HUMAN AFFAIRS 27, 205–218, 2017 DOI: 10.1515/humaff-2017-0018

WHY WE CAN'T AND SHAN'T MEASURE GENDER[1]

JANA FÚSKOVÁ, LUCIA HARGAŠOVÁ, AND SIMONA ANDRAŠČIKOVÁ

Abstract: The aim of this article is to draw attention to the fact that the constructions of gender - frequently quantified in scientific research (and practice)—are unstable across time and space. In this regard, we look at the genesis of the measures and definitions reflective of the social change and knowledge that has shaped views on the gender dimensions. Our analysis of gender measures shows that the majority are based on definitions that conceive of femininity and masculinity as stable personality traits and that these measures are part of essentialist assumptions on gender roles and gender identity. We consider these measures to be strongly stereotypical and "outdated". In the second part, we put forward evidence, from research findings, that indicates that perceptions of gender have not just changed over time. Different interpretations of masculinity and femininity exist within specific cultures, social categories and spaces.

Key words: social norms; gender identity; psychometry; queer.

Introduction

In recent years, there has been an increasing awareness of gender discourse amongst the general public in Slovakia. These discourses centre around the social dimensions of masculinity and femininity—such as equal opportunities, equal pay, gender-based violence and individual identity. In this article, we wish to point out that while gender identity is an intrinsically dynamic social construction, and that there is scientific consensus on this, the research methods used to measure (quantify) it are static. We wish to draw attention to the growing gap between scientific knowledge and practice in operationalising gender in Slovakia. In the first part of the article we look at the basic approaches to defining gender and the most commonly used methods of measuring it along with the theoretical and methodological issues. The problems with gender measures are most apparent in questionnaires that are now ten years "old"; however, their age is not the only weak point—there are significant differences in the (de)construction of male and female social expectations across both time and space. We look at three studies and argue that when attempting to describe gender identity in an individual we should consider it from

[1] The work by Jana Fúsková and Simona Andraščiková on this article was financed by VEGA project 2/0079/15.

a qualitative rather than a quantitative perspective. The article looks at how the issue of gender and gender measures have changed across time—how images of masculinity and femininity have changed historically—and put forward a compelling case for differentiating gender across space—within a culture. The introductory operationalisation is followed by the two main parts of the article. In the first section, we look at the genesis of the measures and definitions reflective of the social change and knowledge that has shaped views on the dimensions of masculinity and femininity. In the second part we put forward evidence, from research findings, that indicates that perceptions of gender have not just changed over time. Different interpretations of masculinity and femininity exist not only within 'subcultures' (non-heterosexual/ heterosexual) but also within specific cultures and spaces. The aim is to draw attention to the fact that the dimension of gender frequently quantified in scientific research (and practice) is unstable across time and space. Methodologically there is a clear argument for not using this kind of quantification, and as far as the expert discourse is concerned, one cannot find good reason for 'measuring' a subjectively construed identity.

What gender is – theoretical contradictions

As Lukšík and Supeková (2003) have stated, masculinity and femininity (as gender dimensions) are constructs that have changed over time and are culturally dependent. The one-sex model that dominated in accounts and assessments of human beings up until the eighteenth century was based on the idea that the male sex was the only model. It was replaced in the nineteenth century with the complementarity model, which considered men and women to be mutually complementary entities.

At the turn of the twentieth/twenty-first century the differences between men and women were considered to be biologically conditioned. The origins of these differences lay in the different male and female reproductive roles. While the role of women was to care for the offspring and the household, men's role was to provide for the material security of the household.

These ideas appeared in psychology around the time Freud began developing his ideas on identity. With the successes of the first wave of the feminist movement came changes in the social perception of women. In the 1940s, with the wholescale engagement of women in industry, doubt was cast on the idea of biological conditioning (Golombok & Fivush, 1994).

These days the main line of thinking on gender is a tendency to see gender not as an unambiguous, clearly defined category but as indeterminate and indistinct, criss-crossing and transitional or as a shift towards an androgynous liberation from sexuality. The second model is based on attempts to define ideal masculinity and femininity and to attempt to fulfil them (Čerešník, 2011).

Part 1: Dynamic construction of gender across time

Why we can't measure gender

In the human sciences femininity and masculinity (as gender dimensions) are considered to be important personality features and since these concepts emerged there have been

appreciable attempts to measure them. Although at first glance the meaning of these concepts may appear to be self-evident, since the beginning of the twentieth century researchers have encountered many serious theoretical and methodological problems when attempting to construct a valid measure. Operationalising the concepts of femininity and masculinity has proved difficult because of their significant social and cultural underpinnings. The present interpretation has changed quite significantly through history, from biologically conditioned gender to the socially constructed gender accepted today. Just as the theoretical perspective has changed considerably, so too have gender measures.

