Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects   CUNY Graduate Center

1986

Viewers' Perceptions of Gender Roles on Television

Susan Barbara Prager
Graduate Center, City University of New York

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a manuscript sent to us for publication and microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. Pages in any manuscript may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.

2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.

3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or in black and white paper format.*

4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, all photographs are available in black and white standard 35mm slide format.*

*For more information about black and white slides or enlarged paper reproductions, please contact the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

Prager, Susan Barbara

VIEWERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER ROLES ON TELEVISION

City University of New York   Ph.D.   1986

University
Microfilms
International   300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

VIEWERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER ROLES ON TELEVISION

by

SUSAN BARBARA PRAGER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Sociology in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy, The City University of New York

1986

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

[signature]

April 23, 1976

date

Chairman of Examining Committee

[signature]

April 23, 1976

date

Executive Officer

Rolf Meyersohn

Gaye Tuchman

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

VIEWERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER ROLES ON TELEVISION

by

Susan Barbara Prager

Advisor: Dr. Charles Winick

This dissertation develops and applies a method for studying viewers' perceptions of gender roles on television. Two hypotheses--selective perception and oversocialization--were tested. In contrast to other studies which rely on subjects' long-term memories, subjects were shown a tape of <u>One Day at a Time</u>, a popular television show, immediately prior to responding to a questionnaire on the show. Subjects were also asked for demographic data and administered the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test. T-Tests and correlations were done, using groups formed around the sex role attitudes of the subjects (as measured by the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test), as well as their gender, education and viewing habits. No support was found for either the hypothesis of selective perception or the hypothesis of oversocialization. The few

differences in perceptions between men and women which were found reflect differences in viewing habits, scores on the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test, or membership in the Loyal Order of Moose, a fraternal organization. (Fifty six percent of the male sample belonged to the Moose). This research provides a method for exploring and developing the concept of an active audience, as developed by the Uses and Gratification Approach.

CECILE V. AUERBACH PRAGER

1910-1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES IN APPENDIX FOUR (DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES)

LIST OF TABLES IN APPENDIX FIVE (SUMMARY OF FINDINGS)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Mary Tyler Moore Show made its television debut in
the fall of 1970 (Meehan, 1983). It was one of the most
popular shows on the air and remained a hit until 1977 when
the producer and the star decided to end its run (Meehan,
1983). In addition to popular acclaim, the show won more
than 25 Emmy awards. The popularity of the show makes it
an excellent example for illustrating the various
perspectives which can be brought to television by both
viewer and creator.

In discussing the show with women students at various
branches of the City University of New York (Brooklyn
College, Hunter College and College of Staten Island), I
found divergent age-related reactions to Moore's character
of Mary Richards. The younger students thought that Mary
Richards was liberated because she had her own apartment
and a good job. The older women, on the other hand,
thought that Mary was not liberated because she called Lou
Grant "Mr. Grant" whereas the men called him "Lou". These
women also felt that, despite her title of "associate

producer", she was, in fact, no more than a glorified secretary.

None of the students commented on her status as a single woman. This lack of concern with her marital status is particularly notable since the creators of the program were primarily concerned with the possible responses to Mary's marital status. They feared that viewers would react negatively to depicting Mary as single: "...our feeling was that if a girl was over thirty and unmarried, there had to be an explanation for such a freak of nature as that" (Gitlin, 1983:214). In addition, because of her previous role as Dick Van Dyke's wife, the network was hesitant to show her as divorced: "fellas, they're going to think she's divorced Van Dyke" (Gitlin, 1983:214). They were equally fearful of depicting her as married on the grounds that her character would be compared to the one she played on the Van Dyke show and the new show would not be accepted on its own merits. Yet, in brief written assignments, students at Brooklyn College indicated that they felt that a boy friend would detract from the show precisely because its focal point would no longer be the workplace. This setting was chosen, almost accidentally, by the creators because its quasi-family setting provided an alternative means of providing a stable set of characters with whom Mary could interact (Gitlin, 1983). The creators did not appear to be concerned with the very factor to which my students were so responsive, notably,

the specific nature of her role at work. Nor did the creators appear to consider the possibility that the very presence of a romantic involvement could detract from the show.

Another example of how divergent and sometimes surprising reactions to popular shows can be is Mash. Mash was deliberately intended by its creators to be an anti-war show (Gitlin, 1983). Yet Mike Farrell, one of the stars, has received a few letters with comments to the effect that the show makes "war look like fun" (Gitlin, 1983:217). Farrell finds these letters puzzling. He has responded to them with statements such as: "I don't quite understand how you can watch our show and come to that conclusion" (Gitlin, 1983:217).

Vidmar and Rokeach (1974), Surlin (1974) and Surlin and Tate (1976), for example, argue that viewers' responses to All in the Family reflect a variety of factors such as age, gender, degree of bigotry of the viewer and education. Similar findings exist regarding viewers' responses to Roots and Sanford and Son (i.e. Hur and Robinson, 1978; Surlin, 1981).

These divergent examples demonstrate the extent to which the same show can be viewed quite differently by different people, producers as well as viewers. Gitlin (1983:217) argues that these diverse reactions are deliberately fostered by television producers who want to avoid offending various segments of the audience by sending

messages which are "susceptible to divergent
interpretations". Typically this goal is accomplished by
picking up and verbalizing the conflicts inherent in our
society: " . . . tv entertainment takes its design from
social and psychological fissures" (Gitlin, 1983:217). The
examples noted above illustrate the extent to which the
creators of these shows have been successful. Much,
however, remains to be known about the social and cognitive
basis of these varying perceptions.

The purpose of this study is to expand our
understanding of viewers' perceptions with specific
emphasis on gender roles.[1] I do this first by measuring
viewers' perceptions of gender roles as portrayed on a
popular show, One Day at a Time, and then by systematically
relating these responses to various demographic categories
as well as to the gender role attitudes of the viewers.

Most previous research concerning gender roles in
television dramas involves the use of content analysis
(i.e. Smythe, 1953; Seggar, 1975; U.S. Commission on Human
Rights, 1977). Using this approach, researchers typically

_____

[1]The term "gender roles" is used as a means of avoiding some of
the difficulties associated with the term "sex roles" noted by
Lopata and Thorne (1972). It is important to realize that their
comments are a critique of the term "roles" as well as "sex
roles". They point out that the term "role" as generally used
refers to a set specific behaviors and expectations and argue that
Zaneicki's use of "role" as a set of relations is a more
appropriate understanding of the term as it is applied to ". . .
learned behavior differentiated along the lines of biological
sex...". The substitution of "gender" for "sex" underscores this.
It also avoids other problems associated with the term "sex roles"
such as reification.

analyze such aspects of television as the types of shows in which men and women appear, their jobs, marital status and various other demographic details such as social class. One limitation of this approach is that it assumes that the social categories that are quantified by the researcher are similar to those seen by average viewers. Another problem with this approach is its assumption that there are in fact "average viewers". While these assumptions have some validity, they also tend to oversimplify the full range of viewers' perceptions of any particular show.

Research of viewers' perceptions of television images has concentrated on analyzing the relationship between a subject's degree of bigotry and that person's perception of characters, such as Archie Bunker, as bigoted. These studies (i.e. Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974; Surlin, 1974; Tate and Surlin, 1976) arose out of the controversy surrounding <u>All in the Family</u>, which was concerned with the extent to which the show reinforces viewer bigotry. Many of these studies also look at the relationship between viewers' perceptions, bigotry, and demographic factors such as age and gender. These studies differ from the research in this study not only in the questions being raised, but in methodology. The studies on bigotry have typically sought to obtain general impressions of characters based on viewing several episodes of a popular show over an unspecified period of time. In contrast, the research in this study involves immediate viewer responses to a single

episode of a show. This provides a common analytical framework for all respondents and enables the researcher to ask very specific questions.

This study has two major objectives. The first is to explore the various ways in which adult men and women perceive gender role portrayals on television. This will be probed by using original instruments as well as one designed by Demplewolff (1972) to measure gender role attitudes. The resultant scores will be statistically related to each other, to demographic data and to general viewing habits.

The second objective of this research is to test the validity of a criticism made by some sociologists of much of the literature on gender roles. Weitzman (1979), for example, argues that the literature presents an "oversocialized" view of men and women which exaggerates the differences between them while ignoring the similarities. Similar criticisms are made by Bernard (1976) and Rossi (1977). After discussing various studies which support the contention that such a perspective exists, the validity of the criticism will be tested by examining the effects of gender, age, education, and viewing habits on viewers' perceptions of gender roles. A close relationship between subjects' gender and perceptions, would indicate that the critique of oversocialization is not valid. If, on the other hand, there is little or no relationship between subjects'

perceptions and gender, the critique of oversocialization would be supported. In the latter case, one would have to look towards other variables to investigate the extent to which they influence viewers' perceptions.

Prior to discussing the methodology and findings of this study, I will discuss the relevant literature. This will be done in the next two sections of this chapter. The first is a discussion of the relevant literature on the media. The sample in this dissertation excludes subjects under the age of 25, therefore, the discussion of the media literature is limited to those studies concerned with adults. The second section focuses on the relevant gender role literature. The pertinent literature on the media may be divided into four major categories:

1. Studies which are concerned
   with selective perceptions
   and bigotry;

2. Studies of viewers' perceptions
   and gender roles on television;

3. Studies based on content analysis,
   which quantify the portrayal of
   gender roles on television;

4. Studies related to the dominant
   theoretical approaches to the
   study of the media.

Discussion of these studies will focus on:

1. Empirical evidence for the selective perception and selective exposure hypotheses;

2. Evidence for the importance of looking at a number of variables in studying viewers' perceptions of gender roles to test the validity of the concept of oversocialization;

3. An analysis of the relative value of the different theoretical approaches to this research;

4. Some of the writings which exemplify a traditional approach to gender role socialization, an extensive discussion of Weitzman's (1979) critique of this literature ("oversocialization") and its relationship to this research.

MEDIA LITERATURE

SELECTIVE PERCEPTION, SELECTIVE EXPOSURE AND ALL IN THE FAMILY

Cooper and Jahoda (1972:208) argue that selective perception is a means of avoiding the recognition of any similarity between one's own ideas and the negative ones being presented:

>"Many people prefer not to face
>
>the full implication of ideas
>
>opposed to their own so that they
>
>do not have to defend themselves
>
>or to admit the possibility of
>
>error. They evade the issues
>
>psychologically by simply not
>
>understanding the message".

Sears (1972:218), in his definition of selective exposure, notes that people are more likely to come into contact with those ideas which agree with their own because "... people prefer exposure to communications that agree with their preexisting opinions".

Vidmar and Rokeach (1974:38) were the first to apply these concepts to All in the Family. They argue that viewers' predispositions towards bigotry will influence their responses to Archie and the show in general: "The selective perception hypothesis would lead us to expect that low prejudiced viewers would be more likely to perceive and enjoy Archie as a satire on bigotry while high prejudiced persons should be less offended by Archie's ethnic slurs and be less likely to see Archie as the person

who is being ridiculed".

Vidmar and Rokeach (1974:38) also tested the "hypothesis of selective exposure", predicting that people who are prejudiced are more likely to watch All in the Family than people who are not: "There is a tendency for persons to expose themselves to social stimuli and situations which are congruent with their prior attitudes".

They measured bigotry with an unspecified test of ethnocentrism suitably altered for Canadians and Americans. They found some support for both hypotheses. High and low prejudice are significant predictors of subject response to a number of questions regarding the relationship between Archie and Mike, for example which of the two "makes better sense" and which of the two "wins"? (Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974:40). Degrees of prejudice effect responses of Canadians to the question "who is made the most fun of Archie or others?" (Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974:40). American responses to that question are not effected by degrees of prejudice. In neither sample do degrees of prejudice influence either reported enjoyment of the show or perception of it as funny.

Degrees of prejudice are significantly related to general viewing patterns for Americans, although not for Canadians, providing some validation for the hypothesis of selective exposure.

The mixed findings indicate that variables other than bigotry are probably important to the study of viewers'

perceptions of television, although methodological difficulties with the study, such as the use of mismatched age groups, limit the extent to which conclusions may be drawn. Subsequent research avoiding some of the difficulties in the Vidmar and Rokeach (1974) study and using more closely matched samples, for example, validates the importance of these hypotheses and explores the relationship between them and some demographic variables.

Surlin (1974) hypothesized that people with high scores on the Powell and Trodahl Dogmatism Test would be less likely to distinguish between ideas and the person espousing them than people with low scores. He found that respondents with low scores on the test are as likely as those with high scores to like Archie although not to agree with him. People with high scores are significantly more likely to agree with Edith than Gloria, but both characters are equally well liked. Subjects with high scores on the dogmatism test are less likely to either like or agree with Lionel or Mike than are subjects with low scores.

Females are statistically more likely than males to agree with Archie. Subjects with high scores are less educated and have lower incomes, lower status occupations and are more likely to be over the age of 51 than subjects with low scores.

Tate and Surlin (1976) compared and contrasted the impact of ethnicity (Canadian or American), dogmatism, as measured by the Powell and Trodahl Test, and other

demographic variables on viewers' reactions to All in the
Family. Canadians are significantly less likely than
Americans to watch the show and to think the show
realistic. They are also more likely to agree with Mike,
Lionel, or Gloria and less apt to like Archie than
Americans. Canadian subjects with low status and education
and high scores on the dogmatism scale are significantly
more likely to agree with Archie than subjects with more
education and higher social status. Income, age and gender
are not significantly related to agreement with Archie.

American subjects with high scores on the dogmatism
test are significantly more likely to agree with Archie
than subjects with low scores. The discussion of the
American sample is limited to the relationship between
dogmatism and viewers' perceptions.

Surlin and Tate (1976) studied the impact of three
variables gender, dogmatism (as measured by The Powell and
Trodahl Test), and ethnicity (Canadian and American) on
viewers' perceptions of humor in three vignettes of All in
the Family. They found that ethnicity is the most
important of the three and that Americans are significantly
more likely to see the show as humorous than are Canadians.
Gender has a greater impact on perceptions of humor than
does dogmatism. Males are more likely to perceive the show
as funny than are females. Dogmatism has the least impact,
although subjects with high scores on the dogmatism test
are more likely than subjects with low scores to think the

show is funny.

Leckenby (1977) looked at the relationship between selective perception, dogmatism (as measured by the Schulze Scale) and the attribution of dogmatism to characters in four shows: All in the Family, The Jeffersons, Kojak and Marcus Welby. He found that although people with high and low scores are equally likely to see Archie and George as dogmatic, respondents with high scores are more likely than respondents with low scores to attribute dogmatism to Welby and Kojak.

Brigham and Giesbrecht (1976) used the Multifactor Racial Attitude Inventory developed by Cook and Associates to study the relationship between racial prejudice, race and agreement with Archie's point of view. They found that Blacks are less likely to either agree with or like Archie. They did not, however, find a relationship between viewing frequency, enjoyment of the show and racial prejudice. These findings are similar for both Black and White subjects.

Chaptko (1975), using the "F" test to measure dogmatism, studied the relationship between bigotry, viewer perceptions and viewing frequency and agreement with Archie. He found no relationship between viewing frequency and dogmatism scores. He did find that subjects with the highest "F" scores are the least likely to disagree with Archie and the most likely to like him. Those subjects with high scores on the dogmatism test are significantly

more likely to think that Archie wins his disagreements with others and to see themselves as similar to him.

Leckenby and Surlin (1976) examined Black and White viewers' perceptions of All in the Family and Sanford and Son. They found that race is not a factor in determining viewing frequency of either show, although it is in determining perceptions of a character as being right, and in the perception of the reality of the show. Blacks are significantly more likely to think that Fred is right, and Whites more likely to sympathize with Archie. Those viewers who agree with both Fred and Archie do not differ significantly by race. Regardless of race, significantly fewer females than males agree with both Fred and Archie. Black and White respondents between the ages of thirty one and forty are significantly more likely than those of any other age group to agree with either character.

All of the above studies lend some support to the hypotheses of selective exposure, selective perception and oversocialization. The importance of the latter is emphasized by noting that variables other than dogmatism, such as education and gender, influence viewers' perceptions.

Surlin (1974) found that education, occupation, age and gender significantly distinguishes between viewers with high and low scores on the dogmatism test. Tate and Surlin

(1976) found that education and occupation significantly distinguishes between respondents with high and low scores on the dogmatism test, but income, age and gender do not.

Vidmar and Rokeach (1974) found that Canadians and Americans differ in their perceptions of whether Archie or Mike is the butt of satire. Surlin and Tate (1976) found that ethnicity is more important than dogmatism in influencing viewers' perceptions of humor in All in the Family.

Leckenby and Surlin (1976) found that Blacks are significantly more likely to agree with Fred and Whites to agree with Archie. They also found that race is a significant factor in determining viewers' perceptions of the reality of both Sanford and Son and All in the Family. Vidmar and Rokeach (1974). Brigham (1976) found no relationship between enjoyment of the show, viewing frequency and race.

Surlin (1974) found that women are more likely than men to agree with Archie and to have high scores on the dogmatism scale. Leckenby and Surlin (1976) found that more women than men agree with both Fred and Archie. Surlin and Tate (1976) found that gender is the least important of three variables in determining viewers' perceptions of humor in All in the Family.

Surlin (1974) found that age is statistically significant in distinguishing between people with high and low scores on the dogmatism scale. Leckenby and Surlin

(1976) reported that respondents between the ages of 31 and 40 are significantly more likely to agree with Fred and Archie than respondents in any other age group. Tate and Surlin (1976), however, found no significant relationships between age, dogmatism, and agreement with or liking a particular character.

Dogmatism scores distinguish between agreement with Archie or Fred, but not liking him (Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974; Surlin, 1974; Brigham, 1976; Tate and Surlin, 1976; Leckenby, 1977). Vidmar and Rokeach (1974) found that dogmatism is significant in determining viewers' relative sympathy for Archie or Mike. Surlin (1974) found that, although respondents with low scores on the dogmatism scale are unlikely to agree with Archie, they are as apt to sympathize with him as people with high scores. Tate and Surlin (1976) also found that people with high scores on the dogmatism scale are significantly more likely to agree with Edith than with Gloria, although both are equally liked. Brigham (1976) found a relationship between race, dogmatism and agreement with Archie such that respondents with high scores on the dogmatism scale, regardless of race, are likely to agree with Archie. Leckenby (1977) found that people with high scores on the dogmatism scale are significantly more likely than people with low scores to attribute dogmatism to Kojak and Welby.

Leckenby's (1977) findings have particular implications for the current research in its emphasis on

the importance of the character's espousing his or her beliefs as a factor in viewer perceptions. His findings imply that although openly sexist characters are likely to be identified as such by the average viewer, those characters whose sexism is either more subtle or less germane to the show are likely to be seen by the viewer as having ideas similar to his or her own regardless of whether this is in fact the case.

SELECTIVE PERCEPTION AND ROOTS

A number of studies were done by social scientists following the televising of Roots. The four studies (Balon, 1978; Hur and Robinson, 1978;, Surlin, 1981; Howard, 1978) which are concerned with selective perception will be briefly discussed.

Balon (1978:300) hypothesized that "racial groups will differ in their perception of how slavery is portrayed in Roots". Comparing Blacks, Whites and Mexican-Americans, Balon (1978:304) found that Mexican Americans and White Americans are significantly more likely than Blacks to think "slavery was accurately portrayed". Balon (1978:303) also found that twice as many Blacks and Mexican Americans as Whites think that "people will selectively perceive and will pretty much see what they want to see".

Hur and Robinson (1978:22) found support for selective perception and "selective behavioral response" which they

define as ". . . the amount of post viewing discussion of
the program". Racial attitudes were measured using a test
developed for the study. They found that Blacks are
significantly more likely than Whites to watch and discuss
the show. Blacks are also more likely to think that the
show is historically accurate. Comparing viewers and non-
viewers, Hur and Robinson (1978:23) found that viewers are
significantly more likely to have "more liberal attitudes"
than non viewers.

Surlin (1981) was concerned with the impact of Roots
on Black and White males three months after the show was
aired. He developed a brief test of authoritarianism using
items from a recognized test. Surlin (1981) found that
regardless of race, subjects with low scores on the test
are more likely to both watch and discuss the show than are
people with high scores.

Howard et al. (1978) found that both race and gender
influences viewers' perceptions. White females are least
likely to think that the show had no impact on Whites,
followed by Black males, White males and Black females.
Conversely, Black males are more likely than other groups
to think that Roots would lead to (Howard et al, 1978:283)
"increased awareness of black slavery or history" followed
by Black females, White females and White males.

Surlin (1978:309) notes that the ability to generalize
from studies concerned with Roots to other shows is limited
by the "uniqueness of the show". Nevertheless, the

differential effects of gender and race on perceptions of
Roots provide support for the critique of oversocialization
and reinforce the findings discussed in the section on
selective perception and All in the Family.

VIEWER PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER ROLES

Two studies, one by Schreiber (1979) and one by Goff
et al. (1980), raise questions which are relevant to the
research at hand.

Schreiber (1979) was concerned with the perceptions of
age and gender held by viewers of soap operas. Subjects
were split into three age categories which correspond to
the ages of the television characters the subjects were
asked to observe. These categories are: young adults aged
18 to 35, mature adults aged 36 to 59 and older adults aged
60 and over. Findings are summarized along the three
dimensions "evaluative", "activity" and "potency" used by
Osgood.

Schreiber (1979) found a complex relationship between
viewer age and the age and gender of the television
characters. Young male characters receive higher scores on
all scales from all groups of subjects than do females
characters. All subjects give the mature female higher
scores on the evaluative dimension, and lower scores on the
activity dimension than are given to the males in this
group. Young and older viewers score the mature female

lower on the potency dimension than the mature male characters, but the mature subjects give the mature female characters a higher score on this dimension. The old females are viewed by all groups as higher on both the evaluative and the potency scale than are the other characters.

Schreiber's (1979) findings indicate a complex relationship between television image, viewers' perceptions and age of both subject and television character. Perceptions were not analyzed by the gender of the subjects, thereby making difficult any direct comments about the critique of oversocialization, yet the consistency of the responses allows some tentative speculations. Since viewers' perceptions vary both with viewers' age, and the characters' age and gender, the study provides some support for the critique of oversocialization.

A recent study by Goff et al., (1980), which looked at the relationship between viewer's gender, gender role attitudes and perceptions of five female characters on television, raises some of the same questions as this study. Goff et al. (1980) used the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Attitude toward Women Scale to ascertain viewers' gender role attitudes. Five female characters, Abby Bradford (Eight is Enough), Chrissie (Three's Company), Edith (All in the Family), Ann (One Day at a Time), and Alice (Alice), were determined by students in a Public

Speaking class to fit the criteria for inclusion in the study. These criteria are (Goff et al. 1980:470) "familiarity, like/dislike and believability".

The subjects were students in other sections of the same course. Each was asked to fill out the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the Attitude Toward Women Scale and to answer demographic questions. Each was also asked to fill out the Bem as he or she felt that each of the five characters would. Subjects were classified according to their Bem Scores as masculine, feminine, androgynous and undifferentiated and these scores compared to those attributed to the television characters.

Goff et al. (1980) found a close relationship between subjects' scores on the BEM and those attributed to the characters. Characters are seen as reflecting the gender role attitudes held by the student viewers. No relationship, however, is noted between subjects' scores on the Attitude Towards Women Scale and the Bem attributed to the characters, except in the case of Edith Bunker. The authors make no attempt to account for this discrepancy in findings. This discrepancy makes it difficult to generalize from the Goff et al. (1980) study to the current investigation, although the former indicates some support for the selective perception hypothesis in this study. To the extent that some relationship was found between the subjects' score on the Bem and that attributed to the characters, the findings in the Goff et al. (1980) study

are similar to those of Leckenby (1977).

No relationship was found by Goff et al. (1980) between subjects' gender and perceptions of the characters as liberated. This would support the critique of oversocialization.

One difficulty with the Goff et al. (1980) study lies in the omission of any demographic data or information on viewing habits of their subjects, particularly with regard to the characters they were evaluating. It would be useful to know if they were frequent viewers of these shows and if so, how recently they had watched an episode. Another difficulty with the study lies in its use of the Bem Sex Role Attitude Test. Griffin Lozano (1985) criticizes the Bem Sex Role Inventory on both methodological and theoretical grounds. She notes that androgyny is defined as the blending of the two independent concepts of masculinity and femininity. A person who is androgynous exhibits either masculine or feminine behavior, depending on which is more appropriate in a given situation. Griffin Lozano's (1985) research indicates that these two concepts may have many overlapping dimensions, in which case the Bem, as currently constructed, would be of little value.

A number of studies concerning viewers' perceptions of gender roles in commercials have been published (i.e. Wortzel and Frisbie, 1977; Lundstrum and Sciglimpaglia, 1977; Lull et al., 1977). However, none of them are

germane to this study because it is difficult to generalize from a commercial to a show. A commercial is brief, perhaps 30 seconds, and may deliberately exaggerate a stereotype to sell a product. There is little attempt at character development in a commercial such as one finds in a half-hour or hour show. Nor is it clear that viewers regard commercials in the same way that they do a show. Finally, many of these studies are flawed methodologically.

DOMINANT THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

USES AND GRATIFICATIONS APPROACH

Under this heading, one finds a variety of different studies. All share the basic assumption that the audience is "active" (Blumler, 1979:13). Such an audience deliberately uses various media to satisfy various needs and can explain to a researcher, if questioned, why a particular media satisfies these needs better than another (Mcquail et al. 1972:143):

> ". . . an important part of television
> viewing is goal directed. . . the
> goals . . . can only be discerned
> from viewers themselves and people
> will be sufficiently self-aware to
> be able to report their interests
> and motives in particular cases or

at least be able to recognize them

when confronted with them".

Many uses and gratification studies concentrate on developing typologies of user needs. One of the most extensive was done by Mcquail et al. (1972). Subjects were asked to indicate on a four point scale the extent to which various phrases described either their reasons for watching a show or the gratifications they expected to receive. Responses were grouped to form clusters of gratifications e.g. (Mcquail et al., 1972:150) "Personal Relationships" or "Personal Identity". Mcquail et al. (1972:153) found that different people receive different gratifications from the same show and that different people receive different gratifications from different media: "People can look to quite different kinds of materials for essentially the same gratifications and correlatively find alternative satisfactions in the same televised material".

Frank and Greenberg (1980:49-50) found that viewers can be divided into fourteen "interest segments", based on viewing habits and general interests.

The Uses and Gratifications approach has been criticized by a number of people (Elliott, 1974; Swanson, 1979; Gans, 1980) for its failure to elucidate and research the concept of the active audience more fully. Elliott (1974) argues that the concept of the active audience is vague and unmeasurable. Swanson (1979) observes that despite the emphasis on an active audience, the approach

does not, in any way, investigate the question of what people perceive when they watch television. He argues that this failure is particularly notable given the historical origins of this position in opposition to the "effects hypodermic approach" (Swanson, 1979:46):

> "A final conceptual problem in the
> uses and gratifications approach
> is a curious failure to take
> seriously what is perhaps the
> approach's most basic tenet, that
> persons are active rather than
> passive mechanical responders.
> Presumably it is their active
> view of persons which unifies
> the widely variant forms of
> uses and gratification research.
> It is both surprising and puzzling
> to realize that the uses and
> gratifications has not sought
> explicitly to investigate how
> persons perceive and interpret
> the content of messages and
> whether those interpretations
> do indeed indeed provide the
> expected link between needs,
> uses and gratification".

In response to these criticism, a variety of studies

have attempted to elucidate the concept. Levy and Windahl (1984:53) distinguish between various "qualitative orientations" of the audience before, during and after viewing. Their findings suggest a variety of levels of activity. Stanford (1984:522) looks at the relationship between viewers' "learned orientations" to television and perceived gratifications from their favorite shows. Noting that the concept of needs has been a source of criticism of the approach, she argues that the concept of "learned orientations" is one which can be more easily tested. She found a positive relationship between such orientations and gratifications obtained from various shows.

The studies just cited do not respond to the criticism raised by Gans (1980), who calls for more basic research into the audience. He raises three basic questions about the audience which are not addressed by the Uses and Gratifications Approach. The first is concerned with (Gans, 1980:62) "how people watch television" i.e. their degree of involvement with television. Secondly, Gans (1980:63) questions our knowledge of "which components of a program viewers take into account when making a choice". And lastly, he (Gans, 1980:63) calls for study of "the qualitative aspects of program use". One component of this is involvement with and comprehension of television characters by various groups of viewers. He emphasizes the need to relate this to viewing habits and demographic variables. The research in this study is both movement in

the direction of developing methods to do this and applying them.

CONTENT ANALYSIS

Content analysis is the predominant method for studying gender roles on television. Most of these studies analyze such things as the relative numbers of men and women on television, their marital status, class positions, and other demographic information. The approach is limited in that it does not evaluate viewers' perceptions of television shows, and implicitly assumes that the typical viewer "sees" the same social categories as does the academic classifier.

Berelson (1952:18) defines content analysis as a "research technique for the objective systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication". Krippendorff (1980) notes that for many researchers content analysis has simply become a process of counting people or phenomena. Most of the studies of gender roles on television follow this quantitative approach.

Since the 1950's a number of such studies analyzing prime time shows have appeared. Despite differences in decades, time segments, and coding decisions, the general conclusions of these studies remain more or less the same. For example, approximately 75 percent of all characters on

television are male (U.S. Commission on Human Rights, 1977;
Smythe, 1953; Seggar, 1975; McNeil, 1975; Tedesco, 1974;
Long, 1974; Haskell, 1979; Dominick, 1979; Greenberg, 1980;
Signorelli, 1982). Women in every age group are more
likely than men to be married or to have a clearly defined
marital status (U.S. Commission on Human Rights, 1977;
Signorelli, 1982). Women are unlikely to be either
perpetrators or victims of crime, although they are victims
more often than perpetrators (Gerbner, 1976; Greenberg,
1980). Women are more likely to be in situation comedies
than in other types of shows (Greenberg, 1980; McNeil,
1975; Tedesco, 1974; U.S. Commission on Human Rights,
1977). Women are likely to be subordinate to men in
decision making situations (Seggar, 1975; McNeil, 1975).
Women who work are most likely to be single and to be in
traditional occupations, (Signorelli, 1982) or at the
extremes of the occupational hierarchy (Greenberg, 1980).

CULTIVATION ANALYSIS

Cultivation Analysis is an approach to the study of the
media, predicated on content analysis. It assumes that
television is the most important means of enculturation in
American society today. The content of television must
therefore be studied in order to determine what ideas and
images are being inculcated (Gerbner, 1976:175):

". . . Television is the central

cultural arm of American Society. . .

Its chief cultural function is to

spread and stabilize socialization

patterns. The substance of the

consciousness cultivated by

television is not so much specific

attitudes and opinions as more

basic assumptions about the facts

of life and standards of judgements

on which conclusions are based. . . "

The approach is concerned with studying the impact of television on average viewers, in order to determine how they have responded to the world views presented there. Cultivation Analysis uses content analysis to determine what images are presented on television and then tests light and heavy viewers to determine differences in their world view which can be attributed to television. Gerbner (1976) expected that the responses of heavy viewers would reflect the television images of the world to a greater extent than those of the light viewers. His expectations are sustained. For example, heavy viewers are more likely than light viewers to think that there is a lot of violence in the world. This holds regardless of education or other variables.

Volgy and Schwartz (1980), testing the assumptions of cultivation analysis, found that viewers of medical shows

on television have more positive images of doctors than do non-viewers. They also found that heavy viewers have more stereotyped ideas about gender roles than light viewers and that viewers of ethnic programs are less likely to see race as a problem in society than people who do not watch such programs.

Their study does not cite the programs that were used in their analysis of gender role stereotypes, although such a discussion is included for their studies of shows concerned with race and medicine in the same article. Their rationale is that the pervasiveness of sexism in the media makes such a listing meaningless. However, if a relationship between heavy viewing and ideas expressed on the media is claimed, such a list is critically important in order to confirm that the tested individuals are in fact watching those particular shows. Variety shows, situation comedies dealing with race or drama shows with medical themes, for example, might well attract different audiences. In addition, their definition of a heavy viewer as one who watches three hours or more per day is too broad to be meaningful.

Volgy and Schwartz (1980) do not provide any demographic information on their subjects, despite their parenthetical acknowledgment that variables other than television viewing may be important. They also eliminated subjects over the age of 50, whom they regard as likely to be more sexist than younger subjects.

Cultivation Analysis assumes a congruence between what researchers believe is presented on television and viewers' perceptions of what is presented on television. It also assumes a congruence between the researcher's depiction of what is presented on television and the viewers' perceptions of the similarity between television images and reality. This is an assumption which has yet to be tested. In addition, the approach does not question the relationship between shows watched and viewers' beliefs - the question raised by the hypotheses of selective exposure. Do viewers develop positive ideas about doctors from watching medical shows, or do these shows merely confirm existing beliefs? Nor does the approach raise the question of selective perception, such as the possible relationship between the score on the gender role attitude test used in the Volgy and Schwartz (1980) study and viewers' perceptions of gender role stereotypes.

GENDER ROLE LITERATURE AND OVERSOCIALIZATION

SOCIALIZATION THEORY

The essential theme pervading much of the extensive gender role literature is an emphasis on the differences between the sexes and a tendency to ignore the similarities. One finds many statements to the effect that men are active and women are passive, but few statements to

the effect that both men and women love sports. This literature has been discussed by a number of writers (i.e. Bardwick, 1971; Freeman, 1976), some of whose research will be noted in this section.

Bardwick (1971) argues that boys are more active than girls, and therefore more likely to be punished by their parents. Consequently boys are more likely to view parents as people (Bardwick, 1971:16) "who thwart their impulses" and to rely on themselves rather than their parents for a sense of self-esteem (Bardwick, 1971:16-17):

> "A boy becomes alienated from his
>
> parents to some extent because
>
> his aggressiveness, impulsiveness
>
> and sexuality are responded to
>
> with parental prohibitions".

In addition, by defining dependent behavior as feminine, society encourages boys to become independent and to seek approval from peers and self rather than from parents.

Girls, on the other hand, tend to be less active and less likely to misbehave. Consequently, girls are less likely to see their parents as a source of punishment, and are less apt to seek outside confirmation of their self-worth. Additionally, dependency is not discouraged in girls as it is in boys, so that girls frequently remain dependent on their parents longer than boys (Bardwick, 1971:16):

"To the extent that girls are

not alienated from their parents

they are not forced to develop

an independent sense of self. . .

girls can remain dependent and

infantile longer. . . . The

practice of obtaining a sense

of self esteem from others then

becomes the basis for the female

belief that she will find

fulfillment in marriage and

motherhood".

Freeman (1976) argues that the socialization process limits women's perceptions of available options by rewarding them for interpersonal success. This forms the basis for the female's belief that interpersonal relationships are the way to fulfill herself. Boys, on the other hand, are encouraged to find success in other ways, thereby broadening their awareness of available options.

Bem and Bem (1976:180) argue that there is a "non-conscious ideology" which is predicated on the assumption of the inferiority of women but "obscured by an equalitarian veneer". This ideology guides socialization practices and results in girls becoming passive, dependent and eager for marriage as a means of escaping a challenging male world (Bem and Bem, 1976:183):

"A girl's sigh of relief is

almost audible when she marries

and retires from the outside

world of novel and unsolved

problems. This, of course, is

the most conspicuous outcome

of all: the majority of American

women become full-time homemakers.

Such are the consequences of a

non-conscious ideology."

Lewis (1979) argues that the gender role socialization literature can be broken down into three divergent theoretical approaches - biological, environmental and cognitive. The environment provides the child with information which becomes the basis for the child's ideas about gender roles. Lewis's (1979) discussion of the cognitive processes by which such knowledge becomes incorporated by the child, and the supporting data he draws on to illustrate the process underscore his traditional view of gender role socialization.

Katz (1979) summarizes four major theories of gender role acquisition (direct reinforcement, modeling, psychoanalytic theory-specifically identification and cognitive development). She criticizes all of them for overemphasizing parental roles and preschool personality formation, arguing that gender role acquisition, like all forms of learning occur throughout ones life. Although

acknowledging some small changes in socialization practices today, Katz (1979) argues that traditional gender role beliefs are still generally transmitted and regarded as socially valid.

Constantinople (1979) argues that the acquisition of gender role knowledge is comparable to the acquisition of any other set of rules. Constantinople (1979:26) prefers the term "rules" to "norms" because it emphasizes the rigidity of beliefs regarding appropriate gender role behavior: "Norms tend to become rules when they are rigidly applied either because a stressful situation induces anxiety or because cognitive flexibility is limited by developmental maturity".

The cognitive approach and the social learning approach describe the mechanisms by which rules are learned, but neither explains the integration of these rules into behavior. Constantinople (1979) argues that this process is facilitated by the highly emotional situation surrounding the transmission of these rules by the parent to the child. The strength of these emotions conveys to the child the knowledge that these rules are inviolate. She stresses the rigidity of the rules and argues that parents are socializing their children according to traditional gender role stereotypes. Constantinople (1979) does not question the extent to which parents accept and transmit such beliefs.

Gilligan (1982) approaches the question of male female

differences from a different perspective. She criticizes theories of development such as Kohlberg and Piaget for exhibiting a male bias which fails to take into account and adequately describe distinctly female experiences. She notes that Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development has six stages ending with understanding and applying universal rules of abstract justice. This stage is more likely to be achieved by men than women who tend to remain in the third level which is concerned with interpersonal morality. Gilligan (1982) argues that the different life experiences of women and men necessitate a separate psychology. The differences in life experiences also imply that men and women are likely to remain at different levels of moral development. Each of these levels are equally valid although, she argues that a blending of the two perspectives is the ideal.

The above cited literature show some of the various ways in which researchers assume that the content of gender role socialization follows traditional patterns. It is this assumption which is the target for the critique of "oversocialization" which follows.

OVERSOCIALIZATION

The gender role literature has been criticized by Bernard (1976), Rossi (1977) and Weitzman (1979) for wrongly assuming the validity of the aforementioned

statements instead of analyzing the socialization process and its outcomes critically.

Bernard (1976:11) argues that much of the existing literature, by focusing on the differences between women and men, has in fact served to emphasize and legitimate these differences:

> "Whatever the objectives of
>
> research on sex differences
>
> may have been its latent
>
> function has been in effect
>
> to rationalize and hence to
>
> legitimate the status quo,
>
> including of course its role
>
> structure, especially the
>
> inferior position of women".

Bernard (1976:17) points out that one way in which science does this is by focusing more on the differences between women and men and less on the similarities: "Despite all the evidence of great intra sex differences, however, we still speak – and think– as though women were a homogeneous population". Social science not only assumes the validity of many differences between men and women, but may act to confirm and legitimate them.

Bernard (1976:16) further argues that much of the social science literature and research on women in fact contains an:

". . . ideological bias. ..

which implicitly or explicitly

accepted the status quo and

took for granted that women

adjusted to it regardless

of whether or not its roles

were congenial to them".

Rossi (1977) raises similar questions. She notes that the gender role literature assumes the validity of the dichotomous roles characterized by Parsons as instrumental (male) and expressive (female). Rossi (1977:229) argues instead that each of these two axes is found in every role and that a "two dimensional approach" to gender roles is a more realistic description of the way in which people behave (Rossi, 1977:229):

". . . every social system, group

or role has two primary,

independent structural axes. . . .

This means that the role of

father husband wife or mother

each has these two independent

dimensions of authority and

support, instrumentality and

expressiveness, work and love".

Weitzman (1979:80) argues that much of the literature on gender role socialization perpetuates an "oversocialized portrait of women" and "exaggerates the cumulative

effectiveness of sex role socialization". She bases her
argument on a criticism of five basic assumptions, derived
from the socialization literature, all of which support the
concept of dichotomous gender roles.

The first is the assumption that (Weitzman, 1979:81)
"socialization is a consistent process". This implies that
girls and boys are expected to exhibit only gender specific
behavior and are in some way reprimanded for not doing so.
Weitzman (1979:81) points out that this is not necessarily
the case: "At the same time that girls are rewarded for
typical feminine behavior, they are also rewarded for some
types of "masculine" behavior." An example of this is
winning athletic awards.

