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ABSTRACT

Female alcoholism was studied and compared to male alcoholism with the use of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Masculinity, femininity and social desirability scores were analyzed; fifty-eight alcoholics and fifty-eight non-alcoholics (males and females of equal numbers) were given the sex-role inventory; two conditions were given for each subject: a sober condition, and an "imagine yourself drunk" condition, in order to investigate the hypotheses that men drink to feel powerful and women drink to feel "womanly." The results did not support the hypotheses; men did not score significantly higher in masculinity in the drunk condition, as compared to the sober condition. Women did not score significantly higher in femininity in the drunk condition, as compared to the sober condition. Female alcoholics did not show any significant change in masculinity scores across both conditions, as had been predicted.
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INTRODUCTION

Current estimates suggest that the rate of alcoholism among women is on the rise (Curlee, 1967). While an estimated 20% of the total number of alcoholics in the United States are women (Efron, Keller and Gurioli, 1974), they are often ignored or lumped together with male alcoholics in research efforts and treatment plans (Beckman, 1975). Further, research studies in this area often are not well designed, using inadequate sampling procedures, inadequate control groups and questionable testing procedures. Rarely, if ever, have males and females been directly compared in studying differences between male and female alcoholism. Consequently, research findings relevant to the etiology, treatment, and prevention of male alcoholism may not generalize to female alcoholism. This study reviews critically a few major research studies in the field of alcoholism. Additionally, this study investigates female alcoholism by using a control group of non-alcoholics. Similarities and differences in sex-role typing between males and females will be studied utilizing an easily scored, objective sex-role inventory.
Male Alcoholism

A well-known theory of alcoholism suggests that conflicts surrounding dependency needs are of major significance in the etiology of alcoholism. This theory, which is based on men (McCord, McCord and Gudeman, 1960) suggests that alcoholics have a repressed but unresolved craving for maternal care. McCord's theory evolved from a longitudinal study based on analysis of the personalities of boys who later became alcoholics. The typical alcoholic, according to McCord, exhibits a facade of self-reliant manhood; underneath this facade, he continues to feel anxious, to suffer conflict, and to be desirous of dependent relationships.

According to supporters of the dependency theory, alcoholism is more prevalent among men due to the greater availability to females of societal opportunities to be dependent. Thus, they say women are less strongly motivated to seek artificial feelings of dependency-need gratification through alcohol. Hence, female alcoholics who do become alcoholics must have extremely intense dependency conflicts.

McClelland, Davis, Kalin and Wanner (1972) contend that the need for power is at the crux of problem drinking. Their research data show that men drink to feel stronger and more powerful and that those for whom personalized power is particularly salient tend to drink heavily.
McClelland's investigations into the motivation for alcoholism spanned a decade and included a variety of studies and methodologies. There were studies dealing with the effects of alcohol on fantasy, with folk-tale themes associated cross-culturally with heavy drinking, and research focused on the attitudes and needs of men who habitually drank too much. Measures included analyses of thought samples, adjective checklists, questionnaires, attitude scales, reports of characteristic actions taken, and most often, a well-known projective instrument, the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT).

A procedure often used by McClelland was to hold "parties" at which a regulated amount of alcohol was served. Subjects, usually male undergraduate fraternity members, would be assigned to either the wet (alcohol served) or dry (no alcohol) conditions. Sample size averaged about one hundred subjects for these studies. The TAT was administered three times: before, during, and after these party experiments. An example of McClelland's coding procedures was as follows: two coders, who would not be aware of the purpose and design of the present experiment and who were practiced in coding procedures, would score the protocols, each one scoring half the protocols. Reliability checks were made three times: at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the coding.
The need for power (n power) was inferred from power-related themes analyzed in the TAT stories. Such themes focused on personal dominance over others (personalized power). These aspects of personalized power appear to be similar to widely accepted characteristics of masculinity, such as aggressiveness, dominance, and impact on others. McClelland found power themes in significantly greater numbers in "wet" parties as compared to "dry" parties.

The TAT is a widely used projective measure which supplies social scientists with information about individuals. Supposedly, fantasies, thoughts and feelings not within conscious reach of a person are projected onto ambiguous stimuli such as found on a TAT card. This test measure has various problems associated with its administration, content analysis, interpretation, and validity.

There is a considerable body of experimental data available to show that other conditions besides present motivation and emotions can influence the TAT, such as hunger, sleep deprivation, social frustration, and the experience of failure in a preceding test situation (Anastasi, 1976). Anastasi contends that even subtle differences in the phrasing of verbal instructions and in the examiner-subject relationship can appreciably affect a subject's performance on the TAT. Such subtle
differences may affect response productivity, defensiveness, stereotypes, and imaginativeness. On criticizing the scoring of TAT protocols, Anastasi asserts that perhaps the most disturbing implication is that the interpretation of scores is often as projective for the examiner as the test stimuli are for the subject!

Particularly relevant to McClelland's findings concerning power themes in the TAT is the lack of significant correlation between expression of aggression in TAT stories and in overt behavior in a random sample of cases (Anastasi, 1976). McClelland has defined "n power" as the need for power without distinguishing between behavioral vs. fantasy needs. Such a clarification would have important implications for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism.

In addition to the above criticisms, it is the opinion of this researcher that the TAT cards conjure up images of traditional male and female roles, attitudes and sexist views. Even a keenly imaginative and creative non-sexist person would find it difficult to respond with novel, non-stereotypic stories to the TAT cards. The set of TAT cards used as stimuli for the subjects' fantasies is at least twenty years old. Men and women are dressed in the styles of another generation. The attitudes of the men and women who originated the TAT were of
traditional concepts of masculinity and femininity. Upon reviewing the TAT, this researcher was encouraged to reminisce about childhood scenes, during which her lifestyle corresponded to those of the people in the pictures; a current theme was not elicited!