As Maccoby (1988, p. 762) has stated, "One can be more or less feminine. One cannot be more or less female." Gender is very loosely connected to biology and it is not easy trying to fit its social and cultural connotations into two precise categories. Difficulties measuring gender were partially overcome in the 1970s by Bem (1974), when she developed her concept of androgyny which holds that individuals have both feminine and masculine characteristics at the same time.

More recently Doyle and Paludi (1998) have divided measures of gender dimension into the following categories:

1. bipolar (one-dimensional)
2. multi-level
3. orthogonal (two-dimensional)

In the bipolar model characteristics, attitudes, behaviours and interests are viewed as being either exclusively masculine or feminine. Femininity and masculinity are therefore mutually exclusive and are found at opposite ends of a single continuum. Femininity is generally negatively defined in relation to masculinity. For example, dominance and independence are defined as masculine traits, while submissiveness and dependence are feminine ones. In this model the individual is either masculine (to varying degrees) or feminine, but cannot be both at once. Masculinity and femininity are conceived of as being mutually distinct from one another; hence, it is not theoretically possible for a woman to be masculine without renouncing her femininity (Burr, 1998; Doyle & Paludi, 1998).

The first of these one-dimensional scales appeared in 1936, created by Terman and Cox-Miles. Their one-dimensional questionnaire, Attitude Interest Analysis (Brannon, 1999; Burr, 1998), consisted of 456 items and significant differences were found in the answers provided by men and by women. However, the questionnaire was not widely used. Its methodology attracted criticism for having weak validity and measuring Victorian notions of masculinity and femininity rather than masculine and feminine characteristics (Brannon, 1999, p. 38).

In 1940, another one-dimensional scale of masculinity and feminity appeared (MF scale) that became a very popular gender measure. The scale is a sub-scale of the multi-dimensional Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory—MMPI. It was created by Hathaway and McKinley. The questionnaire is mainly used in clinical settings and the MF scale was originally designed to diagnose homosexuality in men. The scale was verified by comparing answers given by male soldiers and gay men. It is therefore surprising that the standard used to define femininity was gay men. The test creators were, however, aware of this limitation and did not recommend its use on the heterosexual population. The MMPI diagnostic tool and measure was so popular that it was administered to the wider public and the appropriacy of the MF scale was not discussed further (Brannon, 1999; Burr, 1998).

The multi-level model measures masculinity and femininity on two separate, independent levels—conscious and unconscious. A person can consciously exhibit predominantly masculine characteristics and unconsciously exhibit feminine ones. The Franck drawing completion test is used to measure multi-level femininity and masculinity (Doyle & Paludi, 1998).

In the 1970s S. Bem came up with a completely new perspective on measuring femininity and masculinity. Bem designed the two-dimensional Bem Sex Role Inventory—BSRI (Bem, 1974)—in which masculinity and femininity are conceived of orthogonally, i.e. as two separate dimensions. Bem thus provided an alternative to the bipolar view that assumed a high level of one automatically excluded the other end of the continuum. For Bem femininity and masculinity are not mutually exclusive and a person can be both masculine and feminine. The BSRI a socially conceived view of femininity and masculinity based on different cultural expectations of men and women. Bem administered a list of 200 personality traits to American students who had to state whether each trait was socially desirable in a man or a woman. The items the male and female students agreed were significantly more desirable in men than women formed the masculine scale. The items the students considered to be significantly more desirable for women than for men made up the femininity scale. Using these two scales Bem distinguished between feminine individuals (with a high level of femininity, low level of masculinity) and masculine individuals (a high level of masculinity and low level of femininity), androgynous individuals (high levels of femininity and masculinity together) and undifferentiated individuals (low levels of femininity and masculinity together), independently of their biological sex.

Bem's questionnaire is still used today and viewed by some researchers (Auster & Ohm, 2000) to be a valid tool; this is despite the meaning of some items having changed since it was first designed. Critics of the BSRI argue that femininity and masculinity are not permanent personality traits but an arbitrary way of organising information acquired during socialisation and that they are context-dependent (Burr, 1998).

Masculinity and femininity are not simple categories and men and women differ from one another depending on age, race, ethnic group and social class; hence one can talk of femininities and masculinities. Spence (1993) is critical of Bem's inventory since it only measures instrumentality and expressivity and not the far more complex constructs of masculinity and femininity. As Spence and Helmreich comment (1978), questionnaires of this type only explore instrumental and expressive behaviour and pinpoint the relationship between these traits and other aspects of gender behaviour to a very limited degree.