Weitzman's (1979:81) second assumption is that gender
role socialization is "unidimensional" in its behavioral
effects. This assumptions predicts that men and women will
typically behave in appropriate gender-specifc ways. Yet
as noted, childhood gender role socialization is not
consistent. Therefore, one may find men and women
exhibiting behaviors which are more appropriate for the
other gender.

The third assumption is that (Weitzman, 1979:82)
"women typically internalize the feminine role and derive,
pleasure, happiness and satisfaction from it". Weitzman
(1979:82) notes that a number of studies on housewives
indicate that they tend to be less satisfied with their
lives than women who are either full or part time workers

or women who are single: ". . . almost every study of women's fulfillment has shown that the women who most embrace the traditional female role are the least satisfied with their lot".

Weitzman's (1979:82) fourth assumption deals with the extent to which the socialization process "fosters imitative behavior". Traditional gender role literature argues that the child will imitate gender-specific behavior which they see in the media or which is communicated to them by parents, peers or teachers. Weitzman (1979) argues that the extent to which this is accurate varies from child to child.

The fifth assumption is the belief that socialization takes place only when one is young. As an example of the fallacy of this assumption, Weitzman (1979) cites the literature on mid-life crisis which argues that people frequently change the direction of their lives or the content of their beliefs after re-examination at that time.

IMPLICATIONS OF OVERSOCIALIZATION

If Weitzman (1979) is incorrect and traditional gender role literature is valid, we can assume that gender is the most crucial variable in determining viewers' perceptions of gender roles on television. In that case, inter gender differences would be more important than intra gender

differences and variables such as education, race and general rigidity of thinking would be less important than gender in determining what viewers see when watching television. In this situation, the hypotheses of selective perception would have no predictive value, since the viewers' gender rather than their ideas would determine perceptions.

If Weitzman (1979) is correct and the concept of oversocialization is valid, I would expect to find that gender is not the predominant variable in determining perceptions of televised gender roles, and that variables such as age, race, education and general viewing habits would be as important or more important than gender in determining viewers' perceptions. In this case, the hypotheses of selective perception and exposure might well be of value since it could easily be assumed that viewers' perceptions might be influenced by beliefs regarding gender roles which viewers hold.

CHAPTER TWO

MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

This chapter focuses on the specific measuring instruments and modes of analysis that are used to examine viewers' perceptions of gender roles on television.

One instrument, developed for this study, provides a general profile of each subject's social background and usual television exposure. It contains questions concerning the subject's ethnic and racial background, education, organizational affiliations and television viewing habits. The second instrument is a validated gender role attitude test, designed by Demplewolff (1972). It is used to compare the subjects' gender role attitudes with their perceptions of the characters' attitudes.

The third instrument consists of specific questions based on the episode of One Day at a Time, the popular television show which was shown to all subjects. This instrument consists of two types of forced answer questions: content oriented and paired opposites. The former are concerned with specific events, actions, or ideas expressed by the characters, whereas the paired opposites are more general descriptive words or phrases on

a Likert type scale used by the respondents to rate the characters. Data obtained from both parts of this testing instrument will be placed in the scales specifically designed for this study. Each of these scales revolves around one of the four dominant themes of this study: television character liberation, relationships, self-environment and personality.

The episode of the show used in this study, the instruments, the scales as well the statistical methods used in the analysis of the data will be discussed below.

THE SHOW

The show One Day at a Time depicts a divorced woman, Ann Romano, raising two adolescent daughters and working as an advertising executive. The episode shown to subjects contains three interwoven themes. The first is Ann's conflict between her guilt because of her involvement with Mark, a married man, and her desire for a satisfying relationship. The second is the hostility of her daughters, especially the younger one, to the relationship because of Mark's marital status. Although Ann defends her right to make her own decisions regarding the relationship, she is painfully aware that the girls are expressing her own feelings. Lastly, there is Ann's slow realization that Mark has spent too much time living for other people and needs time to live for himself. These feelings parallel

her own reasons for having gotten a divorce and enable her
to support Mark when he ends their relationship.

The pivotal event in the episode is the couple's
chance meeting with an old acquaintance of Mark and his
wife. This individual, who had not seen Mark and his wife
for a long time, assumes that Ann is Mark's wife. Upset
and humiliated, Ann decides to end the relationship.
Before she can do so, Mark tells her that he has decided to
divorce his wife. Subsequently, with Ann's support, Mark
ends their relationship. The final scene shows a tearful
Ann catching a glimpse of herself in the mirror and saying
"welcome back". This scene expresses the ambivalence that
Ann has felt throughout the episode.

THE INSTRUMENTS

DEMOGRAPHIC INSTRUMENT

This instrument is concerned with basic demographic
data such as income, education and marital status as well
as organizational affiliations as a means of acquiring
additional data regarding attitudes and beliefs of the
subjects. It also includes questions concerned with both
the extent of television viewing and the types of shows
watched. (All parts of the instrument can be found in
Appendix 1). Data from this section will be discussed in
Chapter Three.

DEMPLEWOLFF SEX ROLE ATTITUDE INSTRUMENT

Kirkpatrick (1936) was the first social scientist to develop an instrument to measure gender role attitudes (Beere, 1979). Demplewolff (1972) modeled her test on Kirkpatrick's. She criticizes measures developed after his on the grounds that they are biased, argumentative, limited in scope or not tested for validity or reliability. Her instrument avoids these pitfalls and was therefore selected for use in this study.

The instrument is self administered. The short form (B), which is used here, consists of twenty eight statements. Respondents are asked to circle the letter(s) (DD, D, A, AA) which come(s) closest to describing the extent of their agreement or disagreement with them. Sample items are:

16. Women should not compete in
    football or basketball even
    against other women.

34. Women should have an equal
    chance for custody of
    children in a divorce.

The numerical equivalents of the letters are D=1, DD=2, A=4 and AA=5. (These are not the same weights that Demplewolff uses. She equates "A" with 3 and "AA" with 4. The equivalencies were changed to conform to the one to

five numerical system used throughout the discussion and analysis of the data). A subject's raw score is obtained by adding the numerical equivalents for all responses. Scores can range from 28 to 140. The latter indicates a very liberated respondent, i.e. one who is not enmeshed in traditional notions about gender role ideology and the former a very traditional one. A subject's degree of gender role liberation is determined by his or her score on the Demplewolff Instrument. The raw scores are converted to a mean (MDemp) and used in all statistical tests involving gender role attitudes of subjects in this study.

SHOW SPECIFIC INSTRUMENT

The instrument used to measure viewers' perceptions of gender roles on television was specifically designed for this study. It has two parts each with different types of forced answer questions: content specific questions and paired opposites. All questions have an evaluative component. This ensures that the subject's rather than the researcher's perceptions are measured, since it is the subject who evaluates the actions of a character.

CONTENT-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

The first part of the show specific instrument consists of questions oriented to the unique content of the

television show which was seen by all of the research
subjects. Such questions enable the researcher to ask very
specific questions regarding characters and actions. There
are two types of content specific questions, both of which
are designed to elicit and measure viewer reaction to
specific actions, beliefs and opinions expressed by the
characters.

The first type of content specific questions are
evaluative. The viewer is asked to make a judgement or in
some way to assess a character. Examples are questions
eight and 22:

> 8. Who is more realistic about
>
>   their relationship?
>
>   Ann_____
>
>   Mark_____
>
>   neither
>
> 22. Is Ann right when she says
>
>   that she and Mark were living
>
>   on a cloud somewhere?
>
>   yes____
>
>   no____

Descriptive questions ask the subject to choose which
of the options provided most accurately describes a
character's actions, beliefs or behaviors, or the
relationship between two characters. Because these
questions lack an evaluative component, they must be paired
with an evaluative question as a means of ensuring that the

viewers' rather than the researcher's opinions are ascertained. Examples of this pairing are questions nine (descriptive) with ten (evaluative) and 44 (descriptive) with 45 (evaluative):

9. Which of the following best describes Ann's feelings about Barbara's reaction to Mark?

   guilt_____

   not sure how to cope_____

   angry at her daughter for

   not understanding___

   sure that she is doing

   the right thing _____

10. Do you think that Ann's reaction is appropriate?

    yes_____

    no_____

44. Why do you think that Ann felt relieved about ending the relationship with Mark?

    did not really care for him_____

    wants to retain her independence

    and not marry _____

    not sure Mark is right for her_____

    worried about Barbara_____

45. Do you think that her reason is a

good one?

yes_____

no_____

PAIRED OPPOSITES

The second part of this instrument consists of paired opposites ranked on a one to five scale. These are general descriptive statements or words which provide the researcher with a precise way of measuring a viewer's response to a character. Paired opposites are concerned with the general impressions that a character makes on a subject. Paired opposites differ from content specific questions in two ways. They are concerned with the general impressions that a character makes rather than an evaluation or description of specific actions. In addition, the same paired opposites are used for all characters, thereby providing a common base for comparison. Paired opposites provide a useful supplement to the content specific questions since their brevity makes it possible to obtain more data on a character than would otherwise be possible. Examples of paired opposites are:

dependent - independent

immature - mature

dislikeable - likeable

weak - strong

SCORING

CONTENT SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Responses to evaluative questions or paired evaluative
-descriptive questions are coded as either positive or
negative, depending on the subject's response. If, for
example, the subject thinks that the character's actions
are in some way correct, or better than those of another
character, then the subject is recorded as having given
that character a positive score. If the opposite judgement
is indicated, the character is given a negative score.
Examples of how this works can be seen in questions 22 and
23:

22. Is Ann right when she says that
    she and Mark were living on a
    cloud somewhere?

    yes_____

    no_____

23. Does Ann understand Barbara?

    yes_____

    no_____

In question 22, if a subject thinks that Ann is right, then Ann receives a positive score, otherwise Ann receives a negative score. In question 23, if the subject thinks that Ann understands Barbara, then Ann receives a positive score, if not she receives a negative score. A similar system is used to score the viewer's perception of the appropriateness or agreement with an action. Appropriate actions or those with which the subject agrees are scored as positive, whereas inappropriate actions or those with which the subject disagrees are scored as as negative. Examples are questions 17 paired with 18 and nine paired with 10:

17. Which of the following best
    describes Ann's reason for
    breaking up with Mark?
        embarrassment at meeting
            Bernie in the restaurant____
        guilt over seeing a married
            man____
        worry over Barbara's reaction_____
        she did not care for Mark that
            much____

18. Do you think that her reason was
    a good one?
        yes_____
        no____

9. Which of the following best
   describes Ann's feelings about
   Barabra's reaction to Mark?
   guilt_____
   not sure how to cope_____
   sure that she is doing the
      right thing_____
   angry at her daughter for not
   understanding_____

10. Do you think that Ann's reaction
    is appropriate?
    yes_____
    no_____

In the first example, if the respondent thinks that Ann's reason is in fact a good one she receives a positive score, if the subject does not think it is a good reason, then Ann receives a negative score. In the second example, if the respondent thinks that Ann's reaction is appropriate, she receives a positive score, if it is not, Ann receives a negative score.

In those cases in which descriptive and evaluative questions are paired, the response to the descriptive questions determines the scale on which to classify the answers, and the response to the evaluative question determines if the answer is scored as positive or negative.

A number of questions are designed to provide data on two characters. This is an efficient means of obtaining information. Double data is obtained under a number of circumstances. Firstly, those instances in which the subject is asked to directly compare two characters. Examples are questions eight and 25:

> 8. Who is more realistic about
>
>   their relationship Ann or Mark?
>
>   Ann_____
>
>   Mark_____
>
>   neither_____
>
> 25. If Ann and Mark married, do you
>
>   think that they would be happy?
>
>   yes_____
>
>   no_____

In the first example, the character who is seen as more realistic is scored as positive and the other is scored as negative, if neither is seen as more realistic, then both receive positive scores. Question twenty five is designed so that both characters receive the same score. If the viewer feels that they will be happy if they marry, both receive positive scores, otherwise, their scores are negative.

Double data is also obtained in those instances in which two characters are discussed but not compared. Examples are questions six and seven:

6. Which of the following best

   describes the relationship

   between Ann and Mark?

       he dominates_____

       she dominates_____

       neither dominates_____

7. Which of the following best

   describes the feelings between

   Ann and Mark?

       she cares for him more than

         he cares for her_____

       he cares for her more than

         she cares for him_____

       they care for each other an

         equal amount_____

In question six, if either character is seen as dominating, both are given negative scores on the assumption that in a liberated relationship neither partner should dominate. If neither is seen as dominating, then both are given positive scores. A similar pattern holds for question seven. If either cares more for the other, both are given negative scores, if they care for each other an equal amount, then both are given positive scores.

PAIRED OPPOSITES

Scoring for the paired opposites follows the pattern
used for the content oriented questions. Subjects rate the
character on the various attributes, using a one to five
system. A high score indicates that the character is
perceived favorably, whereas a low score indicates that the
opposite is true. A high score also indicates that the
character is perceived as liberated. A subject's score for
a character is obtained by summing all responses which fall
into the appropriate scale.

By statistically comparing and contrasting the scores
on the various scales, an overall picture of each viewer's
perceptions of gender roles on television is obtained. By
statistically comparing and contrasting the scores on the
various scales to such demographic variables as age,
viewing habits and gender, the oversocialized hypothesis
can be tested. Similarly by relating the scores on the
Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test and the scores given by
the viewer to both Ann and Mark on the liberation scale,
the selective perception hypothesis can be tested.

THE SCALES

As mentioned above, responses to the testing
instrument were placed in one of the appropriate scales,
designed for this research. The use of scales facilitates

comparing and contrasting groups of subjects by providing a means of summarizing responses arithmetically so that statistical operations can be performed. Analysis of the findings will discussed in terms of these scales.

Each scale falls within one of the four major themes previously noted: liberation, relationships, self environment and personality. The major themes concerned with liberation and relationship are each comprised of a number of scales, most of which are content specific. This permits the researcher to uncover and measure the subtle complexities in viewer perceptions by distinguishing between different types of character behavior. For example, a subject could perceive Ann as liberated in her relationship to Mark, but not in her general behavior. The remaining two themes, self environment and personality, are comprised only of paired opposites. This reflects the conceptual difference in the two types of questions: the content based questions are concerned with specific events, and the paired opposites with general impressions such as for example, the character's degree of sophistication.

The number of questions applicable to each character and scale is limited by the amount of air time afforded to each character by the writers of the show. This naturally determines the amount of information provided to the audience. The show _One Day at a Time_ focuses on the character Ann. Therefore more questions were designed to measure responses to her than to the other characters.

Numerical scores based on the number of positive and negative responses given by a subject were determined for each subject, character and scale. These scores will be the basis for the statistical procedures described in the last section of this chapter.

LIBERATION SCALES

The scales, which comprise the liberation theme, consist of questions which focus on the extent to which the subject perceives the characters as acting in a non traditional manner with regard to gender role norms.

The various character liberation scales must be distinguished from the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test. The latter measures the subject's degree of liberation and the former the subject's perceptions of the character's degree of liberation. The relationship between them is one of the major questions of this dissertation, as it is a measure of the hypotheses of selective perception and oversocialization.

The items in the liberation scales reflect, as much as possible, Demplewolff's (1972) concept of liberation. This is important as a means of ensuring unity and coherence in the instrument. She sees feminism as necessitating the development of more flexible gender roles. This requires a strong sense of autonomy which, Demplewolff (1972:11-12) argues, has three elements: "a general sense of control

over one's destiny"; "independence from implicit pressure from seeming to agree with everyone's group opinion"; and "security and individuality".

The close relationship between the character liberation scales and Demplewolff's Sex Role Attitude Test requires discussing the two together and emphasizing the ties between them. Therefore, each scale will be discussed in terms of how it reflects the concerns of the Demplewolff test.

RELATIONSHIP SCALES ANN AND MARK

The content oriented questions in the liberation scale are concerned with the relationship between Ann and Mark. It consists of questions which focus on the extent to which Ann and Mark are "liberated", or act in non-traditional ways, within the context of their relationship, both in terms of ideology and behavior.

Many questions in the Demplewolff test explore the roles of men and women in a number of areas, such as economic responsibility, initiative within the relationship and autonomy. The question of autonomy and independence within a relationship is reflected in a number of questions in the Demplewolff test, for example, question seven:

7. A woman should be able to
officially retain her own
last name after marriage.

This issue, as applied to Ann, is reflected in questions 37
and 44 of the liberation-relationship scale:

37. Do you agree with Barbara
that Ann's seeing Mark is a
sign that she is losing her
loosing her independence?

yes____

no____

44. Why do you think that Ann felt
relieved about the ending of
the relationship with Mark?

did not really care for
him____

wants to retain her independence
and not marry____

not sure Mark is right for
her____

worried about Barbara____

The issue of dominance is raised by Demplewolff in
questions 25 and 26:

25. The initiative in courtship

   should usually come from the man.

26. A wife should often take the

   lead and suggest sexual

   intercourse if she wishes it.

This issue is dealt with in question six, which is coded

for both Ann and Mark:

6. Which of the following best

   describes the relationship

   between Ann and Mark?

      he dominates_____

      she dominates_____

      neither dominates_____

The dual issues of the wife working and the husband

performing household chores emphasize the idea of joint

responsibility for their household. Two questions in the

Demplewolff which focus on the issue of the wife working

are questions 4 and 14:

4. Married women with very young

   children should work outside

   the home if they wish.

14. Husband and wife should share

   responsibility for economic

   support of themselves and

   their children.

This issue is reflected in questions 34 and 35 of the liberation relationship scale. The former refers to Ann and the latter concerns Mark's response to this issue:

> 34. If they married would Ann want
>
>   to continue working?
>
>   > yes_____
>   >
>   > no_____
>
> 35. If she did would Mark agree?
>
>   > yes_____
>   >
>   > no_____

Demplewolff raises the issue of joint responsibility for running the home in the following question:

> 6. Parental responsibility for care
>
>   of young children should usually
>
>   be in the hands of the wife.

This issue, in an appropriate form, is the subject of two questions 32 and 33.

> 32. If Ann and Mark married would
>
>   Ann insist on his sharing
>
>   household chores?
>
>   > yes_____
>   >
>   > no_____
>
> 33. If she did, would he agree?
>
>   > yes_____
>   >
>   > no_____

PAIRED OPPOSITES

All of the paired opposites in this scale reflect Demplewolff's concept of feminism. Some reflect her definition of female autonomy. These appear as "independent", "secure", "assertive", "not compliant", and "makes own decisions". The remaining ones focus on the question of behaving in a stereotypical manner such as "not too sweet", "not too emotional" and "aggressive".

RELATIONSHIPS

The scales which comprise the relationship theme, consist of questions which are concerned with how competently a person functions both in a particular relationship and in general. They explore a character's ability to perceive the feelings of others as well as the extent to which the character is perceived as understanding his or her own feelings.

As with all themes in this study, the number of scales varies with the amount of information available on a character. Ann is shown in more relationships than the other characters. Therefore more scales are used to describe her relationships than those of other characters.

ROMANTIC - ANN AND MARK - MARK AND ANN

Two of the scales in relationship theme are concerned with the relationship between Ann and Mark. One looks at the relationship from Ann's perspective and the other from Mark's. These scales must be distinguished from the relationship scales in the liberation theme which look at the extent to which the characters act in traditional or stereotypical ways. The scales in the relationship theme are concerned with the extent to which the characters understand themselves and each other in the relationship regardless of their degree of "liberation".

An example of a question which looks at the relationship from Ann's perspective is question 22:

> 22. Is Ann right when she says
>
>   that she and Mark were
>
>   living on a cloud somewhere?
>
>   yes_____
>
>   no_____

An example of question which would be put into this scale as it pertains to Mark is question two:

> 2. Do you think that Mark understands
>
>   Ann?
>
>   yes_____
>
>   no_____

ANN AS A PARENT

Another scale in this theme focuses on Ann as a parent. The questions placed in this scale are concerned with her ability to understand and respond to the concerns voiced by her daughters. An example is question 30:

> 30. Is Ann right when she says that
>
> Barbara has an idealized image
>
> of her?
>
> yes_____
>
> no_____

PAIRED OPPOSITES

The paired opposites emphasize traits such as perceptiveness, manipulativeness strength and sophistication.

MULTI SCALED QUESTIONS

Most of the descriptive questions have responses which fall into one and only one scale. A few, however, have options which can be placed in different scales. An example is question 44:

44. Why do you think that Ann felt

relieved about the ending of

the relationship with Mark?

did not really care for him_____

wants to retain her independence

and not marry _____

not sure Mark is right for

her_____

worried about Barbara_____

The first and third of the alternatives are placed in the
scale concerned with Ann's relationship to Mark, the second
in the scale concerned with Ann's liberation in
relationships and the last in the scale concerned with Ann
as a parent.

SELF-ENVIRONMENT

This theme is comprised of questions which measure
the viewers' perceptions of the character's general
competency. The one scale in this theme consists of paired
opposites which include the following: sophisticated,
competent, responsible and mature.

PERSONALITY

This theme is concerned with with an evaluation of the
character's personality. The one scale in this theme

consists of paired opposites. The adjectives chosen are
those which people commonly use to describe one another.
They do not lend themselves easily to content oriented
questions, but are good gauges of interpersonal evaluation.
They include the following: likeable, warm. nice, kind,
unselfish and caring.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

All scales and the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test
are scaled from one to five. This introduces scaling
compatibility and greatly facilitates statistical analysis.
The underlying assumption is that the midpoint "three"
represents a neutral response. This principle is best
illustrated by the paired opposites in which the answer
"three" indicates that the respondent thinks that neither
of the two possibilities accurately describes the character
i.e. that the character is neither "independent" nor
"dependent".

The Sex Role Attitude Test, as developed by
Demplewolff (1972), was initially on a "one" to"four" base
as follows: DD=1, D=2, A= 3 and AA=4, with the feminist
answer receiving the highest score. To convert this to a
five point scale, the "three" is converted to a "four" and
the "four" to a "five".

The content specific questions are also placed on a
one to five point scale in such a way that the responses in

were the least likely to have seen it. At least half of
the respondents in each group had not seen the episode.
Women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition
were the least likely to have seen it (86 percent) and
women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women the
most likely (50 percent).

CHAPTER THREE

THE SAMPLE

The first section of this chapter focuses on the recruitment and testing of the subjects; the second is a demographic analysis of the sample.

RECRUITMENT AND TESTING OF SUBJECTS

RECRUITMENT

All of the subjects were tested in the winter of 1981. The sample consists of 222 subjects, 140 women and 80 men. A detailed numerical description of the sample can be found in Table 3-1. Ten subjects (four women and six men) who do not meet the minimum age requirement of 25 are not included in the calculations.

The sample of women consists of three groups:

National Congress of Neighborhood Women (NCNW)	20
City University Women's Coalition (CWC)	22
Unaffiliated Women	100
Total	142

The term "Unaffiliated" distinguishes those women who were not recruited from feminist organizations such as the National Congress of Neighborhood Women and the City University of New York Women's Coalition.

Many of the men belong to the Loyal order of Moose, a fraternal organization. The others were solicited from the same sources as the Unaffiliated Women and are referred to as "Unaffiliated".

Loyal Order of Moose	45
Unaffiliated Men	35
Total	80

Sixty four percent of the sample are women (Table 3-1). The large number of women is partially the result of the experimental need for three separate groups of women (two feminist and one unaffiliated), and partially the result of the relative ease of obtaining women subjects as compared to men.

The 20 women, who belong to the National Congress of Neighborhood Women in the sample, constitute nine percent of the total sample (Table 3-1) and 14 percent of the sample of women (Table 3-2). The National Congress of Neighborhood Women is a blue collar feminist organization. The organization was founded in 1974 by Monsignor Geno Baroni, then Director of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs (Brightman, 1978). In 1975, he relinquished control of the organization to the Williamsbourg Chapter. The organization focuses on community improvements

(Brightman, 1978). Women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women tend to be active in a variety of community organizations and projects. A large number of the women identify themselves as feminist. They tend to downplay this label, however, so as not to lose credibility among politicians who might otherwise think that they were only concerned with "women's issues". In addition to community projects, the women are concerned about education and have founded a two year college program in conjunction with LaGuardia Community College/City University of New York (Brightman, 1978). All participants in this study are members of the organization, enrolled in the college program. All subjects were obtained from one section of "Introduction to Social Science".

The City University of New York Women's Coalition is comprised of faculty, students and staff at the City University of New York. The 22 women in the sample constitute ten percent of the total sample and 15 percent of the sample of women (Table 3-2). The Coalition was founded in December, 1971 by Lilia Melani and Renata Bridenthal, both on the faculty of Brooklyn College.[1] The goals of the organization, as stated in its constitution are to defend the rights of women at City University and ensure their full participation in the University as well as to further Women's Studies at the University (Constitution of the City University of New York

_____

[1]Conversation with Professor Lilia Melani October 10th, 1985

Women's Coalition). Most of the women who participated in this study work at Brooklyn College, although a few are affiliated with Hostos Community College. Testing took place at both locations. The women affiliated with Brooklyn College volunteered in response to an appeal to help a feminist. Those from Hostos participated in order to raise money for the Women's Center, which received ten dollars for every participant.

The 100 Unaffiliated Women constitute 40 percent of the total sample (Table 3-1) and 70 percent of the sample of women (Table 3-2). These women were recruited from a variety of sources, although most are employed in non-professional capacities at Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center (City University of New York). A few are graduate students. People responded to widely distributed fliers offering them the opportunity to earn ten dollars on their lunch hour. (A sample may be found in Appendix Two). A few people responded to similar notices which were placed in the offices of the Professional Staff Congress, the collective bargaining agent for the City University of New York professional staff and faculty. Some subjects were obtained in response to a fund-raising appeal mailed to the homes of members of a Brooklyn Chapter of Hadassah. A small number were obtained in response to an ad placed in a local Flatbush newspaper.

The Unaffiliated Men constitute 44 percent of the male sample (Table 3.3) and 14 percent of the total sample

(Table 3.1). They were recruited from the same sources as the Unaffiliated Women. However, fewer men were obtained in this way. There are probably two reasons for this. The money may have been less of an incentive to men who generally earn higher salaries than women. Secondly, more women than men are employed in non-professional capacities at City University and hence the pool of possible subjects was smaller. Consequently, I approached a number of local (Long Island) organizations, such as the volunteer fire department of Port Jefferson, New York and chapters of two fraternal organizations, The ELKS and The Loyal Order of Moose, both of which have lodges in Port Jefferson, New York. I offered to donate to each organization ten dollars for every man who participated in the study. The Moose were the only group which was interested. Two groups of subjects consisting only of Moose members were tested.

Men who belong to The Loyal Order of Moose constitute 56 percent of the male sample (Table 3.3) and 20 percent of the total sample (Table 3.1). The Loyal Order of Moose is a fraternal organization, founded in 1888 by John Henry Wilson in Louisville Kentucky (Schmidt, 1980). By 1979 there were over 4,000 lodges in 36 states (Schmidt, 1980) and approximately 1,7000,000 members (Bunch, 1985). The initiation rituals emphasize patriotism, belief in God and loyalty to the organization (Schmidt, 1980). The Moose have a "White only" racial policy (Schmidt, 1980). The organization supports a large senior citizen home, an

orphanage, and various local charities (Schmidt, 1980).
The Moose are one of the few fraternal organizations to
have a stable membership. This is attributed to the
formation of women's chapters which has brought in enough
new members to compensate for the small decline in male
membership. It also attributable to the heavy emphasis on
family oriented activities (Bunch, 1985).

TESTING OF SUBJECTS

MOOSE

I contacted the Moose by phone, asked to speak to the
individual who was responsible for fund-raising and was
connected to Richard, the treasurer. I explained to him
that I was doing research on the media, needed male
subjects and would donate ten dollars to the Moose for
every participant. He was eager for the money and we set
up a date to test that group in two weeks.

When I arrived, I went into his office to chat
briefly, prior to setting up the equipment. He seemed to
be both eager for the study to be successful and somewhat
suspicious. He again asked me what kind of show I would be
screening, a subject which I had thoroughly discussed with
him when we first spoke. I named the show and reminded him
that it was a popular show on CBS. He seemed somewhat
relieved. Richard told me that the Moose were planning to

use the money to buy a 24 foot television screen for their bar to facilitate watching sporting events. He was clearly pleased to be receiving the money. While we were setting up the equipment, however, he asked me in a worried tone, if the show was "porno". I tried to reassure that it was not, reminding him that it was a hit show on prime time. He appeared unconvinced.

He was also concerned that some of the 40 or so men he had promised me would not appear, partially because some were attending a meeting up state. We agreed that I would come a second time, if he felt that he could recruit more men.

When the men entered, many of them were carrying bottles of beer. The Lodge seems to serve as a second home to them. I suspect that beer drinking and television watching are popular activities for many Moose. This is expressed by the domination of the Lodge's bar by a large viewing screen, soon to be replaced by a still larger one, financed partially through my contribution. The men sat down at large tables, on which Richard and I had placed the test papers and pencils. I introduced myself and explained that I was studying the media. I asked them to begin by filling out the questionnaire labelled "one". I told them that when they had done that, I would show them a tape of a hit television show One Day at a Time after which they would fill out the questionnaire marked "two". A large number responded "okay teach".

As they began filling out part one, one commented to
another that he would have trouble with the first two items
("sex" and "age"). A few minutes later one of the men
commented "The Blacks would be put first", referring to the
question on ethnic origins. (I had listed the options
alphabetically). None of the men seemed to like that. As
they proceeded to answer the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude
Test, I heard a lot of snickers.

After putting on the machine so they could view the
tape, I asked if everyone could hear it. Some of the men
jousted with me by clamoring "we can't hear you". I
finally rejoined, "I can't hear you" and they stopped.

While the tape was playing, virtually no one laughed
and the men seemed almost bored. I felt keenly, for the
first time, the extent to which the show was both middle
class and a "women's romance" show, although Mark (the
married man whom Ann is seeing) is presented
sympathetically. I sensed a general impatience on the part
of the men and was relieved when the show was over.

Filling out the second part of the instrument went
fairly smoothly, although a few had trouble understanding
the instructions for answering the paired opposites. One
of the Moose announced in a loud and angry voice, that he
could not do it and was leaving. Other participants nodded
in agreement but did not leave, perhaps because Richard was
glaring at them. He seemed to be afraid that I would

refuse to pay him if people left. (Many other subjects had difficulty with this section).

Cleaning up after the others had left, Richard commented to me that the show "was much like real life, except that a discussion of that sort (referring to Ann's seeing a married man) would not take place in front of the children. However, he added, "it was an open house", looking at me carefully. I commented mildly that the children were in their late teens. He made no response, but did not fully appear to agree.

As I was leaving, a number of men asked me where the television was. They were disappointed at my response, which was to ask Richard.

A second group of Moose was tested two weeks later. This group, like the first, drank beer and appeared somewhat bored. However, they seemed to be more prepared for the study and the session went more smoothly.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN

Most of the men and women who fell into these categories were recruited from within the University. These subjects were, therefore, more familiar with experimental procedures and more relaxed about participating in them. All of them were on their lunch hour and therefore had little time for conversation. A few of the women commented to me that they had found the

Demplewolff Test interesting since the options in it helped to crystallize their own feelings. A few women also commented positively on the choice of the episode or indicated that they had enjoyed participating in the study. In general, the atmosphere was relaxed. The subjects, primarily women, clearly enjoyed the show. Five or six of the women, in sympathy with feminist ideals, refused to accept money for their participation. Most, however, had been attracted by the monetary offer.

The sessions of non University affiliated subjects also went smoothly. All involved small numbers of subjects. The sessions in response to the Hadassah mailing and to an ad in a Flatbush Brooklyn paper, were small because of inclement weather. A testing of some employees of the Professional Staff Congress was also small, reflecting the size of the staff.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN

The one session with this group went smoothly. The subjects appeared to adopt a neutral attitude towards the show, and saw the study as an opportunity to make a bit of money. The test was done at the end of an evening class. Students were tired and eager to get home. There was little discussion after the study was completed.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

The testing of the women in The City University of New York Women's Coalition tests was uneventful. Almost all of the women told me that they enjoyed the study and thought the choice of episode a good one.

DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTS

This section contains a discussion of the demographic categories used in this study. In order to facilitate analysis of the data, some of the original demographic categories were collapsed. In those cases, I will give both the original categories and the new ones, and an explanation as to how they were combined. This will be followed by a demographic description of the sample. (For a sample of the entire instrument, see Appendix 1)

AGE

The questionnaire given to the subjects contains age intervals five years apart. The unevenness of the age distribution of the sample necessitates collapsing these as follows:

original categories	new categories
25-29	25-34
30-34	
35-39	35-44
40-44	
45-49	45-54
50-54	
55-59	55-64
60-64	
65-69	65 and over
70-74	
75-79	
80 and above	

The age distribution of the sample can be found in Table 3-4.

OCCUPATION

The subjects were asked to state their occupation. Their responses are coded, using the basic U.S. Census codes with the addition of a miscellaneous category to encompass a range of responses such as unemployed, housewife, retired and student, none of which are included in the Census categories. The codes are as follows:

Professional - Technical

Managers - Administrators

Sales

Clerical

Crafts

Transportation

Laborer

Service

Miscellaneous

The occupational breakdown of the sample can be found in Table 3-5.

The apparently high percentage of women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women in professional-technical occupations (31 percent) results from the inclusion of "paraprofessional teacher" in this category, by the census. In addition, two of the women teach in parochial schools and one in the public schools.

The concentration of women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition (100 percent) in the professional and managerial ranks reflects my deliberate recruitment of highly educated feminists in order to provide as strong a contrast as possible with the other subjects.

Twenty two percent of the Unaffiliated Women fall into the professional - technical category and 35 percent are managers. These figures reflect the relatively large number of low level professional and managerial jobs at the

University. This also explains the small number of
clerical workers (28 percent). Only one of the women is in
a blue collar occupation.

The men have a broader occupational spread than the
women. Slightly more than one third are in blue collar
occupations and more than one third are in professional or
managerial jobs.

RELIGION

The question on religion provided subjects with the
following options:

    Catholic

    Jewish

    Protestant

    Other

    No religious affiliation (please specify

    parents')

Responses to the option "No religious affiliation" can
be found in Table 3-6 and Table 3-7 provides information on
the religious affiliations on the subjects.

The option "No religious affiliation" was given to
ensure the inclusion of subjects who no longer identify
with their religious backgrounds. Responses for the this
option, defined as "source", were coded separately and are
summarized in Table 3-6. With the exception of the women
in the City University of New York Women's Coalition, over

90 percent of the subjects in each group cite their parents as the source of their religious beliefs. Seventy three percent of the women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition cite their parents as the source of their religious beliefs.

The religious affiliations of the subjects can be found in Table 3-7.

Women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women are most likely to be Protestant (65 percent). This is the largest percentage of Protestants in the sample. The group also has the largest percentage of Catholic women (30 percent) in the sample. Women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition are most likely to be Jewish (41 percent), although more than one third are Protestant (36 percent). The Unaffiliated Women are largely Jewish (65 percent), although 24 percent are Protestant. In contrast to the relatively large number of Jewish women (53 percent of the sample of women), only 18 percent of the men are Jewish. The men are equally likely to be Catholic or Protestant (thirty nine percent). The small number of Jewish men in the sample undoubtly reflects the large percentage of Moose in the sample, since none of the Moose are Jewish.

ETHNICITY

Subjects were provided with the following choices:

Black

Hispanic

White

Other (please specify)

Findings are presented in Table 3-8.

Over 80 percent of every group in the sample is White. The largest percentage of Black subjects are found among the Unaffiliated Women (eight percent) and the largest percentage of Hispanics are members of the National Congress of Neighborhood Women (21 percent). The men are more likely to be White (92 percent) than the women. This undoubtedly reflects the large number of Moose, who as noted, have a White only policy. (There was one Native American in the Moose, coded as "other").

EDUCATION

The next question is concerned with the educational background of the subjects. Subjects were asked to the indicate highest educational level they had completed. The options were combined as follows:

original categories	new categories
8th grade	less than high school
10th grade	
high school graduate	high school graduate
two years of college	two years of college
college graduate	college graduate
post graduate work	post graduate work

(specify degree(s)

Table 3-9 presents the findings.

Most of the women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women are coded as having completed high school, rather than "some college". The options presented distinguish between "high school graduate" and "two years of college" and all of the women who participated had just entered college. One of the women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women identified herself as a college graduate.

All of the women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition have completed college and 90 percent of the women have additional education.

The Unaffiliated Women are more educated than the men. Only three percent of them (as opposed to 21 percent of the men) have not completed high school. Thirty five percent of the women have completed at least two years of college, as compared to 19 percent of the men. Two thirds of the Unaffiliated Women and 45 percent of the men have attended college for at least two years. The men are more somewhat

likely to complete college than the women (18 percent as compared to 11 percent), but the two groups are almost equally likely to have some education beyond college (21 percent for the women and 19 percent for the men).

MARITAL STATUS

Respondents were presented with the following options:

original categories	new categories
married	married
living with someone	
separated/divorced	separated/divorced
widowed	widowed
other	other

The responses can be found in Table 3-10.

At least 35 percent of the respondents in each group are married. Sixty one percent of the Unaffiliated Women are married as are 56 percent of the men. Women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women have the highest divorce rate (25 percent). The men have the lowest (eight percent).

INCOME

Respondents were presented with possible income ranges and asked to specify the one which most approximates total

family income. The original choices and new categories
are:

original categories	new categories
$5,000 or less	$10,000 and under
$6,000-$10,000	
$11,000-$15,000	$11,000-$20,000
$16,000-$20,000	
$21,000-$25,000	$21,000-$30,000
$26,000-$30,000	
$31,000-$35,000	$31,000-$40,000
$36,000-$40,000	
$41,000 and over	$41,000 and over

Findings can be found in Table 3-11.

The lowest income levels are found among women who
belong to the National Congress of Neighborhood Women, 45%
of whom have family incomes of less than $10,000 a year.
The highest incomes are found among women who belong to the
City University of New York Women's Coalition. Thirty two
percent of these respondents have family incomes above
$50,000. This may reflect the fact that 46 percent (Table
3-10) of these women are married, probably to professional
men. The family income levels of most groups falls in the
middle ranges (between $20,000 and $40,000 dollars).

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION

Subjects were presented with a list of organizational categories and asked to specify their affiliations, if any. To provide as complete a profile of organizational affiliations as possible, the options presented to the subjects were expanded as follows:

old categories	new categories
civil/human/women's rights	civil rights
	human rights
	women's rights
	gay rights
	not specific
	all
conservation	conservation
educational	educational
political	Republican Party
	Democratic Party
	other
	not specific
professional	professional
religious	church membership
	additional church
	other religious
	not specific
other	cultural
.	charitable or civic

health (i.e. AA)

fraternal (non-Moose)

other

Findings can be found in Table 3-12. The figures in that table are based upon number of responses, rather than number of respondents.

Table 3-13 summarizes provides information on the number of respondents who indicate organizational affiliation(s).

Table 3-13 indicates that forty one percent of all respondents have no organizational affiliations. These figures are highest for the women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women (70 percent) and men (50 percent). Women in who belong to the City University of New York Women's Coalition are the most active. Seventy three percent of them indicate that they have two or more organizational affiliations. Unaffiliated Women are equally likely to have none or two or more (36 percent). (All of the known organizational affiliations of respondents (Loyal Order of Moose, National Congress of Neighborhood Women and City University of New York Women's Coalition) are excluded from these calculations).

Table 3-12 indicates that women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women and Unaffiliated Women are most likely to be involved in religious or religiously oriented institutions. Such activity accounts for almost 50 percent of the organizational activity of both of these

groups. Women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition are most likely to be members of professional organizations (36 percent). Men are most apt to be active in professional organizations (25 percent) or organizations concerned with the environment (12 percent).