**Female Alcoholism**

For the most part, proponents of both the dependency and the power theories have assumed that the same factors underlie alcoholism in men and women (Beckman, 1975). However, it must be considered that neither of these theories explain why women drink.

Psychologists studying the effects of alcohol on human behavior usually concentrate on male drinkers. Generally speaking, more men than women are hospitalized for alcoholism, thereby making it easier for researchers to gain access to men than women. For researchers interested in social drinking, male drinking situations such as fraternity stag parties are far more common than female drinking situations (Wilsnack, 1973). A stigma against female alcoholics may explain why women have been neglected in alcoholism research, or perhaps there is an attitude that studying men is more "important" since the consequences of problem drinking are more visible for men than for women.

Women alcoholics are called hidden drinkers, since they drink at home, are often unemployed and escape
detection by societal agencies. These women are protected by their doctors and husbands; when the husband of an alcoholic discovers her well-kept secret, he tends to keep his knowledge secret for fear that disclosure will reflect on his ability to control his wife's behavior and on his masculinity (Lindbeck, 1972). With an unknown (though likely high) percentage of women being lone drinkers, protected by men and seen in private practices and private hospitals, how can any meaningful statement be made about the lower percentage of female vs. male alcoholics? Certainly, before McCord's dependency-need theory can be generalized to women, women need to be researched extensively and directly compared to men.

The area of sex-role identification has received attention in recent years in studying female drinking. While men may drink to prove their masculinity, it has been hypothesized that women drink to feel like men (Curlee, 1967). While this is a plausible explanation of why women drink, an equally logical explanation is that women consciously value their womanliness and drink heavily to feel more like women. Wilsnack (1973) has studied female alcoholism and suggests that women alcoholics consciously have strong motivations concerning being womanly and unconsciously doubt their own adequacy as women.
Wilsnack's investigations of female alcoholism included a pilot study, drinking "parties" and informative party games using the TAT, a variety of TAT scoring systems, and a study comparing female alcoholics and female non-alcoholics.

In a small pilot study, Wilsnack had twenty young women list ten adjectives describing how they felt after two drinks. These women listed adjectives such as warm, loving, considerate, expressive, open, pretty, sexy, and feminine. These adjectives seemed unrelated to power or dependency. Instead, the adjectives suggested that social drinking produces a sense of enhanced "womanliness" (Wilsnack, 1973).

Subsequently, Wilsnack conducted an experiment to test the validity of these theories about why women drink. As McClelland had done previously, Wilsnack held several parties, telling subjects that she was interested in the affects of party atmosphere on fantasy. A modified version of the TAT was used. Each guest was shown five pictures at the beginning of the party and asked to write a story about the people in the pictures. The same procedure was repeated at the end of each party.

Approximately six women and eight men came to each party. The women were either Harvard summer school students or college graduates employed in the Boston-Cambridge area. A record was kept of the amount of alcohol served to each
subject; guests were told that they could drink as much as they wanted. A series of dry, or control, parties were staged at which soft drinks were served. In all, twenty-six women attended wet parties and twenty-three attended dry parties.

The TAT stories were collected at the end of each party session and turned over to a panel of outside judges. McClelland's scoring system for power imagery was utilized. The judges scored events that reflected social power (power for the good of others or for the good of a cause) and events that reflected personal power (power in the interest of self-aggrandizement, without concern for others) (Wilsnack, 1973). Wilsnack was looking for an increase in the scores for social power.

The data did not support the power hypothesis or the dependency hypothesis. In scoring the stories for dependency, the judges looked for incidences that involved acts of giving (resources), characters who were in need of help (personal needs), and characters who had been helped (satisfactions).

In testing the hypothesis that women drink to feel feminine, Wilsnack used Robert May's TAT code that relates to certain psychological aspects of femininity. The Deprivation-Enhancement (D-E) code scores the sequence of negatively-toned (deprivation) and positively-toned (enhancement) events in the TAT stories. May found that
women tend to write D-E stories in which pain is followed by eventual pleasure or success. Men tend to write stories in the reverse sequence, i.e., success followed by loss (May, 1969). May suggested that the E-D sequences reflected the assertive approach that characterizes males and the D-E sequences reflected the more yielding style that most people view as feminine.

Wilsnack predicted that social drinking (for the women at her experimental "parties") would increase the number of D-E stories and decrease the number of E-D stories that the women told. It was found that drinking significantly reduced the scores on E-D stories; the increase in D-E stories did occur, though it did not reach statistical significance.

The second scoring system Wilsnack used to test the "womanliness" hypothesis was developed by Sara Winter. This code was called the "being-orientation code" and was developed by comparing TAT stories told by mothers while they breast-fed with stories told by mothers who had already weaned their babies. High scorers on the being-orientation code were the nursing mothers.

Wilsnack predicted that drinking would increase the total score on the being-orientation code. This prediction was based on the assumption that the fantasies of women whose sense of womanliness had been artificially enhanced by drinking might resemble in some respects the
fantasies of women involved with an archetypically feminine experience—breast-feeding one's child. The data confirmed this prediction.

Wilsnack next divided the women who attended the wet parties into two groups: light drinkers (those who drank three ounces or less) and heavy drinkers (those who drank more than three ounces). When comparing the groups' stories on concern with power, several differences emerged. Heavy drinkers scored higher than light drinkers on personal power scores at a near-significant level. Heavy drinkers tended to write more masculine E-D stories than light drinkers. The findings suggested that young women whose fantasies express strong power needs and an assertive approach to life find drinking especially rewarding (Wilsnack, 1973). In presenting such an hypothesis, Wilsnack is suggesting that a conflict about identity may be an underlying factor in female alcoholism. Women problem drinkers may find drinking a temporary escape from sex-role conflict.