Thinking on gender is also reflected in the changes to the measurement scales. Perceptions of gender have evolved theoretically, philosophically and methodologically. In the methodology, we can still see confliction between stability and the progression of gender. Gender is seen as a stable binary characteristic or as a category that directly excludes change and fluctuation (Čerešník, 2011).

Many researchers reject the concepts of masculinity and femininity and prefer to use terms such as instrumental and expressive orientation. Instrumentality tends to be associated more with men and expressivity with women. These concepts were developed from an analysis of family patterns researched globally. In most known cultures the man's role is one of independence leadership-oriented. By contrast women are portrayed as carers and support-

givers (Brannon, 1999). Others use the concepts of agency and communion as in the work of D. Bakan (1966, as cited in Brannon, 1999). Agency is characterised by action and self-assertion, while communion is about relationships and a focus on others.

Ricciardelli and Williams (1995) suggest that femininity and masculinity are comprised of four aspects—positive and negative. Positive femininity is based on things like sensitivity, patience and being responsible, while negative femininity is portrayed through characteristics such as weak, timid and dependent. Positive masculinity includes the traits of being strong and decisive, while negative masculinity is aggressive, despotic, and superior. Bearing this in mind, the BSRI is based on positive femininity and masculinity and on some examples of negative femininity.

We can agree that so far, no measure has been developed that is satisfactorily theoretically grounded. Doubt has been cast on the bipolar and orthogonal scales and on the concepts of femininity and masculinity. All the questionnaires referred to here measure relative masculinity and femininity based on stereotypes and masculine and feminine notions or norms found in specific historical, social and cultural contexts.

Gender differences between cultures, ethnicities, races and classes are so distinct that it is not possible to define, never mind operationalise the essence of femininity and masculinity.

Given what has been said above on approaches to gender and how to measure it, and the criticisms of the measures, the question arises: Can we measure gender? Is gender in any way measurable?

Decades of methodological attempts to create a suitable measure have ended in failure. Attempts at quantification have proved extremely variable—variable across time, as we have shown above, but also across space. In the previous section, we clearly set out the reasons why we 'are unable' to measure gender identity. The lack of a suitable methodological tool is only one reason—much more fundamentally we do not fully grasp the variable. The experts are unable to operationalise gender since they disagree as to what it is, whether it is conformity to social roles, an individual construct, or a personality trait. In the next part, we shall show, on the basis of our research findings, that even if the experts were to agree on this, there would still remain doubts as to whether a tool designed in such a way could truly measure a specific "trait" in an individual or whether it would simply be a tool for creating "values"—which would be of little quality.

Gender is not determined by sex and nor is it fixed as sex is (Butler, 1990); examples of shifts in gender patterns can be found in sexually abused girls (Cosentino, Meyer-Bahlburg, Alpert, & Gaines, 1993) and autistic children (Mukaddes, 2002). The question we wish to explore is whether it is possible to quantify a characteristic that is highly dynamic across time and space? We will attempt to show that it cannot be grasped by looking at the findings of three studies conducted in Slovakia since.

Masculinity and femininity scales "(don't) work" in traditional multi-dimensional questionnaires

Gender-specific norms have formed the basis on which respected, and still widely used, psychometric methods have been established. We were interested in exploring these gender-norm based tools and in establishing how non-heterosexual people approach them, given

that the available data suggests they should strongly deconstruct these norms. Fúsková and Klubert (2013) compared the results of psychometric tests (with a masculinity-femininity subscale) with self-reports by 36 non-heterosexual and 40 heterosexual women. To ascertain their gender identity, they used a subscale of the Freiburg personality inventory FPI-M and MMPI-2 (unpublished Slovak translation by R. Máthé, author of the ongoing Slovak validation).

Freiburg Personality Inventory (FPI) and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)

The *Freiburg personality inventory* was created in Germany in 1991 by J. Fahrenberg, H. Selg and R. Hampel and has been adapted for Czech and Slovak populations by T. Kollárik, E. Poliaková and A. Ritomský (1992). The inventory explores the following independent dimensions of personality—life satisfaction, social orientation, performance orientation, inhibition, excitability, aggressiveness, strain, somatic distress, health worries, openness, extraversion and the masculinity-femininity dimension[2]. These dimensions were chosen intentionally, taking account of the theoretical predeterminants and the authors' experiences. The version being used at present is the seventh (FBI-R), which has been re-analysed for quality control. For our purposes, the most crucial scale in this inventory is the bipolar masculinity-femininity scale. As the authors of the scale have stated, scoring is strongly dependent on gender, with men scoring higher.

