, and what, according to the opinions of the respondents and their responses to the procedure and statements of the tests, they are measuring as a person's ‘gender identity’, ‘sex role’ or ‘level of masculinity and femininity’. I will analyze my findings in accordance with the critique of gender inventories provided in the previous chapters and with the theoretical framing of my research.

In the first part of the chapter I will provide analysis of empirical data from interviews with 11 respondents, females and males of different sexual orientation with the use of procedure described in method section. As I described it in the method section, the respondents are referred here by means of anonymous designations – F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6 for females and M1, M2, M3, M4, M5 for males. Although I perceive my sample to be limited due to small number of respondents, their being all of one origin and approximately the same age, I perceive it to be possible to provide answers for the questions that I raised in my work using the data I obtained from my sample. As I stated in the description of my method, I perceive it to be very important for my research to focus deeply on specific opinions of every of my respondents, because I oppose my method to the

quantitative basis for the usage of gender inventories in psychological research, where the emphasis is made on the number of similar answers and individual opinions are often neglected and considered statistically insignificant.

I will show and analyze main problems and confusions that arose when respondents were filling out the gender inventories and received the statements about their gender identity from the tests.

In the final part of the chapter I will provide theoretical analysis of the data presented and theorize the usage of gender measuring inventories as part of the process of constructing gender identities in society.

### ***6.1. Examining responses to psychological gender testing.***

Procedure of administering gender inventories and interviewing provided several important and interesting findings, illuminating respondents assumptions and opinions about own gender identity, gender norms in the society, existing differences between genders and origins of that differences. I will focus on several findings which are most important for my analysis and that are linked to the analysis of gender inventories provided in previous chapters.

Before offering the inventories to the respondents, they were asked to provide their opinions whether there are any stable and essential differences between males and females<sup>132</sup> and if there are, to specify those. The respondents were quick to answer and mostly named reproductive biological differences, such as ability to give birth for females, and stereotypical ones, such as short hair for males and long for females, and different body constitution. Only once a female respondent (F1) named understanding of “morality” and “way of thinking” as characteristics of the difference between males and females.

---

<sup>132</sup> I specified gender differences here to take place between males and females because gender inventories assume gender differences to be grounded in sex differences.

As for the origin of these differences, respondents in several cases stated that they are innate and biologically determined; as least once, social status was linked by a male respondent (M3) to biological characteristics, when he stated that females are different from males in that they have to take parental leave and take care of children, and it's a given thing because "*women* have children everywhere" and they simply cannot give up nurturing responsibilities.

In addition to that, one of female respondents (F5) stated that she was sure that gender differences are rooted in biology, because she observes many differences in behavior of her children – a boy and a girl – and perceives that the girls is much more sensitive and the boy is more active and that's why her conclusion was that "very much, is determined by biology in us". She explained observed differences in her children by levels of hormones, which, according to her is also relevant for the adults.

It's interesting that along with pointing to the differences between genders, respondents tended to state that any person can have both masculine and feminine characteristics. There was only one occasion when a male respondent (M5) stated that when he thinks of male having female characteristics he tends to "think of gays, to be honest", that's why he doesn't perceive it to be possible for him to combine both sets of female and male characteristics.

This opinion interestingly contrasts with opinion a male respondent (M2), who identified himself as a homosexual and who explained that he has to take on different roles in different situations – female and male ones – and maybe that's why to demonstrate both male and female characteristics. This respondent explained that since he has to work and think of earning money, he can be perceived to play male traditional role by the society, but since he also takes care of his family and has some household responsibilities, he can be perceived as playing female traditional role as well. He pointed to his satisfaction with such situation and concluded that people have to play different roles and express different personality characteristics in different life situations. In connection to this opinion,



a female respondent (F2) in her interview stated that it's difficult to measure something related to gender in a person because "everything is changing and [she] will change through time". To reflect to these two opinions, I have to go back here to the position of Connell, which was discussed in chapter IV. According to Connell, while gender identity or masculinity and femininity are undefined and abstract concepts, which obviously cannot be manifested similarly in every person even of the same gender, gender inventories work to "reify"<sup>133</sup> them, to make them fixed, stable and prescribe certain set of characteristics and specific roles for each gender. As for the case of two latter opinions, the respondents point out that they do not perceive their gender identity to be fixed and stable set of characteristics.

In attempt to measure gender identity in such a way, as it was discussed in previous chapters, gender inventories are inadequate even in their assumptions about gender differences they propose to measure. According to the opinions of the respondents, item selection and content of both tests used for the interviews are irrelevant and sometimes very confusing.