VIEWING HABITS

Respondents were asked to indicate hours of television watched daily. The initial choices were collapsed as follows:

old categories	new categories
none	none
one to two	one to two
three to four	three to four
five to six	five to six
seven to eight	seven or more
nine to ten	
ten or more	

Findings are found in Table 3-14.

Women watch somewhat less television than men, but these figures are, to some extent, skewed by the viewing habits of the women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition who watch less than two hours a day. Fifty six percent of all women watch one to two hours of television or less per day as compared to 43 percent of the men. At the other extreme, 11 percent of all women watch

five to six hours a day or more as compared to 18 percent of the men.

VIEWING PREFERENCES

Respondents were presented with the following list of types of shows (taken from TV Guide) and asked to indicate which two they most preferred and which two they least preferred.

crime drama

documentaries/news

drama

educational

movies

quiz/game

religious

specials

sports

soap operas

situation comedies

talk shows

variety shows

other

no special likes/dislikes

non-viewer

The following categories were added as a result of subject response to the "other" category:

old movies

opera

Table 3-15 summarizes the findings for types of shows most liked and Table 3-16 summarizes the findings for types of shows most disliked.

As can be seen in Table 3-15, approximately 23 percent of the responses of every group indicate a greater preference for news and documentaries than any other type of show. Responses of the women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women also indicate a preference for soap operas and situation comedies (15 percent for each). On the other hand, the responses of women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition indicate a strong preference for drama (23 percent) and movies (20 percent), as do those of the Unaffiliated Women (19 percent and 14 percent). The responses of the men are equally divided between movies and sports (18 percent each). The figure for sports is particularly interesting. The Moose were planning to use the money obtained by participating in the study to buy a large television screen for their bar. This would enable them to watch sporting events on a larger screen than they currently owned. Yet only 20 responses out of a possible 180 (eleven percent) of all male responses indicate a preference for watching sports. Even if we assume that all of these responses came from the

Moose, more than half of the 45 Moose who participated in the study do not seem to like watching sports on television. It is probable that television viewing provides a backdrop for conversation in the bar or that the few individuals who do like sports dominated the decision making process regarding this purchase.

Table 3-16 summarizes the findings for types of shows most disliked.

Virtually every group dislikes religious shows. This is highest among women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition (41 percent), followed by approximately 20 percent of the responses from every other group. Approximately 20 percent of the responses of the women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women and the Unaffiliated Women indicate a dislike for sporting events and soap operas. Responses from members of the City University of New York Women's Coalition also indicate a dislike for sporting events and soap operas (13 percent each) as well as quiz and game shows (22 percent).

VIEWING THIS SHOW

Subjects were asked to indicate the number of times they had watched One Day at a Time in the previous year. They were given the following choices:

never

once or twice

three or four times

five or six times

seven times or more

A summary of the responses can be found in Table 3-17.

Women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition and men are least likely to have seen the show (48 percent and 56 percent). Women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women and Unaffiliated Women are most likely to have seen the show seven or more times (42 percent and 38 percent).

VIEWING OF THIS EPISODE

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they had seen this episode of the show prior to participating in the study. (This question appeared at the beginning of the second part of the instrument).

Responses are summarized in Table 3-18.

The responses reflect the answers given to the question regarding viewing frequency. Respondents in those groups which indicated that they are frequent viewers were the most likely to indicate that they had seen the episode, whereas respondents in groups which indicated the reverse

were the least likely to have seen it. At least half of
the respondents in each group had not seen the episode.
Women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition
were the least likely to have seen it (86 percent) and
women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women the
most likely (50 percent).

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF

THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the results in order to test the two hypotheses of this study: selective perception and oversocialization.

The hypothesis of selective perception holds that viewers' perceptions of gender roles on television are functions of their own attitudes. People are likely to impose their own beliefs on fictional characters, and to see them as similar to themselves, particularly if the situation is somewhat ambiguous. The following hypothesis can be formulated: viewers who hold traditional views of gender roles are likely to see Ann as relatively traditional; viewers who are more liberal are likely to see Ann as relatively liberal.

The hypothesis of oversocialization implies that perceptions of gender roles on television is governed by the gender of the viewer. The impact of gender on perceptions is, therefore, greater than other variables, such as education, age, religion and gender role attitudes.

The following hypothesis can be formulated: men will perceive the characters differently from women.

The first section of this chapter will survey the evidence dealing with the hypothesis of selective perception, and the second with the notion of oversocialization.

SELECTIVE PERCEPTION

To test the selective perception hypothesis, I must measure the relationships between those variables concerned with the viewer's perceptions of the characters' degree of liberation, the viewer's perceptions of the characters as likeable (show oriented variables), and the viewer's own degree of liberation. The last is measured by scores on the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test. This score appears in the form of a mean and will be referred to as MDemp. Pearson Correlations were done to measure the relationship between viewer perceptions of the characters and MDemp. Groups of subjects were formed, using combinations of demographic variables such as age, education and gender. The correlations were done using these groups in order to determine which, is any, of the demographic variables are the most important in influencing viewer perceptions.

The criteria for inclusion of any correlation in the statistical analysis is that the group tested be larger

than 20. Tests which do not meet this criteria will be used to confirm or disconfirm trends, but will not be included in statistical statements, such as percentages, which summarize findings.

Criteria for determining whether or not a statistical relationship supports the hypothesis were also established. When more than 50 percent of the correlations, in any statistical series, are significant at the .05 level, the test is deemed significant. Three sets of correlations were done, each contains a different combination of show oriented variables (i.e. Alpo (Ann's degree of liberation as measured on paired opposites), and or MDemp (mean score of viewers' degree of liberation as measured by the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test) to measure the selective perception hypothesis. (For a discussion of the show oriented variables used in the correlations, the reader is directed to Chapter Two). In the first set, three or more correlations must be significant at the .05 level for the set to be included in the statistical analysis. In the second two sets, both correlations must be significant at the .05 level to be included. Those tests which meet this criteria fall into the first tier or level of significant difference. There will be some discussion of those sets of correlations in which between 25 and 50 percent of the variables are significantly correlated (the second tier), since these may further an understanding of viewers' perceptions.

One set of correlations looks at the relationships
between viewers' perceptions of character liberation and
MDemp (mean score of viewers' degree of liberation as
measured by the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test). The
following correlations were computed:

> -MDemp and Alrl (television
>
> > character Ann's degree of
> >
> > liberation in her
> >
> > relationship to Mark);
>
> -MDemp and Alpo (paired
>
> > opposites by which the
> >
> > subject evaluates Ann's
> >
> > general degree of liberation);
>
> -MDemp and Mlrl (subject's
>
> > perception of Mark's degree
> >
> > of liberation with regard to
> >
> > his relationship to Ann);
>
> -MDemp and Mlpo (paired opposites
>
> > with which the subject
> >
> > evaluates Mark's general
> >
> > degree of liberation).

A second set of tests looks for relationships between
MDemp and viewers' perceptions of both Ann and Mark's
personalities. These tests are a means of the measuring
the relationships between the viewers' liking the fictional
characters and the viewers' degree of gender role
liberation. This is the issue raised by Rokeach and Vidmar

(1974) and others regarding the relationship among selective perception, viewer bigotry and liking Archie Bunker (All in the Family). The following correlations were done:

-MDemp and Mper (paired

opposites by which to

evaluate Mark's

personality);

-MDemp and Aper (paired

opposites by which the

subject describes Ann's

personality).

A third way of exploring this issue is to determine what correlations exist between peoples' perceptions of a character as liberated and their liking of that character. The following correlations were computed:

-Aper and Alpo (subjects'

perceptions of the

relationship between

Ann's degree of

liberation as measured

by paired opposites and

her personality);

-Alrl and Alpo (subjects'

perceptions of the

relationship between Ann's

degree of liberation in

her relationship to Mark

and her overall degree of

liberation as measured

by paired opposites).

These three sets of correlations form the basis for the test results listed in this section.

Groups of subjects were formed using gender and or group affiliation in combination with other demographic variables such as age and education. The variables around which the groups were formed are:

Gender

Group affiliation

Age

Education

Religion

MDemp

Hours of television viewing

One hundred and twelve correlations were done, of which 90 (80 percent) meet the criteria for inclusion.

There are no significant correlations between the demographic variables, MDemp (mean score of viewers' degree of liberation as measured by the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test) and any of the show oriented variables (for example Alpo (Ann's degree of liberation as measured on paired opposites)) designed to measure viewers' perceptions. (To facilitate reading of this study, a summary of tests with non significant findings are in

Appendix Three). The consistency of this finding indicates that there is no relationship between viewers' gender role attitudes, viewers' perceptions of the characters' degree of liberation and the extent to which the viewers like or dislike the characters. Some of the correlations have high probability levels, despite a low correlation. For this reason a co-efficient of determination was done which indicated that a correlation co-efficient of .3394 (the highest obtained), despite a significance level above .05, accounts for only 12 percent of the variation between the two variables.

OVERSOCIALIZATION

This section is concerned with testing the hypothesis of oversocialization.

Subjects were divided into various groups based on gender and MDemp score (mean score of viewer degree of liberation as measured by the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test) or demographic variables. The responses of these groups were statistically compared and contrasted, using the t-test for difference between independent groups.

The emphasis is on differences. The direction or consistency of the differences is not the issue. Intra gender differences are as relevant as inter gender differences. If there are as many differences within each

gender group as there are between men and women, the critique of oversocialization would be supported. The same reasoning would hold if there are a large number of similarities. I am, however, concerned with patterns of differences or similarities between groups. Findings are therefore presented by groups organized around demographic variables.

Twenty seven show oriented variables (scales) were initially developed to measure viewers' perceptions of the characters on One Day at a Time. Each of these scales contains a varying numbers of questions. In order to focus more fully on a few variables, it was decided that those variables which are derived from two or fewer questions would not be included, resulting in the elimination of six (23 percent) variables. A decision to focus only on the adult characters was also made, thereby eliminating the eight variables (30 percent) which deal with Ann's adolescent daughters. A total of 14 variables (52 percent) were eliminated. The following variables are therefore used to measure viewer perceptions: (to facilitate reading of the Tables, abbreviations of the variables are presented in parenthesis. For a full discussion of these variables, the reader is referred to Chapter Two)

Liberation (Ann):

    -Ann's degree of liberation in her

      relationship with Mark (Alrl)

    -Ann's general degree of liberation

      (Alpo)

Relationships (Ann)

    -Ann's relationship with Mark (Amrl)

    -Ann's relationship as a parent (Apar)

    -Ann's general relationships (Arpo)

Self-environment (Ann)

    -Ann's general ability (Aspo)

Personality (Ann)

    -Ann's personality (Aper)

Liberation (Mark)

    -Mark's liberation in his

      relationship to Ann (Mlrl)

    -Mark's general degree of

      liberation (Mlpo)

Relationships (Mark)

    -Mark's relationship to Ann

      (Mran)

    -Mark's general relationships

      (Mrpo)

Self-environment (Mark)

    -Mark's general ability (Mspo)

Personality (Mark)

    -Mark's personality (Mper)

Criteria for determining whether or not a statistical relationship supports the hypothesis were established. When more than 50 percent of the variables, excluding MDemp (mean score of viewer degree of liberation as measured by the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test), in any statistical series are significantly different at the .05 level, the statistical test will be deemed significant. This means that at least seven out of 13 variables must be significantly different at the .05 level. Those tests which meet this criteria will be said to fall into the first tier or level of significant difference. There will be some discussion of those tests in which between 25 and 50 percent of the variables are significantly different (second tier or level), since these may enrich our understanding of viewers' perceptions.

Criteria for inclusion of any test in the statistical analysis are that the sample be larger than 20 and that neither group have fewer than five subjects. Tests which do not meet these criteria will be used to confirm or disconfirm trends, but will not be included in statistical statements, such as percentages, which summarize findings.

I: MDEMP

Sixty eight groups were formed using various combinations of gender and MDemp scores (mean score of viewer degree of liberation as measured by the Demplewolff

Sex Role Attitude Test). This yields 45 tests (60 percent) which meet the criteria for sample size previously established. In six of the 45 (thirteen percent) more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly. In 9 of the 45 (20 percent) between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly and in the remaining 30 tests (66 percent) fewer than 25 percent of the variables are significantly different. (To facilitate reading this study, all non significant findings are listed in Appendix Three).

The following breakdown of MDemp scores form the basis for the groups tested under this heading:

      -one group above the mean and one

         group below the mean (3.844)

      -both groups below the mean (3.844)

      -both groups between the mean and

         one standard deviation above

         (3.844 and 4.185)

      -both groups above the mean (3.844)

      -one group one standard deviation

         above mean (4.526) and one

         group one standard deviation

         below mean (3.162)

      -one group between mean and one

         standard deviation below

         (3.844 and 3.162) and one group

         between mean and one standard

deviation above (3.844 and 4.526)

-both groups below one standard

deviation (3.162)

-one group between mean and one

half standard deviation above

mean (3.844 and 4.185) and one

between mean and one half

standard deviation below mean

(3.844 and 3.503)

-both groups between mean and one

half standard deviation below

(3.844 and 3.503)

-both groups between one half

and one standard deviation

below mean (3.503 and 3.162)

-both groups between one half

and one standard deviation

above mean (4.185 and 4.526)

ALL WOMEN AND MEN

Fifteen tests based on MDemp and gender were done. Two of the 15 tests (13 percent) meet the established criteria of significance in that more than 50 percent of the variables are significantly different. An additional three tests (20 percent) fall into the second tier of differences and in the remaining ten (67 percent) fewer

than 25 percent of the variables are significantly
different. The two in which more than 50 percent of the
variables differ significantly different are:

      -women above one standard deviation

         (4.526) and men below one

         standard deviation (3.162

         (Table a-1))

      -women above mean and men below

         the mean (3.844 (Table a-2))

In both of these tests the MDemp of the men is below
the mean (3.844) and the women's MDemp is above the mean, a
pattern which is repeated throughout this section on
MDemp.

In the following tests between twenty five and fifty
percent of the variables are significantly different:

      -women and men between mean and one

         standard deviation below

         (3.844 and 3.162 (Table a-3))

      -women between mean and one half

         standard deviation above

         (3.844 and 4.185) and men

         between mean and one half

         standard deviation below mean

         (3.844 and 3.503 (Table a-4))

      -women between mean and one standard

         deviation above (3.844 and 4.526)

         and men between mean and one

standard deviation below

deviation below (3.844 and 3.162

(Table a-5)

-women and men below the mean (3.844

(Table a-6))

In all of these tests the MDemp score for the men is
below the mean (3.844). In two of the tests the scores for
both men and women are below the mean. In the other two
the men's score is below the mean and the women above.
Yet, the reverse does not hold true. For example, if the
men's MDemp score is above the mean and the women's below
(Table a-7), the number of significant differences falls
below 25 percent. Additionally, if both men and women have
MDemp scores above the mean (3.844), few differences in
perceptions are likely to be found (i.e. Table a-8).
Furthermore, the smaller the spread of scores the less
likely there are to be differences between men and women.
For example, when both women and men have MDemp scores
which fall between the mean and one half a standard
deviation below (between 3.844 and 3.506 (Table a-9)), the
number of significant differences does not exceed 25
percent.

The MDemp scores of the men reflect not only gender
but membership in the Loyal Order of Moose. Seventy two
percent of all men's MDemp scores are below the mean (3.844
(Table 3-20)) as opposed to 36 percent of the women's
(Tables 3-19). The scores of the Moose members are

concentrated not only below the mean (3.844), but below one standard deviation (3.162 (Table 3-20)). Of the 31 scores below one standard deviation (3.162 (Table 3-20)), 27 (84 percent) are those of Moose. On the other hand, the scores of the Unaffiliated Men are almost evenly divided above and below the mean (3.844 (Table 3.20)). A portion of the differences between men and women found here are clearly attributable to the presence of Moose in the sample.

This complex pattern of findings seems to indicate that gender as an independent variable is not enough to account for differences in perceptions, but must be combined in particular ways with other variables such as MDemp and group affiliation.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN

Fifteen tests were done comparing men and Unaffiliated Women, who are also differentiated by MDemp scores. Three (20 percent) meet the criteria of significance in that more than 50 percent of the variables are significantly different. An additional three tests (20 percent) fall into the second tier of differences. In the remaining nine (60 percent) fewer than 25 percent of the variables are significantly different. The three in which more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly are:

-women above one standard

deviation (4.526) and men

below one standard deviation

(3.162 (Table a-10))

-women above mean and men below

the mean (3.844 (Table a-11))

-women and men below the mean

(3.844 (Table a-12))

The constant in all of these tests is that the MDemp
of the men is below the mean (3.844). In two of them the
women's score is above the mean and the men's below. In
addition, one of the three represents the extremes between
which one would be most likely to find sharp differences.
These tests confirm the importance of male scores below the
mean as a factor in differences in perceptions between men
and women. This pattern is noted in the discussion of
findings when all women rather than only Unaffiliated Women
are compared to men.

One test, women and men below the mean (3.844), in
which more than 50 percent of the variables are
significantly different when Unaffiliated Women and men
(Table a-12) are tested, has below that percentage when all
women (Table a-6) are included in the sample. The former
test excludes 12 women from the National Congress of
Neighborhood Women (Table 3-19). This indicates that these
women are more similar to men in their perceptions of
gender roles on television than the Unaffiliated Women.

This does not hold for those women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women whose MDemp scores are above the mean (Table 4-13). This finding supports the pattern previously noted that differences in perceptions are apt to occur when the men's scores are below the mean and the women's above.

In the following tests between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly:

-women and men between mean and one

standard deviation below

(3.844 and 3.162 (Table a-14))

-women between mean and one half

standard deviation above

(3.844 and 4.185) and men

between mean and one half

standard deviation below mean

(3.844 and 3.503 (Table a-15))

-women between mean and one

standard deviation above

(3.844 and 4.526) and men

between mean and one standard

deviation below (3.844 and

3.162 (Table a-16))

In all three tests the MDemp score for the men is below the mean (3.844). In two the men are below the mean (3.844) and the women above and in the third the scores of both groups are below the mean (3.844). Differences are most likely to be found when the women's scores are above

the mean (3.844) and the men's below. However, the reverse does not hold true. For example, if the men's MDemp score is above the mean (3.844) and the women's below (Table a-17), the number of significant differences is below 25 percent. Additionally, if both men and women have MDemp scores above the mean (3.844), few differences in perceptions are likely to be found (i.e. Table a-18). Few differences in perceptions are likely to be found when the spread of MDemp scores is small. For example, when both women and men have MDemp scores which fall between the mean and one half a standard deviation below (between 3.844 and 3.506 (Table a-19)), the number of significant differences is below 25 percent.

This complex pattern of findings closely parallels those discussed for all women and men. It again indicates the need for variables other than gender, such as MDemp scores or membership in the Moose, to explain what initially appears to be differences in perceptions between men and women.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
AND MEN

The MDemp scores of The City University of New York Women's Coalition, with one exception, are all one standard deviation above the mean (4.526 (Table 3-19)). This and the small number of women in this sample limits the number

when the MDemp scores of the women are above the mean and those of the men below (i.e. Tables a-1, a-2).

MEN TO MEN

Three tests are possible. In one between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly:

-men above the mean to men below

the mean (3.844 (Table a-22))

The distribution of male scores on MDemp is such that in effect, this test comes close to comparing Moose and Unaffiliated Men. As can be seen in Table 3-20, the MDemp scores of the Unaffiliated Men are evenly divided above and below the mean (3.844), whereas 89 percent of the Moose fell below the mean.

MDEMP AS AN INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

Five tests were done in which MDemp is the only independent variable. One of the five (20 percent) falls into the first category of significant differences:

-above and below the mean

(3.844 (Table a-23))

These findings reflect both gender differences and differences between men who belong to the Loyal Order of Moose and women. Thirty six percent of the women scored below the mean (3.844 (Table 3-19), while 72 percent (Table

3-20) of the men did so. Furthermore, men who belong to the Moose are more likely to score below the mean than Unaffiliated Men (89 percent of the Moose fell below the mean (3.844), as compared to 51 percent of the unaffiliated Men and 72 percent of all men (Table 3-20)).

To the extent that this finding reflects gender differences it supports the pattern previously noted, that differences in perceptions between women and men are most likely to occur when men score below the mean and women above (i.e. Tables a-1, a-2, a-10, a-11).

One test falls into the second tier of differences:

-above and below one standard

deviation (3.162 and 4.526

Table a-24))

As with the test just discussed, this finding represents to some extent a gender difference and to a larger extent a comparison of Moose and women. Looking at Table 3-19 we see that of the 41 scores below one standard deviation (3.162), ten (24 percent) come from the women and 31 (76 percent (Table 3-20)) from the men. However, of the 31, 27 (87 percent) are from the Moose (Table 3-20). Only five percent of the male scores are above one standard deviation (4.526), none of these from the Moose. Twenty eight percent of the women's scores are above one standard deviation (46 percent represent scores of women in the City University Women's Coalition and the rest scores of Unaffiliated Women (Table 3-19)). Looking at the

comparable test for gender (Table a-1), the findings are similar, although that test falls into the first category of differences.

II: AGE

Thirty nine tests were done, using groups based on various combinations of age and gender, all of which meet the criteria for inclusion. In two (five percent) between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly. In the remaining 37 tests (95 percent) fewer than 25 percent of the variables are significantly different.

The following age categories were combined with gender to form the groups tested under this heading:

   -25-34

   -35-44

   -45-54

   -55-64

   -65 and over

ALL WOMEN AND MEN

Seven tests were done using groups formed by various combinations of age and gender. One group (fourteen percent) falls into the second category of differences:

-men and women aged 55-64

(Table a-25)

This group differs in composition from other age groups. It has the largest ratio of women to men (39 women and 14 men (Table 3-4)). Eighty five percent (Table 4-2) of the women are Unaffiliated. In addition, 86 percent (Table 4-1) of the men are Moose. The two other age groups with such large concentrations of Moose (ages 45 to 54 and over 65) are much smaller (38 and 28 and compared with 53 in the group aged 55 to 64 (Tables 3-4 and 4-1)). The only other age group with such a large number of subjects (ages 35 to 44) has a smaller percentage of Moose (14 percent as opposed to 23 percent (Tables 3-4 and 4-2)).

In addition to the differences in group size and composition just cited, the women aged 55 to 64 differ from other groups of women on a number of demographic variables. This group watches more television than any other group except the youngest (Table 4-2). Only in these two groups do 60 percent of the women watch three to four hours or more of television per day and only in these two groups do women watch more than men (Table 4-2). This age group also has the highest concentration of Jewish women (Table 4-3). Of the 75 Jewish women in the sample, 39 percent are in this age group (Table 4-3). Women aged 55-64 are somewhat less educated than those in any other age group (Table 4-4). Only 13 percent have post graduate degrees (Table 4-4). In only one other group (over 65) do less

than 25 percent of the women have post graduate degrees (Table 4-4).

An analysis of the men aged 55-64 does not reveal a comparable number of differences. The only way in which men in this age group differ from men in other age groups is that men aged 55-64 have a higher percentage of people who have completed high school and have not obtained any additional education (42 percent (Table 4-4)). However, this group of men is more educated than the others which have large concentrations of Moose. Men in the two other age groups with large concentrations of Moose (45 to 54 and over 65 (Table 3-4)) are most likely to have not completed high school (60 percent and 36 percent (Table 4-4)).

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN

Seven tests were done, one (fourteen percent) of which has between 25 and 50 percent significantly different variables:

-men and women aged 55-64

(Table a-26)

All of the differences between this age group and the others noted in the discussion above hold true, although the numbers differ since the group of women consists only of the Unaffiliated. The ratio of women to men is higher than in any other of the age groups (33 women to 14 men (Table 3-4)). Most of the men are Moose (86 (Table 4-1)).

Fifty eight percent of the women watch more than three to four hours of television a day (Table 4-3). The only other group in which this figure is so high is the youngest (Table 4-2). The women are less well educated than in any other group other than the oldest. Nine percent have post graduate degrees and only nine percent have college degrees (Table 4-4). Forty two percent of the Jewish women in the sample are in this group, making this the largest concentration among the Unaffiliated Women (Table 4-3).

EDUCATION

Twenty four tests are included in this category, comparing responses of men and women based on similarity of educational background. In none of the tests do the number of significantly different variables exceed 50 percent. In two tests (eight percent) between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly. In all other tests the number of differences does not exceed 25 percent.

In addition, eight short tests were done. Short tests include only a limited number of variables. (For a discussion of the variables, the reader is directed to Chapter Two). The variables are:

-Alpo (paired opposites by which
    the subject evaluates Ann's
    general degree of liberation)

-Alrl (Ann's degree of liberation
    in her relationship with Mark)

-Aper (paired opposites by which
    the subject evaluates Ann's
    personality)

-Mlrl (subject's perception of
    Mark's degree of liberation
    with regard to his relationship
    to Ann)

-Mlpo (paired opposites with which
    the subject evaluates Mark's
    general degree of liberation)

-Mper (paired opposites by which
    the subject describes Mark's
    personality)

The following educational categories were combined
with gender to form the basis for the groups tested:

-less than high school

-high school graduate

-some college

-college graduate

-degree beyond college

ALL WOMEN AND MEN

In two tests between 25 and 50 percent of the
variables differ significantly. These tests are:

-men and women with some

college (Table a-27)

-women who went beyond

college and men who

did not graduate from

high school. (Table a-28)

The first of these tests includes five women from the
National Congress of Neighborhood Women (Table 3-9). This
finding is puzzling since men and women in the National
Congress of Neighborhood Women do not generally differ much
from men (Table a-12). However, since in the comparable
test for Unaffiliated Women and Men (Table a-29) fewer than
25 percent of the variables are significantly different,
it appears that the inclusion of the women from the
National Congress of Neighborhood Women underscores
differences between men and women.

The second test includes most of the women in the City
University of New York Women's Coalition, as well as a
large number of Unaffiliated Women (one half of the sample
from each (Table 3-9)). This test is, of course, comparing
two of the most disparate groups possible. What is
surprising is the relatively small number of differences

given the disparities of gender and education between these two groups.

RELIGION

Six tests were done, using various combinations of gender and religion to form the basis for the groups. Five (83 percent) of the tests meet the criteria for inclusion. In none of the tests do more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly. In two of the five tests (40 percent) between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly. In the remaining three tests, fewer than 25 percent of the variables differ significantly.

In addition to these tests, seven short tests were done. (Short tests are done on a small number of variables. The findings of short tests are not included in calculations of percents, but used to confirm or disconfirm trends. For a list of the variables, the reader is directed to the section on education).

The religious categories are:

-Catholic

-Jewish

-Protestant

The uneven distribution of religion by gender, limited the number of feasible tests. The majority of the women are Jewish and the majority of the men are Catholic or

Protestant (Table 3-7). It was, for example, not possible to compare all Jewish women to Jewish men, because there were too few Jewish men.

ALL WOMEN AND MEN

Two full tests and one short test were done, each comparing men and women of the same religion. In one test between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly:

-Protestant men and women

(Table a-30)

RELIGION

Three tests were done. In one (thirty three percent) between 25 and 50 percent of the variables are significantly different:

-Catholics and Jews

(Table a-31)

Given the numerical distribution of the sample, this comparison is to some extent a comparison of Moose and women. As can be seen in Table 3-7, 53 percent of the women are Jewish and 39 percent of the men are Catholic. However, as noted in Table 4-3, Moose are most likely to be Catholic (57 percent of all Moose). Of the 31 Catholic men in the sample, 25 are Moose (80 percent (Table 4-9)).

HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWING

Forty three tests using various combinations of television viewing hours and gender were done. This yielded 38 (84 percent) combinations which meet the criteria for inclusion. In nine of these (24 percent) tests more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly; in five (thirteen percent) between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly and in the remaining 24 (63 percent) fewer than 25 percent of the variables differ significantly.

The following patterns of viewing time form the basis for the group distinctions:

    -less than one hour

    -between one and two hours a day

    -between three and four hours a day

    -more than three to four hours a day

    -five to six hours a day

    -more than five to six hours a day

The number of possible tests in this category are limited because women watch less television than men.

ALL WOMEN AND MEN

Ten tests were done using various combinations of viewing hours and gender, all of which meet the criteria

for inclusion. In 60 percent of these tests more than half
of the variables are significantly different:

> -women who watch three to four
>
>> hours a day; men who watch
>>
>> three to four hours a day
>>
>> (Table a-32)
>
> -women who watch three to four
>
>> hours a day; men who watch
>>
>> two hours (Table a-33)
>
> -women who watch more than three
>
>> to four hours a day; men who
>>
>> watch two hours a day
>>
>> (Table a-34)
>
> -women who watch more than five
>
>> hours a day; men who watch
>>
>> two hours a day (Table a-35)
>
> -women who watch two hours a day;
>
>> men who watch two hours a day
>>
>> (Table a-36)
>
> -women who watch less than two
>
>> hours a day; men who watch
>>
>> less than two hours a day
>>
>> (Table a-37)

Differences in perceptions are found when women are
watching either the same amount (Tables a-32, a-36, a-37)
or more television per day (Tables a-33, a-34, a-35) than
the men. One of these (Table a-35) includes extreme

differences in the amount of viewing each does. Such differences are also found to occur when the men are watching two hours of television a day (Tables a-32, a-36, a-37). In only one of the above noted tests are the men watching television for more than two hours a day (Table a-38).

An analysis of the group composition of the women indicates that those who watch two hours a day or less (Tables a-36, a-37) includes all but one of the women who belong to the City University of New York Women's Coalition (Table 3-14). The Unaffiliated Women are concentrated in the viewing categories of one to two hours and three to four hours (Table 3-14). (Women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women are dispersed throughout the viewing categories (Table 3-14) and therefore unlikely to influence any one of them). The group of men who watch three to four hours a day) includes large numbers of men who belong to the Moose (Table 4-9).

The large number of combinations in which more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly warrants further analysis. Therefore, a demographic analysis of these combinations by age, education and religion was done to further determine if any demographic patterns can be found which might explain the differences in perceptions. The discussion which follows refers to the highest percentage of the particular demographic variable under

discussion. Should the next highest percentage be within five points of the first, it too will be noted.

Women who view three to four hours a day or more are most likely to be between the ages of 55 and 64 (Tables 4-10, 4-11, 4-12), although women who watch more then five hours a day are most likely to be between the ages of 35 and 44 (Table 4-13) as are women who watch two hours a day or less (Tables 4-14, 4-15). Men who view one to two hours a day are likely to be between 25 and 34 or over 65 (Tables 4-10, 4-12, 4-13, 4-14, 4-15). Men who view three to four hours a day are most likely to be between 25 and 34 (Table 4-11).

Women who watch three to four hours a day or more, are most likely to have a high school education (Tables 4-10, 4-11, 4-12, 4-13), whereas women who watch two hours a day or less are most likely to have graduate or professional degrees (Tables 4-14, 4-15). Men who watch one to two hours a day are most likely to have a graduate degree (Tables 4-10, 4-12, 4-13, 4-14, 4-15), whereas men who watch three to four hours a day are almost equally divided between not having completed high school, having completed high school and having some college (Table 4-11).

Regardless of viewing habits, the women are predominantly Jewish (Tables 4-10, 4-11, 4-12, 4-13, 4-14, 4-15). Men who watch one to two hours a day are most likely to be Protestant (Tables 4-10, 4-12, 4-13, 4-14,

4-15), however men watching three to four hours a day are likely to be either Catholic or Protestant (Table 4-11).

Clearly, differences in viewing habits both reflect demographic differences and influence viewer perceptions.

In two (twenty percent) of the tests between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ. These tests are:

-women who watch one to two hours

a day or less; men who watch

more than three to four hours

a day (Table a-38)

-women who watch one to two hours

a day; men who watch three to

four hours a day (Table a-39)

In both of these tests, the women are watching comparatively little television and the men somewhat more.

Analysis of the group composition indicates that these tests include all but one of the women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition (Table 3-14) and 64 percent of the Moose (Table 4-9). These groups tend to differ on between 25 and fifty percent of the variables, as is the case here.

The demographic analysis of this group will follow the criteria used above and will assume the largest percentage of the particular variable under discussion. Should the next highest come within five percentage points of the highest, it too will be noted. The women are most likely to be between 35 and 44 years of age (Tables 4-16, 4-17).

Those men who watch three to four hours a day are most likely to be between 25 and 34 (Table 4-16), whereas men who watch more than three to four hours a day are either between 25 and 34 or 45 and 54 (Table 4-17).

Those women who watch less than two hours a day are most likely to have graduate degrees (Table 4-17), whereas women who watch two hours a day are most likely to have attended college for at least two years (Table 4-16). The men in both tests are likely to be almost equally split between not having completed high school, having completed high school and having some college (Tables 4-16, 4-17).

The women are predominantly Jewish (Tables 4-16, 4-17). Men who watch three to four hours a day are equally likely to be Catholic or Protestant (Table 4-16) and men who view more are most likely to be Catholic (Table 4-17).

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN

Twelve tests were done using the various combinations of viewing habits listed previously and Unaffiliated Women and men. Eight of these (sixty seven percent) meet the criteria for inclusion. In three (thirty eight percent) more than fifty percent of the variables differ significantly:

-women who watch three to four

hours of television a day;

men who watch one to two

(Table a-40)

-women who watch more than three

to four hours of television a

day; men who watch less than

one to two (Table a-41)

women who watch three to four

hours a day of television a

day; men who watch three to

four hours (Table a-42)

In the three tests noted above the women are watching
three to four hours of television a day or more (Tables
a-40, a-41, a-42). The men are either watching less (one
to two hours a day (Tables a-40, a-41)) or the same amount
(three to four hours (Table a-42)).

Comparing these tests to those which include all
women, there are three fewer tests here which met the
criteria for inclusion in the first tier of significant
differences. Those tests in which women are watching three
to four hours a day or more (Tables a-33, a-34, a-35)
remain in this category, the others do not. This, in
effect, eliminates the two tests (Tables a-36, a-37) which
includes women from the City University of New York Women's
Coalition (Table 3-14) and indicates that it is their
inclusion which accounts for the large number of

significant differences found there. This point is made notwithstanding the fact that in many tests which include women from the Coalition less than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly.

The discussion of demographic patterns follows the previously established policy and assumes the highest percentage of a given variable in that test. Should the next highest come within five percentage points of the highest, it too will be noted.

In all of the tests noted above the women are most likely to be aged 55-64 (Tables 4-18, 4-19, 4-20). Men who watch one to two hours a day are most likely to be either in the oldest or the youngest age groups (25 to 34 or over 65 (Tables 4-18, 4-19)), whereas men who watch three to four hours a day are most likely to be in the youngest group (Table 4-121).

The women are most likely to have graduated from high school (Tables 4-18, 4-19, 4-20). The men who view one to two hours of television a day are most likely to have post graduate degrees (Tables 4-18, 4-19), whereas those who watch three to four a day tend to be equally likely to have less than a high school education, have graduated from high school or have some college (Table 4-20).

The women are overwhelmingly Jewish (Tables 4-18, 4-19, 4-20). The men who watch one to two hours of television per day are predominantly Protestant (Tables

4-18, 4-19), whereas those who view three to four hours a day are equally apt to be Protestant or Catholic (Table 4-20).

In three tests (38 percent) between 25 and 50 percent of the variables are significantly different:

-women who watch one to two hours

of television a day; men who

watch three to four (Table a-43)

-women who watch one to two hours

hours of television a day;

men who watch one to two

(Table a-44)

-women who watch one to two hours

or less of television a day;

men who watch one to two

(Table a-45)

In all of the above tests women are viewing either less than (Tables a-43, a-45) or the same amount of television as the men (Table a-44). In all cases the women are watching one to two hours a day, whereas the men are either watching one to two hours of television a day (Tables a-44, a-45) or three to four hours of television a day (Table a-43). These tests include those Unaffiliated Women who appear in the highest tier of differences when looked at as part of the total group of women (Tables a-33, a-34, a-35)). The latter includes both Unaffiliated Women and women in the City University of New York Women's

Coalition (Table 3-14). This appears to underscore the importance of women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition in determining differences in perceptions between men and women, at least when grouping subjects by viewing habits.

In all of tests just noted (Tables a-43, a-44, a-45) the women are most likely to be between the ages of 55 and 64 (Tables 4-18, 4-19, 4-20). The men who view one to two hours of television a day are concentrated at the extremes (between 25 and 34 or over 65 (Tables 4-18, 4-19), whereas those who view three to four hours a day are most likely to be in the youngest group (Table 4-20).

The women are most likely to have attended college for two years (Tables 4-18, 4-19, 4-20). The men who watch two hours a day are most likely to have post graduate degrees (Tables 4-18, 4-19), whereas men who watch three hours a day are almost equally split between not having completed high school, having completed high school and having some college (Table 4-20).

The women are predominantly Jewish (Tables 4-18, 4-19, 4-20), whereas the men who watch two hours a day are likely to be Protestant (Tables 4-18, 4-19) and men who watch three to four hours a day are almost equally likely to be Catholic or Protestant (Table 4-20).

VI: GENDER AND GROUP AFFILIATION

This heading refers to those tests which compare the basic groups in this study - the City University of New York Women's Coalition, the National Congress of Neighborhood Women and Unaffiliated Women - as well as tests involving the Loyal Order of Moose since they are important in many findings. Some additional tests involving age are also included.

LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE AND UNAFFILIATED MEN

One test compares the Moose and Unaffiliated Men (Table a-46). Forty six percent of the variables are significantly different. Although this test falls into the second tier of significant differences, it is of particular importance because all other inter gender comparisons yield percentages below 25 percent. This indicates that under some circumstances there may be more inter gender than intra gender differences.

A demographic analysis of the Moose indicates that they differ from Unaffiliated Men in four ways - education, religion, age and television viewing habits. Men who belong to the Moose are less educated than Unaffiliated Men. Of the 16 men who have not graduated from high school, 13 are Moose (Table 4-7). Sixty six percent of all Moose have no education beyond high school, as compared to

18 percent of the Unaffiliated Men (Table 4-7). Only five percent of the Moose have graduate or professional degrees as compared to 35 percent of the Unaffiliated Men (Table 4-7).

In terms of religion, Moose are more likely than Unaffiliated Men to be Catholic (Table 4-8). Of the 31 Catholics in the male sample, 25 are Moose (Table 4-8). Moose are as likely as Unaffiliated Men to be Protestant (Table 4-8). There are no Jewish Moose (Table 4-8). Of the 14 Jewish men in the sample, all are Unaffiliated (Table 4-8).

Moose tend to be concentrated in the ages 44 to 65 (Table 4-1).

Moose watch more television than the other men (Table 4-9). Sixty four percent watch more than three to four hours per day as compared to 49 percent of the Unaffiliated Men (Table 4-9). Thirty seven percent watch two hours or less per day as compared to 51 percent of the Unaffiliated Men (Table 4-9).

ALL WOMEN AND MEN

All women were tested against all men (Table a-47). Sixty nine percent of the variable are significantly different. This figure meets the criteria for difference established previously and appears to indicate that the critique of oversocialization is not valid. However, as

will be seen below, it appears that membership in the Moose may be responsible for many of the differences between men and women.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN

All men were tested against Unaffiliated Women (Table a-48). Sixty nine percent of the variables differ significantly. These findings match those for all women and men (Table a-47). The caveats made there are equally applicable here.

ALL WOMEN AND LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

All women were tested against members of the Loyal Order of Moose (Table a-49). Sixty nine percent of the variables differ significantly. This is the same figure which was found when all women were tested against all men (Table a-47).

ALL WOMEN AND UNAFFILIATED MEN

In order to examine the impact of Moose on the number of significant differences between men and women, all women were tested against Unaffiliated Men (Table a-50). This test does not meet the criteria established for inclusion, since there are more than three times the number of women

than men. However, it is noteworthy because the number of significant differences falls below 25 percent. This is an indication of the importance of men who are members of the Moose in accounting for differences in perceptions between women and men.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

Comparing these two groups (Table a-51), I found that 77 percent of the variable are significantly different. This is the largest percentage found anywhere in this study and indicates the importance of the Moose in accounting for differences between men and women.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND UNAFFILIATED MEN

Comparing these two groups (Table a-52), I found that the number of significant differences falls to 31 percent. This test underscores the significance of Moose in this study, since comparisons of these women with Moose yields a larger percentage of significantly different variables (Table a-51).