The alcoholic female's conflict, the doubts about her adequacy as a woman, may stem from the existence of masculine traits in the unconscious levels of her personality.

To test the hypothesis that the alcoholic woman does not drink to feel more nurtured, more powerful, or more like a man, but rather drinks to feel more
womanly, Wilsnack proceeded to study twenty-eight women receiving treatment for alcoholism. The women were from lower middle class and middle class families. Their ages ranged from twenty-nine to sixty-three and twelve were outpatients while sixteen were inpatients. The control group consisted of twenty-eight non-alcoholic women matched in age, education, socioeconomic status, and national background. Wilsnack's hypothesis in this study was that alcoholic women consciously accept their femininity and share with other women traditional attitudes, interests and values. With the aid of questionnaires probing these women's conscious views of themselves, Wilsnack found the two groups did not differ significantly, except on one measure involving attitudes toward motherhood. The alcoholic women valued the maternal role more highly than the other women. In order to measure unconscious masculinity-femininity, Wilsnack used a modified version of the Franck Drawing Completion Test. This test is based on theories of differences in simple line completions between men and women. The alcoholics' scores on the Franck test were significantly more masculine than those of the non-alcoholic women.

Wilsnack's findings from the above research suggest that the potential female alcoholic consciously values traditional female roles, but she experiences chronic doubts about her adequacy as a woman. These doubts arise
from sex-role conflict (inadequate feminine identification on an unconscious level). She will manage to cope with her fragile sense of femininity until some new threat (marital problems, miscarriage) severely exacerbates her self-doubts and she turns to alcohol in an attempt to gain artificial feelings of womanliness.

Though Wilsnack's work presents a needed fresh perspective on female alcoholics, there are a number of problems inherent in the use of her scoring systems for the TAT, the test measures and the samples.

Wilsnack utilized the "being-orientation" code to further analyze the TAT stories of the twenty women who had attended "wet parties." Using this small sample of non-alcoholic female Harvard students and college graduates, Wilsnack hypothesized that drinking would increase the scores on the being-orientation code. The women who drank did have significantly increased scores on this code. This is evidence that non-alcoholic female college graduate students score higher on the being-orientation code when drinking.

The being-orientation code is yet another scoring system for the TAT. In order to assess the retest reliability of this scoring system, it would have been necessary to give the same pictures to the same women at a later date. This needed research has not been done; questions such as would the same women offer different
TAT stories on a retest or would the same themes recur are unanswered. To assess the validity of these findings, it would be necessary to cross-validate these findings with TAT stories of matched female alcoholics.

Wilsnack reported a serendipitous finding: one post-party TAT card pictured an adult figure playing with a child. Sex of the adult was ambiguous. Women who drank perceived the adult figure as female more often than did the women who attended the dry parties. Wilsnack assumes that seeing an ambiguous figure as a woman reflects an inner state of feeling womanly, thus supporting the hypothesis that drinking makes women feel more feminine. This assumption seems to be moving too quickly from data to hypothesis to support of hypothesis, considering the test measure used. In order to have the clearest interpretation of test performance, the examiner should have varied the stimuli (the TAT card of the ambiguous adult figure) systematically and in a balanced manner. Details as to how the TAT cards were presented to the subjects, as well as the sex of the examiner, were not available. In addition, considering the subjects and the experimenter were all female, a response-set precipitated by the situation would be a confounding variable.

Though Wilsnack's findings are interesting, they cannot be deemed conclusive due to the small sample size,
and the lack of control groups of male non-alcoholics and alcoholics. Additionally, the assumptions of the Franck Drawing Test are questionable. In particular, interpretations of conscious vs. unconscious on any projective test such as the Franck test are tenuous at best. The fundamental assumption of all projective tests is that the individual's responses to the ambiguous stimuli (i.e., incompleted line drawings) presented to the subject reflect significant and relatively enduring personality attributes. As marked temporal shifts have frequently been observed, there is considerable chance error in projective tests. Responses are stimulus-specific and hence of limited application (Anastasi, 1976). In addition, this researcher questions the validity of the definitions of masculinity and femininity on the Franck Drawing Completion Test. Wil- snack studied women who are reported to have confused or ambivalent sex-role orientations. The Franck test does not allow for the expression of a wide variety of personality characteristics, i.e., (ambivalence) sex-role confusion.

Summary

To summarize, findings from alcoholism research reviewed here have yielded only tentative conclusions. Three major theories have emerged that have generated much
research: McClelland's power hypothesis, Wilsnack's
ownliness hypothesis, and McCord's dependency theory.
Another emerging theme is sex-role orientation or sex-role
confusion in male and female alcoholics.

Research that addresses itself to these major
hypotheses must use methodologies that will allow us
to discern critical variables in female alcoholism.
Men and women need to be directly compared as well as
alcoholics compared with non-alcoholics. Adequate
sample size and sample pool are of importance. A test
measure that will not have the pitfalls of the unreliable
and possibly invalid TAT and other projective tests should
be used. To measure sex-role orientation, a scale should
be used that will not consider masculinity and femininity
as bi-polar opposites in order to give full expression to
the alcoholic's sex-role identity.

Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study is to attempt to support
McClelland's power hypothesis for male alcoholics and
Wilsnack's womanliness hypothesis for female alcoholics.
Thus, the present study was designed to investigate
whether drinking enhances feelings of masculinity in men
and feelings of womanliness in women. The following research
hypotheses were investigated:

1. Male alcoholics will describe themselves as
   significantly more masculine when imagining
themselves drunk than when in the sober condition whereas female alcoholics will show no change in masculinity scores from sober to drunk conditions.