First of all, several times respondents answered that they "have no idea" of what the tests are measuring, because at least some items are totally irrelevant for measurement of masculinity and femininity. Once a female respondent (F5) explained that in her opinion items of both tests "can be measuring something deep in a person, but they have nothing to do with masculinity or femininity". In addition to that, once a female respondent (F4) answering the question that the tests are measuring, according to her opinion, explained the following about the MMPI Mf scale: "I think it measures what I think of my family, what I think of flowers, of sex and so on" but statements altogether were measuring nothing in her opinion. Other interesting answers for this question were that MMPI masculinity-femininity scale is measuring whether someone is "a loser or not a loser"

---

<sup>133</sup> Connell, R. W. (1996). *Gender and power : society, the person, and sexual politics*. p.174

(M5), according to the list of occupations it provides as masculine and feminine ones, and that BSRI measures, according to another respondent (M2) “whether [someone is] a wooden log in a forest”.

Even in the situations when respondents supposed that the inventories measure masculinity and femininity, many items of the tests were stated to be irrelevant to these concepts or just confusing. Every respondent pointed to many items when s/he cannot give an answer to the item because couldn't relate it to personal self receptions, or because “half of the statement is true and half is not” (M4) in relation to a respondent. For example, many respondents pointed to a lot of statements concerning flowers in MMPI Mf scale, and one of the questions in relation to this was “what's up with the flowers?” (F4) to which I couldn't give the answer give an answer at that moment and still cannot give it now, and in another situation a female respondent (F3) pointed to the fact that she can understand the MMPI Mf statement “I believe in the life hereafter” in many different ways – “going to heaven, reincarnation, having many lives...”. In addition to that, I notices that several people understood differently the item “childlike” from BSRI, perceiving it as “having fun” (M3), “desire to be protected” (F1), “being able to play with your children” (F5). Even this small example speaks of existence of various meanings each item can have, and in relation different possible characteristics that can constitute masculinity and femininity.

Certainly, the most important finding of the interview analysis appears to be the way how statement of the inventories about person's gender identity or level of masculinity and femininity resonates with personal own perception of her/his gender identity.

Even though respondents couldn't formulate or define what is masculinity and femininity, and named mostly stereotypical general differences without specifying the origins of all these differences, in several cases it is evident how statement about gender identity provided by the inventories is important for the respondents.

The most interesting case for this analysis is response of my first male respondent (M1) who was very confused by the results the inventories provided for him and stated that they were “shocking”. Before filling the inventories he stated that he perceived himself to have higher masculinity than femininity, but explained that sometimes he is more “sensitive” than ordinary men are and that this quality “eliminates his toughness and instrumentality” which is not very desirable for a man. He perceived that it is important for a man to express certain masculine features because of the requirements of the society. Results of the inventories resonated with his self perception – he was rated “undifferentiated” with higher femininity by BSRI and “highly feminine, close to pathological state” by MMPI Mf scale. His response to this result was the following: “I know about that but I don’t like to here that [because] this interpretation is not really positive”. By this he pointed out to the fact that he perceived feminine characteristics to be quite undesirable for a man. It was evident that he was disappointed by the results, when he said “It’s a problem – I’m too passive, I should be more active” and sated that he would like to change himself but “changing [] is very difficult” and he cannot do that himself, so he *needs to know how to change himself, maybe with help of someone*. In addition to that he said he perceived that other people can measure his personality and gender characteristics better than he can. This desire for help exemplifies how pathologizing statement of the test about one’s gender identity can create a space for non-satisfaction with own gender image and make a person seek help. Since the statement of one’s gender identity or levels of masculinity-femininity is usually made by a psychologist who administers the tests, the most obvious authority to provide *help* in this situation is also a psychologist. This fact of providing help to a person who needs it can be referred to the aim of psychology in connection to gender inventories, which was discussed in the chapter IV, where I argued that while psychologists perceive the function of the inventories to reveal the problem related to gendered behavior or characteristics and to help produce the corrective solution to that problem, at the same time the problem in gendered behavior or set of gender-related

characteristics is defined in psychology in relation to statistically stated norm, which is again defined by means of gender inventories. This fact suggests that gender inventories are the core mechanism to make people adjust their behavior and personal characteristics to a norm, already embedded in the inventories.

An example of expressing of trust to psychologists, similar to the previous one, appeared when one female respondent (F5) stated that she would believe statements of such tests if she knows that they are “standard tests” meaning created by professional psychologists.