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

AND LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

Comparing these two groups (Table a-53), I found that 38 percent of the variables are significantly different. This finding is puzzling since these are, in many ways, the most disparate of all groups looked at in this study. For this reason, a ratio of variance test (Table a-54) was done to determine if statistical anomalies are responsible for the similarities found. This does not appear to be the case.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

AND UNAFFILIATED MEN

Comparing these two groups (Table a-55), I found that fifteen percent of the variables are significantly different.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN

AND LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

Comparing these two groups (Table a-56), I found that 46 percent of the variables are significantly different.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN

AND UNAFFILIATED MEN

Comparing these two groups (Table a-57), I found that no differences.

AGE AND GENDER

-all women and men both excluding

those aged 55-64 (Table a-58)

-Unaffiliated Women and men both

excluding those aged 55-64

(Table a-59)

In tests comparing subjects by gender and group affiliation regardless of age (Tables a-47, a-48) more than 50 percent of the variables are significantly different. Men and women aged 55-64 is the only one age gender group in which the number of significant differences exceeds twenty five percent (Tables a-25, a-26). They were excluded with the expectation that this would result in fewer significant differences. This expectation was not supported. Subsequent tests, both including and excluding Moose, indicate that it is probably the inclusion of the Moose which is responsible for the large number of differences found.

MOOSE, GENDER AND AGE

Four tests, using groups formed from combinations of age, gender and membership in the Moose were done, two of which meet the criteria for inclusion. These combinations are:

-Moose and Unaffiliated Women

both excluding those aged 55-64

-Unaffiliated Men and Unaffiliated

Women both excluding those aged

55-64

-Moose and all women both excluding

those aged 55-64

-Unaffiliated Men and all women

both excluding those aged

55-64

These tests measure the impact of membership in the Moose on the differences found between men and women aged 55-64 (Tables a-25, a-26). If fewer differences are found when the Moose are excluded, this would indicate that the differences noted above are at least in part a function of Moose membership. If the number of differences remains the same, this would be an indication that membership in the Moose is not a factor. In one test more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly:

-Unaffiliated Women and Moose

excluding ages 55-64

(Table a-60)

In the test which excludes the Moose, fewer than 25 percent of the variables differ significantly (Table a-61).

The two tests which include all women (all women and Moose (Table a-62) and all women and Unaffiliated Men (Table a-63)) do not meet the numerical criteria for inclusion. Nevertheless, they support the findings just cited (Tables a-60, a-61) in that the inclusion of Moose results in a larger number of significantly different variables.

These tests support my contention that it is membership in the Moose rather than gender which is the cause of the differences in perceptions found between men and women.

One hundred and ninety three t-tests (full) were done to test the hypothesis of oversocialization, 163 (84 percent) of which meet the criteria for inclusion. In only 22 (13 percent) do more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly. Additionally, in 20 (12 percent), between 25 and 50 percent of the variables are significantly different. In the remaining 121 tests (75 percent) fewer than 25 percent of the variables are significantly different.

A cluster of factors appear to influence differences in perceptions between women and men:

1.. When women are less educated than
   men there are likely to be
   differences in perceptions
   between women and men;

2.. When women watch either the
   same amount or more television
   than men notably three to four
   a day or more, there are more
   likely to be differences in
   perceptions between women and men;

3.. When Moose are either compared to
   women or are part of the group of
   men being compared to women, there
   are more likely to be differences in
   perceptions between women and men;

4.. When the men's MDemp score is below
   the mean (3.844) and the women's
   above or both scores are below
   the mean, there are more likely
   to be differences in perceptions
   between women and men;

5.. When women are aged 55-64, there
are apt to be differences in
perceptions between women and men.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings of this research; to relate these findings to the existing literature and to the major theoretical approaches in the field; and to suggest areas for further research.

HYPOTHESIS OF SELECTIVE PERCEPTION

SELECTIVE PERCEPTION AND ALL IN THE FAMILY

The selective perception hypothesis, as formulated by Rokeach and Vidmar (1974) and others, states that peoples' perceptions of gender roles on television is a function of their gender role attitudes. Since a large number of studies (i.e. Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974; Surlin, 1974 and Surlin and Tate, 1976) report some support for the hypothesis, I anticipated finding significant correlations between MDemp (subjects' mean score on the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test) and subjects' perceptions of the television characters as liberated. No such correlations were found. There appear to be a number of reasons that probably account for the differences in findings.

The studies (i.e. Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974; Surlin, 1974 and Surlin and Tate, 1976) on selective perception and

All in The Family raise a somewhat different question from the dimension under examination here. These studies are in one way or another concerned with the question of which of two television characters, e.g. Archie or Mike "wins", is "right" or makes more overall "sense". The emphasis in these studies is at least as much on the characters' ideas as on their personal qualities. In such a situation, one expects that viewers would see as "right" or "winning", those characters whose ideas are closest to their own.

The current study raises a different kind of question. The subjects were asked to describe or to evaluate a character's actions in a specific situation. The focus is on actions and interactions rather than ideas. The question of morality could have been raised with regard to Ann's seeing a married man. This would have come close to raising questions which are similar to those raised in the studies on All in the Family. However, Ann herself expresses many doubts about the morality of the relationship. In contrast, Archie in All in the Family, never seems to express doubts about anything. The framework presented by each show for answering the moral question is, therefore, very different for the two characters.

The question of who "wins", raised by many of the studies (i.e. Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974; Surlin, 1974 and Surlin and Tate, 1976) on All in the Family, is also not

relevant to <u>One Day at a Time</u>, where there are no winners or losers.

An issue of concern in both this study and the earlier ones (i.e. Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974; Surlin, 1974 and Surlin and Tate, 1976) is the question of whether or not the audience likes the different fictional characters. The earlier studies asked the subjects if they liked the characters. It was assumed that people with high scores on the dogmatism test would both like and agree with dogmatic characters, whereas subjects with low scores on that test might like but not agree with them. In this study people were asked to assess characters' personalities with the use of paired opposites covering a broad range of items. It was assumed that the higher the scores the more the subjects like the character(s). This study found, as did the previous investigations, that most subjects, regardless of their scores on the dogmatism or gender role attitude tests, like the characters they saw.

Some additional differences between this study and the aforenoted earlier investigations can be noted. No previous study looked at the large number of demographic variables that are examined here. In the earlier studies, the experimental situation was remote from actual viewings of the show. Furthermore, none of the previous studies considered the number of times a subject had seen the show, when it was last viewed or the general question of viewing habits.

It could also be argued that Archie, and to a lesser extent other characters examined in the selective perception studies (i.e. Vidmar and Rokeach, 1974; Surlin, 1974; and Surlin and Tate, 1976), are more extreme and exaggerated as personal types than any of the characters in One Day at a Time. Such characters are more likely to elicit exaggerated reactions from viewers. Studies focused on such characters may tend to support the hypothesis of selective perception more than studies of less extreme character types. The extent to which one can generalize from studies of exaggerated caricatured characters to perceptions of more ordinary characters may therefore be limited.

In addition, not all studies found support for the selective perception hypothesis. Surlin and Tate (1976) found dogmatism the least important of three variables in determining viewer perceptions of humor in All in the Family. Brigham (1976) found no relationship between racial attitudes, viewing frequency and viewers' enjoyment of All in the Family. He also found that among Blacks, although not among Whites, racial attitudes are not related to general reactions to the show.

Leckenby (1977) studied the relationship between subjects' scores on a dogmatism test and the extent to which they are likely to attribute dogmatism to Marcus Welby, M.D., police officer Kojak as well as Archie Bunker (All in the Family) and George Jefferson (The Jeffersons).

He found that people with high scores on the dogmatism test are more likely to attribute dogmatism to all four characters, whereas subjects with low scores on the dogmatism test are less likely to attribute dogmatism to Welby and Kojak. This finding implies that subjects whose MDemp score (mean score on the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test) indicates traditional gender role beliefs are more likely to see Ann and other characters as traditional, than are subjects whose scores are low, regardless of the gender role attitudes that the character espouses.

The current research, however, found no relationship between the peoples' scores on the MDemp test and their perceptions of Ann as being more or less liberated. A variety of explanations for this difference in findings are possible. One is that the subjects' perceptions are measured differently than in previous studies. Leckenby (1977) used the same test to measure both subjects' own degree of dogmatism and their perceptions of the characters. This may facilitate the subjects' projections of their beliefs onto the character, particularly if the individual subject is prone to do this. Another possible explanation for the difference in findings is the time lapse between the testing of the viewers in previous studies and the actual viewing of the program. Such a lapse might soften memories of the show and facilitate

viewers' projections of their own personal qualities unto their images of television characters.

A third possible explanation deals with the nature of the characters themselves. Ann is a more complex character than any of the four personalities used by Leckenby (1977). Some subjects might, therefore, find it more difficult to project their own beliefs in a simplified way onto a multidimensional personality. The possible importance of the personality of the character in assessment of viewers' perceptions was noted by Surlin (1974). He found no difference between subjects who have high and low scores on the dogmatism test, and their liking or agreeing with the characters Gloria, Lionel or Michael. This is not the case for Archie.

GENDER ROLE IDEOLOGY AND VIEWERS' PERCEPTIONS

A study by Goff et al. (1980) on viewers' perceptions of gender roles is especially relevant to this research. Goff et al. (1980) found limited support for the selective perception hypothesis. They reported a significant relationship between subjects' scores on the Bem Sex-Role Attitude Inventory and the way in which subjects answer the Bem Sex-Role Attitude Inventory for various television characters. No such relationship is found between that score and the one subjects attribute to characters on the Attitude Toward Women Scale, with the exception of Edith

Bunker. The authors make no effort to explain this discrepancy. It is possible that the explanation lies with the character of Edith Bunker, in much the same way as the nature of the character affected the findings of Surlin (1974) and Leckenby (1977). Specifically, Edith Bunker, is portrayed in many episodes of All in the Family, as a subservient stereotypical female. It would be difficult to view her as anything else. The other female characters, (Alice Alice, Ann One day at a Time, Abby Eight Is Enough and Chrissie Three's Company), studied by Goff et al. (1980) are more complex, thus facilitating a greater range of viewers' interpretations.

One Day at a Time is one of the programs studied by Goff et al. (1980). It is, however, difficult to generalize from their study to the current investigation given the differences in methodology between the two studies. Viewers' perceptions of the characters in the current study is measured on an instrument tailored to the episode. The episode itself was shown to the subjects immediately prior to answering the questionnaire, thereby avoiding the problem of time lag and memory. In addition, Goff et al. (1980) present no demographic data on their subjects.

Problems also exist regarding the use of the Bem Sex Role Attitude Test. The categories of the Bem Sex-Role

Attitude Inventory are not easily translated into MDemp scores, thereby making direct comparisons of perceptions of liberation difficult. Griffin Lozano (1985) argues that concept of androgyny is flawed. The concept is predicated on a definition of masculine and feminine as independent. Androgyny is the blending of the two. Her research indicates that masculinity and femininity are overlapping. This implies that the Bem, as currently constructed, is of little value. Her criticism of the Bem might well be the explanation for the discrepancies found by Goff et al. when the Bem, rather than the Attitude Toward Women Scale was used to measure attribution of gender role attitudes of subjects to the various characters.

HYPOTHESIS OF OVERSOCIALIZATION

The hypothesis of oversocialization states that there are more differences in perceptions between men and women than between groups differentiated by other demographic variables. This hypothesis is not confirmed in the current study. Some significant differences in perceptions between men and women are found, but always in conjunction with other variables.[1]

---

[1] It is possible to argue that few differences in perceptions were found because viewers were responding to the "prefered reading" (Hall, 1982) of the show. However, this concept does not account for the pattern of differences which were found.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

The variable which has the greatest impact on differences in perceptions between men and women is membership in the Loyal Order of Moose. With few exceptions, whenever the Moose form a large part of the group being tested, significant differences occurred. In the tests comparing men and women, I consistently found that those tests which include Moose (Tables a-47, a-48 (all men) a-50, a-55, a-57, a-63 (Unaffiliated Men)) have a greater number of significant differences than those which do not (Tables a-49, a-51, a-53, a-56, a-62).

The impact of membership in the Moose is also seen in those tests based on differences in MDemp scores and gender, in which significant differences are found (i.e. Tables a-1, and a-2 (all women) Tables a-10, a-11 (Unaffiliated Women)). Those tests are characterized by MDemp scores of the men below the mean (3.844) and those of women above the mean. Although, at first, this appears to be a gender based difference, an analysis of the distribution of the men's MDemp scores shows that 88 percent of the scores of men who belong to the Moose are below the Mean (66 percent below one standard deviation), whereas the scores of Unaffiliated Men are almost evenly divided above and below the mean (Table 3-20).

The impact of the Moose is somewhat apparent in those tests which are formed around viewing habits. The men who

belong to the Moose watch more television than Unaffiliated men (Table 4-9). The viewing category of three to to four hours of television a day includes large numbers of men who are members of the Moose. This viewing category figures prominently in two of the tests for viewing hours in which more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly (Tables a-32 (all women and men), a-42 (Unaffiliated Women and men)). The category of Moose does not, however, figure as prominently in this variable as I expected. The analysis of viewing hours (Chapter Four) indicates that differences in perceptions are most likely to occur when women are watching either the same amount or more television per day than the men ((Tables a-32, a-33, a-34. a-35, a-36 (all women and men) a-40, a-41, a-42 (Unaffiliated Women and men)). In only two of these tests (Tables a-32, a-42) are men watching television for more than two hours a day and hence including large numbers of Moose. This indicates that viewing habits may override membership in the Moose as a factor in determining differences in perceptions between women and men.

Moose membership may be one factor in the relatively large percentage of differences found between men and women aged 55-64 (Table a-25 (all women and men), (Table a-26 (Unaffiliated Women and men)), since 86 percent of the men in that group are Moose (Table 4-1). However, this may be concluded only with caution since in the previous age group

(45-54), the Moose constitute the same percentage of men
(Table 4-1), yet fewer than 25 percent of the variables are
significantly different (Tables a-63 (Unaffiliated Women)
a-64 (all women)).

More differences (between 25 and 50 percent) are found
between Moose and Unaffiliated Men (Table a-46) than are
found when comparing any combination of women to women or
most groups of men to women. This serves to underscore the
importance of the Moose in this study.

MDEMP

Differences in perceptions between men and women are
likely to be found when the MDemp scores (mean score on
Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test) of the men are below
the mean (3.844) and those of the women above (Tables a-1,
a-2 (all women) a-10, a-11 (Unaffiliated Women)). These
differences, however, reflect membership in the Moose,
rather than gender. Eighty eight percent of the scores of
men who belong to the Moose have MDemp scores which are
below the mean (66 percent below one standard deviation),
whereas the scores of Unaffiliated Men are almost evenly
divided above and below the mean (Table 3-20). The reverse
does not hold true. Differences in perceptions are not
likely to be found when the scores of the women are below
the mean (3.844) and those of the men above (i.e. Tables
a-8 (all women), a-17 (Unaffiliated)). Such differences,

however, are found when the scores of both women (Unaffiliated) and men are below the mean (Table a-12). Both of these findings underscore the pattern of MDemp scores which is the decisive factor in determining differences in viewers' perceptions.

In evaluating the impact of the MDemp score on differences between men and women in the perceptions of gender roles on television, it must be remembered that in 67 percent of the tests fewer than 25 percent of the variables are significantly different. This finding is of particular interest, since in almost every test, the MDemp scores of men and women differs significantly, regardless of the extent of other differences. Again, indicating that MDemp Score has little impact on viewers' perceptions.

It is important to note that there is a consistency in the direction of differences. Where such significant differences occur, the women always have higher scores on the Demplewolff than the men (Tables 3-19, 3-20). The women always perceive the characters as more liberated, as better able to cope (relationship and self environment scales) and like them more (personality scale) than do the men.

TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS

Television viewing patterns have more impact on differences in viewers' perceptions than any other single

variable tested.   Differences in perceptions are found
when women are watching either the same amount (Tables
a-32, a-36, a-37) or more television per day (Tables a-33,
a-34, a-35) than the men.   One of these (Table a-35)
includes extreme differences in the amount of viewing each
does.   Such differences are also found to occur when the
men are watching two hours of television a day (Tables
a-32, a-36, a-37).   In only one of the tests are the men
watching television for more than two hours a day (Table
a-38).   A similar pattern holds when looking at
Unaffiliated Women and Men.   Differences in perceptions
occur when women are watching three to four hours of
television and the men one to two (Tables a-40, a-41,
a-42).

Viewing patterns and differences in perceptions are
connected in varying ways with education, age and group
affiliation.   Women who have post graduate degrees are apt
to view less television than women who are less educated
(Table 4-5).   These differences appear in two (Tables a-36,
a-37) of the six tests on all women and men in which women
and men differ on more than fifty percent of the variables.
Differences in perceptions are also likely to occur when
the men are more educated and watch less television as is
the case in three of the tests (Tables a-33, a-34, a-35).
This is also seen when Unaffiliated Women are compared to
men (Tables a-40, a-41).

Educational differences, however, do not appear to be consistently related to differences in perceptions, as noted in the section on education. There is, however, some connection between viewing habits and education. Differences in education seem to influence the amount of television one views such that more educated subjects are less likely to watch television (Table 4-6). In those instances where education does influence viewing habits, the perceptions of men and women are likely to differ. This is the case in three (Tables a-33, a-34, a-35) of the six tests analyzed under gender in which more than 50 percent of the variables are significantly different. This pattern does not hold for all tests in that category. In three (Tables a-32, a-36, a-37), despite similarities in both viewing patterns and educational levels, the two groups still differ on more than 50 percent of the variables.

Women who watch three to four hours a day or more are more likely than women with other viewing habits to differ from men in their perceptions (Tables a-32, a-33, a-34, a-35 (all women) a-40, a-41, a-42 (Unaffiliated Women)). These women are likely to be less educated than other women. Fourteen percent of all women who watch three to four hours of television a day have only completed high school, as compared to 34 percent of the women who watch two hours a day (Table 4-6). These women also tend to be less educated than the men who watch less television (Table

4-6). For example, 33 percent of the men who watch two hours a day have a degree beyond college (Table 4-6). Women who watch three to four hours a day or more are most likely to be aged 55-64 (Table 4-3), the age group most likely to differ from men (Table 4-3).

Two recent studies (Bower, 1985; Jackson-Beeck and Sobol, 1980) looked at the relationship between television viewing habits, gender and education with somewhat contradictory findings. Bower (1985) found no differences in the viewing habits of women and men and no relationship between education and viewing habits. My study found that, regardless of gender, people who are less educated are likely to watch more television than people who are more educated (Table 4-6). I also found that regardless of education, women watch less television than men (Table 3-14). It is difficult, however, to make detailed comparisons between the two studies because Bower (1985) does not provide specific data on the relationships between gender, education and viewing habits.

Jackson-Beeck and Sobol (1980) found that women view more television than men. They also found that people who watch at least six hours of television a day ("heavy viewers") tend to be less educated than those who watch less television. The viewing categories used by Jackson-Beeck and Sobol (1980) are not comparable to the categories used in my study, thereby making comparisons difficult. Jackson-Beeck and Sobol (1980) do not discuss the

relationship between gender and education. It is possible that their finding that women watch more television than men is related to the lower level of education of their female subjects. Nevertheless, there does appear to be some confirmation of the findings in my study that people with less education are more likely to be heavy viewers than people with a higher level of education, although the findings for gender and viewing habits differ. The explanation for this may lie in the fact that the women in their study are both heavy viewers and less educated, whereas in my study women tend to watch less television and to be more educated than the men (Table 4-6).

Nielson data for the test period (winter of 1981), indicates that women watch more television than men (AC Nielson Co. 1982). The report does not control for education and therefore the data cannot be compared to mine.

Bower (1985) notes that women watch more television than men, unless one controls for opportunities to view, such as working. Most of the women in my sample worked, as witnessed by the fact that a large part of the sample was obtained in work related situations. This fact may account for the differences in viewing patterns found by Jackson-Beeck and Sobol (1980), Nielson (1982) Bower (1985) and my study.

EDUCATION

Education appears to have very little impact on viewers' perceptions. In only two tests do between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly (Tables a-27, a-28). In all other tests fewer than 25 percent of the variables differ significantly.

Education may be one of many factors which account for the differences in perceptions between men and women aged 55-64 (Tables 4-26, 4-28). Only in that group and in women over 65 are the women less educated than the men (Table 4-5).

Although educational differences have very little impact on differences in perceptions, there is some connection between viewing habits and education. Differences in education seem to influence the amount of television one views such that more educated subjects are less likely to watch television (Table 4-6). In those instances where education does influence viewing habits, the perceptions of men and women are likely to differ.

An obvious caution with regard to the impact of education on differences in perception is that despite the widespread differences in education between the Moose and women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition, they only differ on 38 percent of the variables (Table a-53).

AGE

Neither age nor age combined with gender appears to have much impact on viewer perceptions. There are two cases in which between 25 and 50 percent of the variables are significantly different, both involving men and women aged 55-64 (Tables a-25, a-26), the explanation appears to be a constellation of particular factors with age almost a coincidence.

Women in this age range however, figure prominently in a number of different variables. They are more likely than women of other age groups to view three to four hours of television daily (Table 4-3). They differ from the men in almost all of the comparisons involving that amount of viewing (Tables a-32, a-33, a-40, a-41, 4-42). Women in this age range are also less educated than most other women (Table 4-5). When these women are being compared to men of the same age, they are also being compared to one of the two largest groups of Moose (Table 4-1). In addition, this group of women is the largest in the sample (Table 4-2) and it may well be that some of the differences cited are a function of size rather than demographics.

Volgy and Schwartz (1980), in their study of the relationships between viewing habits and gender role attitudes, eliminated subjects over the age of 50 whom they regard as likely to be more sexist than younger subjects. They make no reference at all to the gender of their

subjects in discussing their findings. The current
research found a relationship between television viewing,
age and gender.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

Two groups - the National Congress of Neighborhood
Women and the City University of New York Women's Coalition
- were deliberately recruited to provide contrast with the
other subjects. Few differences were found. Conversely,
the Moose were not recruited for this purpose, yet provide
much of the contrast in the findings. This section
concentrates on these groups, summarizing the roles each
plays in determining differences in viewers' perceptions.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

The City University of New York Women's Coalition
figures in two sets of tests in which more than 50 percent
of the variables are significantly different and one in
which between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ
significantly.

The impact of the Coalition is most strongly visible
in tests on viewing habits. Two of the six tests for
viewing hours in which more than 50 percent of the

variables differ significantly (women who watch two hours a day; men who watch two hours a day (Table a-36) and women who watch less than two hours a day; men who watch two hours a day (Table a-37) include large number of women in the Coalition (Table 3-14)). These two viewing patterns fall into the second tier of differences when Unaffiliated Women are tested (Tables a-43, a-44). This underscores the importance of women in the Coalition in determining differences in perceptions between women and men.

Women in the Coalition have less of an impact on differences in perceptions involving groups based on differences in MDemp scores. Although both of the tests (Tables a-1, a-2) in which more than 50 percent of the variables are significantly different include these women, the same combinations of MDemp scores also differ on more than 50 percent of the variables when Unaffiliated Women are tested (Tables a-10, a-11).

Comparing women who have gone beyond college to men who have not completed high school, I found that between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly. This test is also a comparison of Moose to women. When Unaffiliated Women were tested, the number of significant differences falls below 25 percent (Table a-29).

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

AND LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

These two groups of subjects are in some ways the most disparate in the sample. I am comparing highly educated and women with high scores on the Demplewolff Sex Role Attitude Test (Table 3-19) with men who are, for the most part, less educated (Table 3-9) and have more traditional views on gender roles (lower MDemp scores (Table 3-20)) and different viewing habits - an important variable in determining differences in perceptions. The small number of differences in perceptions between them is striking (Tables a-53, a-54).

These two groups do play a limited role in differences in perceptions under certain circumstances. An example is when MDemp and gender are the key variables (Tables a-1, a-2). The second of these is particularly interesting since almost 46 percent of the scores above one standard deviation represent women in the City University of New York Women's Coalition (Table 3-19) and 89 percent of the men's scores represent Moose (Table 3-20). On the other hand, when the men's scores are below the mean, differences in perceptions always occur (i.e. Table a-15). Given this, I expected that when tested as groups, the number of significant differences would have exceeded 50 percent. This did not occur (Table a-53).

Differences in viewing habits is the variable with the greatest impact on viewers' perceptions. Despite this and despite the differences in viewing habits between these two groups, only two (Tables a-36, a-37) of the six tests based on viewing habits in which more than 50 percent of the variables differ significantly, involved these two groups. These groups also play some role in those tests in which between 25 and 50 percent of the variables differ significantly (Tables a-38, a-39).

In one test (Table a-28), comparing women who have post graduate degrees and men who have not completed high school between 25 and 50 percent of the variables are significantly different. About one half of the women are in the Coalition (21 of the 41 women (Table 3-9)) and most of the men are Moose (13 of the 16 men (Table 4-7)).

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN

In two tests the inclusion of this group results in changes in significant levels.

The first of these involves MDemp scores. One test (both women and men below the mean (3.844)), in which more than 50 percent of the variables are significantly different when Unaffiliated Women and men (Table 4-12) are tested, has below that percentage when all women (Table 4-6) are included in the sample. The former test excludes 12 women from the National Congress of Neighborhood Women

(Table 3-19). This indicates that these women are more similar to men in their perceptions of gender roles on television than the Unaffiliated Women. This pattern does not hold when the scores of women in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women above the mean are compared to males above mean (Table a-13). The number of significant differences drops below 25 percent (Table a-13).

The second of these is concerned with education. Men and all women with two years of college differ on 38 percent of the variables (Table a-27). These differences do not appear when Unaffiliated Women are tested (Table a-29). The additional women in that group belong to the National Congress of Neighborhood Women.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Previous research has failed to examine the details and dynamics of viewer perception. The Uses and Gratifications Approach, despite its emphasis on an "active audience", does not in any way investigate the question of what people perceive when they watch television, the central question of this study. Gans (1980:63), in his criticism of the approach, notes the need for research on

the "qualitative aspects of program use". This entails studying viewer involvement with and comprehension of, various television characters. Gans (1980) notes the need to relate this both to viewing habits and to demographic variables. The research in this study is both a move in the direction of developing methods to do this and applying such methods.

This is the first study which has attempted to explore such a wide range of variables in studying the relationships between viewer perceptions and gender role attitude. However, no firm relationships between gender, gender role attitudes and viewers' perceptions emerged, except as mediated by other factors such as education, the amount of television viewed daily and membership in the Loyal Order of Moose. Additional research needs to be done to further understand the relationships between such variables as education, gender and viewing habits. The contradictory findings of Bower (1985), and Jackson-Beeck and Sobol (1980) and this study on the relationships between viewing habits, gender and education clearly bear further research, both in and of themselves and on the possible impact of this complex web on viewers' perceptions. Additionally, the importance of such variables as religion which could not be explored in this study because of sampling difficulties need to be further examined.

Future work should include testing a wide range of populations. For example, on the assumption that there are significant differences between men who belonged to the Loyal Order of Moose and other men, it would be interesting to compare their wives to other groups of women to see if they differ from other groups of women. Other populations which could be profitably tested include various other groups in this country and abroad. In addition to studying different populations, future research should focus on different shows. The show used in this study featured a woman. It is not clear if the findings of this study would have been different if the show had featured either a male star i.e. _Magnum P.I._ or a married couple as is featured in _Newhart_.

APPENDIX ONE

THE INSTRUMENT

To facilitate keeping the two parts

of the questionniare together please write:

    1) The first 3 letters of your mother's
       first name

    2) The year of your birth

———————————————————

Please check the line following the most appropriate response.

1) Age:

        25-29 _____

        30-34 _____

        35-39 _____

        40-44 _____

        45-49 _____

        50-54 _____

        55-59 _____

        60-64 _____

        65-69 _____

        70-74 _____

        75-79 _____

        80 and
        above _____

2) Sex:

        male   _____

        female _____

3) Occupation:

        _____ (please be specific)

4) Religion:

        Catholic   _____

        Jewish   _____

        Protestant   _____

        Other   _____ (please be specific)

        No religious
        affiliation _____ (please specify parents')

5) Ethnic Background:

        Black   _____

        Hispanic   _____

        White   _____

        Other   _____ (please specify)

6) Formal Education:

Highest level completed:

8th grade _____

10th grade _____

High School graduate_____

2 years of college _____

College graduate _____

Post-graduate work _____ (specify degree(s) earned)

7) Marital Status:

married _____

single _____

living with someone_____

separated/divorced _____

widowed _____

other _____ (please specify)

8) Total family income:

$5,000 or less _____

$6,000-$10,000 _____

$11,000-$15,000 _____

$16,000-$20,000 _____

$21,000-$25,000 _____

$26,000-$30,000 _____

$31,000-$35,000 _____

$36,000-$40,000 _____

$41,000 and above _____

9) Organizational Affiliation:

civil/human/women's rights _____(please specify)

conservation _____

educational _____(please specify)

political _____(please specify)

professional _____(please specify)

religious _____(please specify)

other _____(please specify)

10) Viewing Habits:

a) Hours of television watched daily:

none _____

1-2 _____

3-4 _____

5-6 _____

7-8 _____

9-10 _____

10 or more _____

b) Place a B next to the two types of television shows you like best and an L next to the two types you like least. If you are a non-viewer or have no particular likes or dislikes, please check the appropriate line.

crime drama _____

documentaries/news _____

drama _____

educational _____

movies _____

quiz/game _____

religious _____

specials _____

sports _____

soap operas _____

situation comedies _____

talk shows _____

variety shows _____

other _____ (please specify)

no special likes/dislikes _____

non-viewer _____

c) Approximately how many times in the past year
have you watched "One Day at a Time"?

None _____

1-2 _____

3-4 _____

5-6 _____

7 or more _____

Below you will find a social attitude test consisting of many
statements which people might make about their attitudes on
certain social issues. Please read each item and determine to
what extent you agree or disagree with the statement. If you
are very much in agreement circle AA. If you agree a little
circle the A. If you are in slight disagreement circle the D.
And if you disagree a great deal circle the DD.

There are no right or wrong answers, since this is a measure
of individual attitudes. Please read the items carefully,
and answer to the best of your ability. You may be undecided
about some items, but try to respond in a way which comes closest
to your feelings about the statements.

AA   A   D   DD   1) The sex of a boss or supervisor is
unimportant provided he or she is
competent.

AA   A   D   DD   2) The husband should be favored by law in
the disposal of family property or
income, provided he is the sole wage
earner.

AA   A   D   DD   3) The influx of women into the business
world, in direct competition with men,
should be discouraged.

AA   A   D   DD   4) Married women with very young children
should work outside the home if they
wish.

AA   A   D   DD   5) In general women should stay out of
political positions.

AA   A   D   DD   6) Parental responsibility for care of
young children should usually be in
the hands of the wife.

AA   A   D   DD   7) A woman should be able to officially
retain her own last name after marriage.

AA   A   D   DD   8) Women should take more responsibility
for solving the intellectual and social
problems of the day.

AA   A   D   DD   9) Because of their physical limitations,
women should be advised to choose less
strenuous types of occupations.

AA   A   D   DD   10) A woman should be allowed to play major
league baseball if she can compete.

AA A D DD   11) Society should not be expected to provide day care centers for working women.

AA A D DD   12) There should be many more women in graduate school even if it means keeping some men out.

AA A D DD   13) The use of obscene language is more unbecoming for a woman than for a man.

AA A D DD   14) Husband and wife should share responsibility for economic support of themselves and their children.

AA A D DD   15) When on a date, the woman should usually open doors by herself rather than letting the man do it for her.

AA A D DD   16) A woman should usually have custody of the children after a divorce.

AA A D DD   17) Generally speaking, men are more fit to run business and industrial enterprises than are women.

AA A D DD   18) Many women need fulfullment which they don't obtain from being a wife and mother.

AA A D DD   19) Every police department should have policewomen with equal authority and responsibility to that of the men on the force.

AA A D DD   20) A woman should not expect to go to the same places or to have the same freedom of action as a man.

AA A D DD   21) The needs of a family should come before a woman's personal ambitions.

AA A D DD   22) Many women are too sensitive to be good at certain occupations.

AA A D DD   23) A daughter in a family should have the same privileges as a son.

AA A D DD   24) A woman earning as much as her escort should bear equally the expense of common entertainment.

AA A D DD   25) The initiative in courtship should usually come from the man.

AA   A   D   DD   26) A wife should often take the lead and
                          suggest sexual intercourse if she
                          wishes it.

AA   A   D   DD   27) Women have equal intelligence with men.

AA   A   D   DD   28) It is foolish for a woman to enter
                          certain occupations that detract from
                          her femininity.

To facilitate keeping the two parts

of the questionniare together please write:

1) The first 3 letters of your mother's first name

2) The year of your birth

On the next few pages, you will find a number of questions relating to the episode of "One Day at a Time" which you have just seen.
Please check the response which you think best answers the question. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Before proceeding with the questions, please check the appropriate box indicating whether or not you have seen this episode of the show previously:

have seen it _____

have not seen it _____

1. Do you think that Ann understands Mark?

    yes _____
    no _____

2. Do you think that Mark understands Ann?

    yes _____
    no _____

3. Which of the following best describes Ann's reaction to Schneider's comment that women are weak and that is why Ann could not stop herself from falling in love with Mark?

    defensive   _____
    insulted   _____
    calm   _____
    angry   _____
    agreed with him   _____
    disagreed with him   _____

4. Do you think that her reaction was appropriate?

    yes _____
    no _____

5. Who do you think is more realistic about Mark and Ann's relationship - Julie or Barbara?

    Julie   _____
    Barbara _____ .

6. Which of the following best describes the relationship between Ann and Mark?

        he dominates   _____

        she dominates   _____

        neither dominates   _____

7. Which of the following best describes the feelings between Ann and Mark?

        she cares for him more than he cares for her _____

        he cares for her more than she cares for him _____

        they care for each other an equal amount   _____

8. Who is more realistic about their relationship - Ann or Mark?

        Ann   _____

        Mark   _____

        neither   _____

9. Which of the following best describes Ann's feelings about Barbara's reaction to Mark?

        guilt   _____

        not sure how to cope   _____

        sure that she is doing the right thing   _____

        angry at her daughter for not understanding   _____

10. Do you think that Ann's reaction is appropriate?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

11. Which of the following best describe Ann's feelings for Mark?

        casual/infatuation   _____

        sexual   _____

        deep caring/loving   _____

12. Which of the following best describes Mark's feelings for Ann?

      casual/infatuation   _____

      sexual   _____

      deep caring/loving   _____

13. Which of the following best describes Ann's attitude toward Schneider?

      grateful for his help and interest   _____

      annoyance at his interference   _____

      affection and friendship   _____

      feels sorry for him   _____

      would like to date him   _____

14. Which of the following best describes Schneider's attitude toward Ann?

      protective   _____

      would like to date her   _____

      affection and friendship   _____

      feels sorry for her   _____

15. Do you think Schneider's attitude is appropriate?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

16. Do you think that Ann's attitude toward Schneider is appropriate?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

17. Which of the following best describes Ann's reason for breaking up with Mark?

      embarassment at meeting Bernie in the restaurant   _____

      guilt over seeing a married man   _____

      worry over Barbara's reaction   _____

      she did not care for Mark that much   _____

18. Do you think that her reason was a good one?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

19. Which of the following best describes Ann's reaction to Mark's announcement that he is getting a divorce?

        joy   _____

        guilt   _____

        confusion   _____

        relief   _____

20. Do you think her response is appropriate?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

21. Is Ann too protective of Mark?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

22. Is Ann right when she says that she and Mark were living on a cloud somewhere?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

23. Does Ann understand Barbara?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

24. Does Barbara understand Ann?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

25. If Ann and Mark married, do you think that they would be happy?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

26. Although Ann is not shown at work, do you think that she would be competent on the job?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

27. Is Barbara overreacting to Mark's being married?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

28. Do you agree with Julie that Mark is a terrific guy?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

29. Is Julie right when she tells Barbara that at least Ann is honest with them?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

30. Is Ann right when she says that Barbara has an idealized image of her?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

31. Is Mark right when he says that he needs to avoid responsibility for a while?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

32. If Ann and Mark married would Ann insist on his sharing household chores?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

33. If she did, would he agree?

      yes   _____

      no   _____

34. If they married would Ann want to continue working?

    yes   _____

    no   _____

35. If she did would Mark agree?

    yes   _____

    no   _____

36. Is Ann right when she says that Mark is too concerned with meeting obligations?

    yes   _____

    no   _____

37. Do you agree with Barbara that Ann's seeing Mark is a sign that she is losing her independence?

    yes   _____

    no   _____

38. Is Ann a good mother?

    yes   _____

    no   _____

39. Which of the following best explains why Barbara wants Ann to marry Mark?

    likes him   _____

    wants a father figure   _____

    thinks that he and Ann would be happy together   _____

    wants Ann to atone for the wrong of seeing a married man   _____

40. Is her reason appropriate?

    yes   _____

    no   _____

41. Which of the following best explains why Julie wants Ann to marry Mark?

        likes him   _____

        wants a father figure   _____

        thinks that he and Ann would be happy together _____

        wants Ann to atone for the wrong of seeing a
           married man   _____

42. Is her reason appropriate?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

43. Is Ann right when she says that both she and Mark are relieved about ending their relationship?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

44. Why do you think that Ann felt relieved about the ending of the relationship with Mark?

        did not really care for him   _____

        wants to retain her independence and not marry_____

        not sure Mark is right for her   _____

        worried about Barbara   _____

45. Do you think her reason is a good one?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

46. Do you agree with Schneider's comment that Ann does not know Mark well enough to marry him?

        yes   _____

        no   _____

The following pages contain lists of paired opposites. Each
list refers to a different character on the show. I want your
opinion as to which of the two words or phrases best describes
the character whose name heads the list.

Please check the point on the scale which most accurately
describes the character whose name heads the list.