The *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory* was published by S.R. Hathaway and C. McKinley in 1940, and the manual was published in 1943 (as cited in Netík, 2002). This empirical method is based on data from the examination of 800 psychiatric patients and 700 clinically healthy people. The test is an attempt to differentiate between the pathological and normal progression of the selected personality traits, and identify any nosological progression during examination (Svoboda, 1999). Originally, the MMPI contained 550 items relating to 26 dimensions of a person's social situation and health (Svoboda, 1999). The inventory was later modified to produce a 567-item version with four validation scales and ten standard clinical scales. MMPI Scale 5, on masculinity and femininity, is a standard clinical scale. In our Slovak psychiatry environment, the MMPI-2 (second version) is considered to be one of the most renowned methods for assessing personality characteristics and psychopathology (Šnorek, 2006).

Fúsková and Klubert (2013) administered these psychometric tools to 36 non-heterosexual and 40 heterosexual women, along with a simple bipolar M-F scale with the two extremes—masculinity and femininity—at opposing ends of the line; there were no other marking points on the line.

[2] The Freiburg personality inventory consists of 114 items on 12 subscales–these represent, with a high level of internal validity, relevant concepts for self-reports in a normal population. The validity is tested by a number of indicators. The internal consistency (measured using Cronbach alpha) of the individual scales in the test is between 0.73 and 0.83.

Reality of measuring masculinity and femininity using traditional multi-dimensional questionnaires

We compared the results of the psychometric tests (including the masculinity-femininity scale) with the self-reports the women made on a bipolar M-F scale. A significant difference was observed between the "perceived" values and the "measured" values, with the perceived gender identity shifting more towards the feminine side, while the results of the traditional masculinity-femininity tests yielded results suggesting a shift more towards masculine behaviour and experience when it came to non-heterosexual women. When we look at the FPI and MMPI masculinity-femininity scales we can see that the gender identity items are, for instance:

"*I think I could be an enthusiastic hunter.*" (FPI)
"*Sometimes I feel very sad and anxious.*" (FPI)
"*At some point, I have done something dangerous as a joke.*" (FPI)
"*I think I would enjoy being a librarian.*" or "*I like to cook.*" (MMPI-2)
"*I like poetry.*" or "*I like the theatre.*" (MMPI-2)
"*I have never indulged in unusual sexual practices.*" or "*Sometimes I feel anxious because of sex.*" (MMPI-2)

We consider these questions to be strongly stereotypical, and even the participants had issues with these questions, refusing to answer them. We challenge the psychodiagnostic value of the MMPI-2 and FPI for some purposes and we suggest there is an issue with the creation and interpretation of the masculinity-femininity scale, making it unfit for use in diagnostic and analytic work; however, it continues to be used for those purposes[3]. Hooker (1965) criticizes any dichotomy in masculine-feminine concepts as inadequate for queer people.

Once we look at the dimension of gender through the optics of LGBTI minorities, we find that psychometrically it cannot be adequately understood. Past ideas that there was a connection between gender identity and sexual orientation (Aaronson & Grumpelt, 1961; Constantinople, 1973; Manosevitz, 1971; Thompson, Schwartz, McCandless & Edwards, 1973) can be supported by recent findings from queer studies (Bazluke & Nolan, 2005; Harmon, 2007; Munt, 1998), but not in an exclusive manner (such as "masculine lesbians" or "feminine gay men"). Various research studies have shown that gay men and women tend to display gender atypicality on a traditional masculinity-femininity scale (Hooker, 1965; Lippa, 2007; Ondrisová, Šípošová, Červenková, Jójárt, & Bianchi, 2002).

Fúsková and Klubert (2013) were inspired by Lippa's study (2007) in which a sample of half a million participants subjectively assessed their masculinity and femininity on a 7-point scale. The non-heterosexual participants (bisexuals and gay men and women)

[3] To create the M-F scale in MMPI, Hathaway used gay vs. straight male responses (see Dahlstrom & Dahlstrom, 1980). He attempted to measure what he considered to be a fundamental psychological difference between gay and straight males. He also attempted to create a separate F-M scale for lesbians vs. straight women, but this scale was not valid. Therefore, cross-sex results (a man with a high femininity score and a woman with a high score in masculinity) were, in the early stages, interpreted as an indication of homosexuality. Nowadays, this interpretation has been discarded, but the M-F scale itself has not changed in any significant way.

assessed themselves as being near the middle of this scale (4), almost a whole point away from heterosexual men (5.1) and women (3.2). Research by Ondrisová et al. (2002) in Slovakia also suggests that gay people do not adopt the traditional extremes of gender roles, and experimental groups of homosexuals and heterosexuals do not differ significantly in other personality traits. However, heterosexual women and men are more inclined to conform to societal ideas of male and female roles, compared with homosexuals. People of a homosexual orientation do not adhere to the traditional male/female expectations to such an extent, challenging the notion that traditional stereotypes are natural, and levelling out socially created gender differences.