These two examples suggest that psychology professionals are often seen as an authority in society, who can provide statements about individuals’ identity and provide help to those whose identity image doesn’t correspond to the norms stated for this identity.

In contrast with the previous example, the statement of the tests caused very different reaction of another male respondent (M3), although he was also confused by the contradiction between his own identity image and the statement of the tests about him. Before taking the tests, he perceived himself to be highly masculine, but while BSRI stated he was “masculine”, MMPI Mf scale stated he was “highly feminine”. While in the beginning he claimed that he would believe the statement of such tests about his gender characteristics, when he learnt the results the MMPI Mf he first of all stated that he anyway believed the tests because he rather perceives himself to be “in between masculinity and femininity”. But by the end of the interview, when I repeated the question of how he felt about the whole procedure he stated that he “anyway [didn’t] believe in these tests”. In contrast with the example of the previous male respondent, this example demonstrates how person tends to adapt to the statement of the tests about her/his gender identity or reject the results as irrelevant, but anyway the most important fact here in both examples is that the inventories may make people perceive their gender identity to be not normal according to social standards expressed through psychological gender inventories.

One more example of how gender inventories can influence image of own gender identity is the case of female respondent (F5) who was happy about statement of the test, which stated that she is feminine, and interpretation of the test that she is traditionally feminine and family-oriented. Responding to the last characteristic, she stated that now she is reassured about her gender image and her self perception is reaffirmed. To analyze this last example I have to go back to article by Connell again, who genuinely explained that the reason why people may recognize themselves in the statements of psychological tests concerning their gender identity is “not because people *are*<sup>134</sup> dots on computer-generated graph in N dimensions<sup>135</sup>... [but] because the process of reification is so far advanced as to make recognition of qualitative diversity threatening”<sup>136</sup>. This quote can be interpreted to claim that the reason for the fact that people can recognize themselves in the statements of the tests is not that tests say something true about people but that *people try to adapt their perception of self to the statements of the inventories*, for which possible reason can again be stated as perception of the gender inventories as a manifestation of the authority of psychology in creating discourse about sex and gender.

One more type of responses important for my analysis of function of psychological inventories and psychological discourse on gender identity were responses for the fact that I was counting all the tests results very quickly in front of the respondents, tossing around many papers with some scales, graphs and interpretations of the inventories. After my question about how respondents feel about this procedure several interviewees (M1, F5, F6) responded that they felt rather “vulnerable” because they felt they had to disclose some intimate and personal issues to a totally stranger, issues that they would rather tell their close friends. One of the respondents (M1) explained that he perceived me to be working as a “machine”, automatically counting something about his personal

---

<sup>134</sup> Original emphasis.

<sup>135</sup> Here Connell refers to the way how quantitative analysis embedded in tests construction graphically represents one's gender identity.

<sup>136</sup> Connell, R. W. (1996). *Gender and power: society, the person, and sexual politics*. p.174-175

characteristics, and that made him *to feel he is in front of a doctor and something is wrong with him*. This response can be seen as a part of the answer to the question how a person feels and what influence – cognitive and emotional – the procedure of administering gender inventories can have on an individual.

As a final item of analysis in this part of the chapter, I will provide an example of how gender inventories can be an instrument of reinforcement of person's self perception, and how 'ideal self' of a person is reflected by an inventory. In two of the interviews – one of female respondent (F1) and one of male respondent (M5) – both of respondents in the very beginning stated their desire to "be more masculine" than they probably are. In case of the female respondent, she explained that she thinks her parents wanted a boy but not a girl and she was "brought up [her] somehow in this way...". She explained she desire to be more masculine as following: "I feel that for self-fulfillment I should adapt more to masculine type... to avoid being fragile". In connection to that she later reflected to the results of the testing, when tests rated her as masculine type, as following "I believe that but it's not something essential about me, it's more about 'wonna be'".

In the second example mentioned above, a male respondent, who identified himself as homosexual, explained that he has to act up to the norms of society concerning gender identity, because "as a member of a marginalized group I have to express some masculine characteristics, just to be accepted". At one moment of the interview he said that he would like be to rated as both masculine and feminine on both tests, but in the very end, when one test rated him as masculine and the other as feminine, he reflected that his "ideal image of the self is more masculine because [this role] makes things easier [in adaptation to social norms], but these results [of the tests] just show that everything is not clear-cut when you measure gender". Both of these examples reflect the fact that male characteristics are perceived as more advantageous and thus preferable for people of different genders. The fact of correlation between self image and the statements of the both inventories in

both of these examples, suggest that gender tests may rather measure how a person perceives herself/himself or how s/he represents her/his identity to others.