ANN:

dependent	1	2	3	4	5	independent
immature	1	2	3	4	5	mature
dislikeable	1	2	3	4	5	likeable
insecure	1	2	3	4	5	secure
incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	competent
naive	1	2	3	4	5	sophisticated
cold	1	2	3	4	5	warm
unperceptive	1	2	3	4	5	perceptive
weak	1	2	3	4	5	strong
manipulative	1	2	3	4	5	not manipulative
nasty	1	2	3	4	5	nice
compliant	1	2	3	4	5	not compliant
sarcastic	1	2	3	4	5	not sarcastic
selfish	1	2	3	4	5	unselfish
mean	1	2	3	4	5	kind
unaggressive	1	2	3	4	5	aggressive
irresponsible	1	2	3	4	5	responsible
uncaring	1	2	3	4	5	caring
cruel	1	2	3	4	5	kind
too sweet	1	2	3	4	5	not too sweet
unassertive	1	2	3	4	5	assertive
too emotional	1	2	3	4	5	not too emotional
does not make own decisions	1	2	3	4	5	makes own decisions
unpleasant	1	2	3	4	5	pleasant

BARBARA:

dependent	1	2	3	4	5	independent
immature	1	2	3	4	5	mature
dislikeable	1	2	3	4	5	likeable
insecure	1	2	3	4	5	secure
incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	competent
naive	1	2	3	4	5	sophisticated
cold	1	2	3	4	5	warm
unperceptive	1	2	3	4	5	perceptive
weak	1	2	3	4	5	strong
manipulative	1	2	3	4	5	not manipulative
nasty	1	2	3	4	5	nice
compliant	1	2	3	4	5	not compliant
sarcastic	1	2	3	4	5	not sarcastic
selfish	1	2	3	4	5	unselfish
mean	1	2	3	4	5	kind
unaggressive	1	2	3	4	5	aggressive
irresponsible	1	2	3	4	5	responsible
uncaring	1	2	3	4	5	caring
cruel	1	2	3	4	5	kind
too sweet	1	2	3	4	5	not too sweet
unassertive	1	2	3	4	5	assertive
too emotional	1	2	3	4	5	not too emotional
does not make own decisions	1	2	3	4	5	makes own decisions
unpleasant	1	2	3	4	5	pleasant

MARK:

dependent	1	2	3	4	5	independent
immature	1	2	3	4	5	mature
dislikeable	1	2	3	4	5	likeable
insecure	1	2	3	4	5	secure
incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	competent
naive	1	2	3	4	5	sophisticated
cold	1	2	3	4	5	warm
unperceptive	1	2	3	4	5	perceptive
weak	1	2	3	4	5	strong
manipulative	1	2	3	4	5	not manipulative
nasty	1	2	3	4	5	nice
compliant	1	2	3	4	5	not compliant
sarcastic	1	2	3	4	5	not sarcastic
selfish	1	2	3	4	5	unselfish
mean	1	2	3	4	5	kind
unaggressive	1	2	3	4	5	aggressive
irresponsible	1	2	3	4	5	responsible
uncaring	1	2	3	4	5	caring
cruel	1	2	3	4	5	kind
too sweet	1	2	3	4	5	not too sweet
unassertive	1	2	3	4	5	assertive
too emotional	1	2	3	4	5	not too emotional
does not make own decisions	1	2	3	4	5	makes own decisions
unpleasant	1	2	3	4	5	pleasant

APPENDIX TWO

SAMPLE ADVERTISEMENT FOR SUBJECTS

EARN $10 IN ONE LUNCH HOUR

Earn

MY NAME IS SUSAN B. PRAGER AND I AM A DOCTORAL

CANDIDATE IN SOCIOLOGY.

I NEED PEOPLE WHO ARE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE

IN MY STUDY ON TELEVISION. IN EXCHANGE, I WILL

PAY EACH PARTICIPANT $ 10.00

Participate

ANSWER THREE QUESTIONNIARES

WATCH A HIT TELEVISION SHOW

Come

TUESDAY DECEMBER 30th 1980

12.00-1.00 p.m.   OR   1.00-2.00 p.m.

ROOM 901 GRADUATE CENTER

APPENDIX THREE

NON SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

This appendix contains the list of all non significant tests, as indicated in Chapter Four. Unless it is indicated to the contrary, all tests meet criteria for inclusion.

HYPOTHESIS OF SELECTIVE PERCEPTION

MDEMP

ALL WOMEN

One test was done.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

One test done run.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN

One test was done.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

One test was done.

MEN

One test was done.

AGE

ALL WOMEN

All women were grouped into the five age groups, three (60 percent) of which meet the established criteria for inclusion.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

Unaffiliated Women were placed into the five age groups, two (40 percent) of which meet the established criteria for inclusion.

MEN

The men were placed into the established age groups, three (60 percent) of which meet the numerical criteria for inclusion.

AGE

Five tests in which age was the only variable were done. All meet the criteria for inclusion.

EDUCATION

Eighteen tests were run, of which 14 (77 percent) meet the criteria for inclusion.

ALL WOMEN

Women were placed into the four education groups, three (75 five percent) of which meet the numerical criteria for inclusion.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

All unaffiliated women were placed into the five educational groups, three (75 percent) of which meet the established criteria for inclusion.

MEN

The men were placed into the five educational groups, two (50 percent) of which meet the criteria for inclusion.

EDUCATION

The two educational extremes - high school graduates and post graduate degrees - were each run as the only variable.

RELIGION

ALL WOMEN

One test for each of the three major religions was done, two (66 percent) of which meet the numerical criteria for inclusion.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

No tests were done since the numerical distribution of religion among the unaffiliated women is so similar to that of all women.

MEN

One test was done for each religion.

RELIGION

The religious breakdown of the sample followed that of gender so closely (Table 3-7) that it did not appear useful to test religion as the only independent variable.

MDEMP

ALL WOMEN

Ten tests were done.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

Ten tests were done.

MEN

Ten tests were done, of which 9 (90 percent) meet the established criteria for inclusion.

MDEMP

Ten tests were done in which MDemp was the only variable used to differentiate the groups.

HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWING

ALL WOMEN

Five tests were done.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

Five tests were done, three (60 percent) of which meet the criteria for inclusion.

MEN

Four tests were done, three (75 percent) of which meet the criteria for inclusion.

TELEVISION HOURS

Five tests were done, four (80 percent) of which meet the criteria for inclusion.

HYPOTHESIS OF OVERSOCIALIZATION

MDEMP

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN AND MEN:

One test was done.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION AND

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN

One test was possible.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN TO SELF

One test was possible.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

AND UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

Three tests were possible.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN AND

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

Two tests were possible.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN TO UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

Three tests were possible.

AGE

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION AND

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

One test was done.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN AND CITY

UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

One test was done.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

Ten tests were done.

MEN

Ten tests were done.

AGE

One test was done.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALTION AND

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

One test was done.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN AND CITY

UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

One test was done.

EDUCATION

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN

Six full tests and two short tests were done.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW

YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

One test was possible.

UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

One full test and three short tests were done.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION TO MEN

One test was possible.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN TO MEN

Two tests were possible.

MEN

One full test and three short tests were done.

EDUCATION

Two tests were done, comparing educational extremes.

RELIGION

ALL WOMEN

Three shorts were done, one of which meets the numerical criteria for inclusion.

MEN

Three short tests were done.

APPENDIX FOUR

DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES

TABLE 3-1

THE SAMPLE

NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
20	9%	22	10%	100	45%	142	64%	80	36%	222	100%

TABLE 3-2

WOMEN BY GROUP AFILIATION

NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.	
N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
20	14%	22	15%	100	70%	142	100%

TABLE 3-3

MEN BY GROUP AFFILIATION

MOOSE*		UNF. MEN*		ALL MEN	
N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
45	56%	35	44%	80	100%

LEGEND TABLES 3-1 -- 3-3

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC*   CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM*   UNAFFILIATED WOMEN
MOOSE*   LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE
UNF. MEN*   UNAFFILIATED MEN

TABLE 3-4

AGE OF SUBJECT BY GROUP AND GENDER

AGE	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER	N	PER	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
25-34	3	15%	0	0%	23	23%	26	20%	19	24%	45	21%
35-44	9	45%	11	50%	18	18%	28	21%	20	25%	48	23%
45-54	4	20%	5	23%	13	13%	22	17%	16	20%	38	18%
55-64	2	10%	4	18%	33	33%	39	30%	14	18%	53	25%
65+	2	10%	2	9%	13	13%	17	13%	11	14%	28	13%
TOTAL	20	100%	22	100%	100	100%	132	100%	80	100%	212	100%

TABLE 3-5

OCCUPATION OF SUBJECTS BY GROUP AND GENDER

OCCUP.	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
PROFESS.	N	PER	N	PER	N	PER	N	PER	N	PER	N	PER
MANAGER	5	31%	17	77%	22	22%	44	33%	16	21%	60	28%
SALES	3	19%	5	23%	35	35%	40	30%	13	17%	53	25%
CLERICAL	1	6%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%	1	1%	3	1%
CRAFT	5	31%	0	0%	28	28%	33	24%	5	6%	38	18%
TRANSPORT.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	12	15%	12	6%
LABORER	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	8%	6	3%
SERVICE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	2	1%
MISC.	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	8	10%	8	4%
	2	13%	0	0%	13	13%	15	11%	15	19%	30	14%
TOTAL	16	100%	22	100%	100	100%	135	100%	78	100%	212	100%

LEGEND TABLES 3-4 -- 3-5

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC*   CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.*   UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 3-6

SOURCE OF SUBJECT'S RELIGION BY GROUP AND GENDER

SOURCE	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
PARENTS	16	94%	16	73%	95	95%	127	100%	76	95%	203	100%
SELF	1	6%	6	27%	5	5%		0%	4	5%		0%
TOTAL	17	100%	22	100%	100	100%	127	100%	80	100%	203	100%

TABLE 3-7

SUBJECT RELIGION BY GENDER AND GROUP

RELIGION	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
CATHOLIC	6	30%	3	14%	6	6%	15	11%	31	39%	46	21%
PROTEST.	13	65%	8	36%	24	24%	45	32%	31	39%	76	34%
JEWISH	1	5%	9	41%	65	65%	75	53%	14	18%	89	40%
OTHER	0	0%	2	9%	5	5%	7	5%	4	5%	11	5%
TOTAL	20	100%	22	100%	100	100%	142	100%	80	100%	222	100%

LEGEND TABLES 3-6 -- 3-7

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC*   CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.*   UNAFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 3-8

ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF SUBJECTS BY GENDER AND GROUP

ETHNICITY	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
BLACK	2	11%	3	14%	8	8%	13	9%	4	5%	17	8%
HISPANIC	4	21%	1	5%	4	4%	9	7%	1	1%	10	5%
WHITE	13	68%	18	82%	85	85%	116	84%	73	92%	189	86%
OTHER	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	4	2%
TOTAL	19	100%	22	100%	100	100%	138	100%	79	100%	220	100%

TABLE 3-9

EDUCATION OF SUBJECTS BY GENDER AND GROUP

EDUCATION	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
LESS THAN H.S*	4	20%	0	0%	3	3%	7	5%	16	20%	23	10%
H.S. GRAD.*	10	50%	0	0%	30	30%	40	28%	19	24%	59	27%
2 YRS. COLL.*	5	25%	0	0%	35	35%	40	28%	15	19%	55	25%
COLL. GRAD. *	1	5%	2	9%	11	11%	14	10%	14	18%	28	13%
POST COLL.*	0	0%	20	91%	21	21%	41	29%	15	19%	56	25%
TOTAL	20	100%	22	100%	100	100%	142	100%	79	100%	221	100%

LEGEND TABLES 3-8 -- 3-9
LESS THAN H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S. GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YRS. COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST COLLEGE DEGREE
NCNW* NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC* CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 3-10

MARITAL STATUS OF SUBJECTS BY GENDER AND GROUP

STATUS	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
MARRIED	7	35%	10	45%	61	61%	78	55%	44	56%	122	55%
SINGLE	4	20%	6	27%	18	18%	28	20%	25	32%	53	24%
DEV./SEP.	5	25%	5	23%	11	11%	21	15%	6	8%	27	12%
WIDOWED	4	20%	1	5%	10	10%	15	11%	4	5%	19	9%
TOTAL	20	100%	22	100%	100	100%	142	100%	79	100%	221	100%

TABLE 3-11

FAMILY INCOME OF SUBJECTS BY GENDER AND GROUP

INCOME	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM		MEN		ALL SUB	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
$10,000/-	8	44%	0	0%	17	17%	25	18%	15	19%	40	18%
$11-20,000	7	39%	5	23%	30	30%	42	30%	20	25%	62	28%
$21-30,000	2	11%	8	36%	26	26%	36	26%	20	25%	56	26%
$31-40,000	1	6%	2	9%	14	14%	17	12%	14	18%	31	14%
$41,000/+	0	0%	7	32%	12	12%	19	14%	10	13%	29	13%
TOTAL	18	100%	22	100%	99	100%	139	100%	79	100%	218	100%

LEGEND TABLES 3-10 -- 3-11

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC*   CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.*   UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 3-12

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF SUBJECTS
BY GROUP AND GENDER

ORGANIZATION	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WO.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER	N	PER.
RIGHTS												
CIVIL	0	0%	1	2%	3	3%	4	3%	1	2%	5	2%
HUMAN	0	0%	4	8%	2	2%	6	4%	1	2%	7	3%
WOMEN	0	0%	4	8%	5	5%	9	6%	0	0%	9	4%
GAY	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
N.S.*	1	14%	0	0%	3	3%	4	3%	3	5%	7	3%
ALL*	0	0%	3	6%	1	1%	4	3%	1	2%	5	2%
ENVIRONMENT												
MEM. 1/+	0	0%	3	6%	4	4%	7	4%	7	12%	14	7%
EDUCATIONAL												
EDUCATIONAL	0	0%	1	2%	3	3%	4	3%	3	5%	7	3%
POLITICAL												
REPUB. PAR.	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	2	4%	3	1%
DEM. PAR.	0	0%	3	6%	6	6%	9	6%	5	9%	14	7%
OTHER	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%
N.S.*	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	3	5%	4	2%
PROF.												
MEM. 1/+	0	0%	17	35%	14	13%	31	19%	14	25%	31	15%
RELIGIOUS												
CH/SYN MEM.*	3	43%	1	2%	20	19%	24	15%	5	9%	29	14%
ADD. MEM.*	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
OTHER*	0	0%	0	0%	20	19%	20	13%	3	5%	23	11%
N.S.*	0	0%	0	0%	6	6%	6	4%	2	4%	8	4%

TABLE 3-12 (CONTINUED)

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF SUBJECTS
BY GENDER AND GROUP

ORGANIZATION	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
OTHER												
CULTURAL	0	0%	8	17%	2	2%	10	6%	1	2%	11	5%
CIV./CHAR.*	2	29%	0	0%	1	1%	3	2%	1	2%	4	2%
HEALTH/FAM.*	0	0%	1	2%	2	2%	3	2%	0	0%	3	1%
FRATERNAL*	1	14%	0	0%	3	3%	4	3%	4	7%	8	4%
MISC.	0	0%	1	2%	3	3%	4	3%	1	2%	5	2%
TOTAL	7	100%	48	100%	104	100%	159	100%	57	100%	202	100%

LEGEND TABLE 3-12

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC*   CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.*   UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

RIGHTS
N.S.*   SUBJECT DID NOT SPECIFY TYPES OF AFFILIATIONS
ALL*   SUBJECT INDICATED MEMBERSHIP IN 1/MORE OF ALL TYPES LISTED

RELIGIOUS
CH/SYN MEM.*   CHURCH/SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
ADD. MEM.*   ADDITIONAL CHURCH OR SYNAGOGUE AFFILIATION
OTHER*   OTHER RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS
N.S.*   TYPE OF MEMBERSHIP NOT SPECIFIED

OTHER
CIV./CHAR.*   CIVIC/CHARITABLE
HEALTH/FAM.*   HEALTH/FAMILY
FRATERNAL*   FRATERNAL (EXCLUDING LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE)

TABLE 3-13

RESPONSE RATE OF SUBJECTS REGARDING
ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION BY GENDER AND GROUP

NUM.*	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
NONE	14	70%	1	5%	36	36%	51	36%	40	50%	91	41%
ONE	3	15%	5	23%	28	28%	36	25%	25	31%	61	27%
TWO/+	3	15%	16	73%	36	36%	55	39%	15	19%	70	32%
TOTAL	20	100%	22	100%	100	100%	142	100%	80	100%	222	100%

TABLE 3-14

NUMBER OF HOURS OF TELEVISION
VIEWED DAILY BY GENDER AND GROUP

HOURS*	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
0-1	0	0%	3	14%	6	6%	9	6%	0	0%	9	4%
1-2	8	40%	18	86%	44	44%	70	50%	34	43%	104	47%
3-4	6	30%	0	0%	39	39%	45	32%	32	40%	77	35%
5-6	5	25%	0	0%	5	5%	10	7%	10	13%	20	9%
7/+	1	5%	0	0%	5	5%	6	4%	4	5%	10	5%
TOTAL	20	100%	21	100%	99	100%	140	100%	80	100%	220	100%

LEGEND TABLES 3-13 - - 3-14

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC*   CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.*   UNAFFILIATED WOMEN
NUM.*   NUMBER OF SUBJECTS WHO INDICATED ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION(S)
HOURS*   HOUR(S) OF TELEVISION WATCHED DAILY BY SUBJECT

TABLE 3-15

TYPES OF SHOWS SUBJECTS
PREFER BY GENDER AND GROUP

SHOW	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
CRIME DR.	0	0%	1	3%	9	5%	10	4%	8	7%	18	5%
DOCUM/NEW	6	22%	8	23%	40	23%	54	23%	27	25%	81	24%
DRAMA	2	7%	8	23%	32	19%	42	18%	4	4%	46	13%
EDUC.	1	4%	5	14%	14	8%	20	9%	9	8%	29	8%
MOVIES	2	7%	7	20%	24	14%	33	14%	20	18%	53	15%
QUIZ/GAME	3	11%	0	0%	7	4%	10	4%	3	3%	13	4%
RELIG.	0	0%	0	0%	9	5%	9	4%	6	5%	15	4%
SPECIALS	3	11%	0	0%	2	1%	5	2%	20	18%	25	7%
SPORTS	4	15%	1	3%	6	3%	11	5%	2	2%	13	4%
SOAPS	4	15%	1	3%	9	5%	14	6%	6	5%	20	6%
SIT. COM.	1	4%	0	0%	8	5%	9	4%	3	3%	12	3%
TALK	1	4%	1	3%	4	2%	6	3%	2	2%	8	2%
VARIETY	0	0%	1	3%	2	1%	3	1%	0	0%	3	1%
OTHER	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	3	1%	0	0%	3	1%
NO PREFS.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
NON-VIEWER	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
OLD MOVIES	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	3	1%	0	0%	3	1%
OPERA	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
TOTAL	27	100%	35	100%	172	100%	234	100%	110	100%	344	100%

LEGEND TABLE 3-15

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC*   CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.*   UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 3-16

TYPES OF SHOWS SUBJECTS LEAST
PREFER BY GENDER AND GROUP

SHOW	NCNW*		CUC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
CRIME DR.	1	4%	1	3%	14	9%	16	7%	4	4%	20	6%
DOCUM/NEW	3	11%	0	0%	1	1%	4	2%	0	0%	4	1%
DRAMA	1	4%	0	0%	2	1%	3	1%	6	6%	9	3%
EDUC.	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	2%	3	1%
MOVIES	0	0%	1	3%	1	1%	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
QUIZ/GAME	2	7%	7	22%	24	15%	33	15%	17	16%	50	15%
RELIG.	5	19%	13	41%	32	20%	50	23%	21	20%	71	22%
SPECIALS	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%	2	2%	3	1%
SPORTS	6	22%	4	13%	31	19%	41	18%	5	5%	46	14%
SOAPS	5	19%	4	13%	34	21%	43	19%	28	27%	71	22%
SIT. COM.	1	4%	0	0%	13	8%	14	6%	6	6%	20	6%
TALK	1	4%	1	3%	5	3%	7	3%	11	10%	18	6%
VARIETY	1	4%	1	3%	5	3%	7	3%	3	3%	10	3%
OTHER	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
NO PREFS.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
NON-VIEWER	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
OLD MOVIES	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
OPERA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	27	100%	32	100%	163	100%	222	100%	105	100%	327	100%

LEGEND TABLE 3-16

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CUC* CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.*   UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 3-17

NUMBER OF TIMES SUBJECT HAS SEEN
SHOW IN PAST YEAR BY GENDER AND GROUP

NUM.*	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
0	4	21%	10	48%	29	31%	43	32%	40	56%	83	41%
1/2	3	16%	3	14%	7	8%	13	10%	6	8%	19	9%
3/4	3	16%	3	14%	10	11%	16	12%	1	1%	17	8%
5/6	1	5%	0	0%	12	13%	13	10%	7	10%	20	10%
7/+	8	42%	5	24%	35	38%	48	36%	17	24%	65	32%
TOTAL	19	100%	21	100%	93	100%	133	100%	71	100%	204	100%

TABLE 3-18

NUMBER OF SUBJECTS WHO HAVE SEEN
THIS EPISODE BY GENDER AND GROUP

EPI.*	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
YES	10	50%	3	14%	28	28%	41	47%	18	23%	59	35%
NO	10	50%	19	86%	71	72%	46	53%	62	78%	108	65%
TOTAL	20	100%	22	100%	99	100%	87	100%	80	100%	167	100%

LEGEND TABLES 3-17 - - 3-18

NUM* NUMBER OF TIMES SUBJECT HAS SEEN SHOW IN PAST YEAR

EPI.* NUMBER OF TIMES SUBJECT HAS SEEN EPISODE IN PAST YEAR

NCNW* NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC* CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 3-19

DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN'S SCORES ON
DEMPLEWOLFF SEX ROLE ATTITUDE TEST

	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		ALL SUB	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
1* BELOW 3.162	3	25%	0	0%	7	18%	10	20%	41	38%
2* BETWEEN 3.162 & 3.503	3	25%	0	0%	12	31%	15	29%	31	28%
3* BETWEEN 3.844 & 3.503	6	50%	0	0%	20	51%	26	51%	37	34%
4* TOTAL BELOW 3.844	12	100%	0	0%	39	100%	51	100%	109	100%
5* BETWEEN 3.844 & 4.185	5	63%	0	0%	21	35%	26	29%	30	29%
6* BETWEEN 4.185 & 4.526	3	38%	3	14%	18	30%	24	27%	32	31%
7* ABOVE 4.526	0	0%	18	86%	21	35%	39	44%	43	41%
8* TOTAL ABOVE 3.844	8	100%	21	100%	60	100%	89	100%	104	100%
TOTAL	20	100%	21	100%	99	100%	140	100%	220	100%

LEGEND TABLE 3-19

1* 1 STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW MEAN (3.162)
2* BETWEEN 1/2 AND 1 STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW MEAN (3.162,3.503)
3* BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2 STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW MEAN (3.844,3.503)
4* TOTAL BELOW MEAN (3.844)
5* BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2 STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE MEAN (3.844,4.185)
6* BETWEEN 1/2 AND 1 STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE MEAN (4.185,4.526)
7* 1 STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE MEAN (4.526)
8* TOTAL SCORES ABOVE MEAN (3.844)

NCNW* NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC* CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 3-20

DISTRIBUTION OF MEN'S SCORES ON
DEMPLEWOLFF SEX ROLE ATTITUDE TEST

	MOOSE*		UNF. MEN*		ALL MEN		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
1* BELOW 3.162	27	68%	4	22%	31	53%	41	38%
2* BETWEEN 3.162 & 3.503	10	25%	6	33%	16	28%	31	28%
3* BETWEEN 3.844 & 3.503	3	8%	8	44%	11	19%	37	34%
4* TOTAL BELOW 3.844	40	100%	18	100%	58	100%	109	100%
5* BETWEEN 3.844 & 4.185	3	60%	7	41%	10	45%	30	29%
6* BETWEEN 4.185 & 4.526	2	40%	6	35%	8	36%	32	31%
7* ABOVE 4.526	0	0%	4	24%	4	18%	43	41%
8* TOTAL ABOVE 3.844	5	100%	17	100%	22	100%	104	100%
TOTAL	45	100%	35	100%	80	100%	220	100%

LEGEND TABLE 3-20

1* 1 STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW MEAN (3.162)
2* BETWEEN 1/2 AND 1 STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW MEAN (3.162,3.503)
3* BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2 STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW MEAN (3.844,3.503)
4* TOTAL BELOW MEAN (3.844)
5* BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2 STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE MEAN (3.844,4.185)
6* BETWEEN 1/2 AND 1 STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE MEAN (4.185,4.526)
7* 1 STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE MEAN (4.526)
8* TOTAL SCORES ABOVE MEAN (3.844)

MOOSE* LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE
UNF. MEN* UNAFFILIATED MEN

TABLE 4-1

AGE OF MOOSE AND OTHER SUBJECTS

AGE	MOOSE*		UNF. MEN*		ALL MEN		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
25-34 YRS.	3	7%	16	46%	19	24%	23	23%	26	18%	45	20%
35-44 YRS.	8	18%	12	34%	20	25%	18	18%	38	27%	58	26%
45-54 YRS.	14	31%	2	6%	16	20%	13	13%	22	15%	38	17%
55-64 YRS.	12	27%	2	6%	14	18%	33	33%	39	27%	53	24%
65/+ YRS.	8	18%	3	9%	11	14%	13	13%	17	12%	28	13%
TOTAL	45	100%	35	100%	80	100%	100	100%	142	100%	222	100%

MOOSE* LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE
UNF. MEN.* UNAFFILIATED MEN
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-2

HOURS OF TELEVISION
VIEWING DAILY BY AGE

VIEWING*	AGE	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
0-1 HRS.	25-34	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%
1-2 HRS.		1	33%	0	0%	8	36%	9	36%	7	37%	16	36%
3-4 HRS.		1	33%	0	0%	10	45%	11	44%	11	58%	22	50%
5-6 HRS.		1	33%	0	0%	3	14%	4	16%	1	5%	5	11%
7/MORE HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		3	100%	0	0%	22	100%	25	100%	19	100%	44	100%
0-2 HRS.		1	33%	0	0%	9	41%	10	40%	0	0%	17	39%
3-4/MORE HRS.		2	67%	0	0%	13	59%	15	60%	12	63%	27	61%
5-6/MORE HRS.		1	33%	0	0%	3	14%	4	16%	1	5%	5	11%
0-1 HRS.	35-44	0	0%	1	9%	3	17%	4	14%	0	0%	4	9%
1-2 HRS.		4	44%	10	91%	7	39%	11	39%	12	63%	23	49%
3-4 HRS.		2	22%	0	0%	6	33%	8	29%	4	21%	12	26%
5-6 HRS.		2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	2	7%	3	16%	5	11%
7/MORE HRS.		1	11%	0	0%	2	11%	3	11%	0	0%	3	6%
TOTAL		9	100%	11	100%	18	100%	28	100%	19	100%	47	100%
0-2 HRS.		4	44%	11	100%	10	56%	15	54%	12	63%	27	57%
3-4/MORE HRS.		5	56%	0	0%	8	44%	13	46%	7	37%	20	43%
5-6/MORE HRS.		3	33%	0	0%	2	11%	5	18%	3	16%	8	17%

TABLE 4-2 (CONTINUED)

HOURS OF TELEVISION
VIEWING DAILY BY AGE

VIEWING*	AGE	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
0-1 HRS.	45-54	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%	2	12%	0	0%	2	6%
1-2 HRS.		2	50%	0	0%	7	54%	9	53%	5	31%	14	42%
3-4 HRS.		1	25%	0	0%	4	31%	5	29%	7	44%	12	36%
5-6 HRS.		1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	2	13%	3	9%
7/MORE HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	2	6%
TOTAL		4	100%	0	0%	13	100%	17	100%	16	100%	33	100%
0-2 HRS.		2	50%	0	0%	9	69%	11	65%	5	31%	16	48%
3-4/MORE HRS.		2	50%	0	0%	4	31%	6	35%	11	69%	17	52%
5-6/MORE HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	2	6%
0-1 HRS.	55-64	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1-2 HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	14	42%	14	40%	6	43%	20	40%
3-4 HRS.		1	50%	0	0%	16	48%	17	49%	5	36%	23	46%
5-6 HRS.		1	50%	0	0%	2	6%	3	9%	3	21%	6	12%
7/MORE HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	1	2%
TOTAL		2	100%	0	0%	33	100%	35	100%	14	100%	50	100%
0-2 HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	14	42%	14	40%	6	43%	20	40%
3-4/MORE HRS.		2	100%	0	0%	19	58%	21	60%	8	57%	29	58%
5-6/MORE HRS.		1	50%	0	0%	1	3%	2	6%	3	21%	5	10%

TABLE 4-2 (CONTINUED)

HOURS OF TELEVISION
VIEWING DAILY BY AGE

VIEWING*	AGE	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
0-1 HRS.	65/MORE	1	50%	0	0%	8	62%	11	65%	4	36%	15	54%
1-2 HRS.		1	50%	0	0%	3	23%	4	24%	5	45%	9	32%
3-4 HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	1	4%
5-6 HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	2	15%	2	12%	1	9%	3	11%
7/MORE HRS.		2	100%	0	0%	13	100%	17	100%	11	100%	28	100%
TOTAL		1	50%	0	0%	8	62%	11	65%	4	36%	15	54%
0-2 HRS.		1	50%	0	0%	5	38%	6	35%	7	64%	13	46%
3-4/MORE HRS.		0	0%	0	0%	2	15%	2	12%	2	18%	4	14%
5-6/MORE HRS.													

LEGEND TABLE 4-3

VIEWING* HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWED DAILY BY SUBJECT

NCNW* NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC* CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-3

RELIGION BY AGE, GENDER
AND GROUP OF SUBJECTS

RELIGION	AGE	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
JEWISH	25-34	0	0%	0	0%	13	20%	13	17%	4	29%	17	19%
	35-44	0	0%	4	44%	6	9%	10	13%	6	43%	16	18%
	45-54	1	100%	3	33%	9	14%	13	17%	0	0%	13	15%
	55-64	0	0%	2	22%	27	42%	29	39%	2	14%	31	35%
	65/+	0	0%	0	0%	10	15%	10	13%	2	14%	12	13%
	TOTAL	1	100%	9	100%	65	100%	75	100%	14	100%	89	100%
CATHOLIC	25-34	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	6	19%	9	20%
	35-44	3	50%	0	0%	5	83%	8	53%	1	3%	9	20%
	45-54	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	1	7%	10	32%	11	24%
	55-64	0	0%	1	33%	1	17%	2	13%	7	23%	9	20%
	65/+	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	1	7%	7	23%	8	17%
	TOTAL	6	100%	3	100%	6	100%	15	100%	31	100%	46	100%
PROT.	25-34	0	0%	0	0%	8	33%	8	16%	8	26%	16	20%
	35-44	6	46%	5	63%	5	21%	21	42%	12	39%	33	41%
	45-54	3	23%	1	13%	4	17%	8	16%	4	13%	12	15%
	55-64	2	15%	1	13%	4	17%	7	14%	5	16%	12	15%
	65/+	2	15%	1	13%	3	13%	6	12%	2	6%	8	10%
	TOTAL	13	100%	8	100%	24	100%	50	100%	31	100%	81	100%

TABLE 4-3 (CONTINUED)

RELIGION BY AGE, GENDER
AND GROUP OF SUBJECTS

RELIGION		NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
	AGE	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
OTHER	25-34	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	2	29%	1	25%	3	27%
	35-44	0	0%	2	100%	2	40%	4	57%	1	25%	5	45%
	45-54	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	18%
	55-64	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	1	14%	0	0%	1	9%
	65/+	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL	0	0%	2	100%	5	100%	7	100%	4	100%	11	100%

LEGEND FOR TABLE 4-3

NCNW* NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC* CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-4

EDUCATION OF SUBJECTS BY
GENDER AGE AND GROUP

EDUCATION	AGE*	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
LESS THAN H.S.*	25-34	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%
H.S. GRAD.*		1	33%	0	0%	3	13%	4	15%	2	11%	6	13%
2 YRS. COLL.*		0	0%	0	0%	9	39%	9	35%	5	26%	14	31%
COLL. GRAD.*		1	33%	0	0%	4	17%	5	19%	8	42%	13	29%
POST COLL.*		0	0%	0	0%	7	30%	7	27%	4	21%	11	24%
TOTAL		3	100%	0	0%	23	100%	26	100%	19	100%	45	100%
LESS THAN H.S.*	35-44	3	33%	0	0%	1	6%	4	11%	2	10%	6	10%
H.S. GRAD.*		5	56%	0	0%	5	28%	10	26%	6	30%	16	28%
2 YRS. COLL.*		1	11%	0	0%	2	11%	3	8%	2	10%	5	9%
COLL. GRAD.*		0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	2	5%	4	20%	6	10%
POST COLL.*		0	0%	11	100%	8	44%	19	50%	6	30%	25	43%
TOTAL		9	100%	11	100%	18	100%	38	100%	20	100%	58	100%
LESS THAN H.S.*	45-54	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	60%	9	24%
H.S. GRAD.*		2	50%	0	0%	6	46%	8	36%	3	20%	11	30%
2 YRS. COLL.*		2	50%	0	0%	3	23%	5	23%	3	20%	8	22%
COLL. GRAD.*		0	0%	0	0%	2	15%	2	9%	0	0%	2	5%
POST COLL.*		0	0%	5	100%	2	15%	7	32%	0	0%	7	19%
TOTAL		4	100%	5	100%	13	100%	22	100%	15	100%	37	100%

TABLE 4-4 (CONTINUED)

EDUCATION OF SUBJECTS BY
GENDER AGE AND GROUP

EDUCATION	AGE*	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
LESS THAN H.S.*	55-64	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	2	5%	1	7%	3	6%
H.S. GRAD.*		1	50%	0	0%	12	36%	13	33%	6	43%	19	36%
2 YRS. COLL.*		1	50%	0	0%	13	39%	14	36%	3	21%	17	32%
COLL. GRAD.*		0	0%	2	50%	3	9%	5	13%	1	7%	6	11%
POST COLL.*		0	0%	2	50%	3	9%	5	13%	3	21%	8	15%
TOTAL		2	100%	4	100%	33	100%	39	100%	14	100%	53	100%
LESS THAN H.S.*	65+	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	36%	4	14%
H.S. GRAD.*		1	50%	0	0%	4	31%	5	29%	2	18%	7	25%
2 YRS. COLL.*		1	50%	0	0%	8	62%	9	53%	2	18%	11	39%
COLL. GRAD.*		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	1	4%
POST COLL.*		0	0%	2	100%	1	8%	3	18%	2	18%	5	18%
TOTAL		2	100%	2	100%	13	100%	17	100%	11	100%	28	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-4

LESS THAN H.S.*   LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S. GRAD.*   HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YRS. COLL.*   2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRAUDATE
POST COLL.*   POST GRADUATE DEGREE

NCNW*   NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC*   CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.*   UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-5

HOURS OF DAILY VIEWING OF TELEVISION
BY GENDER, GROUP AND EDUCATION

TV*	EDUCATION	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
0-1*	LESS THAN H.S.*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	H.S. GRAD.*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	2 YRS. COLL.*	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
	COLL. GRAD*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	POST COLL.*	0	0%	3	14%	4	4%	7	5%	0	0%	7	3%
1-2*	LESS THAN H.S.*	2	10%	0	0%	3	3%	5	4%	3	4%	8	4%
	H.S. GRAD.*	3	15%	0	0%	9	9%	12	9%	7	9%	19	9%
	2 YRS. COLL.*	2	10%	0	0%	19	19%	21	15%	4	5%	25	11%
	COLL. GRAD*	0	0%	2	10%	6	6%	8	6%	8	10%	16	7%
	POST COLL.*	1	5%	16	76%	7	7%	24	17%	11	14%	35	16%
3-4*	LESS THAN H.S.*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	10%	8	4%
	H.S. GRAD.*	3	15%	0	0%	16	16%	19	14%	8	10%	27	12%
	2 YRS. COLL.*	3	15%	0	0%	11	11%	14	10%	9	11%	25	11%
	COLL. GRAD*	0	0%	0	0%	5	5%	5	4%	4	5%	9	4%
	POST COLL.*	0	0%	0	0%	7	7%	7	5%	3	4%	10	5%
5-6*	LESS THAN H.S.*	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	3	4%	5	2%
	H.S. GRAD.*	3	15%	0	0%	2	2%	5	4%	3	4%	8	4%
	2 YRS. COLL.*	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%
	COLL. GRAD*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	2	1%
	POST COLL.*	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	1	1%	3	1%

TABLE 4-5 (CONTINUED)

HOURS OF DAILY VIEWING OF TELEVISION
BY GENDER, GROUP AND EDUCATION

TV*	EDUCATION	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
7/+*	LESS THAN H.S.*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	2	1%
	H.S. GRAD.*	1	5%	0	0%	3	3%	4	3%	1	1%	5	2%
	2 YRS. COLL.*	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	1	1%	3	1%
	COLL. GRAD*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	POST COLL.*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		20	100%	21	100%	99	100%	140	100%	79	100%	221	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-5

TV* AMOUNT OF TELEVISION VIEWING DAILY IN HOURS
0-1* LESS THAN ONE HOUR OF TELEVISION A DAY
1-2* ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY
3-4* THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY
5-6* FIVE TO SIX HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY
7/+* MORE THAN SEVEN HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY

ED.* EDUCATION OF SUBJECT
LESS THAN H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S. GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YRS. COLL.* TWO YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

NCNW* NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC* CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-6

DAILY HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWING
BY GENDER, GROUP, AND RELIGION

TV*	RLG*	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
0-1*	JEW.	0	0%	1	5%	4	4%	5	4%	0	0%	5	2%
	CATH.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	PROT.	0	0%	1	5%	2	2%	3	2%	0	0%	3	1%
	OTHER	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%
1-2*	JEW.	0	0%	7	33%	28	28%	35	25%	8	10%	43	20%
	CATH.	2	10%	3	14%	2	2%	7	5%	10	13%	17	8%
	PROT.	6	30%	7	33%	12	12%	25	18%	14	18%	39	18%
	OTHER	0	0%	1	5%	2	2%	3	2%	2	3%	5	0%
3-4*	JEW.	1	5%	0	0%	26	26%	27	19%	3	4%	30	14%
	CATH.	2	10%	0	0%	4	4%	6	4%	14	18%	20	9%
	PROT.	3	15%	0	0%	7	7%	10	7%	13	16%	23	10%
	OTHER	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	2	3%	4	0%
5-6*	JEW.	0	0%	0	0%	4	4%	4	3%	3	4%	7	3%
	CATH.	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	4	5%	5	2%
	PROT.	4	0%	0	0%	1	1%	5	4%	3	4%	8	4%
	OTHER	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

TABLE 4-6 (CONTINUED)

DAILY HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWING
BY GENDER, GROUP, AND RELIGION

TV*	RLG*	NCNW*		CWC*		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		MEN		ALL SUB.	
		N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
7/+*	JEW.	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
	CATH.	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3	4%	4	2%
	PROT.	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	1	1%	3	1%
	OTHER	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%
TOTAL		20	100%	21	100%	99	100%	140	100%	80	100%	220	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-6

HRS* HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWED DAILY BY SUBJECTS
0-1* NONE TO ONE HOUR A DAY OF TELEVISION VIEWING
1-2* ONE TO TWO HOURS A DAY OF TELEVISION VIEWING
3-4* THREE TO FOUR HOURS A DAY OF TELEVISION VIEWING
5-6* FIVE TO SIX HOURS A DAY OF TELEVISION VIEWING
7/+* MORE THAN SEVEN HOURS A DAY OF TELEVISION VIEWING

RLG* RELIGION OF SUBJECT

NCNW* NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
CWC* CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-7

EDUCATION OF MOOSE AND OTHER GROUPS

EDUCATION	MOOSE*		UNF. MEN*		ALL MEN		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
LESS THAN H.S.*	13	30%	3	9%	16	20%	3	3%	7	5%	23	10%
H.S. GRAD.*	16	36%	3	9%	19	24%	30	30%	40	28%	59	27%
2 YRS COLL.*	9	20%	6	17%	15	19%	35	35%	40	28%	55	25%
COLL. GRAD.*	4	9%	10	29%	14	18%	11	11%	14	10%	28	13%
POST COLL.*	2	5%	13	37%	15	19%	21	21%	41	29%	56	25%
TOTAL	44	100%	35	100%	79	100%	100	100%	142	100%	221	100%

LEGEND TABLES 4-7

LESS THAN H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S. GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YRS COLL.* TWO YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL. * POST GRADUATE DEGREE

MOOSE* LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE
UNF. MEN* UNAFFILIATED MEN
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-8

RELIGION OF MOOSE AND OTHER GROUPS

RELIGION	MOOSE*		UNF. MEN*		ALL MEN		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
JEWISH	0	0%	14	40%	14	18%	65	65%	75	53%	89	40%
CATHOLIC	25	56%	6	17%	31	39%	6	6%	15	11%	46	21%
PROTESTANT	17	38%	14	40%	31	39%	24	24%	45	32%	76	34%
OTHER	3	7%	1	3%	4	5%	5	5%	7	5%	11	5%
TOTAL	45	100%	35	100%	80	100%	100	100%	142	100%	222	100%

LEGEND TABLES 4-8

MOOSE* LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE
UNF. MEN* UNAFFILIATED MEN
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-9

NUMBER OF HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWED
DAILY BY MOOSE AND OTHER SUBJECTS

HOURS*	MOOSE*		UNF. MEN*		ALL MEN		UNF. WOM.*		ALL WOM.		ALL SUB.	
	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.	N	PER.
0-1 HRS.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	6%	9	6%	9	4%
1-2 HRS.	16	36%	18	51%	34	43%	44	44%	70	50%	104	47%
3-4 HRS.	20	44%	12	34%	32	40%	39	39%	45	32%	77	35%
5-6 HRS.	5	11%	5	14%	10	13%	5	5%	10	7%	20	9%
7/+ HRS.	4	9%	0	0%	4	5%	5	5%	6	4%	10	5%
TOTAL	45	100%	35	100%	80	100%	99	100%	140	100%	220	100%
0-2 HRS.	16	36%	18	51%	34	43%	50	51%	79	56%	143	65%
3-4/MORE HRS.	29	64%	17	49%	46	58%	49	49%	61	44%	107	49%
5-6/MORE HRS.	9	20%	5	14%	14	18%	10	10%	16	11%	30	14%

LEGEND TABLE 4-9

HOURS* NUMBER OF HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWED DAILY

MOOSE* LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE
UNF. MEN* UNAFFILIATED MEN
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLES 4-10 -- 4-15
DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF VIEWING HABITS OF WOMEN AND MEN IN
TESTS IN WHICH MORE 50% OF THE VARIABLES DIFFER SIGNIFICANTLY.