Although the study in question (Fúsková & Klubert, 2013) is concerned with other issues, the findings confirm our view that scales used are "outdated".

Part 2: Dynamics of gender constructions across space

How do non-heterosexuals construct gender?

In further research, we looked at how non-heterosexual women construct femininity, using a combined research design, administering quantitative and qualitative tools used in gender research (Fúsková & Hargašová, 2016). The quantitative part consisted of self-report scales: a bipolar and an orthogonal scale of masculinity and femininity—(simple graphs on which respondents could identify themselves) and the masculinity and femininity scale (Škála mužskosti a ženskosti, Kusá, 2000). We further conducted a semi-structured exploratory interview, with questions relating to individual gender constructs. It focused on individual constructions of femininity and masculinity through simple open questions (such as "What does femininity /masculinity/ mean to you?") and encouraged participants to give their own examples and arguments. The participants were nine women of non-heterosexual (primarily gay) orientation aged 23 to 36 living in district towns (mainly) in western Slovakia; the women varied in terms of religion, education and relationship status. Our aim was to explore how these women identify with femininity, formulate prescriptive and descriptive characteristics of a woman, and finally whether they deconstruct the established gender norms. In this research, we perceived deconstruction to be disruption of the hegemonic categories, that is, the categories that reduce gender identity to a heteronormative form where gender roles conform to cultural norms of femininity and masculinity and heterosexuality is "normal".

The results of the bipolar and the orthogonal scale showed that the perceived identity of the participants was predominantly feminine. In the interviews, when exploring in greater detail how the women constructed their self-image, we encountered a problem—the women reflected the gender stereotypes of their environment, but their inner experiences often differed from these external expectations. When describing their personal characteristics in the interviews, they mentioned feminine attributes as well as ones traditionally attributed to men. We identified three trends in deconstructions[4] of femininity that were common to all the

[4] We use the word deconstructions to refer to micro-discourses that did not accord with the currently prevailing gender norms.

interviews. The participants negatively evaluated existing stereotyped gender norms, but had positive views of the shift in gender norms towards ones that are less strict and less limiting than in the past, and their constructions of femininity acknowledged that there is individual variation by calling for diversity to be accepted (Fúsková & Hargašová, 2016).

According to our research results, non-heterosexual women did not align their perceived gender with the one measured by the questionnaires; neither were they willing to accept gender norms as restrictive. Our participants "borrowed" from the prevailing gender discourse and used gender stereotypes to distinguish between femininity and masculinity. At the same time, they do not consider these descriptions to be generally true for all women. They can negate these designations, contradict them with their own experiences, refine them or distance themselves from them. For these participants, masculinity and femininity were not the main differentiator determining sex or gender identity. They stressed the importance of respecting variation in characteristics among individuals. These women created their own micro-discourse on femininity which deconstructed the established definitions. One can ask what we can use as a basis when trying to define femininity if almost anything can be called into question. And how can we measure it? Femininity is whatever the woman (or man) defines it to be; whatever they associate it with. These interviews gave us an opportunity to explore meanings that would have remained unknown due to the limitations of questionnaire items.

The results show that measuring femininity and masculinity as permanent characteristics (essential entities) or as a willingness to follow societal norms is not useful—or at least not in the case of non-heterosexual women. It would appear that better explanations could be provided if their personal constructions of femininity (and masculinity), and secondly their level of subjective identification with femininity, were investigate to see how simple or complex they are and how they change over time. We can argue that these characteristics vary within a person's self-image, and that the cultural definitions of gender are also variable over time. In this regard, we move closer to perceiving gender in the context of post-structuralism—as a construct that is being constantly recreated and transformed depending on the given interaction and situation.

As we have indicated above, the research identifies empirical reasons for not "quantifying" masculinity and femininity. This does not just apply to queers. In our next research, we focused on deconstructions of masculinity and femininity among the non-heterosexual population and the child population.

Dynamics of (de)constructing gender across space

In this article we are interested in measuring and deconstructing gender. Deconstruction involves the disruption of hegemonic categories. In gender identity dimensions these reduce identity to heteronormativity—gender roles conform to cultural norms of masculinity and femininity, and masculinity and heterosexuality are "normal"—in this way patriarchy is maintained in society. In this last section, we wish to show in relation to the majority population how gender and masculinity and femininity are dynamic across time (as we saw in the introduction) and more importantly in space, within a culture.