All the examples analyzed in this part of my work add to the answer to the question what exactly influence gender inventories have on the people who take them, how the gender inventories function as a part of “technology of gender” in the context of psychologically constructed discourse of sex, and what is that ‘gender identity’ which is proposed to be measured by them. It was demonstrated in this subchapter that gender inventories have cognitive and emotional influence on respondents in the form of causing a conflict between personal perception of own gender characteristics, that gender inventories function to make people seek psychological help because of representing psychology as the only authority who can deal with the issues of gender identity and sex role, and that gender inventories actually measure the image of ideal gender identity in the person or how personal characteristics of an individual fit the set of characteristics assigned to her/him by the society.

## ***6.2. Theorizing the process of gender identity construction and perception.***

It is seen from the answers of respondents in the previous part of the chapter how important the statement of gender identity is for people. Such attitude can be linked to two approaches to perception of gender in connection to the individual’s self. First approach to discuss is one of mainstream psychology and psychometrics which perceive gender to be a “core”<sup>137</sup>, about which the personality is constructed. Gender is seen as a variable that determines most personality characteristics, which is seen in the amount of tests produced, in extensive usage of them in psychology, and in attachment of great value to the statements of gender inventories. It is interesting to contrast psychological approach to the feminist vision of gender by Judith Butler. According to

---

<sup>137</sup> Deaux, K and Major, B. A Social-Psychological Model of Gender. From *The Gendered Society Reader* by M. Kimmel and A. Aronson (Eds.) p.84

Butler, there is no “personal identity”<sup>138</sup>, “intelligible” by the society, which is not gendered. So, personality for Butler is constituted by “relations of coherence and continuity among sex, gender, sexual practice and desire”<sup>139</sup>. There is a tendency attached to a “personal identity”<sup>140</sup> to be continuous and stable through time in terms of gender characteristics. Gender identity, following this logic, has to be not only attached by the society but also monitored and controlled. This control is first of all generated by such practices as gender inventories as one mechanism of “technology of gender” which produce definitions and descriptions of gender identities that have to be congruent with specific sex.

But in addition to that, control over stability and continuity of own gendered personality is maintained by the process of “internalization”<sup>141</sup> of social norms assigned to specific gender. Margaret McLaren in her book “Feminism, Foucault and Embodied Subjectivity” uses “internalization” to refer to Foucauldian understanding of process of creation of “docile body” by power relations, but I see internalization to be a process much more complex than “repeated actions that result into habituation”<sup>142</sup>, as she puts it. Internalization is the process that makes a person to be able to *control* her/his behavior and self-image according to the norms of the society that become internalized, because these norms become a part of the personality. I see internalization to be the process by which gendered personality is constructed, because this process is a manifestation of “power relations” which, according to Foucault, “produce psyche [and] personality”<sup>143</sup>. Psychological gender tests are in this case mechanisms that provide messages about one’s gender identity and make individuals monitor her/his gender identity in accordance with the statement of an inventory, as it has been shown in several examples in previous part of the chapter.

---

<sup>138</sup> Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. p.16

<sup>139</sup> Ibid p.17

<sup>140</sup> Ibid p.16

<sup>141</sup> McLaren, M. A. (2002). *Feminism, Foucault, and embodied subjectivity*. p.106

<sup>142</sup> Ibid p.106

<sup>143</sup> Ibid p.84



Discussed examples show that not all the personality characteristics are compatible with “internalized” image of own gendered personality. That’s why, as it has been shown in my analysis, individuals often tend to repress, deny characteristics that are not filling the image of desirable gendered self. It allow to say that construction of gendered self by means of gender inventories is happening through “exclusion” of characteristics that become seen as undesirable because of their incompatibility with one’s internalized image of gendered self. Construction gendered personality through the process of internalization also allows making desirable characteristics visible and manifested by an individual. In the cases discussed in the previous part of the chapter, desirable characteristics were either ones of own sex (for cases of two males compared), or ones of the other sex (for examples of female and male homosexual respondents who perceived masculine characteristics as an ideal self-image).