TABLE 4-10

WOMEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
ALL WOMEN	25-34	11	24%	LESS THAN H.S.*	0	0%	JEWISH	27	60%
	35-44	8	18%	H.S. GRAD.*	19	42%	CATHOLIC	6	13%
	45-54	5	11%	2 YR. COLL.*	14	31%	PROT.	10	22%
	55-64	17	38%	COLL. GRAD.*	5	11%	OTHER	2	4%
	65/+	4	9%	POST COLL.*	7	16%			0%
	TOTAL	45	100%	TOTAL	45	100%	TOTAL	45	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-10

LESS THAN.H.S.*   LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.*   HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.*   2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.*   COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

TABLE 4-11

WOMEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE	N	PER.	EDUCATION	N	PER.	RELIGION	N	PER.
ALL WOMEN	25-34	11	24%	LESS THAN H.S.*	0	0%	JEWISH	27	60%
	35-44	8	18%	H.S. GRAD.*	19	42%	CATHOLIC	6	13%
	45-54	5	11%	2 YR. COLL.*	14	31%	PROT.	10	22%
	55-64	17	38%	COLL. GRAD.*	5	11%	OTHER	2	4%
	65/+	4	9%	POST COLL.*	7	16%			0%
	TOTAL	45	100%	TOTAL	45	100%	TOTAL	45	100%
MEN							JEWISH		
	25-34	11	34%	LESS THAN H.S.*	8	25%	CATHOLIC	3	9%
	35-44	4	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	8	25%	PROT.	14	44%
	45-54	7	22%	2 YR. COLL.*	9	28%	OTHER	13	41%
	55-64	5	16%	COLL. GRAD.*	4	13%		2	6%
	65/+	5	16%	POST COLL.*	3	9%			0%
							TOTAL		
	TOTAL	32	100%	TOTAL	32	100%	TOTAL	32	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-11

LESS THAN.H.S.*   LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.*   HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.*   2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.*   COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

230

TABLE 4-12

WOMEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY OR MORE;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
ALL WOMEN	25-34	15	25%	LESS THAN H.S.*	2	3%	JEWISH	33	54%
	35-44	13	21%	H.S. GRAD.*	28	46%	CATHOLIC	8	13%
	45-54	6	10%	2 YR. COLL.*	17	28%	PROT.	17	28%
	55-64	21	34%	COLL. GRAD.*	5	8%	OTHER	3	5%
	65/+	6	10%	POST COLL.*	9	15%			0%
	TOTAL	61	100%	TOTAL	61	100%	TOTAL	61	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-12

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

TABLE 4-13

WOMEN WATCH FIVE HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY OR MORE;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE	N	PER.	EDUCATION	N	PER.	RELIGION	N	PER.
ALL WOMEN	25-34	4	25%	LESS THAN H.S.*	2	13%	JEWISH	6	29%
	35-44	5	31%	H.S. GRAD.*	9	56%	CATHOLIC	2	10%
	45-54	1	6%	2 YR. COLL.*	3	19%	PROT.	12	57%
	55-64	4	25%	COLL. GRAD.*	0	0%	OTHER	1	5%
	65/+	2	13%	POST COLL.*	2	13%			0%
	TOTAL	16	100%	TOTAL	16	100%	TOTAL	21	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-13

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

TABLE 4-14

WOMEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY OR LESS;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
ALL WOMEN	25-34	10	13%	LESS THAN H.S.*	5	6%	JEWISH	40	51%
	35-44	25	32%	H.S. GRAD.*	12	15%	CATHOLIC	7	9%
	45-54	15	19%	2 YR. COLL.*	23	29%	PROT.	28	35%
	55-64	18	23%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	10%	OTHER	4	5%
	65/+	11	14%	POST COLL.*	31	39%			0%
	TOTAL	79	100%	TOTAL	79	100%	TOTAL	79	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-14

LESS THAN.H.S.*   LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.*   HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.*   2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.*   COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

TABLE 4-15

WOMEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
ALL WOMEN	25-34	9	13%	LESS THAN H.S.*	5	7%	JEWISH	35	50%
	35-44	21	30%	H.S. GRAD.*	12	17%	CATHOLIC	7	10%
	45-54	13	19%	2 YR. COLL.*	21	30%	PROT.	25	36%
	55-64	16	23%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	11%	OTHER	3	4%
	65/+	11	16%	POST COLL.*	24	34%			0%
	TOTAL	70	100%	TOTAL	70	100%	TOTAL	70	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-15

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

TABLES 4-16 -- 4-17
DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF VIEWING HABITS OF WOMEN AND MEN OF TESTS IN
WHICH BETWEEN 25 AND 50% OF THE VARIABLES DIFFER SIGNIFICANTLY.

TABLE 4-16

WOMEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
ALL WOMEN	25-34	9	13%	LESS THAN H.S.*	5	7%	JEWISH	35	50%
	35-44	21	30%	H.S. GRAD.*	12	17%	CATHOLIC	7	10%
	45-54	13	19%	2 YR. COLL.*	21	30%	PROT.	25	36%
	55-64	16	23%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	11%	OTHER	3	4%
	65/+	11	16%	POST COLL.*	24	34%			0%
	TOTAL	70	100%	TOTAL	70	100%	TOTAL	70	100%
MEN	25-34	11	34%	LESS THAN H.S.*	8	25%	JEWISH	3	9%
	35-44	4	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	8	25%	CATHOLIC	14	44%
	45-54	7	22%	2 YR. COLL.*	9	28%	PROT.	13	41%
	55-64	5	16%	COLL. GRAD.*	4	13%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	5	16%	POST COLL.*	3	9%			0%
	TOTAL	32	100%	TOTAL	32	100%	TOTAL	32	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-16

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

TABLE 4-17

WOMEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY OR LESS;
MEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS A DAY OF TELEVISION OR MORE.

GENDER	AGE	N	PER.	EDUCATION	N	PER.	RELIGION	N	PER.
WOMEN	25-34	10	13%	LESS THAN H.S.*	5	6%	JEWISH	40	51%
	35-44	25	32%	H.S. GRAD.*	12	15%	CATHOLIC	7	9%
	45-54	15	19%	2 YR. COLL.*	23	29%	PROT.	28	35%
	55-64	18	23%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	10%	OTHER	4	5%
	65/+	11	14%	POST COLL.*	31	39%			0%
	TOTAL	79	100%	TOTAL	79	100%	TOTAL	79	100%
MEN	25-34	12	26%	LESS THAN H.S.*	13	28%	JEWISH	6	13%
	35-44	8	17%	H.S. GRAD.*	12	26%	CATHOLIC	21	46%
	45-54	11	24%	2 YR. COLL.*	11	24%	PROT.	17	37%
	55-64	8	17%	COLL. GRAD.*	6	13%	OTHER	2	4%
	65/+	7	15%	POST COLL.*	4	9%			
	TOTAL	46	100%	TOTAL	46	100%	TOTAL	46	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-17

LESS THAN.H.S.*   LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.*   HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.*   2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.*   COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE

TABLES 4-18 -- 4-20
DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF VIEWING HABITS OF UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN
OF TESTS IN WHICH MORE THAN 50% OF THE VARIBLES DIFFER SIGNIFICANTLY.

TABLE 4-18

WOMEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE	N	PER.	EDUCATION	N	PER.	RELIGION	N	PER.
UNF. WOM.*	25-34	10	26%	LESS THAN H.S.*	0	0%	JEWISH	26	67%
	35-44	6	15%	H.S. GRAD.*	16	41%	CATHOLIC	4	10%
	45-54	4	10%	2 YR. COLL.*	11	28%	PROT.	7	18%
	55-64	16	41%	COLL. GRAD.*	5	13%	OTHER	2	5%
	65/+	3	8%	POST COLL.*	7	18%			0%
	TOTAL	39	100%	TOTAL	39	100%	TOTAL	39	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-18

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-19

WOMEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY OR MORE;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
UNF. WOM.*	25-34	13	27%	LESS THAN H.S.*	0	0%	JEWISH	32	65%
	35-44	8	16%	H.S. GRAD.*	21	43%	CATHOLIC	4	8%
	45-54	4	8%	2 YR. COLL.*	14	29%	PROT.	10	20%
	55-64	19	39%	COLL. GRAD.*	5	10%	OTHER	3	6%
	65/+	5	10%	POST COLL.*	9	18%			0%
	TOTAL	49	100%	TOTAL	49	100%	TOTAL	49	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-19

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-20

WOMEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE	N	PER.	EDUCATION	N	PER.	RELIGION	N	PER.
UNF. WOM.*	25-34	10	26%	LESS THAN H.S.*	0	0%	JEWISH	26	67%
	35-44	6	15%	H.S. GRAD.*	16	41%	CATHOLIC	4	10%
	45-54	4	10%	2 YR. COLL.*	11	28%	PROT.	7	18%
	55-64	16	41%	COLL. GRAD.*	5	13%	OTHER	2	5%
	65/+	3	8%	POST COLL.*	7	18%			0%
	TOTAL	39	100%	TOTAL	39	100%	TOTAL	39	100%
MEN	25-34	11	34%	LESS THAN H.S.*	8	25%	JEWISH	3	9%
	35-44	4	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	8	25%	CATHOLIC	14	44%
	45-54	7	22%	2 YR. COLL.*	9	28%	PROT.	13	41%
	55-64	5	16%	COLL. GRAD.*	4	13%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	5	16%	POST COLL.*	3	9%			0%
	TOTAL	32	100%	TOTAL	32	100%	TOTAL	32	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-20

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLES 4-21 -- 4-23
DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF VIEWING HABITS OF UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN
IN TESTS WITH BETWEEN 25 AND 50% SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT VARIABLES

TABLE 4-21

WOMEN WATCH LESS THAN ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
UNF. WOM.*	25-34	9	18%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	6%	JEWISH	32	64%
	35-44	10	20%	H.S. GRAD.*	9	18%	CATHOLIC	2	4%
	45-54	9	18%	2 YR. COLL.*	21	42%	PROT.	14	28%
	55-64	14	28%	COLL. GRAD.*	6	12%	OTHER	2	4%
	65/+	8	16%	POST COLL.*	11	22%			0%
	TOTAL	50	100%	TOTAL	50	100%	TOTAL	50	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-21

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-22

WOMEN WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
UNF. WOM.*	25-34	8	18%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	7%	JEWISH	28	64%
	35-44	7	16%	H.S. GRAD.*	9	20%	CATHOLIC	2	5%
	45-54	7	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	19	43%	PROT.	12	27%
	55-64	14	32%	COLL. GRAD.*	6	14%	OTHER	2	5%
	65/+	8	18%	POST COLL.*	7	16%			0%
	TOTAL	44	100%	TOTAL	44	100%	TOTAL	44	100%
MEN	25-34	11	34%	LESS THAN H.S.*	8	25%	JEWISH	3	9%
	35-44	4	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	8	25%	CATHOLIC	14	44%
	45-54	7	22%	2 YR. COLL.*	9	28%	PROT.	13	41%
	55-64	5	16%	COLL. GRAD.*	4	13%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	5	16%	POST COLL.*	3	9%			0%
	TOTAL	32	100%	TOTAL	32	100%	TOTAL	32	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-22

LESS THAN.H.S.* LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.* HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.* 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.* COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

TABLE 4-23

WOMEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION A DAY.

GENDER	AGE			EDUCATION			RELIGION		
		N	PER.		N	PER.		N	PER.
UNF. WOM.*	25-34	8	18%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	7%	JEWISH	28	64%
	35-44	7	16%	H.S. GRAD.*	9	20%	CATHOLIC	2	5%
	45-54	7	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	19	43%	PROT.	12	27%
	55-64	14	32%	COLL. GRAD.*	6	14%	OTHER	2	5%
	65/+	8	18%	POST COLL.*	7	16%			0%
	TOTAL	44	100%	TOTAL	44	100%	TOTAL	44	100%
MEN	25-34	12	32%	LESS THAN H.S.*	3	9%	JEWISH	8	24%
	35-44	5	13%	H.S. GRAD.*	7	21%	CATHOLIC	10	29%
	45-54	6	16%	2 YR. COLL.*	4	12%	PROT.	14	41%
	55-64	4	11%	COLL. GRAD.*	8	24%	OTHER	2	6%
	65/+	11	29%	POST COLL.*	11	33%			0%
	TOTAL	38	100%	TOTAL	33	100%	TOTAL	34	100%

LEGEND TABLE 4-23

LESS THAN.H.S.*   LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
H.S.GRAD.*   HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2 YR COLL.*   2 YEARS OF COLLEGE
COLL. GRAD.*   COLLEGE GRADUATE
POST COLL.* POST GRADUATE DEGREE
UNF. WOM.* UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

APPENDIX FIVE

TABLES SUMMARIZING FINDINGS

TABLE A-1
ALL WOMEN ONE STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE THE MEAN (4.526)
MEN ONE STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW THE MEAN (3.162)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	39	4.7652	.145	33.17	.000**	66
	men	29	2.7365	.344			
ALRL	wom	40	4.0283	.981	2.13	.037*	67
	men	29	3.5931	.589			
ALPO	wom	39	3.7230	.510	2.41	.019*	62
	men	25	3.3377	.772			
AMRL	wom	40	3.9803	.686	5.21	.000**	67
	men	29	3.1737	.557			
APAR	wom	40	3.7917	.646	1.88	.064	67
	men	29	3.4540	.845			
ARPO	wom	39	4.4530	.992	4.45	.000**	61
	men	24	3.2847	1.146			
ASPO	wom	39	4.3120	.456	4.28	.000**	61
	men	24	3.6424	.788			
APER	wom	40	4.3882	.445	3.57	.001**	63
	men	25	3.7733	.937			
MLRL	wom	39	4.2991	.979	2.93	.005**	66
	men	29	3.4828	1.320			
MLPO	wom	39	3.0339	.643	.33	.739	61
	men	24	2.9740	.763			
MRAN	wom	40	3.1492	1.226	1.88	.064	67
	men	29	2.6552	.826			
MRPO	wom	40	3.1250	.972	.53	.597	61
	men	23	2.9928	.916			
MSPO	wom	37	4.3514	1.495	2.64	.010**	64
	men	29	3.2069	2.024			
MPER	wom	39	3.8746	.740	2.04	.046*	
	men	24	3.4410	.936			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-2
ALL WOMEN ABOVE MEAN AND MEN BELOW MEAN (3.844)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	89	4.4467	.329	20.13	.000**	144
	men	57	3.1072	.475			
ALRL	wom	90	4.1059	.860	2.91	.004**	145
	men	57	3.7029	.749			
ALPO	wom	88	3.6853	.537	3.67	.000**	138
	men	52	3.2826	.758			
AMRL	wom	90	3.8735	.553	5.25	.000**	145
	men	57	3.3680	.593			
APAR	wom	90	3.8374	.575	2.88	.005**	145
	men	57	3.5018	.837			
ARPO	wom	88	4.3371	.845	4.78	.000**	136
	men	50	3.5367	1.104			
ASPO	wom	89	4.2406	.524	4.61	.000**	136
	men	49	3.7279	.778			
APER	wom	90	4.4170	.589	3.86	.000**	139
	men	51	3.9363	.888			
MLRL	wom	89	4.1236	1.126	2.45	.015	144
	men	57	3.6199	1.332			
MLPO	wom	88	2.9499	.655	-0.35	.730	137
	men	51	2.9902	.678			
MRAN	wom	90	3.1144	1.161	1.34	.181	145
	men	57	2.8526	1.133			
MRPO	wom	89	3.0955	1.011	0.43	.671	138
	men	51	3.0229	.894			
MSPO	wom	87	3.3036	.820	1.74	.085	135
	men	50	3.0450	.873			
MPER	wom	89	4.0172	.808	3.93	.000**	139
	men	52	3.4450	.876			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mwom subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE   A-3
ALL WOMEN AND MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2 STANDARD
DEVIATION BELOW (3.844, 3.162)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	42	3.5411	.183	1.05	.298	68
	men	28	3.4912	.211			
ALRL	wom	42	4.3016	.585	2.77	.007**	68
	men	28	3.8167	.882			
ALPO	wom	38	3.5866	.627	2.07	.043*	63
	men	27	3.2315	.755			
AMRL	wom	42	3.8479	.673	1.80	.976	68
	men	28	3.5693	.570			
APAR	wom	42	3.9214	.412	2.45	.017*	68
	men	28	3.5512	.842			
ARPO	wom	36	3.8704	.910	.41	.684	60
	men	26	3.7692	1.031			
ASPO	wom	37	3.9962	.667	.85	.400	60
	men	25	3.8100	.775			
APER	wom	37	4.3510	.471	1.57	.120	61
	men	26	4.0929	.825			
MLRL	wom	42	4.1111	.962	1.26	.211	68
	men	28	3.7619	1.354			
MLPO	wom	39	3.1097	.568	.72	.475	64
	men	27	3.0046	.697			
MRAN	wom	42	3.0321	1.212	-.08	.936	68
	men	28	3.0571	1.367			
MRPO	wom	37	3.2252	.746	.87	.386	63
	men	28	3.0467	.892			
MSPO	wom	38	3.4452	.810	1.61	.112	63
	men	27	3.1204	.789			
MPER	wom	39	4.0210	.687	3.07	.003**	65
	men	28	3.4484	.838			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-4
WOMEN BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2 STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE (3.844,4.185)
MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2 STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW (3.844,3.503)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	WOM	26	4.0436	.096	9.71	.000**	35
	MEN	11	3.7174	.086			
ALRL	WOM	26	4.1359	.691	1.72	.094	35
	MEN	11	3.6485	.989			
ALPO	WOM	25	3.6236	.689	2.38	.023*	35
	MEN	11	3.4382	.450			
AMRL	WOM	26	4.5385	1.174	.19	.848	35
	MEN	11	4.4545	1.293			
APAR	WOM	26	3.9359	.483	.67	.507	35
	MEN	11	3.8030	.690			
ARPO	WOM	25	4.2800	.891	1.87	.070	34
	MEN	11	3.6346	1.080			
ASPO	WOM	26	4.1763	.632	2.05	.048	35
	MEN	11	3.6136	1.021			
APER	WOM	26	4.4957	.827	1.78	.084	35
	MEN	11	3.9192	1.066			
MLRL	WOM	26	3.8205	1.324	.31	.756	35
	MEN	11	3.6667	1.461			
MLPO	WOM	26	2.8709	.791	.03	.979	35
	MEN	11	2.8636	.655			
MRAN	WOM	26	2.9923	1.174	-.10	.923	35
	MEN	11	3.0364	1.447			
MRPO	WOM	25	3.2400	1.043	.25	.808	34
	MEN	11	3.4646	.727			
MSPO	WOM	25	3.3700	.905	.96	.346	34
	MEN	11	3.0682	.791			
MPER	WOM	26	4.1624	.840	2.40	.022**	35
	MEN	11	3.4645	.727			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-5
ALL WOMEN BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE (3.844,4.52
MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW (3.844,3.162)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	50	4.1983	.186	15.33	.000**	76
	men	28	3.4912	.211			
ALRL	wom	50	4.1680	.754	1.86	.067	76
	men	28	3.8167	.882			
ALPO	wom	49	3.6554	.562	2.78	.007**	74
	men	27	3.2315	.755			
AMRL	wom	50	3.7880	.405	1.97	.053	76
	men	28	3.5693	.570			
APAR	wom	50	3.8740	.516	2.10	.039*	76
	men	28	3.5512	.842			
ARPO	wom	49	4.2449	.776	2.25	.028*	73
	men	26	3.7692	1.031			
ASPO	wom	50	4.1950	.570	2.38	.020*	73
	men	25	3.8100	.775			
APER	wom	50	4.4400	.687	1.95	.055	74
	men	26	4.0929	.825			
MLRL	wom	50	3.9867	1.221	.75	.456	76
	men	28	3.7619	1.354			
MLPO	wom	49	2.8830	.662	-.79	.433	74
	men	27	3.0046	.607			
MRAN	wom	50	3.0867	1.118	.10	.918	76
	men	28	3.0571	1.367			
MRPO	wom	49	3.0714	1.052	.10	.920	75
	men	28	3.0467	.892			
MSPO	wom	49	3.2755	.844	.78	.435	.74
	men	27	3.1204	.789			
MPER	wom	50	4.1283	.848	3.41	.001**	76
	men	28	3.4484	.838			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE   A-6
ALL WOMEN AND MEN BELOW MEAN (3.844)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	52	3.4227	.315	4.05	.000**	107
	men	57	3.1072	.475			
ALRL	wom	52	4.1128	.768	2.82	.006**	107
	men	57	3.7029	.749			
ALPO	wom	47	3.6525	.719	2.49	.015*	97
	men	52	3.2826	.758			
AMRL	wom	52	3.8335	.648	3.92	.000**	107
	men	57	3.3680	.593			
APAR	wom	52	3.8827	.439	2.93	.004**	107
	men	57	3.5018	.837			
ARPO	wom	46	3.9167	.931	1.82	.073	94
	men	50	3.5367	1.104			
ASPO	wom	46	3.9239	.730	1.26	.209	93
	men	49	3.7279	.778			
APER	wom	46	4.4001	.488	3.14	.002**	95
	men	51	3.9363	.888			
MLRL	wom	52	4.0769	1.074	1.96	.053	107
	men	57	3.6199	1.332			
MLPO	wom	48	3.1230	.660	.99	.326	97
	men	51	2.9902	.678			
MRAN	wom	52	3.0260	1.178	.78	.436	107
	men	57	2.8526	1.133			
MRPO	wom	47	3.0993	.919	.42	.678	96
	men	51	3.0229	.894			
MSPO	wom	47	3.3865	.872	1.93	.057	95
	men	50	3.9450	.873			
MPER	wom	48	4.0078	.720	3.49	.001**	98
	men	52	3.4450	.876			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-7
ALL WOMEN ABOVE THE MEAN (3.844)
MEN ABOVE THE MEAN (3.844)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB	DF
MDEMP	WOM	52	3.4227	.315	-10.08	.000**	73
	MEN	23	4.2342	.262			
ALRL	WOM	52	4.1128	.768	-0.14	.681	73
	MEN	23	4.1884	.634			
ALPO	WOM	47	3.6525	.719	1.21	.232	67
	MEN	22	3.4448	.534			
AMRL	WOM	52	3.8335	.648	-0.18	.859	73
	MEN	23	3.8599	.434			
APAR	WOM	52	3.8827	.439	-0.22	.828	73
	MEN	23	3.9058	.389			
ARPO	WOM	46	3.9167	.931	-0.02	.987	65
	MEN	21	3.9206	.950			
ASPO	WOM	46	3.9239	.730	0.40	.692	65
	MEN	21	3.8452	.796			
APER	WOM	46	4.4001	.488	1.78	.080	66
	MEN	22	4.1111	.582			
MLRL	WOM	52	4.0769	1.074	0.21	.831	73
	MEN	23	4.0145	1.346			
MLPO	WOM	48	3.1230	.660	-0.59	.560	74
	MEN	22	3.2216	.640			
MRAN	WOM	52	3.0260	1.178	-1.85	.069	73
	MEN	23	3.5739	1.199			
MRPO	WOM	47	3.0993	919	-0.41	.685	67
	MEN	22	3.1970	.947			
MSPO	WOM	47	3.3865	.872	.26	.798	68
	MEN	23	3.3261	1.029			
MPER	WOM	48	4.0078	.720	3.41	.001**	76
	MEN	28	3.4484	.838			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-8
ALL WOMEN AND MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2 STANDARD
DEVIATION ABOVE MEAN (3.844, 4.185)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	26	4.0436	.096	1.03	.310	35
	men	11	4.0093	.084			
ALRL	wom	26	4.1359	.691	.18	.862	35
	men	11	4.0909	.770			
ALPO	wom	25	3.6236	.567	.96	.345	33
	men	10	3.4161	.612			
AMRL	wom	26	3.8000	.390	.30	.776	35
	men	11	3.7556	.460			
APAR	wom	26	3.9359	.483	.07	.943	35
	men	11	3.9242	.336			
ARPO	wom	25	4.2800	.981	1.60	.320	32
	men	9	3.6667	1.236			
ASPO	wom	26	4.1763	.632	1.04	.306	33
	men	9	3.9167	.685			
APER	wom	26	4.4957	.827	.99	.330	34
	men	10	4.1667	1.060			
MLRL	wom	26	3.8205	1.324	.32	.749	35
	men	11	3.6667	1.333			
MLPO	wom	26	2.8709	.790	-1.74	.091	34
	men	10	3.3875	.818			
MRAN	wom	26	2.9923	1.174	-1.15	.259	35
	men	11	3.5091	1.432			
MRPO	wom	25	3.2400	1.043	.02	.987	33
	men	10	3.2333	1.112			
MSPO	wom	25	3.3700	.905	-.23	.822	34
	men	11	3.4545	1.1284			
MPER	wom	26	4.1624	.840	1.18	.246	33
	men	9	3.7778	.848			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-9
ALL WOMEN AND BETWEEN MEAN AND 1/2
STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW (3.844,3.503)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	21	3.6978	.079	-.65	.523	30
	men	11	3.7174	.086			
ALRL	wom	21	4.3079	.989	2.38	.024**	30
	men	11	3.6485	.989			
ALPO	wom	20	3.7518	.582	2.79	.009**	29
	men	11	3.1023	.689			
ARAN	wom	21	3.8831	.450	1.78	.085	30
	men	11	3.5382	.450			
APAR	wom	21	3.9683	.328	.92	.362	30
	men	11	3.8030	.690			
ARPO	wom	19	3.9386	1.050	.75	.458	28
	men	11	3.6364	1.080			
ASPO	wom	20	4.0917	.765	1.48	.150	29
	men	11	3.6136	1.021			
APER	wom	20	4.4153	.480	1.79	.083	29
	men	11	3.9192	1.066			
MLRL	wom	21	4.0476	1.127	.82	.419	30
	men	11	3.6667	1.461			
MLPO	wom	21	3.1749	.624	1.32	.197	30
	men	11	2.8636	.655			
MRAN	wom	21	2.8833	1.258	-.31	.758	30
	men	11	3.0364	1.447			
MRPO	wom	21	3.2381	.731	.30	.768	30
	men	11	3.1515	.874			
MSPO	wom	21	3.3056	.854	.77	.450	30
	men	11	3.0682	.791			
MPER	wom	21	4.1118	.595	2.71	.011**	31
	men	11	3.4646	.727			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-10
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN ABOVE ONE STANDARD DEVIATION (4.526)
MEN BELOW ONE STANDARD DEVIATION (3.162)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	21	4.7706	.155	-25.28	000**	48
	men	29	2.7365	.344			
ALRL	wom	22	4.0333	1.004	-1.96	.056	49
	men	29	3.5931	.589			
ALPO	wom	21	3.7296	.474	-2.02	.049*	44
	men	25	3.3377	.772			
AMRL	wom	22	3.9305	.712	-4.26	.000**	49
	men	29	3.1737	.557			
APAR	wom	22	3.9545	.368	-2.59	.013*	49
	men	29	3.4540	.845			
ARPO	wom	21	4.3492	.747	-3.63	.001**	43
	men	24	3.2847	1.146			
ASPO	wom	21	4.2698	.390	-3.31	.002**	43
	men	24	3.6424	.788			
APER	wom	22	4.4230	.482	-2.93	.005**	45
	men	25	3.7733	.937			
MLRL	wom	21	4.4921	.786	-3.12	.003**	48
	men	29	3.4828	1.320			
MLPO	wom	21	2.9558	.563	.09	.929	43
	men	24	2.9740	.793			
MRAN	wom	21	3.3068	1.089	-2.43	.019*	49
	men	29	2.6652	.826			
MRPO	wom	22	3.1667	1.012	-.60	.548	43
	men	23	2.9928	.916			
MSPO	wom	21	3.3690	.769	-1.55	.129	42
	men	23	2.9565	.973			
MPER	wom	21	3.8836	.778	-1.71	.094	43
	men	24	3.4410	.936			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-11
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN ABOVE MEAN (3.844)
MEN BELOW MEAN (3.844)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	60	4.3894	.331	17.01	.000**	115
	men	57	3.1072	.475			
ALRL	wom	61	4.2044	.805	3.50	.001**	116
	men	57	3.7029	.749			
ALPO	wom	59	3.7383	.516	3.74	.000**	109
	men	52	3.2826	.758			
AMRL	wom	61	3.8699	.530	4.85	.000**	116
	men	57	3.3680	.593			
APAR	wom	61	3.9071	.473	3.26	.001**	116
	men	57	3.5018	.837			
ARPO	wom	59	4.3192	.792	4.30	.000**	107
	men	50	3.5367	1.104			
ASPO	wom	60	4.2403	.499	4.16	.000**	107
	men	49	3.7279	.788			
APER	wom	61	4.4531	.626	3.60	.000**	110
	men	51	3.9363	.888			
MLRL	wom	60	4.2000	1.018	2.65	.009**	115
	men	57	3.6199	1.332			
MLPO	wom	59	2.9146	.631	-.60	.547	108
	men	51	2.9902	.678			
MRAN	wom	61	3.2057	1.079	1.73	.086	116
	men	57	2.8526	1.133			
MRPO	wom	60	3.1028	1.076	.42	.675	109
	men	51	3.0229	.894			
MSPO	wom	59	3.2924	.791	1.55	.124	107
	men	50	3.0450	.873			
MPER	wom	60	4.0847	.772	4.11	.000**	110
	men	52	3.4450	.876			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-12
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN BELOW MEAN (3.844)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	39	3.4070	.475	-3.42	.001**	94
	men	57	3.1072	.327			
ALRL	wom	39	4.1778	.774	-3.01	.001**	94
	men	57	3.7029	.749			
ALPO	wom	34	3.6231	.737	-2.06	.043*	84
	men	52	3.2826	.758			
AMRL	wom	39	3.7935	.667	-3.28	.001**	94
	men	57	3.3680	.593			
APAR	wom	39	3.8479	.404	-2.39	.019*	94
	men	57	3.5018	.837			
ARPO	wom	33	3.9464	.988	1.80	.075	81
	men	50	3.5367	1.104			
ASPO	wom	33	3.9217	.920	-1.14	.258	80
	men	49	3.7279	.778			
APER	wom	33	4.4133	.469	-2.84	.006**	82
	men	51	3.9363	.888			
MLRL	wom	39	4.1453	.991	-2.10	.039*	94
	men	57	3.6199	1.1332			
MLPO	wom	35	3.1085	.703	-.78	.436	84
	men	51	2.9902	.678			
MRAN	wom	39	2.9628	1.156	-.46	.664	94
	men	57	2.8526	1.133			
MRPO	wom	34	3.0490	1.015	-.13	.901	83
	men	51	3.0229	.894			
MSPO	wom	34	3.3358	.931	-1.46	.148	82
	men	50	3.0450	.873			
MPER	wom	35	4.0583	.776	-3.35	.001**	85
	men	52	3.4450	.876			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-13
NATIONAL CONGRESS OP NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN AND MEN
ABOVE MEAN (3.844)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	23	4.2343	.262	.42	.680	29
	men	8	4.1920	.194			
ALRL	wom	23	4.1884	.634	1.45	.158	29
	men	8	3.7833	.808			
ALPO	wom	22	3.4448	.534	.24	.812	28
	men	8	3.3906	.580			
AMRL	wom	23	3.8599	.434	.70	.489	29
	men	8	3.7389	.377			
APAR	wom	23	3.9058	.389	-.18	.856	29
	men	8	3.9375	.511			
ARPO	wom	21	3.9206	.954	-.22	.830	27
	men	8	4.0000	.617			
ASPO	wom	21	3.8452	.796	-1.43	.163	27
	men	8	4.2813	.508			
APER	wom	22	4.1111	.852	-.69	.495	28
	men	8	4.3472	.752			
MLRL	wom	23	4.0145	1.346	-.26	.794	29
	men	8	4.1667	1.584			
MLPO	wom	22	3.2216	.640	1.13	.267	28
	men	8	2.9063	.770			
MRAN	wom	23	3.5739	1.199	1.10	.281	29
	men	8	3.0000	1.481			
MRPO	wom	22	3.1970	.947	-.-3	.977	28
	men	8	3.2083	.925			
MSPO	wom	23	3.3261	1.029	-.71	.486	29
	men	8	3.6250	1.044			
MPER	wom	21	3.7460	.703	-.79	.434	27
	men	8	4.4017	1.296			

VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-14
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE
STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW (3.844, 3.162)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	32	3.5271	.176	.72	.475	58
	men	28	3.4912	.211			
ALRL	wom	32	4.3479	.567	2.81	.007**	58
	men	28	3.8167	.882			
ALPO	wom	28	3.6048	.621	2.01	.050*	53
	men	27	3.2315	.755			
AMRL	wom	32	3.7823	.700	1.28	.206	58
	men	28	3.5693	.570			
APAR	wom	32	3.8969	.349	2.13	.038*	58
	men	28	3.5512	.842			
ARPO	wom	26	3.9615	.950	.70	.488	50
	men	26	3.7692	1.031			
ASPO	wom	27	4.0062	.643	1.00	.324	50
	men	25	3.1000	.775			
APER	wom	27	4.3693	.461	1.51	.136	51
	men	26	4.0929	.825			
MLRL	wom	32	4.1250	.934	1.22	.227	58
	men	28	3.7619	1.354			
MLPO	wom	29	3.1180	.568	.72	.473	54
	men	27	3.0046	.607			
MRAN	wom	32	2.8922	1.194	-.50	.620	58
	men	28	3.0571	1.467			
MRPO	wom	27	3.2346	.789	.82	.415	53
	men	28	3.0476	.892			
MSPO	wom	28	3.4167	.822	1.36	.179	53
	men	27	3.1204	.789			
MPER	wom	29	4.0781	.728	3.03	.004**	55
	men	28	3.4484	.838			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-15
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE HALF STANDARD
DEVIATION ABOVE MEAN (3.844, 4.185)
MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE HALF STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW
(3.844, 3.503)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	21	4.0387	.105	-8.72	.000**	30
	men	11	3.7174	.086			
ALRL	wom	21	4.2667	.636	-2.15	.040*	30
	men	11	3.6485	.989			
ALPO	wom	21	3.7232	.537	-2.79	.009**	29
	men	11	3.1023	.689			
AMRL	wom	21	3.8466	.384	-2.69	.011*	30
	men	11	3.4382	.450			
APAR	wom	21	3.9365	.464	-.65	.519	30
	men	11	3.8030	.690			
ARPO	wom	20	4.3833	.919	-2.04	.051	29
	men	11	3.6364	1.080			
ASPO	wom	21	4.1468	.641	-1.82	.079	30
	men	11	4.1468	.641			
APER	wom	21	4.5661	.805	-1.93	.063	30
	men	11	3.9192	1.066			
MLRL	wom	21	3.8571	1.214	-.39	.697	30
	men	11	3.6667	1.461			
MLPO	wom	21	2.8818	.775	-.07	.948	30
	men	11	2.8636	.665			
MRAN	wom	21	3.0857	1.048	-.11	.912	30
	men	11	3.0364	1.447			
MRPO	wom	20	3.2833	1.033	-.36	.723	29
	men	11	3.1515	.874			
MSPO	wom	20	3.3625	.853	-.94	.354	29
	men	11	3.0682	.791			
MPER	wom	21	4.2698	.569	-3.45	.002**	30
	men	11	3.4646	.727			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-16
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE STANDARD DEVIATION
ABOVE (3.844, 4.526)
MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW
(3.844, 3.162)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	39	4.1841	.184	14.27	.000**	65
	men	28	3.4912	.211			
ALRL	wom	39	4.3009	.663	2.57	.013*	65
	men	28	3.8167	.882			
ALPO	wom	38	3.7431	.544	3.18	.002**	63
	men	27	3.2315	.755			
AMRL	wom	39	3.8356	.401	2.25	.028*	65
	men	28	3.5693	.570			
APAR	wom	39	3.8803	.526	1.97	.053	65
	men	28	3.5512	.842			
ARPO	wom	38	4.3026	.826	2.29	.025*	62
	men	26	3.7692	1.031			
ASPO	wom	39	4.2244	.553	2.50	.015*	62
	men	25	3.8100	.775			
APER	wom	39	4.4701	.700	1.98	.052	63
	men	26	4.0929	.825			
MLRL	wom	39	4.0427	1.101	.94	.353	65
	men	28	3.7619	1.354			
MLPO	wom	38	2.8919	.673	-.69	.491	63
	men	27	3.0046	.607			
MRAN	wom	39	3.1487	1.084	.31	.761	65
	men	28	3.0571	1.367			
MRPO	wom	38	3.0685	1.123	.07	.944	64
	men	28	3.0476	.892			
MSPO	wom	38	3.2500	.810	.64	.523	63
	men	27	3.1204	.789			
MPER	wom	39	4.1930	.756	3.80	.000**	65
	men	28	3.4484	.838			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-17
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN BELOW MEAN (3.844)
MEN ABOVE MEAN (3.844)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	39	3.4070	.327	10.33	.000**	60
	men	23	4.2342	.262			
ALRL	wom	39	4.1778	.774	.06	.956	60
	men	23	4.1884	.634			
ALPO	wom	34	3.6231	.534	-.98	.332	54
	men	22	3.4448	.534			
AMRL	wom	39	3.7935	.667	.43	.671	60
	men	23	3.7935	.667			
APAR	wom	39	3.8479	.404	.55	.582	60
	men	23	3.9058	.389			
ARPO	wom	33	3.9646	.988	-.16	.872	52
	men	21	3.9206	.954			
ASPO	wom	33	3.9217	.720	-.37	.717	52
	men	21	3.8452	.796			
APER	wom	33	4.4133	.469	-1.69	.096	53
	men	22	4.1111	.852			
MLRL	wom	39	4.1453	.991	-.44	.662	60
	men	23	4.0145	1.346			
MLPO	wom	35	3.1085	.703	.61	.543	55
	men	22	3.2216	.640			
MRAN	wom	39	2.9628	1.156	1.98	.052	60
	men	23	3.5739	1.199			
MRPO	wom	34	3.0490	1.015	.55	.587	54
	men	22	3.1970	.947			
MSPO	wom	34	3.3358	.931	-.04	.971	55
	men	23	3.3261	1.029			
MPER	wom	35	4.0583	.776	-1.51	.137	54
	men	21	3.7460	.703			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-18
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE STANDARD
DEVIATION ABOVE THE MEAN (3.844, 5.526)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	39	4.1841	.184	.73	.466	56
	men	19	4.1463	.183			
ALRL	wom	39	4.3009	.663	.88	.382	56
	men	19	4.1368	.672			
ALPO	wom	38	3.7431	.544	1.82	.074	54
	men	18	3.4534	.581			
AMRL	wom	39	3.8356	.401	-.05	.957	56
	men	19	3.8421	.466			
APAR	wom	39	3.8803	.526	-.04	.967	56
	men	19	3.8860	.405			
ARPO	wom	38	4.3026	.826	1.38	.174	53
	men	17	3.9412	1.049			
ASPO	wom	39	4.2244	.553	1.98	.053	54
	men	17	3.8382	.888			
APER	wom	39	4.4701	.700	1.56	.125	55
	men	18	4.1235	.938			
MLRL	wom	39	4.0427	1.101	-.14	.890	56
	men	19	4.0877	1.261			
MLPO	wom	38	2.8919	.673	-1.90	.063	54
	men	18	3.2569	.667			
MRAN	wom	39	3.1487	1.084	-1.62	.110	56
	men	19	3.6737	1.293			
MRPO	wom	38	3.0658	1.123	-.81	.424	54
	men	18	3.3148	.980			
MSPO	wom	38	3.2500	.810	-.56	.576	55
	men	19	3.3947	1.103			
MPER	wom	39	4.1930	.756	2.05	.045	54
	men	17	3.7451	.740			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-19
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN BETWEEN MEAN AND
1/2 DEVIATION BELOW (3.844, 3.503)