In investigating ways young people aged 12 to 16 operationalise the concepts of masculinity and femininity we adopt the discourse approach (Willig,1999), which is

epistemologically suited to mapping the process of constructing and deconstructing gender stereotypes. Discourse is used to identify all speech and text, whether it occurs naturally in conversation, interview or as any other kind of text. Discourse analysts research texts as they are, rather than as a means of indicating a particular reality that exists beyond discourse, whether that is social, psychological or material reality (they are not interested in what actually happened but in the attitudes individuals hold on XY etc.) Discourse as used in this method is considered to be a practice. People use discourse in order to do certain things: attribute guilt, apologise, present themselves in a positive light, etc. (Gill, 2000). We understand discourses to be active and that people use them to explain perceptions (segments) of the world (*explanation*), to assess that part of the world/what is right and what is not (*evaluation*) and to define themselves in relation to the world (*identity*).

Using Q-methodology we investigated subjectivity in (de)constructing gender using a research sample of 130 pupils and teachers at middle schools in Slovakia. We identified four basic discourses that cut across liberal and conservative tendencies. Four factors were found in which four discourses can be identified, including the discourse of the *superficial erosion of conservatism*, which is "loyal" to basic conservative attitudes on gender but accepts that some superficial dimensions of gender stereotypes no longer apply. In them we encounter conservative views on infidelity (regardless of whether it is male or female infidelity) and endorsement of other conservative values—woman=mother and her sacrifice for the family, the father's role is to provide for the material needs of the family. However, neutral characteristics are entering conservatism and superficially disrupting it. This is loosening social expectations of men. The discourse construes a male role in caring for children and an ability to resolve conflict by means other than instrumental aggression. By contrast expectations of women are strongly constructed around the necessity of motherhood, looking after the home, family and behaving appropriately. Those who engaged in this discourse expressed only very moderate rejection of a submissive female role.

We labelled the second discourse '*fragility' of women conservatism*. This is the traditional conservative discourse in which the role of women is mother and housewife, while the man has power and resources. It also features formal gender constructions. It celebrates women's maternal and domestic care, motherhood and female physical beauty. It expects men to have power, resources, skills and strength and also accepts male aggression and vulgarity. It judges female infidelity more harshly than male.

The third discourse is *male emancipation*, in which the focus is on men's new position in society: patriarchal expectations of men as the dominant breadwinner are liberalised with the father adopting a caring role in the family, being involved in the running of the family (not simply materially) and there is a move away from the image of men as instrumentally violent and dominant. Men are expected to resolve problems diplomatically and externalise their feelings and emotions.

The last discourse is the *deep erosion of conservatism and superficial sentiment*, and it points to the substantial deconstruction of the traditional division of power between men and women, and features sentiment—male independence, vulgarity, strength, emotional distance/numbness.

A further two basic discursive tendencies can be found in the four discourses—conservatism and liberalism. Conservatism is found primarily in the second factor and more moderately in

the first and fourth factors. The strongest tendency, liberal-humanism, appears in factor three in relation to male emancipation. By contrast strongly conservative Factor 2 is based on the traditional division of gender roles. Women are attributed the roles of motherhood, caring for the family and children, beauty and emotionality, and the male role emphasises power and skill, and portrays them as aggressive leaders whose main role is that of family breadwinner.

In Q methodology the number of persons loading on a factor is not a deciding mathematical statistical criteria; nonetheless, the greatest number of people loaded on *superficial erosion of conservatism* (54 loading participants), indicating that liberalism is gradually emerging in society and in the *deep erosion of conservatism* discourse (5 loading participants). Here, however, it occurs alongside the superficial sentiment for certain traditional images, expectations as to what men and women should be like. One could say that while Factor 1 is a defence of the essence of conservatism, Factor 3 protects the surface.

An important finding is the shift in focus on men in family discourses. The dominant male discursive focus is creating a new kind of manhood (a new form of masculinity). People are reproducing masculinity and masculine practices regardless of their own gender identification or biological sex. The *new manhood* (contemporary masculinity) is being created by both men and women. It is a process in which people internalise certain expectations (dominant expectations concerning masculinity, heterosexuality) from many different sources (and school is also important here) and then reflect these. Even though—as Hort, Fagot and Leinbach (1990) have stated—it is men (masculinity) who are the main bearers of patriarchy and hence profit most from it, the shift in focus points to a redefining of the concept of masculinity. Men are learning to be more flexible in their use of language and behaviour. "Switching" identity helps them understand how different approaches (male and female) can overlap. The question is whether this flexibility is just a reaction to the change in environment—social, political, religious, or whether it is a consequence of a sharply defined masculine heteronorm as argued by R. W. Connell and J. W. Messerschmidt (2005). This new/current masculinity is consumerist rather than creative.