It is very important that excluded characteristics are not totally excluded from personality, but stay as a part of personality and are become to be rejected by an individual. This set of characteristics becomes part of a personality in contrast to which all other personality characteristics are constructed in a gender identity and are controlled as such by an individual. I argue that similarly to differentiating between norm and abnormality in society, within the boarders of personality the concept of ‘norm’ is constructed in contrast to the concept of ‘deviation’. Rejected gender characteristics help to construct ‘normal’ gendered personality with characteristics that fit image of ideal gendered self. The process of exclusion of certain undesirable characteristics is never complete, it is constantly taking place in an individual, in situations similar to comparing the statements of gender measuring inventories to the internalized image of gendered self.

At this point, I it is necessary to contrast the view of Foucault on the function of internalization in the process of construction of personality with the role of internalization perceived by psychology. While Foucault sees internalization as the effect of habitual actions imposed on the

body by power relations and personality to be constructed by power relations by means of internalization of the norms, from psychological point of view internalization of the social norms is an active practice of a person by means of which the internalized norms become a part of a personality, but do not solely form the personality, as Foucault argues. It is very important that the perceptions of this process in Foucauldian and psychological traditions are very close to each other, but the radical difference is in the perception of the role of individual, because for Foucault the subject is constructed by power relations and for psychological understanding the subject is active in the process of internalization of social norms. From psychological position, the readiness of the subject to internalize the social norms is explained by the fact that these norms being internalized help an individual to adapt to society.

To conclude, creation of personality through internalization is perceived by psychology as a positive and beneficiary process for a subject, but it is perceived as a negative one by Foucault, because he sees the process to be caused by existence of power relations and thus impact of them on a subject. An important fact is that representation of the person to be active makes it possible for psychology to see individuals to be deviant from the socially prescribed norms; and arguing that a person is free and active in her/his behavior doesn't prevent psychology from arguing that a person and society as a whole should be controlled, as I argued before in chapter 4.

## **7. Conclusion.**

The main questions I raised in my work were concerning the role of gender-measuring inventories in society, and the reasons of ongoing implementation of these tests in different contexts, such as clinical treatment of psychiatric patients, family therapy, psychological research and many others. The reason why I raised these questions was that there is much literature that analyzes and criticizes the gender inventories due to many reasons, but all the critique is concentrated within the field of psychology and doesn't address crucial questions on this topic, mainly why it is

important to measure gender – related constructs at all, and to theorize gender as a concept based on the data obtained from implementation of gender-measuring inventories. This contradiction in the field of psychology and psychometrics in particular was perceived as the practical problem behind my research.

Through my analysis of gender-measuring inventories as a phenomenon and gender measuring as a practice in psychometrics, I provided evidence for the fact that gender is perceived in psychometrics as one of the core personality dimensions that has to be theorized. And the only way of theorizing this concept properly is perceived to be obtaining from implementation of gender-measuring inventories in different contexts, the assumption in psychology that leads to conducting a lot of research using gender-measuring inventories as main materials for studying and theorizing gender characteristics, gender differences between males and females, gender roles and many other concepts. As I argued in my work, this tendency leads to exaggeration of any differences found in such type of research and makes scientists forget that at the moment when they are motivated to produce a theory on the basis of practical data obtained by means of implementation of the gender inventories, they already have some theoretical assumptions embedded into the inventories they use, because of the certain content of the inventories that reflects creator's perception of gendered characteristics or behavior.

At the same time, as I argued through my work, gender-measuring inventories can be seen as a part of “technology of sex/gender”<sup>144</sup> in the society because they function to control gendered behavior in individuals through imposing gender roles reflected by the content of the inventories. As it has been shown by the analysis of interviews, gender inventories can influence individuals' perception of gendered self through positive or negative reinforcement of self-perceived gender identity, or levels of masculinity and femininity as a part of it. This function of gender inventories

---

<sup>144</sup> These terms appear in the works of Foucault and T. de Lauretis, as I explained it in the introduction.

suggests that psychology occupies the position of authority in the discourse on gender to maintain control over behavior, which is confirmed by many authors and explained as an intention of maintenance of psychological health of the population, since psychological 'well-being' is associated with congruence of sex and assigned gender characteristics. This conception of well-being is produced and conveyed by means of using gender inventories as relevant instruments of assessment, while this position is incorporated in the item-content of the tests and can influence people who take them to change gender characteristics they manifest, or even try to reject some of characteristics that are not associated with the gender role assigned to them by the society.