2. Female alcoholics will describe themselves as significantly more feminine when imagining themselves drunk than when in the sober condition whereas male alcoholics will show no change in femininity scores from sober to drunk conditions.
METHOD

Subjects

The subjects consisted of fifty-eight males, twenty-nine of whom were diagnosed as alcoholic, and fifty-eight females, twenty-nine of whom were diagnosed as alcoholic. All subjects resided within San Bernardino County; the alcoholic sample were individuals currently in treatment at the San Bernardino County Alcoholism Services and County Residential Homes for Alcoholics. The two groups (alcoholic and non-alcoholic) were matched for age and socioeconomic background, as can be seen in Table 1.

The non-alcoholics in the study were randomly selected from a variety of Adult Education Courses from Rim of the World School District in San Bernardino County. Administrators and teachers of the school district provided a schedule of classes and an approximate description of their student population.

Test Measure

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was originally developed by Sandra L. Bem at Stanford University (1974) in order to develop a new type of sex-role inventory that would not automatically build in an inverse relationship
Table 1

Summary: Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alcoholic Subjects</th>
<th>Non-Alcoholic Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female n=29</td>
<td>Male n=29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female n=29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male n=29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed (years of schooling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X age</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

Technical trades = clerk typist, sales, machinists, etc.
Miscellaneous = waitresses, bartenders, cooks, etc.
between masculinity and femininity. Other measures such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory have conceptualized masculinity and femininity as bipolar ends of a single continuum; thus, individuals could be masculine or feminine but not both. Such a dichotomy has dismissed the possibility that a person can be "androgynous" which means that a person can be both masculine and feminine, dependent upon the situation and not on a rigid internalized standard. Bem suggests that a person with a mixed or androgynous self-concept might engage in both "masculine" and "feminine" behaviors.

In addition to its conceptual advantages, the BSRI was also chosen for this research in order to assess sex-role orientation in a comprehensive manner. The BSRI is the instrument chosen for this research due to its simple, objective scoring procedures, which eliminate the problems that attend the use of a projective measure with less objective scoring criteria. The BSRI is also quickly administered and can be administered to groups, enabling a larger sample to be tested.

The BSRI consists of sixty items (adjectives) that people often use to describe themselves. A subject is asked to rate himself on a scale of one to seven as to how true of him each item is. A masculinity, femininity and social desirability score is obtained for each individual. In addition, an androgyny score can be computed.
The androgyny score is the difference between an individual's masculinity and femininity normalized with respect to the standard deviations of his or her masculinity and femininity scores (Bem, 1974). The masculinity and femininity scores indicate the extent to which a person endorses masculine and feminine personality characteristics as self-descriptive (Bem, 1974). Masculinity is the mean self-rating for the endorsed masculine items while femininity is the mean self-rating for the endorsed feminine items. The two scores are independent; the structure of the BSRI does not restrict them and they are free to vary independently.

Procedure

The BSRI was administered twice to all subjects under two sets of instruction: (1) a "sober" condition in which subjects were asked to rate the BSRI items "as you feel they describe you after you have had three drinks." The measurement was administered verbally to groups by the same experimenter. The instructional set was counter-balanced: half of the subjects received the "drunk" condition first and half of the subjects received the "sober" condition first, as can be seen in Appendixes D and E. All subjects were assured anonymity by being given code numbers. Before taking the inventory, subjects were requested to complete a demographic information sheet. (See Appendixes B and C.)
A brief description of the present study was provided to participants, excluding only the specific hypotheses under study, namely, that the questionnaire is a sex-role inventory. At the completion of both administrations of the BSRI, subjects were given the opportunity to discuss their own reactions, questions and discoveries about themselves. (See Appendix A.)
RESULTS

Analysis

The BSRI was scored according to scoring procedures detailed in a "Scoring Packet" devised by Bem and Korula. Three scores for each subject were obtained: masculinity, femininity and social desirability.

A Lindquist Type I analysis of variance also known as split-plot ANOVA and mixed design was used to analyze the BSRI scores across the two conditions.

The independent variables were the two groups (alcoholics and non-alcoholics), the sex of the subject, and the two conditions; the dependent variables were the BSRI scores, namely, masculinity, femininity and social desirability scores. Of particular interest in this analysis will be the interaction between Sex X Scores, Condition X Scores, and Group X Scores. Main effects will be the masculinity, femininity and social desirability scores. A total of 116 questionnaires were analyzed, representing the responses of fifty-eight alcoholics and fifty-eight non-alcoholics who rated the BSRI items once when imagining themselves sober and once when imagining themselves drunk. There was an equal number (N=29) of males and females in each group. The drunk and sober
conditions were treated as within variables (Huck, Cormier, Bounds, 1974). Results will be discussed below in terms of the hypotheses followed by a discussion of additional findings not directly relevant to the hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1**

As will be recalled, the first hypothesis predicted that male alcoholics will describe themselves as significantly more masculine when imagining themselves drunk than when imagining themselves sober, whereas female alcoholics will show no change in masculinity scores from sober to drunk conditions. Partial support was found for this hypothesis as can be seen in Tables 2 and 3, which present ANOVA results and mean masculinity scores. Contrary to predictions, a priori tests for the difference between means indicated that male alcoholics actually decreased significantly in self-reported masculinity from the sober to drunk conditions. Female alcoholics, however, showed no difference in self-reported masculinity between the two conditions. Thus, only female alcoholics conformed to expectations showing no change in masculinity between the drunk and sober conditions.