VAR.#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	wom	14	3.6947	.086	-.65	.520	23
	men	11	3.7174	.086			
ALRL	wom	14	4.2619	.588	1.93	.066	23
	men	11	3.6485	.989			
ALPO	wom	13	3.8764	.493	3.20	.004**	22
	men	11	3.1023	.689			
AMRL	wom	14	3.7755	.802	1.25	.225	23
	men	11	3.4382	.450			
APAR	wom	14	3.9048	.344	.48	.634	23
	men	11	3.8030	.690			
ARPO	wom	12	4.0972	1.125	1.00	.328	21
	men	11	3.6364	1.080			
ASPO	wom	13	4.1731	.732	1.56	.133	22
	men	11	3.6136	1.021			
APER	wom	13	4.3654	.557	1.32	.202	22
	men	11	3.9192	1.006			
MLRL	wom	14	4.1429	1.123	.92	.366	23
	men	11	3.6667	1.461			
MLPO	wom	14	3.1290	.608	1.40	.174	23
	men	11	2.8636	.655			
MRAN	wom	14	2.7964	1.354	-.43	.673	23
	men	11	3.0364	1.447			
MRPO	wom	14	3.3095	.790	.47	.640	23
	men	11	3.1515	.874			
MSPO	wom	14	3.1548	.850	.26	.767	23
	men	11	3.0682	.791			
MPER	wom	14	4.1280	.679	2.35	.028*	23
	men	11	3.4646	.727			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-20
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION ABOVE MEAN
MEN BELOW MEAN (3.844)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	21	4.7076	.182	-14.99	.000**	76
	men	57	3.1072	.475			
ALRL	wom	21	3.9429	1.008	-1.14	.258	76
	men	57	3.7029	.749			
ALPO	wom	21	3.6488	.567	-2.00	.050*	71
	men	52	3.2826	.758			
AMRL	wom	21	3.9352	.677	-3.61	.001**	76
	men	57	3.3680	.593			
APAR	wom	21	3.5968	.794	-.45	.653	76
	men	57	3.5018	.837			
ARPO	wom	21	4.5159	1.037	-3.47	.001**	69
	men	50	3.5367	1.104			
ASPO	wom	21	4.2262	.617	-2.60	.011*	68
	men	49	3.7279	.778			
APER	wom	21	4.3386	.398	-1.99	.050*	70
	men	51	3.9363	.888			
MLRL	wom	21	3.8869	1.253	-.80	.424	76
	men	57	3.6199	1.332			
MLPO	wom	21	3.0655	.694	-.43	.672	70
	men	51	2.9902	.678			
MRAN	wom	21	2.8929	1.286	-.13	.894	76
	men	57	2.8526	1.133			
MRPO	wom	21	3.0317	.881	-.04	.969	70
	men	51	3.0229	.894			
MSPO	wom	21	3.2083	.823	-.72	.475	68
	men	50	3.0450	.873			
MPER	wom	21	3.8148	.686	-1.73	.088	71
	men	52	3.4450	.876			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-21
NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN
ONE STANDARD DEVIATION BELOW (LE) (3.844, 3.162);
MEAN AND ONE STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE (GE) (3.844, 4.526)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	le	9	3.5794	.220	-6.06	.000**	15
	ge	8	4.1920	.194			
ALRL	le	9	4.2370	.628	1.30	.213	15
	ge	8	3.7833	.808			
ALPO	le	9	3.4980	.703	.34	.738	15
	ge	8	3.3906	.580			
AMRL	le	9	3.9531	.475	1.02	.324	15
	ge	8	3.7389	.377			
APAR	le	9	3.9815	.621	.16	.876	15
	ge	8	3.9375	.511			
ARPO	le	9	3.5556	.799	-1.27	.223	15
	ge	8	4.0000	.617			
ASPO	le	9	3.8704	.801	-1.24	.233	15
	ge	8	4.2813	.508			
APER	le	9	4.2731	.544	-.23	.818	15
	ge	8	4.3472	.752			
MLRL	le	9	3.9630	1.111	-.31	.761	15
	ge	8	4.1667	1.584			
MLPO	le	9	3.1647	.577	.79	.442	15
	ge	8	2.9063	.770			
MRAN	le	9	3.3111	1.162	.48	.653	15
	ge	8	3.0000	1.481			
MRPO	le	9	3.2222	.687	.04	.972	15
	ge	8	3.2083	.925			
MSPO	le	9	3.5833	.839	-.09	.929	15
	ge	8	3.6250	1.044			
MPER	le	9	3.8395	.580	-.42	.678	15
	ge	8	4.4017	1.296			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-22
MEN ABOVE (GE) AND BELOW (LE) MEAN (3.844)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG
MDEMP	ge	23	4.2342	.262	10.72	.000**	78
	le	57	3.1072	.475			
ALRL	ge	23	4.1884	.634	2.73	.008**	78
	le	57	3.7029	.749			
ALPO	ge	22	3.4448	.534	.91	.365	72
	le	52	3.2826	.758			
AMRL	ge	23	3.8599	.434	3.60	.001**	78
	le	57	3.3680	.593			
APAR	ge	23	3.9058	.389	2.21	.030*	78
	le	57	3.5018	.837			
ARPO	ge	21	3.9206	.954	1.39	.169	69
	le	50	3.5367	1.104			
ASPO	ge	21	3.8452	.796	.57	.568	68
	le	49	3.7279	.778			
APER	ge	22	4.1111	.852	.78	.437	71
	le	51	3.9363	.888			
MLRL	ge	23	4.0145	1.346	1.20	.236	78
	le	57	3.6199	1.332			
MLPO	ge	22	3.2216	.640	1.36	.178	71
	le	51	2.9902	.678			
MRAN	ge	23	3.5739	1.199	2.53	.013*	78
	le	57	2.8526	1.133			
MRPO	ge	22	3.1970	.947	.75	.456	71
	le	51	3.0229	.894			
MSPO	ge	23	3.3261	1.029	1.21	.231	71
	le	50	3.0450	.873			
MPER	ge	21	3.7460	.703	1.40	.165	71
	le	52	3.4450	.876			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-23
MDEMP ABOVE MEAN (GE) (3.844)
MDEMP BELOW MEAN (LE) (3.844)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	le	112	3.2629	.430	22.40	.000**	229
	ge	119	4.3909	.331			
ALRL	le	112	3.9077	.774	2.22	.028*	230
	ge	120	4.1394	.816			
ALPO	le	102	3.4439	.752	2.15	.033*	217
	ge	117	3.6336	.535			
AMRL	le	112	3.5815	.653	3.73	.000**	230
	ge	120	3.8729	.534			
APAR	le	112	3.6845	.699	1.93	.055	230
	ge	120	3.8419	.539			
ARPO	le	99	3.7138	1.024	3.99	.000**	213
	ge	116	4.2328	.833			
ASPO	le	98	3.8231	.750	3.53	.001**	213
	ge	117	4.1496	.604			
APER	le	100	4.1449	.751	1.98	.049*	217
	ge	119	4.3330	.656			
MLRL	le	112	3.9214	1.250	1.96	.051	229
	ge	119	4.1317	1.150			
MLPO	le	102	3.0518	.661	-.62	.534	217
	ge	117	2.9956	.669			
MRAN	le	112	2.9192	1.148	2.09	.037*	230
	ge	120	3.2392	1.177			
MRPO	le	101	3.0644	.897	.41	.684	217
	ge	118	3.1172	1.006			
MSPO	le	100	3.1992	.888	.71	.478	215
	ge	117	3.2856	.898			
MPER	le	103	3.6965	.852	2.30	.022*	218
	ge	117	3.9522	.795			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-24
NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN AND MEN
BETWEEN MEAN AND ONE HALF STANDARD DEVIATION
ABOVE MEAN (3.844, 4.185)

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	ncnw	5	4.0643	.047	1.36	.195	14
	men	11	4.0093	.084			
ALRL	ncnw	5	3.5867	.703	-1.24	.234	14
	men	11	4.0909	.770			
ALPO	ncnw	5	3.2250	.555	-.59	.568	13
	men	10	3.4161	.612			
AMRL	ncnw	5	3.6044	.395	-.63	.536	14
	men	11	3.7556	.460			
APAR	ncnw	5	3.9333	.619	.04	.970	14
	men	11	3.9242	.336			
ARPO	ncnw	5	3.8867	.691	.33	.747	12
	men	9	3.6667	1.236.			
ASPO	ncnw	5	4.3000	.647	1.02	.327	12
	men	9	3.9167	.685			
APER	ncnw	5	4.2000	.951	.06	.954	13
	men	10	4.1667	1.060			
MLRL	ncnw	5	3.6667	1.886	.00	1.000	14
	men	11	3.6667	1.333			
MLPO	ncnw	5	2.8250	.950	-1.19	.254	13
	men	10	3.3875	.818			
MRAN	ncnw	5	2.6000	1.697	-1.11	.284	14
	men	11	3.5091	1.432			
MRPO	ncnw	5	3.0667	1.188	-.27	.793	13
	men	10	3.2333	1.122			
MSPO	ncnw	5	3.4000	1.207	-.08	.937	14
	men	11	3.4545	1.284			
MPER	ncnw	5	3.7111	1.573	-.10	.918	12
	men	9	3.7778	.848			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-25
ALL WOMEN AND MEN AGED 55-64

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	39	3.8601	.581	3.08	.003**	51
	men	14	3.3162	.521			
ALRL	wom	39	4.0188	.773	1.57	.122	51
	men	14	3.6476	.711			
ALPO	wom	36	3.6696	.585	1.60	.117	45
	men	11	3.2890	.977			
AMRL	wom	39	3.7602	.653	.88	.382	51
	men	14	3.5972	.555			
APAR	wom	39	3.8897	.553	3.66	.001**	51
	men	14	3.0429	1.126			
ARPO	wom	35	4.1524	.833	1.26	.215	42
	men	9	3.6852	1.492			
ASPO	wom	37	4.1622	.655	2.26	.029*	44
	men	9	3.5833	.829			
APER	wom	38	4.5058	.468	3.22	.002**	46
	men	10	3.6889	1.302			
MLRL	wom	39	4.0598	1.034	2.68	.010**	51
	men	14	3.0952	1.453			
MLPO	wom	36	2.9112	.771	-.57	.574	44
	men	10	3.0750	.939			
MRAN	wom	39	3.0346	1.281	.75	.458	51
	men	14	2.7429	1.170			
MRPO	wom	36	2.8241	1.128	-.02	.981	44
	men	10	2.8333	1.009			
MSPO	wom	35	3.1405	.998	-.21	.835	42
	men	9	3.2222	1.208			
MPER	wom	37	4.0454	.908	1.50	.141	45
	men	10	3.5111	1.311			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-26
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN AGED 55-64

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	33	3.7946	.543	2.80	.008**	45
	men	14	3.3162	.521			
ALRL	wom	33	4.1475	.677	2.28	.027*	45
	men	14	3.6476	.711			
ALPO	wom	30	3.7673	.527	2.02	.050*	39
	men	11	3.2890	.977			
AMRL	wom	33	3.8390	.650	1.27	.212	45
	men	14	3.5872	.555			
APAR	wom	33	3.9354	.431	3.96	.000**	45
	men	14	3.0429	1.126			
ARPO	wom	29	4.2644	.827	1.50	.143	36
	men	9	3.6852	1.492			
ASPO	wom	31	4.2016	.683	2.28	.028*	38
	men	9	3.5833	.829			
APER	wom	32	4.5382	.461	3.17	.003**	40
	men	10	3.6889	1.302			
MLRL	wom	33	4.1919	.939	3.09	.003**	45
	men	14	3.0952	1.453			
MLPO	wom	30	2.9685	.819	-.34	.773	38
	men	10	3.0750	.939			
MRAN	wom	33	3.1136	1.243	.95	.347	45
	men	14	2.7429	1.170			
MRPO	wom	30	2.8444	1.154	.03	.978	38
	men	10	2.8333	1.009			
MSPO	wom	29	3.2241	1.012	.00	.996	36
	men	9	3.2222	1.208			
MPER	wom	31	4.1653	.908	1.77	.084	39
	men	10	3.5111	1.311			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-27
ALL WOMEN AND MEN WITH TWO YEARS OF COLLEGE

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	40	4.0570	.561	3.52	.001**	53
	men	15	3.3902	.780			
ALRL	wom	39	4.3333	1.060	2.68	.010**	52
	men	15	3.4000	1.352			
ALPO	wom	37	3.6092	.664	.65	.518	49
	men	14	3.4857	.392			
AMRL	wom	40	3.8197	.659	1.03	.307	53
	men	15	3.6031	.782			
APAR	wom	40	3.8600	.582	2.09	.041*	53
	men	15	3.4556	.775			
ARPO	wom	36	4.1435	.888	2.31	.025*	48
	men	14	3.5238	.748			
ASPO	wom	37	4.0923	.598	2.22	.032*	48
	men	13	3.6218	.816			
APER	wom	38	4.5113	.548	3.06	.004**	50
	men	14	3.8413	1.019			
MLRL	wom	39	4.2821	.910	1.39	.171	52
	men	15	3.8444	1.321			
MLPO	wom	38	3.0658	.703	-.01	.995	49
	men	13	3.0673	.773			
MRAN	wom	40	3.1987	1.149	-.12	.908	53
	men	15	3.2400	1.254			
MRPO	wom	37	3.1757	.995	-.36	.719	48
	men	13	3.2821	.591			
MSPO	wom	37	3.5405	.718	2.12	.048*	48
	men	13	3.0192	.887			
MPER	wom	38	4.1104	.740	1.82	.074	50
	men	14	3.6766	.819			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-28
ALL WOMEN WITH POST GRADUATE DEGREES; MEN WITH LESS THAN A
HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	41	4.4306	.518	8.41	.000**	55
	men	16	3.1668	.485			
ALRL	wom	41	4.0780	.974	1.02	.310	55
	men	16	3.7658	.818			
ALPO	wom	41	3.6717	.572	2.48	.016*	54
	men	15	3.1595	.931			
AMRL	wom	41	3.9383	.908	3.69	.001**	55
	men	16	3.4014	.349			
APAR	wom	41	3.7488	.652	.15	.884	55
	men	16	3.7187	.804			
ARPO	wom	41	4.3415	.956	4.67	.000**	53
	men	14	2.9762	.910			
ASPO	wom	41	4.1870	.571	2.68	.010**	53
	men	14	3.6131	.975			
APER	wom	41	4.3713	.391	3.04	.004**	53
	men	14	3.7619	1.113			
MLRL	wom	41	4.0407	1.212	1.25	.218	55
	men	16	3.5833	1.331			
MLPO	wom	41	3.0247	.657	-.02	.986	53
	men	14	3.0281	.543			
MRAN	wom	41	3.0817	1.351	.49	.628	55
	men	16	2.9000	1.007			
MRPO	wom	40	3.1750	.973	.77	.447	52
	men	14	2.9405	1.020			
MSPO	wom	39	3.2671	.823	.89	.375	51
	men	14	3.0357	.848			
MPER	wom	41	3.8614	.759	2.68	.006**	53
	men	14	3.1825	.773			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-29
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN WITH TWO YEARS OF COLLEGE

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	35	4.0865	.566	3.55	.001**	48
	men	15	3.3902	.780			
ALRL	wom	35	4.1181	.865	1.20	.235	48
	men	15	3.8089	.747			
ALPO	wom	32	3.6001	.676	.59	.559	44
	men	14	3.4857	.392			
AMRL	wom	35	3.8162	.692	.96	.342	48
	men	15	3.6031	.782			
APAR	wom	35	3.8067	.576	1.78	.082	48
	men	15	3.4556	.775			
ARPO	wom	31	4.1989	.921	2.40	.021*	43
	men	14	3.5238	.748			
ASPO	wom	32	4.1146	.604	2.24	.031*	43
	men	13	3.6218	.816			
APER	wom	33	4.5547	.518	3.19	.003**	45
	men	14	3.8413	1.019			
MLRL	wom	34	4.2157	.935	1.12	.266	47
	men	15	3.8444	1.321			
MLPO	wom	33	3.0720	.740	.02	.985	44
	men	13	3.0673	.773			
MRAN	wom	35	3.1014	1.124	-.39	.701	48
	men	15	3.2400	1.254			
MRPO	wom	32	3.1510	1.036	-.43	.672	43
	men	13	3.2821	.591			
MSPO	wom	32	3.5078	.750	1.88	.067	43
	men	13	3.0192	.887			
MPER	wom	33	4.1170	.753	1.79	.081	45
	men	14	3.6766	.819			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-30
PROTESTANT WOMEN AND MEN

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	45	3.9655	.672	4.08	.000**	74
	men	31	3.3607	.517			
ALRL	wom	45	3.9985	.876	.84	.405	74
	men	31	3.8452	.624			
ALPO	wom	43	3.6755	.753	2.33	.023*	71
	men	30	3.2689	.704			
AMRL	wom	45	3.9100	.491	3.13	.003**	74
	men	31	3.4943	.668			
APAR	wom	45	3.7830	.688	1.35	.181	74
	men	31	3.5462	.835			
ARPO	wom	42	4.2103	.931	2.71	.009**	69
	men	29	3.5517	1.109			
ASPO	wom	42	4.1310	.687	2.30	.025*	68
	men	28	3.7024	.870			
APER	wom	42	4.3489	.577	2.43	.018*	69
	men	29	3.8611	1.105			
MLRL	wom	45	4.0074	1.060	.29	.769	74
	men	31	3.9247	1.261			
MLPO	wom	43	2.9481	.673	-.40	.690	70
	men	29	3.0086	.558			
MRAN	wom	45	3.1274	1.110	.37	.713	74
	men	31	3.0258	1.269			
MRPO	wom	42	3.0595	.931	.61	.541	69
	men	29	2.9310	.763			
MSPO	wom	43	3.3004	.899	1.74	.086	70
	men	29	2.9569	.691			
MPER	wom	43	3.8475	.860	2.52	.014*	71
	men	30	3.3306	.866			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-31
CATHOLICS AND JEWS

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	Cath	49	3.5090	.690	-5.20	.000**	140
	Jew	93	4.0708	.566			
ALRL	Cath	50	3.9733	.743	-1.08	.284	141
	Jew	93	4.1240	.827			
ALPO	Cath	45	3.4206	.650	-1.96	.052	132
	Jew	89	3.6334	.563			
AMRL	Cath	50	3.5194	.571	-3.42	.001**	141
	Jew	93	3.8688	.586			
APAR	Cath	50	3.7033	.693	-1.64	.103	141
	Jew	93	3.8642	.471			
ARPO	Cath	43	3.6047	.808	-3.93	.000**	130
	Jew	89	4.2715	.959			
ASPO	Cath	43	3.8140	.613	-2.27	.025*	131
	Jew	90	4.0870	.664			
APER	Cath	45	4.1210	.634	-2.25	.026*	133
	Jew	90	4.3759	.615			
MLRL	Cath	50	3.7733	1.343	-1.63	.105	140
	Jew	92	4.1159	1.105			
MLPO	Cath	45	3.0770	.729	.42	.676	133
	Jew	90	3.0249	.657			
MRAN	Cath	50	3.0690	1.083	-.28	.782	141
	Jew	93	3.1518	1.180			
MRPO	Cath	45	3.0407	.984	-.57	.573	133
	Jew	90	3.1444	1.016			
MSPO	Cath	45	3.000	1.080	.18	.854	132
	Jew	89	3.2687	.839			
MPER	Cath	44	3.7803	.797	-1.72	.088	133
	Jew	91	4.0258	.769			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-32
ALL WOMEN AND MEN WHO WATCH THREE TO FOUR
HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	44	4.0207	.513	4.59	.000**	74
	men	32	3.4068	.654			
ALRL	wom	45	4.3793	.588	3.50	.001**	75
	men	32	3.8167	.823			
ALPO	wom	45	3.7655	.477	4.05	.000**	75
	men	32	3.2372	.667			
AMRL	wom	45	3.8382	.580	2.25	.027*	75
	men	32	3.5366	.578			
APAR	wom	45	3.9119	.541	1.84	.070	75
	men	32	3.6302	.806			
ARPO	wom	45	4.0963	.827	3.80	.000**	74
	men	31	3.3548	.847			
ASPO	wom	45	4.1574	.565	2.82	.006**	73
	men	30	3.7333	.734			
APER	wom	45	4.3744	.522	3.08	.003**	74
	men	31	3.9247	.752			
MLRL	wom	45	4.3185	.926	1.15	.254	75
	men	32	4.0417	1.185			
MLPO	wom	44	3.0848	.560	1.06	.291	73
	men	31	2.9447	.563			
MRAN	wom	45	3.2311	1.214	1.02	.309	75
	men	32	2.9500	1.148			
MRPO	wom	45	3.2481	.927	1.64	.105	75
	men	32	2.9219	.751			
MSPO	wom	45	3.4426	.794	2.07	.042*	74
	men	31	3.0726	.725			
MPER	wom	45	4.0978	.815	3.15	.002**	75
	men	32	3.5104	.793			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-33
ALL WOMEN WHO WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY
MEN WHO WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	44	4.0207	.513	4.4	.000**	76
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	45	4.3793	.588	3.79	.000**	77
	men	34	3.8078	.751			
ALPO	wom	45	3.7655	.477	4.99	.000**	73
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
AMRL	wom	45	3.8328	.580	2.65	.010**	77
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	45	3.9119	.541	2.70	.009**	77
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	45	4.0963	.827	1.37	.175	73
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	45	4.1574	.565	3.38	.001**	73
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	45	4.3744	.522	3.17	.002**	74
	men	31	3.8808	.834			
MLRL	wom	45	4.3185	.926	2.85	.006**	77
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	44	3.0848	.560	.64	.525	73
	men	31	2.9988	.592			
MRAN	wom	45	3.2311	1.214	.33	.742	77
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	45	3.2481	.927	.55	.581	73
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	45	3.4428	.794	2.06	.043*	73
	men	30	3.0583	.790			
MPER	wom	45	4.0978	.815	3.13	.003*	74
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-34
ALL WOMEN WHO WATCH MORE THAN THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION
DAILY   MEN WHO WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	62	3.9436	.538	3.72	.000**	94
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	63	4.2667	.720	2.95	.004**	95
	men	34	3.8078	.751			
ALPO	wom	62	3.8039	.563	4.84	.000**	90
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
AMRL	wom	63	3.8881	.536	3.40	.001**	95
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	63	3.9212	.501	3.15	.002**	95
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	62	4.1720	.772	1.93	.056	90
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	62	4.2325	.552	4.25	.000**	90
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	62	4.4509	.508	4.08	.000**	91
	men	31	3.8808	.834			
MLRL	wom	63	4.3016	.923	3.07	.003**	95
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	61	3.1042	.630	.77	.441	90
	men	31	2.9988	.592			
MRAN	wom	63	3.1746	1.158	.14	.893	95
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	62	3.2876	.944	.77	.443	90
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	62	3.3938	.881	1.77	.080	90
	men	30	3.0563	.790			
MPER	wom	62	4.1051	.781	3.44	.001**	91
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-35
ALL WOMEN WHO WATCH MORE THAN FIVE HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY;
MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	18	3.7551	.565	1.50	.140	50
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	18	3.9852	.937	.74	.461	50
	men	34	3.8078	.751			
ALPO	wom	17	3.9055	.752	4.05	.000**	45
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
ALRL	wom	18	4.0130	.394	3.23	.002**	50
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	18	3.9444	.396	2.18	.034*	50
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	17	4.3725	.576	2.18	.034*	45
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	17	4.4317	.473	4.28	.000**	45
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	17	4.6536	.419	3.57	.001**	46
	men	31	3.8808	.834			
MLRL	wom	18	4.2593	.940	1.88	.066	50
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	17	3.1544	.801	.77	.447	46
	men	31	2.9988	.592			
MRAN	wom	18	3.0333	1.023	-.33	.743	50
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	17	3.3922	1.009	.97	.338	45
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	17	3.2647	1.095	.75	.456	45
	men	30	3.0583	.790			
MPER	wom	17	4.1242	.705	2.73	.009**	46
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-36
ALL WOMEN AND MEN WHO WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	70	4.1375	.601	5.5	.000**	102
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	70	4.0362	.794	1.40	.165	102
	men	34	3.8078	.751			
ALPO	wom	64	3.6210	.608	2.99	.004*	92
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
AMRL	wom	70	3.8427	.624	2.83	.006*	102
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	70	3.8414	.504	2.62	.010*	-1
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	63	4.2672	1.020	2.05	.043*	91
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	64	4.0404	.669	2.43	.017*	92
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	65	4.3722	.616	3.25	.002*	94
	men	31	3.8808	.834			
MLRL	wom	69	3.9565	1.185	1.42	.160	101
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	66	2.9926	.657	-.05	.964	95
	men	31	2.9988	.592			
MRAN	wom	70	3.0207	1.144	-.50	.618	102
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	65	3.0000	.917	-.68	.495	93
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	63	3.3114	.786	1.51	.135	91
	men	30	3.0583	.790			
MPER	wom	66	3.9975	.725	2.98	.004*	95
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-37
ALL WOMEN AND MEN WHO WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OR LESS
OF TELEVISION DAILY.

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	79	4.1675	.617	5.31	.000**	111
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	79	3.9823	.883	1.01	.317	111
	men	34	3.8078	.751			
ALPO	wom	73	3.5635	.620	2.48	.015*	101
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
AMRL	wom	79	3.8355	.628	2.82	.006**	111
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	79	3.8004	.546	2.29	.024*	111
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	72	4.2106	.994	1.87	.065	100
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	73	4.0479	.661	2.55	.012	101
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	74	4.3780	.593	3.45	.001**	103
	men	31	3.8808	.834			
MLRL	wom	78	3.9487	1.213	1.40	.165	110
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	75	2.9352	.677	-.46	.649	104
	men	31	2.9988	.592			
MRAN	wom	79	3.0082	1.171	-.55	.581	111
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	74	2.9369	.982	-.97	.334	102
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	72	3.2801	.798	1.28	.203	100
	men	30	3.0583	.790			
MPER	wom	75	3.9385	.798	2.55	.012*	104
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-38
ALL WOMEN WHO WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY;
MEN WATCH MORE THAN THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	79	4.1675	.617	6.56	.000**	123
	men	46	3.4027	.650			
ALRL	wom	79	3.9823	.883	.73	.464	123
	men	46	3.8681	.752			
ALPO	wom	73	3.5635	.620	1.37	.172	115
	men	44	3.3742	.867			
AMRL	wom	79	3.8355	.628	2.65	.009**	123
	men	46	3.5400	.549			
APAR	wom	79	3.8004	.546	.86	.393	123
	men	46	3.7029	.716			
ARPO	wom	72	4.2106	.994	3.31	.001**	111
	men	41	3.5325	1.137			
ASPO	wom	73	4.0479	.661	1.56	.122	111
	men	40	3.8187	.884			
APER	wom	74	4.3780	.593	2.22	.028*	114
	men	42	4.0688	.905			
MLRL	wom	78	3.9487	1.213	.46	.645	122
	men	46	3.8406	1.337			
MLPO	wom	75	2.9352	.667	-1.27	.208	115
	men	42	3.1050	.727			
MRAN	wom	79	3.0082	1.171	.04	.970	123
	men	46	3.0000	1.213			
MRPO	wom	74	2.9369	.982	-.52	.604	115
	men	43	3.0349	.982			
MSPO	wom	72	3.2801	.798	.55	.583	113
	men	43	3.1860	1.018			
MPER	wom	75	3.9385	.768	2.54	.013*	115
	men	42	3.5370	.909			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-39
ALL WOMEN WHO WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY
MEN WHO WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	70	4.1375	.601	5.54	.000**	100
	men	32	3.4068	.654			
ALRL	wom	70	4.0362	.794	1.28	.203	100
	men	32	3.8167	.823			
ALPO	wom	64	3.6210	.608	2.82	.006**	94
	men	32	3.2372	.667			
AMRL	wom	70	3.8427	.624	2.35	.021*	100
	men	32	3.5366	.578			
APAR	wom	70	3.8414	.504	1.61	.110	100
	men	32	3.6302	.806			
ARPO	wom	63	4.2672	1.020	4.30	.000**	92
	men	31	3.3548	.847			
ASPO	wom	64	4.0404	.669	2.01	.047*	92
	men	30	3.7333	.734			
APER	wom	65	4.3722	.616	3.09	.003**	94
	men	31	3.9247	.752			
MLRL	wom	69	3.9565	1.185	-.34	.738	99
	men	32	4.0417	1.185			
MLPO	wom	66	2.9926	.657	.35	.727	95
	men	31	2.9447	.563			
MRAN	wom	70	3.0207	1.144	.29	.773	100
	men	32	2.9500	1.148			
MRPO	wom	65	3.0000	.917	.42	.677	95
	men	32	2.9219	.751			
MSPO	wom	63	3.3214	.786	1.48	.142	92
	men	31	3.0726	.725			
MPER	wom	66	3.9975	.725	3.02	.003**	96
	men	32	3.5104	.793			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-40
ALL WOMEN WHO WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY
MEN WHO WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	38	4.0700	.522	4.18	.000**	70
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	39	4.4614	.542	4.30	.000**	71
	men	34	3.8078	.751			
ALPO	wom	39	3.7679	.476	5.23	.000**	67
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
AMRL	wom	39	3.8645	.602	2.70	.007**	71
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	39	3.8769	.535	2.36	.021*	71
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	39	4.1453	.864	1.51	.135	67
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	39	4.1720	.596	3.39	.001**	67
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	39	4.3974	.500	3.21	.001**	68
	men	31	3.8801	.834			
MLRL	wom	39	4.2871	.960	2.55	.013*	71
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	38	3.0785	.590	.56	.576	67
	men	31	2.9988	.592			
MRAN	wom	39	3.1846	1.142	.16	.873	71
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	39	3.2607	.950	.59	.557	67
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	39	3.9353	.822	1.72	.091	67
	men	30	3.0563	.790			
MPER	wom	39	4.1243	.852	3.10	.003**	68
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-41
WOMEN WATCH MORE THAN THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION
DAILY   MEN WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
DEMP	wom	49	4.0066	.535	3.98	.000**	81
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	50	4.3667	.682	3.54	.001**	82
	men	34	3.8078	.751			
ALPO	wom	49	3.8571	.535	5.44	.000**	77
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
AMRL	wom	50	3.9110	.560	3.32	.001**	82
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	50	3.9007	.494	2.80	.006**	82
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	49	4.2041	.812	1.94	.056	77
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	49	4.2075	.552	3.87	.000**	77
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	49	4.4433	.502	3.77	.000**	78
	men	31	3.8808	.834			
MLRL	wom	50	4.3333	.904	3.303	.003**	82
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	48	3.0621	.629	.45	.656	77
	men	31	2.9988	.562			
MRAN	wom	50	3.1960	1.100	.22	.828	82
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	49	3.2415	.997	.50	.617	77
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	49	3.3401	.914	1.40	.166	77
	men	30	3.0583	.790			
MPER	wom	49	4.1329	.831	3.33	.001**	78
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-42
ALL WOMEN AND MEN WHO WATCH THREE
TO FOURS HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	38	4.0700	.522	4.72	.000**	68
	men	32	3.4068	.654			
ALRL	wom	39	4.4615	.542	3.96	.000**	69
	men	32	3.2372	.667			
ALPO	wom	39	3.7976	.476	4.12	.000**	69
	men	32	3.2372	.667			
AMRL	wom	39	3.8645	.602	2.32	.032*	69
	men	32	3.5366	.578			
APAR	wom	39	3.8769	.535	1.54	.128	69
	men	32	3.6302	.806			
ARPO	wom	39	4.1453	.864	3.84	.000**	68
	men	31	3.3548	.847			
ASPO	wom	39	4.1752	.569	2.62	.006*	67
	men	30	3.7333	.734			
APER	wom	39	4.3974	.500	3.15	.002*	68
	men	31	3.9247	.752			
MLRL	wom	39	4.2821	.960	.94	.348	69
	men	32	4.0417	1.185			
MLPO	wom	38	3.0785	.590	.96	.342	67
	men	31	2.9447	.563			
MRAN	wom	39	3.1846	1.142	.86	.393	69
	men	32	2.9500	1.148			
MRPO	wom	39	3.2607	.950	1.64	.106	69
	men	32	2.9219	.751			
MSPO	wom	39	3.9353	.822	1.72	.090	68
	men	31	3.0726	.725			
MPER	wom	39	4.1243	.852	3.11	.003*	69
	men	32	3.5104	.793			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-43
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN WHO WATCH ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY
MEN WHO WATCH THREE TO FOUR HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	44	3.9687	.607	3.86	.000**	74
	men	32	3.4068	.654			
ALRL	wom	44	4.0545	.783	1.28	.204	74
	men	32	3.8167	.823			
ALPO	wom	38	3.5652	.642	2.09	.040*	68
	men	32	3.2372	.667			
AMRL	wom	44	3.7551	.636	1.54	.129	74
	men	32	3.5366	.578			
APAR	wom	44	3.9061	.332	2.05	.044*	74
	men	32	3.6302	.806			
ARPO	wom	37	4.2072	1.006	3.74	.000**	66
	men	31	3.3548	.847			
ASPO	wom	38	4.0461	.640	1.87	.065	66
	men	30	3.7333	.734			
APER	wom	39	4.4217	.692	2.87	.005**	68
	men	31	3.9247	.752			
MLRL	wom	43	3.9767	1.082	-.25	.806	73
	men	32	4.0417	1.185			
MLPO	wom	40	2.9882	.673	.29	.773	69
	men	31	2.9447	.563			
MRAN	wom	44	3.0023	1.156	.20	.846	74
	men	32	2.9500	1.148			
MRPO	wom	39	2.9915	1.061	.31	.756	69
	men	32	2.9219	.751			
MSPO	wom	38	3.2961	.771	1.23	.223	67
	men	31	3.0726	.725			
MPER	wom	40	4.0847	.630	3.43	.001**	70
	men	32	3.5104	.793			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-44
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN WHO WATCH ONE
TO TWO HOURS OF OF TELEVISION DAILY.