Although I criticized both mainstream psychology and feminist psychology for assuming gender to be grounded in several stereotypical characteristics that can be quantitatively measured and thus allowing numerous gender-measuring inventories to be developed, the aim of my work was not to attack psychological science as a whole, but to criticize a specific phenomenon in the field of psychometrics – gender inventories. Nevertheless, I argue that psychometric approach to gender as a quantitatively measurable core personality characteristic is linked to the view on gender in psychology as a whole, and due to perception of gender as a normalized set of measurable traits affects view on gender in psychological science and in society as well, since psychological research using gender inventories is replicated in different materials such as academic works, textbooks in different disciplines and thus is converted into widespread perception of gender in the society.

## Appendix I. Bem Sex Role Inventory with answer sheet.

### BEM SEX ROLE INVENTORY

**Rate yourself on each item, on a scale from 1 (never or almost never true) to 7 (almost always true). When you have completed the inventory, transfer your ratings to the inventory score sheet.**

- |                        |                                   |                                 |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. self reliant        | 21. reliable                      | 41. warm                        |
| 2. yielding            | 22. analytical                    | 42. solemn                      |
| 3. helpful             | 23. sympathetic                   | 43. willing to take a stand     |
| 4. defends own beliefs | 24. jealous                       | 44. tender                      |
| 5. cheerful            | 25. leadership ability            | 45. friendly                    |
| 6. moody               | 26. sensitive to other's needs    | 46. aggressive                  |
| 7. independent         | 27. truthful                      | 47. gullible                    |
| 8. shy                 | 28. willing to take risks         | 48. inefficient                 |
| 9. conscientious       | 29. understanding                 | 49. acts as a leader            |
| 10. athletic           | 30. secretive                     | 50. childlike                   |
| 11. affectionate       | 31. makes decisions easily        | 51. adaptable                   |
| 12. theatrical         | 32. compassionate                 | 52. individualistic             |
| 13. assertive          | 33. sincere                       | 53. does not use harsh language |
| 14. flatterable        | 34. self-sufficient               | 54. unsystematic                |
| 15. happy              | 35. eager to soothe hurt feelings | 55. competitive                 |
| 16. strong personality | 36. conceited                     | 56. loves children              |
| 17. loyal              | 37. dominant                      | 57. tactful                     |
| 18. unpredictable      | 38. soft spoken                   | 58. ambitious                   |
| 19. forceful           | 39. likable                       | 59. gentle                      |
| 20. feminine           | 40. masculine                     | 60. conventional                |

### BSRI Score sheet

Enter your ratings in the appropriate columns

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3
1	2	3
4	5	6
7	8	9
10	11	12
13	14	15
16	17	18
19	20	21
22	23	24
25	26	27
28	29	30
31	32	33
34	35	36
37	38	39
40	41	42
43	44	45
46	47	48
49	50	51
52	53	54
55	56	57
58	59	60

## Appendix II. MMPI Masculinity-Femininity Scale with keys.

Female answer sheet.

№	Statement	Yes	No
1	I like mechanic magazines.		+
2	I think I would like the work of a librarian.	+	
3	When I take a new job, I like to be tipped off as to who should be gotten next to.		+
4	I would like to be a singer.	+	
5	I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth shut when I am in trouble.		+
6	When someone does me a bad thing I feel that I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.		+
7	I am very strongly attracted to the members of my own sex.		+
8	I used to like drop-the-handkerchief .	+	
9	I have never been sorry that I am a girl.	+	
10	I enjoy reading love stories.	+	
11	I like poetry.	+	
12	My feelings are not easily hurt.		+
13	I sometimes tease animals.		+
14	I think I would like the kind of work the forest ranger does.		+
15	I would like to be a florist.		+
16	It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.		+
17	I would like to be a nurse.	+	
18	I like to go to parties and other affairs when there is a lot of loud fun.		+
19	I frequently find it necessary to stand for what is right.		+
20	I believe in a life hereafter.		+
21	I enjoy a race or game better when I bet on it.		+
22	Most people are honest chiefly through the fear of being caught.		+
23	My table manners are not quiet as good at home as when I am out in company.		+
24	I like dramatics.	+	
25	I like collecting flowers or growing house plants.	+	