The first-order interaction of Group X Condition was significant: $F(1, 112)=4.65$, $p<.05$. Only non-alcoholics showed a significant decrease in masculinity scores from the sober to drunk conditions. In the sig-
Table 2
Analysis of Variance for the Masculinity Scores of the BSRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between - Subjects</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4715.11</td>
<td>4715.11</td>
<td>4565.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (X)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>12.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Sex (GS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error - Between</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>115.65</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within - Subjects</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>35.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Condition (GC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Condition (XC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Sex X Condition (GXC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error - Within</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .01
** *p < .05

NOTE:
Group 1 = non-alcoholic
Group 2 = alcoholic
X (1) = male
X (2) = female
Condition 1 = sober
Condition 2 = drunk
### Table 3
Mean Masculinity Scores: Interactions
**(GC) *(GXC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sober</th>
<th>Drunk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Alcoholics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcoholics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .01 \) Significant Interaction

** \( p < .05 \) Significant Interaction
significant second order interaction of Group by Sex by Condition, male alcoholics rated themselves significantly less masculine in the drunk condition than in the sober condition: $F(1, 112)=15.01, p<.01$. Female alcoholics scored at the same level of masculinity in both conditions.

Male non-alcoholics' masculinity scores decreased from the sober to drunk conditions, though this was not a significant difference.

Female non-alcoholics decreased significantly in masculinity scores from the sober to drunk conditions.

**Hypothesis 2**

The second hypothesis predicted that female alcoholics will describe themselves as significantly more feminine when imagining themselves drunk than in the sober condition, whereas male alcoholics will show no change in femininity scores from sober to drunk conditions. No support was found for this hypothesis as can be seen in Tables 4 and 5 which present the ANOVA results and the mean femininity scores. The femininity means were subjected to an a priori test for significant differences (Student's t distribution). Both male and female alcoholics scored significantly higher in femininity in the sober condition as opposed to the drunk condition, contrary to expectations. No such finding was obtained for non-alcoholics as can be seen in the significant interaction between Group and Condition,
Table 4

Analysis of Variance for the Femininity Scores of the BSRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between - Subjects</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4121.51</td>
<td>4121.51</td>
<td>7650.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>20.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (X)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Sex (GX)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error - Between</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>60.33</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within - Subjects</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>50.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>22.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Condition (GC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Condition (XC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Sex X Condition (GXC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error - Within</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
Table 5
Mean Femininity Scores: Interactions *(GC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sober</th>
<th>Drunk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Alcoholics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .01$ Significant Interaction
Non-alcoholics did not differ significantly in self-reported femininity from the sober to drunk condition, whereas alcoholics reported themselves as significantly more feminine when sober than when drunk.

**Additional Findings**

As expected, there were significant main effects of sex in both the masculinity and femininity analyses with male subjects in both groups rating the masculinity items significantly higher than females, and female subjects in both groups scoring significantly higher than males on femininity; Table 6 presents the mean scores for all the dependent variables.

There were also significant Condition main effects in both analyses with subjects across groups scoring lower on masculinity and femininity when imagining themselves drunk than when imagining themselves sober.

There was a significant first-order interaction of Group by Condition, $F(1, 112)=13.69, p<.01$, as can be seen in Table 7. While alcoholics showed a significant decrease in social desirability scores in the drunk condition, the non-alcoholics did not. (See Table 8.)

For social desirability scores, Group and Condition were significant main effects with both groups decreasing in self-reported social desirability in the drunk condition (as can be seen in Table 6).
Table 6
Mean Ratings of Masculinity, Femininity and Social Desirability Scores: Main Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Non-Alcoholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity Means</td>
<td>4.74*</td>
<td>4.28*</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity Means</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>4.43*</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>5.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant main effect

*p < 0.05
Table 7

Analysis of Variance for the
Social Desirability Scores of the BSRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between - Subjects</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5391.94</td>
<td>5391.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>27.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>27.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (X)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Sex (GX)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error - Between</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>54.57</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within - Subjects</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>73.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>13.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Condition (GC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Condition (XC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Sex X Condition (GXC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
Table 8
Mean Social Desirability Scores: Interactions *(GC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sober</th>
<th>Drunk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Alcoholics</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholics</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .01$ Significant Interaction
DISCUSSION

Summary of Overall Findings and Their Implications

The results of this study indicate that the explanation of why men and women drink may not be as simple as McClelland and Wilsnack reported. McClelland (1972) believes that men drink to feel powerful; Wilsnack's (1973) theory is that women drink to feel feminine. The present study did not support these hypotheses. The female alcoholics of this research felt less feminine when imagining themselves intoxicated than when sober; they showed no change in masculinity scores across drunk and sober conditions. Male alcoholics felt less masculine when imagining themselves drunk than when sober, whereas they scored significantly higher in femininity in the sober condition as opposed to the drunk condition.

Hypothesis 1

This research differs in a number of significant ways from McClelland and Wilsnack and, therefore, interpretation of differences in results is difficult.

There are a number of plausible explanations for the reported decrease in masculinity scores for male alcoholics from the sober to drunk condition. McClelland hypothesized that men drink to feel powerful. The concept
of "n Power" included physical aggression, name-calling, hostility and exploitative sex. It is possible that McClelland has made inaccurate conclusions; i.e., perhaps men do not drink to feel powerful. The constellation of feelings and behaviors that constitutes "n Power," according to McClelland, could possibly be defined as simply aggression or anger.

No direct measure of need for power was used in this study. The BSRI was constructed with positive attributes. The adjectives on the BSRI reflecting cultural characteristics of masculinity such as aggressive, ambitious, competitive, and dominant, are clustered around positive values, seeming to describe non-exploitative characteristics. McClelland, on the other hand, describes power in a negative cluster of adjectives.