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	44	3.9687	.607	3.38	.001**	76
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	44	4.0545	.783	1.4	.164	76
	men	34	3.8076	.751			
ALPO	wom	38	3.5652	.642	2.31	.024*	66
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
AMRL	wom	44	3.7551	.636	1.95	.055	76
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	44	3.9061	.332	3.01	.004**	76
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	37	4.2072	1.006	1.63	.107	65
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	38	4.0461	.640	2.32	.024*	66
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	39	4.4217	.692	2.97	.004**	68
	men	31	3.8808	.834			
MLRL	wom	43	3.9767	1.082	1.40	.165	75
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	40	2.9882	.673	-.07	.945	69
	men	31	2.9988	.562			
MRAN	wom	44	3.0023	1.156	-.52	.603	76
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	39	2.9915	1.061	-.61	.544	67
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	38	3.2961	.771	1.25	.216	66
	men	30	3.0583	.790			
MPER	wom	40	4.0847	.630	3.44	.001**	69
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-45
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN WHO WATCH
ONE TO TWO HOURS OF TELEVISION DAILY

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	50	3.9982	.653	3.62	.001**	82
	men	34	3.4699	.693			
ALRL	wom	50	4.0213	.856	1.18	.242	82
	men	34	3.8078	.751			
ALPO	wom	44	3.5169	.633	1.98	.051	72
	men	30	3.2671	.327			
AMRL	wom	50	3.7691	.607	2.16	.034*	82
	men	34	3.4682	.654			
APAR	wom	50	3.8673	.367	2.75	.007**	82
	men	34	3.5029	.806			
ARPO	wom	43	4.1783	.959	1.61	.113	71
	men	30	3.8111	.965			
ASPO	wom	44	4.0379	.650	2.31	.024*	72
	men	30	3.6889	.620			
APER	wom	45	4.4346	.648	3.25	.002**	74
	men	31	3.8808	.834			
MLRL	wom	49	4.0204	1.081	1.62	.110	81
	men	34	3.5882	1.351			
MLPO	wom	46	2.9083	.962	-.60	.535	75
	men	31	2.9988	.592			
MRAN	wom	50	3.0260	1.126	-.45	.652	82
	men	34	3.1412	1.173			
MRPO	wom	45	2.9111	1.088	-.96	.341	73
	men	30	3.1333	.800			
MSPO	wom	44	3.2727	.758	1.17	.244	72
	men	30	3.0583	.790			
MPER	wom	46	4.0133	.702	2.93	.004**	75
	men	31	3.5242	.741			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL   Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-46
MOOSE AND UNAFFILIATED MEN

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	moose	45	3.0980	.548	-6.16	.000**	78
	unaf.	35	3.8598	.550			
ALRL	moose	45	3.7674	.716	-1.02	.311	78
	unaf.	35	3.9390	.787			
ALPO	moose	39	3.3071	.821	-.31	.761	72
	unaf.	35	3.3571	.542			
AMRL	moose	45	3.3304	.527	-3.24	.002**	78
	unaf.	35	3.7396	.601			
APAR	moose	45	3.4207	.856	-2.75	.007**	78
	unaf.	35	3.8714	.515			
ARPO	moose	36	3.3009	.997	-2.94	.004**	69
	unaf.	35	4.0095	1.053			
ASPO	moose	36	3.7546	.727	-.09	.926	68
	unaf.	34	3.7271	.842			
APER	moose	38	3.8918	.911	-.99	.326	71
	unaf.	35	4.0944	.834			
MLRL	moose	45	3.4593	1.362	-2.12	.037*	78
	unaf.	35	4.0857	1.243			
MLPO	moose	38	2.9873	.723	-.96	.339	71
	unaf.	35	3.1388	.609			
MRAN	moose	45	2.7244	1.065	-3.00	.004**	78
	unaf.	35	3.4914	1.220			
MRPO	moose	35	2.9868	.973	-.87	.389	71
	unaf.	35	3.1714	.834			
MSPO	moose	38	2.9145	.943	-2.16	.034*	71
	unaf.	35	3.3714	.860			
MPER	moose	38	3.3428	.875	-2.05	.044*	71
	unaf.	35	3.7365	.752			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-47
ALL WOMEN AND MEN

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	141	4.0691	.592	7.36	.000**	219
	men	80	3.4312	.665			
ALRL	wom	142	4.1085	.824	2.38	.018*	220
	men	80	3.8425	.748			
ALPO	wom	135	3.6739	.604	3.71	.000**	207
	men	74	3.3308	.699			
AMRL	wom	142	3.8588	.588	4.24	.000**	220
	men	80	3.5094	.593			
APAR	wom	142	3.8540	.528	2.72	.007**	220
	men	80	3.6179	.757			
ARPO	wom	134	4.1928	.895	3.86	.000**	203
	men	71	3.6502	1.069			
ASPO	wom	135	4.1327	.618	3.71	.000**	203
	men	70	3.7631	.780			
APER	wom	136	4.4113	.55	4.26	.000**	207
	men	73	3.9890	.875			
MLRL	wom	141	4.1064	1.104	2.23	.027*	219
	men	80	3.7333	1.340			
MLPO	wom	136	3.0100	.659	-.51	.612	207
	men	73	3.0599	.671			
MRAN	wom	142	3.0820	1.164	.13	.893	220
	men	80	3.0600	1.191			
MRPO	wom	136	3.0968	.977	.16	.877	207
	men	73	3.0753	.907			
MSPO	wom	134	3.3327	.836	1.58	.117	205
	men	73	3.1336	.927			
MPER	wom	137	4.0139	.775	4.18	.000**	208
	men	73	3.5316	.836			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-48
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	99	4.0024	.583	6.12	.000**	177
	men	80	3.4312	.665			
ALRL	wom	100	4.1940	.789	3.04	.003**	178
	men	80	3.8425	.748			
ALPO	wom	93	3.6972	.605	3.62	.000**	165
	men	74	3.3308	.699			
AMRL	wom	100	3.8401	.585	3.74	.000**	178
	men	80	3.5094	.593			
APAR	wom	100	3.8840	.446	2.94	.004**	178
	men	80	3.6179	.757			
ARPO	wom	92	4.1920	.879	3.55	.001**	161
	men	71	3.6502	1.069			
ASPO	wom	93	4.1272	.603	3.36	.001**	161
	men	70	3.7631	.780			
APER	wom	94	4.4391	.574	4.00	.000**	165
	men	73	3.9890	.875			
MLRL	wom	99	4.1785	1.003	2.54	.012*	177
	men	80	3.7333	1.340			
MLPO	wom	94	2.9868	.662	-.70	.483	165
	men	73	3.0599	.671			
MRAN	wom	100	3.1110	1.110	.30	.767	178
	men	80	3.0600	1.191			
MRPO	wom	94	3.0833	1.049	.05	.959	165
	men	73	3.0753	.907			
MSPO	wom	93	3.3082	.840	1.27	.206	164
	men	73	3.1336	.927			
MPER	wom	95	4.0750	.796	4.37	.000**	166
	men	73	3.5316	.836			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-49
ALL WOMEN AND MOOSE

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	141	4.0691	.592	9.75	.000**	184
	men	45	3.0980	.548			
ALRL	wom	142	4.1085	.824	2.49	.014*	185
	men	45	3.7674	.716			
ALPO	wom	135	3.6739	.604	3.06	.003**	172
	men	39	3.3071	.821			
AMRL	wom	142	3.8588	.588	5.38	.000**	185
	men	45	3.3304	.527			
APAR	wom	142	3.8540	.528	4.07	.000**	185
	men	45	3.4207	.856			
ARPO	wom	134	4.1928	.895	5.21	.000**	168
	men	36	3.3009	.977			
ASPO	wom	135	4.1327	.618	3.14	.002**	169
	men	36	3.7546	.727			
APER	wom	136	4.4113	.555	4.37	.000**	172
	men	38	3.8919	.911			
MLRL	wom	141	4.1064	1.104	3.23	.001**	184
	men	45	3.4593	1.362			
MLPO	wom	136	3.0110	.659	.19	.848	172
	men	38	2.9873	.723			
MRAN	wom	142	3.0820	1.164	1.83	.069	185
	men	45	2.7244	1.065			
MRPO	wom	136	3.0968	.977	.61	.540	172
	men	38	2.9868	.973			
MSPO	wom	134	3.3327	.836	2.64	.009**	170
	men	38	2.9145	.943			
MPER	wom	137	4.0139	.775	4.59	.000**	173
	men	38	3.3428	.875			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-50
ALL WOMEN AND UNAFFILIATED MEN

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	141	4.0691	.592	1.90	.059	174
	men	35	3.8598	.550			
ALRL	wom	142	4.1085	.824	1.10	.274	175
	men	35	3.9390	.787			
ALPO	wom	135	3.6739	.604	2.82	.005**	168
	men	35	3.3571	.542			
AMRL	wom	142	3.8588	.588	1.07	.286	175
	men	35	3.7396	.601			
APAR	wom	142	3.8540	.528	-.18	.861	175
	men	35	3.8714	.515			
ARPO	wom	134	4.1928	.895	1.04	.300	167
	men	35	4.0095	1.053			
ASPO	wom	135	4.1327	.618	2.81	.006**	167
	men	34	3.7721	.842			
APER	wom	136	4.4113	.555	2.69	.008**	169
	men	35	4.0944	.834			
MLRL	wom	141	4.1064	1.104	.10	.923	174
	men	35	4.0857	1.243			
MLPO	wom	136	3.0110	.659	-1.04	.301	169
	men	35	3.1358	.609			
MRAN	wom	142	3.0820	1.164	-1.85	.067	175
	men	35	3.4914	1.220			
MRPO	wom	136	3.0968	.977	-.41	.679	169
	men	35	3.1714	.834			
MSPO	wom	134	3.3327	.836	-.24	.809	167
	men	35	3.3714	.860			
MPER	wom	137	4.0139	.775	1.90	.059	170
	men	35	3.7365	.752			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-51
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MOOSE

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	99	4.0024	.583	8.78	.000**	142
	men	45	3.0980	.548			
ALRL	wom	100	4.1940	.789	3.10	.002**	143
	men	45	3.7674	.716			
ALPO	wom	93	3.6962	.605	3.02	.003**	130
	men	39	3.3071	.821			
AMRL	wom	100	3.8401	.585	5.00	.000**	143
	men	45	3.3304	.527			
APAR	wom	100	3.8840	.446	4.28	.000**	143
	men	45	3.4207	.856			
ARPO	wom	92	4.1920	.879	4.99	.000**	126
	men	36	3.3009	.997			
ASPO	wom	93	4.1272	.603	2.97	.004**	127
	men	36	3.7546	.727			
APER	wom	94	4.4391	.574	4.15	.000**	130
	men	38	3.8918	.911			
MLRL	wom	99	4.1785	1.003	3.55	.001**	142
	men	45	3.4593	1.362			
MLPO	wom	94	2.9868	.662	.00	.997	130
	men	38	2.9873	.723			
MRAN	wom	100	3.1110	1.110	1.96	.051	143
	men	45	2.7244	1.065			
MRPO	wom	94	3.0833	1.049	.49	.626	130
	men	38	2.9868	.973			
MSPO	wom	93	3.3082	.840	2.35	.020*	129
	men	38	2.9145	.943			
MPER	wom	95	4.0750	.796	4.77	.000**	131
	men	38	3.3428	.875			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-52
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	99	4.0024	.583	1.26	.209	132
	men	35	3.8598	.550			
ALRL	wom	100	4.1940	.789	1.65	.102	133
	men	35	3.9390	.787			
ALPO	wom	93	3.6962	.605	2.90	.004**	126
	men	35	3.3571	.542			
AMRL	wom	100	3.8401	.585	.87	.387	133
	men	35	3.7396	.601			
APAR	wom	100	3.8840	.446	.14	.891	133
	men	35	3.8714	.515			
ARPO	wom	92	4.1920	.879	.99	.325	125
	men	35	4.0095	1.053			
ASPO	wom	93	4.1272	.603	2.63	.010**	125
	men	34	3.7721	.842			
APER	wom	94	4.4391	.574	2.66	.009**	127
	men	35	4.0944	.834			
MLRL	wom	99	4.1785	1.003	.44	.660	132
	men	35	4.0857	1.243			
MLPO	wom	94	2.9896	.662	-1.18	.239	127
	men	35	3.1388	.609			
MRAN	wom	100	3.1110	1.110	-1.70	.091	133
	men	35	3.4914	1.220			
MRPO	wom	94	3.0833	1.049	-.45	.656	127
	men	35	3.1714	.834			
MSPO	wom	93	3.3082	.840	-.38	.707	126
	men	35	3.3714	.860			
MPER	wom	95	4.0750	.796	2.24	.027*	128
	men	35	3.7365	.752			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-53
MOOSE AND CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	22	4.6592	.228	12.51	.000**	65
	men	45	3.0980	.548			
ALRL	wom	22	3.9182	.991	.71	.479	65
	men	45	3.7674	.716			
ALPO	wom	22	3.6591	.555	1.79	.079	59
	men	39	3.3071	.821			
AMRL	wom	22	3.9836	.698	4.27	.000**	65
	men	45	3.3304	.527			
APAR	wom	22	3.6227	.785	.93	.355	65
	men	45	3.4207	.856			
ARPO	wom	22	4.5076	1.012	4.50	.000**	56
	men	36	3.3009	.997			
ASPO	wom	22	4.2045	.611	2.42	.019*	56
	men	36	3.7546	.727			
APER	wom	22	4.3485	.391	2.23	.030*	58
	men	38	3.8918	.911			
MLRL	wom	22	3.9394	1.246	1.39	.169	65
	men	45	3.4593	1.362			
MLPO	wom	22	3.0341	.693	.25	.807	58
	men	38	2.9873	.723			
MRAN	wom	22	2.9886	1.333	.88	.384	65
	men	45	2.7244	1.065			
MRPO	wom	22	3.0303	.860	.17	.863	58
	men	38	2.9868	.973			
MSPO	wom	21	3.1984	.803	1.16	.246	57
	men	38	2.9145	.943			
MPER	wom	22	3.8232	.671	2.22	.030*	58
	men	38	3.3428	.875			

LEGEND
#VAR SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-54
RATIO OF VARIANCE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
WOMEN'S COALITION AND UNAFFILIATED WOMEN

VAR#	N(1)#	N(2)#	S(1)#	S(2)#	F	SIG.
ALRL	22	100	0.9910	0.7890	1.5776	1.61
ALPO	22	93	0.6950	0.5550	1.8830	1.90
AMRL	22	100	0.6890	0.5850	1.3872	1.61
APAR	22	100	0.7850	0.4460	3.0979	1.61*
ARPO	22	100	0.6110	0.6030	1.3255	1.61
APER	22	94	0.3910	0.3294	2.1551	1.90*
MLRL	22	99	1.2460	1.0333	1.5432	1.65
MLPO	22	94	0.6930	0.6620	1.0958	1.68
MRAN	22	100	1.3333	1.1111	1.4396	1.61
MRPO	22	94	0.8030	1.0004	1.7066	1.90
MSPO	21	93	0.8400	0.8030	1.0943	1.90
MPER	22	95	0.7960	0.6336	1.4073	1.89

LEGEND
#SEE LEGEND
N(1) CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
N(2) UNAFFILIATED WOMEN
S(1) CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION
S(2) UNAFFILIATED WOMEN
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level

TABLE A-55
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WOMEN'S COALITION AND MOOSE

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	22	4.6592	.298	6.28	.000**	55
	men	35	3.8598	.550			
ALRL	wom	22	3.9182	.991	-.09	.930	55
	men	35	3.9390	.787			
ALPO	wom	22	3.6591	.555	2.03	.047*	55
	men	35	3.3571	.542			
AMRL	wom	22	3.9836	.698	1.40	.167	55
	men	35	3.7396	.601			
APAR	wom	22	3.6227	.785	-1.45	.153	55
	men	35	3.8714	.515			
ARPO	wom	22	4.5076	1.012	1.76	.083	55
	men	35	4.0095	1.053			
ASPO	wom	22	4.2045	.611	2.08	.042*	54
	men	34	3.7721	.842			
APER	wom	22	4.3485	.391	1.34	.187	55
	men	35	4.0944	.834			
MLRL	wom	22	3.9394	1.246	-.43	.667	55
	men	35	4.0857	1.243			
MLPO	wom	22	3.0341	.693	-.60	.552	55
	men	35	3.1388	.609			
MRAN	wom	22	2.9886	1.333	-1.46	.150	55
	men	35	3.4914	1.220			
MRPO	wom	22	3.0303	.860	-.60	.541	55
	men	35	3.1714	.834			
MSPO	wom	21	3.1984	.803	-.75	.459	54
	men	35	3.3714	.860			
MPER	wom	22	3.8232	.671	.44	.661	55
	men	35	3.7365	.752			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-56
NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHHOD WOMEN AND
LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	20	3.7500	.448	4.67	.000**	63
	men	45	3.0980	.548			
ALRL	wom	20	3.8900	.762	.62	.534	63
	men	45	3.7674	.716			
ALPO	wom	20	3.5866	.672	1.31	.195	57
	men	39	3.3071	.821			
AMRL	wom	20	3.8154	.468	3.54	.001**	63
	men	45	3.3304	.527			
APAR	wom	20	3.9538	.524	2.59	.012**	63
	men	45	3.4207	.856			
ARPO	wom	20	3.8500	.729	2.19	.033*	54
	men	36	3.3009	.977			
ASPO	wom	20	4.0792	.715	1.61	.113	54
	men	36	3.7546	.727			
APER	wom	20	4.3493	.632	2.00	.050*	56
	men	38	3.8918	.911			
MLRL	wom	20	3.9333	1.408	1.28	.205	63
	men	45	3.4593	1.362			
MLPO	wom	20	3.0991	.634	.58	.562	56
	men	38	2.9873	.723			
MRAN	wom	20	3.0400	1.284	1.03	.305	63
	men	45	2.7244	1.065			
MRPO	wom	20	3.2333	.742	.99	.326	56
	men	38	2.9868	.973			
MSPO	wom	20	3.5875	.840	2.68	.010**	56
	men	38	2.9145	.943			
MPER	wom	20	3.9333	.901	2.42	.019*	56
	men	38	3.3428	.875			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-57
NATIONAL CONGRESS OF NEIGHBORHOOD WOMEN AND UNAFFILIATED MEN

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB	DEG
MDEMP	wom	20	3.7500	.448	-.76	.451	53
	men	35	3.8598	.550			
ALRL	wom	20	3.8900	.762	-.22	.823	53
	men	35	3.9390	.787			
ALPO	wom	20	3.5866	.672	1.38	.173	53
	men	35	3.3571	.542			
AMRL	wom	20	3.8154	.468	.49	.629	53
	men	35	3.7696	.601			
APAR	wom	20	3.9583	.524	.60	.552	53
	men	35	3.8714	.515			
ARPO	wom	20	3.8500	.729	-.60	.552	53
	men	35	4.0095	1.053			
ASPO	wom	20	4.0792	.715	1.37	.178	52
	men	34	3.7721	.842			
APER	wom	20	4.3493	.632	1.18	.242	53
	men	35	4.0944	.834			
MLRL	wom	20	3.9333	1.408	-.42	.679	53
	men	35	4.0857	1.243			
MLPO	wom	20	3.0991	.634	-.23	.820	53
	men	35	3.1388	.609			
MRAN	wom	20	3.4914	1.284	-1.30	.201	53
	men	35	3.4914	1.220			
MRPO	wom	20	3.2333	.742	.28	.784	53
	men	35	3.1714	.834			
MSPO	wom	20	3.5875	.840	.90	.370	53
	men	35	3.3714	.860			
MPER	wom	20	3.9333	.901	.87	.389	53
	men	35	3.7365	.752			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-58
WOMEN AND MEN EXCLUDING THOSE AGED 55-64

VAR#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	102	4.1490	.579	7.01	.000**	166
	men	66	3.4556	.693			
ALRL	wom	103	4.1424	.844	2.02	.045*	167
	men	66	3.8383	.754			
ALPO	wom	99	3.6754	.614	3.33	.001**	160
	men	63	3.3381	.649			
AMRL	wom	103	3.8962	.560	4.43		167
	men	66	3.4930	.603			
APAR	wom	103	3.8405	.520	1.16	.249	167
	men	66	3.7399	.597			
ARPO	wom	99	4.2071	.919	3.63	.000**	159
	men	62	3.6452	1.010			
ASPO	wom	98	4.1216	.607	3.01	.003**	157
	men	61	3.7896	.776			
APER	wom	98	4.3746	.584	3.11	.002**	159
	men	63	4.0366	.791			
MLRL	wom	102	4.1242	1.133	1.35	.178	166
	men	66	3.8687	1.286			
MLPO	wom	100	3.0469	.615	-.11	.915	161
	men	63	3.0575	.628			
MRAN	wom	103	3.1000	1.123	-.15	.881	167
	men	66	3.1273	1.193			
MRPO	wom	100	3.1950	.903	.56	.575	161
	men	63	3.1138	.893			
MSPO	wom	99	3.4007	.765	2.13	.034*	161
	men	64	3.1211	.892			
MPER	wom	100	4.0022	.725	3.95	.000**	161
	men	63	3.5348	.750			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-59
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN AND MEN NOT INCLUDING AGES 55-64

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	66	4.1063	.579	5.85	000**	130
	men	66	3.4556	.693			
ALRL	wom	67	4.2169	.843	2.40	.018*	131
	men	66	3.8838	.754			
ALPO	wom	63	3.6623	.640	2.82	.006**	124
	men	63	3.3381	.649			
AMRL	wom	67	3.8406	.556	3.46	.001**	131
	men	66	3.4930	.603			
APAR	wom	67	3.8587	.455	1.29	.199	131
	men	66	3.7399	.597			
ARPO	wom	63	4.1587	.907	2.99	.003**	123
	men	62	3.6452	1.010			
ASPO	wom	62	4.0901	.561	2.46	.015*	121
	men	61	3.7896	.776			
APER	wom	62	4.3880	.621	2.76	.007**	123
	men	63	4.0366	.791			
MLRL	wom	66	4.1717	1.040	1.49	.139	130
	men	66	3.8687	1.286			
MLPO	wom	64	2.9954	.581	-.58	.564	125
	men	63	3.0575	.628			
MRAN	wom	67	3.1097	1.049	-.09	.928	131
	men	66	3.1273	1.193			
MRPO	wom	64	3.1953	.986	.49	.626	125
	men	63	3.1138	.893			
MSPO	wom	64	3.3464	.755	1.54	.126	126
	men	64	3.1211	.892			
MPER	wom	64	4.0312	.696	3.87	.000**	125
	men	63	3.5348	.750			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-60
UNAFFILIATED WOMEN NOT INCLUDING AGES 55-64;
MOOSE NOT INCLUDING AGES 55-64

VAR#	GRP	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	66	4.1063	.579	8.46	.000**	97
	men	33	3.0622	.580			
ALRL	wom	67	4.2169	.843	2.33	.022*	98
	men	33	3.8202	.707			
ALPO	wom	63	3.6623	.640	2.24	.028*	91
	men	30	3.3267	.746			
AMRL	wom	67	3.8406	.556	5.21	.000**	98
	men	33	3.2473	.490			
APAR	wom	67	3.8587	.455	2.27	.025*	98
	men	33	3.6061	.643			
ARPO	wom	63	4.1587	.907	4.58	.000**	90
	men	29	3.2644	.784			
ASPO	wom	62	4.0901	.561	1.95	.050	89
	men	29	3.8247	.687			
APER	wom	62	4.3880	.621	2.44	.017*	90
	men	30	4.0259	.754			
MLRL	wom	66	4.1717	1.040	2.25	.027*	97
	men	33	3.6263	1.312			
MLPO	wom	64	2.9954	.581	.18	.857	92
	men	30	2.9714	.644			
MRAN	woa	67	3.1097	1.049	1.87	.065	98
	men	33	2.6970	1.015			
MRPO	wom	64	3.1953	.986	.68	.501	92
	men	30	3.0500	.940			
MSPO	wom	64	3.3464	.755	2.69	.009**	93
	men	31	2.8790	.873			
MPER	wom	64	4.0312	.696	4.62	.000**	92
	men	30	3.3194	.696			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-61
ALL WOMEN AND UNAFFILIATED MEN EXCLUDING THOSE AGED 55-64

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	66	4.1063	.579	8.46	.000**	97
	men	33	3.0622	.580			
ALRL	wom	67	4.2169	.843	2.33	.022**	98
	men	33	3.8202	.707			
ALPO	wom	63	3.6623	.640	2.24	.028**	91
	men	30	3.3267	.746			
AMRL	wom	67	3.8406	.556	5.21	.000**	98
	men	33	3.2473	.490			
APAR	wom	67	3.8587	.455	2.27	.025**	98
	men	33	3.6061	.643			
ARPO	wom	63	4.1587	.907	4.58	.000**	90
	men	29	3.2644	.784			
ASPO	wom	62	4.0901	.561	1.95	.054	89
	men	29	3.8247	.687			
APER	wom	62	4.3880	.521	2.44	.017*	90
	men	30	4.0259	.754			
MLRL	wom	66	4.1717	1.040	2.25	.027*	87
	men	33	3.6263	1.312			
MLPO	wom	64	2.9954	.581	.18	.857	92
	men	30	2.9714	.644			
MRAN	wom	67	3.1097	1.049	1.87	.065	98
	men	33	2.6970	1.015			
MRPO	wom	64	3.1953	.986	.68	.501	92
	men	30	3.0500	.940			
MSPO	wom	64	3.3464	.755	2.69	.009**	93
	men	31	2.9870	.873			
MPER	wom	64	4.0312	.696	4.62	.000**	92
	men	30	3.3194	.696			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-62
ALL WOMEN EXCLUDING THOSE AGED 55-64;
MOOSE EXCLUDING THOSE AGED 55-64

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	102	4.1940	.579	9.37	.000**	133
	men	33	3.0622	.580			
ALRL	wom	103	4.1424	.844	1.98	.050*	134
	men	33	3.8202	.707			
ALPO	wom	99	3.6754	.614	2.59	.011**	127
	men	30	3.3267	.746			
AMRL	wom	103	3.8962	.560	5.96	.000**	134
	men	33	3.2473	.490			
APAR	wom	103	3.8405	.520	2.12	.036*	134
	men	33	3.6061	.643			
ARPO	wom	99	4.2071	.919	5.1	.000**	126
	men	29	3.2644	.784			
ASPO	wom	98	4.1216	.607	2.25	.027*	125
	men	29	3.8247	.687			
APER	wom	98	4.3746	.584	2.66	.009**	126
	men	30	4.0259	.754			
MLRL	wom	102	4.1242	1.333	2.11	.037*	133
	men	33	3.6263	1.312			
MLPO	wom	100	3.0469	.615	.58	.561	128
	men	30	2.9714	.644			
MRAN	wom	103	3.1000	1.123	1.83	.069	134
	men	33	2.6970	1.015			
MRPO	wom	100	3.1950	.903	.76	.446	128
	men	30	3.0500	.940			
MSPO	wom	99	3.4007	.765	3.20	.002**	128
	men	31	2.8790	.873			
MPER	wom	100	4.002	.725	4.56	.000**	128
	men	30	3.3194	.696			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-63
ALL WOMEN EXCLUDING THOSE AGED 55-64;
UNAFFILIATED MEN EXCLUDING THOSE AGED 55-64

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	102	4.1490	.579	2.60	.010**	133
	men	33	3.8491	.565			
ALRL	wom	103	4.1424	.844	1.17	.245	134
	men	33	3.9475	.804			
ALPO	wom	99	3.6754	.614	2.71	.008**	130
	men	33	3.3485	.557			
AMRL	wom	103	3.8962	.560	1.37	.172	134
	men	33	3.7387	.613			
APAR	wom	103	3.8405	.520	-.32	.750	134
	men	33	3.8737	.524			
ARPO	wom	99	4.2071	.919	1.18	.241	130
	men	33	3.9798	1.078			
ASPO	wom	98	4.1216	.697	2.64	.009**	128
	men	32	3.7578	.858			
APER	wom	98	4.3746	.584	1.29	.014*	129
	men	33	4.0463	.835			
MLRL	wom	102	4.1214	1.133	.06	.955	133
	men	33	4.1111	1.232			
MLPO	wom	100	3.0469	.615	-.72	.472	131
	men	33	3.1358	.612			
MRAN	wom	103	3.1000	1.123	-2.00	.048*	134
	men	33	3.5576	1.216			
MRPO	wom	100	3.1950	.903	.13	.897	131
	men	33	3.1717	.858			
MSPO	wom	99	3.4007	.765	.33	.743	130
	men	33	3.3485	.861			
MPER	wom	100	4.0022	.725	1.85	.067	131
	men	33	3.7306	.753			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-64
ALL WOMEN AND MEN AGED 45-54

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	22	4.1874	.540	5.81	.000**	36
	men	16	3.1672	.526			
ALRL	wom	22	4.1061	.958	1.33	.193	36
	men	16	3.6917	.939			
ALPO	wom	21	3.5128	.651	-.03	.973	34
	men	15	3.5200	.617			
AMRL	wom	22	3.8543	.643	4.24	.000**	36
	men	16	3.0361	.498			
APAR	wom	22	3.7500	.541	.60	.551	36
	men	16	3.6250	.739			
ARPO	wom	21	4.1032	.989	2.30	.028*	34
	men	15	3.3778	.844			
ASPO	wom	21	3.9841	.731	.45	.656	34
	men	15	3.8722	.743			
APER	wom	21	4.3638	.821	1.31	.199	35
	men	16	3.9931	.892			
MLRL	wom	22	4.0303	1.247	1.03	.310	36
	men	16	3.5833	1.417			
MLPO	wom	22	2.9148	.634	-.66	.512	35
	men	15	3.0679	.766			
MRAN	wom	22	2.9432	.990	.77	.446	36
	men	16	2.7000	.918			
MRPO	wom	22	2.9091	.904	.23	.823	35
	men	15	2.8333	1.139			
MSPO	wom	22	3.1326	.687	.85	.399	36
	men	16	2.8906	1.061			
MPER	wom	22	3.8434	.745	2.37	.024*	35
	men	15	3.2611	.720			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

TABLE A-65
UNAFFILIATED AND MEN WOMEN AGED 45-54

VAR.#	GRP.	N	MEAN	STAND.	T	PROB.	DEG.
MDEMP	wom	13	4.0077	.569	4.13	.000**	27
	men	16	3.1672	.526			
ALRL	wom	13	4.1333	1.034	1.20	.239	27
	men	16	3.6917	.939			
ALPO	wom	12	3.4807	.718	-.15	.880	25
	men	15	3.5200	.617			
AMRL	wom	13	3.6765	.707	2.86	.008**	27
	men	16	3.0361	.498			
APAR	wom	13	3.6795	.516	.22	.824	27
	men	16	3.6250	.739			
ARPO	wom	12	4.0139	1.272	1.56	.132	25
	men	15	3.3778	.844			
ASPO	wom	12	3.9306	.819	.19	.848	25
	men	15	3.8722	.743			
APER	wom	12	4.3218	1.036	.90	.376	26
	men	16	3.9931	.892			
MLRL	wom	13	3.6667	1.333	.16	.873	27
	men	33	3.5833	1.417			
MLPO	wom	13	2.8654	.576	-.78	.443	26
	men	15	3.0679	.766			
MRAN	wom	13	2.9538	.865	.76	.454	27
	men	16	2.7000	.918			
MRPO	wom	13	2.7949	.996	-.09	.926	26
	men	15	2.8333	1.139			
MSPO	wom	13	3.1474	.708	.75	.462	27
	men	16	2.8906	1.061			
MPER	wom	13	3.8718	.846	2.06	.049*	26
	men	15	3.2611	.720			

LEGEND
VAR# SEE LEGEND
MDEMP mean subjects' score on Demplwolff Sex Role Attitude Test
ALRL Ann's degree of liberation in her relationship to Mark
ALPO Ann's general degree of liberation
AMRL Ann's relationship to Mark
APAR Ann's relationship to her children
ARPO Ann's general ability to relate to others
ASPO Ann's general ability to cope
APER Ann's personality
MLRL Mark's degree of liberation in his relationship to Ann
MLPO Marks' general degree of liberation
MRAN Marks' relationship to Ann
MRPO Mark's general ability to relate to others
MSPO Mark's general ability to cope
MPER Mark's personality
* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Balon, Robert, F.
1978   "The Impact of Roots on a Racially
        Heterogeneous Southern Community: An
        Exploratory Study." Journal of
        Broadcasting. 22:299-308

Bardwick, Judith M.
1971   Psychology of Women: A Study of Bio-
        Cultural Conflicts. New York: Harper and
        Row

Beere, Carole
1979   Women and Women's Issues: A Handbook of
        Tests and Measurements. San Francisco,
        Jossey-Bass

Bem, Sandra L. and Daryl L. Bem
1976   "Training the Woman to Know Her Place" Pp.
        171-179 in Sue Cox (ed) Female
        Psychology: The Emerging Self. second
        edition Chicago: SRA

Berelson, Bernard
1952   Content Analysis in Communication Research.
        Glencoe: Free Press

Bernard, Jessie
1976   "Sex Differences: An Overview" Pp. 9-26 in
        Alexandra G. Kaplan and Joan P. Bean (eds)
        Readings Toward a Psychology of Androgyny.
        New York: Little Brown

Blumler, Jay C.
1979   "The Role of Theory in Uses and
        Gratifications Studies." Communication
        Research. 6:9-36

Bower, Robert, T.
1985   The Changing Audience in American
        Television. New York: Columbia University
        Press

Brigham John, C. and Linda W. Giesbrecht
1976   "All in the Family: Racial Attitudes."
        Journal of Communication. 26:69-74

Brightman, Carol
1978   "Women of Williamsbourg." Working
        Papers 3:50-58

Bunch, William
1985   "The Moose, Elk and Mason May Not Be Long
        For This World." Newsday August 17th. part
        two page two

Carroll, Berenice, A.
1976   Liberating Women's History.
        Champaign Urbana: University of Illinois
        Press

Chapko, Michael and Mark H. Lewis
1975   "Authoritarianism and All in the Family."
        Journal of Psychology. 90:245-248

Constantinople, Anna
1979   "Sex Role Acquisition: In Search of the
        Elephant." Sex Roles. 5:121-133

Cooper, Eunice and Marie Jahoda
1972   "The Evasions of Propaganda." Pp. 287-299
        in Wilbur Schramm and Donald Roberts
        (eds) The Process and Effects of Mass
        Media. 2nd edition Champaign-Urbana:
        University of Illinois

Degler, Carl
1980   At Odds. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Demplewolff, Judith, Ann
1972   Feminism and It's Correlates. University
        Microfilms

Dominick, Joseph R.
1979   "The Portrayal of Women in Prime Time."
        Sex Roles. 405-411

Ducker, Joseph and Lewis T. Tucker
1977   "Women's Libers versus Independent Women: A
        Study of Preferences of Women's Roles in
        Advertising". Journal of Marketing
        Research. 14:469-475

Elliot, Philip
1974   "Uses and Gratifications Research: A
        Critique and Sociological Alternative".
        Pp. 49-268 in Jay C. Blumler and Elihu
        Katz (eds) Current Perspectives in
        Gratification Research. Beverly Hills:
        Sage

Frank, Ronald E. and Marshall G. Greenberg
1980   The Public's Use of Television: Who Watches
        and Why. Beverly Hills: Sage

Freeman, Jo
1976   "The Social Construction of the Second
        Sex." Pp. 136-150 in Sue Cox (ed) Female
        Psychology: The Emerging Self. Chicago:
        SRA

Gans, Herbert, T
1980   "The audience for Television and in
        Television Research." Pp. 55-81 in (eds)
        Stephen B. Withey and Ronald P. Abels
        Television and Social Behavior: Beyond
        Violence and Children. A report of the
        Committee on Television and Social
        Behavior Social Science Research
        Council. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence
        Erlbaum Publishers.

Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Mary Signorielli and
        Michael Morgan
1980   "Aging with Television: Images on
        Television Drama and Conceptions of Social
        Reality." Journal of Communication.
        30:37-47

Gerbner, George, and Larry Gross
1976   "Living With Television: The Violence
        Profile." Journal of Communication.
        26:173-199

Gilligan, Carol
    1982   In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory
               and Women's Development. Cambridge:
               Harvard University Press

Gitlin, Todd
    1983   Inside Prime Time. New York: Pantheon
               Press

Goethals, Gregor T.
    1981   The TV Ritual: Worship at the Video Alter.
               Boston: Beacon Press

Goff, David H., Lynda Dysant Goff and Sara Kay Lehner
    1980   "Sex-Role Portrayal of Selected Female
               Television Characters." Journal of
               Broadcasting. 24:467-478

Greenberg, Bradley S. Linda Hogan and Charles Atkin
    1980   "The Demography of Fictional TV Characters"
               Pp. 161-172 In Bradley S. Greenberg (ed)
               Life on Television: Content Analysis of U.S
               Television Drama. Norwood, New Jersey:
               Ablex Pub.

Griffin-Lozano, Wendy
    1985   "Inside Androgyny: Questioning Concepts and
               Constructs." Paper Presented at The
               Annual Meeting of the American Sociological
               Association Washington, D.C. August 27th,
               1985

Hall, Stuart
    1982   "The Rediscovery of Ideology." Pp. 57-90
               in (eds)Michael Gurevich, Tony Bennett,
               James Curran and Janet Woollacott Culture,
               Society and the Media. London: Methuen

Haskell, Deborah
    1979   "The Depiction of Women in Leading Roles
               in Prime Time Television." Journal of
               Broadcasting. 23:191-196

Hawkins, Robert and Suzanne Pingree
    1983   "Television's Influence on Social Reality"
            Pp. 53-75 in (eds) Ellen Wartella, D.
            Charles Whiteny and Sven Windhal
            (assoc. ed) Mass Communication Review
            Yearbook Vol. 4. Beverly Hills: Sage

Head, Sydney W.
    1955   "Content Analysis of Television Drama
            Programs." Quarterly of Film, Radio and
            Television. 9:175-195

Howard, John, George Rothbart and Lee Sloan
    1978   "The Response to Roots A National Survey."
            Journal of Broadcasting. 22:279-287

Hur, Kenneth K. and John P. Robinson
    1978   "The Social Impact of Roots." Journalism
            Quarterly. 55:19-24

Jackson-Beeck, Marilyn and Jeff Sobal
    1980   "The Social World of the Heavy Television
            Viewer." Journal of Broadcasting. 24:5-11

Katz, Elihu, Michael Gurevitch and Hadassah Hass
    1973   "The Use of the Mass Media for Important
            Things." American Sociological Review.
            38:164-181

Katz, Elihu, Jay C. Blumler and Michael Gurevitch
    1974   "Utilization of Mass Communication by the
            Individual." Pp. 19-32 in Jay C. Blumler
            and Elihu Katz (eds) The Uses of Mass
            Communication. Sage Annual Reviews of
            Communication Research Vol. 111
            Beverly Hills: Sage

Katz, Phyllis
    1979   "The Development of Female Identity." Sex
            Roles. 5:28-35

Kirkpatrick, Clifford
  1936   "The Construction of a Belief-Pattern Scale
          for Measuring Attitudes Towards Feminism."
          Journal of Social Psychology. 7:421-437

Krippendorff, Klaus
  1980   "Content Analysis An Introduction to its
          Methodology." Volume 5 Sage Commtext
          Series Beverly Hills: Sage

Leckenby, John D. and Stuart H. Surlin
  1976   "Incidental Social Learning and Viewer
          Race: All in the Family and Sanford and
          Son."   Journal of Broadcasting.
          20:481-494

Leckenby, John D.
  1977   "Attribution of Dogmatism to Television
          Characters." Journalism Quarterly.
          54:14-19

Levy, Mark R. and Sven Windhal
  1984   "Audience Activity and Gratifications: A
          Conceptual Clarification and Exploration."
          Communication Research. 11:51-78

Lewis, Michael and Marsha Weinraub
  1979   "Origins of Early Sex-Role Development."
          Sex Roles. 5:135-153

Long, Michelle, and Rita J. Simon
  1974   "The Roles and Statuses of Women on
          Television." Journalism Quarterly. 51:
          107-110

Lometti, Guy, E. and Byron Reeves
  1977   "Investigating the Assumptions of Uses and
          Gratifications Research." Communication
          Research. 4:321-338

Lopoata, Helena Z. and Barrie Thorne
  1972   "On the Term Sex Roles." Signs. 4:718-721

Lull, James
    1980   "Family Communication Patterns and the
            Social Uses of Television." Communication
            Research. 7:319-334

Lundstrom, William J. and Donald Sciglimpaglia
    1977   "Sex Role Portrayals in Advertising."
            Journal of Marketing. 41:72-79

McNeil, Jean C.
    1975   "Imagery of Women in Television Drama."
            Journal of Broadcasting. 19:283-28

McQuail, Dennis, Jay C. Blumler and J.R. Brown
    1972   "The Television Audience: A Revised
            Perspective." Pp. 135-165 in Dennis
            McQuail (ed) Sociology of Mass
            Communications. Middlesex, England:
            Penguin Books

Meehan, Diana M.
    1983   Ladies of the Evening: Women Characters of
            Prime Time Television. Metuchen N.J.:
            Scarecrow Press

Rosenberg, Rosalind
    1982   Beyond Separate Spheres. New Haven: Yale
            University Press

Rossi, Alice
    1977   "Transition to Parenthood." Pp. 219-234
            in (eds) Peter J. Stein, Judith Richman
            and Natalie Hannon The Family: Functions,
            Conflicts and Symbols. New York:
            Addison Wesley

Ryan, Mary P.
    1975   Womanhood in America. New York: New
            Viewpoints

Schmidt, Alvin, J
1980   Fraternal Organization: The Greenwood
        Encyclopedia of American Institutions.
        Westport: Greenwood

Schreiber, Elliot, S.
1979   "The Effects of Sex and Age on the
        Perceptions of TV Characters." Journal
        of Broadcasting. 23:81-93

Sears, David, O. and Jonathan Freedman
1972   "Selective Exposure to Information: A
        Critical Review" Pp. 209-235 in (eds)
        Wilbur Schramm and Donald Roberts
        The Process and Effects of Mass
        Communications.   Champaign-Urbana
        University of Illinois Press

Seggar, John F.
1975   "Imagery of Women in Television Drama."
        Journal of Broadcasting. 19:273-282

Signorelli, Nancy
1982   "Marital Status in Television Drama: A Case
        of Reduced Options." Journal of
        Broadcasting. 26:585-598

Smythe, Dallas, W.
1953   "Three Years of New York Television."
        National Association of Educational
        Broadcasters, Urbana

Stanford, Serena, Wade
1984   "Predicting Favorite TV Programs
        Gratifications from General Orientations".
        Communication Research. 11:519-536

Surlin, Stuart H.
1974   "Bigotry on Air and in Life: The Archie
        Bunker Case." Public Telecommunications
        Review. 2:34-41

Surlin, Stuart, H and Eugene D. Tate
    1976   "All in the Family: Is Archie Funny?."
            Journal of Communication. 26:61-68

Surlin, Stuart, H.
    1978   "Roots Research: A Summary of Findings."
            Journal of Broadcasting. 22:309-320

Surlin, Stuart, H.
    1981   "Race and Authoritarianism: Effect on the
            Perception of Roots." Journal of Black
            Studies. 12:71-82

Swanson, David
    1979   "Political Communication Research and the
            Uses and Gratifications Model: A
            Critique." Communication Research.
            6:37-53
Tate, Eugene, D. and Stuart H. Surlin
    1976   "Agreement With Opinionated TV Characters
            Across Cultures." Journalism Quarterly.
            53:203,210

Tedecso, Nancy C.
    1974   "Patterns in Prime Time." Journal of
            Communication. 24:119-124

Turrow, Joseph
    1974   "Advising and Ordering in Daytime and
            Primetime". Journal of Communication.
            24:138-141
United States Commission on Human Rights
    1977   "Window Dressing on the Set: Women and
            Minorities in Television." Washington,
            D.C. United States Printing Office.

Vidmar, Neil and Milton Rokeach
    1974   "Archie Bunker's Bigotry: A Study in
            Selective Perception and Exposure."
            Journal of Communication. 24:36-48

Volgy, Thomas J. and John E. Schwartz
    1980   "Television Entertainmnet Programming and
            Sociolpolitical Attitudes." Journalism
            Quarterly. 57:150-155

Weitzman, Leonore, J.
    1979   Sex Role Socialization. Mew York: Mayfield
            Publishers.

Wortzel, Lawrence and John M. Frisbie
    1974   "Women's Role Portrayal in Advertisements"
            Journal of Marketing. 38:41-46