Conclusion

The analysis of gender measures shows that the majority are based on definitions that conceive of femininity and masculinity as stable personality traits and that these measures are part of essentialist assumptions on gender roles and gender identity. Equally though, quantitative gender measures that rely on degree of conformity to socially defined gender roles require tools that are good reflectors of the social definitions of gender roles or assume that they do not change.

For example reports from Slovak psychiatry (Kollárik & Havlíček, 2016) indicate that they use MMPI and FPI (and other psychometric tools) to "measure" transgender individuals. If transgender individuals wish to undergo sexual reassignment, they must be "diagnosed" as cross gender, i.e. as having a gender identity that is not consistent with their biological sex. This diagnostic is supported in the Slovak legislation including formal (administrative) sex changes, and yet one can argue that the tools being used to make these formal changes are both stereotypical and absurd as well as heteronormatively masculine—that is, reflecting the norm of heterosexuality and dominance.

It has clearly been shown that we still do not know how to quantify things like gender identity, and that it is only the basis of certain conceived social norms we can say how much "the thing measured" corresponds to these norms. And any norms we might base other measures on (not only in relation to minority populations) are simply part of the ongoing change and differences in the culture. These (de)constructing differences shape what masculine and feminine mean in very dynamic and individual ways. So anyone who is interested in investigating gender and human sexuality has to ask themselves whether it is possible to measure something so subjective and dynamic?

Exploring gender qualitatively seems to be more meaningful for everyone including those who have gone through the struggle of defining and defending themselves in hetero-normative society (non-heterosexuals, those of cis-gender, or of trans-gender identity). Given the variability of the traits, abilities and attitudes a person may possess, and given the variety of social interactions, social expectations, societies and cultures in which gender is created, it is only reasonable to suggest that we abandon quantitative methodology as the main method of "defining" gender.

When considering gender identity of an individual we can think about the extent to which that individual conforms to social norms and stereotypes. This approach is sensitive to the extent to which an individual adheres to social norms as a fundamental part of their masculinity or femininity. If we wish to know the extent and degree to which an individual identifies as a man or woman and what the concepts of masculinity and femininity mean to them, then we have to choose a method that does not assess a person according to opposing concepts. If practitioners and others wish to understand their clients, they need to understand how their conceptions of masculinity and femininity are constructed.

References

Aaronson, B. S., & Grumpelt, H. R. (1961). Homosexuality and some MMPI measures of masculinity-femininity. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 17,* 245-247. doi: 10.1002/1097-4679(196107)17:3<245::AID-JCLP2270170310>3.0.CO;2-A

Auster, C. J., & Ohm, S. C. (2000). Masculinity and femininity in contemporary American society: A reevaluation using the Bem sex role inventory. *Sex Roles*, *43*(7/8), 499-528.

Bazluke, F. T. J., & Nolan, J. J., (2005). Gender identity and expression issues at colleges and universities. *NACUA NOTES, 3*(3).

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.472.525&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Brannon, L. (1999). *Gender: Psychological perspectives*. New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Burr, V. (1998). *Gender and social psychology*. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Čerešník, M. (2011). *O mužoch a ženách: psychologický pohľad na problematiku rodu* [About men and women: psychological view of gender]. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre.

Connell, R.W., & Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender and Society, 19*(6), 829-859.

Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? *Psychological Bulletin*, *80*(5), 389-407.

Cosentino, C.E., Meyer-Bahlburg, H. F., Alpert, J. L ., & Gaines, R. (1993). Cross-gender behavior and

gender conflict in sexually abused girls. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 32*(5), 940-947. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8407767

Dahlstrom, W. G., & Dahlstrom, L. E. (1980). *Basic readings on the MMPI: A new selection on personality measurement.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Doyle, J. A., & Paludi, M. A. (1998). *Sex and gender: The human experience*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Fúsková, J., & Hargašová, L. (2016). Dekonštrukcia normatívu ženskosti: Konštrukcia feminity u žien s neheterosexuálnou orientáciou. In D. Marková, M. Bočák, & Z. Sloboda (Eds.), *Sexuality 8: Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní vědecké konference* (pp. 26-39). [CD] Olomouc: Vydavatelství Univerzity Palackého.