Another potential explanation for the present results is that imagining themselves drunk did not duplicate the drinking experience itself for the males. In McClelland's and Wilsnack's research, actual drinking parties were thrown. It is possible the current results would have differed if subjects had been served alcohol. However, providing alcohol to alcoholics poses problems beyond the scope of this research.

Another difference concerns McClelland's and the present researcher's samples. The male alcoholics that
were given the BSRI were currently living in residential treatment centers or were on outpatient status at the local mental health facility. This group of men varies significantly from the population that McClelland tested. In his work on drinking in this culture, McClelland tested college men and men who were heavy drinkers rather than alcoholics in detoxification centers. Men living out of the mainstream of society, already experiencing failure, may not see themselves as powerful or masculine in any sense. In essence, they may have given up the struggle to maintain a masculine image or to strive to live up to the cultural expectations of men. In addition, the male alcoholics in this study were trying to stop drinking, whereas McClelland's subjects did not have this goal.

Female alcoholics showed no change in masculinity scores from the sober to drunk conditions. This was the predicted result of this study, lending partial support to the hypothesis that women drink to feel womanly. In other words, masculinity, as measured by the BSRI, was not found to be a salient variable for female alcoholics (though it may be for female non-alcoholics). Though it is best to keep in mind that the BSRI is a measure of conscious identity as opposed to a projective measure of unconscious processes, it is plausible that sex-role ambivalence or unconscious masculinity is not the real problem for female alcoholics.
Hypothesis 2

Female alcoholics scored significantly higher in femininity in the sober condition as opposed to the drunk condition, contrary to the prediction of this study and to results predicted and obtained by Wilsnack. Several explanations are possible to account for the present results.

The BSRI assesses positive characteristics of femininity, and it is likely that alcoholic women imagining themselves drunk would not describe themselves in a positive way. The test measures and coding systems that Wilsnack used, such as the Franck Drawing Test, the TAT and the being-orientation code, may have negatively valued sex-typing adjectives and be substantially different from Bem's questionnaire. The results obtained in the present study could reflect the use of positively valued sex-typed adjectives such as gentle, compassionate and loyal.

All alcoholic subjects decreased in femininity scores when imagining themselves drunk. These results suggest that alcoholics see themselves as less "nurturant" when drinking than when sober. This is possibly an accurate evaluation of one's behavior when drunk. Drinking is actually a selfish activity; one cannot be in the service of others when drinking heavily. A person usually becomes preoccupied with himself. If one is drunk, one is usually in need of being taken care of by someone else. Also, since alcoholic men decreased significantly in fem-
ininity scores in the drunk condition, contrary to ex-
pectations, perhaps femininity, as defined on the BSRI, is
a salient variable for male alcoholics.

Another plausible explanation for the lack of
support for the predicted increase of femininity scores
for female alcoholics in the drunk condition is that, as
was discussed previously, imagining oneself drunk does
not duplicate the actual drinking experience.

It is also possible that Wilsnack was inaccurate in
her conclusion that women whose self-esteem is low drink
to feel "womanly." It is an equally possible explanation
that women who are committed to the traditional role of
women are drinking as a protest against the expectations
that are laid on them (Chesler, 1972). It might be the
lack of flexibility, as well as the lack of positive
reinforcement for traditional roles, against which these
women are protesting. The void and emptiness that "hidden"
drinkers experience in their everyday lives come from a
number of sources, some of which are external to the
individual woman. For example, the lack of status,
privilege and economic reward for the housewife has long
been a source of concern for those people dedicated to
social change for the status of women. It is conceivable
that problem drinking for these females functions as an
escape from the frustrations of the housewife role.
Traditional and non-traditional females are dissatisfied with the rigidity of their social roles. There seems to be an essential distinction between the escape route of traditional women versus non-traditional women. Chesler (1972) brilliantly describes the anger and frustration of achievement-oriented, creative women whom she views protesting in state hospitals, diagnosed as schizophrenic ("mad"). These women are committed to contributing to the world in a different style from traditional women. Both are protesting, one by hiding in their homes, drinking, the other in institutions. Both receive little support from either men or women; neither one has many positive role models.

Additional Findings

Alcoholics showed a significant decrease in social desirability scores in the drunk condition as compared to the sober condition. Non-alcoholics described themselves as less socially desirable in the drunk condition than in the sober condition, though this decrease did not reach statistical significance. Being embarrassed or ashamed may be the response of most people, alcoholic or not, to heavy drinking.

The social desirability scores of alcoholics possibly reflected the stigma attached to alcoholism. The alcoholic group scored significantly lower in social desirability
(self-rated) than did the non-alcoholics. It is the opinion of this researcher, after observing problem drinkers in clinical settings, that alcoholics feel shame after a drinking episode. Despite efforts made by concerned doctors, clinicians and advocates of Alcoholics Anonymous, alcoholism is still regarded as a blight on one's character.

It did make a difference in self-rated masculinity and femininity for the subjects to imagine themselves sober or drunk. Both alcoholics and non-alcoholics were aware that they may engage in different behaviors or manifest different characteristics when drunk as opposed to being sober. Alcohol has an effect on behavior.

Summary

It seems that there is not an easy answer to why men and women drink. Although the literature suggests a connection between sex-roles and problem drinking, the exact nature of this connection remains unclear. It can be assumed that there will always be a certain percentage of people vulnerable to alcoholism, even if everyone were androgynous. Vulnerability may be influenced by physiological factors, transient stress and/or genetic factors. Once addicted to alcohol, a person's "payoff" for remaining so may be correlated to sex-role expectations and his/her protest against unfair conditions and expectations associated with traditional femininity and
Implications for Future Research

Even though projective measures have definite problems, it would be interesting to replicate the present study using the TAT. This might shed light on differences and similarities to McClelland's and Wilsnack's work. In particular, scales with negatively valued masculine and feminine traits should be used.