26	I have never indulged in any unusual sex practices.	+	
27	I times my thoughts have raced ahead faster than I could speak them.	+	
28	I like to cook.	+	
29	I would like to be a soldier.		+
30	I used to keep a diary.	+	
31	I do not have a great fear of snakes.		+
32	I am worried about sex matters.		+
33	My hands have not become clumsy or awkward.	+	
34	I daydream very little.		+
35	If a were a reporter I would like very much to report news of the weather.	+	
36	I would like to be a journalist.	+	
37	While walking I am very careful to step over sidewalk cracks.		+
38	I have never had any breaking out on my skin that worried me.		+
39	I frequently find myself warring about something.	+	
40	I thing I would like the work of a building contractor.		+
41	I like science.		+
42	I very much like hunting.		+
43	Some of my family have habits that bother and annoy me very much.	+	
44	I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.		+
45	I like to talk about sex.		+
46	I have been disappointed in love.	+	
47	I believe that there is a Devil and a Hell in the afterlife.		+
48	I like to be with a crowd that plays jokes about one another.		+
49	I was a slow learner in school.		+
50	If I were an artist I would like to draw flowers.	+	
51	It doesn't bother me that I am not better looking.		+
52	I am entirely self-confident.		+
53	I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.	+	
54	Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.		+
55	Once in a while I feel hate toward members of my family whom I usually love.	+	



56	If I were a reporter I would very much like to report sporting news.		+
57	I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll.	+	
58	I wish I were not bothered by thoughts about sex.		+
59	I think that I feel more intensely than most people do.	+	
60	There never was a time in my life when I liked to play with dolls.		+

Male answer sheet.

№	Statement	Yes	No
1	I like mechanic magazines		+
2	I think I would like the work of a librarian	+	
3	When I take a new job, I like to be tipped off as to who should be gotten next to		+
4	I would like to be a singer	+	
5	I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth touched when I am in trouble	+	
6	When someone does me a bad thing I feel that I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing		+
7	I am very strongly attracted to the members of my own sex	+	
8	I used to like drop-the-handkerchief	+	
9	I have often wished I were a girl	+	
10	I enjoy reading love stories	+	
11	I like poetry	+	
12	My feelings are not easily hurt		+
13	I sometimes tease animals		+
14	I think I would like the kind of work the forest ranger does		+
15	I would like to be a florist	+	
16	It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth		+
17	I would like to be a nurse	+	
18	I like to go to parties and other affairs when there is a lot of loud fun		+
19	I frequently find it necessary to stand for what is right		+
20	I believe in a life hereafter		+
21	I enjoy a race or game better when I bet on it		+
22	Most people are honest chiefly through the fear of being caught		+
23	My table manners are not quiet as good at home as when I am out in company		+
24	I like dramatics	+	
25	I like collecting flowers or growing house plants	+	
26	I have never indulged in any unusual sex practices		+
27	I times my thoughts have raced ahead faster than I could speak them	+	
28	I like to cook	+	
29	I would like to be a soldier		+
30	I used to keep a diary	+	
31	I do not have a great fear of snakes		+
32	I am worried about sex matters	+	

33	My hands have not become clumsy or awkward	+	
34	I daydream very little		+
35	If I were a reporter I would like very much to report news of the weather	+	
36	I would like to be a journalist	+	
37	While walking I am very careful to step over sidewalk cracks		+
38	I have never had any breaking out on my skin that worried me		+
39	I frequently find myself warring about something	+	
40	I think I would like the work of a building contractor		+
41	I like science		+
42	I very much like hunting		+
43	Some of my family have habits that bother and annoy me very much	+	
44	I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges		+
45	I like to talk about sex	+	
46	I have been disappointed in love	+	
47	I believe that there is a Devil and a Hell in the afterlife		+
48	I like to be with a crowd that plays jokes about one another		+
49	I was a slow learner in school		+
50	If I were an artist I would like to draw flowers	+	
51	It doesn't bother me that I am not better looking		+
52	I am entirely self-confident		+
53	I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically	+	
54	Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them		+
55	Once in a while I feel hate toward members of my family whom I usually love	+	
56	If I were a reporter I would very much like to report sporting news		+
57	I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll	+	
58	I wish I were not bothered by thoughts about sex	+	
59	I think that I feel more intensely than most people do	+	
60	There never was a time in my life when I liked to play with dolls		+

## Appendix III. Interview schedule.

1. Do you think there are any differences between males and females?
  - a) What are those differences? Can you enumerate them?
  - b) Are there spheres, activities, fields that are only for males and females? Why?
  - c) How do you think differences are constituted? Are they innate or something?
2. Do you think it is possible to have male (female, for males) characteristics for you or combine both types of them?
  - a) What does it mean to have to have characteristics of the other sex? Does it say something special about a person?
  - b) What characteristics are not compatible and what can be compatible?
  - c) Would you prefer to express characteristics of another gender, or engage in activities of another gender? What does it mean to do that for men and women?
3. Is it possible to measure if a person is a 'true' feminine or masculine?
  - a) Is it important to do so? Why?
  - b) How would you suggest doing that measurement?
  - c) Can others measure if and to what extent you have masculine or feminine characteristics? Can you do it for others? Who can do that or has a right to do that?
4. Do you identify yourself with traditional role of male or female? Why? What characteristics do that roles embrace?