Fúsková, J., & Klubert, P. (2013). Aspekty agresivity a hodnotenia rodu u lesbických žien [Aspects of agresivity and gender wihtin lesbian women]. In *E-mental : elektronický časopis pre mentálne zdravie* 1., issue 1, pp. 22-25. http://sasap.sk/content/e-mental-elektronicky-casopis-pre-mentalne-zdravie

Gill, R. (2000). Discourse analysis. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound: A practical handbook* (pp. 172-190). London: SAGE.

Golombok, S., & Fivush, R. (1994). *Gender development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harmon, L. (2007). *Gender identity, minority stress, and substance use among lesbians*. Michigan: ProQuest.

Hooker, E. (1965). An empirical study of some relations between sexual patterns and gender identity in male homosexuals. In J. Money (Ed.), *Sex research: New development* (pp. 24-52). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hort, B. E., Fagot, B. I., & Leinbach, M. D. (1990). Are people's notions of maleness more stereotypically framed than their notions of femaleness? *Sex Roles*, *23*, 197-212.

Kollárik, T., Poliaková, E. & Ritomský, A. (1992). *FPI - osobnostný inventár.* Bratislava: PSYCHODIAGNOSTIKA, spoločnosť s.r.o..

Kollárik, R., & Havlíček, Ch. (2016) *Výskumná správa o stave zdravotnej starostlivosti o trans-rodových ľudí na Slovensku* [Status of healthcare about trans-people in Slovakia - research report]. TransFúzia (unpublished report).

Kusá, D. (2000). Psychologická androgýnia – evergreen v chápaní maskulinity a femininity? [Psychoglogical androgyny – evergreen in understanding of masculinity and feminity?] In D. Heller & J. Šturma (Eds.), *Psychologie pro třetí tisíciletí* (pp. 129-132). Praha: Testcentrum.

Lippa, R. A. (2007). The preferred traits of mates in a cross-national study of heterosexual and homosexual men and women: An examination of biological and cultural influences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *36*(2), 193-208.

Lukšík, I., & Supeková, M. (2003). *Sexualita a rodovosť v sociálnych a výchovných súvislostiach* [Sexuality and gender in social and educational context]. Bratislava: Humanitas.

Maccoby, E. E. (1988). Gender as a social category. *Developmental Psychology*, *24,* 755-765.

Manosevitz, M. (1971). Education and MMPI Mf scores in homosexual and heterosexual males. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *36*(3), 395-399.

Mukaddes, N. M. (2002). Gender identity problems in autistic children. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 28*(6), 529-532. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1365-2214.2002.00301.x/full

Munt, S. (1998). *Butch/Femme: Inside lesbian gender*. Continuum International Publishing Group, p. 229.

Netík, K. (2002). *Příručka Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory – 2 (S.R. Hathaway, J.C. McKinley)* [Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory – 2nd - Manual]. *První české vydání.* Praha: Testcentrum.

Ondrisová, S., Šípošová, M., Červenková, I., Jójárt, P., & Bianchi, G. (2002). *Neviditeľná menšina. Čo (ne)vieme o sexuálnej orientácii* [Invisible minority: what we (do not) know about sexual orientation]. Bratislava: Nadácia Občan a demokracia.

Ricciardelli, L. A., & Williams, R. J. (1995). Desirable and undesirable gender traits in three behavioral domains. *Sex Roles*, *33*, 637-655.

Spence, J. T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a multifactorial theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(4), 624-635.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. http://www.yorku.ca/rokada/psyctest/paq.pdf

Svoboda, M. (1999). *Psychologická diagnostika dospělých* [Psycho-diagnostic assessment of adults]. Praha: Portál.

Šnorek, V. (2006). Možnosti a meze integrace Rorschachovy metody a MMPI-2 [Possibilities and limits of Rorschach and MMPI-2 integration]. *Příspěvek na 24. Psychologických dnech „Prožívání sebe a měnícího se světa“.,* Olomouc, 7. – 9. 9.

Thompson, N. I., Schwartz, D. M., McCendeless, B. R., & Edwards, D. A. (1973). Parent-child relationships and sexual identity in male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41*(1), 120-127.

Willig, C. (Ed.). (1999). *Applied discourse analysis: Social and psychological interventions.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Institute for Research in Social Communication,
Slovak Academy of Sciences,
Dúbravská cesta 9,
841 04 Bratislava 4,
Slovakia

Email: jana.fuskova@ savba.sk
Email: hargasova.lucia@gmail.com
Email: simona.andrascikova@savba.sk

Department of School Pedagogy,
Trnava University in Trnava,
Priemyselná 4, P.O.BOX 9
918 43 Trnava,
Slovakia

Email: simona.andrascikova@savba.sk