Future studies should include alcoholics still functioning in the mainstream of society, perhaps men and women being treated with Antabuse. These people are probably still conforming to some sex-role expectations. Women would be most interesting to research while in their homes.

A treatment study would be appropriate to study traditional women receiving ongoing support, perhaps involved in a political activist group working towards social change in their best interests. Would they then feel increased confidence and satisfaction in the traditional role and have less need to protest with alcohol? Comparing these women, using the BSRI, with non-traditional women who are also protesting unfair conditions (frustrated, angry) would give us needed information as to education, prevention and support for these alienated women.

The androgyny scores of subjects, male and female
alcoholics and non-alcoholics, should be analyzed. These data could provide more information about how masculinity and femininity are combined in problem and non-problem drinkers.

For too long, researchers have viewed female alcoholism as if it were the same phenomenon as male alcoholism. Researchers are reluctant to believe that female alcoholics value the traditional feminine role; we look for "unconscious" masculinity in these unhappy women. Their unhappiness could be the result of a cultural climate of non-support, a negative assessment of women in general and traditional women in particular. It is time to take a fresh look at female alcoholism influenced by recent literature on the psychology of women and women's issues.
APPENDIX A

Alcoholism Study

1. (Introduce myself. Make a statement about terminating. Make statement about master's degree. Weed out people who have been drinking. If research is to be meaningful, subjects must be sober.

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS

Read slowly with many pauses.)

2. The research you are participating in is concerned with understanding people with alcohol-related problems and how they describe themselves. You will be completing a short questionnaire which consists of words and phrases which people use to describe themselves. You are going to complete this questionnaire twice, once rating yourself according to how you feel when you have been drinking and once according to how you feel when you are sober. Your ratings will be your own ratings of yourself. There are no right or wrong answers. Also, there is no right or wrong way to make the two ratings. You may rate yourself differently when drinking than when sober or you may rate yourself the same. What is important is that you try and make each set of ratings as honest as possible because the accuracy and potential benefit of this research depend on your honest self-description.

Are there any questions at this point?

3. Please be assured that all your responses will be confidential and anonymous. You will be assigned a code number so that your name will not appear anywhere on the questionnaires.

4. Your total participation in this research should require approximately 45 minutes. After we have finished today, I will be available to answer some of your questions and to rap about any feelings you have had during your participation. Unfortunately, I am unable to discuss in detail the exact nature of this study until I have the required number of people fill out this questionnaire.
I will make available to the Alcoholism Service a short typed paper on the exact nature of this research when I have finished administering this questionnaire. Upon completion of my total research project, I will make available to the research department of San Bernardino Mental Health Unit a copy of my results.

5. (Distribute questionnaire packet.)

6. Please fill out the informed consent sheet. This sheet will be placed in your file at the MHU and is a requirement insuring that your participation is voluntary in this research.

7. (Collect consent sheet.)

8. Hand out index cards.)

9. Please complete the first page, putting your code number which you will find on the index card I have just handed out on the appropriate place on this page.

10. Now please put this cover sheet aside and turn to the next page. Read the instructions silently as I read them aloud.

11. Are there any questions about how to complete the questionnaire?

12. Please put your code number on the questionnaire in the upper right hand corner.

13. Okay, you may begin. After you finish the questionnaire, turn it over and place it in front of you and wait for further instructions.

14. (Collect questionnaire.

      Five minute break.

15. Distribute second questionnaire, telling subjects not to look at it yet.)

16. Please put your code number in the upper right hand corner of the questionnaire.

17. Now, please read the instructions silently as I read them out loud.

18. Any questions about how to fill out this questionnaire?
19. Okay, you may begin.
20. (Collect questionnaire.
21. Rap up.)
APPENDIX B

Confidentiality Statement

I agree to participate in this research project. I understand that confidentiality will be maintained when the material is published and that my name will not be mentioned.

Date________________________

Name____________________________________
APPENDIX C

Demographic Sheet

Code Number: __________

Sex: __________

Education Completed: __________

Occupation: __________

Marital Status: (Check one)
  Married ______
  Divorced ______
  Separated ______
  Single ______
  Widow ______
  Widower ______

Length of Drinking Problem: __________

Age: ________
APPENDIX D

Instructional Set

On the following page, you will be shown a large number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics in order to describe yourself as you feel when you are sober. That is, we would like you to indicate on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you these various characteristics are. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

Example: sly

Mark a 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE that you are sly.

Thus, for example, if you feel it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are "sly," put a 3 in the box next to the word "sly," as seen below:
Please note that you have received a list of definitions for certain words in the questionnaire. If you are unsure about the meaning of a word, please read its definition before making your rating. You will use these definitions both times you complete this questionnaire.

Remember now how you feel when you are sober. Now go ahead and complete the questionnaire.

You are now going to rate the same list of personality characteristics but this time we want you to rate them as you feel they describe you after you have had three drinks. That is, we would like you to indicate on a scale from 1 to 7, how true these various characteristics are after you have had three drinks. Please do not leave any characteristics unmarked.

Example: sly

Mark a 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.
Mark a 5 if it is **OFTEN TRUE** that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 6 if it is **USUALLY TRUE** that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 7 if it is **ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE** that you are sly after three drinks.