*Inventories are administered, BSRI and than MMPI scale. Interview continued:*

1. How do you feel about the tests you have taken?
2. Were you confused by any statements or adjectives, characteristics suggested by the tests? (you can take a look at both of them again)
3. Was it difficult to make choice? Why?
  - a) What kind of statements were the most confusing or difficult to choose between?
5. Can you say what the tests are measuring, can you formulate it somehow for yourself?
  - a) Is such a way of measuring a proper one?

- b) Do you think the statements and adjectives of the tests are relevant for measuring existing gender roles in the society they are assuming?
- c) Would you believe the statement of your gender role, identity stated by these tests?
- d) How do you think you 'performed' on these tests? How are you going to be defined by them?

*Scores on the tests are counted before the interviewee. Interview continued:*

- 1. How did you feel when I was counting something about you here? What do you think I was counting?
- 2. What were you thinking about at that moment?
- 3. How were you feeling about me personally?

*Scores are reported to the interviewee. Interview continued:*

- 1. What do you think about gender role defined for you by these inventories? Do you agree with anything?
  - a) Is it different from your perception of your gender role? How? If not, are you happy with it and why?
  - b) Can you say it will influence your sense of self or your behavior?
- 2. Do you think you were sincere when taking the tests?
  - a) If you take the tests one more time, do you think you will answer in the same way about yourself?
- 3. Have you changed your opinion about gender differences after taking the tests?
- 4. *(results if Social Desirability Scale are reported)* Do you agree that you are conventional/unconventional as the test describes? Do you think it influences your life? Why is it so?

## Bibliography.

- Beere, C. A. (1990). *Gender roles: A handbook of tests and measures*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bem, S. L. (1985). Androgyny and Gender Schema Theory: A Conceptual and Empirical Integration. [Nebraska Symposium on Motivation.]
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender Schema Theory: A Cognitive Account of Sex Typing. *Psychological Review*, 88 (4), 354-364.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2), 155-162.
- Bordo, S. (1998). Brining body to theory. In D. Welton (Ed.) *Body and Flesh: A Philosophical Reader*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bodro, S. (1993) "Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture and the Body". Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burn, S. M. (1996) *The social psychology of gender*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106, 676-713.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). Imitation and gender insubordination. In H. Abelove, M. Aina Barbare, & D. Halperin (Eds.) *The lesbian and gay studies reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. Berkeley:

University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. (1996). *Gender and power : society, the person, and sexual politics*. Cambridge, UK : Polity Press.

Constantinople, A. (2005). Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (4), 385-407.

Delphy, C. (2002). Rethinking sex and gender. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.) *Gender: A sociological reader*. New York: Routledge.

Eagly, A. H. (1994). On comparing women and men. *Feminism & Psychology*, 4, 513-522.

Foucault, M. (1988). *The history of sexuality. Volume 1: Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended : lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*. New York : Picador.

Gatens, M. (1995). *Imaginary bodies: Ethics, power, and corporeality*. New York : Routledge.

Ghosh, S., Walker, L. *Sexuality, Gender Identity*. Retrieved 03.15.2009 from

<http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/917990-overview>

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hoffman, R. M. (2001). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: historical perspective and implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 79 (4), 472-85. Retrieved 02.20.2009 from [http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\\_0286-27173315\\_ITM](http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-27173315_ITM)

Jacklin, C. N. (1981). Methodological issues in the study of sex-related differences. *Developmental Review*, 1, 266-273.

Kimmel, M., & Aronson, A. (Eds). (2000). *The gendered society reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lauretis, T. (1987). *Technologies of gender: Essays on theory, film and fiction*. Indiana University Press.

McLaren, M. A. (2002). *Feminism, Foucault, and embodied subjectivity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Morawski, J. G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality*, 53 (2), 196-233.

Sonderegger, T. B., & Anastasi, A. (1985). *Psychology and Gender*. University of Nebraska Press.

Terry, J. (1999). *An American obsession: science, medicine, and homosexuality in modern society*. University of Chicago Press.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multinational study*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.