Thus, if, for example, you feel it is **sometimes but infrequently true** that you are "sly" after three drinks, put a 3 in the box next to the word "sly," as seen below.

```
Sly 3
```

Allow yourself now to remember how you feel after you have had three drinks. Imagine yourself under the influence of alcohol. Now go ahead and complete the questionnaire but this time describe yourself the way you feel after three drinks.
Dictionary Definitions

Adaptable - can easily adjust to new situation; flexible

Aggressive - forcefully energetic; disposed to attack and to dominate

Analytical - one who studies the factors of a situation or problem to determine a solution; scientific

Assertive - disposed to claim one's rights or position

Childlike - innocent; trustful

Compassionate - sympathetic; responsive to others' distress

Conscientious - conforming to the dictates of conscience; morally correct

Conventional - lacking originality; conforming to society's customs and values

Dominant - commanding; controlling; superior to others in power and influence

Flatterable - one who can be charmed or influenced by excessive praise

Gullible - easily deceived

Independent - not dependent on others; not subject to control or influence from other people

Individualistic - pursuing a markedly independent course in thought or action

Inefficient - not productive or effective

Moody - subject to different moods; subject to depression

Reliable - trustworthy; dependable

Secretive - disposed to make or keep secrets; private; silent

Self-reliant - reliance upon one's own efforts and abilities

Self-sufficient - able to accomplish goals without outside help; confident in own abilities

Solemn - highly serious; deeply earnest
Theatrical - dramatic; showy

Unpredictable - one is not able to predict in advance how one will be in future

Unsystematic - not organized; not methodical

Yielding - tend to submit or defer to others
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defends own beliefs</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatrical</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatterable</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong personality</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Usuall</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Instructional Set

On the following page, you will be shown a large number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics in order to describe yourself as you feel after you have had three drinks. That is, we would like you to indicate on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you these various characteristics are after you have had three drinks. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

Example: sly

Mark a 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.

Mark a 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE that you are sly after three drinks.
Thus, if, for example, you feel it is *sometimes but infrequently true* that you are "sly" after three drinks, put a 3 in the box next to the word "sly," as seen below.

| Sly | 3 |

Please note that you have received a list of definitions for certain words in the questionnaire. If you are unsure about the meaning of a word, please read its definition before making your rating. You will use these definitions both times you complete this questionnaire.

Allow yourself now to remember how you feel after you have had three drinks. Imagine yourself under the influence of alcohol. Now go ahead and complete the questionnaire but this time describe yourself the way you feel after three drinks.

You are now going to rate the same list of personality characteristics, but this time we want you to rate them as you feel they describe you when you are sober. That is, we would like you to indicate on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you these various characteristics are. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

**Example**: sly

Mark a 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are sly.
Mark a 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE that you are sly.

Thus, if, for example, you feel it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are sly, put a 3 in the box next to the word "sly," as seen below.

| Sly | 3 |

Remember now how you feel when you are sober. Now go ahead and complete the questionnaire.
### DESCRIBE YOURSELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER OR USUALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMOST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER TRUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT INCASIONALLY TRUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENTLY TRUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE-OFTEN TRUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USUALLY TRUE OR ALMOST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solemn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take a stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defends own beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has leadership abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts as a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childlike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatrical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not use harsh language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatterable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsystematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dictionary Definitions

Adaptable - can easily adjust to new situation; flexible

Aggressive - forcefully energetic; disposed to attack and to dominate

Analytical - one who studies the factors of a situation or problem to determine a solution; scientific

Assertive - disposed to claim one's rights or position

Childlike - innocent; trustful

Compassionate - sympathetic; responsive to others' distress

Conscientious - conforming to the dictates of conscience; morally correct

Conventional - lacking originality; conforming to society's customs and values

Dominant - commanding; controlling; superior to others in power and influence

Flatterable - one who can be charmed or influenced by excessive praise

Gullible - easily deceived

Independent - not dependent on others; not subject to control or influence from other people

Individualistic - pursuing a markedly independent course in thought or action

Inefficient - not productive or effective

Moody - subject to different moods; subject to depression

Reliable - trustworthy; dependable

Secretive - disposed to make or keep secrets; private; silent

Self-reliant - reliance upon one's own efforts and abilities

Self-sufficient - able to accomplish goals without outside help; confident in own abilities

Solemn - highly serious; deeply earnest
Theatrical - dramatic; showy

Unpredictable - one is not able to predict in advance how one will be in future

Unsystematic - not organized; not methodical

Yielding - tend to submit or defer to others
### DESCRIBE YOURSELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER OR USUALLY</td>
<td>ALMOST</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>BUT IN-</td>
<td>CASIONALLY</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FREQUENTLY</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>OG-</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>USUALLY</td>
<td>OR ALMOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>OR ALMOST</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Self-reliant
- Reliable
- Warm

- Yielding
- Analytical
- Solemn

- Helpful
- Sympathetic
- Willing to take a stand

- Defends own beliefs
- Jealous
- Tender

- Cheerful
- Has leadership abilities
- Friendly

- Moody
- Sensitive to the needs of others
- Aggressive

- Independent
- Truthful
- Gullible

- Shy
- Willing to take risks
- Inefficient

- Conscientious
- Understanding
- Acts as a leader

- Athletic
- Secretive
- Childlike

- Affectionate
- Makes decisions easily
- Adaptable

- Theatrical
- Compassionate
- Individualistic

- Assertive
- Sincere
- Does not use harsh language

- Flatterable
- Self-sufficient
- Unsystematic

- Happy
- Eager to soothe hurt feelings
- Competitive

- Strong personality
- Conceited
- Loves children

- Loyal
- Dominant
- Tactful

- Unpredictable
- Soft-spoken
- Ambitious

- Forceful
- Likable
- Gentle

- Feminine
- Masculine
- Conventional
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